UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 91—PART 7

SEPTEMBER 11, 1945, TO OCTOBER 18, 1945
(PAGES 8467 TO 9822)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1945

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, September 10, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God omnipotent, only Thou art the hope of our distracted world in the disaster the wrath of men hath brought upon it. Though the people imagine a vain thing Thou still art God, Thy mercy endureth through all human denials and betrayals. As we see Thy righteous sentence swiftly overcoming the ungodly, we know that for us and for all who sin against the light of truth Thy judgment is not postponed to some far-off future day. Give us to know that upon the slopes of the Sinai of Thy immutable law our feet stand, that even now the books are open and the thrones set. Make plain to our understanding that our legislative enactments and our economic adjustments in themselves cannot bring social salvation except as they clear the way for that spiritual strength without which we labor in vain, without which all else is as futile props against a decaying house that the Lord hath not made.

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, September 10, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3907) to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NOTICE OF DISPLAY OF JAPANESE SURRENDER DOCUMENTS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have been requested to announce to the Senate that at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, Wednesday, September 12, the Japanese surrender documents will be placed on public display in the exhibition hall of the National Archives. Speaker RAYBURN will serve as master of ceremonies and the Japanese surrender documents will be unveiled by Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright. The ceremonies will be broadcast by several of the networks and local stations. The Archivist of the United States has requested me to extend a cordial invitation to all Members of the Senate to attend this historic ceremony. Those attending should enter by the Pennsylvania Avenue door by 10:50 a. m. and go to the conference room.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Morse
Andrews	Gurney	Murdock
Austin	Hart	Murray
Bailey	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hayden	Overton
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hill	Reed
Briggs	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Burton	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Smith
Capper	La Follette	Stewart
Carville	Lucas	Taft
Chandler	McCarran	Taylor
Connally	McClellan	Tobey
Cordon	McFarland	Tunnell
Donnell	McKellar	Vandenberg
Downey	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Magnuson	Walsh
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Mead	White
George	Millikin	Wiley
Gerry	Moore	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

JURISDICTION OVER WATERWAY, RIVER, AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—RESOLUTIONS OF COMMON COUNCILS OF MANITOWOC AND STURGEON BAY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I received through the mail resolutions adopted by the Common Council of the City of Manitowoc and the Common Council of the City of Sturgeon Bay, both in the State of Wisconsin. These resolutions respectfully urge the Congress to retain jurisdiction over waterway, river, and harbor improvements in the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolutions and that they be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions presented by Mr. WILEY were received and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

MEDICAL CENTER AND VETERANS' HOSPITAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD resolutions recently adopted at the twenty-seventh annual convention of the Department of the District of Columbia of the American Legion, memorializing Congress to enact legislation for the erection of a new modern medical center and veterans' hospital for the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas pursuant to a request of the Department Commander, your Department Committee on Veterans' Administration Affairs has conducted an extensive survey of existing veterans' hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas as a result of this survey it has been found that while present requirements of veterans for hospitalization within the District of Columbia are met by existing facilities, but with the known plan of the armed forces to discharge at least 2,000,000 men during the current year, it is apparent that the local daily patient load will, within the near future, increase to such an extent as to render present Veterans' Administration hospital facilities, within the District

of Columbia, totally inadequate: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the twenty-seventh annual convention of the Department of the District of Columbia of the American Legion do memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to enact proper legislation for the erection of a new modern medical center and veterans' hospital for the District of Columbia, said hospital to contain not less than the 800 beds to be used for general medical and surgical cases and to be erected within the District of Columbia; be it further

Resolved, That this, the twenty-seventh annual convention of the Department of the District of Columbia, American Legion, do memorialize the Veterans' Administration of the United States to assist by all proper action the purposes of this resolution; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the proper committees of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Senate of the United States of America, and to the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

PROTEST AGAINST NATURALIZATION OF HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD resolutions adopted by Charles Earnest Scott Post, No. 47, the American Legion, Dodge City, county of Ford, Kans., suggesting that Harry Bridges is an undesirable alien and protesting against approval of his application for citizenship. I have received similar resolutions from Woodson Post, No. 13, Yates Center, and Ellsworth Post, No. 174, Ellsworth, Kans.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Immigration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Harry Bridges is an agitator and an undesirable alien—

Who has been guilty of and participated in subversive activities against the people and Government of the United States;

Who has called, aided, and abetted unlawful strikes, fostered strife and violence in labor and essential war industries, and otherwise interfered with the war effort in the present emergency;

Who is a member or affiliated with a party or organization advocating the overthrow of the duly constituted authority and Government of the United States and its people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Charles Earnest Scott Post, No. 47, of the American Legion, located at Dodge City, county of Ford, State of Kansas, in regular meeting assembled:

First. That the Charles Earnest Scott Post, No. 47, of the American Legion, of Kansas, protests against the naturalization of Harry Bridges as a citizen of the United States, demands that his application for citizenship be denied, and requests that the Governor of the State of Kansas, and the Senators and Representatives from Kansas in Congress, leave nothing undone to secure a denial of the application of Harry Bridges for citizenship.

Second. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor of the State of Kansas, to each Senator and Representative from Kansas in Congress, and to the Department of the American Legion of Kansas.

Unanimously passed and adopted this 2d day of August 1945.

C. R. HARNER,
Commander, Charles Earnest Scott Post, No. 47.

Attest:

C. M. REDFIELD,
Acting Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1353. A bill to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator; without amendment (Rept. No. 557).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring an extension of the air-transportation system in the United States to small cities and towns; without amendment.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 1378. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1379. A bill to provide for the payment of accumulative or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories, or possessions, or the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1380. A bill to amend section 15 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, so as to afford to producers an opportunity to reacquire products of their own manufacture; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 1381. A bill to provide for the payment of retired pay to certain retired judges of the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1382. A bill for the relief of Dr. Herbert M. Greene; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution dealing with the future reception of the flag which waved over the Capitol Building when war was declared, and then was raised over Rome, over Berlin, was flown on the battleship *Missouri*, and later was raised over Tokyo. The joint resolution provides that appropriate recognition be given the flag. I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on the Library.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. HILL, and Mr. CORDON):

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to provide for a proper ceremony commemorating the flag which flew over the Capitol on declaration of war against Japan, Germany, and Italy, and which has now been flown in those surrendered countries, and for the creation of a commission to provide a proper celebration of such flag and to preserve and perpetuate war flags and symbols and all the records pertaining thereto; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to voting qualifications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McMAHON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 3907) to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES — ADDRESS BY SENATOR CARVILLE AND ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO HERALD-AMERICAN

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Conservation and Development of Our Natural Resources, delivered by Senator CARVILLE at the National Governors' Conference at Mackinac Island, July 3, 1945, and an article from the Chicago Herald-American of August 20, 1945, containing extracts from the address, which appear in the Appendix.]

SIXTY MILLION JOBS — REVIEWS OF BOOK WRITTEN BY HENRY A. WALLACE

[Mr. MILLIKIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Senator TAFT reviewing the book Sixty Million Jobs, written by Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace; and Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed a review of the same book by Senator PEPPER, which reviews appear in the Appendix.]

THE RISE OF THE UNITED STATES—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Rise of the United States," by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post of September 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] on page 29, to strike out lines 4 to 8, inclusive.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I propose an amendment on page 36, line 25, to insert the following:

Provided such funds shall also be available for the development of class 4 and larger airports upon the initiative and upon the approval of the respective State airport agencies having jurisdiction.

This amendment purports to allow the State agencies to use a part of the 65 percent fund which would be allocated for class 1, 2, and 3 airports in the respective States, to supplement any amounts which might be provided by Congress for the development of class 4 and 5 airports.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the present time the amendment is not in order. If the Senator from Michigan will ask permission, it can be printed and lie on the table, and be taken up later.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will ask the Senator in charge of the bill——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Can the Senator from Michigan at this time ask and receive unanimous consent that the Brewster amendment, so called, be set aside until we consider the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan? I wish to say in that regard, that I intend to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am very happy to note that the Senator from Nevada, representing, I think, the committee viewpoint, is moving in the direction, as the amendment proposes, of more direct State responsibility, with the principle of which I am in complete accord. I am happy the Senator is willing to accept the amendment to the committee amendment, and I shall be equally happy to accept it as an amendment to the amendment which I have proposed, if it is necessary. I am not clear that it is necessary. I shall certainly have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment proposed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 36, line 25, to insert the following:

Provided such funds shall also be available for the development of class 4 and larger airports upon the initiative and upon the approval of the respective State airport agencies having jurisdiction.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I may give a word of explanation as to what the amendment would do in connection with the general philosophy of the bill, it would permit the States to engage in the construction of class 4 or class 5 airports, and it would permit them to divert or utilize some part of the 65 percent which is provided for State airport construction, into the construction of class 4 or class 5 airports, if in the opinion of the State aeronautic agency and in the opinion of the Administrator it were proper to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does that differ from the bill which is now being considered?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill now limits the construction of airports by States to classes 1, 2, and 3 airports.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the bill, as it now stands, none of the 65-percent allocation could be used except for class 1, 2, and 3 airports?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment would permit the use of a part of the 65 percent for class 4 and class 5 airports?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; it would permit a State to use a portion of its allotment of 65 percent for the construction of class 4 or class 5 airports.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would it affect the jurisdiction of cities in building airports?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is true also, I think, that under the bill now before the Senate, as submitted by the committee, class 4 and class 5 funds, the 35-percent fund, may not be fully allocated for that program, but some portion of the 35 percent might be turned over to the State program for smaller airports under the 65 percent.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will be temporarily set aside. Is there objection?

Mr. BREWSTER. Before that is done, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan whether or not he would prepare an appropriate amendment, if necessary, which would cover the same provision in the amendment I have proposed.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall prepare such an amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have no objection to what is proposed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. What effect would this amendment, which deals only with the 65 percent, have upon the provisions of the bill regarding the 35 percent?

Mr. McCARRAN. The 35-percent provision would remain exactly as it is, and the cities would have the same authority; they could deal directly with the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is my understanding also.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the event the amendment should be agreed to and a city should initiate and sponsor a class 4 or class 5 airport, would the State authority, under the Senator's amendment, be authorized to supplement the city's funds and help it to build a class 4 or class 5 airport if the State authority saw fit to do so?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the city could either build one itself through the cooperation of the State and the Federal Government, or the State could help a local community to construct a class 4 or class 5 airport?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my understanding also.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan for the consideration of his amendment? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment, which will again be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the amendment of the committee on page 36, line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided such funds shall also be available for development of class 4 and larger airports upon the initiative and upon the approval of the respective State airport agencies having jurisdiction.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] on page 29, to strike out lines 4 to 8, inclusive.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order that the Senate may understand what would be wrought by the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], I wish to say that if the amendment is adopted it will mean the complete destruction of the philosophy of the bill. The Senator from Maine admits that his amendment is offered under one philosophy, while the bill has been constructed and reported by the committee in the way of a compromise between two philosophies, one being advocated by a group which wants all the money channeled through the State, so that a city must go to the State and ask if it may have a class 4 airport or a class 5 airport, or any other airport. The other philosophy is that a certain percentage, to wit, 35 percent of the money appropriated by Congress, shall be set aside by the Administrator to be called for by municipalities or local subdivisions of a State, to be negotiated for directly between the municipality and the Federal Government, without going to and through the State. Between those two contending factions, the Governors on one side and the mayors on the other, the committee brought out this compromise by which we gave to the cities or municipalities or independent municipal agencies in the States 35 percent of the amount that Congress might appropriate each year. In other words, if Congress appropriates $100,000,000 this year for construction of airports, then 35 percent is immediately set aside to be called for by municipalities to build class 4 or class 5 airports. Sixty-five percent is allocated to the States, which control the construction of class 1, 2, and 3 airports.

Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], which has just been adopted, there is another compromise worked out, and I am entirely content with it. Let me use as illustration the State of the Senator from Michigan. Let us say the city of Detroit wants to construct a class 4 or a class 5 airport. Under the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, Detroit may call upon the State of Michigan and ask the State to allocate money from its part of the 65 percent to aid in the construction of the Detroit airport. But it leaves the city of Detroit at all times free to act on its own initiative if it sees fit. In other words, the city of Detroit, in place of going to the State authorities for the money, could go directly to the Federal agency and deal directly with it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the Senator's solicitude for Detroit, but it is also true that under Federal operation hitherto Detroit probably has the worst and most dangerous airport in the

country, a situation which I think not only every State but every intelligent authority ought to recognize. Yet we have been pouring money into certain other metropolitan areas which are far less in need of airport development. So it seems to me that the Detroit example which the Senator so aptly makes—Chicago would present an almost similar situation—argues for bringing in the State as well as local enterprise in the effort to develop the airports which those areas certainly need.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall not pass on the condition of the airport at Detroit, because I know nothing about it; but, if it is in the condition mentioned by the Senator from Maine, it is a matter which the Federal authorities could have looked into and which the authorities of the State of Michigan or of Detroit could have looked into a long time ago.

My desire—and I solicit the attention of the Senate to it—is to carry out the philosophy of the bill as it came from the committee. It is a compromise bill. We hope that we will not go to one side or the other too far. In other words, we want to compromise between the two theories, the one being the theory that all money should be channeled through the State, and the other theory being that a municipality should be able to go directly to the Federal Government. That situation is not impaired by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, and it is the one thing we want to preserve, which in turn would be destroyed by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I want to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. If the bill is passed as approved by the committee, and a State wished to control entirely its own cities and its own approach to this problem, could it not have everything channeled through the State, if it desired to do so, by State law, and then the cities would act through the State agency, if the State so wished them to do?

Mr. McCARRAN. It could not channel the 35 percent allocation through, but it could——

Mr. BURTON. My point is that in the case of the 35 percent which is provided for the large airports—and the question there comes up as to a city applying for a part of the $35,000,000 by matching it—is it not perfectly true under the committee bill that if a State wishes to require a city to proceed through its State agency the city must do so? The Federal Government is not controlling the State procedure. The State therefore can compel local procedure to be taken through a State agency if it wants to do so. The bill does not interfere with that at all, does it?

Mr. McCARRAN. What the Senator says is true, but what I have in mind is that this bill holds out 35 percent for city activities, and cities which desire to act on their own initiative ought not to be interfered with by the State.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The 35 percent is not simply for cities but for class 4 and 5 airports?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. And that fund can go through either the State agency or the city; can it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the bill as it is before the Senate class 4 and 5 airports are reserved to the cities or to the urban program.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. May I ask the Senator a question on the point? If the so-called urban program—which does not necessarily relate to urban areas or cities, but simply to large airports——

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. If it is decided that that program shall go through the State, that can be done?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; or a county can build the airport.

Mr. BURTON. Yes. Therefore the point I want to make is that it seems to me that the Senator's bill, the committee bill, takes the position on the part of the Federal Government that the States can handle their matters any way they want to handle them. If they want to subject their cities to State control, then the Federal Government will deal with the State. If the States permit their cities to deal directly with us, then we should let the cities deal directly with us, and not compel them by Federal law to act through a special State agency.

Mr. McCARRAN. We cannot control the policy of the State within its own boundaries.

Mr. BURTON. But the difficulty with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine is that it is in a way controlling that policy because it would prevent the cities from dealing directly with the Federal Government even though the cities and the States might wish that course to be followed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The honorable Senator suggested that the Brewster amendment, so called, would completely ruin the compromise embodied in the pending bill. The proposed amendment as I understand—and I believe it is a correct understanding—still leaves 35 percent of the Federal appropriation directly in the possession of or in the control of the Federal Administrator. The only thing that the State agency can do is to say, "We do not want that spent in the city of Detroit," to use the example which the honorable Senator used. It does not break down the compromise effected by the bill. It merely gives to the State agency the approval before the Federal Government can spend the money in the State. Am I not correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me read to the Senator what the Brewster amendment does. It is very interesting. On page 29 is the first place where the Brewster amendment touches the bill, and there it destroys or strikes out all of subsection (e), which reads as follows:

(e) "Authorized project" means a project included in the national airport plan provided for in section 6 and, in the case of projects under the urban program, a project which has been selected and authorized as provided in subsection 7 (a).

The next place touched by the Brewster amendment is on page 31, under the caption "Sponsor." The following language would be stricken out:

(n) "Sponsor" means any non-Federal public agency which meets the requirements prescribed by the Administrator for sponsorship of a project under this act, and enters into a contract with the Federal Government, satisfactory to the Administrator, agreeing to operate and maintain the airport to be developed.

On page 32, lines 16 and 17, the Brewster amendment proposes to strike out "their political subdivisions, and other non-Federal public agencies."

On page 32, beginning in line 20, it is proposed to strike out the following language:

Such Federal-aid airport program shall consist of two parts, hereinafter referred to as the "State program" and the "urban program." The State program shall include all projects for the development of class 3 and smaller airports and the urban program all projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports. In each program, the State airport agency or project sponsor receiving a grant may use to match such grant any State.

On page 33, beginning with line 24, it is proposed to strike out the following:

Provided, That each such appropriation shall specify the maximum amount thereof that may be expended for the development of Class 4 and larger airports, in no event to exceed 35 percent of the total appropriation.

On page 35, beginning in line 20, it is proposed to strike out the entire section 7, under the heading "Selection of projects." That whole section was drafted after months of diligent study and great care in the selection of the language.

In section 8, on page 37, it is proposed to strike out the first part of the section, which reads as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) As soon as possible after the beginning of each fiscal year, all Federal funds available for the State program during that fiscal year shall be apportioned by the Administrator among the several States, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States. All sums so apportioned for a State shall be available to pay the United States pro rata share of the allowable project costs of authorized projects in that State, as provided in sections 9, 10, and 11.

On page 38, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the words "or public agencies therein", which destroys the text of the entire paragraph.

On page 38, in lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to strike out the words "and to public agencies", destroying the sense of the whole paragraph.

On page 38, beginning in line 16, it is proposed to strike out the following language: "and any public agency desiring to sponsor an authorized project in the

urban program, or an authorized project in the State program if located in a State in which no State airport agency exists."

That would destroy the text of the entire provision.

On page 40, in section 10, lines 1 and 24, it is proposed to strike out the words "or project sponsor"; and in line 15, it is proposed to strike out the words "or project sponsor as the case may be", That would practically destroy section 10.

On page 41, line 1, it is proposed to strike out the words "or project sponsor," which would destroy the sense of the entire paragraph.

On page 41, in lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to strike out "under either the State program or the urban program," destroying the sense of the entire section.

On page 42, lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to strike out "or project sponsor as the case may be," which would destroy the text.

On the same page, in lines 19 and 25, it is proposed to strike out the words "or project sponsor." The same is true on page 43, line 5.

I make mention of these items in the Brewster amendment because the Senate can see in a moment that if the Brewster amendment is adopted the bill must be entirely revamped. It is impossible here on the floor of the Senate to substitute appropriate language for the language which has been studied for months and inserted at the proper place in a section.

On page 45 the Brewster amendment proposes to strike out lines 18 to 21, inclusive, which read as follows:

(3) The State shall have adequate legislation to enable its political subdivisions to participate in the benefits of both the State program and the urban program, either by sponsoring projects therein or otherwise.

I could continue indefinitely to discuss the effect of the Brewster amendment. As I have previously stated, the bill is a compromise between the demand of the Governors' organization on the one hand, that all Federal funds be channeled through the State authority, and on the other hand, the philosophy of the mayors, who say that they wish to deal directly with the Federal Government. We had to compromise between the two viewpoints. At the time when some of the mayors appeared before the committee the bill provided only 25 percent for airport activities of cities. In other words, they could receive only 25 percent of the money appropriated. We compromised and made it 35 percent. We increased the amount so that the cities might come to the Federal Government and receive an allocation of 35 percent of the money appropriated by Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill nowhere defines an urban area. Under the definition of the Bureau of the Census in 1940, an urban area was described as an area having a population of 2,500 or more. Under the Federal Highway Act of 1944, an urban area was defined as an area with a population of more than 5,000. It is perfectly clear that if an urban area with a population of only 2,500 or 5,000, is to be a project sponsor, it cannot possibly support a class 4 airport project.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. Let me interrupt the Senator to say that that question is taken care of specifically in the bill, because a project sponsor is one who sponsors the construction of an airport; but the agency which enters into a contract with the Government for the maintenance and upkeep of the airport is another entity. In other words, unless the project sponsor shows to the Civil Aeronautics Authority that the sponsor is capable of maintaining the airport, it is the duty of the Administrator to refuse a grant of Federal funds.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When we consider the question of a project sponsor which is larger than some of the small urban areas, we come to the question as to whether a new entity is to be created within the State, so as to permit the State aeronautical agency, together with the State engineering agencies, with all the State forces behind them, to assist in the development of the airport within the State. If a new corporate entity is to be created, it must be done by the State legislature, under paragraph 3 of section 14. Therefore the State must be brought into the picture in creating such a project sponsor. Why not use the State?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has an example in his own State. I believe that the airport at Boston is a State airport. Is not that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is nothing to prevent the State from maintaining that airport. It belongs to the State. From the funds allocated to it by the Federal Government, the State may improve that airport or build another airport.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator called attention to Boston. In Massachusetts there are three airports built largely by Federal funds. There is one at Orange, which is uncompleted. There is one at Westfield, which is completed, and there is one at Beverly. The State legislature has been solicited to have the State government take over all those airports. The State has to take over the Boston airport because Boston was not in a financial position to sponsor it. Furthermore, there are approximately 20 town and cities within an area of 15 miles of Boston, and if this bill goes through in its present form many of those would be project sponsors and such airports would compete with the Boston airport which the State has had to take over. Therefore, the airports would have to be developed with the State's approval.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may not understand the Senator's point. I hope I do. But if the larger communities wish to build airports of their own, they should have a right to do so if they can sustain the airports. Suppose that under the conditions existing in Massachusetts the State wished to aid the smaller communities in building airports, the State could do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The State could do so, but would it be desirable for the State government to do so without the approval of the Federal Government?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Federal Government could deal directly with the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It might not, if the airport were a class 4 airport or an urban development.

Mr. McCARRAN. If it were an urban development it would have to be sustained by the community which built it; and if the Administrator were not convinced that could be done, it would be the duty of the Administrator not to make the grant.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct; but the bill under its present terms would permit the Federal Administrator to say, "The State airport is not a proper airport. We shall build a new one, with another sponsor, 20 miles away." Then the State would have nothing to say about it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course, the impossible is not expected to happen, and conditions of that kind are not supposed to happen. In other words, we are supposed to be dealing with reasonable conditions and reasonable men and reasonable administration. It is impossible to write a bill in which a flaw cannot be found in some way, a bill under which some peculiar thing could not be done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But it would seem to me that some protection should be afforded. Otherwise, a comparatively small corporate entity within a State might find itself compelled to maintain an airport which was much too large for it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I believe and the committee believes that protection against that situation is afforded by the provision that they must guarantee the Federal Government that they will sustain and maintain the airport, before they receive the grant.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply wished to ask the Senator if he can tell us how many cities have airport commissions or other commissions which are independent of other State agencies or commissions.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am advised that approximately 40 States by their laws now have set up separate commissions. Many of the States, like my own State, for instance, will work through their highway commissions or highway organizations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the actual number is 44. Forty-four States have provided in some way for a State aeronautical authority or agency or, as the Senator has pointed out, some other agency.

Mr. AIKEN. Those agencies are independent of the public-service commissions or any other State commissions; are they?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is so in some instances; I would not say it is so in all

cases. But I think my own State proposes to use the State highway commission, set up as an aviation commission.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A few minutes ago under the questioning of the Senator from Ohio it was developed that cities could apply through the States for Federal aid. If a city should, of its own choice or under the policy of the State, apply through the State, the money it would receive would come out of the 65-percent fund, not the 35-percent fund; is that correct? The funds allocated to the cities under such circumstances would come out of the 65-percent fund, as set up under the bill; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. The funds now could come from either, because under the Ferguson amendment they could come out of the allocation of 65 percent or, if I caught the question correctly, the city could go directly to the Federal Government and could get its allocation from the 35 percent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct. Suppose the city applied through the State. Then the allocation would come out of the 65 percent; would it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct, if the airport were a class 4 or class 5 airport.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to make an observation in that connection. I understand that the Federal Government sets aside funds up to approximately $35,000,000 for so-called urban airports, which really are not urban airports but are major airports, with runways of up to a mile or so in length, and I understand that $65,000,000 is to be set aside for the smaller airports. The approach can be made, as I see it, either by the local governments or the State governments in connection with the allocation of the $35,000,000 fund for the large airports. If a city wishes to match the Federal money for a large airport, it may do so, under the terms of the Senator's amendment and the committee amendment. But if under the law of a particular State—for instance, the State of Ohio or the State of West Virginia—the State were to say to particular cities, "We will require you to deal through the State," the State would then go to the Federal Government and would say to it, "It is a State matter, and we ask for our Federal money for the large airports through the State," and similarly the cities could ask for the money for the smaller airports.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a further question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then, as I understand the Senator's position, the division is really made upon the basis of the size of the airport, not on the basis of the method of application; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is made on the basis of the program.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If a city desired to have a class 4 airport—one of the larger ones—and if it made its application through the State, the funds would come out of the 35 percent; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator assume that the city would make its application through the State?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; through the State, for a class 4 airport. The money would come from the 35 percent allocated for class 4 airports; would it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the Ferguson amendment it might come out of the 65 percent; it might come from either.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Under the Ferguson amendment might it not come from both?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. If the city asked for an allocation out of the 35 percent and if the State wished to join, it could obtain funds from the 65 percent and could add them to the city's allocation under the 35 percent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; that would be a joint participation as between the city and the State.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then, if the State policy required the city to act through the State in obtaining funds for an airport of any size, and if the city desired to have a class 4 or class 5 airport, if it went through the State and the application were made in the name of the State, but for the city alone, would the funds come from the 65 percent or the 35 percent, or both?

Mr. McCARRAN. If it were made by the city alone it would come from the 35 percent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Even though made in the name of the State?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is another matter.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that the last point is in line with the question I asked. Thirty-five percent of the $100,000,000 is set aside by the Federal Government for major airports, so-called urban airports, class 4 and class 5 airports, and that $35,000,000 is to be available for use under the major plan for larger airports. There will also be available $65,000,000 primarily for the smaller airports. In answer to the Senator from West Virginia, let me say that, as I understand his question, if a city in West Virginia wished to have a large airport and if the law of West Virginia required, let us assume, that the city must proceed under State leadership and through a State agency, because the State wishes to control its cities through the State government, under those circumstances a city of West Virginia would go to the State of West Virginia and would say to it, "We wish to apply for a large airport." Then the State would make application to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government would say, "Under the plan, you need an airport at Charleston," or wherever it might be. You can match it with any public non-Federal funds you can raise. The city could therefore get its money for the large airport if it went to the State, and the State could ask for a small airport if it went the other way.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In order to clarify the situation, let us stick to the major airport and not the small airport. The matter is handled through the State because of State policy requiring that the application be made through the State.

Mr. McCARRAN. First of all, it must be stated that the State is requiring every municipality within its borders to handle through it the matter of building an airport.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; and the application is for a major airport. It is presented in the name of the State because the State requires it to be presented in that form. When the State asks for a matching sum does it come out of the 35 percent or the 65 percent?

Mr. McCARRAN. It comes out of the 35 percent and out of the States' allocation of 65 percent.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, does the Senator know of any State in which it is necessary to go through the State agency in making an application for an airport?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no such knowledge.

Mr. LUCAS. All the questions of the Senator from West Virginia were based on the assumption that the State had taken over jurisdiction and that no city within the particular State could deal directly with the Federal Government. I do not know of any State having laws making it necessary to proceed through the State authority. I wondered if the Senator had evidence disclosing that such a situation exists.

Mr. McCARRAN. Not that I know of, but the theory is that at some time in the future some State might be in that category.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in section 9, line 13 on page 38, I believe it is stated who may make application so far as airports of class 4 or 5 are concerned. Section 9 reads in part as follows:

> Any State airport agency representing a State which has complied with the provisions of this act and desires to avail itself of the benefits of the State program—

And I am uncertain what the State program would be with regard to airports of classes 1, 2, and 3—

> and any public agency designed to sponsor an authorized project in the urban program, or an authorized project in the State program if located in a State in which no State airport agency exists—

And so forth. That would indicate that any public agency such as a municipality, a county, a school district, or the State itself, could be such a public agency, as I read the language, qualified to make an application.

Mr. McCARRAN. Allow me to go a little further and say that the State might create by law a new agency for that very purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I read the provision, it would appear that everything can be done by the State, through its law, if it is so desired, that is being proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. Does not the Senator think that is true?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think that is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. And it is provided in section 9 that any municipality, whether it be a city or not, may make application to build even one of the larger airports.

Mr. BREWSTER. I quite appreciate the force of the logic of the Senator from Michigan. I am sure he is not so naive as to suggest that we are not all aware of the fact that cities are merely the children of the State, and that no city in this country may do anything whatever without legislative authority of the State. That is obvious. I think, furthermore, the Senator is not so naive as to believe that we do not realize that one of the great problems of the country is the maladministration of our great cities, and the bankruptcy of some of them as a result of their misadventures. Whether or not we are going to embark upon a program of city-States, such as threatens in some aspects of the program under consideration, I do not know. But the suggestion that the State government may be powerful enough to break a city lobby, and that the State may restrict the city in its exercise of its present powers under existing law by affirmative legislation, in the face of the bait that we as a Federal authority are here offering, is to me somewhat dubious. We know so well the consequences which have frequently resulted.

I am not revolutionary in my suggestion that we should adopt the long-settled principle of "Federal to State aid." I wish to discuss the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts. The fact is that the idea of State responsibility did not originate with me, or with the Council of State Governors, but was advanced by a well-recognized body, being none other than the Civil Aeronautics Administration itself under the responsibility of the law enacted by Congress in 1938. I believe that was the law which was sponsored by the Senator from Nevada. The legislation which created the Civil Aeronautics Administration also provided for a report on the airport situation, together with recommendations for future policy. I have in my hand a copy of the National Airport plan in which the Acting Secretary of Commerce reported on this matter and referred to the interim report filed on the legislation on February 1, 1939, and the final report of March 3, 1939, embraced in House Document 245. I read from the summary of the report a significant passage which I think answers fully the comments which the Senator has made as to whether we should have State responsibility involved in this matter, or whether we are introducing a novel doctrine.

The language to which I refer reads as follows:

> Wherever possible, the guaranty of local contribution of expense should be obtained and the sponsorship assumed by a State.

I read further:

> All applications for Federal airport grants from such a supplementary appropriation should be presented through agencies of State government.

I cite that language as showing that we are suggesting no revolutionary proposition.

Mr. McCARRAN. What is the date of the report?

Mr. BREWSTER. 1939.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the report on the original bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. It shows that at that time the Federal authority recognized this very sound principle to which we have referred. The amendment which is proposed by the Senator from Michigan, and the discussion here, have all looked in the direction of recognizing a primary State responsibility. The only question is whether the city-States in various sections of our country should be given further encouragement to cut loose from State control which, in my judgment, is the fundamental issue here before the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Allow me to say in that respect that the report read by the Senator from Maine, which was made, I believe, by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, was dealing entirely with a different situation. The Civil Aeronautics Authority is behind this bill in its present form. It is interested in it. The bill was worked out by and with the accord and cooperation of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am quite aware of that point.

Mr. McCARRAN. The larger cities have been the sources from which large airports have risen. In other words, the cities of this country have in the past constructed these airports largely at their own expense. They are the ones which, to a large extent, have gone forward with aviation, so far as landing areas are concerned. There are exceptions.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was not that equally true before 1939? In other words, there has been very little city cooperation and construction of airports since the war period began. I think most of the great airports the Senator speaks of were constructed prior to the date of this report.

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot say as to that. Let us take the LaGuardia Field. That came into existence after 1938. It has been completed only a few years. The Chicago landing area has been perfected only within the last few years. All the large airports have been constructed by the municipalities themselves, at their own expense. Then there are the smaller airports constructed by the Government itself. For instance, many airports were constructed where no municipality or State furnished any money at all. All they had to do was to furnish the land, and the Federal Government constructed the airport.

My attention is drawn to the statement on page 15 of a digest of the testimony on Senate bill 2, prepared by the Secretary of Commerce for Civil Aeronautics, who says:

> There are only 316 airports of class 4 and above under Civil Aeronautics Administration's present airport plan and Civil Aeronautics Administration witnesses stated that they would have no difficulty in dealing on a direct basis with the individual cities, counties, or States which would sponsor these projects.

In other words, that was drawn to the attention of Mr. Burden and others at the time we were holding hearings, and they then said they would have no objection and no difficulty in dealing with cities in the construction of the larger airports.

I shall now yield the floor to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SALTONSTALL rose.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall answer a question, if the Senator from Ohio will permit.

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are two more points I should like to have cleared up. There are two provisions in the bill which have not been discussed which seem to me quite important from the standpoint of State government. The first point is that under the terms of the bill as it is now drawn a State will get no aid under the bill unless any taxes which it collects from aviation sources are used for aviation purposes alone. That is just putting one more whip on the States as to their revenue sources and what they shall do with them.

Mr. McCARRAN. We have had the same with reference to the highways. All moneys collected under the gasoline tax have to be used on the highways, and all moneys collected at an airport should be spent on the improvement and maintenance of the airport. That all goes to answer the question of the Senator from Maine, wherein he referred to cities which have gone bankrupt and have been unable to bear normal burdens. In other words, the income which comes to an airport should be applied to the upkeep and maintenance of the airport.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the Highways Act, I believe, does not go quite so far as the Senator suggests, if my memory is correct. The State collects gasoline taxes and the Federal funds match those the State uses for highway purposes, but the State can use them for purposes which are not highway purposes, whereas under the pending bill if the State uses a penny for anything not collected with aviation, it will lose all.

Mr. McCARRAN. Money collected in the way of gasoline taxes in a State cannot be used for other than highway upkeep and maintenance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is not the case in Massachusetts.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I believe the National Highways Act requires the application of gas taxes and other special use taxes only in those cases where a State is unable from any other source to match the Federal money. If they can match it from other sources, there is no requirement for using the gas taxes.

Mr. McCARRAN. That refers to matching the Federal money, but the gas tax and other highway taxes which are collected must be applied to the maintenance of the highways.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts with respect to the control the Federal Government has over the funds going to the States raises a further question in my mind. What other controls does the

Federal Government maintain, if any, over the airports, once the States or the cities accept the grant provided for in the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall read the provision in that regard. I read from page 47 of the bill, section 15:

As a condition precedent to his approval of an airport project under this act, the Administrator shall assure himself to the extent feasible, that—

(1) the airport will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms;

(2) the airport and all facilities thereon or connected therewith will be suitably operated and maintained, with due regard to climatic and flood conditions;

(3) the aerial approaches of the airport will be adequately cleared and protected by removing, lowering, relocating, marking, and lighting or otherwise mitigating existing airport hazards and by preventing the establishment or creation of future airport hazards so far as existing legislation permits;

(4) all the facilities of the airport developed with Federal aid and all those usable for the landing and take-off of aircraft will be available to the United States for unrestricted use by military and naval aircraft in common with other aircraft at all times without charge other than a charge sufficient to defray the cost of repairing damage done by such aircraft or, if the use by military and naval aircraft shall be substantial, a reasonable share, proportional to such use, of the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities so used;

(5) the airport operator or owner will furnish the Government at a reasonable rent therefor such space in airport buildings as may be reasonably adequate for use by the Government in connection with any airport air traffic control, or weather reporting, and communications activities pertinent thereto which the Government may wish to establish at the airport;

(6) all project accounts and records will be kept in accordance with a standard system of accounting prescribed by the Administrator;

(7) the airport operator or owner will submit to the Administrator such annual or special airport financial and operations reports as the Administrator may reasonably request; and

(8) the airport and all airport records will be available for inspection by any duly authorized agent of the Administrator upon reasonable request. To provide such assurance, the Administrator shall prescribe such project-sponsorship requirements as he may deem necessary, consistent with the terms of this act: *Provided*, That nothing contained in such regulations shall be construed to require any State or State airport agency to acquire any airport owned by any other public agency, to assume control over the operation of any such airport, or to sponsor a project which any other public agency is desirous of sponsoring. Among other steps to insure compliance with such requirements, the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with the States and other public agencies, on behalf of the United States, and such contracts shall be enforceable by decrees for specific performance.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for reading that section. It clears up a number of things in my mind. After the money is spent by the Federal Government on one of these projects, what further control, if any, does the Government have over the project?

Mr. McCARRAN. The provisions of the section I have read apply.

Mr. LUCAS. All the time?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; all the time.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. McCARRAN. I promised to yield to the Senator from Ohio some time ago.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator may proceed, but I have to catch a plane pretty soon.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I suggest a further quotation from Mr. Burden?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to quote from Mr. Burden's testimony before the committee as it appears on page 330 of the hearings.

I wish to say, however, as I have said before, that the Civil Aeronautics Administration is prepared to administer the bill on either basis, either deal entirely through the States or through the States and cities, depending upon what Congress determines.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall now yield to the Senator from Ohio, because I have kept him on his feet a long time. I apologize to him.

Mr. BURTON. I am asking for the floor in my own right for the reason that I must leave with Admiral King in a few minutes to go to Cleveland to participate in an event he is attending there. But I should like to make some remarks on the bill and the amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will permit, I should like to make a brief observation relative to what the Senator from Illinois said. I call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that while it is true the bill does provide certain conditions which must be fulfilled by a State, there is nothing in the bill, though I think there should be something in it, which provides for conditions in regard to the airports which the Army and the Navy now have and which I understand they are prepared to turn back to the cities and to the States, after having spent on them millions upon millions of dollars of Federal funds. I understand that by the end of next week, at the latest, the Army and Navy will be prepared to turn back, that is, to declare surplus, six or seven hundred fields. There is nothing in the pending bill about that, and I therefore submit an amendment, which I shall call up later, which places certain safeguards on the return of such airports to cities and municipalities. It provides that the Federal Government, in time of emergency, may have the right to use those fields, on which we have spent millions of dollars. I do not know that there is anything in Senate bill 2 that would cover the already existing facilities.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is one provision in the bill which provides that the Administrator shall confer with the Army and the Navy as to fields which may be made available for public use. That is a general term.

Mr. McMAHON. I feel it is too general, because it does not sufficiently protect the Federal Government's rights in those fields after we turn them back, and I have submitted an amendment which I should like the Senator to look at, to cover what seems to me to be a very serious situation.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for his courtesy.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in support of the bill as recommended and reported by the committee, and therefore in opposition to the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Maine. I believe it is necessary for us to understand the fundamental outlines and purposes of the bill in order to see the issue clearly.

First of all, I believe we should bear in mind that this is a bill to continue the development of aviation in America, particularly interstate aviation which has grown to such an extraordinary degree. The bill, as reported by the committee, carries forward the program which has been the source of that development, and I believe that the bill as it stands actually recognizes more fully the right of the States to do as they please within their own areas than does the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine.

I believe in protecting the States in their rights to do as they please within their respective areas and to aline their subordinate organizations as they please, and I believe the Federal Government should not dictate to them how they should proceed and how they should channel their applications. We should make Federal assistance in developing the backbone of our whole air facilities available to whatever agencies are ready and able to match it.

To understand this issue, it is first necessary to understand what is meant by airports of classes 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. The simplest definition——

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Before the Senator leaves that point, he recognizes, does he not, that the option of most of the Governors and the Council of State Governors is contrary to the opinion which the Senator expresses out of his possible background as the mayor of a great city? Does the Senator concur in the view that they feel differently about it?

Mr. BURTON. I think I can make the reason for my position perfectly plain, and I shall do so in a few moments. I think that under the bill as reported by the committee the States as such have complete jurisdiction over their own areas, whereas under the Brewster amendment I think the State governments as such are told by the Federal Government to restrict their cities. The Federal Government has no business to tell the States how to handle their cities. The States can do that best for themselves, and we should be willing to deal with the cities directly if the State laws now permit it.

Referring to the general definition of the airports involved, it is somewhat confusing in the bill for the reason that airports involved in classes 1, 2, and 3 are referred to as State program airports, and those involved in classes 4 and 5 are referred to as urban airports. That is not the real distinction between the airports in those classes. Classes 1, 2, and 3 involve airports with runways extending up to 4,500 feet, and those of 4 and 5 with

runways exceeding 4,500 feet. Therefore, the real distinction, to my mind, is between the major airports and the minor airports, and, roughly speaking, the so-called urban program of major airports has to do with airports that have a runway of more than a mile in length, whether the airport be in a city, in a village, or in a part of a State where there is no municipal government at all. It is this major airport program that has been the foundation of our interstate air commerce through the years.

How shall the Federal Government proceed to administer that program? We are setting aside by this bill an authorization of as much as $500,000,000 over a 5-year period—$100,000,000 for the first year. That is to be divided in two clear-cut amounts. Thirty-five percent—the bill says "not to exceed 35 percent," so it might be less than 35 percent—is allowed for the major airports. The urban program therefore may get $35,000,000 of Federal money annually. That is, it is to be distributed among those airports regardless of State lines, but is to be distributed according to the national program. Under the committee bill Congress is to have the final say as to which ones it shall go. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine the matter comes directly under the Administrator of the national program, and Congress has nothing further to say as to which airports the money shall go. As a matter of fact, therefore, Congress retains a greater control over the distribution of the $35,000,000 under the committee bill than under the Brewster amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator has made a point that the Federal Government maintains control over the $35,000,000.

Mr. BURTON. That is, the Congress has the right in the appropriation it makes and is expected to specify the ones to which the $35,000,000 shall go, as recommended by the national program, but is not bound by the national program, and the money cannot be used until Congress authorizes it in each case.

Mr. McMAHON. But if that is the philosophy with regard to the 35 percent, why is it not provided in the bill that the 65 percent, or the $65,000,000, should also be reviewed by the Congress? As I read the bill, the entire power is put in the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to draw up such plans as he desires without any review by the Congress for a period of 5 years. We commit ourselves for 5 years under this bill, which means $325,000,000 from the Federal Government and $325,000,000 from the States, or $650,000,000, and neither the States, the cities, nor any one in the Federal Government, except the Administrator, have the right to project the plans for these airports. That is more power than I want to put in any single Government agency.

I should like to point out to the Senator how dangerous the situation might be if there should be adopted the kind of plan the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics proposes as the fifth revised plan. I suggest that every Senator would do well to obtain a copy of that plan and consider the absurdities it contains.

As I pointed out yesterday, $15,600 would be provided for an airport at a place called Antelope Island, which has a herd of moose and one family of five. That is typical of the absurdities which are contained in the plan which has been proposed by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. The bill gives to the Administrator the right to draw up a plan without anybody gainsaying it for the period of 5 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. Before yielding to the Senator from West Virginia I should like to answer the statement just made by the Senator from Connecticut, because I am afraid it is not correct, and it ought not to be left standing as made.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wanted to ask the Senator about the particular airport of which the Senator from Connecticut spoke.

Mr. BURTON. I shall yield to the Senator from West Virginia in a moment. I want to make clear that there are certain limitations in regard to the preparing of the program set forth in the bill. But the vital thing is that the program respecting the major airports to which 35 percent, or $35,000,000, is to be allotted, is a Federal program, and under the committee proposal that Federal program is not conclusive as to where the $35,000,000 will go. The $35,000,000 may not be adequate to cover what may be proposed, and therefore there should have to be some choice made between this or that airport. But in the committee bill now before the Senate it is provided that such allocations shall not be made unless authorized by Congress.

Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine the 35 percent is allocated in accordance with the national airport program.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not attack the provision of the bill respecting the 35 percent. I am pointing out the absolute lack of control over the 65 percent.

Mr. BURTON. Then, turning to the 65 percent——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska in a moment, but I should like first to answer the question raised by the Senator from Connecticut. The 65 percent is to be expended in accordance with the plan, but the applications are of course to come from the sponsors, and in that case the sponsors are under their various State programs, and therefore the State itself will determine which of the many minor locations might be selected within the State, although it could not select one which did not come within the scope of the general plan, because Federal money is involved.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator see that they can sponsor, request, and apply until the cows come home, but under the bill as now written the Administrator can select sites for airports anywhere he chooses, without any right of veto in either the Congress, the States, or the small cities?

Mr. BURTON. I think that is not quite accurate. For example, the State of Connecticut might have in mind a number of airports. The national board might look over the sites and decide that three or four of them came within the national program. Then an application would be made, but Connecticut could not obtain Federal money to assist in the construction of airports which did not come under the jurisdiction of the Federal board and meet with its approval. It could construct all the local airports it might desire to construct; but if it were to obtain Federal money, the projects must fit into the Federal program. However, the Federal board could not make the State build an airport where the State did not want to build it.

Mr. McMAHON. I am afraid that the Senator does not answer the objection that as the bill is now written the power lies in the Administrator either to accept or reject; and no one could do anything if he accepted or rejected a certain project.

Mr. BURTON. The Federal Administrator would list the projects with respect to which he was willing to make a grant of Federal money, and the State would choose the projects it wished to sponsor.

Mr. McMAHON. He could reject or accept any project, as he pleased, without any right of veto on the part of anyone.

Mr. BURTON. But the State would still have its quota of the $65,000,000, and it would be found that the Administrator would be anxious to build any airport which came within the national program.

Mr. McMAHON. I prefer to have it distinctly provided in the bill that he shall not alone be the determining factor in the location of airports involving an expenditure of $650,000,000, if we are to adopt the sum in the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. He is not the determining factor under the terms of the bill as it now stands, because he might select any number of airports, but if there were not a sponsor to guarantee the matching of Government money, dollar for dollar, and if there were no guaranty with respect to upkeep and maintenance, there would be no airports.

Mr. McMAHON. Even if the State should offer to sponsor an airport, the Administrator could accept or reject the project.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In connection with the answer given by the distinguished Senator from Ohio to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, that under the terms of the bill as it now stands the Administrator would not be able to locate airports throughout the country without the approval of Congress, let me say that at the proper time the Senator from

Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and I expect to offer an amendment to the Brewster amendment, inserting the language of section 7 (a) of the bill as it now stands.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. That language is not now in the Brewster amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment is at the desk, but it has not yet been offered, because it would not be in order at this time. If the distinguished Senator from Ohio will yield to me for the purpose of presenting the suggested amendment out of order, I shall be glad to do so at this time. It would cure the very difficulty which has been discussed, relative to whether or not the Congress shall authorize such projects, or whether it shall be left in the hands of the Administrator to locate class 4 and class 5 airports wherever he pleases.

Mr. BURTON. I have no objection to yielding in order that the amendment may be presented. However, I shall be compelled to leave the Chamber shortly in order to catch an airplane, and I should like to have the discussion of it postponed.

Mr. WHERRY. With that understanding, I should like to offer the amendment at this time.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment submitted in behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and myself, and ask that it be read at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I believe that the point of order which the Senator from Nevada is about to make is well taken. If the Senator from Ohio will yield to me, I will accept the amendment as a part of my amendment. I believe that that will clear the point of order which the Senator from Nevada was quite properly about to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. BREWSTER, on page 3, line 1, after the word "as", it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the line and all of line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

As hereinafter provided, at least 2 months prior to the close of each fiscal year, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a request for authority to undertake during the next fiscal year those of the projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports, included in the then current revision of the national airport plan formulated by him under section 6 hereof, which, in his opinion, should be undertaken during that fiscal year, together with an estimate of the Federal funds required to pay the share of the United States under this act on account of such projects. In determining which projects to include in such a request, the Administrator shall consider, among other things, the relative aeronautical need for and urgency of the projects included in the plan and the likelihood of securing satisfactory sponsorship of such projects as required by the sponsorship requirements prescribed by him. In allocating and granting any funds that thereafter may be appropriated for the carrying out of such program during the next fiscal year, the Administrator shall consider the appropriation as granting the authority requested unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress, and no such allocations or grants shall be made unless so authorized.

(b) State program: After deducting from the amount of each appropriation available for grants the amount thereof that may be granted for projects in the urban program, the remainder shall be available for the development of class 3 and smaller airports under the State program, as proposed in the then current revision of the national airport plan. All such funds shall be apportioned as prescribed in section 8 and shall be granted for the carrying out of projects selected and approved for operation as provided in section 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the proposed modification of the amendment of the Senator from Maine accepted?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Maine accepted the modification. Unless the Senator from Maine had accepted the modification, a point of order would have to be sustained.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is quite right. I thought I made it clear that I accepted the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the proposed amendment is accepted by the Senator from Maine. It has not been agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not understand that any amendment has been agreed to by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed modification of the amendment of the Senator from Maine has been accepted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment was not agreed to by the Senate. It was accepted by the Senator from Maine. He agreed to accept the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska as a modification of his amendment. He can do that of his own accord. It is not the action of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent would be required——

Mr. McCARRAN. Unanimous consent is not required.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment is not related to the Brewster amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think it is a very essential part of the Brewster amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, it is proposed to strike out——

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment before the Senate is the Brewster amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator from Maine wishes to modify his own amendment by accepting language suggested by some other Senator, he may do so; but that is not the action of the Senate. He has accepted the modification, and it is now, by his act, a part of his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not in order if there is objection.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If a point of order is made, it must go out.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator from Nevada object?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not object to the Senator from Maine accepting the modification, but that is not the action of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. I quite agree with the Senator from Nevada in his parliamentary position.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada if he will withdraw his point of order, because we are all agreed, with the exception of the Chair, that the Senator from Maine can accept the amendment, and I should like very much to have it accepted.

Mr. McCARRAN. All the Senator has to do is to say "I accept it."

Mr. BREWSTER. I accept it.

Mr. WHERRY. I still would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee to withdraw his point of order, because the Chair has decided that we must have unanimous consent, and inasmuch as the only thing involved is the acceptance of the amendment by the Senator from Maine, I should like to have it accepted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from Maine give unanimous consent? [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada object?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I do not object.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as I understand, the question before the Senate is now on agreeing to the Brewster amendment, as modified, to the pending committee amendment. Is there any question about that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not understand that to be so, because the Brewster amendment, which is the pending amendment, proposes to strike out lines 4 to 8, inclusive, on page 29.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Chair has the wrong page in mind, if I am correct about this matter. I think it comes under 7 (a). That was the provision which was affected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is my amendment. I am offering the amendment to the language at the top of page 3, following the word "as", in order to fit it in as a new section, to be 7 (b).

Mr. BREWSTER. It is offered to the Brewster amendment; is it not?

Mr. WHERRY. It is offered to the Brewester amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not offered to the pending amendment, so it is not in order at this time. When that point is reached it will be in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. We are now considering the amendments en bloc, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the motion before the Senate was that they be taken up in order. The first one was

on page 29, to strike out lines 4 to 8 inclusive.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator from Nevada and I, at any rate, are agreed that no decision had been made on that matter, and in fact he indicated to me earlier in the day that he wished to consider the amendments en bloc, with a single exception, to which I fully agreed.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. A suggestion was made that it might be desired to consider them seriatim, but no agreement to that effect was reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is afraid there is some misunderstanding.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me clear up the matter by requesting that we consider the amendment en bloc, with the exception of the amendment dealing with the Federal condemnation provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senate will proceed under that arrangement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then, that makes this amendment in order for consideration at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which has been read, as proposed in behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and myself.

Mr. McCARRAN. I rise to a point of order. The Senator from Maine can accept it, and he has accepted it. That settles the matter. It is a part of the Brewster amendment now.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am pleased to accept the amendment as a modification of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his own amendment, of course.

Mr. BREWSTER. I so modify my amendment by the Wherry amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, returning to consideration of the Brewster amendments en bloc, as modified, the fundamental issue here, after considering the allocation of the funds and the terminology used for airports, is how shall the $35,000,000 for the major airports be sponsored by those who wish to participate in that program and how shall the $65,000,000 for minor airports be sponsored by those who wish to participate in that program. We have in the past developed our great airport system through the States and cities, whichever were willing and ready to proceed. On that basis we have made substantial progress.

It is the purpose of this bill to continue that progress, not to put handicaps in its way. As I understand, the bill as originally proposed contained provision for a division as between the smaller airports and the larger ones, by leaving only class 1 and class 2 airports to purely State control insofar as sponsorship is concerned, and by placing class 3, class 4, and class 5 airports wide open to sponsorship by States or subdivisions thereof. Therefore the original bill, in order to continue the program sponsored by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, recommended that the smaller airports—those in classes 1 and 2—be under State control, and that airports of classes 3, 4, and 5 be wide open for State or local control or sponsorship. Throughout the hearings it was developed that the States had been more active than in the past, and there was request that there be further allocation of funds for airports under State control. As a result of that testimony, the committee voted that airports in classes 1, 2, and 3—that is, those with runways up to 4,500 feet in length—should come under the sponsorship of the State agencies, but that airports of major character, namely, those with runways 4,500 feet or more in length—practically a mile or more in length—should still remain open for sponsorship by States or municipalities or any other public agencies which might have the initiative and the funds and might be ready to go ahead in conjunction with the Federal Government.

The point I wish to make particularly is that in the case of the major airports there is no prohibition against having a State sponsor such an airport, and there is no requirement that municipalities and counties in a State shall proceed only through the State. Therefore, under the committee bill, the Federal Government will leave to the State the entire choice regarding how it shall proceed in sponsoring the airports within the State, whereas the amendment is an intrusion upon rather than a freeing of the States from Federal control. To my mind, the amendment says, "In the case of major airports you shall proceed only through the State channels," whereas the States can require that now; but under the amendment the State would not be able to do anything except that. It would not be able to permit the municipalities to proceed as they wish and to provide the money. One hundred million dollars has gone into municipal airports so far. Many States, such as the State of Ohio, have no statutory authority to issue bonds. The cities are anxious to be able to continue as they have. I have before me telegrams from the cities of Cleveland, Toledo, Youngstown, Akron, and Dayton asking that they be able to continue in this matter as heretofore. Therefore I ask for adoption of the committee's theory. That will leave the States free, if they choose to be free, to permit their municipalities to act as sponsors; but if the States wish to do it, they will be able to do it. If a State wishes to do it, let it do it, but not the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure the Senator will agree that a State is equally free under my amendment to accord the right which the State of Ohio so urgently wishes it may exercise. So whether the Federal Government makes the proposal to the States or to the cities, I am glad the Senator recognizes the theory of State sovereignty. But if the State decides in any instance that it wishes to allow a city to act contrary to what the Senator from Ohio has stated, the State will be at full liberty to do so. It will be able to proceed through any agency and in any way it deems best, in cooperation with the Federal Administrator, so that the exercise of the city's power to borrow and cooperate will in no way be restricted by the amendment.

Mr. BURTON. The practical answer to that is that at the present time the situation is such that the States have in large measure hung back in the development of the major airports of the Nation. We now have a situation in which the cities and local governments have taken the initiative and are ready to proceed. Therefore, if the Federal Government merely recognizes the facts as they are, we should pass a bill of this kind and deal with the cities or States as they are, rather than legislate something new into the situation and thereby require the States to proceed by a new method of dealing with their cities in some manner that will hamper continuation of the development which thus far has been obtained.

I believe the best way to make use of the funds of the cities, which are merely parts of the States and are controlled by State law—and their financial policies are controlled by State law—is to permit them to participate in State activities of this sort. If we do that we promote the aviation business and we keep out outside interests.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator will agree that while in many instances the cities have proceeded—particularly the Senator's own city of Cleveland—it is also true that in the past few years the States have rapidly recognized the situation and 44 agencies have been created to deal with this very matter. Therefore, I think it is unfortunate that the Federal Government should attempt to bypass the States. At that point it seems to me most unfortunate that the Federal Government should now bypass the States.

Mr. BURTON. The point is that the Federal Government is not bypassing the States. It is making its funds available to whoever is ready to use them under the State laws as they stand.

Mr. BURTON subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago, when I was addressing the Senate on the pending bill, I referred to telegrams I had received some time ago from the cities of Cleveland, Toledo, Youngstown, Akron, and Dayton, stating the position they are taking.

I wish to make the record complete. I did not at that time have before me the telegrams which I now hold in my hand, but my colleague the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] just handed me telegrams from the Governor of Ohio and the acting director of aeronautics of Ohio, taking the opposite position. I do not believe they understand the bill. [Laughter.] I ask that the telegrams be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *September 8, 1945.*
Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senator:

Believe that S. 2 ought to be amended so as to provide that the Federal Government will work through State governments in the development of a national system of airports the pattern applicable to highway improvements has worked out successfully it would be a mistake to have the Federal Government work directly with each of the local agencies.

GOV. FRANK J. LAUSCHE.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *September 10, 1945.*
Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senate:

Understand S. 2, bill to provide national system of airports and to deal directly with hundreds of locals with reference to States, coming up on floor of Senate today. Wish to go on record as favoring bill with proviso that State participation is assured as provided by Brewster amendment.

G. A. STONE,
Acting Director.

Mr. SALTONSTALL rose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish the floor? If he does, I shall not speak at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. President, I hope that the Brewster amendment will be adopted because I believe it will make more practical the means for greater aviation activities, and provide them more quickly. The amendment merely channels the funds through the State without giving the localities the opportunity of going directly to the Federal Government without first consulting with the State authority. At least, that is true in case of the 35-percent Federal grant. I believe that one State enacted a law at the last session of its legislature which would require all funds to pass through the State aeronautical commission. I am not quite certain with respect to that, but I believe I have stated the situation correctly.

The measure under consideration does not provide how the engineering shall be done. Under the Hayden-Cartwright law, which is a law concerning Federal aid to State highways, the work is done directly through the public works departments of the various States. The pending bill deals with projects authorized and developed, but does not contain anywhere, so far as I can see, a statement with regard to who is to do the engineering. If the engineering is to be done by the Federal Government it will mean the building up of another Federal agency when the work can now be done through State agencies.

The amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] coordinates within the State all airport activities. It continues the present method of distributing Federal funds to the State. So far as I know, the only funds of the Federal Government which were distributed directly to municipalities in the past were the WPA funds. I believe that all child welfare funds, social security funds, public-highway funds, and funds of similar character were always distributed through State agencies. The pending measure provides for a new method of distributing Federal funds. On the other hand, the Brewster amendment does not prevent the Federal Administrator coordinating into one city all the Federal funds which are available in any one year for the construction of a major airport.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, I respectfully invite his attention to section 12 on page 42 of the bill providing for engineering facilities. I did not wish to interrupt the Senator, but I thought that he might like to have that reference brought to his attention while he was on his feet.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The section to which the Senator refers reads in part, "in accordance with its laws, and under the direct supervision of the State airport agency or project sponsor as the case may be," and so forth. But there will be comparatively few cities, certainly few of the smaller cities, and certainly few of the project sponsors, which will have engineering facilities of their own, and they will have to turn to the State facilities or the Federal Government facilities.

It seems to me that the important point for us to consider and remember in connection with the Brewster amendment is that it does not prevent the Federal Administrator from going ahead with the national airport plan for larger airports. Under the Brewster amendment the Administrator will still have power to direct the $35,000,000, or 35 percent of $100,000,000, into any one airport, or any two airports in any one year. The only thing that the Brewster amendment does is to say that it cannot be done by the Federal Administrator without having the approval of the State aeronautical commission. If the State aeronautical commission approves, it can be done. If the State aeronautical commission does not approve, the Federal Administrator may put all that money into some other city in some other State. It seems to me that that is very important for us to remember. The program would be continued as has been suggested, and in a more effective way.

There is one provision to which I referred briefly in my discussion with the distinguished Senator from Nevada. I believe that the committee report goes further in compelling the States to use their taxes in specific ways than does the law concerning the building of highways. I know that in my State of Massachusetts we matched certain funds from gasoline taxes with Federal funds. But certain receipts from gasoline taxes were not spent for highway purposes. This bill states in substance that unless all the money which is received as revenue from aviation sources goes into aviation, then the State will receive no money under the terms of the bill. That seems to me to be one step further in compelling a State to take certain action which may not be desirable in a particular section of the country.

The Brewster amendment also eliminates the right of the Federal Government to compel the State to live up to its agreement by forcing it into the courts. I am not familiar with the provisions of the Hayden-Cartwright law in that connection, but I believe it is going pretty far to allow the Federal Government to have the right to force a State into the courts. It can always stop its appropriation, but to compel the State through court procedure to perform a certain act seems to me to be going very far.

Whether we agree to that part of the Brewster amendment which eliminates condemnation of land by the Federal Government, seems to me to be relatively unimportant. The need is to build the airport. The airport should be built in the most practical manner. Perhaps it can be built in a more practical way if the Federal Government is given the right to condemn the land on which the airport is to be built. In some localities it may be necessary to condemn land outside the corporate entity of a city. Just what Government agency would do that if the Federal Government did not do it, I am unable to say. I do not believe that part of the Brewster amendment is of very great importance. However, I feel at this time, when we are entering the postwar era, during which the Federal Government will be asked to do many things in connection with State governments, and when cooperation between them will be needed more than ever before, that we should do our work through and with the approval of the State authorities instead of by-passing the State authorities and dealing directly with municipalities or project sponsors which will be new corporate entities within the State, and which the State government will have to create through legislative action. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to the committee amendment will be adopted.

CRITICISM OF ADMINISTRATION RECONVERSION POLICIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is becoming increasingly evident that a number of practices of the administration are proving inimical to the rapid and successful reconversion of our country.

I should like to call attention to four of the harmful practices:

First. Demobilization: It is obvious that the armed forces are demobilizing more with promises than with actions. This matter is, of course, primarily within the jurisdiction of our Commander in Chief and his military officials. Nevertheless, it has become an intense congressional concern in view of the fact that hundreds of thousands of anxious wives, parents, sweethearts, and servicemen themselves, have written to express their righteous indignation that the armed forces are proving longer on pious intentions than on fulfillment of those intentions.

I note that the President has just nominated 6 brigadier generals to the temporary rank of major general, and 17 colonels to the temporary rank of brigadier general. I do not question the right of our military officials to determine which men are entitled to commendation and promotion, but I do question very seriously whether the Army thinks that is expanding rather than contracting and whether it is paying attention to the fact that it is adding to the crushing overhead costs of the Federal Government.

Second. Federal 5-day week: A second harmful activity is that of the Federal Government in slamming its doors in the face of the public on Friday evening and telling the public to twiddle its thumbs over the week-end in spite of any urgent problem that may come up.

The skeleton forces which some departments say they leave on Saturday to transact emergency business are not forces, they are farces.

I am certain that every one of my Senatorial colleagues has had the experience of receiving urgent requests from his constituents on Saturday and being absolutely unable to get any action from the skeleton "farces," of the Federal bureaus, when, as, and if those "farces" are purportedly at work.

No one begrudges the Federal worker his week-end rest. But surely a system could be established whereby Federal workers could work one Saturday during a given period in return for compensatory time off during the week. This means having a solid working force on hand every Saturday to transact Government business.

Speed is of the essence in servicing industry, labor, agriculture, and our returning veterans in the reconversion period.

The situation is outrageous that Federal agencies like OPA and WPB should tie our people up in knots through arbitrary regulations and then blithely close up shop Friday evening, thus denying our people the opportunity to straighten out knots over the week end.

Third. Federal 30-hour week: There is talk now of a 5-day 30-hour week of Federal workers.

Enactment of such a workweek would be an insult to every taxpayer since it would add $2,000,000,000 annually to the already crushing Federal tax burden.

It would be an insult to every farmer and farm laborer who have been and are continuing to work a minimum of 10 hours a day, 7 days a week in exhausting duties.

Such a workweek would encourage the cry for similar weeks in private industry. Thus, this proposed measure would be an insult to every businessman in the country who is trying to secure a peak output of goods in order to meet the huge backlog of consumer and industrial demands. It would be also an insult to every consumer whose need for goods would go unsatisfied for needlessly longer periods.

While the danger of inflation is still so pressing, everything must be done to encourage the maximum output of goods in order to soak up the vast amount of liquid savings in the hands of our people.

The Government should be striving by its model example to reconvert our thinking along the lines of the traditional American virtues of humility and industry instead of encouraging self-overvaluation and indolence.

Fourth. Farm inductions: In some farm areas farm deferments are now being arbitrarily canceled. Even these faw essential hands, who were formerly deferred, are now being reclassified and inducted.

If this atrocious policy continues, it will strike a body blow against the American farmers who have already been stripped down to a bare minimum of help.

During the war the administration blatantly ignored and violated the Tydings amendment by inducting necessary and unreplaceable farm help. Does the administration propose to continue violating the letter and spirit of the Tydings amendment now that the war is over?

I have already written to General Hershey protesting the continuation of this policy. The text of the letter follows:

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: I am informed that back in my State farm labor which had formerly been deferred is now being reclassified into I-A.

A friend of mine who is running a dairy says that three of his milkers have just been so reclassified. I am interested in knowing what causes this change of policy on the part of the draft boards regarding the deferments of essential farm labor.

Can it be that the draft boards believe that unskilled returned veterans and unemployed industrial men can replace the deferred farm help? The fact is, for example, according to this letter, "that not one returned veteran has applied for a farm job in these parts and neighbors with houses to put families in have advertised for farm help without receiving a single answer."

I am further informed that the loss of more men will put many dairy farms out of business. As you know, farmers everywhere have been getting along with the very minimum of labor, and now is no time, after the magnificent job that they have done, to sabotage their readjustment to peacetime markets. Farmers have been working man-killing hours and simply cannot stand to be deprived of the essential hands who have helped them to keep the Nation's bread basket filled. That basket still needs to be kept filled and every available skilled hand will, therefore, be needed on the farms in the coming period.

I hope, general, that some definite action will be taken to put an immediate halt to the intolerable reclassification actions of which I write, lest further serious injury be inflicted on the food production of America.

REMOVAL OF RATION POINTS ON CHEESE

To offset this, Mr. President, I was just called to the telephone and informed that OPA has taken the ration points off cheese. It looks as if happy days will soon be here again, and I hope it will be my privilege ere long to see that my fellow Senators will be privileged to sink their teeth into some vitamin rich, luscious, aromatic Wisconsin cheese, let it be Cheddar or Swiss or Blue, brick, or other brands produced by that great State.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly.

Mr. TOBEY. Is that a threat, or a promise?

Mr. WILEY. I never make threats to a fellow Republican. Once in a while I may threaten when I am talking to a New Deal Democrat, but not when I speak of cheese, that is too pleasant a subject.

It is the stuff, sir, which you, of New Hampshire, need to nourish that fine working brain of yours and to put a little added vitamin into your blood corpuscles.

THE SUPPLY OF MEAT AND THE LIFTING OF MEAT RATIONING

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on September 8 the Office of Price Administration issued an order which terminated the order made some months ago relative to quotas on the slaughtering of cattle. This order is set out in detail in a release issued by the Office of War Information on September 8, 1945. I think it is only fair to the Office of Price Administration to have the entire order printed in the RECORD. It gives the reason why the Office of Price Administration placed controls on the slaughtering of livestock and the shipment of meat, and the reason why it removed the controls. I ask unanimous consent that the release may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Administrator Chester Bowles of the Office of Price Administration announced today that OPA controls over how much livestock can be slaughtered and where the meat is shipped ended at 12:01 a. m., September 8, 1945. The action was taken on the recommendation of Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson. Meat rationing is not affected by the action.

When the slaughter control program was put into effect last April, lower meat production, compared with last year, and continued high military requirements had resulted in a serious distribution problem, OPA explained.

The slaughter-control program was designed to increase the amount of livestock slaughtered in federally inspected plants by decreasing the amount of slaughter in non-federally inspected plants, from which meat cannot be shipped across State lines. In this manner, the requirements of the armed forces and other Government needs could better be protected. At the same time, a larger proportion of meat for civilians would be made available for shipment across State lines.

The objectives of the slaughter-control program were accomplished by imposing quotas on the number of animals non-federally inspected slaughterers and farm slaughterers (for sale) could process. Another major provision of the program called upon slaughterers to follow the same geographic distribution pattern in making shipments that they used during the first quarter of 1944.

"The decision to suspend these slaughter and distribution controls was reached after the matter was discussed with representatives of the Department of Agriculture," Mr. Bowles said. "They are in complete agreement with OPA that these controls should be dropped.

"Termination of the distribution and slaughter-control program is possible because reports of the Department of Agriculture indicate that present supplies of livestock are sufficient to assure good distribution under rationing without the use of quotas.

"The end of the slaughter-control and fair distribution program will have no immediate effect on meat rationing," Mr. Bowles said. "While there has been marked improvement in the supply of meat available to civilians in the last few months, particularly since fighting stopped, the supply is not yet sufficient to assure good distribution without the help of rationing controls."

Major factors that resulted in the decision to suspend the slaughter control and fair distribution programs were:

1. Department of Agriculture reports show there has been a large increase in

cattle receipts at terminal markets during the last few weeks and indications are the upward trend will continue.

2. Government meat requirements have sharply decreased. "Together, these two developments have resulted in more meat being available for civilians," Mr. Bowles said. "Now that the period of acute scarcity has been passed and with increased numbers of livestock being sold, we want to be sure there are no obstacles to prevent the slaughter of every animal that is marketed.

"Controls on slaughter and distribution were imposed as an emergency measure to correct bad distribution. Getting the program started on short notice involved a tremendous burden and called for great effort on the part of those responsible for the task. They did their work well. Without the control program, the meat situation would have been much more trying for most of us. As it turned out, within a relatively short time after the controls were introduced, it was much easier for housewives and others to get more meat than they did before."

Little more than a month after the program was begun—by the middle of June—reports received from OPA field offices indicated a slight but definite improvement of distribution in shortage areas. Late in July, when point values were established for the August rationing period, distribution of meat had improved so that it was possible to reduce point values of nearly all cuts of beef, lamb, and veal by one or two points a pound. Sharp reductions in point values were possible for the September rationing period.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch and a United Press dispatch dealing with meat rationing, and two articles, one written by Malcolm Lamborne, Jr., of the Washington Evening Star, and the other by Helene C. Monberg, of the Washington Times-Herald, in which they predict the end of meat rationing as of October 1, 1945, as well as three news items dealing with the same subject.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 11, 1945]

BUTCHERS IN NEW YORK HAVE PLENTY OF MEAT BUT PATRONS ARE LACKING IN RED POINTS

Some officials reported yesterday that an end of meat rationing is "possible" by October 1, but OPA and the Agriculture Department said no definite date could be predicted.

In New York, however, a food dealers' spokesman declared the meat supply had improved so much in recent weeks that the commodity "could be taken off rationing entirely."

E. F. Guckenberger, secretary of the New York State Retail Food Merchants Association, said many retailers in that area were sending meat back to wholesalers because consumers lacked enough red ration points to buy it.

In Chicago Mrs. Rose Marie Kiefer, secretary-manager of the National Association of Retail Grocers, said a week-end telegraphic survey of State and local affiliated associations in 45 States indicated a prompt termination of meat rationing was necessary.

She said complete figures on the survey would not be compiled until tomorrow, but that broad samplings were so strong the association had telegraphed the Office of Price Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and Congress asking an end to meat rationing.

The two Government agencies issued a joint statement denying what they described as "rumors" of disagreement between them on the lifting of ration controls.

"The Department and OPA are in agreement that meat rationing should be ended as soon as supplies are adequate and distribution is sufficiently equitable to permit such action," said J. B. Hutson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

"However, they are also in agreement that the present supply situation does not now make possible predictions of the time at which meat rationing can be ended."

Shoe rationing may end before November, if desires of some members of the shoe trade are followed, but neither OPA nor the War Production Board has yet fixed a likely date.

[From PM of September 11, 1945]

REPORT MEAT RATION TO END

WASHINGTON, September 11.—Reliable sources disclosed yesterday that meat rationing will end October 1 and that shoe rationing will be discontinued on the same date or shortly thereafter.

OPA Chief Chester Bowles and Acting Secretary of Agriculture J. B. Hutson quickly announced that, while they are agreed that meat rationing should end as soon as possible, it now is impossible to predict when the action will be taken.

The United Press was informed reliably, however, that the two agencies already have drafted plans to take meats off the ration list at the end of the month. According to the informant, Agriculture Secretary Clinton P. Anderson favored lifting the controls on September 1 but OPA held out for the October 1 date.

President Truman notified all war agencies on August 15 that as many controls as possible should be lifted within 60 days after the Japanese surrender. Rationing of processed foods, fuel oil, and gasoline already has been discontinued and OPA believes that, with the exception of sugar, fats, and oils, other rationing can be ended this year.

Rationing of sugar, fats, and oils is expected to continue into next year because of a serious shortage in these items. But there is a good supply of beef, lamb, mutton, and poultry on the market to offset a continuing shortage of pork.

Informed quarters said that shoes probably will be removed from the ration list sometime between October 15 and November 1—and possibly as early as October 1.

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 10, 1945]

GROCERS LAUNCH DRIVE TO END MEAT RATIONING—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION TELLS FOOD OFFICIAL SUPPLIES ARE AMPLE

(By Malcolm Lamborne, Jr.)

An intensive drive to bring about an immediate end of all meat rationing has been opened by the National Association of Retail Grocers, representing a large segment of the Nation's retail food industry, it was learned today, as reports persisted that meat rationing would be ended by October 1.

An OPA spokesman pointed out, meanwhile, that no date has been set by the OPA and the Agriculture Department for the termination of meat rationing.

Reports that meat rationing would end much sooner than anticipated followed an OPA action Saturday lifting all its controls over the amount of livestock that could be slaughtered and doing away with its distribution program controlling meat shipments.

WIRE PLEA TO BOWLES

The Grocers' Association has wired Price Administrator Bowles, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, chairman of Senate and House Agriculture and Small Business Committees and two special food-study committees urging a prompt termination of rationing.

The association based its recommendation on a wire survey last Friday and Saturday of member organizations in 45 States.

The group claims there are ample supplies of meat, particularly in the light of better supplies of beef and chicken, but that wholesalers in some cities are finding retailers turning down shipments for lack of red points.

Meat waste likewise is claimed by the association which cites instances of spoilage above normal in Omaha and Chicago.

A check with the retail trade here showed no instances of spoilage or meat wholesalers' trucks being turned back by retailers for lack of ration currency. Beef and veal supplies were described as plentiful, however, the best, in fact, since last year. In this connection, one chain store began advertising beefsteaks today for the first time in many months.

SEE TREMENDOUS MARKETINGS

An official of the national retailers group predicted that by September 15 "we will have tremendous marketings of livestock, particularly of utility beef."

"All we want is to give retailers an opportunity to supply consumer appetities which are limited by red-point rationing," the official declared.

Secretary Anderson was quoted several weeks ago to the effect that meat supplies would improve sufficiently to justify an end of rationing early this fall, perhaps as soon as September. Mr. Bowles was opposed to such action so soon and proceded to establish new and reduced point values for September.

Agriculture Department officials, in the meantime, report that the final decision on lifting of rationing will be determined by cattle marketings during the next 2 weeks. An extra large run of cattle could bring about a decision to halt rationing, they said.

Movement of cattle to market is some 4 weeks behind normal so far, according to the Department. This situation has been brought about above normal pasture conditions, encouraging a longer feeding of range cattle.

NEW YORK STORES REPORT OVERSUPPLY OF BEEF

NEW YORK, September 10.—The supply of beef in New York is so plentiful, according to a meat industry official, that many "retailers report sending it back to the wholesalers."

A. F. Guckenberger, secretary of the New York State Retail Food Merchants' Association, said yesterday the lack of red ration points was causing an oversupply of beef among many butchers.

"The situation has improved so much in the last couple of weeks," Mr. Guckenberger said, "that meat could be taken off rationing entirely."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 11, 1945]

MEAT RATION SLATED TO END ON OCTOBER 1—SHOES TO BE FREED ABOUT SAME TIME

(By Helene C. Monberg)

Reliable sources disclosed yesterday that meat rationing will end October 1 and that shoe rationing will be discontinued on the same date or shortly thereafter.

OPA Chief Bowles and Acting Secretary of Agriculture Hutson quickly announced that, while they are agreed that meat rationing should end as soon as possible, it now is impossible to predict when the action will be taken.

PLANS ARE DRAFTED

The United Press was informed reliably, however, that the two agencies already have drafted plans to take meat off the ration list at the end of the month. According to the informant, Agriculture Secretary Anderson favored lifting the controls on September 1 but OPA held out for the October 1 date.

More good news came from an Agriculture Department spokesman who said that all cheese soon will be ration free and that the

order may be issued "almost immediately." He said the 40 percent set-aside for Government purchase will be canceled since the Army has cut back drastically on its requirements and has large supplies on hand.

SUGAR STILL SHORT

President Truman notified all war agencies on August 15 that as many controls as possible should be lifted within 60 days after the Japanese surrender. Rationing of processed foods, fuel oil, and gasoline already has been discontinued and OPA believes that, with the exception of sugar, fats, and oils, other rationing can be ended this year.

Rationing of sugar, fats, and oils is expected to continue into next year because of a serious shortage in these items. But there is a good supply of beef, lamb, mutton, and poultry on the market to offset a continuing shortage of pork.

AGREED ON QUICK END

Hutson said that OPA and the Agriculture Department are agreed that meat rationing should be ended as soon as supplies are adequate and distribution is "sufficiently equitable to permit such action." He added, however, that they also are agreed that "the present supply system does not now make possible predictions of the time at which meat rationing can be ended."

Bowles described as ridiculous a report that he had asked Anderson to defer action from September 1 until October 1 so that termination of meat rationing could be timed with liquidation of OPA's field personnel.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of September 11, 1945]

SEE MEAT RATION PROGRAM ENDING—POSSIBLE BY OCTOBER 1—ANDERSON PREDICTS END OF SUBSIDY IN 1946

WASHINGTON, September 10.—The end of all meat rationing by October 1 was seen as a possibility by some rationing officials today, although no date has been set.

Office of Price Administration officials said the decision would be made by agreement with the Agriculture Department but one Government spokesman said:

"If supplies look good by the end of the month, rationing will go."

OPA's action Saturday night removing all limits on the slaughter of livestock was taken in expectation of heavy runs of cattle to packinghouses. It was accepted generally as indicating a possible early end of rationing.

There is no dispute between Price Administrator Chester Bowles and Secretary of Agriculture Anderson on the desirability of dropping ration controls as soon as possible. An OPA spokesman declared that Bowles is "strong for decontrol."

Bowles has assured Congress that most rationing will end this year. Sugar and fats and oils, however, remained dubious. Bowles said continued scarcity of their supply made their release impossible to predict with accuracy.

Agricultural Department officials said the final decision on lifting of rationing October 1 will be determined by cattle marketings and demands for meat during the next 2 weeks. They said an exceptionally heavy market run of cattle could lead to an earlier ending of rationing.

SUBSIDY END PREDICTED

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., September 10.—Subsidies on cattle may be removed by April 1, 1946, Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, said today in addressing the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association.

The date, he said, will be set far enough in advance that feeders will know how to govern their purchases.

"I have been extremely hopeful that subsidies could be removed at a time when it would aid the producer without effecting the destruction of the cattle industry," he continued.

The Cabinet member assured the cattlemen that America would avoid the pitfalls that followed the last war and urged them to go about their tasks with the knowledge that the bottom won't drop out of things.

A food dealers' spokesman here declared that the meat supply had improved so much in recent weeks that the commodity could be taken off rationing entirely.

E. F. Guckenberger, secretary of the New York State Retail Food Merchants Association, said many retailers here were sending meat back to wholesalers because consumers lacked enough red ration points to buy it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope the action taken by the Office of Price Administration, as set forth in its news release, will become completely effective. With that in mind I took up with the Office of Price Administration the question whether they would remove the point requirements on meat, because it is my theory that inasmuch as the OPA has now done away with the meat quotas, which I think is a very fine thing, and in view of the fact that we are now having the seasonal heavy runs of cattle, cattle should be permitted to be sold and slaughtered and then marketed without any point restrictions. If that is done we will obtain the best distribution we possibly can obtain and I think we will also obtain the best prices we can possibly obtain, because it is my theory that production control to a great extent controls prices.

Mr. President, a memorandum addressed to me under date of September 11 directed to my attention the fact that Mr. Max McCullough had just confirmed this morning's report that no date has been set for lifting meat rationing; that Mr. Anderson and Mr. Bowles have not conferred yet on a lifting date, that is a date for lifting the points from meat, which has been predicted as October 1.

The memorandum further states in effect that OPA's action on Saturday night removing all limits on slaughter of livestock was taken in expectation of heavy runs of cattle to packing houses, and this move was generally thought to be a forewarning of the end of rationing.

The memorandum states further:

As you know, point values on meat were lowered over 20 percent as of September 1—and Mr. McCullough says they will be lowered again on October 1, but he can give no word on the end of meat rationing.

The reason being that the Office of Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture have not yet agreed on the date of October 1.

Mr. President, a step in the right direction was taken when quotas on slaughtering were removed, especially in view of the fact of the heavy runs that are now approaching at this season of the year. But the removal of the slaughtering quotas will not help the situation unless ration points are removed, because it is one thing to kill the animal, and it is another thing to permit the flow of the meat freely over the retail counters of this country.

I hope Members of the Senate will use their good offices with Mr. Bowles, for whom I have the highest regard, and with Mr. McCullough especially, and see if arrangement cannot be made for meat ration points to be taken off on October 1, and if possible, sooner, because the sooner meat points are removed the better will be the distribution and the more meat will flow into the homes of this country.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I will speak for only a moment. I think the discussion has made it very clear that the only purpose of my amendment is to determine the issue between the States and the city authorities, and the presentation made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], which emphasized the rather comprehensive character of my amendment, I think he will agree, simply deals with the portions of the measure which could be calculated to create these distinct authorities in the city or some other agency.

With that statement I am quite ready for a vote at any time the Senator desires.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murdock
Andrews	Hart	Murray
Austin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Smith
Burton	Knowland	Stewart
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Carville	McCarran	Tobey
Chandler	McClellan	Tunnell
Cordon	McFarland	Vandenberg
Donnell	McKellar	Wagner
Downey	McMahon	Walsh
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Mead	Wiley
George	Millikin	Young
Gerry	Moore	
Guffey	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing en bloc to amendments, as modified, offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words. Yesterday, in a colloquy between the Senator from Maine

and myself and others, I indicated my feeling that these amendments were unwise, notwithstanding the analogies which have been drawn between this program and the construction of highways and other cooperative activities between the Federal Government and the States. I feel that any local community, any city or county, which wishes on its own to inaugurate a program for the construction of airports ought to be allowed to deal directly with the Federal Government. Otherwise I believe that we shall run the risk of upsetting programs in many progressive communities which are able and willing to assume the responsibility of inaugurating these programs and carrying them out.

I shall not go into the question of power involved in giving to a State agency control over the expenditure of Federal funds. It is not necessary to go into that question. It seems to me that in connection with many of what might be called the urban sections of the country, the term "urban" does not necessarily mean building an airport in a city. The difference between class 1, class 2, and class 3 airports, and class 4 and class 5 airports, does not depend upon the size of the community. It depends upon the size of the airports.

Up to the present time many city councils, city administrations, and county administrations have taken the initiative in inaugurating the construction of airports to link up with interstate systems of air transportation. They ought to be permitted to deal directly with the aeronautical authorities of the Government of the United States. They ought not to be required to go through the State authorities.

For that reason, Mr. President, I feel compelled to vote against the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine. I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], which has been agreed to, whether it was offered as a compromise between the two theories or for any other reason, adequately deals with the problem, and leaves the great urban centers and the great independent agencies free to deal with the aeronautical authorities of the Federal Government, free from any repression, influence, or arbitrary determination on the part of State authorities as to whether or not they shall have airports.

For that reason I feel compelled to vote against the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments, as modified, offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State. I am advised that if present the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" on this question.

I further announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. If present, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who would vote "yea" if present, and who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are necessarily absent. Both of these Senators would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—40

Austin	Gerry	O'Daniel
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hart	Reed
Brewster	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hayden	Smith
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Taft
Buck	Hoey	Tobey
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Walsh
Capper	Knowland	Wherry
Carville	La Follette	White
Chandler	McClellan	Wiley
Cordon	Millikin	Young
Donnell	Moore	
Fulbright	Morse	

NAYS—33

Aiken	Hill	Murdock
Andrews	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Ball	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Lucas	Revercomb
Burton	McCarran	Robertson
Downey	McFarland	Russell
Ellender	McKellar	Stewart
Ferguson	McMahon	Taylor
George	Magnuson	Tunnell
Guffey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Hatch	Mead	Wagner

NOT VOTING—23

Bankhead	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Green	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Mitchell	Tydings
Capehart	Myers	Wheeler
Chavez	Overton	Willis
Connally	Pepper	Wilson
Eastland	Shipstead	

So Mr. BREWSTER's amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote just taken.

Mr. REED. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 33 of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair requests the Senator to defer his amendment for a moment. Under the agreement there was another amendment, namely, on page 49, beginning with the word "Among", in line 5, to strike out down through and including line 8 on page 50 and to renumber the succeeding sections. The present occupant of the chair understands that while he was absent awhile ago it was agreed that that amendment should be next considered.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, is that the amendment dealing with the right of Federal condemnation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. BREWSTER. That matter has been rather fully discussed. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that it is not of great consequence one way or the other, so I shall not request a record vote. I simply ask for a vote on the question whether to give the Federal Government the right of condemnation in connection with these airports.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not prevail, because this method of making sure that either the State or a municipal agency may have suitable ground on which to construct an airport has been worked out so that only on request of a State can the Federal Government proceed in condemnation. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine to the committee amendment on page 49, in line 5.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Maine whether his amendment proposes to take away or deny the power of the Federal Government to condemn.

Mr. BREWSTER. The bill as reported by the committee includes the power of condemnation for the Federal authority, on the request of the State or other local agency. My amendment would strike out that provision, so that such additional authority would not be cre-

ated. My amendment would leave the full power of condemnation with the States, where it now resides.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I recall, under the Federal-aid highway legislation, provision is made that the States shall furnish the rights-of-way.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under that program the responsibility rests upon the States to procure the rights-of-way before Federal aid is available. I simply express my own view when I say that I think we should follow that same policy in connection with this legislation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe that is a sound principle.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maine or the Senator from Nevada whether there is any provision in the bill as reported by the committee which would require a State to furnish the rights-of-way or the property upon which an airport would be constructed.

Mr. BREWSTER. The bill so provides.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill makes that provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. It provides that the land must be furnished by either the State or the local authority; does it?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine to the committee amendment on page 49 in line 5. [Putting the question.]

The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I offer an amendment on page 33 of the bill, in line 16, after the word "first", to strike out "postwar"; after the words "year" and before the comma, to insert "following the enactment of this act"; and in line 17, after the word "successive", to strike out "postwar." The language would then read:

> For the purpose of carrying out the Federal-aid airport program authorized by the act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $100,000,000 for the first fiscal year following the enactment of this act, and $100,000,000 for each of the four successive fiscal years thereafter—

And so forth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I always hesitate to disagree with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], particularly in connection with a matter on which he lays so much stress as he does with respect to the bill under consideration. I shall vote against the pending bill for two reasons: First, it represents an unsound policy. The aviation industry, carried on largely by private capital, is already heavily subsidized. It is a competing form of transportation. This bill would increase the subsidy already paid for carrying on one of the competing forms of public transportation. Mr. President, the Congress should not support such a measure. It is not fair; it is not good policy, and it ought not to be done.

Secondly, sooner or later we must stop spending money in such amounts as $500,000,000. The only thing that keeps this Nation from becoming known as a bankrupt nation is the confidence which our people and the peoples of the remainder of the world generally have that somehow we will pull through. There is no one who can blueprint any method or policy by which we can take care of our enormous public debt and keep our Government running even without trying to find some way by which to pay off the debt. In the name of Almighty God and sound public policy we should stop this spending, and the way to stop spending is to begin now. Following the Civil War a question arose to as to whether specie payments should be resumed. Uncle John Sherman, the then Secretary of the Treasury, said, "The way to resume is to resume." He was correct. The way to stop spending money is to stop spending it except when the purpose of the spending is definitely necessary to the general public interest. The present proposal does not fall within that category.

An attempt has been made to compare the building of airports with the building of highways. No two things could be further apart than the program for building highways and a program for building airports. In the first place, it is true, as the Senator from Kentucky said yesterday, the Federal Government started its participation in highway building before it started collecting a tax on the sale of gasoline. But the fact is that in recent years the Federal Government has collected more money from the excise taxes imposed upon users of the highways than has been used for Federal aid in connection with highway systems. That is not true in connection with aviation. Here the beneficiaries pay nothing. All the people of the United States use the highways. An insignificant fraction of them uses aviation. There is every reason in the world why a national highway system is of vital necessity to the interests of the people generally in this country. That is not so in the case of aviation. As a matter of fact, aviation is being developed very largely—I am referring to aviation that is not military in characted—by private companies for profit. They are making a profit. The Senator from Nevada, in preparing the bill, could have made the proposal a self-liquidating one. If he had done so I should be delighted to vote for it. If the proposed expenditure were to be paid back as the airports come into use, by the people who use them and make a profit from them, doubtless the proposal could be made self-liquidating.

So, Mr. President, while quite definitely in the minority, I want to make my record not only upon this bill, but upon every bill of a similar character which may come before the Senate while our National Treasury is bankrupt. I shall vote against such bills unless there can always be shown to be an urgent need for them in the general public interest. Fearing that there may not be a roll call upon the passage of the pending bill, I want to have the RECORD show my position with respect to it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to strike out at the beginning of line 16, on page 33, "$100,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000", and at the end of line 16 to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000." So far as I know the figure "$100,000,000" was simply taken out of the air.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator have a copy of his amendment?

Mr. TAFT. I do not have a copy. My motion would simply strike out the "$100,000,000" in each instance and substitute "$75,000,000." The total expenditure would thereby be reduced from $500,000,000 to $375,000,000 for the 5 years.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. What is the necessity of providing $75,000,000 for 5 years? Why not make it $75,000,000 for 1 year, and then take another look at it the following year?

Mr. TAFT. I believe that if we are going to make a plan for public works it is wise to make it for a number of years in advance. I do not object to the 5-year period. Perhaps it is a little long, but I think that if we are going to encourage and develop a program for a system of airports—and I am in favor of doing so with some Federal assistance—it must be longer than for 1 year. I feel very strongly that we do not know what the Federal Budget is going to be, we do not know what the expenses of the Federal Government are going to be, we do not know what the taxes are going to be, and we do not know whether we are creating an additional deficit, or whether we will have money to spend. I feel that in connection with all these expenditures—and one bill after another calling for appropriations will be coming before the Senate—we should go about the matter very cautiously and very carefully. I believe that we should hold the figures down as much as we possibly can do so. I believe in the development of the air industry. The development of air transportation is one of the industries which we should encourage during the postwar period. I believe that a program along that line is justified, but I also feel that we should hold the expenditure to as reasonable a figure as possible. I could have provided in my amendment for $50,000,000, but it seems to me that $75,000,000 a year represents a substantial reduction and yet will meet the demands of the situation.

Mr. McMAHON. It seems to me that the Senator's remarks are sensible and well taken. However, I can see no good reason for providing that the expenditures be made over a period of years. I think we should provide for 1 year, and at the end of that period we could consider the matter further.

Mr. TAFT. I should be glad to have the Senator offer any amendment to my amendment he wishes to present, and I would not greatly object to supporting it, but I should like to make the statement, if I may, as to why I think there should be at least a reduction in the figure now provided by the bill.

In the first place, there is no Federal Budget today. I have here perhaps the best study that has been made by the Brookings Institution, and they show the estimates in three classes for 1949, which they consider the first postwar normal year. They estimate the minimum at $18,800,000,000 for the Federal Budget, maximum of $25,240,000,000, and a probable Federal Budget of $22,000,000,000, without any of the increases which are now being proposed, and which the Senate will have to consider.

On the other hand, the tax results, so far as they have been estimated, seem to indicate that under the present tax system, if we go into the fiscal year 1947 with the present tremendously high taxes, we are likely to raise only about $32,000,000,000 a year.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Finance, has proposed a reduction of taxes which amounts to five or six billion dollars a year, which will reduce the Federal revenue to approximately $26,000,000,000. If we proceed as we are now going without any attempt to save, we will find that we cannot hope for any further reduction in taxes if we are to meet the expenses of the Federal Government, and that is without making any payment on the national debt.

I think the Senator from Georgia hopes, as I hope, that if we make a reduction of five or six billion dollars this year, we should be able to reduce the taxes that much more next year, or the second year, and that we will then have a system which will still represent a very high tax assessment, but I think it will not be one which we cannot hope to support and still have expansion in industry.

The spending proposals which are now before the Congress I have enumerated once or twice before, and they are very substantial. We have a bill proposing $550,000,000 annually for aid to education.

We have a bill appropriating $100,000,000 for aid in financing vocational education.

We have a national food allotment stamp plan involving $500,000,000.

We have already passed a rural electrification measure calling for an expenditure of $200,000,000.

We have a bill for a Rural Telephone Administration, $50,000,000.

There is a bill to provide annual aid in the construction of hospitals, $110,000,000.

There are proposals of various kinds for further aid to States in the health programs, amounting to $600,000,000 a year.

There is a bill for school-lunch programs, proposing $100,000,000 a year.

There is a bill to aid the States in eliminating river pollution, $50,000,000 a year.

There is the bill for aid for aeronautical experiments, $50,000,000.

There is provision for additional subsidies for public housing, about $80,000,000.

We have proposals for aid to foreign governments, in the nature of loans, which may or may not be repaid. Evidently we are going to have at least $3,000,000,000 in requests from the British, in addition to all we have already provided under the Bretton Woods agreements, and the three and a half billion dollars we have provided for the Export-Import Bank.

We have various veterans' bills, the largest being one for a bonus of a thousand dollars, which will cost $13,000,000,000.

There is a bill to increase Federal salaries by proposing a 30-hour week, which will cost probably $500,000,000 a year.

The President has indicated his intention to submit an additional program for UNRRA costing $1,350,000,000.

There is $25,000,000 for the Inter-American Highway.

There is $500,000,000 a year for veterans' hospitals.

There is $500,000,000 more for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The total spending that has been proposed in Congress might easily run the Federal Budget up to $50,000,000,000 a year, and, so far as I can see, no one can devise a system of taxation which is not too burdensome which will produce more than about $25,000,000,000, and I think that would be very burdensome. Certainly, I hope we can hold the Budget fairly close to $20,000,000,000 a year. There is a big difference between $20,000,000,000 and $25,000,000,000. If the Budget shall amount to $25,000,000,000 a year, I think we will have such a burdensome system of taxation that it will actually choke enterprise and the production which will be necessary to produce the very taxes we are trying to obtain.

Therefore it seems to me that in connection with every project proposed, we should hold the program to as reasonable a figure as possible. I myself have in mind that we can provide for public works and the various social welfare plans which have been proposed by adding to all previous expenses perhaps a billion dollars, that is, in addition to the highway program of $500,000,000 a year, which is the largest part of our public-works program. I hope we can hold to that, and I believe that if we are to do it, whenever any of these meritorious projects are presented—and many of them are meritorious—we should hold them to just as low a figure as possible.

The general feeling is that we have to put people to work. I would say that, so far as the public-works program for that purpose is concerned, we should plan it. I am very hopeful that conditions in private industry are going to be such, the demand is going to be so great—the backlog of demand is now very great—that as soon as we get over the period of reconversion, we shall have one of the most prosperous periods in our history, and we do not want to set up tremendous competition on the part of the Federal Government if we are to have such prosperity. I do not believe there is any justification, from that standpoint, in providing these permanent public-works programs, which are going to take a year to get going, and which will produce work and employment at the very time when it is unnecessary any longer to do so. We might say the Nation is entirely shabby, and out of repair, and hundreds of millions of dollars can be spent on bringing the plant up to normal. I believe that is the only kind of work we can get going in the next 6 months, when we will face the only serious crisis of unemployment.

For these reasons I think when these measures are prepared, they should be prepared in the most reasonable amounts, and I hope very much that the Senate may see fit to provide in this bill $75,000,000 a year, and at least show its intention of approaching these problems from an economical standpoint.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator think that a hundred million dollars, spent over 2 years, would meet his suggestion about the necessity for intelligent planning, and yet provide sufficient funds to inaugurate the program?

Mr. TAFT. I think so.

Mr. McMAHON. What I have in mind is that, apparently, there is no field in which technological progress has been so rapid, as in the field of aviation. Within 2 years these great airports, calling for landing strips from eight to ten thousand feet long, might be obsolete, due to the fact that the present planes, giant though they are, might be replaced by rocket-propelled and jet-propelled planes, which would require only short runways. So I think it is not wise to tie ourselves up to a 5-year plan, but I suggest $100,000,000 for 2 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what would the Senator think of having a 3-year program of $75,000,000 a year, as I propose, so as to inaugurate a fairly general plan? It will really take 2 or 3 years to complete many of these projects. I am glad to accept any reasonable amendment which is in accord with the will of the Senate, but I do not want to indicate any opposition to the whole project. I think it is generally a very worthy project.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not wish to be understood as being in opposition to the project. It seems to me that $100,000,000 matched with another $100,000,000 is about all that will be available for the first 2 years. I think the 2-year period is quite sufficient. Let the sponsors of the proposal come back to us at the expiration of that time, and we can then consider what to do.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] offered his amendment I had in mind to offer an amendment reducing the amount of the annual authorization to $50,000,000 a year. I shall offer that amendment now as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, I want it understood first that I favor the general objectives of the bill. I think we all recognize that there is going to be tremendous development in the field of aviation within the next few years. I do not think the Federal Government should hesitate to take part in promoting this program, but I agree with what the Senator from Ohio has said with respect to proposals for huge Federal expenditures. We ought to approach them with caution.

If there ever was a time in America when we ought to begin to think and act in terms of economy, now is the time. For that reason, Mr. President, I believe the amount proposed in the bill as well as the amount proposed by the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio are far too large and ambitious, and do not represent a cautious approach to the problem. Certainly after having proceeded with the program for a year or two, when we have gained experience, and have had opportunity for further observation and an opportunity to determine the real need, and the response that is being given to the proposal from the different communities throughout the United States, then if the program is not adequate and if the authorization is not adequate, it will be very easy for the Congress, when it recognizes that fact, to increase the authorization from time to time. But once we commit ourselves by the passage of the proposed legislation to an authorization of $500,000,000 it will be accepted that we are going through with a program of that proportion.

Mr. President, in spite of all the anticipated development of aviation and the progress we anticipate it will make within the next few years, I seriously doubt that the country can absorb a program of this kind. If it does, there will be a $1,000,000,000 airport construction program in the Nation within 5 years' time. During the war period, through the work of the Army and the Navy, and in the general national defense program and in the war effort, we have already constructed many airports throughout the Nation. We do not know what we are going to do with some of them today. I know of one very large airport constructed in my home State in connection with a testing ground for ammunition and explosives which is located in a comparatively small community. Even if the Government turned that airport over to the city free, the community is not large enough to maintain and support it. There are a number of such situations throughout the Nation. A number of airports have been built as well as training fields. I think before we launch upon such a tremendous and so ambitious a program as this we ought to reduce the amount and proceed with caution.

Frankly, Mr. President, if I were simply setting the figure in my own mind, I think it should even be less than $50,000,000 a year, but I feel that we ought to have a program of this character. Others think the program ought to be on the basis of the figures contained in the bill as it was reported by the committee and as it is now before the Senate. I feel that $50,000,000 a year for a period of 5 years will not only be adequate, but that it will meet the needs of the country, and certainly at this time, at the very beginning of the postwar era, with so many demands being made upon the Federal Government for more money and greater spending for this purpose and that purpose, the wise thing for the Congress to do is to approach the question in a cautious and conservative manner. Let us proceed at this time on the basis of $50,000,000 a year until experience and development indicates that that program ought to be enlarged and expanded.

Mr. President, I offer my amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee amendment, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment proposed by Mr. TAFT on page 33, line 16, it is proposed to strike out $75,000,000 and insert $50,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is entitled to recognition. I should like to yield to him. He has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has been on his feet longer than I have.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from Vermont if he will permit me to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The Navy Department has called my attention to certain principles it would like to have incorporated in this bill. I have conferred with the Senator from Nevada and he thinks they are already embodied in the bill, and I am inclined to agree with him, but I should like, for the sake of the record, that he make an affirmative statement.

The Navy Department requests that the following principles be incorporated in the bill:

(a) All airports developed or improved with Government funds should be available at all times on a limited basis for use by Government aircraft in common with others without charge.

(b) The Government should have the right to full and unrestricted possession and control of such airports during the period of any national emergency.

I understand the Senator has stated that though the language is not the same as that suggested by the Navy Department, these principles are within the scope of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator that I drew the Senator's attention to the language of the bill and I am certain that the principles he calls attention to are adequately covered by the language of the bill.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I have listened attentively to the answer given by the Senator from Nevada to the question asked him by the Senator from Massachusetts. I cannot find in the bill any language which covers the postwar use of the surplus Army and Navy fields which the Army and Navy will shortly turn over to the Surplus Property Board. I find nothing in the bill to protect the Government's use in the national emergency of the hundreds and hundreds of fields involved. I would appreciate being referred by the Senator from Nevada to that portion of the bill which he thinks protects the Federal Government's right in the postwar use of these fields after they are turned back to the Surplus Property Board.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the bill protect the Federal Government in the use of the fields after they are turned back? Is that the question?

Mr. McMAHON. That is the question. I understand that the Senator from Massachusetts is concerned about the right of the Government to use, during some future national emergency, fields which we have constructed at an expense of hundreds of millions of dollars. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that there may be such a provision in the bill, but I have not found it.

Mr. McCARRAN. That was not the question of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. The inquiry which I made was not in reference to airfields which become surplus property, but airfields which are operated, controlled, and developed as a result of the proposed legislation. The Navy Department has not called my attention to what control it should have, and what rights it should have over airfields which become surplus property.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator believe that that would be a very proper subject for treatment in this bill?

Mr. WALSH. I am inclined to agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that if an airport is turned over as surplus property to a municipality or State, it can be turned over with any conditions which may be imposed by the conveying agency. In other words, if the Navy has an airport which it considers surplus, and wishes to turn over to a State, it can turn it over with any condition it may impose as to return for future use.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator that there is no legislative guide or direction on the books, either in the Surplus Property Act or in this bill, setting forth the conditions under which cities and States shall use these airports, subject to use by the National Government.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is nothing which requires the Army or the Navy to turn over the airports, either.

Mr. McMAHON. I know that they are going to turn them over.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know that.

Mr. McMAHON. I happen to know it, and I think that situation should be taken care of.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator may know it, but the Congress does not know it.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator can learn the facts from the same source from which I learned them.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Connecticut has raised a very important question, and I should like to contribute this thought: Recognizing this situation, during August we called a conference in Maine with the Federal authorities concerned, including the highest representatives of both the Army and the Navy. We asked this specific question: Since we have five class 5 airports in Maine, built almost entirely by Federal funds, some of which airports the Government was preparing to abandon, we wanted to know what the situation was going to be.

I can say that the War and Navy Departments themselves are entirely unclear as to how the problem should be handled. I believe that it is a matter of the highest importance, on which there should be a declaration of Federal policy by the Congress. I hope the Senator from Connecticut will address himself to the question and perhaps propose an amendment or legislation dealing with the question. I can assure him that every State in the Union will face the same situation.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator from Maine that I now have an amendment on the desk, which I should like to call up for discussion, which would take care of this problem, if this is the proper time to take it up.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not yield for the consideration of an amendment at this time.

I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and any other amendment which would cripple the airport expansion program of the United States will be defeated. At this time I believe that we should look ahead, and not backward. We should realize the situation in which the country finds itself at the present time. We must realize that we have a national debt of almost $300,000,000,000. In order to take care of that debt and maintain the value of the bonds which the people of the country have bought, we must have a tremendous expansion of our national economy and business. We cannot have such an expansion unless we have a great expansion of our transportation systems of all kinds.

It has been said that no study has been given to this question, and that the amount of $100,000,000 is purely arbitrary. As I understand, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has made a thorough study. It has determined upon the program which is necessary adequately to service the United States with airports.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. To emphasize what the Senator is saying, let me say that the Civil Aeronautics Administration set up a program of $625,000,000 over a period of 10 years. We thought differently in the committee, and set up a program of $100,000,000 for 5 years. The House is now working on a bill which carries a larger sum.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that if this sum is not sufficient, it will be increased by the House or in conference.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment to take up a bill?

Mr. AIKEN. No; because I expect to take only a few minutes longer. If the Senator from Texas does not mind, I am sure that I shall take less time than he would take, because I am almost through with what I have to say. I do not wish to be discourteous, but I shall consume only a few minutes more, and I know that any bill which might be taken up would consume more time than that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to leave the Chamber to attend a meeting of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. AIKEN. The sum of $100,000,000 has been determined upon by the committee, and I assume that the committee made a thorough study before it made its recommendation. This is no time for us to go along with those interests which advocate a policy of scarcity, because that will not suffice to keep our country on a sound basis in the future.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] stated that the expenditures on airports were all outgo, with no income. If I am correctly informed, Mr. President, approximately 25 years ago the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who is now President pro tempore of the Senate, secured the inauguration of the air-mail system in the United States. At the time he promoted it he was subject to ridicule and was joked about because he saw a future in the air-mail system. However, during the past year the air-mail service of the United States made a profit of about $25,000,000 for our Government, or 25 percent of the annual amount which is asked for an airport expansion program. It is entirely conceivable that if this airport expansion program were put through and the air-mail rates should remain as they are now the profit on the air-mail business alone would pay the entire cost of this construction program. I feel that the expenditure of $100,000,000 would not be an expense to the United States, but would be a sound investment, which would yield very beneficial returns to our country. I hope that any amendment which would cripple the airport expansion program of the United States will be rejected.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not mean to interrupt the Senator again, but I thank him just the same.

Mr. AIKEN. I am practically through.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS AS REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1365. The bill has been unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1365) to amend section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act to permit the appointment of supervising conciliation commissioners as referees in bankruptcy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, under the present law commissioners appointed under the Lemke Farm Adjustment Act cannot be appointed as referees in bankruptcy. A person may not be appointed as a referee in bankruptcy if he holds any office under the United States or any State, with the exception of certain specific offices. Notaries public and certain others are exempted. This bill would simply include among the exemptions supervising conciliation commissioners. A certain judge in my State wishes to appoint as a referee in bankruptcy a friend of mine who is an adjuster of the Farm Security Administration, and he cannot do so under the law. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is a member of the Judiciary Committee. He knows all about this subject. He has had some experience with it, and he strongly favors the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I heartily support the bill, and I hope that my colleagues will also support it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, was the bill unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. CONNALLY. The bill was unanimously reported favorably.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I did not hear all the remarks of the Senator from Texas; but is the proposed legislation inspired by a desire to take care of a specific situation in Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; but the language is general.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator believe that the general value is sufficient to justify the passage of the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. It would apply to the Senator from New Hampshire as well as to anyone else.

Mr. TOBEY. With that understanding and interpretation, I will say "amen."

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from New Hampshire can find time, amid his onerous duties, to be consulted, this bill will apply to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That clause (2) of section 35 (relating to qualifications of referees) of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended (52 Stat. 857; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 11, sec. 63), is amended to read as follows: "(2) not holding any office of profit or emolument under the laws of the United States or of any State other than commissioners of deeds, justices of the peace, masters in chancery, notaries public, or supervising conciliation commissioners."

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, referring to the remarks of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I wish to suggest another reason why we should be economical in the matter of granting aid to cities. I read from the New York Times' account of the Idlewild airport

proposal. It says that the cost of the field and the central terminal building will be $90,000,000, while an additional $70,000,000 will be spent for hangars, shop facilities, and a 3-mile-long, two-story arcade enclosing the terminal area. I read from a further portion of the article:

> The comptroller expressed the hope that the leases for airport space would be ready to sign in about 10 days, so that they could be presented to the board of estimate and advertised for a public hearing. The board will receive a report outlining the financial prospects of the airport. Mr. McGoldrick declared his complete confidence that the airport would be "a financially sound, self-supporting investment."

Under this bill, although New York will spend $90,000,000 on this airport, we would put up $45,000,000, and they would get their airport for almost nothing; on their $45,000,000 investment they would get twice as much return as they were going to get on the $90,000,000 investment.

So, by reason of the facts cited by the Senator from Vermont, namely, that air traffic is profitable and is increasing, it seems to me that many of these airports will be self-supporting. If the Federal Government makes a hand-out of half the money, the city or State will get the airport for next to nothing. Probably that is not true of many of the small airports, but certainly it is true of many of the large ones.

Furthermore, if the States get all the money from the Federal Government, they will build shops and concession buildings as large as they possibly can, and one-half the cost will be at the expense of the Federal Government, as I read the bill. So it seems to me there is room for economy in the dispensation of Federal funds.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly the Senator does not intend to make the statement that the Federal Government is going into the construction of buildings of the kind he has mentioned, because it is expressly provided in the bill and in every other bill about which I have ever known anything that all such buildings are to be erected by the municipality.

Mr. TAFT. The bill says it shall include the administrative buildings, including the construction of airport administration buildings, but it shall not include hangars.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. But from the fact that the hangars are expressly excluded, I assume that "administrative buildings" covers the ordinary buildings into which people would go, such as the main building at the Washington Airport or any other similar building. That covers the building where tickets are sold and where people buy reading matter, and so forth.

If the Senator wishes to exclude that, that would meet my objection; but I do not understand that the provisions presently proposed do exclude it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course, the administrative building is provided for, but the hangars and other buildings mentioned in the article the Senator has read are not included.

Mr. TAFT. I myself am rather astonished to find that Mr. McGoldrick, the comptroller of New York City, says that this airport, in which the city of New York without any encouragement or aid from us is spending $90,000,000, is a sound, self-supporting investment. That is his statement. Certainly there should be some arrangement by which bonds would be issued or some other arrangement made so as to remove this burden from the Federal Government in the case of cities which do not need aid.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we appropriate $50,000,000 or $75,000,000 at this time, there will be nothing to prevent a future Congress from increasing the amount.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. If it appears that we have the money in the fund or can raise it by a fair system of taxation or that we are on a going basis, I certainly would not object to increasing it. But I think we should have in mind self-supporting investments before we begin to subsidize cities. However, that is another subject. I merely wish to say on this subject that I think there is a clear case for reducing the sum of $100,000,000 a year for 5 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to ask a question. I understand the amount of $100,000,000 a year for 5 years has been arrived at after a study. I understood yesterday that nearly everyone disavowed that study as being the program for the expenditure of this money. Is that study the basis for the $100,000,000 to which reference has been made?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know the basis for the $100,000,000. I assume that, like the bill, it came out of the air as a convenient round figure. I assume it to be somewhat larger than necessary.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; it did not. The bill was reported after studies were made by the Civil Aeronautics Administration and after testimony was given on the program with which the Civil Aeronautics Administration desires to have go forward.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, this matter is very important, and it is one which I believe should be decided after considerable discussion and consideration. It was before our committee for some time. It involved long study on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. I am very much afraid it is not receiving the objective thought which it requires.

I do not believe any of us, no matter how enthusiastic we may be, are able to raise our sights high enough to see the aviation activity which will exist in this country 1 year, 2 years, 5 years, or 10 years hence. We are looking at the subject in very much the same light, perhaps, as that in which we looked into the question of highways and waterways. But here is a brand new industry. If I were to give reasonable figures for the appropriations necessary and needed for the airports which we should have in the next 5 years, I think my figures would be dwarfed by those which would be found necessary as a result of our experience in the next 5 years.

Mr. President, 3,000,000 of our boys in the armed forces will come home to us air-minded. They will continue their interest in aviation. Three million workers were employed in the aviation plants in the United States, and they are air-minded. In any State of the Union any sizable community which finds itself without an airport will be an unfortunate community. Every community in the United States should immediately plan for the construction of a county-wide airport. The States should have supplemental programs.

Within 10 years we shall have in this country 500,000 airplanes flying the skies. Fifty thousand of them will be in the State of New York. From now on we shall be behind in the construction of airports.

It may be said that technological changes will occur. If we look to the experiences of the immediate past, those technological changes will require larger and more airports. If perchance the technological changes require smaller or fewer airports—although I do not believe that can happen—we can, as has been said half a dozen times during this debate, modify the law, amend the law, or enlarge the law in succeeding sessions of the Congress.

But, Mr. President, there are other considerations which should enter into this discussion. First of all, we are on the eve of a great expansion of aviation. Secondly, facilities for the expansion of aviation are a real investment in security. We are the leader in the aviation world today, but will not remain the leader unless we take the necessary steps. Let us remain the leader. Furthermore, millions of our boys are going to look to aviation for employment when they return from the war. We already have a mounting army of unemployed, and the best statistics which we are able to gather from the most reliable sources tell us that there will be 8,000,000 men out of work by Christmas.

Mr. President, this is the soundest program which is before the Senate at this particular time. It is better than any of the work programs of the past few years, and it should recommend itself because it will provide work for the unemployed in an activity which will pay dividends.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] brought up the question of the Idlewild Airport, and the fact that it is a sound investment. That is true. It may be that there are not many airports in the country which are so attractive and so large in the number of airplanes they can accommodate as is the great New York airport, but there will be hundreds of such airports in the immediate years ahead, and there will be a great need for them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if we appropriate $100,000,000 a year for the next 5 years, only such part of the $100,000,000 will be spent as the States and communities are willing to match, and no State or community will put up half the

money necessary to build airports unless the airports are needed in those States and communities. If they are needed we should not by any means deprive those communities of the airports which they need and which are absolutely necessary to an expansion of industry and commerce in those localities. If the money is not needed, as the Senator from Arkansas and as the Senator from Ohio have implied, then the money will not be spent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to offer one other thought in conformity with that of the Senator from Vermont. This bill is only an authorization.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. The matter comes back to Congress this year for an appropriation. Congress may cut the appropriation down if it sees fit to do so.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. This bill is an authorization. If the authorization is insufficient, it can be enlarged. If it is too large, it can be reduced.

Mr. President, when the construction of the LaGuardia Airport was completed it was then considered to be the largest in the world. It was hardly put to use before it was so busy that immediate plans had to be drafted for the construction of another airport. That shows how rapidly the aviation industry is developing.

I believe that we shall be amazed at the growth of this industry during the postwar period. The revenue which will be derived as a result of the commerce developed and the taxes which will be collected as a result of the growth of this industry, will dwarf, in my opinion, the appropriation which we are discussing today. We need the authorization provided in this bill. I am sorry the bill is not more liberal in its treatment of the cities, because it was the cities of the United States which pioneered in the building of airports. Above all, we need the proposed law. It will fit admirably into the postwar picture. We have delayed the adoption of such a measure altogether too long. Recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration have been well studied, and every sizable community in the United States will not only want an airport, but will need one in order to maintain its economic prestige.

So, Mr. President, from the standpoint of security, from the standpoint of the necessity to meet demands, and from the standpoint of the work and opportunity which will be afforded by the enactment of this measure, I hope that it will be passed, and that it will be sent to conference. If during the next session of Congress, or the session following, we feel that we did not raise our sights high enough, or that we raised them too high, we can meet the situation in whatever way we believe to be best. But the planning of the preparation for the construction of airports, and doing the preliminary work in connection with their construction, should be a 5-year program, and I hope the program as contained in the pending bill will remain in the bill when it leaves this Chamber.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, at the present time there is being held a special meeting of the Committee on Finance. I observe that nearly all the members of the committee, excepting myself, are in attendance at the committee meeting. This afternoon we have a very important matter to consider. I hope, although I will not press for it, that further consideration of the bill may go over until tomorrow. I will not press for it if the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who is in charge of the bill, wishes to continue consideration of the bill to a conclusion today.

Mr. McCARRAN. I had hoped that the bill would go to a vote this afternoon and be disposed of. However, if there are Members of the Senate who cannot be here who would like to have further consideration of the bill go over until tomorrow, I shall not oppose such action.

Mr. BAILEY. I can accommodate myself to the situation by talking only 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the request of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], because I am under the same embarrassment as he is, and hope to attend the meeting of the Finance Committee in order to consider a matter for which we were primarily called back from vacation.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection, and, after holding an executive session further consideration of the bill may go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the understanding that the Senate is now to recess until tomorrow?

Mr. McCARRAN. The plan is to hold an executive session after which the Senate will recess until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry nominations of persons for promotion or appointment in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the legislative clerk will proceed to call the Executive Calendar.

TREATIES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read Executive D (79th Cong., 1st sess.).

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may the treaties on the calendar go over?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the treaties will go over, and the legislative clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claud N. Sapp to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oscar Henry Doyle to be United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfeld to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel and Chief of Naval Personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Archie F. Howard to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That completes the calendar.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

RECESS

Mr. McCARRAN. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 12, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 11 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

Civil Engineer Lewis B. Combs to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 20th day of July 1942.

Admiral Samuel M. Robinson, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 27th day of August 1945.

Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of September 1945.

Rear Adm. Cato D. Glover, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of December 1943.

Rear Adm. Austin K. Doyle, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of December 1943.

Rear Adm. Thomas G. W. Settle, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving on special duty with the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 10th day of August 1945.

Rear Adm. Milton E. Miles, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval group, China, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 13th day of August 1945.

Commodore Oscar Smith, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to the commander in chief, United States Atlantic Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 12th day of April 1943.

Commodore Benjamin V. McCandlish, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commandant of a naval operating base, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 17th day of September 1943.

Commodore Gordon Rowe, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval operating base, Midway, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 24th day of April 1944.

Commodore Elliott B. Nixon, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier, and commandant, Tenth Naval District, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 3d day of April 1945.

Commodore James K. Vardaman, Jr., United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as naval aide to the President, to rank from the 9th day of August 1945.

Commodore William S. Parsons, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving with the atomic bomb project, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 10th day of August 1945.

Commodore William W. Behrens, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval training center, Bainbridge, Md., and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 22d day of August 1945.

Commodore Mark L. Hersey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval operating base, Manila Subic, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 24th day of August 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 11 (legislative day of September 10), 1945.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Claud N. Sapp to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

Oscar Henry Doyle to be United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel and Chief of Naval Personnel, for a term of 4 years, effective from September 15, 1945.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Archie F. Howard to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from July 26, 1945.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Christ, the revelation of eternal love and the Saviour of the world, be Thou our personal ideal; sweeten gladness with gratitude and every grief with comfort. We would be guided by Thy spirit—toiling for the good of our fellows, using our influence and our knowledge to soften sorrows, lift the burdens, and hasten the day when contentment and good will shall be among us as an everlasting light. We plead for inward vision that will smooth exhausting difficulty and give to aspiration mastery, progress, and success. Today, give wisdom and direction to the Congress. May it prescribe sovereign remedies that will touch the vitals of the Nation with the largest and the most promising future. Almighty God, be Thou the supreme will in the current of our history, and be the power behind the purpose that sweeps us on as a great people to a glorious destiny. In the name of the Teacher of man, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial that appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass.

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech by Senator TYDINGS, also an editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, and also to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the New York Daily Mirror of Friday, July 27, 1945.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several letters.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal entitled "A $25 Maximum for Jobless Pay" and to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal entitled "The Full Employment Bill."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one an article in reference to veterans' hospitals.

Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include letters in each.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the creation of an information service in the State Department.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a resolution in each.

WHERE IS THE MONEY COMING FROM?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am not from Missouri; I am from Pennsylvania. You will have to show me. When we consider the various points recommended by the President in his message to the Congress concerning jobless pay, minimum wages, great agricultural payments, larger congressional pay, and a whole lot more that are going to require enormous sums of money, I want to know where you are going to get the money; when is he going to reduce taxes and still do all of these things; I just do not think it makes sense. He never mentioned that we should have a balanced Budget. I ask the question, Why?

Someone other than Members of Congress should give a definition or explanation of how you are going to fulfill such promises. Certainly it is going to take something else than the remarks that we hear coming from those from Missouri, so you will have to show me.

Why such spending? Why not balance the Budget? Then we can reduce taxes. Then we can get a solvent Government. Oh! I warn the Congress, let us get some sound business administration or else our Nation will suffer with a national debt of over $260,000,000,000. We must economize. We must not spend, spend, spend, elect, elect, elect. If we do we will perish, perish, perish.

MILITARY PROBLEMS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the country being deeply concerned and, in some sections, angrily aroused at the cumbersome regulations proposed by the military for the release of the men drafted for military purposes.

The Selective Service Act was passed by Congress to raise an Army to fight this war. The war is now over. The military should not be permitted to use the Selective Service Act as an instrument to force compulsory military training upon this country.

The draft age was lowered from 20 to 18 in order to get sufficient manpower to fight the war. It is a fallacy to say they are needed to win the peace.

The army of occupation should be made up of mature, seasoned men. It is a job for a policeman and not for teen-age youngsters. They should be in school.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress should insist and pass legislation which would end the operation of the Selective Service Act and, as of November 1, declare hostilities and the War Power Act terminated. Every soldier who was drafted to defend America in this crisis shall have the right to be discharged by May 1, 1946.

This Congress should insist that all military personnel who have had 2 years' service in the armed forces shall have the right to be dismissed within the next 6 months.

All liberated American prisoners of war should have the right to secure immediate discharge from the military services.

The Military Affairs Committee should prepare an enlistment incentive program that will provide the forces necessary for occupation by voluntary methods.

Bills have been introduced in Congress to carry out the recommendations I have just made. Unless these bills are given immediate consideration, I shall enter a petition to your desk, which when signed by sufficient Members of Congress, will force consideration of bills dealing with selective service, discharge from the Army, liberation of war prisoners, and voluntary enlistment program.

These things, Mr. Speaker, are uppermost in the minds of the people in this country. They need and demand immediate attention.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, no one is more anxious than I am to have the boys and the girls discharged from the Army and the Navy as soon as possible. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the proper officials of the Army and the Navy and the State Department could appear not only before the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs, but before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and tell us why the men should be kept in. We are taking up the investigation of Pearl Harbor. Neither the Congress nor the House was kept informed of conditions before Pearl Harbor. Certainly none of us here wants a single man or woman let out too soon or kept in the armed services longer than is necessary. The public should be told the truth. The public cannot be blamed if it is not kept informed.

QUOTA RESTRICTIONS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week, the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee charged that OPA and the Department of Agriculture had failed utterly to carry out the will of Congress providing for the removal of quotas on small slaughterers.

The committee disclosed that quotas had been removed from only 138 slaughterers while more than 15,000 were still restricted by OPA.

As a result of these disclosures the Department of Agriculture met with OPA on Thursday and on Saturday, the quotas were abolished.

Beef is now moving in great quantities from the slaughtering houses of the country but is piling up in the groceries and butcher shops because consumers do not have red points with which to purchase it. It is the butter story over and over again. This situation is serious and can and should be eliminated immediately.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

RATIONING OF BUTTER

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to compliment the OPA and the War Food Administration for removing as many controls as they have up to date, but supplementing the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio, may I say that the present situation with respect to butter is perfectly absurd. There is no reason in the world why the housewives of America should be compelled further to pay ration points for butter. All controls over the sale and distribution of cream have been removed. The people can buy all the cream they want and make their own butter. There are no ration points involved. But when that same butter is made in a creamery and offered for sale to the people of America, they are compelled to pay ration points. The ration points on butter should be removed immediately in order to remove this ridiculous situation from the rationing program.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have, as have other Members of Congress, been giving some thought and study toward the best practical use and control of the atomic bomb, which by the grace of God was first developed by us instead of our ruthless enemy.

On the morning of July 16, 1945, the most far-reaching and world-shocking experimental test occurred in the desert of Arizona. The success of the first atomic bomb tested at that time completely astounded even the scientists and others who had worked on its development.

In all history no discovery has so completely revolutionized the world. We have had many important discoveries in the past few years, that have permitted our gallant armed forces to move closer and closer to complete and total victory.

We know that when the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, completely destroying that city, it not only ended the war immediately but brought about what could very likely be a new world era.

Developing the practical use of uranium has thrust upon us grave problems which must be dealt with immediately. Because of the dangerous consequences in this discovery, of its importance to the future of the world, both in war and in peace, adequate control and regulation must be provided.

Consequently, I am proposing in a concurrent resolution that a joint committee of the Congress be created to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the use and control of the atomic bomb, to assist the Congress in dealing with the problems presented by its development.

The executive branch of the Government is giving this important subject attention, as President Truman in his message a few days ago said, as you will recall, that he would have a further report on this subject at a later date. Certainly the Congress has the responsibility to the people and the national welfare of our Nation and it seems to me that such a study is not only desirable but necessary.

I doubt if any of us yet know just what is the best approach to this subject at this time, and therefore, a joint committee of this Congress to make this study and investigation seems to me highly important. I hope this Congress in its wisdom will give immediate attention to this all-important and new discovery.

ANTHRACITE COAL

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to inform those who are interested in the work of the Solid Fuels Administration that I have already begun an investigation and a collection of information in order to ask that all authority of the Solid Fuels Administration be disbanded and terminated insofar as it affects anthracite coal. Presently oil has been taken off the ration list with all kinds of restrictions removed, but anthracite coal is still restricted on an 80 percent quota basis.

Certainly the problem of reconversion of the anthracite area will be difficult enough without the additional hardship of any kind of governmental restriction which can possibly be removed.

The consumers of anthracite coal do not want to have to be filling out all kinds of Governments forms in order to obtain the necessary coal to heat their homes in winter.

The problem of anthracite in the free, open competitive market is difficult enough without any additional burdens. I therefore request the help of each and every Member of Congress who is interested in the best interests of the anthracite-coal industry, as well as in promoting a healthy, speedy reconversion to a prosperous economy in the anthracite-coal fields, to give their help in every possible way to see that this objective might be accomplished at the earliest possible date.

With all due respect to those who have been in charge of the Solid Fuels Administration during the course of the war, I believe that the time has come for them to terminate their controls. I expect to get in touch with them directly and ask them why such controls should not be terminated forthwith.

REPEAL OF WAR TIME

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce voted today unanimously to bring out a bill to repeal war time, what we call daylight saving time. I want to see the color of the Congressman's eyes who votes against it.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am am not the wisest man in the world, but I believe I have some knowledge. As far as this atomic bomb is concerned, I do not believe the Members of Congress are competent, I do not believe they know anything about it. There are very few people who know what the atomic bomb is, what it can do, and what it would do if it were let loose. I believe that is purely an administration matter at the present time. There are many things to come up in this Congress, and I believe we should stick to the things with which we are familiar, things on which we can give good, sound advice.

We have many bills which will come up for consideration in this Congress, bills providing for reconversion from war to peace, as well as providing for the demobilization of the armed services and getting our soldiers and sailors home. We have the problem of taking care of the aged. There is the problem of housing construction so that it will not only provide housing but also provide employment. I believe we should stop talking about things we know nothing about.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include four separate statements.

SEPTEMBER 2 A LEGAL HOLDAY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to recognize September 2 as a legal holiday. That is the date proclaimed by the President of the United States as the end of the fighting in World War II. It is one of the outstanding dates of all history. It is liberty day. The sooner we in Congress recognize that day as a legal holiday, a recognition to which it is more than entitled, the more appropriate will be our action and the more it will be appreciated by the Nation.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like to have followed the gentleman from Minnesota in order to tell the House that the time I requested on tomorrow for a special order was asked for in order to talk about the problem of the atomic bomb. I am glad for what the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] said. I do not profess to know anything about the science or technology of the atomic bomb. But it has implications for the future of humankind to which no man can shut his eyes. These are clear to anyone. I certainly believe unless we handle this problem in the right way it will do us little good to try to do what we can in other fields. It seems to me it is the most tremendous question which lies presently upon the doorstep of anyone who is concerned about the future of mankind. Therefore I shall speak about it tomorrow and tell about a bill I am introducing.

FINANCING GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, some of us are wondering whether the gentleman from Minnesota in stating that Congressmen should not talk about things they do not know anything about was attempting to limit free speech. The gentleman says we should talk about things we know about or ought to know about or remain silent. I hope the gentleman will not limit himself in such a manner. I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER] will answer the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who asked where we are to get the money to finance all these various things that the President recommended. I have one answer to that question. It was given to me by a CIO official when I wrote him and asked him how we are going to get the money to pay that $25 a week, not for 26 weeks—they have jumped it up a week up in my district—but for 27 weeks, for unemployment, and he gave me a very clear answer which I wish the gentlemen of the House would take to heart. He wrote we could get this money from the same source that we got the money to finance the war. That is to say, we could borrow it. Well, that is all right too if we want to put the burden of repaying billions onto the returning veterans and their children. That is one source we can get it from. If the gentleman from Minnesota knows any other way so that the burden will not be placed on the veterans who will return I would like to have him tell us. I think it cowardly for us, in order to please the voters, to borrow billions which the returning veteran must repay with interest.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent, Judge Ad V. Coppedge.

WASHINGTON STATE

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I know a great many Members of the Congress are going to visit my State in the far West, the State of Washington, now that the war is over. I know that some Members did visit there during the recess. Washington is the State where Lieutenant General Wainwright was born. He was born in Walla Walla which is just a few miles from the Hanford project where they helped to develop the atomic

bomb. Lieutenant General Wainwright still has a sister who lives in Seattle, Mrs. Frederick Mears. I just want you to know that some great heroes have come out of the State of Washington, which State has also greatly aided the war effort by the production of ships, planes, aluminum, and a great quantity of food, and I certainly would like to be your host when you come to my State to see the place where General Wainwright was born and where the atomic bomb was developed, and besides, you will have an opportunity to do some of the greatest fishing you have ever done in your life.

The people in the State of Washington are proud that General Wainwright became one of the war's greatest heroes and they will greatly appreciate the honor that Congress has bestowed upon him by having him here as our guest.

ABOLITION OF DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to advise that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House this morning unanimously reported out a bill to return the Nation's time back to the old prewar schedule on September 30, next.

As a member of that committee, along with the gentleman from New York, Senator WADSWORTH, I opposed the passage of the bill which established war time in the first place, now I am very happy to see so many Members of the Congress coming to the mourners' bench and agreeing, along with the various agencies of the Government, that time changes should never have been made in the first place, and that we should now return to the standard-time schedule which was in effect before the war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

RETAINING HIGH RANKING MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, my office has received a mounting flood of protests over War Department policies. It is apparent that some of the high ranking military personnel are more interested in retaining their positions than in speeding demobilization. I am reliably informed that Selective Service Headquarters in Columbus, Ohio, are overwhelmed with high-ranking officers. There are more colonels and majors on the staff at Columbus than there were when inductions were at their peak. I have reason to believe that a similar situation exists in other induction areas.

The suspicion that many men are being kept in military service so that there can be justification for unnecessary personnel in the higher ranks runs through hundreds of letters coming to my office. I am calling upon the War Department now to cut down on the high-graded officers whose services are no longer necessary. Many of them have no further duties to perform and should be demobilized at once.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from General Bradley in accepting the report of Mr. Bernard Baruch regarding returning veterans.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts and letters.

BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM E. BROUGHER

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I notice that on yesterday the names of a large number of brigadier generals were sent to the Senate with the recommendation that they be promoted or that they be confirmed as major generals.

I was utterly surprised to find the name of General Brougher left out. Gen. William E. Brougher, of Mississippi, whom most of us know, was captured with General Wainwright at Bataan. He has gone through all the hell and suffering of Japanese cruelties. He is one of the outstanding men who has come back from the Orient. I can see no reason on earth why he should not have been promoted while they were promoting men who have never got outside the continental United States.

I hope President Truman will appoint General Brougher a major general at once.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, everyone present knows that in the most desperate war in human history the American Army has had the greatest leadership that has ever been known. Everyone present knows that the same men who led this Nation to a glorious victory in two wars and who built the greatest fighting machine in history are the men who are charged with the demobilization of 8,200,000 men—no small problem.

I am advised by General Anderson, Chief of the Ground Forces as the head of personnel, that he has already established within the last 10 days 37 new separation centers, and that by the end of the week he expects to have something over 100; that they are doing everything they can do to discharge the men in order and justice and without discrimination, and on the basis of equality as far as they can. We have traveled the bloody portion of the long trail to world peace. No one now knows how long the remainder of the path to peace is. I hope, therefore, that my colleagues in the future will be discreet and temperate in their remarks with respect to the Army.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS REGULATIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3644, an act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional rates of compensation or pension and remedy inequalities as to specific service-incurred disabilities in excess of total disability, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That subparagraphs (k) to (o) of paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, are hereby amended, and a new subparagraph (p) added to said paragraph II, to read as follows:

"'(k) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of pension provided in part I, paragraph II, subparagraphs (a) to (j), shall be increased by $35 per month; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subparagraphs (l) to (n), inclusive, of part I, paragraph II, as herein amended, the rate of pension shall be increased by $35 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed $300 per month.

"'(l) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of one hand and one foot, or is blind in both eyes, with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be $200.

"'(m) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of two extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be $235.

"'(n) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the antomical loss of two extremities so near the shoulder or hip as to prevent the use of a prosthetic appliance or has suffered the anatomical loss of both eyes, the monthly pension shall be $265.

"'(o) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to two or more of the rates provided in one or more of the subparagraphs (l) to (n), inclusive, of part I, paragraph II of this Regulation, no condition being considered twice in the determination, or has suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, the monthly pension shall be $300.

"'(p) In the event the disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed the requirements for any of the rates prescribed herein, the Administrator, in his discretion, may allow the next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of $300.'

"SEC. 2. Subparagraphs (k) to (o) of paragraph II, part II, Veterans Regulations No. 1 (a), as amended, are hereby amended, and a new subparagraph (p) added to said paragraph II, to read as follows:

"'(k) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of pension provided in part II, paragraph II, subparagraphs (a) to (j), shall be increased by $26.25 per month; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subparagraphs (l) to (n), inclusive, of part II, paragraph II, as herein amended, the rate of pension shall be increased by $26.25 per month for each such loss or loss of use but in no event to exceed $225 per month.

"'(l) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of one hand and one foot, or is blind in both eyes, with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be $150.

"'(m) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of two extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be $176.25.

"'(n) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss of two extremities so near the shoulder or hip as to prevent the use of a prosthetic appliance or has suffered the anatomical loss of both eyes, the monthly pension shall be $198.75.

"'(o) If the disabled person as the result of service-incurred disability has suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to two or more of the rates provided in one or more of the subparagraphs (l) to (n), inclusive, of part II, paragraph II, of this Regulation, no condition being considered twice in the determination, or has suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, the monthly pension shall be $225.

"'(p) In the event the disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed the requirements for any of the rates prescribed herein, the Administrator, in his discretion, may allow the next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of $225.'

"SEC. 3. The increased rates provided by this act shall be effective from the first day of the first month following the passage of this act, and shall be deemed to include the 15 percent increase in the rate of compensation or pension payable for service-incurred disability under section 1, Public Law 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, May 27, 1944, or Public Law 469, Seventy-eighth Congress, December 7, 1944."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this amendment is so long, and there was considerable confusion in the Chamber while it was being read, that I suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that the matter go over until we can read the amendment in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. I will explain to the gentleman the difference between the House bill and the Senate bill. This bill has already passed the House by unanimous vote, and was amended in the Senate.

Mr. KNUTSON. That does not mean anything.

Mr. RANKIN. It does mean a great deal. I think the Congress knew what it was doing.

Mr. KNUTSON. Sometimes I think so; sometimes I do not.

Mr. RANKIN. These are men who have been shot to pieces in this war, and they are badly in need of the assistance. Before the recess we brought out this bill, which was laid before the House and passed unanimously. It went over to the Senate. The Senate made some changes. It is true it increased most of these provisions. If the gentleman will give me time, I will explain them in detail, and I am sure the House will be glad to know the situation and the Members will all go along. The gentleman from Minnesota will go along with us, too, I am sure.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have no disposition to shut the gentleman off from explaining the bill. At least that would be helpful.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I want to remind the gentleman that this has the approval of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration. They all heartily endorse it.

Mr. RANKIN. It has the approval of the administration, the Budget, and the Veterans' Administration. The bill that passed the House had the unanimous approval of the members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. The bill went to the Senate where it was amended by making some slight changes increasing the compensation of these boys who have lost two arms or two legs or one arm and one leg or both eyes or one eye and one limb and sent it back here. The bill passed the Senate unanimously, and if you will give me time to explain these changes I doubt if there will be any objection to the bill whatsoever.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This is the bill that came out of the committee known as the double-amputee bill and applies to veterans who have lost two limbs or one limb and an eye.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. All the Senate did in the amendment was increase the amount a few dollars in some instances that will be paid to these double amputees over what we had in the bill when it passed the House.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. KNUTSON. The amount is increased how much?

Mr. RANKIN. I shall be glad to show the gentleman the amount of the increases.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that the bill passed the World War Veterans' Committee at a lower amount than was recommended by the Veterans' Administration, because it was the last day that the House was sitting; otherwise the committee would have reported out unanimously the bill the Senate passed which is now before us. I tried to secure the passage of a bill I introduced similar to the Senate bill, but which provided also for $20 increase in compensation for single amputees. I introduced a bill yesterday which I hope will soon pass which grants $20 a month increase in compensation to single amputees. It is very little to do for these veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. These are men for whom the war will never close. If you doubt that, just catch a taxicab and go out to Walter Reed Hospital and go through it. Yes, and some of you might go to Mount Alto or St. Elizabeths and find some of these disabled victims of this war.

The first paragraph, subparagraph (k) makes only one change where we provide in subparagraph (o). It ends at subparagraph (n) and leaves a maximum of $300, just where it was in the original bill.

The next paragraph, subparagraph (l) provides that—

(l) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of one hand and one foot, or is blind in both eyes, with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be $200.

The House bill provided, as the lady from Massachusetts said, for $165, because we took the minimum bill before us in order that we might not have any considerable row on the floor of the House, because there was not a quorum of the House present at that time. So that has been increased from $165 to $200 a month.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, does this apply to the veterans of all wars?

Mr. RANKIN. This is for the veterans of this war.

Mr. KNUTSON. What do the veterans of World War I get who are similarly situated?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It will give them the same amount, may I say to the gentleman. It gives the veterans of World War I the same amount.

Mr. RANKIN. It is an amendment to the present law. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota, that puts them all on a parity.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have no desire to deprive these unfortunates of everything that they need, but I do think that we should go at these matters in a practical manner.

Mr. RANKIN. I think we have done that, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota. I am sure, as he said, that he is in favor of giving these disabled men what they are entitled to. But we went into this matter in committee, went into it carefully, and while the Senate has made some increases, under the circumstances we feel that these increases are justified.

Mr. KNUTSON. How many does it involve?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not sure of the number, but the load is still coming in. Probably we will have men coming out of these Japanese camps who have lost feet and hands and eyes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that there are not more than 12,000 involved.

Mr. RANKIN. I am sure there are not more than that number involved.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say here that the reason we have not done more before is because there are so few of them.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right, and there were very few in the last war, in comparison with the number coming out of this conflict.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the gentleman's statement he referred to the individual who was bedridden or needed some assistance.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is that the individual who has had an amputation, or does that refer to anyone, for instance, physically or mentally incapacitated, so that he would be bedridden?

Mr. RANKIN. It applies to one "who has suffered the anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of one hand and one foot, or is blind in both eyes, with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As a result of disability?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; service-connected disability. These are all service connected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, the gentleman knows that there are individuals who are injured mentally from the war just the same as these men are injured physically.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications:

TRENTON, N. J., *August 27, 1945.*

Hon. SAMUEL RAYBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: You will find enclosed a copy of a letter, dated August 27, which I have forwarded to Governor Edge, resigning from the House of Representatives as of Thursday, August 30, noon.

As you know, the Governor has appointed me a member of the Public Utility Commission of the State of New Jersey and I am qualifying Thursday afternoon.

I just want to take this opportunity to thank you for all your helpfulness and kindness during my 13 years in Washington. No Speaker within my memory has ever done a more patriotic and outstanding job than you. You have the love, affection, and respect of every Member of the House, regardless of their political affiliations.

I hope, when you are in the vicinity of Trenton, you will drop in on me. I should be more than happy if you would partake of some of our New Jersey hospitality.

With warm, personal regards, I am

Very sincerely yours,

D. LANE POWERS.

TRENTON, N. J., *August 27, 1945.*

Hon. WALTER E. EDGE,
Governor of New Jersey,
State House, Trenton, N. J.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: I hereby submit my resignation to you as a Member of Congress representing the Fourth District of the State of New Jersey, effective at 12 noon, August 30, 1945.

Respectfully yours,

D. LANE POWERS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of an address delivered by Brigadier General ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, on the occasion of the welcoming of Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright yesterday, together with comments thereon from the Washington Post, the New York Times, and the New York Herald Tribune.

LOANS TO ENGLAND

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that negotiations are now under way wherein England is attempting to borrow from the United States the sum of $6,000,000,000. This is not a loan to relieve starving people, or suffering humanity, or to defeat a Hitler. The purpose of this exploitation of the American taxpayers is to furnish funds so that the English Government can buy the Bank of England, their mines, and their railroads.

No American official has a constitutional right to make such a loan. The already overburdened taxpayers of the United States should not be called upon to pay for the socialization of the industry of England. The Labor Party in England promised the people of England Government ownership of their bank, their mines, and their railroads, and now they want the American people to pay for it. Why should the American taxpayers have to make good the promises of any political party, let alone the political party of a foreign country?

England's debt to the United States at the present time is as follows:

Principal and interest due on old debt	$6,415,664,782.58
Lease-lend balance (estimate)	26,000,000,000.00
Total debt	32,415,664,782.58

Mr. Speaker, there are about 48,000,000 individual taxpayers in the United States. England's debt to us already amounts to $675 for each taxpayer. Is this administration going to add to this sum by $6,000,000,000?

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 142]

Abernethy	Gossett	Murray, Tenn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Graham	Murray, Wis.
	Grant, Ala.	Norrell
Anderson, Calif.	Gross	O'Brien, Ill.
	Hagen	O'Brien, Mich.
Baldwin, Md.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Halleck	Pfeifer
Barrett, Pa.	Hare	Phillips
Barry	Hart	Powell
Bennet, N. Y.	Hébert	Rabaut
Biemiller	Heffernan	Rayfiel
Bland	Hendricks	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Carnahan	Hoeven	Robertson, N. Dak.
Case, S. Dak.	Hope	Rockwell
Chapman	Horan	Roe, N. Y.
Chiperfield	Huber	Ryter
Clark	Jackson	Shafer
Clements	Jarman	Sharp
Coffee	Johnson, Ind.	Sheridan
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Luther A.	Simpson, Ill.
Colmer	Jones	Slaughter
Corbett	Jonkman	Smith, Ohio
Courtney	Judd	Snyder
Crosser	Kefauver	Somers, N. Y.
Curley	Kelly, Ill.	Starkey
Daughton, Va.	Keogh	Stefan
Dawson	Kerr	Stevenson
Delaney, James J.	King	Sumner, Ill.
	Kirwan	Thomas, Tex.
Delaney, John J.	LaFollette	Tibbott
Douglas, Ill.	Larcade	Tolan
Drewry	Lea	Vursell
Dworshak	LeFevre	Weaver
Elliott	Lynch	White
Engel, Mich.	McGregor	Wickersham
Engle, Calif.	McKenzie	Winter
Feighan	McMillen, Ill.	Wolcott
Flood	Mahon	Wolverton, N. J.
Fogarty	Mason	Woodhouse
Fuller	Merrow	Worley
Gathings	Monroney	Zimmerman
Gavin	Morgan	
Gerlach	Mott	
Gibson	Mundt	
Gorski		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 299 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the agreement reached yesterday, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint committee on the investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack, to be composed of five Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party), to be appointed by the President pro tempore, and five Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party), to be appointed by the Speaker of the House. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events and circumstances leading up to or following the attack made by Japanese armed forces upon Pearl Harbor in the Territory of Hawaii on December 7, 1941, and shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than January 3, 1946, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. The testimony of any person in the armed services, and the fact that such person testified before the joint committee herein provided for, shall not be used against him in any court proceeding, or held against him in examining his military status for credits in the service to which he belongs.

SEC. 4. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress (prior to January 3, 1946), to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later, as usual, and in accordance with the existing agreement, I shall yield 30 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman that the House has already provided for that. Under the agreement under which this resolution is being considered, we have been allotted 30 minutes of the hour of general debate.

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] controls 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] controls 30 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

You have heard the reading of the resolution, which calls for the establishment of a joint committee of the House and the Senate to make an investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster, the report of such committee to be submitted by January 3, 1946. The resolution also provides the sum of $25,000 for this important work.

Mr. Speaker, I was hopeful that after peace had been effected, at great sacrifice by millions of our men, a peace which I know is bound to inure to the best interests of humanity the world over, we in this country might take advantage of the situation and in our personal and governmental relations have peace, harmony, and cooperation in the trying days ahead. Unfortunately, in the last 10 days or 2 weeks I have read and heard from many people comments, statements, and articles satisfying me that the aim is to make a political issue out of this proposed investigation.

Personally, I have always favored the investigation, but I realize that many other men better informed than I felt that it would be unwise to conduct the investigation during the war, which investigation then would have detracted the attention of our military leaders and of the country generally, and given comfort to the enemy. But now the war is over, and I feel that the resolution providing for the investigation should be passed and that the investigation should proceed. I feel that it should be, and I hope it will be, a fair, courageous, and thorough investigation. I hope it will meet the lamentable attacks upon men who have served the Nation with distinction, honor, and unselfishly, men who have given even their lives in a great patriotic effort to serve and safeguard the future of our Nation and place the blame, if such there be, squarely on the blameworthy.

I regret exceedingly that my friends on the other side, as I am now told, will say that the proposed committee should be evenly divided, with three members of each party composing it, something that never has been done during my nearly 40 years' service in this House. I know that the country has entrusted the Democratic Party with governmental leadership four times in succession and continues to have confidence in its leaders and consequently the Democratic Party is responsible to the country. I feel that Members and Senators who will be appointed by the Speaker and the acting Vice President will be men above reproach, able, judicious, honest and fearless, who will make the kind of investigation that will elicit the truth and place the blame where it unmistakably belongs, instead of charging men like our late beloved President, our former Secretary of State, our great military leader, General Marshall, our then great naval leader, Admiral Stark, with neglect, which to my mind is manifestly unfair and unjustified. The evidence will disclose that fact beyond any doubt.

I have listened to about 15 Republicans in their 1- to 5-minute speeches and it is to be regretted that nearly all of them are seeking to detract from the achievements of our military and naval forces under the leadership of our late beloved President Franklin D. Roosevelt, our military staffs under the leadership of Generals Marshall and Eisenhower, and the naval staffs under the leadership of Admirals Stark, Nimitz, and King. It appears to me that the Republicans in their desperate effort to smear these officers are trying to leave the impression that Short and Kimmel won the war. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, if our able chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. MAY] states with confidence, as he has this very afternoon, that in the most desperate war in human history the American Army has had the greatest leadership it has ever known, that is good enough for me.

To prove that all of your attacks, harangues, charges, and insinuations are politically inspired and purely for political purposes, I venture to say that if a record vote is had on Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 none of you will dare to vote against its passage. If it is your aim to beclcud the issue of who was responsible for this war and that the American people will forget that you opposed nearly every effort of the late President Roosevelt to prepare our defenses and fortify Guam and other bases, you are mistaken.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Republicans have seen fit to call a conference of their steering committee to evolve the plan now unfolding. I do not wish to speak for them. That is their duty. But I think they again have made a mistake in trying to make it a political issue. They claim that the proposed committee, if appointed according to the usual practice, will be more or less political. But why have they called that political meeting, the meeting of the Republican steering committee? If there is any politics, it will come and has come from the Republican side. I know the Democrats have never aimed to make this a political issue. I recollect, my friends, that after World War I, the Republicans, under the leadership of the then chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and a majority of that committee defeated the aims and recommendations of President Wilson to enter the League of Nations, which mistake will require many years to live down.

I am of the opinion, and I am satisfied that the vast majority of outstanding Americans feel that such was a great mistake on the part of Senator Lodge and the Republicans, because they feel and I feel that if we had entered the League of Nations, Hitler and the Japanese war lords would never have dared to attack the entire world and subject it to ruthless dominion.

But at that time the Republicans had no real issue. They have none now, and they think they are going to make an issue out of this proposed investigation. I think, as I stated before, they again are making a mistake that will plague them evermore.

I also remember that before World War I, Kaiser Wilhelm, when he contemplated unrestricted submarine warfare, was informed by his stooges in America that America would not dare protect its rights and interests—that there was no real danger of our entering the war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Consequently, he started World War I.

In the last 5 or 6 years, again, many of the isolationists, pacifists, Roosevelt-haters, and others made Tojo and Hitler believe that this country would never dare to oppose them in grabbing control of the world and enslaving the people, not only of Europe but all the world. That misinformation of itself encouraged them, because there were many in our own midst who believed that President Roosevelt did not have the American people behind him and that if he dared to effect a proper military defense or opposed Tojo and Hitler in their mad and devilish aims there would be a revolution in this country.

Those are the facts and the record, and history will show what I am saying today is true. But we were forced into war. Unfortunately, the sneak attack occurred. Oh, it is charged that we should have been notified in time, and that we should have known. Oh, President Roosevelt knew, and he informed the country, as far back as 1935, that the country was in danger of attack. Yes, in 1935 he started to increase our Navy notwithstanding great opposition and criticism. He did everything in his power to effect a proper defense of our Nation, but, unfortunately, he was thwarted in his foresighted efforts. Frequently, when he made recommendations concerning military defense and endeavored to create adequate defenses, both land and sea, that would have precluded the enemy from obtaining the initial advantages they had, which cost us so dearly, he was thwarted. But that is water over the wheel.

Now, the question is whether this proposed investigation should be made to assess the merits and demerits of this controversy. We and the country want to know. We want the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Democrats also desire the whole truth. I hope we may have it. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, was under the impression that it might have been the best thing for a committee outside of both Houses and outside the armed forces, not connected with any political party, to make the investigation, not because we could find abler, more reliable, more patriotic men than we have in this House or the other body, but because such action would have deprived the Republicans of the opportunity of playing politics with it. In view of the fact, however, that the Senate has acted, and acted unanimously, I feel that the only thing for us to do is to approve the wise action of the Senate, approve the resolution without a great deal of debate; and I hope this will be done.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I have a short excerpt from the New York Times of September 9. I ask unanimous consent to insert this in my remarks. This article explains more thoroughly and more intelligently than I possibly can the underlying reason why this resolution should pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

PEARL HARBOR INQUIRY—OPEN, FEARLESS INVESTIGATION URGED TO GLEAN DATA OF VALUE FOR FUTURE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

UNLIMITED INQUIRY URGED

The investigation should be unlimited in scope. It must not only consider the attack upon Pearl Harbor and the events that led up to and followed it; it must investigate the whole course of American foreign policy and military policy in the prewar and initial war period, and it should determine whether or not these policies were mutually supporting. It should also consider the events in the first disastrous Philippine campaign, including the loss of our B–17's in the surprise attack upon Clark Field, and the friction that developed between Admiral Thomas C. Hart, then commander of the Asiatic Fleet, and General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. The investigation must be without fear or favor.

An investigation of such scope and sincerity is essential—not only in justice to men whose reputations already have been clouded—but because of the importance to the future of the lessons learned. Already some of the lessons of Pearl Harbor are being misread in the light of incomplete and, in some cases, misleading facts. Pearl Harbor can be not only the "date that will live in infamy," but a sign-post to a better organized Government and a more responsible citizenry—but only if its full lessons are carefully and impartially analyzed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield for a question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has stated that the Democrats want the truth about Pearl Harbor. I can tell him that the Republicans and all America are entitled to have the truth.

Mr. SABATH. I question whether the Republicans are seeking the truth. It appears to me that what they want is some publicity that they can use in the next campaign. I repeat that the Democrats are anxious to have the real truth and what the President desires is an unrestricted investigation and report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to my good genial friend from Illinois as he tried to draw the "red herring" of politics across this proposal for an investigation. I knew that he must be laboring in great difficulty to sustain his position or he would not have attempted to bring politics into what should be a nonpartisan debate.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to see the almost unanimous support for this congressional investigation. There have been two previous reviews of the Pearl Harbor disaster, but neither has been satisfactory to the American people. That fact is responsible for the overwhelming support for a congressional investigation. This investigation must not be partisan; it is too serious a subject to permit of partisanship. We must not use it either as a basis to shield or unjustly attack any individual. There is only one duty before the committee and that is to give the American people the full facts of the greatest military disaster in the history of the American Nation. That is the only purpose of this resolution.

Some person or persons not at Pearl Harbor, failed to discharge their responsibility to this great Nation. As a result we suffered a shocking and humiliating defeat. This defeat was responsible for the loss of the lives of precious American boys. It wiped out our Pacific Fleet and left us practically unprotected; it made it possible for the Japanese to extend their supremacy over vast regions; it might easily have cost us the war in the Pacific. To retake these lands because our fleets in the air and on the land were destroyed, cost the American Nation many, many more thousands of lives than would otherwise have been necessary. It cost months of toil and sacrifice. Thank God, victory came at last.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this is too serious a question to permit petty politics to intervene.

You of the Democratic Party face a grave responsibility. You have a big majority in this branch of the Congress. You can reject our appeal to make it thoroughly nonpartisan by providing equal representation. You can then later, if you wish, exclude witnesses because of that majority in the committee; you can shape the evidence which will be submitted and you can, if you dare, cover up the real truth.

I am making no accusations. I hope you will not do this, but you could do it if you so desired. But let me say that there is a mightier force than even the Congress. It is the powerful voice of public opinion.

This great voice is demanding the truth about Pearl Harbor. It wants the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Let us satisfy this demand. Let us tell the world by providing equal representation on this important committee that it is to be a genuine, nonpartisan inquiry that seeks only the truth. It is true that we have not in the past been in the habit of having committees of equal representation. Ordinarily, we have a majority representation by the party which is in control of the Congress. But this is no ordinary investigation; this is not a partisan question; it is a question of, Shall the American people know the truth? In that there should be no dividing partisan line. We should all be seeking this end.

I repeat, Congress, and particularly the Democratic Party, faces today a great responsibility to the American people. Let us not fail in this great responsibility.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, there is apparent unanimity of opinion that this investigation should be made. The shroud of mystery surrounding the several admittedly incomplete reports concerning the responsibility for the unpreparedness at Pearl Harbor, on December 7, 1941, should be lifted, and the spot-

light of publicity turned on. The American people will be satisfied with nothing less. If there is blame and culpability on the part of the Army, the Navy, the State Department, the President, or public officials, high or low, the facts should be known. No right-thinking person wants other than the truth.

During the war it was unthinkable that a public congressional investigation should be held. The judgment of the administration, the Army, and the Navy properly was adhered to concerning the airing of the Pearl Harbor disaster. The very fact that only a part of the story was given to the public makes that same public more insistent now. Possibly even a court martial during the war might have been injurious to the war effort. A congressional committee can be depended upon to use proper discretion in making public essential security information. Neither a court martial trial by the Army of General Short or by the Navy of Admiral Kimmel will furnish a proper forum to develop all the facts. The rules of evidence in either trial would confine the proof to its bearing on the guilt or innocence of either General Short or Admiral Kimmel. The investigation contemplated by this resolution will remove any such limitations. This is no time for technicalities or red tape. We have had too much of that already.

If there is to be a congressional investigation, it should be devoid of partisan politics. Therefore, there should be an equal number of the majority and the minority on the committee. The principle that the majority party should have enough votes on a legislative committee to make it possible for that committee to carry out its political promises does not obtain in this case. To insist on such political majority is to advocate that political considerations are involved. Mr. Speaker, when a jury is selected to try a case in court, it would be the height of folly and unfairness on the part of anyone to even urge that a majority of the members of the jury be selected from one political party. It is just as unreasonable to make any such claim in the setting up of this committee.

Yes, there are plenty of precedents. Not long ago on January 18, 1945—when this body created a special committee to investigate and report on the organization of the Congress, it recognized the principle, which should be invoked at this time, and the minority and the majority in Congress were given equal representation on the committee. This is as it should be, because the efficiency of the Congress should not be a political question. Republicans and Democrats alike are interested in better and more workable machinery to carry on the people's legislative business. Why, then, is a political majority demanded to investigate and report on this entirely nonpolitical subject?

It is regrettable indeed that the distinguished and lovable chairman of the Rules Committee should open this matter-of-fact debate with the charge that the resolution had its inception in politics, and that the Republicans are attempting to play politics. Remember, the chairman was the first speaker in this debate, and let us hope that his attitude and his remarks will not be pacesetters for that which is to follow.

Mr. Speaker, if there was ever an occasion when a judicial, unbiased, unprejudiced, and unselfish hearing by an investigating committee is required, it is in this instance. While it is a fact that our Democratic friends were in control in the White House, in all of the departments, and in the Congress at the time of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe, it does not necessarily or logically follow that the Congress should, therefore, create a Democrat-controlled committee to investigate this most unfortunate and deplorable occurrence. Would it not be more reasonable, and at least as fair, to follow the precedent referred to above and adopt the amendment that is to be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] giving equal political representation on this committee? I have not yet heard any plausible reason why such a bipartisan committee could not and would not be able to render a verdict and give a report to the American people that would not be tinged with party politics.

Great care should be taken in the selection of the membership of this committee, regardless of whether the majority of its members are of the controlling party or not. The American people are going to watch with a jealous eye the conduct and the findings of this new forum. Suppose that the Democratic national committee were to propose an investigation and at the same time insist that the majority of the investigators be Democrats and that a minority be Republicans. How would any such proposal be received by our people who want to get the unbiased facts? The majority party has the responsibility for legislation, and legislative committees are constituted with this thought in mind. Finding the facts in connection with the Army and the Navy, which are presumed to be in no sense political, is entirely a different matter.

This resolution will pass the House. The Martin amendment will probably not pass. However, just because the majority has the votes and the power is no reason why it should use them in this case. Better satisfaction all the way around will result from an impartial investigation, and the adoption of the Martin amendment will remove and clear up the charge that the majority, for political reasons, is insisting on controlling the committee. No harm can come from this amendment, all political suspicion will be removed, so just what is the bona fide objection? I hope it is not politics.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I favor this resolution, with the amendment which will be presented later, because I believe very deeply that the people of America and of the world are entitled to know all of the facts surrounding the attack on Pearl Harbor. It was for such reason I introduced in the House, on the day we reconvened, a concurrent resolution similar to the one now before us providing for a complete investigation of the Pearl Harbor tragedy by a joint committee of the Congress.

I feel this investigation should be conducted by a joint nonpartisan committee of the Congress, without any attempt in any way to protect, to whitewash, to shield, to smear, or to injure any individual. To the men who died at Pearl Harbor, to those who have died since, to the American people, to ourselves as a great legislative body, and certainly to history, we owe the duty and the responsibility of seeing to it that the truth about Pearl Harbor is fully established and the facts are forever fixed.

Let us hew to the line and let the chips fall where they may. Let us remember, despite the words of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that this is not a partisan issue, nor is it a political question; but it is a question which affects not only the America of the past and the America of today, but perhaps may insure that in the future America will never again suffer from a tragedy such as that which took place at Pearl Harbor.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this resolution with my vote. I trust it will pass unanimously. I hope, of course, the resolution will first be amended to provide for the appointment of a bipartisan committee so as to safeguard against any possible charge in the future that politics entered into the investigation. Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] such time as he may desire.

THE PEARL HARBOR DISASTER SHOULD BE COMPLETELY INVESTIGATED

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the resolution to provide for an investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster should be adopted. The investigation should be made by a committee from the House and Senate. It should be thorough and complete. It should be nonpolitical and must be conducted without favor of any kind to any individual or group. If there is anyone to blame for the Pearl Harbor tragedy of December 7, 1941, that blame should be placed exactly where it belongs. If there was dereliction of duty of any kind, we ought to find it out.

The Pearl Harbor tragedy is far too important to pass over lightly. Every bit of factual evidence with regard to the situation must be presented. The American people are entitled to know whether any person or any group was responsible in any way for the tragic loss of the lives of more than 3,000 American boys who were killed without warning of any kind. Somebody somewhere appears to have been responsible to have permitted the destruction of seven of our big battleships, together with other ships amounting to a total sinking of one-third of our Navy, that were huddled in Pearl Harbor without a chance of firing a single shot. Hundreds of our planes were bunched on the ground and were

destroyed without any chance for resistance on our part. The Pearl Harbor incident will go down as one of the greatest tragedies in our history.

Mr. Speaker, there have been two or three partial reports, but no complete investigation. Admiral Husband E. Kimmel and Gen. Walter C. Short, the two commanders at Pearl Harbor when the disaster occurred, have been under a cloud for more than 3 years. They have been denied the right to be heard on the grave charges announced to the public by the Roberts Commission on January 23, 1942. While the war was raging, it was pointed out, a trial of these men would need to be postponed, but now that the war has come to a victorious conclusion these men are entitled to their day in court without further delay and without prejudice in accordance with justice as provided by our Constitution.

We want an impartial investigation where no secrets or no evidence shall be kept from the American people. It must be open and aboveboard in all respects. This is not a problem of the Army or the Navy, or any individual, or even of Congress—this is a matter that is of grave importance to America. It affects the American public and the American public will demand the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Among the urgent problems facing this Congress none are more important than the determination of the responsibility for the American catastrophe at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. The American people demand the facts. It is the responsibility of this Congress to see that they get them.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire, to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with one of the gravest disasters that has ever come to any nation, when we discuss the Pearl Harbor attack and the resulting death and destruction which followed. It is now proposed that the facts incident to this strange and cruel attack be completely investigated, and that the people be given the plain and unvarnished facts which relate to that attack, and I hope this resolution will be passed and that a full, fair, courageous, and complete investigation will be made of this disgraceful incident. The people want to know all of the facts surrounding that cruel and murderous attack, and they want any person who may have been responsible therefor, or who may have been guilty of any dereliction of duty in connection therewith, to suffer the punishment commensurate with the offense so committed. The people have not forgotten Pearl Harbor, and the people will not forget Pearl Harbor. That incident is a blot and a stain upon the scroll which will endure through time and until eternity.

More than 3,000 of our fine American boys died in that attack. We lost the greater part of our Pacific fleet in that attack. Our planes and equipment were destroyed. That incident which happened on December 7, 1941, under circumstances which require a complete investigation, and a full disclosure to the people, was undoubtedly accomplished through the bungling of someone, somewhere. Who it was, no one is now prepared to announce. We do know that the fine young soldier from Pennsylvania, who was operating the listening devices, reported the approach of a large number of planes to his lieutenant, who was in command at that particular post, but this soldier was ordered to leave the device he was operating and the lieutenant made no report of the approaching planes. Many other reports of a conflicting nature have been made regarding this vicious attack. The result is, the people have been greatly confused respecting it. Now, this war is over and the people want to know the facts—yes, they demand to know the facts regarding Pearl Harbor.

Quite recently, the President of the United States made a statement, which was evidently very unguarded, in which he laid the blame of Pearl Harbor upon the people of the United States of America. That was very unfortunate, indeed, because the people then had very little information respecting any of the facts relating to our relations with any of the foreign countries. Everything was couched in secrecy, and it appeared that those in power and in possession of the facts did not want the people of this Nation to know what those facts were. Even in the Halls of Congress, if any Member would arise and speak upon any subject relating to our own situation respecting other nations he was immediately branded as a "tory," or an "obstructionist." Those were serious days, and those were eventful days, as succeeding events have evidenced. But, permit me to say the American people were not responsible in any way for the Pearl Harbor disaster; they had no part in it, and they know very little, if anything, about it. They did have their boys stationed there in the Army, in the Navy, and in the Air Corps, all subject to the command of their superior officers—and those same boys yielded their lives in large numbers because of the bungling of someone, somewhere. We have heard reports that the commanding officer of the Navy received instructions "to keep all of the naval vessels in the harbor," and that one officer was removed because he refused to accept such orders from the Commander in Chief because of the danger incident to such strategy. What those facts are, the people want to know. They want this investigation, and they want it to be complete. They do not want any whitewashing of anyone, and they do not want anyone condemned without the facts being first established which prove guilt. What they want is the facts, and all of the facts, of that sordid and devastating incident.

Before I close, may I say that I hope this investigating committee may be appointed wholly as a bipartisan group. Our boys fought in this war as Americans. Democrats and Republicans, alike, shouldered the gun—they slept in the damp and dismal fox holes side by side—they bared their breasts to the enemy bullets—they died together that victory might be ours. They were not asked what their political affiliations were when they entered the service—and they were not asked to what political party they belonged when they were ordered to advance in assault upon the enemy. When they were seriously wounded, they were not asked anything about their political beliefs, and when they were captured and made prisoners of war by the enemy they were not asked anything about voting. They were Americans. So, Mr. Speaker, this investigating committee should be a bipartisan committee. The function of this appointed body will not be political, but its functions will be to secure the facts about Pearl Harbor, and where the error was, if any, and who committed it; its function will not be to whitewash anyone, nor to persecute anyone; its function will be wholly American, and, acting as Americans, to make an American report to the American people upon this sad and never-to-be-forgotten event. Therefore, I will support the amendment to be offered to this resolution, to make this a bipartisan committee, with an equal number of Democrats and Republicans constituting the personnel of the investigating group—because they are investigating this most serious incident for the American people, and to give to them all of the sordid facts, as they find them—certainly not to give political facts, and certainly not to protect anyone of any political party.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most serious incidents now recorded in American history. Let this investigation go forward, immediately and without delay, let the facts come to the people from a bipartisan investigating committee, and let any person or officer, any soldier or sailor, who may be found to be guilty of dereliction of duty in that connection be properly charged and tried, in the American way, and if guilt is established, beyond any reasonable doubt, let the guilty walk the gangplank like any other war criminal.

But, let all of the facts come from a committee which cannot be accused of partisanship. If politics should enter into this investigation, then the people of this Nation will not be satisfied. They will continue to be confused over this very sad and disgraceful incident. However, let it be finally established—and I am confident that fact will be conclusively shown—that the American people are not responsible for the tragedy of Pearl Harbor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the investigation of Pearl Harbor should not be a partisan matter, and I therefore support the resolution, with the proposed amendment, offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Pearl Harbor has been the greatest national tragedy in the history of our country. It meant the death of over 3,000 men at Pearl Harbor. It was the impetus which carried us into the great conflagration. It led to the black days of Bataan and the fall of the Philip-

pines and the death of the thousands who have fought since that time.

In the memory of every living American there is still the heartache due to not only the tragedy of Pearl Harbor and what followed but the fact that we have been told so little about that which is so important to us, and there has been in the minds of many millions of people the feeling of an attempt to whitewash rather than give the factual side of this disaster.

I repeat, it is a nonpartisan matter for I have talked to both enlisted men and officers of our regular and wartime services who have felt bitterly that the facts have not been brought out and who entertained that feeling while fighting for our country and to the successful conclusion of this war. I have talked to Democrats and Republicans alike who have bitterly expressed themselves as to the need of such an investigation. In my own congressional district I have talked to a widowed mother who lost a son at Pearl Harbor, and I have talked to the widowed mother of the second man in our Nation to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor in this war, who was killed aboard the Japanese prison ship which was sunk last December.

It is not in a spirit of malice or politics that such investigation should be made; it is in a spirit that we must learn the facts of Pearl Harbor so that every citizen in this country, whether he holds high or low office, in or out of service, must know that he will be held responsible and be accountable for the discharge of his duty in the name and in the memory of those who have died in this war.

It is imperative that a full and sweeping investigation be made and that we learn the truth and the whole truth so that history and the people who have carried on this war may know the facts.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I seem to stand pretty much alone in the view that I hold on the pending resolution. Very frankly, I think it is a mistake. I have the feeling and it is my opinion that the Army Board of Inquiry did a good job, and as amended by the statement of the President defending General Marshall and Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, defending and repelling any implication of dereliction on the part of Secretary Hull, that Congress might well afford to let the matter rest there and the country accept the report as fairly presenting the facts of the case. To give this investigation a political tinge would defeat the very purpose of the inquiry. To seek political advantage as regards this matter would be most unworthy. It is impossible for me to see how any Member of this body who loves his country—and we all love it—would want to make politics out of the investigation. It is not a Democratic investigation or a Republican investigation, or any other party investigation; it is an investigation to be made by the American Congress representing all the people.

I look to my left and I see men in the Republican Party to whom I would gladly trust the duty of conducting this investigation. The same is true on the Democratic side. As far as I am concerned, I would take the judgment of the leader of the Republican Members of this House, and I would accept that, too, of the leader of the Democrats.

The President took a most extraordinary position as regards this proposal. In expressing a willingness or a desire that an inquiry be conducted, he expressed the hope that no one in the country would suspect that there was any disposition on the part of the administration to shield anybody.

I will probably support the resolution simply because it represents the judgment of practically the entire membership. I do not support it because I think it a well-advised proposal. There can be but one purpose in conducting the investigation, and that is the development of pertinent facts which have not been developed by inquiries heretofore conducted. Your concern, I take it, is that it be made possible for history to tell the whole story, and of course I can understand that that is an important consideration. But nobody could be guilty of any culpable act as regards this matter. There may have been those whose judgment was bad, but if there was mistake in judgment it does not mean there was dereliction, because everyone who touched this entire problem could have but one thing in mind, and that is the protection of this common country of ours.

So, Mr. Speaker, I trust that those who are appointed on the committee will go about the performance of their duties with just one thing in mind, and that is to develop a factual record. I know that as far as the Presiding Officer of this House is concerned, politics do not enter into the matter, the same attitude being taken by the President of our country, and that his selections will be made upon the basis of the fitness and the qualifications of the Members he puts on the committee to do a good and satisfactory job that will answer the seeming desire of the country, and that is to tell the country anything about the transaction that has not thus far been developed.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has made a splendid and logical nonpartisan speech. I agree with him that the Speaker will use good judgment. But does not the gentleman feel, in view of all the circumstances, the precedent should be followed which was followed when a nonpartisan committee was set up recently to study the reorganization of Congress and that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts should be adopted so that the hands of the Speaker will not be tied and so that he will not be compelled to appoint a political committee?

Mr. COX. I wonder if you would not give it that political tinge which I counseled against by doing just that very thing. Of course, the responsibility is upon the majority. It is up to them to perform in a manner that will earn the confidence of the country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call to the attention of the gentleman from Georgia that I have an indication of the state of mind of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] when he introduced his resolution. He recognizes the time honored custom. His resolution did not provide for six Members from each body but provided for a joint committee to be composed of seven Members of the House and seven Members of the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, for over a year now the Republican Members of Congress, as well as many of the Democratic Members have insisted on a thorough and complete investigation of the Pearl Harbor surprise attack resulting in the loss of half of our Pacific Fleet and 3,800 American casualties at Pearl Harbor. Actually, some 42,000 American soldiers were killed and wounded at Pearl Harbor, in the Philippines, Wake Island, and Guam in the first few days of the attack due to our unpreparedness.

Military leaders and the administration have opposed this thorough investigation right up to the convening of this session of Congress. President Truman practically took the same position and sought to place the blame on the American people equally with our military leaders.

With the convening of the present session, the Republican Members almost unanimously with the support of many members of the Democratic Party have made such a determined effort for a thorough investigation now that the administration, seeking to extricate itself from its untenable position before the American people, grabbed the ball and said, "We, too, want an investigation." But the administration apparently wants a partisan investigation. It insists the investigating committee must be made up of a majority of Democrats. Such a position cannot be condoned by the Republican Members nor will it be approved at the bar of public opinion by the American people. The Republicans insist on an equal number of Democrats and Republicans on the committee.

The men who died and who were wounded there were not fighting in the defense of our country as Democrats or Republicans. Their fathers and mothers and next of kin recognized no political partisanship when they gave their boys to the service.

The Republican Members of this House have been commended by the Democratic majority leader of the House on more than one occasion for their absolute disregard of political lines in supporting every appropriation bill and every effort for the prosecution of the war.

In this question which caused such a heavy loss of life, the destruction of half of our Pacific Fleet, and the war to last many months longer with the result in much greater loss of life, this is no time to resort to partisan political maneuvers.

For this reason, I urge the Members of this House to insist on and support the

amendment which provides that the investigating committee of the House and Senate be made up of an even number of Republicans and Democrats.

Certainly the majority party has nothing to fear if their purpose is to bring out all of the facts in such an investigation, and the people want all of the facts.

If this House votes against giving both parties equal representation and if you of the majority make the mistake of voting this amendment down, you may later be accused of a whitewash investigation by the American people who want to know in fact who was responsible for the greatest naval disaster in the history of our Government. This investigation should be lifted entirely above any question of political bias. Nothing less will satisfy the American people.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, it so happened that I was the only Member of this House who was present at the conference held at the request of the President in the White House on Sunday evening, December 7, 1941. I heard from the lips of President Roosevelt the shocking and amazing story of the greatest disaster that has ever overtaken our American honor and our American arms. When the evening was over, I was convinced then, and I am equally convinced now, that the attack of the Jap barbarians was not against just the Democrats or Republicans or any other party or section of this Nation but against the American Nation as a whole. It was an attack against America and Americans of all breeds and creeds, against Americans in all conditions and all sections. It was Americans of all breeds and conditions and sections and parties who have driven the rats back to their hole. When this resolution was called up, I could not but recall that meeting and what it meant. I wondered then and I wonder now if the causes of that disaster were to be found not solely in the conduct of certain official leaders present in Honolulu at that time but in the conditions of thought and method and life in our Government and among our people which had dominated us for a long period in complete concentration upon our own material affairs rather than upon our great spiritual responsibilities and relationships to mankind.

Mr. Speaker, when yesterday there stood here that sad-faced soldier who came out of hell to speak to us, I do not believe that any two men in Hawaii put him there. He was put there by conditions that had long held sway over the spirit of the American people and paralized the efficiency of this Government. So I want to see this committee big enough, nonpartisan enough, to deal open-minded and unafraid with these great spiritual realities that were the cause of this frightful catastrophe. I therefore hope and pray that we will eliminate entirely in this House any hint of partisanship in the make-up of this committee, and make it representative, equally, of all people, of all the country, represented here by you and by us, not as partisans but as Americans.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, at last the resolution for a full and complete Congressional investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster is before us for consideration. It has my wholehearted support. It should have the unanimous approval of the House. This subject is of national concern. The people of the United States want the whole truth regarding it, they are entitled to have all the facts and they will never be satisfied until the whole record is presented to them. Truth is always fair. Let the blame for the worst disaster in American history be placed where it belongs, without fear or favor. The prestige of the Army and the Navy is at stake. They have served the Nation well and efficiently for more than 150 years. Why did they fail at Pearl Harbor? The Nation should know in order to insure the future defense of America and prevent a repetition of Pearl Harbor with its fatal results. The war with Japan is at an end, we are at peace with the world. What has been considered "top secrets" in this affair can no longer be withheld for national security reasons.

There must not be any whitewashing or smearing of anyone, high or low, but an unbiased, unprejudicial and nonpolitical report to the Nation of all the facts by the committee to be appointed under this resolution. Nothing more is asked and nothing less will satisfy the American people. This is a grave matter. We owe it as a duty to our honored dead at Pearl Harbor. A heavy responsibility is ours to discharge here today as well as the opportunity to serve our Nation. I welcome the privilege of voting for this legislation, so the people may have the full story of this country's worst and most humiliating tragedy—Pearl Harbor.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the adoption of the Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 which we are considering which provides for the establishment of a joint committee on the investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the interest of fairness and to keep this investigation on a high, nonpartisan level, we should adopt the amendment which, I understand, is to be proposed providing for a committee of six Members from each body, three from each of the two political parties. This is not a partisan investigation. It is not a Republican investigation. It is not a Democratic investigation. It is an investigation demanded by all of the people regardless of political faiths, and the committee should be without any suspicion of partisanship in its make-up. Therefore it should be made up of equal representation from both political parties.

Many of the facts surrounding the great disaster at Pearl Harbor have been suppressed too long. There have already been several investigations but unfortunately they have not gone fully into the regrettable incident, and furthermore all of the facts and information collected by the several committees have not been released to the American public. Portions of the reports have been suppressed. This investigation should be open and aboveboard, free of partisanship, and all facts and information gathered should be made available to the American people by having a nonpartisan committee, that is, a committee made up of equal representation from each of the parties so there may be no charge that testimony was suppressed or witnesses were not allowed to be called or full information on every phase of the catastrophe gathered, so that the report when finally completed will present the true facts surrounding the attack at Pearl Harbor.

With that end in view, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment to the resolution and the resolution as amended.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, within a matter of days after December 7, 1941, as soon as America began to recover its senses and think coherently about the staggering catastrophe which had struck us at Pearl Harbor, it began to appear that some one in a position of highest responsibility was guilty of the most glaring incompetence, negligence, and bungling.

The early official statements about the disaster, even in the light of the meager facts then available, were patently evasive and confusing, if not, in fact, grossly and deliberately deceptive. The Roberts Report, returned by the special commission selected by the President to investigate the disaster and to advise the American people, was notable not so much for what it told, as for what it failed to tell us.

As an instance, you will recall the story of the obscure young soldier who manned the antiquated aircraft warning station beyond his tour of duty the morning of the attack; and who tried in vain to warn his immediate superior officer of approaching hostile forces well in advance of the attack.

The Roberts Report did not even name that soldier. In its brief anonymous mention of him, it even erred in stating his rank. But for my personal efforts, that young Pennsylvania hero might still be unidentified and unrecognized. But my personal appeal brought him back to the United States to receive the Distinguished Service Medal and a commission as second lieutenant, to which he additionally proved his title in officer candidate school.

Thus the one man who above all others at Pearl Harbor displayed outstanding alertness and devotion to duty might have remained in obscurity except for my purely unofficial insistence upon proper recognition. What of the lieutenant who refused to heed this advance warning of disaster? I understand he has enjoyed regular promotions, and now holds the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Much of the story so far given the American people is similarly inconsistent and baffling. Just a year ago I stood before this House and called attention to certain facts and to reports from a variety of sources which were entirely at variance with the pitifully scant information which the administration had permitted to seep through the official walls of secrecy surrounding the whole ugly disaster.

I asked Congress to make a complete and open investigation which might clear up the whole mass of confusions, evasions, and contradictions which have marked this black spot in our history. Repeatedly since that time I have urged that the whole truth be placed before the American people, so that they may properly assess the blame wherever it may belong.

I regret that the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] felt impelled, during my absence a few days thereafter, to direct certain intemperate remarks against me because of my earnest efforts to bring the Pearl Harbor story to the people. I have always understood, of course, that the gentleman was under the pressure of a political campaign for the election of a President and Vice President, and have been willing to believe that his remarks were intended purely for political benefit.

I cannot refrain, in passing, however, from calling attention to the fact that the recent reports of the Army and Navy investigating boards confirmed in substance practically everything I said on this floor a year ago. I must emphasize, also, the fact that the man who was then campaigning for Vice President and who now holds the high office of President, publicly condemned General Short and Admiral Kimmel in a prepared and published article; and that he has since found it necessary to admit publicly that his charges against these two career officers in command at Pearl Harbor were unwarranted and without basis in fact.

The recent reports by the Army and Navy boards have at least served in part to lift the cloud under which Short and Kimmel have lived since they were summarily disgraced and removed from command more than 3 years ago. The reports plainly show, in fact, that if there was dereliction of duty which made the disaster possible, it centered primarily in Washington, not at Pearl Harbor.

But these official reports, together with official statements by the President and Secretary of War, serve merely to confuse the situation, rather than to clarify it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Indiana two additional minutes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It seems significant that the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, said he referred to his diary, and that the President had advised both Mr. Stimson and Mr. Knox, the Secretary of Navy, that the Japs were expected to attack on Monday. He further said this information was communicated to them only a matter of hours before the attack on Sunday. This is merely in line with all manner of reports that the highest authority in Washington was well aware, far in advance of December 7, that offensive action by the Japanese was inevitable. I believe the American people are entitled to know just what information of this nature our highest authority had, where it came from, and why we were nevertheless caught completely defenseless when the expected attack came.

We are told that much of the real inside information has still been withheld from the Army and Navy reports because it still remains among the top strategic secrets. I insist that there can no longer be information in this affair of such strategic value that it should be withheld from the American people.

We listened here just yesterday to the story of Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, the martyr of Bataan and Corregidor, who, along with thousands of other brave Americans, paid the extreme penalty for the stupidity which at a single blow stripped us of what naval strength we had remaining in the Pacific and left those heroes alone and defenseless in a hopeless cause. Possibly General Wainwright's humiliation and suffering could have been alleviated, possibly the lives of thousands of American boys could have been spared in the bitter campaigns to gain back the Pacific, if this so-called "top secret" information had just been used a little more intelligently 4 years ago.

I urge that this resolution be adopted. I hope, however, that it will be enacted in the form of the amendment which my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will offer, so that a fair, unbiased, nonpartisan investigation will be insured.

In complete fairness, I wish to remind the majority here of the comments already widespread that the administration recognizes the insistent cry for more facts about Pearl Harbor; that it knows a full investigation is finally inevitable; and that it is moving now to air the matter before a congressional committee only to insure that it can dominate that committee and the forthcoming inquiry. I hope the majority here will heed those comments and that it will insure a strictly fair, unprejudiced, uncontrolled inquiry which will finally enable the American people to evaluate this catastrophe correctly.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker if it were not for the tragic consequences of Pearl Harbor, it would be appropriate to refer to it as a comedy of errors. From those in the highest position to the lieutenant—since promoted to lieutenant colonel—who ignored the radar warnings, everybody concerned made an incredible series of blunders. The blood and treasure which those blunders cost is incalculable.

It is my judgment that the American people are determined upon a thoroughgoing investigation to determine the truth of the whole matter, not only to fix responsibility therefor, but to make plans to prevent any recurrence. For this purpose, I think they are entitled to an investigation which is neither partisan, nor indeed bipartisan, but wholly nonpartisan. In so serious a matter, it is hardly to be expected that the question of which political party dominates the investigating committee should be given serious consideration.

I, therefore, respectfully advocate the appointment of a wholly nonpartisan committee headed by a chairman in whom the whole country has confidence. I am perfectly willing to trust our President with this responsibility, or in the alternative the committee could be selected by the majority and minority leaders of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a great mistake to use the power of the majority for the purpose of dominating or controlling the proposed investigation. The inquiry should be free of the slightest possible suspicion, and no other type of investigation will satisfy the American people.

I am inclined to the view that the administration will be held responsible if any other approach is made.

I subscribe to the theory that responsibility goes with power, and I certainly have no objection that the majority party ordinarily have majority representation, but in so grave a question as this, the country must be assured that party politics and party maneuvering on either side should not enter the picture in the slightest degree.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

NOT TOO LATE

The House, in postponing until today its action on the Pearl Harbor investigation, gives an opportunity for one last and urgent plea. The issue between the Senate bill, setting up a 10-member commission, including 3 majority and 2 minority Members from each House, and those who demand equal party representation is purely political and deserves no place in this extremely serious matter. Neither course should be followed. A congressional investigation with a Democratic majority would whitewash everything reflecting upon the Roosevelt administration's handling of the political side; in an equally divided investigating committee the Republicans would presumably deadlock on every finding which did not discredit the New Deal's political arm. We have had enough of all that. We have had enough, and more than enough, of political shenanigans—of Army politics and Navy politics and State Department politics, of Democratic politics and Republican politics. We want the truth, and it is not too late to get it.

It is not too late to set up an independent and genuinely nonpartisan commission under congressional authorization, including Congressmen, but also including expert military, naval, and diplomatic members and including competent civilian representatives. It should be under the chairmanship of a disinterested citizen—Mr. Baruch's name has been suggested, and it is difficult to think of a better one—and it should have powers to compel the production of the evidence from the Navy, the Army, and the State Department, and it should be under a mandate to report without fear or favor, without regard to the effect upon any party or any service or any other interest involved.

For the importance of Pearl Harbor does not lie in the possibility of convicting someone of past failure. The facts of Pearl Harbor, are, or ought to be, the most decisive single beginning upon the whole reorganization of our military, naval, and diplomatic policy. They are essential data for formulating sound answers to the vast questions

now before us. To make them again a football of Democratic politics or Republican politics or service politics will be to end once more in the same kind of chaos in which we have floundered for so long. This time there must be a real, unprejudiced, and fruitful investigation, and it is the first duty of Congress to create an instrument which can provide one.

(Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include an editorial appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune.)

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, on five previous occasions I have addressed the House urging a complete and impartial investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster. I am convinced that the full story has not been told and it is in the public interest, as well as only fair and just to the dismissed officers, that the whole subject be thoroughly investigated.

I hope the pending resolution is amended so that there will be equal representation and amended so that the time limit to report is extended.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have previously said on the subject of Pearl Harbor. The truth will make us free.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD may I say for the information of many gentlemen who have addressed the House that several resolutions had been introduced prior to the day on which the Republican steering committee met and each and every one of these resolutions provided for a five- or seven-man committee, thereby conceding and agreeing that the majority party, which has been intrusted by the country with managerial responsibility, should have a majority on that committee. This not only includes the two resolutions referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], namely, the Brown and Harness resolutions, but also two resolutions introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress—Senate Resolution 336 and House Resolution 644, none of which called for an even number of membership.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if my good friend from Illinois, whom I love and esteem and who has rendered a splendid service, is trying to establish the fact that several individual members of the Republican Party are always right? Does he feel that way about everything that any individual on this side may do?

Mr. SABATH. I may say that many times they are right before you call them into conference. When you start to use the club or whip on them, when you start to use your weapons and the weapons of those that are behind you in the Republican Party, then they melt and yield and, unfortunately, are pledged to the poor judgment of the Republican Party for which it has been discredited by the American people.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will my distinguished colleague yield once more now so that I may square the RECORD?

Mr. SABATH. With pleasure.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to tell the gentleman from Illinois that, coming as he does from the great city of Chicago, he cannot realize the fact that we on the Republican side have a real democratic rule. We have conferences and caucuses and we determine what our position shall be. Is there anything wrong about that?

Mr. SABATH. I am mighty glad that you have adopted at times a democratic rule, which is invariably fair and just to all, but you do not follow it consistently. You only speak of it but you do not follow it, and you do not practice it, unfortunately. There is practically always a wide lapse between promise and performance. That is the mistake that you have been making.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am perfectly willing to have my practices compared with those of the Democratic side.

Mr. SABATH. Let me say this to the gentleman: Yes; we have a strong Democratic organization in Chicago which some of your loving Republican newspapers call a machine. If it were Republican, oh, what a wonderful, patriotic organization it would be. But because it is Democratic, it is wrong. The gentleman charges me with being a member of that organization. I want to say to him that I started as an independent and have been independent, frequently opposing some of the Democrats when I felt that they were not right. When I feel that the party is right I am with the party, and I am mighty pleased to see that my party has been right nearly all of the time, and that is more than I can say about the Republicans.

At the present time I can say that I am cooperating wholeheartedly with the Democratic organization in Chicago under the leadership of Mayor Edward J. Kelly, who has given Chicago one of the most splendid, efficient, and honest administrations in its history—an administration that even Republican newspapers have not been able to attack.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would just like to say that the gentleman is correct; that my original resolution did provide for a committee of 14, 7 members from the House and 7 from the Senate. I knew and realized that under the procedure of the House my resolution would go to the Committee on Rules, of which the genial gentleman from Illinois is chairman, and I felt certain that the gentleman in all of his fairness would not want to name or arrange for the naming of a committee that would be partisan and would insist upon my resolution being adopted and the committee being made up of four Republicans and three Democrats from each body.

Mr. SABATH. If you are right now, you would have been wrong then. Could that have been a nonpartisan committee? Surely not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Evidently I was wrong in judging the gentleman's nonpartisanship.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, now, I am sorry that you are wrong again in judging me.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. If the distinguished minority leader wants an example of machine rule, I would like to direct his attention to the machine of his own political party in the city of Philadelphia which in the past and at present is the most notorious institution in the history of the country.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, that is not the only notorious Republican city machine. You will find it in every city where the Republicans control.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the concurrent resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint committee on the investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack, to be composed of five Members of the Senate (not more than three of who shall be members of the majority party), to be appointed by the President pro tempore, and five Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party), to be appointed by the Speaker of the House. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "five" and insert "six."

In line 4, after "Senate", strike out the remainder of the line and all of line 5, and insert in lieu thereof "(three of whom shall be members of the Democratic Party and three of whom shall be members of the Republican Party)."

On page 1, line 6, strike out "five" and insert "six."

In line 7, after "Representatives", strike out the remainder of the line and down through the comma in line 8, and insert in lieu thereof "(three of whom shall be members of the Democratic Party and three of whom shall be members of the Republican Party)."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have had a little humor injected into the debate and particularly by the majority which seeks in so doing to defeat a fair, honest, sincere proposal.

I believe everybody in this House is eager to have the right kind of investiga-

tion, the kind of an investigation that will satisfy the American people. This resolution is of great concern to the people who have observed panic-stricken efforts during the past 4 years to hide the real facts. The people are entitled to know the facts, and now that the war is over, there is no longer any excuse to keep them concealed. My amendment will make certain the whole truth is disclosed.

I know that ordinarily we do not have equal representation in inquiries. The majority members are apt to believe that they must protect their party and, therefore, they retain the majority on committees.

But this should not be the case here. This is an unusual case. This is not a Republican inquiry nor a Democratic inquiry. It has been sponsored by men of both parties, so that makes it a genuine nonpartisan inquiry. In the spirit of a nonpartisan inquiry, it is reasonable and right that there should be equal representation on the committee.

I am not the guardian of the conscience of the great Democratic Party, but I may say that if I were a Democrat, I would want this amendment I am offering to prevail. I would want it to prevail because it would require the Republicans to assume responsibility in the inquiry that is to be conducted. You can reject the amendment. You have the 50 majority that is sufficient to reject it.

But mark you well. You will be responsible to the American people. They will hold you responsible if there is any suppression of the facts. In the months to come you of the Democratic Party may regret it if you cast an adverse vote here.

In the spirit of nonpartisanship I issue a challenge right now. Let us make this inquiry fully open to the public. Let us make this inquiry fully a nonpartisan one by having equal representation of the two parties. Let us make certain that no witness is excused from testifying. Then let us try to secure that great American whom everyone respects, Charles Evans Hughes, to head up the legal staff. Do this and the public will be satisfied that the facts have been disclosed.

The single objective of this inquiry must be to unfold to the people the whole and unvarnished facts concerning this greatest military disaster that ever happened to the American people.

With the introduction of this amendment, I discharge my obligation. In conformity with real nonpartisanship, I ask for its adoption.

If it be rejected, the responsibility for the full revelation of this sordid chapter in American history rests with those who deny fair, equal representation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much surprised at the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader. He knows the amendment which he has offered is not in accordance with the custom of Congress from time immemorial.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I always yield to the distinguished gentleman. I know to what the gentleman is going to refer but that does not dispute anything that I say.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield briefly.

Mr. MICHENER. Not later than January 18, 1945, in this House, as shown by the RECORD, on that day the Congress wanted to set up a nonpartisan, nonpolitical committee. It was so stated in the debate. Such a committee was created. The Democrats brought in the resolution which provided that six Members be appointed by the Speaker and that not more than three of them be Democrats. If that is not a precedent and a recent precedent, then I would like to know what a precedent is.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan has not said anything which contradicts what I have said. I said I am surprised that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, has offered this amendment which is not consistent with the time-honored custom of the Congress of the United States.

Now, the amazing thing is that we see two Republican Members of this House, and what a weak apology they made, how sorry I felt for them—the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], whom I like very much, trying to get into a discussion of Chicago politics to divert the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. Today we hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] say that he favors an amendment providing for three Members from each party. This is September 11, and only 6 days ago he introduced a resolution calling for a joint committee of 14 Members—7 from the House and 7 from the Senate.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no need to yield to the gentleman because the gentleman cannot escape the fact that he did introduce a resolution. The gentleman was either wrong then and right now or he is wrong now and was right then.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to correct a misquotation made by the gentleman now holding the floor? Will the gentleman yield for the purpose of correcting a quotation which he made?

Mr. McCORMACK. A quotation?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; you quoted me as discussing Chicago politics with the gentleman from Illinois. I am afraid that the gentleman from Massachusetts was either not present or did not hear the discussion that took place.

Mr. McCORMACK. That does not take away the fact that the gentleman on September 5 introduced a resolution for a joint committee to investigate the Pearl Harbor distaster, providing for seven Members of the House and seven Members of the Senate. Is that not correct?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman sure he is as correct about that as he was about the Chicago politics?

Mr. McCORMACK. Is that correct? The gentleman cannot get away from that fact because here is a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 69 introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and I assume the gentleman with whom I am having this colloquy is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree that resolution was introduced by me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Now we come to the other gentleman, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman withdraw the remarks he made about Chicago politics?

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe I have yielded sufficiently to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. We now come to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. He comes now and says we want representation on the committee of three and three so "we can have a fair and impartial committee to investigate this matter." He says that with his crocodile tears and yet on the same day he introduced a resolution. There was a unanimity of opinion, some kind of atmosphere went into the minds of both of the gentlemen because on the same day the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] introduced a resolution providing for a joint committee. What did it provide? Did it provide for three Republicans and three Democrats? No. It provided for a committee of seven members on the part of the House and seven members on the part of the Senate. Are we to believe the gentleman from Indiana thought that there might be four Republicans appointed from the House and three Democrats or did he intend, if his resolution were adopted, that there should be four Democrats appointed and three Republicans?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What difference does it make, I say to you. If you want a fair and impartial investigation, you will give us equal representation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why did you introduce this on September 5, only 6 days ago, if you did not think you were going to get a fair investigation?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Because I do not think you are going to give that to us now.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is in an indefensible position. The politics is on your side. That is where the politics is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. We have had that all out. But what we would like to have you do is to tell us whether you favor a nonpartisan committee or not. We have heard all the rest of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is pretty much like the question the lawyer asked a witness on the witness stand: Do you still beat your wife?

Mr. JENSEN. No, is it a lot easier than that. It is a lot easier than that.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. The last time I remember the Republican Party acted in a nonpartisan manner was at the impeachment proceedings of Andrew Johnson.

Mr. McCORMACK. This resolution calls for a committee of five on the part of the House and five on the part of the Senate. If the Republicans were in control of the House the ratio would have been 5 to 2 or 5 to 3 at best. That is the fairest ratio that can be given. It is consistent with the time-honored custom and traditions of the House.

In the other body, when the resolution was introduced, there was no objection from the Republicans, on the ground that it was in the ratio of 3 to 2. As a matter of fact, the unanimous-consent request suggested over there in the first instance to have it considered, came from a Republican Member. There was no indication in the minds of the Republican Members of the other branch that there was anything wrong with a committee of five, consisting of three Democrats and two Republicans. But when it comes over here, that is when they try to cast a cloud, try to create an impression in the minds of the American people that three Democrats and two Republicans on the part of the House would not give it a clean, wholesome, judicial investigation. Mr. Speaker, this will be given a judicial investigation, the same as our Committee on Elections judges election cases. That is what all Members should do. Politics in this resolution is injected by the offering of this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader belabored the question as to what we wanted. May I call his attention to the fact that we are cast in the role of trying to determine what the American people want. We are not their rulers. We are their representatives. What do the American people want is the question that this House should decide today.

The American people want a nonpartisan investigation. They want to stop this control of the Pearl Harbor incident by any one party. They want us to represent them. If it were left to a vote of the American people, the fathers and mothers who have given their sons, not as Republicans or Democrats, to die because of the bungling of those in charge of the military at that time, doubtless they would vote overwhelmingly for the position which the Republican side of this House is taking today. They want to know the facts. They know they will come nearer getting the facts if it is left to a committee of investigation which is made up of Members equally divided from both sides of this House.

That is the question. I doubt whether the majority party can afford to assume the responsibility before the bar of public opinion that their leader is asking them to assume today. Something like 42,000 men were killed or wounded on Wake Island, in the Philippines, on Guam, and in Pearl Harbor because something went wrong with the high command; because they were not properly alerted in the Southwest Pacific. The fathers and mothers who saw this war dragged out because of the greatest naval disaster in the history of this country, because of negligence saw this war dragged on until the toll ran into the hundreds of thousands of killed and wounded, have a right to know what the real answer is. There is no question but that the minority side of this House today is attempting to represent the composite will and judgment of the American people.

I say again that the majority leadership, the majority party in power, cannot afford to assume this responsibility; they cannot longer give the opportunity for the American people to say that they never learned all of the facts surrounding and concerning this great disaster. The majority leader says this is something different and that the time-honored practice of the House is about to be upset in asking for a committee equally divided politically. Let me tell you that we are attempting to investigate something that is different from anything that has ever happened in the military annals of this country, something exceptional, the greatest naval disaster with the greatest loss of life that has ever come to this free people, and we can afford to act a little differently here as the representatives of the people on the floor of this House and give a square deal and a fair, free, and impartial investigation to the taxpayers of this country, to the mothers and fathers, and to the millions of boys who went out and won this fight for us. We in this body are supposed to represent them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I believe it very important that the American people be vindicated of the charges that were made by the Chief Executive of the United States when he said that all the American people were responsible for the disgraceful Pearl Harbor disaster. If ever there was an indictment of the American people for something they were not responsible for, it was that statement. It was unjust and not a fact. It seems to me that the representatives of the American people who are assembled here today and are going to vote on this resolution should do so with the idea that we are going to vindicate the American people from that charge. How are you going to do it? You certainly cannot do it by a political set-up. It must be a nonpartisan set-up; and the only way you can have that is to have a 50–50 committee of the two great parties in this country, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. The American people are not going to believe a report that comes out unless it is from a bipartisan committee. Why spend $25,000 to make this investigation if you are not going to have an investigation in which the American people will have some confidence made by a committee for which they will have some respect for the decisions to be rendered. It seems to me by all that is right, honorable, and sensible that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] should be adopted; and I hope the membership will consider it in the light in which it was offered, for the purpose of having a nonpartisan investigation. I ask the membership at this time to support this amendment. This will be the third investigation. We want the facts, the American people want the facts. The Pearl Harbor incident was the greatest blot on our Army and Navy for unpreparedness at a time when they should have been on the lookout for trouble. Someone was to blame, and I say to you it was not the American people, it was the administration, the Army, or the Navy; now who were the ones responsible and why? That is what the American people want to know, and that is what I want to see them get.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that this resolution has been introduced. To start with we had a resolution here that was nonpartisan and that was going to be passed by a vote of both sides. Now the results will speak for themselves as to whether this is political or not and it will brand itself. Nearly every Republican will have to vote for the resolution and practically every Democrat will have to vote for it. You have thrown into a measure that was nonpolitical a political aspect by the very motion here when it ought not to have been done. We are as American on one side as on the other; so this will be an American and fully democratic investigation.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, today is another field day of hypocrisy. There is not a man in this House who does not know that for the past 15 years the American people have intrusted the Government, both the administrative branch and the legislative branch, to the Democratic Party. During those 15 years, both in time of peace and in time of war, the people of this country have repudiated the Republican Party and have left control of the Government to those who sit on this side of the aisle.

If they have had faith in our party properly running the administration of the Government for all these years, I do not think they have lost faith in the Democratic Party to run an investigation of this type. We are the majority party; we have been made such by the electorate of this country, and not only according to the rules of the House should we conduct this investigation but according to the elementary rules of American fair play and the old American rule that the majority shall rule.

I hope no Member on my side of the aisle will get excited by the false impressions given by the minority. I hope we are not going to be panicked by hypocrisy of the rankest kind.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time because when I asked the distinguished majority leader to yield in order to ask him a question and to offer a bit of pertinent information on the question he was discussing he declined to yield.

The majority leader questioned the fact that there was any precedent for appointing investigating committees composed of an equal number of both minority and majority Members. The gentleman from Michigan gave him one example, and I intended to give him another if he had yielded.

You will recall only 2 months ago when General Eisenhower was very much concerned over what the American people might think about reports that were coming out of Germany in regard to political concentration and slave-labor camps he asked that a delegation from the Congress be sent over to Germany to investigate. It was determined by the majority and minority leaders of both Houses that this should be a nonpartisan committee, equally divided between the two parties. That is another precedent, very recent one and very much in point.

I could give the gentleman many more precedents. The Naval Affairs Committee of this House, for example, has made a number of very important investigations involving policy, not only naval policy but administrative policy, as it affects the Navy. Time after time those committees have been composed, not only of equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans, but sometimes actually of more Republicans than Democrats. No one on the committees thought anything about it, and the reports of those committees have received the highest praise both of the Congress, the Executive and the people.

This is a different kind of an investigation than the Congress has ever undertaken before. In a way it has to be somewhat political, if we use that term in its proper sense, because it will involve political persons; I mean persons who at the time held important political positions in the administration. The nonpolitical persons involved in the Pearl Harbor disaster, that is, the Army and Navy officers, have already been investigated by the Army and Navy boards, and the facts in regard to their part in the incident have been fairly well established. If you will read, for example, the report of the Navy Board carefully on Pearl Harbor, you will find that categorically the report has vindicated and exonerated, item by item, every naval officer that was ever accused of responsibility for the Pearl Harbor disaster. The Secretary at the conclusion, it is true, states that certain officers should not in the future hold any position involving superior judgment, but the findings of the board itself do not support the Secretary's conclusion.

No unbiased person can read the findings of either the Army or Navy board without feeling that the responsibility for the Pearl Harbor disaster did not rest upon the shoulders of General Short and Admiral Kimmel. The findings themselves plainly state this, and aside from the statement of the Secretary, to which I have referred, I have yet to hear of anyone who has questioned those findings, either directly or indirectly.

The findings show conclusively that Kimmel and Short acted under orders and that they obeyed all of their orders implicitly. The strange thing about the investigation and reports of the Army and Navy boards is that having found this to be the fact the investigation was stopped. It was not carried up to those who gave to Kimmel and Short the instructions, advice, and information upon which they acted. The investigating committee authorized by this resolution will have to do that. It will have to begin where the Army and Navy boards left off, and its investigation must necessarily include the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of State, and the President himself, who was the Commander in Chief.

That such an investigation should not be a partisan one must be clear to everyone who wants to find the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and the surest guaranty that it will not be partisan is to make this committee strictly bipartisan by providing equal representation on it from both of the major parties in Congress.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish also to call to the attention of the House the fact that on April 23 of this year at the request of General Eisenhower and General Marshall this House create a committee to investigate the Nazi concentration camps in Germany, for the purpose of determining what steps the Congress and the War Crimes Commission and the military should take, and that committee was created exactly as the gentleman from Massachusetts provides in his amendment, that is, six Members from each party in the two Houses.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think that committee brought back a unanimous report.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say a word about that, because he knows something about it. It was not an investigating committee at all. It was a committee selected pursuant to a request by General Eisenhower to inspect the concentration camps and view the atrocities.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If the Chair draws a distinction between investigation and inspection, all right; otherwise I respectfully submit that the records show that the Chair is in error, as shown by the report filed in the Senate by Senator BARKLEY and read here by the ranking Democratic Member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], I was on that committee. We investigated those camps and we reported the facts. We inspected and inquired. That was a six-man-from-each-House committee, six from each party. During part of the time that we were overseas, due to sickness, it happened that the Republicans outnumbered the Democrats, but there was no politics in the matter because it was a nonpartisan, a bipartisan responsibility to get a job done.

When the President of the United States selected representatives from Congress to go to the San Francisco Conference he did not choose two and one; he did not choose a majority from each House of his own party. He selected one member from each party from each House. I do not know of any case in history where there was less partisanship shown than at San Francisco. It was the action of a two-party country, of representatives of both parties, attempting to get a solemn and important job done. Unless we adopt this amendment there will be procedural questions come up as to whether a witness should testify on a certain day, limitation of hearings, as to whether a witness should be excused, questions of admitting or barring evidence, questions that will be decided by majority party control. The work of the committee can best be discharged and best be carried out by following the pattern that this House and our President have adopted in momentous cases in recent days, by adopting the machinery proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to place equal responsibility upon each party in each House to get the job done. In adopting this amendment we are not going away from precedent but we are adopting recent precedents established by the majority in both Houses and by the President of the United States.

This is no routine investigation. It is of the utmost importance that it should start with every assurance of impartiality. That assurance can only be given by having the majority share its power and responsibility by making this committee truly bipartisan. If the majority uses its power to defeat this amendment the committee will get off to a bad start.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to get the gentleman from Ohio to yield to point out the fact that the atrocity committee of which he was speaking was not an official committee of this House. There was no resolution authorizing it. There was no action on the part of the House at all and no official report of the House of Representatives involved in that matter at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The committee had no power to subpena.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. The committee had no power at all. It was simply an unofficial delegation named by the Speaker of the House at the request of General Eisenhower to go over there and view the atrocities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as an illustration of procedure, suppose there were three Democrats and three Republicans.

How are you going to elect a chairman if the vote is 3 to 3, or 6 to 6, in the committee composed of both branches?

There is an illustration of why one party is given a majority. You could not even elect a chairman. If you have three Republicans and three Democrats from both the House and the Senate, there is 6 to 6, and then how can you elect a chairman and a vice chairman, and how can you select counsel, or anything else? The answer given is that they will go along, but no majority party can depend on that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say in a spirit of nonpartisanship that we would be very glad to give the Democrats the chairmanship.

Mr. McCORMACK. The fact remains that with a vote of 3 to 3 or 6 to 6 that situation could easily exist.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Of course it could, and it is contrary to our concept of party government. I am a little bit amazed that our Republican friends would inject such an issue into this thing. It is really astonishing to me. I do not know exactly what the motive is. Certainly it is contrary to the entire concept we have of a two-party system, that the party that wins the election holds the responsibility and exercises that responsibility. I cannot for the life of me understand why our Republican friends want to raise an issue here. It must become political. It is political in its concept whether they intended it to be that or not. Why they want to vary the unwritten law that has existed since we have had the two-party system is just beyond my imagination.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. May I ask the gentleman if he has observed that even in the discussion of this nonpartisan amendment every man supporting it has been a Republican, and every man opposing it has been a Democrat?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is what you would expect with this sort of an amendment pending. It is a natural result. That is why I say that I cannot understand why the Republicans injected that sort of an issue into a thing of this sort, which they claim they want to be nonpartisan.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last 6 words.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this is an opportune time for me to undertake to make a Republican speech, and I shall not do that. We are proposing not a political investigation but an investigation in the nature of a judicial proceeding. It matters not so much what may be the conclusion of the Members of this committee or the final verdict of the Members of this House, but it does matter tremendously what the verdict of the 130,000,000 people of this country will be.

Truth is neither Democratic nor Republican, nor is justice an adherent or a partisan of either party in this body. What the American people want and what they are entitled to have is the whole truth and nothing but the truth. They will be able to render a verdict upon the facts.

Let me read from a letter written to me by a native of the State of Mississippi, an eminent Democratic lawyer of my city, whose boys have been in the armed forces since this war began. He says:

> The American people are entitled to know the facts and I think they are tired of both whitewash and lampblack. It seems to me a congressional investigation would be in order.

Then he says:

> What the American people want to know and are entitled to know is: (1) Whether Admiral Kimmel had specific instructions from his superiors to relax his vigilance; (2) specifically what these instructions were; and (3) who issued these instructions. If the authorities will give this information, the American people can arrive at a verdict without their opinions, their whitewash, and their lampblack.

The American people some of these days will find out what the truth is. What the facts are is not a partisan issue. And the man or the party that makes a partisan issue out of this investigation will incur the wrath of the people. There is a deep-seated conviction in the minds of our people that they have been denied a disclosure of facts that would show who are to blame for the Pearl Harbor disaster.

When you try a lawsuit in the courts which involves the property rights or the life or the liberty of the citizen, you do not undertake to get a jury composed of either a minority or majority of men of a certain political faith. You seek impartial men who will bring in a just verdict based upon the law and the facts. All in the world that the people want from the hands of this committee which is about to be appointed by the Congress is a full disclosure of the facts. When that is done, the people are amply able to make up their own minds. The men who will be on this committee will assume a tremendous, yes, I might say, a fearful responsibility to themselves, to this Congress, and to the people of this country. The worst politics that either side of the Chamber could play would to suppress or to distort the facts; would be to bring in a report which had the least tincture of partisanship or politics in it because this investigation involves the good name, the reputation, the whole future, the standing, the very lives of members of our armed forces, and they are entitled to a full and fair disclosure of the facts. I shall support this amendment. I do not question or challenge the integrity or the intellectual honesty of any Member on the Democratic side of the Chamber nor do I claim that Republicans have a monopoly on fairness or honesty. I do believe this investigation should be a 50–50 proposition and that the floodlights should be turned on and every fact available should be made known to all the people to the end that justice may be done the men at whose doors these serious accusations have been laid. I do not say this as a Republican. I say it as an American citizen, as one who numbers among his friends both Democrats and Republicans. I have never measured a man's integrity or his worth as a citizen by his politics and I would despise myself if I did. The men accused are entitled to the truth, and the Nation demands it. By this sort of an investigation another Pearl Harbor can never happen. No innocent man can be hurt by the truth. No guilty official, high or low, should escape by a suppression of the facts.

Give the American people the truth, "the eternal years of God are hers," and it is demanded at our hands.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, believing all Members who desire to do so have spoken on the amendment, I move that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 136, nays 168, not voting 126, answered "present" 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—136

Adams	Fulton	McCowen
Allen, Ill.	Gamble	McDonough
Andresen, August H.	Gearhart	McGregor
Andrews, N. Y.	Gifford	Martin, Iowa
Angell	Gillette	Martin, Mass.
Arends	Gillie	Michener
Auchincloss	Goodwin	Miller, Nebr.
Barrett, Wyo.	Grant, Ind.	Mott
Bates, Mass.	Griffiths	O'Hara
Beall	Gwynne, Iowa	O'Konski
Bender	Hale	Pittenger
Bennett, Mo.	Hall, Leonard W.	Ploeser
Bishop	Hancock	Ramey
Blackney	Hand	Reed, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Harness, Ind.	Rees, Kans.
Brehm	Hartley	Rich
Brown, Ohio	Henry	Rizley
Brumbaugh	Heselton	Robsion, Ky.
Buck	Hess	Rodgers, Pa.
Buffett	Hill	Rogers, Mass.
Butler	Hinshaw	Schwabe, Mo.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman	Schwabe, Okla.
Canfield	Holmes, Mass.	Scrivner
Carlson	Holmes, Wash.	Short
Case, N. J.	Howell	Simpson, Pa.
Chenoweth	Hull	Smith, Maine
Church	Jenkins	Smith, Ohio
Clason	Jennings	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Jensen	Springer
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Calif.	Stockman
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Ill.	Sundstrom
Crawford	Kean	Taber
Cunningham	Kearney	Talbot
Curtis	Keefe	Talle
D'Ewart	Kilburn	Taylor
Dirksen	Kinzer	Thomas, N. J.
Dolliver	Knutson	Towe
Dondero	Kunkel	Vorys, Ohio
Eaton	Landis	Vursell
Ellis	Latham	Wadsworth
Ellsworth	LeCompte	Weichel
Elsaesser	Lemke	Welch
Elston	Lewis	Wigglesworth
Fellows	Luce	Wilson
Fenton	McConnell	Wolfenden, Pa.
		Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—168

Andrews, Ala.	Bunker	Davis
Bailey	Burch	Delaney, James J.
Barden	Burgin	Dickstein
Barry	Byrne, N. Y.	Dingell
Bates, Ky.	Camp	Domengeaux
Beckworth	Cannon, Fla.	Doughton, N. C.
Bell	Cannon, Mo.	Douglas, Calif.
Biemiller	Celler	Doyle
Bland	Chapman	Durham
Bonner	Chelf	Earthman
Boren	Cochran	Eberharter
Boykin	Combs	Ervin
Bradley, Pa.	Cooley	Fallon
Brooks	Cooper	Fernandez
Brown, Ga.	Cox	Fisher
Bryson	Cravens	Flannagan
Buckley	Curley	Flood
Bulwinkle	D'Alesandro	

Folger	McKenzie	Riley
Forand	McMillan, S. C.	Rivers
Gallagher	Madden	Robertson, Va.
Gardner	Maloney	Robinson, Utah
Gary	Manasco	Roe, Md.
Geelan	Mansfield,	Rogers, Fla.
Gordon	Mont.	Rogers, N. Y.
Gore	Mansfield, Tex.	Rooney
Granahan	Marcantonio	Rowan
Granger	May	Russell
Green	Miller, Calif.	Sabath
Gregory	Mills	Sadowski
Harless, Ariz.	Morrison	Sasscer
Harris	Murdock	Savage
Havenner	Murphy	Sheppard
Hays	Neely	Sikes
Healy	Norton	Smith, Va.
Hedrick	O'Neal	Sparkman
Hoch	O'Toole	Spence
Holifield	Outland	Stewart
Hook	Pace	Stigler
Izac	Patman	Sullivan
Johnson,	Patrick	Sumners, Tex.
Lyndon B.	Peterson, Ga.	Tarver
Johnson, Okla.	Philbin	Thom
Kee	Pickett	Thomason
Kelley, Pa.	Poage	Torrens
Kilday	Price, Fla.	Traynor
Kirwan	Price, Ill.	Trimble
Kopplemann	Priest	Voorhis, Calif.
Lane	Quinn, N. Y.	Walter
Lanham	Rabin	Wasielewski
Lesinski	Rains	Weaver
Link	Ramspeck	Weiss
Ludlow	Randolph	West
Lyle	Rankin	Whitten
McCormack	Rayfiel	Whittington
McGehee	Resa	Winstead
McGlinchey	Richards	Wood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Patterson

NOT VOTING—126

Abernethy	Gossett	Mundt
Allen, La.	Graham	Murray, Tenn.
Andersen,	Grant, Ala.	Murray, Wis.
H. Carl	Gross	Norrell
Anderson, Calif.	Gwinn, N. Y.	O'Brien, Ill.
Arnold	Hagen	O'Brien, Mich.
Baldwin, Md.	Hall,	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Edwin Arthur	Pfeifer
Barrett, Pa.	Halleck	Phillips
Bennet, N. Y.	Hare	Plumley
Bloom	Hart	Powell
Bolton	Hébert	Rabaut
Campbell	Heffernan	Reece, Tenn.
Carnahan	Hendricks	Reed, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Herter	Robertson,
Chiperfield	Hobbs	N. Dak.
Clark	Hoeven	Rockwell
Clements	Hope	Roe, N. Y.
Coffee	Horan	Ryter
Cole, N. Y.	Huber	Shafer
Colmer	Jackson	Sharp
Corbett	Jarman	Sheridan
Courtney	Johnson, Ind.	Simpson, Ill.
Crosser	Johnson,	Slaughter
Daughton, Va.	Luther A.	Snyder
Dawson	Jones	Somers, N. Y.
De Lacy	Jonkman	Starkey
Delaney,	Judd	Stefan
John J.	Kefauver	Stevenson
Douglas, Ill.	Kelly, Ill.	Sumner, Ill.
Drewry	Keogh	Thomas, Tex.
Dworshak	Kerr	Tibbott
Elliott	King	Tolan
Engel, Mich.	LaFollette	Vinson
Engle, Calif.	Larcade	White
Feighan	Lea	Wickersham
Fogarty	LeFevre	Winter
Fuller	Lynch	Wolcott
Gathings	McMillen, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gavin	Mahon	Woodhouse
Gerlach	Mason	Woodrum, Va.
Gibson	Merrow	Worley
Gillespie	Monroney	Zimmerman
Gorski	Morgan	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Bennet of New York for, with Mrs. Woodhouse against.

Mr. Graham for, with Mr. Clements against.

Mr. Tibbott for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Stefan for, with Mr. Grant of Alabama against.

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Jarman against.

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Patterson against.

Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Gorski against.

Mr. Robertson of North Dakota for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.

Mr. H. Carl Andersen for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Mr. Jones for, with Mr. John J. Delaney against.

Mr. Arnold for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Fuller for, with Mr. Hobbs against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Kerr against.

Mr. Jonkman for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Johnson of Indiana for, with Mr. Thomas of Texas against.

Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Somers of New York against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Simpson of Illinois for, with Mr. Roe of New York against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Zimmerman against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Gibson with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Crosser with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mrs. Douglas of Illinois with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Rockwell.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Horan.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. MURRAY. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: On page 1, line 4, after the word "of", strike out lines 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, including the word "House" in line 9 and insert "six Members of the Senate to be equally divided between the two major political parties to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, two each from the Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Appropriations Committees of the Senate, and six to be appointed in like manner from the House by the Speaker from three similar committees of the House."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us proposes to create a committee of 10 members—5 from the House and 5 from the Senate—to investigate the great disaster at Pearl Harbor December 7, 1941. It proposes that the Speaker shall appoint in the House three Democrats and two Republicans, and the President pro tempore shall appoint in the Senate three Democrats and two Republicans so that the committee as composed shall be made up of six Democrats and four Republicans.

My amendment proposes to have the committee composed of three Republicans and three Democrats in the House, and three Republicans and three Democrats from the Senate and that two each be taken from the Military, Naval, and Appropriation Committees. I suggest that they be taken from these three committees because these committees have had to do, through the years, especially with the plans of construction and the appropriations for Pearl Harbor. These three committees have had and now have special knowledge of all the matters relating to Pearl Harbor.

It is quite evident that the American people are not satisfied with the two investigations that have been made. They generally believe that the two committees that have made investigations were more or less limited in the scope of their investigations as well as in their reports; and these two committees were selected by the administration, one by the Secretary of the Navy, as suggested by the President, and the other by the War Department.

It is only natural that the administration and the Navy Department and War Department disclaim, as far as possible, responsibility for this disaster. The Secretary of the Navy, immediately after this disaster, flew to Hawaii and came back with the report that only one old battleship and two or three lighter craft were seriously damaged or injured, and that the balance of the Pacific fleet was out on the ocean looking for the enemy.

With this report the American people were expecting for some time a clash between our Navy and the Japanese Navy, with victory for our Navy. There was very little indication that any person there at Pearl Harbor was guilty of any serious negligence, and there after a committee headed by Justice Roberts made an investigation. They were very much limited in the scope of their powers and authority and only part of their report was available to the public. That report, however, did charge that the disaster was due to the negligence of Admiral Kimmel and General Short and some lesser officers.

It began to leak out that more than the obsolete battleship *Arizona* had been seriously damaged. We had lost some two or three or four battleships.

We had nine battleships based at Pearl Harbor. This was the bulk of the American Navy. It began to leak out, although not known definitely by the American people, that one of the battleships was at the time not at its base at Pearl Harbor, but the other eight ships were there, and either sunk or badly damaged, and all were put out of commission—in fact, we had lost, for the time being, our magnificent Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor—and in about a year the administration in public statements admitted this was true.

This was the greatest disaster and defeat ever suffered by the American Navy or Army in the entire history of our country. The lives of more than 3,000 seamen and soldiers and nearly a thousand officers of the Army and Navy were snuffed out in the twinkling of an eye.

We had hundreds of bombers and fighter planes based at Hickam Field,

close to Pearl Harbor. The destruction of our Navy and our air forces gave control of the Pacific to the Japs, and they made the most of it to subdue the Philippines, the East Indies, and other islands of the Pacific. To recover control of the Pacific by reason of this disaster has cost the lives and health of hundreds of thousands of American boys and billions of dollars, as well as untold hardships to our fighting men throughout the Pacific.

THE ADMINISTRATION PREVENTS COURT MARTIAL

Although the committee headed by Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court investigated and made a report soon after Pearl Harbor, and declared that that great disaster was due to the negligence of Admiral Kimmel in charge of the fleet and General Short in charge of the army, neither President Roosevelt nor the Secretary of the Navy nor the Secretary of War made any effort to have court-martial proceedings instituted against Admiral Kimmel or General Short or other persons responsible for that disaster.

No such court martial could be held or prosecutions instituted if not instituted within 2 years after the disaster. Congress by numerous acts urged upon the administration and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make an investigation of this disaster and that they take appropriate action; but the administration and the Army and the Navy ignored these acts of Congress and up to this moment no court martial or criminal proceedings have ever been instituted against either Admiral Kimmel or General Short or any other person, and no other action has been taken to atone for the loss of lives of our officers and men killed at Pearl Harbor and the destruction of our great fleet and our air force.

But finally a board was appointed under heavy pressure of these congressional acts and it convened July 20, 1944. After hearing numerous witnesses this board made a report which was made public and which report was approved by President Truman August 30, 1945. Of course, more than 2 years have elapsed and no court martial or other proceedings have been taken against these officers in charge at Pearl Harbor; and according to the statement of President Truman and Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy no court martial or prosecutions are contemplated in the future.

President Truman blames the American people. When the report was submitted to President Truman, he, on August 30, 1945, affixed a written statement to the report in which he used this language:

I have read it—

The report on Pearl Harbor—

very carefully, and I think the country is as much to blame as any individual in this final situation that developed at Pearl Harbor. Every time the President made an effort to get a preparedness program through the Congress it was stifled. When the President made a statement about the necessity of preparedness he was vilified for doing so.

This is a sweeping indictment of the American people individually and as a whole. It is not in harmony with the facts. There was quite a lot of sentiment in Congress for a two-ocean navy. When the question of a two-ocean navy was brought to the attention of President Roosevelt in May 1940 he stated: "Any person who favors a two-ocean navy is just plain dumb."

And in January 1938, when there was a lot of talk about developing an air force in this country, the President in his message to Congress pointed out that it was not the purpose or policy of this country to build up an air force equal to that of other countries of the world.

While I do not have the exact amount, all in all Congress must have appropriated a billion dollars to develop the great naval base, Army base, and airfield at Pearl Harbor through the years. It was admittedly the most powerful fortification in the western hemisphere and was surpassed only by the great British fortress at Gibraltar. Congress had granted every dollar for Pearl Harbor that President Roosevelt and other Presidents had asked for to make Pearl Harbor the mightiest fortress in the Western Hemisphere.

Furthermore, in June 1940 the President urged Congress to appropriate, as I recall, about five billions to cover a period of 5 years for national defense and urged Congress to act on that and adjourn.

Due to war conditions the Republicans of the House objected to the adjournment of Congress and the Congress remained in session and bills were passed appropriating many more billions in the interest of national defense. From 1933 to 1940 under President Roosevelt and his administration, through acts forced through Congress, there were placed at his disposal more than twenty-two billions, most of which he used in various forms of boondoggling and other nonessential projects throughout the Nation. Instead of using this money for raking leaves and other boondoggling and nonessentials, he could have used any amount of that sum that he desired to build up national defense and at the same time he could have provided real jobs for the American people.

Quite a number of people in all walks of life—farmers, miners, factory workers, business, and professional men and women—have taken strong issue with President Truman when he says that the American people are as much to blame as any individual for the disaster at Pearl Harbor. What did the people have to do with this great disaster? The American people certainly were not to blame for this disaster. The blame rests squarely on the shoulders of Mr. Roosevelt's administration, and Admiral Kimmel and General Short who were placed in charge of Pearl Harbor and Hickam Field by Mr. Roosevelt.

ADMIRAL KIMMEL, GENERAL SHORT, ADMIRAL STARK

The report, contrary to the statement of President Truman, blames Secretary of State Hull; Chief of Staff, General Marshall; Admiral Kimmel; and General Short with certain derelictions of duty in connection with the disaster of Pearl Harbor, but the President and others rushed to the defense of Secretary of State Hull and General Marshall. The American people are still not satisfied. They feel, as many of us in Congress feel, that a complete, full, and impartial investigation has not yet been made—all of the facts have not yet been brought out, and as Congress assembled there was a general feeling in the Congress that a more thorough and impartial investigation should be made. While the President and others apparently desired the whole matter dropped there was so much criticism throughout the country and in Congress that Senator BARKLEY, Democratic leader of the Senate, introduced this resolution calling for a sweeping congressional investigation and that resolution was passed unanimously in the Senate and according to this action Senator BARKLEY and his colleagues in the Senate must have believed that we, up to this time, had not had a complete report on this, the greatest disaster that had ever befallen American arms.

The Secretary of the Navy in this report stated:

That Admiral Stark and Admiral Kimmel failed to demonstrate the superior judgment necessary for exercising commands commensurate with their rank and their assigned duties and that neither one of these men should ever be considered for appointment to active duty for any position in which the exercise of superior judgment may be necessary.

Now, who placed Kimmel, who failed to have the qualifications, in charge of our great fleet at Pearl Harbor and who placed General Short in charge of Hickam Field? It was President Roosevelt. Admiral Richardson, a very able and experienced naval officer, was in charge of Pearl Harbor, and we are advised that because he would not move this fleet inside of the harbor in violation of the rules and best traditions of our Navy, as well as other navies of the world, his command was taken from him, and he was brought to Washington and put at a desk and President Roosevelt picked up his friend, Admiral Kimmel, and jumped him over 46 or 47 other naval officers of higher seniority and placed him in charge of Pearl Harbor, and at the request of some higher-ups Admiral Kimmel moved the fleet inside of the harbor so that our battleships and other units of our fleet were sitting like ducks on a pond when the Japs came on the morning of December 7, 1941. The American people had not a thing on earth to do with that. According to the naval rules, these naval units, or at least two-thirds or three-fourths of them, should have been out on the ocean. Our planes on Hickam Field, instead of cruising and keeping the necessary lookouts, were sitting idly on Hickam Field, and the Japs came along with their bombers and subs and destroyed our fleet and destroyed our planes and bombers and left our country helpless in the Pacific. Yet President Truman says that the country, the American people, are as much to blame as any individual for that disaster at Pearl Harbor.

The Japanese traveled thousands of miles over the Pacific with a force of 3 battleships, 8 cruisers, 20 destroyers, 4 airplane carriers, and other vessels to reach Pearl Harbor. If there had been the least exercise of care on the part of

those in control of Pearl Harbor this destructive armada of the Japanese could and would have been discovered long before it reached Pearl Harbor. Anyone it appears with ordinary intelligence should have been on the alert under all the circumstances. The Japanese Prime Minister was giving out statements almost daily as to what they were going to do to the United States. Secretary Hull had given his ultimatum to the Japanese. The situation had been tense for weeks, yet there was no precaution taken to prepare Pearl Harbor against the assault, althought it was the mightiest fortress in the Western Hemisphere, with a great fleet, and with a reasonably strong air force. Furthermore, about 40 percent of the population of Hawaii and the Hawaiian Islands are Japanese nationals. They did not pretend to be American citizens. Japan had sent to Honolulu a Japanese Consul, and 250 Vice Consuls, all of them bright, alert Japs, with their eyes and ears open and their noses in all of the activities going on in and around Pearl Harbor, and with diplomatic immunity from arrest. A great spy ring was developed there and the FBI called upon General Short to help arrest them, and he declined to do so, and an appeal was taken to Washington, we are informed, and they declined to do anything with this spy ring. We are also advised that the FBI was in possession of communications between these Japanese Consuls and the Foreign Minister of Japan indicating that an attack was imminent. This information was delivered on Saturday morning, December 6, to General Short. Other warnings were given to Short and Kimmel.

A leading newspaper there warned there would likely be an attack from Japan on that week end, and yet the fleet and air power was not in a position to defend against such an attack. Many officers and men were away from their posts. The fleet was not in readiness to move or engage in combat. There might have been some excuse for not disclosing all the facts in this case soon after Pearl Harbor, although the Japs had photographed all of the damage they had done to Pearl Harbor, our fleet, and our Air Force. There certainly has been no excuse for holding these facts from the American people all this time and for not taking action against those in charge who were responsible for the deaths of these men and officers. Many people believe that no action was taken against Admiral Kimmel and General Short because a court martial would have brought out all the facts which would involve the higher ups, and that was why a vigorous fight was made against the resolutions passed by Congress by the administration to avoid a thorough investigation and court martial against the guilty parties.

When those in charge at Pearl Harbor and those in charge of all of our armed forces failed to take the proper precaution for the United States, the wonderful instrumentalities that had been provided at Pearl Harbor for the defense of the Hawaiian Islands and our country, how can President Truman blame the Nation and the American people as a whole? Under the conditions, would 20 battleships or 1,000 bombers or planes have been any more effective in the defense of Pearl Harbor than the fleet and air power we had there? If we had had 20 battleships and a thousand bombers there at that time, it is likely they would have been destroyed, all of them.

Inasmuch as the American people and the country have not accepted the investigations and reports already made by the administration and its agencies, I should like to see this committee, made up of six Democrats and six Republicans, and that they make a most thorough and searching investigation and get the facts and make a report to the Congress and to the American people and let the chips fall where they may, and let our generation know and history record the cause of the destruction of our Pacific Fleet and the deaths of nearly 4,000 American officers and men. There certainly should be no partisanship whatsoever, and the guilty, whoever they may be, should not be spared in this investigation and report.

I have always had the highest regard for General Marshall, as a man and as a soldier. This committee should not hesitate to exonerate those who have been charged and who are found without fault. This is not a partisan question. The American people want to know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We might just as well settle this question now as later, as to who is going to be Speaker and who is going to name committees. I have never named a committee without consulting the minority leader about the minority membership; but if resolutions are going to be passed in this House when investigations come up, and if the Speaker is going to be told whom to appoint, then the Speaker is going to avoid any responsibility about the appointment of investigating committees.

I do not know that membership on any standing committee of the House qualifies any man to serve on any other committee, especially an investigating committee.

On the matter of three and three, that has already been passed upon and the House has voted it down. I trust the House will vote down this amendment and let us go on as we have ever since we organized the Congress, and free the Speaker, if he is going to have any responsibility, and let him select Members from the membership of this House and not tie him up to any special committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

On page 1, line 4, after the words "composed of", strike out the word "five" and insert the word "seven"; also in line 5, strike out the word "three" and insert the word "four."

Also in line 6, strike out the word "five" and insert the word "seven"; also in line 8, strike out the word "three" and insert the word "four."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I shall not impose upon the House to debate this amendment at any length. The amendment simply changes the resolution from a committee of 10 to a committee of 14 members. I think such an important committee should have at least this number of members.

Of necessity there will have to be subcommittees to make investigations, and I believe this could be done more efficiently and expeditiously if the number were increased from 10 to 14, granting as you of the majority demand 8 Democrats and 6 Republicans. I still believe that if we are to have an impartial investigation, the representation on the committee should be divided equally to assure an unbiased nonpartisan investigation and reports which will fully satisfy the American people.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete investigation of the facts relating to the events and circumstances leading up to or following the attack made by Japanese armed forces upon Pearl Harbor in the Territory of Hawaii on December 7, 1941, and shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than January 3, 1946, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. The testimony of any person in the armed services, and the fact that such person testified before the joint committee herein provided for, shall not be used against him in any court proceeding, or held against him in examining his military status for credits in the service to which he belongs.

SEC. 4. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress (prior to January 3, 1946), to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of

the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair is putting the question.

Mr. RICH. I was on my feet and addressed the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognized the gentleman in charge of the bill.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SABATH and Mr. MARTIN asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. After the reading of section 4 of the bill which contained subsections (a), (b), and (c), could not a Member have risen to strike out the last word and have been recognized?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman did not state for what purpose he rose. The gentleman from Illinois who is in charge of the resolution was on his feet at the same time. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentleman from Illinois made a preferential motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Must a Member on the floor addressing the Speaker state the purpose for which he addresses the Speaker before he may be recognized?

The SPEAKER. Two Members rose. The Speaker always has the right to recognize whichever Member he desires. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Illinois who was in charge of the resolution. The gentleman from Illinois made a preferential motion; the Chair put the motion and it was adopted.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and there were—yeas 308, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—308

Adams	Bell	Bulwinkle
Allen, Ill.	Bender	Bunker
Allen, La.	Bennett, Mo.	Burgin
Andersen, H. Carl	Biemiller	Butler
Andresen, August H.	Bishop	Byrne, N. Y.
Andrews, Ala.	Blackney	Byrnes, Wis.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bland	Camp
Angell	Boren	Canfield
Arends	Boykin	Cannon, Fla.
Arnold	Bradley, Mich.	Cannon, Mo.
Auchincloss	Bradley, Pa.	Carlson
Bailey	Brehm	Case, N. J.
Barden	Brooks	Celler
Barrett, Wyo.	Brown, Ga.	Chapman
Barry	Brown, Ohio	Chelf
Bates, Ky.	Brumbaugh	Chenoweth
Bates, Mass.	Bryson	Church
Beall	Buck	Clason
Beckworth	Buckley	Clevenger
	Buffett	Cochran
		Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.	Holifield	Price, Ill.
Combs	Holmes, Mass.	Priest
Cooley	Holmes, Wash.	Quinn, N. Y.
Cooper	Hook	Rabin
Cox	Howell	Rains
Cravens	Hull	Ramey
Crawford	Izac	Ramspeck
Cunningham	Jenkins	Randolph
Curley	Jennings	Rankin
Curtis	Jensen	Reed, N. Y.
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Calif.	Rees, Kans.
Davis	Johnson, Ill.	Resa
Delaney, James J.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rich
D'Ewart	Johnson, Okla.	Richards
Dickstein	Kean	Riley
Dingell	Kearney	Rivers
Dirksen	Kee	Rizley
Dolliver	Keefe	Robertson, Va.
Domengeaux	Kelley, Pa.	Robinson, Utah
Dondero	Kilburn	Robsion, Ky.
Doughton, N. C.	Kilday	Rodgers, Pa.
Douglas, Calif.	Kinzer	Roe, Md.
Doyle	Kirwan	Roe, N. Y.
Durham	Knutson	Rogers, Fla.
Earthman	Kopplemann	Rogers, Mass.
Eaton	Kunkel	Rogers, N. Y.
Eberharter	Landis	Rooney
Ellis	Lane	Rowan
Ellsworth	Lanham	Russell
Elsaesser	Latham	Sabath
Elston	LeCompte	Sadowski
Ervin	Lemke	Savage
Fallon	Lesinski	Schwabe, Mo.
Fellows	Lewis	Schwabe, Okla.
Fenton	Link	Scrivener
Fernandez	Luce	Sheppard
Fisher	Ludlow	Short
Flannagan	Lyle	Sikes
Flood	McConnell	Simpson, Pa.
Folger	McCormack	Smith, Maine
Forand	McCowen	Smith, Ohio
Fulton	McDonough	Smith, Va.
Gallagher	McGehee	Smith, Wis.
Gamble	McGlinchey	Sparkman
Gardner	McGregor	Spence
Gary	McKenzie	Springer
Gearhart	McMillan, S. C.	Stewart
Geelan	Madden	Stigler
Gifford	Maloney	Sullivan
Gillette	Manasco	Sumners, Tex.
Gillie	Mansfield, Mont.	Sundstrom
Goodwin	Mansfield, Tex.	Taber
Gordon	Marcantonio	Talbot
Gore	Martin, Iowa	Talle
Granahan	Martin, Mass.	Tarver
Granger	May	Taylor
Grant, Ind.	Michener	Thom
Green	Miller, Calif.	Thomas, N. J.
Gregory	Miller, Nebr.	Thomason
Griffiths	Mills	Torrens
Gwinn, N. Y.	Morrison	Towe
Gwynne, Iowa	Mott	Traynor
Hale	Murdock	Trimble
Hall, Leonard W.	Murphy	Vinson
Hancock	Neely	Voorhis, Calif.
Hand	Norton	Vorys, Ohio
Harless, Ariz.	O'Hara	Vursell
Harness, Ind.	O'Konski	Wadsworth
Harris	O'Neal	Walter
Hartley	O'Toole	Wasielewski
Havenner	Outland	Weaver
Hays	Pace	Welchel
Healy	Patman	Weiss
Hedrick	Patrick	Welch
Henry	Patterson	West
Heselton	Peterson, Ga.	Whitten
Hess	Philbin	Whittington
Hill	Pickett	Wigglesworth
Hinshaw	Pittenger	Wilson
Hobbs	Ploeser	Winstead
Hoch	Poage	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hoffman	Price, Fla.	Wood
		Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—123

Abernethy	Corbett	Gavin
Anderson, Calif.	Courtney	Gerlach
Baldwin, Md.	Crosser	Gibson
Baldwin, N. Y.	Daughton, Va.	Gillespie
Barrett, Pa.	Dawson	Gorski
Bennet, N. Y.	De Lacy	Gossett
Bloom	Delaney, John J.	Graham
Bolton	Douglas, Ill.	Grant, Ala.
Burch	Drewry	Gross
Campbell	Dworshak	Hagen
Carnahan	Elliott	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Case, S. Dak.	Engel, Mich.	Halleck
Chiperfield	Engle, Calif.	Hare
Clark	Feighan	Hart
Clements	Fogarty	Hébert
Coffee	Fuller	Heffernan
Cole, N. Y.	Gathings	Hendricks
Colmer	Herter	Mason
	Hoeven	Merrow
	Hope	Monroney
	Horan	Morgan
	Huber	Mundt
	Jackson	Murray, Tenn.
	Jarman	Murray, Wis.
	Johnson, Ind.	Norrell
	Johnson, Luther A.	O'Brien, Ill.
	Jones	O'Brien, Mich.
	Jonkman	Peterson, Fla.
	Judd	Pfeifer
	Kefauver	Phillips
	Kelly, Ill.	Plumley
	Keogh	Powell
	Kerr	Rabaut
	King	Rayfiel
	LaFollette	Reece, Tenn.
	Larcade	Reed, Ill.
	Lea	Robertson, N. Dak.
	LeFevre	Rockwell
	Lynch	Ryter
	McMillen, Ill.	Sasscer
	Mahon	Shafer
		Sharp
		Sheridan
		Simpson, Ill.
		Slaughter
		Snyder
		Somers, N. Y.
		Starkey
		Stefan
		Stevenson
		Stockman
		Sumner, Ill.
		Thomas, Tex.
		Tibbott
		Tolan
		White
		Wickersham
		Winter
		Wolcott
		Wolverton, N. J.
		Woodhouse
		Woodrum, Va.
		Worley
		Zimmerman

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Clements with Mr. Graham.

Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. King with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Tibbott.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Stefan.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Gorski with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Bloom with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. John J. Delaney with Mr. Jones.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Jonkman.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Ryter with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.

Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall and listening when his name was called?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I was not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL OF WAR TIME

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow, immediately after the meeting of the House for business, to consider the bill (H. R. 3974) to repeal war time; that general debate be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object,

and I shall not because I want to congratulate the committee on bringing in the legislation at this early date, as I understand it, that will be the first order of business tomorrow?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I was under the impression that H. R. 3660 was to be the next order of business.

The SPEAKER. That is a question for the Chair, as to whether the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois to call up the rule or recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma to call up the bill repealing war time. The request being made at this time is for the war time repeal bill to take precedence.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this legislation will take only an hour and it is necessary that it be enacted at the earliest possible moment. The bill H. R. 3660 will follow immediately. Both bills will be considered tomorrow.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this important or urgent because the war is over?

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is. A great many Members are asking for the passage of this bill and a great many bills have been introduced. The committee reported this bill unanimously. It is intended to go into effect on September 30, provided the Senate passes the bill and the President approves it before that time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the end of the war is what makes this urgent?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wanted to know whether the war had ended or not; that was all.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am saying that we have decided that war time should end regardless of the other.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow to consider as the first order of business the bill (H. R. 3974) to repeal war time; that there be not to exceed 1 hour's general debate, to be equally divided and to be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES].

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STIMULATING ENLISTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday next to call up the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate enlistment in the Regular Army of the United States; that general debate on the bill not exceed 3 hours, to be confined to the bill; that it be equally divided and controlled by myself as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and by the ranking Member on the minority side; that after general debate the bill be read under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this bill reported unanimously by the committee?

Mr. MAY. Yes; it is a unanimous report and I think a very excellent report.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does it need 3 hours? Can we not make it less?

The SPEAKER. The request was not to exceed 3 hours.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

THE JAPANESE SURRENDER DOCUMENTS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to announce to the House of Representatives that at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, Wednesday, September 12, the Japanese surrender documents will be placed on public display in the exhibition hall of the National Archives. Speaker RAYBURN will serve as master of ceremonies and the Japanese surrender documents will be unveiled by Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright. The ceremonies will be broadcast by several of the networks and local stations. The Archivist of the United States has requested me to extend a cordial invitation to all Members of the House of Representatives to attend this historic ceremony. Those attending should enter by the Pennsylvania Avenue door by 10:50 a. m., and go to the Conference Room.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from a New York newspaper.

Mr. CARLSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a compilation of matter from an outside source.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech made by President Green of the A. F. of L.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier in the day and to include certain excerpts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on tomorrow for 10 minutes at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] may be excused from attending the sessions of the House this week on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with on tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LOANS TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning's Times-Herald announced that the British Government will open negotiations today for three to six billion dollars of financial assistance for the industrial and commercial rehabilitation of Britain. We are told that a plea of "poverty and grim picture of economic chaos in the wake of British bankruptcy" is to be offered by high British officials in support of the demand of the Empire, which received $18,000,000,000 of war aid from the United States.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Are we to understand that the British have received the amount of money the gentleman has stated through lend-lease?

Mr. KNUTSON. Through lend-lease; yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. At the expense of the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; to the extent of $18,000,000,000. The news story goes on to say that—

> British financial leaders are asking for a gift of the billions, cancellation of lend-lease, cancellation of the World War debt, and return of money spent by Britain on war supplies in this country before lend-lease; that unofficial British proposals would go even further. It has been proposed that the United States give Britain $6,000,000,000 so that the United Kingdom can cut its war debt in half, pay 50 cents on the remaining dollar with American money and give IOU's for the rest.

It does not take an economist or statistician to realize that Britain is in a serious way financially. But for that matter, so are all the other United Nations—America, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, and the Dominions.

If the British treasury is in such precarious condition why did a majority of the voters of the United Kingdom go to

the polls at the recent election and vote to have the Government take over the coal mines, utilities, transportation, and the banking systems, not to mention a liberalization of old-age assistance? Where did they think the billions to finance such an ambitious program were to come from? From the United States, of course. The American people are being asked to finance the socialization of the United Kingdom through the forcible acquisition of business and industry. Why should we finance this journey into utopia? We were not consulted, neither were we allowed to vote on the proposition. Would not that be "taxation without representation" and did not the heroes of the Boston Tea Party reject that philosophy 170 years ago?

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I am amazed to hear the gentleman's statement to the effect that England expects us to finance its experimentation in socialization. That raises this question in my mind: Can the gentleman cite any provision in our Constitution which permits and authorizes the levying of taxes upon the American people to carry on the functions of government in a foreign country?

Mr. KNUTSON. I cannot. I may say to the gentleman that for the past decade or so the Constitution has been more honored in the breach than in the observance.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. It is true that there is no constitutional authority for such a thing, but this administration did go into Brazil and spend $3,000,000 to build a steel plant.

Mr. KNUTSON. More than $3,000,000, was it not?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not recall the exact figure, but those in charge of the project admitted that it had nothing to do with our war program. It was merely taking substance out of the Treasury of the United States and building an industrial enterprise in a foreign country. It was entirely without foundation in law.

Mr. KNUTSON. That enterprise is now going to embark upon production which will come into competition with American products and displace American workers. Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. CURTIS. I think that is right, but the unlawful spending of the taxpayers' money in secrecy is a greater crime than any trouble that will arise out of competition.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, pursuing that thought, if I understand it correctly. Britain intends to take the coal mines in her country by the exercise of eminent domain, which is the highest function of sovereignty next to national defense. That means that they will take this property and pay for it. England ought to pay for the property that she takes. Why do they expect the American taxpayers to pay the bill resulting from the taking of property under eminent domain? That is the thing that amazes and shocks me. It is beyond comprehension.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman has not forgotten the last extension of the so-called pseudo Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act wherein we extended to the administration the power to take another cut of 50 percent off the tariff. It is plainly to be seen that the whole program is now developing to the point where it is clear that we have been building up in foreign countries at our expense industrial empires which in the years to come will produce and bring into this country practically free of tariff commodities in competition with our own factories.

Mr. KNUTSON. Uncle Sam has become a glorified Santa Claus. I think it is high time we take the old gentleman into a barber shop and give him a shave.

While the war was on, the American people in many instances, bought war bonds until it hurt but it is to be doubted that they will continue to buy Government bonds, the proceeds of which are to be used to promote a program of governmental banditry, for that is precisely what it amounts to. I, for one, will not invest a single nickel for that purpose. It would seem to an unbiased American that Britain should look to Moscow for financial aid in carrying out the ambitious program of expropriation which the new labor government of Britain has mapped out to be financed by Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable to me that President Truman and the Congress will permit billions to be taken out of the American Treasury and given to foreign countries to be used for expropriation of privately owned and operated property, especially in view of the depleted condition of our own Treasury.

In a few days the American people will be called upon to subscribe for an $11,000,000,000 bond issue. Every dollar realized from that sale should be devoted to helping America get back on her own feet. Before we can get back to a normal basis we will have to spend billions of the taxpayers' money in smoothing out the road to normalcy. Today our aged are receiving less than a bare subsistence allowance to live on and that allowance must be increased without delay if further suffering among them is to be avoided. We have many other equally pressing problems. The solution of which will cost billions.

Just what kind of saps do they think we are? They tell us that we should make this grant because they got into the the war and held the line until we could get ready and that it was our war. That war was declared by Britain and France without consulting us, so far as I can learn. Churchill, on more than one occasion, has boasted how he finally succeeded in dragging America into the war.

There has been altogether too much bunk put out about the late war. In the early days we were told time without number that the British Navy was our first line of defense and I need not remind the House how it was necessary for us to send half the Pacific Fleet to the Atlantic to bolster up that "first line of defense," which action left our Pacific outposts exposed and defenseless and later invited the attack on Pearl Harbor.

If America finances the socialization of British economy, other countries will expect us to do as much for them and no one can foretell with any degree of accuracy what the total cost would be.

Fellow Americans, the time has come for us to be realistic and fair to our own people. We should tell the Government of the United Kingdom that if they wish to forcibly take over all major private activities they must themselves finance it and, failing in that, they should look to Moscow for such financing. The program that we are asked to finance is alien to our concepts of government and contrary to our philosophy of economics.

Nearly 150 years ago, when our sovereignty was threatened on all sides by hostile governments which I will not now name, the hardy and indomitable Americans of that day coined the phrase, "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute." Let the Americans of this generation paraphrase that courageous slogan and say to the world, "Millions for relief but not one cent for Socialist or Communist experimentation."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from California stated that he was amazed and shocked by the proposal to spend American dollars to socialize Great Britain—to purchase their railroads and banks. I do not know why he should be because for the last 10 or 12 years we have been following that course, and why should we change so suddenly? May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota another question? As long as this is an experiment in which we do not believe—that is, we do not believe any good will come out of it—might it not be along the line of reasoning we have had in the past 3 years to get them to try that experiment over there instead of trying it here in America? Perhaps some of those who favor the socialization of our industries could get an object lesson from what happens over there.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is just possible it would be cheaper for us in the long run to let Britain have the money and use the British people as guinea pigs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right, and we will see how it comes out instead of using our own people.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. Is it not a fact that there will always be an America if we do not give the country away?

Mr. KNUTSON. Absolutely. May I say to the gentleman he never uttered a greater truth in his life. There will always be an America if we do not give it away. But to preserve America it is also necessary that we keep sacred our oath of office.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. It is evidently true that England intends to use this money for the socialization of her industries because just recently their No. 1 brain truster, Mr. Laski, protested over the fact that Americans were objecting to that. We have a right to object when we are the ones to pay the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. We are not objecting to the experiment if they pay the bill. It is their government and they can do with it as they wish. But we do object when they expect Americans to finance such a revolutionary move.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Does the gentleman know whether or not this money will be given to the British or borrowed, as it is so called, from us?

Mr. KNUTSON. What difference does it make? Britain owes $6,500,000,000 from the last war. If she cannot pay $6,500,000,000 plus the $29,500,000,000 we have advanced through lease-lend, then she cannot pay the additional $6,000,000,000 that she is now asking for.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Whether she can or cannot, it has already been demonstrated by the action of Great Britain and other nations working with her, led by Great Britain and with mutual understanding. Previously we loaned money to Britain and these other 17 countries. What was the answer to that?

Mr. KNUTSON. They welshed on their debts.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. They repudiated those debts.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Those debts remain repudiated to this day. Today there is a charge of $14,500,000,000 against the taxpayers of the United States from the other war, and they are again looking to us to take their chestnuts out of the fire.

Mr. KNUTSON. No one but a sap would advance a loan to a person who already has repudiated a previous loan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Nobody unless they were bereft of their senses would dream of it.

Mr. GEARHART. I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is entitled to the gratitude of the Nation in calling attention to the fact that whatever they call it, lend-lease operation or a loan operation, in the end it amounts to nothing less than a gift.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is correct.

Mr. GEARHART. And that gift must come out of the pockets of the American taxpayer. That is the only place Uncle Sam can raise the money. Uncle Sam must raise the money by taking it from his people.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means knows we are going to have all we can do to finance our peacetime Budget, which includes $6,000,000,000 for the servicing of the Federal debt, perhaps two or three billion dollars for the care of those who have made the great sacrifice of losing limbs or eyes and coming out ruined in health and in body and in mind and the dependents of our honored dead. The best you can figure for the postwar Budget is $20,000,000,000 and there are those who say it is going to be $35,000,000,000. If it is $35,000,000,000, it will mean a tax of 33⅓ percent on every dollar that we earn.

Mr. GEARHART. If the gentleman will yield further, I think it would be proper to place in the RECORD at this time the additional amount of money that they planned to ask for just a month ago. This is a break-down which does not include the present demand for $6,000,000,000 to relieve England and to promote and finance her adventures into socialism. Just a month ago when the list was made up they were going to demand from us a further appropriation to UNRRA; a further appropriation for Army relief of $1,000,000,000; a further appropriation for lend-lease through FEA of $4,375,000,000; an American appropriation to the International Bank of $9,100,000,000; an appropriation to the International Bank fund of $2,750,000,000; an appropriation to the Export-Import Bank of $3,500,000,000. That makes a total of $21,625,000,000 coming out of the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. To conclude my statement, I just want to say in addition to the $21,625,000,000 which is to be taken from the American taxpayers, they now want to add $6,000,000,000 more for Britain, making the total $27,625,000,000 to be given to the outside world.

Mr. KNUTSON. But it is not only Britain that is asking for loans. The gentleman recalls that Russia has announced she is going to need that much also from us. Also all of the other United Nations will apply for loans from us. We have already concluded an agreement with France, if the gentleman will recall, whereby we are committed for approximately $1,000,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. It is $2,575,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Michigan corrects me and tells me it is $2,575,000,000. Where is all this money coming from? Are we going to keep our own people under the heel of oppressive taxation for generations to come to play the role of Santa Claus to all the world? Our taxes will remain onerous and burdensome with the national debt we now have. If we take on all the other obligations which we are asked to assume we will bankrupt the Treasury and we will have the wildest inflation the world has ever seen; inflation that will wipe us all out and force us to again start from scratch, down at the grass roots. Probably that is what the planners want. I want to salvage something out of this America that we all love and revere. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] when he says there will always be an America if we do not give it away.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. I have here a press dispatch, a radio release, from London, dated August 31, in which they say if we do not come across with at least $2,000,000,000 they are going to raise against us further trade barriers and also other forms of discrimination against the movement of our commerce into their sphere of influence.

Mr. KNUTSON. As the gentleman well knows, they have been using such discriminations against us for years; the sterling bloc; the Empire Preference Trading Act, and other artificial devices that I might mention.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Am I correctly informed when I labor under the impression that Lord Keynes, the man who sold this Nation on the heresy of deficit spending, is here now trying to put a gun at our heads on this proposition?

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not think he needs to put a gun at our heads. We are such generous souls that we will probably give them this money without being subjected to duress of any kind.

Mr. JENNINGS. I have no animosity toward the British people. I am 90 percent British by ancestry, but I am wondering how long we can maintain the British Empire in the style to which she has been accustomed.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is a very pertinent observation.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. It seems to me that in pondering this whole question we ought not lose sight of the fact that today the debt of the United States is greater than the combined debts of all our allies.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is true.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. All those people who are now looking to us for further billions.

Mr. KNUTSON. Not only that, but the debt of the United States today is as much as the assessed valuation of the country—property of all kinds. In other words, we owe one hundred cents on the dollar. It speaks volumes for our credit that we are able to keep on borrowing under the circumstances.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If I understand the gentleman, he has been explaining to the country in his discussion that it is a false statement to say that lend-lease has stopped. Lend-lease continues to go on. Is that correct?

Mr. KNUTSON. It is proposed to continue lend-lease in a new garb.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is the whole thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert therein an article entitled "United States Urged To Hold Fast to Huge Merchant Marine," by Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Sunday Star, September 2, 1945.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION AND THE MAINTENANCE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I do not in any way wish to minimize the importance of the problem brought to our attention by my good friend the gentleman from Minnesota, but the most important problem facing the Government of the United States today is the matter of returning to their homes those valiant members of our armed forces who have made victory possible. Words of praise for the great work they have done will never compensate them for the sacrifices that they have made. In fact, nothing that we can do will wholly repay them. The least we can do, however, is give them prompt action in the direction of satisfying the principal desire that is in all their hearts—the desire for freedom of action.

Let us remember that most of these men are not in the armed forces by reason of choice. They were not sweating it out in the jungles and swamps of the Pacific or the beaches and deserts and mountains of Africa, France and Italy by choice. They were taken by the Government of the United States. They were assigned to a particular job, not by choice, but by the Government of the United States. They were sent where the Government of the United States decided they were needed. But now the shooting is over and it is time to give back to these men that which they by their blood, sweat and tears have saved for us, namely—Freedom.

I recognize as I believe everyone does that the war will not necessarily be over until Germany and Japan are rendered impotent to ever again make war. This is an important job and it is a job that requires men.

The question facing us, however, is—Must we compel men to do the job or can it be done by volunteers?

I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that it can be done by volunteers and we shall be breaking faith with the young men and women of this country who have so nobly served in the time of need if we do not make every effort to have the job done in that way.

There is a job to be done. This job takes men. First let us learn how many. I think, Mr. Speaker, that Congress should get this information immediately and please understand me, I do not mean how many men the Army and Navy authorities would like to have, I mean how many men are actually needed.

When we have that information, the job of the Government is to go out immediately and get them, not by compulsion, but by inducement.

I am convinced there are many things that can be done to make this work attractive enough so as to assure sufficient volunteers. There are the matters of better pay, better living conditions, more frequent furloughs, shorter periods of service, educational facilities, retirement benefits, merit advancements, security, and many others.

When we had a production job to do we did not hesitate to hire the job done regardless of the effort or cost necessary. We now have a replacement job to do. Let us not hesitate in doing anything that is necessary in order to get those men and women in our armed forces home and back to civilian life who want to go home.

If anyone's wishes should be respected, it is the wishes of these men and women who have already given so much to their country.

There are those who talk about the continuation of the draft. In my humble judgment, Mr. Speaker, the drafting of men should be continued only as a last resort. It should be used only if it is necessary in order to return the veterans of this war to their homes. If it is necessary for that purpose, then by all means it should be used. But at all times let us make sure that its use is necessary to accomplish that objective.

And while I am on this subject of the draft, Mr. Speaker, I wish to give voice to my vehement objection to the further drafting of teen age boys. I can readily appreciate that they were probably needed in the services during some of the dark hours of the war. Those dark hours have now passed and the drafting of these men under any circumstances should be discontinued immediately.

This afternoon I call for action. The Congress has already been back in session for a full week and as of this hour nothing has been done on this matter. If the administration is going to take up "the first things first", it will give this matter immediate attention. Now is the time for action, not words. Let us get results.

CONSCRIPTION IN PEACETIME UNNECESSARY—GET THE MEN HOME

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday next the Republicans will hold a conference in this room. It is my hope that every Republican Member of this House, and Members on the majority side if they feel so inclined, will read and reread the speech just made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Our colleague from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] talked about the expenditure and the giving away of our dollars. The gentleman from Wisconsin clearly and accurately presented the case of our young men who should not be drafted and of those who are in the service and who are entitled to come home.

Some time ago I dropped into the hopper a bill to end the conscription in peacetime of our men. I have received many, many protests from men who are now in the service, from men who are serving in the Pacific and across the seas in the European area. They wrote that it is not fair to discontinue the drafting of those who have not served and the drafting of those who have become of age in more recent months. They would be right about that if it were not for the fact that they mistake the issue. The question is not as to who shall be forced to serve abroad—but is whether any of our men should be forced to serve abroad after the fighting is over.

There may be some Republicans, there may be some internationalists, there may be some New Dealers, who still believe it to be our duty to clean up Europe and the South Pacific, to rebuild all damaged cities and towns and to do it by forced conscripted men who are inducted into the Army. That is not my belief.

Yesterday I received a letter from a farmer in my district, an elderly man, and I hope the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] will not go out as he evidently intends because I know, I think I know, how he feels about this matter of taking care of Europe and these other countries and I would like to have him some time tell us just what would be fair to these young men who are coming 18 and those in the service and who expect to be the fathers of the future generation on which America must depend if she is to continue as a free and independent Nation.

This farmer said that the buildings on his farm were run down, that he and the old lady had not been able to carry on as they should, that the fences needed fixing; there were washouts on the farm, and he wanted to know when his boy, who had served across the seas for more than 2 years and who wrote him that he was cleaning gutters and streets in Europe, was going to get home and do some home work.

Now, that is a question that more and more people throughout the country are asking. It seems to me that we should not only discontinue the drafting of men but every man who served across the seas is entitled to come home, and should be brought home.

Well, then, what are you going to do about it? There are several answers. The gentleman from Wisconsin advanced what I think is the real answer. If we will give to those who want to make a life career in the services, the Army the Navy, or the Air Corps, anything in Uncle Sam's services, just a fraction of the amount which we paid to the war workers who stayed at home and worked in the factories during the war, I think that we will get enough men to do all necessary work abroad. Twice our young men, not we—I do not mean "we" won the war, but if the young men of our country, having won two wars, having twice put Germany down where she belongs—having done that, they are entitled to come home and leave the task of keeping Germany disarmed or preventing those who want to make money out of war, furnishing funds so that Germany can rearm, leave that task to the British Empire, to France, and to Russia, and let them keep the Germans in line

now. And it will take a very comparatively small force in Japan under General MacArthur, or better yet, if he wants to go back, under that hero who addressed us here yesterday—let him go back if he wishes, when he has recovered his health, with those men who were prisoners in Japan, who know by actual experience the character of the Japanese—let them go back if they so desire, and take care of Japan and see that she does not have opportunity to rearm—I say, if they want to. No need to worry but that General Wainwright and his men will do a real job of—shall I say, learning or teaching the Japs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why is not the plan offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin well worth trying? I notice the chairman of our Republican conference present. Why cannot the gentleman on Friday, when this matter comes up, be given ample time to explain to the Members of the party, not in the 5 minutes that I understand each one is to have, but ample time to offer his plan—I trust he will be given all the time needed—and that the plan he explains will be tried.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STEVENSON (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. CLEMENTS (at the request of Mr. CHELF), for 5 days, on account of business in his Second District of Kentucky.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 12, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

At 10 a. m. on Wednesday, September 12, 1945, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a public hearing on the bill (H. R. 3750) to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941. The meeting will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a public hearing before the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 10 a. m. on Thursday, September 13, 1945, in the committee hearing room, 247 Old House Office Building, on H. R. 1653, by Representative HENDRICKS, and H. R. 2073, by Representative LUDLOW, bills to extend benefits to veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their dependents.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

675. A letter from the secretary, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

676. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report covering the period from July 1, 1944, to June 30, 1945, pursuant to Public Law No. 779, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3686. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the registers of the land offices in Alaska to perform functions under the Alaska real-property-ownership-declaration law; without amendment (Rept. No. 944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3974. A bill to provide for termination of daylight saving time; without amendment (Rept. No. 945). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 3989. A bill to incorporate the Victory Mothers of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3990. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain commissioned officers, commissioned warrant officers, chief warrant officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 3991. A bill designating September 2—the date proclaimed by the President of the United States as the final surrender of Japan and ending hostilities in World War II—as a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 3992. A bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act, except section 9; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 3993. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. a right-of-way and easement for railroad purposes across a portion of Camp Cooke Military Reservation, Calif; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3994. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health and welfare of mothers and children and for services to crippled children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 3995. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3996. A bill relating to the treatment for tax purposes of commissions paid for the acquisition of real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 3997. A bill to prohibit unauthorized disclosure of information concerning atomic bombs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution to terminate the effectiveness of the act of January 20, 1942, which established daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States to study and investigate the control of the atomic bomb; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 3998. A bill for the relief of O'Connell & Sweeney, of Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3999. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christine L. Middleton; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1135. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Petition from Mrs. Nettie LeFors, of Buffalo, Wyo., requesting passage of H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1136. Also, petition from Mrs. Clara Millhouse and 46 citizens of Newcastle, Wyo., requesting passage of H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1137. Also, petition from Mrs. Anna Donahue and 17 citizens of Rawlins, Wyo., requesting passage of H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1138. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of W. C. Van Denburg and other residents of Baldwinsville, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1139. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition urging the President and the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant certificates for overseas air service to shipping companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1140. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of citizens of What Cheer, Iowa, urging the continuance of the draft and the early release of fathers now serving in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1141. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Mansfield, Ohio, urging passage of H. R. 752, the Pace bill, to keep alcohol and gambling away from camps, and S. 623, the Johnson bill, to stop advertisement of alcoholic beverages over the radio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1142. Also, petition of citizens of Richland County, Ohio, expressing the feeling that our boys should be given a chance to continue their normal way of life—that a government such as ours can arrange a system to furnish boys for occupation of Japan and Germany on a strictly voluntary basis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1143. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 4879 of the Board of Supervisors of the City and

County of San Francisco, urging the President and the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant certificates for overseas air service to shipping companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1144. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Missouri River States Committee, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the development of the Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, September 10, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God who art in heaven and in all Thy works, we pause in the midst of thronging duties and confused issues to commune with Thee, unseen source of goodness, beauty, and truth, that the light which is the light of the world may shine upon us and illumine our path of action. May we know no glory but the supreme satisfaction of rendering to the Nation and to the world our utmost service unsullied by base motives of self-interest as again with the golden gift of a new day we pledge at this white altar of devotion integrity of character, purity of heart, and cleanness of hands and unswerving firmness of purpose in the fulfillment of this high and holy calling as servants of the Republic. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, September 11, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill H. R. 3644, an act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional rates of compensation or pension and remedy inequalities as to specific service-incurred disabilities in excess of total disability.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) to investigate the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and events and circumstances relating thereto.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	O'Daniel
Andrews	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hawkes	Overton
Bailey	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hoey	Robertson
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brooks	Knowland	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Taylor
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McFarland	Tobey
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
Cordon	McMahon	Tydings
Donnell	Maybank	Vandenberg
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
Fulbright	Morse	White
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent: The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the issue of the Washington Post of this morning contains a statement which I wish to correct. In a report respecting the visit to the White House by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and myself it is stated:

> Meanwhile, Senator CLYDE R. HOEY (Democrat, North Carolina), after a White House visit, said the President had told him he is considering the appointment of Federal Circuit Judge Orie L. Phillips, of Denver, to the Supreme Court. The appointment of Phillips, a Republican, was recommended by Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON (Democrat, Colorado) and EUGENE D. MILLIKIN (Republican, Colorado).
>
> HOEY called at the White House with Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY (Democrat, North Carolina) to urge appointment of Judge Parker to the Supreme Court vacancy. The President, according to HOEY, pointed out that Judge Phillips had the longest period of service of any circuit-court judge.

I wish to say that I made no such statement to the newspapers about this matter. The senior Senator from North Carolina and I called at the White House and discussed with the President the appointment of Judge Parker, but I did not say at all that the President had made a statement with reference to Judge Phillips' appointment, as stated in the newspaper article. The President did not make any statement to me or to the senior Senator from North Carolina that he intended to appoint Judge Phillips or any other person, but his statement was that he had not yet made up his mind as to whom he would appoint to the Supreme Court. I wish to correct the newspaper statement because I made no such statement as is contained in it as to what the President said.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Hon. Bennett Champ Clark, of Missouri, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Thurman W. Arnold, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF E. BARRETT PRETTYMAN TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of E. Barrett Prettyman, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Justin Miller, registration effective October 1, 1945. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILBUR K. MILLER TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Com-

mittee room, upon the nomination of Wilbur K. Miller, of Kentucky, to be associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Fred M. Vinson, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Alexander Holtzoff, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Bolitha J. Laws; elevated. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN J. O'CONNELL TO BE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of John J. O'Connell, of Pennsylvania, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit; new position. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for the Commission for the quarter ending December 31, 1945, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1354. A bill to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of general of the Army and fleet admiral of the United States Navy, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War; without amendment (Rept. No. 559).

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. Res. 172. Resolution to investigate certain economic questions in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States resulting from the termination of the war; with an amendment.

EXTENSION OF AIR TRANSPORTATION TO SMALL CITIES AND TOWNS—REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, submitted a report (No. 558) to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) favoring an extension of the air-transportation system in the United States to small cities and towns, heretofore reported.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1383. A bill to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1384. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, so as to provide for recomputation of annuities of employees who retired prior to January 24, 1942; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to provide for the formation of policies with respect to the control and use of atomic energy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LABOR'S OPPORTUNITY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Labor's Opportunity," written by him and published in the Labor Day edition of Trade Union Courier, September 3, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT: MAN AND STATESMAN—ARTICLE BY JONATHAN DANIELS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Roosevelt: Man and Statesman," written by Jonathan Daniels and published in Liberty magazine of September 8, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED MEDICAL-SERVICE PLAN—ARTICLE BY DR. HARRY C. GUESS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding a proposed combined medical-service and hospital plan, by Dr. Harry C. Guess, from the Buffalo Evening News magazine of August 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATOMIC BOMB RESPONSIBILITIES—ARTICLE BY HANSON W. BALDWIN

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Atomic Bomb Responsibilities," written by Hanson W. Baldwin and published in the New York Times of September 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE JAPANESE ATTACK ON PEARL HARBOR—ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "John T. Flynn Charges Government Knew Jap Cabinet Intended To Break Relations," from the Chicago Tribune of September 2, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SUPPLY OF MEAT AND THE LIFTING OF MEAT RATIONING

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, yesterday by unanimous consent I had printed in the RECORD several newspaper articles relative to the lifting of red points on the sale of meat. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news comment from today's Washington Post entitled "Meat Piles Up as Dealers Ask End of Curbs." The article is printed in today's Washington Post. In this particular article the writer sets forth:

Washington's wholesale meat lockers had that bulging, prewar appearance yesterday while the public still went around with the same lean and hungry look.

Six of 10 meat wholesalers disclosed their freezers were either overstocked or would be within the next 10 days. They echoed the announcement with a plea to the Office of Price Administration to remove meat rationing in the midst of plenty.

OPA's only comment was that no definite date has been set to end meat rationing. Unofficial reports had set either October 1 or November 1 as the ration-lifting date, but OPA would name no specific date.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEAT PILES UP AS DEALERS ASK END OF CURBS—WHOLESALERS REPORT BULGING LOCKERS—OPA HEDGES ON FIXING DATE

Washington's wholesale meat lockers had that bulging, prewar appearance yesterday while the public still went around with the same lean and hungry look.

Six of 10 meat wholesalers disclosed their freezers were either overstocked or would be within the next 10 days. They echoed the announcement with a plea to the Office of Price Administration to remove meat rationing in the midst of plenty.

OPA's only comment was that no definite date has been set to end meat rationing. Unofficial reports had set either October 1 or November 1 as the ration-lifting date, but OPA would name no specific date.

An OPA spokesman commented that the end of cheese rationing at midnight last night would fail to ease the situation "too much" because housewives have been using only 2 percent of their red points for cheese purchases.

End of all controls on slaughtering September 8, and the bumper cattle run this season were given as reasons for the growing meat supply here. Wholesalers said pork was the only meat still not plentiful.

The wholesalers' situation, at a glance, was this:

Auth Bros. Co.: "We're managing now, but next week I'm afraid we'll be caught with a lot of extra meat."

Washington Beef & Provision Co.: "Beef's coming in fine, but moving out slowly."

Capitol Kosher Sausage & Provision Co.: "We've turned down two shipments of meat this week. We may have to look for more storage space."

Gamble Co.: "Supplies gradually getting heavier."

Anderson's Meat Market and National Hotel Supply Co. had similar answers and, as the others, urged an end to rationing.

OPA EXPECTED TO CLOSE 10 OF 14 BOARDS HERE

Local OPA is awaiting official word from Leo F. Gentner, acting OPA administrator for region 2, that the 14 ration boards here will be reduced to 4 by January 1, 1946, it was learned yesterday.

Gentner made such a statement Monday in New York to representatives of retail trade associations. He also said the 640 boards in the region will be reduced to 194 by January 1.

A local spokesman said 92 of the 213 employees here received 30-day dismissal notices at the end of August in anticipation of such an order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, once again I call to the attention of the Members of the Senate the fact that at this very season of the year there are tremendous runs of livestock into the slaughtering houses. OPA Administrator Chester Bowles has lifted the slaughtering quotas, which is a step in the right direction, but hand in hand with that must go the lifting of the red points in order to prevent an embargo such as will have to come later to stop the shipment of cattle into the feed lots for slaughter. Unless the meat is sold over the retail counters, that will have to be done.

I ask once again that the Members of the Senate, if possible, take the matter up with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration, and ask them to lift the red points on the sale of meat, so that the tremendous meat supplies which are now coming through and being slaughtered may be funneled out over the retail counters and reach the public, thereby breaking this dam and this overkilling of cattle. Unless that is done it must eventually result in embargoes on shipments.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate the remarks made by the Senator from Nebraska. Only this morning I received word from my own State of New Hampshire of a large supply of meat beyond the points available for purchasing of the meat. I share the Senator's apprehensions and feelings respecting the present situation, and I have already made my representations in connection therewith.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his comment. I appreciate very much his interest in the situation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to inform the Senator from Nebraska that I have received a number of letters from meat dealers and meat processors in my home State of Iowa indicating that there is now a surplus of meat on hand; that the present point system for purchase of meat is preventing the distribution of the meat, and that the OPA policies are strangling the distribution of meat which would otherwise be available. However, I should like to give the Senator a note of hope. In the Washington Evening Star of yesterday I noticed an article stating that the OPA had taken some very drastic action respecting price ceilings. This brief article says:

Hula girls add 25 cents to cost of pictures in Hawaii, OPA rules.

Mr. TOBEY. I am from New Hampshire. What are hula girls?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That will be explained to the Senator in a moment as I read from the article. This is a new price order which OPA has master-minded over there in Hawaii:

OPA has put a ceiling on hula girls.

In a new price order covering commercial photography in Hawaii, OPA said a 4- by 5-inch picture would cost 50 cents, but added: "With hula girl, each, 75 cents."

"Hula girl," said the official definition, "means any female posing for compensation or profit for a direct positive photograph whether paid by the photographer or the subject of the photograph."

I commend to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that the OPA expert on hula girls no doubt has been imported from Hawaii in furtherance of the OPA's policy.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to thank the distinguished Senator for his comment, but I should like to say to the Senator that I have been talking about a different type of livestock than that which he mentioned. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Nebraska will recall that beginning in 1943 the western Senators, from the livestock producing States, undertook to handle questions similar to the one which is now before the OPA. Does the Senator from Nebraska remember when the OPA ever took any intelligent action in respect to any of these things?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to answer the distinguished Senator from Kansas by saying that the OPA finally took action and I think it was intelligent in one or two instances. Outside of that, I know of no action that one might qualify as intelligent. But I should like to mention one. I think the Senator will remember that OPA finally did lift the red points on pork, but that action came so late, after the need had arisen, that it really did not do the pork situation much good.

Mr. REED. The Senator will remember that we made that request of the OPA.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. REED. We made the request in November 1943.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. REED. And the OPA at that time told us that they knew how to run this matter, and that we did not. Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. WHERRY. I remember those words very distinctly.

Mr. REED. The best market for pork is in the wintertime. After that market time had passed, in about May of 1944, 6 months after we had urged this action on the OPA, they did lift the restrictions upon marketing.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. REED. What we are now approaching is a congestion in cattle similar to that which occurred with respect to hogs in late 1943 and the first part of 1944. But, Mr. President, the OPA is again failing to apply the simplest rules of common sense in handling this question. The Senator from Nebraska is eminently correct in saying that rationing points should be lifted, on beef especially, that is, the restriction of sales to those who have ration points should be lifted so far as beef is concerned because there is an ample supply of beef coming to the market at this time. This situation, as I have said, is very similar to that which existed respecting hogs and pork in the latter part of 1943 and the beginning of 1944. The failure of the OPA to comprehend the situation and take proper action is one of the most incredibly stupid things with which we have had to deal.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for his comments.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to supplement what the Senator has said. Before I left Minnesota I was called upon by stock raisers, grocers, and members of the general public to do everything possible to have rationing of meat eliminated. The stockyards are becoming so crowded that unless the people are allowed to buy meat, an embargo will have to be put into effect.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Fall is coming, and cattle which have been kept on ranges and pastures will have to be shipped. The people are hungry for meat, and they ought to have it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his comments.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude by stating that I deeply appreciate the fact that the OPA has lifted the slaughtering quotas. As I have previously stated, that is a step in the right direction, because it permits the immediate slaughter of the cattle now coming in under the seasonal runs. I have presented the situation to the Office of Price Administration and also to the Secretary of Agriculture as constructively as possible, and I am sure they will lift the red points; but each day they fail to lift them means the possibility of greater congestion in the livestock centers. I hope the result will not be an embargo. We should like to move the cattle into the slaughtering plants, have them butchered, and have the meat go out over the retail counters into the households of the country.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3644) to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional rates of compensation or pension and remedy inequalities as to specific service-incurred disabilities in excess of total disability, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] yesterday moved to amend the committee substitute by inserting in lieu of the figures "$100,000,000," where they occur in lines 16 and 17, on page 33, the figures "$75,000,000."

To that amendment the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has offered an amendment proposing to insert in lieu of the figures "$75,000,000" the figures "$50,000,000." The question is, therefore, on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio will not prevail. It would curtail the entire program 50 percent, and in my judgment would destroy the program.

Undoubtedly this country must go forward in commercial aviation if we are to keep abreast of the commerce of the world. Every State and every community which hopes to occupy a place in the commercial picture for the next 25 or 50 years must of necessity have access to air commerce. Notwithstanding the fact that we are all interested in economy, to say now that we are going to be miserly about setting up this plan is to say that we shall be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

During yesterday afternoon and evening I gave a great deal of thought to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. This morning I had a very brief discussion with him on the subject. I am inclined to believe that it would be well to accept the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, which would mean an appropriation of $75,000,000 a year for a period of 5 years. The bill is so framed that any unused funds in one year will be carried into the program for the next year. Certainly $75,000,000 for the remainder of this year would be ample to start the program and to get it in working order. Much work could be done. Although I would rather have $100,000,000, I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is a fair compromise, and I am willing to accept it; but I cannot accept the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, because I think it would destroy the whole philosophy of the plan.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in my judgment the Senator from Nevada is extremely liberal in the proposal which he makes. If I had charge of the bill I doubt very seriously if I would go that far.

We must move forward rapidly in the air-transport business, and the Federal Government must do its part. It is not a local matter. It is a national matter. It goes even further than that. It is international. Our international aviation will depend very largely upon the development of our national aviation. Great airports will be constructed in our large cities. Not only will magnificent airports be constructed on the transcontinental lines, but subsidiary airports will be constructed, which will be feeders for the large airports. Landing fields will be constructed which can be used for private aviation. The Federal Government must recognize its responsibility in this great venture. I do not believe that $100,000,000 is sufficient. I voted for the figure of $100,000,000 after close study in the committee with the Senator from Nevada, but I did so rather reluctantly. I thought that the amount should be larger.

Why should we be parsimonious in this matter? Why should we chisel away at the amount of the Federal contribution? Why should we undertake to hamper the development of this great modern method of transportation? I will go along with the Senator from Nevada in his proposal, if accepted by the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Arkansas withdraws his amendment. I am willing to go along with the figure of $75,000,000. However, I believe that in the next year or two we shall be increasing the figure far beyond $100,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Louisiana. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will see fit to withdraw his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas has not been accepted by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Nevada for accepting the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. I do not believe that it will impair the value or the effectiveness of the program in contemplation. It is my judgment that we can reduce the figure from $100,000,000 a year for 5 years to $75,000,000 for the same period, soundly and consistently—consistent with common sense and with the interest of the country and the Congress in the progress of aviation.

I have said very little about it, but I have been very seriously troubled by the report to the House entitled "National Airport Plan." I consider it official. The hearings were very largely based upon it. The bill was very largely derived from it. In the bill the language of the report is to a considerable extent repeated.

The source of my trouble has been that according to the report, it was proposed to adopt the class 1 type of airport, which comes very close to being no airport at all, located in no city at all, located in towns some of which cannot be discovered in the atlas, and amounting to a very great number—altogether 3,200 more than we now have. Some of the towns, if the truth be told, have populations of 100, 200, or 300, and a great many have populations under a thousand. That type of airport is described in the report. We can understand what will be lost if they are omitted. The total cost of all class 1 airports is put down as $155,650,000. Such airports are not suitable for commercial operations, and the report says so. They are supposed to be personal airports, consisting of two landing strips at right angles, rather in the shape of the old carpenter's square with which all of us are familiar, and extending 1,700 feet, more or less. The report states that the class 1 airport landing strips or runways are from 1,700 to 2,000 feet in length. Manifestly that does not meet the demands of this growing situation. I have been wondering who would maintain such ports after they were built. If one is located away off in the wilderness at some small town and if the United States Government pays one-half of the cost and the State government pays one-quarter of the cost and the city pays one-quarter of the cost—at least, that is the procedure in North Carolina, although it is not the rule for the entire Republic—after the field is built, who will maintain it, who will take care of it, and who will patronize it? Possibly one or two inhabitants of the community will wish to go up in the air once or twice a week in a private plane. Some say those fields will be good for training, but who will go there to train fliers? There will not be many who will be seeking training on a small field with a 1,700-foot runway. If the people of those communities take training at such fields, they will take a very great risk, it seems to me.

So I think that without any serious detriment to this great cause we could omit that type of airport. I know the Department wants them, and I have a great deal of respect for the Department; I think they are working at the job in all earnestness. But I am saying that this matter troubles me very much. The Federal Government is being called upon to spend one-half of $155,000,000, which is approximately $80,000,000, to build airports of that type, but I cannot see how they can be maintained or be very useful, and they cannot even serve as feeder ports or feeder landing fields; in fact, they are not ports at all.

In the legend we find the class 2 fields written in. That appears on page 5 of the National Airport Plan. They are described as "class 2, private owner, larger type aircraft, and feeder transport aircraft." Such airfields have three landing strips. I am not a Mason, but as I see the diagram it is in the form of one of the Masonic symbols which I frequently see on the watch fobs of my friends. It is shown as an acute triangle with a straight runway across it. After all, that is a local port. I agree that it would be better than a class 1 field. Here is where the larger portion of the money is to be expended. The class 2 airports are supposed to require $463,000,000. That is nearly half the total expenditure which is contemplated.

If we adopt the compromise we shall cut the total figure by $125,000,000. We shall cut out all funds for the class 1 group, and we shall cut off a large sum from the class 2 fields. We shall not have interfered in the slightest degree with the class 3, class 4, or class 5 airports, which are the important ones. The class 3 airports, as designed in the National Airport Plan, provide for transport aircraft. Why should we be especially concerned about providing and maintaining a field for a man who wishes to ride around in his own plane? I do not think we can fix him up to save our lives. Airplanes

LAW LIBRARY FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

are entirely different from automobiles. The airfield is put off in the country somewhere, and the man who has a plane there has to ride out to the field, and he also has to store his plane there. He renders no public service. It is said that it will make him air-minded. Perhaps it will, but today everyone in the United States is air-minded; we have nothing to worry about on that score. Air transportation has arrived; it has arrived in full force. What we have to deal with is not something which must be started, but something which is likely to develop faster than we can keep up with it.

Mr. President, I thought I might bring some statistics to the attention of the Senate today. I do not like to read statistics to Senators or anyone else, because it is very hard to carry them in mind. Yesterday I heard a Senator say that we had been subsidizing air transportation. Certainly we are not subsidizing it now insofar as air mails are concerned. Last year the United States Government made, I should say as the lowest estimate, $25,000,000 profit from carrying the air mails. I have the data here, and I intend to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I wish to speak of the expenditures and the possibility of recovering any of them. Insofar as the class 1 airports are concerned, we could recover scarcely a dollar. I do not know how we could recover very much from them. Some money will be recovered from class 2 ports; but we shall recover great amounts from the class 3, class 4, and class 5 airports. We have placed a tax on gasoline. The consumption of gasoline in air transportation is something perfectly amazing. This morning I telephoned the Office of Internal Revenue to find out how much revenue the United States Government is deriving from gasoline sold for air transportation. I was somewhat disappointed; they said the figures had never been broken down and segregated in that way. Of course, they should be, and I shall take some steps, as a member of the Finance Committee, to see that that is done. However, when we consider the extent of the present development, to say nothing of the future development, of transportation by air and the use in that connection of power derived from the consumption of gasoline—and in my judgment it is likely to continue to be so for 10 or 15 years to come—we find that we shall lose no money whatever, and on the other hand we shall stand a chance of recovering a great deal of the money we spend, for we shall be developing a source of revenue by means of the use of gasoline, and also revenue from income taxes.

I do not like to bring up these rivalries between the various forms of transportation. However, I may say that the New York Times of last Monday carried an article to the effect that the transcontinental lines had, by authority of the Government or with the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, reduced passenger fares. For example, from Pittsburgh to Detroit and other points it is now possible to obtain a ticket on an airplane for a price less than it would be necessary to pay for transportation on a railroad if the transportation included pullman. If one travels by day coach the rail transportation is only a little cheaper than by air. When the expense of meals saved by reason of the swiftness of air travel is considered it can be seen what advantage there is in traveling by air. We are in full sight of a real saving to the traveling public.

I have just had some information handed to me by someone in my office. It was furnished by the office of Mr. Burden, Assistant Secretary for Air, Commerce Department. The total Federal revenue from gasoline tax as applied to aviation gasoline for the years 1932 through 1944, actual, and the estimate for the first 6 months of 1945, is $11,775,000. That figure represents revenue which was received during a period representing practically the beginning of air transportation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is that information for a 10-year period?

Mr. BAILEY. It covers a period from 1932 to 1944, or 12 years.

We had prior to 1939 only a few airports worthy of the name. Here is the record: We had in 1939 100 of the class 3 ports, and 1 of the class 4 ports, and none of the class 5 ports. We now have in 1944 443 of the class 3 ports, 443 of the class 4 ports, and 305 of the class 5 ports.

What I am saying is, that by way of reducing passenger fares and improving airfield facilities we can make handsome returns to the traveling public. Through taxes on gasoline we can and will recover every dollar which we will spend in the cause of developing air transportation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I agree with the Senator in his last observation. The potentialities of future revenues are great. It is also true that during the first 10 or 15 years of the Federal-highway program the Government had to contribute Federal funds before the traffic could be developed.

I regret that the Senator from North Carolina has expressed doubt as to the desirability of class 1, 2, and 3 airports. From my experience in flying it is my conviction that such ports will serve in furnishing taxi service to and from the larger centers. We have no conception of the volume of traffic which will develop at the small ports. They will serve not merely individual fliers, but a very large traveling public as well. I know that in my own State that has already proven to be true, and I am sure it will be the case in other States as well. In my State plans have already been made along that line for the future.

Mr. BAILEY. It may be planned for summer weather, but I do not know who would use a one-horse port up in Maine during the winter. I am not against the class 2 and 3 airports by any means. My question is as to the class 1 landing strips.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very glad the Senator has brought that point up, because we have one of those one-horse ports in connection with my own town, out of which flying service was conducted last winter on skis in taking various individuals to different parts of the country for winter fishing. So we are making considerable use of one of those one-horse airports about which the Senator speaks.

Mr. BAILEY. In spite of all my weaknesses I have never been caught fishing in the wintertime, and when I am caught doing that I hope someone will take care of me. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. I can assure the Senator that winter fishing is the finest sport in the world.

Mr. BAILEY. And the coldest. There can be no debate on that point.

Senators are familiar with the National Airport plan. I have been going over it a great deal. I thought at one time that I would put it into the RECORD. I refer to pages 31 to 120. There are 90 pages of names of places at which it is proposed to establish airports. If I thought that the money which is asked for was to be used to any great extent for the building of little 1,700-foot runways in remote places to be used very largely for personal use, and very little for commercial use, I would not be in favor of giving any authority to spend money for construction of that kind. I believe that we can develop some of the class 2 ports in the cities and towns which will afford patronage. We can develop the class 3 ports in cities of larger size, and then we can fully develop the class 4 and 5 ports, which are the transport ports. Class 3 ports will take a transport. I believe that such development will greatly stimulate air transportation at no cost to the Government. I believe that every dollar of this money will be recovered in gasoline taxes. I think that a great deal of it will be recovered in reducing passenger fares. I can draw no other conclusion from the statistics.

This morning I brought along with me a copy of the Aircraft Year Book, which obtained its statistics mainly from the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce and the Civil Aeronautics Administration. I shall read some statistics just for the purpose of showing the Senate something of the progress of civil aeronautics in this country during recent years, such as 1942, 1943, and 1944. The air-carrier route mileage, unduplicated, in America today is 40,392 miles.

Express service runs over the same distance, 40,392 miles, and mail service is afforded on every mile.

Passenger service, 39,251 miles.

Daily average of miles flown in 1942, 301,662, and in 1944, 484,610.

The revenue miles flown were 110,102,860 in 1942 and 142,234,837 in 1944.

The passenger traffic carried in 1942 was 3,551,833 miles, and in 1944, 4,668,330 miles.

Passenger miles flown—that is .one passenger carried 1 mile—in 1942, 1,481,976,639; in 1944, 2,264,282,443.

Passenger seat miles flown were 1,983,672,755 in 1942 and 2,492,893,507 in 1944.

Passenger fare per mile: 5.27 cents in 1942, and 5.35 cents in 1943. The figure is not given for 1944.

Ton-miles of mail: 21,066,627 ton-miles of mail in 1942, and 50,825,200 ton-miles in 1944.

Express and freight: Ton-miles in 1942, 11,691,208, and in 1944, 17,094,029.

Now let us come to the number of accidents with all this traffic. There were 31 accidents in 1942, 24 accidents in 1943, and 30 accidents in 1944.

Miles flown per accident: In 1942, 3,551,705; in 1944, 4,741,161. In 1944 more than a million more miles were flown per accident than in 1942.

Number of fatal accidents: Five in 1942, and five in 1944.

Number of miles flown per fatal accident: 22,020,572 in 1942, and 28,446,967 in 1944.

Fatal accidents per million miles flown: Five one-hundredths in 1942, and four one-hundredths in 1944.

Passenger fatalities: 55 in 1942, and 48 in 1944.

Total fatalities, including passengers and crew: 71 in 1942, and 58 in 1944. Only 58 people were killed in air travel in 1944.

Miles flown per accident: 3,551,705 in 1942, and 4,741,161 in 1944.

Passenger-miles flown per passenger fatality: In 1942 26,945,024, and in 1944 47,172,551.

So we can say upon this showing that air transportation is here. The thing for us to consider is what to do about it, how to guide it and direct it.

After having said that, so far as we are concerned, the Government and the people will get a great deal more money out of air transportation than air transportation will ever get out of the Government or the people, I wish at this point to say that aviation is probably the greatest development in the way of human convenience in the whole history of the world, and the greatest timesaver.

I think if we were to prepare a list of great inventions and human conveniences we might start with the wheel and then the sail, things that sent the world forward. I think the next one was the invention of money. I think the man who invented money invented the one thing in this world that is surest to make people work, if they are given an opportunity and are not paid unless they work.

Mr. MURDOCK. How about interest?

Mr. BAILEY. Interest is money, interest is the hire paid for money, and interest is the thing that makes money work and keeps it alive. If it is desired to go into it, interest is the profit within which the dollar lives, and if you take away a man's profit you destroy his capital, you destroy his money, and you destroy his incentive to work. But that is along another line.

I was going to develop the thought that when the steam engine and the automobile came we thought the highest point in human transportation had been reached, but not so. The statistics I have here show that air transportation is perfectly safe, and we all know it is exceedingly swift, as airplanes travel from 300 to 500 miles an hour. Air transportation is already inexpensive, and it is destined to be much less expensive.

So that, far from this activity drawing on the taxing power, I think it is going to be one of the greatest contributors to the public revenue. I just now showed we had obtained $11,000,000 from the taxes on aviation gasoline, but it will not be long now before we will be getting $11,000,000 of revenue from that source every year. So I am not disturbed about that.

Mr. President, I shall support the Taft amendment; I am glad the Senator from Nevada has accepted it, and I hope the Senators who asked for less will fall in line and support the $75,000,000 proposition.

I think that argument could be made, as the Senator from Maine just now made one, about class 1 ports, but I do not think it would be any great loss to let them wait awhile. Conceding there may be something in the contention regarding class 2 ports, I do not think that we will lose in the way of progress by not developing now about half the class 2 ports. Half of them can be developed and all class 3 ports and class 4 ports and class 5 ports can be developed within the $75,000,000 a year.

The bill has some virtue. The Government has been in the habit of giving all, but this is a 50–50 proposal. This puts it up to the States, and I hope the States will put it up to the local communities, as my State has done. North Carolina proposes to put up 50 percent as against the Government's 50 percent, and then it will divide the North Carolina 50 percent between the towns and cities which get the benefit of it. So North Carolina, after all, will put up only 25 percent as a State, and 25 percent will be put up by the localities which are benefited.

I cannot see that we should be troubled with going further along this line, and I can see a good deal of advantage in it. I like the idea of dividing with the State. If we do not divide with the State, if we do not do anything, we cannot control this instrumentality of interstate commerce. That is what it is. The Constitution expressly puts the Congress in full control of interstate commerce, and I think when it put us in full control, it put the entire obligation upon us. We must see interstate commerce through at all times. It is our function and our care.

In considering the pending bill, it should be remembered that every dollar we pay out is paid out on condition, and the conditions are very strict. We will not let the States build airports to suit themselves. We will not let them locate them to suit themselves. We will not let the localities build them. We are going to build them, under a great plan of national defense and national safety. We can afford to make a contribution in order to do that.

I could elaborate the argument, but I shall take my seat after saying merely that I do not think the suggestion of $75,000,000 a year is extravagant. I think the Senator from Nevada was very wise in accepting it. I think it should allay all criticism.

In my opinion, the United States Government will recover in revenue every dollar it pays out, and that in the not distant future. I think the public will benefit. We are bound now to reduce the rates on mail. We cannot afford to have the Government making $25,000,000 a year on airplane mail. The rates will have to be reduced and that will be a direct benefit to the people, and I think that in the not distant future the rates on express and on passenger traffic will actually be reduced to such an extent as to mean a direct benefit to every man, woman, and child in the land.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and what I have to say is equally applicable to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

In considering the pending bill I think we should face the fact that we are now entering a period of legislation which will determine whether the Congress will put its stamp of approval upon a great expansion of industry and commerce, and a raising of living standards for all people, and freedom of enterprise for all men.

The pending airport bill is only one of a great many bills having to do with a program for a greater and happier America and a better world.

It is proposed in the bill that the amount to be made available for airport construction be cut far below the amount which those who have made a complete study of the situation have said is necessary to meet the needs of a greater peacetime economy.

It is inconceivable to me, Mr. President, that any Member of the Senate should not realize the absolute necessity of expanding our system of airports as rapidly as possible so that they may be in use at the earliest possible date.

Surely, one must recognize the fact that it was American superiority in the air that enabled us to win the war as quickly as we did.

Surely, one must recognize the fact that it is American superiority in the air that is enabling our businessmen to assume a dominant position in the economic affairs of the world.

Surely, one must recognize the fact that if American industry is going to expand within our own borders, greatly increased facilities for air transportation and air travel must be provided.

Is it not clear to everyone that America must have a tremendous expansion of commerce and industry if we are to keep our economy on a sound basis?

Does anyone believe that we can go back to anywhere near a prewar national income without inviting disaster?

How can we maintain the value of the billions of dollars worth of Government bonds held by citizens of the United States on an economy much less than that which prevails even now?

No part of a program designed to expand American industry and commerce is more necessary or more vital than an expansion of air transportation to many times the amount which prevailed previous to the war.

For years, industry has crowded into our great cities. Unhealthy conditions, both social and economic, have been created through this great centralization of humanity in a few congested areas. The very safety of our country depends upon a decentralization of industry and population over the entire Nation. This cannot be done without expanding our air facilities.

I believe that the program of 3,300 airports proposed by the Civil Aeronautics Authority is none too many.

I believe that the hundred million dollars a year proposed by the bill which we are now considering is none too much for the next 5 years, and I am very sorry that the sponsor of the bill, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], has seen fit to say that he will accept the reduction proposed by the Senator from Ohio.

Not only would these airports make it possible for a person to do business in any part of this country much more easily and economically than he ever has before, but their construction alone would furnish work for thousands upon thousands of men during the critical years just ahead of us.

They would furnish thousands upon thousands of permanent jobs in the form of airport management, control tower employees, aviation mechanics and maintenance men, as well as thousands of pilots.

Hundreds of thousands of our young men have become expert flyers during this war. Are we going to let them come home to learn that Congress has turned thumbs down on aviation? Are they to come home to learn that Congress has failed to provide for the expansion of industry and commerce which will mean jobs and happiness for them?

Are we going to take our stand with those boys who have spent years in all parts of the world fighting for a greater America and a better world, or are we going to stand with those groups who are so well satisfied with their own positions, financially and otherwise, that they oppose the changes which would provide greater opportunities for others?

This airport bill is one of the most important of many bills which will come before the Senate. We should pass it as it is now, without any crippling or delaying amendments whatsoever.

Our action on the pending bill will indicate whether Congress looks with favor upon creating greater opportunity for millions, or whether it fears to take the step which might conceivably require a few people to change their ways of doing business.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I withhold it.

Mr. GURNEY. I am in hearty accord with the necessity for the proposed legislation. I believe I have only one suggestion to offer, in the shape of a short amendment.

After studying the bill and listening to the debate, I feel that there is not provided a vehicle for our State agencies to come to the Administrator. Of course, I notice in the bill that the Administrator is told to consult the State agencies, but there is no absolute ticket for the State agencies to get to the Administrator, and present their views. So I wish to suggest an amendment on page 35, line 8.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that a point of order must be raised, because there is an amendment now pending. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the consideration of the Senator's amendment at this time or at any other time, because I have discussed it with the Senator, and know what it is.

Mr. GURNEY. I was under the impression that, since the Senator was calling for a quorum, the pending amendment had been acted on. Of course, I shall wait until it is acted on.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry, but the parliamentary situation is such as to prevent what the Senator has in mind to do at this time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has had to say about the pending bill. I also listened with great interest to the statement made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. I agree with what he said in reference to our enormous national debt at this time, and that every appropriation which comes before the Senate should be studied by us carefully before we increase the indebtedness of the United States. That is something we should at all times take into consideration.

I am also glad that an amendment to the bill has already been adopted giving to the States of the United States the right to say where the money shall be spent.

The legislature of my State, South Carolina, in 1935, passed an aeronautics bill making it a criminal offense to spend any money on any airport unless approval by the aeronautics commission was first secured, and anyone failing to do so can be imprisoned for 90 days and be made to pay a fine of $500. That is out of the question at the present time because of the adoption of the amendment to the bill now before the Senate.

I am glad the Senator from Nevada has agreed to reduce the amount provided by the bill from $100,000,000 to $75,000,000 each year for the next 5 years. I say that because I believe $75,000,000 each year will be sufficient. I do not believe $50,000,000 each year would be enough. I agree with the statement made by the Senator from Nevada that if we reduce the amount to $50,000,000, it would cripple the program for building airports throughout the United States.

Therefore, I hope, Mr. President, that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] will withdraw and not urge his amendment, which would reduce the amount to $50,000,000 each year.

Mr. President, I have had a little experience as a result of sitting in with the South Carolina Aeronautics Commission and finding out how expensive it is to build airports. From that experience I would say that $50,000,000 could be spent in the United States almost before those engaged in providing for airports would know what they were doing. Therefore I believe that $75,000,000 a year is not too much. At the same time, I believe it is a proper amount to provide, taking into consideration the enormous debt of our Government at the present time. Seventy-five million dollars a year will allow us to move forward on a program of aviation which will benefit all the people of the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I rise to ask some questions of the distinguished Senator from Nevada, who is the author of the bill, and with whom I have been associated for many years in dealing with the subject of air commerce. I think there is a point which ought to be clarified by a colloquy, and for that purpose I ask indulgence to read certain parts of the bill before I ask the questions. It will not take me long, Mr. President.

My questions are based on the assumption that the Civil Aeronautics Administration has the power under the act of 1938 to change the standards in the national-airport plan; indeed, that it has authority to change them tomorrow if it sees fit. That basic power being so great, it is important, I believe, to bring out and emphasize the fact that it can be exercised if this bill is passed only if the Congress at some future time amends the bill. That is, it can be exercised with reference to the classification of airports into 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

To make clear the reason for this interrogatory I must say that I have had complaint that if Senate bill 2 were passed without change it would be a simple matter in 2 or 3 years to drop the dividing line down to class 3 fields, then to class 2, and soon, through inability to exercise a voice in the matter, the State could easily find itself the unwilling recipient of an assortment of airfields which would bring satisfaction to no one but a boondoggler. The McCarran bill would apply to "the then current revision of the national airport plan."

I now call attention to the following provisions in the bill concerning which I wish the distinguished Senator from Nevada would make a statement. On page 29 of the bill, beginning in line 9, there are two paragraphs defining or describing these classifications by reference to the Civil Aeronautics Administration bulletin Airport Design, of April 1, 1944. They are as follows:

(f) "Class 3 and smaller airports" means all airports which, as to size, lay-out, and facilities, are not properly classifiable as class 4 or higher class airports according to the airport classification standards of the Administrator stated in Civil Aeronautics Administration bulletin Airport Design dated April 1, 1944.

(g) "Class 4 and larger airports" means all airports which, as to size, lay-out, and facilities, are properly classifiable as class 4 or higher class airports according to the airport classification standards of the Administrator stated in Civil Aeronautics Administration bulletin Airport Design dated April 1, 1944.

Now, please refer to page 33, where there will be found the following, beginning in line 3 and ending in line 10:

For purposes of this act, a project shall be considered one for development of an airport of a certain class if, upon completion of the airport development proposed, the airport so developed would be properly classifiable as of that class according to the airport classification standards of the Administrator stated in Civil Aeronautics Administration bulletin Airport Design dated April 1, 1944.

That still remains in the bill unaffected by the amendment adopted yesterday.

But the particular section to which the criticism refers, namely, "the then current revision of the National Airport Plan," is on page 36, beginning in line 19:

(b) State program: After deducting from the amount of each appropriation available

for grants the amount thereof that may be granted for projects in the urban program, the remainder shall be available for the development of class 3 and smaller airports under the State program, as proposed in the then current revision of the national airport plan.

I shall not read the remainder of it, because it is unnecessary for my point.

The last sentence quoted was stricken yesterday by the Brewster amendment, so there no longer remains before us any reference in the bill—unless the distinguished Senator can point one out which I have overlooked—to the "then current revision" of the National Airport Plan. What I should like to ask the Senator is this: Is it a correct interpretation of the bill that, notwithstanding the power given by the act of 1938 to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, this bill, if it becomes law, will not permit the Civil Aeronautics Administration to change the classifications of the various types of airports from the description referred to in what I have quoted?

Mr. McCARRAN. My answer is that the standards set up by the bill in paragraphs (f) and (g) on page 29 refer to the standards now fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and its authority for fixing those standards is found in the act of 1938. It could change those standards, but the change would not be effective so far as this bill is concerned. No money could be obtained under the provisions of this bill if the standards were changed.

Mr. AUSTIN. If an attempt were made to obtain an appropriation under the provisions of this bill for an airport which had been reclassified by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, would there be any law or justification for such an appropriation?

Mr. McCARRAN. This appropriation bill makes a part of it the standards now fixed by the published instrument of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; and the money which will be appropriated under the terms of this bill during the period of the program, 5 years, must be applied to the construction of airports in accordance with the standards fixed in that published bulletin.

Mr. AUSTIN. And they cannot be changed except by an act of Congress.

Mr. McCARRAN. They cannot be changed except by an act of Congress; and if they were changed by an act of Congress, reference would have to be made to this measure. So the money appropriated under the terms of this bill would apply to the old standards and not to the new standards.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I wish to say to the able Senator who is sponsoring this measure that Florida is very deeply interested, and naturally so, because the termini of many of the large air lines are in Florida. I shall not undertake to name all of them. The great Pan American Airways System had its inception in the city of Miami. During the first 2 or 3 years of the war more persons from foreign nations entered through that port than through all the other ports of the Nation combined.

I have a telegram from the Governor of my State, Hon. Millard F. Caldwell, who, it will be remembered, was recently an honored Member of the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, to show that Florida is ready for this program, has anticipated it, and will cooperate, even down to the municipalities.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., *September 8, 1945.*

Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Understand Senate bill 2 providing national system of airports may reach Senate floor Monday. Nineteen hundred and forty-one legislative act creating Florida Improvement Commission provides: "To advise and cooperate with municipal, county, regional, and other local agencies and officials within the State to plan for and otherwise coordinate in the development of a system of air routes, airports, and landing fields within the State and to protect their approaches; to cooperate with other State departments and with boards, commissions, and other State agencies and with appropirate Federal agencies and with interested private individuals and groups in the coordination of plans and policies for as the official agency of the State in all matters affecting aviation under any Federal laws now or hereafter to be enacted." Would be helpful in Florida if national legislation is so drawn as to fully utilize this commission.

MILLARD F. CALDWELL,
Governor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	O'Daniel
Andrews	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hawkes	Overton
Bailey	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hoey	Robertson
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brooks	Knowland	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Taylor
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McFarland	Tobey
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
Cordon	McMahon	Tydings
Donnell	Maybank	Vandenberg
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
Fulbright	Morse	White
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to section 10 on page 40, in regard to grant agreements. It reads in part as follows:

Each such offer shall state a definite amount as the maximum obligation of the United States and shall stipulate the obligations to be assumed by the State airport agency or project sponsor. If and when any such offer is accepted in writing by the State airport agency or project sponsor to which it is made, such offer and acceptance shall comprise a grant agreement constituting an obligation of the United States. Unless and until such a grant agreement has been executed with respect to a project under this act, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of the project costs which have been or may be incurred in carrying out that project.

That would imply that if a grant agreement is made, there will be an obligation upon the United States to appropriate the money therefor.

In answer to that point, in speaking to the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, he called my attention to subsection (b) on page 39, which reads as follows:

(b) All such projects shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator, which approval shall be given only if the Administrator is satisfied that the project is designed to accomplish the purposes of this act, that sufficient funds are available therefor—

And so forth. With a contract which obligates the Government and if the funds are availabile, there is some doubt in my mind whether this language would result in by-passing the Appropriations Committee. I ask the Senator whether he will agree to the adoption of an amendment striking out the words "are available therefor", and inserting as a substitute "have been appropriated therefor."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall be willing to agree to its adoption when consideration of the amendment is in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the amendment I have just proposed to the committee amendment be considered and agreed to at this time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator please state his amendment again? I did not quite understand his proposal.

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 39 of the committee amendment, in line 11, after the word "funds", I propose to strike out the words "are available therefor" and insert "have been appropriated therefor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. It merely substitutes two or three words for the words "are available." I think it would mean the same thing, and the words now in the committee amendment were intended to mean the same thing; but if the Senator from Tennessee would take more comfort from the words he has suggested, I shall accept them. It is all the same to me. However, we cannot do it at this time, because another amendment is pending.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amendment I have proposed can be considered now only by unanimous consent. Inasmuch as it has been brought up at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be now considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to discuss the matter for a moment with the Senator from Tennessee. If we substitute for the words "are available therefor," which mean out of the whole appropriation, the words "have been appropriated therefore," that would mean that the funds would have to be appropriated for that particular project.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. I am not so sure but that the entire $500,000,000 carried under the committee amendment as it reads at the present time would be presently available and that contracts committing the Government might be made presently for the entire $500,000,000, and the Government would be committed under the language I first read. Therefore, in order to make it perfectly plain, and inasmuch as the Senator from Nevada has said that is what he intended, I suggest the amendment. I have in mind, for instance, the appropriation of the first $100,000,000, thus making it available.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it would be wise to change the language as I have suggested.

Mr. OVERTON. I differ with the Senator from Tennessee in regard to the construction. I think it would mean an appropriation made for a particular project.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield to me further——

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I think the Senator has in mind something like the following: "That sufficient funds within the limits of appropriations made are available."

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that means exactly the same thing, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that perhaps even better language would be: "That sufficient funds are available therefor from appropriations made under the provisions of this act."

Mr. OVERTON. That would be better.

Mr. McKELLAR. That wording means exactly the same thing, and I am perfectly willing to accept the suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to present consideration of the modified amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to state the amendment again, Mr. President, to make sure that I understand the wording finally agreed upon: On page 39, in line 12, after the word "therefor", insert the words "from appropriations made under the provisions of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the modified amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment? Without objection, the modified amendment to the committee amendment is considered and agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Louisiana for their courtesy and cooperation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the question now is on the McClellan amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I wish to say just a few words, and then I shall take my seat. I am willing to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which would reduce the funds from $100,000,000 a year to $75,000,000 a year.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas to the Taft amendment proposes that the funds be reduced to $50,000,000 a year. If that amendment prevails, in my judgment the whole program will be sadly wrecked, to put it very bluntly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, when I presented my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, I said that I favor this legislation. In committee I voted to report the bill favorably because I think the Congress should take action in this matter and legislation of this character should be enacted. I have not changed my mind about that. I shall support this bill. I will vote for it on final passage if the provision for $500,000,000 remains in it.

I have concluded, however, that in view of the tremendous demands which are going to be made upon this Congress for public expenditures, the time has come when we must accept greater responsibility for the financial affairs of this Government. I commend the Senator from Nevada for having submitted this measure. Basically it is sound. This Government owes an obligation to help promote the development of transportation of this character. I am in entire accord with that idea, and I shall support the measure. I have offered an amendment to reduce the authorization to $50,000,000 a year from $100,000,000 a year, as now provided in the bill. This amendment is in lieu of the $75,000,000 a year which is proposed by the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. President, I have offered the amendment for this reason: The minute we pass this bill we make a definite committal on the part of the Federal Government to spend a certain amount of money irrespective of how the program progresses, and irrespective of whether, under experience, it is ascertained that the program is too ambitious. It may be said by some, "Yes; we can reduce it at the next Congress." Yet, Mr. President, we all know that we will never reduce it. Once we pass this bill and provide for $375,000,000, $400,000,000, or whatever the amount may be, it will be a definite committal on the part of the Government, in my opinion, an irrevocable committal, in advance of knowing what the requirements may be.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator believe that we will be in better position to judge the progress of the program 3 years from now instead of 5 years, as the Senator suggests in his amendment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree that we would be better able to judge at the end of that time. However, I am trying not to wreck this bill, even with this amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not want to wreck the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I know the Senator does not want to wreck it. But it has been charged that even this amendment would cripple and practically destroy the program. I refute that charge.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not exactly understand the Senator's statement that the enactment of this proposed law would be a definite and irrevocable commitment on the part of the Federal Government to the expenditure of $500,000,000. It would be simply an authorization to make appropriations. If, as the Senator suggests, the program unfortunately should turn out to be unsuccessful, we would have the power to curtail the program, or prevent its execution altogether, by limiting or withholding requested appropriations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will not the Senator also agree that the authorization which has been requested may be increased?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes. My opinion is that it should be at least $100,000,000 a year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, there is a difference of opinion about that. I assert that the best procedure to follow is to start on a program which we can all agree will be justified by the situation as it now exists. As experience is gained in handling the program, if more money is needed I will join with every other Senator in voting for an adequate appropriation, because I am interested in this program. I want to see it successfully developed. But I assert to my colleagues that the time has come for Congress to count dollars and not appropriate them recklessly, or make authorization for committals farther down the road than the distance we can now see and fully comprehend.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, as an instance of how easy it is for Congress not to appropriate as much money as it has previously authorized, I can cite the authorization of $75,000,000 last year by Congress to help local communities, cities, States, and so forth, to make plans for the postwar period. When the matter of appropriation reached the House it provided only $5,000,000 of the $75,000,000 which had been asked for, and when it got to the Senate we were able to increase it only to $35,000,000, or less than half of what we had authorized. It is not at all hard for Congress to appropriate less than it has previously authorized. I am sure that Congress will exercise the same judgment in determining from year to year whether it should appropriate the entire amount that will be authorized

when we pass this bill, even if the Senator's amendment is adopted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Kentucky has pointed out one instance on one side of the argument, but I am sure that with his long years of experience he could point out many instances on the other side of this issue.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Kentucky has selected one occasion to illustrate his point. As a rule, when an authorization is fixed at a certain amount, the argument is invariably made that Congress has held out to the communities, to the States, and to the subdivisions of Government, for example, the assurance that if they would prepare their plans Congress would appropriate a certain amount of money.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And when the authorization is made it is a definite committal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Nine times out of ten the argument to which I have referred was persuasive because it was advanced by those who had pet projects. They would come forward and say in effect, "You told us that if we would appropriate a certain amount we would be able to get money from the Government to complete the project."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the passage of this bill will be a definite committal on the part of the Government that if the communities throughout the United States will meet the conditions established in the judgment of the Administrator we will be under a moral if not a legal obligation to make the appropriation to cover the expenses incurred.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said that I picked out one solitary example.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not use the word "solitary."

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, whatever the word was, he thought I did not have much ground to stand on. I dare say that in the majority of the years during which we have appropriated for highways since we enacted the good-roads legislation in 1916, Congress appropriated less than the amount which had been authorized. It was not done invariably, but there were many years in which the amount of the appropriation was not as much as the authorization would have permitted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator from Kentucky point out one instance in which Congress reduced an authorization which had been made?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I would have to examine the entire history of Congress in order to do that. However, I have been interested in road legislation ever since I came to Congress. I do know that frequently Congress did not appropriate all the money which it could have appropriated under the authorization, even for highways.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The point that I am trying to make is that I realize that the Congress can make appropriations for a less amount than the authorizations, but if a demand is made we are under moral obligation to make the appropriation. Congress can and does increase authorizations. When, after experience has been had in connection with a particular program, it develops that the initial authorization by Congress is not adequate, Congress has from time to time increased the authorization. That is the safe way to proceed. It is a sound procedure for the Congress to follow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky is, of course, more familiar with all details of legislation than perhaps any other Member of this body, because he is charged with the responsibility of handling legislation from the standpoint of the leader of the majority.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not as familiar with appropriations as is the Senator from Georgia, because he is on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Nevertheless, the Senator from Kentucky keeps himself informed as to all matters of the kind under discussion. I assert, however, that the illustration with reference to the road program is very inadequate. We have not made appropriations for that program within the last 8 years except to confirm commitments which had been entered into under the authorization of contracts. If the Senator from Arizona, who is the repository of all knowledge, and who is present in the Chamber, is willing to do so, I know that he can confirm my statement that under the highway legislation program when we directed the Bureau of Roads to enter into contracts involving certain amounts, it became a binding obligation on the Government of the United States and we have never failed to meet such obligation during at least the last 10 years.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator from Arizona know of any instance during the last 10 years of Congress failing to appropriate the full amount for the contractual obligation authorized by the enabling legislation?

Mr. HAYDEN. The full amount is authorized by years. Congress does not necessarily have to appropriate for a certain year, or the next year, but as contracts mature we have never failed to provide the money.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me, I have not the figures from year to year as to whether we appropriated, in each year or in all years, as much as the statute authorized. I am talking about the road program for a period of 30 years. We passed the road legislation in 1916, as I recall. We authorized an appropriation of $125,000,000 or $150,000,000 a year from the start. We did not for a long time appropriate all that money. The point I was trying to make was that the mere fact that we authorized a maximum of appropriation in any year for any one purpose did not mean that Congress either had to appropriate that much or that it would appropriate that much, unless it thought it was justified.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Arkansas will yield——

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to call upon the Senator from Georgia as a witness to another item of road appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Forest roads and trails?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, forest roads and trails.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am thoroughly familiar with that item.

Mr. HAYDEN. The authorization has been made year after year, and never has the Congress appropriated the full amount authorized. The House of Representatives simply will not do it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not rise to dispute the fact that there were authorizations for which appropriations had never been made. I recall that once the Committee on Appropriations made a study of that subject, and it was discovered that there were some $6,000,000,000 of authorizations the Congress had made for appropriations at one time and another for which appropriations had never been made. The authorizations were on the statute books, and the appropriations had not been made.

In the case of roads, of course the Senator from Kentucky immediately confused me by going back 30 years. I cannot go back that far.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that when I go back 30 years I find the Senator in his cradle. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. In the more than a decade I have been in the Senate there has never been a time when the Congress of the United States has not appropriated the total amount of the contractual authorizations for the public highway program.

Of course, Congress can adopt this authorization for $50,000,000 or $100,000,000, and it can fail to appropriate that much. I also might point out that under the peculiar rules of the Senate affecting the Committee on Appropriations, if we make this authorization $50,000,000 and the Committee on Appropriations, after consideration, thinks it should be larger, it can recommend more than the $50,000,000, and the recommendation will not be subject to a point of order, notwithstanding the fact that the authorization is limited to $50,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. They would be up against the Budget, however.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; but we know where the Budget would stand on the item under discussion. They would be for the full amount of the authorization.

My observation has been that in the ordinary run of cases it is much easier to get more money than is authorized than it is to get an appropriation cut down by as much as $1. I think this program would be on a much safer basis if the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas were adopted and the limit were placed at $50,000,000, than if we placed it at $100,000,000. If $50,000,000 is not sufficient, we can either amend the statute and increase the authorization, or the Committee on Appropriations can recommend $75,000,000, $100,000,000, or $200,000,000, for this same purpose, and it would not be subject to a point of order on the floor of the Senate. Of course, if any individual Senator offered the amendment from the floor, it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me give the Senator one more example, and then I shall be through.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator will not cite another 30-year proposition, because he absolutely confused me.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; this is within the Senator's recollection. Congress authorized the construction of the Florida Barge Canal a few years ago, and never did appropriate any money for it. That is just another example of what I was saying. Congress is not a slave to its authorizations. It can do as it pleases with them after they are made.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia, and also the Senator from Arkansas, how they arrived at the figure $50,000,000 as being the proper figure, rather than $100,000,000. The record shows—and the Senator has read the record and kept up with it, and I think I am correct in the statement—that there can be easily and judiciously expended more than one hundred million dollars a year. In my opinion, there should be an authorization of $100,000,000 a year at least, not $75,000,000, and I think we would be perfectly safe in making the authorization. I do not see how the Senator arrives at $50,000,000. Why not make it $25,000,000? Many seem to take the position the amount can be increased, that Congress should make it $10,000,000, or $5,000,000, and subsequently Congress could increase it as the program advanced.

Mr. President, we have to go by the record, by the testimony of different witnesses who have made a thorough study of the situation. Some of them have investigated aviation throughout the United States, and it is their well considered opinion that there should be an appropriation of at least $100,000,000 a year in order to get this program under way.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, if the Senator from Louisiana chooses to rely on those representing the Civil Aeronautics Administration, who, being human, wish to get all the money they can, he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. OVERTON. No; there were witnesses who were connected with aviation, there were witnesses from municipalities, there were witnesses representing every phase of American life connected in any wise with aviation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it is the old situation which has existed ever since the beginning of the Congress, that is, that the people who want money out of the Federal Treasury always make a case, and there is no one ready to controvert it. It would have been just as easy to have made a case for $200,000,000 as for $100,000,000. I assume the $100,000,000 was arrived at in this fashion. All the mayors, and all the representatives of the various localities which wanted airfields, wrote to the Civil Aeronautics Administration. They considered how much it would take to build those airfields, and decided it would take $200,000,000, the Federal Government putting up $100,000,000 and the municipalities putting up $100,000,000. I assume that is the way the figures were arrived at. My experience on the Committee on Appropriations in times past, in similar cases, has demonstrated that that is frequently the way the amount of money deemed necessary for new projects is arrived at.

In my judgment—and my judgment is not founded on any evidence I have, certainly not on any special pleading, it is simply a feeling of actual caution in embarking on a program of this kind—it will be much easier for us to increase as the program goes along than to reduce if we find we are moving too fast.

Mr. President, for that reason I propose to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in my opinion if we provide for the amount I have suggested we will obtain more careful and more economic planning and a wiser expenditure of the funds. If we are merely to write the Civil Aeronautics Administration an authorization check for the amount they have asked, I think they will be far more generous and far more liberal in their program possibly, than circumstances sometimes would justify.

I do not make that charge against the Civil Aeronautics Administration, except that we know it is human nature that the more public money governmental agencies have to spend and the fewer restraints there are on them in the discharge of their duty, naturally the more liberal and more generous they are, and in some instances more careless and inefficient.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say two other things before I conclude. First, this is not a life and death issue. This is not an issue which goes to any fundamental principle, except the matter of wise legislative procedure, and that which is sound as an economical program. I believe what I have proposed is the wiser course, to make the authorization for what we can see now is fully justified. Then thereafter, if conditions warrant, and if further authorizations and expenditures are justified, Congress can and will promptly respond.

In conclusion, Mr. President, there are some who have taken the position not only on this question, but I can recall some other occasions, and I can well anticipate that we are going to hear more of it as we proceed in the postwar era, that if someone objects to spending Federal money, he is not interested in the prosperity and happiness of the American people, and is trying to cripple progress. Let me say to Senators who want to make that charge that I am not interested in their opinion about it, but I answer them by saying that I do not agree with them in what they imply that the only way this country can ever be prosperous again is through the expenditure of public funds, and by deficit spending at that. If that is the philosophy of any of my colleagues, I certainly disagree with them, and so long as I am in Congress I shall defend the idea and the philosophy that in the postwar period and hereafter, in view of our heavy national obligations, this country must as quickly as it can become self-sustaining in its public expenditures. I am willing to spend the amount of money I now propose as a deficit expenditure, if necessary, in order to advance the airport program, a program which I think will add to the capital wealth of the Nation and enhance our prosperity on a sound basis.

Mr. President, I am not going along with those who advance the idea of simply spending money out of the Public Treasury merely for the sake of bringing temporary prosperity. I think it is morally wrong to do so. I do not believe that the present generation has a moral right to set up a standard of living or a standard of prosperity for itself, and charge to future generations the deficit which we cannot earn to support that standard.

Mr. President, I have offered my substitute amendment, and I am supporting it in an effort to try to find the middle of the road. There are others who think the authorization should be less, but I am offering it in an effort to find the middle of the road and a way to proceed safely and soundly, and without closing the door for tomorrow, or for the next session, or for the next year, or for any other time. The door will still be open whenever the justification is presented to the Congress. In my humble judgment, that is the sound and wise way to proceed with the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I had no idea of making my amendment, which I offered yesterday to the proposed legislation, an issue, but there seemed to be considerable sentiment for reduction in the amount, and for proceeding a little more judiciously and cautiously, and since the issue has been made, I ask for the yeas and nays on my substitute amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question I transfer my pair to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent on important public business. I am advised that if present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is absent from the Senate on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay" on this question.

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent from the Senate on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness. The Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—25

Ball	George	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Gerry	Reed
Brooks	Gurney	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	McClellan	Tydings
Byrd	McMahon	Wherry
Capper	Millikin	Wiley
Connally	Moore	
Fulbright	O'Daniel	

NAYS—54

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Overton
Andrews	Hill	Radcliffe
Austin	Hoey	Revercomb
Bailey	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Barkley	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Bilbo	Knowland	Shipstead
Briggs	La Follette	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Carville	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	Maybank	Tunnell
Ferguson	Mead	Vandenberg
Hart	Morse	Wagner
Hatch	Murdock	Walsh
Hawkes	Murray	White
Hayden	Myers	Young

NOT VOTING—17

Bankhead	Eastland	Pepper
Brewster	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Green	Wheeler
Capehart	Guffey	Willis
Chandler	Magnuson	Wilson
Chavez	Mitchell	

So Mr. MCCLELLAN'S amendment to Mr. TAFT'S amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee amendment on page 33, lines 16 and 17.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, as I stated before the vote on the amendment which has just been disposed of, I am willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Ohio reducing the amount to $75,000,000 a year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, line 8, in the committee amendment, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Administrator shall consult with, and give consideration to the views and recommendations of, the Federal Communications Commission, and shall make all reasonable efforts to cooperate with that Commission for the purpose of eliminating, preventing, or minimizing airport hazards caused by construction or operation of any radio station.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, under the bill as it now stands it would appear that the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics could condemn the antenna of a radio station if he felt that it was within the "air space" required for an airport and constituted an "airport hazard." It is true that the bill provides for the filing of objections to airport applications and an opportunity for hearing. Nevertheless, final authority rests in the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. Not only would the bill affect radio stations now in operation, but it would likewise affect applications for new radio stations, because in the final analysis the Civil Aeronautics Administrator would have the say as to whether or not a station could locate in a given area. I am sure that the Congress does not desire to enact legislation of that kind. We have the Federal Communications Commission, and certainly questions of this kind should be settled between the two commissions, so that the Americans people may be fully protected.

In this connection I have before me a letter written by Paul A. Porter, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, addressed to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. In the absence of the Senator from Montana, the letter has been handed to me to bring to the attention of the Senate. I read the letter, which is dated September 11, 1945:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., September 11, 1945.

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WHEELER: There have recently come to the attention of the Commission a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 which is now pending before the Senate. Reference is made specifically to S. 2.

The Commission has made a study of S. 2 and is of the opinion that certain of its provisions present a possibility of conflict of jurisdiction between the Civil Aeronautics Administrator and this Commission. This possibility of conflict appears to arise from those provisions of the bill which confer upon the Administrator authority to formulate a Nation-wide zoning program for clearing and protecting aerial approaches to airports through regulation of the height and location of structures in the vicinity thereof and to promulgate reasonable standards with respect to the maximum height and location of structures within such safety areas as may be necessary to effectuate the zoning program.

As you know, heretofore this Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Administrator have effected a practicable and satisfactory plan of operation under which this Commission, before authorizing the erection or change in any radio station antenna towers, has submitted the matter to the CAA for its approval in order to minimize the creation of hazards to air navigation. The present bill, however, appears to take no cognizance of this established procedure which has worked well in practice.

Accordingly, it is respectfully suggested that a provision recognizing the interests of the Federal Communications Commission and requiring a continuation of the present practice of consultation and cooperation between the two Commissions be included in such bill as may be finally enacted by the Senate. A draft of a proposed provision is attached.

By direction of the Commission:

PAUL A. PORTER,
Chairman.

The amendment which I have just offered, and which has been read at the desk, is the amendment to which Mr. Porter refers.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I ask merely for information. I have not seen the Senator's amendment. It has been stated that under the provisions of the bill final authority would rest in the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. Under the Senator's amendment where would final authority rest?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It would be worked out between the two commissions.

Mr. HATCH. Would there be divided authority between the two commissions?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will ask that the amendment be again read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be again stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, line 8, in the committee amendment, after the period, it is proposed to insert:

The Administrator shall consult with, and give consideration to the views and recommendations of, the Federal Communications Commission, and shall make all reasonable efforts to cooperate with that Commission for the purpose of eliminating, preventing, or minimizing airport hazards caused by construction or operation of any radio station.

Mr. HATCH. As I understand the amendment, the final authority would still rest in the Civil Aeronautics Administration?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, yes.

Mr. HATCH. The Administrator would be required to consult with the Federal Communications Commission, and to give consideration to its views. Nevertheless, the final authority would rest in the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator's interpretation is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In other words, if the amendment is adopted, the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics will have to consult with the Federal Communications Commission, just as the bill now prescribes that the Civil Aeronautics Administration or the Administrator shall consult with the Army and the Navy. But it will not give the Federal Communications Commission any more power or authority than is now given under the language of the bill to the Army or the Navy. The Commission simply would be consulted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; and I think that is perfectly proper.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. It is rather difficult, upon a hurried reading of a proposed amendment, to understand its full significance. I am not at all sure that I understand the amendment and its

necessary implications. My only feeling about it is that it might be construed as a limitation upon existing authority of the Federal Communications Commission, rather than as an enlargement of its authority over radio transmission and radio communications. There can be no doubt that under our general radio law the Federal Communications Commission has authority over the radio frequencies which may be used by airplanes while in operation. There can be no doubt that the Federal Communications Commission has authority over the power which they may use in radio transmission. So far as the ground installations are concerned, it seems to me that if such installations conduct operations in interstate commerce at all, the Federal Communications Commission now has authority over them.

By an amendment imposing upon the Federal Communications Commission directions that it consult with and take into consideration the views of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, I should dislike to see raised any question whether we are really taking from the Federal Communications Commission a long-established jurisdiction which it has. I cannot help be a little apprehensive that that might be the result of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but the measure the Senate is about to enact will do the very thing the Senator from Maine is worried about. Of course, I do not pose as an expert on radio law or anything of that kind; but I am fortified in my position by the statement which Mr. Paul Porter, acting in behalf of the Federal Communications Commission, has made in his capacity as Chairman of the Commission. I wish to read his letter again to the Senator from Maine. He makes the following statement in behalf of the Commission:

> This possibility of conflict appears to arise from those provisions of the bill which confer upon the Administrator authority to formulate a Nation-wide zoning program for clearing and protecting aerial approaches to airports through regulation of the height and location of structures in the vicinity thereof and to promulgate reasonable standards with respect to the maximum height and location of structures within such safety areas as may be necessary to effectuate the zoning program.

Now we are giving the Administrator the power of zoning. What the Senator from Maine expresses as his fear has already occurred; the power of the Federal Communications Commission has already been limited by the provisions of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have been listening to the reading of the letter or communication the Senator has presented. I notice that it does not designate any place in the bill where the results complained of would be effectuated. I am very much inclined to believe that the communication addresses itself to an entirely different bill, one which is pending before the Commerce Committee and is known as Senate bill 1. But I am at a loss to understand what provisions of the pending bill are referred to.

Mr. JOHNON of Colorado. He says he refers to Senate bill 2.

Mr. McCARRAN. He does; but I, as the author of the bill, am unable to see where those provisions are to be found.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He offers his proposed amendment to a specific page and line of the bill; he wishes to put it in on page 35, in line 8.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. That section reads in part:

> In formulating and revising said plan, the Administrator shall take into account the needs of both air commerce and private flying, the probate technological developments in the science of aeronautics, the likely growth and requirements of civil aeronautics, and such other considerations as he may deem appropriate, and shall consult, and take into consideration the views and recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the several States, and their political subdivisions.

I am at a loss to know where there is anything there which would give rise to the complaint Mr. Porter has made in his communication with the Senator, because no such provision exists in the pending bill. It does exist in Senate bill 1. He may have some complaint with respect to that bill, but not with respect to the pending bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Nevada will accept the amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I see no particular harm at all in the amendment. So far as that is concerned, the Civil Aeronautics Administration might consult anyone, and, as was stated by the Senator on the basis of the communication he has received, they have in fact had an arrangement whereby they did consult from time to time in the past, and they have worked along that line. But there is nothing in the bill which would give rise to the suggestion which has been made.

However, I have no objection. I shall accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the magazine Broadcasting on June 25, 1945, referring to this particular point, and also a second editorial appearing in the same magazine on July 9, 1945, with respect to how the new airport bill affects radio.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Broadcasting magazine of June 25, 1945]

AIR RIGHTS—AND WRONGS

Radio and aviation, twin miracles of our era which have romped along hand in hand, are headed for domestic trouble. These two arts which use the ether are on the brink of their greatest development. Both need room. That's where the trouble brews. From the administrative standpoint, it's already here.

Television and FM, to render peak service, must have altitude for their antennas—the springboards from which their ultra-high, line-of-sight signals are bounced so as to "rain" on the Nation's homes. Air transportation needs tremendously expanded airport facilities. Obstructions to air navigation close to airports must be avoided.

Both radio and aviation look for their home sites in areas contiguous to centers of population. Heretofore a single airport would do for even the biggest city. Post-war expansion contemplates a multiplicity of them—possibly different ones for different types of transport service. Similarly, radio must have new locations for FM and television (as well as AM) for the far-flung radio relay systems planned for networking of these new services.

We said the problem exists today. Many applications, cleared by the FCC, for new stations or modifications of existing ones and hundreds for FM and television are on file. The Civil Aeronautics Authority, interested in aviation and not in radio, is holding up clearances until Congress writes a new law for the vast airport construction program.

Such a bill, creating a $650,000,000 fund for Federal airport aid, has been written by the very House committee charged with radio legislation. It shortly goes to the House. If that bill becomes law in its present form, it could hamstring radio's development to point of virtual strangulation. The FCC, in effect, would be superseded as the radio licensing agency, because it would be up to the CAA to decide whether a station could locate in a given area.

Beyond that, existing installations which the CAA might conclude are located at sites desirable for new airports could be condemned as "airport hazards." Should the Administrator decide to establish an airport at or near the site of an existing transmitter, he would have authority to remove, lower, or relocate.

It doesn't take clairvoyance to foresee the obstacles to radio development if this bill passes as now written. Think particularly of the flat plains areas of the Middle West where 1,000-foot antennas would be required for ultra-high transmission. Radio can't locate indiscriminately on a "what's left" basis.

The aviation industry obviously has done an able job of congressional relations. Radio, on the other hand, appears to have been caught napping. The fact that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which handles radio as well as aviation, would draft such a bill without even considering the effect upon radio's development certainly indicates the committee either didn't know about or wasn't impressed with radio's impending plight.

The first thing needed is to redraft the airport aid bill so the FCC will be able to continue its full licensing function without veto by CAA. Then radio must tell its story in the appropriate forums, lest it find itself smothered and suffocated by the very ether to which it gave voice.

[From Broadcasting magazine of July 9, 1945]

NEW AIRPORT BILL STILL AFFECTS RADIO—CAA ADMINISTRATOR TO HAVE FINAL SAY IN TOWER REMOVAL

Although terms of a new airport bill (H. R. 3615) reported out by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, give broadcasters the opportunity to object to removal of transmitter towers to make way for new airports, the Civil Aeronautics Administrator still would retain final authority on all decisions.

In its report the committee said it considered amendments to H. R. 3170 [Broadcasting, June 18] and several other pending bills. Broadcasters did not appear at hearings on the original measure, introduced by Chairman CLARENCE F. LEA, Democrat, California, of the committee. Neither did the FCC, although radio interests were involved.

Commission attorneys were studying the bill last week.

SEC. 9 (c) provides that "any public agency, persons, association, firm, or corporation" having substantial interest in any application for an airport may file with the CAA Administrator a memorandum supporting or opposing a proposed project, and a public hearing shall be accorded. The power of eminent domain is invested in the Administrator when, in his opinion, property needed for airports cannot be acquired without undue delay.

The bill does not define how much adjoining area may be acquired to eliminate hazards. Thus, it was pointed out, should a small town decide to build an airport, and the project sponsors decided that a radius of 10 miles were needed for landing and taking off airspace, the community's only radio station could be removed.

Pending before the Senate is the McCarran bill (S. 2), already reported favorably. That measure does not conform to amendments to the House bill which were intended to give broadcasters an opportunity to protest.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to say a further word. I am far from satisfied about this matter, but I have had no occasion to study the text or to refresh my recollection as to the provisions of our radio law. Inasmuch as the Federal Communications Commission, through its chairman, recommends this language, and inasmuch as they either know their business or should know it, I have no disposition to contest the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I certainly cannot answer the Senator from Maine, because I take it for granted that the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission knows far more about the matter than I do.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, while there is a goodly attendance in the Chamber, I should like to submit an amendment which I send forward.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 46 of the committee amendment, at the end of line 18, it is proposed to change the period to a colon and insert the following: "*Provided*, That where a State has not appropriated any State funds for airport purposes or where a State does not have legislation which permits its participation in a program through an adequate State airport agency, the Administrator shall carry out projects under this act by direct arrangements with any qualified public agency within the State."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we are trying to amend this bill so that it may go forward at once. Necessity for immediate progress under the bill is apparent. I do not have to dwell upon that point, but in many of the States there has been no money appropriated to go forward with the program. It seems to me that we should not have to wait 1 year, 2 years, or whatever the time may be, for the legislatures of the respective States to meet. The program should be carried forward promptly, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration should deal with any agency of the State which may be in position to handle the matter, be it the governor, a group of State officials, or whatever the agency may be. The program should be allowed to go forward at once by cooperation with the State in such a way as the State itself may designate for the time being without waiting for legislative action.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I call up for immediate consideration the amendment which I have heretofore submitted. It has been printed, and copies of it are lying on the desks of Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of section 21, on page 54, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 22. For the purposes of sections 22 to 27, inclusive, the term "landing facilities" means all land, rights in land, avigation easements, access roads, improvements (but not including buildings), paved or otherwise improved areas, equipment and aids to navigation owned, controlled, or operated by the Federal Government, directly used or useful in connection with the landing, taking off, taxiing, and parking of aircraft, and including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, runways, parking aprons, taxiways, lighting, communication, and landing equipment.

(b) For the purposes of sections 22 to 27, inclusive, the term "nonlanding facilities" means all land, rights in land, buildings, structures, and improvements owned, controlled, or operated by the Federal Government, directly used or useful in connection with the maintenance, servicing, storage, and operation (except landing, taking off, taxiing, and parking) of aircraft and all land, rights in land, buildings, structures, and improvements owned, controlled, or operated by the Federal Government not directly used or useful in connection with the landing, taking off, taxiing, parking, maintenance, servicing, storage, and operation of aircraft, but which are established on, adjacent to, or in connection with landing facilities as an incident to the operation thereof. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, nonlanding facilities shall include control towers (but not such equipment and aids to navigation as may be situated therein), administration buildings, hangars, barracks, warehouses, and recreational facilities.

SEC. 23. Anything in the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to the contrary notwithstanding, all landing facilities and nonlanding facilities determined to be surplus property and not requested for use any Federal agency, pursuant to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, shall be disposed of by the Surplus Property Board or its designated Federal agent in the manner and under the terms and conditions prescribed in sections 24 to 26, inclusive.

SEC. 24. Any State in which is located surplus landing facilities or nonlanding facilities may request the Surplus Property Board to convey the same to said State: *Provided, however*, That if said surplus landing facilities or nonlanding facilities are located on or adjacent to, or in connection with, an airport which is owned, controlled, or operated by a political subdivision of a State, such political subdivision, rather than the State, shall have the paramount right to request the conveyance thereof to said political subdivision. The Surplus Property Board or its designated Federal agent shall convey on behalf of the Federal Government, all of its right, title, and interest therein to the State or political subdivision thereof requesting such conveyance.

SEC. 25. Any State or political subdivision accepting a conveyance of surplus landing facilities or nonlanding facilities, pursuant to section 9, shall be under the following obligations:

(1) Title to the land comprising all or part of the surplus landing facilities or nonlanding facilities shall be retained by the State or political subdivision, although the same may be leased subject to the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of this section.

(2) Surplus landing facilities shall be used and maintained as aeronautical facilities for the use and benefit of the public, without discrimination. Nothing in this paragraph shall prevent a State or political subdivision from leasing all or part of said surplus landing facilities: *Provided*, That the same is used as aeronautical facilities for the use and benefit of the public, without discrimination.

(3) Surplus nonlanding facilities, except the land comprising a part thereof, may be used, leased, sold, salvaged, or disposed of in any manner by the State or political subdivision as it may deem expedient: *Provided*, That no use or disposition shall be made thereof which will materially interfere with or adversely affect the efficient maintenance, operation, and development of the landing facilities.

(4) During any national emergency, the Federal Government shall have the right to make exclusive or nonexclusive use and have exclusive or nonexclusive control and possession, without charge, of the surplus landing facilities or nonlanding facilities, in whole or in part, as it may desire, to the extent that the same are then in existence: *Provided, however*, That the Federal Government shall be obligated to maintain such part of the surplus landing facilities or nonlanding facilities as it may use exclusively, or over which it may have exclusive possession and control; and shall be obligated to contribute a reasonable share, commensurate with the use made by it, of the cost of maintenance of such surplus landing facilities or nonlanding facilities as it may use nonexclusively or over which it may have nonexclusive control and possession: *And provided further*, That the Federal Government shall pay a fair rental value for its use, control, or possession, exclusively or nonexclusively, of any improvements to the surplus landing or nonlanding facilities theretofore made without Federal Government aid.

(5) The Federal Government shall have the right at all other times to make nonexclusive use of the surplus landing facilities, without charge: *Provided*, That the Federal Government shall be obligated to pay for damages caused by its use, or if its use of the surplus landing facilities is substantial, to contribute a reasonable share of the cost of maintenance of the surplus landing facilities, commensurate with the use made by it.

(6) Any State or political subdivision accepting a conveyance of surplus landing facilities or nonlanding facilities under the provisions of this act shall release the Federal Government without any additional consideration therefor from any and all claims

the State or political subdivision may then have against the Federal Government for restoration or other damages under any lease, or other agreement, covering the use by the Federal Government of any airport, or part thereof, owned, controlled, or operated by the State or political subdivision upon which, adjacent to which, or in connection with which, the landing facilities or nonlanding facilities were established: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this paragraph shall prevent the State or political subdivision from accepting a conveyance of surplus landing facilities or nonlanding facilities in partial settlement of such claims where the fair value of such surplus landing facilities or nonlanding facilities is less than the amount w' ich the Federal Government is legally obligated to pay in liquidation of such claims. The Surplus Property Board or its designated Federal agent shall negotiate and execute on behalf of the Federal Government all settlements of claims of the State or political subdivision under the leases or other agreements mentioned above, and in the event such settlements include cash payments by the Federal Government in addition to the conveyance of surplus landing facilities and nonlanding facilities, the Surplus Property Board or its designated Federal agent shall make such cash payments from any appropriations which Congress may have made to it or may hereafter appropriate for this purpose.

SEC. 26. Any State or political subdivision which has requested and received a conveyance from the Federal Government of surplus landing facilities may request the Federal Government to contribute such amounts annually toward the cost of maintenance as will equal the deficit in such annual cost. If the Federal Government fails or refuses, within 6 months after such a request is made, to grant such request, the State or political subdivision shall have the right to convey to the Federal Government, without consideration or compensation of any kind, said surplus landing facilities, together with any remaining surplus nonlanding facilities conveyed in connection therewith, in the then existing condition thereof. Upon making such conveyance to the Federal Government, said State or political subdivision shall be relieved of the obligations imposed in connection therewith under section 10.

SEC. 27. Surplus landing facilities or nonlanding facilities which are not requested to be conveyed to a State or political subdivision in accordance with section 24, or which are conveyed by a State or political subdivision to the Federal Government pursuant to section 26, shall be disposed of in the manner provided by the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as the same may hereafter be amended or supplemented."

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have conferred at some length with the sponsor of the bill regarding the proposed amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the amendment just read by the clerk cover all the amendments appearing in the printed copy on our desks, or merely a part of them?

Mr. McMAHON. No; it does not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator please explain?

Mr. McMAHON. The amendment which has been read by the clerk starts on page 3 of the amendments submitted by me, line 7, beginning with section 22. The other amendments I have not pressed because we have already acted on two of the amendments in acting on the Brewster amendment and the Taft amendment. So I am addressing myself strictly to the paragraph on page 3, beginning with line 7.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And continuing to the end?

Mr. McMAHON. And continuing to the end, on page 9.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter at length with the Senator in charge of the bill, and he informed me yesterday that he would agree to accept the amendment which I have proposed.

Perhaps I should say a few words in explanation of what is proposed in the amendment. As I informed the Senate yesterday, I am told that very shortly hundreds and hundreds of airfields will be declared surplus by the Army and by the Navy. Some of these fields are owned outright by the Federal Government, others are owned by States and by cities but have been taken over by the Federal Government during the period of the war emergency, and millions of dollars have been expended thereon for improvements.

Mr. President, in considering any national airport plan it would seem wise indeed for us to determine how such surplus airports shall be disposed of, and I think it is most important that we restore then to the possession of the States and of the cities as quickly as possible. It was with that end in view, to plug up a hole, if you please, which I thought existed in the bill, that I suggested the amendment.

The amendment provides for a division of the property into two classifications. It provides that "the term 'landing facilities' means all land, rights in land, avigation easements, acess roads, improvements—but not including buildings—paved or otherwise improved areas."

A landing area, as defined under the amendment, is the actual operating part of the field. I provide further that when the State or the city takes title to the airport it may never release title to the atcual operating part of the field. The reason for that is, I think, obvious. In a future national emergency we would want those flying fields to remain unencumbered. We would not want them sold by the State or the city for a subdivision, for instance.

My amendment also provides that in a time of national emergency the Government shall have a right, without charge, to step in and use the field.

In the amendment that situation is differentiated from the accessories that go with a flying field, such as administration buildings. On some of the fields the Army or the Navy has erected barracks. My amendment provides that there shall be no strings on this kind of an improvement. Obviously we cannot tell a State or a city, if it is going to take back an airport, that it cannot move the administration building, cannot enlarge it, or take it away.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. In differentiating as to the nature of the property, does the Senator propose that where the gift is made or the property is conveyed to the municipality or the State it shall carry with it the buildings thereon, and the towers and other equipment?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Everything that is fastened to the ground?

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct. In other words, the whole of it goes either to the State or to the city. Of course, if the Federal Government takes it away from the city in the first place, and spends a million dollars on it, it will naturally go back to the city.

The point I wish to emphasize is that we are retaining this kind of control over the landing fields on which we spent so many millions of dollars, and yet we are not tying up the buildings which are not necessary for the landing of an airplane. That is the definition which is provided for in the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, where is the title now to most of the airfields?

Mr. McMAHON. It is a little difficult to say, because I have not the figures, but I know, as the Senator knows, that the Federal Government has built hundreds and hundreds of airports. It has also taken hundreds of airports that were owned by States or by local governments.

Mr. LUCAS. I am thinking primarily of the airports which have been appropriated by the Federal Government from certain cities and municipalities. Certainly, the title remains in the city or municipality to this day, and seems to me we might run into some difficulty in attempting to retain any control under any agreement that might be made between the Federal Government and the State. I can understand that where the Federal Government has title to property there cannot be any question about retaining control, but I think there might be some difficulty in the other case.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not think so. Of course, those fields were taken under leases, and lease money in the amount of many thousands of dollars was paid. Federal Government also entered into an agreement to restore the buildings or to reimburse for any damage done.

Mr. LUCAS. I presume what I have said might depend in great measure on the terms of the lease or the terms of the agreement between the Federal Government and the State or the municipality which owned the airport.

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator about section 26. If a State requests the Federal Government to turn over its airfield to it, why should the State then be able to ask the Federal Government to pay an annual deficit, and if it does not, within 6 months turn it back. If the State wants the airport, should it not be willing to pay for its annual maintenance? Otherwise, the Federal Government will have an annual bill for the airport. It would be better

for the Federal Government to get rid of the airport altogether, and let it go into house lots, would it not?

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator has raised an issue which needs explaining, and I shall be glad to try to explain it.

This will not, of course, affect any airports which are not declared surplus. The Senator understands that. Now that they are surplus, something has to be done if we want to encourage the States and the cities to see if they can make a go of operating them. If they find they cannot make a go of it, it may be that, for the purposes of national defense, we would not want the field turned into a subdivision or a cemetery. Therefore, it is provided that if they cannot make a go of it, if we refuse to contribute to the cost, it comes back to us and we can make an election as to what to do with it. But the idea is to have the airports under the jurisdiction of the cities and the States to see if they can be operated successfully.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the bottom of page 8 of his amendment, as follows:

> Upon making such conveyance to the Federal Government, said State or political subdivision shall be relieved of the obligations imposed in connection therewith under section 10.

Section 10 of what? Of the Senator's amendment, or of the bill? If it refers to the bill then it should be section 25.

Mr. McMAHON. I think that is an error in the numbering, and the Senator from Nevada is entirely correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. And the Senator will correct his amendment to that effect?

Mr. McMAHON. I ask unanimous consent to substitute "section 25" for "section 10", in my amendment on page 9.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to section 13 (c) of the Surplus Property Act, and ask him whether that provision has been taken into consideration in the drafting of the amendment which he now offers. Let me read the subsection:

> (c) No airport and no harbor or port terminal, including necessary operating equipment, shall be otherwise disposed of until it has first been offered, under regulations to be prescribed by the Board, for sale or lease to the State, political subdivision thereof, and any municipality, in which it is situated, and to all municipalities in the vicinity thereof.

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that that was taken into consideration, but there are no rules or standards laid down in this measure for action by the Surplus Property Board in disposing of these fields. There is no requirement that the Federal Government shall retain the use of the hundreds of millions of dollars worth of land or facilities it has constructed during the national emergency, for some future national emergency, nor is there any provision, as I see it, in the Surplus Property Act for any adjustment of damages which migh accrue under the leases, all of which is provided for in my amendment. I can say to the Senator that I considered the provision in question, but it did not seem to me to be sufficient to cover a very pressing situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It occurs to me to suggest to the Senator that the most comprehensive amendment which he has presented on the floor and which, as I take it, has not had study by the committee—am I correct in that, may I ask the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. I did not receive a copy of the amendment until yesterday.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The proposal may very vitally affect negotiations which are already proceeding.

Mr. McMAHON. There are none now proceeding, I will say to the Senator from Wyoming, because none of these facilities have been declared surplus, and it is in order to anticipate this immediate situation that I have offered the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is misinformed in that respect because I have some knowledge of negotiations which have been in progress for the acquisition of such facilities.

Mr. McMAHON. Within the continental limits of the United States?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. I wonder if the Senator would not feel that his amendment would be much more relevant if offered as an amendment to the surplus property law rather than to be offered to the pending bill? It has to do solely and wholly with surplus property, and it deals with a subject matter of such great importance to so many communities, to so many States, that I doubt very much the advisability of our acting upon it today in this summary manner.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that we are proposing by the bill to enact a national air policy. No account has been taken in the bill of the hundreds and hundreds of surplus fields which are going to be immediately thrown upon the market. There have been suggestions made for amending the surplus property act since I have been a Member of the Senate, but I have not seen any action yet. There has been a good deal of talk, but there seems to be very little action. My amendment deals with an immediate situation respecting one particular class of property, and it outlines what I think is a sensible plan respecting what to do with such property. It would restore it to the cities and the States and retain certain rights under the deeds which would be given.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But that policy has already been declared by existing law. What the Senator complains about is that the regulations of the Surplus Property Board have not been in sufficient detail to develop the sort of plan which he thinks should be followed. I might very well agree with the Senator in that respect.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to the statement made by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] yesterday. I cannot find it immediately in the RECORD, but I will endeavor to paraphrase it. He said that he had attended a conference in Maine this summer and talked with various State and Federal officials, and no one seemed to know—although they were there talking about the disposition of airports—just how it was going to be done. I wish I could find the statement for the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt that is quite correct. I have heard such conversations myself. But the point I am making is that this is no time and this is not the place in which to legislate on a matter of such great importance. I should like to secure the acquiescence of the Senator from Connecticut in the suggestion I am about to make which is that the amendment be sent to the Committee on Military Affairs where amendments to the Surplus Property Act are presently under consideration. I think the matter is of such grave importance that we should not undertake to enact an eight-page amendment to the surplus property law this afternoon without the benefit of reports from the Army, the Navy, and the Surplus Property Board.

Mr. McMAHON. Is the Senator a member of the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; and chairman of the Subcommittee on Surplus Property.

Mr. McMAHON. Oh, I understand. If the Senator will give me his assurance that an immediate hearing can be had on this proposition I shall be quite willing to follow his suggestion. I have no desire to try to jam through, if you please, an amendment which Senators might feel they wanted further to consider.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should be very glad to give the Senator that assurance. I may say that the subcommittee has been awaiting the return from abroad of Mr. Symington before calling him and other representatives of the Surplus Property Board, and for the purpose of obtaining testimony upon numerous amendments to the Surplus Property Act which have been suggested. There is one in which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is particularly interested which has been acted upon by the Committee on Agriculture, I think unanimously, and which, after it was on the calendar, was, on motion of the Senator, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is giving me some assurance now, I take it, that that committee is going to act immediately after Mr. Symington returns?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I certainly will be glad to give the Senator that assurance. I may say there is on the calendar a bill reported by the Military Affairs Committee yesterday which I hope to ask the Senate to act upon this afternoon after it has disposed of the pending bill, which would create a Surplus Property Administrator in place of the Surplus Property Board, the first step in what I fondly hope will be a complete and constructive reexamination of the whole Surplus Property Act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might confirm what the Senator from Wyoming has stated with regard to the general revamping and overhauling of the Surplus Property

Act. It has been a feeling of a good many of us for some time that experience has made it necessary, and when the President recommended and the House passed the bill creating a single administrator, and the Senate committee on yesterday reported it unanimously, the question arose why the committee did not at the same time consider the question of amending the law. The committee—I think very properly—took the position that it was wiser to set up a single administrator. When he returns from his official mission abroad within the next few days he, in the capacity of a single administrator, can come before the committee and discuss with it necessary amendments to the law. I believe that that is a wise procedure. The Senator from Wyoming and other Senators on the committee have assured me that that will be done immediately upon his return. Of course, there is no guaranty as to what amendments will be agreed to by the committee, but the whole field will be discussed and the question thrashed out.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, let me say in conclusion that I am perfectly confident of the soundness of this amendment. I think it is a thing which we ought to do without delay. However, if it were done 2 weeks from now it would be just as well as though it were done today. I am glad to accede to the Senator's request, since he is chairman of the committee, and I am pleased to have his assurance that it will be given immediate consideration. I should like to be advised so that I may appear, if that is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure that if the amendment is referred to the committee, the Senator will receive immediate notice.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, is there anything in this amendment which would in any way affect the apportionment of funds for new airports, taking into consideration the surplus airports which may be available, and which have been built over the country by the Army and Navy, so that States which do not have adequate facilities may have an equal opportunity with States in which surplus airports already exist?

Mr. McMAHON. I take it that not many airports were built in West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. There were none except what we built ourselves.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that no consideration is given to increasing the appropriation to those States which did not get what might be considered by the States a sufficient allocation.

Mr. KILGORE. There is no reason for creating a surplus of airports. Existing airports which may be declared surplus should certainly be taken into consideration in the allocation for building airports to constitute a continental chain.

Mr. McMAHON. That is why I was in favor of the $50,000,000 provision instead of a provision for $75,000,000 or $100,000,000. We have airports distributed all over the country, on which we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars. No one knows what they are or what they consist of, so far as the bill which we have before us today is concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With the understanding which has been reached with the Senator from Connecticut, I move that the pending amendment be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration in connection with amendments to the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Instead of asking that the amendment be referred to the committee, which I think is a rather unusual procedure, would it not be better for the Senator to withdraw his amendment and then introduce it in the form of a bill, which could then be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The procedure which has been suggested by the Senator from Wyoming would not be in order.

Mr. McMAHON. In view of the ruling of the Chair, I withdraw the amendment and will introduce a bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 2 is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 35, line 8, to strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following:

He shall request the airport agency of each State to submit a recommended plan of airport development for that State, which he may approve in whole or in part.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I believe that the proposed legislation is necessary, first, because we need airports, and second, because the Army and the Navy have built a few airports—sometimes many—in every State of the Union. In many cases the building of those airports for national defense has created a very favorable condition for certain cities in each State. Because of this favoritism, some cities having been fortunate enough to secure national airports without expending any of their own funds, there has been a demand on the part of other cities for the construction of airports with Federal funds. Therefore I believe that Congress is completely justified in enacting legislation of this kind. Because of the demand of some cities in each States which do not have airports, the demand being on their own State legislatures and Governors, State aeronautical agencies have been created in almost every State. In my State I have found that our airport agency, in cooperation with the cities, has developed a plan for airports in the State, and I am sure that the same situation obtains in every other State in the Union.

I see in the bill a complete lack of opportunity for State agencies to deal with the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. Of course, in the line just preceding the point at which my amendment would be inserted, it is provided that the Administrator shall consult with the several States. However, I should like to have provided a vehicle which would enable the various State commissions or agencies to come to the Administrator. Further, I should like to have an invitation by Congress written into the bill, so that the agencies in each State may know that their program, whether it be complete or not, and their suggestions, will receive full consideration by the Administrator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think we can get together on this amendment, if the mechanism is changed a little. I suggest retaining the period after the word "subdivisions" in line 8, and inserting a new sentence commencing with the language offered by the Senator from South Dakota, adding after the word "approve" the words "or modify."

Mr. GURNEY. The change is wholly acceptable to me.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to the amendment as modified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to the committee amendment, on page 35, line 8.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, lines 14 and 15, in the committee amendment, after the word "including", it is proposed to strike out the remainder of line 14 and all of line 15.

On page 28, lines 17 to 22, after the word "hazards", in line 17, it is proposed to change the semicolon to a comma, strike out the remainder of the paragraph, and insert "but not including the acquisition of land or the construction, alteration, or repair of airport buildings."

On page 30, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "and acquisition of property interests."

On page 30, line 15, it is proposed to change the period to a comma and add "but not including the cost of acquisition of land or the construction, alteration, or repair of airport buildings."

On page 41, lines 23 and 24, it is proposed to strike out "and the costs of acquiring property interests necessary for a project."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment is self-explanatory. It would merely eliminate Federal aid so far as the construction of administration buildings and the acquisition of land are concerned. I am asking that for the reason that it would place this program on the same basis on which we appropriate funds for Federal highways. We require the States to provide the rights-of-way. If the Administrator were to approve a large airport for an urban project I feel that there might be a tendency to overbuild so far as administration buildings are concerned. If that would be the result, it would mean the expenditure of large sums of Federal money, which the States would be required to match, for the construction of large administration buildings throughout the country. I am

not saying that they should not be built. I suppose they are a part of any airport project. However, this is a new act. We are setting forth a new policy. I feel that Federal aid for airports should be in absolute harmony with the system of Federal aid for highway construction.

I notice at the bottom of page 28, in lines 21 and 22, that the construction, alteration, or repair of airport hangars is specifically excluded. I am merely proposing with respect to administration buildings and the acquisition of land what the committee proposes in regard to the construction, alteration, or repair of hangars. I see no difference. If we are to help construct administration buildings, why not help to construct hangars? If we are going to buy the right-of-way, why not build hangars? It all goes together. I offer the amendment in good faith. There is no use in delaying the bill by discussion or debate. I think the situation is perfectly clear. I am sure if Senators will check the language of the committee amendment which I have asked to have stricken and the language I have suggested for insertion, they will find that my amendment will do just what I have said. First of all, we would not extend Federal aid to build administrative buildings or alter or repair them and we would not provide Federal aid for the acquisition of land. That is all I am asking for by the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if an airport is to be of any value whatever it must have an administration building. An airport which has no administrative facilities would be out in a cow pasture somewhere, and it would be of very little use to anyone. Therefore, an administration building is as essential as the airport itself. The acquisition of land is essential for the airport.

It seems to me that this amendment, coming at this late hour when there is not time for full discussion and consideration of it, should not receive the approval of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Why is provision for hangars omitted?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is omitted because the hangars are usually put in by private concerns, and belong to them, not to the airport proper.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. On page 37, section 8 provides for the apportionment of funds. In subsection (b), line 15, I notice that provision is made for the certification of sums which have been apportioned or reapportioned for projects within a State. I wish to ask the Senator what would happen to a State which has no public agency. Assuming that a State were in that situation and assuming that a town in that State applied for and was allowed some of the funds, some of the allowances might be so large that other cities in the State could not get any money for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have just offered an amendment, which has been adopted, providing that in the interim when there may be no public agency for this particular purpose within a State, the Civil Aeronautics Authority may deal with the Governor or any agency of the State.

Mr. LANGER. So the point is already covered; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; the situation is covered, and such States and cities will be protected in that regard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Aid Airport Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act, unless the context otherwise requires—

(a) "Administrator" means the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

(b) "Airport" means any area of land or water which is designed for the landing and take-off of aircraft and all appurtenant areas necessary for buildings or other airport facilities or rights-of-way.

(c) "Airport development" means (1) any construction work involved in constructing, improving, or repairing an airport or portion thereof, including the construction, alteration, and repair of airport administrative buildings and the removal, lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards; and (2) any acquisition of lands or property interests, air rights, or avigation easement therein which is necessary to permit any such construction work or prevent or limit the establishment of airport hazards, but does not include the construction, alteration, or repair of airport hangars.

(d) "Airport hazard" means any structure or object of natural growth located on or in the vicinity of an airport, or any use of land near an airport, which obstructs the airspace required for the flight of aircraft in landing or taking-off at the airport or is otherwise hazardous to such landing or taking-off of aircraft.

(e) "Class 3 and smaller airports" means all airports which, as to size, lay-out, and facilities, are not properly classifiable as class 4 or higher class airports according to the airport classification standards of the Administrator stated in Civil Aeronautics Administration Bulletin "Airport Design" dated April 1, 1944.

(f) "Class 4 and larger airports" means all airports which, as to size, lay-out, and facilities, are properly classifiable as class 4 or higher class airports according to the airport classification standards of the Administrator stated in Civil Aeronautics Administration Bulletin "Airport Design" dated April 1, 1944.

(g) "Military or naval aircraft" means aircraft owned and operated by the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Coast Guard, or the United States Marine Corps.

(h) "Population" means the population according to the latest decennial census of the United States.

(i) "Project" means a proposal for the accomplishment of certain airport development with respect to a particular airport.

(j) "Project costs" means all necessary costs involved in accomplishing a project under this Act, including those of making field surveys, preparation of plans and specifications, supervision and inspection of construction work, procurement of the accomplishment of such work by contract, and acquisition of property interests, and also including administrative and other incidental costs incurred by a State airport agency or project sponsor specifically in connection with the accomplishment of a project, and which would not have been incurred otherwise.

(k) "Public agency" means any agency of the Federal Government or of a State, any municipality or other political subdivision, any body politic or public corporation supported by taxes, or any department, commission, board, or official of a municipal or county government, which in the opinion of the Administrator has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized to satisfy the requirements of the Administrator for participation in the Federal-aid airport program herein authorized.

(l) "Public airport" means any airport which is used or to be used for public purposes without unjust discrimination, under the control of a public agency, the landing area of which is publicly owned.

(m) "State" means any State of the United States of America, excluding the District of Columbia.

(n) "State airport agency" means any department, commission, board, or official of a State government, which in the opinion of the Administrator has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized to satisfy the requirements of the Administrator for participation in the Federal-aid airport program herein authorized.

(o) "State funds" means any funds, other than Federal funds, which are available to a State airport agency or project sponsor for expenditure under this Act, including any funds contributed to it by any other non-Federal public agency for use in matching the Federal funds made available for a particular project.

AIRPORT SERVICE

SEC. 3. The Federal-aid airport program authorized by this act shall be administered by the Administrator through an Airport Service which shall be responsible for carrying out all the functions of the Administrator relative to airports and landing areas under sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 451, 452, 453, 456, and 457).

FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT PROGRAM

SEC. 4. In order to bring about the establishment of a Nation-wide system of public airports adequate to meet the present and future needs of civil aeronautics and to promote the interests of national defense, the Administrator is hereby authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made therefor by the Congress, to make grants of funds to the States for the development of public airports as hereinafter provided in amounts not to exceed 50 percent of the allowable project costs of each project, except as otherwise provided in section 9 of this act. The State airport agency receiving a grant may use to match such grant any public funds available for the purpose. For purposes of this act, a project shall be considered one for development of an airport of

a certain class if upon completion of the airport development proposed, the airport so developed would be properly classifiable as of that class according to the airport classification standards of the Administrator stated in Civil Aeronautics Administration Bulletin "Airport Design" dated April 1, 1944.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the Federal-aid airport program authorized by this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $75,000,000 for the first fiscal year, following the enactment of this act and $75,000,000 for each of the four successive fiscal years thereafter, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed 5 percent shall be available to the Administrator for all necessary planning and research and for all necessary expenses incident to the administration of this act, including the objects specified in section 204 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 424). There is also hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, immediately upon passage of this act, $3,000,000 for preliminary planning and surveys preparatory to commencement of the program. The first postwar fiscal year shall be that fiscal year which ends on June 30 following the date proclaimed by the President as the termination of the existing war emergency, or following the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, or following the date on which the Congress by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses finds as a fact that the war emergency hereinbefore referred to has been relieved to an extent that will justify proceeding with the airport program provided for by this act, whichever date is the earliest.

NATIONAL AIRPORT PLAN

SEC. 6. The administrator is hereby authorized and directed to prepare, and revise annually, a national plan for the development of public airports, which plan shall specify, in terms of general location and type of development, all the airport projects considered necessary to provide a Nation-wide system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics and to promote the interests of national defense. In formulating and revising said plan, the Administrator shall take into account the needs of both air commerce and private flying, the probable technological developments in the science of aeronautics, the likely growth and requirements of civil aeronautics, and such other considerations as he may deem appropriate, and shall consult, and take into consideration the views and recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the several States, and their political subdivisions. He shall request the airport agency of each State to submit a recommended plan of airport development for that State, which he may approve or modify in whole or in part. The Administrator shall consult with, and give consideration to the views and recommendations of, the Federal Communications Commission, and shall make all reasonable efforts to cooperate with that Commission for the purpose of eliminating, preventing, or minimizing airport hazards caused by construction or operation of any radio staton. The Administrator shall also consult, and consider the views and recommendations of, the War and Navy Departments as to the extent to which existing facilities constructed for national defense purposes may be made available in whole or in part for civilian use and as to what public airport development is needed for national defense, to the end that all such development included in the said plan and program may be as useful for national defense as is feasible. In carrying out this section, the Administrator is authorized to make such surveys, studies, examinations, and investigations as he may deem necessary.

APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS

SEC. 7. (a) As soon as possible after the beginning of each fiscal year 65 percent of all Federal funds available for grants during that fiscal year shall be apportioned by the Administrator among the several State airport agencies, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States. All sums so apportioned for a State shall be available to pay the pro rata share of the United States of the allowable project costs of authorized projects for the development of class 3 and smaller airports in that State. The remaining 35 percent of the Federal funds available for grants during such fiscal year shall be apportioned to State airport agencies to pay the pro rata share of the United States of allowable project costs of such approved projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports in urban areas, as hereinafter provided.

(b) At least 2 months prior to the close of each fiscal year, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a request for authority to undertake during the next fiscal year those of the projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports, included in the then current revision of the national airport plan formulated by him under section 6 hereof, which, in his opinion, should be undertaken under the urban program during that fiscal year, together with an estimate of the Federal funds required to pay the share of the United States under this act on account of such projects. In determining which projects to include in such a request, the Administrator shall consider, among other things, the relative aeronautical need for and urgency of the projects included in the plan and the likelihood of securing satisfactory sponsorship of such projects as required by the sponsorship requirements prescribed by him. In allocating and granting any funds that thereafter may be appropriated for the carrying out of such program during the next fiscal year, the Administrator shall consider the appropriation as granting the authority requested unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress, and no such allocations or grants shall be made unless so authorized.

(c) Upon making an apportionment or reapportionment, as provided herein, the Administrator shall certify to the Governor of each State, and to any public agency having requested such certification, the sums which he has so apportioned or reapportioned for projects within each State for the current fiscal year.

(d) All moneys apportioned hereunder shall be available as apportioned until the close of the fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the apportionment was made. Any apportioned amount which has not been granted at the end of the period during which it is available as apportioned under the terms of this section shall be reapportioned within 60 days thereafter, on the same basis as provided in subsection (a) of this section, among the States in which substantially all currently apportioned funds have been matched by the State funds, and which have satisfied the Administrator prior to the close of the preceding fiscal year of their desire and ability to so match funds in excess of the annual apportionment. All sums so reapportioned shall be certified to the Governors of the States in the same way as if they were being apportioned under this act for the first time.

SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECTS

SEC. 9. (a) Any State airport agency representing a State which has complied with the provisions of this act and desires to avail itself of the benefits of the program may submit to the Administrator project applications in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator, setting forth the airport development proposed to be undertaken. Without exception, such projects shall include only such airport development as is included in the then current revision of the national airport plan formulated by the Administrator under section 6 hereof, and all such proposed development shall be in accordance with standards established by the Administrator, which shall include standards for site selection, airport layout, grading, drainage, seeding, paving, and lighting. Each project application shall be accompanied by such plans, specifications, forms of contract, cost estimates, and other supporting materials as the Administrator may require.

(b) All such projects shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator, which approval shall be given only if the Administrator is satisfied that the project is designed to accomplish the purposes of this act, that sufficient funds are available therefor from appropriations made under the provisions of this Act, that the project will be completed without undue delay, and that all sponsorship requirements prescribed by or under the authority of this act have been or will be met. No project shall be approved by the Administrator with respect to any airport unless a State or a public agency holds good title, in form satisfactory to the Administrator, to the landing area of such airport or the site therefor, or gives assurance satisfactory to the Administrator that such title will be acquired. Unless and until a project is so approved either as originally proposed or as subsequently revised, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of any costs in connection with such project.

(c) If the Administrator approves any such project, he shall notify the State airport agency. The share of the United States, payable under this act on account of any such project shall not exceed 50 percent of the total estimated project costs thereof: *Provided*, That in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, such share payable to the State airport agency shall be increased by a percentage of the project cost equal to one-half the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of its total area.

GRANT AGREEMENTS

SEC. 10. Upon approving a project as provided in section 9, the Administrator shall transmit to the State airport agency an offer in behalf of the United States to pay 50 per centum of the allowable project costs of said project, or such larger share as may be required by the provisions of section 9, on such terms, and subject to such conditions, as the Administrator may deem necessary to meet the requirements of this Act and the regulations prescribed hereunder. Each such offer shall state a definite amount as the maximum obligation of the United States and shall stipulate the obligations to be assumed by the State airport agency. If and when any such offer is accepted in writing by the State airport agency to which it is made, such offer and acceptance shall comprise a grant agreement constituting an obligation of the United States. Unless and until such a grant agreement has been executed with respect to a project under this act, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of the project costs which have been or may be incurred in carrying out that project.

ALLOWABLE PROJECT COSTS

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of a project cost incurred in carrying

out a project, unless the Administrator has first determined that said cost is allowable. A project cost shall be allowable under this act provided—

(a) It was incurred in accomplishing airport development in conformity with approved plans and specifications for an authorized project;

(b) It was incurred subsequent to the execution of a grant agreement with respect to the project in connection with which it was incurred, except that necessary costs of preparing a project, including those of field surveys and the preparation of plans and specifications, and the costs of acquiring property interests necessary for a project, may be allowable even though incurred prior to the execution of the grant agreement for such project, if incurred subsequent to the passage of this act; and

(c) It is reasonable in amount, in the opinion of the Administrator: *Provided*, That if the Administrator determines that a project cost is unreasonable in amount, the amount which he determines would have been reasonable shall be an allowable project cost under this act.

The Administrator is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations with respect to the auditing of project costs and other matters which he may deem necessary to effectuate this section.

METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION; WAGES AND HOURS

SEC. 12. (a) The construction work and labor in each State shall be done in accordance with its laws, and under the direct supervision of the State airport agency, subject to the inspection and approval of the Administrator and in accordance with the rules and regulations made by him pursuant to this act: *Provided*, That a State airport agency may utilize the construction services of other public agencies qualified to perform or supervise the work, including other State agencies: *Provided further*, That all contracts pursuant to this act which involve labor shall contain provisions establishing minimum rates of wages, to be predetermined by the State, which contractors shall pay to skilled and unskilled labor, and such minimum rates shall be stated in the invitation for bids and shall be included in proposals or bids for the work. Such rules and regulations shall require such cost and progress reporting by the State airport agency to the Administrator as the Administrator may by regulation prescribe.

(b) All contracts let for construction projects and all loans and grants pursuant to this act shall contain such provisions as are necessary to insure (1) that no convict labor shall be employed on any such project; (2) that (except in executive, administrative, and supervisory positions), so far as practicable and feasible, no individual directly employed on any such project shall be permitted to work more than 40 hours in any one week; (3) that in the employment of labor in connection with any such project (except in executive, administrative, and supervisory positions), preference shall be given, where they are qualified, first, to persons honorably discharged from the military service of the United States, as defined in section 101 (1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940, and then to citizens of the United States and aliens who have declared their intention of becoming citizens, who are bona fide residents of the State in which the work is to be performed: *Provided*, That these preferences shall apply only where such labor is available and qualified to perform the work to which the employment relates.

(c) The acquisition of articles, materials, and supplies, wholly or in part with funds appropriated pursuant to this act, shall be subject to the provisions of section 2, of title III of the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1934; and all contracts let pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be subject to the provisions of section 3 of title III of such act.

(d) Any allocation, grant, or other distribution of funds for any project, pursuant to this act, shall contain stipulations which will provide for the application of title III of the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1934, to the acquisition of articles, materials, and supplies for use in carrying out such project.

GRANT PAYMENTS

SEC. 13. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations governing the manner in which payments shall be made under grant agreements executed pursuant to section 10: *Provided*, That no advance payments shall be made, except that partial payments may be made as work progresses or project costs are incurred, in such amounts, and at such times, as the Administrator may deem advisable. All grant payments shall be made to such official, or officials, or depository, as may be designated by the State airport agency entitled to such grants, and authorized under the laws of the State to receive public funds.

ELIGIBILITY OF STATES

SEC. 14. (a) To be eligible for participation in the benefits of the program, a State shall, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, satisfy the Administrator that it meets the following requirements for such participation:

(1) Its legislature shall have assented to the provisions of this act and to its acceptance of Federal airport aid on the terms and conditions prescribed by the Administrator hereunder: *Provided*, That until the final adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature of such State convening after approval of this act, the assent of the Governor of the State shall be sufficient.

(2) The State shall have a State airport agency as defined herein.

(3) The State shall have adequate legislation for the prevention and removal of airport hazards by airport zoning under the State police power and the acquisition of property or air rights or avigation easements therein.

(4) The State shall have taken adequate steps to insure that all airports developed within the State under the program will be operated and managed in the public interest without unjust discrimination in favor of or against any person or class of persons.

(5) The State shall have taken adequate steps to insure the proper maintenance, with due regard to climatic and flood conditions, of all airports developed within the State under the program.

(6) The State shall have taken adequate steps to insure the availability each year of the State funds required for the development and maintenance of all airports developed or to be developed within the State under the program.

(b) The requirements of paragraphs (2) to (6), inclusive, of subsection (a) of this section shall be suspended during a period of three years from and after the date of approval of this act: *Provided*, That where a State has not appropriated any State funds for airport purposes or where a State does not have legislation which permits its participation in the program through an adequate State airport agency, the Administrator shall carry out projects under this Act by direct arrangements with any qualified public agency within the State.

PROJECT SPONSORSHIP

SEC. 15. (a) As a condition precedent to his approval of an airport project under this act, the administrator shall assure himself to the extent feasible, that—

(1) the airport will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms;

(2) the airport and all facilities thereon or connected therewith will be suitably operated and maintained, with due regard to climatic and flood conditions;

(3) the aerial approaches of the airport will be adequately cleared and protected by removing, lowering, relocating, marking, and lighting or otherwise mitigating existing airport hazards and by preventing the establishment or creation of future airport hazards so far as existing legislation permits;

(4) all the facilities of the airport developed with Federal aid and all those usable for the landing and take-off of aircraft will be available to the United States for unrestricted use by military and naval aircraft in common with other aircraft at all times without charge other than a charge sufficient to defray the cost of repairing damage done by such aircraft or, if the use by military and naval aircraft shall be substantial, a reasonable share, proportional to such use, of the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities so used;

(5) the airport operator or owner will furnish the Government at a reasonable rent therefor such space in airport buildings as may be reasonably adequate for use by the Government in connection with any airport air traffic control, or weather reporting, and communications activities pertinent thereto which the Government may wish to establish at the airport;

(6) all project accounts and records will be kept in accordance with a standard system of accounting prescribed by the Administrator;

(7) the airport operator or owner will submit to the Administrator such annual or special airport financial and operations reports as the Administrator may reasonably request; and

(8) the airport and all airport records will be available for inspection by any duly authorized agent of the Administrator upon reasonable request. To provide such assurance, the Administrator shall prescribe such project-sponsorship requirements as he may deem necessary, consistent with the terms of this act: *Provided*, That nothing contained in such regulations shall be construed to require any State or State airport agency to acquire any airport owned by any other public agency, to assume control over the operation of any such airport, or to sponsor a project which any other public agency is desirous of sponsoring.

USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS

SEC. 16. (a) Whenever the Administrator determines that use of any lands owned or controlled by the United States is reasonably necessary for the development of an airport under this act, or for the operation of any public airport, he shall file with the head of the department or agency having control of such lands a request that such property interest therein as he may deem necessary be conveyed to the State airport agency of the State in which the lands are located or to the public agency sponsoring the project or owning or controlling the airport, as he may designate. Such property interest may consist of the title or any lesser estate or interest in property, including any leasehold estate or avigation or other easement or right-of-way.

(b) If within a period of 4 months after such filing the said department or agency head shall not have certified to the Administrator that the requested conveyance is contrary to the public interest or inconsistent with the needs of that department or agency, the said department or agency head is hereby authorized and directed, with the approval of the President and the Attorney General of the United States, and without any expense whatsoever to the United States, to perform any acts and to execute any instruments necessary to make the conveyance requested: *Provided*, That each such conveyance shall be made on the condition that the property interest conveyed shall automatically revert to the United States in the event that the lands in question are not developed, or cease to be used, for airport purposes.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR DAMAGE BY ARMY OR NAVY

SEC. 17. (a) The Administrator is authorized to reimburse States or public agencies for the necessary rehabilitation or repair of public airports substantially damaged by the Army or the Navy, or both. The Administrator is authorized on behalf of the United States to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine in accordance with regulations he shall prescribe pursuant to this section, any claim submitted by any State or public agency for reimbursement of the cost of necessary rehabilitation or repair of a public airport, under the control or management of such State or public agency, substantially damaged by the Army or the Navy, or both.

(b) Such amount as may be found to be due any claimant under this section shall be certified by the Administrator to Congress for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor. Such certification shall include a brief statement of the character of each claim, the amount claimed, and the amount allowed. No claim shall be considered by the Administrator pursuant to this section unless notice of intention to file such claim has been presented to him within 30 days after the occurrence of the damage upon which the claim is based, except that in case of damage caused by operations of a military nature during time of war such notice may be filed within 60 days after termination of the war.

REPORTING TO CONGRESS

SEC. 18. On or before the first Monday in February of each year the Administrator shall make a report to the Congress on his operations under this act during the preceding fiscal year, which shall include detailed statements of the Federal-aid airport development accomplished, the status of each project undertaken, the allocation of appropriations, and itemized statement of expenditures and receipts, and his recommendations, if any, for new legislation amending or supplementing this act. The Administrator shall also make such special reports as the Congress may request.

FALSE STATEMENTS

SEC. 19. Any officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or any officer, agent, or employee of any State or public agency, or any person, association, firm, or corporation who shall knowingly make any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof, in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or estimates of construction costs for any project submitted to the Administrator for approval under the provisions of this act or shall knowingly make any false statement, false representation, or false report or claim for work or materials for any project approved by the Administrator under this Act, or shall knowingly make any false statement or false representation in any report required to be made under this act, or any acts supplementary thereto, with the intent to defraud the United States shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not to exceed 5 years or by a fine of not to exceed $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

EXISTING AIRPORT PROGRAMS

SEC. 20. Nothing in this act shall affect the carrying out of the program for the development of public landing areas necessary for national defense, authorized by the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, or the program for the development of civil landing areas, authorized by the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, which programs shall be additional to the Federal-aid airport program authorized herein.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 21. This act shall take effect on the date of its approval.

DELAY IN DISCHARGE OF OVERSEAS VETERANS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in common with most Senators, I find that my desk is piled high with postal cards, letters, and telegrams from servicemen and relatives of servicemen who seek discharge. This morning I received a telegram which illustrates most clearly the complete break-down and inefficiency of the present discharge system. I wish to read the telegram, for the benefit of the Senate:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1945.

HON. E. V. ROBERTSON,
Senator from Wyoming,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following men, all overseas veterans, are now being held at Charleston Army air base. We were formerly members of the Eighth and Fifteenth Air Forces after being in England for 38 months, and the men from the Fifteenth in Italy for 2 years were transferred to Africa to ATC bases. Last month we were transferred back to the States via the so-called purple project. All of us being flown and rushed to Charleston for discharge and reassignment. Many of the men have from 85 to 131 points and a great majority are over 38 years old. We were to ship to the Fourth Service Consolidation Center namely Fort Bragg, Camp Shelby and Fort McClellan. Many of the men are ex-infantry men and gunners in the Air Forces. Quite a few men being wounded and deserve these rightful rewards which at the present time is KP, cutting the grass. We were to ship the 1st of the month and then the Fourth Service Command cancelled it till the 12th. Today it was shoved up till the 17th. All of the men have not been home expect a few on the East Coast from 2 to 4 years. We have not even had a furlough since we hit the States and the men are just about ready to go over the hill and take the consequences as they have not seen their families for nearly 4 years. We went to the air inspector who is a 26-year-old major, never overseas, and he told the two men we sent as delegates, to hold up their pants and feel sorry for the flying officers that are going to the Pacific. We were told that if we had cars we could leave for the separation center. The men are in a state of chaos and don't know where to turn. After reading your name in the papers we decided to write you this night letter. Incidentally the major who told us to hold our pants wants to stay in the Army. He can well afford it. We would just like to be treated like the men we are and given a break and treated like a soldier and not like PW's. Would appreciate it very much if you kindly acknowledge this telegram to * * * and to investigate the attitude of the Fourth Service Command toward our present situation. Would be advisable to keep the men's names secret due to Army repercussions. Thanking you for your great speeches in the papers and hoping this information can be of help to you, I am,

Respectfully.

That telegram is signed by more than 70 men 38 years of age or over, with from 85 to 131 points. The ages and points of the men signing the telegram are as follows.

1. 104 points.
2. 110 points.
3. 100 points.
4. 94 points.
5. 99 points.
6. 95 points.
7. 90 points.
8. 106 points.
9. 109 points.
10. 97 points.
11. Over 38.
12. Over 38.
13. 100 points.
14. 93 points.
15. 95 points.
16. 106 points.
17. 123 points.
18. 122 points.
19. 75 points.
20. 75 points.
21. 55 points.
22. 121 points.
23. 92 points.
24. Over 38.
25. 96 points.
26. Over 38.
27. 110 points.
28. 106 points.
29. Over 38.
30. 96 points.
31. Over 38.
32. 95 points.
33. Over 38.
34. 101 points.
35. 110 points.
36. 95 points.
37. 108 points and 39 years.
38. 113 points.
39. 116 points.
40. 100 points.
41. 94 points.
42. 92 points.
43. 99 points.
44. 94 points.
45. 109 points.
46. 115 points.
47. 109 points.
48. 91 points and over 38.
49. 98 points.
50. 86 points.
51. 119 points.
52. 93 points.
53. 93 points.
54. 92 points.
55. 95 points.
56. 96 points.
57. 96 points.
58. 85 points.
59. 110 points.
60. 103 points.
61. 94 points.
62. 100 points.
63. 95 points.
64. 95 points.
65. Over 38.
66. 96 points.
67. 106 points.
68. Over 38.
69. 93 points.
70. 96 points.
71. 98 points.
72. 96 points.
73. 90 points.
74. Over 38.
75. 102 points.

I have read a tabulation of the qualifications of the men for discharge, and yet they seem to be unable to receive their discharge.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Wyoming for yielding to me.

I am glad that he has read the telegram to the Senate. It is a telegram which I have heretofore seen. Its reading is certainly timely.

The Military Affairs Committee of the Senate met this morning and the very question which the Senator from Wyoming has brought up was presented to the Under Secretary of War in connection with the subject of keeping in the camps of this country men with more than 85 points. They are sometimes kept in the camps for weeks at a time. I was glad to hear the Under Secretary of War make answer to the inquiry concerning the subject, that if we would give him the names of those men he would see to it personally that they were released, or that their cases would be attended to.

Already today I have handed to the Under Secretary of War four names. I hope that the Senator from Wyoming will present immediately to the War Department the names of the men to whom he has referred. If he desires me to do so, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee I will present the names.

I can think of nothing meaner or nothing more neglectful than to return these boys to this country from long service on the battle fronts and then keep them in camps while performing KP service and other work of that kind when, under the order of the War Department, they are supposed to be released.

I hope the able Senator from Wyoming will proceed at once to present for release the names to the War Department. I express it as my own opinion that if the conditions to which reference has been made are the fault of

anyone locally, or if they are the result of a plan of anyone in authority, I trust the War Department will take proper measures not only to correct what is being done, but to see that proper disciplinary action is taken.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his offer to help obtain the release of these men. I will see that he is supplied with a complete copy of the names which were signed to the telegram, but which I did not read.

SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 555, House bill 3907. The bill is identical with a bill which was reported yesterday by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs providing for a single Surplus Property Administrator for the Surplus Property Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by its title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3907) to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, this bill would do away with the Board as such, and substitute for it a single Administrator. Am I correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. And it would also transfer to the single Administrator all the power and authority which was given to the Board, and would embrace all the purposes and obligations that were given to the Board.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. WHITE. The bill makes no other substantial change in the law?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It makes no other substantial change in the law. The committee was of the opinion that it was advisable not to take up various controversial amendments which would impede consideration of the measure which seems to be in the interest of efficient administration.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator from Wyoming will yield further, I may say that I have contacted, as best I could, the minority members of the Military Affairs Committee, and I found no opposition among them to the proposal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Recommendation of legislation of this character was made by the President in a message dated July 7, 1945. A subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, having to do with the subject of surplus property, went into the matter before the Japanese surrender. The subcommittee prepared an identical bill. It was impossible, however, to get action upon it until after Congress had reassembled. The House has passed the bill for which I have moved consideration, and it remains only for the Senate to take action.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3907) to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator, inasmuch as the bill comes before the Senate with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Military Affairs, and there is practically no opposition to it, that I hope it may be disposed of this afternoon. In that event it will be the purpose to adjourn until Friday instead of until tomorrow. On Friday we may attempt to call the calendar. It is very light. Then the Senate will go over until Tuesday by which time we hope to have legislation before the Senate dealing with unemployment compensation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not rise to oppose the passage of the pending bill, but merely to make a statement with respect to it.

The Special Senate Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning gave careful consideration to this entire problem many months ago. As a result of the work of that committee, the bill providing for plant clearance, contract termination, and early adjustment of contracts was passed in the form very much as recommended by the committee, and in the form in which the chairman of the committee introduced the bill following the report of the special committee.

The committee also recommended the creation of the Office of Director of Mobilization and Reconversion, and with the exception of provisions relating to unemployment compensation, that bill was passed in a form very much as the committee had recommended.

The committee also, in dealing with the surplus property of the Government, suggested to the Senate a bill which the chairman of the committee jointly with another member of the Senate introduced. The recommendations of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, and the bill introduced by that committee in this body, provided for a single Administrator precisely as the President has recommended, and precisely as the Board itself has recognized, after some experience, as a necessary change in the basic law. I therefore do not oppose the measure, but heartily concur in it. There are other provisions in the surplus property law which, in my opinion, it will be necessary to correct by amendment, but I concur in the statement made by the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that the committee deemed it wise not to go into any question of dealing with other provisions of the surplus property bill. I think that the Senate will concur in that view as being an altogether wise one.

Moreover—and this seems to me to be controlling—experience and recommendation of the Administrator himself, who is to be established as the sole and final authority under the Surplus Property Act, will be necessary before the Senate and the Senate committee can intelligently act with respect to further amendments to the Surplus Property Act.

So, Mr. President, I hope this bill will be passed. I realize now, and I realized it in the beginning, as I believe all Senators did, that, because of the desire to have unified authority in an effort to avoid criticism, well-founded in many instances, which would likely flow from the disposition made by any organization or agency of Government of the vast surplus property held by the Government, the board theory was injected into this discussion and finally passed this body, and after a long time in conference the board was whittled down to three, as I recall.

I think the committee has acted very wisely in following the President's recommendations, and also in refusing to go into other highly controversial provisions of the Surplus Property Act, because it will be necessary to have the advice and recommendations of the administrator himself, based upon his experience.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope the bill may be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 3907) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, a similar bill, Senate bill 1353, will be indefinitely postponed.

AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT BILLS

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report tomorrow, during the recess of the Senate, several bills which have been approved by the Committee on Civil Service, but reports on which are not yet ready.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

Paul V. McNutt, of Indiana, to be United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Benjamin V. Cohen, of New Yerk, to be counselor of the Department of State;

Donald S. Russell, of South Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

William Benton, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, United States Army, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Panama, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; and

Sundry persons for promotion in the foreign service.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Public Health Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand the action on the Executive Calendar just taken does not include passing on the treaties.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the Senate considered merely the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until Friday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes) the Senate took a recess until Friday, September 14, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 12 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

John J. O'Connell, of Pennsylvania, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, new position.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Bennett Champ Clark, of Missouri, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Thurman W. Arnold, resigned.

Wilbur K. Miller, of Kentucky, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Fred M. Vinson, resigned.

E. Barrett Prettyman, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Justin Miller, resignation effective October 1, 1945.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Alexander Holtzoff, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Bolitha J. Laws, elevated.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Gael E. Sullivan, of Illinois, to be Second Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, effective October 1, 1945, vice Smith W. Purdum, retired.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Harrington Wimberly, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1948, vice Basil Manly, resigned.

Richard Sachse, of California, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1947, vice John W. Scott, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONELS WITH RANK FROM SEPTEMBER 1, 1945

Lt. Col. Rexford Edwin Willoughby, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. William Glenn Livesay, Infantry (temporay major general).

Lt. Col. James Washington Barnett, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. John Charles Mullenix, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Andrew Weeks, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Robert Lincoln Christian, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. William Hampton Crom, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Delphin Etienne Thebaud, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. George Sheppard Clarke, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Charles Andrew Willoughby, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Walter Eyster Buchly, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Harold Chittenden Mandell, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 12 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be passed assistant surgeons, effective date indicated

Robert V. Holman, July 1, 1944.
James R. Hurley, September 12, 1945.
James F. Maddux, July 1, 1945.
Wardell H. Mills, September 14, 1945.
Willoughby J. Rothrock, Jr., September 4, 1945.
Richard C. Siders, July 1, 1945.

To be temporary senior surgeons, effective August 1, 1945

Llewellyn L. Ashburn	Hollis U. Maness
Bert R. Boone	Thomas B. McKneely
Don S. Cameron	Carroll E. Palmer
Kenneth E. Gamm	Donald W. Patrick
Alfred B. Geyer	Thurman H. Rose
Clifton K. Himmelsbach	George G. VanDyke
	Victor H. Vogel
Marion K. King	Oliver C. Williams
Benton O. Lewis	William G. Workman

To be temporary senior dental surgeons, effective date indicated

Leonard R. Etzenhouser, May 1, 1945.
Mark E. Bowers, August 1, 1945.
Gordon G. Braendle, August 1, 1945.
John M. Francis, August 1, 1945.
Charles B. Galt, August 1, 1945.
Frank E. Law, August 1, 1945.
Robert H. Moore, August 1, 1945.
Walter J. Pelton, August 1, 1945.

To be temporary surgeons, effective date indicated

Clarence L. Hebert, July 1, 1945.
Charles L. Williams, Jr., July 1, 1945.

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons, effective date indicated

John W. Murray, Jr., July 1, 1945.
Fred W. Harb, July 1, 1945.

To be temporary medical director, effective July 16, 1945

Estella Ford Warner

To be temporary senior nurse officers, effective date indicated

Pearl McIver, July 9, 1945.
Jessie MacFarlane, July 6, 1945.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be assistant dietitians, effective date of oath of office

E. Grace Gibson
Myrtle M. Morris
Georgia Stephens

To be junior assistant dietitian, effective date of oath of office

Christine F. Flanders

To be senior assistant dietitians, effective date of oath of office

Elsie Trautman
Janet E. Eley

To be junior assistant physical therapist, effective date of oath of office

Gerda Busck

To be senior assistant nurse officer, effective date of oath of office

Amy E. Viglione

POSTMASTERS

INDIANA

Julius L. Green, Lanesville.
Virginia L. Trautman, Sunman.

LOUISIANA

A. Frank Fairley, New Orleans.

MONTANA

Vera Pryde, Bearcreek.
Cleola Ralston, Glacier Park.

NEBRASKA

Maude L. Brockett, Atlanta.
George E. Price, Cortland.
Mildred E. Tomes, Dwight.
Florence Hartnett, Jackson.
Maxine L. Neal, Tryon.

VIRGINIA

C. Moir Marshall, Laurel Fork.
Louise G. Sterrett, Rockbridge Baths.
Nannie Rose Tiller, Rocky Gap.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessing and honor, glory and power, be unto Him who sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb forever and ever. In all things, dear Lord, inspire us to be faithful and diligent, patient and hopeful, and to know that it is no vain adventure to be directed and held by these virtues. Give to us glad assurance, and cease not to guide us in all our ways. By Thy grace bind together the tissues of

our habits that we may be blessed with the hand that helps and with the heart that cheers.

Merciful Father, we remember those who have been watching and longing for the day-dawn through these unrewarding years; O Lord, give them help and comfort, and set their very souls climbing eagerly toward that life which is vast and heavenly and in which there are no more fears or distrust. Bring to our whole land peace and service, and we shall hail the hour with rejoicing. In the name of Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1365. An act to amend section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act to permit the appointment of supervising conciliation commissioners as referees in bankruptcy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received from the editor of the Detroit Westward and an article written by him in the same paper.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dr. J. Raymond Schmidt.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from Thomas Butler, a recently returned veteran, with regard to the cumbersome and clumsy manner in which the GI bill is being administered.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein two resolutions.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, when I say that the American people are intensely dissatisfied with the delay in formulating and carrying out speedy and effective demobilization plans, I am merely voicing a sentiment known to every Member of this House.

Now that General MacArthur has announced to the world that the Japs have been disarmed and cannot fight again within predictable time, we want all our boys, wherever they are located, to come back home. Together with the forces of our allies, our Regular Army and Navy can adequately perform all occupational duties and speedily complete the work of demilitarizing our recent enemies.

It is very clear now that the discharge point systems of the services are not working out satisfactorily. They are too complicated and too slow. They are causing basic inequities and confusion. In my opinion the service-discharge point systems should be abolished at once and measures taken to carry out the orderly demobilization of all our boys save those who will remain in the regular Army and Navy.

At the same time Congress should move to suspend the operation of the draft.

I respectfully suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the able chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of this House, that he press for immediate action on this proposal which he advanced some time ago.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein certain editorials about the rehabilitation of the Philippines.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a column by Mr. James Brady.

COMPOSITION OF ARMIES OF OCCUPATION

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, our primary concerns must be to render our enemies impotent ever to wage aggressive war and to conduct our policy toward them so as to destroy the roots of totalitarianism and to sow the seeds of democracy. This requires occupation. That requires troops and civilians.

Our next vital objective must be to release the men and women whose noble achievements have won these great victories, back to their homes, families, and normal civilian pursuits as quickly as possible.

These two goals come into conflict. One way to help to reconcile the two is for our President, through the State Department and our military leaders, to make definite arrangements with the other United Nations to furnish General MacArthur with their fair share of the forces to be used in the occupation of Japan. These quotas should be under the command of General MacArthur. China, the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia have Far Eastern interests at least as important to them as are our Far Eastern interests to us. Great Britain, Russia, France, and Holland all have a big stake in that area. They should bear their part of this responsibility.

If these nations furnish one-half million men, that means 500,000 American boys can come home now. It means that more Americans everywhere can be released and discharged to their homes and families sooner. This should have been done before. Not another moment should be lost.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Bristol Courier entitled "Truman Swings Left." It is worth reading by all people and shows the continued trend of the Second Deal in the game that we are playing our Government into communism and it is a shame and a crime to our civilization. I am in hopes it will wake up the American people ere it is too late.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am for private enterprise. I am now and always have been. It is the thing that made America great. It is the thing that made America one of the greatest nations on the face of the earth. We are gradually destroying it by putting the Government into all kinds of business; into practically everything that makes private enterprise reluctant to go into business. It is about time that the Congress recognized that fact. Unless the Congress does something to take the Government out of business, eliminate many of the departments and consolidate others so that the people of the country will know the Government is not interfering with them, and do away with a lot of Government regulations, it is just going to be too bad for this country. The past 10 years we have been heading for a Communistic form of government, you are tearing down private initiative, you are permitting a new deal to become a raw deal so far as private business is concerned, its time to get rid of the radicals, the Communists and all those that would destroy private initiative and our American form of government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Governor of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include an article on the electrification of railroads, by Richard L. Neuberger, and in

the other to include an article on the control of forest fires.

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an editorial, and in the other a statement regarding the work of the Women's Volunteer Corps.

Mr. McKENZIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by C. T. Revere, cotton expert, on the marketing machinery of cotton.

INDUCTION OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which has as its purpose to prohibit the induction for further service in the armed forces of veterans of World War II. The resolution reads as follows:

That no man who (1) shall have been engaged in active service in the land or naval forces of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to September 2, 1945, and (2) shall have been discharged or released from such active service under honorable conditions, shall be inducted for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

It does not make sense in any language, once a boy has been honorably discharged from the armed forces, to subject that boy to the whim and fancy of some selective service board who may send that boy up again for induction.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TERMINATION OF DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3974) to provide for termination of daylight-saving time and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the act of January 20, 1942, entitled "An act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight saving time," at 2 o'clock antemeridian on Sunday, September 30, 1945, the standard time of each zone established pursuant to the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended, shall be returned to the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing the standard time for such zone as provided in such act of March 19, 1918, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] such time as he may desire.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] to repeal what was known as war-savings time.

In 1941, immediately after Pearl Harbor, the Army, the Navy, the power companies, and various other industries appeared before the committee asking that a war-savings time of 2 hours be given, if my recollection serves me correctly. The committee at that time reported out the bill which subsequently became the law advancing time 1 hour.

The war is over now as far as the fighting is concerned. There have been numerous requests by Members of Congress as well as from organizations over the country that the act of 1942 be repealed. The committee by unanimous vote yesterday reported out this bill for consideration today. The report carries with it the names of those Members who have introduced similar repeal bills, together with the numbers of the bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take these few moments to point out the fact that a number of bills along this line were introduced in this Congress calling for the repeal of the act of January 20, 1942, providing for daylight-saving time as a temporary war measure. Among them was H. R. 3915 which I introduced on September 5, 1945.

The subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, held hearings on the proposition last year at which time everybody except the Army, the Navy, and the War Production Board indicated their approval. Since the end of the war with Japan and the reconvening of Congress on September 5, all three of these Government agencies have withdrawn their objection, and the President himself has recommended that the war time advance of 1 hour be repealed.

H. R. 3974 comes with a unanimous report not only of the subcommittee but of the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and certainly should be passed at this time. Its passage will meet with the universal approval of Americans in all walks of life.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, as one of the early advocates and author of a bill to repeal the so-called daylight-saving time, I am more than happy to rise in support of the pending bill.

As a member of the subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which held extensive hearings last year for the purpose of determining whether war time should be terminated, there was actually no factual justification presented for the continuation of war time even then.

It is a serious question as to whether such a bill creating war time should have ever been passed. It irritated and annoyed more people and caused inconveniences which should never have been created for people working under the pressure and strain of wartime conditions. It created various traffic hazards and hardships, particularly for school children, and added to the tremendous difficulties under which the farmers of this country were already operating.

I was the author of a bill to repeal war time, which I introduced early in January. To illustrate the interest and feeling on the part of the country generally, there were 58 other bills introduced by various Members of the House for the repeal or amendment of this legislation in one form or another. I know of no such number of bills introduced upon any one subject in the recent history of Congress. The considerable lapse of time which has occurred since the enactment of the bill, despite its unpopularity, emphasizes the difficulty of repealing legislation after it is once enacted. The term "daylight saving" is a misnomer.

This bill has been reported out unanimously by the committee and I believe it will have, and should have, the unanimous approval of the House, and its passage will meet with universal approval by the country.

It is indeed a happy day for the country to be done with this confusion and irritation.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, daylight saving, or war time, has proven to be a great detriment in agricultural areas ever since this law was passed by Congress in 1942. I question very strongly whether the benefits claimed for industrial areas by setting the clock ahead 1 hour offset the loss of production and inconvenience suffered in rural areas.

We are about to repeal this act and in so doing will take away the dismal picture of small children waiting in the darkness for their school busses along country roads.

We will enable the farmer to go to work when he should in the morning and not have to wait an additional hour until the sun becomes powerful enough to dry off the dew which has accumulated on the crops overnight.

Going back to standard time is just good common sense—let us repeal as soon as possible this act and hope that

many more wartime laws can soon follow it into discard.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the artificial legislation of turning back the clock should never have been enacted. This legislative experiment failed to accomplish its purported objectives. It saves nothing, it was merely an unnecessary unnatural irritation.

Regardless of the law the day was still 24 hours with the sun following its natural orbit. It is hoped that no similar experiment will ever again be tried, in view of the fact that this abortive effort so convincingly demonstrates that laws of nature cannot be successfully changed by legislative bodies.

Restoration of "God's time" will meet unanimous approval and it is hoped it is the forerunner of the elimination of other unnecessary wartime restrictions.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMBAUGH].

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the legislation now being considered providing for the abolition of daylight-saving time and restoring the Nation to standard time. As one of the several Members of the House who have introduced similar bills, I feel that there is Nation-wide sentiment for returning to the observance of standard time on October 1.

With the cessation of hostilities on the battle fronts of the world there is no necessity for the continuance of daylight-saving time. Even during wartime the beneficial results were questionable and the inconvenience and trouble experienced were cheerfully accepted as one of the sacrifices to be endured by a nation engaged in war.

Now that we are occupied with the manifold problems of the postwar era to retain daylight-saving time will actually hinder and retard our efforts to achieve an orderly return to peacetime pursuits. The school children of the Nation both in the city and rural sections have been the innocent victims of daylight-saving time, as they have been forced, especially in the fall and winter months, to endure severe hardships by being obliged to stand in early dawn on the street corners and highways of America awaiting transportation to school. Foggy weather has added immeasurably to the danger of early morning travel not alone for the school children but also for employees of mercantile establishments, banks, and certain small industries maintaining employment schedules during daytime. The menace of early morning automobile driving by employees forced to use such means of transportation has been a constant threat to highway safety because of foggy weather.

Among postal employees city and village carriers have reported great difficulty in serving their routes due to having to begin their tour of duty when darkened streets hampered their travels and hindered their efforts to deliver mail promptly.

Many retail establishments have been forced to rearrange working schedules to keep employees, especially women, from being required to travel dimly lighted streets in the early morning hours. In addition, industrial workers who travel several miles by private automobile or who are obliged to commute by train or bus to reach their place of employment have found it necessary to arise before dawn in order to maintain the schedule exacted by daylight-saving time.

The farmers of the Nation have been harassed and distressed in their efforts to maintain milking schedules and to cope with the problems of harvesting the Nation's crops due to advancing the clocks of the Nation. They have found that such practice has worked untold hardship with farm labor unable to utilize the extra hour before dawn and then being unwilling to continue harvesting in the late afternoon because of the advanced time which in reality shortens the working day at a time intended as most suitable for agriculture.

The shorter workweek in industry has weakened the argument that the morale and physical well-being of employees are benefited by daylight-saving time by providing additional time for wholesome recreation. In like manner the contention that fuel is saved has also proved a myth and a delusion since the Nation arises 1 hour earlier and uses electric power at home and in office, store, and factory before daylight rescues it from a world of darkness.

By approval of this legislation I am certain that we will be acting in accord with the sentiments of an overwhelming majority of the American people. At the same time there is no restriction imposed upon any community in the Nation to adopt daylight-saving time during certain months of the year if local sentiment favors such action. Therefore I am hopeful that this legislation will receive the unanimous approval of the House so that standard time may be restored to the Nation on October 1.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when the original legislation changing standard time to war time was enacted I opposed the passage of that bill in committee and on the floor of the House, in the belief that such change of time would not be beneficial to the war effort nor to the people of the United States. I am, therefore, very much pleased to see the Congress now taking action to change the Nation's clocks back from war time to standard time. I believe it will meet the approval of the vast majority of the citizens of this Republic.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I have been asked the question if the Federal Government changes this time back to standard time whether it will interfere with local communities in the advancing of their time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will not interfere in any way with local communities or the States taking any action they desire. I believe it would be unconstitutional for the Congress to attempt to enact any legislation so interfering with States' rights.

Mr. RICH. It makes for confusion all over the land when they have daylight-saving time in certain communities and the Federal Government has standard time all over the Nation. The confusion exists one way or the other.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is correct, but there probably will not be as much confusion from now on as there has been during the last few years as the result of the wartime legislation which we are now, in effect, repealing by the passage of the pending bill.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that this bill eliminating wartime is receiving very little opposition, if any at all, in this House, because there are some of us who are somewhat new here who feel very certain that this act represents the will and wish of the people back home.

Coming from an agricultural area, I can say with all assurance that war-saving time was a nuisance. Some of my constituents used much stronger terms. It upset the even tenor of a farmer's life. It interfered with the orderly conduct of his affairs. It disarranged the relationship between the life he lived next to nature, and that portion of his life related to schools and business and transportation and all the variegated activities controlled by the clock.

In addition, it now appears that daylight-saving time did not actually live up to the claims made for it. It saved neither time nor daylight. It did not materially conserve power or fuel or aid the war effort. Most of the benefits claimed for it when it went into effect have proved illusions.

Therefore, when this law passes and goes into effect, it will be with no regret. Rather it will be buried in the limbo of forgotten things—one of the annoyances of this war. Let us hope that many more of the shackles on the American people will be removed, now that the war has come to a victorious conclusion.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, no group has performed a better service than the farmers throughout the entire war period. They have produced beyond expectation and beyond all predictions throughout the whole country, and they have done so under a severe handicap; shortage of help, as well as shortage of farm machinery and equipment. The so-called daylight-saving time actually did not save any time. It has been a delusion and a fraud. The farmers throughout the country are now asking to have this bill repealed forthwith, and I am happy that the Congress is doing this as practically the No. 1 piece

of legislation as we resume sessions this fall.

Daylight saving was an unnecessary, artificial means of saving fuel and light, and anyone with common sense knows that one does not have to turn the clock ahead just to get up at daylight or get home before dark. Hours of work can be changed at will, but the farmer had to work from sunup to sundown and often well into the night in order to produce the vast amount of food required in the war effort. Daylight-saving time made his task even more difficult than before and at the same time it did little if anything to cut down the consumption of fuel and light and benefit war plants in any way. Iowa Members of Congress sponsored a bill early in May providing for repeal of daylight saving and restoring standard time. The measure before the House today accomplishes the very thing we proposed months ago and the bill should be adopted without delay.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the one hundredth meridian passes through Cozad in the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska. A little ways west we pass from central time to mountain time. The folks in this district and, in fact, all over Nebraska, have found that war time has caused a great deal of inconvenience to them. Children going to school in winter must go when it is still dark.

One thing I heard when visiting in Nebraska last month was, "Well, doctor, when are you going to get us back to God's time. You know the cows in our district and the chickens and pigs have not been told about this change of time business."

Mr. Speaker, this act was called an act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight-saving time. This was supposed to be a war measure and one which the New Deal and the military authorities insisted upon having. A great many foolish things have been done under the guise of national security. This was created under that emergency.

More than 40 bills have been introduced to do away with this so-called war time. Bills have been in Congress all the time for this purpose but the administration and the military authorities did not want these bills to pass. Now the war is over and the administration is willing to let the people go back to normal time. It could have been done long ago had the administration wanted it done. It is doubtful in all this time if one bit of energy and good has been done. The law has created a lot of irritations and inconveniences to the people.

The committee has done the wise thing in setting up the day and hour at which the clock is to be turned back. The original act of 1942 provided for the termination of daylight saving time effective 6 months after the cessation of hostilities. No one seems to know when the President or the Congress will declare the war at an end. After World War I it took nearly 3 years before Congress finally got up courage enough to declare the war was over.

There are many regulations which ought to be terminated and cannot and will not be terminated by the administration until Congress declares hostilities at an end. I expect to introduce a bill which will have the effect of declaring hostilities at an end as of VJ-day. This will stop all the powers under the Second War Act in 6 months. The Congress should not hesitate in performing this duty.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering this afternoon is similar to one I introduced several days ago. I am glad to see the House take action to correct what I regard as a mistake having been made when we went off of standard time.

It was done on the theory that it might possibly contribute to the war effort. I cannot speak for the entire country, of course, but it certainly did not contribute to the war effort in my section of the country. In fact, it has been a handicap to the farmers and to school children, especially in rural communities. It has also made it inconvenient for a good many other people. I have had a good many people write me with respect to this matter.

The sooner we can get back to regular standard time, the better it will be.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on the day when the House reconvened I introduced a bill to terminate daylight-saving time, and I am very happy that the time has come that the House is taking this action. Daylight-saving time has never served the purpose for which it was established. It is some of that nuisance legislation that has been passed in the days gone by.

I want to mention another nuisance that is going on right now around the country, and that is in the Department of Agriculture. They are sending agents over the country now canvassing the farmers to take wheat insurance. They have put out a lot of crop insurance salesmen. These salesmen are just nuisances, wasting their time and the farmers' time trying to sell insurance on the basis of a faker plan. It sounds to me more like a fake than anything else. They come around with a proposal such as is outlined in the letter I hold here, sent out by the Department of Agriculture. It states:

> The farmer with a crop failure will collect from the pool and get 75 percent of the value of a normal crop. If he desires insurance on half a normal crop he puts less money into the pool—1 to 2 pecks per acre.

In other words, what they are after is to get 50 men in a county to sign up for crop insurance. They do not care whether it is little insurance or more insurance, just so it is insurance, so they can establish an office there with a couple of field agents and a couple of secretaries, and then add to the taxpayers' burden. If, as the administration claims, this insurance is financed by the farmers, then they should let the farmers sell it and manage it and promote it. The fact is if we could take the "do gooders" out of the Government we would have less agencies and no insurance of this kind.

They go on to say that if the farmers are not all contacted in the next few days, they should come to their office and take out this insurance. It is just like putting another peck of wheat into the drill, they say. Now, if this is farmer financed, why did this House appropriate $30,000,000 after they had lost $37,000,000 on this vote-getting scheme?

This is absolute folly. It is ridiculous, it is disgraceful. It is something we should be ashamed of, that the Government should carry on a faker plan to get farmers involved in something that will serve no purpose except to create more jobs for a gang who are just too downright lazy to work. That is all it does.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman and all the other Members here remember that we appropriated $30,000,000 a couple of months ago for this insurance, when they had $40,000,000 5 years ago and lost $37,500,000 of it in the insurance plan they had before this; and in addition, the Crop Insurance Corporation was given $7,500,000 to pay these fellows for going around to collect this insurance.

Mr. GROSS. That is entirely right.

Mr. RICH. The whole thing will probably be a hand-out. And where is the faker? Is part of it here in the Congress or is it out on the farm?

Mr. GROSS. Some of them are here, and some of them are out yonder. It gets down to this, that the responsible farmer, the farmer that is in the know, will not take this insurance. They are preying on a lot of fellows who just are not up to the minute on things; in other words, some of these fellows who sow a little wheat and who work in a factory, and who never intend to harvest it. They will take out this insurance. The Government is taking advantage of it in the case of most of these cooperators. We should not become involved in this kind of business. It is nothing but a faker program. No matter what its genesis is, it is a faker scheme.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who speak on this bill be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to vote for the bill to repeal daylight-saving time, and to restore honest time, sun time, God's time to our people. Changing the hands of the clock cannot add one second of daylight to any day. This legislation has been a terrible handicap to the people of my district. I pledged in the campaign

last fall to work for the repeal of so-called wartime, and the restoration of God's time. I introduced a resolution on January 17 last and introduced a bill on September 5 last for this purpose.

Wartime has made our people get up in the dark, dress in the dark, eat in the dark, milk their cows in the dark, send their little children down the long lanes of our farms to the public highway and get on our school busses in the dark. I rejoice at the repeal of this foolish regulation, and I hope that no matter what calamity America may face in the future that another effort will not be made to upset honest time.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire, not to exceed 10 minutes, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the language of the ancient poet—

> This is the hour we long have sought,
> And mourned because we found it not.

In every city block and in every countryside and hamlet in the United States, the passage of this bill today will be hailed with joy and gratification. Of all the many irksome restrictions which the war made necessary, this has been one of the most vexatious and its repeal will meet with more general approval than the repeal of any other legislation incident to the successful prosecution of the war.

I note that someone seems to have the impression that the demand for this bill comes exclusively from the farm. On the contrary, the demand for this bill comes from every section of the Nation and from every class and profession throughout the country.

At the time that this act went into effect there were millions of automobiles, trucks, and other automotive machinery in operation in the United States. Under our modern economy, those machines were essential to efficient transportation and to the business and commerce of the country. When this bill became effective and another hour of darkness has added to the working day, accidents on the streets and highways increased 17 percent. In addition to that, the extra hour of darkness and the extra hour of cold placed an added drain on the batteries of every car and truck and tractor and the heavily congealed oil in their crankcases and bearings involved additional and unnecessary wear and tear upon those machines—indispensable machines—which had to last during the entire war because we had completely discontinued the manufacture of all such machines. It is a matter of serious doubt as to whether this provision introduced with the idea of saving power, fuel, and machinery did not cause a greater loss by far than any savings which it may have effected.

In the cities, in the extra hour of darkness and in the early hours of the morning, in every household, and place of business it was necessary to have the lights prematurely turned on when otherwise this consumption of power and fuel would have been delayed 60 minutes, if not entirely obviated, had we followed sun time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman feel in the light of his splendid remarks that the bill was necessary in 1942? Was it necessary for Congress to pass the bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. When we entered the war, the Congress pledged to the war effort every resource at the command of the American people. At that time it was represented to us on authority of the experts and technicians of the country that it was legislation calculated to contribute to the successful prosecution of the war. The American people, always willing to make any sacrifice for the war program, agreed to it resignedly but wholeheartedly.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman would doubt, however, whether it had the desired results.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I seriously doubt whether it had the desired results. But it is to the credit of the American people that they, with practical unanimity, approved the proposition and exerted every effort to make a success of it, believing it would help in the winning of the war.

But, whether it contributed to the war effort or not, the war is now over. We can now consider the question on its merit. And to many people the taking of an hour from the start of the day and adding it to the end of the day is in the same category with the device of the Indian who took 6 inches from the top of his blanket and added it to the foot of the blanket in order to make the blanket longer. There may be a slight discrepancy in the analogy but it is indictative of the attitude of a decided majority of the American people at this time.

I do not believe there will be a vote against the repeal of the wartime law, and I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] and his committee on the promptness and celerity with which they have reported this resolution and given the House the opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, in the minute or two remaining of my time, may I comment briefly on the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on crop control.

It is an unexpected diversion from the discussion of an important measure, but the gentleman is evidently laboring under such an apparent misconception of the crop-control situation that I am certain he will welcome a word on the actual provisions of the new law.

It is possible that the objections which he voiced may be applicable to conditions prior to the passage of the recent crop-control bill. But it is provided in the new law that the service is to be self-supporting; that those who are insured must pay into the fund a sufficient amount in premiums to take care of the losses. That being true, this bill provides for agriculture a long-needed facility. It renders a service that is being rendered every other industry in the country. If you deprived industry of insurance you would paralyze the business of the country. Modern economy cannot operate without protection against unforeseeable losses. The farmer is the only man up to this time who has been denied that essential facility. The crop-insurance bill gives the farmer the same facility accorded every other business. It insures him against unforeseeable and unpredictable losses. It supplies the farmer with insurance at his own expense. He must pay in premiums enough to cover the losses. That is a specific provision of the law.

What objection is there to giving the farmer the same opportunity to secure business insurance that is given to every other industry?

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. If it is a good thing, why should not the farmers form their own insurance company? Why is the Government in it? Why is the Department of Agriculture in it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman himself must be aware that no private company can be organized on the vast scale required for this purpose. Lincoln said, "The function of government is to do for men what they cannot do for themselves." Here is a case in point. Every other industry is protected. The crop-insurance law provides protection for the farmer. I am surprised that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would deny the farmers of his State something which will cost the Government nothing except the costs of administration. The law merely permits the farmer to finance his own losses.

Now if I may get back to the question of repealing daylight saving, we have received numerous petitions and letters from workers in the factories and in the fields, from people in industry, and in agriculture urging repeal.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has made the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The Chair will count.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have a bill to pass in which the whole country is interested. What is the objection?

The SPEAKER. A point of order has been made that a quorum is not present.

The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order, if the gentleman from Missouri will finally recognize that other Members are on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman realizes that it is impossible to yield to half a dozen Members in the remaining minute of the time allotted me.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has been speaking about crop insurance and why the farmers could not handle the insurance on their own account. I quite agree with that. I remind the gentleman, however, that he is chairman of

the Committee on Appropriations. His committee appropriated for this organization 4 or 5 years ago some $40,000,000 and there was paid into the Government each year about $7,000,000 expense money. In 3 years all that money was lost in the insurance of cotton and wheat with the exception of some two and one-half million they had left this year when another $30,000,000 was appropriated. As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman knew that in 3 years handling this matter as they did they lost all this money, why does the gentleman feel he has any right to recommend to the Congress and to the people that they should put another $30,000,000 in to be squandered in that manner? And why should they send out letters with the $7,500,000 extra that they are sending out to the farmers, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] suggested a few minutes ago? I should like to have an answer to that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri three additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Pennsylvania does not take into consideration the history of the legislation to which he refers. When we began crop insurance it was a new field. It was an experiment. We could not judge accurately what the effect would be. We expected it to be self-sustaining. As a matter of fact, after we had tried it out for a few years, we found it was not self-sustaining. Thereupon, I myself cooperated with other members of the Committee on Appropriations to withdraw the appropriation, thereby terminating activities under the old law. Appropriations were not resumed until Congress this year enacted a new law carrying the provision that it should be self-sustaining and that the premiums paid in should be sufficient to take care of the losses.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit me to discuss daylight saving repeal, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. I was about to suggest to the gentleman that I am interested in the matter before the House, which is the repeal of daylight-saving time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; I hope the gentleman will permit us to get along with it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has indicated very forcibly that the country is demanding immediate repeal. Yet the gentleman instead of talking about the repeal of daylight-saving time talks about everything under the sun. Why not vote on it and get rid of this daylight-saving time at once?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman instead of filibustering and obstructing proceedings will permit us to go ahead we will repeal daylight saving within the hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wanted to make the point of order that the author of the rules of the House is not speaking in order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I hope the gentleman from Michigan will permit us to proceed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am one of many here who hope that Congress will repeal this law. While there are many in town and country who demand that it shall be abolished, certainly the farmers of the West whose endeavors have been hampered by it from the start are opposed to its continuance. I have repeatedly urged that it has worked an intolerable hardship upon food production. Our Wisconsin Legislature long ago added its protest. Whatever benefits war time may have brought to some has been more than counterbalanced by the losses and draw-backs of others. It should be repealed now and never again be reenacted.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the repeal of the wartime law will be welcome news to the agricultural sections. Farming in accordance with artificial rather than sun time has created many problems. Particularly is this true in those areas where dews are heavy.

On May 24, 1945, the Iowa delegation in both the House and Senate sponsored legislation declaring wartime at an end. The press and radio stations reported that support for the proposed legislation was almost universal. On May 31, Mr. Hugh Muncy, farm director for the Josh Higgins Broadcasting Co., Waterloo, Iowa, reported that many letters had been received and that an overwhelming majority indicated a definite need for standard time. At the same time, A. G. Woolfries, farm-service director of WMT radio station, Cedar Rapids and Waterloo, reported that a poll of the farm audience showed a vote of 600 to 1 favoring a return to standard time. The consistent effort of these radio stations and of the country papers in this matter is very much appreciated. The people who are responsible for producing the Nation's food will be very grateful for the action now being taken by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to congratulate the committee for bringing this bill in at this time.

It was my privilege to sit in the office of Judge Patterson in the presence of Mr. Krug with some 25 or 30 members of the house and senate from my State at which time we protested against this type of legislation. At that time there was no reasonable excuse given for the so-called war time. I have never been convinced that it was worth a 5-cent piece to our people as a defense measure or for any other purpose and, of course, I am delighted to join in the repeal of this law in order to get it behind us, and, as someone said, forget it as quickly as we can. I think the legislation was unfair to our people, I do not believe it aided agriculture or industry or our service activities or our professions, and I am therefore glad to get rid of this law. The problems of peace are generally as great as those of war. We well know war comes out of bad conditions in peacetime. If such a law was a great aid to war production, could we not effectively argue it would assist peacetime production?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this bill. It will be welcome news to the farmers and people of Iowa. Daylight saving has worked a hardship on the Iowa farmer but they were willing to put up with it as long as it was necessary for the war effort. Now that it is no longer necessary for the war effort it will be a great relief to the people of Iowa to get back to standard time. I congratulate the committee for reporting the bill at this time and hope it passes the House quickly and unanimously.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

STANDARD TIME SHOULD BE RESTORED

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for bringing the pending measure before the House for action so soon after the reconvening of the Congress.

The enactment of this bill will accomplish the purpose of the concurrent resolution which I introduced the day the Congress resumed work following the summer recess.

It is the general opinion of the people in my district that there can be no good argument advanced in support of the continuation of so-called daylight-saving time, now that the war has been ended. In 1942 the hands of the clock were moved forward 1 hour in the name of wartime emergency. It would be pointless at this time to debate whether that move was necessary or constructive. The important thing is the fact that the emergency is ended and the clock should be reset and standard time reestablished.

Some people may not understand why moving the hands of the clock forward 1 hour causes any hardship to anybody or makes any difference in the length of anybody's effective workday. But most people do, and the farmer surely knows the difference and the hardship. For instance, he cannot go into his fields to harvest crops before the dew has been cleared away. The sun alone can do that job, and the rising and the setting of the sun cannot be changed by law, by Presidential order, or otherwise. For reasons

well known to the farmer, he can carry on his business most effectively when our Nation's economy is geared to standard time.

Most people will welcome the return to standard time. The farmer surely will. He carried a heavy burden during the war years, and he is still carrying that toilsome burden. Certainly, the Congress cannot do less than to approve a bill which will restore standard time and by that act cooperate with him in his program of food production which is so essential to the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that this bill may become law without delay. Not a single vote should be registered against it.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I introduced one of the bills on this subject and I am very happy to see it acted upon so promptly by the House of Representatives. I hope that it will be acted upon just as promptly by the Senate as it will be by the House of Representatives within the next few minutes.

Daylight-saving time is a product of the war. The emergency for war saving time is now over and the people of the United States want to see the law repealed at once. With many groups of people in my section of the United States, war saving time was a serious inconvenience. With many other groups of people it was a positive hardship. Under the operation of this unnatural time schedule, our people have grown weary, and they want to return to the time which the Almighty in His wisdom established for mankind. The farmer has been compelled to arise uselessly early under the operation of the war saving time. The dairyman has burned the light and fuel necessary for the predaylight hours. In the depth of winter, the business man and woman, and even the housewife, has been compelled to arise before daybreak, using fuel and electricity to begin the daily work.

In the minds of our people, peace means a return to normalcy. A repeal of the war saving time act is another stage along the road that leads away from war and back to the land of peace.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, the first speech I made on the floor of the House was on the subject of daylight-saving time.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can add to that which has already been said in support of this important legislation. However, I want to thank the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for bringing this bill up for consideration. I also want to thank the subcommittee of this committee, headed by my able colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, LYLE BOREN, for the courtesies shown me when I appeared before this subcommittee in support of this legislation.

It is indeed high time that we return to standard time. Since July 20, 1942, our Nation has been on what is referred to as "war time." This arrangement has resulted in untold inconveniences and hardships to the people of our great country, particularly in the rural sections thereof, with no material contribution to the war effort.

I realized the folly of the so-called war time soon after coming to Congress in 1943, and, on January 26 of that year, I introduced a concurrent resolution to repeal Public Law 403 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and reinstate standard time. This resolution was the first effort to be made by any Member toward the repeal of the so-called war time. Thereafter, my legislation received the support of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and several other resolutions and bills similar to mine were introduced during the Seventy-eighth Congress. Later a hearing was granted before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. However, we who supported this legislation did not meet with success during the Seventy-eighth Congress. Therefore, when the Seventy-ninth Congress convened, I reintroduced my resolution. Many other similar resolutions were also introduced, and the people again let it be known through correspondence with their Representatives and through the medium of the press that they favored a return to standard time at the earliest possible date.

I was indeed pleased when our President announced shortly after VJ-day that he, too, favored this legislation. I know of no serious opposition to this bill and hope that none will develop as it is of the utmost importance to our people and our Nation that we now return to standard time. Therefore, I sincerely hope that this bill will be speedily passed by both the House and Senate in order that it may become law in time to set our clocks back on September 30, 1945, as provided in the bill.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, may I say that a good many Members of the House have taken a keen interest in this subject. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], on the majority side, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], on the minority side have all presented bills. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has been one of the leading advocates of repeal of this measure. There have been quite a number of other Members of the House, all of whom we have tried to list in the report in order to note their interest and action on this subject. They have been interested in the matter and have taken an active part in the work that we are consummating today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say just one word about the pending bill and the measure it is intended to repeal. There was a time when this Nation was in dire circumstances in attempting to gather together all of the possible forces of production. Evidence was presented to a great committee of this House that there would be saving of power and that there would be a great addition to the productive power of this country if what we called daylight-saving time were enacted. It has been clearly shown to the committee that there has been a saving in electrical energy which was critically short in the great productive enterprises of this country during the war.

The following letter to Chairman LEA from Donald Nelson when we were considering this subject in 1944 clearly set forth the values the temporary measure gave to the war effort. I quote:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1944.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of April 7 requests my views on H. R. 4439, a bill to restore standard time.

The War Production Board is strongly opposed to the abandonment of war time at this stage of the war. This year, our utility systems will be called upon to supply 16,000,000 kilowatts of electric power for war production and facilities; they must also supply 22,000,000 kilowatts for other uses. The total load is the highest in history. Repeal of war time would immediately add to these unprecedented loads another 1,500,000 kilowatts and would require an extra million tons of coal annually. These figures are not the production of guesswork. They represent the savings actually effected by war time last year. Now, when the resources of the Nation are being strained to the limit to support our most critical military effort, the loss of these savings would be serious. Some idea of the importance of the power savings can be gathered from the fact that 1,500,000 kilowatts is enough to supply the greater part of our aluminum load and more than enough for all our shipbuilding.

The problem that confronts us in maintaining adequate electric supply is to provide enough electric generating, transmission, and distribution facilities to meet the peak power requirements. Without war time, a sharp peak occurs on most utility systems toward the end of the day as the lights are turned on in commercial establishments, in homes and on the streets. With war time, this extra load is postponed until later in the evening, after the industrial load begins to slack off; the additional illuminating load which wartime causes in the darker morning hours occurs before most industrial activities have gotten to full capacity.

Thus, war time reduces the evening peak sharply, the reduction is not offset by the increase in the morning, and the net effect is to give a lower over-all daily peak. This means that we can supply our total power requirements with substantially less electric facilities than would be necessary without war time. It also means that we save fuel, first, because we do not need to operate our less-efficient generating stations over such long periods and, second, because the added morning load, due to war time, is never as great as the saving in evening load which it effects. It should be emphasized again that these results of war time are not based upon theory but upon actual operating experience during 1942 and 1943.

Our electric utility systems, thanks to war time and the other measures which the utilities and the Government are carrying out, will be able to assure an adequate supply of electric power for all necessary purposes for the duration. But, if another 1,500,000 kilowatts were suddenly superimposed upon existing requirements—the consequence of repealing war time—we would be threatened with power shortages which could not be met except by curtailing war production or rationing power for civilian use. Nor can we carry this aditional burden by increasing the

present power-expansion program. We could not provide the material, equipment, and manpower for the job without interfering with important military needs. In any case, even if the resources could be made available, it would take 2 years to expand our power systems sufficiently so that they could safely supply the necessary war loads and the increase in requirements that repeal of war time would bring about.

I recommend that H. R. 4489 should not be adopted at this time. I recognize the inconviences which war time causes and I am anxious that the country should be relieved of them the moment the course of the war permits. But a return to standard time now would be a blow to the war effort which the country cannot afford.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

The present act has, no doubt, served a good purpose, but it was intended to be a temporary measure, and the Democratic Party, from the President of the United States and the Speaker of the House on down the line, have been prompt in seeing to it that immediately upon cessation of hostilities that this temporary measure which has served its wartime purposes is repealed and the American people again given standard time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINANCIAL CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 339 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3660) to provide for financial control of Government corporations; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for an open rule which makes in order for immediate consideration an extremely important measure of legislation, namely, H. R. 3660, providing for the financial control of Government corporations. It provides for 4 hours of general debate after which it will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. Before discussing the delay for this much needed legislation, I want to compliment the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments, especially the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], for the efficient manner in which they presented the request for the rule. During my many years of service as a member of the Committee on Rules and presently serving as its chairman, I have never listened to any chairman or a member of a committee urge or present an application for a rule on a bill with such convincing clarity and understanding intelligence of a subject matter as was expressed by these Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, as reported by the committee, proposes to bring the Government financial corporations, of which there are 101, within the control and scrutiny of the Congress under the supervision of its regular fiscal agencies. I have prepared a résumé of what the bill actually aims to accomplish, but, appreciating the knowledge and authority of the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], and of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] on the subject matter of the bill, I shall refrain from attempting to explain its provisions and shall not detain the House. These gentlemen have given the bill many months of hard study and due credit must be given them in drafting the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, before taking the floor, I prepared a résumé of what the bill aims to do, but, on second thought, I shall leave to the able gentlemen whom I have mentioned, together with other able members of the committee, the opportunity of giving a detailed explanation and the effect of the provisions of the bill when enacted into law.

I shall not take up the time of the House, with the exception of saying that this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It is endorsed by the President and every member of the Cabinet and was urged by the late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, it is for the first time in years that I have observed the United States Chamber of Commerce has endorsed legislation recommended by the Democratic administration. Their action made me give diligent study to the bill. But even they are entitled to be right once in a great while, and in this instance I think they have come to the conclusion that it would be unwise on their part to oppose this bill, it being a meritorious and long-delayed piece of legislation. Undoubtedly, they came to the conclusion that it was legislation in the right direction and approved its passage.

The bill, as I have stated, applies to about 101 governmental corporations with assets of about $29,000,000,000, with liabilities of $28,000,000,000, and a capitalization of less than one and a half billion dollars. To save the time of the House, I ask unanimous consent that a résumé on the bill which I have prepared be included as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to again compliment the committee upon its splendid work, study, and preparation of the bill which they have unanimously reported for the consideration of the House. Here I insert my résumé in explanation of the provisions of the bill which I feel will to some degree give its effect when enacted into law.

RÉSUMÉ IN EXPLANATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF H. R. 3660

During the last 25 years Government corporations have assumed a role of increasing importance in the financial structure of the Government. However, during that time there has been developed no over-all financial coordination and control of such corporate activities comparable to those provided by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 for the regulation of Government departments and establishments. That act, designed to provide a budget system and an independent audit for Government expenditures, was enacted at a time when Government corporations did not form an important part of the total governmental financial picture. Aside from the Panama Railroad Company and the Federal land banks, the Government corporations then in existence were wartime corporations even then in various states of liquidation. With the exception of the Federal intermediate credit banks and the Inland Waterways Corporation, this situation continued practically unchanged until the creation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1932. The establishment of this corporation marked the advance of Government into new fields of economic activity, a trend which has continued until today there are 101 separate corporations engaged in various fields of production, transportation, generation of power, loans, housing, insurance, and other lines of business.

The magnitude of the operations of Government corporations is evident from an analysis of their combined balance sheets as of March 31, 1945. As of that date gross assets of these corporations amounted to $29,600,000,000, gross liabilities totaled $28,400,000,000, and net worth amounted to $1,200,000,000. Of the total gross assets, the major items after taking out reserves for valuation and estimated losses, consisted of $13,300,000,000 in loans receivable; $7,800,000,000 in land, structures, and equipment; $2,900,000,000 in commodities, supplies, and materials, $2,100,000,000 in investments; and $1,600,000,000 in other receivables. Of the total gross liabilities, $22,000,000,000 were in bonds, notes, and debentures issued by the corporations, of which $11,600,000,000 were held by the Treasury, $8,100,000,000 were held by Government corporations, and $2,300,000,000 were held by the public. It is also significant to note that during the 9 months ended March 31, 1945, the financing, investment, and lending operations reported by the corporations reflect, on a combined basis, borrowings of $7,900,000,000 and repayment of borrowings of $7,500,000,000; investments of corporate funds of $600,000,000 and repayment of investments of corporation

funds of $800,000,000; and loans made of $6,600,000,000 and repayments of loans of $6,800,000,000.

In the past decade there has been increasing awareness in the legislative and the executive branches that the financial program of the Government cannot be effectively coordinated without some control over Government corporations. At the same time, it has been recognized that Government corporations were created to conduct their activities with a freedom thought to be inconsistent with the types of financial control applicable to the regular Government departments and agencies. While various steps have been taken from time to time by the President and the Congress to bring Government corporations under some measure of financial control, the type and degree of control effected has varied widely among the corporations, often without regard to the real needs of the situation or the relation of the corporation to the general financial program of the Government.

The purposes of this bill are strongly endorsed by the Comptroller General of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury.

The power of the purse is one of the most important powers reserved to the Congress in the Constitution. In the case of many Government corporations the Congress has not adequately exercised its power to control public expenditures. This bill is designated to bring Government corporations and their transactions and operations under annual scrutiny by the Congress and provide current financial control thereof through the regular fiscal agencies of the Government.

It is recognized that there are certain activities of Government that can be more effectively administered through the corporate device than by a regular agency. Therefore the development of financial control must necessarily take into account certain peculiarities of the corporate device, since to do otherwise might impair the ability of the corporations to carry out their statutory responsibilities. However, care is taken in the bill to the end that the application of any financial control by the Congress or the executive branch of the Government will not hamper the corporations in the execution of their authorized program. The bill is designed to coordinate the financial operations of the corporations with those of the Government in general. Due to their magnitude, the financial transactions of Government corporations have a distinct bearing upon the general financial condition and fiscal policies of the Government. Properly administered, the requirements of this bill should facilitate the operations of the corporations by giving them a periodic opportunity to appear before the Congress and justify their programs. This bill provides for an annual congressional scrutiny of the entire operations of all wholly owned Government corporations and a review of their programs for the ensuing fiscal year.

The bill distinguished between wholly-owned Government corporations, in which the Government holds all the stock or other capital interests, and mixed-ownership Government corporations, in which the Government has only a partial interest. As to wholly-owned corporations, it provides a business-type budget to be incorporated as a part of the annual Budget of the Federal Government. As to both classes of corporations, it provides for an annual commercial-type audit by the General Accounting Office and a report thereof to the Congress. With certain exceptions, the bill also provides for an over-all Treasury control of the depositaries, financing, and Government security transactions of all Government corporations.

Attention is called to the fact that there are still in existence certain corporations established during World War I which should have been completely liquidated years ago. This situation should be corrected under the provisions of this bill, since the annual scrutiny of each corporation's operations should permit the Congress to take whatever steps are required to assure liquidation of the corporation when it is no longer required for the purpose for which it was originally established. The bill comes from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with unanimous approval.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to my congenial, well-informed friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, after the explanation of the bill by our distinguished chairman, and in view of the technicalities inherent in the bill, I am not going to attempt to enter into a discussion of the provisions of the bill, other than to say that I know of no Member of the House who is opposed to it. The committee reporting the bill has demonstrated before the Committee on Rules that it is fully and adequately advised, and I hope the Members will listen to the explanation of the bill by the members of the Legislative Committee who thoroughly understand it. The Rules Committee has performed its function and brought the bill before the House for action. I have no requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who speak on the bill in Committee be permitted to include in their remarks certain tables, excerpts, and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3660) to provide for financial control of Government corporations.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3660, with Mr. COOLEY in the chair.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur in what both the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] have said in reference to the author of this bill the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and also the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO]. For nearly 20 years the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and I have served on committees together. I know of no man in this House who understands more fully legislation, of which he is the author, and who is more thorough in explaining that legislation, than the gentleman from Mississippi. It is the same in reference to legislation that comes from any committee of which he is a member. Listen to his explanation of this bill.

We have all heard a lot about checks and balances. The legislative branch of the Government checks the executive branch of the Government, then the judicial branch of the Government checks both the legislative branch and the executive branch. But there are dozens of corporations with billions of dollars of Government money at their disposal that are not subject to any check except by private auditors that they employ. Briefly, the purpose of this legislation is to have a check upon these Government corporations where the stock is wholly owned by the Government or where it is partially owned by the Government.

As far as I know, the only opposition to this legislation comes from some, I say some, not all officials of some of these corporations. There is no reason why any Government corporation should not be checked by the Comptroller General and there is no reason why they should not be required to explain their budget to our Committee on Appropriations. This bill provides for that. It is true that the bill also provides that in certain instances under regulations laid down by the Comptroller General the corporation will be allowed to operate on what might be termed a commercial basis. That undoubtedly is necessary. To say that these corporations which have involved over twenty billions of dollars should be permitted to continue as they have in the past without an audit by the Comptroller General cannot be defended. Of course, the corporations are not to blame. The truth of the matter is we are to blame because we did not provide for audit by the Comptroller General in the original law. That mistake by the Congress is corrected by this legislation.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], a member of the committee.

Mr. RICH. Might I call attention to one statement made by the gentleman where he said that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] knows more about these corporations than anyone else and can probably explain this bill better. I wonder whether the gentleman would not put Mr. Lindsay Warren in that class, a man who I believe is

more familiar with these Government corporations than any other man I know. I am not detracting from the honor that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] may have in this connection.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania misunderstood my statement. What I did was to pay a tribute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] who is the author of this legislation. His knowledge of its provisions and the necessity for such a law. I repeat, there is no Member of the House who will more thoroughly present an argument as to why a bill he introduced be enacted than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. I did not say Mr. WHITTINGTON knows all about the corporations because no one on the outside does.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman as to that.

Mr. COCHRAN. I never question Mr. Warren's ability. The gentleman from Pennsylvania knows what I think about Mr. Warren. The truth of the matter is Mr. Warren has not had an opportunity to learn anything about the corporations because the doors are shut to him under existing law.

Mr. RICH. And we ought to open it up today.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is what we are going to do in the passage of this legislation. When this bill becomes a law and Mr. Warren gets an opportunity to see how these corporations actually operate then he will know something and so will we because it is his duty under the law to report to us.

Let us pass this legislation. I feel confident that when it does become a law you will see many reforms because many officials know now Mr. Warren will take exception to many of the existing policies.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who can more ably present the bill than any member of our committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to my colleagues for their kind personal sentiments and observations.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to permit me to enlarge on that?

I would like to pay the gentleman a tribute also. I have served with him so long on that committee. He is so thorough and so well understands everything that he presents. I made use of an expression on yesterday when I said no one should praise me unless he himself is worthy of praise. JACK COCHRAN, who praised you, is himself worthy of praise. I hope some time the gentleman who now has the floor or someone else will give JACK COCHRAN the degree of praise he deserves. I think you and I would agree that he understands, perhaps better than any of the rest of us, the workings of all these Government corporations and of the Government structure itself.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I very thoroughly approve and endorse every word that my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts has just said, and I gladly join him in tribute to the service, courage, industry, and ability of the gentleman from Missouri, my valued friend, JACK COCHRAN, one of the most industrious and among the most useful Members of the Congress. I wish there were more Jack Cochrans in the Congress of the United States. He is able and courageous, battling always for his district and county.

Mr. Chairman, in 1921 the Congress adopted the Budget and Accounting Act, which provided for the control, including the budgeting, of Government departments and agencies, and for the auditing of those departments and agencies by the Comptroller General of the United States, the good right arm and the agent of the Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. This is one of the most important and far-reaching pieces of legislation that has been before the House since the end of the war. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOLEY). The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 145]

Abernethy	Hálleck	Norrell
Anderson, Calif.	Hare	O'Brien, Ill.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Harness, Ind.	O'Brien, Mich.
Beall	Hart	Pace
Bland	Hébert	Peterson, Ga.
Bolton	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Buckley	Hendricks	Phillips
Camp	Herter	Plumley
Campbell	Hobbs	Powell
Cannon, Fla.	Hoeven	Rabaut
Carnahan	Hope	Randolph
Case, S. Dak.	Horan	Rankin
Celler	Huber	Rayfiel
Chiperfield	Jackson	Reece, Tenn.
Clark	Jarman	Reed, Ill.
Clements	Johnson, Ind.	Rivers
Coffee	Johnson, Luther A.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Cole, N. Y.	Jones	Rockwell
Colmer	Jonkman	Roe, N. Y.
Courtney	Kee	Sharp
Crosser	Kefauver	Sheridan
Daughton, Va.	Keogh	Short
Dawson	Kerr	Sikes
Delaney, John J.	King	Simpson, Ill.
Dickstein	Larcade	Simpson, Pa.
Dondero	Lea	Slaughter
Douglas, Ill.	LeFevre	Smith, Va.
Drewry	Luce	Snyder
Durham	Lynch	Somers, N. Y.
Dworshak	McGehee	Starkey
Elliott	McMillen, Ill.	Stefan
Engel, Mich.	Mahon	Stevenson
Feighan	Mansfield, Mont.	Thomas, Tex.
Fuller	Marcantonio	Tibbott
Gerlach	Mason	Tolan
Gibson	May	Wasielewski
Gillespie	Merrow	Weiss
Gore	Monroney	White
Gorski	Morgan	Wickersham
Gossett	Mundt	Winter
Granger	Murray, Tenn.	Wolcott
Hagen	Murray, Wis.	Wolverton, N. J.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norrell	Woodrum, Va.
		Zimmerman

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. COOLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3660, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 299 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration involves the control of the corporate device in governmental agencies and administrations. It comes before you with a unanimous report. The bill is a composite of the views of the members of the committee. A very adequate and comprehensive report has been filed and extensive hearings have been published, and are available to the Congress and the country. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 provided for the control and budgeting of Government agencies and departments. Twenty-two years have passed. The first annual budget, for 1923, was in the neighborhood of $3,000,000,000. The budget for the current year is about $84,000,000,000. All of those appropriations and expenditures were subject to the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act. A few corporations had been organized when that act was passed. They were all small and except for the Federal land banks and the Panama Railroad Company, the corporations were in connection with the first World War and were all substantially in liquidation. No provision was made for their control or for their auditing in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

After the passage of that act and prior to 1932 the Federal intermediate credit banks and the Inland Waterways Corporation were established, but the establishment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1932 marked a new era in governmental administration and in the utilization of the corporate device in governmental activity. That trend has continued until today there are approximately 101 Government corporations engaged in various fields of economic activity and production, including transportation, housing, insurance, loans, and other lines of business.

The magnitude of Government corporations is staggering. Their total assets, including intercorporate liabilities, amount to about $29,000,000,000. The largest of all the corporations, of course, is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It has assets today of substantially $11,700,000,000. When we recall the total assets of the largest private corporations in the United States, the largest being, as I remember, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., with assets of about $5,500,000,000; the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, with assets of $2,250,000,000; the United States Steel, with assets of around $2,225,000,000; General Motors, with assets of about $2,500,000,000 we are reminded that the total assets of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are much larger than the assets of any other corporation in this or any other country, or in this or any other age.

It is fair to say that among the assets of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are those of defense corporations that have been established for the prosecution of the war, for food subsidies, for the production of facilities and of munitions, and of war plants.

I should divide roughly the assets of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

into two classes: First, there are the usual or peacetime functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. My information is that the assets in those functions aggregate $2,250,000,000. The record shows that since its establishment the RFC, in its usual or peacetime activities, has a surplus of around $500,000,000, but we have provided for war production and for war facilities and for munitions by authorizing the establishment of corporations and by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation borrowing money from the Treasury for the establishment and operation of those corporations. So that today the RFC owes the Treasury approximately $9,200,000,000, borrowed or advanced for the establishment of those plants. They are carried, in approximately $9,000,000,000, among the assets of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The purpose of the legislation under consideration is to provide for the control, by auditing and budgeting, of Government corporations. The purpose of budgeting is to give to the Congress and to the country a view of the financial structure of the United States Government. But when we remember that the assets of these corporations aggregate the totals I have mentioned, as compared with our normal Budget of around nine or ten billion dollars, there is evident the increasing place in the financial picture that Government corporations occupy when we consider our financial structure.

The problem in connection with these corporations was a difficult one. The corporate device was utilized in the first instance by the United States as it is being utilized by other countries, notably Great Britain, for the purpose of enabling the Government to engage in activities that were not strictly routine governmental business, without the limitations and restrictions that ordinary Government establishments would be bound by in their operations; so the problem was an extremely difficult one.

We are dealing here with the auditing and accounting of business corporations rather than the established governmental departments, and we must provide for flexibility both in the auditing and the budgeting of these corporations that will enable them to carry out the functions for which they were established. The hearings were most interesting. The committee had put its cards on the table. There were objections in the first instance by many of these corporations. They asked to be exempted from the provisions of this bill. They said they had done a good job—and they have in most instances. They came before us and said that the Government had provided the money for their capital stock and that they had succeeded and ought not to be subject to the restrictions and auditing of the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If my colleague will bear with me, I want to yield to every Member of the House who wishes to interrogate me but I believe it would be helpful for me to complete my general statement, and if I do not anticipate I will gladly answer any questions propounded. There were requests for excepting the loan agencies of the Government. The Farm Credit Administration said, "We were established for the purpose of providing farm credit; to bring us within the audit provisions applicable to the Government would put us in a strait-jacket and prevent our accomplishing the purposes for which we were established." We replied, "Is it thinkable that now the Congress that provided the language that enabled you to function and carry out your operations is impotent to devise language that would provide for the supervision, auditing, and budgeting of your institutions? Are you, the creature, larger than the creator—the Government?" The spokesman for the Farm Credit Administration was embarrassed.

The second question was likewise perplexing if not embarrassing to those who asked to be excepted from the provisions of this bill. It was pointed out that private corporations, including the large ones I have named, provide for annual budgets, provide for clear and efficient auditing; and this question was asked those who objected and wanted to be excepted: "Is it sound for you, representing a business interest, to ask to be exempted from the requirement that efficient private institutions practice in this country?"

We pointed out that when it came to flexibility the Congress of the United States in one appropriation bill under the Budget and Accounting Act appropriated during the current fiscal year—$23,000,000,000 approximately to the Navy Department and in another some forty-billion-odd dollars to the War Department. We insisted that if the Congress of the United States, having taxed the people of the country for the money that was appropriated for the capital stock of these corporations, could devise language for the auditing, supervising, and budgeting of billions and billions of dollars in the prosecution of the war, surely that Congress was not impotent to provide now for the auditing and budgeting of these Government corporations. There is and there was no sound answer from the objectors who sought exemptions.

So the committee in an effort to be just heard every corporation. The reports are in the hearings. Many of them asked to be exempted. We wanted to be fair. We considered their objections and when they pointed out their objections we agreed in some cases that the bill as originally introduced might hinder and delay them. We invited them to submit substantial and material amendments which would enable them to carry out the functions that they were authorized to perform under the substantive law providing for their organization and establishment.

After thorough and complete hearings, and after objections and protests, the original bill introduced as 2177, prepared in collaboration with the Comptroller General, the Director of the Budget, and the Treasury Department, was revised and substantially every section of that bill was rewritten. The bill as reported to this House and as it is now before the House represents the composite views of the committee after careful, full, and exhaustive hearings. I am delighted to say to the membership that many of the agencies, the principal agencies that asked to be excepted from the provisions of the bill, have said after the bill had been perfected, rewritten, and clarified that there is no valid objection on the part of any Government corporation to the supervision and to the auditing required by this bill. One of the highest executive officers in the departments of this Government said to me after there had been protests by agencies under his supervision that no honest man could object to the provisions of the bill.

There are two classes of Government corporations. One is a corporation that is organized with a Federal charter under statutes providing for its creation. The other is a corporation that may be authorized by statute but is created under the laws of one of the several States of the Union. Many of the corporations have been created under the laws of Delaware, some under the laws of other States.

The United States has a corporation today that was created under the laws of New York in 1849. I refer to the Panama Railroad Company. A charter was granted to that corporation by the State of New York almost 100 years ago. That corporation, that institution, that railroad, was acquired by the Government as a part of the construction of the Panama Canal and under its charter the corporation today is engaged in transportation, communication, highway, hotel, and other activities almost too numerous to mention.

There are corporations of two other categories. One is a corporation all of the capital stock of which is owned by the Government—the RFC, for instance. The other is a corporation in which a part of the capital stock is owned by the Government and a part by other institutions and other agencies—the Federal land banks, for example.

After full and complete, and I undertake to say fair, hearings all corporations of every kind and class are embraced in the terms of this bill and the bill now under consideration has not exempted a single Government corporation of any kind in the United States.

I should like to say also in this connection that the committee gave careful consideration to the flexibility that is required in auditing and in budgeting so as not to destroy the functions for which these Government corporations were established.

The committee took the view that ours it was to coordinate and correlate the corporations as we found them with the activities authorized by law and by their charters, so that we, in reporting this bill under the guise of auditing and supervision, in no wise change the substantive law under which any of these corporations are now functioning and are now authorized. In all fairness we thought that the Congress of the United States, having established the functions of those corporations, ought to pass upon any changes with respect to those functions regardless of what my personal views or the views of the committee might have been.

Take, for example, the Farm Credit Administration. They are engaged in production credit. They are engaged in farm credit. It was urged, in the first place, when they submitted their report, that they should be exempt because, for instance, the Production Credit Corporation or the Intermediate Credit Bank might make capital investments or loans for 1 year amounting to $350,000,000 and the next year, because of a change in conditions, they might be required to make outlays of twice that amount. They said, "We cannot anticipate in advance the amount of our budget." We thought that was a reasonable view, and we have provided for amendments to the budget. We have provided for a flexible budget. We have provided that the provisions of this law will not change any of the substantive law under which the Farm Credit Administration is operating, but, at the same time, the Chief Executive, in submitting his budget, and the Comptroller General, in making his audit, will examine these corporations and ascertain whether or not their functions are provided by law and whether or not they are functioning efficiently, and they will submit their recommendations within existing law to the Congress of the United States, and the Congress of the United States for the first time will have an opportunity to take a look at the management of the corporations established by the money of the taxpayers of the United States.

I gave you one illustration; I give you another one. The Tennessee Valley Authority objected to the original provisions of the bill and they said that they would be prohibited from carrying on business under section 26 of their act along established lines authorized specifically by the substantive law of Congress. So we said, "We do not propose to change that law; that is an another matter; we do not want to usurp that function." So this bill makes no change in that existing section of the law. The Agricultural Credit Corporation, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks said, "if we are required to submit a budget beginning with July 1 we will be hampered. We do not know how much money we will spend during the current year; much less are we in a position to make an estimate as to what we will spend the following year." So we undertook to provide for that, and I think we have done it satisfactorily by having the budget estimates presented September 15, so that they will have the completed year as a basis upon which to submit their budget for the following year, as well as by allowing the submission of amendments to the annual budget programs.

The Congress, during the current session, has undertaken in a measure to provide for the omission of the past 20 years or more by providing in the so-called George law, Public, No. 4, approved February 24 of this year, for the auditing of all Government corporations. This is the language, "all Government corporations." Immediately some of the corporations, where the Government did not own all of the stock, said, "We are not within the provisions of that act." The Committee on Appropriations in the First Deficiency Act of 1945, approved April 25, undertook to perfect and implement the provisions of the George Act and did in a fine way supplement the provisions of that act by providing for the employment of 10 of the outstanding accountants of the Nation to head up the accounting department that must provide for the audit and that must audit these corporations. The Comptroller General, in appearing on that deficiency bill and before the Committee on Expenditures, as well as in a published decision, has taken the position that all these mixed-ownership corporations are under the audit provisions of the George Act.

The provisions of the said Deficiency Act, modifying, implementing, clarifying, and perfecting the George law, are all brought forward in the bill under consideration.

I may say also in this connection that there are other provisions in this bill that we think are notable. In the event a corporation established under a charter authorized by Federal law, or by authority of law under the laws of one of the States, has been functioning through the years, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget finds that in his judgment there is no occasion for that corporation, that the activities can be carried on just as the regular activities and departments of the Government are, he can so recommend, and thereafter, if approved by the Congress, budgets will be made as are provided for the Government departments.

I have thus undertaken to cover the high points of this bill. They are, first, for the audit of all wholly owned Government corporations; second, for the budgeting of all wholly owned Government corporations; third, for the auditing but not the budgeting of mixed-ownership corporations like the Federal land banks; and finally, to make the picture complete, the Treasury of the United States should be advised of the financial operations where billions of dollars are involved, for the credit of the United States must be maintained. Bonds are to be bought and sold, and if these corporations have the power to incur indebtedness, to issue bonds, and to pay interest thereon, without coordination with the Treasury, you can very easily see that the financial policy of the Government might be interfered with.

On the other hand, there are some corporations authorized by Congress that do not depend for their funds upon moneys from the Federal Treasury. Take the Federal intermediate credit banks. They sell their debentures to the public, they sell them to the banks. As businessmen, you Members know that when you borrow, one of the first questions your bank or the loaning institution asks you is, "Are you going to put this money on deposit with us?" So we thought in all fairness to enable the farm credit agencies to function as contemplated by law there should be an exception where those agencies do not sell their debentures and their obligations direct to the Treasury but to the people of the United States, including banks, and that they should be exempted from those provisions of the bill, but we provide at the same time that any and all sales and deposits of funds shall be reported to the Secretary of the Treasury, and we require the Secretary of the Treasury to communicate with Congress if he finds that the policy of making deposits or the policy of issuing bonds or debentures hinders, interferes with, or delays the fiscal policy and the fiscal program of the United States. That is most helpful and constructive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Again, as I have indicated, some of these corporations are Federal corporations. Some of them are incorporated under the laws of States.

In our hearings we asked all who appeared before us if there was any objection to requiring all corporations to become chartered under the laws of the United States, where they are now doing business and are chartered under the laws of the several States. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the largest of all the largest corporations in human history, with the greatest assets, together with all other witnesses reported there was no objection. On the contrary, there are many desirable reasons as to why a corporation should be chartered by act of Congress rather than under the laws of the several States. The Government of the United States ought not to be required to ascertain and to search and to find out as to whether or not their corporations are authorized to engage in their activities by exploring the laws of the several States. There is no good reason for this course. So this bill provides a reasonable time for the liquidation of all Government corporations now organized under the laws of the several States or for their incorporation by acts of Congress.

This is an important bill. It marks a new day in Government administration. If the Members will bear with me, in just a moment I will take it up section by section and title by title and explain the bill in a summary way and then answer any questions Members desire to propound. There is a complete analysis and detached explanation of the bill in the report.

TITLE I

Section 101, title I, of the bill covers wholly owned Government corporations. They are all named. There are about 63 of them, it being kept in mind that when you refer to the Production Credit Corporations, for example, you refer to 12 corporations and not to one. There are 12 in the United States. So that no corporation wholly owned by the Government is exempt from the terms of this bill.

It is fair to say we have included at least one and probably five or six that are in process of liquidation. Cargoes, Inc., was reported to be in process of liquidation, but we have no testimony that that liquidation is complete. Under Public Law 109, approved on June 30, the Defense Plant Corporation, the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Metals Reserve Company, the Rubber Reserve Company, and the Disaster Loan Corporation were transferred to the Recon-

struction Finance Corporation. We do not know whether those transfers are complete or not. I say that the Government of the United States through its Treasury invested some $9,200,000,000 in those and similar corporations. I do not know how much is going to be recovered. I think the Congress should be advised and for that reason we have left them in the bill subject to reports by the Comptroller General.

Section 102 provides for the business type of budget of these wholly owned Government corporations which I have attempted to describe in a general way.

Section 103 provides that there may be amendments to the annual budgets and that they become in reality a part of the Budget transmitted to the Congress under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. It concludes by providing that these requirements cover the year beginning July 1, 1946, and subsequent years.

Section 104 provides for consideration by the Congress of the budget programs and enactment of legislation, if necessary, making available such funds as Congress may determine, and it provides that the corporation shall not be deprived of the exercise of any functions now authorized by law, specifically applying to Section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and generally to the Farm Credit Administration Corporations.

Section 105 provides for the same type of audit, the commercial type, as provided by the George Act, to be made by the Comptroller General.

Section 106 is the provision of the George Act to implement the provisions of this act providing for a more nearly business-type Budget. It requires that the audit report shall show specifically any program, expenditure, or any other financial transaction observed in the course of the audit which in the opinion of the Comptroller General has been carried on or made without authority of law. The language that the report shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Treasury is new language. The President is required to submit his Budget on the first day of the session. In practice the Director makes it available to the Committee on Appropriations before the first day of the session informally. I feel the same will be followed by the Comptroller, who is required to submit his report to Congress on or before January 15.

Section 107 is new. It provides for recommendations by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to treating a Government corporation the same as a regular Government agency as to its finances.

TITLE II

There are two classes of corporations, as I stated: wholly owned and mixed ownership. Title I covers the wholly owned; title II covers the mixed-owned corporations. They include the Federal land banks; the Federal home-loan banks; the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives. In section 202 it will be kept in mind that mixed-ownership Government corporations are subject to the auditing but not to the budgeting provisions of this act. They are partly owned by the Government. It occurred to us that the public interest would be promoted by not requiring a budgeting of those institutions only partly owned by the Government. But I call attention to this significant language in section 202, that any mixed-ownership Government corporation, when it has fully paid all that is owing to the Federal Government, thereby becomes exempt from the provisions of this bill. That is proper and as it should be.

Section 203 makes the general provisions of the audit reports for wholly owned corporations applicable to the provisions for auditing and reporting under this act.

Section 204 permits the President to include in the annual Budget recommendations as to the return of Government capital by mixed-ownership corporations.

TITLE III

Under title III, General Provisions, we bring forward, we clarify, the provisions of the George bill, and to answer the objections made by a number of agencies that they are required already by substantive law to examine their corporate subsidiaries, this new provision, not occurring in the George Act or the Deficiency Act, is contained in this section 301, to wit, that in making audits the Comptroller General shall utilize and not duplicate any examinations that are now required by law, but no auditing of any corporatio nnow required by law is to be repealed, and no provisions of existing law with respect to the mere administrative expenses and administrative budgeting are to be repealed by this bill or section.

Then I call attention to the provision I have already emphasized in sections 302 and 303 with respect to the banking and checking accounts and note and bond operations of the Government corporations, with the exceptions in the farm credit corporations that I mentioned.

Finally, under section 304 (a) and (b), this bill provides that no corporation shall hereafter be created or hereafter acquired by any officer or agency of the Government, except by act of Congress or pursuant to an act of Congress specifically authorizing such action. Secondly, it provides that no wholly owned Government corporation created under the laws of any State, now owned and controlled by the Federal Government, shall continue in business longer than June 30, 1948, but provides that if they are to be continued thereafter they shall be chartered by acts of Congress.

Uniformity will be promoted. Efficiency will be aided, and in my judgment the public interest will be promoted by the passage of this bill, to enable the taxpayer to follow up the taxes that have been levied and appropriated for the establishment of these institutions, at least one of which is larger in its ramifications than the peacetime Budget of the Government itself.

If we had complied with the initial requests of these institutions asking to be exempted, we would have admitted that it is a case of the tail wagging the dog, and that the creature was larger than the creator.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have now completed my statement. I yield first to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that I discussed this subject on two occasions before the Congress some months ago. I am very glad to note that this committee has brought this bill before the House. I note, however, that in subparagraph (b) of section 304 reference is made to Government corporations wholly owned by the Government, created by or under the laws of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States or any political subdivision thereof or under the laws of the District of Columbia. What does the gentleman say about those corporations which are in existence and are operating corporations which have been created by the direct action of the officers of the RFC? Take the case of the Defense Supplies Corporation; that has never been chartered by any State or any political subdivision nor by the Government, but it is a creature of the RFC itself. Should there not be language in subsection (b) that would clearly and unambiguously include those subsidiaries of the RFC that have been created by action of the officials of RFC itself, and that are acting or pretending to act as Government corporations just as much as any other Government corporations? I think it is an inadvertence or an oversight perhaps. While they are named as corporations that are subject to the act in section 101, yet in subsection (b) of section 304 they are eliminated and excluded because they do not fall within the reference in subsection (b) of section 304.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I get the gentleman's question.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman get my point?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; I do. Section 304, subsection (b), deals with one matter and one matter only, and that is whether or not Government corporations that were not organized by Congress but under State law should be continued. This section is confined to one thing and one thing alone and that is whether or not we are going to permit them to continue or require them to be reorganized under Federal statute. If they are not completely liquidated that question will arise. In the case of the Defense Supplies Corporation, it was organized by the RFC under authority of section 5d of its act, as amended. However, I anticipated the gentleman's question as best I could in my humble way by saying that of course it is contemplated that the war corporations organized for the production of munitions and war facilities should be liquidated and dissolved as soon as possible. And for that reason Congress itself has provided already for the transfer of the largest of them all, to wit, the Defense Plant Corporation, the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Metals

Reserve Company, and the Rubber Reserve Company to the RFC.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Just a moment; and the RFC is proceeding with the liquidation of those corporations in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress. Those corporations organized for the prosecution of the war are among the plants, the big items of surplus property that will be disposed of as provided by the Surplus Property Act. I answer the gentleman by saying that it is the purpose that not a single one of those corporations shall continue but that they shall be liquidated. If they are not the Congress will take action on it when they come before it in the next 2 years.

Mr. KEEFE. Should they not be transferred to the RFC?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I anticipated that. Public Law 109, approved June 30, 1945—my recollection is the act is dated June 30, 1945, effective the 1st of July—takes care of it. That has been anticipated. I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. As I recall, subsection (b) of section 304 contains a proviso on page 15 of the bill which states in substance that these corporations shall be liquidated provided that prior thereto any such corporation may be reincorporated by an act of Congress, and so forth.

Of course, that is a permissive thing and it is entirely up to the Congress whether or not the permission be granted that it be reincorporated; but might it not be considered that this permissive language is permissive likewise for a corporation to continue in some way? What is the reason for that language being in there at all when it is permission?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will answer the gentleman in the negative by saying that is the best language the committee was able to devise for two purposes: First, they have to be liquidated, if they are not reincorporated by an act of Congress. Second, if so reincorporated, it will be with specific powers, privileges, and duties as provided by such act.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the act be any different in effect if that proviso was stricken out?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think the proviso should remain there to make definite and certain it is intended that these corporations are to be liquidated unless they are reincorporated by a specific act of Congress.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I should like to ask the gentleman two questions. I understood the gentleman to say that under some circumstances the Bureau of the Budget, if it finds certain situations exist, can change the classification of a corporation. For instance, it can transfer a corporation from one group to another.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; I did not say that. Here is what I did say, so that there may be no misunderstanding: This bill provides in specific language that if the Director of the Bureau of the Budget finds that the corporation is not necessary to accomplish the purposes for which it was organized and its purpose can more properly be accomplished and carried out by an agency or department of the Government, he will recommend that it be treated not as a corporation but as an agency of the Government.

Mr. JENKINS. He makes that recommendation back to the Congress?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand it then, that will give him a chance to clear out a lot of these corporations that are sort of worn out and that are on the edge, as far as jurisdiction is concerned. He will have a good deal of authority, if he will exercise it, to clean up some of those things?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; and the matter the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] brought to our attention will be facilitated. If you will take the list of corporations in section 101, one after the other is organized, as I stated in my preliminary observations, under the laws of the State of Delaware or under the laws of some other State. We Members of Congress have a look at them for the first time here, if this bill is passed.

Mr. JENKINS. I want the gentleman to discuss, if he will, just a minute, the Tennessee Valley Authority. I notice on the second page there are two corporations. There is the Tennessee Valley Authority and also Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc. What is the difference?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The Tennessee Valley Authority was created as a corporation by an act of Congress. The Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., was created under the laws of the State of Tennessee. I am not going to discuss the merits of that organization, but this bill will provide that it certainly cannot function very much longer unless the Congress approves it because that is one of the institutions that has to come before us at the expiration of the next 2 years.

Mr. JENKINS. I would like to ask several other questions, if I may. As I remember it—and I think I am right in this proposition—the Tennessee Valley Authority has for years been the principal bone of contention with reference to the matter of the jurisdiction of the General Accounting Office; is that right?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will say there has been a very considerable controversy with respect to it.

Mr. JENKINS. It has been running on for years.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will say, in all fairness, that the law now provides for an audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It also provides for an audit of the Crop Insurance Corporation, and in the law as it existed before the George Act there was a provision that does not obtain in this law. It is utterly indefensible. That provision is they have got to present their audit to these two corporations before they present it to the Congress. That is definitely repealed by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. I think perhaps this is the most important issue involved, if there is any issue, and I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine understanding he has of this bill and the very fine way in which he has explained it. He no doubt has given it a great deal of consideration. To get back to the Tennessee Valley Authority, that has been the real bone of contention in Congress for many years. The gentleman knows all about it, I am sure, so I would like to ask him this question: Does this law provide that the General Accounting Office can audit the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It certainly does.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well. On my left a very distinguished gentleman, one of the best-posted gentlemen of the House, answers to the contrary, and that raises a question in my mind.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Pardon me. There ought not to be any misunderstanding. The corporations are named, and they are named specifically.

Mr. JENKINS. But there are two instances in this bill, on page 5 and on page 6, where special exceptions are made with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Wait 1 minute now. Let us have no misunderstanding about it. The first exception with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority is in section 104, and that language is this, and I quote:

> Nor shall any provisions of this section be construed as affecting in any way the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended.

That was a controversial matter, and I made the statement in the beginning that the committee took the view that it was not the province of this committee to undertake to change the substantive law. Our province was to provide for a budgeting and an accounting under existing law, and we felt that if you amended section 26 it should be taken up on its merits and disposed of by Congress.

Mr. JENKINS. To put the gentleman right—of course, he knows more about it than I do—but he will notice down further in section 105 the Tennessee Valley Authority is referred to especially, with special exemptions at the bottom of page 5 and the top of page 6.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated in the beginning that there were two exceptions here and that they were intended not to change the substantive law with respect to the agencies referred to, as in this instance, the Tennessee Valley Authority. The first provision in section 104 has to do with the spending of receipts. The second provision, which occurs in section 105 in the act of November 21, 1941, an act passed by Congress, has to do with the expenditure of items, and it leaves to the Authority whether that be right or wrong. This committee has not undertaken to say, but it leaves to the Directors of that Authority rather than the Comptroller General's opinion whether or not the expenditures made are necessary to carry out the provisions

of the Corporation's creating act. Personally, I think that that law ought to be changed, but this is not the time nor place. That is a controversial matter. Congress has passed on it. We leave it just where we find it, but the Comptroller General reports to Congress so that appropriate action may be taken. I repeat that the Comptroller General reports that to the Congress, and if the Congress agrees with the Comptroller General Congress can take proper action.

Mr. JENKINS. Does the Comptroller General approve this section of the TVA? The reason I ask that is this: The Comptroller General's department for many years has been demanding that we provide legislation to audit the TVA, and the TVA has been the most arrogant violator——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Your question, please. I understand that there is controversy about the TVA. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. JENKINS. Does this law audit the TVA?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have stated repeatedly that it does.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It audits the TVA in a businesslike manner, and requires them to submit a proper budget. A commercial audit is to be done, and it is the most forward step with respect not only to the control of the $700,000,000 that the people of the United States have invested in the TVA, but in following up the other investments we have made in other corporations.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask the gentleman one or two questions. Referring to section 304 (b) again, in the first place am I correct in assuming that section 304 (b) does not affect corporations which have been created by act of Congress?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does not.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In other words, it only affects those corporations which have been created by the action of some executive agency or in some other manner?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; as authorized by Congress, under State law, or recognized by Congress, perhaps.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I mean, if the corporation itself has been created by an act of Congress, this section would not apply, as I understand it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But all other corporations would cease to operate in 1948 unless the Congress in the meantime passed legislation setting them up?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. They would be liquidated and dissolved if not operating under Federal charters.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. So the net result of the bill, as I understand, will be, first of all, that all Government corporations will make an annual budgetary report to Congress, and they will be audited in order to prevent action by the corporations which is contrary to the intent of Congress with regard to them; and second, that after 1948 there will not be in existence any Government corporations except those duly authorized by specific action of the Congress.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Unless Congress extends them and authorizes them to continue.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Why is it considered necessary to limit the holdings of Government bonds by corporations?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The bill does not limit that, it just provides that these corporations can issue bonds and debentures of $100,000 without taking it up with the Treasury.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. Something has been said here about the attitude of the Comptroller General with reference to one particular section. Is it not true that the Comptroller General highly favors the passage of this bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. He not only favors it, but recommended it in very strong and persuasive language.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I wish to commend the gentleman for his industry in presenting this bill and for his fine work on the committee. His explanation here on the floor has demonstrated that this measure has already been too long delayed. May I ask the gentleman to cover one point briefly. The gentleman recalls that I raised the question of the economy of having two audits. I think the gentleman covered that very well in the hearings, but for the benefit of the House I wish he would cover that briefly now.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I anticipated the question by calling attention to the fact that in section 301 we affirmatively require the Comptroller General to give careful consideration to those administrative audits that are now required by law to be made. We did not prevent him, when he audited the head agency, if he found that something was wrong with a subsidiary organization, from going into that and ferreting it out and reporting it to Congress and auditing it. However, we did undertake to prevent a duplication in expenditures, because the House will keep in mind that all of these corporations pay for these audits out of their funds ultimately, and they are required by the specific provisions of this bill to do so.

Mr. CHURCH. There is no release of the responsibility of the corporations to audit their own affairs?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is no release when required by Congress, or for the functioning of the corporations. We do prohibit private audits that would be a repetition of these Government audits that will be made by the Comptroller General, and properly so.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. I understand that the Treasury Department has not been audited by independent auditors since its inception. Why should it not be included, and why should we not know more about what really is taking place, so that a lot of the inaccurate statements in regard to money in circulation may be finally straightened out?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not know of any provision in the Budget and Accounting Act that exempts the Treasury Department from the provisions of that act. On the contrary, for 20 years and more I have considered the Budget recommendations with respect to the Treasury and Post Office Departments, annually, and the Treasury Department is under the Budget and Accounting Act and is not exempted in any way.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has called attention to the fact that we have 63, I believe, of these corporations. Most of them have come into being in the last 10 or 12 years. Evidently, from what the gentleman has said, Congress has been rather derelict in its duty in not having had an accounting long before now.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The RFC was established under Hoover, but it is never too late to repent.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Now, in the last days, when we are about to eliminate some of these agencies, we are talking about auditing them. Does not the gentleman believe we are a little late?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The gentleman has consumed 1 hour, and if further time is yielded to him it will have to be by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for one additional minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. When we appeared before the Committee on Rules this final question was asked me: "How much money will the Government of the United States lose because of these war corporations?" I answered then as I answer now, "Frankly, I do not know." But $9,200,000,000 has been advanced by the Federal Treasury to build many of the plants for war facilities, and for food subsidies and production. We may realize 10 percent on some of that $9,200,000,000. We may realize more, and I trust we will, but it is difficult and really impossible at this time to forecast the losses. We know enough to know that the war losses will be enormous. I will say that under the terms of this bill the Congress will be advised annually as to the progress and liquidation of these corporations.

Congress owes it to the taxpayers to safeguard the public funds invested in Government corporations. Control and examination are essential to protect the integrity of the corporations. Efficient Government corporations should welcome examination and inefficient corporations should be subjected to audit and

scrutiny. The bill will not destroy corporations, but it will enable the Congress, as the stockholders of the people, to follow up, examine, scrutinize, and protect the investments of the taxpayers. The bill is the most forward step toward promoting the sound financial structure of the Government that could be taken by the Congress. It marks an advance in the right direction that has been too long delayed. It provides for coordination and for control by providing budgets and audits that are sound and in the public interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, notice has been served that after October 31, 1945, funds provided under the humanitarian Lanham Act will not be available for the continuance of child-welfare centers throughout the country. This creates a most critical situation in many sections of the country.

The Pacific Coast States of California, Oregon, and Washington have been a vast training center for hundreds of thousands of men drafted into the armed services. Because they were to be located in these training camps for some periods of time, thousands of men brought their wives and children to live near them. Unable to adequately support their families on the small allowances given by the Government, these wives took positions in all kinds of work to supplement their family incomes.

In the city of San Francisco and the bay area this problem is more acute than in any other section of the United States. San Francisco is the world's greatest port of embarkation at the present time. Thousands of mothers, with their children, have located in San Francisco and the bay area, where they will remain until their husbands return from overseas. Many of them are employed in productive work because it is necessary for them to continue helping in the support of their children.

While it is true that war work has stopped in most sections of the country, it is not true in San Francisco and the San Francisco Bay area. At the end of August more than 400 ships were in San Francisco Bay shipyards for repairs and reconditioning. This work will continue as long as we have troops overseas. Until all of these ships have been completely reconditioned there will be full employment for many of these mothers in the shipyards and related industries.

The children of men still in our armed forces deserve every opportunity we can give them. These good mothers, earnestly striving to keep their homes intact, should receive every assistance our Government can give them. It will be tragic to close these child centers when they are so badly needed.

The situation is so acute in the city of San Francisco that almost every public organization interested in social welfare has urged and petitioned the maintenance of these child centers. Congress should take immediate steps to guarantee the continuance of them as long as they are needed.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a resolution adopted by the Board of Education of the City and County of San Francisco on September 4, 1945.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

Resolved, That this board of education does hereby memorialize the President of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to continue to provide for the maintenance of child-care centers in the city and county of San Francisco until such time as the services of working mothers may be dispensed with; and further

Resolved, That Governor Warren be urged to include in a call for the next special session of the legislature any legislation needed for the continuance of the authority of school districts to operate child-care centers with Federal funds until the services of working mothers may be dispensed with; further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to His Excellency, Earl C. Warren, Governor of the State of California, as well as to United States Senators DOWNEY and KNOWLAND and Congressmen WELCH and HAVENNER.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I am glad to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I endorse what the gentleman from California has said concerning the child-care centers. May I contribute to his remarks by saying that the problem is just as acute in southern California in Los Angeles County, not only because of the working mothers, but because of the wives of the thousands of servicemen who are awaiting the return of their husbands from the South Pacific. In southern California we have some of the largest training camps, where the wives of servicemen who are awaiting the return of their husbands need the help of the child-care centers to take care of their children. It would be a tragedy if the child-care centers were shut off. In endorsing my colleague's remarks, I urge the Congress to give serious consideration to this humanitarian proposition.

Mr. WELCH. I appreciate my colleague's statement.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, in my district conditions exist almost identical with those which the gentleman has mentioned in the bay area around San Francisco. I met with a great many of the social agencies in my district while I was there recently during the recess. The social welfare agencies are at their wits' end as to what to do when this order becomes effective and the day nurseries and recreational centers for children are closed. Literally thousands of families in that area who have come there as war workers and the families of servicemen have young children who are receiving care in these day nurseries. There will be no way to take care of them while the mothers are working if the nurseries are closed. It is still a war problem and not a local one. It is a very urgent problem that the Congress should face, and at least give temporary relief until the local agencies or the State agencies can act, if it is ultimately determined they should be the ones to take over the problem. At the present time they cannot act. I urge the Congress to act at once so these nurseries can be maintained to care for children of veterans and war workers.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman from Oregon for his remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to supplement the gentleman's fine statement. Probably the most acute place in California with reference to this situation is the city of Vallejo. We are doing all we can to get the Federal Government to carry out the letter and spirit of the Lanham Act by taking care of these very situations. The entire problem there is due 100 percent to the impact of the war. I hope the Members of Congress and the Federal agencies will give heed to the gentleman's warning about the continuance of these projects so long as the effects of the war impact are in those communities.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. HAVENNER. I want to endorse the recommendations made by my colleague from San Francisco for the continuation of this very important service for the children of working mothers and the wives and widows of servicemen in particular. I have had scores of letters from mothers in San Francisco saying that they would not know how to get along, how to keep their families decently, unless this service should be continued. The appeal for continuation of the service has been endorsed by every civic agency in San Francisco.

Mr. WELCH. That is true, and I thank my colleague.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to endorse and supplement the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from California. I have been informed that at the present time more than 40 percent of the children in the child-care centers in Los Angeles County and in California are children of men still in the armed forces. So certainly it becomes the obligation of the Federal Government to have these children well cared for. There are more than 21,000 such children in the State of California, and over half of them are in Los Angeles County. They have held mass meetings there. I have received more letters on this subject in the last 2 weeks than on any other subject. I hope the Congress will take whatever steps may be necessary, at least to extend the use of these funds

for a period of several months, until the State of California can get in line to do its duty.

Mr. WELCH. I appreciate my colleague's remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order part of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] made as fine a statement in support of a measure considered by the Committee of the Whole as I have heard since I became a Member of this House. I do not know a Member who is more thoroughly conversant with his subject than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. I do not know what anyone could add to the excellent statement he has made for this measure. He has answered all questions of the skeptics in committee, out of committee, and on the floor of the House. I am sure there will not be an adverse vote on the floor against this bill. I have indicated to the chairman and some of the members of the committee that I propose to use most of the time allotted to me on some questions other than those pertinent to this measure.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. The bill specifically lists the different corporations that come within its provisions. Does that mean that there are other Government corporations that are excluded from the provisions of the bill?

Mr. BENDER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] wish to answer the question?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I believe the gentleman has answered it correctly. This includes every corporation we were able to ascertain or that any agency of the Government was able to ascertain, including some that were in liquidation put in here to make assurance doubly sure that we had omitted none.

Mr. BENDER. If any corporation has been omitted and the gentleman will let us have the name of the corporation we shall be pleased to add it.

As the United States Congress reconvenes to consider the many complex problems immediately before the Nation, it is important that the guiding lines of national policy be clarified and redrawn to avoid the danger of losing ourselves in the multiplicity of details which must be considered.

In my judgment there are three basic problems which must be solved by Congress in cooperation with the executive department of our Government and our military staffs. These issues are:

First. The determination of the most effective methods of establishing and maintaining a genuine world peace in which the causes of war are eliminated.

Second. The restoration of American military personnel to civilian life as speedily as possible.

Third. The establishment of a peacetime economy at home capable of furnishing full employment by private industry to all who seek work.

1. To achieve the first objective of this policy, it is clearly essential that the capacity of those nations which have adopted aggressive warfare as part of their political philosophy be disarmed and kept disarmed. The capacity of both Japan and Germany to wage war must be utterly obliterated and that destruction must not be repaired as time goes by.

Obviously enough, the supervision of the processes by which we dismantle the industries of the former Axis countries and the methods by which we seek to reeducate the peoples of these lands must be the primary responsibility of the United Nations. Both the policing and the retraining of the conquered aggressors will necessarily require the long-continued presence of thousands of men and women from our own land on foreign soil. It is a major task of Congress to establish conditions which will induce our own citizens voluntarily and happily to engage in this work of reconstruction.

Military service overseas must be compensated at higher rates of pay; educational opportunities must be provided; living standards must be raised to attract alert and able military and civilian personnel for these assignments. Nothing less will suffice, for on our ability to do this job effectively may rest the entire future of our own country, and, indeed, of mankind.

The policing and retraining of Nazi Germany has been well begun. There, cooperative and immediately contiguous members of the United Nations who have suffered two disastrous wars in one generation can be relied upon to act strongly in their own self-interest. In the treatment of Japan, the prospects for equal success are not yet apparent.

Thus far, the occupation of the main islands of Japan has been an exclusively American task. It should be expanded at once to include occupation forces from other nations, particularly from those nations which have felt most closely the complete impact of the Japanese thrust for world dominion. China and Australia have been more sensitive to the threat of conquest than our own great Nation. The people of China understand the Japanese more thoroughly than any other people. The American temperament is almost instinctively antagonistic to the occupation of alien lands. Moreover, our individual American soldiers, trained in the schools of our own country to ready sympathy and frequently susceptible to outward kindness, are unlikely to make good policemen. To keep Japan disarmed and to undertake the change in mental attitude necessary if she is to alter her views on the imperial destiny of the Japanese Empire, we shall require years of tough-minded occupation. This can be—and must be—undertaken in cooperation with the United Nations.

But this is only the first aspect of the problem of preventing future wars. Our Government must work closely and incessantly with the new Social and Economic Council of the United Nations to remove the sources of friction which furnish the sparks of war. There can be no better assurance of world peace than the raising of living standards of men and women everywhere. Contented peoples will not heed warmongers.

2. The second immediate task before us must be the restoration of American military personnel to civilian life as rapidly as possible. We must set up many more separation centers than are now in operation to speed this process. All eligible servicemen in our country who are awaiting discharge should be furloughed home and recalled to their separation center when the center is ready to act in their discharge.

Such a policy would be a recognition of the human side of our military needs. By permitting our men to come home while awaiting their discharge they would have an opportunity to investigate business openings, plan for additional education, and be reunited with their families.

In addition, men overseas are entitled to much more definite information on the plans concerning their own cases than is now being offered. Every man in a foreign land should be informed as to the schedule of his return. Such information is certainly ascertainable and would end the interminable flood of rumors which make life so uncertain to our men overseas. Those who are scheduled for relatively late shipment home should be offered educational opportunities on levels identical with those now available at home, and if necessary educational centers should be established at central points for their convenience.

The GI bill of rights which has been so justly criticized in its operation must be quickly amended to provide for a more substantial mustering-out pay, a more liberalized loan policy, and a clarification of former job rights.

Perhaps more than any one of these things, there must be an end to the impatient attitude of some military administrative personnel. Perhaps there was some excuse for the treatment of men in uniform as part of a vast army with little real opportunity for individualized attention during hostilities. There is no longer any justification for such an attitude. Our returning soldiers are not collections of serial numbers, and their problems today can demand personal attention from those charged with these responsibilities.

3. Nothing we can do on the international scene or in aiding our returning servicemen and their families will be equal in effectiveness to the establishment of a peacetime home economy capable of furnishing full employment by private enterprise to all who seek work.

There seems to be an idea abroad in the land that somehow or other the Government must take care of everybody with Government jobs. Back in 1938, when I was first elected to Congress, I recall that we had 78,000 men on WPA in the city of Cleveland. Frankly, Government employment is not the answer. This Government today owes approximately $275,000,000,000, and after the

various corporations organized by RFC come to an end we will find that we possibly owe an additional $25,000,000,000.

It has been variously estimated that the national wealth of the United States was never over $300,000,000,000, and when the country is in the hole to the extent of what the country is worth, the country is broke. This business of operating with bales of money, as they operate in some of these foreign countries, is not in order here. I hope the dollars that we are talking about today will at least have the value of the dollars of today. The dollar of today in America certainly is not the dollar of 5 years ago.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Who got us into this terrible mess that this country is in, which the gentleman is now describing? Who spent all this money? We have asked the question for years where we were going to get it, but we never could get an answer. Will the gentleman tell us who is responsible?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman asks a question. I refer to the statement made by the President of the United States in discussing Pearl Harbor. He said all the people were responsible for Pearl Harbor. Frankly, I disagree with that point of view. But in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the fact of the matter is that the people voted for the present administration and voted for it four times. It seems to me that they were gluttons for punishment. But in any event, in this country where we have majority rule, the people voted for it. They wanted it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And they got it.

Mr. BENDER. They got it, and they got it with a vengeance.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The administration got the votes by buying them with taxpayers' money; is not that a fact?

Mr. BENDER. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio that he is correct. In my own city, in 1938, 78,000 were on WPA, receiving Government checks at the rate of $15 a week.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In other words, the administration attained its power with taxpayers' money.

Mr. BENDER. There is no question at all about that.

Mr. RICH. Who is going to pay now for the administration the people have elected in the last 4 years?

Mr. BENDER. I met a professor on the train going home one week end. This professor made this very interesting observation. He said, "Well, we owe this money, but we owe it to ourselves." That professor made a very "screwy" observation. We do not owe it to ourselves, we owe it to each other. When I have a Government bond, a Liberty bond, or one of these War bonds, you owe me that money. You are a part of the Government, as I am. If you have a bond, I owe it to you, because we are all a part of the United States Government. We cannot write it off.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not interested so much in who got us into it, as most of us know about that, but the gentleman said that he owed it and I owed it, that we are going to pay each other. The gentleman knows very well we are going to shove it off on the returning veterans and let them and their descendants pay it.

Mr. BENDER. I hope that that will not be the case.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is just exactly what is happening and the gentleman knows it very well.

Mr. BENDER. I hope that will not be the case, but I think that is in the minds of some people.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman made the statement that he heard a man in a pullman say that we owed this debt to ourselves. The gentleman said it was a "screwy" statement for any man to make. Did not the gentleman hear that same statement coming from one of the Chief Executives of this country a few years ago?

Mr. BENDER. Of course. We have heard all kinds of conversation. Talk is cheap. In this country for many years a radio voice had the country all hypnotized. Many were not thinking very much about anything else except listening to that radio voice, and they got conversation, loads of it.

Mr. RICH. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is with us now. Probably he can tell us how we can get the money to pay off all this great debt that we have created, because the Committee on Ways and Means is responsible for raising the funds. Probably if the gentleman were to ask that question of the gentleman from North Carolina, he might be able to give us some enlightenment.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure he would tell us that there is no short cut, and that all of us have to pay through the nose, that only through taxation can we possibly pay off this debt. When you carry a debt in this country 10 times larger than we knew anything about 10 years ago, if you have an idea that somehow or other there is some short cut or that you can get around it and that you do not have to pay the debt, you are just as "screwy" as that professor was. You have to pay. It is a part of your personal obligation. If you have repudiation or inflation, you have conditions comparable to the conditions that some of the returning Congressmen tell us now exist in foreign countries, where they have to pay as much as $1,500 for a fountain pen, and as much as $4,000 for a meal.

I will say frankly to the gentleman, I am in favor of any legislation which will provide for better conditions for the average citizen in our country, providing that such legislation does not in any way rock the boat as far as our entire economy is concerned.

I have a letter here from a lady constituent of mine from Rittman, Ohio, and I would like to read it to you:

> It is almost more than we mothers of returned prisoners of war can take when we see pictures of President Truman pinning on a Distinguished Service Medal on Harry Hopkins. He who had everything easy, sitting behind a desk in comfort, traveling in luxury, getting a whale of a salary while our boys were on a starvation diet, almost freezing for want of clothes, locked in boxcars, barns, and railroad stations through bombings, and now since they were fortunate enough to live through this torture, they are forgotten.

This is typical of thousands of letters I am receiving, and when I say thousands, I do not mean hundreds. Perhaps this lady draws on her imagination a little, but in any event this is the temper of the American people today, and this letter is typical of the kind of letters which come to my desk by the thousands. The letter says further:

> They are never mentioned on the radio, in the news, or by the Government.
>
> Yes, everybody talked how terrible the atrocities were, but since they are back, no mention is made as to how they are to be repaid for their suffering.
>
> We who know what they have endured feel they should be discharged. They have paid enough for freedom. Instead they are keeping them in camps as "clean-up boys," "salad makers," and even sent back to the Infantry.
>
> Many of these boys are going a. w. o. l. saying, "If the Army cannot be fair to me I won't play fair either." Is this the American way? Are we supposed to just be quiet and take what they hand to our boys? They couldn't earn points in prison camps, so some arrangement should be made at once. They can't take much more without cracking up. Do you want our insane institutions to be filled to overflowing?
>
> Please try to do something for these boys. My son was a prisoner of war for 8 months in Germany and I know what I am talking about. He is a "salad maker" now and writes, "We are the forgotten men."
>
> Mrs. N. M. WENGER.
>
> RITTMAN, OHIO.

The people of the United States have seen our country turn from depression to prosperity through the manufacture of the destructive weapons of warfare. It will be difficult to persuade any right-thinking citizen of our Nation that the ingenuity and skill which produced this wartime record cannot be utilized for the fulfillment of a better life for all men. We must be mindful of the fact that there are still large areas of our land where living standards are distressingly low. There are huge areas in foreign countries which have been devastated. They must be rebuilt. Our industry has the technology and the "know-how" to rebuild them. Our people have the skill. They have equally the will to aid in this effort. For they know that today the prosperity of the entire world, and indeed its ability to survive, may well rest upon the decisions we make right here in this country in the next few years.

The prospects may frighten some. They will not discourage Americans who have overcome obstacle after obstacle to become the greatest producing nation on earth. We must take our stand now. American industry, encouraged by domestic policies, must expand to cover the globe. American resources must make possible an international lifting of living standards which will be reflected in

world-wide prosperity and enduring peace. Nothing less will achieve this goal. Nothing less must be contemplated by the framers of American policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, there is being presented to the committee today a bill providing for the financial control of Government corporations. This is a bill that has been very long overdue. This should have been enacted 10 years ago and the Congress has been derelict in its duty because it has not enacted this legislation. I have proposed it for years. I am glad that it comes before us today with the unanimity of opinion that seems to exist among the members of the committee because all of them seem to realize today that we do need to have financial control of these Government corporations. All private corporations have an audit because it's good sound business for them to do so and it's good business for the Government to audit its corporations.

There has been and is at the present time some corporations that do not want to come under the scrutiny of the Comptroller General, but, in my opinion, it is up to the Congress to see to it that all Government corporations are audited so that the people of the country may know just what is happening.

I wish the Members could have been present at the hearings when Comptroller General Lindsay Warren told the committee about the duplication of effort in the various departments, bureaus, and corporations of this Government. It is a shame and a crime that we have gone on for so long a time without consolidating these various bureaus and various functions of the Government departments and corporations. The taxpayers of the country are being compelled today to pay for the inefficiency of Government operations and you have been very derelict in your Government duties I must admit.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I have been interested for a long time in seeing this sort of measure brought up for consideration and passage and I intend to vote for it. However, I have not the confidence it will do what some hope it will or believe it ought. I do not believe it is possible to control the finances of a Government corporation. In my opinion, the only way to control the finances of a Government corporation is to abolish it and I hope the day is not far distant when the Congress will make a clean sweep and abolish practically all of the existent Government corporations.

Mr. RICH. I think if all Members of Congress were as interested in seeing good business practices followed by the Government as is the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, they would do exactly as he suggests. There is no reason why we should have the Government in all the kinds of business that it is in today. We are going to ruin private initiative in this country, the thing that made the country the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. If we do not stop the Communists in the Government from going ahead and taking over and making our form of Government communistic, American freedom, American liberty and American independence will be lost. I think the same as the gentleman of Ohio does and I am glad that he brought the point out at this particular time.

We have a hundred and one corporations owned and controlled by this Government. Some people do not want Lindsay Warren to go into their corporations. Why? They are afraid that the people will become enlightened. They are afraid that the people of this country will know all the things that are happening, and that is what I want to see done so that the people of this country will know the true facts by having these corporations audited, and so that Congress will be in a position whereby it can change and regulate every corporation that is in existence until it is put out of business. I do not fear any harm that will come to anyone by the enactment of this legislation. It will only injure those who do not want to lose their easy jobs and their snaps by getting off the Federal pay roll. They are the only fellows that are going to be hurt, and I want to hurt them just about as quick as I can and about as bad as I can, because I believe that we ought to work and earn and save, and we certainly will have to do that if we are going to save this country of ours. I want to save this country of ours if it is possible. This bill should save the country millions and millions of dollars. It should lead to the cutting out of many functions and departments of government that are not necessary, to encourage private initiative and get the Government out of business. Let us keep America American. Let us keep the American standard of living high.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to discuss an amendment I propose to offer to section 301 of the bill. The amendment reads:

On page 11, line 3, after the period, insert the following:

"In the case of any wholly owned or mixed-ownership Government corporation which is specifically required by law to be examined at least annually by examiners appointed or designated by the Farm Credit Administration, such examinations shall be in lieu of the requirements of sections 105, 106, 202, and 203 of this act and of section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945 (Public Law 4, 79th Cong.); but the Comptroller General shall from time to time review the scope of such examination and the adequacy of the reports thereof, and may make such report thereon in writing which he deems advisable to the Farm Credit Administration, to the President, and to the Congress."

I am in accord with the general objective of this legislation; namely, to bring Government corporations and their transactions and operations under annual scrutiny by Congress, and to restore to Congress appropriate control over the financial operations of such agencies. I want to commend the committee for the many constructive improvements they have made in this bill as compared with the original bill—specifically with respect to corporations serving agriculture. There still remains, however, a serious weakness in the auditing requirements as they affect the corporations which are under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.

Under the provisions of the bill as it now stands, "the financial transactions of wholly owned Government corporations shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States" (sec. 105). The bill also contains a similar requirement with respect to the auditing of the financial transactions of mixed-ownership Government corporations for any period during which Government capital has been invested therein. (Sec. 202.)

In addition, there is a general provision, section 301 (a), which requires every corporation to "reimburse the General Accounting Office for the full cost of any such audit as billed therefor by the Comptroller General." It is further provided in section 301 (a) "that in making the audits provided in said sections, the Comptroller General shall, to the fullest extent deemed by him to be practicable, utilize reports of examinations of Government corporations made by a supervising administrative agency pursuant to law."

This means that the Comptroller General would be required to audit such agencies under the Farm Credit Administration as the Federal land banks, the production credit corporations, the central banks for cooperatives, and the regional banks for cooperatives, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and the Federal intermediate credit banks—except that he is required to utilize "to the fullest extent deemed by him to be practicable," the reports of examinations of these corporations made by the Farm Credit Administration, which, in this case, is the supervising administrative agency.

There is no justifiable reason for Congress requiring a separate audit of these farm-credit agencies by the Comptroller General. These corporations stand in an entirely different class from Government corporations which have been set up by Executive order and not by statutes enacted by Congress. In the case of these farm-credit corporations, they have all been established pursuant to enabling acts enacted by Congress; and Congress, by various statutes, has specifically charged the Farm Credit Administration with the responsibility not only of examining regularly and carefully the fiscal operations of these various corporations but also exercising supervision of these institutions.

At the end of my remarks I will insert in the RECORD the various provisions in the statutes under which Congress has placed specific responsibilities upon the Farm Credit Administration to make such regular and thorough examinations of these various corporations.

For example, in the case of the Federal land banks, the law now requires the Farm Credit Administration to have a thorough examination made of these banks at least once a year. The law further requires that "farm-credit examiners shall be subject to the same requirements, responsibilities, and penalties as are applicable to national-bank examiners under chapters 2 and 3 of title 12 (U. S. Code) and other provisions of law." The existing statutes also require similar examinations by these farm-credit examiners of various other corporations under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.

Furthermore, these examinations which are required by law to be made by the Farm Credit Administration go far beyond the scope of the audit. They include not only a thorough audit of fiscal and financial matters, but they also make a thorough examination of the operations of these institutions to see if they are carrying out all of the farm credit laws and rules and regulations thereunder in all of their operations and activities.

The cost of these examinations by examiners of the Farm Credit Administration is now required by law to be assessed against these corporations. Hence, in the last analysis, the farmer borrowers pay the cost of these examinations.

If another audit by the Comptroller General is to be required to be assessed against these corporations, it will be the farmer borrowers, in the last analysis, who will have to pay the cost of this additional audit. Thus, if this bill passes in its present form, the Comptroller General can make independent and complete audit of any and all of these corporations under the Farm Credit Administration, and assess the entire cost upon these corporations, thus imposing a double burden upon the farmer borrowers. This is an unnecessary and unfair burden to be imposed upon farmers who borrow from these institutions.

Congress has already adequately safeguarded the borrowers, the investing public, and the Government's investments through farm credit statutes which prescribe the extent and manner through which these corporations are to be supervised and regulated by the Farm Credit Administration.

Now, why should Congress come along and require another agency of the Federal Government to duplicate what the Farm Credit Administration is already doing in the manner already prescribed by Congress? I am in agreement that Congress should impose proper safeguards around the operations of Government corporations, but it simply does not make sense to me for Congress to provide two agencies to audit these farm credit agencies and impose a double cost upon the farmer borrowers. I can see no useful purpose whatever that can be accomplished by such a requirement.

Under the amendment which I have suggested, in the case of any wholly owned or mixed-ownership Government corporation which is specifically required by law to be examined at least annually by examiners appointed or designated by the Farm Credit Administration, such examination shall be in lieu of the requirements in this bill for audits by the Comptroller General and the requirements of section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945.

However, I have provided that the Comptroller General "shall, from time to time, review the scope of such examination and the adequacy of the reports thereof" and I have also authorized him to "make such report thereon in writing which he deems advisable to the Farm Credit Administration, to the President, and to the Congress." Under this provision the Comptroller General must, from time to time, review the scope and adequacy of examinations and reports made by the Farm Credit Administration, and if he finds that they are inadequate or if he finds anything to criticize in them, he is authorized to make appropriate reports to the Farm Credit Administration, to the President, and to the Congress. It seems to me that this provision will accomplish every needed purpose so far as these farm credit agencies are concerned, and will avoid placing an unnecessary burden and expense upon these agencies and their farmer borrowers.

I desire also to insert at the end of my remarks a letter I have received from the American Farm Bureau Federation, strongly indorsing my amendment.

What will happen if the amendment is not adopted is this. The audit made under the existing law by the Farm Credit Administration is paid for by your local farm organization. The Farm Credit Administration has to make some four or five thousand audits every year, due to the fact that the audit has to be carried down to the local land bank associations, local P. C. A. Association, and so forth. Now they come along and require the General Accounting Office to duplicate every bit of this work. What does that mean? Under the provisions of the bill the cost of that duplication will be passed right down to your local association, and when the local associations find out that they have been charged twice for the audit, you are going to hear from them, meaning by "you" those of you who represent farm districts. I have never heard a complaint about a single examination made by the Farm Credit Administration. As a matter of fact, I do not know of a single Government department that has a higher standard set for its auditors. The reports are accepted by the country at large, and the best evidence of the fact is that the Federal farm land-bank bonds are selling right up with Government bonds today. If the investing public thought there was anything wrong with the audit those bonds would be at the bottom.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. Is it not a fact that the Comptroller General under the proposed bill could accept the examinations of these auditors of whom the gentleman speaks?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The language is mandatory. He has to make the examination. Let me read the language:

Provided further, That in making the audits provided in said sections the Comptroller General shall, to the fullest extent deemed by him to be practicable, utilize reports of examinations of Government corporations made by a supervising administrative agency pursuant to law.

Under that language, the Comptroller General could "to the fullest extent deemed by him to be practicable" use the audits that have been made by the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. HENRY. So it would not necessarily be a duplication of effort.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do not know if there would be a complete duplication or not. I do know that the bill makes it mandatory upon the General Accounting Office to make audit known. Here you have an auditing agency set up that is recognized from one end of this country to the other as being one of the most competent auditing agencies in America. You are going to disregard its work, paid for by the farms of America, and provide for a second audit by the General Accounting Office, and saddle every penny of that cost upon the farmers.

Mr. HENRY. Does the distinguished gentleman disagree with the statement made by the Comptroller General:

For every exemption granted from its provisions, the Congress will lose just that much of the benefit to be obtained from this uniform pattern of control and independent report.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I certainly do, when it comes to the Farm Credit Administration, because we have a real audit made by that Administration, and have had from the beginning. This Congress set the pattern. This Congress said that those auditors shall measure up in standard to the examiners of the Federal land banks, one of the highest standards we have in this country.

Mr. HENRY. The Comptroller General's Office is, after all, an arm of the Congress.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. So is the Farm Security Administration. But the Comptroller General's Office is not staffed by men of the type of the Federal bank examiners. Everyone knows that. Yet the auditors in the Farm Credit Administration, under act of this Congress, have to measure up to such a standard.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. Under the audit provisions of the First Deficiency Act of 1945, Public, No. 40, the Comptroller General is already directed to make these audits. They are not the commercial type of audits such as we have provided in this bill but are direct Government audits. It means they have to audit every voucher and everything else, and the cost is imposed on the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman is talking about the George law now?

Mr. MANASCO. I am talking about the First Deficiency Act.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Under the George Act, passed in February 1945, that is true, but you do away with the George Act in this proposed legislation.

Mr. MANASCO. The First Deficiency Act provides that.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Here we have an agency set up to audit these farm credit organizations.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman's statement that this bill does away with the George Act, with all due deference, is utterly inaccurate.

The George act provides for the auditing of all Government corporations. So does this act. Under the George Act the Farm Credit Administration contended that the Federal land banks were exempt because they were not wholly owned. Instead of repealing the George Act, instead of destroying it, this bill carries forward and clarifies and improves the language of the George Act. In other words, as the law now stands, it is required that these corporations be audited. This is a more liberal act and a more generous provision than the provisions of the George Act.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that under the substantive law as originally passed setting up the auditing system for the Farm Credit Administration certain standards were established, namely, that these auditors had to measure up to the level of Federal land-bank examiners. The George Act was passed in February 1945 and there was some question as to whether or not it included some of these farm lending agencies.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I know of the gentleman's interest in agriculture. Personally, I have been interested and I was in Congress when the production credit corporations were organized. I doubt if there is a Member who is more interested in production credit than I am. May I say to the gentleman that in the hearings he will find the committee in every way did its dead level best to prevent any duplication of the cost. It is true that these agencies will pay it, but it is also true that people of the United States put the money up for the capital stock of these corporations. It is also true, and I am not saying that the bank examiners are not qualified, but it is also true that one national bank after the other with good bank examiners failed just as fast as they could when the crash of 1929 came upon us.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes; and the Federal land banks examined by these auditors I am speaking of stood up during the whole depression.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With all due respect—I am not criticizing—but is it not true that instead of those audits standing up the Government of the United States doubled the capital stock of the Federal land banks audited by those institutions and that if we had been advised by a look-in we might have discovered long before we did that that capital stock had been impaired? We, I and other Members of Congress, voted money out of the Public Treasury to supplement and double the capital stock of the Federal land banks.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes; and the Federal Government will get every penny of it back. Do not worry about that. Practically all of the banks are in a position now to retire every penny of Government stock.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is a fine statement, and under the terms of this bill, when they do it, they are automatically exempted from it. That is the complete answer to your contention.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It is not the complete answer.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. At least it is in my view.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. We have the best auditing system I know of in this country outside of the national bank system. Why do you want to duplicate it and pass the cost on down to the farmers?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Can the gentleman give the House any idea of the number of corporations within the Farm Credit Administration which would be subject to this audit?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. We have to make each year nearly 5,000 separate audits.

Mr. COOLEY. Does that indicate there are at least 5,000 separate organizations within the Farm Credit?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Why, certainly, when you go down to your local land-bank association, the PCA and the cooperatives, there are at least 5,000.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, every loan made to a cooperative association would come under the supervision of the General Accounting Office?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Absolutely. At present all the local associations are audited by the Farm Credit Administration. When you further provide, as this bill does, that these local associations have to be audited by the General Accounting Office, you simply duplicate the work and the cost.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With all due deference, with respect to 5,000 audits, there are just 12 intermediate credit banks.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I could give the gentleman some figures on that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is true, is it not?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is true.

Mr. COOLEY. You mean production credit associations.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This is the Production Credit Corporation. We are not talking about associations.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. But you have to audit each association. The national level, the district level, the State level, the county level, and when you get down to the county level you break it up into the different associations in the counties.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield to see whether or not the gentleman from Mississippi agrees with that statement?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No. We just provided for the Credit Corporation audits. With all due deference, we have only provided for 101 corporations altogether, and your statement that we would have to audit every little corporation is not supported by this bill.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is the law today. When you require the PCA to be audited, the only way you can audit the PCA is to get right down to the grass roots and start right up and audit every local PCA in America. The same is true of your local Federal land-bank associations.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And you are entitled to do that if you want to, and you pay for it.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is the kind of audit we make, and this bill duplicates the work. For instance, take the Federal Land Bank of Baltimore, which serves Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. You could not audit the Federal Land Bank of Baltimore by going to the general office in Baltimore. The only way the audit could be made would be by going to every local land-bank association in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia and working a complete audit of each association.

LAWS REQUIRING EXAMINATIONS TO BE MADE BY THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION OF CREDIT UNITS UNDER ITS SUPERVISION

Federal land banks, title 12, sections 831, 952, United States Code.

Joint stock land banks, title 12, sections 831, 952, United States Code.

National farm loan associations, title 12, sections 831, 952, United States Code.

SEC. 831. Enumeration (powers of Farm Credit Administration) shall have power—

* * * * *

(e) Requiring reports, etc.; examining banks and associations.

To require reports and statements of condition and to make examinations of all banks or associations doing business under the provisions of this subchapter.

* * * * *

SEC. 952. Requirements, responsibilities, and penalties applicable to examiners; examinations; reports.

Farm credit examiners shall be subject to the same requirements, responsibilities, and penalties as are applicable to national-bank examiners under chapters 2 and 3 of this title and other provisions of law. Whenever directed by the Farm Credit Administration, said examiners shall examine the condition of any national farm loan association and report the same to the Land Bank Commissioner. They shall examine and report the condition of every Federal land bank and joint stock land bank at least once each year. (As amended July 12, 1943, ch. 215, sec. 1, 57 Stat. 424.)

Federal intermediate credit banks, title 12, section 951, United States Code.

SEC. 951. Farm Credit Examiners; appointment; number.

The Farm Credit Administration shall appoint as many farm credit examiners as in its judgment may be required to make careful examinations of the banks and associations permitted to do business under this subchapter and subchapter III of this chapter. (July 17, 1916, ch. 245, sec. 28, 39 Stat. 381; Executive Order No. 6084, Mar. 27, 1933; Aug. 19, 1937, ch. 704, sec. 20, 50 Stat. 710.)

Production credit corporations, title 12, section 1138a, United States Code.

Production credit associations, title 12, section 1138a, United States Code.

Central Bank for Cooperatives, title 12, section 1138a, United States Code.

Banks for cooperatives, title 12, section 1138a, United States Code.

SEC. 1138a. Examination; assessments against corporations for cost of examinations.

At least once each year and at such other times as the Governor deems necessary, the Central Bank for Cooperatives, and each production credit corporation, production credit association, and bank for cooperatives, organized under this chapter, shall be examined by examiners designated by the Governor. The Governor shall assess the cost of such examinations against the bank, association, or corporation examined, which shall pay such costs to the Governor. The amounts so assessed and unpaid shall be a prior lien on all assets of the bank, association, or corporation examined except on assets pledged to secure loans (June 16, 1933, ch. 98, sec. 61, 48 Stat. 267).

Each of the above institutions is required to pay the cost of these examinations by section 601a of the act of September 21, 1944 (Public Law 425, Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944).

"SEC. 601. (a) The Farm Credit Administration shall, prior to the first day of each fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1944, estimate for the ensuing fiscal year the cost of examinations of the joint-stock land banks, Federal land banks, national farm-loan associations, banks for cooperatives, Central Bank for Cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit corporations, and production credit associations; shall apportion the amount so determined among the joint-stock land banks, Federal land banks, banks for cooperatives, Central Bank for Cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit corporations, and production credit associations on such equitable basis as said administration shall determine; and shall assess against and collect in advance the amount so apportioned from the banks, corporations, and other organizations among which the apportionment is made."

The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation are examined by Farm Credit examiners by orders of their respective boards of directors. Each corporation examined pays for the cost of its examination.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., September 11, 1945.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN FLANNAGAN: On behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation I wish to advise you that we heartily support your amendment to H. R. 3660 which eliminates the provision for a separate audit by the Comptroller General of Farm Credit Corporations under the Farm Credit Administration which are already required by existing law to be audited by examiners of the Farm Credit Administration.

We can see no useful purpose in having additional audi of these corporations by the Comptroller General as these corporations have been set up pursuant to acts of Congress and the Farm Credit Administration is specifically charged with the responsibility by various statutes already enacted by Congress, not only to have careful and regular examinations made of these corporations but to exercise supervision over their operations and activities pursuant to various statutory requirements. We see no objection, however, to permitting the Comptroller General to examine the scope and adequacy of these audits by farm credit examiners and to report such findings and recommendations as he sees fit, but to require or permit the Comptroller General to make a separate and additional audit of these corporations places an unfair and unnecessary burden upon them and upon the farmer-borrowers. When all is said and done, the final cost of these audits has to be paid by the farmer-borrowers.

We favor the general objectives of H. R. 3660 to bring Government corporations and their operations under annual scrutiny by Congress to give Congress a greater measure of financial control over their operations, but it is vitally important not to unduly hamper or jeopardize the proper functioning of these agencies which have been set up by Congress to aid agriculture. President O'Neal in a statement submitted to members of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments pursuant to action taken by the Board of Directors supported the general objectives of this legislation but urged a number of amendments to safeguard the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporations and the Tennessee Valley Authority and completely exempt the Farm Credit Agencies under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration from the provisions of this legislation. Since then the bill has been greatly improved and, in the main, the bill as reported by the committee appears to correct most of the objectionable features as they affect these particular agencies. However, the bill still contains a serious defect in the auditing requirements affecting Farm Credit Corporations under the Farm Credit Administration. Your amendment will effectively correct this defect. We sincerely hope that your amendment will be adopted.

Sincerely yours,

W. R. OGG,
Director, Washington Office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the subject matter involved in the bill now under discussion has intrigued me ever since I have been a Member of this body. As some Members know, I have made rather an extensive study of this subject matter, and have been privileged to address the House upon a number of occasions, calling attention to some of the problems that should be dealt with in the matter of control of Government corporations.

I recall that some months ago I discussed the ramifications of the Commodity Credit Corporation for nearly an hour on the floor of this House. I purposed to discuss the ramifications of the Defense Supply Corporation but was foreclosed from doing so on account of limitations of time.

I have had an opportunity, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations in Charge of Appropriations for the Treasury Department, to go at some length into the ramifications of those Government corporations insofar as they affect and utilize the credit of the United States Government itself.

I want to compliment the committee upon recognizing, at long last, the tremendous character of the problem involved, and upon bringing to the Congress the first step in the direction of dealing with this problem. However, let it be said here and now that by the passage of this bill I do not for a moment believe that all of the iniquities which are to be found in the discussion of this problem by the Comptroller General are to be eliminated.

Let me call your attention to this fact, that not one of those corporations owes its existence to anything except the organic law passed by this Congress. Every one of those corporations exists by virtue of the organic law and authority passed by this Congress. Every one of those corporations is utilizing the Government credit under authority given to it by acts of this Congress. The organic law specifies the power that those corporations shall have. It specifies the character of their borrowing power. It says how they shall borrow from the Treasury Department, and indicates that the Treasury Department shall take their notes, debentures, and bonds, and shall raise the money to turn over to those corporations by treating the transaction as a public debt transaction, and taking the money from the sale of the bonds that are being sold from day to day in order to finance the affairs of those corporations.

Nowhere in this bill is there any attempt to limit the power or authority of a single one of these corporations, and the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi stated throughout his entire dissertation on this bill that there was no attempt to repeal any existing organic law. So long therefore as these corporations shall remain in existence they are authorized to carry out the same functions and powers they are now exercising. The only thing this bill does is to place them, after July 1, 1946, under the jurisdiction and control of the Comptroller General as far as audit is concerned. Just remember that. If you will read this bill you will find that despite all of the views that have been expressed here that Mr. Warren wants to dig into these corporations and find out what they have been doing with this money, the limitations of this bill will preclude the General Accounting Office from going back into any transaction happening before July 1, 1946. So those who expect or hope that Lindsay Warren for the purpose of audit is going to be able to dig into all of the transactions of these various and sundry corporations that have been operating, lo, these many years I think are doomed to disappointment by the very language of the act itself which is found on page 6, and I quote:

> The audit shall begin with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of this act.

This would be July 1, 1946. I do not say that in criticism of the bill but I do want it to be understood and I want the public in this country to whom I have addressed myself in the past to know that by the passage of this act we are not going into an examination of what has transpired in the past. We are not going to be advised from the audit of the Comptroller General as to any transactions that may have been illegal or

otherwise in the past. We are turning a new leaf and are saying to the corporations, "Beginning with the fiscal year July 1, 1946, you are going to be subject to the auditing powers of the General Accounting Office."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe it is time we turned over a new leaf and got started right?

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania I do not want to take up too much of my time on that phase, if the gentleman will pardon me. I have complimented the committee on bringing this bill here. The gentleman knows I have stood in the well of this House time and time again and urged that this action be taken, and I am glad the committee has seen fit to take the step, although it does not in my opinion go as far as it should go.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman on that statement.

Mr. KEEFE. I do want to say, however, that in the final paragraph of this bill, namely, section 304, the Congress has finally declared its policy to retrieve the powers that it has given to these corporations that have been exercised by them almost carte blanche, because we provide in that section that these corporations shall continue after June 30, 1948, only in the event that the Congress of the United States by appropriate action sees fit to charter them to carry on the functions the Congress may then prescribe. In that connection I express the hope that between now and June 6, 1948, the vast majority of these corporations will be completely liquidated and that we will create if necessary Government bureaus, and functions, and departments under the complete and continuous control of the Congress to carry on the public business, and do away as I have urged time and time again for more than 2 years—do away with this false and iniquitous vehicle of Government corporations with authority to spend, and spend, and spend, and waste the credit of the people of the United States without the Congress assuming even a modicum of control over them.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I agree and am in accord with the gentleman's views, but may I make this statement. He asked me with respect to the Metals Reserve Company.

Mr. KEEFE. I asked the gentleman in respect to Defense Supplies Corporation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Defense Supplies Corporation. I responded during the course of my argument that Congress itself had done what the gentleman is advocating with respect to that Corporation by providing for its dissolution through public law. I think the gentleman is on sound ground and I would like to see the Congress as fast as practicable provide for the dissolution of these other corporations.

Mr. KEEFE. If I had the time I would like to put in the RECORD the history of this Corporation known as Defense Supplies Corporation. If there is a member of the bar in this body who could read the history or the genesis of the creation of this Defense Supplies Corporation without being completely astounded, then he would be completely impervious to the facts of the situation.

Here is a corporation that was created with vast powers, created by the mere stroke of the pen of the Chairman of the Board of RFC and the Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. No exercise of the right of sovereignty by any sovereign authority, no exercise of the right of sovereignty by any State, no exercise of any right of sovereignty of any political subdivision, but by the mere stroke of a pen by the Chairman of the RFC and the Secretary of that Corporation they create a corporation and say, "Now, here are the articles of association which we have written; here are the bylaws which we have written. We have now created a corporation with vast powers to handle and expend the money of the people of the United States."

Mr. Chairman, it is one of the greatest stories that could be told on this floor to show the ridiculous extent to which we have gone in this matter of Government corporations. I congratulate the committee and I hope this bill will pass without a dissenting vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I hope it will be possible to get a vote on this bill today, so I will not delay the committee. May I say only this: that it is not our purpose in bringing in this legislation to handicap or to hamstring any Government corporation or to interfere in the least with its carrying out the functions for which it was set up. Rather it is just to make sure that each corporation does carry out the functions for which it was set up, under proper control and proper supervision, that this bill was prepared and brought in by the committee.

I agree with others who have spoken that surely it would be a mistake to exempt this or that corporation from the provisions of the bill. If the affairs of a corporation are in proper order why should it hesitate to have a proper independent audit by the agency of the Congress? It seems to me the first thing that might raise a question as to the credit of a particular corporation would be for its sponsors to insist that it be exempt from these audit and budgetary provisions.

I hope we will pass this act immediately and that it will be passed promptly by the other body, not because we do not want Government corporations to function properly, but so we can be sure that they will function properly.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to duplication, I recall the gentleman's interest in that subject, and I recall also the questions that he propounded. In order to prevent duplication of audit and costs, I want to call attention to the language on page 10 as follows:

Provided further, That in making the audits provided in said sections the Comptroller General shall, to the fullest extent deemed by him to be practicable, utilize reports of examinations of Government corporations made by a supervising administrative agency pursuant to law.

Not only did we have his statement that he would do that, not only have we stated it in our report, but we have provided here in the strongest language that we could that there will be no duplication and that those reports shall be made; except we have not closed the door so that he, the Comptroller General, the arm of Congress, the agent of Congress, can go behind those if at any time he feels he should do it in order to give the facts to the Congress.

Mr. JUDD. Yes. It seems to me we have done all that it is possible to do to avoid duplication and unnecessary expenditures of money for audits and still carry out our first responsibility, namely, to protect the stockholders of these corporations, and those stockholders are the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Under the language of the section the gentleman from Mississippi referred to, the audit on the part of the Accounting Office is mandatory; is that not true?

Mr. JUDD. By the General Accounting Office?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; it is mandatory.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And the General Accounting Office is required to make another audit?

Mr. JUDD. He is required to make an audit but he shall to the fullest extent deemed by him to be practicable utilize the reports and audits made by the corporations themselves or their supervising administrative agencies.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It is mandatory that he shall make a second audit.

Mr. JUDD. No; not a second audit; it is required that he shall make an audit and in making that audit he shall use the material already available to him if it seems satisfactory. It is a commercial type audit independent of the periodic examination some of these banks and corporations are required by law to have made by their supervising agency. It is mandatory to make such a regular commercial audit in order to report to Congress regarding the financial condition of the corporations.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. But section 301 makes it mandatory upon the General Accounting Office to make this second audit.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is nothing said about a second audit in the whole bill.

Mr. JUDD. Not a second audit; an audit. Surely that is the job of the General Accounting Office to make audits for the benefit of Congress.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Every Member of Congress should be cognizant of the fact that under the existing law of today every farm credit organization has to be audited. That is one audit.

Mr. JUDD. And so do most of these other corporations have their own audits.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Oh, no; not written into the law by Congress and the standard set up by Congress, as in the case of the Farm Credit Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Surely the gentleman would not expect the stockholders in a private bank to ask anything less than an independent audit of the financial transactions of the bank; and how can we therefore ask the people of the United States who are the stockholders of these corporations to expect less than an independent audit of the financial transactions and conditions of these corporations which they own in whole or in part?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. We already have an independent audit by the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. JUDD. It is an auditing system set up by itself, is it not?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The Farm Credit Administration administers the laws with respect to the farm loaning agencies under it. It is a supervising agency clothed with the power and commanded by Congress to make audits of all of these farm-loaning agencies, and is required to employ auditors of a standing equal to national-bank examiners.

Mr. JUDD. Surely when the Comptroller General reviews those audits, if they are in perfect order, then he will, under the language of the bill, utilize those audits to the fullest extent, but we want him to be in a position to go into any corporation's books, if there is anything that requires attention, to make an independent audit. Not a person is suggesting there is anything wrong with the financial transactions of the Farm Credit Administration. It should welcome this audit, which is to protect the corporation whose affairs are in proper order, as well as to expose the corporation whose activities have gone beyond legal authorization, if such there be.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Why would there be so much virtue in an audit made by the General Accounting Office who can employ a schoolgirl or a schoolboy, whereas here, on the other hand, we have an auditing system set up by Congress requiring auditors to measure up to the standard of Federal bank examiners?

Mr. JUDD. When they have such a good auditing system, why should they object to review or audit by the agency of the Congress?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. They are not objecting. It is the farmer who is going to be saddled with the cost.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am curious and am looking for information. Does this bill provide and practically inform the people of the United States that no audits have been made of these corporations heretofore, and that this is the beginning of the audits of these corporations? I am asking the chairman of the committee that question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No, and we have never so stated. There have been audits made by the corporations themselves, but they have not been made by an independent agency of the Government.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Under the Comptroller General?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. By the Comptroller General. In other words, the Comptroller General is the agency of Congress in making audits. Heretofore he has never been authorized and never been required to make audits of corporations.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But has there been an annual audit of each of the separate corporations?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think so. I think the departments of government, audited by the Comptroller General, have to have audits of some kind to keep up with their expenditures. There is nothing new about the departmental audit. If a department is properly administered, it has to have an audit, but that would not prevent the Comptroller General from going in there and making an audit for us.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

THE TVA AND THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the chairman, who brought this bill before the House, on the very able explanation he has made of it, and to express myself as entirely in accord with its provisions. I think it is a step in the right direction.

I now direct this inquiry to the distinguished chairman. I read on page 5 of the bill:

> Nothing in this proviso shall be construed as affecting the powers reserved to the Tennessee Valley Authority in the act of November 21, 1941.

As I understand it, the meaning of the provision is that the Tennessee Valley Authority is in no wise curtailed or crippled or interfered with in its operations under the general law creating it. It simply provides for an audit of its affairs, which is now the law.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is generally correct. No substantive law respecting the TVA or any other corporation provided for in this bill is changed generally. It will say with respect to that particular provision that it just covers the matter of the expenditures in the discretion of the directors. Section 26 covers the reinvestment of proceeds and receipts, as the gentleman knows, and that is preserved in this bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. In that connection may I say that by reason of the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the construction and operation by it of a series of 20 dams and 6 steam-generating plants, when this war came on there was available in the Tennessee Valley an abundance of electrical energy, as a result of which the Aluminum Co., which owns perhaps the largest plant in the world, at Alcoa, in my district, was able to more than double its output of aluminum, which material in abundance enabled this country to build a fleet of fighting and bombing planes that darkened the skies over every battle front wherever this war was waged. It generated and distributed in 1945 more than 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power. Within 30 miles of Knoxville more than 250,000 men and women in 1945 were engaged in war production. Each and every plant in which they were employed obtained its power from the TVA.

In addition, by reason of the existence of this abundance of electrical energy, the United States Government located in my district the Clinton engineering project, at which was developed the atomic bomb, two of which bombs blew Japan out of the war. It was thought 10 bombs might be required to put her out, but 2 did the job.

That great project is located on an area of 56,000 acres in Anderson and Roane Counties in my district. The project was begun in December 1942. It was a secret and therefore unprecedented effort to capture and utilize atomic energy. It was conducted under the supervision of Gen. Leslie R. Groves, one of the ablest and most courteous gentlemen with whom it has ever been my pleasure to come in contact. The local enterprise was under the control of Col. Kenneth Nichols, of Cleveland, Ohio. Colonel Nichols is an able man of fine personality. He did a great job of managing the operation on the ground. After this project was started, I knew it was a secret undertaking and I did not go out there because I did not want to know what the Government said it did not want people to know. Within the brief period since December 1942 and this good hour, the Government built on that area the largest city ever constructed by the Federal Government. Oakridge, the name of the town, has 300 miles of streets and a modern system of sewers and waterworks. It has a population of 75,000 people. The total cost of the project is more than $2,000,000,000. More than 1,000 scientists contributed to the success of the enterprise, and people from every State in the Union worked on the project. I have this attitude toward that expenditure: It is worth all it cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, this expenditure of $2,000,000,000 dollars is entirely justified by the results. The use of the two bombs dropped on Japan most likely saved the lives of 500,000 American boys. The Army officers who planned their use thought perhaps it might take 10 of the bombs to put Japan out of the war, but only 2 did the work.

There is one plant there which cost $500,000,000. It is bigger than the Willow Run plant. The elements which enter into the bomb will last for a long time and can be stockpiled. These materials become dangerous only when assembled

and there is no necessity to assemble the materials unless it is necessary to use a bomb. People gossiped and said an effort was being made to crack the atom, but nobody knew the processes by which it was being done. I assume that what has been told about achieving this triumph is common knowledge but I take it that the secret process by which this marvelous instrumentality of destruction was brought about will be retained within the knowledge of the scientists of this country. This Nation will never use the new bomb in a war of aggression. Some other nation might. We have no moral right to disclose this great discovery to those who might use it against us.

The only way to keep a secret is to keep it. You do not need help to keep it. When you ask others to help you keep your secret, they in turn will also seek help, and soon what was your secret is common knowledge. The atomic bomb was developed by English, Canadian, and American scientists with the help of an Austrian and a Danish scientist, but the ultimate achievement is the property of our country. The existence of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the inland isolation of the site where the project was located, and the great supply of patriotic and efficient labor available brought about the location of this plant in Anderson and Roane Counties, Tenn., More than 100,000 men and women from all over the Nation put their muscle, skill, learning, and devotion into the success achieved. It is the triumph of intellect over matter, a demonstration that free men and free women in a land of free enterprise are the superiors of the regimented peoples of the totalitarian states. They extended their devoted efforts in the devastating and victorious force that put Japan down and out, and gave the United States final and complete triumph over the last of the Axis powers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if I understood the chairman of the committee correctly, he obtained permission from the Speaker that we might include in our remarks certain excerpts from the hearings.

With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks page 23 of Report No. 856, which shows the financial condition of Government corporations as of March 31, 1945.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement follows:

FINANCIAL CONDITION OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AS OF MARCH 31, 1945

The following table is a combined balance sheet of Government corporations as of March 31, 1945, and reflects total gross assets of $29,600,000,000, gross liabilities of $28,400,000,000, and net worth of $1,200,000,000.

Assets: Of the $29,600,000,000 in gross assets, $9,400,000,000 represent intercorporate assets, leaving net total assets of $20,200,000,000. Included in this $20,200,000,000, however, is $1,000,000,000 representing interagency assets due from other Government agencies. Of the total gross assets, the major items, after taking out reserves for valuation and estimated losses, consist of $13,300,000,000 in loans receivable; $7,800,000,000 in land, structures, and equipment; $2,900,000,000 in commodities, supplies, and materials; $2,100,000,000 in investments and $1,600,000,000 in other receivables.

Liabilities: Of the $28,400,000,000 in gross liabilities, $8,900,000,000 represent intercorporate liabilities, leaving net total liabilities of $19,500,000,000. Included in this $19,500,000,000, however, are $13,600,000,000 representing interagency liabilities due to the Treasury and other Government agencies. Of the total gross liabilities, $22,000,000,000 were in bonds, notes, and debentures issued by the corporations, of which $11,600,000,000 were held by the Treasury, $8,100,000,000 were held by Government corporations, and $2,300,000,000 were held by the public.

Net worth: While the combined net worth of the corporations is reported as $1,200,000,000, this amount includes $451,000,000 belonging to private interests, leaving $750,000,000 as the net capital investment of the United States in the corporations as a group.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, my only reason for taking the time of the House at this hour of the day is to make a few brief observations for the RECORD.

In my opinion we are engaging in some of the most fantastic financial activities that any country on earth ever participated in. I do not know just what our people will finally do when they comprehend what all this means from the standpoint of servicing, to say nothing about amortizing, the Federal debt, and when it comes down to carrying the tax burden which will be imposed upon us, incident to that debt.

I think Mr. Morgenthau in his final statement to the Congress at the time he left the office of Secretary of the Treasury, in pointing out that the two big things which will undoubtedly control the fiscal policy of the Government is whether or not we have a reasonable peace for several years to come, and whether or not we have full employment, struck the keynote, as far as I am concerned. These Government corporations which this bill somewhat attempts to control have run wild in so many directions that it is utterly impossible for the average person to comprehend what the show is all about.

The statement which I am placing in the RECORD, which comes from the report, shows assets of $29,600,000,000, liabilities $28,400,000,000, with a net worth of $1,200,000,000.

I think the committee is exceedingly wise in going as far as it has at this particular time with this bill. Personally, I am not at all satisfied with the exceptions or exemptions which are carried in the bill as far as TVA is concerned, but that is a very difficult matter to deal with. This committee is not the only one which has wrestled with that particular problem.

Mr. Chairman, also as a part of my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD section 26 of the May 18, 1933, TVA Act and the amended section 26 of that particular act which came about in a bill approved August 31, 1935:

SECTION 26 OF THE MAY 18, 1933, TVA ACT

SEC. 26. The net proceeds derived by the Board from the sale of power and any of the products manufactured by the Corporation, after deducting the cost of operation, maintenance, depreciation, amortization, and an amount deemed by the Board as necessary to withhold as operating capital, or devoted by the Board to new construction, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year.

SECTION 26 OF THE MAY 18, 1933, TVA ACT, AS AMENDED AUGUST 31, 1935

SEC. 26. Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation, and from any other activities of the Corporation, including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients. A continuing fund of $1,000,000 is also excepted from the requirements of this section and may be withheld by the Board to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the use by the Board, after June 30, 1936, of proceeds accruing prior to July 1, 1936, for the payment of obligations lawfully incurred prior to such latter date.

I also include as a part of my remarks the act of November 21, 1941, which consists of only one paragraph, so that we will have in the RECORD in this debate the provisions which are carried in the present proposal and which act as an umbrella in protecting the substantive law pertaining to the Tennessee Valley Authority:

[Public Law 306—77th Cong., ch. 485—1st sess.]

H. R. 4961

An act to amend section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended by section 14 of the act of August 31, 1935

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (b) of the original Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended by section 14 of the act of August 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1080), be, and the same is hereby, further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to relieve the treasurer or other accountable officers or employees of the Corporation from compliance with the provisions of existing law requiring the rendition of accounts for adjustment and settlement pursuant to section 236, Revised Statutes, as amended by section 305 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 24), and accounts for all receipts and disbursements by or for the Corporation shall be rendered accordingly: *Provided*, That, subject only to the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, the Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures and to enter into such contracts, agreements, and arrangements, upon such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may deem necessary, including the final settlement of all claims and litigation by or against the Corporation; and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office, in the settlement of the accounts of the treasurer or other accountable officer or employee of the Corporation, shall not disallow credit for, nor withhold funds because of, any expenditure which the Board shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of said act.

"The Corporation shall determine its own system of administrative accounts and the forms and contents of its contracts and other business documents except as otherwise

provided in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended."

Approved, November 21, 1941.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With those additions in the RECORD, perhaps we will have a clearer concept of just how far this bill goes, insofar as the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority are concerned. If I were an auditor sent out by the General Accounting Office to make an audit of the TVA records, I would not feel that this bill gave me the authority with respect to the TVA, which it does with respect to the other corporations listed on pages 2 and 3 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the author of the bill a question. What, if any, effect does this bill have upon a public power and irrigation district created under State law, managed by a board of directors elected pursuant to State law, but which obtained its funds by means of a grant and a loan from the PWA and the bonds created by the loan are now held by the Government of the United States?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. They are not embraced in the terms of this bill. This bill has nothing more to do with them than it does with the many other thousands of debtors to the RFC and the United States.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman and, Mr. Chairman, yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the absence of so many Members from the floor during the discussion of this bill is proof positive to me that they have the utmost confidence in the chairman of the committee and also the members of the committee.

The bill itself embodies the principles for which the Republican Party organization here in the House has contended ever since the coming of the New Deal. For the last 12 years the administration in power has been creating corporations and appropriating billions upon billions of dollars, much of which was spent without any supervision or control by the Congress. The Republicans have always contended ever since the beginning of the New Deal that the Congress itself, which is charged with the responsibility of appropriating the taxpayers' money should retain some supervision, some control over the expenditure of those billions of dollars. This legislation will give us not the full measure of control which we should have over every governmental agency and every organization created under the authority of law enacted by the Congress, but it gives us at least a part of that control and I know of no one who really opposes it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman join me in going so far as to say that he believes the step here taken will enable us to take further steps later on?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes; I believe we should go further later on; and I know that the Republicans individually and as an organization are extremely grateful to the President for coming out and endorsing this measure which they have so long advocated.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, under general permission secured in the House by the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein excerpts from letters, and other matters.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Government Corporation Control Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to bring Government corporations and their transactions and operations under annual scrutiny by the Congress and provide current financial control thereof.

TITLE I—WHOLLY OWNED GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

SEC. 101. As used in this act the term "wholly owned Government corporation" means the Commodity Credit Corporation; Federal Intermediate Credit Banks; Production Credit Corporations; Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations; Farmers Home Corporation; Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Defense Plant Corporation; Defense Supplies Corporation; Metals Reserve Company; Rubber Reserve Company; War Damage Corporation; Federal National Mortgage Association; The RFC Mortgage Company; Disaster Loan Corporation; Inland Waterways Corporation; Warrior River Terminal Company; the Virgin Islands Company; Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated; United States Spruce Production Corporation; Institute of Inter-American Affairs; Institute of Inter-American Transportation; Inter-American Educational Foundation, Incorporated; Inter-American Navigation Corporation; Prencinradio, Incorporated; Cargoes, Incorporated; Export-Import Bank of Washington; Petroleum Reserves Corporation; Rubber Development Corporation; U. S. Commercial Company; Smaller War Plants Corporation; Federal Public Housing Authority (or United States Housing Authority) and including public housing projects financed from appropriated funds and operations thereof; Defense Homes Corporation; Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; Home Owners' Loan Corporation; United States Housing Corporation; Panama Railroad Company; Tennessee Valley Authority; and Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Incorporated.

SEC. 102. Each wholly owned Government corporation shall cause to be prepared annually a budget program, which shall be submitted to the President through the Bureau of the Budget on or before September 15 of each year. The Bureau of the Budget, under such rules and regulations as the President may establish, is authorized and directed to prescribe the form and content of, and the manner in which such budget program shall be prepared and presented. The budget program shall be a business-type budget, or plan of operations, with due allowance given to the need for flexibility, including provision for emergencies and contingencies, in order that the corporation may properly carry out its activities as authorized by law. The budget program shall contain estimates of the financial condition and operations of the corporation for the current and ensuing fiscal years and the actual condition and results of operation for the last completed fiscal year. Such budget program shall include a statement of financial condition, a statement of income and expense, an analysis of surplus or deficit, a statement of sources and application of funds, and such other supplementary statements and information as are necessary or desirable to make known the financial condition and operations of the corporation. Such statements shall include estimates of operations by major types of activities, together with estimates of administrative expenses, estimates of borrowings, and estimates of the amount of Government capital funds which shall be returned to the Treasury during the fiscal year or the appropriations required to provide for the restoration of capital impairments.

SEC. 103. The budget programs of the corporations as modified, amended, or revised by the President shall be transmitted to the Congress as a part of the annual Budget required by the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921. Amendments to the annual budget programs may be submitted from time to time.

Budget programs shall be submitted for all wholy owned Government corporations covering operations for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1946, and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 104. The Budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress shall be considered and, if necessary, legislation shall be enacted making available such funds or other financial resources as the Congress may determine. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing wholly owned Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor shall any provisions of this section be construed as affecting in any way the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as affecting the existing authority of any wholly owned Government corporation to make contracts or other commitments without reference to fiscal-year limitations.

SEC. 105. The financial transactions of wholly owned Government corporations shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*, That such rules and regulations may provide for the retention at the offices of such corporations, in whole or in part, of any accounts of accountable officers, covering corporate financial transactions, which are required by existing law to be settled and adjusted in the General Accounting Office, and for the settlement and adjustment of such accounts in whole or in part upon the basis of examinations in the course of the audit herein provided, but nothing in this proviso shall be construed as affecting the powers reserved to the Tennessee Valley Authority in the act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 775). The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the respective corporations are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office

shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the respective corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians. The audit shall begin with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of this act.

SEC. 106. A report of each such audit for each fiscal year ending on June 30 shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a statement (showing intercorporate relations) of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expenses; a statement of sources and application of funds; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the several corporations, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including a report of any impairment of capital noted in the audit and recommendations for the return of such Government capital or the payment of such dividends as, in his judgment, should be accomplished. The reports shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to the corporation concerned at the time submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 107. Whenever it is deemed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the President, to be practicable and in the public interest that any wholly owned Government corporation be treated with respect to its appropriations, expenditures, receipts, accounting, and other fiscal matters as if it were a Government agency other than a corporation, the Director shall include in connection with the Budget program of such corporation in the Budget a recommendation to that effect. If the Congress approves such recommendation in connection with the budget program for any fiscal year, such corporation, with respect to subsequent fiscal years, shall be regarded as an establishment other than a corporation for the purposes of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and other provisions of law relating to appropriations, expenditures, receipts, accounts, and other fiscal matters, and shall not be subject to the provisions of this act other than this section. The corporate entity shall not be affected by this section.

TITLE II—MIXED-OWNERSHIP GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

SEC. 201. As used in this act the term "mixed-ownership Government corporations" means (1) the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives, (2) Federal land banks, (3) Federal home loan banks, and (4) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

SEC. 202. The financial transactions of mixed-ownership Government corporations for any period during which Government capital has been invested therein shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the respective corporations are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the respective corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians. The audit shall begin with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of this act.

SEC. 203. A report of each such audit for each fiscal year ending on June 30 shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a statement (showing intercorporate relations) of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expense; a statement of sources and application of funds; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of, and the use of Government capital by, each such corporation, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including a report of any impairment of capital or lack of sufficient capital noted in the audit and recommendations for the return of such Government capital or the payment of such dividends as, in his judgment, should be accomplished. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to the corporation concerned at the time submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 204. The President shall include in the annual Budget any recommendations he may wish to make as to the return of Government capital to the Treasury by any mixed-ownership corporation.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. (a) The expenses of auditing the financial transactions of wholly owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations as provided in sections 105 and 202 of this act shall be borne out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office, and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized: *Provided*, That each such corporation shall reimburse the General Accounting Office for the full cost of any such audit as billed therefor by the Comptroller General, and the General Accounting Office shall deposit the sums so reimbursed into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That in making the audits provided in said sections the Comptroller General shall, to the fullest extent deemed by him to be practicable, utilize reports of examinations of Government corporations made by a supervising administrative agency pursuant to law.

(b) For the purpose of conducting such audit the Comptroller General is authorized in his discretion to employ not more than 10 persons without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, only one of whom may be compensated at a rate of as much as but not more than $10,000 per annum, and to employ by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, professional services of firms and organizations for temporary periods or for special purposes.

(c) The audit provided in sections 105 and 202 of this act shall be in lieu of any audit of the financial transactions of any Government corporation required to be made by the General Accounting Office for the purpose of a report to the Congress or to the President under any existing law.

(d) Unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no funds of any Government corporation shall be used to pay the cost of any private audit of the financial records of the offices of such corporation, except the cost of such audits contracted for and undertaken prior to April 25, 1945.

SEC. 302. The banking or checking accounts of all wholly owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations shall be kept with the Treasurer of the United States, or, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, with a Federal Reserve bank, or with a bank designated as a depositary or fiscal agent of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may waive the requirements of this section under such conditions as he may determine: *And provided further*, That this section will not apply to the establishment and maintenance in any bank for a temporary period of banking and checking accounts not in excess of $50,000 in any one bank. The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit corporations, the Central Bank for Cooperatives, the regional banks for cooperatives, or the Federal land banks, except that each such corporation shall be required to report annually to the Secretary of the Treasury the names of the depositaries in which such corporation keeps a banking or checking account, and the Secretary of the Treasury may make a report in writing to the corporation, to the President, and to the Congress which he deems advisable upon receipt of any such annual report.

SEC. 303. (a) All bonds, notes, debentures, and other similar obligations which are hereafter issued by any wholly owned or mixed-ownership Government corporation and offered to the public shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, shall bear such rates of interest, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, shall be issued in such manner and at such times and sold at such prices as have been or as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) Hereafter, no wholly owned or mixed-ownership Government corporation shall sell or purchase any direct obligation of the United States or obligation guaranteed as to principal or interest, or both, for its own account and in its own right and interest, at any one time aggregating in excess of $100,000, without the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may waive the requirement of his approval with respect to any transaction or classes of transactions subject to the provisions of this subsection for such period of time and under such conditions as he may determine.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to exercise any of the functions vested in him by this section through any officer or employee of any Federal agency whom he may designate, with the concurrence of the head of the agency concerned, for such purpose.

(d) Any mixed-ownership Government corporation from which Government capital has been entirely withdrawn shall not be subject to the provisions of section 302 or of this section during the period such corporation remains without Government capital. The provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not be applicable to Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit corporations, the Central Bank for Cooperatives, the regional banks for cooperatives, or the Federal land banks, except that each such corporation shall be required to consult with the Secretary of the Treasury prior to taking any action of the kind covered by the

provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and in the event an agreement is not reached, the Secretary of the Treasury may make a report in writing to the corporation, to the President, and to the Congress stating the grounds for his disagreement.

SEC. 304. (a) No corporation shall be created, organized, or acquired hereafter by any officer or agency of the Federal Government or by any Government corporation for the purpose of acting as an agency or instrumentality of the United States, except by act of Congress or pursuant to an act of Congress specifically authorizing such action.

(b) No wholly owned Government corporation created by or under the laws of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States or any political subdivision thereof, or under the laws of the District of Columbia, shall continue after June 30, 1948, as an agency or instrumentality of the United States, and no funds of, or obtained from, the United States or any agency thereof, including corporations, shall be invested in or employed by any such corporation after that date, except for purposes of liquidation. The proper corporate authority of every such corporation shall take the necessary steps to institute dissolution or liquidation proceedings on or before that date: *Provided*, That prior thereto any such corporation may be reincorporated by act of Congress for such purposes and term of existence and with such powers, privileges, and duties as authorized by such act, including the power to take over the assets and assume the liabilities of its respective predecessor corporation.

Mr. MANASCO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that it be open to amendment to any section.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object, but make the suggestion that the Chair announce the sections numerically so that amendments may be offered, if desired, to the sections as announced.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will adopt the gentleman's suggestion.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 101? Section 102?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take all of the time allotted me, but I have had no opportunity to speak on the pending bill today and there is one thought I want to express.

The Members of the House will realize that from my point of view the work of some of these Government corporations has been most valuable to the Nation. I am not speaking about all of them now; I am speaking about some of them, and I will not take the trouble to differentiate. In other words, I would fight very hard in favor of legislation to continue some of these corporations and the work that they are doing, particularly those the work of which is specifically outlined by the Congress in attempts to meet certain definite objectives which have been carefully set forth in the legislation. From that point of view, may I say that I am very much in favor of the legislation. I think it is the kind of thing the Congress should have been doing for a long time.

The only difficulty is that this is what might be called broadax legislation. In other words, we take the whole problem that we have recognized as piling up, and we try to deal with it in one piece of legislation. We lay down broad, sound principles.

I want to try to point out what the root of this problem actually is. What this bill really means is that the right of existence and all the acts of every one of these Government corporations, whether it was created by the Congress in the first place by specific legislation or not, is going to be subject to congressional review and congressional scrutiny. I think it implies more than that. It implies the basic duty of the Congress to legislate specifically and in detail not only about every one of these corporations but also about the other problems of government. That is something which we have not always done, but when we pass this bill we are placing that obligation upon ourselves. The real answer to this problem of the proper place of the Congress in the American Government lies not only in the passage of legislation like this to assert congressional control, which is proper, but lies even more fundamentally in the original instance of passing legislation in sufficient detail and with sufficient care and spending enough time on it so that we outline exactly what the functions of a Government agency are supposed to be and provide in the first instance for the kind of thing that we provide here for Government corporations as a whole. That is the way our job must be done.

As I said in the beginning of my remarks, there are some of these corporations for whose continuance I would fight very hard. I would also fight very hard to have their powers and duties specifically defined and as carefully as Congress can do it, to have the safeguards of this legislation concerning audit control and such matters as that. We should look at this problem as it really is, because, after all, we are not going to meet the future problems of this Nation, as momentous as that future is and as fraught with new elements as it is, merely by control. We are going to have to meet it by dynamic forward-looking action. When we take that forward-looking action, let us take it in accordance with the spirit of this bill and see to it that congressional control over it may be had and that a congressional outline of exact functions is also carried therein.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments to section 102? Any amendments to section 103? Sections 104, 105, 106, 107? Section 201, page 8? Section 202? Section 203? Section 204? Section 301, page 10?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLANNAGAN: On page 11, line 3, after the period, insert the following: "In the case of any wholly owned or mixed-ownership Government corporation which is specifically required by law to be examined at least annually by examiners appointed or designated by the Farm Credit Administration, such examinations shall be in lieu of the requirements of sections 105, 106, 202, and 203 of this act and of section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945 (Public Law 4, 79th Cong.); but the Comptroller General shall from time to time review the scope of such examination and the adequacy of the reports thereof, and may make such report thereon in writing which he deems advisable to the Farm Credit Administration, to the President, and to the Congress."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, we had a rather full discussion of this amendment. I do not believe anything further can be said one way or the other. I think those present understand the nature of it. The only purpose of the amendment is to keep the farmers of America from being saddled with this additional burden. As I stated awhile ago, the substantive law provides for an audit of every one of these farm-credit agencies. The bill, as drawn, provides that another audit shall be made of each one of those agencies, and my amendment would eliminate that mandatory provision in the bill with respect to these farm loaning agencies.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto and all amendments to the pending section close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in the very kindest spirit permit me to say that the pending amendment is wholly unjustified. Under the guise of amending this section and this bill the amendment provides that the only truly independent audit that Congress has ever provided for the Farm Credit Administration shall be repealed. There is in this amendment the provision that section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945, the George Act, shall not apply to the Farm Credit Administration; in other words, in addition to being exempt from the provisions of the pending bill, the gentleman's amendment would exempt the Farm Credit Administration from the provisions of the existing law, to wit, the George bill, as amended and clarified by the First Deficiency Act of 1945.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this, that the members of this committee were as diligent as the members of any other committee interested, as many of them are, directly in agriculture, in seeing that there be no duplication, and in an effort to prevent any duplication and in the very best language we provide that the Comptroller General shall utilize—and I read:

To the fullest extent deemed by him to be practical * * * reports of examinations of Government corporations made by a supervising administrative agency pursuant to law.

There are other agencies that make their examinations. The Home Loan Bank Administration has its examiners, and I dare say they are as well qualified as the examiners of the Farm Credit Administration, yet Federal home-loan banks are included in this bill.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, having to do with banks in

every State in the Nation, is also included. In an effort to be doubly fair, in an effort to prevent any duplication, we asked the Comptroller General to give us a written statement that he would not duplicate and that he would not disregard these independent audits. He submitted a letter to the committee on June 15, 1945, and in that letter stated that it was his plan and his purpose, as the independent agency of the Congress, to utilize these reports, but that it would not be fair at all to prevent his taking a look at the farm credit corporations or other similar corporations to see whether or not these corporations had complied with the law under which they function. There is a need for the examination and reports made under the direction of the Farm Credit Administration. They are essential to good administration, but they are not a substitute for the independent audit by the Comptroller General. In addition to that statement and, in addition to the substantive language of the bill, the committee report on page 9 states that it is the intent of this bill that not only the audits of these agencies such as the Farm Credit Administration are to be considered, but that the audits of the Federal home-loan banks in the municipalities of the country, and those made by any other agencies shall be utilized where there are independent audits under the pending bill to the end that there may be no duplication. The Congress wants its agent to audit and report on both the Farm Credit and the corporations under its control.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman made a statement which I know he wants to correct, that if this amendment is adopted the farm-lending agencies will no longer be audited.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I made the statement that if the amendment is adopted there would be no independent audit and I repeat it. The language is, and I quote from the gentleman's amendment:

Such examinations—

That is, the examinations by his examiners—

shall be in lieu of the requirements of sections 105, 106, 202, and 203 of this act and of section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945.

The latter is the George Act. In other words, it absolutely exempts the Farm Credit Administration from the provisions of the George Act.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I want to correct the record. Prior to the George Act all of these farm-lending agences were audited.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, by the Farm Credit Administration. It makes its own audit. We do not argue that. I have stated that not only the Farm Credit Administration but the Federal home-loan banks and other agencies make audits, but they are not exempted from the George Act. Because the Farm Credit Administration audits and examines comparable to other examiners, no better and maybe no worse, there is no occasion to exempt it or others. I maintain that no corporation of any kind or character should be exempted from the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 302? Section 303? Section 304?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GORE) having assumed the chair, Mr. COOLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3660) to provide for financial control of Government corporations, pursuant to House Resolution 339, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill just passed may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

FINANCIAL CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, may I say that it is a source of gratification that this bill passed unanimously.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN (at the request of Mr. WHITTINGTON) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made previously today and to include therein a short magazine article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article and, further, to extend his remarks and include therein some correspondence.

Mr. LEFEVRE (at the request of Mr. JUDD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

STATE FAIRGROUNDS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the War Department at the beginning of this war took over a number of State fairgrounds throughout the country on leases that ran for the duration and 6 months at $1 a year. I have offered a bill today directing the Secretary of War, upon the request of the respective governors, to return the fairgrounds within a period of 60 days and restore the buildings to the condition in which they were at the time they took them over. This will assure resumption of State fairs next year. This will be helpful to both industry and American farmers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON THE DAYLIGHT-SAVING BILL AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD within five legislative days on the daylight-saving bill, H. R. 3974.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, may I inquire from the majority leader as to what the program is going to be for the rest of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no further legislation for the remainder of the week. The Members being advised may govern themselves accordingly. On Monday, the bill out of the Committee on Military Affairs having to do with voluntary enlistments will be brought up. It is my understanding that if there is a roll call vote on that bill the roll call will take place on Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is my understanding.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder why the Military Affairs Committee bill on voluntary enlistments was set over

until Monday. I understood it was coming up tomorrow and I think it is of such vital importance that it ought not to be delayed any longer than is absolutely necessary.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I can say to the gentleman is that the action was taken insofar as I know as the result of the suggestion of members of the committee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. May I say to the gentleman that what we are attempting to do is to encourage voluntary enlistments.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is to the end that we can hasten the termination of the draft and replace every single soldier who is serving abroad. I think we ought to hurry.

Mr. McCORMACK. I concur in every statement that the gentleman has made with reference to the hastening of voluntary enlistments. But the gentleman asked me why the bill was going to be brought up on Monday. My understanding is that that is what was desired by the members of the committee handling the bill. Naturally, since the committee had such a desire, it is my recollection, though I may be wrong as I was not on the floor, that the ranking member of the committee was to submit the unanimous consent request. In other words, it was in agreement with the desires of the members of the committee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I want to make it clear that we came down here 10 days before the Congress convened and worked to get that legislation out. I do not understand why it is delayed another week. I am not saying it is the fault of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that on tomorrow you will probably adjourn over until Monday. Is that the intention?

Mr. McCORMACK. We probably will meet on Friday, but there will be no legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the reason for meeting on Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state now but I will advise the gentleman tomorrow. However, the chances are that we may meet on Friday, but there will be no business transacted.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is curious, if you do not have any legislation scheduled why we do not know. A great many would like to know whether they should be here or not.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing that will require the presence of Members on Friday if we do meet.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if he will not try to get that bill up tomorrow or Friday. I think it is vitally important to the country to get this legislation passed.

Mr. McCORMACK. The arrangement has been made. I was not on the floor at the time. All I know is that I was asked if I had any objection to the unanimous-consent request being made that it be in order to consider the bill on Monday, with 3 hours' general debate. I have no knowledge of the reasons why that request was made. I simply said that I had no objection. I understand the House has already agreed by unanimous consent that the bill be considered on Monday next, with 3 hours' general debate. If I had known the gentleman's views, certainly I would not have made such an agreement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think probably the committee did not know when this bill would be finished. They knew the other bill would require more than 1 day and wanted to start it on Monday and have the vote on Tuesday. I think that was the situation.

Mr. RICH. The chairman of the committee made the request that it be taken up on Monday. It was done that way in order to obviate the necessity of going before the Rules Committee and getting a rule and letting it lie over for a day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was simply asked if I had any objection to the unanimous-consent request. Frankly, I do not know who made the request.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] made the request.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Kentucky. It was simply in accordance with the request made by the chairman and the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman can understand my anxiety about the matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume that by doing that they felt they were expediting action, because it was assumed this bill would go over until tomorrow, and then the unanimous-consent request obviated the necessity of going before the Rules Committee. I imagine they expected that Monday would be the earliest time it could be taken up.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Probably that is correct, but I want this demobilization speeded up.

Mr. McCORMACK. So do I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that there are other special orders.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. After the other special orders have been concluded, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be allowed to speak for 10 minutes on Friday following the legislative program and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include five short letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned to Washington from my district. While I was there I made an earnest effort to secure the point of view of the returning veterans of this war, not only about their personal problems, but also about the general policies which our country should pursue. In one of the meetings held for this purpose a young veteran who has completely lost his eyesight as a result of his military service to this country, was called upon to state his problems and give his views. He started out by saying that he had no particular problems himself and concluded his brief statement by saying, "All I want is to see a peace made like we fellows fought for."

Mr. Speaker, this is the primary, insistent, overriding duty of this Congress, and of every government of the United Nations, including our own. Beside it, nothing else is of such very great consequence. Because if we do all other things and fail to make such a peace, we shall have fundamentally broken faith with every man who gave his life, or a portion of his physical well-being, in the service of our country.

And here we come face to face with the atomic bomb.

No thoughtful American will fail to give thanks that the war was brought to as speedy a conclusion as it was. Nor will he fail to be eternally grateful that American soldiers, sailors, and marines were spared the necessity of storming the beaches of Japan with the terrible losses that undoubtedly would have been suffered. It is, however, our duty to face the future in the most fearless and realistic manner of which we are capable, and in that future this release of atomic power is the one central factor that overshadows all others.

Indeed we are told that what science has actually done in this case is to bring to earth and to place into the hands of man the power that is inherent in the sun itself and which may be the basic power of the whole universe. I think it quite impossible for us to grasp the significance of our duties under these circumstances without approaching them from a fundamentally religious point of view. The Greeks expressed their beliefs in the form of myths. One of the myths was about a legendary figure named Prometheus who is supposed to have brought the secrets of fire from heaven to the earth. According to mythology, Prometheus was condemned through all eternity to be bound to Mount Caucasus and every day to have a vulture come and consume a portion of his

liver which during the night grew back again, only to have him suffer the same excruciating torture on the day following.

Somehow I cannot get this out of my mind as I think about the atomic bomb. We no longer believe in myths, but it seems to me that the logic is inescapable that whoever presumes to take to himself a power as great as this one must either use and dedicate it to the welfare of mankind, rather than its destruction, or see the day come when this power will itself return to destroy its own creators. Nor is there an unlimited amount of time in which to make the right decisions about this terrible weapon. If I believed for one moment that it were possible for the United States to keep the secret, to lock it in the military archives of this Nation and to dedicate it for all time to the single use of preserving peace on this earth, that is what I would be for doing. I know this Nation would keep its word. But there is absolutely no evidence from those who really know about this matter that such a simple course is feasible. We are told, on the other hand, that the Germans were on the point of its discovery and that in all probability it will be 10 years at most before scientists generally around the world will know this secret and be able to harness this power in other nations as well as the United States.

Constantine Brown, writing in last Sunday's Washington Star, had this to say:

> The atomic bomb which has brought about such a radical change in the outlook on war, on the part of nonprofessionals at least, will not remain for long the exclusive secret of the United States. Within the next few years its manufacture will be known to other nations which will be able to improve on the present weapon. Most professional soldiers discount the chances of the atomic bomb ever being used in another war. They are convinced that this new instrument of destruction, which is only in its infancy at the present moment, will become even more destructive and terrifying as research progresses.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that we consider how we would be feeling here today had Americans not won the race for the discovery of the atomic bomb. What would have happened, for example, had Hitler discovered it first or had the secret been uncovered first by Japan? I need not, I think, elaborate on the type of slavery into which mankind would have been plunged. Mankind can, today, hope for freedom and a better world because the indefatigable efforts of American scientists were the first to discover the secret of the release of this awful power. Surely, however, it is not hard for us to understand the tremendous weight of responsibility which rests upon the shoulders of our country since we did win that race. What then shall we do?

The first thing I think is to try as best we can to realize how fundamentally the release of this universal energy has changed the face of the world. If we can believe what we read about it and what those of us have been told who have had opportunity to talk with scientists, the atomic bomb has rendered warfare as it has been known in the past an almost obsolete thing. Unless harnessed by stronger bonds than any yet forged among the nations, this power in the next war will render that conflict one of total destruction in which the victory, if such it can be called, will go to that nation which is first able to release over an enemy country a comparatively tiny number of these missiles, thus killing its population and rendering the revival of its civilization a virtual impossibility. Even a small nation under the heel of some would-be Hitler could, if it possessed a comparatively few of these missiles, wipe out large sections of a neighboring country in one dawn raid. Every advantage will lie with ruthless aggression. Valor and heroism will have no chance, not even a place in such a conflict.

As a means of defense it has already been suggested that nations like our own devote practically all of our resources to relocating our cities beneath huge mountain ranges and adapting ourselves to the kind of underground life of which we have read in fantastic novels. As for peacetime, whatever benefits from increasing productive power might be derived from atomic energy, it is a foregone conclusion that in the absence of some effective means of preventing the atomic bomb from being used for the kind of war that I have briefly outlined the nations must embark upon an armament race which will make all previous armament races pale into insignificance. Already we are told that broader and more terrible applications of this power to weapons of offense are on their way and that experiments are being conducted into possible means of defense against them. Into this stratosphere of scientific thought only a few will dare to venture and I am not one of those. But the impact upon mankind is easier to understand and it spells but one of two conclusions. Either preparation for future war must swallow the entire consciousness and the life of man or else this fantastic power must be harnessed for the preservation of peace.

I have said in many speeches that I believed the pages of history reveal the fact that when mankind has been confronted with the absolute necessity of making a certain type of progress, then he has been endowed with the ability to make such progress. To believe otherwise is to disbelieve in the existence of any God at all, let alone the kind of God which those who place their faith in the Christian religion have through the centuries believed in. For this rather simple but I believe compelling reason, I am not hopeless but am of the belief, on the contrary, that it is possible for us to make right decisions about this almost overwhelming question and thus to save our children from utter destruction and the life of moles.

I talked at length with one scientist about this atomic bomb, and after he had pointed out to me that there is no reason it has to be made from uranium or plutonium but that the time might speedily come when it could be made from some far commoner substances, I asked him what, then, the future of mankind was going to be. His reply was that there simply cannot be another war. I know this has been said before after every great war in history. I also know that it was no doubt said after every great feudal conflict by the people who suffered as a result of those conflicts, that the time must someday come when some civil power superior to the will of the medieval barons to make war must be established. Eventually such a power was established in the governments of nations. And there is no logical reason why when all mankind realizes that it is either peace or death, the choice cannot be for peace. In any event, there is so far as I can see no use planning on any other basis.

For even from the point of view of those who believe war to be an inevitable part of the life of mankind, there must by now be a realization of what a continuance of war will mean. The President himself in his great message to the Congress has brought out forcibly a thing which most of us have deliberately hidden our eyes to while the war was going on—the untold drain upon the natural resources of this Nation which World War II has cost us. What, then, would an atomic-bomb war do? Some will remember a book by H. G. Wells called Things To Come, in which he depicted a long period of warfare in the world which started out with wars fought with bright and shining weapons and ended up with the destruction not only of civilization but of the means of producing such weapons so that the final struggle between the so-called great powers of the world was a battle between ragged armies over the last remaining virtually exhausted resources of a few abandoned coal mines. One way or another God will have his way with us. As David Lawrence has put it in his United States News:

> But we shall miss the entire significance of the new discoveries if we do not apply a spiritual interpretation. It is man and not God who must assume responsibility for this devilish weapon. Perhaps He is reminding all of us that man-made weapons can, if their use is unrestrained, destroy civilization, and that man still has the chance to choose between the destructive and constructive use of the findings of science.
>
> What will man say to this? Will he foolishly toy with the new weapon, build huge factories and husband supplies of atomic energy against potential enemies? Or will man see that at last there must be the greatest surrender that has been known from the beginning of time—a surrender to reason and the process of tolerance and forbearance, a surrender to unselfishness and self-restraint, a surrender to conscience and the will of God as the only way to survive in this world?

There are certain inescapable conclusions to which we are driven. The first of these is fairly obvious. It is that this power must be completely owned and controlled by the American people as a whole. Surely no thoughtful person will advocate turning it loose in the hands of individuals, corporations, or cartels to be used as they see fit. We have not even been ready to control the machine, let alone the airplane in the interests of the welfare of mankind. We have not as yet demonstrated the will to expand the buying power of the people anything like as rapidly as the power to produce things has expanded under the impact of new devices, new machines, new sources of power. Mr. Speaker, this

power of the universe must belong to the people as a whole, its use must be controlled and licensed only for their benefit, and only under such circumstances as will be safe for them and their children and their children's children. This much is clear and evident. Just what the significance of atomic energy is for peacetime use no man knows. But we do know that its unregulated and unlicensed use could smash literally to split atoms every institution that we have cherished in the past.

The first thing, therefore, for which a bill which I am introducing today and credit for which I will presently give to another Member of Congress, will provide is for the vesting in the Government of the United States of all control and title to the secrets and the applications of atomic energy. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have stopped there, and had I believed it was possible for my own evident duty and that of other Members of Congress to be discharged by so doing, I would have stopped there. But in the face of all the evidence about this tremendous matter I cannot in good conscience stop there. As I have said, every scientist who has spoken to us about this matter has said that this secret cannot be kept by us alone. He has pointed out that other nations will in the course of a very short time have it, too. He has told us the development will go on, that the only question is whether it will be controlled development or whether it will ultimately lead to an explosion that will devastate the world.

And there is another consideration. We ourselves have taken a leading role in the formation of the United Nations Organization. It is perfectly evident that either this organization will become a mockery or else some relationship between that Organization and its effort to preserve the peace on the one hand and the release of atomic energy on the other will be established in an orderly way. The decision after the First World War which had to be made by the United States was whether or not it would adhere to the League of Nations. That decision was made in the negative, with what consequences we now know all too well. The decision this time will be not only whether we will adhere to the United Nations Organization, but whether we will do so in such fashion as to demonstrate our full good faith as a full partner in the task of preserving world peace in the future.

Oh, I am deeply conscious of the fact that that peace cannot be preserved on the basis of inequities and injustices. I fully recognize the vast importance of the establishment of free speech and individual liberty throughout the world. I realize quite as fundamentally that in a world wracked by poverty and want, peace cannot be established. But neither I think is it conceivable that there can be peace in world where nations vie with one another in the development of bigger and more terrible atomic bombs and devote their whole energies to a feverish attempt to devise fantastically costly means of defense againt them. Along that road there lies an abyss which is inescapable and over which mankind eventually must plunge. I am not saying that research or scientific discovery should be stopped where it now is. For I know that is quite impossible. But I am saying that unless the social and moral progress of mankind is stepped up now resolutely with supreme devotion and with unfaltering vigor until it is brought up somewhere near to the plane of scientific advance which has been achieved, then all that scientific advance will become the most terrible curse that mankind has ever known.

America has believed all through her history in the salutary value of having the people know what was going on in their Government and, so far as possible, in the world. For all these reasons it has become more and more clear to me that the thing America must do in this profound crisis in history is to dedicate this discovery of the release of atomic energy to the cause of the maintenance of world peace and to accomplish this by establishing at the same time a principle in international relations. Hence the bill which I am introducing provides for the submission to Congress for its approval of an agreement among the nations whereby the United States would make available to the Security Council of the United Nations Organization information regarding the application of the atomic energy on condition that all the nations agree that henceforth the Security Council of the United Nations Organization shall have access to all information possessed by any nation concerning development in the field of armament and munitions of war, as well as access to and the right of inspection of all physical plants, laboratories, and operations relating to the development or production of armaments or munitions of war.

Someone will say this is too much to expect; that the nations will never agree to any such thing. I am not so sure, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure but that the peoples of the world will rise up and insist that something of this sort be done. What I am sure of is that it is up to us to take the first step in harnessing this terrible power which, thank God, we discovered before someone else did to the cause of the preservation of peace. Indeed, I cannot see that we have any other course or any other choice in the matter.

Several days ago in the Senate of the United States, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] introduced a bill embodying the measures and the principles about which I have spoken here today. With his consent I am introducing that same bill in the House today. I am also introducing a second bill which I have prepared and which differs somewhat from the McMahon bill but seeks the same fundamental objectives. I do so with full realization that before action is taken on this portentous matter there will be the fullest possible discussion, no doubt the introduction of other bills, and contributions to the discussion by many other Members of the House and Senate. I have taken this action because I felt there was no time to be lost in having someone place before the Congress a reasonably concrete proposal with regard to the one matter upon which all other things now depend. I think it possible that this great discovery can be turned to the benefit of mankind. But I do not think that is more than possible. I do not think it is even probable as yet. And it is plain to be seen that the very monumental character of the discovery itself necessarily means that only by the boldest action can that one possibility be realized. And unless it is realized there is no man living who will dare to say that the future may not, indeed, that in all probability, it does not hold within itself the likelihood of the destruction of all the great and good work that all the great men and women of history have contributed to the well-being of mankind.

The human race stands at the greatest crossroads in all its history and either it will make in the next few years a moral advance corresponding as I have said to the scientific advance represented by the atomic bomb, or we will live to regret the hour when our children saw the light of day. May God guide our thoughts and actions in the days and months and years that lie immediately ahead of us.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend in today's RECORD, during the debate on the bill H. R. 3974, his remarks on that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM] is recognized for 10 minutes.

COMPOSITION OF ARMIES OF OCCUPATION

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, while at home during the summer recess I had hundreds of personal visits and telephone calls, the theme of which was: "When are we going to get our boys home?" The trend running through practically every conversation was: "Are we going to do all the policing of the world in the occupied areas?" "Why should not the other nations of the world do their proportionate share?"

As one who spent almost 3 years in active duty in the Navy, I recognize the practical difficulties of a quick return of all of our boys, if we are to furnish most of the world police force. I have devoted considerable sober thought to what, if any, constructive contribution I could make to the discussion of this subject, to the end that fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, and brothers and sisters could more speedily heal the anguish of aching hearts in the warm embrace of reunion. A thought came to me—simple and yet obvious.

A short time ago we ratified the United Nations Charter. We looked with hope to the operation of this mechanism in its fullest meaning. We prayed that it would be a real instrumentality for securing peace and good will on earth. There are 50 nations signatory to this Charter. From the point of view of securing the return of the largest number of men and women of our armed services at the earliest possible date, and in order to make the nations of the world who signed this Charter feel that they are part of this world machinery, I think it would be not only desirable, but highly equitable to have all of the United Nations participate in the occupation and

policing of occupied enemy territory at the earliest possible moment.

This united effort and the experience in cooperation of all of the peace-loving nations at this crucial hour in world relations would establish a bond of friendship and understanding which in the first instance should insure the true working of the United Nations Charter and at the same time automatically release overwhelming numbers of our armed forces for return to civilian life at an earlier moment than is now possible.

The mothers and fathers of America and the men and women in the armed services, who know what war is, would welcome such a move as the first step in the effective operation of the world peace machinery.

We realize that many of the countries which are signatories to the United Nations Charter were not in a position to lend substantial aid in a military sense to the winning of the war. Should they not, however, now that the fighting is done, make a proportionate contribution to the maintenance of the peace by contributing their fair share of the occupation forces?

If the other countries of the world are to be partners in this movement to keep the peace, I believe that they would be more than willing to assume this obligation, and it is little enough to ask of them. They are covered by the international peace insurance contract, and should pay their proportionate share of the premium.

This country has willingly borne the brunt of winning the war. But must we also, practically alone, bear almost the entire responsibility for keeping the peace?

The San Francisco accord was reached after much planning and work by all the signatory powers. They have all solemnly declared themselves, and I quote from the Charter:

> We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and * * * to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security.

I believe that was their sincere intention, and if any concrete result is to come from their efforts at San Francisco, here is a golden and immediate opportunity to demonstrate it. Let us test this Charter and see whether it is to have some real effect in world affairs or is merely the conclusions of a group of idealists and wishful thinkers.

Mr. Speaker, what are we waiting for? If the United Nations Charter is not a mere scrap of paper; if we are in earnest in our declared belief to break down language barriers, create better understanding and good will among nations, and make all the nations of the world peace partners in fact instead of merely on paper; if we wish to discourage any one great power from playing power politics with its occupation forces; and, what is most important to us today, if we want to bring as many of our boys home as soon as possible, let President Truman direct Secretary Byrnes, who is now in conference with the foreign secretaries of the Big Five, to negotiate for the United Nations taking joint responsibility in occupation of the defeated countries right now.

Mr. Speaker, what are we waiting for?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 30 minutes.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING ENDANGERS THE SAN FRANCISCO CHARTER

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to issue a solemn warning that there is a movement on foot in our national life which, if it succeeds, will absolutely nullify the San Francisco Charter and blast the long-last hope of mankind for a peaceful world.

I wish I could shout this warning from the housetops for it is my considered opinion that the movement I speak of is full of danger to civilization and that its success would impose the greatest tragedy that could be inflicted upon the people of this earth at this crucial time when they are groping out of the miasmas of war and hate and are seeking to find a new kind of world, based on fraternity, peaceful relations, and mutual understanding.

I refer to the movement to force through Congress legislation that would establish universal, compulsory military training in the United States. That movement is now having a great build-up preparatory to a high-pressure effort to push a bill through Congress early in the coming months. Many organizations of a military and semimilitary character have swung into action back of it. Other organizations of a distinctly antisocial nature are giving it Herculean support. Top Army and Navy officers are feverishly working overtime to advance it. Many powerful reactionary newspapers are printing long, labored editorials to help to give impetus to it. The onslaught on Congress is being supported by a heavy fire of propaganda. Much of this propaganda is of a most insidious and plausible type, which makes it all the more dangerous. The movement to force our boys into the military training camps has reached such proportions that it poses this question: "Do we want the San Francisco Charter to succeed or do we want it nullified even before it begins to operate?"

FIXING THE FUTURE OF THE WORLD

We must remember that we are right now at the point of determining the course that will fix the kind of a world we are to have in the ages to come—the kind of world in which our children and our children's children and all the children of the future are to live. We have gone through the grimmest, blackest, most awful nightmare of bloody war the world has ever known, and we are now making our reconnaissance on the other side. We are at the crossroads of decision. We cannot go forward and backward at the same time.

Whether the advocates of compulsory military training realize it or not, what they would have us do is to reverse the hands of the clock and plunge the world back into the old military welter that has been the spawning cause of wars from time immemorial, and fix it there permanently.

What we shall have to do in reaching our great decision is, first of all, to fix the future psychology of the world. Shall it be a psychology of war, or shall it be a psychology of peace?

The adoption of compulsory military training by the United States would definitely fix the future psychology of the world as a war psychology. This is inevitably true because of the position of leadership which our Nation holds among the nations of the earth. We have emerged from the war the most powerful—the most irresistibly and preeminently powerful—of all nations. The world concedes to us the premiership, and its eyes will be on our every action. Whatever we do will be the cue for other nations. They will follow suit, or go us one better. If we adopt forced military training and regimentation, other nations will follow our example and the world will become an armed camp. If we goose-step our 18-year-olds Nations B and C and D will goose-step their 17-year-olds. If we goose-step our 17-year-olds, Nations B, C, and D will goose-step their 16-year-olds. Benito Mussolini, it will be recalled, had the 8-year-olds of Italy goose-stepping with wooden guns in lieu of the heavy rifles which they were not yet strong enough to carry. What it all adds up to is that if we regiment our boys and other nations, feeling themselves compelled by our example, regiment their boys, we will be in no stronger relative position than if we did not initiate a regimentation program at all, but the world will be the sufferer because a death blow will be dealt to the spirit of the San Francisco Charter and in the years to come we shall have the same old explosive international situation, with war likely to break out at any time. I repeat that if by our example we initiate a race of military competition and rivalry we will be reestablishing in the world the psychology of war when we should be seeking to establish the psychology of peace.

PLENTY FOR ALL IF WE OUTLAW WAR

Now what I want and what I think every other right-thinking citizen wants, is to get away from war as far as possible—not only as far away from it as possible but clear away from it—permanently and forever away from it. I think I am typical of the average American citizen and when I say that I am sick and tired of war I think I speak what is in the minds and hearts of most of us. There is no need of war if human beings will act with sense and with the respect they ought to show for the Commandments of their Maker. There is enough land lying uncultivated and fallow to support all human beings on the earth, if they would but agree to the principles of the Sermon on the Mount, forget their hatreds, lay down their guns, and go to work We must accept that philosophy as the motivating rule of conduct before we can attain the perfect permanent peace the world is now demanding. After all of the suffering and travail humanity has gone through no peace will be acceptable except a peace of the ages and there can be no peace

of the ages that is not founded on principles of Christian faith. My objection to compulsory military training is that by regimenting the world and starting a competitive race of armaments that will emphasize the arts and objects of war it will hinder, if it does not completely obstruct, the achievement of the world peace envisioned in the San Francisco Charter.

Wars would cease if nations would accept the principles of the Sermon on the Mount as the common denominator of their relations and practice those principles. Let us suppose as a specific instance that a tense feeling has developed between nations A and B, and that those countries are on the verge of war. Let us suppose further that an epidemic breaks out among the children of nation B and that it gets beyond control. Then let us suppose that the statesmen of nation A say: "Instead of spending untold billions of dollars and sacrificing innumerable lives in waging war on nation B we will spend the equivalent of the cost of one little Mosquito boat in manufacturing serum and sending it to them, so that the lives of their little ones will be saved."

If that should happen, do you suppose there would be the least likelihood of those nations going to war?

Have we not had enough of war, enough of its miseries and heartaches, enough of the pain it puts in the hearts of mothers, enough of the back-breaking burden of debt which generations of Americans of the next century will still be struggling to pay? Then why should we, by adopting compulsory military training, fill the world with combustible material that will create still more wars?

Speaking again as a typical citizen I do not want to be a small unit in a colossal regimentation. I do not want to live with all the habiliments and reminders of war constantly around me. The saddest thing I can imagine in this world is a conscript army marching off to war, no one in it knowing just why he is going, but realizing that while he would like to be a friend of everybody and live in loving kindness toward everybody, his hopeless mission is to go forth and kill. I had liked to think that the San Francisco Charter would bring an end to all of this forevermore, but if the San Francisco Charter is to be negatived and nullified through the adoption by Congress of a scheme of military regimentation and forced military service, I am afraid that I and millions of others will be subject to serious disillusionment.

Since Pearl Harbor, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee of 12 members on deficiencies, I have helped to process measures to carry on the war appropriating $150,000,000,000, the equivalent of half the estimated wealth of the United States as shown by the last census of national wealth. I would never have done this except for my faith in the prospect for the establishment of a better world when the storms of war had swept their course, a new and different kind of a world which I fondly hoped would bear some approximation to the divine vision of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. I had faith to believe that we were fighting a war to end all wars. I supported these vast outlays in order to eradicate military fascism from this earth.

NOBODY WILL FOOL ME INTO VOTING FOR FASCISM

Now nobody is going to fool me into voting to establish in this country the very things we have been fighting against in other countries. Unless we bury military fascism so deep it will never again rear its ugly head World War II will have been fought in vain, and we shall be doing a monstrous wrong to our boys who gave their lives thinking that they were helping to usher in a better world. The practical question that confronts us is, "With the war over, are we going to have a new order in the world, or are we going to have the same old order, with its evils expanded and intensified?"

Untold agonies have been suffered in the crucible of war and oceans of blood have been shed to establish this new order. Let us, the living, see that this new order really is established and thus keep faith with our precious boys who gave their last full measure of devotion to make men free from such things as forced military service in times of peace.

I would not want it understood that I am making a wholesale indictment of all who are pushing the program for compulsory military training. Some of the influences back of this campaign undoubtedly are malign, but for many of the outstanding proponents of universal compulsory military training, both organizations and individuals, I have the highest personal regard, and it would be farthest from my thoughts to accuse them of any Machiavellian plots to wreck the San Francisco Charter. Their motives are as pure as mine; their patriotism the equal of mine. But I believe they are tragically mistaken and oblivious of the serious potential consequences of the thing they are playing with. That peacetime conscription is necessary, as they contend, for security reasons I deny. That they are in error is easily demonstrable by the record of history.

NATIONS THAT LIVE BY THE SWORD DIE BY THE SWORD

The most convincing proof that trained and regimented militarism is not security in any sense is found in the fact that all of the nations that have lived by the sword have died by the sword. That is true in the entire range of history. Empires have risen, built on tyranny and military might, have flourished for a time, and have toppled like houses of cards. Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, all the great conquerors, have gone the same way. Modern examples are France, Italy, Germany, and Japan, nations that staked their all on military might, whose peoples are now impoverished beyond description, and whose cities are now masses of rubble. Someone has truthfully said that if conscription guarantees peace, as so often contended, Europe should today be blossoming as the rose, the most peaceful spot on earth, instead of the shambles that it is.

France, a few years ago, proudly boasted that it had the best-trained regular army in the world, brought up to the highest possible peak of perfection under a compulsory law, but its vaunted strength and proficiency did not save it from utter rout and defeat. German militarism began to flower in the reign of Frederick the Great and under Hitler Germany became a vast military camp. The militaristic in all its ugly and dominating forms was rampant in every phase of German life and the caste system it created was almost unbelievable. The average citizen had rammed down his throat the theory that he was nothing and that the state was everything; that he must bow down to uniforms and brass buttons and fairly lick the boots of the military officers. Under Mussolini Italy swallowed the German military caste system and added a few frills of its own. Some of us remember seeing photographs of Mussolini reviewing his battalions of 8-year-olds with their solemn childish faces and little wooden guns, and of Hitler decorating for bravery two score wounded youngsters, some of whom were only 12 years of age.

PITIFUL LITTLE ARMY DESTROYS TRAINED LEGIONS

I asked the Library of Congress, our great repository of factual information, to advise me the relative sizes of the crack trained armies of Europe compared with the size of our own little Army just before peacetime conscription became effective in our country.

The report of the Secretary of War on June 30, 1939, showed that our Army was composed of 13,814 officers and 174,079 enlisted men; total, 187,893.

Compare this diminutive army, the butt of Hitler's irony and contempt, with the numerical strength of European armies of approximately the same period, as follows:

France, 5,000,000.
Germany, 6,000,000 to 8,000,000.
Italy, 2,500,000.

The lessons of history are too well known and fresh in mind to need repetition here, but the fact is that notwithstanding this disparity of strength the power of our unified purpose was such that we organized and equipped an army in record time, and when that army went on the march it swept into utter destruction and oblivion the trained legions opposing it, while our enemies were still prating about "decadent democracies." I think this shows the difference in the quality of soldiers who are freemen, fighting for high ideals, and those who have no more interest and initiative than as mere cogs in a machine. The difference between the two types of soldiers is the difference between a thoughtful, dignified human being who loves his country and a robot. It is not hard to guess which makes the better soldier.

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION WOULD PLANT AN OLD WORLD CANCER IN THE HEART OF AMERICA

We must be extremely careful to see that Old World ideologies do not take root in our free American soil. Just as it was found earlier in our history that a nation could not live half slave and half free, neither can liberty survive long in a surrounding of military regimentation. It must be one or the other.

If we adopt old world military regimentation ideas we will create in this country the most colossal and costly bureaucracy in the history of all time, a bureaucracy founded on unthinking

obedience, the elimination of free discussion, totalitarianism at its worst. Democracy could not live long in such a stifling atmosphere. If we go militaristic at this transition period of our history and adopt forced military training after 150 years of individual freedom we will transplant an old world cancer in the heart of America, to corrode our fine thinking and to bend the popular will to the head of the state. Many of our citizens came to this country to escape the very kind of military conscription which it is now proposed to establish. As a Nation we are the beneficiary of countless centuries of struggle and suffering for the cause of human freedom. Our duty now is to make our own major contribution by supplying the vital spark of leadership that is indispensable to human progress toward the goal of everlasting freedom and peace for all of the sons of men.

PSYCHOLOGY OF MASS MURDER

I repeat that when we in Congress pass on this issue of military conscription we are going to fix the future psychology of the world. We cannot regiment the bodies of men without regimenting their minds. If we are to have a world of peace we must lift the human race to a higher level than the psychology of mass murder, which we euphemistically call war. Do we wish to follow the thorn-strewn road to eternal misery or are we willing to try to follow the Prince of Peace by making a start, feeble though it may be, toward the establishment of a new order in the world? With over a quarter of a million of the flower of our youth resting under white crosses and three times that number temporarily or permanently disdisabled; with a back-breaking debt of $300,000,000,000 to be redeemed by the sweat and toil of our posterity, is it not about time that America should exert its leadership toward bringing about a better world psychology? If America says that the world of the future shall be a warless world it probably will be because the power of our leadership is so great. If America says the world of the future shall be an armed camp with every nation training to spring at every other nation's throat, it will be just that. The two psychologies will not mix. If one psychology is to be the directing force of mankind the other will not be. We cannot say to the youth of America, "You must practice the art to kill 6 days out of the week, but you may practice the art to love on Sunday."

There is not room enough in our heads for both psychologies.

This is the most serious speech of my life and it is serious because I believe a crisis confronts our Nation. I believe the quicker we get such ideas as compulsory military training out of our heads the better it will be.

RIGHTEOUSNESS AND NOT BIG GUNS EXALTETH A NATION

It is still true, as it ever will be true, that it is righteousness and not big guns that exalteth a nation. It is still true, as it ever will be true, that there is a moral force that is greater than battalions and battleships. My prayer is that America will take the lead in applying that force for the salvation of the world.

There is one phase of the compulsory military training experiment which I have not dwelt upon because I consider it relatively the less important though it is not by any means to be neglected in over-all consideration of the matter, and that is the cost. It is estimated by experts that the cost would be at least $2,500,000,000 and perhaps as high as $3,000,000,000 a year.

TERRIFIC COST OF COMPULSORY TRAINING

Think what an additional burden this would place on the brain and the brawn, the toil and the sweat of our people, who are already suffering under grinding taxation. The latest figures on national wealth, compiled by the National Industrial Conference Board, estimate the wealth of the State of Indiana at $8,548,000,000. This includes all the property, real and personal, and all of the wealth of every description. Every 3 years of compulsory military training would cost the taxpayers of America the equivalent of all of the wealth of the State of Indiana. The same board, which is the highest accredited authority, estimates the total wealth of the United States at $300,750,000,000. If compulsory military training should be made permanent, as the proponents hope it will be, its cost in one century would consume the equivalent of the total wealth of the United States, making no allowance for interest on the borrowings that would be necessary to keep the system going. The annual cost alone of the compulsory military-training program would equal the total wealth of four States—Delaware, Wyoming, Nevada, and New Mexico.

RELATION OF ATOMIC BOMB TO COMPULSORY TRAINING

Nor can I refrain from discussing modern developments which appear to me to prove the obvious uselessness of compulsory military training as a protective measure. We know now that the war of tomorrow, if it comes, is destined to be a war of science and the principal instruments of destruction will not be men but lethal instruments. Wars of the future will not be decided on the battlefield; they will be won in the laboratory. The atomic bomb points altogether in that direction. The dropping of two atomic bombs wreaked a greater harvest of destruction on two cities in Japan instantaneously than 10 entire divisions could have done under the most advantageous circumstances in many months. What is the use of training millions of men at fabulous cost, when it is plain that the wars of the future, should there be any, will be decided by these amazing and horrifying inventions? I think the principal lesson to be derived from the atomic bomb is that competition in military armament simply must not be allowed to happen, for another war with these inventions in full sway would mean the mass destruction of the life of our planet and the complete annihilation of civilization.

PEACE OR COSMIC SUICIDE

To avert this cosmic suicide nations must find a workable basis of mutual understanding and friendly cooperation. This is not optional; it is a necessity if they are to survive. We hoped that they had found this in the San Francisco Charter which seems to have been providentially ordained to meet the situation created by the atomic bomb. I will not be a party to wrecking the future peace of the world by nullifying the San Francisco Charter and for that reason I am unalterably opposed to the plan for the military regimentation of America. The San Francisco Charter simply must succeed.

Under existing circumstances the enactment of compulsory military training would be the same as saying, "We know that the San Francisco Charter will not work. We have no confidence in it."

It would serve notice on all of the world that we are preparing for war and it would serve that notice on the nations before they have an opportunity to try the peace-making machinery of the United Nations. I would like to ask the proponents of compulsory military training this question, "If we have any faith in the San Francisco Charter why should we be preparing for a third world war?"

LINCOLN'S INSPIRING MESSAGE OF 80 YEARS AGO HAS A NEW WORLD APPEAL

On March 4, 1865, a very tall, gaunt man stepped out upon a platform in front of the Capitol at Washington to deliver an inaugural address as President of the United States. About the first thought that would have occurred to a casual observer on that occasion would have been that this ungainly, awkward man was greatly lacking in pulchritude, though eyewitnesses said that there was something illuminating his mournful, dignified face that made it singularly attractive. Its furrows had been deepened by the terrifying responsibilities of the chief magistracy during 4 years of fratricidal strife, but there burned in his soul an unquenchable love for his fellow men. His speech on that day was brief, terse, epigrammatic as it usually was. He closed with these words which, the moment they were spoken, became a part of the literature of the ages:

> With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

The great and good President was thinking of the common people when he uttered these words, the common people of both North and South, the common people of whom he once before had said that "God must love them because He made so many of them." He knew that the common people have to do the dying and the suffering and to bear the unspeakable burdens and griefs of war and he was addressing them. He was making articulate—beautifully articulate—what the common people of America of 1865 felt in their minds and hearts. He did not know nor could those of his generation know that his words would again touch the heart strings of the common people 80 years after he had returned to dust, but they have the same inspired

meaning, the same magic potency, today to the common people of the entire world who during the last 6 years have suffered until they can hardly stand it any longer.

If we substitute "world's wounds" for "nation's wounds," Lincoln's kind and inspiring philosophy is just as applicable to the situation today as in 1865 and if we examine his words we will find in them the magic balm that will cure and heal now just as it cured and healed then. The "work we are in" at this time has no national boundaries nor limitations of space as when he spoke, but it has the cosmic dual purpose of overthrowing oppression and tyranny everywhere and the establishment of something akin to God's rule on earth. The first part of our purpose we have gloriously achieved by the overthrow of the Axis tyrants; the second part, the establishment of lasting peace on earth, is our noble aim and incentive for the future. Humbly let us pray, as Lincoln prayed, that God will give us to see the right. We have won the war; let us not by the adoption of such a fatuous policy as compulsory military service lose the peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 2 minutes.

PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced two bills in the House of Representatives. They are to grant authority to the War Department and the Veterans' Administration to cause to be conducted experimentation, studies, and research for the purpose of aiding in the rapid development and prompt manufacture of more adequate and efficient prosthetic appliances and parts of such appliances. The first bill grants authority to the War Department and the second bill grants the same authority and direction to the Veterans' Administration.

The care of our disabled veterans is our first duty and obligation. Now that the pressing need for the manufacture of munitions and other materials of war is over, we must give immediate and intense study and attention to making our disabled veterans as nearly whole and normal as possible. Artificial legs are still inadequate thus far. Artificial hands have been unsatisfactory and nothing has been accomplished in replacing arms off above the elbow. I am confident that if the Army uses the same energy and efficiency it showed in developing the atomic bomb, it can develop a satisfactory arm and leg. If we can spend $2,000,000,000 to develop a bomb to injure and destroy, we can spend large sums to restore. If we can invent instruments to detect airplanes in the air though unseen and mechanics that can successfully shoot down that same unseen airplane, we can invent prosthetics that are acceptable and useful to replace the loss of arms and legs.

We must never stop until we secure results. Miracles have been discovered in treatment of disease and wounds. Miracles can and must be discovered in prosthetics.

I shall press for early hearings and action on these bills.

They are as follows:

A bill to aid in the development and manufacture of improved prosthetic appliances

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed (1) to cause to be conducted by the appropriate agency or agencies in the War Department experimentation, studies, and research for the purpose of aiding in the rapid development and prompt manufacture of more adequate and efficient prosthetic appliances and parts of such appliances, and (2) to allocate from time to time, from funds appropriated under authority of this act, to such corporations and business firms as he deems best qualified, such sums as he deems necessary to be expended by such corporations and business firms in conducting experimentation, studies, and research for such purpose.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

A bill to aid in the development and manufacture of improved prosthetic appliances

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans Affairs is authorized and directed (1) to cause to be conducted by the appropriate agency or agencies in the Veterans' Administration experimentation, studies, and research for the purpose of aiding in the rapid development and prompt manufacture of more adequate and efficient prosthetic appliances and parts of such appliances, and (2) to allocate from time to time, from funds appropriated under authority of this act, to such corporations and business firms as he deems best qualified, such sums as he deems necessary to be expended by such corporations and business firms in conducting experimentation, studies, and research for such purpose.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for 1 week, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1365. An act to amend section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act to permit the appointment of supervising conciliation commissioners as referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3644. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional rates of compensation or pension and remedy inequalities as to specific service-incurred disabilities in excess of total disability.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3644. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional rates of compensation or pension and remedy inequalities as to specific service-incurred disabilities in excess of total disability.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 13, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a public hearing before the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 10 a. m. on Thursday, September 13, 1945, in the committee hearing room, 247 Old House Office Building, on H. R. 1653, by Representative HENDRICKS, and H. R. 2073, by Representative LUDLOW, bills to extend benefits to veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their dependents.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents Thursday, September 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m. on H. R. 3424. The meeting will be held in the committee room, 416 Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Public Health Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, September 18, 1945, to begin hearings on the bill, H. R. 2550, cited as the National Neuropsychiatric Institute Act.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

677. A letter from the Alien Property Custodian, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the period ending December 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

678. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 4000. A bill to prohibit the induction for further service in the armed forces of veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 4001. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4002. A bill to provide for the leasing of allotted lands on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4003. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of certain deceased Crow Indian allottees; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4004. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law relating to trading with Indian tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4005. A bill amending the act of December 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 845), Public Law 525, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4006. A bill to authorize the execution of plans for a permanent memorial to Benjamin Harrison; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4007. A bill to provide for the poll of military and naval service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 4008. A bill to amend title 11 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1175), in order to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing and equalizing retirement and retainer benefits for enlisted men of the Regular Navy and thereby encouraging a higher type of young men to make the Regular Navy a career, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 4009. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cancel War Department leases on State fairgrounds and to deliver up possession of such grounds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4010. A bill to direct the discharge of all members of the armed forces who have served at least 18 months; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4011. A bill to aid in the development and manufacture of improved prosthetic appliances; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4012. A bill to aid in the development and manufacture of improved prosthetic appliances; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 4013. A bill to direct the discharge of all members of the armed forces who have served at least 2 years; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4014. A bill to conserve and restrict the use of atomic energy for the national defense, to prohibit its private exploitation, and to preserve the secret and confidential character of information concerning the use and application of atomic energy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4015. A bill for the creation of an agency of the United States Government to be known as the Atomic Power Authority, to define its powers and functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. Res. 340. Resolution providing for the establishment of Army separation centers in the various States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution establishing a joint congressional committee to make a study of claims of Indian tribes against the United States and to investigate the administration of Indian affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to authorize the President to transfer certain records and documents to the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4016. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 4017. A bill granting an increase in pension to Martha E. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 4018. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Hudson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 4019. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ermelinda Tognarelli; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 4020. A bill for the relief of Harvey E. Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4021. A bill for the relief of Harvey E. Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4022. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in Valley County, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4023. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Frederick Alden; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4024. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Bullshows and Horse Bullshows; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4025. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Rose Bearcloud; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4026. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Ruth Morning; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4027. A bill authorizing sale of the allotment of LeRoy Milliken on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4028. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Martha Long Neck Little Light a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4029. A bill to authorize the sale of the allotment of Henry Keiser on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4030. A bill authorizing the issuance of patents in fee to the heirs of Lucky Horse Singer and Ambrose Singer; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4031. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Joseph J. Pickett a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4032.—A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John J. Akers a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4033. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Irene Scott Bassett a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4034. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Alice Yarlott; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4035.—A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Wilbur Keiser; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4036. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Josephine Gray Hawk; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4037. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mary K. Reed; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4038. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Alfred Murray; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4039. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Estelle Hughes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4040. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Christine West; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4041. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Everett F. McInerney; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4042. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to A. C. Ladd; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4043. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Cassie E. Howard; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4044. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John Harold Brown; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4045. A bill for the relief of the trustees of school district No. 2, Dodson, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4046. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard S. Fisher; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 4047. A bill for the relief of Edward A. Hollis, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4048. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decisions of the Court of Claims in two suits instituted by H. B. Nelson (doing business as the H. B. Nelson Construction Co.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 4049. A bill for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese-beetle quarantine; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1145. By Mr. BUFFETT: Petition of Mrs. Jessie Mayo and 88 other citizens of Omaha, Nebr., urging continuance of child-care centers; to the Committee on Education.

1146. Also, petition of Ella Haynes and 65 other citizens of Omaha, Nebr., urging continuance of child-care centers; to the Committee on Education.

1147. Also, petition of K. H. Leslie and 93 other citizens of Omaha, Nebr., urging continuance of child-care centers; to the Committee on Education.

1148. By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Resolution of the city of Manitowoc, Wis., urging the retention of the jurisdiction over the improvement of waterways, rivers, and harbors, flood and erosion control, and allied matters under the control of the Corps of Engineers, War Department; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1149. Also, resolution of the city of Sturgeon Bay, Wis., urging the retention of the jurisdiction over the improvement of waterways, rivers, and harbors, flood and erosion control, and allied matters under the control of the Corps of Engineers, War Department; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1150. By Mr. COLE of Missouri: Petition of Rev. M. E. Garlock and 100 others; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1151. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, for the discharge from the armed forces of any person who has suffered the loss of a father, mother, son, daughter, brother, or sister through death, while serving in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1152. Also, petition of the Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, for the continuance of nurseries for the children of men in the armed forces, under the Lanham Act; to the Committee on Education.

1153. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by numerous citizens of the State of Oregon, urging enactment of the Lemke bill (H. R. 491); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1154. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey, endorsing and recommending the passage of House bill 2536; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1155. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Oscar R. Rosevear and many citizens of Williamsport, Pa., and vicinity, in opposition to winter daylight-saving time and urging that Congress put an end to it; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, again Thy mercy has been our portion; whether as a cherished anticipation or a glad, sweet surprise, it is upon us, and we thank Thee; we would hear Thy teaching: Blessed are they who carry forward life's broken ministries; blessed are they who renew the light in some dark human tenement; blessed are they who hold onto their better selves in the face of temptation; blessed are they who take their places in the councils of a nation and seek to serve unselfishly and even sacrificially. O God, bless our whole country and all its institutions that promote human welfare; fill it with the best things ever attained, with the greatest things ever longed for, and with the highest hopes that ever throbbed in its great soul.

Heavenly Father, in all our alliances with Thee, give us strength and vision that we may bend ourselves to our tasks. Touch the desires behind our thoughts, the inclinations behind our resolutions, for out of these are the issues of wise legislation. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3907. An act to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2. An act to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Friday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PSYCHIATRIC INSTITUTE BILL

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of the House have indicated a desire to be heard or to submit statements when hearings are held on the bill H. R. 2550, the psychiatric institute bill. I take this opportunity to announce that these hearings will begin at 10 o'clock next Tuesday morning in the committee room of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MALONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an interesting statement made by Mr. Ben J. Williams, of New Orleans, relating to postwar problems.

Mr. CURLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered on Labor Day.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I be allowed to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of our colleague the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines that he may be permitted to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include excerpts from editorials on the subject of the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands. The Public Printer estimates the cost to be $143. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the additional cost, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when Tojo and Hitler decided that they could take on the United States in the recent war, ending with victory for the United States, they undoubtedly took notice of the deficiencies in our merchant marine.

Our hats should be off to the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., for all it did to supply the deficiency of trained personnel for our merchant marine during the war. Its record is outstanding.

Scuttlebutt, which, in the language of the men of the sea, means the rumor factory, has it that an attack is soon to be launched against this Academy. I am loath to believe this. I do not think that the Army and the Navy would approve, and it is my conviction that any program which might decimate this institution, which trained so many officers for our merchant marine, would be tragic.

Let us remember that when Mahan described seapower he said it included a strong merchant marine protected by an adequate Navy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Columbus Commercial Dispatch.

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made on Defenders' Day in Baltimore City.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement issued to all Members of Congress by Chief of Staff General Marshall, entitled "The Facts of Demobilization of the Army."

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday of next week be dispensed with and that it be in order to call the Consent Calendar on

Tuesday of next week, following the disposition of the bill reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs in the event that bill goes over to Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what program he has scheduled for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The only bill scheduled now for next week is the voluntary enlistment bill to which I referred yesterday, and that is on the program for Monday. Then there is the call of the Consent Calendar on Tuesday. The omnibus private bill will not be called on Tuesday.

No other legislation is scheduled now for next week, but legislation will be assigned later for consideration next week, depending upon rules coming out of the Committee on Rules. I shall advise the gentleman from Massachusetts and the House as soon as possible so that the Members will be aware of what will come up during the remainder of the week after Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following any special orders heretofore entered for today I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CONSCRIPTING AMERICAN BOYS TO DO THE DIRTY WORK IN EUROPE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, some profiteers, worshipers of the dollar, wanted us in this war so they could make a profit. Others—internationalists—caring little for America or her future, and apparently not at all for the lives of our young men, told us it was our duty to carry the "four freedoms" throughout the world. They preached the doctrine that the salvation of the world depended upon the sacrifice of our independence, the formation of one big international organization, in the control of which we were to play a minor and subservient part. At the cost of a substantial part of our natural resources, of billions of dollars, and more than a million casualties, the United States demonstrated that, while it did not provoke the war, had nothing to gain from it, and, except in the Pacific, little to say as to how it should be fought, it did supply an overwhelming part of everything, including manpower, needed to win it.

The war was started by ambitious world politicians. It was won by the young men of America. Now, the war over, as their reward for their part in the winning of the "four freedoms" for the rest of the world, this administration—evidently still under the thumb of the internationalists—apparently intends to keep millions of the men who have survived the fighting in the European area to do the dirty work of cleaning up and policing the conquered and overrun countries.

We howled our heads off when Hitler conscripted workers from conquered countries. We yelled to high heaven at Stalin's policy of following the same course. But we continue to keep our men, who offered everything they had in the world in their effort to win this war, in foreign lands.

A letter from a farmer of my district quotes part of a letter from his son, who is in Germany. The son, a volunteer, tells how now it is his duty, as a soldier in the Army of the United States, to clean up the streets and gutters, the filth and the refuse, in basements and outbuildings, in one of Germany's cities. His dad tells me that there is plenty of work at home on the farm. Buildings and fences are out of repair, soil erosion is depleting the fertility of the land, and the farmer and his wife—both of whom are well past 50—just cannot do the necessary work. But the boy, the son, their only son, their only child, is kept in Europe to tidy up the streets and the public squares, to aid in rebuilding the homes of those he fought.

This boy, and a million others, are in Europe—and presumably will stay in Europe—because in this country a group of internationalists, who think more of other people and of other nations, than they do of our own people, our own Nation, insist that it is our duty to rehabilitate—and that is a good word—it just means setting on their feet peoples and nations who are either too indolent or too quarrelsome to look after their own interests—every land, every city, in the European area.

Those who want to rebuild Europe, restore all its towns and cities, should be permitted to do so, but unfortunately—so far as I know—not one of these so-called internationalists is willing to earn a callus or spend 1 hour in actual physical labor, to assist those abroad. All he wants is to furnish the idea and force the American boy to do the dirty work.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUFFETT. The administration apparently proposes to deprive young men of their liberty in this country and then send them over to Japan or Austria to teach the people of those lands the blessings of liberty. Does the gentleman know of any procedure that is more stupid on its face than that kind of procedure?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me read you part of a letter from a man in the service, which shows that they are being used to further commercial interests. I read:

DEAR SIR: I do not think that this is the time to stop the draft. We men overseas realize that just about the only way the men in the Army for long periods of time can get out is through an at least temporary continuation of the draft for approximately a year. If the War Department plans to have an Army of 2,000,000 men and the draft is stopped, that would mean that 2,000,000 men would have to remain in the Army who would otherwise stand a chance of being replaced.

Listen to what this young man says. This just came in:

I do not think that this is the time to stop the draft.

He is criticizing the measure I introduced to quit drafting boys. I am going to tell this young man as I have told others that we want to get those across back, but it is not necessary in order to enable them to come home to draft other men.

There is a group of internationalists in this country, there are some columnists in this country, like Drew Pearson, like Walter Winchell, who as soon as Russia got into this thing against Germany have been frantic that we should sacrifice not only our natural resources and our dollars, but they wanted us to sacrifice our young men in this fight. People like Winchell—and mark you he was in the Navy but he was safe at home all the time—they want to continue to occupy those foreign countries but none of them so far as I know want to serve over there themselves. Now, to go back to this letter, the writer says:

I do not think that this is the time to stop the draft. We men overseas realize that just about the only way the men in the Army for long periods of time can get out is through an at least temporary continuation of the draft for approximately a year.

He is in, he has suffered; he has suffered so much that he thinks somebody else ought to have part of the burden, and he is correct, if we are to continue to bear that burden. But my point is that we ought to throw that load off our shoulders, for it never belonged there in the first place and there is no reason why we should continue for years to come to have our men working in Europe, or any other place for that matter.

If the War Department plans to have an Army of 2,000,000 men and the draft is stopped, that would mean 2,000,000 men would have to remain in the Army who would otherwise stand a chance of being replaced.

Let me acquaint you with our own case here. We are stationed at Cazes Air Depot at Casablanca. We have been here for about 33 months. I have been here 32 months. Our headquarters in Cairo which is called the First Air Service Area Command says we are needed here. They also require replacements for us if we are to leave. Actually we do not need replacements because the majority of the men sit around all day doing nothing. But you know the Army. They hate to let go of personnel because it is hard for a colonel to become a general without a large number of personnel under him. Now, if we could get some replacements here we could go home. We have been overseas for nearly 3 years and because this has not been a war zone since the early days of the war we do not have many points. The average here would be about 75 as of VJ-day. This is not enough for discharge. If you cut off the draft you leave us with the feeling that we too are being cut off from any hope of replacement.

Our situation here is a rather disgraceful one at best. You may not be aware of the situation in Africa and indeed many of my relatives do not even believe we still have any soldiers in Africa and suspect that I am staying over here for fun. Africa is not a pleasant place at best and to spend nearly

3 years here without ever once seeing home is a rough deal. There are things that contribute to make it even rougher. We have been told by the commanding general of the Amet theater that we must stay here to service ATC. In the meantime ATC is sending home their personnel when they have completed 18 months of overseas duty.

This boy has been there 32 months.

It really hurts to be told you have to support an outfit whose own men are not essential to them after they have been here for 18 months.

In addition a charming situation exists here which you may not be aware of. We are not only being kept here for the upkeep of ATC but also for the upkeep of commercial air lines. Did you know that of 30 trips from Casablanca to the United States, 17 of them are flown by commercial air lines. Now it is bad enough to be kept here over 33 months to service the Army but when you are being kept here to maintain civilian air lines then the thing has become disgraceful.

I hope you will bear in mind that most men in the Army think we need at least another year of draft to get the veterans out. It's been a long time since we saw home and we would damn well like to see it again.

Congressmen cannot endure staying away from home a year at a time, yet this boy and his buddies have taken it in Africa for 33 months. I guess he would "damn" well like to see home again.

I wish you would send me whatever information is available to you as to what is being done to get men out of Africa who have been here for so damn long. We never read one word about Africa in a paper and we feel forgotten.

Sincerely yours.

SEPTEMBER 6, 1945.

I have another letter from a farmer in my district.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. It is hard for these boys evidently to understand, from the many letters we are getting, why the Congress can get them into the Army but apparently cannot do anything toward getting them out. I received a very interesting letter this morning from a young man who has been overseas for 2 years. He has a wife and two children. He does not have enough points. He raises the question about noticing in the newspapers where men that they know have not enough points are being released to play baseball and football professionally. He said, "I am a baseball fan and I am also a football fan, but why are they entitled to priority over a man like me? I have a business to go back to if I can get out."

What are you going to say to a man like that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am going to tell him that we, against our will, have been forced to follow the policies of the internationalists, the Union Now fellows, these people who want us to get into this super United States of the World, these men and women who want us to surrender our independence and come under another flag, haul down the Stars and Stripes, an idea that is as crazy as that other place; yet we are still following that; they want us to continue to police and rebuild the world when not one of them will turn a hand to an honest day's toil or do a part of that work themselves.

They want us to continue to keep the men who are overseas over there and to draft these other boys 18 through 25. That is what they want us to do. I do not believe in it. I do not think it is necessary, and I never intend to support that sort of a program. I believe that if we offer the men who volunteer a fraction of what we paid the war workers for 8 hours' work all through the war, with time and one-half and double time for overtime and holidays, that we will get all the men that are needed for legitimate purposes. There are many young men who want to make the Navy or the Army a life work, a life career, courageous young men who want to see the world, who want to go into those services, and if we will offer them proper inducements we will get the men that we need.

Of course, if you want to police the whole world as the internationalists do, as the Winchells and the Pearsons and the rest of the bond clippers who sit around doing nothing, big, fat, baldheaded men who never fought a battle any more than I will—if you want to please them, if you want to follow their ideas, the ideas of a bunch of crackpots who never sacrificed so much as a strip of bacon during the years of this war, all well and good. But after they have fought a war and so many of them have died, and so much of our country has been given away, it seems to me about time that Congress awakens and tells those people that we have had enough of wet-nursing other nations.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Does the gentleman know any Member of the House who is an internationalist who does not want the men to get out of the Army, considering the past and present program?

Mr. HOFFMAN. How can an internationalist want a man out of the Army? He wants—insists upon an internationalist police force. If the gentleman will read the record back over the years and understand what it means he will be able to put his finger on the internationalists in Congress. He can mark down very easily the Members of this House who believed then and who believe today that it is our business to police and rebuild the whole world.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] said yesterday that there will always be an America if Congress does not give it away. Well, we have gone a long way toward giving it away.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me tell you again about this letter that came from a farmer in my district. I do not want you to forget it. I know him very well. He is a good citizen. He sent me a letter from his boy who is in Germany, and has been in Germany for 2 years. This man's farm is run down, because for the last 3 years there has been nobody on it but the old man and the old lady. When I say old I mean 60 or 65. You know what it means when you reach that age to farm a farm with more than 200 acres under cultivation. The fences are out of repair, the buildings are out of repair, and the machinery, what there is of it, is all loose and rattles. In fact, there is nothing about the place that does not need fixing except the old man and his wife; they are all right.

The boy writes home and he says:

Dad, I have been over here more than 2 years. I went through these battles. You know what I am doing now?—

He answers his own question—

I am cleaning streets and gutters, the basements of buildings that have been wrecked, and out houses, out buildings in Germany.

He said:

Dad, I would like to come home. Can you write HOFFMAN and see if I can't come home?

You all have dozens of letters similar in import to that. What can we do about it? Not one single thing until Congress asserts itself and determines whether or not this Nation is not only to continue to send money and material abroad to every country in the world to put them on their feet and reestablish them in business, but in addition to go one step further and conscript men and keep men who are now in the service over there doing the dirty work of rebuilding Germany and other countries.

A fellow says, "What would you do? Let them all come home and leave the rest of the world go to wrack and ruin?" No. I told you what I would do about Germany. "What would you do about Japan?" Well, just as soon as Wainwright and those men who were in prison in Japan have recovered their health and their strength, if they want to—mind you, I say "if they want to"; they have earned a rest and we should not ask anything more of them, but if they want to, and some of them may want to, if they want to go back to Japan and teach the Japs the American way of life, with the aid of volunteers that we can get, I think they would do a very good job. I think the Japs would really learn something worth while if Wainwright went back there, and if some of those fellows who were kicked around and knocked around in the Jap camps were put in command over those camps, I am quite sure the Japs would have a lesson which they would remember for a long, long time.

I much prefer that way of dealing with Japan to having some fellow with a choke collar and a long-tail coat and a boiled shirt, down here in the State Department or some other department of the Government—and I mean no disrespect to them—go over there and try to run things. Let the boys who took the kicks, the beatings, and the blows over there do the policing and the teaching.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman has made a splendid suggestion. I should like to suggest also that the survivors of Bataan and Corregidor and the Philippine Islands be used as the court martial to prosecute the war criminals in Japan. Does the gentleman concur in that suggestion?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not having had any actual part in the war, I do not have much to say about it except that I want these American boys back home, and I do not want any more sent over there.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman on that, too.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does the gentleman not think if we need a large-scale occupation force in Japan and Korea that the Chinese people who understand the Oriental mind and who have suffered at the hands of the Japanese for many years and who have some four-hundred-odd-million population, of which many millions are unemployed, could supply part of that occupation force?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It does occur to some of us that if you put an American here and there over there and give him enough Chinese and enough volunteers we would make out all right. I think they could take care of Japan. The fellows who have won the war ought to have something to say about what should be done about it, if they want to.

Mr. BUFFETT. The Chinese can understand them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. BUFFETT. They know the oriental mind. They are of the same color and race. They could certainly do a better job than we could do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You mean that the Japanese would come out of the Chinese laundry highly polished, or perhaps as stiff as a properly laundered shirt?

Mr. BUFFETT. That is right.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman has made a very serious charge, if it is true, against those who are handling our army of occupation. It was never my understanding that the army of occupation was to be used for the purpose of reconstructing and rebuilding Germany or any of those countries. We were to go over there to police those countries. Certainly the gentleman does not mean to intimate that our boys are going to continue to be drafted, and thus kept over there in armies of occupation to rebuild the country which we have torn up in order to win the war? Does the gentleman make that charge, that we are setting up a labor battalion to send over there under the guise of a policing army to do the rebuilding over there?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, listen, we yelled our heads off when Hitler took those people out of the conquered countries and put them in his factories, did we not? We thought it was an outrage, and it was. We squawked when Stalin, following Hitler's policy, started taking the Germans up into Russia and took some of the Polish folks as well. That was wrong. That was unthinkable. But I am telling you if the statements in letters which I receive, not one letter, but many letters, are true, that our men over there are not only doing policing duty but doing manual work and cleaning up and rebuilding some of those towns and cities, that, to my mind, is outrageous and unthinkable. Are not the folks at home working long hours to feed and clothe the people of the overrun countries? Do you think men in the service are not doing manual labor as well as walking a beat? I make no charge against the Army officials nor the officials of the Navy. That is not the point. It is these internationalists down here at the other end of the Avenue and in New York City and other cities who are determined that our men, who they say were fighting for the four freedoms, should be kept over there. Now, why should we keep them over there?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Talking about the letters that you have been receiving, I received a letter this morning from the president of the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Association, the organization that supplies the milk to Washington, asking that the German prisoners of war be kept here to work on these farms because they cannot get anybody else, and that with all the unemployment that we have. I know that on VJ-day three farm hands, milking hands, in my community packed up that night and left the farms. Now, what are we going to do here to keep these farms running when that kind of a condition exists? Do we want to provide money to keep people on the idle list, these idle groups that form everywhere because of unemployment? Are we going to pay them to stay idle and have people leave the farms? What is going to happen to these people?

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I say to the gentleman that in my home county of Allegan we have a prisoner-of-war camp. I do not know how many hundred German prisoners of war are there. Day after day they go out in their trucks to packing plants and to the farms. They are eating three good meals a day. They are enjoying the society of our people and living out in the open. And the last time from my own county, a small agricultural county, there went fifty-odd young farm boys to be sent across the seas in the occupational forces. Now, what are they going to do when they get over there? They will take orders and they will work. Meanwhile, these several hundred German war prisoners travel around in the boys' home streets and their country roads enjoying everything there is to enjoy here in America, except the privilege of going where they wish.

Mr. GROSS. Yesterday I had a letter from a young wife saying, "I have six children, the youngest is 4 weeks old, and the oldest is 8 years old. They took my husband a month ago."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure, that is the internationalists' idea.

Mr. GROSS. That is stirring up a lot of indignation. Do not forget that. That is righteous indignation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you not know that the plan has been to send American young men across to fight that war and then to have perhaps a million or two of them to act as a police or occupational force?

At the same time, they are keeping German prisoners in this country; at the same time, they are bringing refugees in and retaining other refugees to fill the places of the men who are conscripted. In some of the buildings in the packing places where our boys rightfully belong, the cooperative canning plants—and I saw them last week myself—these German prisoners are sitting down to their meals at places where these boys ought to be. Our boys are going away. These prisoners are here, safe from the Russians.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be granted 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Getting back to the army of occupation, I would suggest to the gentleman, and also to the administration, that we allow soldiers from New Zealand, Australia, the Philippines, and China to become a part of our occupation forces so that we can relieve some young Americans who are entitled to come back home.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, that is not in accordance with the internationalists' plans. America furnishes the most of the money, the material, and the men; and others reap the benefit.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I had a letter a day or two ago from a soldier saying that his group all had enough points to be discharged but they did not discharge them. He said, "They put us out mowing grass, and we are cutting the grass with bayonets, just to keep us in the Army, just to keep jobs for a lot of brass hats." That is what he wrote, and I think he wrote the truth.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This is my point, and the only point I am trying to make. Yes, our men abroad should be returned to their home land. They have completed their tasks and they are entitled to enjoy at least one of the freedoms for which they fought, for which their comrades died.

True, it is just possible that some of them, if they are returned home, may want jobs and so come in competition with the political allies of the Administration, of the New Dealers, the union bosses. It is possible that if a million, or several million, of these young men return home, they will insist upon working, upon jobs, and it is barely possible that, having fought an enemy on foreign soil, they will refuse to pay dues to labor

racketeers and politicians, and so, if the closed shop advocates have their way, be prevented from holding a job, be denied freedom from want.

That the internationalists and the New Dealers are determined to conscript American young men for foreign labor, for work in other lands, is shown by the fact that it is now said that we must continue to draft young men 18 through 25. Vicious propaganda is being employed to put over that measure—false propaganda which holds that unless we continue the draft in peacetime, men now in the service must stay in for years—which is being pushed not only by Communists and by New Dealers, but by well-dressed, well-fed, well-financed, old men who sit in their club rooms or in their palatial homes and—figuratively speaking—clip coupons coming from war babies' stocks. These staid, eminently respectable gentlemen, with a toddy at their elbow, comfort surrounding them, take no part in the fighting or the working. They just sit, and sit, and plan for others to sacrifice while they in safety profit. They take what they are pleased to call the larger, liberal view.

The truth of the matter is that, if we would give, if we would offer, to volunteers and to men who wish to make the armed services their life work, compensation and benefits in any way comparable to those given workers in war industries, there would be no need either to retain in Europe those who now want to come home, or to draft here in America those boys who are just entering upon life's threshhold, who should be either in schools, colleges, and universities, or in business enterprises, preparing for the future.

Britain's request that we give her $6,000,000,000 to finance socialism—a scheme of government contrary to our own tried methods and procedure—would seem to have reached the apex of absurdity. We have given Britain billions of dollars, yet, when Republicans oppose giving her another six thousand millions to finance her political experiments, the President calls us silly. Someone is whispering in his ear.

Unable to furnish the capital to purchase the banks, the mines, and the railroads of England, they ask us to give them the money to try the experiment of government ownership and operation. We have given Great Britain billions upon billions of dollars. Our forefathers—more courageous and independent than are we—demonstrated by eight long years of warfare that taxation without representation would not be permitted here in America. The New Dealers have forsaken that policy and for the past 12 years have yielded to the blandishments of the British so-called nobility. Not content with giving away our national resources and our dollars, the internationalists now propose to continue the policy of conscripting American youth to do the dirty work of Europe and to keep in foreign lands those who fought, won, and survived the war.

It is time that true Americans—isolationists, if you wish, nationalists, if you prefer—hand back to the mongrel outfit which got us into this war, which engineered our national bankruptcy, which would destroy our Government, a little advice, give it an outline of policy, and make its members understand by our acts, as well as by our words, that America has had enough of their efforts to betray her, that from this day on we intend that we, like Stalin and Churchill, will insist that the interests and the welfare of our Nation and our people be given first consideration.

Let us force the return to his home, if he so wishes, of every man and woman in the service. Let us end the conscription of Americans for the policing, the street cleaning, the rebuilding of foreign towns, cities, and lands.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

WORLD-WIDE COMMUNISM

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Lord John Maynard Keynes, one of the arch leaders of world communism and the British Welfare State, if not the outstanding leader of both, is again in the United States conniving with Treasury and other Government officials to draw more blood from the American people for transfusing the economy of his native country, which is now so critically ill from the deadly nostrums administered to it by him and others like him.

Keynes is probably the leader of world communism because he is the greatest exponent of fiat money (he is credited with being the father of New Deal deficit spending) which is both the basis and sustaining power of this archaic cult.

According to newspaper reports, Keynes wants the taxpayers of the United States to make an additional gift of from three to five billion dollars to his country, though, of course, he seems not to recommend that the terms of it be couched in such bald terms as this:

The United States and the rest of the world will be better off—

He says—

as the result of Great Britain's economic salvation.

In my judgment there is no hope whatsoever for the economic salvation of England under the scheme of state socialism—a euphemistic expression for communism—whether we make a gift to her of five or fifty billion dollars. In fact, the more we give her the more she will have to squander upon her messing with communism, which can only lead to her ultimate doom.

Of course, Treasury and other Government officials will lend a sympathetic ear to Lord Keynes' spurious pleas because our Nation is now also dominated by the spirit of the welfare state—a euphemistic term for political exploitation of our people as a whole and of the poor and laboring classes in particular — which also identifies itself with communism. Through the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme, so-called lend-lease, and the Charter of United Nations, the regime now in control of our Government has committed this Nation to the establishment of world-wide communism. Lord Keynes understands these things, else he would not be here as a suppliant for more hand-outs.

Of course, I would favor the extension of aid to England if I had the least idea that it would be used by her to rebuild her economy instead of destroying it, but even then only with due consideration of our own financial situation. But I am not convinced of this. On the contrary, I feel strongly that Lord Keynes and his political clique would only use what funds we might give them to further undermine the English economy, pauperize her people, and complete the authoritarian state toward which they are now driving at full speed.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does not the gentleman think that there may come out of this present visit quite a striking similarity between the military appeasement of Hitler in 1938 and what is now proposed as the financial appeasement of England in 1945? Hitler told the English at that time that they either had to go along with this scheme or there would be military trouble in Europe. Now we are told we had better go along with this English scheme or there will be financial trouble in England that will extend to us. Does not the gentleman believe that any kind of appeasement, whether it be military or financial, will bring disaster in the long run?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Generally speaking, I certainly agree with that proposition.

Mr. BUFFETT. On the other hand, if England had some sound plan for establishing a balanced budget in their land and reestablishing their finances America should cooperate in every way practical consonant with our financial situation. Is not that right?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is correct, but how can you expect the English people to adopt a program of that kind when our own Government is definitely committed to endless deficit spending as certainly is exhibited in the President's recent message to Congress?

Mr. BUFFETT. Does the gentleman know of any instance in history where a government has followed consistently the pathway of deficit spending without eventually having dictatorship, concentration camps, and disaster of all kinds?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I know of none such.

Mr. BUFFETT. I do not believe there are any in history.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], may have permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

POSTWAR LOANS TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, at his press conference on yesterday President Truman is quoted as having declared it was "a perfectly silly conclusion" that the United States should not give aid to Great Britain because of the socialistic program of the laborite government now in power there. Let us see just how silly my proposal is.

The President no doubt recalls that the British Government back in 1929 was also controlled by labor. Ramsay MacDonald was then Prime Minister, and it was his government that repudiated Britain's debt to the United States. What one labor government has already done it is perfectly capable of doing again.

For the President's information let us examine the record of some of these so-called liberal or radical governments in paying their debts. When the Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky took over control in Russia back in 1917, one of their first acts was to repudiate all government obligations and foreign holders of Russian securities lost hundreds of millions of dollars. Many were wiped out.

France also had a radical government when she reneged on her debt to this country. In fairness I want to say that we can have little criticism over her action beeause it was with the help of France that America achieved her independence.

It has been the experience down through the years that liberal governments are notoriously liberal with other people's money but they are shyer than a Shylock when it comes to paying the bill.

We are told in this morning's papers that a British commission is now in Washington to negotiate for financial aid and expects the American taxpayers to give them outright anywhere from three to six billion dollars to be used to finance rehabilitation of trade and industry, and failing in that, to negotiate an interest-free, long-term loan.

Do not my colleagues think that it takes a lot of nerve for a country that has already gypped us out of $6,500,000,000, and who was given $29,500,000,000 in lend-lease during the war, to come here and ask us to again trust them?

Barnum never said a truer thing in his life than when he said that the American people love to be humbugged. There are no other people so naive and trusting. Many times have I seen crowds of them stand gaping pop-eyed about the stand of a patent medicine vendor selling a medicine that would cure everything from bunions to consumption and when he got through with his spiel had money shoved at him faster than he could take it in.

This morning's mail contained a very considerable number of letters from American taxpayers and without a single exception all of them commended my efforts to protect the Treasury and the American taxpayers. Among the letters is one from a foreign-born gentleman who for many years represented one of the leading European newspapers in America. While he expressly requests me to not use his name, I can say that he was born in one of the occupied countries and his loyalty to the cause of the United Nations cannot be questioned. Let me read from his letter:

DEAR SIR: I have just been reading an outline in the New York Sun of your speech regarding the efforts of the British to milk their American "colonials" of another few billion dollars. I wish to congratulate you on your efforts to stick up for us American taxpayers; it is about time the American Congress, and Government in general, began to look after the welfare of Americans as contrasted to the concern always shown in Washington for British welfare. When I see that we Americans have contributed roughly about $40,000,000,000 to the British Treasury during the last 25 years, nearly $400,000,000 a year over the last 100 years, I am frank to say that it seems to me the labor of General-President Washington was a failure, or at least that his great works have been more or less nullified by subsequent administrations in Washington, D. C. I for one have never felt that an American citizen has any duty to pay taxes into the British Treasury nor that he has any obligation of any sort to the British Empire—the continued assessment of taxes upon Americans for the benefit of the British, mostly hitting the low-income taxpayer seems to imply a situation bordering on dual citizenship without any representation to vote on British affairs on the part of the American tax contributor. I wish Congressmen would always speak of the taxpayers' money rather than of the Treasury's money when discussing Government funds, that would make the general public conscious of where the money comes from and to whom it really belongs.

You ask, according to the newspaper reports, "What kind of saps do they think we are?" Well, that's a fair question and now I am going to hand you an opinion that will make your eyes pop, and so much more so because it is (or was) semiofficial inasmuch as the speaker of the piece was none other than Mr. Philip Kerr, former Secretary to the late Lloyd George, and later to become Lord Lothian, Ambassador of the British to our own Government. I think the big handsome friendly Lord Lothian was a very likable fellow and about the best representative the British ever had in Washington, even though some American officials have taken pretty good care of British interests, too. I wonder if Philip Kerr would have talked so freely had he then dreamed that he some day would be Ambassador to the United States.

Well, this is what happened around 1921 or 1922 when I attended an international gathering at Williamstown, Mass., where Philip Kerr was heading a round-table conference at a session at Williams College discussing international polices. I was present there for a short time as a special representative for the * * * newspaper * * *. I had hoped to meet Mr. Lloyd George who was traveling the country about the same time but I missed a chance to see him. So, what was more natural than to seek an interview with the man who was his private secretary during the last—no, let me say, the First World War. I found Mr. Kerr staying at a private residence on the campus of the college and sent a request for an interview in behalf of the * * * paper. I was told to call the following forenoon, which I did, introducing myself as the correspondent for the * * * paper.

Our conversation turned more or less to what he thought of America, Americans, and America's part in the European war from 1917 to 1918. Mr. Kerr evidently took me for a visiting reporter just over from * * * for he said right to the start: "Well, I see you are not an American so we can talk freely." And talk freely he did. I think he loved to talk with people. Part of his answers about things American ran about like this, and I remember that conversation almost as if it had been last month (it was during the month of August)—"Well, as to America's claim that the Americans won the war, you know, and I know, of course, who won it, but if it makes the Americans happy to think that they won it, why hurt their feelings by disputing them."

Further: "The American people are rather naive and provincial, but they are also very good hearted, and very friendly. If they like you they will give you their shirt off their back. All you have to do is to tell them what a wonderful country they have got, that they have the biggest of everything, and—here's the pay-off—what a wonderful fellow President Washington was. If you do that there is nothing they won't do for you."

I have never forgotten that conversation but I never used it for any reports to the * * * paper because it was of no special value to their readers. I have never used it here either in any letters to the editor, because I am an American citizen and since Mr. Kerr became Lord Lothian and Ambassador to the United States of America, I felt I would not use a private conversation to stir up a hornet's nest during troubled times. I must say, though, that when Lord Lothian appeared before a gathering in Virginia while he was Ambassador, and claimed that the British felt that Washington was one of their own and what a great man the British thought he was, that I thought was the old master himself, out to get the shirt off the back of the Americans, and he certainly got it, and more than that, he got the blood and sweat and the tears as well. And that's the story of my little talk with Philip Kerr, may his soul rest in peace, for he was a great statesman, and a great Englishman, and if he took us American provincial, naive "suckers" for a ride I shall not blame him, but rather the American politician who is always looking after the welfare of the British "firsters."

I am in perfect accord with those who take the position that what the United Kingdom does in her internal affairs is none of our concern. If the majority of their people wish to take over the banking system, the railroads, the coal mines, the utilities, and heavy industries, which I doubt, with their background, they have every right to do so without outside interference or criticism, that is a matter for the English to determine for themselves. On the other hand, we do have a right to scrutinize with meticulous care the prospectus and financial situation of any country that applies to us for a loan or a grant. One of the British negotiators is John Maynes Keynes, long touted as one of Britain's outstanding economists. If my memory serves me right, it was Lord Keynes who sold the late President Roosevelt on the idea that the more the Government owed the better off it would be. Also, that he was one of the Britons who was instrumental in bringing about Britain's repudiation of her debt to us in 1929. So much for Lord Keynes.

The policy announced by the new labor government in Britain is somewhat along the lines followed by Leon Blum, who, while Premier of France, followed an economic and political policy

that culminated at Dunkerque. I merely mention these incidents of history in order to keep the record straight.

If we make a grant or loan aggregating billions of dollars to a government that is dedicated to the destruction of the free-enterprise system, what assurance have we that it would not in time be again repudiated as were the debts of Britain, France, Belgium, and Russia? I would like to ask the President if he would approve such a loan if he were president of a bank. I would like to further ask what American banks would be willing to underwrite such a loan.

These are some things we should think of before we rashly enter into commitments that we have every reason to believe later would be repudiated, if we care to judge the future by the past.

ALLOWANCE TO ENLISTED MEN FOR UNUSED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of our law and Army regulations an officer is permitted to accumulate as much as 30 days leave of absence a year. In the event he does not use the 30 days a year, when he asks for his discharge he becomes entitled to pay for the unused leave of absence.

Mr. Speaker, this does not now apply to the enlisted man, and I am therefore introducing a bill which will give to the enlisted man and every enlisted man 2½ days per month, or 30 days a year leave of absence and when he asks for a discharge he will be entitled to the same pay he is receiving in the Army during the time he has been in the service for the unused portion of his leave. This, in my opinion, is only fair to the enlisted personnel. The officers get it and the men who have been serving under them, the GI Joes, should receive the same consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will give serious consideration to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAVAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a letter and also an editorial.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a copy of a letter addressed to the President.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2. An act to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 14, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, September 27, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 1751, to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Merchant Marine Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 4050. A bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act, except section 9 thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 4051. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 341. Resolution urging the United States to insist on fair trade practices by Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4052. A bill for the relief of Clement Euziere; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4053. A bill for the relief of Benali El Oukili Boucheta; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4054. A bill for the relief of H. A. Edd; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4055. A bill to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of water damage occurring at certain naval and Marine Corps shore activities; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 4056. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jud Hendry and her daughter, Gladys Hendry; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1156. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of residents of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, September 10, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the quiet of this moment of prayer, we would make our souls the sanctuary of Thy spirit. Be Thou our chart and compass in all the complex problems of state. Endue with understanding and sympathy, as well as with a sense of stern justice, those who as Thy ministers in great capitals of the world are planning peace and plenty for lands torn and uprooted by the ghastly horrors of war.

Grant us brotherhood, not of words but of acts, not bounded by barriers of tongue—a brotherhood that sees that freedom must be nurtured or it dies, that if our brethren anywhere are oppressed we are oppressed, that if they hunger we hunger. As workers together with Thee, teach our hearts and our hands to build, in these our days, that city where Thou shalt dwell with man, where darkness and sorrow and pain and want shall be no more. In the dear Redeemer's name, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, September 12, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3660. An act to provide for financial control of Government corporations; and

H. R. 3974. An act to provide for termination of daylight saving time.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the bill (H. R. 3907) to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE FILED DURING THE RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 12th instant,

Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which were referred the following bills, reported them on Sep-

tember 13, 1945, and submitted reports thereon:

S. 102. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil-service status under such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 560);

S. 405. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 563);

S. 576. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification; without amendment (Rept. No. 561);

S. 1036. A bill to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave; without amendment (Rept. No. 562); and

H. R. 3256. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, in order to protect the retirement rights of persons who leave the service to enter the armed forces of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 564).

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PEARL HARBOR ATTACK

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] as the members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee to Investigate the Pearl Harbor Attack, authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 27.

The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of these appointments.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FOR FLORAL WREATH ON OCCASION OF FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR JOHNSON, OF CALIFORNIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Hiram W. Johnson, Jr., of San Francisco, Calif., expressing appreciation on the part of the family of the late Senator Johnson, of California, for the floral wreath sent by the Senate on the occasion of his funeral, which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RESCISSIONS OF PORTIONS OF NAVY DEPARTMENT AND NAVAL SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS (H. Doc. No. 286)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed rescissions of portions of appropriations available for the Navy Department and naval service for the fiscal year 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF POSTMASTERS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the Alien Property Custodian transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for his office for the quarter ending December 31, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Floyd W. Nelson, president of the Artesia Growers Association, Bell Flower, Calif., praying for the continuation of the present system of recruiting and distributing farm labor; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A telegram from Erwin Clarkson Garrett, of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the purchase of war bonds by members of the armed services; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Thirty-seventh Annual Governors' Conference, at Mackinac Island, Mich., favoring the location of the headquarters and capitol site of the United Nations organization at some place within the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of several citizens of the States of California and Minnesota, praying for the completion of the monument to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in the granite of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial in the Black Hills of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Library.

A letter in the nature of a petition from F. W. Brown, Sr., of Pell City, Ala., relating to the secret of the atomic bomb; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A radiogram in the nature of a petition, from the American Chamber of Commerce of the Philippine Islands, Manila, P. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for reimbursement of a part of the war damage losses in the Philippines, and the extension of free trade between the Philippine Islands and the United States for a specified period, so as to provide immediate economic rehabilitation to the islands; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

A resolution adopted by mothers of infants receiving care at the South Boston (Mass.) nursery, favoring the enactment of legislation to continue the nursery to care for the children of men in the armed forces at South Boston (Mass.); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by Clinton Post, No. 523, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Clinton, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation providing that a veteran of the armed forces be allowed to return to his former employment after discharge from the service, and that this right be not dependent upon the official date set for the end of the war; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Duluth, Minn., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 599, to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in periodicals, newspapers, radio, motion pictures, or any other form of alcoholic advertising; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSING FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a national conference of civic organizations was held at the Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C., on September 12, 1945, for the purpose of studying the full-employment bill. This conference adopted a resolution endorsing the full-employment bill, S. 380, to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, and urging its early passage by the Congress. During the course of the conference Mr. Lewis G. Hines, legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor, in discussing the proposed legislation, said:

The 7,000,000 members of the AFL stand squarely behind the Murray bill, better known as the full-employment bill, now pending before Congress. The approval of the AFL for this legislation was contained in a statement presented by AFL President William Green to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency during the recent hearings. There is insistent need for this type of legislation to insure the perpetuation of free enterprise and sufficient employment for all who need work and are willing to work. Our membership has been fully apprised of the merits of this legislation through contacts with our national, State, and city bodies. Wide response from the millions of wage earners represented by the AFL reflects the demand of the American workers that this legislation should pass without delay.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution which I have just mentioned, together with a list of the organizations represented at this conference, be appropriately referred and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution and list of organizations represented at the conference were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF EARLY ENACTMENT OF AN EFFECTIVE FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL (PROPOSED AND ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, SEPTEMBER 12, 1945, WASHINGTON, D. C.)

The following statement is made by the undersigned in behalf of their organizations:

"Action to assure confidence in continuing full employment is necessary for the transition to peace and later. The sequence of temporary dislocation, postwar boom and final collapse are deadly threats to economic and social stability at home and to the maintenance of peace throughout the world.

"Dislocation and transition are already upon us. Millions of Americans are already turned out unwanted to look for jobs. Measures to alleviate these temporary hardships are necessary and should be taken immediately but confidence in postwar prosperity and stability is the essential to prompt and lasting recovery.

"Nothing can so foster that necessary confidence in the hearts of workers, farmers, business and professional people and all others as to know that their Government will, in their names, dedicate its full constitutional power to the performance of this duty.

"It is necessary and proper for the Government of the United States to adopt immediately legislation which will recognize the right of all Americans willing and able to work to useful, regular, remunerative, and full-time employment, and which will recognize the responsibility of the Government, acting on behalf of all the people, to assure opportunities to exercise that right.

"Legislation which will commit the power of the Federal Government to assure sustained full employment is the first step needed. Such legislation must contain these vital and indivisible principles:

"1. All Americans willing and able to work have the right to useful, remunerative, suitable, regular, and full-time employment;

"2. It is the responsibility and the duty of the Federal Government to assure, by whatever means are needful, that sufficient employment opportunities exist for all Americans to exercise this right at all times;

"3. It is the responsibility and the duty of the Federal Government to coordinate the appropriate activities of the Federal Government in order to foster the highest possible sustained level of employment through private enterprise and to provide useful Federal investment and expenditure adequate to maintain full production and full employment.

"We urge the Congress of the United States to pass promptly legislation containing as a minimum these positive commitments and to this end we pledge our efforts and support."

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (TO DATE) WHICH SIGNED THE ABOVE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL AT THE FULL-EMPLOYMENT CONFERENCE, SEPTEMBER 12, 1945

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.
American Association of Social Workers.
American Federation of Labor.
American Jewish Congress.
Americans United for World Organization.
American Veterans Committee.
Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches.
Disabled American Veterans.
Hosiery Wholesalers National Association.
Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.
League of Women Shoppers.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Board, Y. W. C. A.
National Citizens Political Action Committee.
National Conference of Jewish Women.
National Consumers League.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Council of Scientific, Professional, Art, and White Collar Organizations.
National Council for the Social Studies.
National Education Association of the United States.
National Farmers Union.
National Lawyers' Guild.
National Urban League.
National Women's Trade Union League of America.
Non-Partisan Council of Alpha Kappa Alpha.
Progressive Businessmen, Inc.
Railway Labor Executives Association.
Southern Conference for Human Welfare.
Union for Democratic Action.
United Christian Council for Democracy.
United Council for Church Women.
United States Conference of Mayors.
United Steel Workers of America.
W. I. V. E. S.
Methodist Federation for Social Service.
Business Men of America, Inc.
National Catholic Welfare Conference.
Synagogue Council of America.

SENIORITY RIGHTS FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on the 13th of August 1945, the Grain Processors Union No. 18619, of the American Federation of Labor, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, adopted resolutions proposing that veterans of this war be given seniority rights in employment equal to the length of their service in the war. The story of this action appeared in the Cedar Rapids Tribune about August 17. The article tells the story concisely, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL 18619 FIRST TO GIVE NEW SERVICE MEMBERS SENIORITY

Grain Processors Union No. 18619 (AFL), the members of which are employed at the Cedar Rapids Penick & Ford plant, so far as it can be determined became the first local union in the Nation to give nonmember honorably discharged veterans of World War II seniority rights equal to the length of their service in the armed forces.

The action of the union came on adoption of a resolution submitted at a special meeting of the local held in the Labor Temple Monday night. The resolution was introduced by Hugh A. Sheridan, legislative officer of Post No. 788, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the local also stipulated that initiation fees for servicemen would be waived.

Sheridan said that the principle upon which the union action was based was incorporated in an agreement reached in 1944 between national headquarters of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the presidents of the American Federation of Labor and the CIO, William Green and Philip Murray, both of whom left it up to local organizations to make the agreement effective. Sheridan credited Senator B. B. HICKENLOOPER with furnishing information and advice relative to the Selective Service Act and other data on which the union's resolution was based.

The resolution adopted by the grain processors should not be confused with the action taken by practically all international and local unions guaranteeing no loss of seniority rights to members who left their jobs to enter the armed services. The grain processors union was one of the first to take that action. The resolution adopted Monday night deals with an entirely different phase of the matter as it pertains to honorably discharged persons who may enter employment under the union's jurisdiction after the war for the first time.

The resolution grants such workers the same number of months of seniority as they have served in the armed forces since September 16, 1940. In other words, plant seniority begins with the time the new worker entered the service, less the time that may have elapsed between the date of his discharge and the day on which he entered employment at the plant.

There are no conditions imposed under the seniority rights granted by the resolution. In case of lay-off, the new worker will be protected for the entire time of his service-acquired seniority, regardless of the length of his employment before lay-offs occur.

Officers of local No. 18619 include Roy Houser, president; L. B. Stastny, recording secretary, and R. T. Tanner, financial secretary. The union is an affiliate of the American Federation of Grain Processors, the Cedar Rapids Federation of Labor, and the Iowa State Federation of Labor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I also ask that the resolutions be appropriately referred and printed at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL LABOR UNION NO. 18619,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa, September 12, 1945.

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and the leaders of the AFL and the CIO did meet and agree to principles of seniority for honorably discharged veterans of World War II; and

Whereas this has been left to the action of local unions in putting this principle of seniority for veterans into practice: Therefore be it

Resolved, That local No. 18619, American Federation of Grain Processors, hereby endorses and proposes to amend the seniority clauses of the existing agreement to read: "New employees who are honorably discharged veterans of World War II shall be given full seniority credits equal to the number of months served in the armed forces since September 16, 1940"; and be it further

Resolved, That at the union meeting of August 13, 1945, we hereby go on record as amending our seniority clauses to this effect, and copies of this resolution shall be submitted to the president of the American Federation of Labor and the president of the American Federation of Grain Processors for their consideration and further action among the affiliated locals.

Respectfully submitted by:

HUGH A. SHERIDAN.

Adopted by unanimous ballot at the regular meeting, Monday, August 13.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, let me say further that I commend the action of this group in recognizing the seniority rights of returning servicemen in this manner, in confronting the problem, and taking some substantial and, I believe, forward steps in trying to put seniority recognition for the servicemen into their program.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 565) thereon.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report from the chairman of the Surplus Property Subcommittee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURPLUS PROPERTY,
September 12, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Surplus Property Subcommittee (S. Res. 129) of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the Department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Surplus
Property Subcommittee.

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Kurt Borchardt	6007 34th Pl. NW., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	$7,240
Mabel Graham	1474 Columbia Rd. NW., Washington, D. C	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C	2,320
Bertram M. Gross	613 South Quincy St., Arlington, Va	Navy Department, Washington, D. C	8,750
Hilda Hamilton	705 18th St. NW., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	2,890
Doris Phippen	40 Plattsburgh Court NW., Washington, D. C	Navy Department, Washington, D. C	2,650

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1385. A bill to provide for aid in industrialization of underdeveloped areas; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. OVERTON (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER) introduced Senate bill 1386, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. HATCH, by request, introduced Senate bill 1387, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1388. A bill concerning the guardianship in the District of Columbia of incompetent veterans, and other incompetent and minor beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration, and concerning commitment to the Veterans' Administration or other agency of the United States of persons eligible for care or treatment; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. REED introduced Senate bill 1389, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference four bills and ask that they may be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills introduced by Mr. LANGER were received, read twice by their titles, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and referred, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1390

A bill to limit the time within which certain actions may be brought by the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That no suit shall be brought by the United States or by any department, independent establishment, or agency thereof (including a Government-owned or controlled corporation), upon any contract, express or implied, or for damages, liquidated or unliquidated, in cases not sounding in tort, unless the same shall be commenced within 6 years after the date on which the cause of action accrued, and any such suit pending on the date of enactment of this act, which was brought by the United States more than 6 years after the date on which the cause of action accrued, shall abate.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1391

A bill to prohibit further inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) after the date of enactment of this act no person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and (b) any person who was inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States prior to the date of enactment of this act shall be discharged from such forces upon written application therefor in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be.

S. 1392

A bill to provide for the immediate release from the armed forces of persons two or more of whose brothers or sisters have lost their lives in line of duty in the military or naval service of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That in any case in which two or more brothers or sisters of any person in the armed forces of the United States shall have died in line of duty while serving as members of the armed forces of the United States, such person shall, upon application therefor filed by himself or by his parents, be immediately discharged or released from active duty in such forces.

S. 1393

A bill to provide for the discharge of all but one member of any family that has two or more members serving in the armed forces

Be it enacted, etc., That in any case in which there are two or more brothers or sisters in the armed forces of the United States, and all of such brothers or sisters are not otherwise entitled to a release or discharge, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized and directed to immediately discharge or release from active duty all but one of such brothers or sisters. In determining which of such brothers or sisters shall be discharged the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized and directed to retain only such brother or sister who has the lowest relative number of discharge points under the discharge system of the service of which he is a member and who does not have a sufficient number of points to be entitled to a release or discharge on such basis or is not otherwise entitled to a release or discharge. In no case shall such brother or sister retained be kept in the armed forces beyond the date on which he would be entitled to a release or discharge by virtue of any law of the United States or regulation of the armed forces.

(Mr. BROOKS introduced Senate bill 1394, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1395. A bill to authorize the incorporation of National Association, Rainbow Division Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1396. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in potatoes so as to provide an adequate and stable supply with fair prices for producers and consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. REVERCOMB (for himself and Mr. BYRD) introduced Senate bill 1397, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McMAHON (for himself and Mr. MCFARLAND):

S. 1398. A bill to assure the disposition of Government surplus airports and airport facilities in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of public airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1399. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain enemy property to the government of the Philippine Commonwealth; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

GEN. CLAIRE L. CHENNAULT

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. ELLENDER] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for proper reference a bill.

I desire to state that the purpose of this bill is to provide that upon retirement from temporary active duty Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault shall be placed upon the retired list with the rank and shall receive pay computed on the pay of the highest grade held by him while serving on active duty under temporary appointment.

I am introducing this bill without the knowledge and without the suggestion, direct or indirect, of General Chennault. I am doing so because I feel that this recognition ought to be given to one of the great generals of World War II, a master of strategy in air combat. I am happy to become sponsor of this bill because General Chennault is a Louisianian.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1386) to permit Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault to retire at the highest rank held by him while on active duty was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. In connection with the bill I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Interior addressed to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] explaining the purposes of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1387) relative to the disposition of public lands of the United States situated in the State of Oklahoma between the Cimarron base line and the north boundary of the State of Texas was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The letter presented to Mr. HATCH is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., August 23, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: Enclosed is the draft of a bill "Relative to the disposition of public lands of the United States situated in the State of Oklahoma between the Cimarron base line and the north boundary of the State of Texas." I request that this draft be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and recommend its enactment.

This proposed bill is substantially the same as S. 1868, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Although the lands covered by the proposed legislation are public-domain lands, the public-land laws will not permit the proper disposition of these lands so as to benefit the claimants thereto.

When the original surveys were extended over the western part of Oklahoma, it was believed that the Cimarron base line and the true north boundary of Texas were identical. Accordingly, no public-land surveys were extended south of that base line. It was later ascertained, however, that the Cimarron base line is north of the true north boundary of the Texas Panhandle and that lying between the two lines there is a strip of land approximately 156 miles long, which varies in width from a point to 500 feet and which contains approximately 4,900 acres. All the land in question was "withdrawn from settlement, location, sale, or entry, for classification and pending legislation authorizing the disposal thereof and for the relief of bona fide claimants" by Executive order of April 17, 1934, and the order is still in full force and effect. A survey has been made of the strip and the plats of survey have been accepted, but the official filing of these plats has been held awaiting legislation protecting the rights of the parties who claim under Texas title.

There are many improvements within the strip, most of which are the property of Texas landowners. It appears that in most cases the Texas landowners considered the Cimarron base line, which was plainly marked, as the true north boundary of Texas. This strip of land was never a part of Texas, although claimed by Texas landowners.

The draft of the bill, like S. 1868, varies in material respects from H. R. 4890, Seventy-fifth Congress, which was passed by the House of Representatives on June 9, 1937. The period of adverse possession for the establishment of a claim is increased from 10 to 20 years and the 160-acre limitation is omitted. The 20-year period is the length of time in which color of title claims are generally considered to have become established, and is the length of time specified for this purpose in the general color of title act of December 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 1069, 43 U. S. C., secs. 1068, 1068a). The 160-acre limitation, while being of no advantage to the Government, would defeat the purpose of the bill, because it appears that at least two persons claim areas in the strip in excess of 160 acres. The phrase "railroad rights-of-way" is omitted from the dedication clause in section 2, as such rights-of-way are amply protected by existing law.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

RETURN OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE FACILITIES, ETC., TO THE STATES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to return to the States the employment service facilities, property, and personnel lent by them to the Federal Government for the duration of the war.

My bill would require the return within 90 days after enactment of the legislation. President Truman suggests the ultimate return of the employment services to the States. But not now. I think the return should be made at once.

The present policy, under which the United States Employment Service handles the registration of those seeking jobs and the State authorities pay the unemployment compensation claims, must inevitably produce much confusion. These two functions should be combined in one agency. I further propose to return the remaining employment functions to the Department of Labor where they belong. I have never been able to understand why a department created to especially deal with labor problems should be stripped of all authority to deal with such problems.

Furthermore, I am opposed to two propositions that seem to be in the mind of the administration in Washington now and for the past 12 years:

First. The evident intention to make the States provinces of the central government; bearing the relation to the Federal Government that counties bear to the States at present.

Second. The regionalization of the Nation into seven to nine regions, to be ruled by administrators or administrative boards to start with appointed by the President.

The attempt to federalize the employment service is one of the steps to put the first proposition into effect. Right in line is the effort to federalize unemployment compensation, and a number of other proposals along the same line.

The proposed valley authorities, through which the economic and political lives of individuals would be placed under Washington control, is an example of the second. I am opposed to these efforts also.

I believe in a strong central government, with adequate authority to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare in line with the basic principles upon which the Original Thirteen States adopted the Constitution and made it workable.

But the farther from home the administration of everyday local affairs is controlled, the less chance of the individual having any rights.

I do not admit that we fought this war to the end that the individual shall become the pawn of the all-powerful national state.

In the past two centuries we in the United States, and comparably in Europe, have worked for the freedom and dignity of the individual; using the Government as a device to protect and further the interests of the individual.

Now we seem to be rushing backward to create a state in which the individual counts for nothing—to reach ultimately the place where the ruler can say: "The State—I am the State."

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1389) to provide for returning to the States the Employment Service facilities, property, and personnel loaned to the United States, to transfer to the Department of Labor certain functions exercised by the War Manpower Commission with respect to such Service, and to abolish the War Manpower Commission, introduced by Mr. REED, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

FREE POSTAGE FOR HOSPITALIZED VETERANS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, for the first time in the history of the United States, the men and women of the armed services during the present war were granted free mail privileges. I am firmly of the opinion that it was one of the finest steps taken in the building of the morale of our servicemen and their loved ones and friends.

To many who will leave the service that privilege will come to an end, but for those who carry the marks and effects of war who will in the future, because of their service, be confined to hospitals for medical care and attention the war will not truly be over.

It was my pleasure to introduce the original amendment which paved the way for the final passage of the law for the free mail of our men and women in the service, and I now ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, the purpose of which is to provide the same free-mail privilege for the men and women of our armed services who may be confined to the hospitals conducted by the Veterans' Administration as a result of their service to our Nation.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to provide free postage for hospitalized veterans

Be it enacted, etc., That any first-class letter mail matter admissible to the mails as ordinary mail matter which is sent by a former member of the military or naval forces of the United States (including the United States Coast Guard), while hospitalized under the provisions of laws providing for the hospitalization of former members of the armed forces, to any person in the United States, including the Territories and possessions thereof, shall be transmitted in the mails free of postage, subject to such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1394) to provide free postage for hospitalized veterans, introduced by Mr. BROOKS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

RETURN TO VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENT SYSTEM

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for voluntary enlistments in the Army of the United States and the United States Naval Reserve, and for other purposes. The bill deals with voluntary enlistments in the Army of the United States, which is now filled by draftees under the selective-service law.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1397) to provide for voluntary enlistments in the Army of the United States and the United States Naval Reserve, and for other purposes, introduced by

Mr. REVERCOMB (for himself and Mr. BYRD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3660. An act to provide for financial control of Government corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3974. An act to provide for termination of daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PALESTINE: ENGLAND'S RESPONSIBILITY AND OURS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on September 11, 1945, on the subject, Palestine: England's Responsibility and Ours, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT WE ARE UP AGAINST IN ASIA—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What We Are Up Against in Asia," written by him and published in the Washington Star and other newspapers, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT'S LEGACY TO AMERICA AND THE WORLD—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared by him entitled "Roosevelt's Legacy to America and the World," published in the July 1945 issue of the India Quarterly, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY BEFORE MEETING OF CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator GUFFEY before a mass meeting of the Congress of Industrial Organizations held in Convention Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., September 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOME ASPECTS OF FOREIGN COMMERCE — ADDRESS BY SENATOR HART

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Some Aspects of Foreign Commerce," delivered by Senator HART before the New Haven (Conn.) Junior Chamber of Commerce, on September 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS POTATOES—RECOMMENDATIONS OF WHITE POTATO INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the recommendations of the White Potato Industry Advisory Committee at a meeting at Washington, D. C., on September 12–14, 1945, dealing with disposal of surplus potatoes, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE FUTURE OF FARMERS—ARTICLE FROM FARMERS DEFENDER

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Future of Farmers," published in the August 1945 issue of Farmers Defender, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—ARTICLE AND LETTER BY DR. MORRIS E. GARNSEY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article and a letter by Dr. Morris E. Garnsey, of the University of Colorado, published in the Rocky Mountain Union Farmer for May 1945, on the subject of the proposed Missouri Valley Authority, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEACE AND A NEW WORLD—ARTICLE BY WALTER J. MURPHY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Peace and a New World" written by Walter J. Murphy, editor of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, and published in that publication, which appears in the Appendix.]

PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the most important single phases of America's future national defense will be our international intelligence activities. If we would sleep peacefully at night without fear of a Pearl Harbor infinitely worse than the disaster of December 7, 1941, occurring, then we must have intelligence second to none in this world. Such intelligence must cover all military, naval, aerial, technological, and commercial activities abroad affecting our own defense.

It is shocking to note that as a nation we do not now have and never have had a single coordinated intelligence service. During the war Office of Strategic Services performed intelligence functions abroad with regard to enemy affairs. But the coordination among the OSS, Army, Navy, State Department, and FBI intelligence units apparently left much to be desired.

We can no longer allow this state of affairs to continue. At this very moment there may very well be occurring foreign developments with regard to the atomic bomb which, were they known to our military officials, might seriously affect our own defense plans, and which, were they known to our private citizens, might send shivers down their spines in fear for the security of our Nation.

I am informed by some of the best authorities in America that right now atomic bombs can be fired from virtually any point on earth to any other point. It has been stated that 2 pounds of this atomic energy would destroy the entire cosmopolitan Washington.

It is intolerable that our Nation, mightiest on the globe, should continue like a rank amateur, stumbling over our own big feet in the deadly foreign-intelligence game. It is absurd that any scrap of vital information affecting our defenses should be ignored and filed away in some sleeping agency's filing cabinet.

We all want the United Nations Organization to succeed, but at this early stage of its development, it is particularly foolhardy to rely on it exclusively for our security.

Now what are we going to do about our security?

First. We must have a new permanent international intelligence service.

This service must be located at the highest possible level of national defense.

This service must have superauthority to coordinate and supplement but not to supersede the respective intelligence activities of the Army, the Navy, the State Department, the Department of Commerce, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and any other Federal agency dealing in international matters.

The work of this service would be facilitated by creating a new Cabinet Department of the Armed Forces. I have heretofore spoken on this subject. This Department would be headed by a Secretary of the Armed Forces. He would be assisted by an Under Secretary for the Army, an Under Secretary for the Navy, for Air, and for Research and Technology.

I might interpose to say that there was announced over the radio last night the very important fact—and two of our colleagues of the Senate engaged in the broadcast—that during World War II America was the only Nation which did not take the youth who were specialists, scientists, and set them apart. Other nations did. As a result, it was stated, the United States will be two generations behind in scientific development.

Second. This international intelligence service must be given ample funds for such specified and unspecified purposes as it may deem fit.

Third. Because of the very nature of this service and because the expenditure by it of a considerable amount of funds will be for unaccounted purposes, the service must be headed by a man of the highest caliber.

That man must have a spotless record of American patriotism, a proven record of effectiveness in the field of detection, a long background of experience in coordinating the work of various investigation authorities. That man, I humbly submit, should be J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He fits that description to a "t." He is a man who has the confidence of the American people, who is deservedly and implicitly trusted by them, who, they feel, will never abuse his prerogatives, who will never engage in Gestapo or OGPU tactics, in arbitrary snooping, in political propagandizing, in reckless extravagance, in the building of an unnecessary bureaucracy, in the appointment of men on any other basis than merit.

J. Edgar Hoover has, moreover, won the willing cooperation of the American press. In intelligence activities abroad, the fearless gathering of news by our journalists may indeed prove an important adjunct in the pattern of American intelligence work.

J. Edgar Hoover is as faithful a public servant, as dynamic a leader, as stalwart a citizen, as any man now or previously in the employ of the people of the United States. His agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with its modest appropriations and facilities, has done as outstanding a job as has ever been performed in American history by a bureau or department of the Federal Government.

On the domestic front the intelligence role of the FBI must be expanded. Moreover, it must be as well integrated into the over-all intelligence picture as the foreign intelligence units of other departments.

Let us, therefore, coordinate and improve our intelligence so as to make impossible another Pearl Harbor. And let the nemesis of the Nation's criminals, J. Edgar Hoover, be given the well-deserved opportunity to prove himself the nemesis of international criminals—the would-be aggressors.

Mr. President, our time here in the United States is pretty much taken up with domestic problems. We are concerned about demobilization, we are concerned about balancing the Budget, we are concerned with a multitude of problems, but there is no more challenging problem before the American people than that which has arisen out of the atomic bomb. The life of the Nation is at stake in this matter. The Foreign Relations Committee must act at once. Yesterday I listened to a man whom I consider to be one of the five great economists of America, who stated that the atomic bomb will change America from a dominant Nation, if the atomic bomb becomes a matter of public property, to one which will not be dominant. He used this simple analogy. He said that before the atomic bomb any nation which was 50 percent licked was entirely licked—in other words, it would be put out of combat—but now, he said, the machinery of a nation, its productive plants, and the like, might be 90 or 95 percent put out of business, but if it had, first, the knowledge of how to produce the atomic bomb, and, second, the materials to produce it, and, third, the men and the facilities with which to produce it, the 5 percent might destroy any other nation.

I feel that it is important for the United States, which is still the treasury of the world, to see to it that we know what is going on in the world, and that international racketeers, gangsters, whether they be a small group in a nation or a nation itself, do not get possession of the knowledge of how to produce the atomic bomb, together with the materials and the machinery with which to produce it.

It has been stated that the new League of Nations will handle the subject. Be that as it may, we cannot afford to delay, as I have heretofore stated. The job is before us, Mr. President. We may fall asleep to other things, but we cannot fall asleep to this. If we do, we may have more than a Pearl Harbor, a catastrophe which will shake more than an outlying seaport. America, and especially this body, must act now.

WHEN WILL DADDY COME HOME?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish the Members of the Senate who are present to give me their attention for just a moment. Thousands upon thousands of American boys all over the world who have contributed so much to the winning of the war are now sincerely desirous of returning to their homes. Mothers and fathers and kinsmen in this country are anxious to have them return. Most of us realize, however, that the peace which has been won must be secured, and that the President and those in charge of our military establishments must keep sufficient strength in the countries we have taken and in which we are presently undertaking to reestablish the peace until the peace is definitely secured.

I received a letter yesterday from a little mother at Maysville, Ky. She sent me the pictures of her three children pasted on a sheet of paper, and on the same sheet is a poem. She said each of the children in substance wrote four lines, which appear opposite each picture. I want the Senate to hear this poem because we cannot renounce the sentiment and the love we have in our hearts for the men and women and children of this country who have contributed so much in these troublous times.

The letter is addressed to me.

DEAR SENATOR "HAPPY"—

Then follows the verse written by the first boy:

I'm Johnny, jr. I go to school.
And I know all the answers to things as a rule.
The war's over now. I heard people cheer.
Can somebody tell me why Daddy's not here?

Then comes the verse written by the little girl whose picture appears in the middle:

I'm Dianne; and I tell my Mommy all day
"I want my Daddy. Why he go away?"
Mommy say he at sea, and I say, "You go get him!"
Why she say, "He can't come home because they won't let him."

Next comes the picture of a little one, and he says:

I'm Charlie. I'm not sure I know what they mean.
But I wait for this Daddy that I've never seen.
Mommy says I'm the most patient one of all three
Because I don't know what I'm missing, you see.

Then the fourth verse:

We can't understand why our Daddy must go
To some other country when we miss him so.
Will somebody somewhere on land or on foam
Please tell us WHY or else let him come home?

The letter is signed

John Leslie Carter, Jr.; Dianne Morgan Carter; Charles Wright Carter.

Then follows a postscript:

We thought you might help us find the answer. Our daddy is Pvt. John Leslie Carter, 35954783, Misc. Co. A, First Platoon, APO 21142, c/o P. M., New York, N. Y.

I sincerely hope that in some convenient season and at some early time men who have earned the right to come home, like perhaps Pvt. John Leslie Carter, may be delivered safely, with God's help, to their children and their faithful wives.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, during the recent hearings on the full-employment bill, S. 380, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, testimony was received from the leading religious groups in the country. Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of Chicago; Msgr. John O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities; and Rabbi Ahron Opher, of the Synagogue Council of America—all endorsed the specific principles of this vitally essential legislation.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, president of the American Jewish Congress, had also been expected to testify on the full-employment bill. Unfortunately, he was in London at the time and was unable to attend the hearings.

However, I have just received a personal letter from Dr. Wise endorsing the full-employment bill on behalf of the American Jewish Congress.

The paramount considerations that prompt my endorsement of S. 380—

States Dr. Wise—

are of an ethical, indeed, religious nature * * * As rabbi of a Jewish congregation, I am on the solid ground of an age-old tradition, which makes of work a right and a duty of all, regardless of need, of income, of learning, or status.

In answer to those who mistakenly regard the full employment bill as a step toward collectivism, Dr. Wise makes the following statement:

Confronted with a choice between the attainment of economic benefits and preservation of a free society, I should not hesitate for a moment in renouncing and denouncing any scheme of legislation that would presume to create abundance at the cost of destroying liberty. I advocate a full-employment program, not because my concern is prosperity but because it is freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I have just received from Dr. Stephen S. Wise on behalf of the American Jewish Congress be inserted at this point in the record in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS,
New York, N. Y., September 6, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: It is a matter of deep personal regret that your invitation to testify before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the full employment bill came to me while I was on the high seas returning from the recent London conferences of the World Zionist Organization and the World Jewish Congress. Unfortunately, I arrived too late to be able to accept your invitation to testify, but I do wish to avow my complete support for S 380, the full employment bill.

As president of the American Jewish Congress, I endorse S. 380 wholeheartedly, not because the Jews of America have any interest in full employment apart from the interest of non-Jews, but because this bill is vital to all Americans. Nor am I especially concerned with the strictly economic effects of employment and unemployment. The paramount considerations that prompt my endorsement of S. 380 are of an ethical, indeed, religious nature.

The full-employment bill does much more than lay the basis for a freedom from want—it creates a freedom from idleness. Men could be freed from want by many devices. Atomic energy, concentrated in the hands of a few, and operated by them could conceivably assure a sufficient income to the rest of mankind. But no boon or dole under whatever form or name can free man from the humiliation and corruption which idleness inevitably causes.

Confronted with a choice between the attainment of economic benefits and preservation of a free society, I should not hesitate for a moment in renouncing and denouncing any scheme of legislation that would presume to create abundance at the cost of destroying liberty. I advocate a full employment program not because my concern is prosperity, but because it is freedom.

Unemployment—and underemployment—mean spiritual serfdom. Not unlike the evils of war, the main evils of unemployment are not material in nature. No society is freer than the individuals who comprise it, and no man is free unless he has respect for himself. Human nature is fortunately such that only those who know that they are useful can have genuine self-respect and enjoy genuine freedom. As rabbi of a Jewish congregation, I am on the solid ground of an age-old tradition, which makes of work a right and a duty of all, regardless of need of income, of learning or status.

Unemployment—or underemployment—reaches in its corroding effects far beyond the circle of its immediate victims. It menaces the texture and fabric of society and threatens its prime basis, the home and the family. Wives and children have no respect for a husband and father who does not have a real job while others do. Those who are not employed hate those who are. Those who have work do not enjoy the fruit of their labor because they fear the hatred of the jobless of today and know that they themselves may be among the jobless of tomorrow. The cancer of unemployment generates contempt, hatred, and fear. However unreasoningly, it incites class against class, people against people, race against race, creed against creed, one generation against another. It destroys the national cultural capital, which must be transmitted by education or perish. It throws its dark shadow upon generations to come and gnaws at a country's life core. Empty factories mean not empty schools, but empty cradles as well.

In a few days, during the high holy days, Jews all over the world will listen to the words of Jeremiah, which foretold the days in which "the planters will plant and enjoy their fruit in common." I support the full employment bill because it lays the foundation for a great human freedom, the freedom of work. I support it because it will bring us nearer to the prophetic vision of a society in which men will be fully themselves, in which all planters will plant, all workers will work, all builders will build.

Faithfully yours,

STEPHEN S. WISE,
President.

SUFFRAGE FOR RESIDENTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—HEARINGS ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] upon the decision of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of which he is chairman to hold hearings, starting September 25, on the resolution to submit a constitutional amendment that will give voting rights to the residents of the District of Columbia.

I wish especially to congratulate him upon the statement he made supporting the joint resolution sponsored by Representative HATTON SUMNERS, of the House of Representatives, and myself, and urging its adoption. I have been asserting for years that deprivation of citizens residing in the District of Columbia of their voting rights is an injustice which should be corrected by submitting the necessary constitutional amendment.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the front-page, byline story of Don S. Warren in the Washington Star of September 11, and also a letter to me from Mr. Victor Schormann, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., on this subject.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEARING CALLED SEPTEMBER 25 ON D. C. SUFFRAGE—HATCH BACKS PLAN; SEEKS TO SPEED COMMITTEE ACTION

(By Don S. Warren)

Calling for early action on proposed amendments to the Constitution—now that the war has ended—the Hatch subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee today ordered public hearings for September 25 on the proposal to empower Congress to grant suffrage to the disfranchised people of the National Capital.

While announcing hearings on this joint resolution, Senator HATCH, Democrat, of New Mexico, the subcommittee chairman, announced his personal approval of the object of the proposed constitutional amendment and said he would vote for it.

"I have always been of the conviction," said Senator HATCH, "that a member of a political party should support pledges which are made in the platform of the party. The Democratic platforms, more than once, have called for extension of the rights of suffrage to the people of the District of Columbia. Therefore, I believe we should act on the proposal and I believe we should carry out the pledge which we have made."

AMENDMENT PROPOSED

The national representation joint resolution is sponsored in the Senate by Senator CAPPER, Republican, of Kansas, a former chairman of the Senate District Committee, and in the House by Chairman SUMNERS of the House Judiciary Committee, a Texas Democrat.

It proposes an amendment to the Constitution, to be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years of its submission by Congress. The proposed amendment provides that people of the District may vote in Presidential elections and have representation in Congress in such numbers and with such powers as Congress shall determine.

It reads: "The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President Members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

AMENDMENT BAN ENDED

The Hatch subcommittee acted promptly today after the full Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday brought to an end its policy against consideration of constitutional amendments, now that the war has ended. This policy was enunciated as a wartime measure because millions of voters were overseas in the armed services.

The doors were opened again, however, with the war's end, because it is assumed that by the time ratification is voted by the States, most all the veterans will be back home.

The national representation movement had a bright outlook in the House early this year until the Senate judiciary group adopted its policy. The No. 1 subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, headed by Representative CELLER, Democrat, of New York, reported favorably on the Sumners-Capper plan, but later the full committee voted 8 to 7 against placing the resolution before the House for action, presumably because of the position taken on the Senate side.

In a desire to speed action on various proposed constitutional amendments, the Hatch subcommittee scheduled hearings for three of them, including the District vote proposal, for September 25. However, Senator HATCH gave assurances that additional hearings would be granted by his group if it were not possible to give desired study to the plan on the single day.

On the other hand, he declared his belief extensive hearings would not be necessary and he asked that advocates select a few of their best witnesses.

"It is my hope," he said, "that the statement of the case will be direct, brief, and concise."

In addition to Chairman HATCH, members of the Constitutional Amendment Subcommittee are Senators O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and WHEELER, of Montana, Democrats; and WHERRY, of Nebraska, and MOORE, of Oklahoma, Republicans.

Senator CAPPER, a veteran champion of the District's right to vote, has called for action repeatedly during the past year, stressing that the failure to grant this democratic right to District residents has been strikingly and painfully demonstrated when District boys, fighting America's wars overseas, were humiliated by having to stand aside while those from the States were given absentee ballots in the last Presidential election.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
September 9, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: In yesterday's Post I read of the efforts you and Congressman SUMNERS are exerting to continue the fight for District suffrage.

I commend you on your determination and on your regard for fairness.

You no doubt feel too the tragic comedy, not to say great injustice, which deprives several hundred thousand American citizens of the right to vote, and prevents them from having representation in Congress. Washington is one of the 15 largest cities in the United States. It is no longer tolerable that her people should be deprived of one of the most fundamental privileges and duties of citizens. It is as if the whole people of a small or sparsely populated State were denied the right to vote.

Taxation without representation has never been in accord with the basic American philosophy of governing.

The present unfair situation is not one deliberately planned by evil genius. It grew this way. This makes it much harder to combat. Indifference and uninformed or misinformed judgment on the part of many makes the establishment of fair practice hard. The fight will probably create little appeal nationally or in your home States. The fight will no doubt get a full share of ridicule and small-minded criticism. When the decisive battle is won, the blessings of victory will largely be taken for granted.

In view of all this, you deserve praise and warm, active support for your courageous stand in the interest of fairness and equality for all.

With admiration,

VICTOR SCHORMANN.

CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR—ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am compelled to leave the Chamber and the city for a day or two, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar

to which there is no objection, beginning at the point where we left off at the last call of the calendar.

While I am on my feet I also wish to ask unanimous consent that the Senate, when it concludes its deliberations for today, stand in recess until 12 o'clock on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the Senator intend to take up any other business than the calendar today?

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 503.

SALE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

The bill (H. R. 1992) to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of Alaska, in trust for the Roman Catholic Church, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 518) to provide for the issuance of permits for the use of live decoys in the taking of ducks was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is in charge of the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL FOR LOSS OF PERSONAL PROPERTY ON STEAMSHIP *MAASDAM*

The bill (S. 1215) to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the steamship *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $2,859.35, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for the value of personal property lost in the sinking of the steamship *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR PROPERTY LOST OR DAMAGED BY FIRE AT NORFOLK, VA.

The bill (S. 1135) to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,167.60, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL FOR PROPERTY LOST OR DAMAGED BY FIRE IN SAMOA

The bill (S. 1134) to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in buildings 102 and 102–A in Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa, on August 17, 1944 was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $804, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in buildings 102 and 102–A in Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa, on August 17, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST OR DAMAGED BY FIRE IN BERMUDA

The bill (S. 1119) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 146 at the naval operating base, Bermuda, on April 26, 1945, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggreate not to exceed $243.95, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 146 at the naval operating base, Bermuda, on April 26, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

FIRST LT. JACK SANDERS, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The bill (S. 1118) for the relief of First Lt. Jack Sanders, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of an explosion at Camp Lejeune, N. C., on January 22, 1945, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $71.80 to reimburse First Lt. Jack Sanders, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed by reason of a premature explosion due to a faulty detonator while engaged in a field problem in demolitions at Camp Lejeune, N. C., on January 22, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exeeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR PROPERTY LOST OR DAMAGED BY FIRE AT DEVON, ENGLAND

The bill (S. 1103) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944,

was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $4,310.90, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PROPERTY LOST OR DAMAGED BY FIRE AT BANNING, CALIF.

The bill (S. 1102) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval convalescent hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,672.25, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval convalescent hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PROPERTY LOST OR DESTROYED BY FIRE AT TUTUILA, SAMOA

The bill (S. 1076) to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $4,000, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 958) to provide for more effective inspection and supervision by the Congress with respect to the administration of the laws of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2504) to discontinue certain reports now required by law was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RELIEF OF GLASSELL-TAYLOR CO., ROBINSON AND YOUNG

The bill (H. R. 1975) for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson & Young, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF KLAU-VAN PIETERSOM-DUNLAP ASSOCIATES, INC.

The bill (S. 562) for the relief of Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap Associates, Inc., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap Associates, Inc., of Milwaukee, Wis., the sum of $1,664.05, in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States (1) for compensation for services rendered at the request of district representatives of the War Production Board, in preparing a presentation setting forth the facilities in the State of Wisconsin for the manufacture of plywood aircraft, and in conducting the necessary research in connection therewith, and (2) for reimbursement of expenses incurred by it in the preparation of such presentation: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

GEORGE E. BAKER

The bill (H. R. 1456) for the relief of George E. Baker was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUFUS A. HANCOCK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EDMUND F. DANKS

The bill (H. R. 2089) for the relief of Edmund F. Danks, as administrator of the estate of Edna S. Danks, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

G. H. MOORE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1015) for the relief of G. H. Moore, of Butler, Taylor County, Ga., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated" to strike out "to G. H. Moore, of Butler, Taylor County, Ga., the sum of $1,081.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the injury of G. H. Moore when the car in which he was" and insert "(1) to G. H. Moore, the sum of $1,081.50; (2) to Mr. A. J. Moore, the sum of $500; and (3) to Mrs. A. J. Moore, the sum of $500, all of Butler, Taylor County, Ga., in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the injury of G. H. Moore and Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Moore when the car in which they were."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of G. H. Moore and Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Moore."

PATRICIA M. KACPRZYK AND ALEX D. LEONTIRE

The bill (H. R. 2511) for the relief of Patricia M. Kacprzyk and Alex D. Leontire was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK GIEN

The bill (H. R. 2641) for the relief of Frank Gien was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STANLEY E. SMALLWOOD AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 799) for the relief of the estate of Stanley E. Smallwood; to the legal guardian of Frank Carter, Jr., a minor; to the legal guardian of Donald R. Keithley, a minor; to Keithley Bros. Garage was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM W. MADDOX AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1564) for the relief of William W. Maddox and the legal guardian of Donna Sue Maddox and Saddie Inez Maddox was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAYMOND W. FORD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 857) for the relief of Raymond W. Ford, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "the sum of", strike out "$127.50" and insert "$97.25"; and after line 7, to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to pay from any unappropriated money in the Treasury the sum of $97.25, in full payment of the claim of Raymond W. Ford for articles belonging to him lost by the Navy Department in the naval hospital at Seattle, Wash.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARL BAUMANN

The bill (S. 451), for the relief of Carl Baumann, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl Baumann, captain, Quartermaster Corps, Army of the United States (army serial number O–278586), the sum of $800, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of amounts collected from him in settlement of his liability for public funds which were lost or stolen from the subsistence warehouse building, Central Signal Corps School, Camp Crowder, Mo., on or about November 3, 1943, and for which he was accountable as mess and subsistence officer: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ESTATES OF WILLIAM F. BACON AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 201) for the relief of the estates of William F. Bacon, Myrtle Jackson, Catherine Smith, and Tibbie Spencer, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500"; at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500"; and in line 9, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William F. Bacon, the sum of $3,500; to the estate of Myrtle Jackson, the sum of $3,500; to the estate of Catherine Smith, the sum of $3,500; and to the estate of Tibbie Spencer, the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of the claims of such estates for compensation for the deaths of their respective decedents, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by them when the passenger bus in which they were riding collided with a United States Army vehicle near Allenhurst, Ga., on April 24, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CHARLIE TYSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 883) for the relief of Charlie Tyson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charlie Tyson, of Aberdeen, N. C., the sum of $1,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of having been shot by a member of the military police force of the Army of the United States, in Aberdeen, N. C., on April 25, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

RELIEF OF CITY OF COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

The bill (H. R. 1634) for the relief of the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TERESA TINE

The bill (H. R. 2163) for the relief of Teresa Tine was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALOYSIUS G. MILLER

The bill (H. R. 1913) for the relief of Aloysius G. Miller was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE C. TYLER AND DORIS M. TYLER

The bill (H. R. 1257) for the relief of George C. Tyler and Doris M. Tyler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. CELIA ELLEN ASHCRAFT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1085) for the relief of Mrs. Celia Ellen Ashcraft, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "appropriated, to", to strike out "Mrs. Celia Ellen Ashcraft, of Clinton, Okla., formerly of Gore, Okla." and insert "the estate of Edwin Perry Ashcraft"; at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "Mrs. Celia L. Ashcraft" and insert "estate"; and in line 10, after the words "death of", to strike out "her husband."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Edwin Perry Ashcraft."

MRS. RUBY H. HUNSUCKER

The bill (H. R. 241) for the relief of Mrs. Ruby H. Hunsucker was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN VISNOVEC AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 2028) for the relief of John Visnovec, Rose Visnovec, and Helen Visnovec was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CANAL DREDGING CO.

The bill (H. R. 1713) for the relief of the Canal Dredging Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LILY L. CARREN

The bill (H. R. 999) for the relief of Lily L. Carren was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. EDMOND J. ST. AMANT, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 980) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edmond J. St. Amant, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Edmond J. St. Amant, Jr., of Biloxi, Miss., the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their daughter, Lucille St. Amant, who died as a result of injuries sustained when she was struck by a United States Army truck in Biloxi, Miss., on March 17, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF MARGARET HOCKENBERRY, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 1057) for the relief of the legal guardian of Margaret Hocken-

berry, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. L. WHITTINGTON AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1882) for the relief of R. L. Whittington, Mrs. R. L. Whittington, and Mrs. J. B. Whittington was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 129) to provide for the barring of certain claims by the United States in connection with Government checks and warrants was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 825) to establish a Research Board for National Security was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT—MOVEMENT OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC

The bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic was announced as next in order.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Let the bill go over.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection until I can be heard?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am glad to do so.

Mr. AUSTIN. For the information of the public as well as of Congress, I wish to read into the RECORD at this point the amendment which the Committee on Interstate Commerce unanimously agreed to, because it not merely has the effect of postponing the time when this bill, if passed, will go into effect, but it also has an economic result, for during the period of 90 days mentioned in the amendment the rates now existing will continue to be in effect. Therefore, I wish to read into the RECORD the brief amendment appearing on page 2 of the bill, beginning at line 23:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect 90 days after the date of the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, whichever is the earlier: *Provided, however,* That any travel or transportation contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for giving me this privilege.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am very glad to have that information. I was not here at the time when the bill was reported.

Mr. AUSTIN. I realize that.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I should like to study the bill before the Senate passes on it.

Mr. AUSTIN. There is really no hurry to pass the bill today, because, as will be seen, it cannot take effect until after the period of 90 days to which I have called attention.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, at this time will the Senator who seems to be sponsoring the measure agree to fix some definite date for its consideration?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think I could agree with the Senator on a definite date, in this manner: The language provides for a time 90 days from the date of the proclamation, and the proclamation was made on the 2d day of September. Therefore, a mere calculation of 90 days from September 2 will fix the date.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to serve notice on the Senator that I shall have some extended remarks to make on this bill. This is the third or fourth time an attempt has been made to have it passed. Regardless of the amendment, which I think is a very poor compromise, I propose to discuss the bill so that the country may know just what is involved in it. There is nothing in the title which suggests its magnitude, and when it was introduced and attempted to be passed in the House of Representatives in 1944 without a record vote, no newspaper in Washington even mentioned it; no radio broadcaster mentioned it. Yet, Mr. President, it was a bill attempting to take out of the Treasury of the United States tax moneys amounting to approximately $1,000,000,000 which belong to the people of this country. When we passed a small local bill requiring the vaccination of dogs in the District of Columbia, about two columns were required in each Washington newspaper to tell the story. Here is a bill involving approximately $1,000,000,000 to be used in the interest of the railroads of the country, who have been lobbying here for three or four years to have the measure passed, but no mention of it has ever appeared in the newspapers. So I wish to discuss it at length when we agree on a time to take it up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 962) to provide assistance to the States in establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of school-lunch programs and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) favoring an extension of the air-transportation system in the United States to small cities and towns was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let the concurrent resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

GENERAL OF THE ARMY, FLEET ADMIRAL OF THE NAVY, AND GENERAL IN THE MARINE CORPS

The bill (S. 1354) to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of general of the Army and fleet admiral of the United States Navy, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill, and I should like to make a comment and offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Consideration of the bill has been objected to, and it will be passed over.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, has Senate bill 1354, Calendar 557, been passed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was passed over.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am wondering whether the Senate should not pay respect to the request of the Senator from Illinois that an explanation of the bill be given.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that may be done. Consideration of the bill was objected to, and the bill was passed over. Does the Senator wish to have that action reconsidered?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am wondering whether the Senator who objected to consideration of the bill would also object to the request of the Senator from Illinois for an explanation of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] objected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I intended to offer no objection to Senate bill 1354.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore subsequently said: The Senate will now recur to Calendar No. 557, Senate bill 1354, to which the Chair has been informed there is no objection.

The bill (S. 1354) to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of general of the Army and fleet admiral of the United States Navy, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint to the permanent grade of general of the Army any individual who shall have served in such grade after December 14, 1944, and before August 14, 1945, and to appoint to the permanent grade of fleet admiral of the United States Navy any individual who shall have served in such grade after December 14, 1944, and before August 14, 1945. The officers appointed under the provisions of this act shall take rank in the manner provided in the act of December 14, 1944 (Public Law 482, 78th Cong.), and shall receive pay and allowances prescribed by section 4 of such act. Any officer on the active list, or any retired officer, who is appointed under the provisions of this act and who may hereafter be retired or relieved from active duty, shall be entitled to have his name placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him on the active list while on active duty, and shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances while on the retired list as officers appointed under this act are entitled to receive while on active duty.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I wanted to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, was an objection made to the consideration of this bill when it was first called?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. When the bill was first called the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] objected, but the Chair has been since informed

that he did not intend to object to the bill.

Mr. LANGER. I did not intend to object to Calendar No. 557, Senate bill 1354.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. And the bill has been passed.

Mr. WHITE. I shall not voice any objection in this instance, but when a bill is called on the calendar and an objection is made to its consideration, I think it is bad practice at some later time to recur to the bill and act upon it. In this instance, the objection and its withdrawal are so nearly contemporaneous that I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine is entirely correct, but after the Chair and the clerk had both understood that the Senator from North Dakota objected, and when he made the statement immediately afterward that he had not objected, it was the duty of the Chair, in the Chair's opinion, to suggest that the Senate recur to the bill, and the Chair did so voluntarily.

Mr. WHITE. I quite agree with the Chair, and I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which the bill was passed is reconsidered, and the Senator from Illinois may present his amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, this bill provides for making permanent the grades of five-star general and five-star admiral for those now holding such rank. It applies to none others.

I wish to amend the bill so as to provide that the commandant of the United States Marine Corps, who is a four-star general, shall also come within the provisions of this act which would entitle him to a life tenure of his rank and its privileges. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read. The amendment is offered in behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. I understand there will be no objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the bill as follows:

On page 2, line 2, strike out "act" and insert "section."

On page 2, line 7, strike out "act" and insert "section."

On page 2, line 13, strike out "act" and insert "section."

On page 2, after line 14, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 2. The President is hereby authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint to the permanent grade of general in the Marine Corps any individual who shall have served as Commandant of the Marine Corps, with the grade and rank of general, after March 21, 1945, and before August 14, 1945. Any officer appointed under the provisions of this section shall receive the pay and allowances prescribed by section 3 of the Act of March 21, 1945 (Public Law 19, 79th Cong.); and any such officer who may hereafter be retired or relieved from active duty shall be entitled to have his name placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him on the active list or while on active duty, and shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances while on the retired list as officers appointed under this section are entitled to receive while on active duty."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] on behalf of himself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois makes necessary a change in the title of the bill.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of general of the Army, fleet admiral of the United States Navy, and general in the Marine Corps, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War."

INVESTIGATION OF ECONOMIC QUESTIONS AFFECTING CERTAIN STATES

The resolution (S. Res. 172) to investigate certain economic questions in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States resulting from termination of the war was announced as next in order.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to ask the author of the resolution to explain it. I do not understand it. The proposal is to investigate the economic conditions resulting in a certain section of the country from the termination of the war. It strikes me that the economic conditions in several sections of the country need investigating. There must be some special reason why the proposed investigation is limited to only certain sections of the country, and I should like to know what the Senator who reported the bill has in mind.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I may say to my friend the Senator from Mississippi that I do have particular conditions in mind. The title of the resolution as given in the calendar is somewhat misleading. The question to be considered affects approximately 325,000 civil-service employees in the State of California. Being from that State, of course, I am particularly interested. It happens that California has more civil-service employees than does any other State in the Union. Most of them will be displaced from their positions because of the end of the war. We desire to have a clear, factual understanding regarding how many of them are housewives and will go back to their homes, how many of them are citizens of other States and will go elsewhere, how many of them will go back to school, and how many of them will enter various other activities in our economic life.

The resolution also calls for investigation of the condition of our soldiers and sailors. I believe California, next to New York, will have the greatest number of soldiers returning to its borders. In addition, it appears that from 250,000 to 500,000 young soldiers and sailors will settle in California. We are faced with such questions as to how they are going to be supported, how they can find jobs, how they will be educated, how many of them will wish to go on farms.

Perhaps I might disarm the Senator from Mississippi by calling to his attention the fact that no funds are requested in the resolution providing for the investigation. What we desire to do by it is to obtain a clear, factual understanding of some very critical problems existing in the West between the Federal Government and the States, and I may say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I merely limited it to the Western States because there would not be time to have a Nation-wide investigation, and of course it is in the West that our interests lie.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I resent one insinuation contained in the remarks of the Senator from California. He seemed to intimate that I was going to object to the measure because the investigation might involve an appropriation. In other words, his observation left the impression that I am picayunish. I am not. The title of the resolution seemed to imply that the section of the country from which the Senator came has as a result of the war economic conditions which require an investigation. I do not think that his section is different from Michigan, New York, Illinois, or, possibly, Mississippi. I merely wanted to know what was behind the resolution. If the Senator wants an investigation to be made, and conditions justify it, I am willing to vote for any amount of money which may be necessary to conduct the investigation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this measure deals with only a few of the States of the Union. It does not, as I understand, call for any appropriation. It seems to me, however, that if such an investigation is justified, it should apply to all States and all sections. With that thought in mind, it is my opinion that the resolution should be given careful consideration rather than be adopted on the call of the calendar. I do not believe that a measure of this nature should be passed on the call of the calendar.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I withhold the objection for the time being.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that conditions are exceedingly critical in the State of California. So far as I am concerned, I would not want to head a committee to investigate national conditions because it would preempt all my time, and it would be impossible for me to give all my time to the work necessarily involved. But, as a Senator from California, and desiring to perform my duty, I believe it to be my duty to undertake this proposed investigation and ascertain the necessary facts looking toward the relief of conditions in the West. If the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from West Virginia desires an investigation to be made concerning his State of course it is perfectly proper for him to ask for it. I can conceive of no reason why any Senator would be particularly interested in objecting to the resolution. The various groups in

California such as the veteran groups, the farm groups, civil-service groups, groups concerned with Japanese resettlement, and other groups concerned with serious questions, are anxious that this investigation should proceed at the earliest opportunity. Unless the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has some reason in mind for objecting to the investigation being held with regard to conditions in California, I would appreciate his acquiescing in action on the resolution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I would certainly aid the Senator from California in calling the matter up for special consideration. I do not think the resolution is of a nature which warrants its being adopted on a call of the calendar without first giving to it proper consideration. Therefore, I feel that I must ask that it go over.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I insist that the resolution be passed, considered, and acted upon. Only yesterday I received a telegram from San Pedro, Calif., as I recall, asking me to call on the Maritime Commission and secure the use of a vessel because 1,600 Negroes were ready to go to Africa and wanted immediate transportation. [Laughter.] There must be something wrong out there.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, Senate Resolution 172 is passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, what action was taken by the Senate on Senate Resolution 172, Calendar No. 558?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It went over on objection by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to give notice that if at any time that measure comes up I shall want to be heard and to object to it, because it is being covered entirely by another bill that is now before the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

INCLUSION OF MILITARY SERVICE IN DETERMINING CIVIL SERVICE STATUS OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 102) to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil-service status under such act was announced as next in order.

Mr. BILBO. Over.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that there are on the calendar five bills dealing with the rights of returning soldiers to civil-service employment. Those bills were all reported by the Civil Service Committee unanimously. They are all supported by the various agencies of the Government interested in such matters, and they are also supported by the various veterans' organizations. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I believe a simple explanation would satisfy him as to the justice of the bills and the critical necessity of their passage. If the distinguished Senator wishes me to give an explanation of Senate bill 102 I shall be happy to explain it, and I believe the Senator will be convinced that the interests of the veterans require that these bills be passed.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I will accept the explanation of the Senator from California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, Senate bill 102, which was introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], is designed to amend the present law under which any legislative employee in a Senator's office, or in the Congress itself, upon 4 years of service is entitled upon appropriate showing to be placed on the classified list.

The Taft bill provides that if an individual has had such legislative experience for 2 years, and has been in the military service for 2 years he may, by reason of that 4-year service—two in legislative employment and two in the Army—be preliminarily qualified to enter the classified service.

If the distinguished Senator has any objection to a veteran being given that right, of course, I would want him to object to the bill. If he thinks the veteran should be helped to the extent provided, I should appreciate his allowing the bill to be passed on the Consent Calendar. Already there are returning veterans who have had 2 or 3 years' legislative experience, who want to be transferred to the classified list, but who cannot be. If this bill were enacted, they could be.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I offered my objection because Senate bill 102, introduced by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is not in my file, and I did not know what it was about. I merely objected in order that I might be informed what was in the bill. Sometimes I think the civil service covers too much territory. I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for any inquiry?

Mr. DOWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand the bill under consideration merely gives the soldier who has been absent from the country, and absent from his job, credit for the time he has been in service.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is true, with this limitation: Presently in order to be transferred to the classified list, a person must have 4 years in the legislative service. If he has had 2 years in the legislative branch and 2 years in the military service, the bill would qualify him to be transferred.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It gives him credit for his military service?

Mr. DOWNEY. It does.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 1212; U. S. C.; title 5, sec. 631 (b)), is amended by adding at the end of such subsection a new sentence as follows: "In the case of an individual who shall have held such a position in the legislative branch for at least 2 years and who shall have been separated from such position for the purpose of entering the military or naval service, such individual shall be deemed, for the purposes of this subsection, to have held such position during the period within which he shall have served in the military or naval forces."

COVERAGE INTO CIVIL SERVICE IN CERTAIN CASES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 576) to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That clause (1) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 1212), is amended to read as follows: "(1) upon recommendation by the head of the agency concerned, and upon certification by such head to the Civil Service Commission that such incumbent has served with merit for not less than 6 months immediately prior to the date such office or position was covered into the classified civil service."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will not the Senator from California give us an explanation of the bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, under the civil-service laws, by Executive declaration certain positions could be covered into the classified civil-service status. But that was only upon recommendation by the head of the agency concerned, within 1 year after the positions were covered into the classified service.

In certain cases the heads of agencies failed to carry out the mechanical and routine provisions by which Congress attempted to give to employees the right to be covered into the classified civil-service lists. The pending bill gives such an employee the right to secure his position on the list. I shall read one paragraph from the report, which will perhaps make the matter plain:

> The provisions of S. 576 would merely amend the act of November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the 1-year time limit and permit agencies to recommend and certify such employees for classification without regard to the date on which their positions were covered into the classified service.

Do I make it clear?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT FOR ACCUMULATED OR ACCRUED LEAVE TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1036) to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the

United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act making provisions for payment of employees of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, for accumulated or accrued annual leave when ordered to active duty with the military or naval forces of the United States," approved August 1, 1941, as amended April 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 200), is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Any person, who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, shall have entered upon active service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or in any of their respective components, may, while on terminal leave pending honorable discharge from or release from active duty in such service, enter or reenter employment of the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia (including any corporation created under authority of an act of Congress which is either wholly controlled or wholly owned by the United States Government, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, whether or not the employees thereof are paid from funds appropriated by Congress), and, in addition to compensation for such employment, shall be entitled to receive pay and allowances from the armed forces for the unexpired portion of such terminal leave at the same rates and to the same extent as if he had not entered or reentered such employment.

"(b) Any such person who, prior to the date of enactment of this section, entered or reentered such employment withqut having used all accumulated and current accrued leave to which he would have been entitled as a result of such service had he not entered or reentered such employment, shall, upon application therefor filed with the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, be entitled to be paid a lump sum equal in amount to the pay and allowances to which he would have been entitled while on terminal leave for the unused portion of such accumulated and current accrued leave had he not entered or reentered such employment."

Mr. CORDON. May we have an explanation of this bill, Mr. President?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am very glad to make an explanation. I can make the situation clearer by stating that in 1940, when we thought war was coming, Congress enacted a law by virtue of which a civil-service employee who had accrued annual leave, and was going into the military forces, could be on the military pay roll and the civilian pay roll at the same time. There is a general statute which forbids a person taking two salaries from the Federal Government at the same time. But Congress thought that, in view of the fact that civil-service employees were going into the Army, they should be entitled to draw from the Government their compensation during the time of their accrued leave, and at the same time receive military compensation.

In the pending bill we have the reverse of that situation. There are many men in the military service who, because of their duties, have had no leave. They may have 60 or 90 days' military leave coming to them. The bill would allow them to be paid for such leave, even though they have taken positions in civilian employment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE IN COMPUTING LENGTH OF SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 405) to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the word "substitute" to strike out the period and insert a colon and the words "*Provided*, That an employee may, at his option, receive full credit for all such military or naval service, without deposit, in lieu of the leave credit accorded herein, without reduction in annuity benefits", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 2 of section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out all of the said paragraph 2 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"In computing length of service for the purposes of this act, all periods of separation from the service, and so much of any leaves of absence as may exceed 6 months in the aggregate in any calendar year, shall be excluded, except leaves of absence granted employees while performing active military or naval service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States or while receiving benefits under the United States Employees' Compensation Act, and in the case of substitutes in the postal service credit shall be given from date of original appointment as a substitute: *Provided*, That an employee may, at his option, receive full credit for all such military or naval service, without deposit, in lieu of the leave credit accorded herein, without reduction in annuity benefits."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may we also have an explanation of this bill by the Senator from California?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, under present conditions, if an individual in the Army who has had civil-service employment desires, he can receive 6 months' credit at his civilian salary out of one calendar year in the retirement fund, without any payment to the Government. He presently has the right to elect to proceed either under his military salary by paying 5 percent of his salary into the fund or to accept 6 months' credit in the fund at his civilian rate of pay.

The pending bill will liberalize that law for the veteran. For the length of time any civil-service employee has been in the military service he will be credited in the retirement fund either on the basis of his civilian pay, when he left employment, or his military pay, at his option. So what the Government is doing is to waive for a member of the military personnel the payment of his 5 percent during the time he was in the military service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIREMENT RIGHTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3256) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, in order to protect the retirement rights of persons who leave the service to enter the armed forces of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with amendments, on page 2, after line 7, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Sections 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, are amended by striking out the words "June 30 of each year" wherever they appear in such sections, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "December 31 of each year": *Provided*, That interest shall not be compounded as of December 31, 1945.

And to renumber the sections.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the calendar.

DISCHARGE OF DOCTORS FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, it is generally recognized that there is a serious shortage of doctors in this country. For the past few weeks I have been receiving letters from doctors in the armed forces indicating that there is really no need for their services.

This week, for instance, I have received a letter from a very distinguished surgeon of my State, who served overseas for a year and a half, who was brought back, and has been in a camp for 6 weeks. He states that during that entire time he has not been called upon for any service which a drug clerk with 6 months' experience could not perform. Doctors are very seriously needed at home.

This morning I have a letter signed by nine physicians, eight of them having the rank of captain, one the rank of lieutenant. They are in a camp in this country, and are writing about the conditions there, and about the absolute lack of any need for their services. Several of these men have been overseas, they have received decorations for service in combat, they have been awarded medals, but under the circumstances they are very tired of remaining in camp with nothing to do.

I wish to read the letter, omitting the names of the signers, because I want this matter called to the attention of the War Department. The letter was written on September 4, was address to me as a Senator, and is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: This group of medical officers at an Army Air Force station hospital earnestly solicits your continued help toward effecting a fair, sensible method of release from the Army of medical officers. Our own American Medical Association exerts only feeble efforts toward the attainment of this goal, and consequently we turn to you with full confidence that you will make energetic representations in our behalf.

So that you may feel confident that your efforts will be expended toward correcting grave injustices to thousands of doctors and the civilian population, allow us to call to your attention that the medical profession responded most generously when this country was in need of their services, never questioning the requirements for the number of doctors needed as set down by the Surgeon General. After a few months in service, it became painfully apparent that the number of doctors was a gross overestimate. Disillusionment became more complete as the months and the years passed, and the doctors with very little work to do heard of frantic appeals by the War Department for more and more doctors. It is no idle estimate that the vast majority of doctors have led a very leisurely existence in the Army. It is, and has been, very common to have less than 2 hours of work to do per day. This state of affairs has existed in the majority of Army hospitals for over a year. In this deplorable situation, which is bad for energetic doctors used to a busy existence in civilian life, the doctor in the Army becomes restless, to say the least. When he hears of the crying need for more and more doctors and nurses, he becomes enraged beyond words. His bitterness and disgust can only be partially appreciated from his letters to Senators, Congressmen, commentators, and newspapers.

What the sequelae will be as a result of this short-sighted and stupid attitude of the authorities toward the medical profession is hard to say. This much is certain, however. It will be next to impossible for the Army, Navy, United States Public Health Service, and Veterans' Administration to obtain able doctors after the war. Numerous questionnaires circulated by the Army, relative to the desires of medical officers toward an Army career have met with a most emphatic "No." The pay, the politics, and the poor professional associations are enough to make any doctor shudder.

Allow us to further draw your attention to the artful defenses the Regular Army has prepared for any attack upon their hoarding of doctors. They will tell you of the huge number of patients in Army hospitals. Patients in convalescent hospitals are still counted as bed patients, even while they are home on convalescent furloughs of up to 90 days. New-born babies are counted as regular patients. Uncounted thousands of ambulatory cases are retained in hospitals long after they are ready for discharge. Some hospital commanding officers instruct their admitting officers to pack the hospital with patients. Cases are brought in for observation and prolonged "treatment" of minor conditions.

Although these facts are true, the Army still desires a ratio of 1 medical officer to every 165 men. Civilian medical care is adequately administered, in peacetime, by only 1 doctor per 1,000 individuals.

We fully appreciate your past cooperation and interest, as known to us through the press and the radio. We earnestly hope that you will continue your efforts to aid an honorable profession from being degraded by military politics.

The letter is signed by nine outstanding physicians. As I have said, eight of them are captains and one a first lieutenant. Several have had service overseas and have been awarded Distinguished Service Crosses.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have listened very carefully to the reading by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina of the excellent letter, and I am very much interested in the comments made in it by the doctors who wrote it. Some of us have received somewhat similar letters, and certainly all of us feel that the release of the doctors from the services has been entirely too slow. The main thing in the letter that impressed me, aside from the statement respecting the lack of work for the doctors, and their desire to get home, was the statistical information contained in the next to the last paragraph of the letter, and if it is not asking too much, I wish he would read it again. I refer to ratio of men to medical officers in the services.

Mr. HOEY. The letter says:

Although these facts are true, the Army still desires a ratio of 1 medical officer to every 165 men.

Then the letter continues:

Civilian medical care is adequately administered in peacetime by only one doctor per thousand individuals.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I know that my distinguished colleague the Senator from North Carolina, will agree with me that we can go further than the writers of that letter have gone in respect to the ratio of doctors to civilians. In South Carolina there is 1 doctor, as I recall, for 2,570 individuals. I am not exactly familiar with the figure for North Carolina. I placed it in the record of the hearings in the Military Affairs Committee yesterday. I believe the ratio in North Carolina is 1 doctor to every 2,100 individuals.

Mr. HOEY. That is about correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. So the situation in those two States is even far worse than the doctors who wrote the letter believe it to be. They believe the ratio to be about 1 to 1,000.

Mr. President, I should like to add, with the Senator's permission, a brief comment, respecting the ratio of one doctor to 2,500 individuals in South Carolina and one doctor to 2,100 individuals in North Carolina. Those civilians are the mothers and the fathers, the sisters and the brothers of the enlisted men and officers in the armed services. Not only is the present situation of concern to the doctors themselves who are in the services and want to get out, but it is of deep concern to the personnel of both the Army and the Navy, because they believe that their families back home, for whom they have been fighting and for whom they have sacrificed so much, are not receiving proper medical care.

Mr. HOEY. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from South Carolina, and I thank him for his statement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to supplement what the Senator from North Carolina has so ably presented. I think all of us have received letters from doctors in the services telling of their enforced idleness wherever they may be stationed, and the fact that they have very little to do. I have received many letters from communities in my own State telling of the desperate conditions those communities are in for lack of medical services. Only this morning I received a letter from the secretary of the State medical association pointing out that there was bound to be great distress in the rural communities this winter if some of the doctors now in the military service were not released in time to get home to attend to the civilian population.

I think all of us want the armed services to have all the doctors they need, but we do not want them to keep doctors in idleness in the services while their communities at home are in desperate need of them. I hope the armed services will take steps to release men who are necessary in their home communities, not only doctors but others, and get them back there as soon as they can without any further encouragement from or legislation passed on the subject by the Congress.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator from Vermont. The condition which he describes in his State is exactly the condition that obtains in North Carolina. For instance, I applied to the War Department the other day for the release of a doctor for a community in North Carolina with a population of 8,000, in which the doctor had died. There was not a single doctor in that community. So far the War Department has not granted the discharge of that doctor from the service. In that particular instance it was indicated that the doctor for whose release I asked had been on no active duty of importance for 6 weeks.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I wish to say that I thoroughly agree with the statements made by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina as well as the distinguished Senator from Vermont. The situation which has just been explained to the Senate, including the statistics just given as applying to the Army, also applies to the Navy. The same situation exists with respect to the dentists and pharmacists. For example, one can hardly secure an appointment with a dentist to take care of an emergency situation, in less than 60 days. That has been my experience. Some emergency situations simply cannot wait that long. The result is that doctors and dentists must take care of cases which cannot wait at all, and let such a matter wait as taking care of one who has lost the filling from his tooth. Such an individual must suffer for a considerable time. I know the situation has become difficult to handle. I know of many instances of doctors now in the service who have done nothing much except something like guard duty, and I feel that the civilian population should be better protected by releasing doctors who are really not needed in the armed services.

Mr. President, we ought to thank the Lord each day we continue to live that no epidemic has afflicted this country such as occurred during the last World War. It is terrible to contemplate what would have happened to the United States if such an epidemic had afflicted us, because there would not have been a sufficient number of doctors to take care of it, nor would there have been a sufficient number of pharmacists, or a

sufficient number of nurses. Many more lives would have been lost, as was true in the last war, by reason of illness and the conditions at home. The boys in the service are deeply interested in what is happening to their wives, mothers, fathers, and sisters at home.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has brought to the attention of the Senate a most important and urgent matter. I wish to state that on Wednesday the Senate Committee on Military Affairs began hearings and an investigation of the whole question of demobilization of the Army and Navy and the matter of discharges and releases from our armed services. The hearings have now continued for 2 days. They are not yet completed, but the record of the hearings will disclose that there has been no matter with respect to which the members of the Committee on Military Affairs have been more insistent, or have more strongly urged upon representatives of the departments who have appeared before the committee, than the matter of the compelling need for the immediate release not only of doctors, but of dentists as well, in order that they may return home and meet the needs which the distinguished Senator from North Carolina has described to the Senate today.

I think I can say that when the hearings are resumed on Monday we shall find that the members of the Committee on Military Affairs will continue to demand and insist that action be no longer delayed, but that as many doctors and dentists as possible be released and sent home now in order to meet the conditions which the Senator from North Carolina has so well and timely brought to the attention of this body.

As the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] suggests, we have pressed not only for the release of doctors and dentists, but also the release of nurses. There can be no question that throughout the country there is a most urgent need for doctors, dentists, and nurses. I think there can be no doubt that there are in the armed services today many doctors, dentists, and nurses who could be released at this time, and who should be released so as to enable them to return to their homes and meet the crying and compelling needs of the civilian population.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have listened to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama with approval, but I am of the opinion that doctors and dentists are not the only ones in the Army who ought to be discharged. Many married men with families lack only a point or two, and cannot get out of the Army, when they ought to be released and permitted to go home and reestablish their homes and businesses. I have talked with responsible persons in the Army and Navy, and in some cases I get just about as much response as I would get from talking to that wall over there.

I do not notice that there is any stoppage in the activities of the War Department in promoting lieutenant generals and major generals. A large list of nominations comes here quite often. I want the War Department and the Navy Department to get together in this matter and adopt a program intended to get persons out of the Army and Navy, and not to keep them in. Everyone knows that we do not need an army of seven million or eight million men in time of peace; but it is with the greatest difficulty that we can get any action along this line. I certainly hope that the Committee on Military Affairs will keep after the Army, and that the Committee on Naval Affairs will keep after the Navy until they begin to show some disposition to relax the rigid rules which they have imposed.

In most cases married men with families and men who have seen combat service overseas ought to be released. There may be some exceptions. The Army and the Navy are the only ones who can release them. We can talk here all we please, write letters to the newspapers, and write to our constituents at home that we are doing everything we can; but the point remains that the Army and Navy are not going to take action unless we compel them to do so. I am relying on the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to tell us how to make them take action. There are various classifications in the Army, and it seems to me that some sort of a program could be adopted to classify the men into various groups. The Army has a point system, and there is talk about reducing the number of points necessary for discharge, but no one knows how much the number will be reduced, or when the reduction will be operative, or the basis on which it will operate.

I am very much in sympathy with the effort of the Committee on Military Affairs; but something more than talk will be required. I am of the opinion that we shall have to do more than say, "Good morning, General. Come in. We are delighted to see you. We wish to congratulate you on your fine service at that desk down at the War Department where you have been ever since Pearl Harbor." [Laughter.] We must do something to make the Army and Navy act with some promptness. I hope the committees will stay on the necks of the Army and Navy.

I notice that three or four bills to make permanent generals and permanent admirals are pending. The Army and Navy have time to do that, but they do not have time to go through the rolls and select those who should be released from the service.

With regard to the army of occupation, it seems to me that the Army might devise a method of going through the rolls and screening them. Probably a great many young men with a desire for adventure would like to be in the army of occupation. The Army and the Navy might also send to the areas of occupation some of the men who have been serving in the United States, and who have never been outside the United States, and let some of the men with combat service, who have fought and suffered, be released.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator from Texas, and also the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for his indulgence.

Mr. HOEY. I heartily endorse all that has been said by the Senator from Texas. We have in the Army 8,050,000 men. We have 3,000,000 men in the Navy. The Army admits that it needs only two and one-half million men for all purposes—both for the armies of occupation and for service in the United States. That leaves five and one-half million men whose services are not needed in the Army. The Navy admits that it needs only 500,000 men for peacetime occupation. Therefore we have two and one-half million men in the Navy who ought to be discharged.

The point system operates very unfairly. Take, for example, the National Guard, which was called out in September 1940. I happened to be Governor of North Carolina at that time, and called out the National Guard under the President's order. Those men have been in service for 5 years. A great many of them have been kept in this country. Many from North Carolina have been kept in camps to train soldiers. Under the point system they cannot be discharged, although they have been away from their homes and families for 5 years. I do not believe that the point system is fair. I do not think it takes into consideration all the elements which ought to be considered.

I believe that the Army and Navy ought to adopt a more rapid method of releasing men from the service. They are not needed. The war is over. They have gladly fought for their country, and now they ought to be permitted to return to their homes and families. In my judgment their retention in the service is absolutely unjustifiable. There is no defense for it. I believe that Congress ought to insist that greater speed be exercised on the part of the Army and Navy in releasing men from the service.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to call attention to the fact that the theory that when a man is discharged from the services he gets his old job back, or resumes the status in the community which he held before he went into the service, is simply not working out. We are now reconverting to civilian industry, and the time comes when an employer simply must fill the position formerly held by the serviceman, who has been in the Army or Navy from 2 to 4 years. That serviceman cannot ask his employer to hold the position open for him until he returns, and thus his competitors get ahead of him. He must tell his employer to go ahead and fill the position which he once held. Several cases of that nature have been brought to my attention, as well as cases of men who had small businesses or farms. Those small businesses or farms have been held onto in some way up to the present time. The men themselves have been away in for-

eign service from 2 to 4 years. Some of them have been wounded and hospitalized. Now it is proposed to send them to the other side of the world for another 6 months, a year, or 18 months. They will lose everything which it took them years to work for, because they cannot come back. The point system does not permit them to come back, even though they have been through various campaigns, have been wounded, have recovered, and have been put back into the service. They will lose their jobs, and they will lose everything for which they have worked for 10 years, perhaps, unless some provision is made for their return.

Perhaps it is unfortunate, but I am proud that some of them will not admit they are hardship cases. Yet, the Senator from North Carolina and every other Senator knows that there are hardship cases. Certainly, Mr. President, it simply is not right to have a man lose all he has worked for over a period of 10 years because he cannot be home to look after his business, now that reconversion has occurred in a wholesale manner, or to have a man lose a job which perhaps he has worked up to over a period of several years.

Mr. HOEY. I agree heartily with the Senator, and I think hardship cases should receive attention at once.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to say that yesterday Gen. Stephen G. Henry, who is at the head of the G–1 branch of the General Staff of the Army, the branch of the General Staff which handles personnel—and he is the highest authority in the Army, under the Chief of Staff, on the question of personnel—advised us that the Army has now liberalized considerably the policy of granting releases on the basis of hardship, and is now in the process of establishing a special division in the Office of the Adjutant General in an effort to expedite the processing and release of men who should be released on the basis of hardship.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as the Senator from Alabama has said, I think the Army is endeavoring to expedite the release of hardship cases; but how much better it would have been never to have taken such men into the Army at all, because the Selective Service System has made hardship cases faster than the Army has been releasing them. Certainly for the last 3 months the Selective Service System has created hardship cases of the very worst kind of all that have come to our attention during the war.

Mr. HOEY. That is true.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am not a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I wonder whether any member of that committee can tell us where we can obtain information regarding what I understand is the attitude of the War Department. I understand that the Army is now maintaining 900,000 men in Japan, and I do not know how many men the Army has in Germany. We should have information regarding the number of countries in which we have troops at the present time and why they are there, and we should have information about the number of troops our allies supply to police those countries and to what extent we have to furnish troops for such work. It seems to me that concise information should be brought together and furnished regarding many such questions. Such information would help us to arrive at an understanding of the situation, and would enable us to answer those who write by the hundreds every day to find out why their boys cannot come home. If any collection of information of that character exists, I should like to know where it is.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that I think one of the chief purposes of the hearings and investigation now being conducted by the Committee on Military Affairs is to seek to obtain the very information the Senator has referred to, which is important information which all Senators should have. From the testimony given by the War Department so far, I think the Department has made clear that it recognizes that it cannot fix the size of the Army and cannot determine how many men we shall have in the United States or how many men we shall have outside the United States. That matter must be determined by the Congress of the United States. The War Department estimates that, considering transportation facilities, administration facilities, and the other facilities which affect the entire matter of demobilization, it certainly will have released, by July 1, approximately 6,050,000 men, and in the opinion of some of those in the War Department more men than that will be released by that time.

But the War Department stands committed to the release of 6,050,000 men by July 1. That will leave approximately two and one-half million men in the Army. But the figure two and one-half million men was not arrived at by the War Department as the figure for the size of the Army of the United States. The War Department is not in any way attempting to fix the size of our Army. That figure came about because it represents the residue or the remainder of the men whom the Army felt it could not release by July 1, considering the limitations of transportation and other facilities. The War Department may be able to expedite the discharge of the remaining two and one-half million men, and it may be able to release some of them before July 1. But the Congress will have to determine what shall be the size of the Army.

I should like to say that General MacArthur himself has arrived at the figure 900,000 as the number of men he needs in the Pacific. I speak not only of troops for the occupation of Japan, but also of the troops needed in the Philippines, Guam, Wake, and other islands which the Congress may determine should be retained as military bases. I take it that General MacArthur's figures are subject to reduction or might be subject to it, in any case, depending on the developments of the situation in the Pacific in the days which lie ahead.

I understand that at present General Eisenhower plans to have approximately 500,000 men in Europe, including England, Germany and all the other countries in the European theater of operations.

If we add the 900,000 and the 500,000, we arrive at the figure 1,400,000, which represents the number of men who will be needed abroad. The difference between 1,400,000 and 2,500,000 is the number of men who will be in the Army in the United States. But Congress itself must determine the size of the Army. The figure 2,500,000 is arrived at in view of the fact that the Army estimates it certainly can reduce the number of troops to that many by July 1. That will mean the discharge of approximately 6,050,000 men between now and then.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, it will also be interesting to know how long it will take Congress to obtain the information needed to enable it to determine what shall be the size of the Army. As the Senator from Alabama has said, the Congress must make that determination. The necessities of the situation require us to take advice and receive demands from the General Staff of the Army. We assume that the war is over. As the Senator from Alabama has said, the Congress itself must determine what the size of the Army shall be. So far, we do not seem to have sufficient information to enable us to arrive at such a determination.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that one avenue through which to obtain that information is the Committee on Military Affairs of this body. That committee is now in the very process of trying to obtain informaiton—although perhaps not all the information the Senator may have in mind. But certainly the important question now before the committee is demobilization. The committee also has before it a bill relative to voluntary enlistments, and also the question whether the draft shall be continued and, if so, for how long a period of time.

I am sure the committee will endeavor to obtain the information the Senator has in mind. It may take a little time to obtain all of it.

I am sure the Senator also recognizes that some of these questions go to the very top military level, so to speak. I refer to questions regarding the number of troops our allies will maintain in the occupied countries; whether there will be Chinese troops and, if so, how many; whether there will be British or Australian troops and, if so, how many. Obviously there are questions which cannot be determined overnight. But, as one member of the Military Affairs Committee, I believe I can say that the committee is now making an earnest effort to obtain the facts which the Senator has in mind, which all other Members of Congress have in mind, and, for that matter, which all the American public should have in mind.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Can the Senator state how many troops our allies are

furnishing, and in how many countries we have troops stationed at the present time?

Mr. HILL. We have not reached that stage of the matter. That information has not come before the committee as yet. As I have said, the immediate problem has been the question of discharges and releases. I would not attempt to give the Senator those figures offhand.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am sure that, as a member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama could render a distinct service to the Congress and to the people if the information could be furnished them. I hope that he will let us have the information at the earliest possible moment, so that we can give at least some reason for assisting those persons who are puzzled by the maintenance of troops in foreign countries in such immense numbers as they are now being maintained. It has been said that we must maintain an army of a million men in this country.

Mr. HILL. I to not believe the War Department has said anything which would give a basis for any person drawing the conclusion that the Department is now asking or recommending that an army of a million men be maintained in the United States. The figure, 2,500,000 men, including 900,000 in the Pacific area and 500,000 in the European theater, came about as a result of the number left after the War Department had reached its conclusion as to how many men should be discharged and released by July 1. July 1 was, as the War Department said, taken as an arbitrary date. The War Department suggested that it was taken because that date was the beginning of he fiscal year. The War Department figured that it could discharge 6,500,000 by July 1. That does not mean that the War Department is asking that we maintain an army of 2,500,000 men, or an army of a million men in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement of General Henry, of whom I have spoken as being the head of the G–1 branch of the General Staff in charge of personnel matters. The statement was made yesterday by him before the Senate Military Affairs Committee. I believe that the reading of the statement should challenge all of us to a realization of the complexities involved in this problem.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. S. G. HENRY, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, G–1, BEFORE THE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1945

The War Department has given the Congress and the public assurance that just as soon as the situation in Japan crystallized to a point where it was possible to estimate Army manpower needs in the Pacific during the coming months that the War Department would make an adjustment in its schedules for demobilization consistent with those needs. Since this question is uppermost in the minds of the great majority of soldiers and their families, and since it is of such vital concern to our economic security here at home, I am glad to report that we have been able to realize our most optimistic estimate of the possible number of men who will be available for discharge during these next critical months and to comply with the President's statement that "war veterans who do not volunteer to remain in the service should be discharged as soon as it is practicable to do so." My part in this picture, as Chief of the Personnel Division of the War Department, is to see that these long-service veterans are released by the most expeditious means, while, at the same time, insuring that the rights of the individual and the interests of the Government are safeguarded in the most understanding and fairest manner.

Toward this end we have jumped the rate at separation centers from 12,000 per week in the week following VE-day to 72,000 in the week ending September 7, an increase of 500 percent. Six hundred and sixty-one thousand men and women were returned to civilian life between VE-day and September 7. Right now, 24 hours a day, 500 men and women leave the Army every hour, and this rate is increasing every day.

Because of our expanded capacities, we have been able to lower the critical point scores for discharge of enlisted men and women, and, at the same time, have directed a recomputation of the points of all enlisted personnel as of VJ-day, which, in effect, adds a minimum of 4 to 8 points to the score of every man and woman who has served continuously in the Army since May 12.

We have also been able to announce that enlisted personnel 35 years of age or over who have had a minimum of 2 years of honorable service will be released from the Army upon application. This means that at the present time an enlisted man is eligible for discharge if—

(a) He has 80 or more points under the recomputation of September 2, 1945, or

(b) He is 38 years of age or over, or

(c) He is 36, 36, or 37 years of age, and has had a minimum of two years of honorable military service.

An enlisted woman is eligible for discharge if—

(a) She has 41 or more points under the September 2 computation of points, or

(b) She is 38 years of age or over, or

(c) She is 35, 36, or 37 years of age and has had a minimum of 2 years of honorable tary service, or

(d) She is the wife of a member of the military forces who has been discharged.

Officers are eligible for discharge if they have the following point scores on the basis of the September 2 recomputation:

Male officers (colonel, lieutenant colonel, major)	100
Male officers (captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant)	85
Male officers (warrant officer, flight officer)	80
Nurses	65
WAC officers	44
Physical therapists, dietitians	41

There are now only three highly technical skills which are considered essential to the extent that enlisted men in those classifications must remain in the Army notwithstanding their point scores. Officers who are qualified for separation on the foregoing basis may be held on present assignments for not to exceed 60 days. In addition a relatively small number in six categories of specialists may be held up to 6 months after becoming eligible for release under the point system. Six months is the absolute maximum which any officer or enlisted man may be held because of his specialist qualifications after he is qualified for separation.

More recently, with the occupation of Japan proceeding according to schedule, the War Department ruled that no enlisted man would be sent overseas if—

(a) He is 34, 35, or 36 years of age and has had over 1 year of honorable military service, or

(b) He is 37 years of age, or

(c) He has 45 or more points under the May 12 computation. And based on these most recent developments we can now say that by next February, barring unexpected developments, all soldiers in Europe except those in the Army of Occupation and the minimum required to dispose of the Army's surplus property will have been returned to the United States and that the corresponding group in the Pacific will have returned by next June according to present estimates.

I should like to go back for a moment to review with you what the Army has accomplished since VE-day and how the defeat of Japan has changed the emphasis of our plans. Prior to the defeat of Japan, the Army's prime objective was the redeployment of our forces to the Pacific. At the same time we set about demobilizing men as fast as we could without jeopardizing that primary objective. With the prospect of massing our power in the Pacific to defeat a formidable enemy, we also planned at that time to return 2,000,000 soldiers to civilian life during the 12 months after VE-day. It was expected that we would take in 800,000 through selective service during the same period of time or for every man we would take in we planned to let out 2½ men.

We "pushed the button" of the demobilization plan on May 12, 4 days after VE-day. By the end of that week 1,900 men had been returned to civilian life by means of the point system. Through the end of May the number of point releases totaled 29,000. Between VE-day and the 31st of August, about 3½ months later, we had returned to civilian life under the point system 370,000 men, and for all reasons had separated 581,000 men. Through September 7 these figures became 428,000 and 661,000, as I stated before. This latter figure was almost double the number of separations that we had planned for. Our separation center operations expanded from a flow of 12,000 a week in May to a rate of about 40,000 a week in the middle of August. At the same time we were in the process of redeploying to the Pacific 400,000 men, about 70,000 of whom had already arrived at their destination or were well west of the Panama Canal when Japan fell. Some 50,000 others en route were turned back to the United States. Because our first responsibility at that time was the redeployment task, the flow of men out of Europe consisted largely of low-point individuals who were needed in the Pacific or in this country as replacements for men who had not been overseas. I would like to emphasize that through this entire period we exceeded the planned separation rate by several hundred thousand despite the fact that the flow of separations was accomplished simultaneously with the tremendous redeployment program. This was one of the most difficult tasks which any army has ever encountered in military history.

The situation described above was completely reversed by the early surrender of Japan. Our principal objective now is the rapid demobilization of millions of long-service veterans in the fairest, fastest, and most understanding manner possible. This must be done without jeopardizing the responsibility to provide occupational forces in conquered and liberated areas with sufficient trained personnel, supplies and equipment, to assure the proper performance of their missions and to assure their maintenance at standards befitting American soldiers.

Our entire VJ-day plan for demobilization was based upon the continuance of the point system as it is now working. The same factors, length of service, overseas service, cambat service and parenthood and the same weights will continue. One point is given for each month of total service, one additional

point for each month of overseas service, five points for each combat award or decoration and twelve points for each child under 18 years of age up to a limit of three children. We believe the plan is the fairest we can devise and it is based upon a system of credits established as a result of opinions expressed by the soldiers themselves all over the world.

It seems evident that the public and the soldiers approve of this merit system of discharge. A Gallup poll on June 23, 1945, showed that 72 percent of the public thought that the point system was fair. Only 15 percent did not think so; 13 percent had no opinion. A similar type of poll conducted by our information and education division among a representative group of soldiers indicated that 70 percent of the soldiers favored the plan with 25 percent against and 5 percent undecided. Before leaving this subject, I should like to quote a statement made by the Secretary of War on May 10 with respect to this plan: "Obviously, our program will not satisfy everyone. There will be some who feel other factors should have been taken into account or greater weight assigned to one point or another. But we are confident, after the most diligent examination, that it would not have been possible to devise a system that would operate with greater justice to each individual soldier or that would more accurately reflect the desires of the soldiers themselves."

Since the demobilization procedure was announced the Army has received many requests for preferential discharge consideration for particular groups such as industrial workers of various kinds, professional and scientific men, farm workers, limited servicemen, fathers, men whose education was interrupted by their military service, and many others. All of these groups can present valid reasons for their prompt release. The granting of special consideration to such groups, however, would result in the complete destruction of the point system and would be contrary to the expressed wishes of the soldiers themselves as to the men who should be discharged first. The War Department is firmly committed to the point system as the fairest and most equitable that it could devise and it has therefore consistently declined to accede to requests for the preferred discharge of members of such groups, since this could only result in delaying the discharge from the Army of an equal number of men who have earned the right to discharge through long and arduous service.

With the speeding up of demobilization we imediately expanded facilities in our separation centers to take care of the increased loads. This is the reason why daily separation center output has increased from 3,813 on August 1 to nearly 12,000 today. In addition, the 22 separation centers in operation on VE-day are being expanded to 26. The number separated in the centers during September 1 through September 7 was 72,000. I have here a chart which indicates the location of our separation centers and the peak capacities of each. It is expected that these peak capacities will be reached by January 1946. At that time we will be separating about 700,000 per month.

We hope to have all men in Europe who have 85 or more points under the May 12 computation back in this country and discharged by the end of October. We plan that all enlisted personnel wherever located who had more than 85 points as of May 12 will be discharged by the end of November. The exact schedule of further point reductions and the attendant probable time of return of men with lower point scores cannot now be forecast with accuracy. This will depend upon the rate at which our shipping facilities, surface and air, can return men to this country from overseas. The critical discharge score will be dropped as often and as much as is necessary to insure that all available facilities are kept filled to capacity. The time required before men ineligible for discharge can expect to be separated depends upon their point score. The higher their score, the earlier they can expect to be released.

I should like to briefly review for you the processing which is required in a separation center in order to return a soldier to civilian life. This chart furnishes a typical separation center schedule.

I have here a chart which shows the planned decrease in strength of the Army from this date to the first of July 1946. I want to emphasize that the date, July 1, 1946, does not indicate a leveling-off point, but is rather a date arbitrarily chosen for planning purposes. We will continue to reduce after that date as the military commitments of the Nation will allow. The strength of the Army on the first of September was approximately 8,050,000 of which 10 percent or some 800,000 were officers. This strength was distributed as follows:

Atlantic	2,750,000
Pacific	1,900,000
Continental United States	3,400,000

Our purpose is to reduce the strength of the Army to 2,500,000 by the first of July 1946. To do this, it will be necessary to return from the Atlantic some 2,450,000 men while we ship to the same area 200,000 men who have not been overseas and to begin the rotation of men home who would otherwise have to stay with the Army of Occupation. In the Pacific we estimate it will be necessary to return 1,540,000 high score men while we ship out 540,000 new men. In the continental United States we estimate 2,100,000 high score and overage men will be separated while an additional 300,000 men will be discharged for reasons of disability and other causes. We plan a total separation of some 6,050,000 men during the next period of readjustment. During this period, furthermore, we are counting on 500,000 new men being inducted into the Army so as to become available in monthly increments for the rotation of veterans home.

Now, let us look at this other chart to see more in detail how our strength is going to come down. Note the over-all strength of 8,050,000 as of the first of September and the 2,500,000 on July 1, 1946. Of the present strength of the Army we are going to retain 1,700,000 to which number we plan to add 800,000 new men (500,000 inductees at 50,000 a month for 10 months plus 300,000 volunteers). Thus, the 1,700,000 retained and 800,000 new men gives the strength of 2,500,000 on July 1, 1946. At the same time 300,000 will be separated for physical disability, 5,750,000 for points and age, giving us our total release of 6,050,000.

I want particularly to point out to you the importance of this 800,000 with its 500,000 inductees. Suppose we do not take in 500,000. It just means we would have to keep in 500,000 more veterans to have the strength of 2,500,000 on July 1, 1946. And, further, we would not be able to move out of the Army any more than about 5,500,000 veterans instead of the over 6,000,000 which we plan.

To further emphasize this, let me break down the 2,500,000 that we must retain a little longer: 900,000 of these men, if there are no inductions, are going to be in their third and 250,000, I estimate, are going to be in their fourth year of service. You must realize that 5,600,00 men have been in the Army over 2 years at the present time. Therefore, unless there is some means of rotation, some means of sending into the Army new men to replace those who have already done a good job for us in this war, we are going to keep over 1,000,000 in their third and fourth years of service.

The facts I have just given to you point up the urgent necessity for a continuing flow of new manpower into the Army unless many men now in the Army are to be retained for an unfair length of time. If we are to make suitable provision for continuing return of these veterans from overseas and in addition provide a scheme of rotation for the men in our occupation armies, it is estimated that inductions must be continued at the minimum rate of 50,000 per month. Let us examine that for a minute. It takes 42,000 men a month, in round numbers, to rotate 1,000,000 men every 2 years. The 50,000 men a month that we have asked for through selective service inductions will rotate 1,200,000 men in 2 years. There is where we go into the third and fourth years of service which I have been talking about. Of course, the 300,000 volunteers we hope to get will be of additional assistance.

There are two methods of meeting this need for replacements: One, volunteering; two, continuation of inductions. Of course, we would all prefer to do it with volunteers, but frankly we do not believe that sufficient volunteers can be acquired to meet our requirements. It is our most optimistic estimate that we can average 30,000 volunteers a month for the next 10 months.

On the basis of what the War Department and theater commanders have determined as our needs for occupational forces and operation of installations in this country, I have shown you that the strength of the Army can be reduced from 8,050,000 to 2,500,000. On the basis of continued selective service and some volunteering of men for the Regular Army we can demobilize more than the difference between these two figures, or a total of 6,050,000. For planning purposes we have established July 1, 1946, as the date in which we can reach our minimum needs, which gives us a period of 10 months in which to carry out this tremendous task of demobilization. Your most obvious question is "Why can't we discharge all those who want to be discharged now?"

I should like to point out that there are three factors which must be considered in accomplishing the job set up for us. First, in order to have a fair, equitable, and orderly system of release we had to determine who should go first. The point system, based on long and arduous service, accepted by both the GI and the public, is one that involved an individualized selection of eligibles; it is not mass movement of units. Second, we have the transportation problem to consider. Men eligible for discharge under the point system are scattered all over the globe. Time and available transportation must determine their return. Third, we must have adequate facilities in this country to handle the separation of hundreds of thousands of men per month. The number of separation centers is being increased and the capacity of each is being enlarged to enable us to handle peak loads before they arise.

We have set ourselves a goal. We know the extent of the job. Right now, we are going beyond our greatest expectations in returning men and women to civilian life and exceeding our planned rate of demobilization as each day goes by.

Anyone who has dealt with problems of logistics, and particularly those on this committee who served in World War I, know that there is more to returning in excess of 40,000,000 men from overseas than simply putting them on boats or planes. The Army is bending every effort to return and demobilize in 10 months the greater part of and Army which required almost 5 years to assemble, organize and deploy throughout the world. The greatest number of men who ever left these shores by water transportation during any one month, when we were making every effort to reinforce our front line units, was 278,852 in January of this year. Compare this figure with over 400,000 men who reached these shores by water during last month alone. From the standpoint of time it's interesting to mention that the average period for an average troop transport in the Atlantic to make a round trip is 30

days; and from San Francisco to Manila and back is 2½ months.

To go back for a moment to World War I, you'll be interested too to know that it was a year and 2 months before the last of our forces who were not a part of the Army of Occupation left Antwerp, Belgium for home. This is specially significant when you consider that at no time did we have more than 2,050,000 overseas in World War I, and in that war our troops were concentrated in a single part of the world and had to cross only one body of water.

I take your time to recite all these facts and figures because they, better than anything else, will give you some idea of the herculean task we are undertaking in setting a redeployment target of 10 months; and in doing so I ask this committee and all members of Congress to approach this problem with patience and understanding. We're doing all we can to bring the men home in the shortest possible time and to demobilize them in the fairest, fastest and most understanding manner possible.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as has been stated during the past 2 days, the Military Affairs Committee, as the present occupant of the chair knows, he being a member of that committee, has been hearing representatives of the Office of the Chief of Staff, the War Department, and the Army on the question of releasing men from service. Some very interesting facts were developed. Figures have been asked for, and I wish now to submit a few of them.

There were 8,050,000 men still in the Army on August 1 of this year. It has been said that the Army is not talking about keeping—I believe it was said—a million and a half or a million men in this country. Allow me to state what the Army plan is, as projected for July 1, 1946. The plan is that there will be available in Europe, I believe, 500,000, 900,000 in the Pacific, and 1,100,000 in this country.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will yield in a moment.

I know that the Congress fixes the size of the Army. But it acts in that regard only after the plans are laid before it by the officials of the War Department. I do not know why the plans have been projected for an Army in this country of 1,100,000. However, such a plan was frankly stated before us within the past 2 days. We are interested in expediting the discharge of the men from our armed forces, particularly those who have experienced severe service, and the hardship cases as well. I must frankly state that very little progress has been made so far in releasing our men. However, we have been assured that the rate of their release will be increased. At the present time there are separation camps to which men are being sent. Twenty-six such camps are located in this country. We have been assured that 50 more of them will be established. It has also been stated to me that separation offices will be established within those camps so that men may go to them and be released.

Allow me to say to the Senator, since he has raised this interesting question, that we have found men with more than 85 points who have been in some of those camps for a long while. They were returned particularly from the European area, and some of them were returned from the Pacific area. They have been performing KP duty, cutting grass, or doing nothing at all. That has been a terrible wrong. It should be corrected.

I was glad that the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, stated that if names were given to him of those cases, he would attend to them at once.

I may say to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] that more than 75 names have already been handed to the Under Secretary of War. At one camp in this country we found 71 men with as many as 131 points who had been there for some time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Wyoming knows more about this matter than many of us do, and I shall yield to him in a moment.

I found another case of a veteran from the Pacific area who had been back in this country for months, and who had 97 points.

Mr. HOEY. Of the men to whom I referred, one had 118 points, one had 125 points, and another had 95. Yet they were unable to obtain their discharge.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We have called that to the attention of the War Department and the Army. We have been given assurance by them that they will step up the rate of discharges, and I hope they will do so. However, I am not pleased with the projected idea of the size of the Army to be maintained in this country. The plan which has been projected is one which indicates the ideas which are being entertained by our military officers.

Earlier in the day I introduced a bill opening up the Army of the United States, which is today an Army made up of selectees, to voluntary enlistments of men who are already in service, those who have been discharged, and those who have not been in the service. I believe that if such a law is enacted we will then have fully enough men who will know what their term of service will be, instead of "duration and 6 months thereafter." We will then have a volunteer force for the armies of occupation, a satisfied volunteer force such as this country should have. The bill was introduced today, and it was referred to the Senate Military Affairs Committee. I am glad the Senator from North Carolina brought up this important question because I think it is as important as any which we have before us today. I think we should see that men are returned to their homes who are entitled to be returned, and who have performed service for a sufficient period.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia has referred to a matter which I brought before the Senate earlier in the week when I read a telegram which I had received from 71 servicemen stationed at the Charleston, S. C., Army air base. These men, with others, had been returned from Europe and Africa after from 3 to 4½ years' service. Practically all of them were over 38 years of age, or had in excess of 90 points, up to as much as 125 points, as the Senator has said.

I immediately took the matter up with the War Department, and I am glad to be able to tell the Senate that last evening the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, telephoned me and advised me that the matter was having his personal attention, and that unquestionably these men were ready for discharge and had the right to discharge.

This morning, in fact, less than an hour ago, I received a telephone message from Colonel Zeiss, the assistant executive officer to the Under Secretary, advising me that a brand new demobilization camp had been set up, and that the entire group, which is known as the "Purple Project"—I do not know what that means, but that is the name under which they go, some 160 men eligible for discharge—will be sent to that camp, and the entire 160 will be discharged within 1 week.

Mr. President, that is very satisfactory, so far as the men themselves are concerned, but it does not go to the root of the trouble as to why these men, who have been in this country more than a month, and have been eligible for discharge on points, have not been discharged, but have been kept in the camp in South Carolina doing KP duty.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I knew the Senate would be interested in the matter of having eligible men discharged from the Army and Navy, and their discharges speeded up. I think there is no doubt about the fact that the American people are more supremely concerned about having these men discharged and sent home than about any other matter which now confronts the public.

I wish to refer again to the matter of doctors for a moment. In my State of North Carolina before the war began we had only one doctor for every 1,900 of population. The State of New York had a doctor for every 700, but the doctors in my State, notwithstanding the scarcity of physicians, not only volunteered and filled the quota, but they volunteered to the extent of 160 percent of the quota, therefore reducing very greatly the number of doctors in comparison with the population of the State.

These doctors have served across the ocean, in both the Pacific and the Atlantic areas, and when the war is over I think there is not any justification for retaining them, when their services are not needed in the Army, and when they are so seriously needed at home.

I wish to endorse very fully all that has been said about discharging the servicemen. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] that if we should adopt the method of permitting voluntary enlistments for either 1 or 2 years, a large number would enlist. When the men are discharged and go home for from 30 to 60 days I think a great many would like to return to the military service for a year or two if they knew definitely how long they were to be in it, and what service they were to

render. I do not think it is necessary to maintain an army of 1,100,000 men in the United States in peacetime.

Mr. President, I think the Committee on Military Affairs is doing a fine job in investigating this matter, and I trust the investigation will be pressed strongly, both for the release of men who have the points, and for a liberalizing of the system, taking into consideration the long service of a great many men who have not had an opportunity to accumulate points.

Many young men had their educations interrupted by the draft, and I think it is important for them to have a chance to return to school before the opportunity of acquiring an education has passed. I hope the committee will press this matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am happy that the Senator from North Carolina brought up this subject and that other very qualified Senators have discussed it, because I am very much interested in it. I have received my quota of letters, and I can sympathize greatly with those from States which have larger populations than mine if they have received a proportionate number of letters.

I wish to say to the Senator from West Virginia that I hope he will take an increase in compensation into consideration, in his proposed bill opening the services to voluntary enlistments. I feel that it is a man's duty in wartime to serve his country, that the monetary compensation is of secondary consideration at that time; but in peacetime I feel that in a democracy service in the army should be an occupation, that it should be a job rather than a duty. We should make it sufficiently attractive financially so that men would volunteer to fill all the jobs, just as in the case of other departments of the Government.

Certainly I am in favor of a volunteer army rather than conscription, and I hope the Senator from West Virginia will give that consideration in attempting to provide for filling up the quotas voluntarily by volunteers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Idaho. I am glad he subscribes to the view of a volunteer army of the United States, that is, the Army of the United States as distinguished from the Regular Army. I am glad to have his expression of views and his consideration of the subject, and when we come to the consideration of the bill, his thoughts will certainly be considered by all of us.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Col. Samuel L. Howard to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 30th day of March 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul V. McNutt, of Indiana, to be United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald S. Russell, of South Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, because of the interest of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] in this nomination, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina, who now occupies the Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Benton, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Benjamin V. Cohen, of New York, to be counselor of the Department of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, United States Army, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry other nominations in the foreign service.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask that the other nominations in the foreign service, which are promotions, and which are more or less routine, be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining nominations in the foreign service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the nominations on the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, and under the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, September 18, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 14 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY AND ELECTRICITY AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WITH RANK FROM AUGUST 3, 1945

Col. Boyd Wheeler Bartlett, Army of the United States, vice Prof. Chauncey L. Fenton, retired.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE A MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. William Clayton Rose (colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States, to be a temporary major general in the Army of the United States.

UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE

Capt. Gilchrist Baker Stockton, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as naval aide and liaison officer to the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, to rank from the date of confirmation by the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 14 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER

Paul V. McNutt

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

Donald S. Russell
William Benton

COUNSELOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Benjamin V. Cohen

FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO PANAMA

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, United States Army.

PROMOTIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

To be foreign-service officers of class 2

John W. Bailey, Jr.
Charles A. Bay
Hiram A. Boucher
Clarence C. Brooks
William W. Butterworth, Jr.
Paul C. Daniels
Owen L. Dawson
Samuel H. Day
Charles E. Dickerson, Jr.
Harry F. Hawley
John R. Minter.
Howard H. Tewksbury

To be foreign-service officers of class 3

Warren M. Chase
Oliver Edmund Clubb
Cabot Coville
Raymond A. Hare
Edward P. Lawton
Clarence E. Macy
Paul W. Meyer
Shelton T. Mills
James S. Moose, Jr.
James B. Pilcher
Harold M. Randall
William T. Turner
James R. Wilkinson
Miss Frances E. Willis

To be foreign-service officers of class 4

J. Kenly Bacon
Philip W. Bonsal
Wilson C. Flake
Richard B. Haven
Charles H. Heisler
Erik W. Magnuson
Harold B. Minor
R. Borden Reams
Edwin Schoenrich
Albert W. Scott
Horace H. Smith

To be foreign-service officers of class 5

Ralph J. Blake
Charles E. Brookhart
Bernard C. Connelly
Merritt N. Cootes
Andrew E. Donovan 2d
Walter C. Dowling
John K. Emmerson
William E. Flournoy, Jr.
Claude H. Hall, Jr.
Fred W. Jandrey
Robert Janz
Frederick P. Latimer, Jr.
Harrison Lewis
E. Allan Lightner, Jr.
Douglas MacArthur 2d
Harvey Lee Milbourne
Ralph Miller
Calvin Hawley Oakes
Kennett F. Potter
Paul J. Reveley
Clare H. Timberlake
Joseph I. Touchette
Mason Turner
Gerald Warner
Milton K. Wells
Kenneth J. Yearns

To be foreign-service officers of class 6

Hector C. Adam, Jr.
William C. Affeld, Jr.
Fritz A. M. Alfsen
W. Stratton Anderson, Jr.
Russell W. Benton
Maurice M. Bernbaum
Roswell C. Beverstock
M. Williams Blake
Carl Breuer
Aaron S. Brown
Stephen C. Brown
William F. Busser
Harlan B. Clark
William E. Cole, Jr.
Frederick J. Cunningham
Harry M. Donaldson
Overton G. Ellis, Jr.
Perry Ellis
Frederick E. Farnsworth
Richard D. Gatewood
Jule L. Goetzmann
Edmund A. Gullion
Miss Constance R. Harvey
Walter W. Hoffmann
Hartwell Johnson
Reginald S. Kazanjian
Easton T. Kelsey
Perry Laukhuff
Aubrey E. Lipponcott
Gordon H. Mattison
Roy M. Melbourne
John Fremont Melby
Robert B. Memminger
George E. Miller
Charles S. Millet
H. Gordon Minnigerode
Harold E. Montamat
Bolard More
William D. Moreland, Jr.
Jack B. Neathery
Miss Katherine E. O'Connor
Herbert V. Olds
Elim O'Shaughnessy
Fred K. Salter
Elvin Seibert
Walter Smith
Orray Taft, Jr.
Charles W. Thayer
David A. Thomasson
Ray L. Thurston
S. Roger Tyler, Jr.
Evan M. Wilson
William Witman 2d

To be foreign-service officers of class 7

Roland K. Beyer
V. Lansing Collins, Jr.
Adrian B. Colquitt
A. David Fritzlan
John C. Fuess
John P. Hoover
John Evarts Horner
Coldwell S. Johnston
Donald W. Lamm
Frederick J. Mann
Delano McKelvey
Miss Minedee McLean
Carl F. Norden
Julian L. Nugent, Jr.
R. Kenneth Oakley
J. Kittredge Vinson
George Lybrook West, Jr.
Charles H. Whitaker

To be foreign-service officers of class 8

Stewart G. Anderson
William L. Blue
John H. Burns
John A. Calhoun
Don V. Catlett
Irven M. Eitreim
Robert S. Folsom
Edward L. Freers
Paul E. Geier
Caspar D. Green
Roger L. Heacock
David H. Henry 2d
Oscar C. Holder
Frederick D. Hunt
J. Jefferson Jones 3d
David LeBreton, Jr.
Scott Lyon
Robert H. McBride
David H. McKillop
Lee D. Randall
Stuart W. Rockwell
Claude G. Ross
W. Horton Schoellkopf, Jr.
Charles W. Smith
Byron B. Snyder
Wallace W. Stuart
Joseph J. Wagner
Andrew B. Wardlaw
Livingston D. Watrous

POSTMASTERS

IDAHO

Frank L. Shaffer, Grangeville.
Thelma Watson, Menan.

KANSAS

Ethel Thompson, Kismet.
John R. Pratt, Studley.
Homer Pearce, Sun City.

KENTUCKY

William S. Vertrees, Cecilia.
Carrie Smith, Kosmosdale.
William C. Bryant, McKinney.
Margaret O. Tucker, Parksville.
Maurine C. Elliott, Yosemite.

LOUISIANA

Daniel A. Williams, Clayton.
Grover C. Quarles, Goldonna.
Myrtle C. Beridon, Hamburg.

MARYLAND

T. Bayard Scott, Childs.
Agnes C. Birch, Secretary.
Helen B. Long, Stevenson.
Marshall F. Armacost, Upperco.

NORTH CAROLINA

Olive V. Underwood, Altamahaw.
Oscar E. Ross, Ansonville.
James R. D. Simmons, Ash.
Myrtle W. Harris, Bahama.
Leland R. Geiger, Balfour.
Herman Bone, Black Creek.
Glenn G. Gibbons, Colfax.
Alma S. Marz, Derita.
Maude Harris, Efland.
Bessie E. Hyman, Gaston.
Benjamin Franklin Hardison, Grantsboro.
Joel A. Britt, Harrellsville.
Cole I. Lee, Lake Toxaway.
Denard R. Lewis, Marshallberg.
Sallie H. Adams, Merry Hill.
Paul R. Dozier, Shannon.
Estelle Eason, Sharpsburg.
Norman H. Clark, Snow Camp.
Velon L. Auman, Steeds.
W. Fred Garrison, Stocksville.
George H. Roebuck, Stokes.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou to whom we turn as our loving Heavenly Father, accept our praise and our gratitude for Thy continued providence at the beginning of another day. We pray for that understanding, for that vigor of thought, and for that conviction that shall be ours as we meet the challenge of the problems of this hour. Strengthen us so that we shall be altogether adequate to approach every question. We thank Thee for life, for its visions, for its privileges, and for its possibilities, and pray that we may grasp it with energy that fires, and with wills that flame. Gracious God, we would share Thy thoughts and be possessed of Thy sense of justice and goodness. Grant that each day we may be of some real service to the world, made so by the spirit of Him who was earth's humblest servant, man's greatest friend, and Master of all. In the name of Jesus we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT OF HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF PEARL HARBOR

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of Pearl Harbor the following-named Members of the House:

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file three special and privileged reports; one on H. R. 520, one on H. R. 1196, and one on House Joint Resolution 225.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to, but for the information of the House, will the gentleman tell us the nature of these bills?

Mr. SABATH. One is the Murdock bill, a bill that would provide and make possible some additional reclaimed land for our boys who may want to go into farming and obtain farms in good sections of our country out west. The second bill has to do with the creation of an additional judge in the State of Missouri, and the third one is a bill that will quitclaim to the States certain riparian rights, and so on, on the navigable streams, rivers, and lakes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the equal-rights amendment from the Union Times of New Haven.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in regard to the motion-picture industry.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on foreign affairs, which appeared in the September 8, 1945, issue of the Army and Navy.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the report of the members of the Committee on the Mer-

chant Marine and Fisheries who accompanied the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs on their investigation of bases in the Pacific.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio program emanating from Scott Field on the day of the Japanese surrender.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GALLAGHER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BRIG. GEN. LEWIS C. BEEBE, A GALLANT SOLDIER

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from the Philippines?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, the other day when this House welcomed the hero of Corregidor, Gen. Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright, he was accompanied by a modest, unobtrusive soldier, his Chief of Staff, Brig. Gen. Lewis C. Beebe, a native of Ashton, Iowa, and now a resident of Faribault, Minn. It was but proper that all the tribute and all the honors should have been accorded to General Wainwright when he was here. He was the man of the hour, and a grateful Nation wanted him to feel the depth of its gratitude for his heroism, courage, and sacrifice.

Today, I want to pay my homage to General Beebe. I saw him in action in the stinking tunnel of Corregidor. I saw him sick and ailing and yet on his feet giving General Wainwright the help and support that he needed in those trying days. I saw him on duty day and night without any let-up, and I know how highly he was respected by the staff and how beloved he was by the men. Here is an officer who lived up to the highest traditions of the American Army, whose record in Corregidor entitles him to be on the honor roll of America's heroes.

When we parted in Corregidor on April 8, 1942, he was a brigadier general. When I saw him the other day his face showed the torture—mental and physical—that he had suffered at the hands of his brutal captors. He still wore only one star on his shoulder. It is my privilege to be able to make of record today my high admiration for one who so nobly and so heroically served his country.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and to include an editorial in one instance.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper item.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the Tulsa Real Estate Board.

T. R. SPANGLER

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Inasmuch as there is no legislative program before the House today, the Chair will entertain the request of the gentleman.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, on August 30 in my town tragedy struck four of our leading citizens, all men with all their children in the services of the United States. The frantic mother of one of these soldiers stationed in the Philippines and her husband, a veteran of a former war, appealed to me on the morning of the 31st to contact the Adjutant General's department in this city to see if we might get a message to her son, the Red Cross having failed to get a satisfactory reply. I sent this message to the Adjutant General:

Please send fastest message to Lt. T. R. Spangler, 1,011,849, Tank Battalion 763, APO 96, San Francisco, that his father, Ross Harry, and Court drowned at Lake James. Return if possible. Wire me at Bryan, Ohio, report of delivery your message to Lieutenant Spangler.

I sent a similar message to Admiral Jacobs, of the Bureau of Personnel of the Navy, to advise the sister, wife of Lieutenant (jg) Levenson, of the U. S. S. *Vicksburg*, of the death of Mrs. Levenson's father. I waited 48 hours for a reply while this mother was importuning me to find out if this message had been sent. The first message went out on Friday morning. On Sunday noon I repeated these telegrams to both of these officers. On Monday and Tuesday I repeated them once more, threatening to do what I am doing right now. On Tuesday morning just prior to the last of these funerals which have saddened this little town, I wired to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] to see if he could contact the Adjutant General and find if this message had been sent. I received a wire from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in a couple of hours that this message would be sent. I have been in contact with the Bureau of Personnel of the Navy during this week, and was promised a reply on the day before yesterday as to who was at fault and why. So far I have heard nothing. I have had no explanation and no apologies of any kind from the Adjutant General's office. You know, these people out in the country still naively believe that a Representative in Congress is somehow worth as much attention as a city councilman. Is it any wonder that with the puissant, complacent brass hats reclining on the back of their laps for 5 days—that thousands of long overdue discharges of overage men pile up, as the men are shipped from camp to camp instead of to separation centers. Surely in these hundreds of thousands of officers are plenty of warm-blooded Americans who can fill these places efficiently, and in whose veins ice water does not circulate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

DISCHARGE OF MEN FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced in the House a bill and a resolution. The bill, if enacted into law, makes the following provisions. It stops selective service from drafting men or women into the Navy or Army. It also provides that any man who has served for 2 years in the Armed forces will be entitled to a discharge if he desires it. It provides that any liberated American prisoner of war will be entitled to immediate discharge from the armed forces if he desires it.

The resolution which has been introduced provides that the powers of the President under the Second War Powers Act shall terminate 6 months after VJ-day or the day the surrender was signed in Tokyo Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that these bills are important enough to have the immediate attention of this Congress. It is true the Army has been announcing from day to day new approaches and suggestions on how they expect to demobilize the armed forces. They want to continue drafting under the selective service as an instrument to force compulsory military training upon the country. The provision which provides that any individual in the military who has served 2 years shall have an immediate discharge if he so desires it makes a clean-cut decision. I realize it takes some time to put into motion the machinery to demobilize an army. During this time, the Army should send home on a permanent furlough all of these men. They can then await their discharge but should be able to start picking up the loose ends and getting in business for themselves.

The President does not desire to relinquish the powers he has under the Second War Powers Act. It is only natural that he and his bureaucratic henchmen want to retain power over the American people. Congress should have the courage to declare this power ended. They should have the courage to declare that hostilities have ended as of VJ-day.

These bills, I presume, will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I am writing the chairman urging that they be given immediate attention. It is my determination to call the attention of the House to these bills again. If the Military Affairs Committee does not give them proper attention, I expect then to introduce under the rules of the House a petition which will take the bills from the committee when signed by sufficient Members of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a resolution by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly called the attention of Congress to the critical situation facing the American merchant marine in the postwar period. In keeping with this situation the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce has taken timely action, as indicated in the following resolution, which I include under leave to extend my remarks. Similar action should be taken by every public-spirited organization in the country.

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board is now considering the allocation of overseas air routes in accordance with the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which directs that there shall be the fullest development of American-flag air transport services under private ownership and operation, including such competing services as can be constructively supported by the traffic potential; and

Whereas transportation is San Francisco's lifeblood, and the city, therefore, has an intense interest in all forms of transportation which serve it, whether by sea, air, rail, highways, or other forms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce—

1. Strongly favors and urges the maximum of transport service in all of its phases, types, and character to the end that the flow of commerce and travel through the port of San Francisco may be facilitated;

2. Urge upon the Civil Aeronautics Board San Francisco's desire for the maximum air transportation services by as many lines as will serve the public interest;

3. Oppose, in the allocation of overseas air certificates, any discrimination against shipping companies because they operate surface craft, and which companies propose to serve their regular routes and patrons with both air and surface equipment;

4. Favors the provision of coordinated sea-air service under single management, particularly for tourist and pleasure travel, which service cannot be adequately provided by a shipping company operating surface vessels alone, nor by an aviation company operating aircraft alone;

5. Favors the fullest and freest competition between various air transport services to the extent consistent with the policy of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and other national transportation legislation; and

6. Looks with especial favor upon service to San Francisco by operators who will concentrate upon this community's requirements as a regional carrier, as distinguished from operators who serve San Francisco only incidentally in connection with service to other communities and areas in which their interest is as much or more; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the United States Maritime Commission, members of the United States Senate Committees on Commerce and Interstate Commerce, members of the United States House of Representatives Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and all California Members of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make two short insertions in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

MARIA JACKSON'S GREAT CONTRIBUTION TO OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the history of any community is a history of its outstanding leaders and citizens who have, through the years, worked for the public good. In Oregon we have such a benefactor in Maria Jackson, generally known as Mrs. C. S. Jackson, the widow of the founder of the Oregon Journal.

Almost every civic and humanitarian enterprise which has been carried on in Portland, in my district, during the last 40 years has profited by the sincere and effective work of Mrs. Jackson. Although 83 years of age, her enthusiasm and desire to help Oregon and her people prosper has not diminished. The Portland Realty Board last year, in selecting Portland's leading citizen, with almost universal acclaim named Mrs. Jackson for this honor.

In the Pathfinder for September 10, 1945, the life of this great humanitarian leader was briefly discussed. I include this article as part of my remarks:

HUMANITARIAN

Maria Jackson likes servicemen. She likes veterans, too. Today's heroes must not be tomorrow's forgotten men, she says. In Portland, Oreg., at least, no vet will lack bed or board. The Veterans of Foreign Wars gave her a citation for establishing the eight-story George A. White Veterans Club last spring to give dischargees free fun, food, facts.

Wife of Oregon Journal's founder, Mrs. C. S. Jackson began working for soldiers during the 1916 Mexican incident, when President Wilson called out the National Guard without providing for dependents. After World War I she gave land and effort to build Portland a veterans' hospital second to none.

SAVED THE "OREGON"

For 40 years Portland has benefited by her interest, her fearless campaigns. She sparked an investigation resulting in a system of standards and grading for Oregon dairies. The famous battleship *Oregon* was saved from the scrap heap and made a State shrine at her insistence. Her 83 years sit lightly on Maria Jackson's soft white hair. Under a gentle southern manner lies determination—in little ways as well as big.

PIONEERS

This doggedness came from her brilliant, courageous mother. When Virginia-born Maria's father—of course on the Confederate side—made the supreme sacrifice, his young widow raised two sisters as well as her two small children, alone. Leaving Richmond in 1871, the family journeyed to Oregon.

Pearl Harbor whisked away the Violet de Parme perfume Maria Jackson used 60 years. But war hasn't hindered her civic work. Last year Portland Realty Board named her the town's leading citizen.

WOMEN'S JOB

She's convinced women belong in the home: "If a woman has dictated policies for a successful, happy home, she's prepared to take on civic duties. A city is only a combination of homes—a nation a combination of cities."

OREGON TOPS LIST IN PER CAPITA E-BOND SALES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will pardon my pride in my native State of Oregon in attaining top place in the E-bond sales. As shown by the report of the United States Treasury Department, cumulative E-bond sales from

May 1941 through June 1945 shows Oregon to have a per capita of $396.68. This is the highest reported for the Nation. Oregon represents a total sales of $465,179,000. The people in my State throughout the war have made an enviable record in carrying their full share of the load to bring victory to our cause. They not only attained top rank in bond sales but likewise in the building of ships and providing aluminum for airplanes, as well as supplying men in uniform to fight on the battle fronts. I am proud of the record of my native State.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a progress report of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

RELEASE OF MEN FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the resolution to which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] refers, for speeding up the program to release men from the armed forces, goes far enough.

I want to tell Members of Congress now that if the Congress does not get busy and expedite the release of these men from the armed forces—men who are needed at home, who have jobs to go back to, who have wives and children to look after, or who have crops to gather, or young men who should finish their education—you will soon be in the hottest water you have ever been in since you have been in Congress—and ought to be.

We saw the same reluctance on the part of brass hats to discharge men from the armed forces after the last war. I had a letter on yesterday from the Marine Corps expressing sympathy for a woman whose only son was in the service, or expressing the hope that she might be able to run her farm without his help, but saying that they had no authority to discharge this young man from the service to go back home and operate his widowed mother's farm, for the reason that—

> Current Marine Corps policies do not permit releasing personnel for the purpose of engaging in agricultural work.

He is no longer needed in the armed forces, but is badly needed on the farm. There are untold thousands of such cases. It is time that Congress changed the policies of the Marine Corps in this respect, as well as the policies of the Army and Navy.

Some of the largest apiaries in the world are located in my district. There are very few men who know how to handle bees. One man writes that unless his brother is released he will be unable to operate his apiary. Yet, under the regulations it is impossible to get that young man out in time to meet the emergency.

I want to serve notice on the House now that this is your responsibility and mine, and the American people, and especially these boys who have gone forth and valiantly fought the battles of this war, are not willing to have them stand around in uniformed idleness and lose their opportunities at home, or have their people suffer for want of their assistance.

I do not know about the gentleman's resolution. I have not read it, but unless something is done, I propose to introduce a bill to expedite the discharge of these men from the armed forces who are no longer needed; and I promise you now that we will either put it through or have the darnedest fight we have ever had in Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CONSCRIPTING AMERICAN BOYS TO DO THE DIRTY WORK IN EUROPE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for an additional 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] just said undoubtedly meets with the hearty approval of the overwhelming majority of the Members of this House, but just how we are to go about passing the right kind of drastic legislation which will get the men out without confusion I am not yet advised, but I rather take the chance of a mistake than to leave them in. Certainly I will not be backward in voting for it. I have introduced legislation of that kind, I have advocated it for many weeks, and I shall continue to do so.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Perhaps the gentleman will be able to explain where we will get the ships in which to bring these men back from Europe more rapidly than they are being returned at the present time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Where we will get the ships to bring them back on?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me tell the gentleman there are many ships over there in the Pacific right now with boys on them. You can turn their prows this way instead of the other way; you can pull up their anchors and start them home. That will get home several thousands of them, if not several hundred thousand. That is one way of getting ships. There are ships enough to haul cargoes to Europe all right when our allies want something, and our men should have priority on all shipping.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. It might be possible to keep in service the *Queen Mary* and these other large ships that are going to be taken off that service.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right, that is, if Great Britain does not want them; but if she wants them, we may find it kind of hard to keep them. You know, some folks who condemn nationalists never can find a way to put our men and their welfare first.

Prior to getting into this war there were several organizations that were well financed, they had plenty of money, they had newspaper ads in the larger daily papers advocating that we get into this war and that when we got in we should have a sort of world government. They had a half dozen names for it, but the purpose of all of them was that after the war had been won we were to surrender our own independence, haul down our flag and run up this flag of Union Now. I have a silk replica of that international flag. It is a nice piece of silk but none of the veterans I have met want to stay in Europe under it. It was not my idea that we follow a course which would get us into this war, but nevertheless we went on that course until we were in. One of those organizations was Federal Union, Inc., headed by Clarence K. Streit, who so far as I know does not want any part of rebuilding Europe himself, but has a head filled with plans for the young men of America to do the job.

Another one was World Fellowship, Inc., which on January 29, 1942, put on the desk of every Congressman a proposal to give the then President of the United States on his birthday $100,000,000 to start the thing going and an additional $1,000,000,000 to finance the preliminary work of the United Nations of the World, which was one of the proposed names of the organization.

Both proposals were by America firsters, by isolationists and by nationalists of America, by pro-Americans, considered a surrender of our independence, of our sovereignty; a proposition, in short, to make us a subordinate part of a world organization, which many of us then prophesied, which we now know, intended to use our money and our men to further international interests.

Well, they aided us in getting into this war and without the help of any of them, of any of these organizations or of their sponsors, the war has been won by our young men and now the fighting over, that same internationally minded group wants to keep the boys who are in, in—yes, in, indefinitely and they also want to continue the draft of young men through 18 and 25. What do they care about America, her future or the prosperity, the happiness and future of our young people? They have their eyes fixed on an international star and until we stop them, they will continue to sacrifice the youth of America, in the interest of world politicians, of the successors of those who have always made war.

I want to say this, I never heard of one American boy who went into the war, whether he was conscripted or whether he enlisted, who did not do his full

measure of duty from the moment he was inducted right up to the present moment. They performed every task that was asked of them, they never flinched; nor, so far as I have been able to read, there never was a group of men in any country at any time that fought with more ability or greater courage. While there was fighting to do they were ready, but now that is over, they do not propose to be used as pawns in any scheme which is not for the best interests of their homeland.

Now the fighting is over, their real job is over. They want to come home. And they propose to come, "One Worlders" to the contrary notwithstanding. I want to read to you two letters which came to me yesterday which indicate that those who advocated that they wanted men to stay over across to police the world, who said that our people were willing, anxious, and eager to have a world police force, a rehabilitation force of a million or more, all to do the bidding of an international group of so-called statesmen—more accurately world politicians—just simply did not know what they were talking or writing about. I want to say to anyone who follows me today that I have not the slightest objection to gentleman or gentlewomen of the House or the other body, or anyone outside, going across the seas and policing any country anywhere in the world, or cleaning or rebuilding the cities of Europe as long as he or she wants to; but I think in justice to our men, those who advocate that sort of program, that sort of procedure, should take up a part of the burden and carry it a little of the way. I am tired and I am sick, as are millions of other Americans, of this idea that we should draft and send abroad the young men of our country to further the commercial interests of other nations. I recall that Germany and Great Britain and Russia kept in their colleges, professional and scientific schools, a sufficient number of young men so that when the postwar period should come along they would have trained men in all branches of professional and scientific endeavor. But we did not. Oh, no; that was not our policy. Our men, even those who wanted to continue their education, were sent across to fight in the ranks or do manual labor. The result is that today we are in desperate need of professional and trained men, and that need will continue for years.

This first letter is from a young man in my district whom I have never met. I do not know him. It came in yesterday and reads as follows:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1945.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I have enclosed a copy of a letter I have just sent to my commanding officer.

I do not expect you to do anything about my situation. My goose is cooked, and I know it. I do wish, however, that if you do not think I am too much in the wrong, you would keep an eye on my family in case they try to cut out my allotment after I go back.

And if there is anything you can do to keep them from giving me a dishonorable discharge, I would be forever grateful. Congress should let the rest of the fathers out before there is a whole epidemic of these things.

Yours very truly,

JAMES PFAUTH.

BRIDGMAN, MICH.

I will read you the boy's letter addressed to his commanding officer:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1945.

COMMANDING OFFICER, COMPANY D, EIGHTY-THIRD BATTALION,

Camp Maxey, Tex.

SIR: Because I was just transferred into your company before I went on furlough you do not know me or about my problem here at home. I regret that I must dump this situation in your lap. I know that whatever action is taken will be under the direction of certain higher powers, and it is to them, through you, that I address this letter.

If you will check at the Red Cross, you will find that I came home last May because my wife was sick. I won't explain. I know all you want is facts, and the Red Cross has them. The past summer my wife has gotten worse. I didn't know just how bad, but I was plenty worried. I knew it was necessary for her to take shots three times a week. She did not complain, other than to say that she was short of money. I sent all the pay I drew each month to help her get by. The first part of August I received a letter in which the Red Cross suggested that I ask for a furlough, which they would verify was needed. Having only 2 weeks until I received a delay en route, I wrote my wife and asked her to try and get by until I got home. Shortly after this I went to the hospital for 8 days. The last day I received a letter from my wife begging me to come home at once. Greatly upset, I asked the Red Cross to check. The answer came at once. I was needed immediately. After quite some delay I got a 10-day furlough.

When I got home I found my wife too weak to get out of her chair; she and the children had been eating breakfast food three times a day because they had sent me money to come home on my delay en route. My boy Tim had not had a haircut in 2 months, and his shoes were worn so badly he had to go barefoot. Donna, my oldest girl, 6 years old, had been feeding and dressing the children, doing dishes, sweeping floors, and going to the store. She had to start school in a few days and had outgrown her old clothes. Nancy, the baby, was cutting teeth and was cross as a bear. It was enough to wear down a well woman, let alone a sick one.

I went out at once and borrowed some money. We got food in the house; Tim got a haircut and shoes; Donna got clothes to start school. I GI'd the house and did 2 weeks' washing. Then I went to see my old boss on the bus line and went to work. I wired for an extension and was given 5 days. That is according to regulations, and in an ordinary case I would be considered lucky. But this is not an ordinary case, so I have made this decision.

I have tried to find someone to come in and help my wife. It is impossible. We do not have enough money to entice a professional, and I will not impose on my friends, nor does my wife desire to do so. She cannot care for herself, a house, and the children, especially since the oldest must start school, and I will not ask Donna to stay home.

Our fifth child is due in November. Until that time when my wife is able to care for five children or until that time when she has help provided to enable her to do so, I shall not willingly return to Camp Maxey and to my duties there. Ever since I have been in the Army I have been told again and again that my first duty is to the Army. I heard but did not believe. My first duty is to my family; that is why I was a good soldier, and I was a good soldier.

What I propose to do is not easy. I am aware of the fact that it will be hard on me when I come back. But my mind is made up, and I must live with myself. I can take any punishment when my wife is on her feet again.

Please try and understand that I am not defiant. I am desperate, worried, and I think I am scared. At the same time I do not want sympathy. I did not write this in order to promote sympathy. I wrote it because I do not want a dishonorable discharge, and I thought this explanation on record might help me when I get my court martial.

You and others reading this might say, Why doesn't he come back and go through channels? I have had too much experience with channels and red tape. In May it took 14 days to get my furlough. This last time it took 3 days to get an emergency through after the Red Cross had verified it. And then I had to run it through channels, three separate and distinct times. Then, too, I saw two other fellows wait for dependency discharges for 2 months and then get turned down.

Do not, I beg of you, take me too lightly. I shall not sit around here where you can grab me. This may be a dumb trick on my part, but I cannot imagine anything worse than sweating it out in Texas when my family needs me as bad as they do. You would have to lock me up, anyway, because I would probably brain a second lieutenant the first week. Again I say I do not want sympathy. It is as useless as advice from the chaplain; my wife cannot wear it, my children cannot eat it, and I do not want it. I am probably a poor soldier, but I am a good man, as you will find out when it comes time for you to sentence—

Pvt. JAMES A. PFAUTH.

Well, I wired the boy:

It will be impossible to help you unless you return to your outfit.

I wired a personal friend of mine, the editor of the local paper, to go over and interview the boy and try to get him to go back to his company. What is the matter with him? Something wrong up here [tapping head], of course. But he is not alone in being in that condition. He is one of thousands, yes, one of hundreds of thousands, and the people back home know that the fighting is over, and they sympathize not with the administration, not with the Congress or the Navy or the Army, their sympathy is with that boy and with the family. As the gentleman from Mississippi said, it is time for us to get busy about this thing. It is time for us to remember our own country and our own people and to let some of these folks across the sea do some of the necessary work of cleaning up, of rebuilding.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I have introduced a bill to carry out what I said the other day, to the effect that the boys who have served 18 months shall be released, shall be discharged. I am going to follow that up, and if necessary that bill will appear on the desk and be petitioned on this floor. What the gentleman just read is one of hundreds of letters.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, hundreds.

Mr. REED of New York. And they are pouring in from all parts of the country, and I have letters to show that they do not want a man in Congress to be reelected from these districts, no matter what his politics are, unless something is done to relieve these boys.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York who is a loyal and active representative of the Army, certainly.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I thank the gentleman for the compliment. I did not hear all of the recital the gentleman has made. Was application made by this man or for this man for discharge under the hardship clause?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Apparently there has been, but I do not know the facts.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is that man from the gentleman's district?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Has the gentleman talked with the man or his family? Was an affidavit made in proper order? Were two affidavits for discharge filed, and did the gentleman bring the matter to the attention of the War Department?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I have not asked Secretary of War Stimson, the head of Union Now, or of the United States, or the World Organization. And as I am here and the boy is in Michigan I have not interviewed him. I wired a friend to go see him. The boy made application. He should not be required to go through my office for relief. His letter shows that he and the Red Cross presented the facts to the Army.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am merely asking those questions for information.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know, because the gentleman wants to help him and I do, too.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It comes within the hardship clause clearly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Since the gentleman is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, knowing the Army officials as he does, I will give him a copy of that letter and he can take it up with the Army even though the boy does not live in the gentleman's district. The boy is a little bit off in his head. He is worried because of his family, the condition of his wife, because of his children. It has unbalanced his mind to a certain extent, and he is in for trouble unless somebody like you will come to his aid and get immediate relief.

Here is another letter from an entirely different individual. Here is a letter from a young man who is an officer in the Navy, who has a wife and three children, a man that I have known all my life; since the day he was born. He is a graduate of a high school, of a college, of a university. He was elected to office in his own home county. He is a lawyer. He is well balanced. He was making good money as a lawyer. He was close to the top in his profession in his home town. He could not have been conscripted because of his age, but he heard his country's call and he enlisted because he was patriotic and he wanted to serve his country. He left his office, his home, his wife, his children—he left everything that was near and dear to him—because his country needed him. Now that the war, and the need, is over he should be released. He has the right to an honorable discharge.

As I said a moment ago, while the war was on, our boys, whether they liked it or whether they did not, whether they believed it was necessary or whether they thought it was not, nevertheless, to the last ounce of their strength, performed their duty. This boy writes this way:

OKINAWA, *September 4, 1945.*

DEAR CLARE: Right now the thought that is upmost in the minds of all of those who aren't crazy or "Regular Navy," is when in the hell are we going to get home? Am enclosing a clipping taken from a recent issue of the New York Times.

This boy has been in almost 3 years.

I will read the three pertinent paragraphs from that clipping:

No matter what may be done about Army or Navy reduction, Washington officials are bending every effort to prevent a repetition of the last war, when, following the armistice, thousands of men were thrown hastily into civilian life and widespread unemployment ensued.

Moreover, officers say, even should all the transportation required be at hand, the facilities for reception of the men here would demand great expansion. Separation centers would have to be enlarged; others would have to be built.

On the other hand is the realization that mass demobilization would seriously interfere with national economy, overflow the mechanical facilities for discharges and impair the needs of the fighting forces.

I will read you his answer to the first one:

It has been much discussed, unfavorably, by the officers on this ship and all of us are worried that the views expressed by the writer may be the views of Congress and/or the Navy Department. As a matter of fact most of us are convinced that they are the views of the Navy—the real question being: can the Navy get away with it.

This boy is on a carrier.

You will note the writer makes three points opposing quick demobilization.

1. "Mass demobilization would seriously interfere with the national economy."

That is a quotation from the paper. Then he writes:

Did we get into the Navy and this war to improve the national economy and working conditions or to lick the Japs. What do they want to do—exile three or four million of us out here so the shipyard workers and your CIO friends won't have their economy dislocated—and if you don't think this is exile, Clare, come out and get a taste of it. From April till July we operated off Okinawa without setting foot on land. After 5 days in the Philippines we went down to Borneo—then back to the Philippines where we hung at anchor for a month, then back up here where we've been for the last 30 days without doing a damned thing. During that time we've been able to get ashore a total of about 10 times—and the men (enlisted) have not been able to do that, and our experience is typical of all the ships in our division.

There, my friend from Pennsylvania, you will find one ship, the one that man is on, that might come home and bring some of the men with it.

So you can see that I don't look kindly on the idea of staying out here, not seeing my wife and the children just so somebody back there can continue to earn a good salary.

2. There aren't enough facilities to handle separation—the answer to that is there's plenty of facilities if they would use them and take the Navy red tape out of the program—as to points.

3. Impairing the fighting forces—one answer is let some of the others do their share—this providing it's going to take more than the regular peacetime Navy to do the job. Right now, and from the time the Japs quit, there is no reason for any escort carrier to be out here—there isn't a single thing for them to do. As a matter of fact, there's no reason for any carrier to be out here now that we have land-based planes with adequate bases. Ask any military or naval authority and he will tell you that carriers are a poor substitute for land-based aircraft. In my opinion, CLARE, the whole problem boils down to this—there are about 300,000 officers in the Navy; 85 percent are Reserves; 15 percent USN; the 15 percent USN officers hold all the commissions of admiral, captain, and commander—the three top ranks in the Navy. Practically all of their present ranks are temporary. As soon as demobilization is effected they will drop back several grades to their permanent ranks. In order to prevent this they will do anything they can to slow down and impede demobilization in general and in particular of their own commands.

"In order to prevent this, they will do everything they can to slow down and impede demobilization in general and in particular of their own commands."

It makes me think of one of my boys who was in for 2 years and 8 months. When he was down here in an office in Philadelphia in a shipyard, there were six of those young fellows down there, six lieutenants, and the boy said, "Dad, I can do all the work in 3 hours that the whole outfit does all day long." He said "But the admiral is happy and contented." There you are, with that kind of treatment for a bunch of young fellows who enlisted and who had wives and children and left them to go into the service to fight Japs and Germans. They put them at a desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATRICK). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes in order to read the rest of this letter, that is, if the gentlemen who have special orders at this time will permit me to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The letter reads further as follows:

For example, about 7 officers and 32 men on this ship (out of a total complement of about 900) are now and have been for the past 3 weeks eligible for discharge—to date not a single one has left the ship.

In closing I think I should point out that the present Navy point system allows nothing for overseas duty and makes no distinction between a man with one dependent and another man with several dependents. Under the present point system, although I have been in the Navy 22 months with 17 months foreign sea duty, I will not be eligible for discharge until around September 1947. And if you think I'm going to wait that long before going home to my wife and the kids you're crazy.

My roommate is a little younger—has a wife and child—same length of sea duty and a little longer duty in the Navy, plus a Purple Heart received in the battle of Leyte—will not be eligible for discharge until November of 1947. How do you think he likes that?

In all of the foregoing, CLARE, I've said little about the enlisted men. They really have a more legitimate complaint than the officers. We stand an officer of the deck watch (4 hours long) once every other day—as such we

have some responsibilities and do a little work—but how would you like to be an enlisted man and have to dress up in a white monkey suit and sit on a quarter deck for 4 hours at a time—just so when the admiral or captain came aboard or left the ship you could jump up, stand in line, and salute him—sure they're "side boys" and that's what's called "piping the admiral aboard." He gets eight of them, CLARE, and that's better than you rate as a Congressman.

We started doing that aboard this ship today—the second day after the peace was signed. Do you wonder we want to get out of the Navy and fast?

I don't know what you can do about this, CLARE, but somebody has got to do something quickly. I do know that if conditions continue as they are and if the program outlined in the enclosed article is carried out there is literally going to be hell to pay.

Talk to ——— about this and see what he says. My guess is he will verify most of what I have said, and you can take this for granted, I for one do not intend to let the personal ambitions of a bunch of admirals and captains keep me from my family now that the war is actually over.

I'd like to request two things, first, do everything you can to hasten demobilization; second, if you have or can obtain any information as to the Navy's demobilization send it to me by return mail. I'd like to start to make some plans for my future and that's damned hard to do when you don't know whether you are going to be in this outfit for 2 more months or 2 more years.

Best wishes.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman knows of course that since the date of that letter the Navy discharge point formula has included one-fourth of a point for each month of sea duty or service in a station beyond the continental limits of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will that get this boy out in 1946, or in '45?

Mr. MOTT. It will take them all out in 1946. In July 1946, the Navy will be reduced to the standing figure contemplated for a peacetime Navy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says it will take them all out in '46. That is not soon enough. May I write this boy, saying that the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, told me he will be out soon?

Mr. MOTT. This is what you can write them, that by July 1946 it is the program of the Navy to reduce the personnel to a peacetime establishment of approximately 500,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Could you not shove that date up to Christmas 1945?

Mr. MOTT. That is as fast as the Navy thinks it can do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can we not expedite the Navy's thinking?

Mr. MOTT. Just a moment. Now, you can write and tell the boy something valuable. There is no indication that the Navy is not carrying out this program of demobilization as fast as possible. Within a few days the Navy is to submit to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House its entire plan and what has been accomplished under it for the purpose partly of getting the advice of Members as to how it may be speeded up and expedited. And, as I say, there is no indication that anyone can see now that the Navy is not doing the very best it can under the circumstances.

The gentleman, and his correspondent, must remember in the conquering of Japan we have taken literally hundreds of islands and others are being surrendered every day. These islands are still being surrendered every day. You cannot simply take the Fleet away from all these places and expect the war to come to a logical conclusion in an orderly way in the near future.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not overnight, I know. And I would not desert that area until every island has been searched for lost Americans.

Mr. MOTT. No; some of them have to be retained.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wish the gentleman would write the man about that because I would like to finish this letter.

Mr. MOTT. I would like to tell the gentleman something else which I believe he would be interested in.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sure that these boys will not be satisfied until they get out. They have been told a lot of "bunk."

Mr. MOTT. You will be interested in this, that when the Navy gets down to its peacetime strength, which the Congress has yet to set, the entire personnel establishment will be voluntary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is fine—that is the way it should be—and in the Army as well. That is the American way.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot. I want to finish this letter first. I am going to send the gentleman's statement to the Stars and Stripes and the naval publications and see if it will not help these boys out. But this is what I want you to listen to. This boy is not a crackpot.

Mr. MOTT. I may say to the gentleman that I have a son-in-law who has been in combat on an LCT for a year, so I am just as much interested as the gentleman is.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not interested from a personal angle. This boy is not a crackpot. He enlisted when he had a wife and children. A home and a lucrative profession. He did not have to go. Now listen to what he says, because it is along the same line as that expressed in that letter. I am sure this man does not mean it.

If you think I am going to wait that long before going to my wife and kids you are crazy.

The Navy had better think about that, and the Army better think about the letter I just read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATRICK). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FULL EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks the names of the cosponsors and coauthors of H. R. 2202.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The list referred to follows:

Alabama: PATRICK, LUTHER.

Arizona: MURDOCK, JOHN R.

California: DOUGLAS, HELEN GAHAGAN; DOYLE, CLYDE; ENGLE, CLAIR; HAVENNER, FRANCK R.; HEALY, NED R.; HOLIFIELD, CHET; IZAC, ED. V.; KING, CECIL R.; MILLER, GEORGE P.; OUTLAND, GEORGE E.; PATTERSON, ELLIS E.; SHEPPARD, HARRY R.; TOLAN, JOHN H.; VOORHIS, JERRY; WELCH, RICHARD J.

Connecticut: GEELAN, JAMES P.; KOPPLEMANN, HERMAN P.; LUCE, CLARE BOOTHE; RYTER, JOSEPH F.; WOODHOUSE, CHASE GOING.

Delaware: TRAYNOR, PHILIP A.

Illinois: DOUGLAS, EMILY TAFT; DAWSON, WILLIAM L.; GORDON, THOMAS S.; GORSKI, MARTIN; KELLY, EDWARD A.; LINK, WILLIAM W.; O'BRIEN, THOMAS J.; PRICE, MELVIN; RESA, ALEXANDER J.; ROWAN, WILLIAM A.; SABATH, ADOLPH J.

Indiana: MADDEN, RAY J.

Kentucky: BATES, JOE B.

Massachusetts: LANE, THOMAS J.

Michigan: LESINSKI, JOHN; DINGELL, JOHN D.; HOOK, FRANK E.; O'BRIEN, GEORGE D.; RABAUT, LOUIS C.; SADOWSKI, GEORGE G.

Minnesota: GALLAGHER, WILLIAM J.; STARKEY, FRANK T.

Missouri: CARNAHAN, A. S. J.; COCHRAN, JOHN J.

Montana: MANSFIELD, MIKE.

New Jersey: HART, EDWARD J.; NORTON, MARY T.; WOLVERTON, CHARLES A.

New York: BALDWIN, JOSEPH CLARK; BARRY, WILLIAM B.; BYRNE, WILLIAM H.; CELLER, EMANUEL; DELANEY, JAMES J.; DICKSTEIN, SAMUEL; MARCANTONIO, VITO; PFEIFER, JOSEPH L.; POWELL, ADAM C., JR.; QUINN, PETER A.; RAYFIEL, LEO F.; ROGERS, GEORGE F.; ROONEY, JOHN J.; TORRENS, JAMES H.

Ohio: BENDER, GEORGE H.; BREHM, WALTER E.; GARDNER, EDWARD J.; HUBER, WALTER B.; KIRWAN, MICHAEL J.; RAMEY, HOMER A.

Oklahoma: STIGLER, WILLIAM G.; WICKERSHAM, VICTOR.

Oregon: ANGELL, HOMER D.

Pennsylvania: BARRETT, WILLIAM A.; EBERHARTER, HERMAN P.; FLOOD, DANIEL J.; GERLACH, CHARLES L.; GRANAHAN, WILLIAM T.; GREEN, WILLIAM J., JR.; HOCH, DANIEL K.; KELLEY, AUGUSTINE B.; MCGLINCHY, HERBERT J.; MURPHY, JOHN; WEISS, SAMUEL A.

Rhode Island: FOGARTY, JOHN E.; FORAND, AIME J.

Tennessee: GORE, ALBERT; KEFAUVER, ESTES; PRIEST, J. PERCY.

Texas: COMBS, J. M.; PATMAN, WRIGHT.

Utah: GRANGER, WALTER K.; ROBINSON, J. WILL.

Virginia: FLANNAGAN, JOHN W.

Washington: COFFEE, JOHN M.; DE LACY, HUGH D.; JACKSON, HENRY M.; SAVAGE, CHARLES R.

West Virginia: BAILEY, CLEVELAND M.; HEDRICK, E. H.; KEE, JOHN; NEELY, MATTHEW M.; RANDOLPH, JENNINGS.

Wisconsin: BIEMILLER, ANDREW J.; O'KONSKI, ALVIN E.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, before the recent recess 103 Members of the House of Representatives—both Democrats and Republicans—joined together as cosponsors of the full employment bill (H. R. 2202), a bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government." The House sponsors now total 106.

Mr. Speaker, in sponsoring this measure, we joined with the four Democrats and four Republicans who are sponsors of the bill in the Senate.

When we first joined our forces in support of this historic measure, our aim was to obtain enactment of the bill before the end of the war so that our businessmen, our farmers, our working people, all the men and women of America, could face the economic shocks of reconversion confident in the knowledge that we as a nation were moving forward into a period of sustained full employment and full production. But events have moved faster than the legislative process. The war has been happily brought to an end before our most optimistic estimates indicated it possible. War contracts are being canceled every day, war plants are being shut down. Reconversion is upon us.

Today, with the single exception of the unemployment compensation bill, early enactment of the full employment bill is the most important business before the United States Congress. This was indicated by President Truman when he summoned the Senate Banking and Currency Committee back to Washington to complete the Senate's hearings on the bill, which had started earlier in the summer. It was indicated in the President's recent message to Congress.

If this bill is to be effective—and it must be effective—it must be passed without crippling amendments. It must be passed in such form as to be the clearest possible expression of our principles and objectives in drafting it.

A number of constructive amendments designed to strengthen the principles or to simplify the language of the bill have been made by the Senate sponsors of the bill. We, too, will have similar amendments to clarify and strengthen the principles of the bill. Accordingly, it is of the greatest importance that we who sponsor the full employment bill in the House restate the principles that we advocate in the enactment of this measure. We must know the basic principles on which there can be no compromise, in order to maintain perspective on the many suggestions and amendments that will be offered.

First. We are wholeheartedly committed to the principle that every American who is able to work and desires work has the right to the opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment. This basic human right is clearly stated in section 2 (b) of the full employment bill.

It has been attacked and will be increasingly attacked by those who are disdainful of human rights and who are against full employment.

We sponsors of the full employment bill, however, take our stand with our former colleague, Clinton P. Anderson, now Secretary of Agriculture. Let me quote from Secretary Anderson's recent testimony on the full employment bill before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency:

> The "right to a job," which this bill proposes to make a basic policy of our Government, is as important to the preservation and sound functioning of democracy as are the time-honored rights of free speech, a free press, and freedom of religion.

Second. We sponsors of the full employment bill are committed, without qualification, to the principle that the Federal Government has the responsibility of assuring continuing full employment opportunities.

This responsibility also is clearly stated in the provision of section 2 of H. R. 2202, which reads:

> It is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans * * * freely to exercise this right (to employment).

This provision has been attacked and will be increasingly attacked by those who are against full employment. The sponsors of the bill will not compromise on this question

As the Secretary of the Treasury, Fred Vinson, has stated:

> Clearly it cannot be the responsibility of businessmen alone to prevent unemployment. We must face the fact that all of us have a responsibility to see that our economic system works efficiently, that there are jobs for men and women able and willing to work. When we are confronted with problems of national scope involving collective responsibility we must look to the National Government, acting for all the people to take the leadership in their solution. Let there be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of the word "assure." It is more than a mere pious hope—a mere paper promise to be kept to the ear and broken to the hope. It means the assumption of a definite moral responsibility. It does not, of course, mean that every individual will be led by the hand from one job to another.

Third. We are committed to the principle that the Federal Government must make full use of all its powers and functions relating to employment and production and must in addition specifically pledge its financial resources to make good on the assurance of continuing full employment opportunities.

No stone must be left unturned in our efforts to obtain the highest feasible levels of employment and production with the lowest feasible amount of Federal investment and expenditure. But to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, we must provide sufficient useful investment and expenditure by the Federal Government to assure the existence of employment opportunities for all who are able and willing to work.

This provision will be attacked, and is already being attacked, by those who prefer to spend billions for relief after we have a depression, rather than to use useful public expenditure as a means of preventing depression. On this point, I should like to quote a recent statement by Mr. Harold Smith, Director of the Budget:

> Several critics of the full-employment bill have suggested that the bill is designed to pave the way for huge deficit spending. This is a distortion of the meaning of the bill. I believe it was the intention of the authors to reach the objective—full employment—with maximum reliance on private enterprise and minimum reliance on Government spending.
>
> It is my conviction that a policy designed to prevent depression and unemployment is the best contribution we can make to hold down Federal expenditures and the public debt.

Fourth. We believe that the President should submit to Congress every year a national production and employment budget. This budget should include the proposed economic goals for the Nation—in terms of employment opportunities, production of goods and services needed to provide such employment opportunities, and the amount of consumption we require in order to absorb the goods and services that are produced at full employment. It should include his appraisal of growth and foreseeable economic trends—in terms of employment, production, and consumption. And, finally, it should include the general outlines of the administration's program to assure continuing full employment.

Since the introduction of the bill, the idea of having a National Budget of this type has been generally accepted.

Fifth, and finally, we believe that the United States Congress, through a Joint Committee on the National Budget, must take the responsibility for considering and acting upon the President's program as a whole. The Congress must take the responsibility for considering and acting upon all specific legislation within the framework of its approved, coordinated program for full employment. This provision of the Full Employment Bill has also received widespread endorsement.

The controversial principles I have listed have been firmly and specifically endorsed by President Truman, Secretary of the Treasury Fred Vinson, Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson, Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Director of the Budget Harold Smith, Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace, and other officials in the executive branch of the Government.

These principles have whole-heartedly and specifically been endorsed by innumerable businessmen, by representatives of the Protestant, Catholic, and Hebrew faiths, by mayors, the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Labor Executives Association, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the United Mine Workers, and by a large number of other national organizations: Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, American Association of Social Workers, American Jewish Congress, Americans United for World Organization, American Veterans Committee, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Business Men of America, Inc., Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, Disabled American Veterans, Hosiery Wholesalers National Association, Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, League of Women Shoppers, Methodist Federation for Social Service, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Board of Y. W. C. A., National Catholic Welfare Conference, National Citizens Political Action Committee, National Conference of Jewish Women, National Consumers League, National Council of Negro Women, National Council of Scientific, Professional, Art and White Collar Organizations, National Council for the Social Studies, National Education Association of the United States, National

Farmers Union, National Lawyers' Guild, National Urban League, National Women's Trade Union League of America, Non-Partisan Council of Alpha Kappa Alpha, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Synagogue Council of America, Union for Democratic Action, United Christian Council for Democracy, United Council for Church Women, United States Conference of Mayors, United Steel Workers of America, W. I. V. E. S.

Above all these are the principles which the authors and the sponsors of this bill have staked out as representing the essential prerequisites to full employment and full production in the postwar period. We have written these principles in this bill. Minor changes may be made; we will not compromise on basic principles. We would rather see this bill defeated than to have these principles emasculated.

In this moment in history, our hopes for world peace and for the very preservation of the human race, depend to a large degree on whether or not we Americans can maintain a healthy and expanding economy, and avoid a depression that would plunge the world into economic chaos.

With so much in the balance, the sponsors of the full employment bill will make no compromise with those short-sighted individuals who are opposed to full employment. We will grant no concessions to those faint-hearted souls who believe that full employment is impossible in our free enterprise system.

We shall press forward toward swift passage of this bill.

We shall then move forward toward development of our comprehensive full employment program in all the basic fields of Federal action—taxation, agriculture, small business, housing, social security, wages and hours, and so on—to translate the promises of the bill into a living reality to all Americans who are able and willing to work and make effective the right to employment for those who wish to exercise it.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman states this bill will be opposed by those who do not believe in and who do not want to obtain full employment. I do not know what position personally I shall take on the bill because I have not read it. But would the gentleman be more specific in pointing out who these people are who do not want full employment in this country?

Mr. OUTLAND. I should be glad to refer the gentleman to an article in a national business magazine of a few weeks ago in which it was said that an unemployment pool of between three and five million people in this country is a good thing for America. I also recall a statement that was made by the mayor of a certain city to the effect that depressions are a good thing for the American people and that depressions are wholesome. May I also say that I hope very much the gentleman will read the bill and would welcome him as a member of our steering committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Is not the gentleman willing to concede that most of the little and big businessmen of this country and 98 percent of the thinking people of this country want full employment? If so, the gentleman cannot afford to indict men or organizations, including millions of business people and millions of farmers, or the Members of this Congress who believe this is the wrong approach to the problem. The gentleman's indictment is much too broad.

Mr. OUTLAND. I may say, in answer to the gentleman, that I am not indicting anyone. May I say, too, that there are people all over the country who pay lip service to full employment but are not willing to take concrete steps to achieve it.

Mr. VURSELL. There are people on this floor who will pay lip service to full employment probably for political purposes.

Mr. OUTLAND. Anyone who treats the full employment bill as a political proposition or from a partisan standpoint is toying with human suffering. I will join with you in condemning him. However, I am certain the gentleman must realize that we cannot have full employment merely by hoping for it. Wishing, alone, will not bring jobs. We must work and we must plan if we are to achieve such a goal. Many different approaches can be made. I do believe that H. R. 2202 is the first important step, and I sincerely trust that the Members of this House, regardless of partisan affiliation, will get solidly behind it. I hope that as many members of the minority as of the majority party will join with me in putting this bill across. It is not partisan and should not be made partisan. There may be honest disagreement. I certainly think there may be honest disagreement on any controversial issue. This bill is an enabling act only; it states a policy, and it seems to me that that policy cannot very well be controverted by anyone who truly desires full employment in the United States.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, September 19, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TREATMENT OF RETURNING VETERANS

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, a great many of the Members of the House, knowing that the New York Port of Embarkation headquarters is in my district, have been inquiring of me as to the type of treatment men returning from overseas receive. I feel it best rather than to reply to them individually to make a statement here on the floor of the House as in that way, I can reach the greatest number of Members.

The New York Port of Embarkation has been the greatest embarkation point in the United States. From Pearl Harbor to VE-day, the New York port shipped 3,080,355 soldiers and 35,213,037 tons of supplies to the European theater. This achievement completely dwarfed all previous military movements and led the Army to call the New York Port of Embarkation the greatest port of war the world has ever known.

Now, under the direction of Maj. Gen. Clarence H. Kells, the New York Port of Embarkation is setting newer and greater records. One of every two home-bound American soldiers passes through the piers and staging areas of the New York Port of Embarkation, and few remain there more than 24 to 36 hours before continuing on their way.

From VE-day through August 25, a total of 510,090 American soldiers debarked at the New York Port of Embarkation and about 500,000 more came through other east-coast ports. That means that the New York Port of Embarkation handled a daily average of 4,465 soldiers.

For the month of May 54,187 troops returned through the New York port of embarkation, 86 percent of them on 85 American troop ships, and 14 percent of them on 5 British troop ships.

For the month of June 132,948 troops came back through New York's great port of war, 79 percent of them on 134 American troop ships, and 21 percent of them on 3 British troop ships.

For the month of July the returns increased to 140,901, 78 percent on 163 American transports, and 22 percent on 9 British transports. The incomplete figure for August up to the 25th is 182,054 soldiers who have come through the New York port of embarkation. It is expected that the peak load will not be reached until November.

This monumental job which is being carried out under the direction of the Army Transportation Corps is America's guaranty from the Army that every single soldier who is not needed for occupation duty in Europe will come home quickly.

I know that the average Member of the House is more interested in the actual treatment these men receive, more interested in the humane side than in cold statistics.

Every ship that returns from Europe and enters the port of New York passes my home. With this opportunity and coupled with the fact that I have made personal trips down the harbor to meet some of the ships gives me first-hand information that I will endeavor to describe to you.

As the transport comes in from the ocean to the mouth of the Lower Bay, it is met by the private boat of the commanding general of the New York Port of Embarkation. Also present in the

waters are a former Central Railway of New Jersey boat that has been taken over by the Transportation Corps of the Army, together with a yacht known as *Miss America*. On the former Jersey Central boat are the press and several hundred civilian employees of the port of embarkation. On the *Miss America* is a WAC band. All three of these boats accompany the transport from the time she enters the Lower Bay until the moment that she docks either in the North River or at Staten Island. The people on these accompanying ships do everything that is humanly possible to make it known to the veterans that they are happy to have them back and that they have been missed.

As the transport passes the Fort Hamilton Military Reservation, the soldiers see a gigantic sign, "Welcome Home—Well Done." Every ship in the harbor has been alerted by General Kells as to the time of arrival of each transport, and as she proceeds up the bay and the river each ship in the harbor salutes with three blasts of a whistle which is answered in return by the transport.

The Army Transportation Division has requested that all of the hundreds of piers in the harbor be decorated and the pier owners have responded magnificently. The entire water front presents a festive appearance to those on board the ship when they see the red, white, and blue signs expressing such sentiments as "Our Heroes, Welcome Home," "We Thank You."

By this time the men on the transports being aware of the fuss that is being made over them have become so joyous that it amounts almost to a hysteria. Their cries of delight can be heard on the Brooklyn, Jersey, Staten Island, and Manhattan shores. The ship is finally docked at a pier that is spotlessly clean and decorated with thousands of flags and "Welcome home" banners.

The men are then immediately taken by train to either Camp Kilmer, near New Brunswick, N. J., commanded by Col. Cecil L. Rutledge, or to Camp Shanks, near Orangeburg, N. Y., commanded by Col. H. D. W. Riley.

When the train pulls into either of these camps, there is a truck alongside of each railroad coach. The men's baggage is loaded aboard by prisoners of war. Then our veterans march to a theater about 600 feet away where they are welcomed by the commanding officer of the camp. This is something that I wish every Member of Congress could see. As the men march into the theater they find the stage occupied by a jazz band that is making some real hot licks. The men go crazy and whoop it up all during the music. After three or four numbers are played, the commanding officer addresses the men, thanking them for the splendid job that they have done and assuring them that they are welcome and that during their stay in the camp every effort will be made to prove the truthfulness of this statement. He then informs them of the essential movements they must make and assures them if they will cooperate, and he is sure they will, they will be out of the camp and on the way to their homes the next day. This statement brings down the roof. The commanding officer then informs them that a major will address them and inform each unit as to which barrack they will be assigned and that their baggage is already at the barrack.

By this time the men are delighted at the service they are receiving. The commanding officer further informs them that as soon as they receive new equipment, which will be within the next hour, they will be compelled to go to the mess hall where they must eat as much steak, ice cream, and drink as much milk as they can hold. By that time one would think that the theater was going to be taken apart.

A major follows the commanding officer and instructs the men as to the whereabouts of the various points of interest on the post and then informs each unit as to the exit they will use. The band then plays God Bless America and it is indeed an impressive sight to hear about fourteen hundred of these fine young Americans who have come through so much sing with the greatest of gusto and the greatest of sincerity this fine song.

I have accompanied these men to the mess hall and I can say with the utmost sincerity that the Army Transportation Corps deserves the highest of praise for the meal that it gives the veterans. The last day I was there they were served steak, mashed potatoes, peas, string beans, corn, a head of lettuce with dressing, ice cream, and all of the milk they could drink. When the first man walks down the line with his tray filled and the other men see it, the shouts they let out would lead you to believe that they had not eaten in years. After all are served and seated at the tables, there is not a sound in the large hall. This is the greatest tribute that can be paid to the food and the manner in which it is served.

During my visits I have spoken with hundreds of men and without exception they shower the highest of praise upon the Transportation Corps for the thoughtful and courteous manner in which they have been received by both the officers and the enlisted men.

It is a pleasure to see colonels, majors, and captains walking among the men asking, "Are you satisfied? Is there anything that can be done for you?" This could happen only in one army—the Army of the United States.

At the camps there are hundreds of telephones with numerous operators anxious to serve these men and to promptly place their calls to all corners of the country so that their parents and loved ones may know they are home and may have the pleasure of a few words with them. Each of the posts has theaters, recreation halls, and USO clubs, which are used to the fullest extent by the returning veterans.

It must be borne in mind that all of these facilities that are extended to the men and the prompt and efficient manner in which they are put through the camps and started for their homes is something that could not be done in a helter-skelter fashion. The handling of each individual necessitates 112 separate items of checking, clerical work, and other details. It is a monumental task and once again we must doff our hats to the efficient manner in which the Transportation Corps has solved this devious problem.

I have been critical on many occasions of the Army, but where credit is due it is but just that it be given.

Let me in my humble way on behalf of myself and of the hundreds of men from my community who have passed through these camps say, "Well done, General Gross, well done, General Kells, and all of your efficient and willing command."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

BRITISH SEEK UNITED STATES BILLIONS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Lord John Maynard Keynes, the British economist, who has not felt it amiss to offer his gratuitous advice in American governmental fiscal affairs in the past, under the Roosevelt administration, is back in this country again. Lord Halifax, the British Ambassador, and a delegation of British supersalesmen came to Washington for the purpose of asking the United States for an outright cash gift of billions of dollars, or an interest-free, long-term loan to finance rehabilitation of British trade and industry.

It was only a few days before this British delegation arrived in Washington that Mr. Harold Laski, the leading Socialist of Great Britain, and chairman of the British Labor Party, informed America to attend to its own business, and said:

> We have to persuade * * * America to accept our full right to experiment with our own lives on our own terms. The age of capitalism is drawing to a close.

Every American, I think, will agree that the British have the right to conduct their affairs in any way they see fit so long as we are not called upon to finance such experiments in socialism as they care to make.

Apparently Lord Keynes and his British delegation want America to give them five or six billions of dollars with which the British Socialists may experiment with their own lives in their own way, and some large part of which they may use to finance their effort to bring the age of capitalism to a close.

There was much cool insolence exhibited by Lord Keynes in his press conference with American correspondents. When asked specific questions, which he did not choose to answer, he coolly informed his questioners that their interrogations were "somewhat premature." He did state flatly, however, according to the newspaper reports, that he did not favor negotiation of an interest-bearing commercial loan with the United States. He also said he did not favor Great Britain having to work herself out of her postwar economic difficulties through her own resources and without aid from the United States.

He announced that the British delegation wanted financial aid from the United States and, in addition thereto, "a liberal American trade and tariff also."

In other words, the British want, not only our money but our markets also. They will not be satisfied with our shirts, but insist upon our pants as well.

It would be well for the American people to keep in mind that it was this same Lord Keynes who advocated the British repudiation of its First World War debts.

He tells the American people through the correspondents at his press conference that "an easy course would be negotiation of a commercial loan without considering Britain's ability to repay it. He said, however, that the British do not favor such an expedient, and that his Government was not in the mood to repeat the experience of the last war debts. He added that he believed the United States similarly did not want a recurrence of the experience with the First World War debts. Need I add that he was correct in his statement that America does not want a repetition of the defaults and the Uncle Shylock accusations which followed the First World War?

Lord Keynes then proposed that perhaps a long-term, interest-free loan might solve the problem. Refusing to make any comment on the $19,500,000,000 of lend-lease, advanced by the United States to the British Empire during the war just closed and payment by the United States of a share of the war costs incurred by Britain prior to American entry in the war, this cool British gentleman finally took the position that Britain's difficulties are the concern of the world, and the particular concern of the United States, and that we should feel ourselves fully repaid if we succeed in helping Britain back on her feet as a world power.

Before extending further gifts or loans to Britain, or anyone else, we should carefully consider how they have treated us in connection with previous gifts and loans, whether they have been as scrupulous in discharging their obligations to us in a way a debtor should if he expects further accommodation.

As of July 1, 1945, Great Britain owed the American people on the debt acquired during and following the First World War the colossal sum of $6,664,000,000—(6,664 million dollars). On this debt she has not paid a dollar on either principal or interest since December 15, 1933. Under these circumstances it is needless for me to say that no more brazen and insolent proposition has ever been made to the American people by responsible officials of any foreign government at any time in the past. If we were to accept the Keynes-Laski doctrine, America would be expected to finance all the rest of the world, regardless of the depletion of our own resources, or the hardships on our own people. We could then expect, if we were stupid enough to accede to any such proposition, to be told to mind our own business thereafter.

This British economist insults the intelligence of the American people when he proposes or even suggests a long-term, interest-free loan. If Britain repudiated her interest-bearing loans, as she did, after we had voluntarily reduced the same by 50 percent, how could we expect her ever to liquidate non-interest-bearing loans? If the loan provided no interest, there would be no incentive for Britain or any other country to repay. It would be easier, simpler, and more sensible for them just to let it ride forever. It is obvious such a loan would not be a loan; it would be a gift.

For cool assumption, supercilious presumption, and weird economic figuring, it would be very difficult to beat John Maynard Keynes and Harold Laski.

Their attitude is that in some way the United States was responsible for Britain's suffering during the war. They appear to think that the world owes Britain a living and that the American taxpayers ought to pay their bills. Their thesis is that we, having saved Britain's Empire in two different wars, and having spent hundreds of billions of dollars and more than 300,000 lives doing it, have obligated ourselves to continue to pay Britain's debts, furnish her our American markets, finance her political experiments, and keep our mouths shut if we do not like the way Britain conducts herself.

One wonders what has become of that proud Britannia who ruled the waves and asked no odds of the world in the centuries gone by? One wonders what has happened to the British spirit of rugged self-confidence? This is hat-in-the-hand mission which Britain sends over here. They do not even say "please give us more billions added to the billions you have already given us." They said instead, in effect, "give us more billions, or we will come and sit on your doorstep and starve to death. We will give up our national pride, and our national economy, and we will go into a hysteria of economic chaos unless you people of America are willing to support us as a nation in the style to which we would like to become accustomed."

It might be pertinent to this discussion to recall that back in the days when England was the first world power, she didn't run around handing India, or any other of her colonies, to say nothing of other countries and nations, billions of dollars, just because John Bull wanted to be a good fellow. In the days gone by, when she loaned money, and when her nationals loaned money, she demanded repayment—and she always saw that she collected in full.

It seems not to have occurred to these British gentlemen that we ourselves in the United States of America face a threat of unemployment of the first magnitude. It seems not to have occurred to these British gentlemen that we have spent more money in this war than all of our allies combined, and that our national debt is greater than that of all seekers of billions combined. It seems not to have occurred to these British gentlemen that we will have millions and millions of our own men and women from the armed forces to find employment for, and that we will have hundreds of thousands of them requiring pensions, vocational training, and other aids in order to readjust themselves to the postwar economy of America. It seems not to have occurred to these British gentlemen that when we went into this war to help them out, not one of our own grave domestic problems had been solved, and that those problems, obscured and aggravated by the war, will now confront us for a solution. And certainly they will not wait until we have first solved all of Britain's problems.

We ourselves are partly to blame for the cool effrontery of the national leaders of other countries—England, France, Russia—who tell us that, unless we finance them, world without end, that they will sit down and permit themselves to become infected by an economic plague with which later they will infect us.

No man today can tell the American people what it is going to cost us in terms of both men and money to continue to help police Europe and Japan. No man can tell what enormous expenditures are going to be necessary in our own country to enable us to weather the storms and stresses which will beat upon us in this postwar era we have just entered.

These British gentlemen give not the slightest consideration to America's problems. Not one single foreign nation has so much as suggested to America "how can we help you in your postwar recovery?" No; quite to the contrary, in every language of the globe almost, these national rulers and officials have, with hands outstretched to America, set up the cry of give, give, give.

Too many people, during the war apparently, were for America last and all the rest of the world first. The rash, irresponsible, and unjustified promises made to all the peoples of the world by the Lord Bountifuls of the New Deal administration during the war have encouraged every foreign country to believe that we have inexhaustible resources, hearts as big as the universe—and not very much intelligence.

It is time now for Americans to begin to think of America first. We are willing to help the other peoples of the world to help themselves back to sanity and prosperity, but only a sound, prosperous, free, and financially solvent America can do that.

Let us not forget there will always be our America if we do not give it away.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1945, just prior to the recess, I called the attention of Congress to the unjust manner in which the reduction-in-force regulations of the Civil Service Commission were prejudicing the rights of veterans and career-service employees in the Federal Government. I stated if corrective measures were not adopted by the time the House reconvened I would introduce an amendment to the Veterans' Preference Act which would make

it mandatory upon the Commission to issue regulations which would fully protect the veteran and the career-service employee.

The situation is growing steadily worse. I am approached on all sides by civil-service employees, both veterans and nonveterans, who report that the reduction-in-force regulations are not only a violation of the law but are unreasonable and designed primarily to protect nonveteran and war-service employees.

After reviewing the reduction-in-force regulations of the Commission it is quite obvious that neither the spirit nor the letter of the Veterans' Preference Act is being observed by the Civil Service Commission. Veterans are being eliminated from the Federal service while war-service employees are being retained. Career-service employees with long years of experience before the war are being discharged, while war-service appointees are being retained.

The provision of law upon which the Commission relies for its reduction-in-force regulation is, it is true, loosely drawn for the purpose of giving sufficient latitude to the Commission so that fair and equitable regulations could be promulgated. Instead of strictly interpreting the broad language of the statute and observing the obvious intent of Congress, the Commission has, in my opinion, used section 12 of the act as a device for the protection of nonveteran war-service appointees.

Therefore, I propose that before this situation gets entirely out of hand, and the words "career service" become absolutely meaningless, that Congress specifically define the method by which reductions in force shall take place in the Federal Government. I should like to state that, by all means, reduction in Federal personnel should take place at a faster rate than is now being accomplished. However, there are two problems, one the actual reduction in force and the other the manner in which it is done. Today I am talking about the manner in which it is being done. At a later date I shall devote quite some time to the question of just how much our Federal employment has been reduced since VJ-day.

I am today introducing a bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act by striking out section 12 of that act and substituting language which will make it mandatory on the Commission when reductions in force are made to give primary effect to military preference and secondary effect to length of total Federal service and minimum effect to efficiency ratings. Of course, if any employee is not performing satisfactory service, he should be separated regardless of reduction in force.

In other words, those employees in any Federal agency entitled to military preference would be the last to go when a reduction in force is necessary in any agency, and next to last will be those who have the greatest length of total Federal service. The misplaced emphasis on efficiency ratings by the Civil Service Commission at the present time renders inoperative both the military preference and length-of-service provisions of the existing law.

Under its academic methods, the Commission has been too prone to rely upon the efficiency ratings as a basis for the retention of Federal employees. Let there be no misunderstanding. Efficiency ratings in administrative and personnel management have their proper place; but when it comes to depriving an employee of his livelihood on the hairline distinction between a "very good" and a "good" efficiency rating, this academic devotion to subjective values is going a little too far, particularly if the employee in question has seen military service.

I shall ask for immediate hearings on this bill because I think action should be taken immediately before the departments and agencies eliminate more veterans or career-service employees. The misinterpretation of the Veterans' Preference Act by the Civil Service Commission leaves no alternative. It is a situation which should have been corrected a long time ago. I have been relying upon the Civil Service Commission to rectify its mistakes and amend its regulations. That it has not seen fit to do so is evidenced by the fact that further regulations have been issued in recent months which depart even further from the Veterans' Preference Act than did the original reduction-in-force regulations.

I predict that if this bill is not considered immediately and favorable action is not taken upon it or something similar to it almost every Member of the House and the Senate will be deluged with letters, phone calls, and personal calls from veterans and career-service employees in the Federal service whose rights are being violated by arbitrary regulations which do not follow the intent of Congress. Therefore, I urge speedy consideration and enactment of this legislation.

RETURN OF SOLDIERS IMPRISONED BY JAPANESE IN BURMA AND THAILAND

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I returned from Casablanca with a group of our own GI's who have been imprisoned by the Japanese in Burma and Thailand for three and one half years. Merely to associate with these boys was one of the greatest privileges that I have ever had.

I am asking permission to insert the names and home addresses in the RECORD at this point, and I urge their Congressmen to contact them.

Those boys have been through hell, but their appreciation of the things that this Nation stands for is clear and beautiful.

To meet and talk with them is truly to rediscover the greatness of this Nation, for the things that are really worthy of our national life are deeply engraved in their hearts.

I found them, without exception, almost worshiping the memory of a Dutch doctor, one Henry Hekking, whose address I am asking permission to insert in the RECORD at this point:

Dr. Henry Hekking, Off-V. Gez, Department V, Oorlog, Java.

Dr. Hekking was at once the big brother as well as the practitioner for these boys. They insist that their being alive today is probably because of him. Medicines, of course, were meager and not always available, but Dr. Hekking, with his vast knowledge of tropical medicine, was able to disappear in the jungle and come back with the herbs, roots, and other things necessary to ward off diseases. It is my hope that our Nation's Government will properly recognize and reward this unsung Dutch doctor for his glorious work in preserving the lives of some of our most valuable citizens.

I was most happy to find that one of my own constituents was well and being hospitalized in Calcutta. George Goodwin, whose home is in the Colockum Valley, south of Wenatchee, Wash. George came out of Burma with an intestinal disorder but will be home soon. His pal, Arthur Smith, of Abilene, Tex., told me that George was well and happy when he last saw him. They became close pals during their long imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point the names of those who were on the plane with me, also the address of Dr. Henry Hekking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Earl Weiss, 809 Quincy Street, Plainview, Tex.

Odos Hendrick, 3400 South Ryan Avenue, Fort Worth, Tex.

Clifford R. Johnson, Jacksboro, Tex.

Charles E. Worthington, Jacksboro, Tex.

Johnnie W. Buck, Decatur, Tex.

Jack D. Key, Decatur, Tex.

Arthur E. Smith, Abilene, Tex.

Audie D. Rickel, Pratem, Mo.

Ellison P. Leathenwood, Box 104, Jermyn, Tex.

J. R. Morris, 1320 Twenty-eighth Street, Lubbock, Tex.

D. Williamson, 1016 Ninth Street, Lubbock, Tex.

Garth S. Oliver, Jacksboro, Tex.

Ardie M. Mabe, 1227 Oxford Street, Fort Worth, Tex.

James M. Cooper, Jacksboro, Tex.

C. J. England, Lometa, Tex.

George Embrock, Hawarden, Iowa.

Raymond D. Reed, 1221 South Lake Street, Fort Worth, Tex.

LaVern A. Curley, Route 3, Monroe, Mich.

Lawrence Snake, Washita, Okla.

Stanley J. Galbraith, 209 Third Street, South Virginia, Minn.

Joe J. Garcia, 504 W. Jackson Street, Harlingen, Tex.

Dr. Henry Hekking, Off-V. Gez, Department V, Oorlog, Java.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3907. An act to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3907. An act to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 17, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, September 27, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 1751, to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Merchant Marine Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

679. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 7, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Red River and tributaries, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, for flood control on Bayou Pierre in the vicinity of Shreveport, La., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on November 12, 1941, and November 24, 1942, and a resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on October 28, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 285); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

680. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a recommendation for reductions in certain wartime appropriations (H. Doc. No. 286); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3871. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas; with amendment (Rept. No. 946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Roads. H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution providing that the war emergency has been relieved to an extent which will justify proceeding with the highway construction program under the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 3424. A bill to permit renewal of certain trade-mark registrations after expiry thereof, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 342. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1196, a bill to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri", approved December 24, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 949). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 343. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 520, a bill to facilitate settlement of returning veterans on farms in projects constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation; without amendment (Rept. No. 950). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 344. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 225, to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; without amendment (Rept. No. 951). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4057. A bill to provide for the payment of retired pay to certain retired judges of the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4058. A bill to stop inductions into the land or naval forces, and to provide for prompt discharge or release from active duty of certain members of such forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4059. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health and welfare of mothers and children and for services to crippled children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4060. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4061. A bill to extend to enlisted personnel of the Regular Army the same retirement benefits as are applicable to enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4062. A bill to provide for the discharge from the armed forces of certain married men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4063. A bill to stop inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4064. A bill to prohibit the compulsory service in any occupation forces of members of the armed forces who have served overseas during World War II; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 4065. A bill to amend the act of July 4, 1836 (5 Stat. 107), entitled "An act to reorganize the General Land Office"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 4066. A bill to amend the immigration and naturalization laws to deny admission to the United States of all aliens who are unable to establish good moral character; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4067. A bill to amend Revised Statute 4131 (46 U. S. C. 221); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 4068. A bill to provide for aid in industrialization of underdeveloped areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4069. A bill to provide for the protection of veterans and career-service employees in connection with reductions in force in the Federal service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4070. A bill to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution to terminate the effectiveness of certain provisions of the Second War Powers Act, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution declaring the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution to provide for a study and investigation with respect to the establishment and operation of a national lottery for the benefit of disabled war veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 345. Resolution to investigate the future of the atomic bomb, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 4071. A bill for the relief of Benjamin R. Hammett, Jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4072. A bill for the relief of Daniel Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsang 3d; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 4073. A bill for the relief of Jesse Lawrence Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMES of Washington:

H. R. 4074. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Burnison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4075. A bill for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEELY:

H. R. 4076. A bill granting an increase of pension to Earl W. Newlon; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 4077. A bill for the relief of the National Exchange Bank of Wheeling, a corporation, committee for Louis Horkheimer, an incompetent person, surviving member of the firm of Horkheimer Bros., a copartnership doing business in Wheeling, W. Va., and Ernest S. Horkheimer, administrator cum testamento annexo de bonis nun of the estate of Julius Horkheimer, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 4078. A bill for the relief of Claude Chappelle; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1157. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Petition of Allen T. Frams and 51 citizens of Meeteetse, Wyo., in favor of H. R. 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1158. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. H. L. Shaw and other citizens of Howell County, Mo., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, in Thy holy name we would draw apart and acknowledge Thy abounding mercy and seek the kingdom of heaven which lies within us. Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the children of God! We thank Thee that Thou dost measure Thy justice by love, rather than Thy love by justice.

O Thou Christ, peace so long desired has come to our country; grant that it may not be defeated by the costly and dangerous fog of disunity. We pray that we, as a people, may be in harmony with the necessities and aspirations of all true patriots. As each succeeding day brings new duties, prosper the works of Thy servants; make us more earnest, more full of faith, more empty of self, and more willing to accept Thy guidance. Thou mighty fortress, Thou bulwark never failing, guide our citizens in every critical emergency, united by one aim, ruled by one purpose—love for our country and for our fellow men, and praise be unto Thee forever. In the name of Him who spake as never man spake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 14, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 241. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruby H. Hunsucker.

H. R. 799. An act for the relief of the estate of Stanley E. Smallwood; to the legal guardian of Frank Carter, Jr., a minor; to the legal guardian of Donald R. Keithley, a minor; to Keithley Bros. Garage;

H. R. 999. An act for the relief of Lily L. Carren;

H. R. 1057. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Margaret Hockenberry, a minor;

H. R. 1257. An act for the relief of George C. Tyler and Doris M. Tyler;

H. R. 1456. An act for the relief of George E. Baker;

H. R. 1564. An act for the relief of William W. Maddox and the legal guardian of Donna Sue Maddox and Saddie Inez Maddox;

H. R. 1634. An act for the relief of the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa;

H. R. 1713. An act for the relief of Canal Dredging Co.;

H. R. 1882. An act for the relief of R. L. Whittington, Mrs. R. L. Whittington, and Mrs. J. B. Whittington;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Aloysius G. Miller;

H. R. 1975. An act for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson and Young;

H. R. 1992. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of Alaska, in trust for the Roman Catholic Church;

H. R. 2028. An act for the relief of John Visnovec, Rose Visnovec, and Helen Visnovec;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Edmund F. Danks, as administrator of the estate of Edna S. Danks, deceased;

H. R. 2163. An act for the relief of Teresa Tine;

H. R. 2511. An act for the relief of Patricia M. Kacprzyk and Alex D. Leontire; and

H. R. 2641. An act for the relief of Frank Glen.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 102. An act to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil-service status under such act;

S. 201. An act for the relief of the estates of William F. Bacon, Myrtle Jackson, Catherine Smith, and Tibbie Spencer;

S. 405. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 451. An act for the relief of Carl Baumann;

S. 562. An act for the relief of Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap Associates, Inc.;

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification;

S. 857. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Ford;

S. 883. An act for the relief of Charlie Tyson;

S. 950. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edmond J. Saint Amant, Jr.;

S. 1036. An act to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave;

S. 1076. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943;

S. 1102. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval convalescent hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945;

S. 1103. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944;

S. 1118. An act for the relief of First Lt. Jack Sanders, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of an explosion at Camp Lejeune, N. C., on January 22, 1945;

S. 1119. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 146 at the naval operating base, Bermuda, on April 26, 1945;

S. 1134. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in buildings 102 and 102-A in Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa, on August 17, 1944;

S. 1135. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Fungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945;

S. 1215. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the steamship *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941; and

S. 1354. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of general of the Army, fleet admiral of the United States Navy, and general in the Marine Corps, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1015. An act for the relief of G. H. Moore, of Butler, Taylor County, Ga.;

H. R. 1085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Celia Ellen Ashcraft;

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock; and

H. R. 3256. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, in order to protect the retirement rights of persons who leave the service to enter the armed forces of the United States.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore had appointed as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee to Investigate the Pearl Harbor Attack, authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. FERGUSON.

The message also announced that the Secretary was directed to notify the House of Representatives of the above appointments.

REEMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GRANGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, the unexplainable delay in demobilization has caused a wave of indignation among servicemen and their relatives that is approaching serious proportions.

I am reliably informed that the net reduction in Army personnel between September 1, 1944, and September 1, 1945, is 53,000 men. Still 50,000 men between the ages of 18 and 25 are being inducted monthly, despite the fact that the war has been over for many weeks.

Every minute of delay in demobilization is costing the taxpayers of America tens of thousands of dollars. It is shattering the morale of these citizen-soldiers. It is weakening the confidence of our people generally in our Government's integrity.

Instead of providing discharges, I am reliably informed by soldiers long in the service that nefarious information is being decimated by many officers in an attempt to induce the enlisted man to sign away his life for another 4 years.

Soldiers and sailors, who want to get back to their college classrooms, are being told that the GI bill is a hoax and that its benefits are entirely inadequate for the continuation of their education.

Others are being told that a major depression is impending and that they are better off in the Army.

Still others are being told that Congress will pass a bill extending the time of their service to 1 or 2 years after the cessation of hostilities.

It is not difficult to understand why many officers—not all, but many—after drawing the most lucrative salaries they ever received—will want to retard demobilization and thus delay the day when they must go back to the jobs and wages they earned before their elevation in the service.

It is high time for the House Military Affairs Committee to find the answer for the delay in demobilization and bring in the legislative remedy. Congress is being held responsible for the conduct of departments of the Government that are not keeping faith with the people. We must have immediate action.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from Earl B. Isbell, a veteran of World War II and commander of Fey-En-Heye Post, No. 46, the American Legion, of Antlers, Okla., with respect to veterans' priorities and surplus property, and, further, to extend his remarks in another instance and include an editorial from the Norman Transcript of Norman, Okla.

MAJ. GEN. CLAIRE L. CHENNAULT

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Louisiana and with the unanimous consent of the Louisiana congressional delegation, and also I believe in behalf of all the people of the United States, I have today introduced a resolution to retire Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault at his present highest rank. I am sure that he is one of the greatest aerial strategists that the world has ever produced. I know what Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek had to say about his efforts in China. We all know it was through Claire Chennault and his genius as a military leader that this war was shortened by many, many months although he had much too little and it came much too late. He and his immortal Flying Tigers will ever live as one of history's outstanding examples of courage, inspiration, and devotion to duty. In recognizing and thus honoring General Chennault we honor a native Louisianian who is one of our greatest American officers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include copies of letters and telegrams from constituents.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of tax relief.

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a young soldier friend.

Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Raleigh Register of Beckley, W. Va., entitled "Raise for Congressmen."

Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Evening Star.

THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my attention has recently been called to the situation regarding the educational benefits in educational and training institutions where veterans wish to take advantages of the rights under the GI bill. In my own home town of Columbia, Mo., perhaps 30 students were in danger of being turned away this past week. They were veterans who wished to take advantage of their rights under their bill. If we could have some of the prefabricated houses, which I understand are in St. Louis and which belong to the War Department, transferred to that educational center for the use of these veterans and their families, it seems to me it would help to alleviate the situation and be of great benefit to the veterans. I know that that applies to other areas of the country. Therefore, I am introducing a bill today to give the necessary legislative authority to the War Department to transfer all these properties.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I know they are housing some of the veterans in automobile trailers in Columbia. That is not a very satisfactory solution of the problem.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. That is true. It is only a temporary measure and it would not be fitting to the veterans in my opinion. Nothing is too good for them in consideration of their record of service. Why content ourselves to provide trailers just because some legal technicality prevents the use of these prefabricated houses that are not needed by the War Department.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the business on the Speaker's desk has been completed and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of the future of UNRRA.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after any other special orders and the business on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the regular business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

HOME FOR HOMELESS VETERANS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think all the Members will be interested in the fine spirit of a patriotic family in my congressional district. This article appears in the New York Times of today:

COUPLE, TWO SONS LOST, SEEKS TWO HOMELESS VETERANS

CATTARAUGUS, N. Y., September 16.—Mr. and Mrs. Arthur G. Milks are looking for two homeless war veterans to share their farm home and take the place of their two sons who died as war prisoners of the Japanese.

The Milks, who wrote to a Buffalo newspaper asking help in locating "one or two homeless or crippled returned service boys," said today "we prefer to take in boys who have no folks or home, and who are unable to support themselves."

Corp. Stanley Milks died in Cabanatuan prison in 1942, and Robert, a private, went down with a Jap prison ship sunk off the Philippines in 1944.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks on the question of "demobilization—when?"

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Palmer Hoyt.

THE SIZE OF THE ARMY

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the press reports this morning indicate that General MacArthur has indicated he would need about 200,000 men to police Japan. The original estimate was for something like 900,000 for the Pacific area. I am sure his reduction in the number of men he needs will call for a similar reduction in the reserves at the Philippines, Hawaii, and the surrounding islands. I presume that General MacArthur has in mind using some Filipinos and Chinese in helping to police Japan and her former islands. I believe the majority of Americans feel that it ought to be done that way.

The bill we are presently to consider deals with voluntary enlistments in the Army. It should also deal with the size of the Army. The Navy has indicated that they would need about 500,000 and that they would secure these men after the first of the year by voluntary methods. To date I have not seen where the Army would give an accurate estimate of the number of men they might need 1 or 2 years from now. One branch of the service would tell you they need 2,500,000 men in the Regular Army. General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, said sometime ago that when the world was finally settled an Army of 500,000 would do the job. It seems to me that Congress should very soon set the size of the Regular Army.

I have a bill on my desk which I expect to introduce which will limit the size of the Army to 1,000,000 men as of the 1st of July 1946. I also have a bill which, in effect, declares hostilities at an end 6 months after VJ-day, September 2. After the last World War it took 3 years for Congress to finally decide that hostilities had ended. I expect to introduce these bills for your consideration.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The first order of business is the bill which will be taken up today from the Committee on Military Affairs. As I previously stated, if a roll call is required on that bill, it will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It appears, from what I understand, that there will be a great deal of discussion and quite a few amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, if there is debate which takes it over, it will go over until tomorrow.

Thereafter, on tomorrow will be the call of the Consent Calendar.

After the disposition of the bill which we will take up today, the next bill will be H. R. 520. That is a bill relating to the settlement of returning veterans on farms, on projects constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation. I notice 1 hour of general debate has been provided for that bill in the rule.

After that bill, it is my intention to call up House Joint Resolution 225, which is a joint resolution to quiet the title in respective States and others, to land beneath tidewaters, and so forth.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Could the gentleman put that bill down for Thursday? There are several Members who have requested me not to have that bill taken up before Wednesday at least.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to do it and will make this announcement now: This bill will be in order for this week, be on the program, but will not be brought up before Thursday. I am very glad to do that.

There is another bill for which a rule has been granted providing 1 hour's debate, H. R. 1196, to make permanent a judgeship in Missouri, which I want to work in this week if I can. Whether I can do so after the veterans' bill and before the consideration of House Joint Resolution 225 which I doubt can be brought up before Thursday, I do not know; but if I can I will; if not, I do not want to say it will follow because some more important legislation may develop meanwhile, but if the program permits I want to bring that bill up too.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

DISCHARGING MEN FROM OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been urging that our young men who have families to support, jobs or positions to return to, or who need to return to school be discharged from the armed services. I have said time and again that we do not need this vast army of men in our armed forces, now that the war is over.

Today General MacArthur says that "within 6 months the occupational forces, unless unforeseen factors arise, will probably not number more than 200,000 men."

In other words, General MacArthur, with 200,000 men, according to his own statement, can control the situation in Japan. If General MacArthur can control the Japanese Empire with only 200,000 men, why cannot the same thing be done in Germany, with France, England and Russia aiding us?

Why not act now and let these men out who are needed on the farm, in the factories, in the offices, in the stores, in the schoolrooms?

Why not pass a bill now, as we are going to have to do later, and release these men from service who are not needed there, but who are needed at home?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Wednesday next as near as may be following the special order of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT-BUILT PIPE LINES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Committee on the Library last Tuesday.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Missouri State Legislature.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday and again on Friday of this week, following the legislative business of those days and any other special orders that may have been entered for those days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] often expresses ideas with which many of us can agree. There is no doubt but that General MacArthur knows more about what can be done in Japan than do a few Members of this House and that we should follow his advice. However, the gentleman may fall down because he evidently has not consulted Drew Pearson or Walter Winchell, or obtained the opinion of either as to what should be done. He ought to see those men first to find out whether they approve of his ideas or of General MacArthur's opinion, because, if he does not, the gentleman from Mississippi will be told in a broadcast by one or the other or both of those gentlemen that he is all wrong, that MacArthur is wrong. Watch them both for a smear campaign against General MacArthur.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

MEMORIAL SERVICES

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on May 23 we held memorial services in the House for deceased Members.

As the chairman of the Memorial Committee, I remind the membership that we were given 60 legislative days within which to extend our remarks. I am advised that today is the fifty-first legislative day after May 23; so that we have only the rest of this week and next week until Thursday or Friday within which to hand in our extension of remarks on Memorial Day.

STRIKES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, strikes and disagreements are growing steadily. The Nation is in peril.

From 1919 through 1923 there were 12,091 strikes in the United States involving 9,092,000 workers. From 1940 through 1944 there were 18,516 strikes in this country, involving 7,861,000 workers.

We are experiencing today one of the worst situations that can possibly happen at a time when we are trying to get the country on its feet. It seems to me that the President should call a conference of businessmen and the heads of the great labor unions to try to settle these disagreements at once so that the country may start anew to build and rebuild in order that the boys, when they come home, will find places to work, that our own countrymen can work who wish to work. Certainly communistic radicals are trying to kill private industry and make America communistic.

The situation is serious and requires the greatest ingenuity of the Chief Executive and the Labor Department in getting labor and business together so that the people may work. Congress has its responsibility and must face the situation for legislation that will require arbitration for settlement of differences, so that our country and all of our people will not be wrecked, just for want of a good dose of what we term common sense.

THE LATE CLYDE L. HERRING

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I announce to the Members the death on September 15 of the late Clyde L. Herring, two-term Governor of the State of Iowa and a former Member of the United States Senate from Iowa. The Iowa delegation in the House feels the passing of Senator Herring keenly because he was a genial companion who could always be depended upon by his colleagues from his home State for cooperation and assistance in legislative work. The passing of Senator Herring is a great shock to his many friends in Iowa and the Nation, and his loss will be keenly felt by all who knew Clyde Herring. He had an excellent record as a Governor and Senator, in addition to a splendid record as a businessman before he entered political life. In paying final tribute to the passing of a distinguished Iowan, the members of the Iowa delegation in the House extend sincere and heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Herring and the other members of his family.

THE LATE CLEVELAND ALEXANDER NEWTON

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and genuine sorrow that I announce to the membership of the House the death of a former Member of this body, the Hon. Cleveland Alexander Newton.

Mr. Newton was born in Wright County, Missouri, 1873; attended public schools; Drury College, Springfield, Mo.; graduated law department, University of Missouri, 1902; admitted to the bar and commenced practice in Hartville, Mo., same year; member of the Missouri State House of Representatives 1902–6; Assistant United States Attorney for the western district of Missouri, 1905–7, when he resigned to become Assistant Attorney United States Circuit Court at St. Louis; resigned this office in 1911 to become Special Assistant to Attorney General of the United States, which office he resigned in 1912 to resume practice of law in St. Louis; elected as Republican to Sixty-sixth, Sixty-seventh, Sixty-eighth, and Sixty-ninth Congresses, March 4, 1919 to March 3, 1927; was not a candidate for reelection in 1926; again resumed practice of law in St. Louis.

For 8 years following World War I, Mr. Newton worked unselfishly and untiringly for his people during the postwar period of reconstruction. He faced many of the baffling and perplexing problems then that we are today facing in this House. It was not long after entering this Chamber until his outstanding abilities were recognized. During the four terms he served here he became one of the leaders in this body.

Since voluntarily retiring from Congress Mr. Newton has practiced law alternately in St. Louis and Washington, D. C. He enjoyed a profitable general practice and was for some years chief counsel of the Mississippi River Valley Association. His knowledge of rivers and harbors was wide and he was tremendously interested in conservation and development of our natural resources. He was a strong constitutionalist and believed in our American system of individual initiative and private enterprise. Only last Friday he spent an hour or more with me in my office. He frequently called and gave me the benefit of his wise counsel born of a rich experience. Having been born and reared in Wright County, Mo., in my congressional district, we have been stanch friends since my early boyhood. My father and Cleve Newton have attended political conventions together for the past 40 years. Most of his people—and there are no finer on earth—reside in two or three counties in my congressional district; and those of you in this body who were privileged to serve with him during those 8 years following the last war, will recall that he was an indefatigable worker; that he was a great patriotic American; that he was an astute and an able lawyer; always diligent and faithful not only to his own constituency in the great city of St. Louis, but also to the people in our whole State and Nation.

Cleve Newton at one time could have received without opposition the nomination for Governor of our State, and no doubt he would have been elected overwhelmingly as was the man we nominated for that high office, but because of his modesty and because of his lucrative practice in the law he declined that office.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to realize that Cleveland Newton is gone. His sunny disposition I shall sorely miss and the precious memory of his loyal friendship I shall forever cherish. To his sweet, charming wife and to his fine son is extended the sincere sympathy of all the Members of this House who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish, may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it was a source of great regret to me to learn this morning of the death of former Representative Cleveland A. Newton, who served in this House for 8 years.

His district adjoined mine, and I had known Mr. Newton for many years prior to his service in this body.

He was born in Outstate, Mo., and reared on a farm. After attending Drury College in Springfield, Mo., he enrolled at the Missouri State University, graduating in law. Returning to the county of his birth, he was elected a member of the Missouri Legislature. After a few years, he was appointed assistant to the United States district attorney for the western district of Missouri. Later he became an assistant to the circuit attorney of the city of St. Louis. Receiving an appointment as a special assistant to the Attorney General, he came to Washington.

Mr. Newton served in the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-seventh, Sixty-eighth, and Sixty-

ninth Congresses. He retired voluntarily and returned to the practice of law in St. Louis. During the period of his service in Congress he specialized in rivers and harbors and flood-control legislation and was one of the best informed men in the country on those subjects. after leaving Congress, he became associated with the Mississippi Valley Waterways Association and represented them in Washington, appearing before House and Senate committees on many occasions.

Only last Friday he visited the House and I was talking to him for 15 minutes. He appeared to be in excellent health and told me he was going to do some fishing, which was his hobby.

Mr. Newton left behind him a record of public service anyone could be proud of. I am sure I express the sentiments of all Members of this House who knew him and served with him when I say we regret his loss and extend to his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly shocked to hear the statement made a few minutes ago by my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] who advises that Cleveland Newton, a former Member of this House, passed away this morning. Cleve Newton was my friend. Only last Friday he came on to this floor and we had one of our friendly little visits. Cleve was a great fellow to tell stories. He had a rich store of experience upon which to draw for his stories. Rising from a rocky Ozarks farm to success as a lawyer and statesman he served his Nation with distinction in this House through a difficult period and was the friend of many men of both high and low estate. He was the friend and trusted adviser of Presidents. He was the friend of the common man. He had lived a good life, a life full of zestful living. A useful life of devotion and service to God, his family and his country. I will miss Cleve Newton. His sudden passing is a distinct loss to many people. He was the kind of a man this old world could scarcely afford to lose at a time like this. But, our loss is heaven's gain.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the news that the Honorable Cleveland A. Newton, former Member of the House from the old Tenth District of Missouri, had suddenly been called to his eternal reward is a shock to all who knew him. His long career of honorable public service endeared him to the people of Missouri, as well as St. Louis.

By hard work and close attention to his congressional duties, he became a master of the complicated question of rivers and harbors. He was widely known as an authority on waterway transportation.

He was modest, quiet and retiring. His handclasp was warm and friendly; his disposition, sunny. One always felt better after he had come along.

With a distinct feeling of personal loss, I join my colleagues in their expression of sympathy to his devoted wife and son.

Their consolation will include the knowledge that he had endeared himself to all who knew him.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Very respectfully,
GORDON CANFIELD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 346), as follows:

Resolved, That GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

ARMED FORCES VOLUNTARY RECRUITMENT BILL OF 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent request previously granted, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate volunteer enlistment in the regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 3951, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] for 1½ hours.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower is in charge in Germany and the Stars and Stripes float over conquered and demolished Berlin. Gen. Douglas MacArthur is in Tokyo, and the Stars and Stripes float over the imperial palace, and yet the war is not over.

I bring to the House of Representatives today by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Military Affairs H. R. 3951, a bill which provides for the recruitment of men for the Regular Army of the United States. We think we have framed and brought here a splendid piece of legislation. We think it not only deserves but will have the support of the entire House. We have undertaken to safeguard the prerogatives of the House of Representatives and, as a matter of fact, of the Congress itself, by retaining control of the size of the Regular Army that is to be. Under existing law, the maximum size of the Regular Army is limited to 280,000 men and officers. We have not repealed that provision, but have merely suspended it and authorized recruitment until the first day of June 1947 of all able-bodied men over 18 years of age who desire to become members of the Regular Army.

We have undertaken and I believe we have succeeded in liberalizing the pay and allowances to the men who will constitute the Regular Army in the future to such an extent that we have made this a really attractive measure. What we have tried to do is to encourage the young men of the United States to become professional soldiers, to choose the Army as a profession. May I add that we have provided for retired pay after certain years of service for all men who volunteer and serve the required length of time as fixed in the bill, and thereby we have provided a system by which they can have security in their old age, or even at middle age if they enter at an early age and continue in the service.

I am not going into the details of the bill because the time I have allotted to myself is necessarily brief in order that I may be rather charitable and liberal with the other members of my committee. One or two members of the committee will deal strictly with the details of the amount of the pay, the amount of the allowances, and the very many things we have done to make Army service attractive.

There are two sources to draw from, the civilian population of the country who have not been in the Army, and the Army of the United States, constituted of the men who have been mobilized as what might be called the fighting army in wartime. Out of the Army as it is now constituted; that is, the Army of the United States, we hope to secure enough enlistees, plus those who will come in from civilian life, to enable the Army to reach its desired maximum strength by the 1st of June 1947.

We have safeguarded the matter by providing that the Army shall report to the Congress every 3 months the number of enlistees and the strength of the regular organization, so that we may keep tab on the size of it. At such time as Congress thinks it should stop recruitments and inductions and fix the maximum size of the Army, we can do so by putting on the lid, so to speak. That, I think, is one of the fine things we did, because you have heard here on this floor of the Congress lend-leasing or delegating its powers to the bureaus and agencies so much that I am sure you will be happy to know that we thought about you when we came to that feature of the legislation and fixed it so that you will have a say hereafter and can provide for the taxpayers' relief by saying "Stop there and go no further."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Several days ago it was stated on the floor of the House that about 800,000 men would be required in Japan. This morning General MacArthur says he will need 200,000 men. May we expect the same reduction in Europe, and if so, does not the gentleman believe the voluntary enlistment system will fulfill all of our requirements?

Mr. MAY. I would not like to hazard an opinion on a situation with which I am not familiar. I prefer to follow the course which the committee followed in this instance by following the wise military leadership of General MacArthur in the Pacific and of General Eisenhower in Europe. But I will say to my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is meritoriously entitled to the reputation of being the watchdog of the Treasury, that there are 419,000 men in the Army of the United States now eligible for immediate induction into the regular Army if they desire to go in. We hope that out of that group we will obtain a very large supply of manpower and that with the system which is being put into effect now for recruits and the campaign that is being waged by the Army, we will be able to take in enough men to build an Army in a few weeks, for instance, or at least in a few months, which will be sufficient to constitute the Army of occupation in Europe.

Mr. RICH. I believe that if General MacArthur, and I am sure he will do the right thing, will give the Chinamen a chance to guard those Japs, I think they would enjoy the privilege and I am sure that our boys would like to come home. If General MacArthur gives the Chinamen the guns, they certainly will take care of them.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to my colleague, a member of the committee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The very purpose of this bill is to raise a Regular Army by voluntary enlistments so that all men who are now in the services and who want to get out may be released. That is the purpose, is it not?

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

We provide their mustering-out pay shall be facilitated in order to encourage them to leave the Army of the United States and go into the Regular Army.

Going now to another feature of the legislation, in connection with all of this news which we hear about the demobilization of the Army, I want you to know what the witnesses from the War Department told us about that. They are doing a fine job. Since VE-day they have discharged 750,000 men. General Henry tells us they have roughly 400,000 men who have more than 85 points. They are eligible for immediate discharge and are being discharged. The computation and lowering of the number of points required brings it down to the point where they hope to be able to discharge 700,000, plus the 400,000, making 1,100,000 rather promptly. Then this rate of discharge is to be accelerated to the point where the discharge rate for December next will be 600,000 and for January 1946 and each month thereafter 672,000 until the military strength reaches the minimum requirements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, one of the subjects to which the committee gave especial consideration was the length of the enlistment period for those now volunteering for the Regular Army.

Section 3 of the committee bill, H. R. 3951, as finally agreed upon, provides for 2- and 3-year enlistment periods. The person enlisting decides which period he wants. If he is qualified, the Secretary of War is directed to enlist the volunteer for the period he selects.

The committee studied several proposals for including in the bill a 1-year enlistment period. It rejected them all, as unsound from the viewpoint of national interest and as unfair to the long-service veteran.

The national interest requires that we shall maintain a sufficient measure of our military strength for such time as may be required to establish in a stable peace those principles for which we fought. A decent regard for our veterans of long service during wartime requires that we shall replace them with fresh troops, to the extent that we must continue to man our greatly reduced military strength.

But neither of these objectives can be attained through 1-year enlistments. To enlist large numbers of 1-year soldiers at this time would aggravate, rather than solve, our demobilization problem.

As you know, the War Department's existing plans call for a tremendous reduction in the Army strength by next July. Over 8,000,000 men are rapidly shrinking to some 2,500,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairmen, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. On what basis do they plan to let these men out? On the point system?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. On the point system, on age, and otherwise. Let me finish my discussion first, please.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] just told us there would be 700,000 plus 480,000 on the point system.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. They will naturally lower the point system as fas as they can.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They will lower the point system?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Of course, as time goes on.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman tell us about it?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am discussing this bill and the 1-year-enlistment period.

Transportation facilities and separation center operations will be stepped up to the peak compatible with the safety of our occupation armies and with carrying through all the discharge steps required by law.

Even so, next September there will still be many men in the Army who will be entering their fourth year of service and 70,000 more, each month, who will be entering their third year. This situation is fully described in the committee's report on H. R. 3951. One-year enlistments obtained now would expire in and following September 1946, at the very time when replacements for all these veterans will be most required. Thus, the 1-year enlistee would be getting out next September, and the 2- and 3- and 4-year veteran would be called on for further sacrifice to man our Army. Such a situation would be unthinkable.

We must not lose sight of our great objective. We are not merely seeking to recruit volunteers. We are seeking to recruit volunteers in order to replace veterans in a minimum Military Establishment.

The argument is made that, since only a few men would volunteer for 1-year enlistments, the dire results that I predict would not occur. But the historical records do not support this argument. This Nation has tried 1-year enlistments before and found them unsatisfactory, wasteful, and costly.

History shows that in the immediate postwar period men choose the 1-year term. Thus in the year after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, 78,450 enlisted for 1 year, and 73,063 for 3 years. Taking all enlistments in the Regular Army from March 1919, through June 1921, we find that 44 percent were for 1 year and the balance—56 percent—for 3 years.

We cannot do the job of bringing home from overseas our war-weary and deserving veterans if half our volunteer replacements will walk out next September.

The present term of an inductee is for the duration plus 6 months. After World War I the duration necessarily continued for more than 2 years after the armistice. After this war the duration will necessarily continue for such time as may enable an orderly reduction of the machinery of war. The soldier knows this. And he will know, too, that if he does not want an army career the quickest way to get back home might be a 1-year enlistment. Accordingly, a system of 1-year enlistments, instead of providing a replacement for the long-service veteran, would provide an escape exit for the replacement.

Would we get a bona fide replacement for a year by enlisting a 1-year man? Obviously not. We are talking of overseas duty, where time, space, and distance control. The new recruit would require 2 months' minimum basic training in the United States before dispatch overseas. His travel to his unit in the Orient and his return home for discharge would consume almost 3 months more. The new recruit would thus be a replacement overseas for only 7 months, and a considerable part of this limited period would have to be devoted to additional training.

But, as contrasted with the new recruit, the man in service who might reenlist for 1 year would be available for even shorter actual service. Men now in the Army receive a reenlistment furlough of 90 days, under current policy, upon reenlistment. Such a furlough period is longer than the raw recruit's basic training. The reenlistee, therefore, would be a replacement overseas for only about 6 months.

There is still another objection to the 1-year enlistment which will, I think, weigh as heavily with the House as with our committee. The bill is a measure to stimulate volunteer enlistments. It offers to the enlistee benefits and inducements which place him on a parity with

the long-service veteran. Such provisions are wise and necessary in order that the recruiting campaigns may succeed, as we all want them to. Having regard for those millions now in the armed forces who have during wartime given 2, 3, and 4 years of their lives to their country's service and have won the proud right to be called veterans, it would seem only fair to expect from those who now serve during the transition years from combat to peace a term of at least 2 years in the Regular Army, if they are to be treated by the Government as veterans. To give veteran status to a boy without prior service who is willing to spare but 1 year for his country does not sit right with me. Nor will it sit right with 8,000,000 real veterans and their families.

The Committee discussed at length, and rejected, a modification of the 1-year enlistment provision. Under this proposal, which I believe may be offered from the floor, the Army would be required to accept 1-year enlistments if tendered by persons now in the Army who have had at least 6 months' service and are therefore already trained. I understand that this proposal would exclude from the 1-year term the reenlistment furlough time of 90 days. The reenlistee, deducting his travel time to and from the Orient, would under this proposal be a 9-months replacement overseas.

I think the House will see that this proposal does not do the job we have to do any better than the straight 1-year enlistment that I have already discussed. Instead of providing replacements overseas, it offers an easy way for many now in the service surely to get out with less than 2 years service. And it contributes nothing to provide manpower to replace long-service veterans 1 year from now, since ex hypothesi the 1-year reenlistments will all be expiring just at the time when many veterans will be commencing their third and fourth years in khaki.

I want to add a word on the wastefulness of 1-year enlistments. The cost of recruiting and maintaining the strength of the Army on a 1-year-enlistment basis is more than three times that on a 3-year-enlistment basis. It has been the experience of the recruiting service that men who enlist for 1 year do not reenlist in substantial percentages. Therefore, in addition to the cost of obtaining three enlistments in lieu of the single enlistment obtained under the 3-year scheme, the Army would be faced with tripled costs of equipping and training recruits and of providing discharge allowances and mustering-out pay.

The 3-year-enlistment period has not been found generally to be an obstacle in recruiting. It is less, of course, than the Navy enlistment term of 4 years.

In his recent message, the President said that "The times call for a broad and realistic appraisal of our military needs and obligations." To direct the Regular Army to accept 1-year enlistments, which will naturally predominate, would be neither broad nor realistic. Such a mandatory provision would tend to hamstring the Military Establishment and would utterly fail to raise replacements for the return next summer of long-service veterans.

The proposal for a 1-year enlistment period should be defeated.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the Army decided what its maximum strength is going to be as yet?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No; it has not; and I do not see how they can know until after some months, 3, 4, 5, or 6 months of experience with the Japs and the Germans.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not quite understand from the list here as to the regular pay.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is the same pay scale that has been in force for men in the Army. They draw $50 per month base pay and if they serve in the occupational troops they draw a 20-percent bonus.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would an amendment be in order to raise that pay by 20 or 30 percent if Congress saw fit?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Such an amendment would be germane, but let me ask the gentleman what the veterans in his district would say to a proposition where they had gone through the whole war at $50 base pay per month and then see new men brought into the Army after the fighting is over and given higher pay?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We are doing this to make an incentive. They will understand that.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Is there any serious objection to making retirement pay start at a proportionate rate at the end of 10 years?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I believe there is not; no.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. What is the difference between the 2- and 3-year enlistments other than the duration?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. There is no difference; it is just a question of getting them for at least 2 years.

Mr. COLE of New York. Why not make the enlistment for just 2 years?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Some may want to go in for 3.

Mr. COLE of New York. Why not make it possible for a man to enlist for 4 or 5 years?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. He may reenlist one or more times.

Mr. COLE of New York. Unless these inducements are made we will not get the men.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. We are anxious to get as many men as possible to use as replacements for the men everybody in this House has been talking about bringing home. Unless we get them some will not come home so soon.

Mr. COLE of New York. Unless there is some distinction between the 2 and the 3 years I do not see how you are going to get them.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman stated that the Army had not determined the size of the peacetime establishment. I was wondering if from the gentleman's long experience as a member of the Military Affairs Committee and his informal talks with responsible men in the Army, he could give us his own personal estimate about what that peacetime Army should be?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The size of the Army for the next year or two is one thing. The size of a permanent army thereafter is another thing. General Marshall has said repeatedly, and the testimony before the Military Committee and the Postwar Military Committee is, that it is not felt that we will need a Regular Army beyond 500,000 men. That may be 2 years from now. That is, provided we have a regularly organized National Guard. It will also make some difference to the Army to know whether we will have any backlog, whether or not we will have universal military training.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Does that 500,000 include officers?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes. The officers would probably be cut to 50,000.

Mr. STEFAN. The 500,000 includes commissioned officers?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No. I think it is 500,000 men and 50,000 officers. Of course, there is nothing definite.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the gentleman whether or not any showing was made as to the number of inductions at this time or since Japan capitulated?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is hoped we will secure eventually under this program 300,000 men. That is the hope. Personally, I do not believe we will get over 100,000. In the first month of reenlistment following the bill of June 1 there were only 18 who reenlisted. Of course, this offers greater advantages for any one to reenlist.

Mr. SPRINGER. I was speaking alone of the inductions, those who have been taken in under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The President has issued a directive cutting the monthly load from 80,000 to 50,000 and there is a further order that those must be taken from the 18–25 age group.

MR. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think the statement the gentleman made that the Army had recruited by enlistment only 18 men is quite misleading.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That was in June.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman should explain that they had no

program. They were not trying to enlist men and have not been up until now.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is true.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That was due to the ceiling that we have placed of 280,000. They have 280,000 in the Regular Army today.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is true.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall spend such time as I take in explanation of the bill, taking it up section by section. I realize that there are some technical provisions in this bill, and if the Members will get a copy of the bill and a copy of the report and follow me, I will do my best to explain it.

The first section simply gives the title of the bill.

The second section specifically directs the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to put on a vigorous voluntary recruitment campaign. It is our hope that they will do their very best to get every volunteer that they possibly can up to the required number for the purpose of maintaining whatever the necessary forces may call for.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am curious to know why it is necessary for the Congress to direct the War Department to put on a campaign for enlistments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was the wish of the committee. I offered an amendment to strike out the whole paragraph but the committee decided it should remain in the bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. The War Department has that authority now; is that not correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. This directs and certainly shows the intent of Congress by leaving it in.

Section 3 is the section that gives the Secretary of War the right to take enlistments for 2 years. We have left it optional for either 2- or 3-year enlistment periods. The gentleman who preceded me spoke the mind of the committee as a whole in opposition to the 1-year enlistment. Personally I was in favor of allowing a 1-year reenlistment of those who had had at least 6 months training. The amendment was offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and if I am not mistaken he will offer that amendment again in the Committee of the Whole, eliminating the furlough period from that 1-year reenlistment period.

Section 3 also provides that the Secretary of War shall report to Congress each quarter on the progress of the voluntary recruitment program, the first report to be made not later than December 31, of this year.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. How would the gentleman under this bill determine when the enlistment of a draftee or the term of service of the draftee terminated? Take the draftee that is in the Army now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This bill has nothing to do with him.

Mr. BARDEN. Just a moment. It might have.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does not and cannot.

Mr. BARDEN. How would he enlist in the Regular Army now?

Mr. SPARKMAN. He would simply go to his recruiting office and offer his services, and he would be accepted, if he was found qualified.

Mr. BARDEN. Just switch over?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the gentleman mean if he is already in?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; that is what I am talking about.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; he could not enlist unless he was discharged. If he wanted to enlist in the Regular Army or in the peacetime army, whatever you call it, he could apply for discharge for the purpose of reenlisting in the Regular Army, and upon being granted that discharge he would immediately reenlist under a contractual condition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman says that this bill has nothing to do with demobilization. I am sorry about that, and I wish the committee had inserted that provision, because it will be in there when it comes back from the Senate. This wave of indignation that is sweeping over the country will write that in in the Senate, and we ought to do it here.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think I said it had nothing to do with demobilization. I think I said it had nothing to do with terminating the service of a person previously inducted into the Army. Indirectly it has something to do with demobilization, because we are going to have to maintain some force—I do not know what the size is going to be—and if we do not get the replacements for those men, we are going to have to keep them in there that much longer, and in that way it does affect demobilization.

Section 4 of this bill, I think, is one of the most important sections in it. It relates to retirement. Under the present law, a man who goes into the Army with the idea of making a career out of it cannot look forward to retirement until he has served 30 years. When he has served 30 years he can retire at 75 percent of the average base pay that he has drawn for the 6 months preceding his retirement.

This lowers that retirement period and puts it somewhat on a parity with the Navy, although not completely so. The Navy permits its men to retire after either 20 years or 30 years. It has only 2 retirement periods. This provision lets the Army man retire any time after he finishes 20 years of service. If he retires after completing 20 years of service, he gets 50 percent of his base pay. If he retires after completing 24 years, he gets 60 percent. If he retires after 25 years, he gets 62½ percent. In other words, he can retire at any time after 20 years of service at 2½ percent multiplied by each year of his service up to 30 years, so that he will get 50, 52½, 55, 57½, 60 percent, and so forth, on up to 75 percent, depending upon the number of years he serves.

Get this distinction. In the Navy, if he serves 26 years he still gets the retirement pay he would have gotten had he retired at 20. Here we give him an increase so as not only to make it possible for him to retire after 20 years of service but to lend some inducement for him to stay in, and make it possible for him to retire at any time between 20 and 30 years of service. Of course, when he completes 30 years of service he goes out under the regular retirement law.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It would seem from a hasty reading that his retirement pay could be less than the old-age pension he would get as a mere citizen. Would that deprive him of getting his old-age pension in addition?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe there would be any connection between the two. Ordinarily a boy going into the Army will not be an old-age pensioner when he retires after 20 years. He could be if he enlisted at the age of 45 or so, but what we are trying to do is encourage the young fellows to go into the Army and stay there 20 years, then to come out with retirement pay.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Did the gentleman point out that a boy who has served 4 years during this war and who now enlists would have 4 years' credit toward retirement? In other words, he would have to serve only 16 more years in order to retire.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true. They get credit for all the service they have done, regardless of the grades in which it has been done. They are retired with the average pay they have received for the 6 months preceding their retirement.

Section 5 has to do with reenlistment in grade. It authorizes the Secretary of War to make regulations, and the Secretary of the Navy also, to provide for reenlistment in whatever grade the man may have been in. We do not say that he shall be reenlisted in that grade because all of the places in that grade might be filled up, so that a man might want to come into the service but there would be no opening in that particular grade. At least we do contemplate encouragement being given to these men if they will reenlist.

Section 6 has to do with furloughs. It provides that any man who is discharged for the purpose of reenlisting in the service may get a 90-day furlough to his home, with his travel paid for or with an allowance in lieu of travel paid to him. He remains in the service during the 90 days but is allowed to come back and spend the time at his home before going into his new enlistment. It is a part of his enlistment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman say whether or not a man who is presently in the Army through process of induction is entitled to be discharged as a matter of right in order to enlist under the provisions of this amendment to the present law, or is it left to his commanding officer to determine whether or not he shall be permitted to be discharged in order that he may enlist?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would not say it was either a matter of right or that it was left to his commanding officer. I think it would be determined by the recruiting campaign and the recruiting needs. Certainly, as long as they are in need of men to go into the regular establishment, I would say that every encouragement would be given to these men to reenlist.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California who I believe has something to say on that subject.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. According to section 2, the Secretaries of War and Navy are authorized to accept these enlistments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, that is true.

Mr. KEEFE. Has there been any determination as to the size of the Regular Army Establishment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not yet. I think the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from New York both explained that quite fully.

Section 7 has to do with mustering out payments. Under the law as it stands now, if a man should be discharged for the purpose of being reenlisted he could not collect his mustering out payment until the end of his new enlistment. This provides that he may collect it immediately. It does not give him any additional money, but it does accelerate the payment of it.

Section 8 relates to the reenlistment allowances. Under the law as it stands now, we give to every man in the first three grades, that is, first sergeant, master sergeant, technical sergeant, and staff sergeant, a reenlistment bonus of $50 a year for each year that they have served since their last enlistment. And to those in the lower grades we give a $25 a year bonus. This provides that the same allowance shall apply to the men who are in the Army of the United States and who will reenlist, going into the regular establishments.

I have one thought on that which I want to advance. I do not think our greatest need is going to be for staff sergeants, master sergeants, technical sergeants, and first sergeants. I think our greatest need is going to be for those fellows in the lower grades. Therefore, I propose to offer an amendment when we reach this section making that reenlistment bonus $50 for all grades, regardless of whether they are buck privates, privates first class, or top sergeants. I might say that that amendment was not considered in the committee.

Section 9 relates to the allowance in lieu of quarters option which is given to the men of the first three grades. They have always had that option until about a year ago, when we amended the act so as to take the option away from them. The act was amended so as to take the option away from all those who were going in after that time. There is an allotment of $37.50 for rental. Under the Dependency Allotment Act, a man with one child was entitled to more than $37.50 if he took under that act. Therefore, we required that those coming in after that time, regardless of the number of children, take that, so that money would go to their dependents back home. Now that was more or less a wartime measure. We are leaving that here and giving them the option, but we provide that nothing in this bill shall be construed as to extend the dependency allotments because that is a wartime measure and was not contemplated originally for a peacetime Army.

Section 10 simply extends the franking privilege for 2 years. Under the law as it stands now, that privilege would expire on December 31 of this year. We extend it to December 31, 1947.

Section 11 extends the GI bill of rights, insofar as the statute of limitation applies.

Section 12 simply extends and makes permanent the present overseas pay differential of 20 percent to enlisted men and 10 percent to officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] a member of the committee.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, of course I am very anxious that legislation of this type shall be enacted at the earliest possible moment. I would like to see every man who has been overseas during the present hostilities returned to the United States as quickly as possible. I think all of us are agreed that we would also like to see any man who is a father returned to his family. We would like to see young men go back to college who wish to do so. We would like to see any other man who wished to return home or his business have an opportunity to do so just as soon as we can make it possible if it is within our power.

I have been particularly interested in the men who have been decorated for bravery; in men who have received the Purple Heart, or men who have actually served 2 years already.

It seems to me they are entitled to consideration at this time, and I think, insofar as the Congress is able to do so, they should be returned to their homes and be discharged.

As far as this particular bill is concerned, we are assured that it will aid to accomplish these purposes.

I have received several letters in the last few days to which I would call your attention. For instance, there is one battalion of 680 men now in England on laboring work. Five hundred and eighty of those men are ex-combat men with 95 to 99 points for discharge. Strangely enough, they have already been in service 4½ years, with the Twenty-sixth Yankee Infantry Division.

Presumably, in order to help those men, on July 28, 1945, all men in the Eighth Armored Division, with between 95 and 99 points for discharge, were sent to the Seven Hundred and First Tank Battalion. That included these 580 men. Two days later, approximately 2,500 men with 85 to 94 points for discharge were sent to the Sixth Armored Division. The situation today is this: The Sixth Armored Division is embarking at Le Havre, France, for home and discharge. These men with more points, with 4½ years' service, much of it in combat, find themselves as laborers at the United States General Depot at Ashchurch, England. That seems to be most unfortunate and most unfair and something that the War Department should have corrected before this time.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman knows to what extent our American soldiers are being used in work battalions over there. I recall that earlier in the war, at least a year or so ago, when we were short of troops, quite a large number of engineers were sent over to London to do construction work, purely civilian work. Does the gentleman think it necessary for us to conscript these men to send them over there for that purpose?

Mr. CLASON. I hope it is not being done at present.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. I have had five similar cases and took the question up with the War Department and received a definite letter stating that everybody with 85 points or over—this was before the point score had been reduced—would be back in this country within 2 months. That letter was written at least 2 or 3 weeks ago. Most of the cases that I had in mind have already started back.

Mr. CLASON. One of these letters just came to my desk today. They are dated in September.

I also had a letter from one mother who has two sons in France, one of whom has the Silver Star. He was wounded and, for 3 days, while injured, continued on his duties, and received a very fine citation. Although he has been in the service for more than 2 years and is only an enlisted man, he is still on duty in France. So with his brother who has also been in many combats.

So far as the bill is concerned it has been explained in considerable degree by Members who have spoken ahead of me and I do not wish to go over the same ground. I do, however, wish to call attention to subsection (b) of section 7 on page 6, referring to section 3 of the Mustering Out Pay Act, as amended. So far as that Mustering Out Pay Act is concerned it is a good act, but this particular section ought never to have been in the act. Already five different bills—and perhaps ten—have been introduced by Members of the present Congress to have this section stricken from the act. One of them was introduced, I believe, by the

gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], the ranking minority member of the committee. Referring to these bills the Secretary of War has filed a report under date of June 6, 1945, relating to H. R. 70, H. R. 1509, H. R. 2020, H. R. 2076, and H. R. 2295, all introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress, bills to amend the Mustering Out Pay Act of 1944.

The Secretary points out that the purpose is to eliminate this section which denies any mustering-out payment to a member of the armed forces without overseas service who is discharged or relieved from active service on his own initiative to accept employment. I quote further from the Secretary's letter as follows:

In addition, H. R. 2040 and H. R. 2076 contain provisions which are intended to authorize mustering-out payments to any person discharged or relieved from active service on his own initiative to accept employment prior to the enactment of the bills.

The administration of section 1 (b) (3) of the Mustering Out Payment Act has been difficult, due to the consideration which must be given many borderline situations. For example, it is considered that a consent to relief from active service to accept employment in essential war industry, when a request is initiated by a third person, precludes the receipt of mustering-out payment. Also, the release of a person from active service to return to self-employment, such as farm work, has been held to preclude such payment. Interpretations of the section have been based on the assumption that the underlying purpose of the basic act is to provide "tide-over" funds for the period of unemployment which may occur during the transition from military to civilian life. Thus persons who are released from active service to accept essential employment do not fall within the class intended to be benefited. Yet persons released from active service on their own initiative to accept employment who have had service overseas or in Alaska are permitted to receive mustering-out payments. Inasmuch as very few, if any, members of the Military Establishment have personal control over their respective assignments, it is believed inequitable to allow performance of such service to remain the determining factor for mustering-out payments in these cases.

In view of present conditions, it is reasonable to assume that individuals discharged or relieved from active service may obtain civilian employment without difficulty. The rationale of paragraph 1 (b) (3) would, if extended, deprive all such persons of mustering-out payments, as all may obtain immediate employment under present employment conditions. However, it would appear that all those in grades eligible to receive mustering-out payments require such funds for readjustment expenses, such as civilian clothes, even though employment is immediately available. Accordingly, it is believed that no equitable reason exists for setting apart those persons who are discharged on their own initiative to accept employment. It is further believed that such persons who have been heretofore discharged or relieved from active service should be authorized to receive such payments, if application therefor is made within a reasonable time.

The Bureau of the Budget advises there is no objection to the submission of this report. I understand that there are tens of thousands of Americans who have served from months up to 3 years in the United States Army who have been released from service and who have not been able to receive mustering-out pay because of that section; and I am very glad that Secretary Stimson has stated that in his opinion it is inequitable and that it ought to be wiped off of the statute books. When the bill is read for amendment I propose to offer an amendment to accomplish that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, everything in this bill is highly desirable and everything in it should be adopted. In this connection I want to make it clear that I do not believe the bill contains everything that might be necessary for the purpose of securing voluntary enlistments in the service.

I want to digress for a moment at this point to answer the speaker who just preceded me who, to my surprise, has raised objection to including in the bill a provision for the payment of mustering-out pay to men who are mustered out for the purpose of enlisting in the Regular Army, because that was the greatest stumbling block that the Army found in securing voluntary enlistments from the present members of the Army of the United States. In other words, the men who are in the service have accrued a right to this mustering-out pay and they do not see why they should waive the time of its payment when they enter the Regular Army.

The purpose of this bill is to stimulate enlistments and to offer inducements to men now in the service to join the Regular Army so that there will be a voluntary corps and to the extent of that voluntary corps we will be able to release men who have served for long periods of time.

The gentleman from Massachusetts states that he is going to offer an amendment striking that provision from the bill, but I trust it will not be adopted because the provision is placed in the bill to remove one of the greatest existing handicaps to voluntary enlistment on the part of the men now in the service.

I feel that there are many other things that might be done to offer inducements to men to enter the regular service and I propose to offer, when we come to that stage of the proceedings, an amendment to require the acceptance of 1-year enlistments in the service. I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] as he spoke against the inclusion of such a provision. I recall back in 1939 and 1940 when we were attempting to stimulate enlistments in the Army, and I remember very well all of the stock arguments which the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] has repeated here against 1-year enlistments. However, those arguments apply in the case of the 1-year enlistment of a raw recruit. My amendment will provide that any man physically qualified and otherwise acceptable who is in the service and who has served not less than 6 months shall be accepted for a period of 1 year. All of the argument against the 1-year enlistment is the fact that the recruit must be trained for a period of 6 months and must be equipped, so that the equipping of him and the training of him for 6 months is an expense and a dead loss when only 6 months of service remains. My amendment will provide that he must have had his 6 months' service; in other words, he must have had his basic training and he is already equipped, so that you will not lose the time of training and the expense of equipping.

It will also provide that the time which he may take as a reenlistment furlough shall not be counted within the year. Under existing regulations a man who reenlists is entitled to a 90-day reenlistment furlough. Under my amendment if he takes a 30-day furlough his reenlistment will then be for 13 months, if he takes a 60-day furlough his reenlistment will then be for 14 months, and if he takes the full 90 days' furlough his reenlistment will amount to 15 months. He may waive his furlough, go ahead and serve his year and have the matter over within exactly 1 year.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does the gentleman's amendment take into consideration those who have completed ROTC courses up to 4 years at some of the military schools? For instance, Virginia Military Institute, the Kentucky Military Institute and others?

Mr. KILDAY. No; it would not include them because you are then getting into the very field which gives rise to opposition to a 1-year enlistment, and I think justly so; that is, taking a raw recruit, equipping him and then training him. If you are going to consider a man who had some experience offered by the military schools, you do not know how long ago it was, the nature of his training, and things of that kind, and then you might just as well not have the 6 months' provision, because getting him into physical condition is one part of the basic training. So I feel the fact that he is equipped, that he is in the service, there is no necessity to enlist him or send him through a reception center or give him the basic training, then they are thoroughly justified in accepting him.

The point is made here that the enlistments are going to expire in 1 year. Insistence is made for enlistments and inductions for 2 years. Then again, we have to give him training for 6 months. They say travel might consume 3 months. Well, we have to transport the 2-year recruit or inductee just as much as we have to transport the men who reenlist. In many instances to a greater degree, because the men who reenlist may be in the overseas theater and are willing to stay there. But in 2 years, taking the raw recruit, equipping him and giving him 6 months' training and travel, you only get a year and 3 months out of him, or at the most, 18 months out of him. The purpose is to get as large a body of men as possible to enroll in the Army voluntarily for a period, as I see it, to carry us over the period of the emergency, to carry us past the point where we can see just exactly what our military necessity is and to see what we must provide in the future. This whole thing is fluid. Each day it changes. There is no set number necessary as yet. Reference

has been made here today to the effect that General MacArthur announced that he expects to get along with 200,000 men within the next 6 months. His previous estimate had been 480,000. It is my hope that we can make it attractive enough to get the men to enlist in the Army and that we will be able to release by that time all the men who want to be out of the service.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that some raw recruits crack up in their initial training and you lose a lot in that way?

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, yes.

Mr. JENNINGS. Whereas if you have a man in the Army, he has gone through that course and he is a trained soldier.

Mr. KILDAY. Do not forget this, when you take a man in the service it is going to throw a great burden on the United States. Every man who goes in is entitled to the provisions of the GI bill of rights; he will be entitled to his mustering-out pay, compensation of a veteran, hospitalization and compensation for any disability which he may have in the future. Whenever you take on a man who is already in the service, who has already accrued his mustering-out pay and all his benefits under the GI bill of rights, you are then reducing the obligation which the Nation must face in the future with reference to men who serve in our armed services. I think it is highly economical.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is there any provision at all made with reference to permitting a man in the service to carry any member of his family to foreign assignments?

Mr. KILDAY. This bill does not affect that. I do not know whether the gentleman is referring to families going into occupational areas or not.

Mr. BECKWORTH. There is no provision that will permit a person to carry any member of his family to any section other than this country?

Mr. KILDAY. This does not change the existing law in that situation. That is not involved in this particular bill. As I say, this bill and all in it is good and should be adopted, but other things can also be adopted to make the Regular Army more attractive. I have a bill pending which I think would make the enlisted service in the Regular Army attractive on a comparable basis as is the commissioned service at this time; in other words, to guarantee to a young man going into the Army a profession in which he can realize financial security for himself and his family and place him in a position where he can raise and educate his family. I feel that we can make the enlisted service of the Army a very attractive profession. At the present time the average man going in at 18 to 20 years of age can go out at 48 and 50 and receive $154 a month. I do not know of any other business, trade, or profession that a young man with a high-school education can enter where he has a reasonable expectancy of an annuity of $154 a month for the balance of his life by the time he reaches 50 years of age. Such is the present situation, and I think we can make it so attractive during his service that we can maintain an excellent Army of high standing.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill. I believe that this bill is a start in the right direction. I must emphasize, however, that is only a start. I am convinced that much more must be done than is provided for in this bill in order to immediately secure voluntary replacements for those men and women who are now in the service involuntarily.

A week ago on the floor of this House I stated my position with regard to the discharge of veterans of this war. At that time I stated that I believed it the duty of this Congress to keep faith with those men and women who served so nobly in a time of need by replacing them with volunteers at the earliest possible time. I stated that we should let nothing stand in the way of securing sufficient volunteers. The question raised in my mind by this bill is whether it goes far enough to accomplish that objective.

I am impressed by the hearings and the report on this bill. I am impressed not so much by what they say as what they do not say. The purpose of this bill as set forth in the title is "To stimulate volunteer enlistment in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States." Let us admit that what we are principally interested in is getting volunteers to replace GI Joe—the enlisted man, and the noncommissioned officers and the junior officers. Yet nowhere do we find that any effort has been made to obtain the sentiments and recommendations of men in those classes. Whose testimony is relied on—three major generals in the Army, one brigadier general in the Marine Corps and two captains in the Navy. I in no way question the ability or testimony of these men. It does seem to me, however, that the best way to find out what would stimulate the voluntary enlistment of GI Joes is to ask the GI Joe what he thinks. How do we know whether the provisions of this bill will furnish a sufficient inducement to get volunteers? I think the answer must be obvious—we do not.

Mr. Chairman, I warn the House at this time that the passage of this bill is not and cannot be the final solution to the problem of getting our veterans home. The matter of obtaining an Army of volunteers must be under constant study and review. Needed changes must be made promptly. If by the passage of this bill we call the matter closed, our action today will be but an idle gesture.

Another thing about the hearings and the report on this bill that impresses me, Mr. Chairman, is that they in no way throw light on that most important question—how many military men and women are actually needed to do the job ahead. Oh, I recognize that the Army and Navy have stated their desires as to the number they would like to have. But I must be frank to state that no longer am I too impressed by the conclusions of these gentlemen with the gold braid. We all remember their conclusions just 9 months ago that the so-called work-or-fight bill was an absolute necessity and their conclusion with regard to the absolute necessity for drafting nurses.

Many questions are being asked today and will continue to be asked on the matter of how many men and women are actually needed by the Army and Navy. It is the duty of Congress to answer these questions. Are large numbers of men and women being kept in the service today in order that high officers can retain their temporary rank and station? Are many men and women being kept in the service today in order to avoid unemployment problems? Are the services sincere in their statements that they want to reduce the number of their personnel to the point of actual need just as soon as possible? These questions are familiar to you. Members of Congress find them every day in their mail. The questions must be authoritatively answered. Congress must find the answers. Yet, as far as I can learn, nothing is being done in this direction. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to merely ask the Army and Navy how many men they think they need and let it go at that—or are we going to investigate and find out for ourselves and the people of this country whether the requests of the Army and Navy are legitimate and reasonable? As for myself and my people, Mr. Chairman, we want to know why the Army needs 2,500,000 as of next June 30; we want to know why the Navy will need an enlisted strength of 500,000 as of next September 1. Please understand me—I do not say that these figures are unreasonable or too large. I simply say—"I don't know whether they are or not"—but I believe that it is the responsibility of Congress to find and know the answer.

Just the other day, I received a letter from a friend of mine in the Army Medical Corps which has a bearing on this subject. I would like to read a part of it to you:

> Am enclosing a memorandum sent to all officers this command. A little rapid calculation will reveal that a doctor that has been in the Army since December 7, 1941, has 2 children, was overseas 2 years, still has no chance whatsoever of getting out of the Army. If this hypothetical individual happened to have been ambitious and done graduate work to qualify himself as a specialist, he would then be short 22 points for discharge. In the entire Personnel Distribution Command there are at the present 31 doctors eligible for discharge, all of them with large families and considerable overseas service. I quote this just to give you an idea of the fairness of the Army's point system and the War Department policy of hoarding doctors.
>
> Granted that the Army needs some doctors in the peacetime Army, but surely not in the ratio of seven doctors per thousand as has recently been stated by Surgeon General Kirk. This may be compared with the civilian ratio of New York City of one doctor

per thousand persons and many rural communities of 1 per 5,000. If the War Department and incidentally also the Veterans' Administration made a reasonably attractive monetary offer and assured professional men they could actually care for patients and practice scientific medicine without the hindrance of administrative red tape, directives, and regulations, they wouldn't have a damn bit of trouble getting all the doctors they needed. We all realize that starting out in the postwar private practice won't be easy and a good share of us probably won't know where our next meal will come from for a hell of a while. However, even this prospect looks far better to us than staying in the military service. We haven't liked it for the past 3 or 4 years, but our country was at war and we willingly served. Now that the peace treaties have been signed and all the speeches made, we feel that the contract we signed for the duration has been fulfilled; now let's get started on those last 6 months.

The memorandum referred to in the letter was dated August 30 and was sent from the office of the commanding officer, AAF Regional and Convalescent Hospital, Fort George Wright, Wash., and sets forth the regulations with regard to discharge of doctors. Bear in mind that this memorandum was issued August 30. Major General Kirk, Surgeon General of the Army, testified before the committee on August 31 with regard to the discharge of doctors. I suggest you bear in mind the contents of the letter from which I have just quoted in studying Major General Kirk's testimony.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the problem of obtaining replacements for our veterans is the No. 1 job of this country. It is a problem that will not be solved merely by passing the bill now before the Committee. Certainly the bill should be passed. But Congress must continue to study and act in the solution of this problem so that no stone will be left unturned in the direction of getting our veterans home to their families and friends.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, "Bring the boys back home" is a cry that wells up from the heart of America today. An early demobilization, as complete as prudent, is necessary, not only for the safe rehabilitation of home life, but also that this Army may be employed in productive effort in business, industry, and on the farm.

I am concerned that not an unnecessary day be lost in making it possible for those who desire to resume their education be permitted to do so. Probably the greatest argument against a continued draft of boys of high-school age, is the enforced interruption of schooling.

I realize that a realistic preparation for defense does not consist so much in mass manpower as in a nucleus of intelligent, interested, and willing reserves. I realize, too, that it is easier to raise an Army by legal compulsion than by voluntary methods. For this reason I favor a program to make it as attractive as possible to build up at once a strong volunteer force to replace selective service soldiers. Such a voluntary program can enlist sufficient numbers of really desirable recruits to constitute an adequate reserve force in times of peace. We may well add the incentive of adequate emolument and other correlative incentives to those attractions which already exist, including the lure of travel, and the acquisition of skill and experience in occupational work.

I am satisfied that by drawing upon the lists of those who are ready to volunteer, in addition to the hundreds of thousands now in the service, in cases where there are no home ties beckoning, no problem of schooling or essential job waiting, and further scanning of IV–F lists, an Army sufficient in number to meet the requirements of the present and future, for purposes of occupation or otherwise, may be readily acquired and thus make it possible to bring about a more speedy and more complete demobilization than is now contemplated.

To be successful, a voluntary program must be founded on good public relations. If we can adopt such a program, I am certain that we will be able to build up a defense of our security which will not only be adequate, but also capable of winning the widest possible public support, for we will be planning for the moral and educational upbuilding of the country, for its future safety, and taking a mighty step forward toward business and industrial rehabilitation.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee has taken a step in the right direction in bringing out a bill which in effect attempts to make voluntary enlistments in the Army more attractive. I am sorry the committee did not go further in some directions.

All of us realize that the big problem before every Member is how to get the boys out of the armed forces. I know your mail is just as heavy as mine on this problem. I am concerned, as every Member of this House should be concerned, with how the the Army is going to get them out.

I attempted to question the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee about the critical point system of discharging the men. I was told afterward that the Army is willing to let out the 700,000 men who have 80 points or more, and that when those men are out the number of points required will be dropped another 5 or 10 points so that a few more can be discharged. I am wondering how many men we will have in the United States in the armed forces under that kind of a system. Is there not a bottleneck some place which prevents these men from getting back home to their families and their businesses?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The bottleneck is the shipping space to carry the men across the ocean. The absolute maximum the Army could bring back, using every boat and plane, is 672,000 a month.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman. However, there are 3,500,000 men in this country in the armed forces, and they are outside of that bottleneck for discharge. That is what I am talking about—the men in this country who will not get out for a year under the present system. It may well be that nearly 4,500,000 men under the present discharge system of the Army will be staying at various camps in the United States, and they want to get home. They are writing me and they are writing you about it. I know it takes time to move men back from the Pacific. Certainly it takes time. We could stop some of this delay if the Army turned our boats around and bring the boys home. According to the press this morning, General MacArthur has announced that he could get along with 200,000 men in Japan. The original estimate was 900,000 men. That is 700,000 men less than what was originally called for. At one time in Germany the Army thought they would need 1,500,000 men to control Germany, but that has been scaled down, and undoubtedly can be scaled down further.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This bill is all right as far as it goes, but does the gentleman find anything in it anywhere that will be of any help in getting any of those who are now in the service discharged?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have been searching this bill for an opportunity to offer an amendment which would in simple words be something like this, that anyone in the armed forces of the United States might be sent home for an indefinite furlough until the bottlenecks at these discharge centers are broken. There is a bottleneck now. The Army is letting out those men with 80 or more points. I do not know what they will make the requirement this week or next week. I understand they are coming out with another system of discharge soon. They change it twice a week, to confuse the soldiers and to confuse the public. I think that if every man in the United States who is not definitely needed in the machinery of working over the discharges could be sent home, there would be close to 3,000,000 men who would be affected by it, men now in the United States or who will soon be brought back from overseas. They should loosen up this discharge system and let the men go home for an indefinite furlough, to your community and my community, and then when the Army is ready to discharge them let them be sent for or brought back to a center where they can be discharged, if that is necessary. They should be brought back to the center nearest their home. The Army knows who will be discharged in the next 6 months, why not send these men home to their families and business and discharge them later.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman stated a moment ago that the recent dis-

patch from General MacArthur was to the effect that he needed 200,000 men for Japan and the gentleman contrasted that with the previous estimate of 900,000. I fear the gentleman is mistaken in that regard. The 900,000 estimate was made to cover the whole Pacific area.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, is not General MacArthur in charge of the whole Pacific area?

Mr. WADSWORTH. He is, but he has not reduced the estimate from 900,000 to 200,000, as the gentleman stated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would the gentleman admit that he has reduced the number that might be needed for Japan?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is, by 290,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Very well then.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is as the result of the experience which has been had. His original estimates were made before the landings started.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is true, and in the light of experience, they are now reducing those estimates.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He felt then that he would need 490,000 men in Japan; a reserve force in the Philippines; more men in Korea, and troops stationed in Hawaii, the Panama Canal, and the Aleutians, totaling 900,000 for the whole area. It is obvious that now that is going to be reduced as a result of their experience in that region.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman from New York. I think he is absolutely right on that. The number of men in Japan could further be reduced if we make use of the Chinese and the Filipinos to help do some of the policing work and the guarding in Japan. Perhaps when we take another look and review what is happening, that can be done. We should not be stingy one iota in the amount of money we might expend for technical and scientific laboratories. This war was eventually won by scientific laboratories. Germany very nearly beat the world to its knees by the use of the robot bombs because we did not see fit after the last war to say to Germany that she could not have scientific laboratories to develop instruments of warfare. This country should stay abreast of every other nation in the development of radar, the atomic bomb, and all the other new inventions that may well come out of scientific laboratories if we give them the green light. I am not so sure but what the atomic bomb has made vessels obsolete in warfare. I believe that all we need in this country now is a closet full of bombs and not a tremendously large army.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. MAY. With reference to the bottlenecks at the discharge centers over the country, the gentleman no doubt remembers and has had experience in dealing with veterans' claims since the last World War that then they discharged them by divisions and regiments and the individual soldier did not have a perfect record.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right.

Mr. MAY. Or perhaps the veteran did not have any kind of record. Now they are try to do it on an individual basis. The individual veteran is entitled to know whether his insurance is in force, whether his discharge is right, and whether his compensation has been looked after, or whether his reemployment rights have been protected. They are trying to do all of that and it naturally slows down the discharges.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct, but would the gentleman feel they could send these men home on an indefinite furlough to their families and their business and back to their farms and then when they are ready for their discharge, which might only be a matter of 3 or 4 months, bring them back to those discharge centers and look over their service record and physical condition and then discharge them. It would stop many irritations that now exist.

Mr. MAY. I would say that the man is entitled to know what his physical record is by a strict physical examination at the time of his discharge. If the individual goes home for an indefinite period and stays there 3, 4, or 6 months, he might incur some disability while he is there and there would then always be a question about it. The better way to do it, in my opinion, is to do it right at the time they are discharged.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Oh, well, a man might be hit by lightning or be sick at an Army camp as well as at home.

I do not believe that selective service should be used as an instrument of forcing universal compulsory military training upon the country, and that is just what the military brass hats want to do. I feel that in this bill if there is any way to write into it an amendment stopping selective service from taking the 18- and 19-year-old boys, it should be done. I propose to try to do that at the proper time by offering an amendment. If universal compulsory military training is needed it ought to be done in another bill.

I am going to do it this way:

And said Army shall not exceed 500,000 enlisted men and officers, none of whom shall be under 20 years of age, except through voluntary enlistments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I hear a great many people, both in and out of Congress, sneeringly refer to what they are pleased to call the "brass hats." Somehow or other, while I hold no brief for the War Department, I happen to be one of those who still has a lot of confidence in General Marshall, General MacArthur, General Eisenhower, Gen. Hap Arnold, General Wainwright whom we heard the other day, General Patton, General Hodges, General Patch, General Bradley, and all of the others of their kind who have won a glorious victory against two of the most brutal enemies in all history. They and their officers and men have taken our flag to every part of the world and brought it back without a spot or a blemish on it. But, strange to say, although it has been only 15 days since VJ-day, the common thing—and I presume, under present circumstances, the popular thing—to do is to heap abuse on those men because they are still in command. The criticism, however, is in marked contrast to the praise they were receiving only a few weeks ago. I plead for patience, tolerance, and calm judgment, and the best and wisest thing will be done.

However, anticipating there would be some discussion about the matter of discharges, I asked the War Department only this morning for an official statement regarding discharges, and I now read, word for word, that statement, submitted to me through the office of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army. I think you will find these figures of interest. I think there is still such a thing in life as being just and fair. I hope you will carefully consider these figures when you read them in the RECORD tomorrow, because, as I say, they are official, and I obtained them at my own request about 2 hours ago:

1. On August 14, the day Japan surrendered, the Army was discharging at the rate of 4,200 men per day or 1,500,000 per year.

2. By September 14, 1 month later, the rate per day had risen from 4,200 to 15,200, and the annual rate had risen from 1,500,000 to 5,500,000. This means that by September 14 the Army was actually discharging 650 men per hour, 24 hours per day.

3. Between now and next December the discharge daily rate will steadily rise to better than 22,000 per day. It will reach maximum capacity in January, when the daily rate will exceed 25,000 men per day. This means that by January discharges will be made at—

(a) Better than 1,100 per hour, 24 hours per day.

(b) Better than 24,000 per day.

(c) Better than 700,000 per month.

(d) Better than 8,000,000 per year.

4. To discharge at the rate just indicated the Army will operate 26 permanent and 155 temporary facilities for this purpose. When the 26 big centers reach their full capacity, the smaller temporary facilities will probably be closed, as they are not as efficient as the large centers and are qualified only to meet the big backlog in this country of men entitled to discharge. This big backlog was created by the sudden collapse of Japan.

5. Between VE-day and September 15 over 750,000 men were discharged from the Army.

I would say that was a pretty good showing. They are making progress. The discussion in Congress and over the country has done good. Some mistakes have been made, but when I recall our little Army of some 200,000 men and 14,000 officers we had 4 years ago and how it grew under the leadership of men like Marshall and Eisenhower and MacArthur until we built it up to 8,000,000 men and sent it to every part of the world and won glorious victories, I just refuse to believe that we are going to throw away that victory by sending all our men home overnight. Certainly we

all want our boys and girls home as soon as possible but it must be done in an orderly way and in justice to all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman tell us how many boys are being taken into the Army now?

Mr. THOMASON. Fifty thousand a month under the direction of the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. General Marshall some time ago stated that about 500,000 would be all we needed for a standing Army. Would the gentleman accept that figure?

Mr. THOMASON. I have such confidence in General Marshall that I would be disposed to accept his recommendation. But I hope under the provisions of this bill, which I am actively supporting, that we get enough volunteers to materially relieve the situation and reduce the number of men to be drafted. We ought to do away with the draft just as soon as possible, but we cannot do it until we know how many men we must have in our armies of occupation. I want us to quit drafting 18-year-old boys who want to go to school at the earliest possible moment. But first of all I want to get the combat, and long-service men, and men of families back from overseas and out of service. We get nowhere abusing our high officers.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Does not the gentleman believe that these abusive terms that are being applied to men who at the risk of their own lives led our victorious armies and navies ought to be reserved for those who deal in calumny, libel, and slander over the radio?

Mr. THOMASON. Of course I do. I believe the President of the United States and every Member of this Congress in both bodies, and likewise the War and Navy Departments are making an honest and sincere effort to get these boys back home and out of service just as soon as possible. All of us, of course, are getting a lot of mail from fathers and mothers, because this comes close to every home. My boy has been in the Army 4½ years and in the Pacific over 2 years and has just been ordered to Japan. I would like to have him come back, but I am for working this problem out in a way that is fair and just to everybody and also preserve our great victory so that we do not get ready for another war.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. The gentleman has a statement from the Army which is quite enlightening and I know we all appreciate it. What is the Navy doing toward discharging boys?

Mr. THOMASON. I could not answer that; I refer you to the subcommittee that drafted the bill.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. I find this provision in the bill:

> Notwithstanding the limitations contained in any provision of law, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to accept original enlistments and reenlistments.

Is that confined exclusively to the Army? Does it not apply also to the Navy?

Mr. THOMASON. I did not return to Washington until after the hearings had been concluded and the bill reported. The gentleman would have to ask some other member of the committee but I think it also applies to the Navy.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. I understand the last page of the report to indicate quite conclusively that it is the plan of the War Department to have everyone who has served 2 years or more mustered out by July 1, 1946. Am I right?

Mr. THOMASON. That is a correct statement; and I have heard enough testimony from those in authority in the War Department to believe absolutely that every man who will have served 2 years by next July 1 will be mustered out by that date.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I wish the gentleman would explain how a great victory might be jeopardized by a demand for more expeditious demobilization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. I did not say that, but some people say, "Bring all the boys back from overseas." Others say, "Get rid of the draft." I just wonder who is going to occupy the conquered countries. We have certain commitments and must keep them.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman knows that no one is making any such statement as that, but there is a demand in Congress and throughout the country for a more expeditious demobilization of the men in the Military Establishment.

Mr. THOMASON. Absolutely. I agree with that.

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot go along with the gentleman in any contention that that perils the preservation of the fruits of victory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. THOMASON. May I ask the gentleman, how does he propose to relieve these men who have been overseas and in combat?

Mr. HALLECK. How do I propose to relieve them?

Mr. THOMASON. Where are you going to get your replacements?

Mr. HALLECK. If you need replacements they can be obtained. The point I am making is that the process of demobilization should be stepped up and I believe can be stepped up without any jeopardy anywhere.

Mr. THOMASON. I agree with that statement, and the statement I read from the War Department shows we are making great progress.

Mr. HALLECK. All over this country little communities need doctors; boys want to renew their education; farm boys are needed to produce the food that we need; jobs are crying for placement everywhere; and to my mind in that circumstance certainly every possible effort should be made to get these boys back home as quickly as possible.

Mr. THOMASON. I agree with the gentleman absolutely. At the same time you cannot bring back all these men from overseas and also abolish the draft at home because you must have a comparatively large army for the next few months and until things settle down.

Mr. HALLECK. I have not said anything about abolishing the draft. I am talking about demobilization.

Mr. THOMASON. But the gentleman's colleague from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] said he had a bill to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, one of the most pressing questions before the country and Congress is the release or discharge of men in our armed services, and their return home to civilian life.

Every Member of this body is in sympathy with that objective. The bill before us, H. R. 3951, seeks to solve that problem, at least partially. It provides for voluntary enlistment and reenlistments in our Regular Military and Naval Establishments. I am supporting this bill and shall vote for it. It contains the very heart and cornerstone of our way of life—freedom of action. In addition it provides for reasonable compensation, incentives, and retirement pay after 20 years' service to make voluntary enlistment attractive and desirable. The length of service is optional with the individual; he may enlist for 2 or 3 years. It is believed that the provisions of the bill will provide a sufficient number of men for the armies of occupation in Germany and Japan and our Regular Establishments to permit a faster demobilization program of our present armed forces who served in the war recently terminated. It may also bring an early repeal of the present draft law. I am definitely opposed to a selective-service law in peacetime and in my opinion a vast majority of our people do not favor it. If the present system is continued then it should be amended to exclude young men below the age of 21 years. I shall vote for an amendment to this bill to achieve that objective. We all have confidence in our military and naval leaders. They have won an overwhelming and decisive victory. General MacArthur believes an Army of 200,000 men is sufficient as an occupational force in Japan. China has an unlimited supply of manpower in a population of more than 400,000,000 people. No other nation could have more justification for occupying Japan than China unless it be ourselves. The Philippines could also provide forces if necessary and with equal justification. An army of occupation made up of nationals of China and the Philippines, staffed, trained and equipped

by the United States might very well be considered as a means of releasing our men from the armed services in the Pacific and reducing the personnel in our armed services. I trust that subject will have the attention of the War Department and the proper committees of the Congress.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, if there is one admonition that the Members of this body ever needed and particularly at this moment, it is the advice that Hamlet's mother gave her son in that great tragedy of Shakespeare when she said:

> O gentle son, upon the heat and flame of thy distemper sprinkle cool patience.

If we will keep calm and try to throw more light and less heat on this subject, I think we will discover there is not so much difference between the various views that have been expressed on this floor.

The whole problem of demobilization is not as simple as it first seemed. Indeed, it is very difficult and complex, and it is utterly impossible for anybody or any agency, not only the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps, but even this august Congress, to lay down a definite, hard, and fast plan, or rule, or inflexible formula without doing some men an injustice. It is inescapable by the very nature of the problem. There are bound to be cases of individual inequities. I regret there are so many. We must correct all we can.

During the recess I had prepared a resolution to introduce the first day we reconvened to declare a cessation of hostilities and an end of the war. I had another bill to introduce to stop the draft immediately. But our Committee on Military Affairs held hearings for a whole week before we reassembled, and after listening attentively and carefully to the testimony of General Edwards and General Henry, I was convinced that for a little while following the capitulation of both Germany and Japan we should move slowly, cautiously, and exercise the greatest care in order not to lose the very thing for which millions of our men have been fighting and over a million of whom have suffered either death or serious wounds.

Sir, when I have been engaged in deadly combat with a bitter, vicious, and ruthless foe, I shall not throw away my weapons and carelessly walk away from him after beating him to the ground unless I want a stab in the back or a shot through my head.

After all the billions of treasure we have poured out; after all the lives we have sacrificed; after all that we have given up not only on the battlefields, on the seas, in the air, but here on the home front shall we foolishly and recklessly abandon the objective of our achievement and let the sands of victory flow through our open fingers?

Mr. Chairman, what will it suffice us to defeat the Axis Powers—Italy, Germany, and Japan—on the field of battle and then lose all the fruits of peace in the open wide world of public opinion? There are economic, political, and moral, as well as military, issues to be considered.

If the Members of the House had heard the fair, logical, and clear presentation by the War Department, there would not be all this hullabaloo on the floor and we would not as Members of Congress be swamped by an avalanche of mail from naturally disgruntled and discontented people all over America.

I do not know of any member of the Committee on Military Affairs or of this House—yes; I do not know of anyone in this country, regardless of race, party, or creed—who is not exceedingly anxious to bring as many of these boys and girls back home at the earliest possible moment unless it is the PAC of CIO. God knows I would like to see some of my kin. I have a nephew 36 years of age who has a wife and 2 children, 10 and 12 years of age, who has been in the Pacific for over 2 years. He is in Tokyo now. I was happy to receive a letter from him this morning in which he said, "Uncle DEWEY, I am glad to be here as a part of this show. I would not have missed it." I have another nephew down in the stinking, steaming equatorial region in South America who was in the service 6 or 8 months before Pearl Harbor. He wants to come home. But he is not bellyaching. Of course, it is the privilege and prerogative of any soldier or sailor to bellyache at any time. We did it in the last war and they do it in this. Another nephew is in Germany, and he is barely 19. His mother would like to see him. I have other nephews in this country. We all want these boys and girls brought home at the earliest possible moment. Nearly every family in America is affected.

How are we going to do it? We took 5 long years, gentlemen, to build up the mightiest war machine in the history of the world. About 12,000,000 men and women are scattered all over this universe—on every continent and on every sea. It has taken years to get them out there. Now, after 4 long years of war and after glorious victory over two of the mightiest, most determined, and most ruthless military powers the world has ever known, we stop fighting the Italians, the Germans, and the Japs and start fighting among ourselves and start kicking around the "brass hats" and the "gold braids" who, in spite of all their faults and shortcomings, have won immortal renown. Heaven knows that I have never claimed infallability for any of our generals or admirals. No member of our committee has more violently opposed them at times. I know that they are not perfect, and that they have and will make mistakes. Nevertheless, it must be conceded that they are free from many of the pressures that elected officers are subject to and that they can, with sympathy and resoluteness, decide certain problems peculiar to their own field.

It does seem strange that only a few months ago when the fate of this Nation hung in the balance, when our very lives were at stake, that we were praising to the skies our generals and admirals. You know, I wonder how in the name of God, Leahy and Marshall, King, and Arnold, Eisenhower, and Devers, Bradley, Patch, Hodges, and Patton Simpson, Brereton, Doolittle, and Chennault, Spaatz and Kenney, Eaker and Sommervell—I wonder how in the name of heaven Nimitz or his commanders in the Pacific, Mitscher, whom we will soon see in this House, along with Admirals Halsey, Kinkaid, and Spruance—I wonder how in the world these gallant marines under Vandegrift, and the forces under gallant and colorful MacArthur, able Krueger, suffering Wainwright, patient Eichelberger, ever won this war without these parlor generals and pink tea strategists back home who are now willing, after they have saved our necks, to kick them all over hell's half acre. But it is only natural after a war for everybody to want to come home. And it is also natural to "cuss" the generals and admirals. They expect it. And I say this as one who I do not think has ever kowtowed to them or been subservient in the least—I know that the generals and admirals make mistakes; even Members of Congress do sometimes, because all of us are human.

I do want to say that I think the Army was not prepared for demobilization as it was for war. Why should it be? The primary interest, the paramount duty of the leaders of our armed forces on land and sea and in the air was to win this war. It was not to think, plan, dream, and waste time about setting up machinery to demobilize. It was to win the war quickly and stop the bloodshed immediately. This they have done. Now then, we are so darned impatient, we are not willing to give them a few weeks to adjust themselves and find out where they really are. MacArthur has to take inventory.

I did not want to see the Eighty-sixth, the Ninety-fifth, or the Ninety-seventh Divisions that had seen long months of bitter combat in Europe transferred or redeployed to the Pacific. It was bad, but MacArthur demanded seasoned combat troops. Why? Because he did not know what in the world he was going to get into when he went into Japan. He did not want an Army of green, raw, inexperienced troops. What intelligent general would? He knew he would have to go in there under an air umbrella, he knew he would have to have the best naval support possible, he knew he would have to have a ground force that could hold this toehold. He did not know just what resistance he might possibly meet. He did know there were millions of Japanese under arms that they had never encountered, and he was thinking only of the safety of our men. That was the one thing foremost in his mind. That is why he demanded that these trained combat divisions go in there. I do not blame him. He did it for safety. We were assured by the War Department that these combat divisions from Europe will be the first to be brought back from the Pacific, and I dare say they will. They had better be.

I do not like to see 18- and 19-year-old boys drafted; in fact, I think that is one of the mistakes we made in this war. I never did think they were essential, and

I think we could have won the war without them. We were told they were needed because of their boldness, their daring, their resiliency. I know they were good in combat, but the casualties were high, they were enormous and terrific. Certainly we should not need them for occupational purposes, because you need older men with mature judgment to occupy territory.

I also know we are going to wake up 5, 7, or 10 years from now with an acute shortage of doctors, dentists, technicians, scientists, and engineers. I think we have been more foolish than some of our allies. Britain and Russia and other countries have continued the education of their youth. I realize that it is tough to take 18- and 19-year-old boys, but you are confronted with this alternative. What are you going to do with these married men with families back home who have been in Europe and in the Pacific fighting for 2, 3, and 4 years through the stinking, steaming jungles of Burma and the Southwest Pacific, the hot sands of north Africa and India, the cold and fog of Iceland and the Aleutians, the mud and hills of Italy, the unspeakable conditions and the rugged barriers of western Europe. Are you going to keep them on without rotating them in an orderly and a gradual manner? That is the thing we have to decide. We want only justice. Most people want the other fellow to do it.

I think we can reduce the occupational forces in both Germany and Japan. I stated so in the hearings before our Committee on Military Affairs several days ago. General MacArthur so announced today. I do not see why in the name of common sense we need 370,000 to 400,000 men to occupy Bavaria, a little section of Germany. Germany is divided into four zones; it is occupied by the Russians, the British, the French, and the Americans. I do not see why any occupation force of 400,000 men is needed in our particular region in Bavaria in Germany. All Germany has been blasted and annihilated. General Knudsen was correct the other day when he stated it would take 50 years to repair the damage to Berlin. God only knows when there will be a market for automobiles or any other American goods in Germany, which has been literally leveled.

It is better to have too many men there than too few. Bring them home in a gradual and orderly manner. Tell your friends back home to be patient. They are a little impatient. I built a fire under the Army, I put a burr under the tail of several generals, and told them to get busy, that if they did not speed up demobilization, Congress would take this thing over. But I think the Army can do a better job than we can. I think a lot of us are demagoging and taking advantage of a critical situation here in a perilous time, absolutely because we know it is popular back home. I had rather be right than to be popular. Play safe with the country and not your seat in Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I will always have to yield to my dear friend. I hate to oppose him, but I shall not hesitate to when I know he is wrong.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman must be conscious of being wrong or he would not say he is opposing me, when he does not know what I am going to ask. The gentleman is talking about the armchair generals that demand the return of the boys. Does not the gentleman know it is the men themselves, their fathers and mothers and wives, who are asking it? I have not heard from any armchair generals but I have heard from the boys.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, I have, too. However, I know several generals who are not let out and who want to be retired. I know a great many officers who are trying to be retired and they cannot get out. These subordinate officers are anxious to get home, to get into their professions, into law and medicine, and to go back on the farm. They have jobs to do and families to care for.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You talk about demagogs—will you speak for yourself and not for the rest of us?

Mr. SHORT. Oh, well, you maintain your own opinion; you are welcome to it. I speak for the whole country—neither for you nor myself.

They are landing thousands of men every day in the ports of Boston, New York, and Charleston, and particularly in Norfolk and Newport News, and they are landing thousands in Seattle and San Francisco. They are landing some in Los Angeles and in New Orleans. We will bring these men home just as quickly as shipping facilities will permit, and as quickly as we can set up these separation centers and the machinery whereby they can be carefully discharged. I am trying to tell my constituents, and I do not care what the gentleman from Michigan tells his, but I am trying to tell my constituents not to be too anxious to get out too fast. A lot of the boys did that in the last war. I had buddies who were so anxious to get back home that they never took the time nor the trouble to have their disabilities written on their discharges and ever since the close of the last war they have been hounding me to death, for the 14 years that I have been in Congress, trying to establish service connection. If they had been discharged just a little more slowly and in a little more orderly way, we would not have had all that trouble. We had only 2,000,000 men in France in the last war. We had 3,500,000 there this time. We have an Army and Navy and Air Force and Marine Corps of 12,000,000 men and women. I want to say that the parents in this country should be advised to see to it that each one of their boys or girls who happen to be in the service is given a proper physical examination. They should inquire about their GI rights and benefits, their insurance, reemployment, and all other rights. The Army is seeing to that much better in this war than they did in the last. They should see that everything is absolutely in order before they finally get their release because they will need that information in days to come. We want to avoid past mistakes and take proper care of those entitled to it.

The passage of this bill will speed the end of the draft. I am for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am just as anxious as anybody in this Hall to see the program of demobilizing the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard speeded up as much as possible. I think everyone in this Chamber has taken the position that no man or woman must be kept in the service one single day longer than is necessary. But, Mr. Chairman, here within 2 weeks of VJ-day the Army tells me that on Saturday it released 15,200 persons. I think that is a remarkable record made within 2 weeks after the enemy has surrendered. That rate of discharge totals 456,000 men per month far better than was done after the last war, I believe, at its high peak of discharges.

Mr. Chairman, as anxious as we are to see these men discharged immediately, I want to add a word of caution at this time. A year ago, or perhaps a year and a half ago, working with some of the veterans' organizations, I drew up a draft of the procedure which we thought the armed services should use in discharging the men and women from the armed services when the war was over. The veterans' organizations, especially the organizations of disabled veterans, are most anxious that those men receive a thorough physical examination before being finally discharged from service.

At that time I suggested in a draft of a bill which I introduced that discharge centers be set up at the end of the war; that no man be discharged from those discharge centers until his service record had been brought down to date and sent to that particular discharge center. I suggested at the time the serviceman was to be brought up for discharge he should be given a most thorough physical examination, with X-rays where X-rays are necessary, with special treatment where necessary, blood tests, analyses, and other work necessary, and that before he was released from the service he be told fully and frankly of any disability he might have. That bill contained a stipulation then and suggests now that those men, before they be discharged, be given a full opportunity to know their physical condition and an opportunity to file any claim they might have with the Veterans' Administration for physical disability at the time of discharge.

We wanted to see representatives of the employment services there to advise with the veterans as to their opportunities for employment when they got out of the service and into civilian life. We wanted to have there at the time of discharge representatives of the patriotic organizations, the veterans' organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the DAV, to advise these men as to their rights when they were on the eve of returning to civilian life.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the note of caution that I would give today would be that the armed services continue to discharge its personnel in a methodical

and orderly manner. As anxious as we are to get these men and women out of the service, we must conform to rules and order that they not be thrown back upon society with physical disabilities they know not of and without claims filing with the Veterans' Administration when they should be filed and without the full opportunity of asserting their veterans' rights to the fullest extent.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It seems to me there could not be any more orderly way than to discharge people you do not need. Right here in Washington there are newspapermen writing stories they do not need. There are boys in the service working only 1 hour out of the day. They could just as well go home, and if the Congress does not pass a law like this the American people will rise up and insist and see to it that they do.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentlewoman is certainly in error if she thinks I am not in favor of this bill. I am in favor of this bill and every part of it, and I, if anything would strengthen the bill, rather than weaken any of its particulars. I say to the gentlewoman I want these veterans discharged in an orderly, systematic manner. I do not want our veterans out on the street corners with battle disabilities, perhaps with wound chevrons, selling apples and pencils, as they were after the last war. I want them fully informed at the time of discharge and permitted to file timely their claims for disability as they come out of the service. This is very important and may affect the lives of some of these men for many years to come.

Many of us have run into cases of veterans, many years out of service, with cases of serious service-connected disability, which were not asserted at the time of discharge. The serviceman was not examined by physicians at the time of discharge, or he was not told that his service record reflected serious physical ailments, service-connected, which should form the subject of a claim to be filed by him against the Veterans' Administration. Many of these men which we have seen have struggled, trying to carry along, under the weight of these disabilities when it is the intent of Congress and a grateful Government that they receive financial help for a disability incurred in line of duty. It is this that causes many of us, Mr. Chairman, to hope that in the push for immediate discharges, and I join with the others to get the men out immediately, the orderly, systematic, methodical way of releasing the service men and women be not dispensed with.

I am as anxious as the next one to get these men out of service, but let us not, Mr. Chairman, to save a day or two, wrong these men for years to come.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say will be largely repetition of things that have already been said. One point I want to stress as much as I can is that the purpose of this bill is to recruit men by voluntary enlistment, so the soldiers who have been in service a long time can get out. Those recruits are to take the places of men in the occupation armies. For every recruit we get it means one more soldier can come home that much quicker. Also, it will reduce the number required to be inducted by the Selective Service System.

To show you what this means, let me give you an illustration that is simple and near home. In the block in which I live in Stockton, California, are five boys, one of whom is my son. Those boys all enlisted and went into the Army or the Navy. Three of those boys have served over three years. Two of them have served almost three years. Three of them were in combat; one of them in the Seabees was wounded, and one was in the Army Air Forces in the training command. I call your attention to the Fortieth Division most of whose men came from California. That division has been in the service for four years and they are still out in the Pacific. If we can recruit men to take their places these men will come home quicker. The purpose of this bill is to get these recruits, to offer the inducements which have been mentioned and which I think are very, very good, so we can get back home very soon the veterans who have served a long time and given so much toward victory. That is the purpose we all have in mind.

I wish to mention one other matter in this connection. Reference has been made to the large number of troops in the United States, 3,100,000. These men are partly new recruits and are intended to replace men who are coming back from the various theaters in the Pacific and the Atlantic, to take their places in the armies of occupation. Many of these men are in supply, communications, and administration necessary in the support of our occupation armies and the transporting of troops home. Sixty-five thousand are in direct deployment work at separation centers. It may be that if we find our occupation armies are going to be smaller than was anticipated—and that is the trend today—we can release some of these men, discharge them right here in America without sending them away. That is what we are all hoping for; and, of course, the more recruits we get for occupation armies the less there will be need for others who are now being inducted.

Another place where I believe there is a lag in getting men out of the Army is the separation centers. If you will look at pages 54 and 55 of the hearings you will see the separation centers listed as being utilized and you will see the routine a soldier goes through in getting discharged. I visited half a dozen separation centers. The thing which annoys me and the thing which gives me concern and doubt which I cannot get away from is the delay in getting men out of the separation centers. For instance, the man who drove me around in the center in New Mexico told me he had been in America for 4 months awaiting his discharge. He had the necessary 90 points and was ready to get out but had been held for 4 months. I have called that to the attention of our committee and asked the chairman to look into it. If necessary, a half dozen subcommittees should be appointed and sent to various separation centers and behind the separation centers and statements taken, not from the officers, but from the enlisted men to find out what the records of their cases were, and if there is undue delay find out about it.

There is altogether too much delay in cutting down the time from the day a man leaves his boat to land and the day when he is handed his honorable discharge from the Army. It may be that the delay is not at the separation center itself but in places between the port of entry and the separation center. My information—and I hope it is wrong—is that there is delay along the route a man must travel from the port of entry and the separation center. The whole process should be speeded up so a man will go almost directly to a separation center from the port where he landed.

The Army claims they have the personnel; it claims they have the machinery to step up releases from the Army after the men get off the boats. We will all have to recognize and admit that in getting the men back from overseas for relief we are limited to 672,000 in any single month, for that is the total capacity of all the boats available, and to be made available, plus the planes that are available. When they get up to 672,000 men a month, they cannot bring another man back that month.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I note that in section 4 of the pending bill which is found on page 3 and deals with retirement pay and retirement benefits. Did the gentleman's committee give consideration to allowing something like time and a half in months for service outside of the continental limits of the United States, and perhaps double time for combat service as a time allowance against retirement for these men? It seems to me such a provision would encourage the more experienced and older men to stay in the service longer so that they could retire at an earlier date.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Answering the gentleman's question, we do not expect there will be any more combat. They get 20 percent additional now for overseas duty.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am not talking about pay, I am talking about time; I am talking about the number of years needed for retirement. I note in the bill men may retire who have completed not less than 20 or more than 29 years of active service. Why not allow a little extra time for those who serve overseas so they might accumulate their retirement at an earlier age and thus be encouraged to reenlist?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The committee did not consider that. This is a very liberal retirement bill. A man may retire after 30 years of service and get three-quarters of his pay. That means that a sergeant could retire from the Army probably at 50 years of age or less and draw $150 a month for the rest of his life.

Mr. HINSHAW. I was merely considering it from the standpoint of obtaining reenlistments.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We have all the inducements we need. We do not believe that additional inducements will get any more men.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I call the gentleman's attention to the language on page 2 beginning in line 4:

That notwithstanding the limitations contained in any other provision of law, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to accept original enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of 2 or 3 years, at the option of the person so enlisted, from among qualified male persons not less than 18 years of age, including persons in active service in the Army of the United States or any component thereof. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any right to reenlistment in the Regular Army under any other provision of law.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think I can explain that to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does that not repeal the act of 1925 which provides for the discharge of any man who enlisted in the Army after July 21, 1925, under 21 years of age?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know about that.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does it not repeal that law?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know what that law is the gentleman is referring to; but I may say under this act it is intended to suspend the act that provides the Regular Army shall be 280,000 men, and build up a bigger army until we get to the time when we can determine, by factual knowledge and experience, what the appropriate size of the Regular Army shall be. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman's question because I do not know what the bill of 1925 provides.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It provides that the Army must discharge all persons under the age of 21 where application is made by parent or guardian to have such person discharged; consequently there is a rule that only those boys under 21 were taken who had the consent of their parents.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think this repeals that act.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am informed it does.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know. The gentleman will have to follow his own information. I do not think it does.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I think this bill actually does repeal the provisions of law referred to by the gentleman from Ohio which requires the consent of the parents where they are under 21 years of age. I am having drafted now an amendment which will probably be offered to require their consent anyway.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for the contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say one word along the line referred to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]. There seems to be in the air now a terrible incentive or effort to criticize the so-called brass hats. They have been defended here adequately today. They were among the leaders of the men who won the war and we should have enough confidence in them to know that they will properly and rapidly unwind the war as well as they have helped to win it. I want to say just a word about the so-called Pentagon soldiers. There are men in this war who have sat in the Pentagon Building during the war and they are being severely criticized, but if anyone will stop to think, they will realize that the servicing of a great, giant army in all parts of the world requires a great deal of administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAY. I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We all know that it requires a great deal of planning and that the planning and administration contributes to victory. For instance, in the last war General Eisenhower did not get overseas and General Arnold and General Doolittle did not get overseas, but that does not mean they were not excellent soldiers.

I want to pay my tribute to the men who have sat down here in the Pentagon Building in Washington and who helped operate and conduct this war. Many of those men would have gladly taken a reduction in rank in order to get to a combat area where it was more interesting and active, but they had to stay here and perform arduous duties and lay the groundwork and carry out the administration that made the ultimate effort of our Army in all parts of the world very highly successful.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. At the peak of the war the gentleman well knows that many of those officers worked 18 and 20 hours a day.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes. I know of two cases where men worked themselves into a sick bed. One man was in bed for 4 months with a collapse.

Mr. SHORT. I know two or three officers who worked themselves to death. They died because of exhaustion and overwork.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman is absolutely right, and I think we should recognize that and be fair enough to realize that those men are not there to hide out. They are there because somebody told them to be there as an essential part of the administration of this giant war. They had to do a very arduous and undramatic job, and they deserve our sincere thanks. Let us not be so impatient as to do a grave injustice to these men. Some of them are now engaged in the arduous duty of getting our men back to civilian life. Taken as a whole their work has been good and instead of sniping at them we should help them in every way possible to speed up the discharge of men by offering constructive and understanding suggestions.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I want at this time to call to the attention of the Congress my views on the present discharge policies of the Army and the Navy. For the past month I have been urging the Secretaries of the Army and Navy to outline a definite discharge policy whereby the men in the services can be discharged at the earliest practical moment. I am not interested in estimates for a year from now, but I am interested in getting as many men and women out of the services just as soon as it is humanly possible to do so. I want to see married men and men with dependents discharged and given an opportunity to make a decent livelihood in civilian life. I want to see men who have served two and more years given an opportunity to be discharged now. I want to see everything possible done to allow boys who had their schooling interrupted to go to war now to be able to go back to school. I want to see men with businesses allowed to return to them and once again take up their peacetime pursuits. I want to see American prisoners of war, who have been in Japanese and German prison camps and who are now waiting for points to pile up, given their release immediately. I want to see the Army and Navy release doctors so that these practitioners can return to the communities where they are needed now. I want to see the men and women who have performed their jobs overseas returned home at the earliest possible moment.

Now that General MacArthur has stated that all our citizen soldiers in the Pacific can be demobilized in 6 months and that Japan can be garrisoned for occupation purposes by 200,000 regular Army men, I feel that it is up to General Eisenhower and the War Department to tell us our actual needs for occupying Germany. There will be no reason, then, why we cannot formulate a definite policy now as to the number of men we will need, and thereby release all the rest at the earliest possible moment.

I see no need for an 8,000,000 Army and 3,000,000 Navy now that the war is over and certainly it will not take that many—or anywhere near that many—to occupy Japan and Germany. I think the Chinese and Filipinos should make up a proportionate share of the occupation forces in Japan. I do not think we need to retain our forces in China and Korea, and therefore I urge that they be withdrawn at the earliest moment, and these countries given an opportunity to look after their own internal affairs. I urge also that our soldiers and sailors be withdrawn, except for occupation purposes from all overseas places except those areas needed for our security and the maintenance of peace. This should be done at once. Furthermore I do not see the need for all these separation centers now being set up, as the soldiers can be discharged from the camps at which they are stationed and the sailors from the ships they are serving on. Every camp that is maintained just for appearances

or just to keep a division or a school activated should be liquidated and restoration of the Army to its proposed peacetime size should be accomplished at once. Surplus officers and enlisted personnel should be discharged immediately and the point systems as such should be lowered drastically. This is no time to quibble over this very serious situation. The time for action is now, and if the services do not see fit to rapidly speed up the discharge rate, then the Congress will have to enact legislation to that effect. The hardest thing today is to get action on the part of the armed forces to reduce their personnel at a more rapid and desirable rate.

At least 6,000,000 men should be released by the Army within the next 6 months and 2,500,000 men should be released by the Navy in the same period. With the war over these men are not needed now. They have performed their duty well during an extremely perilous period in our Nation's history and they should be allowed to return to their families, businesses, and responsibilities now. In my considered judgment their further retention in the services is absolutely unjustifiable. If something is not done to rectify the present discharge policies, many of these men will become problems. I know how these men feel, because in the last war I was in their boots, and the hundreds of letters which I am receiving now are ample proof that the situation is just as bad as it was in 1919 and 1920. This matter is so important that I have waited for this legislative day, when we are discussing the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, to bring it to your attention. The entire House membership is in attendance to consider this military legislation and I urge all of you to join with me in my efforts to accentuate the discharge rate of men from the armed forces. That is the most important factor now and I feel that Congress, which ordered the induction of these men, should now do everything in its power to get them released from the service.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the hope of speedier demobilization has produced H. R. 3951. The Army has stated that it must have replacements, and that it must send additional men overseas, or undue hardships will be worked on those men who have been in the service for long periods or who are now overseas. The Army has emphasized its inability under present conditions to obtain volunteers in numbers sufficiently large to permit a suspension of the draft. The services do not now appear sufficiently attractive to make Army careers inviting. This measure is the answer of the House Military Affairs Committee to the immediate problem of recruitment. It proposes to make Army service more attractive as a career, and it directs the Secretary of War to make every effort to obtain the needed replacements through recruitment of volunteers.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Does this bill extend the Selective Service Act for two additional years?

Mr. SIKES. It does not.

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman explain what relation this bill has to the Selective Service Act, so that there will not be any confusion in the minds of the Members?

Mr. SIKES. It has no relation to the Selective Service Act, except it provides inducements to serve in the Regular Army. It directs the Secretary of War to proceed with the voluntary recruitment program. It is an effort to obtain by voluntary recruitment the personnel who otherwise would have to be inducted through Selective Service.

Mr. BOREN. It does not in anywise extend the Selective Service?

Mr. SIKES. It does not.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am very happy that the gentleman from Oklahoma asked that very pertinent question because the chief and practically the only reason that the Committee on Military Affairs brought this bill out was in order that we might end the draft if it worked successfully, which we hope it will.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. This bill is entitled "to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States." I fail to find any provision for the stimulation of enlistments in the Navy.

Mr. SIKES. Obviously our committee being concerned most immediately with those functions dealing with the War Department, we would hesitate to presume on the sphere of the House Committee on Naval Affairs. I am confident that legislation will be presented by that committee within a reasonable time if additional legislation is required. As a matter of fact, however, officials from the Navy Department met with our committee, discussed their needs and indicated that the legislation we propose will meet their immediate needs.

Mr. FOLGER. I note, however, in the bill that it does make provision for certain pay and allowances applicable to the Navy as well as to the Army, and I was wondering why in section 3 there should be this proviso:

> That notwithstanding the limitations contained in any other provision of law, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to accept original enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army.

Mr. SIKES. For the same reason I pointed out a moment ago, the Committee on Military Affairs would hesitate to presume on the sphere of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, but that it appears that no additional language is required for immediate recruitment by the armed forces.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. A few minutes ago the gentleman from Alabama indicated in his remarks that there was nothing mandatory in this bill to force the War Department authorities to accept the discharges and reenlistments of men in the service now. Does not the gentleman think that we ought to have something in this bill to make it mandatory; that if a man now in the service wants to reenlist, that the authority will be forced to accept him?

Mr. SIKES. I feel that the War Department should have discretion as to who it shall accept for service in the military establishments.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana that what we want to make sure of in this bill is that when these men ask for discharge to reenlist, that we are sure they will get that opportunity.

Mr. SIKES. I do not think there is any question but what most of them will get that opportunity. I do feel that the War Department must have the discretion of accepting those men that it wishes to keep within the military establishment.

The measure now before us does not answer all the problems of demobilization, but it is a good bill and it is safe legislation. It permits a trial period in which a thorough-going recruitment program can be undertaken. And it permits the Administration needed time in which to steer a course through the troublesome waters of a peace that has not yet been secured.

There are many things to be desired which this legislation does not accomplish. Actually some of these do not require legislation. The War Department can put them into effect by regulation, if it chooses to do so. For instance, men in Army camps complain of idleness and of "made" tasks. Long furloughs at home would solve this one. Many a farm boy would be doubly welcome back home right now, when labor for the harvest is probably scarcer than at any time since the war began.

Many soldiers find it hard to obtain information from their commanding officers about demobilization. I receive letters almost daily from men who are eligible for discharge but whose commanding officers will not accept their application for discharge. These conditions are inexcusable. It does not matter how well the War Department maps its demobilization program if inefficient or indifferent officers allow it to bog down before it reaches the men who are to benefit.

The demobilization program is a good one. It is well planned and it is proceeding more rapidly than the public now realizes. The task is an enormous one and patience is required for the program to show its real capacity.

The point system obviously is working out well. We can either have a point system or some other orderly program of demobilization or we can have discharges by political influence, and that is the last thing we or the people of this country

want. The point system will do the job satisfactorily, although there are weaknesses which can and should be corrected.

I had the privilege of serving on the subcommittee on redeployment which studied that question very thoroughly in its application both here and in Europe. We were tremendously impressed as far back as May and June with the program that had been set up. We are pleased with the way it is now operating, and the speed with which demobilization is progressing bears out that confidence. I believe it has been shown here this afternoon that demobilization in the Army has been speeded up by about 400 percent in the past month, that it is now proceeding at a rate which was not anticipated for several months, and that goals for numbers of men to be separated from the service by July 1 next will easily be met and surpassed.

I do not believe sufficient thought has been given to the plight of the man with long service who does not have the benefit of points for battle stars or overseas service. After all, men in uniform go where they are ordered. There is little choice of station. A man with 4 years of service in this country has given a pretty sizable part of his life to the armed forces, yet he may have but few points. When the point system was being evolved, I asked that extra weight be given to the second, third, and fourth years. I still feel that this should have been done. Some time ago, I requested the War Department to study a plan for the release of all men with 4 years or more of service, at their own request. Never in history have Americans been kept in the armed forces for periods longer than 4 years. The fact that the Revolution lasted more than 4 years does not disprove this statement. I do not feel that it should now be necessary for men to give more than 4 years of their lives to service in the armed forces. Eight hundred thousand men have now been in the Army more than 4 years, and 1,200,000 have given between 3 and 4 years of service.

I would like to see factors such as this clarified, either by legislation or by War Department regulation. I would like to see a proviso for a 1-year enlistment for men who already are trained. I am convinced that it would not be unduly costly to the Army, and that it would be attractive to the soldiers.

There is the matter of promotion. The Army has not in the past put its best foot forward in opportunities for advancement of enlisted men. In the Navy advancement to seaman first class within a year is almost automatic. This compares to the rank of corporal in the Army in pay and privileges. Continued advancement in the Navy depends almost solely upon the initiative and ability of the individual; in the Army a man must wait for vacancies to occur.

The noncoms are the backbone of the Army. When it starts expanding for a wartime basis, the noncoms provide the trained personnel essential to rapid expansions and efficient operation. It appears to me that it is advantageous to have a great many people familiar with the duty and responsibilities of noncoms in the peacetime Army. The factors of morale and esprit de corps are equally important.

Opportunity for advancement, and opportunity for normal, healthy social contacts are extremely important to a smart, alert, peacetime Army. They have not been provided in our peacetime Army in the past. Something closely akin to a caste system has created a social gulf between enlisted personnel and others which made it difficult for an enlisted man to reconcile his self-respect with his duties in the service. It has been difficult for enlisted men to establish a home. Many of them found their duties monotonous paths to a dead-end existence.

However, opportunities for advancement, improved living conditions, and better social standing are not matters which can readily be legislated into existence. They can be insured by an alert and progressive War Department.

We, at the moment, are concerned with volunteer recruitment, which if vigorously pushed should make it possible to end the draft within a few months. I believe H. R. 3951 is the answer. It will make possible the return of men now in the occupation forces who otherwise could not return. It will expedite demobilization, which is of most immediate concern to all of us.

The features of this measure already have been ably presented. It will give advantages and offer attractions to service in the regular Army which it has never before possessed. The passage of the bill is hardly in doubt. Sentiment obviously is strongly in its favor. It is a long step in the right direction. Its reception by the public will be spontaneously favorable if the War Department lends its ability and enthusiasm to carrying out the provisions of the bill and to supplementing those provisions with morale boosters of the type I have referred to in this statement.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is as important to achieve the aims we fought for as it was to defeat the enemy we have fought against. We have spent the lives of our boys and spent the wealth of our people that we might have freedom and peace restored in many lands throughout the world. It is unthinkable that we leave these countries before the elementary conditions of order are restored. This requires that we must maintain and supply the necessary force to assure the world that we intend to fulfill our obligations.

It is highly desirable that all the boys be returned to the States as soon as possible, but I am sure if anyone has visited the battlefields in Europe and other parts of the world, it will be necessary for him to reach the conclusion that it is going to take time to restore order in those countries.

This bill before us is designed to help recruit and maintain the Regular Army. This bill carries the obligation of the War Department to report to us every 3 months. Certainly we can watch the operations, and if this does not secure the required number of men, we can try something else. Whether we should have 500,000 men or 1,000,000 men for the standing Army is still a debatable question and one we can arrive at with more wisdom in 6 or 8 months from now.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, there has been much said today about the draft, demobilization, and other problems, many of which are not dealt with in this bill. There has been a good bit of discussion about the higher-ups of the Army and the Navy. They are fine men and have done a grand job and no one would want to tarnish a single star on their shoulders. But they should not mind being kicked around a little bit, for heaven knows they have done right much kicking other folks around, including Congressmen, for the last few years. Many of them would kick a private around for even writing to a Member of Congress. We did not cry and they should not. I am interested in the job this bill seeks to do. I am interested in seeing that job done quick. I am a little fearful it will not accomplish its whole purpose. If this bill does what it should do, it will do three things: one, it will build up our Regular Army; two, it will get our boys and girls home more quickly; and, three, it will stop the draft. Those are the three things we seek to accomplish by this bill. One reason I think it will not do a complete job is that we are now having to go into the open market in peacetime to get men to do a very necessary and indispensable job. It was not a question of paying the soldiers what their services were worth during the war. You cannot estimate the value of that service in dollars and cents. It is impossible to do it. They were fighting to protect their country. Their patriotism was involved and all those things. Now, however, we are having to go into the open market for men to do a job just as we hire men to do a job at a desk in the Department of Commerce. To save my life, I cannot see how we can expect to build up our standing Army to the point where we want it and now need it on the $50 pay rate which now exists and yet we must have men to complete the victory. Personally, I would certainly like to see it at least $75 per month for domestic service and $100 per month for foreign service. There will be good economy in such a rate of pay. Remember, our Army is no longer just a foot army. It is a mechanized Army. We must have a tremendous number of mechanics and men skilled and trained. There must be some inducement to keep them in the Army. They should be paid enough so that these men can lead a normal life; and if they have families, to live with a fair degree of comfort. I want an adequate standing Army, Navy, and Marine Corps composed of volunteers. The quicker we get it the quicker every man and woman now in service who wants to get out can get out.

These men will not be doing just a loafing job from here on out. The job confronting the Army and Navy now is a necessary, important, and vital job that must be done.

When visiting the various bases we find men working on one side at a lathe in uniform. Some of the finest and most skilled men will be found there. They are working on their regular $50-a-month pay. Across the table is another man in civilian clothes making $100 a week. I do not see how you can get the idea that you will get the men we need unless the base pay is changed. Someone may say that is just demagoging. I think it is common sense. I think we will get what we pay for. That is exactly the way I feel about it. This job is not going to be any party for the next 2 or 3 years. I do not believe you will be able to get men to enlist for foreign service at $50 per month. I do not think it will be accomplished. There is too much at stake. Of course, I think the Army now should begin to do a few things that will make the men feel like remaining in the service. All of these camps are loaded down with men who are just loafing around, many of them just wearing out their pants. Why could they do not give those boys 10 days', or 20 days', or 30 days' furlough? They do not have anything for them to do. They say they cannot discharge them. Then let them go home for 2 or 3 months, and many of them will get lonesome for the service and will want to reenlist. But, when a boy asks for a furlough, the stock answer is "No." Of course, the boy cannot ask why. He has been in there long enough to know better than that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is concerned, as I am, for an occupational force that will be glad to serve.

Mr. BARDEN. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does not the gentleman believe that if the occupational forces are granted one and one-half credit or double credit toward retirement they might be much more willing to serve than even for the matter of increased pay?

Mr. BARDEN. That is one inducement, but I am very serious about this. We cannot expect these men to go into foreign service and come back with nothing. A man might say, "With a hundred dollars a month and with some additional credits like that, I can go over and save some money, come back and have a little to start on." I do not think the bill carries enough inducement to do the job that must be done. I want to see every man or woman who wants out to get out, I want to see the draft stopped at the earliest possible date. To accomplish these objectives we must have a volunteer standing Army to take their places. The inducements should be attractive enough to guarantee getting them at once. The boys now in uniform have served long and well. We should not further delay their release by adopting a policy of pinching pennies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the passage of H. R. 3951, which is before us for consideration. The title of the bill shows its main objective, namely, to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the regular military and naval establishments of the United States. This bill, coming out of the Committee on Military Affairs, naturally is devoted to the military service and not to naval establishments. While it is true there are modifications which many of us would like to make in this bill, on the whole it will at least give legislation to make the military service more attractive so that we will have the opportunity to build up our peacetime forces by volunteer enlistments, which is a desirable thing to accomplish. It will not, of couse, take the place of the needed regulations and possible legislation to secure the demobilization of our armed forces who are not needed in the service.

All of us are receiving many letters and protests from relatives of men in the service who are bitterly complaining because they are not being discharged and allowed to return to their homes. Personally, I want to see every man in the service who is not needed discharged without any unnecessary delay. There would seem to be no excuse for keeping the men in the service 2 and 3 months, as has been done, after they have been selected for discharge. There are at the present time many thousands of servicemen here in the United States who are merely marking time, are doing menial jobs around the camps and posts, who have been in the Army for long periods of time, some of them several years. The regulations should be made effective so that this group could be discharged without weeks, and at some times months of delay and hedged about by red tape. Men with families, men who have been in prison camps, men who have been injured in combat or through service have been confined in hospitals for long periods of time, and men who have been in the service at least 2 years, and men who have served in the European front, all should be discharged from further service.

Reports coming today from General MacArthur are most heartening. The statement that only 200,000 men will be needed by him in the Japanese theater means that the statement of the War Department that 2,500,000 men will be needed is entirely too high. There should be a program of demobilization adopted at once so that men in the service in the categories to which I have referred would be demobilized at once and returned to their homes and families. Furthermore, provisions should be made so that young boys in the teen age now subject to the draft should not be deprived of the opportunity to complete their schooling.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the War Department and the Navy Department will without further delay enact the necessary regulations within the powers they already have to demobilize their forces without inflicting additional hardship upon the men and women who have already suffered enough in the defense of their country. Let us act, and act now.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMBAUGH].

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion legislation that will aid the volunteer recruiting program of the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States is most timely and for that reason I am supporting H. R. 3951. There is widespread dissatisfaction voiced over the delay in returning service men and women to civilian life. Each of us knows that the volume of mail we are receiving on the subject is proof that the American people are indignant and demand immediate action by Congress.

There are countless instances of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers with months and years of service at home and abroad who are being detained in the armed forces when they should be returned to their wives and children. In many instances men who were classified for limited service have served many months in uniform and they too have families dependent upon them for fatherly counsel yet under the present point system governing discharges they are unable to qualify. Hundreds of thousands of young men entered our armed forces as teen-age youths and were obliged to interrupt their plans for further education. Many, you will recall, received their high-school diplomas in absentia because they were scheduled to be on far-flung battle fronts by the time their high school held its commencement program.

I am heartily in favor of employing the traditional American spirit of justice and fair play for certainly the boys who have borne the brunt of battle are entitled to be returned to civilian life at the earliest possible moment. However, I am of the opinion that if we make an earnest effort to make volunteer enlistments attractive we can abolish the present draft system in its entirety. The continuance of the draft is estimated to yield in a 12-month period approximately one-half million men and the Army and Navy is reported to have estimated their combined needs as totaling 3,000,000 in peacetime. Personally, I am inclined to share the opinion of an overwhelming majority of the American people that such a large sized peacetime army is not necessary. While volunteer recruiting programs are now in effect, without any special inducements to offer interested young men the enrollment is not expected to yield over 300,000 volunteers. It is evident that according to those figures nearly two and one-half million men will be needed in addition to the number of new inductees yielded by the draft for the next 12 months.

It is conceded that the Navy is fast approaching the completion of its mammoth wartime mission to clear sea lanes and land troops and critical matériel in enemy territory; and that the brunt of our postwar military demands must be met by the Army.

I feel that if volunteer recruiting is stimulated by increasing the pay and offering other opportunities for enlisted personnel that such action will make a

military or naval career attractive enough to warrant the peacetime enlistment of the highest type of young Americans. The legislation now being considered is a step in that direction and I am heartily in favor of improving its provisions.

In my opinion we should lend every effort in having H. R. 3951 enacted as a means of securing a postwar Army and Navy through volunteers and thus releasing hundreds of thousands of young men who have served their country and are deserving of being returned to their homes so that they may take up the broken threads of life caused by the necessity for their services during the most critical period in the history of this Nation.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I will give this measure my full support, because I believe the purpose of this measure is intended to do three things: The first is to obtain enough soldiers from the Regular Army Establishment, and those who desire to make the Army a career, to properly handle the occupational duty which our Nation is called upon to do; the second is to provide an army sufficient for the regular service, after the occupational duty devolving upon us has ceased to exist; and the third is to stop the drafting of the men and boys from our country. It is my hope that this measure will accomplish the things it is intended to do. For the reason that I want to try to aid in the demobilization of our Army, and to reduce the size of the Navy, at the very earliest possible moment, I intend to support this measure. It is the wish and the will of the people, all over our land, that the men and boys who are now in the service, and who have home ties that must be recognized, should be released and discharged as quickly as possible. The married men, the doctors and professional men, the young men who have not yet completed their high-school work and those who have completed their high-school work and desire to proceed with their college education, the farm boys and the boys who have engaged in business before being inducted into the service, and those in positions of trust and honor and those skilled in trades, all must be discharged at the earliest possible date. We have our own economic conditions to meet, and in this we must not fail.

Mr. Chairman, we have some very great hardship cases now pending regarding these boys. I call to mind a very grave situation, which exists with at least one commissioned officer in our Army, in which a boy who has been through the African and European theaters of war, and he has a total of 138 points, under the point system inaugurated by the War Department. This boy has applied for his discharge upon that ground. However, he is not released, because his immediate commanding officer claims that this boy is essential to his outfit. This is a most flagrant case, and this is a glaring example, of the attitude that some of the officers are now taking regarding the discharges of these boys. However, it is my hope that this measure will be helpful in this matter, and that our men and boys will be released and discharged as rapidly as possible, and it is further my hope that by reason of voluntary enlistments, and by the consent method, enough men and boys will be secured to take care of all occupational work in both Europe and Japan, and the drafting of more of our men and boys for the service will be found to be entirely unnecessary. I know that is the wish and the will of the people, generally, in my home State of Indiana—and I am confident that is the wish and will of the people generally throughout the Nation.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I will support this measure with the feeling that it may not accomplish all that it is intended to do, but that it will, in a measure, reach that objective in part—and it is my hope that the War and Navy Departments will revise their point system, or, better still, place the right of discharge upon the length of service, and that a base of 2 years or less will be established, and that reduced as rapidly as possible, so the men and boys who have waged such a gallant fight during this war may be coming home at the very earliest moment. They have jobs, they have families, and they have their future before them. We must not retard them in their opportunity to go forward as American citizens in the future.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable defense of the mahogany fox holes of Washington this afternoon, which perhaps is not entirely necessary. I think we all agree that many of the so-called brass hats have done a magnificent job. I certainly know some who have. I also know some who I think did not have quite the brains or quite the heart that they should have had for the job. But, nevertheless, that does not indict all of them.

I think one of the things that irritates the Congress is just as the gentleman from North Carolina has said, that they rode pretty hard for a while and the people sort of expect Congress to take over now and develop the policies from here on in. I hope that will be the prerogative, the duty, and the responsibility of Congress in the next month or so when we review some of these matters.

As far as I am concerned on this bill, I think there are one or two things as inducements that certainly all of us want to see adopted for the encouragement of a volunteer army. Certainly there are many problems which it is rather difficult to determine involved in the question of what we should have and what we should do at this time. It has been a tough job for either the War Department or the Congress to attempt to develop the policy as to what the size of the standing army should be because of the unpredictable things that may happen. I believe it will continue to be difficult until the situation in Japan has leveled off. Certainly, however, I do not believe in permitting this universal conscription act to go on indefinitely or to get universal conscription in by the back door; nor am I deluded that this bill meets that issue. I believe it is up to us to determine very soon what shall be done, what the size of our Army shall be, and what the age of the men in the Army shall be. Personally I have disagreed all along with the proposition that it was necessary to draft these 18- and 19-year-old boys. I am still glad I voted against that bill when it came in here. But I do want to say that the critical point system has been a lot of bunkum. I believe there should be a simple rule that every boy who is in the Army 2 years should be relieved of service and discharged if he desired it, and that within a very short time.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It has developed into politics and special privilege. Lobbyists, Congressmen, people with political influence are writing letters to commanding officers to get special privilege, to get people out. It is just getting to be a political racket; that is what it has become.

Mr. O'HARA. That is exactly what I am fearful of. I have a boy in my district who had 104 points but who could not get out of the Army. I have another boy with over 90 points—I am speaking of boys in service from my district. It is certainly ridiculous to set up these rules if they are not followed. Just because some officer is too lazy to train some boy in his outfit to fill the job to take the place of another who is doing a good job and perhaps doing the officer's job, is no reason why the sergeant entitled to discharge should be kept. We should have a simple rule which states that all of these boys who have been in 2 years shall be released. It would eliminate a lot of this "bunkum."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that one of the boys from my district, now in Germany, has 138 points. He has applied for release and discharge by reason of that fact, but his commanding officer states that this boy is essential to his outfit and he will not approve his application for discharge.

Mr. O'HARA. That, of course, is an injustice to the boy.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, I believe, made a statement that he ought either to modify or explain, and that is that this point system was a political line-up. Has the gentleman any proof of that?

Mr. O'HARA. I did not say that.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I made that statement and I stand by it.

Mr. O'HARA. I suggest that the gentleman from Kentucky take that up with the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mr. MAY. I will be glad to yield her some time.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Surely there is nobody here who is ignorant of the situation.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield me a little time?

Mr. MAY. I will if I have it.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it plain that I believe it is perfectly horrible that we conscript and send the best brains and blood of our country over to become labor battalions in Europe or any other place. I want to see it stopped. I want it made very plain as far as my position is concerned that when we draft boys to fight they are there to fight. They are not there to do labor battalion work for somebody who may have certain ideas about building up other countries that I think are able to furnish the labor themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to a few other things. We have thousands, literally hundreds of thousands, of these boys who are lying around doing nothing. I have before me a letter from a boy living in my district, now at Fort Benning, Ga., who writes as follows:

FORT BENNING, GA., *September 5, 1945.*

DEAR MR. O'HARA: You will understand that I'd like very much to be going home sometime in the near future. Yet, I'm being kept here at Fort Benning, along with thousands of others, doing needless tasks or nothing at all. We all are tired of picking up paper, mowing grass, and digging holes—then alternately filling them up again.

For an enrolled student body of 4,000 here they have a teaching staff of 24,000. This would certainly seem as if there was a surplus. No one is accomplishing a thing. Perhaps Mr. Dewey was emphatically right when he said the Democrats wanted the men in the Army and Navy as long as possible. I know it would create a little prosperity. The former defense workers would be able to obtain the available jobs, and the service people get enough money to have some purchasing power; but this does not sound very agreeable to men who have families, are around 30 years of age, and want nothing else than to resume their civilian jobs.

If it is impossible for immediate discharges, why couldn't 60- or 90-day furloughs be granted, so as to stagger the discharge schedule?

The service people were glad to serve our country when we felt we were needed, but now that idleness is apparent all around us, we feel the need is no longer there. This condition undoubtedly exists in every camp in the country, and I would think at least the unassigned unattached group of soldiers in the United States could be let out of the Army among the first.

I feel that you will be able to do something constructive in getting the program of demobilization started.

Mr. Chairman, as part of my remarks, I include the following letters which I have received:

SEPTEMBER 5, 1945.

The Honorable JOE O'HARA,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: As one of your constituents I sincerely urge you to support the following legislation and policy which seems certain to come up in Congress in the near future.

1. Legislation granting inducements for the purpose of encouraging men to remain in the Army.

2. Until such a force can be mustered, require the Army to use those men for occupation duty who have less than 2 years service and no combat duty; taking the youngest single men first.

It is the opinion of a great number of soldiers with whom I have talked that there are more than enough men in the above category to fill temporary occupation requirements if the Army is made to use them. Our experience has shown that the Army always takes the easiest way and will in this instance unless forced to do otherwise. This means they will take for occupation the most readily available men with less than 45 discharge points; giving no consideration to previous combat service, age, length of service, or marital status.

(Letter from Fort Sill, Okla.)

AUGUST 25, 1945.

The Honorable J. P. O'HARA,
Glencoe, Minn.

DEAR SIR: Time and again it has been emphasized by spokesmen of industry that the influx of engineers needed for the replacement of elders and the additional ones needed for reconversion and possible expansion of industry are far below the amount obtainable.

The shortage, of course, is due to the nondiscrimination policy of selective service. Army authorities placed all young men into fields where they were most needed and where military necessity dictated. As a consequence, it has happened quite often that men trained in technology and the sciences found themselves assigned to activities which were far below those which their training and background enabled them to do. For the duration of the war, most everyone was satisfied to contribute to the war effort in some way which was considered essential. With the termination of the war, however, the activities which those men were engaged in have lost their characteristics of being essential. Most men, moreover, are continuing to serve in a capacity which is far below the one in which they could serve if their capabilities are utilized to their fullest.

The means to fulfill this aim, in my estimation, would be to return undergraduates and graduates to school and industry. Discharge is not absolutely necessary to effect this change. Men could be sent back to school in uniform to finish their education. Under the GI bill of rights, tuition and maintenance are paid by the Government. If men were kept in uniform, Army pay could be used for maintenance. Thus, this change does not entail any additional expense by the Government.

Most of us men realize that this program would contain personal benefits, but sincerely and honestly believe that by proper utilization of our training and background we would make a better contribution to the country's welfare.

Respectfully.

(Received from Camp Gruber, Okla.)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3951 has been thoroughly and completely analyzed by my colleagues on the Military Affairs Committee and I shall not attempt to review its provisions which are designed to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States. I favor its passage for I sincerely hope and pray that it will not be necessary to continue the drafting of our boys into the armed forces.

It has been brought out in arguments that a differentiation in the amount of pay for foreign and sea duty and duty in the continental United States might act as an inducement for volunteer enlistments. And I think the liberal provisions of an amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Texas, Congressman KILDAY, permitting enlistment for 1 year of those now in service, would also greatly stimulate volunteer enlistments. One-year enlistments could not be offered new recruits, since experience has taught us that it takes 6 months to train a raw recruit and before their services could be fully utilized in the zones of occupation the expiration of their enlistment would come. But with men who have already had boot training, 1-year enlistments would be practicable. Oklahoma's Forty-fifth Division was mustered into service 5 years and 1 day ago today. They landed on home soil on September 13, just 4 days ago. With 5 years' service and possibly one of the longest combat records of any division in the entire Army, they are very eager to return to civilian life, yet there will be exceptions in many instances where many of those in that division will choose to reenlist under the provisions of H. R. 3951.

But if we cannot raise an adequate army by the volunteer method, I think we are agreed, and the country at large is agreed, that it will be necessary to resort to methods of conscription. We are all conscious that we must play the leading role in policing the countries we have conquered, that we must not throw away a victory and begin laying the ground work for World War III. We are told upon the best authority we have that an army of occupation in the European and Pacific theaters is very necessary, and we are advised likewise that it will be necessary to maintain an army of more than a million in the interior of the United States. To do this, the limitation which prohibits a peacetime army of more than 280,000 must be repealed.

Since the reconvening of Congress on September 5, considerable criticism has been directed against our military leaders about the point system and the expense of operation. Yes, mistakes have been made, possibly as many mistakes as this Congress has made. Yet we must realize that these mistakes were not made in the normal courses of civil affairs, which are controlled by business policies, but were made in an effort to win victory. These great generals and admirals who have been in charge of our affairs of war have not watched the clock. They have untiringly put forth the best within them. Some of our great leaders before going to battle were criticized on the floor of this House but they distinguished themselves in the field of battle and when any one of them is returned to their homeland, the reception given is the best evidence of the appreciation of this great democracy.

Demobilization appears to be moving slowly but the figures of the War Department disclose, as set forth by the gentleman from Texas, Representative THOMASON, the ranking member of the Military Affairs Committee, that men and women are being discharged in much greater numbers than we realize. We long for the day when as many as possible have been returned to civil life. We stand ready to cast our vote and do our mite in reestablishing them in the jobs and places they left behind. This,

in our opinion, will entail doing something about the strikes being called by the labor unions over the country which are not only taking advantage of those in the armed forces but of every citizen in the United States by slowing down production of many useful and needed articles.

Your judgment is as good as mine as to whether this bill will raise an adequate Army by volunteer enlistments but I think we should give it a trial.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

OCCUPATION RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, military victory in Europe and in the Pacific is just a few weeks old, but the responsibility for the occupation of these conquered nations still remains with the American people.

Just what does that responsibility entail? Taking first things first, it seems to me that the first thing to do is to see that there is complete disarmament of our foe in the Pacific. As everyone who has studied the question knows, there are still between one and two million Japanese under arms in isolated islands of the Pacific. These soldiers must be completely disarmed so that guerilla warfare cannot break out soon when hunger encompasses those islands.

The second thing is to maintain civil order in the home islands as well as the outlying islands.

The third thing, and this applies both to Europe and the Pacific, is to encourage democratic groups in those countries to strengthen democratic groups that democracy may have enough growth in those countries so that fascism will be squeezed out permanently and the war will not have to be fought all over again.

How many troops will it take to do this job? We go to our authorities, General Eisenhower and General MacArthur who are in charge of the respective territories, and neither of those gentlemen can tell us exactly how many troops will be needed as yet. It is impossible to forecast the number of troops that will be necessary at this time. It depends on whether civil order is easy to maintain or is hard to maintain. It also depends on the development of democratic groups and the time that it takes to develop democratic groups in those countries. Only when that is done can we say that our job is started and we can begin to cut down on those necessary troops.

How are we going to get these troops? Outside of those who are now in the Army we must depend on the draft to bring in an additional number of men from 18 to 25. The reason it is necessary to continue with the 18-year-olds is that above that age the bottom of the barrel has been pretty well scraped. We have been told by the military authorities and by those in charge of the Selective Service that they must depend on the 18-year-olds in order to get the 50,000 a month.

The second thing is encouragement of volunteers, and that is what we hope to do under this bill. We have been promised by Selective Service and by the military leaders that to the extent that volunteers come in, to that extent will the draft be cut, so if this is successful in bringing in 50,000 per month on the volunteer basis, we may expect that the draft will be completely eliminated. I do not expect that many, frankly. There will have to be a continuation of the draft, I am sure, because I do not believe that there will be enough volunteers come in. But time alone will tell how many will come in.

I am for this bill, H. R. 3591, with certain amendments which will be offered by members of the committee, one amendment in particular, to allow those who have a record of service, to volunteer for one additional year. I intend to support that amendment.

Now let us get to the demobilization of the present army which we admit is oversized at this time. The Army had to turn its system completely around, its system of purpose and its system of procedure, in order to start in the opposite direction in which they were headed. A great deal of the criticism that we have seen in the newspapers and from individuals is founded on rumor to begin with and on a lack of knowledge of the physical task involved in processing the papers of these men and in the actual transportation. We know just how many ships are available and how many are equipped for transporting troops. General Bedell Smith, Chief of Staff under General Eisenhower, this morning said that transportation of returning soldiers from Europe was proceeding at a rate 12 times as fast as they were carried to Europe in the first place, and that all but 370,000 troops will be back in the United States by June of 1946.

One thing that has been touched on here is the proper processing of these discharge papers. All of you Members know how many veterans of World War I were discharged without proper papers. They are trying to overcome that this time, and they have set up a wonderful system, I think.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. In regard to that may I say that when I was back home I had at least 50 discharged, disabled veterans of this war approach me. They had no idea what their percentage of disability was and they were completely at sea, just as badly as were the veterans after World War I.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am surprised to hear that.

Mr. HOOK. If the Army is not going to do a better job than they have done in the past for taking care of some of these disabled veterans, I feel sorry for them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, but I do not believe that that will be the general order of the discharges in this war. We have inspected their demobilization centers, and we can certify that their discharge papers are brought up to date before they are discharged, in most instances.

Let us now refer to the type of ships. We have discharge ships that will take up to 3,600, outside of a few big ships. We have the C-type of ship that carries 1,750. The Victory ships will carry around 1,500 in the Atlantic, and we have Liberty ships that will carry from 200 to 550 people on the return trip from Europe and the Pacific. These ships take from 60 to 120 days to make the round trip. So you can see it is a mathematical equation. We divide the number of ships and carrying capacity into the number of people to bring back, and it just simply takes a certain number of months and days.

From information that has been given to this committee I believe that the demobilization crews of the armed forces are proceeding as fast as possible. They are setting up additional separation centers and auxiliary processing centers all over the Nation. They are doing everything they can to bring this demobilization up to where they expect the maximum will reach 700,000 in January 1946. They will continue at this rate of speed which is the maximum of ship and plane capacity until June 1946, and at that time—and I want to impress this fact—we will still have approximately two million to two and a half million members in the armed forces due not to the lack of lowering of points or lowering of ages, but due absolutely to the lack of time and the lack of transportation necessary to facilitate the demobilization of these troops.

I think this is a time not to yield to hysteria and not to yield to what is considered the popular thing to do, not to jump on the bandwagon and start panning the "brass hats." I think it is a time for us to inform our constituents in our respective districts and to prove to them that the job to be done is a tremendous one, a job which the ordinary person cannot conceive of in its complications and in the burden with which these men are charged. It is not a time to yield to demagoguery or to ill-advised sentiment.

I know that the members of the House Committee on Military Affairs are very watchful. We are watching the Army and this demobilization program. We intend to check with them constantly, every month. If you will send every fair complaint you know of in failure of demobilization procedure to our committee, I assure you that some members of our committee and our chairman will take the responsibility to check, and where demobilization can be stepped up it will be stepped up. Where demobilization is lagging, we will do our best to see that the lag is removed.

The Military Affairs Committee of the House realizes that demobilization of armed personnel is the first order of business before the families of service men and women. We have our share and more of letters on this subject from the home folks. We intend to see that the maximum number of our men and women are demobilized in the shortest space of time possible.

BRING THE BOYS HOME—STOP DRAFTING 18-YEAR-OLDS

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I shall not indulge in any derogatory statements against those who have conducted our military and naval operations in World War II. I have nothing but the highest words of praise

for General Marshall, General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, General Arnold, Generals Patton, Hodges, Clark, and Bradley, for Admiral King, Admiral Nimitz, and Admiral Halsey, and the other great commanders of our military and naval forces. I know of no war having been more ably conducted in the history of the world than World War II. I know of no major mistakes having been made in strategy by these commanders. They and the men under them planned and executed with great efficiency and heroism the strategy that ended in one of the greatest and most complete victories in the greatest war of all time.

Therefore, I have nothing but the highest praise for our commanders and their courageous men on land, sea, and in the air.

The war is now over. At its close we have approximately 12,000,000 men and women in our armed services. General MacArthur has stated that he will need about 200,000 to police Japan, and General Eisenhower states that he will need about 400,000 to police Germany. It is quite clear that there are at least 11,000,000 in our armed forces who will not be needed and who can be returned to their homes and discharged.

We should not require the boys who have fought and won this war and who have been away from their homes and families from 1 to 5 years, and who with their families have sacrificed so much, to police Japan or Germany. They should be brought home and discharged.

We are not unmindful of the fact that we must have some trained men in Japan and Germany and in the continental United States until plans can be perfected for their discharges.

There should be no delay, however, in demobilizing these millions in our armed forces. If we at once make every possible effort and use all the available shipping space, we shall still have more than enough men to take care of Germany and Japan. Notwithstanding the millions of surplus men we have in our armed forces, President Truman and his administration have insisted that we continue to draft about 50,000 men and boys every month. A great majority of these draftees are boys 18 years of age. I am opposed to drafting these young boys to do police duty in either Germany or Japan. They are not the type of persons that should be used for this important service in those critical areas by reason of their youthfulness and inexperience. Soldiers and sailors for that important service should be of more mature years and experience than these boys. I am very much opposed to drafting of these 18-year-olds.

VOLUNTEERS WILL SOLVE THE PROBLEM

The bill before us proposes to secure whatever additional men we may need for the policing of Germany and Japan and other military and naval requirements at this time through volunteers. Undoubtedly we have many trained young men in our armed forces who desire to make the Army and Navy a career and who desire to go to Europe or to the Pacific for the training and experience that this will give them. Therefore this bill offers special inducements to any of the twelve million now in the armed services. I have talked with quite a number of these young men and have had letters from others indicating their desire to continue in the service. In the first place, this bill permits them to be discharged, now with mustering-out-pay and with a long furlough and other benefits when they reenlist for another year of service. It also grants to them and to the dependents of these volunteers family dependency allotments and such other benefits as their dependents have been and still are receiving; and if they should continue to be in the service for as much as 20 years and not more than 29 years, they may retire with benefits according to the number of years of their service.

Should they make the Navy or Army a career this retirement proposal is very attractive indeed. They would be able to retire while still comparatively young men and with a retirement pay that would adequately provide for their families and themselves throughout the balance of their lives. Of course, those not now in the service could likewise volunteer. This bill permits all those who desire to volunteer to do so if they are 17 or over. Of course, if they volunteer during their minority they have to have the consent of their parents.

I believe, as many others do, that this proposal will secure for us all the men necessary to police Japan and Germany and carry on the activities of our naval and military requirements, and this would make unnecessary any continuation of the draft.

I strongly favor this bill. Many of us would like to have an opportunity to consider the selective-service law. It should be amended or suspended, and in due course repealed. Certainly these young boys should not be drafted and sent to these foreign lands to help in the uncertain and critical situations in Japan or Germany. The policing of these countries requires men of more maturity and experience. These young boys ought to be in school. They were taken in the first place because it was urged that it was absolutely necessary to win the war. The war has now been won, and the reason for the boys being taken no longer exists. The fact that we have taken millions of our young boys out of school will be reflected in the years to come in the lack of educated and trained young men for the economic, professional, and social life of the Nation. We should now go about this to give these boys an opportunity to recover the lost ground, as far as it may be done, and rebuild their lives.

HAS THERE BEEN UNNECESSARY DELAY?

We cannot be too extravagant in our praise for those who have fought and won this great war, yet we know the reluctance of our Army and Navy men to cut down the personnel as well as the equipment for the Army and Navy and their auxiliary forces. We have our soldiers and sailors scattered over the face of the earth. These soldiers and sailors have nothing to do and their morale, according to all reports, are deteriorating very rapidly. We still have thousands and thousands of soldiers in France and in other so-called freed European countries. We helped them win their independence. Our boys should not be kept there to help carry on their affairs.

We have many thousands of American boys in the hot and humid climate of the Persian Gulf and in Iraq and Iran. These are both supposed to be free countries. I received a letter from one of my constituents, who is a member of the Persian Gulf command, in which he says:

> I have a wife and one child, and I would like very much to get back to see them. Our operations here ceased absolutely on the first day of May. It is very hot here. It is 120° in May and 160° in August. On yesterday one of our buddies died with the extreme heat. Others have died and still others will die if we are not permitted to leave this country. We have nothing whatsoever to do except to spend the Government's money with no services to perform. The newspaper and radio men report that the American soldiers are out of Iran, but I know that we are still here and likely to be here for another 6 or 8 months. It is reported that our colonel in charge expects to be made a brigadier general, but why should we stay here in order that he may receive that promotion? The billets of the officers are air-conditioned, but we private soldiers must take the heat.

Iran is the country with great oil deposits. Iran was on the side of the Allies. They agreed for Russia, Great Britain, and the United States to come into their country, but Russia, Great Britain, and the United States agreed to leave when the war was over. I think the United States is willing to withdraw its soldiers, but neither Great Britain nor Russia has made any effort to withdraw. Each one states that it will stay so long as the other nation remains. Apparently they are unwilling to keep their word with this little country. There must be too much oil. Are we keeping our boys in that hot and humid climate to watch our two big allies? And what if Britain and Russia refuse to get out of Iran?

We received a letter from a soldier in India, with wife and children in the United States. He stated that we had a great many American soldiers in that country. India, as you know, is a part of the British Empire. We have had had lots of information that during the war and since American soldiers are being kept there to help guard British soldiers and British interests against the people of India. How long are our boys to be kept in India since the war is over, and since they can be serving no purpose except to help protect the British Empire and deny to the Indian people the liberties they have been and are seeking?

We also have a letter from a soldier in China. We have tens of thousands of soldiers in China, Indochina, and in Burma. It it not enough that our boys and our country have contributed so much in bringing victory in those countries and liberty to the people? Should our boys be required to stay in those countries? They should be brought home and discharged. Since we have contributed so much of blood and treasure to bring liberty and freedom to the people of those countries, we certainly have sacrificed in vain unless they are willing to preserve the freedom and liberties that we have given to them.

We also have countless thousands of men in other parts of the Pacific and in other parts of the world. I refer to those who claimed to be our allies and whose liberties had been taken from them by the Germans and Japs. The Germans and the Japs have been disarmed and their countries destroyed so far as the power to make war is concerned. Must we now take over those countries and continue to spend billions of dollars and keep our boys away from their homes and families and opportunities to reshape and rebuild their lives? The American people will not be satisfied until all of these boys who desire are brought home and discharged.

I have and shall continue to vigorously protest against this policy of red tape and deliberate delay in bringing our boys home and the conscription of hundreds of thousands of other American boys to go to these liberated countries. If we continue to impose our will upon them, we shall find that we have made enemies out of a greater portion of the world. As we have become entangled in various parts of the world, we, of course, must see to it that neither Japan nor Germany is again able to engage in a war of aggression against us or other peace-loving nations.

I might say that I would not be honest if I did not say that since Germany and Japan have been disarmed, their economic and industrial life disrupted and destroyed, I do not believe that in the predictable future that either Germany or Japan will have the power to engage in another war of aggression. If there is aggression in the future, it will come from one or more of the four great powers with which we are now associated. My concern is over the disposition of Russia, France, and Great Britain in their policies to grab territory and control Europe, Asia, and Africa. Unless one or more of these great powers enter upon a program of aggression, I think the world will be free of aggressive wars for a long, long time to come. I hope it is not the policy of President Truman and his administration to keep our boys in these foreign lands to help keep Russia, Great Britain, and France in line for world peace.

I conclude my remarks as I began, that our boys must be brought home as rapidly as shipping facilities are available; and if we can rely upon the statements of General MacArthur and General Eisenhower while this process is going on, we will have ample men in Japan and Germany to take care of the situation, and it is my sincere hope that this volunteer measure will furnish all the men that are reasonably necessary for police duty in Japan and Germany. Send the boys home, except those who desire to reenlist under the liberal provision of the bill before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, as other Members have said here today, this bill is a step in the right direction. But in my opinion it does not go far enough to accomplish what I would like to see accomplished. I am in favor of the entire bill. I supported the Kilday amendment in the committee and expect to do so on the floor. If Members really want to do what we are talking so much about, to stop the drafting of 18- and 19-year-old boys, if we are endeavoring to get family men and those men with long service back home, as well as those not needed, then it is absolutely necessary to offer sufficient inducement to recruit a sufficient number of men for military purposes. This I believe is our duty. The Army now must be an employed army, a volunteer army. The holding of drafted men longer than is absolutely necessary for the Regular Army to take over cannot be justified. There has been a lot of praise and some condemnation of our Chief of Staff and other generals. I have the highest regard for General Marshall and the other military leaders who have led the Nation to victory. I appreciate the statement made by my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]. The only trouble that we are having in this country is that those in high places in the Army do not get the view of the average soldier, his family, and the people at home, that you and I receive.

Of necessity, they have to delegate authority to various commanding officers while you and I know what is going on today. There are many men in America who have 65 and 70 points. The point system does not permit the release of those men. They have nothing on earth for them to do and they are just holding them in camps until the point system can be dropped in order to release them. If they would start releasing the men and women in this country who are doing nothing and never will be called on for further work for the benefit of the services, then return men from overseas as rapidly as possible; give attention to discharging those who are suffering undue hardship, many of them having families, wives, and children, and many with businesses which need their attention back home, and those called out of school, they would really keep faith with the statement that has been given to us by high officials of the War Department. But you and I know what they said about the rotation system. A prompt rotation policy was promised. Yet in reality, few men were ever rotated. If the membership of this House and the American people really knew that the War Department would carry out the demobilization plan with the utmost speed possible, they would not be so disturbed today. So far as I am concerned, let us give to the men in service the chance to reenlist if they have had as much as 6 or 12 months' service. While I don't agree with them, it is argued that an 18-year-old should be drafted for a period of 2 years. If this is done they have to give them 1 year's training and this leaves only 1 year's service. You could certainly get as much service from a trained man for one additional year as you could if the 18-year-olds were continued to be drafted. I was not a Member of the Congress when the draft age was reduced to 18 years. Certainly now, further calls of 18- and 19-year-old boys is unnecessary. Where is the man who argues that an 18-year-old boy is qualified for police service here, much less in an enemy country such as Japan or Germany?

One other thing: This bill will save money, because the man who is already in the service has already met the requirements, and of new men many would be discharged after the expense of training—for disability and for other reasons—and before they would be able to render any service.

Many servicemen would gladly reenlist because they would be glad to know their service would be over in that length of time. I believe, with this amendment adopted, by this bill we will be able to get enough men to eliminate the Selective Service and return all the men and women in the armed forces who certainly are entitled to be released at once.

I shall support that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH.]

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the enactment of this bill. For some time I have been advocating that we should encourage those boys who wish to follow military careers, and that we could get all of the men we require through voluntary methods. I believe we should make a military career more attractive, both from the standpoint of remuneration and promotion. I think we will be surprised at the number of young men who, after being discharged and spending a little time at home, will be interested in enlisting. I refer particularly to men without families and who do not care to resume their education.

I agree with the other speakers today who have reported widespread dissatisfaction with the discharge and demobilization programs now in effect. I presume every Member of Congress has been deluged with letters on this subject. I cannot believe that the Army and Navy is deliberately holding these boys in the service, although it is difficult to understand some of the delays that are called to our attention. For instance, I received a letter just last week from a young man I have known for many years. Amony other things, he says:

> The Army is rather slow in discharging its men—even the eligible ones. I talked to a gunner the other day, who had 140 points, and yet he is being held. Although I have been in 3 years I haven't nearly enough points to get out. But, I would like to get out so I can complete my engineering. I wish Congress would consider we GI's who had completed 2 or 3 years of college and then had been grabbed by the Army.
>
> As far as our importance in this Army is concerned we're not needed any longer. We are like drones in a beehive—our usefulness is gone. Our minds are slowly being killed by the way the Army is throwing us around. We are doing such details as sweeping the ground, day after day, which is not only depressing, but silly. I only hope Congress does something to speed us on our way to a better life.

I am sure this letter is typical of those being received by every member from

men in the service. I see no excuse for keeping a boy like this in the Army. Surely the time is here when the Army should begin to let these men out of the camps who are serving no useful purpose.

It is my considered judgment that there are certain groups in our armed forces today that should receive special and immediate consideration. I am glad to note that the Army and Navy have already recognized some of these as entitled to such treatment. I realize it may not be possible to do exact justice in every case, but I believe the following groups should be discharged at the earliest possible moment:

First. Combat veterans who wish to be released. I am absolutely opposed to sending any combat troops from the European area to the Pacific theater. I believe the Army has now recognized that this was a mistake and has canceled the orders for certain divisions that were headed for Japan.

Second. Boys whose education was interrupted and who are anxious to return to college and resume the same. This would apply to any age, but particularly to those 18- and 19-year-old boys who were taken immediately out of high school. Also to men anxious to complete professional training.

Third. Every man over 35 years of age, regardless of the time he has served, who wishes to be released. The Army is now releasing those over 35 with 2 years of service.

Fourth. Men with families or other dependents, who are needed at home, and particularly where small children are involved.

Fifth. Professional men, doctors and dentists in particular. I note the Army has announced that some 13,000 doctors will be discharged by Christmas. This program should be started at once, as these men are badly needed in their local communities. Letters from many of them indicate they are now rendering no service of any consequence in their present assignments.

Sixth. Men who have served in the Army for 3 years, regardless of where that service has been.

Of course, there are others who should have special attention. However, these groups would be a good start toward demobilizing our armed forces. I hope our military leaders will recognize the fact that they owe an obligation to every man in the service to see that he is discharged as soon as possible after his services are no longer required. Now that we have quit fighting there can be no justification for holding millions of men in the service, and neither can I see any reason for continuing to draft men each month. This bill should be passed without delay, as I consider it the answer to our demobilization and manpower problems.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the bill, H. R. 3951, because I feel very certain it will soon bring enough voluntary recruits into the service to meet our military needs, so the draft may be discontinued at an early date, and to replace men now in the service who want to be discharged.

Something has been said about physical examinations. I certainly want our servicemen to get out just as fast as is feasible and possible. However, I certainly want each man and woman in the service to have a physical examination and to have the records straight in that regard before they are discharged. After the last war we did have a great deal of trouble in getting men service-connected who deserved to be service-connected, but because of their incomplete service record, because of no record of their disability, it was not possible to prove service-connection, and many of them most deserving have never to this day received the compensation which they deserve. I know what I am talking about, for I was service officer of my post of the American Legion for a number of years. I know every veteran of World War I will agree with me on that point. So, therefore, I am very anxious that before men are discharged, they have their service records completed even if it means they must stay in the service just a few days longer.

Now, I think it is well to have the views of some of our officers in the Army as well as our own views about this discharge matter. So I want to read some excerpts from a letter which I have just received from a high ranking officer in whose judgment and sincerity of purpose I have much confidence for I have known him personally for many years. He says:

Slowing down of discharges by Army and Navy will be a "hot issue". Soldiers and sailors want out. Truman seems to be leaning toward a slow retirement.

You will get little help from either the Navy or Army in cutting expenses. The Navy has been the most wasteful of the two.

I continue quoting from this letter:

There are over 600,000 troops in this service command. When the war with Japan has officially ended three-fourths of them could be let out at once, if they wanted to do so. This is one of the nine service commands with the same thing.

Officers: There is a large surplus of high graded officers like myself. I am trying to get out—hard. Do they let me? No. Still there is a great surplus of officers in pools all over the world. You can save $500 a month letting me go. There are thousands like me. Send them home quick and save much money—heaps in fact.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this officer, whose name it is best not to mention, also sends a number of suggestions. Here are some suggestions worked out by officers at his post. It is a big topic of the day in the Army. He says these suggestions at least are concurred in by his fellow officers. I will read them into the RECORD:

Here are some things which need to be done to speed the discharge of men:

1. Do away with separation centers, or add to them by making every installation a separation center.

a. Separation centers are now swamped. At Fort Douglas they have a backlog of 1,100 men awaiting discharge. They do discharge them in 48 hours, but only when they get to them. This means 6 days generally.

b. All during the war men have been discharged by all installations, why can't they continue doing it? The separation centers just build another empire for some officer—probably a general—spend money for new buildings, etc. They are not needed and never have been.

c. Take Jones. He is at Kearns Air Base, Salt Lake City, now. He lives in Iowa. So he will be sent to Fort Leavenworth Separation Center. Then discharged and sent home. This involves many additional miles of travel and waste of time. He should be discharged at Kearns.

d. Don't let them kid you on the 48-hour story.

2. Make present point plans of War Department work.

a. At present the point system has failed to operate because officers refused to release them. Men with the correct number of points should be discharged within 15 days unless in hospitals. That is 15 days after they arrive in this country. Forget the fancy leave spots; the receptions and show-off, just discharge them.

b. If the point system worked then we would be able to reduce points rapidly and speed the rate of getting these men out.

c. Make it mandatory to discharge on the point system. It has never worked because the empire builders didn't want to lose good men with experience.

3. This is political, but sound. We enlisted or accepted commissions on basis of duration plus 6 months. Now they want to wait until someone declares the duration over. O. K., let's declare it. Soldiers feel they are cheated when we postpone the duration. Congress should pass a joint resolution declaring the war at an end and the duration over. Thus they must get us out in 6 months.

a. The New Dealers will not like this. They will try to make the emergency last until after the coming election.

4. Get rid of the top-ranking officers and reduce them to grade.

a. It will be difficult if not impossible to reduce the Army until these officers of the Regular Establishment have been reduced to their grades. They will fight in the usual manner of bureaucrats to hold on.

b. Send all officers back to the grade they are to have in the postwar Army at once and a great part of the trouble is over right then.

5. Decide at once the size of Army needed for policing Japan and Germany.

a. It is almost impossible to make permanent plans if one doesn't decide such a fundamental thing.

b. Even if the figure is too high it can be reduced, but some figure should be established at once.

6. Stop all promotions.

7. Discontinue all schools. We have paid enough for these fellows who are in college. Many of them just used the doctor angle to avoid war.

8. Hire civilians to do most of the jobs now being performed by Army and Navy in this country.

a. Civilians could guard prisioners of war, who should have been sent home long ago before they created such a problem.

b. Civilians could run discharge centers and do most all the work on posts now being performed by soldiers, except those posts doing actual Army training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the entire House membership will support the bill now before us. Personally I feel and hope that we should strengthen it in many particulars. The fighting is over and, although the war has not been declared to be at an end by either the Congress or the President,

the duty certainly devolves upon the Nation and upon the Congress to supply the military needs from a system of voluntary enlistments just as soon as the required force can be raised and as soon as it can replace the veterans of this war. No one has the right to force the American soldiers into the service during peacetime nor into an occupation army longer than may be required to replace them with volunteers. The bill before us offers certain inducements to voluntary enlistments. I think to be attractive enough to draw men into further enlistment the rate of pay will have to be increased and the term of reenlistment will have to be shortened to at least 1 year. This bill may not entirely answer the problem before us, but it certainly recognizes that the Army from now on must be met by enlistment and not by draft, which cannot be justified under present conditions with the fighting over.

However, a strong program on the part of the Army and Navy in an effort to secure enlistments will not answer the present strong feeling on the part of the public that men in the service are not being discharged at the rapid rate that they should be. All recognize the tremendous problem of releasing or discharging 12,000,000 men. The office problem of merely handling their discharges, their physical examinations, and their records so that in future years their record will be in shape to show service-connected disabilities, lengths of service, and so forth, is a great one. The job of transportation, the moving back from Europe and the Pacific of hundreds of thousands of men is a great problem. This is recognized by the American people and by the Members of Congress. It is unfortunate that some of the men now in service are called on to hold the fort until the Regular Army and the new volunteers can take over. We must make every effort to make such hold-over as short as possible. Since all in the service have made their own sacrifices, it is hard to determine which ones should be called on to do this additional service. The point system was adopted in an effort to consider some of the things which should be considered in determining who would be called upon for added service.

Of course, consideration should be made of length of service, battles, hardships endured, and age, as well as other things. Those of us in Congress can and do know of individual cases where this system in effect now works an undue hardship. Doubtless there would be much criticism of any other system which pointed out certain men as being essential to hold on until the Regular Army can take over.

Unfortunately, however, because these problems are recognized, both the Army and Navy Departments have used them to justify and to cover up certain failures on the part of these Departments to effect prompt discharge of servicemen. Many men are retained in the service with the required number of points for discharge. This situation, in view of the number of servicemen there are, in my judgment cannot be justified under any consideration. Many other men with almost enough points for discharge are returned to the United States or retained in the field. Even from the Departments' viewpoint they are too close to the required number of points to retrain for any other job so they are sent to some station where they "sweat it out," so to speak, and have nothing to do until they reach the required number of points. Certainly holding a man for that purpose cannot be justified. The only justification I have heard from either the Army or Navy is that to discharge such men would destroy the point system. If they cannot be practical or sensible about the use of the point system, of course it will fail. There are other men who have few points due to their assignment. Practically all men in the service need to get back to their businesses, to school, and to their regular activities. The great shortage of labor on the farms, in the towns, and elsewhere shows that they are greatly needed at home. But because to release such men now before transportation can bring other men home might bring criticism on the Departments, these men are held. Such practice cannot be justified. However, on the question of transportation, servicemen tell me that if they reenlist they can get transportation home on a furlough immediately, but otherwise they are told there is no transportation.

The Committee on Military Affairs has had high ranking generals before them to testify with regard to the release of servicemen but a check of the records will not disclose any privates testifying and few officers of minor rank. We know that under military procedure it is next to impossible for the views of men in the service to reach any of the Army officers who testified before this committee. Our offices, however, are filled with letters from men in the service who know they have no work to do. Our offices are filled with letters from men with hardship cases. Of course, the Army says that that these servicemen can file application with their commanding officer. The Army requires that the application must by supported by two affidavits from persons other than members of the serviceman's family, proving hardship. That looks good on paper and sounds good and seems to be a sensible arrangement but the commanding officer discharges practically none of these men. They will continue to do this until they are instructed from the top down that they must pass on these cases and release such soldiers when the situation is such that he should be released. The Navy too, says it is releasing men in hardship cases. I know of plenty turned down but none which has been approved. This has the earmarks of a brushoff. Members of Congress recently faced the War Department and cited this situation. They were promised that the War Department would do something to remedy this situation; and promised to issue orders to actually do something on hardship cases. I have had Army officers and Navy officers in my office who have stated off the record that literally thousands of servicemen in their departments are kept in this country doing nothing today because the services are afraid to discharge them because of the criticisms which might follow if they were discharged earlier than someone else. It is a hard job, as I have said, to determine who must be held for additional service at this time. Their numbers should be as few as possible. I was glad to see in today's paper that General MacArthur has reduced by half his estimate of the number of men who will be needed to occupy Japan. I believe the same thing can be done in Germany and Europe. If this reduction is made, certainly from the Regular Army of 280,000 and the voluntary enlistments which we should get if we make the present bill attractive enough, we can meet the needs of the services and thereby bring home at the earliest possible date veterans in the foreign fields. Every unnecessary minute men in the service now are held the less the chance of such men reenlisting. Dragging around on discharges will result in failure of the voluntary system. Some men in this country will have to hold on until the Regular Army can take over their duties. Here again it is a hard job to decide which of many considerations should enter into such designations. This the Army and Navy say they are trying to do. That designation should be made immediately and people so designated should be replaced by the Army and Navy within a very short time. These men having been designated to hold on, certainly then every man regardless of points who is doing nothing and for whose services the Army and Navy have no use and are making no use should be discharged at once. Unless this is done the services should have further criticism.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset the duty devolves on the Congress to see that a Regular Army of employed soldiers replaces those drafted at the earliest possible moment. If we have to pay high prices to employ them we will just have to do it. This bill is directed toward meeting the needs with a Regular Army and for that reason should be passed. Some insist that the War and Navy Departments feeling the need for a large Army and Navy in future years and, being afraid that they cannot get such by legislative action, are trying to hold on to a large Army and Navy by being slow to discharge the men in service. I do know that some in the War and Navy Departments feel that the American people will not support nor the American Congress provide for as large a peacetime volunteer Army and Navy as the Departments think we need. Even though they have those fears, certainly the situation is being made worse and the chances of the Army and Navy having the forces of regular enlistees that they feel necessary in the next few years is being jeopardized still further by every minute's delay which they make in returning servicemen home wherever they are and whatever points they may have. We must continue our efforts along the line toward which this bill is directed and we must secure a volunteer Army. We must continue to insist that the War Department discharge servicemen promptly. If they will that can do the job more expeditiously than can be done any other way but if the War Department fails to do this the American people are likely to insist on a limit on the number of men in the services, which according to Army

and Navy officials would not be to the best interests of the country at this time. Now is the time for them to help if they wish to maintain an adequate Army and Navy supplied from a system of voluntary enlistments. If they will push this voluntary enlistment program and promptly discharge those called into service in time of war and who have done a great job, I believe the American people will be willing to pay the expense of an adequate Regular Army and Navy in the years ahead.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill. I wish it could be made broader by adding greater inducements to the men who volunteer to take the place of those men overseas who should be brought home. I realize, however, there are two sides to the question of demobilization. It fell to my lot in the summer of 1919 to be a demobilization officer at one of the largest camps in the United States. This camp, as I recollect, had the record for getting men out faster than any other camp in the country. The colonel in charge of demobilization went after a record for his own benefit and he secured that record. I recall that troop trains came in from Germany at 9 o'clock in the morning and by 5 p. m. o'clock the same day we had those men on trains bound for home with their discharges in their pockets. We all received a lot of commendation for doing that and the man in charge covered himself with glory for speed and efficiency in getting the men out of the service and back home. That was 26 years ago. I have been in Congress now going on 5 years, and I am receiving letters every month from men who were discharged at that very camp asking assistance in getting the record of their service corrected so they can get disability compensation and allowances from the Government, including pensions, and in some instances their insurance, all because their records were not made perfect before they were discharged.

I do not know how many letters my predecessors and other Members have received from men discharged from the same camp, but judging from my mail I would say a great many.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Many of those records are scattered all over, in and around garages and other places all over the city of Washington and the city of New York. I have a list of all the places where these records are stored. They are not taken care of. They are simply piled up and millions and millions of dollars of claims stand to be lost.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is right and in addition to that the records are not complete because of the speed at which the men were discharged and also the desire of themselves to get back home.

I recall when these troop trains came in we had a regular system. About 30 to 45 minutes only were used by a force of men to check the service records for an entire trainload of soldiers. So much time was allowed to get over to the medical detachment for a medical examination, usually 30 minutes for a trainload. If a boy said to the doctor in charge, "I am all right," the doctor slapped him on the back and told him to go on. His papers were filled out stating that he was in good shape without a thorough physical examination. Many, many other instances regarding his papers were just passed over and blanks left on the demobilization papers in regard to the service record of the man, or his record in the service, with the result that he got home in a hurry. To this day his paper record is not up to date and many of the boys are suffering yet because of the speed with which they were demobilized.

In the anxiety today on the part of Members of Congress and the people of the United States to get the boys out of the service and get them home in a hurry, with which I am in accord, that is getting them home at the earliest possible date, I do want to caution against undue haste, because haste makes waste, and I do not want to see a repetition of the haste in demobilization of the men of the last war occur in this war, because Members of Congress for the next 50 years will have to help get the discharge records straight in order for them to get the benefits to which they are justly entitled under the GI bill and the many bills that will be passed by the Congress for the benefit of the service men.

It has been stated on the floor today that the maximum that General MacArthur will need in the Pacific is 900,000 men and that that number may be scaled down; that not to exceed that number, probably less, will be needed in all other portions of the world. It is my understanding that there are about 8,000,000 men in the armed service. I do not mean in the Navy—I mean in the Army. What about the 6,000,000 men who should be started on their way home now? What is the necessity of keeping them in the service?

According to my information, 200,000 men, maybe 250,000, will be sufficient to look after the paper work and protect the records of these men and the property belonging to the Government that needs to be protected. So from five to six million men certainly can be gotten out of the service just as speedily as the boats can bring them to the country and they can be gotten to demobilization centers and started on their way home.

Much as I favor using every care and caution in protecting the rights of the men, I cannot see any justification for withholding the large number of men in the service that are now being withheld. To me there is no excuse for it, to me there is no excuse for continuing the draft providing the bill before us will get the necessary replacements for the boys overseas who have done their bit and want to get home. There can be no other excuse for continuing the draft. If my information is correct more men are being taken into the service every day through selective service than are being discharged. Why is that, with the war over? It seems to me this matter should be looked into; these boys should be gotten home, yet they should be gotten home with care and not with undue haste that will leave their records incomplete to the detriment of their future rights as ex-servicemen. In addition to that I think it would be well to let the people of the United States know what a job it is to discharge an Army of eight or nine million men. It has been brought out on the floor of the House that if every boat belonging to the United States were used to bring these boys back, not to exceed 600,000 a month could be demobilized, and with an Army of eight million men it would take a year or better to discharge them. The people do not understand that. The people do not understand that after the time of the Armistice, November 11, 1918, of the last war, it was almost a year before all the men were discharged at the speed with which we turned them out at that time. So no matter what we do today it is going to take a long period of time to get all these boys home, and I believe if the correct information were given to the people, it would help solve our problems.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the passage of this legislation reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. It is a step in the right direction. Passage of this bill is an indication that Congress has been diligent in drafting legislation toward the end that we secure for our armed forces, as many volunteers as is humanly possible. It is our expressed hope that we may be able to obtain volunteers in sufficient numbers to fill up our whole armies of occupation. I hope this bill will get the job done, in order that our military strength will eventually be composed entirely of enlisted personnel.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will lend my support to H. R. 3951 because the voluntary method of enlistment can be the answer to the question of maintaining a sufficient armed force to occupy the conquered lands and at the same time provide a substantial armed force to protect our interests everywhere. H. R. 3951 is along democratic lines. I doubt, however, that this program will succeed because the inducements are not sufficient. I wish the bill provided more ample remuneration.

At this point it would not be amiss to say that I have been deluged with complaints concerning men in the Army, particularly, who have been transferred from the European to the Asiatic theater, and by men who complain of not being discharged even though they have the prescribed points. Now I do not contend that this is the fault of the War Department, but I am convinced that it is the deliberate work of subordinate officers and it would be very well if the War Department made it its business to look into some of these practices in the various camps.

For instance, at Camp Hood, Tex., veterans from the European theater are

obliged to indulge in long periods of training and inspection, and even to engage in 10-mile practice marches from 8 until 12 o'clock at night. To me, this is ridiculous, and I wonder what the commanding officer thinks he is training these men to do. Does he expect them to go immediately into another war? I suggest that the War Department look into this matter very carefully. The practice march was scheduled to take place on Thursday, September 13, well after VJ-day.

Another instance was that of 6,000 troops, most of whom served in England, France, Belgium, Luxemburg, and Germany, who were transferred directly to the Pacific without a furlough home. This transport, crowded and uncomfortable with 6,000 men has been lying off the Ulithi Islands from the 16th of August, and was still there on the 5th of September. The most flagrant maladministration in this case, however, was the food. I have been informed that the cereal served every morning for breakfast was wormy and that frankfurters served were inedible.

It is these complaints of actions in violation of common sense that irritate the American people and it seems to me that these are problems in which the War Department should be intensely interested. All of these men are American citizens and not the pawns of any group of subordinate officers.

There are many instances of married men in both the Army and Navy who have from three to five children, and who are retained in the service even though they have 42 or 43 points.

Another thing of which the American people might reasonably complain is the commanding officers of various posts issuing orders forbidding enlisted men to write to their Congressman. This, to me, is abridging the rights of American citizens.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use the remainder of the time for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that the Army has furnished me with a sheet which is 20 feet long and contains the names of 1,600 ships, all of the ships we have available, that are now engaged and have been from the time they commenced demobilization in the transportation of troops from Europe and from the Pacific back to the United States for discharge. Five hundred and thirty-five troop carriers are involved with a carrying capacity of 665,555. I merely mention this to show that the Army is using every facility it has available for the purpose of expediting the great problem that it has on its hands in the demobilization of our vast armies.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In reading this bill I observe that under its provisions these enlistments can be recruited only from those above the age of 18. In view of the fact that we take boys into the Navy from 17 years of age up—of course, with parental consent—why, if we are so interested in a recruiting program, do we not lower the age to the same level as the Navy, and with parental consent permit these boys to go into the Army?

Mr. MAY. We have an amendment prepared which will do that very thing, and for that reason we will offer the amendment later.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward intensive recruiting campaigns to obtain volunteer enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: Page 1, after line 9, insert a new section to read as follows:

"That there shall be discharged from, or released from active duty in, the military and naval forces of the United States, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit, all members of such forces whose active duty therein has been of a duration of 18 or more months since September 16, 1940, except that no commissioned officer of the Regular Military or Naval Establishment shall be discharged or released under this act, and no member of the military or naval forces who is serving therein under an enlistment need be discharged or released from such forces under this act prior to the expiration of the contract period of enlistment."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. MAY. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I never expected to see the day in the Congress of the United States when a person who sought to give expression to the will and desire of a large proportion of 130,000,000 people would be classed as a demagog. It is a serious thing if the time has come when a person who has enjoyed a seat in this House for 27 years should be classed as a demagog because he sees fit to speak for the sentiment of a great majority of his constituents.

There is no man in the House who feels a higher regard for the Army officers—the generals and the colonels and other officers—than I do, and that has been true during my official life. We know how necessary they are and what a fine service they render in the time of the country's peril. But that does not mean I consider them to be infallible or their judgment always as good in many respects, and especially in approaching peacetime, as that of the great sovereign people who, after all, pay the bill and furnish the boys for these wars. This is a people's country and it is the people who rule, and the people know just what it means if their boys are deprived of the privilege of coming home after having won the war in Europe and having won the war in Japan. They also know what a serious thing it is to police these countries and how dangerous it is if there is an excess of men beyond the number necessary for that job. There is nothing so irritating or provocative to any people as the uniform of a foreign soldier on their soil, marching up and down in front of their homes or their buildings. It eventually leads to trouble—to bloodshed.

When I say that I have the highest respect for these officers, I do. I have a still greater respect for the infantry—the men who faced the fire of the enemy at close range, and those who went to their death in close contact with the enemy. I know how they feel and you know how they feel about getting home after having been in the service all these years—away from their wives and children, their sweethearts, their mothers, and their fathers. They also know that they are needed, and they know that their fathers and mothers are weakened in health because of the burdens the absence of their sons have placed upon them, which they should not take on at their age except during actual war.

I am here to speak, whether it be demagogery or not, in behalf of the parents and the boys and all those who are interested in getting the soldiers home to take part in the adjustments and the reconversion of the country now that combat service is over, both in Europe and in Asia.

My respect for the men higher up was somewhat shaken a few years ago in the trial of Billy Mitchell. I think it would be advisable for those who are always bootlicking around the higher-ups to read that court-martial proceeding, in which Billy Mitchell, the hero of that day, and more so of today in the light of subsequent events, who was simply excoriated more severely than a criminal in any police court. It is to the credit of at least one outstanding hero of this war that he did not vote to court martial Billy Mitchell. Had the opinion of Billy Mitchell and those who believed in him at that time prevailed, we would not have had a Corregidor or a Pearl Harbor, and all the tragedies and consequences of the short-sightedness of those men at that time.

There is no question in the world but that these Army officers with all their so-called efficiency in time of war can arrange to have these boys who have served 18 months demobilized, or arrange to have them sent home on an extended furlough and then recalled for final discharge. The War Department can do this, and it can do it quickly and efficiently. It ought to be done.

I have offered this amendment to bring this matter before this House and the people, because it must be followed up until these boys who have served at least 18 months are brought home at the earliest possible moment. I regret that the majority side of the House should make a point of order to deprive the House from recording its vote on the question of Nation-wide interest.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky insist on his point of order?

Mr. MAY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. REED of New York. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York that it is not germane. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York applies to and affects the Army of the United States, whereas the bill before the Committee is more limited in scope and applies only to volunteer enlistments in the Regular Army. Therefore the amendment is not germane, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am another one of those Members of the House who does not agree with the gentleman who charged that all those who voice the protest of men who are in the services, their parents, and their wives, and advocate their early discharge are demagogs. The gentleman can pin that label on himself if he wishes, but he cannot stick it on me and make it stay any more than certain Members who are advocates of a big Army and compulsory military training in peacetime can do that thing. I am not one of those who believe that the generals and subordinate officers of those who are higher up, if there are any higher than the generals, are infallible or that they are indispensable. There was a time when some few millions of Americans had the idea that one man might be indispensable. But some of us are getting that out of our heads since the death of our late President. After his death, the country seemed to get along, perhaps not as well but nearly as well as it did before, and we are swinging as a Nation in much the same way as we did before. Some of us continue to believe the Nation will go along successfully despite the death of even Members of Congress or the death of all of the present Members of Congress. The old country with God's help will get along some way and in some manner.

Now, I know that specific instances do not establish a practice, but to my desk has come not one single complaint except from men in the service across the seas, or from parents or wives of those who are in the service, and from parents who do not see the necessity of drafting 18-year-old boys. There may not be many cases like the one I cite, but here is one. There is in the service from my district a young man who had, when he enlisted, attacks of asthma and hay fever, and he needed an operation or two. But he concealed his condition. He should not have done so but he did. He did not want to be termed a "slacker." He was taken in and examined by the Army physicians. He served a short time and finally he went through Walter Reed. In his record they made a notation that he was not fit for active service and that he needed a surgical operation. Now that was more than 1 year ago. Fortunately, I had a copy of that record, and when he was transferred, he went through basic training twice, when he was transferred once more, I called the attention of the Adjutant General to that record. One of the subordinates in his office called me on the phone. He said, "You are all wet." He did not use that language, but that was the substance of it. He said, "That man never was in the hospital."

I said, "Now, that is fine. I am sorry I was so misled. Let me read you this." And I began to read from the Walter Reed report. He said, "Well, now, wait a minute. I guess you got us over a barrel." I said, "I sure think I have. What are you going to do about it?"

He said, "We will do something about it."

He looked it up. They assured me that man should never again be put through basic training and that he should not be assigned to active service. Today he is down in New Mexico on active duty. He has been sent out of the Washington area, which, they told me, he would not be. My complaint is not primarily in behalf of the boy and it is not on behalf of his parents. I am just hard-boiled, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], and I want to know why it is that the Government or the Army keeps that man in when from the day he went in right down to the present moment he is a liability and costs us money and is no particular good to the service. That is the question I asked the Department over the phone. That is the question I asked by letter. It is the question I am going to continue to ask of you gentlemen on the committee right along day after day. As other instances pile up I am going to call them to your attention because I do not believe we should support in the service men who are not physically fit. He is not, because of his condition, an asset to the service.

This bill is a step in the right direction and I shall vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, we are now considering a bill to stimulate and encourage volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States. I shall vote for this measure because I believe if we make service in the Army and Navy sufficiently attractive to men now in the service we will get all the men we need to man our Navy and to maintain the Army in sufficient numbers and strength.

In this country, public sentiment, the wishes of the fathers, mothers, and wives of the members of our armed forces, and the desires and interests of the boys themselves, along with the safety of the Nation must all be considered by the Congress. The people naturally turn to their Representatives in Congress. They can be heard, and their wishes and rights can be made effective only through the voices and votes of those they have sent to Congress as their representatives.

The people, including members of our armed services, have borne the burdens and made sacrifices necessary to win the war with heroism and without complaint. They are willing to do all necessary to preserve the fruits of victory. They realize that Germany and Japan must be disarmed, their ability to again threaten and destroy the peace and liberty of mankind must be destroyed and held in check. Our generals and admirals admit that we do not need an armed force of 12,000,000 men to do this job. At the most, it is agreed that in any event 1,500,000 men are sufficient for the next year, and that ultimately 1,000,000 men are all that will be required.

This bill, when it becomes a law, will go far to do away with the necessity for drafting men and boys for the Army and Navy, and should speed up the discharge of our armed forces.

Those who volunteer under its provisions will retain all their accrued rights under the selective-service law and under the GI bill of rights. They can volunteer for 1 year's service. Those who volunteer must have served for 6 months. Thus, each man who volunteers and is accepted will be fully trained and ready for service. I am informed that there are thousands who are anxious to and will volunteer.

I have received many letters from fathers, mothers, wives, and other relatives of men in the Army, Navy, and Marines, and from the men and boys themselves. Many of them are justly terribly distressed. Men and women write who are too old to operate their farms and business establishments. Most of their loved ones have served more than 2 years and many 4 years or more. And many have fought in battle. This is a tremendous sacrifice for a young man to make in the service of his country. The relatives of these boys and the boys themselves now feel the time has come when those who have given so much for their country should be discharged.

I do not criticize any Army or Navy official. We should not hastily nor rashly assail any of the great and brave men who have planned and won this war. It is an easy thing to criticize. What to our dim eyes may seem a fault on the part of a leader who has borne the brunt of battle may prove a scar won on some hard-fought field, where we would faint and yield.

Millions of our boys are overseas. Ships must be provided to bring them home. When they reach home, each of them must be carefully examined to determine his physical condition so that if a service-connected disability has been incurred this fact may be noted on his discharge and a record made of such disability. Only by so doing is it possible for the rights of such boy to be secured to him and to his dependents.

This bill, when it becomes law, will enable the boys who are discharged to enter school and finish their education if they so desire. These young men are the seed corn of the Nation. We must see to it that they are given every advantage the schools afford, and get them home in school as soon as possible. Those who gave up jobs must be brought back and given jobs.

I believe the future of this country and of the world will be determined in the laboratories of this Nation. The able scientists of the country developed the atomic bomb that ended the war. More than a thousand scientists from all over the United States contributed to

that effort, and people from every State in the Union labored on that project. I hold in my hand a letter from a young man, 27 years old, who is almost blind. Three years of his life have been cut out during his service in the Army, and he has now been ordered to go abroad. We do not need blind men over there or men with impaired vision.

I like the statement of General MacArthur appearing in today's news dispatches. He has been unjustly criticized by his enemies. He ranks with the world's greatest soldiers and is one of the world's greatest administrators. He is the one man in the world who is as good as he thinks he is. He has gone everywhere he has ever started, and he has succeeded in everything he has set out to accomplish. He went into Japan. He knew the Japanese psychology. He gave them an opiate, and anesthetic, a shot in the arm, and rendered them quiescent. Then suddenly Japan woke up and found she was in a strait-jacket. The screws were being turned, and they are on the way to pay for their many barbarous crimes. He says he can get along with 200,000 men in Japan. I think it would be the finest thing in the world to move a lot of Chinese troops in there and let them operate in the policing and administration, not of the land of the rising sun but the land of the setting sun. They will put the Japs in their places. It will give the Chinese the self-confidence they need to become one of the great powers on this earth.

To make certain that the purposes of this bill when passed are accomplished, I have introduced a measure requiring the discharge from the armed services of every man and woman, other than commissioned officers and members of the Regular Army who volunteered, who has served as much as 18 months. The passage of the measure we are now considering and the one I have introduced will relieve the distress of fathers and mothers, advanced in years, and of wives and children who need the presence and support of sons, husbands, and fathers. These measures will quiet the nerves and apprehensions of the people. Their enactment will give those who wish to enlist for further service the chance to do so. And they will bring home those who are desperately needed by their loved ones.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this legislation. I want to commend the committee for bringing in this bill. I think it is a step in the right direction. I take this time, however, to make a few objections in connection with the hearings on this bill. Nowhere in the hearings is there any information stating how many boys in the Army had from 75 to 80 points nor how many boys had from 70 to 75 points, and so on down the line. I believe that the boys in the service are entitled to that information. Since the information was not available in the hearings, I took occasion to call General Henry's office on Friday last and inquire about the matter. I was advised that the War Department would not release that information. I asked why. I was told that if that information was given to the public that then the boys could easily determine when they might reasonably expect to be discharged and that this would have a bad effect on their morale, and that it would be quite difficult for the military to get much work out of them during the last month or so in the service. Now I take the position, Mr. Chairman, that this is a matter of public interest and certainly of public business, and that both the boys in the service and their parents at home are entitled to that information from the War Department.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask if there is any reason why this information should not be released at this time so that the boys themselves would know where they stand in relation to the others?

Mr. MAY. As a civilian I do not know of any reason why it should not be released. If the Army has some reasons they should explain them, of course, to the committee. They were not asked about it, as I recall it, in the hearings because we thought the score system was being conducted in a reasonably satisfactory manner and as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. My information, Mr. Chairman, is that very few people think that the demobilization is being conducted in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. MAY. Just a minute. If you divide this into three different groups of so many men with 40 points, so many men with 50 points, so many with 60 points; or, to take it a step higher, so many with 60, so many with 70, and so many with 80, I imagine the boys will gather around swapping information as to when they will get out. Some fellow will say: "Well, I have been in as long as he and I have done a lot more hard fighting. I do not understand why he is getting out."

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I believe the boys are entitled to this information so they can tell with some degree of certainty when they can expect to be discharged. The fighting is over and to my notion secrecy in the public business should be over, too. I would ask the chairman another question. I have read the hearings on this bill very carefully. I studied the chart submitted by the General Staff and shown on page 56 of the hearings. It shows that in the European theater as of September 1 there were 2,750,000 men. It shows that on January 1 it is expected there will be 1,500,000 men in Europe. On Friday last the Evening Star carried an article purporting to quote General Eisenhower in which he urged families to hold up Christmas packages for the Yanks. In that article, which I am inserting in the RECORD, General Eisenhower said that only 700,000 troops would be left in his theater on January 1.

FAMILIES URGED TO HOLD UP YULE PARCELS FOR YANKS

PARIS, September 14.—General Eisenhower today appealed to families of soldiers to hold up Christmas parcels if it appears the men will be home for the holidays.

He said only 700,000 troops would be left in this theater by January 1.

"We are exerting every effort to get the greatest number of soldiers home or on their way home by Christmas," he said in a statement intended to lighten the burden of Army postal units.

"Last year approximately 30,000,000 parcels—an average of 12 per man—were handled in the Christmas mails in this theater. Getting that mail to Europe was a comparatively simple matter. Getting it back—following the trail of a redeployed soldier—will be a complicated task requiring the services of thousands of Army postal troops who also want to go home."

Army postal units are expected to drop from 285 to 127 by December 25, he said.

Mr. Chairman, I also note that in the same chart the General Staff contends that we had 1,900,000 boys in the Pacific on September 1 and that on July 1 next we will still have 900,000 in the occupation Army in the Pacific. In the Washington Evening Star of Friday last, which I am inserting in the RECORD, I find the statement from General MacArthur's headquarters in Tokyo that the occupation of Japan may end within a year and today general MacArthur stated that the occupation would necessitate the use of only 200,000 American troops.

OCCUPATION OF JAPAN MAY END WITHIN YEAR, EICHELBERGER SAYS—MAC ARTHUR ANSWERS CRITICS; DENIES ANY "KID-GLOVE" POLICY

TOKYO, September 14.—The occupation of Japan "may be washed up" within a year, Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger predicted today, while General MacArthur promised there would be no "kid glove" enforcement of surrender terms and ordered complete suspension of all operations of the Domei news agency.

General Eichelberger expressed his views at a press conference in his Eighth Army headquarters, where he observed that "when an insular country loses its land, sea and air power and is without raw materials and has big countries sitting on its flanks, it can't be much of a threat."

"If the Japs continue acting as they are now," he said in answer to a question, "within a year this thing should be washed up."

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is something wrong somewhere. In the first instance, General Eisenhower disputes the General Staff on the situation in Europe as of January 1 next, and in the second instance, the general officers on the ground in Tokyo say that we will need only 200,000 boys for occupation purposes and that occupation can be ended within a year.

Mr. Chairman, the conflicting statements coming from the War Department and from the commanding officers of both the European and Pacific theaters are extremely confusing to the American people. Something is wrong somewhere. It seems strange that the War Department cannot effect speedier demobilization of our troops. According to the War Department over 2,000,000 of our boys have served over 3 years, and 3,600,000 have served from 2 to 3 years. I think this Congress owes a duty to those

boys to see that they are discharged from the service with the utmost speed. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that separation centers could well be established in the European theater and the Philippines so that a great deal of the paper work in connection with discharges could be taken care of while the boys mark time overseas. To my way of thinking, Congress must insist here and now that demobilization program be put to high gear. There has been entirely too much conflicting information. Eisenhower has stated that he needs less than 400,000 men for occupation, and MacArthur only half that number. The American people are demanding action. The boys expect this Congress to protect their interests. To do less would be unworthy of the trust they have in us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the objects of this legislation. I think it is a step in the right direction. While it does not go as far as I would like to see it go, nevertheless, I am persuaded that if promptly enacted, and its enactment followed by the Army and Navy putting on a real honest-to-goodness intensive campaign to obtain volunteers, that in a few months we will obtain more than enough volunteers to make up the army of occupation.

I hope the Congress, having passed this legislation, will not assume that there is nothing further to be done in order to get our boys back home. If the Army and Navy do not take the proper steps to bring our boys back home at the earliest moment possible, Congress should step in and see that the proper steps are taken. I hope, however, that the Army and Navy will immediately set up the necessary machinery, so there will be no necessity for Congressional action.

There is one thing that needs immediate attention. The drafting of teen-age boys should be stopped. When the Congress lowered the draft age, it did so under pressure from the Commander in Chief and the Army and Navy chiefs. We were told that the young boys were absolutely necessary to the successful prosecution of the war because they could stand the hardships incident to combat duty better than the older boys. As the combat service is now over, this argument is no longer a valid one. At best it will take from 6 months to 1 year to train these young boys, and after you train them will anyone contend that they will make better policemen than the older boys? The army of occupation is nothing short of a police force, and on a police force you need primarily men of mature judgment, and not primarily men able to withstand hardships. The army of occupation does not call for men able to withstand endurance and hardships. It calls for seasoned men capable of exercising sound judgment. Who ever heard of putting a teen-age boy on the police force.

If the Army and Navy do not forthwith stop the drafting of teen-age boys, I hope Congress will step in and take immediate and positive action.

The sensible thing to do is to keep these teen-age boys at home and in school. Yes, the sensible thing to do, as I said, is to keep these youngsters at home and in school, training them for citizenship, rather than drafting them into the Army and training them to become a bunch of policemen.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) The act entitled "An act to provide for enlistments in the Regular Army during the period of the war, and for other purposes," approved June 1, 1945 (Public Law 72, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That notwithstanding the limitations contained in any other provision of law, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to accept original enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of 2 or 3 years, at the option of the person so enlisted, from among qualified male persons not less than 18 years of age, including persons in active service in the Army of the United States or any component thereof. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any right to reenlistment in the Regular Army under any other provision of law.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of War shall report to the Congress quarterly, the first such report to be made as of December 31, 1945, the number of enlisted men on active duty in the Regular Army who have been enlisted or reenlisted on or after June 1, 1945. The authority conferred by section 1 to accept original enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army shall terminate on June 30, 1947."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective as if it had been part of such act of June 1, 1945, when such act was originally enacted.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 2, line 11, before the period, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That upon the presentation of satisfactory evidence as to his age and upon written application for discharge by his parent or guardian presented to the Secretary of War within 6 months after the date of his enlistment, any man enlisted under the provisions of this act who is under 21 years of age and who has enlisted without the written consent of his parent or guardian, if any, shall be discharged from that portion of his contract of enlistment as extends beyond the duration of the present war and 6 months thereafter: *Provided further*, That such person when discharged from the service shall receive the form of discharge and the travel and other allowances to which his services after enlistment shall entitle him."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to speak on the amendment, and ask for a vote.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman to explain the latter part of his amendment which refers to the war and the 6-month period thereafter? How does that affect those under 21 years of age?

Mr. MAY. The 21-year-olds and upward? It does not affect the men over 21 years of age because it is intended to take care of the question of the right of a parent to have his son who is under 21 years of age discharged, and he can have it done on application if the son has enlisted without his consent in writing, and that may be done at any time during the present war or 6 months thereafter.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In other words, this leaves in effect the original acts of 1921 and 1925?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. So that there is no change whatever in the acts. This assures us that parents will have control over their children up to the age of 21.

Mr. MAY. There is no question about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPARKMAN: Page 2, line 24, strike out the quotation marks at the end of the line, and after line 24 insert the following:

"SEC. 4. Any person who enlists or reenlists in the Regular Military Establishment on or after June 1, 1945, in the seventh grade, upon the completion of 6 months' active service, shall, unless sooner promoted, be promoted to the sixth grade, provided he meets such qualifications as may be prescribed in regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes. I will simply state that this amendment provides for the automatic promotion of privates to privates first class after the completion of 6 months training, provided they meet such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War. This is somewhat in line with the policy of the Navy now. The Navy automatically promotes its new men to the sixth grade at the completion of their boot training: This simply brings the Army practice in line with that of the Navy.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to speak in opposition to the amendment. I agree that it may be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY: On page 2, line 14, after the period, add: "Any qualified and acceptable member of the Army of the United States, or of any component thereof, who has performed active service therein for a period of not less than 6 months, shall, upon his application, be accepted for an enlistment period of 1 year plus the period of any furlough granted at the beginning of such enlistment."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the bill as presented authorizes and directs the

Secretary of War to accept enlistments for 2 or 3 years. I am of the opinion that if we accept enlistments for a period of 1 year we will be offering a real inducement to many of the young men now in the service to remain in the service during that period of time.

In the past and now, the only objection made to a 1-year enlistment has been that it is not economical, in other words, that you take a raw recruit, first of all you equip him, and then you train him for 6 months, and you have only a 6 months' period of service. He is a liability for 6 months, and during 6 months you get service from him.

My amendment eliminates all of that argument because it is limited to those men who are now in the service and, therefore, have their equipment, so that expense will not have to be incurred. They must have been in for a period of 6 months, and 6 months is the period of basic training, it is the period Congress directed be given to a man before being sent into combat. Therefore, under my amendment you will take only the man now in the service, the man who is trained for service, and you will keep him for a net period of 1 year.

It even takes care of the case of the reenlistment furlough to which men are entitled under existing regulations. If he does not want any furlough upon reenlisting, he will serve a period of 1 year and the entire year will be service of benefit to the Army. If he takes 30 days, then he will be required to serve 13 months under his enlistment. If he takes 60 days, it will be 14 months, and if he takes the full 90 days it will be 15 months; so that you will have a period of 12 months net service out of a man already trained and already equipped.

The next 12 months is the period of time we must get beyond. That is the period of the emergency. It is the period during which we must take up the slack and convert from the Army of the United States to the United States Army.

The President has requested that those men now inducted be inducted for a period of not to exceed 2 years. The War Department is agreeable to enlistments for 2 years, so that you are going to take a raw recruit by induction or enlistment for a period of 2 years, you are going to train him for 6 months, and that will leave only 18 months of service you will get out of that raw recruit.

The point is made that travel will consume 3 months, so you are now reduced to the 15 months of which I speak. In other words, you will get practically as much net time, after allowing for that 3 months, out of this man as you will get out of the recruit you will take in for voluntarily enlistment for 2 years or the man you will induct for 2 years.

In addition, the man already in the service has accrued all of the rights under the GI bill of rights, he has accrued his mutering-out pay, and he has accrued to him all of the benefits and compensations from the Veterans' Administration.

It is a real obligation we take on with each man we induct into the service, because he is going to get all of these benefits which the men in the service have already accrued or have coming to them.

My proposal is that we use those men for a net period of 1 year, to tide us over the period of reconversion from the Army of the United States to our Regular Army.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] if we adopt the genetleman's amendment, would it not be possible for any man who is overseas with only 6 months' service to volunteer for 1 year or get a 90-day furlough and the War Department would be obligated to bring that man home at once on a 90-day furlough in preference to the man who has served 2 or 3 years in the Army in the front lines?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman could be correct, but, of course, he has stated an extreme case of the kind which probably never would result. No man has a right now under the law to this 90-day furlough nor as to the time when he is going to get it. If that situation should arise, that could conceivably be true. But at the same time I think the inducement which you hold out to the man who is in for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter to now make his election to become a volunteer for a period of 1 year or to take his chances on serving for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, is a sufficient inducement so that we will have men who are in voluntarily. Every one of these men will be men who are contented because they have no one to blame for being there but themselves. They will no longer be there through the compulsion of their draft boards. They will be in the Army because of their own voluntary action.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. But any man overseas could request a 90-day furlough and I think it would take priority and such a man could return home before men who have served in foreign countries a much longer period of time.

Mr. KILDAY. There is nothing in the law which would require that man to get a priority. That is a matter controlled entirely by regulations of the War Department and the War Department can make such regulation as it sees fit with reference to that period of 90 days. So that that situation does not arise.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas becomes law, these men who have had 6 months or more of service may enlist for 1 year in any part of the world. Assuming that these men in Europe were to avail themselves of the opportunity to enlist for 1 year, they would be brought back home for a furlough and then it would take 45 days to ship them to Japan and 45 days would be allowed to bring them back. There are 90 days or 120 days gone from his enlistment. You would have such a big turn-over of your entire Army in 9 months that it would be unsound.

Mr. KILDAY. I am sorry that the gentleman has neither read the amendment nor heard it read because my amendment specifically provides the period during which the man is on furlough is not included within his year of service. It has nothing to do with the year that he serves. He must serve that in addition to the time he served on active duty. The balance of the transportation that the gentleman is talking about must be incurred for a raw recruit the same as it would be for these men. If you take a raw recruit, you are going to have to transport him. And under my amendment the furlough that he would take is not included in the year.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes; but you have 90 days taken off the year to begin with for transportation.

Mr. KILDAY. You have 90 days taken off your duty plus transportation plus 6 months' training, in the case of the raw recruit or inductee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No; they do not have 6 months' training. The Army has basic training of 17 weeks.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is mistaken. The last time a bill was brought up here from our committee we provided for 6 months' training and prohibited the use of men in combat without 6 months' training. The Army has revised the basic training from 17 weeks to 6 months in accordance with the provision of the law which Congress passed.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes; but we are not at war any more. Therefore, combat service is out.

Mr. KILDAY. Take your 17 weeks and put that against your 45 days for transportation if you want to. You are still making a profit on your 1-year enlistment of the difference between 17 weeks of training and 45 days of transportation.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. You would have every transport vessel which is available belonging to the Army and Navy moving troops back and forth.

Mr. KILDAY. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to General Henry's testimony when he appeared before the committee. In his testimony he said that if we thought it would produce more men he was willing to try it. There was no objection from General Henry other than the matter of logistics. In other words, transporting them on leave would make it unprofitable. I have taken care of that by providing that the leave shall not be included in the year. That was the sole objection which was raised in testimony brought out before the committee. Here is General Henry's testimony on page 28 of the hearings. You can see that the Army raised no objection other than the logistic question of moving these men on leave. I took the period of that leave out of the 1 year of service.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was carefully considered, along with several other proposals akin to it, by the Military Affairs Committee of the House, and decisively rejected. It was rejected on the ground that it is discriminatory against the long-service men, and also that it is uneconomical, in the sense that it brings into the service a man who is obligated, as a matter of fact, for only 9 months.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Not now. I will yield later.

The proposal is discriminatory against the millions of men who are already in foreign service. A man at home or abroad or anywhere else in the world can enlist for 1 year. Then, at the expiration of that time, he comes out and he gets the benefit of all the privileges that a man who served a long number of years would get.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MAY. I am not making any misstatement.

Mr. KILDAY. I am sorry, but you have made a misstatement.

Mr. MAY. Well, he does get mustering out pay?

Mr. KILDAY. He must have it accrued or he is not admissible to reenlistment.

Mr. MAY. Well, he has already got it accrued if he is in service.

Mr. KILDAY. But you say he is going to serve 1 year and get all the benefits of the older men. But I am taking only men who have accrued benefits.

Mr. MAY. Well, he is to get out of the Army with all the benefits. It is uneconomical. It is unsound. It discourages the idea of a professional army.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Under this amendment a young man who has been deferred throughout this war could enlist in the Army for 1 year.

Mr. KILDAY. No.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The amendment requires 6 months' prior service?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Then I am mistaken about that.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman stated it was decisively defeated in the committee. It was defeated by a vote of 8 to 6, was it not?

Mr. MAY. I do not remember the vote.

Mr. KILDAY. And the gentleman from Kentucky cast 4 of the votes on proxies.

Mr. MAY. Perhaps I did. I was doing a good job if I did, but I am not in the habit of telling the votes in committee.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman stated it was decisively defeated.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The effect of this amendment would be this: If a man were inducted and served 6 months, he could limit the service to 1½ years by promptly enlisting at the end of 6 months; is that correct?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] I think has sold me a bill of goods. Insofar as I understand it, I am going to support his amendment. The argument that it is uneconomical falls flat, as far as I am concerned, because if you will cite one single thing that happens incident to warfare that is economical, I will buy you a good dinner. You go into war and in preparation for war and you do not deal with it on an economic basis. Every bill that the Military or Naval Affairs Committee has approved in the last several years is proof of that. That is number one.

Number two is, you are talking about compulsory military training for 1 year. Then let us approve the Kilday amendment and try it out on the 1-year basis and see where we land. Certainly his proposal is more economical than it will be to induct men into the military forces for only 1 year under compulsory military training.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Kilday amendment applies to men only who have already been trained.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the point. It is more economical to engage a man who has been trained than it is to engage a man who has not been trained, I do not care what field of endeavor you put him in. Therefore, I am for it on those grounds.

As to taking rights away from the fellow who served 2 or 3 years, suppose he does get his 90-day furlough the fellows who are in the service want new men brought in who are going to stay so they can replace the fellows who want to get out. As I understand the Kilday amendment it will certainly effectively operate in that respect provided the boys reenlist. So, with all due respect to the chairman's argument I am for the Kilday amendment. My mind is still open and I will not accept the decision of the votes cast in the committee as indicated here as something that should form my judgment in the matter.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wonder if the gentleman from Michigan will ask the gentleman from Texas if his amendment provides for reenlistment in grade.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I shall be glad to ask him that.

Mr. KILDAY. It would be a part of the bill, and the bill provides for that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am certainly for not rejecting the voluntary proposition but I should like to ask the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee this question, because it is a big thing in my mind, that is whether in the judgment of the Military Affairs Committee and those in charge of the administration of the defense program we can safely resort to a voluntary enlistment system and protect the agreements we have consummated with the other nations of the earth? Or do you propose now to initiate a voluntary system to move concurrently with the compulsory selective service for the time being? What is the situation on that?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman has asked a rather far-reaching question. First he wants me to say what the judgment of the House Military Affairs Committee is and I cannot say that. I can speak for myself.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to have the gentleman's personal opinion.

Mr. MAY. My understanding of the situation is that it is the purpose of this committee to provide for a Regular Army sufficient to make it unnecessary to continue inductions under the selective service.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman means by voluntary enlistment.

Mr. MAY. By voluntary enlistment, of course, under this bill; and we are hopeful we will get it. If we do then that will render unnecessary further inductions under selective service.

Mr. CRAWFORD. How long will the Selective Service Act run concurrently with this plan provided we adopt this proposal here?

Mr. MAY. It will run until the 15th day of May 1946, to which time it has been extended by the Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So, from now until May of 1946, based on experience and observation and contacts we shall have to make up our minds as to whether or not voluntary enlistment is sufficient to take care of the agreements we have entered into.

Mr. MAY. That is exactly right. And, furthermore, I wish to say to the gentleman that we tried to meet the interests of the country the best we could by merely lifting the ceiling on the size of the Regular Army until such time as we felt the ceiling ought to be put on again. If between now and May 15, 1946, we get as many as a million men in the service and think that is all we need we will put the ceiling at a million.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not now forming any judgment as to what the size of the Regular Army should be. I think there are better experts on that than I.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full 5 minutes. I wish to call the attention of the House to an amendment I intend to offer if the Kilday amendment is defeated. I am in favor of the principle of 1-year enlistments which is carried in the Kilday amendment. The amendment I intend to offer will require that the enlistee for 1 year shall have served 1 year in the Army instead of 6 months. I shall offer the amendment if the Kilday amendment is defeated.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. What effect will that have upon the enlistee? I wish the gentleman would explain that more fully.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In place of the bill reading as it does, allowing 2-year enlistments, it will provide that the man who is a member of the Army of the United States shall have the privilege of

enlisting for one additional year provided he has served 1 year.

Mr. BROOKS. It will mean, then, that every man who is inducted, by accepting voluntary enlistment will serve 2 years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right, unless he is a member of the United States Army at the present time.

Mr. BROOKS. Whereas, under the Kilday amendment a man by taking advantage of that amendment could serve only 18 months.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right; and the reason I intend to offer the amendment is that we are offering a 2-year enlistment. At the present time I believe it would be fairer to ask men to serve for a minimum of 2 years rather than a minimum of 18 months.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. It is true that the man who has had 6 months training is just coming out of basic training and the greatest appeal, the greatest inducement to enlistment, would be to that man at the time he has just completed his first training and has had no active duty and he would then be willing to accept a period of 1 year's service, whereas if there is a lag of 6 months there, he performs a routine duty and the chances of fairness, if we offer a 2-year enlist- the pool from which you may enlist them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is a matter of opinion as to what might follow on that point, but I think from the standpoint of fairness, if we offer a two-year enlistment we should not allow a man who is now an enlistee in the Army to have an 18-month enlistment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to make one observation. Assuming that the draft will be ended on May 15 or sooner and this amendment is adopted, it is reasonable to suppose that the Regular Army will be composed entirely of 1-year enlistees or reenlistees and there would come a time, about a year from late this fall, when the entire Regular Army of the United States would be out of service.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, as I see this proposition we must have reenlistments if we are to demobilize quickly and eliminate the draft. It is my humble opinion this amendment will provide sufficient men in the Regular Army to both demobilize and eliminate the selective service calls. Frankly, I believe we will not secure a sufficient number of men if we hold to the 2-year enlistment. The decision we will have to make is whether or not we want to get sufficient men through the voluntary system or whether you want to continue the drafting of the 18-year-olds and others.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. How much of an army is it anticipated we will need?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I cannot say. Some who appeared before our committee talked about two and a half million, but to me that does not make sense. General MacArthur today reduced by one-half his estimate of the number needed in Japan. I think we will be able to reduce by one-half the number needed in Germany.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman remembers that General Marshall suggested 500,000 would be sufficient.

Mr. WINSTEAD. But he did not say when we could reduce to that number.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman feel this Congress should set a limit?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I certainly do, but we better give the War Department a little more time before we set a limit. There is no question but what the War Department can handle this problem best if they will. They can expedite the discharge of servicemen. What worries us all is whether they are giving their best efforts toward that end.

I say candidly unless the War Department does speed up the discharge of men in the service the Congress is likely to limit the size of the Army, and I know unless prompt action is taken the War Department will be seriously weakening the willingness of the American people to support an adequate army in the future.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, when this amendment was first suggested I had in mind opposing it on the theory it would be uneconomical, but since the gentleman explained it would give 1 year of net military service I am inclined to support it.

We have two propositions to think of in approaching this matter today under the pending bill. One is the professional Army. We do not know how large that will have to be. However, first and ahead of that comes the army of occupation. This 1 year, this short-term note, so to speak, may make the difference between success or failure in getting enough volunteers so that we can provide the army of occupation with men and get these boys home quickly. For this reason I intend now to support the pending amendment in the belief that with this short term of reenlistment for these men now in the Army, we may be able to solve the problem through the voluntary system. I am fearful that unless this amendment carries we might not be able to get the job done.

They talk about selective service running until May 1946 and drafting these teen-age boys into the Army. I cannot conceive there is any possibility that it will be necessary to continue from now on until next May to draft teen-age boys who should be in school, and to send them over as policemen in Japan and Germany. We are going to hold back the progress of this country for half a century if we continue such a policy. We have already drafted young men that ought to be in school and now, when the war is over, we propose to continue this iniquitous policy which cannot be but to the detriment of the future of this country. It will help to destroy our educational progress and our advancement in scientific research which is so necessary to keep this Nation in the forefront. Selective service should be stopped now instead of next May.

It want to see this bill put on the statute books so that it will work and do the job, and then, if it will take care of the army of occupation, we shall have a little time to find out how much further we must go. I shall support the amendment and I believe it will add strength to the bill and help to accomplish the purposes and the hopes of many of the Members of this Congress.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Page 2, line 11, after the word "thereof", insert "but said Army shall not exceed 500,000 enlisted men and officers, none of whom shall be under 20 years of age, except through voluntary enlistment."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane; on the ground that it reaches into the enforcement of the Selective Service Act and interferes with it by providing that those under 20 years of age cannot be inducted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this does not touch the Selective Service Act. I wish it could. This refers merely to the Regular Army and has no reference to the men taken into the armed forces through selective service. Further, in this bill we set up the terms of enlistment and set the age as 18, and make many other provisions for the Regular Army.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska propose to place an over-all ceiling on the Regular Army?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. On the Regular Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is proposed solely in relation to the Regular Army?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And the 20-year limitation applies solely to the Regular Army and not to the Army of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right; to the Regular Army.

Mr. MAY. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I wish it were possible to make this 20-year limitation apply to the Selective Service Act, because when we lowered the age from 20 to 18 we did it to win the war. We needed the manpower. We were told that by the brass hats. So we need these boys to win the peace.

My amendment attempts to limit the size of the Regular Army to 500,000 men.

I offer this amendment because General Marshall, in a not too late release, stated that he felt that 500,000 men was the proper size of the Army. If General Marshall feels that way, I am willing to take his advice on it.

This morning the answer came from General MacArthur that he would need fewer men in the Pacific area than was indicated, 200,000 for Japan and the areas thereabouts. This also undoubtedly means that the reserve men in the Pacific would be taken out, there would be fewer men required in that area.

I am not one who wants to cripple the size of the Army. I am not sure that we know just how many men we need. The report of the committee indicates 1,400,000 men in 1947. The Army release as of September 14, 1945, indicated they would need 2,500,000 men. Who is right?

The Army recently announced that 30,000 doctors and 10,000 dentists will be released soon, but they have set up some restrictions. They say, "You will get released if you have 80 points, are 48 years of age, or enlisted before December 1, 1941." I am reliably informed that under those restrictions fewer than 10,000 doctors can get out of the Army. Who is fooling the American people and the doctors of this country?

It is for that reason I believe that Congress sooner or later ought to signify the size of the Army. We ought to do something about selective service. We ought to do something about releasing those men from the military who have had 2 years' service at this time. We should insist that every liberated American prisoner of war be immediately discharged.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. If this amendment were adopted and it should then prove that we need more men in the occupation forces and on the home front than 500,000, would it not then strengthen the argument of those who say we have to continue the selective-service law, that you cannot get more than 500,000 men in the Regular Army so you have to continue the selective service law to induct them into the Army of the United States? It seems to me the amendment offered by the gentleman, if adopted, would in some degree defeat the very thing I suspect he has in mind.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The only thing I am worrying about is that if we do not put any ceiling on the Army we may get 2,500,000 or 3,000,000 men in the Army under the voluntary method. There is no way for the Congress to shut them off.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman is not worried about that, is he?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think they can get 1,500,000 men; yes.

Mr. JUDD. Voluntarily?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; under this bill we are now considering.

Mr. JUDD. I do not believe that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Navy now states they want 500,000 and will get them by voluntary enlistments after January 1, 1946—why should we not limit the Army?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment which is now before us should be adopted by the House, it means that we have passed final judgment at this hour upon our military obligations for the future. It proposes that the Regular Army shall not exceed 500,000 men.

Let us review the situation just a moment. I do not pretend to know all there is to know about it or what the future will unfold.

The last word of General MacArthur is to the effect that we shall need 200,000 men in Japan alone up to July 1, 1946. The last word from General Eisenhower is to the effect that we shall need in the European theater, not merely for the occupation of Germany, but for the caring of $8,000,000,000 worth of Army property and the handling of it, 395,000 men up to July 1, 1946. Forgetting the supply system which must be maintained in this country, forgetting the numbers of men who must be used for the training of recruits and replacements, forgetting patients in Army hospitals and the men caring for them, forgetting all those elements and many others, it is now proposed that in spite of this situation the Regular Army shall not number in excess of 500,000 men.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman remember General Marshall's statement that 500,000 would be sufficient?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not. He did not make it in this connection whatsoever.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Such a statement was made, however.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He made it in connection with estimates as to the ultimate strength of the Regular Army after this world is settled down. He never suggested such a limitation as this to take effect in September 1945—never. That should be understood.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. He made a direct statement that an Army of that size would suffice provided we had universal military training.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; that is perfectly true. The statement was conditioned on an event that has not yet come about.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The amendment has another decidedly dangerous effect. That is, it removes from the voluntary enlistment group those under 21 years of age, out of which group we expect to get most of the men, by providing that they shall not be taken below 21.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No, the amendment provides that those from 18 to 21 may enlist voluntarily. That is provided in the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not disturbed so much about that feature of the amendment as I am of the over-all picture of 500,000. It seems to me we are jumping pretty fast here if we adopt an amendment of this sort.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I agree with the gentleman that it is very difficult to determine the size of the Army at this time. Is that the point the gentleman is making?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the point. I do not know how many we should have. This bill is carefully drawn so that the Congress between now and 1947 can get a report every 3 months from the War Department as to how the recruiting program is coming along and then match those reports on that progress with the condition of affairs the world over, including the occupation of Germany and the occupation of Japan. In that way we will learn from time to time of the situation. We will learn step by step. We have not learned this afternoon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I call attention of the gentleman to the fact that there are in the Army now 419,000 with Regular Army status. In other words, there is not much need of us passing a voluntary recruitment bill to recruit 81,000 people, and that is what this limitation would amount to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee has seen fit to amend the bill so as to retain the 1925 act which provides that men under 21 years of age who have enlisted without the consent of their parents or guardian upon application by parent or guardian would be discharged.

When the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], member of the Military Affairs Committee, was on the floor discussing H. R. 3951, the bill which provides for voluntary enlistments in the Regular Naval and Military Establishments, I inquired of him whether section I did not repeal the act of 1925 which provides for the discharge upon application by his parent or guardian of any man who enlisted in the Army under 21 years of age who had not had the consent of such parent or guardian. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] stated, in his opinion, it did not repeal that section of the 1925 act, but he was somewhat indefinite.

I stated that the act before us did propose to repeal the 1925 provision. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, interrupted and stated that I was right in my position and that an amendment would be prepared to provide for retaining the 1925 act which gave parents an opportunity to have their sons under 21 years of age discharged who had enlisted without their consent.

I have been informed by one of the members of the Military Affairs Committee that this particular matter was

entirely overlooked and was not considered. I know from a previous conversation I had with this member that he himself was sincere about it and that he truthfully stated what he believed to be the case. However, I cannot conceive that the War Department or those members of the Military Affairs Committee who are responsible for the drafting of this bill wrote this language without specifically intending to repeal the act of 1925 which prohibited the enlistment of men under 21 years of age without the consent of their parent or guardian. The language relating to this subject in the pending bill was, in my judgment, intentionally written with the view of repealing that act without definitely designating it. The context of the provision is such that it cannot be otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHENOWETH: Page 3, after line 2, insert a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 3A. After the date of the enactment of this act, no man below the age of 20 years shall be inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, that it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. MAY. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kindness of the chairman of the committee in withholding his point of order, as I wish to call the attention of the Committee to a situation wherein I think Congress has a definite responsibility to act. I personally believe my amendment should be adopted and made a part of this bill which is being considered today. All afternoon we have been hearing criticism of the demobilization programs as now being carried out by the Army and the Navy. I personally feel that it is the responsibility of the proper officers of the Army and Navy to decide who shall be discharged and when. That is a job which properly belongs to them. I feel the Congress of the United States should not invade that field at this moment.

However, unless these discharge programs can be accelerated we will have to act, as the people are growing impatient. I hope it will not be necessary, and I trust our boys will be released more rapidly from now on.

I want to remind you that the amendment I have offered belongs in a field where we should properly legislate. Congress should determine whether it shall be the policy of this country to draft 18-year-old boys in time of peace. I do not think we can delegate this responsibility to General Marshall or anyone else in the armed forces. Parents of America expect us to make this decision. When in 1942 we had the matter before us of inducting 18- and 19-year-old boys, we gave the military leaders these boys very reluctantly. We were told they were needed to win the war. Now the war is over. So far as I know, no branch of our armed forces is now fighting in any place in the world, but we have not yet heard of our military leaders coming to the Congress and saying, "Now that the fighting is over, these 18- and 19-year-old boys should be left at home and be allowed to complete their education."

Every day I receive letters from mothers and fathers who say, "I wish to make some plans for my son who will be 18 in a month or two. What shall I do?" In all instances I have told them to send the boy to school. I do not believe it is the policy of the United States Government, in time of peace, to take an 18-year-old boy out of high school. Many of them are in their senior year and need only a few months to graduate. I introduced a bill in this House several months ago providing for the deferment of any boy 18 years of age who is a senior in high school. I had a similar bill pending during the last session of Congress, but for some reason the same has not been reported from the Military Affairs Committee. I submit that the United States Congress has a definite responsibility in this matter and we should act without delay. I have talked to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and he agrees with me. I think it is unfortunate we are postponing action on this matter when every day, throughout the country, these 18- and 19-year-old boys are being inducted. Surely no military necessity justifies or excuses the continuation of such a program.

I say there is a matter of public policy involved, and I think that Congress is derelict in its duty by permitting such a situation to continue. I think we are failing the people of this country in postponing consideration of this matter. Therefore, I am disappointed that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs intends to make a point of order against this amendment, which merely provides that 18- and 19-year-old boys shall not be inducted. While we are considering the matter of voluntary enlistments we should at the same time say to the Army and Navy that the 18- and 19-year-old boys will no longer be subject to induction.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Your amendment is not mandatory? It would not preclude them from volunteering if they wanted to volunteer, with the consent of their parents?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Oh, no. Absolutely not. My amendment says that Selective Service shall no longer induct 18- and 19-year-old boys under the Selective Service Act. They can enlist any time under the terms of this bill.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. If your amendment were adopted we would get just as many people under the Selective Service Act starting in at 20 as at 18?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I might say I believe the time is coming soon, if it has not already arrived, when we should repeal the entire Selective Service Act. I am ready to vote for its repeal now, but my amendment only covers 18- and 19-year-old boys.

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to vote for your amendment because I think it would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman. I hope that we may soon have the opportunity to vote on this question. In my opinion, it is no longer necessary to draft these boys, and they are entitled to finish their education. I think every boy should have at least a high-school education. The exemption of these teen-age boys will have no bearing whatever on our demobilization program, as I am confident we will get all of the men we need by the enactment of this bill providing for voluntary enlistments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado desire to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Colorado offers an amendment which affects and relates to the Army of the United States. The bill before the Committee affects and relates to the Regular Army. For reasons enunciated earlier by the Chair, the amendment is held not to be germane, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the statement made by the gentleman from Colorado and I must say that I am very sympathetic with some of the opinions he has expressed. One of the things that has been of great concern to me all during this draft program, particularly when we dropped down to the 18-year-old boys, has been the effect it might have on us in after years because we were taking those boys out of school. I thought this was the appropriate time to call the attention of members of the Committee to something with which we may not all be as familiar as we should, and that is the fact that both the Army and the Navy are maintaining rather comprehensive educational systems. In this connection I quote from my colloquy with General Edwards at page 35 of the hearings:

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was not thinking so much of going to school in this country, but certainly in the army of occupation, both in Europe and the Pacific, you are going to have a great many men that you do not need on a military basis except in emergency. Certainly they will have plenty of idle time, and I was just wondering if it was possible to set up some kind of a school system whereby those fellows, in their spare time, could be taking advantage of it. That is a matter of very serious concern to the people of this country.

General EDWARDS. We have quite elaborate plans for such an educational system in our European theaters. We have a system of utilization of civilian universities overseas.

We have a system of vocational schools which start right down at the company level and work on up, and we have recently sent several hundred educators overseas to manage and direct that system. Now, when we get in shape over in the Pacific we intend to institute similar measures over there.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will it be such a system that a boy who, for instance, has been taken out of high school in this country before finishing, might anticipate the possibility of completing his high-school education there?

General EDWARDS. That is right. If his education has reached the level where he could go to the university, we have made provision for him. We have one large institution in England. We have an institution in Paris, and we are using universities in Italy, where those boys may go to school if they want to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The same thing would be true in Germany?

General EDWARDS. In Germany, also.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And would it be true in Japan?

General EDWARDS. We intend to institute similar measures in Japan as soon as we get some kind of a stabilized situation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. So that a boy could reasonably expect to be able to continue his educational work while serving abroad?

General EDWARDS. I don't want to make any broad promises that are so all-embracing as that, but there will probably be specialized courses. They will have an opportunity to continue their education, and most of the educational institutions in this country have agreed to accept those credits for graduation and for a degree in this country. And more than that, we are making more vocational schools and technical schools on a lower level, so that men can learn a trade and really put their time while in the occupational forces to some good use.

General HENRY. Very recently we opened up the University of Okinawa.

I am not going to read further from the testimony but I commend it to your very careful reading because I think it is a good thing for us to know about. It must afford us all some satisfaction to realize that the boys who are going over there will have a reasonable opportunity to continue their education while serving in the armed forces.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate the fact that they are going to continue these educational courses over there, but nearly every boy who has a year to complete his high school education or his preparatory school education wants to get a degree from his home high school or his home preparatory school. He does not want any possibility of his having to seek a degree by Army credits being passed back to that institution. They cannot grant a degree.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think I disagree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very happy to learn that the Army is going to give these 18- and 19-year-old boys an opportunity to continue their education.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It applies to boys of any age.

Mr. STEFAN. I will not agree, and I am not going to be willing to let my boy fall into the clutches of Army brass hats to educate him.

Mr. SPARKMAN. These are not Army brass hats. They are educators taken over from this country under the general supervision of a distinguished educator. I cannot recall his name, but if I remember correctly he is the dean of Harvard University.

Mr. STEFAN. That is all right, but I do not believe our boys should be educated by the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, on page 2, line 9, I move to strike out the figures "18" and insert "17." Since we adopted an amendment which requires the consent of the parents and since the Navy of the United States permits enlistments on a voluntary basis down to 17 years of age, this amendment would put both services on an equality and allow the Army to receive similar enlistments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 2, line 9, strike out "18" and insert "17."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to ask a question. This only applies to those 17 years or over exactly as it is in the Navy Department and has been for a long time past; that is, with parental consent?

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

It occurs to me that the Navy has indicated that the only reason why it is able to go ahead with a voluntary enlistment plan is because they are able to get men out of the 17-year-old class. It seems to me we are taking this up without much testimony either from the Army or Navy as to the effect of such amendment. If the Army is allowed to draw from the 17-year-old pool, the Army and Navy will have to fight it out on something more than a voluntary enlistment basis or we may find that the Navy is in trouble.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not think the Navy will get into trouble over a matter of that kind and, furthermore, I believe that the boy should have a choice as to which branch of the military service he wants to go into with his parents' consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this bill as drawn seems to have merit, but if any Members of this House have the notion that the passage of it is going to still the rising tide of righteous indignation of the people over the slow pace of Army demobilization they are in for a rude awakening. The people of the country are not satisfied with a situation in which the Army of the United States was down less than 1 percent on September 1 this year from what it was on September 1 a year ago, when we were fighting two wars.

If I read the papers rightly, Canada stopped the draft on the 7th or 8th of May. I wonder if liberty is more precious in Canada for a young man 18 years of age than it is in this country? I think the Members should answer that question because the people are asking it. The correspondence I get from boys in the service and their parents indicate they expect Congress to take some action to restore to the young men of this country rights equivalent to those in Canada.

I would be interested in knowing how many men are still in the Canadian Army under conscription, and if somebody can give me that information I think it would be worth while to have it in the RECORD at this point.

We hear the suggestion made also that there are going to be educational courses in Europe. I received a letter the other day from a soldier in Europe who has a close connection with this educational course business, and I am not going any further toward identifying him than that, because I am afraid I might get him into trouble. In his letter he said, "This educational course business is to create publicity to salve the folks back home and try to quiet their nerves and make them think that their boys are happy here. But that is not the truth."

The boys want to come home. They want to get back to their own land.

No one has discussed here this afternoon the effect of 5 years of unnatural and abnormal living of 30,000,000 Americans during the last few years. These thirty millions have commitments due them ranking at least equal with these commitments our officials have made all over the rest of the world. The casualty list of lost morals, broken homes, and broken hearts of those 30,000,000 American people who have lived unnatural lives has not yet been published.

Let me say to those who favor a strong military system that they might be wiser to take into account the feelings of the people of this country if they want a long term, sound, military program. The people are not going to stand idly by and watch the military master minds destroy their future.

Some may wish to defer to the military master minds in these matters but I do not think Congress should. Those master minds came up here 6 months ago and said they had to have a national-service act to win the war. It was a thinly disguised slave-labor bill. After House passage the Senate turned that bill down. Then a few weeks later they said they had to have the nurse-draft bill or everything would be lost, and they high pressured this House into passing such a bill. But the Senate was wiser in its discretion and refused to pass such a bill, and now we learn of a surplus of nurses in the services.

So we find out that the claims of the military master minds are not always infallible. When they are made without discretion and with high pressure methods by the Committee on Military Affairs and others, it is time for Congress to watch its step.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. In other words, so far as the nurses were concerned, they did not even try to get enlistments, and I think Congress should be very alert in seeing that they carry out this program sincerely and effectively.

Mr. BUFFETT. I thank the gentlewoman. I think her observation is very much to the point.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, had come to no resolution thereon.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Consent Calendar will be the first order of business, after which the bill which has been considered today will be considered further.

I particularly desire to announce that next Thursday morning at 10 o'clock General Marshall will speak to the Members of the House and the Senate in the auditorium of the Library of Congress on the subject of demobilization. It is hoped that all Members will be present on that occasion.

NEED FOR OCCUPYING GERMANY AND JAPAN

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] be permitted to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, there is no Congressman on the Hill today who is not under constant and terrific pressure from servicemen and their families to secure their release from the Army, wherever they may be. Everybody wants out now that the war is over. And yet the tough fact remains that we must have a million and a half men for the postwar policing job of Europe and Asia if we are to fulfill our commitments in Europe and pin down the peace. Where are these men coming from?

The vast majority of them, of course, are coming from the ranks of men who were already in uniform when VJ-day came, but do not have the necessary points for discharge. If these men who have had no overseas service, or merely short service overseas, do not see the importance of our fulfilling the postwar military commitments which we have made, and if their failure to see it, results in our pulling out of Asia and Europe in the near future, then our foreign policy is certain to be undermined abroad.

There is no more important job for the information and education division of the Army than to indoctrinate and orientate these men, who have been assigned to the policing of Germany and Japan, with the importance and vital character of their assignment.

I call the attention of the information and education division to the following alarming article by Gladwin Hill which appeared in the New York Times of September 10. If the situation described in it is true, Maj. Gen. F. H. Osborn still has his work cut out for him. For his is part—a large part—of the responsibility for the "appalling lack of comprehension" among our troops abroad about the elementary facts of their presence there today.

ARMY FAILS TO CONVINCE TROOPS ON NEED FOR OCCUPYING GERMANY—SURVEY SHOWS LACK OF COORDINATED EFFORT TO EDUCATE MEN, WHO ASSERT: "WE WANNA GO HOME"—MORALE AT VANISHING POINT

(By Gladwin Hill)

BERLIN, September 9.—The United States Army, which did a lot of good work enlightening soldiers on why they were fighting the Germans, has fallen down woefully on the equally important matter of putting across the importance of occupying Germany.

Amid all the excitement about redeployment, the fact remains that under our program a force of nearly half a million Americans has to be maintained in Germany indefinitely. It goes without saying that for this force, to be effective, to be anything but a great mass of dangerously disgruntled men, must have some interest in and appreciation of the importance of the occupation. Yet in this correspondent's conversations with hundreds of soldiers since VE-day, virtually none showed such comprehension or consciousness of their responsibility. A number of experienced observers, some of them Army personnel, concur in this impression.

During the fighting a remarkable proportion of the soldiers felt that regardless of how tough their lot was, they would rather stay abroad until Germany was beaten. The fact Germany will not be really beaten until not only her armed forces have been smashed but also the nation itself reformed has not been brought home to our soldiers. Frequently one hears officers, even in high occupation posts, saying fatuously and dangerously, "Oh, I don't know why we don't go home and let the Germans stew in their own juice."

ESPRIT HAS VANISHED

Even after VE-day a good many soldiers indicated their awareness of the fact that there still was work to be done here and kept at it with a will. But because of the Army's negligence, even this remnant of esprit waned, and with the defeat of Japan it has vanished, indicating that while the Army had convinced its soldiers in Europe on a war 10,000 miles away, it had not engendered much understanding of the end product of what they had been fighting for themselves. VJ-day crystalized the universal "I'm going home" attitude, and now gold-bricking is the rule rather than the exception.

It is only natural for the men to want to go home and to think that the occupation force should be made up of "somebody else," but the point is that virtually every soldier over here, regardless of his amount of service, considers himself by right a potential candidate for discharge, regardless of what it might mean to the occupation program. It is evident that in the present climate of opinion those who are left are going to feel not only that they have drawn a dirty job but also have been cheated for an uncertain purpose.

TOUGHEST PROBLEM YET

This atmosphere has been aggravated by a torrent of unofficial and official reports of the lowering of the point score, which has given discharges the character of wildcat stock or a catch-as-catch-can lottery in which everyone has an equal right. The result has been that even soldiers with only a few points, whose war contribution was small compared with their comrades' and who therefore can reasonably be called upon to help out with the remaining task, are thinking only of the day when their points will reach the discharge level.

All observers recognize that "indoctrination," an ugly word in the Army, and justifying the occupation even as a disagreeable duty are extremely difficult at best—perhaps the toughest problem of that sort that the Army ever faced. Yet convincing the soldiers who had fought in Europe on the necessity of going on fighting the Japanese was similarly tough, but it was done. But on the occupation, observers agree, little effective effort has been made in this direction.

VE-day caught the Army short on the problem of occupying the time of the average 2,000,000 troops it was going to have on its hands in Europe for a year and the Army's main "educational machine," the Information and Education Division, was thrown into the task of hastily organizing a mass scholastic and recreational program.

The Information and Education Division takes in and channels such indoctrination as orientation lectures, discussion groups, movies, and publications such as the Stars and Stripes, Yank, and Army Talks. The keymen in indoctrination activity unit the information and education officers have been so busy organizing and selling courses in Shakespeare and poultry raising that they have had no time to put across just what we are trying to do in Germany.

NO COORDINATED EFFORT

The publications have reported in piecemeal fashion the occupation development, but there has been no coordinated effort to create the interest and understanding of the occupation that even Army officers acknowledge are important to its success.

With all the Army's extensive machinery for indoctrination, this correspondent has not found a soldier who could recall having received any elucidation, stimulation or encouragement about his present chores. Confidential Army investigations, in fact, have disclosed in some groups an appalling lack of comprehension of some of the elementary facts about the Germans.

A number of observers feel this deficiency is as likely to undermine the American occupation effort as any of the difficulties that may arise in the four-power management. They feel that the maintenance of police power in Germany for a number of years is essential to rehabilitating and neutralizing it, and that if the soldiers assigned to the occupation have nothing more than "I wanna go home" outlook, this is likely to be the keynote for opinion at home and to result in the same kind of futile occupation that followed the First World War.

They also feel that the effort to convince the soldiers on the importance of the occupation must extend to the American public, since, if the soldiers have no moral support, from home, their work is no more likely to be successful than it would have been if there had been no support of the fighting.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HANCOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include excerpts from certain letters.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain excerpts from a letter.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include some newspaper articles.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by General MacArthur.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of the Republican National Platform of 1944.

Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Kansas City Star.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two short articles.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a tribute paid to the late President by a former colleague, Mr. Burdick, of North Dakota.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a number of men who were taken prisoner by the Germans, stating that they feel there ought to be an added number of points given to them. I certainly think so, Mr. Speaker, because they were starved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for today be carried over until Thursday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CONTINUANCE OF CHILD-CARE PROGRAM

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 12, the question of continuing the child-care program was discussed at some length by Members of the House. The disastrous effect of termination of this program on communities which were heavily engaged in war production was indicated at that time. It was also noted that many wives of men still in the armed forces must continue working to supplement the family income over the dependency benefits allowed servicemen's families.

Shortly after the announcement by General Fleming that child-care centers would be terminated by October 31, I called his office to determine the reason for the order. I was advised that the Federal Security Agency had entered a compact with certain committees in Congress agreeing to immediate discontinuance of child-care facilities upon the end of hostilities. This agreement was reputedly made to pacify certain Members who were hostile to the granting of additional appropriations last June.

During the discussion last Wednesday I heard no objection raised to the continuation of this program. If it was the intent of Congress to terminate these centers immediately on the cessation of hostilities I have not been advised of it. There are still ample funds available for their continuation. The national emergency has not yet been declared ended. National selective service is still in operation, as is the War Production Board, OPA, and the Labor Board. It has been recognized that the continuation of these agencies will be necessary for a time. Why then have the child-care centers been discontinued? There are doubtless few Members of the House who have not had a flood of letters and telegrams from working mothers, desperate because care for their children during working hours is shortly to be ended.

To my knowledge, there is nothing in the Lanham Act or in the language of the recent appropriation calling for the end of child-care centers at this time. I would appreciate a clarification of this situation at the earliest possible moment.

If additional legislation is necessary for the continuation of this program, there must be no delay in its passage. The War Department has advised this House that as much as a year or longer will be required to return many servicemen to their families. Many men who served in the defense of our country will never return. It will indeed be an ironic tribute to these men who are still in service and to those who died in the defense of our great Nation if Congress should refuse to give the assistance of child-care centers to these mothers in order that they may provide for themselves and their children.

Perhaps the most important part of this whole question is the tremendous contribution that the child-care centers have made to the well-being of this new generation. I have visited many of these child-care centers while a member of the City Council of Los Angeles and also on my recent visit home. I saw these children given opportunity to play with other children in surroundings few homes can afford. Competent women specially trained in the care of children guided them in their activities. Excellent meals prepared by dietitians were served to these children. The excellent care given at these centers will be reflected in sound bodies and healthy minds. Surely America can make no sounder investment than in the welfare of its children.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LIQUIDATION OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS ORGANIZED FOR WAR AND EMERGENCY PURPOSES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last week the House passed H. R. 3660, providing for an audit of Government corporations by the General Accounting Office. Although I am in favor of the intent of the legislation I believe it has come too late to attack the problem realistically or to provide a basis for its solution.

Various authorities, including Members of Congress, have pointed out that the Government's use of the corporate device marks the entrance of the Government into a new field of economic activity. As has been stated on many previous occasions, there are over one hundred separate Government corporations competing with private industry and engaged in production, transportation, housing, insurance, lending, and other businesses. The gross assets of these corporations approximate $30,000,000,000. These corporations were organized under the laws of the States where charters could be more conveniently and easily secured. Most of them, of course, under the laws of the State of Delaware.

With this in mind I believe that the proper solution to the problem is not merely an audit of these corporations but legislation which will compel immediate liquidation of those corporations which have outlived their usefulness within a specified period of time. Many of the Government corporations were created during the prewar depression era and were intended to expire when the depression was over. No date has been set for their expiration. The ridiculous part is that in some cases Congress specified an expiration date, but such corporations are in liquidation many years after the expiration date. For example, the statute creating the Home Owners' Loan Corporation specifically states that the HOLC shall expire on June 12, 1936. That corporation has been in the process of liquidation for over 9 years. If the head of that agency has his way I believe that corporation will be liquidating for the next 9 years. If there are assets to be disposed of then why not let some other agency dealing with housing take over the assets rather than continue this one in continuous operation.

Another example which is equally ridiculous concerns the United States Housing Corporation which was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York on July 8, 1918, for the purpose of supplying emergency housing during World War I. It, too, is still in the process of liquidation.

The majority of these corporations will expire when dissolved. It should be the direct responsibility of Congress during this reconversion period to determine the dissolution dates for these corporations and, at the same time, specify a reasonable period for liquidation.

On June 30, 1945, this Congress passed an act providing for the consolidation and transfer of the Defense Plant Corporation, the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Metals Reserve Company, and the Rubber Reserve Company to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for

liquidation. This, of course, does not mean that these corporations are to go out of existence, because if past history is any indication of what will happen, these corporations will still be in the process of liquidation 10 years from now.

The bill which passed the House last week provides that unless Congress, by specific action, redefines the powers and duties of Government corporations they shall not continue after June 30, 1948. Even this section does not solve the problem. The Congress can set expiration dates but unless it provides for a date upon which liquidation must be completed these corporations or their successors will continue in operation forever.

I am told that the real purpose of the bill which passed the House providing for an audit of the Government corporations is to allow the General Accounting Office to make an audit and report its findings to Congress. Many Members of Congress, including myself, have upon various occasions called attention to the findings of the General Accounting Office in connection with the mishandling of Government funds by the various departments and agencies. The report of Mr. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General, is most critical as to the manner in which these corporations carry on their financial affairs. The waste and extravagance to which he has directed the attention of Congress is a disgrace to say the least. Our pleas were ignored, and the agencies at fault received even larger appropriations for the next succeeding fiscal year. I have no reason to believe that the situation will be any different in the case of the accounting of the Government corporations. This bill reminds me of locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen.

Within the next few days I shall expect to introduce legislation that will specifically provide liquidation, not merely expiration dates for various Government corporations which have outlived the purpose for which they were created. This to me is a sound approach to the problems of corporations that were organized according to those in charge of them either for emergency purposes or to be used for the prosecution of the war. It is rather late in the day to spend huge sums of money and employ thousands of additional employees to audit and make accountings of corporations years after they have been in operation. What they really need is liquidation in most instances and not auditing and accounting. Some of those whose services are needed may be continued, but most of them could well be liquidated now the war is over.

My attention has been called to an article that recently appeared in the August 1945 Reader's Digest by John T. Flynn, entitled "Government Corporations Should Be Wiped Out." It is an objective study of Government corporations and was undertaken, I am told, after much research. The conclusion which Mr. Flynn reaches is the same conclusion which I have reached; namely, the remedy is not to regulate these corporations, but to abolish them and reform those which have a useful purpose as ordinary Government bureaus. It is my opinion that the Government corporation bill that passed the House last week will become a device to stop pressure for the abolition of useless Government organizations that are no longer needed. The audit of the Government corporations will accomplish very little good now especially with respect to those whose services are no longer necessary. Only definite and specific action by Congress will achieve proper results. The time for action with respect to this problem is now.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUCK (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness.

To Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness in the family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 102. An act to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 23, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil-service status under such act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

S. 201. An act for the relief of the estates of William F. Bacon, Myrtle Jackson, Catherine Smith, and Tibbie Spencer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 405. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

S. 451. An act for the relief of Carl Baumann; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 562. An act for the relief of Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap Associates, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act exending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

S. 857. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Ford; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 883. An act for the relief of Charlie Tyson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 980. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edmond J. Saint Amant, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1036. An act to provide for the payment of accumulated or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories, or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

S. 1076. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1102. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval convalescent hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1103. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1118. An act for the relief of First Lt. Jack Sanders, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of an explosion at Camp Lejeune, N. C., on January 22, 1945; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1119. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 146 at the naval operating base, Bermuda, on April 26, 1945; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1134. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in buildings 102 and 102-A in Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa, on August 17, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1135. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1215. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the steamship *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 241. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruby H. Hunsucker;

H. R. 799. An act for the relief of the estate of Stanley E. Smallwood; to the legal guardian of Frank Carter, Jr., a minor; to the legal guardian of Donald R. Keithley, a minor; to Keithley Bros. Garage;

H. R. 999. An act for the relief of Lily L. Carren;

H. R. 1057. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Margaret Hockenberry, a minor;

H. R. 1257. An act for the relief of George C. Tyler and Doris M. Tyler;

H. R. 1456. An act for the relief of George E. Baker;

H. R. 1564. An act for the relief of William W. Maddox and the legal guardian of Donna Sue Maddox and Saddie Inez Maddox;

H. R. 1634. An act for the relief of the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa;

H. R. 1713. An act for the relief of Canal Dredging Co.;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Aloysius G. Miller;

H. R. 1975. An act for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson and Young;

H. R. 1982. An act for the relief of R. L. Whittington, Mrs. R. L. Whittington, and Mrs. J. B. Whittington;

H. R. 1992. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of Alaska in trust for the Roman Catholic Church;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Edmund F. Danks, as administrator of the estate of Edna S. Danks, deceased;

H. R. 2028. An act for the relief of John Visnovec, Rose Visnovec, and Helen Visnovec;

H. R. 2163. An act for the relief of Teresa Tine;

H. R. 2511. An act for the relief of Patricia M. Kacprzyk and Alex D. Leontire; and

H. R. 2641. An act for the relief of Frank Glen.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 18, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Thursday, September 20, 1945, Subcommittee No. III of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue the hearings on H. R. 2357, to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended. The hearing will be held in room 346, House Office Building, and will begin at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, September 27, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1751, to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Merchant Marine Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

681. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize payment for accumulated and accrued leave to persons whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 952. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Interim report filed pursuant to House Resolution 192, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, directing the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to investigate the Veterans' Administration (Rept. No. 953). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr BOYKIN:

H. R. 4079. A bill to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for patents, for taking action in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto, for preventing proof of acts abroad with respect to the making of an invention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 4080. A bill to amend section 476, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 2), providing for officers and employees of the Patent Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4081. A bill designating September 2, the date proclaimed by the President of the United States as the final surrender of Japan and ending hostilities in World War II, as a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4082. A bill to continue in effect the reemployment rights of veterans after the termination of other provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4083. A bill authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri:

H. R. 4084. A bill authorizing the transfer to educational and training institutions of prefabricated houses or other housing units for use in housing veterans attending such institutions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4085. A bill to provide for a 75-percent guaranty of loans to veterans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property, and to increase the aggregate amount which may be guaranteed to $3,000; to the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4086. A bill to provide that all general officers in the Regular Army appointed to a higher temporary grade shall revert to their permanent grade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4087. A bill to amend title II of the act entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1175), in order to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing and equalizing retirement and retainer benefits for enlisted men of the Regular Navy, and thereby encouraging a higher type of young men to make the Regular Navy a career, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4088. A bill to direct the discharge of all members of the armed forces who have served at least 18 months; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. J. Res. 240. Joint resolution calling upon the President to call a peace-treaties conference in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution declaring the date of termination of hostilities in the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4089. A bill to provide for an examination and survey of Aberdeen Creek, Gloucester County, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 4090. A bill for the relief of Roy Hesselmeyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 4091. A bill for the relief of James M. Dingwall, Eileen Reynolds, W. G. Peterson, Bert Woolslayer, and Maisie Purser Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 4092. A bill granting a pension to Ethelyn Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4093. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 4094. A bill for the relief of Homan R. Lee and Jessie B. Lee; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4095. A bill for the relief of Bradley F. Hawley, Hazel E. Hawley, and Bob R. Hawley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:

H. R. 4096. A bill for the relief of Woody L. Craft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKENZIE:

H. R. 4097. A bill to permit Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault to retire at the highest rank held by him while on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1159. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Petition from Ella Hughes and 37 citizens of Meeteetse, Wyo., and vicinity, in favor of H. R. 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1160. By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri: Petition of War Dads Chapter, No. 6, of Springfield, Mo.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1161. By Mr. HAVENNER: Memorial of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging continuance of Federal aid for maintenance of child-care centers in the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Education.

1162. By Mr. RICH: Petition of City Council of the City of Williamsport, Pa., urging the removal and rescinding of WPB Regulation L-41; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, September 10, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most loving Father, grant unto us quiet hearts, freed from fear and feverish anxiety as we stay our minds on Thee. In the midst of problems that perplex, in a world so full of shouting and tumult, may we keep clear a path to the inner temple where, bowing our spirits in humility and reverence, we guard in unceasing vigil the sacred flame of hope and faith and love on the altar of the unseen and eternal.

In these days wherein the souls of men are sorely tried, when so much is demanded of those who would serve the present age, grant us the divine strength and grace that we may prove worthy of every trust the Nation commits to our hands, as on the anvil of vast issues

there slowly takes shape the new and better world that is to be. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, September 14, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. COOPER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GEARHART, and Mr. KEEFE members of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of Pearl Harbor.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 241. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruby H. Hunsucker;

H. R. 799. An act for the relief of the estate of Stanley E. Smallwood; to the legal guardian of Frank Carter, Jr., a minor; to the legal guardian of Donald R. Keithley, a minor; to Keithley Bros. Garage;

H. R. 999. An act for the relief of Lily L. Carren;

H. R. 1057. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Margaret Hockenberry, a minor;

H. R. 1257. An act for the relief of George C. Tyler and Doris M. Tyler;

H. R. 1456. An act for the relief of George E. Baker;

H. R. 1564. An act for the relief of William W. Maddox and the legal guardian of Donna Sue Maddox and Saddie Inez Maddox;

H. R. 1634. An act for the relief of the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa;

H. R. 1713. An act for the relief of Canal Dredging Co.;

H. R. 1882. An act for the relief of R. L. Whittington, Mrs. R. L. Whittington, and Mrs. J. B. Whittington;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Aloysius G. Miller;

H. R. 1975. An act for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson & Young;

H. R. 1992. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of Alaska in trust for the Roman Catholic Church;

H. R. 2028. An act for the relief of John Visnovec, Rose Visnovec, and Helen Visnovec;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Edmund F. Danks, as administrator of the estate of Edna S. Danks, deceased;

H. R. 2163. An act for the relief of Teresa Tine;

H. R. 2511. An act for the relief of Patricia M. Kacprzyk and Alex D. Leontire; and

H. R. 2641. An act for the relief of Frank Gien.

LETTER OF APPRECIATION FROM GENERAL WAINWRIGHT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate two short letters, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My comrades and I are deeply grateful to the United States Senate for the honor accorded us on Monday of being present in the Senate Chamber. I also greatly appreciate the honor of being permitted as their spokesman to address the Senate. Thank you for this distinguished honor.

The rousing welcome that has been given us in this country since our liberation from captivity has been overwhelming. It has been ample evidence that the people of the United States are determined to maintain their free and democratic institutions. It has been an assurance to the individuals of this great Nation that those so unfortunate as to be denied their freedom, as we were, will receive the entire support of the Nation to regain their liberty.

I would be grateful if you would convey our thanks to the Members of the Senate.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN M. WAINWRIGHT,
General, United States Army.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1945.

Gen. JONATHAN M. WAINWRIGHT,
Care of the Office of Chief of Staff,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL WAINWRIGHT: Your letter of the 12th has been received and noted.

We were happy and delighted and proud to have you with us, and we thank you for your most interesting address.

I believe I speak for every single Member of the Senate when I say you have the respect and admiration of every Member of our body for your unwavering and masterly defense of our country and that you and your associates also had our every sympathy during the time you were denied your freedom.

We are indeed proud of you.

With great respect,

Sincerely your friend,

KENNETH MCKELLAR.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letters will lie on the table.

NOTICE OF EXPLANATION BY GENERAL MARSHALL OF DEMOBILIZATION PROCEDURE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to announce that on next Thursday at 10 o'clock a. m., in the auditorium of the Library of Congress, General Marshall desires to address the Members of the two Houses of Congress to explain fully to them the question of demobilization, so that he may do so before the membership of both Houses, not simply before committees of the two Houses. That meeting will not be executive but will be open, in order that we may have an opportunity to hear from General Marshall the plan, and an explanation of it, by which an attempt is being made to discharge men from the Army. I believe that it will be helpful for all Members of the Senate to be present at the meeting.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. When the Senator says that the meeting will be open, I understand that it is to be limited to Members of Congress. I raise the question because some inquiries have been made as to whether others than Members of Congress will be allowed to attend. I believe that the meeting is to be limited to the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand that to be the case.

Mr. HILL. That is my understanding. I think it is important that we know whether attendance will be limited, because there are only a certain number of seats in the hall of the Library of Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the attendance were to be limited to Members of Congress the meeting would not be open and it would be an executive meeting. I was informed that the General decided to make a statement not only to the Members of Congress but to members of our office forces, for example, who might wish to attend, as well as others. Of course, it is not expected that such a small auditorium can accommodate many persons from the general public, and it is not so contemplated. I asked definitely whether attendance would be limited to Members of the two Houses of Congress, and I was told that it would not be so limited.

Mr. HILL. The Senator may have more recent information than I have.

CORRECTION

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to make a correction in the RECORD of Friday last. I invite attention to page 8745 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings of the Senate on last Friday. In the first column of that page, where I was referring to a bill which had been introduced earlier that day on behalf of the Senator from Virginia and myself providing for the voluntary enlistment for 1 year in the Army of the United States, the RECORD shows my having stated "enlistments of men who are already in service and who have not been discharged." That is an error. Under that bill enlistments would be open not only to those already in service, but also to those who have been discharged from the services, and those who had not been in service. I wish to have the correction made in the RECORD. The bill to which I have referred is now pending before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate.

On page 8744 of the daily RECORD, in the discussion on the question of demobilization of the men in service, I am quoted as saying that under the projected plan of the Army there is to be an army on July 1, 1946, of three-hundred-and-some-odd thousand in Europe, 500,000 in the Pacific, and 1,100,000 in this country. Those figures are in error. I certainly did not intend to use those figures as they appear in the RECORD. The projected plan of the Army as stated in the hearings now being held before the Military Affairs Committee are, for July 1, 1946, 500,000 in Europe, 900,000 in the Pacific, and 1,100,000 in this country.

As I have already stated, and as I stated last Friday, I cannot understand why the Army would want 1,100,000 men in this country in 1946.

Mr. President, in view of the announcement made by General MacArthur and printed in the newspapers of today, that within 6 months no more than 200,000 men will be needed for the army of occupation of Japan, I cannot under-

stand the justification for asking for 900,000 men for the Pacific area. Certainly, no one knows the needs of our Army in the Orient better than does General MacArthur. It is my hope that we will continue to urge——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will yield in a moment. It is my hope that we will continue to urge demobilization as fast as possible of the men in the armed forces.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator think that it would have been a fine thing for General MacArthur to have notified the officials in Washington of his discovery of the minimum number of 200,000 men which he has said will be needed?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am certainly less concerned with the method which General MacArthur may use in conveying information and his opinions upon this subject than I am in his opinions, because I have a very high respect for his opinions. I am glad that he is being frank with the people of this country in telling them the needs of the services. I am glad that the statement has been forthcoming because to many of us it was hardly understandable that 900,000 men would be needed in the Pacific. It has now been stated by General MacArthur that within 6 months he will need only 200,000 men in Japan. As to whether he should give the information first to the public, or to the officials in the Pentagon Building, I am not concerned. I want the public to have the information, and I want Congress as well to have these figures.

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S STATEMENT ON SIZE OF EASTERN ARMIES OF OCCUPATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the vacation last August, in fact just at the close of the session, I made some brief remarks relative to the question of demobilization, the termination of the draft under selective service, and the size of the Army and of military forces necessary to be maintained in occupied zones. Since then many statements have been made both in Congress and out of Congress, in the military and outside the military, at home and abroad. I said in that speech that whether we discontinued the draft and whether we had rapid demobilization would depend mostly upon the size of the Army we maintained in the occupation zones.

Last night I read a release by General MacArthur, printed by the Washington Post this morning, in which the general sets out very specifically and in detail that the occupation of Japan and the Southwest Pacific can adequately be taken care of by the use of 200,000 men. According to General MacArthur 200,000 men is all we need in Japan and the Southwest Pacific to occupy those territories. Possibly he has in mind the use of some Chinese and Philippine divisions. Yet, we have been told by those high in authority in the military in this country that the minimum number to maintain peace runs as high as two million and a half.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I have a profound respect for General MacArthur, his policies and judgment. If we can maintain and police Japan and the Southwest Pacific areas with 200,000 men, we ought to do the same with less men in the European theater. I was over there and I think I know something about the conditions there. If we can police both theaters with not to exceed 200,000 men in each theater that will take only 400,000 men. We have 400,000 regularly enlisted men in the Army who will continue in the service when the war is over.

So here we have the first suggestion of a peacetime Army that meets with the approval, I think, of the people quite generally throughout the country, and ought to meet with the approval of the Members of Congress. If we can reduce the armies of occupation to that size, 400,000, then the problems of the continuation of the draft, the retention of two and a half million men in the armed services, and the termination of the war, are settled without debate, if General MacArthur is correct in his judgment and policies.

I respectfully ask, Mr. President, that the remarks made by General MacArthur which are publicized in this statement be made a part of my remarks at this point, and I ask the members of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, for whom I have profound respect, to take this under advisement, and at an early date, based upon this declaration, to report to the Senate a resolution which will terminate the war, end the draft, and bring about a demobilization of the military forces just as rapidly as possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Nebraska will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

DEPENDENCE ON REGULARS WOULD FREE CITIZEN ARMY—STATEMENT JOLTS STATE DEPARTMENT; FOREIGN MINISTER SHELVED BY JAPS

TOKYO, September 18.—General MacArthur declared today 200,000 regulars probably could keep prostrate Japan in line, permitting complete demobilization of his victorious citizen army of draftees.

So smooth was the occupation that he junked plans for military rule—which might have taken several million troops to enforce—and pledged that those freed from duty would go home as fast as ships can take them.

(The State Department here moved quickly last night to investigate MacArthur's statement, Acting Secretary Dean G. Acheson tersely commenting that the Department knew nothing about the report and was attempting to find out about it. Amplification was refused.

(It was learned, however, that MacArthur's statement had created sharp surprise and considerable concern.)

APPARENTLY WITHOUT NOTICE

(One official, who asked that his name be withheld, said MacArthur apparently made his statement without notifying Washington in advance. He added it was feared here it might create the impression the United States was preparing to withdraw from the Pacific area at an early date, leaving the Japanese largely to manage their own affairs.)

The Japanese showed their cooperation by shelving militarist-tainted Foreign Minister Mamoru Shigemitsu and replacing him with Shigeru Yoshida, veteran diplomat once jailed for opposing the war.

Simultaneously MacArthur put into effect a drastic reeducation program designed by dint of press, radio, and the public schools to lead Japan's millions from militarism to the ways of democracy.

Four more suspected Japanese war criminals were locked up. Twenty-nine of the 46 on MacArthur's wanted list now are in custody. Two others were suicides.

Lieut. Gen. Yoshio Shinotsuka, classmate of War Dictator Tideki Tojo in Japan's West Point and former member of the supreme war council, committeed suicide yesterday. He was not on MacArthur's list.

MacArthur moved his headquarters to Tokyo.

"No greater gamble has been taken in history than the initial landings, where our ground forces were outnumbered a thousand to one, but the stakes were worth it," MacArthur declared.

WOULD HAVE REQUIRED YEARS

Military rule would "have involved a force running into millions of our men and would have taken many years of additional time and untold billions of additional dollars," he said.

But by using the Japanese Government to carry out Allied demands, the same purposes could be accomplished "with only a small fraction of the men, time, and money originally projected."

MacArthur predicted that within 6 months the "occupational force, unless unforeseen factors arise, will probably number not more than 200,000 men, a size probably within the framework of our projected regular establishment (Army)."

First to be rewarded will be the veteran Thirty-first, Thirty-seventh, and Thirty-eighth Divisions, now in Manila. They will be sent home from there.

Yoshida, former Ambassador to London, was chosen for foreign minister because Japanese sources said, he alone was "free of any suspicion of actively supporting the war."

Yoshida was jailed for a month early this year for demanding peace when he realized the war was lost, authoritative Japanese quarters said.

MacArthur converted his psychological warfare into an information dissemination section to convince every Japanese of his country's defeat and war guilt, to eradicate militarism and to encourage democratic principles.

By the press, radio and public-school program of direct information, an announcement said, the Allies hoped to "foster a sound economy," encourage democratic organization, and a "free government responsible to the people."

By this program the Army likewise expected to promote "civil liberties, the free right for assembly, public discussions, education, free elections, and respect for human rights" among 80,000,000 Japanese raised on militarism and the premise that might makes right.

PRINTS ATROCITY STORIES

As the first fruits of this campaign, the influential Nippon Times printed the first atrocity stories, declaring the people learning of them for the first time must shiver with shame. It urged stern punishment for the perpetrators.

Domei repudiated its own story that the atomic bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima had left the land unfit for human habitation for 75 years.

Two members of Tojo's cabinet at the time of Pearl Harbor were among the latest clapped into Yokohama prison to await investigation and possible courts martial as war criminals.

They were Vice Adm. Ken Terashima, former communications minister, and Nobosuke Kishi, former commerce and industry minister.

With them were Lt. Col. Seiichi Ohto, held responsible for atrocities in Manila, and Lt. Honashi Takuchi, who must answer questions about the brutal treatment of internees at Kawasaki prison camp.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the number of men in active service in the land forces on June 30, 1945, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES RESULTING FROM EXPLOSION AT NAVAL MAGAZINE AT PORT CHICAGO, CALIF.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to section 5 of Public Law 423, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, a summary of the reports of claims for damages resulting from the explosion at the naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SALARY OF SOLICITOR OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF LETTER AND PAPER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this point the Chair asks that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from the further consideration of the letter of the Secretary of the Interior dated August 8, 1945, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, and that the letter and accompanying paper be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

There being no objection, the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from further consideration of the letter and accompanying paper, and they were referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate for reference to the Committee on Military Affairs telegrams from John O. Chamberlain, of Knoxville, and Lucy B. Moore, of Memphis, both in the State of Tennessee, which will be read by the clerk.

The telegrams were read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., *September 18, 1945.*
Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Favor bill to release all men with 2 years' service, but it should include officers.

JOHN O. CHAMBERLAIN,
First Lieutenant, A. U. S.,
Knoxville, Tenn.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *September 17, 1945.*
Hon. KENNETH D. MCKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

As one of your constituents for many years in Shelby County and a widowed mother of two only sons 3 years in Pacific, urge you draft legislation at once to speed discharge of the so far forgotten men, namely, service forces which point system never seems to touch.

LUCY B. MOORE.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions and memorials, which were referred as indicated:

A letter from H. Ennis Jones, executive vice president and treasurer, Philadelphia (Pa.) Convention and visitors bureau of the chamber of commerce and board of trade, relating to a national plan entitled "Selling the American Way of Life"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions from several citizens of West Virginia praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the prompt release of certain members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter from R. H. Smith, of Beaumont, Kans., relating to the use of the atomic bomb; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Vernon Hancock, of Winston-Salem, N. C., praying for the enactment of the so-called emergency unemployment compensation bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a memorial, from Kathleen Knotts, of East Paterson, N. J., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called emergency unemployment compensation bill; ordered to lie on the table.

CONTINUATION OF CONSCRIPTION TO POLICE CONQUERED COUNTRIES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution recently adopted by Comanche Post, No. 122, the American Legion, at Coldwater, Kans., in regard to continuation of conscription to police the conquered countries, which I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comanche Post, No. 122, the American Legion, with a membership of 65 and a potential membership of 200, being duly assembled at its regular meeting in Coldwater, Kans., September 11, 1945, unanimously passed the following resolution:

"We favor the continuation of conscription to police the conquered countries. This enormous task cannot be accomplished on a voluntary basis. Talk to the contrary is senseless, with something like 1,000,000 men involved. The American way is to let each man take his turn. Germany and Japan must be occupied for years to come. Otherwise, they will get ready for another war. Thus World War II boys will have died in vain, as did the boys of World War I. With the atomic bomb what about civilization? We dare not take chances on having another war.

"Furthermore, we believe that a peacetime conscription program can be worked out whereby the conscript can carry on useful studies or technical training, leading toward some occupation, in conjunction with his military service. The Army and Navy will need expert and skilled technicians more than ever. We believe that all this will fit into a preparedness program that will be the very best and the cheapest insurance against having another war."

VERNON W. PEPPERD,
Post Adjutant.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSOURI VALLEY—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS FARMERS UNION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have just received a copy of a resolution adopted by the Kansas Farmers Union at a meeting held in Topeka on September 5 in which that organization goes on record as favoring the development of the MVA project in the Missouri Valley.

I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution and request that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

"The people of the Missouri Valley face common problems of natural resources development, including flood control, power development, irrigation, soil conservation, navigation improvement, reforestation, mineral resources development and others.

"A proper solution of these problems requires that the Federal Government provide unified, comprehensive planning and management of resources development in the valley.

"The Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, and the River and Harbor Act of March 3, 1945, embodying the Army Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation plans for flood control, navigation and irrigation are unacceptable to the people of the valley for the following reasons:

"1. The acts do not provide a unified, comprehensive program for development of all the resources of the valley, but are aimed only at flood control, navigation, and irrigation, with minimum power generation. They completely ignore the development of natural and human resources, improvement of agriculture, encouragement of industry and other phases of development necessary to a better economy in the Missouri Valley.

"2. The acts would continue the river in control of two major agencies which have lost all claim to public confidence. The Army engineers, after 100 years and hundreds of millions of dollars in expenditures, have not only failed to control floods, but have actually aggravated them in many areas, including the lower Missouri Valley. They have ignored many water values, such as electric power generation, in their development. They have maladministered such great projects as the Inter-American Highway, Alcan Highway, and the Canol project. The Bureau of Reclamation has built isolated projects, failing to develop a comprehensive plan for the West, until it hurriedly proposed the semblance of such a plan to avert the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority and to save the jobs of its personnel. It has, under pressure of the MVA proposal, shamelessly agreed to the construction of dams by the Army engineers which it once told Congress were worthless—a waste of taxpayers' money—and has even agreed to the enlargement of one major, dangerous project.

"The Murray-Cochran bills now before Congress, S. 555 and H. R. 2203, would establish a Missouri Valley Authority—an autonomous Federal agency with over-all responsibility for the planning and administration of balanced development in the interest of the 7,000,000 people living in the valley.

"These same bills promise the production and transmission of low-rate power, with resultant stimulation of industrial development in the Missouri Valley and the provision of jobs and security for hundreds of thousands of Missouri Valley servicemen and war workers whose efforts helped assure the triumph of the United Nations over the Fascist powers.

"The enactment of these bills will result in substantial benefits for the State of Kansas.

"In view of these facts, this conference of people of the State of Kansas, including leaders of organizations with a combined membership of 100,000, favors the enactment of the Murray-Cochran bills, S. 555 and H. R. 2203, at the earliest possible moment and

particularly urges the Senate Irrigation and Agriculture Committees that are about to conduct hearings on S. 555 to give the bill unqualified support.

"Copies of this resolution are to be forwarded to the governor, Senators, Congressmen, the Industrial Development Commission, and State legislators of Kansas, to the press, and to all persons participating in this conference."

I am submitting the foregoing resolution for your consideration in line with the request set out in the resolution.

E. K. DEAN,
President, Kansas Farmers Union.

SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS IN KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a telegram from Hon. Andrew F. Schoeppel, Governor of Kansas, in which he sets forth the serious doctor shortage in Kansas as brought to his attention by the Kansas State Procurement and Assignment Division.

On the very day on which Governor Schoeppel's wire reached me, the War Department issued an announcement of a liberalized demobilization program for their medical personnel. I look forward with confidence to a similar announcement by the Navy liberalizing the policy under which their doctors may be returned to civilian life in order to protect the health of our home community.

Mr. President, I would like to invite the attention of the Senate to conditions in my State by reading Governor Schoeppel's telegram. It is as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS.,
September 14, 1945.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate:

I am wiring you concerning our serious doctor shortage. Kansas State Procurement and Assignment Division have advised me concerning the urgent need of having some doctors returned to Kansas to relieve a situation which is becoming acute. Kansas is one of the first States to exceed its medical quota assigned to it for medical purposes. Topeka, for instance, has lost nine doctors by death since war started and not one doctor has as yet been returned from services. Growth of this community and lack of doctors is creating genuine hardship on an overworked medical staff here at this time. We urge you to press for release of sufficient number of doctors to alleviate our situation. It would seem to me that those doctors who are awaiting reassignment could and should be permitted to return.

Regards,

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Governor of Kansas.

I ask that the telegram be appropriately referred. There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 680. A bill to encourage and protect small oil refineries by extending preference to such refineries in disposing of royalty oil under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 566).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 932. A bill to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 567).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1400. A bill for the relief of Robert R. Rowe, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1401. A bill to authorize the disposition of the United States Navy Motor Torpedo Boat Squadron Training Center at Melville, R. I.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1402. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. WHEELER (by request):

S. 1403. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Norman Nedrud; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(Mr. WALSH introduced Senate bills 1404, 1405, and 1406, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1407. A bill to permit any person actually performing duties as an employee of a Federal agency to be extended recognition as an accredited representative of a veteran organization, within the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1408. A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of enlisted men who have at least 2 years of service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. RUSSELL introduced Senate Joint Resolution 94, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution requesting the Secretaries of War and Navy, the Commissioner of Education, and the Chairman of the National Research Council to transmit to the Congress certain recommendations concerning the establishment of minimum standards for military training to be required in conjunction with educational training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INCREASE OF PERMANENT AUTHORIZED ENLISTED STRENGTH OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference two important naval bills. The first proposes to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments to the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. This is a bill to provide personnel for the postwar Navy.

I ask that a brief statement explanatory of the bill be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1404) to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. WALSH is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WALSH

The Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, and the Honorable DAVID I. WALSH, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, introduced legislation today which, if approved, will establish the postwar personnel strength of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and will also authorize officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and former commissioned warrant, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps who served in higher commissioned officer grades or ranks during the war, to be appointed to commissioned or warrant ranks on the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps.

The legislation is an endeavor on the part of Chairman VINSON and Chairman WALSH to establish a personnel strength for the Navy and Marine Corps in order that plans may be more firmly made and a speedy demobilization effected within these services.

Chairmen WALSH and VINSON stated the bill was prepared by them after consultation with officers in the Navy Department and that the bill represents in a general way the views of these officers. They stated also they expected to hold hearings on the measure in the very near future and at that time they would have officers of the Department, as well as other interested persons, appear before the committee to express their views.

The bills authorize 500,000 enlisted and 58,000 officer personnel or a total of 558,000 personnel for the Navy and 100,000 enlisted and 8,000 officer personnel or a total of 108,000 personnel for the Marine Corps. During the war the peak numbers of personnel in those services was 3,389,000 for the Navy and 582,500 for the Marine Corps.

The Navy and Marine Corps have already instituted vigorous recruiting campaigns for volunteers in order to meet enlisted personnel requirements.

In order to meet officer requirements for the postwar Regular Navy and Marine Corps an opportunity should be afforded to those officers of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve and former enlisted and warrant personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps who served in commissioned grades during the war to transfer to the officer list of the Regular Naval Establishment. These personnel performed their duties admirably during the war and the way should be opened in order that they may continue to serve in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps if they so desire. Former officers who served on active duty during World War II and who were separated from such services under honorable conditions by discharge or resignation are also eligible for appointment.

Personnel appointed to permanent grades or ranks under the proposed legislation will

be temporarily appointed to the same grade and rank with and the same precedence in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps as they held in their Reserve status, and will retain this temporary higher appointment as long as and in the same manner as will other officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps.

Appointments in the regular services are to be made pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President. These regulations are to include the standards and qualifications for appointment, the determination of lineal position and precedence of appointees, and provisions for the assignment of running mates to officers appointed to the Staff Corps of the Regular Navy.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C.

Memorandum for the chairman, Senate Naval Affairs Committee:

1. In accordance with your verbal request I am attaching herewith a draft of proposed legislation which will

(1) Increase the authorized personnel strength of the Navy and Marine Corps, and

(2) Authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps of:

(a) Male Officers of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve.

(b) Officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps who were formerly commissioned warrant, warrant, or enlisted men but were temporarily appointed to highest ranks or grades during World War II.

(c) Former officers of the Navy or Marine Corps or their Reserve components who served on active duty during World War II and who were separated from such services by reason of resignation or discharge, under honorable conditions.

2. Section 1: Provides that the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the Regular Navy shall be 500,000. The present permanent authorized enlisted strength of the Navy is 232,000 as authorized in Public Law 39—Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 22, 1941.

Section 2: This section re-enacts present law (Public Law 393, 77th Cong., approved January 12, 1942) and continues the authorized enlisted strength of the Marine Corps at 20 percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Regular Navy.

Section 3: Provides that the number of enlisted men provided for shall mean the daily average number of enlisted men in the naval service during the fiscal year.

Section 4: Provides for an authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, of 8 percent of the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the Navy.

Present law authorizes the line strength of the active list of the Regular Navy to be 5½ percent of the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the Navy.

Section 5 (a): This subsection authorizes the President to appoint to permanent rank or grades in the Navy and Marine Corps in numbers not to exceed the authorized strength, and in ranks not above the highest rank in which he served on active duty:

(1) Male officers of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve.

(2) Officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps who were formerly commissioned warrant, warrant, or enlisted men of the Regular Navy and were temporarily appointed to higher grades or ranks during World War II.

(3) Former officers of the Navy or Marine Corps or their Reserve components who served on active duty during World War II and who were separated from such services, under honorable conditions, by reason of resignation or discharge.

Appointments to commissioned rank are to be with the advice and consent of the Senate; appointments to warrant grade may be made by the President.

Section 5 (b) (1): This subsection authorizes the temporary appointing of officers who are transferred to the highest temporary rank in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps that they served in the Reserve and with the same precedence held by them at the time of appointment.

Section 5 (b) (2): Authorizes officers who are transferred to the Regular Navy and Marine Corps to retain their temporary higher ranks and precedence as long as the present temporary promotion law is in effect.

Section 5 (c) (1): Provides that appointments shall be made pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President.

Section 5 (c) (2) (3): Indicates the provisions which shall be included in the regulations and which are required in order to establish standards for appointment and to fix lineal position in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps.

Section 5 (d): Provides the limiting date on which such eligible personnel may be transferred to the Regular Navy and Marine Corps. The limiting date is the same as that provided for temporary appointments and promotions, viz, 6 months following June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall terminate or 2 years after the effective date of this act, whichever shall be later.

Section 6 (a): Authorizes the revocation by the Secretary of the Navy of appointments made under the act as long as the officer of Regular Navy or Marine Corps next senior in lineal position to the officer transferred is serving under a revocable commission.

Section 6 (b) (c): Provides that those persons whose commissions are revoked shall be discharged without pay. An exception is made in the case of persons who were formerly permanent commissioned warrant or warrant officers of the Regular Navy; such persons may revert to their former commissioned warrant or warrant status.

Section 7: Repeals former acts which are inconsistent with this act.

RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE REGULAR NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the second bill I wish to introduce for appropriate reference is one to authorize the President to retire certain officers of the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

I ask that a brief statement explanatory of the bill be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1405) to authorize the President to retire certain officers of the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. WALSH is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., September 17, 1945.

Memorandum for the chairman, Senate Naval Affairs Committee:

1. In accordance with your verbal request, proposed legislation is submitted herewith which will authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint boards of officers to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the line and staff corps of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps in all ranks below that of rear admiral in the Navy and major general in the Marine Corps.

2. An analysis of the proposed legislation is included:

Section 1: Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to appoint boards to consider and recommend rear admirals and commodores of the Navy and major generals and brigadier generals of the Marine Corps for retirement.

Section 2 (a): Established the composition of boards for consideration of rear admiral and commodore to consist of not less than five officers of the regular Navy in ranks above rear admiral. Officers of the staff corps are eligible for membership on boards for consideration of staff corps officers.

Section 2 (b): Establishes the composition of boards for consideration of major generals of the Marine Corps to consist, so far as practicable, of three line officers of the Regular Marine Corps in ranks above major general. If insufficient numbers of Marine Corps officers are available officers of the line of the Regular Navy in ranks above rear admiral shall be appointed to supply the deficiency.

Section 2 (c): Establishes the composition of boards for consideration of brigadier generals of the Marine Corps to consist, so far as practicable, of five line officers of the Regular Marine Corps in ranks above brigadier general. If insufficient numbers of Marine Corps officers are available, officers of the line of the Regular Navy in the rank of rear admiral or above shall be appointed to supply the deficiency.

Section 3: Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to convene boards of officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the rank of captain and below in the Regular Navy and of the rank of colonel and below in the Regular Marine Corps.

The Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe, in the precept convening the boards, the categories or group of officers to be considered by each board.

Members of such boards shall be senior to any officer under consideration.

Section 4: Provides that recommendations of each board shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Navy to the President for approval or disapproval, in whole or in part.

Section 5: Provides the date on which officers shall be placed on the retired list pursuant to recommendations of boards approved by the President. This date is the first day of the month set by the Secretary of the Navy but not later than the first day of the seventh month after approval of the recommendation by the President.

Section 6 (a): Provides that officers of the rank of rear admiral and commodore of the Navy and major general and brigadier general of the Marine Corps, recommended for retirement, shall be placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him on the active list and with 75 percent of the highest pay to which he was entitled on the active list.

Section 6 (b): Provides that officers of the rank of captain and below in the Navy and colonel and below in the Marine Corps, recommended for retirement, shall be placed on the retired list with the highest rank held on the active list, provided performance of duty in that rank has been satisfactory, and with retired pay based upon 2½ percent of the pay of the rank in which retired multiplied by the number of years of service, not to exceed 75 percent.

If an officer's service in the highest rank has not been satisfactory he shall receive the next lower rank not below his permanent rank with retired pay based on such lower rank.

Section 6 (c): This is the saving clause if an officer is entitled to a higher rank or pay under other provisions of the law.

Section 7: Authorizes the President to discharge, without pay, any officer of the regular Navy or regular Marine Corps who has completed less than 7 years of active commissioned service and who has not received a temporary higher appointment during the war or who, having received a higher appointment, performed service such that it was necessary to revoke the appointment and revert the officer to his permanent rank.

Section 8: Changes the statutory retirement age to 62 years, for all officers below the rank of fleet admiral, but authorizes the President to defer placing any such officer, in numbers not exceeding 10, on the retired list for the length of time he deems advisable.

The section also provides that officers immediately affected by the lowering of the retirement age from 64 to 62 will not retire for 6 months following the date of approval of this act.

Section 9: The repeal provisions.

Section 10: Limits the time in which the Secretary of the Navy may convene boards to consider officers in ranks of captain and below in the Navy and colonel and below in the Marine Corps for retirement, also, limits the authority of the President to discharge officers with less than 7 years' active commissioned service now serving in permanent rank, until June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall be declared ended by proclamation of the President or by act or resolution of the Congress.

STIMULATION OF VOLUNTEER ENLISTMENT IN THE REGULAR MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States. This bill is similar to a bill which is pending in the House of Representatives. When it passes the House in the natural course of events it will go to the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate. It is a very important bill because it is designed to stimulate enlistments in the Navy. I am introducing a similar bill and ask that it be first referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, in order that the provisions relating to naval enlistments may be studied, and then I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, so that that committee may discuss and study the provisions relating to enlistments in the Regular Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1406) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that a brief explanatory statement of the bill be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement presented by Mr. WALSH was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WALSH

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill entitled "A bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States." I ask that the bill be referred first to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The committee, of which I am chairman, will meet in the near future to consider the naval features contained in this bill. After the bill has been considered by the Committee on Naval Affairs, I will ask that it be re-referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The bill which I am introducing is identical with H. R. 3951 now on the House Calendar and was drafted by a subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee, with the assistance of officers from the Personnel Divisions of the War and Navy Departments.

In the past, our peacetime Army and Navy have been composed entirely of volunteers. I feel quite sure the Members of the Senate and the American people as a whole desire our postwar Navy be manned by volunteers if possible. Practically all persons who entered the naval service immediately prior to and during the war are now anxious to be released. Very few of them show any indications of reenlisting and making the naval service a career. Many of these men are those whom the Navy would like to keep and who would make the best type of men for our postwar Navy. They are not applying to remain in the naval service due chiefly to the fact that under existing laws they cannot obtain certain benefits provided by the Congress until after they are discharged or placed on an inactive status.

As one example, men cannot receive mustering-out pay if they reenlist or elect to remain in the postwar Navy.

The main purpose of the bill is to make available now and to men who elect to remain in the Navy the benefits which they will receive at once under existing law only if they become separated from the service.

I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill which has been made be inserted at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

ANALYSIS OF BILL

Section 1: This section cites the act as the "Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945."

Section 2: Authorizes and directs the Secretaries of War and Navy to initiate an intensive campaign for volunteer enlistments, and reenlistments of Naval Reservists, in the Regular Army and Navy.

Section 3: Applies only to the War Department and reenacts the Army Voluntary Reenlistment Act of 1 June 1945.

Section 4: This section is applicable only to the Army. It establishes retirement for the Army enlisted men any time after 20 years of active service with retired pay equal to 2½% of the base pay plus longevity multiplied by the number of years of active service.

The intent of this provision is to establish, in the Army, something comparable to the Navy 20 year Fleet Reserve.

Section 5: Authorizes the enlistment or reenlistment in such grades or ratings as may be prescribed by the Secretaries of War and Navy, respectively.

The Navy already had this provision but it is necessary to reenact it here in order that there would be no question of the Navy being authorized to continue present practice.

Section 6: This section provides for a travel allowance of 5 cents per mile for enlisted men who reenlist upon discharge or upon enlisting in the Regular Navy from the Naval Reserve to cover the cost of travel when granted a reenlistment furlough or leave, and subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War or Navy. The travel allowance may be either to and from their home or to such other place as the man may select. If sea travel is involved the man would be furnished the transportation in kind and subsistence en route.

Present law provides a travel allowance only on reenlistment or upon expiration of enlistment of 5 cents per mile only to the man's place of enlistment. The travel allowance provided in this section does not duplicate the allowance now provided by law but extends the allowance both to and from his home.

If a man has good reason, such as if his family were residing somewhere else other than his official residence, the Secretary of the Navy, under appropriate regulations, could permit the travel to and from the location of his family rather than insist that it be computed only to his official residence.

Section 7: This authorizes payment of mustering-out pay under the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to enlisted men and officers not above captain in the Army or lieutenant in the Navy who are discharged from their Reserve status for the purpose of being reenlisted or appointed in the Regular Naval or Military Establishment.

The present Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 authorizes this pay only when discharged or released to inactive duty. It is not a new provision but merely extends the Mustering-Out Payment Act.

Section 8: This section authorizes the reenlistment allowance to be based upon the highest enlisted grade held at the time of reenlistment with regard to the Navy or at the time of discharge or release from active duty in the Army of the United States for the purpose of enlistment in the Regular Army. It permits, including all continuous active Federal service (Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard), whether in enlisted grades or in commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant officers' grades in computing, the number of years' service for the purpose of reenlistment allowances.

Navy temporary promotion law now permits enlisted personnel who are serving temporarily in higher commissioned grades to count such commissioned service for purpose of reenlistment allowance if they revert to enlisted status. Navy is included in this section to insure that it can be so allowed.

Under the law an enlistment allowance of $50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which last discharged, is paid to every honorably discharged man of the three highest pay grades upon reenlistment, and an allowance of $25 is paid to men in the four lower grades under the same conditions.

Section 9: This section permits enlisted men of the first three pay grades (chief petty officers, petty officers first class, petty officers second class) in the Navy to elect to receive either the money allowance for quarters for dependents provided in the Pay Act of 1942 or the family allowance provided by the Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended. It would continue the provisions of existing law providing that the payment of monetary allowances may be paid only for such dependents as the enlisted man has made an allotment of pay not less than the amount of such monetary allowances for the support of the dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

Existing law provides that a man has only one chance to determine whether to accept a money allowance in lieu of quarters or to elect to receive the allowance under the Family Allowance Act. Conditions have changed in many instances, such as, a man having had several additional children born during the war or having been promoted to a higher rating. Where this has happened and the man elected to receive the money allowance in lieu of quarters he receives less than if he had elected payment under the family allowance provision.

Section 10: This section continues sending first class letter mail free of postage by any person in the armed forces until December 31, 1947.

Section 11: This section makes the GI bill of rights (Servicemen's Re-Adjustment Act of 1944) providing for education, loans, and certain unemployment benefits which are now only authorized to personnel who are discharged or released to inactive duty payable to personnel who transfer from the Reserve to the Regular Establishment. The

GI bill of rights is made applicable only during a man's first period of enlistment or reenlistment after which he will, if he remains in the service, not be entitled to these provisions.

Section 12: This section makes the provision of 10 percent increase in pay for officers and 20 percent increase in pay for enlisted men and warrant officers for service at sea and foreign service permanent legislation. Under present law this sea and foreign service pay would terminate 12 months after the termination of the present war.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WAGNER submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COMPENSATION TO MUNICIPALITIES FOR LOSS OF CERTAIN REVENUES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on July 24 last the bill (S. 1300) to provide for the payment to municipalities of compensation for loss of revenues on tax-exempt real property of the United States, was erroneously referred to the Committee on Claims. I discussed the matter with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who introduced the bill, and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Committee on Finance, and I now ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELIZABETH C. BYRNE

Mr. GERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 174), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Elizabeth C. Byrne, widow of James A. Byrne, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PEARL HARBOR EXPLODES AGAIN—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Pearl Harbor Explodes Again," written by him to be published in the Washington News Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID FOR SURVIVING HEBREWS OF EUROPE—STATEMENT BY HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Hon. Guy M. Gillette on becoming president of the American League for Free Palestine and chief political adviser for the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, which appears in the Appendix.]

POSTWAR LOANS BY THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Postwar Loans by Our Government," delivered by former President Herbert Hoover in Chicago, September 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPEAL FOR FOOD FOR STARVING NATIONS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an appeal by 48 national organizations calling on the President for greater effort in providing food for suffering nations, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR JOHN IS COMIN' HOME TOMORROW—ARTICLE BY MARK M. SHAW

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our John Is Comin' Home Tomorrow," written by Mark M. Shaw, and published in the Greater Nebraskan, which appears in the Appendix.]

POEM IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT BY JUDGE FRED E. MUELLER

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem in tribute to the late President Roosevelt, written by Judge Fred E. Mueller, of Missouri, which appears in the Appendix.]

RETURN OF SERVICEMEN TO THEIR HOMES

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from a Missouri soldier urging speed in returning servicemen to their homes, which appears in the Appendix.]

A LIVING TRIBUTE TO WAR HEROES

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Helena (Ark.) World relative to the proposal by Hon. John M. Quarles, of Helena, Ark., of a living tribute to war heroes, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ATOMIC BOMB—ARTICLE BY HENRY PAYNTER

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the development and danger of the atomic bomb, from Newsweek for September 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR CLYDE LA VERNE HERRING

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, with a deep sense of sorrow, I announce to the Members of the Senate the death last Saturday evening of a former Member of this body, from my own State of Iowa, Clyde La Verne Herring. Many of the present Members of the Senate were colleagues of Senator Herring. To those who knew him it is needless to make reference to his genial disposition, his lovable character, and the vigor of his action, although it is well to repeat it.

Senator Herring was long a most prominent citizen of my home State of Iowa. Early in his career he became a highly successful businessman in our State, much respected and greatly honored. Together with his business activities, he took an early interest in the politics of his State and of the Nation. In those years, when he began to take an interest in politics, his party, the Democratic Party, was not in the ascendancy in Iowa, and, so far as the polls were concerned, he fought a losing battle. He was successively his party's nominee for governor, and later his party's nominee for United States Senator. As I have said, that was in the days when his party was not in the ascendancy. Later, in 1932, he again became the candidate of the Democratic Party for Governor of the State of Iowa, was successful in the election, and was subsequently reelected for a second term.

Following his service as governor he was nominated for United States Senator, was successful in the election, and served a full 6-year term in the Senate with credit and distinction.

He enjoyed in the State of Iowa and elsewhere, a host of friends, and he was loyal to them, and they were loyal to him. He was the type of public servant and individual citizen with whom one could vigorously disagree on public matters and yet maintain for him admiration, love, and respect. He carried that reputation and that ability throughout all the years of his life.

Mr. President, I am sure I state the sentiments of a great host of our people who, since his death, express their personal sorrow at his passing. It is to be said to his everlasting credit that they will continue to mourn him. He made his mark not only in Iowa politics and affairs but in national politics and affairs.

Mr. President, I regret having to bring to the attention of the Member of the Senate the sad fact that Clyde La Verne Herring, at a comparatively early age, was called from us.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Iowa in expressing my profound regret and sorrow over the news of former Senator Herring's death a few days ago. I am sure all of us who were Members of the Senate during the 6-year term in which he served his people in this body learned to regard him with affection, with great respect, and I know we would all agree that he contributed during that time to the legislative history of the United States and of the United States Senate.

Ordinarily men are supposed to remain in the Senate a good long while before they become effective or influential. That used to be the theory, although I never adhered to it or subscribed to it, because I think that when a man is sent to the Senate by a State he is sent to begin his activities and duties at once, without any period of waiting until he becomes acclimated to the senatorial atmosphere. Former Senator Herring having served as governor of his State, and having acquired a reputation for ability and efficiency and fidelity to duty in that executive position, came to the Senate with his reputation preceding him, and he was welcomed here not only by those in the majority but by the entire Senate, as a man of ability and character.

Of course, we on this side of the Chamber regretted that he did not return in the election which terminated his one

term in the Senate. That was perfectly natural. But we did not thereby lose our respect and admiration and affection for him.

Mr. President, I have very happy and pleasant memories of his services, his cooperation, and his assistance in the Senate in the performance of my duties at this desk. I deeply mourn his loss, and on my own behalf, and I think on behalf of the Senate, I wish to express to his family and friends in Iowa and throughout the Nation the sorrow which we all feel over his death.

POLICY OF WAR DEPARTMENT RESPECTING RETENTION AND DISCHARGE OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on September 1 I addressed a letter to the Secretary of War, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, asking certain pertinent questions with reference to the discharge and release of soldiers from the military service. Up to the present time I have not received an answer from the Secretary of War, but, rather strange to say, I have had an answer from a GI, a boy in the service over in Europe, who makes some very pertinent statements and some very pertinent answers and asks some very pertinent questions. I have eliminated the name of the boy and also his connection with the military service. I ask, however, that his letter be printed in the RECORD, together with a copy of my letter to the Secretary of War, and also a clipping from the Stars and Stripes bearing on the subject of the letters.

There being no objection, the letters and the clipping were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In Stars and Stripes of yesterday I read the attached item wherein you asked the Army to answer five questions which constituents have been asking Members of Congress, and foreseeing the Army answer to question No. 5, "How is the War Department handling the heavy load of discharge applications"? I am taking the liberty of giving you an answer to this question by a man who is on the scene and not in a chair-borne corps in the Pentagon Building juggling statistics to confuse the public, members of the Army, and the juggler himself, and which mean nothing but the old Army game of eyewash and passing the buck. I imagine the Army answer to your question will be in substance that 3,000,000 have been shipped to the States, half of which went directly to the Pacific; 500,000 are in staging areas; 17 divisions have been alerted for shipment home, and 100,000 men are on the high seas, all adding up to a hopeless confusion; but I am going to give you the answer to your question No. 5 right from where I sit as a battery clerk of —— Battery, ——, Battalion, with my fingers on the pulse and knowing every movement that is made in connection with discharge applications, the shipping out of high point men, etc.

So far as high point men are concerned, we still have 22 in this battery with scores from 85 to 102, and they were sent to this outfit from their old outfit on — July when we moved into France from Germany and were told they would be with us 2 weeks before being shipped home, and they have now been with us 2 months and about eight of the original group have gone home.

With regard to men 40 years old and over, men that I know have put applications in for discharge, have had these applications in for 3 months, have sent tracers regarding their original application, and nothing has been heard from the application, or the tracer, and the man is still here even though the War Department announced that these men could not be held 90 days after date of application. This man is 47 years old, submitted his original application for discharge on May 20, 1945, sent out a tracer on July 21, 1945, has heard from neither, and even though his 90-day limit for discharge expired on August 20, 1945, he is still here in the outfit.

So far as applications for discharge of men 38 is concerned, I sent one application in to the headquarters, Le Havre Port of Embarkation, and it was returned and all we have done regarding these men is to send in the number of men between the ages of 38 to 40 and the number 40 and over desiring discharge. There has been no effort to process individual applications for discharge of men 38 and the longer the date of the application is delayed the longer will be the 90-day expiration date.

As for men 35 years, with 2 years' service, nothing has been done regarding their applications for discharge, and no instructions have come down from higher headquarters, although it has only been 1 day since this announcement appeared in Stars & Stripes and it is really not yet time to expect much action on this. Our immediate headquarters is Le Havre Port of Embarkation Headquarters, and the headquarters over them is Chanor Base Section, Brussels, Belgium.

I, myself, am 36 years of age, and have had almost 3 years in the Army, and so am eligible for discharge, but if things keep going as they have I am not hopeful of getting home before February 1946, but what hurts is that my wife reads in the paper about what the War Department is doing and expects that I will really be home within the 90 days or sooner, and it is this War Department eyewash and hypocrisy that I am against, and either tell the public the truth or not say anything, as this policy of evasion and numerous announcements regarding discharge and the time when men will be home is really disappointing to folks at home and to us here but if I myself knew the truth, or that there were no facilities to get me home, it would be a sacrifice to make, as during the war, but to be told that I will get home, get discharged, and then see lots of men here who have been promised the same thing and are still here, is not very good.

What I have told you in this letter is the truth, and any reason for the delay in not getting men eligible for discharge home does not lie within the provinces of this battalion as we have submitted our rosters on time, processed the applications for discharge when we were told to do so, and followed instructions, but there is a sad mix-up in higher headquarters and I am thinking it is in the Chanor Base Section, Brussels, Belgium, APO 562, United States Army.

When we came through the port of embarkation at Camp Kilmer, N. J., on our way over here I was amazed with the efficiency with which the Army handled men going through this camp on their way to Europe, and if the Army could handle men so good on the way over here, it seems to me, if they desired, they could use the same efficiency in getting men to the States from Europe. However, when coming over here men were not handled as individuals but as battalions, regiments, etc., and it is probably easier to handle large groups of men this way than individually as is now the case with discharges.

I have no constructive criticism to offer, and if I did, I wouldn't offer it anyway, because this is not done in the Army to my knowledge, but I just thought that I would write to you in answer to your question and give you the experiences of one battalion in this matter.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1945.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
The Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I regret the necessity of imposing on you at this busy time, but I feel it imperative that I have, from you, specific answers to the following questions, in order that I may respond to the many queries I have from people who are justifiably and personally interested in the matters touched upon in these questions.

At your earliest opportunity, may I have the following information:

1. What steps are being taken by the War Department to ascertain specifically how many men now in uniform would choose, voluntarily, to remain in the service

2. What specific efforts are being made by the War Department to assure a proper sharing of combat duty? In other words, are you specifically endeavoring to bring home those men who have had overseas service, and, where necessary, replacing them with men who have not served on foreign soil?

3. Does your Department have any way of ascertaining the specific number of men you will require for the Army of occupation? If so, could you give me what your estimate might be as to the size of this Army?

4. What steps have been taken by your Department to inform families of servicemen of the policies which are to be carried out in connection with discharge of men now in service? I make this inquiry in view of the fact that letters coming to me seem to indicate a widespread lack of understanding and state of confusion among the general public.

5. Do you look with favor to any extent on a policy which would permit young men within a year of college graduation to be given any kind of preference toward discharge for the purpose of completing the necessary requirements to prepare themselves for their chosen vocation?

6. Is your department finding itself swamped, if I may use the expression, by discharge procedure and, if so, have proper steps been taken to alleviate this condition and provide sufficient staff to bring about prompt handling of the necessary papers for men whom you can approve for discharge?

The general tenor of the above questions may possibly reflect to you the queries which come to me and to other Members of Congress in countless numbers. I bespeak your prompt response and urge upon you that any problems suggested by these questions be solved with as much rapidity as possible in order to preserve the splendid morale and fine spirit which has been and should continue to be traditional with the armed forces of the United States.

My kindest personal regards to you.

Sincerely.

SENATOR DEMANDS ARMY BARE FULL DETAILS OF DISCHARGE PLAN

WASHINGTON, September 3.—Senator PAT MCCARRAN (Democrat, Nevada) asked Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson last night for detailed information on the Army's reconversion manpower policy, as congressional sentiment for immediate end of the draft appeared on the wane.

With adjustments in the military machine scheduled for early consideration when Congress reconvenes Wednesday, MCCARRAN asked for prompt answers to five questions

which are coming "to me and to other Members of Congress in countless numbers." They are:

1. What is the War Department doing to find out how many men would volunteer to remain in service?

2. How many men will be needed for occupation purposes?

3. What is the Army doing to make sure that overseas service is shared—that men with combat service are brought home and replaced by those who have not been overseas?

4. Is the Army giving adequate information in discharge policy to the families of men still in service?

5. How is the War Department handling the heavy load of discharge applications?

The House Military Affairs Committee, meanwhile, turned its attention to ways of building up the Regular Army by enlistment. A subcommittee will meet Tuesday to consider proposed inducements, among them higher pay and 90-day furloughs.

Earlier demands for halting inductions promptly were lessening, the United Press said, apparently because of the growing conviction that the draft should not be stopped until the Regular Army is strong enough to handle the bulk of the occupation.

Under present authorization, the Selective Service Act expires May 15 unless Congress or the President decrees otherwise.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1274, to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VII—TEMPORARY RECONVERSION UEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 701. When used in this title—

"(a) The term 'reconversion period' means the period (1) beginning with the fifth Sunday after the date of enactment of this title, and (2) ending June 30, 1947.

"(b) The term 'compensation' means cash benefits payable to individuals with respect to their unemployment (including any portion thereof payable with respect to dependents).

"(c) The term 'weekly benefit amount' means the amount of compensation to which an individual is entitled with respect to a week of total unemployment, under the provisions of a State unemployment compensation law.

"(d) The term 'benefit year' means the benefit year prescribed in the applicable State unemployment compensation law; except that, if such State law does not prescribe any benefit year, such term means any period of 52 consecutive weeks specified in an applicable agreement made under this title or, if there is no such applicable agreement, then any period of 52 consecutive weeks prescribed by the Director.

"(e) The term 'Federal service' means service performed as a civilian in the employ of the United States, including any wholly owned instrumentality thereof; except that such term does not include service performed by an individual outside the United States, unless such individual is a citizen of the United States, or resided in the United States for a continuous period of not less than 6 months immediately prior to December 7, 1941.

"(f) The term 'maritime service' means service performed, in employment as defined in title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel, if no State unemployment compensation law was applicable to such service at the time it was performed.

"(g) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii.

"(h) The term 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, means the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

"EXTENSION OF THE DURATION OF BENEFITS

"SEC. 702. (a) Upon the written request of the governor of any State (or, in the case of the District of Columbia, upon the written request of the Commissioners of said District), the Director is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with such State, or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency (1) will make, as agent of the United States, payments of compensation to supplement the duration of compensation payable under the law of such State with respect to unemployment occurring in the reconversion period, and (2) will otherwise cooperate with the Director and with other State unemployment compensation agencies in making payments of compensation authorized by this title.

"(b) Any agreement made under this section shall provide—

"(1) for paying compensation with respect to unemployment occurring in the reconversion period in cases where compensation is not payable under the State law because of the exhaustion of benefit rights under such law for a benefit year;

"(2) that compensation with respect to such unemployment will be payable under such agreement at the same rates, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as the compensation which would be payable under the State law with respect to such unemployment except for the exhaustion of such benefit rights; and

"(3) that compensation will be payable under such agreement to any individual for any benefit year in such aggregate amount that compensation with respect to unemployment occurring in the reconversion period will not be denied such individual, by reason of the exhaustion of his benefit rights, until the total amount of compensation paid to him for such benefit year (including compensation paid under the State law and compensation paid under the agreement) is equal to the smaller of the following:

"(A) twenty-six times his weekly benefit amount, or

"(B) 160 percent (adjusted to the next higher multiple of $1) of the aggregate amount of compensation payable to him for such benefit year under the State unemployment compensation law (such aggregate amount of compensation payable under the State law being computed for this purpose without any deductions on account of any reduction of his benefit rights under State law);

except that such total amount of compensation shall be subject to the same reduction or cancellation as if such total amount of compensation (whether payable under the agreement or under the State law) were compensation payable under the State law.

"COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND SEAMEN

"SEC. 703. (a) The Director is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State, or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency (1) will make, as agent of the United States, payments of compensation, on the basis provided in subsection (b), to individuals who have performed Federal service or maritime service, and (2) will otherwise cooperate with the Director and with other State unemployment compensation agencies in making payments of compensation authorized by this title.

"(b) Any such agreement shall provide that compensation will be paid to such individuals, with respect to unemployment occurring in the reconversion period, in the same amounts, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as the compensation which would be payable to such individuals under the State unemployment compensation law (supplemented as if an agreement had been made under section 702 in the case of such State, whether or not such agreement has actually been made) but for an existing or prior exclusion in such State law, from the definition of employment, of service by reason of the fact that it was Federal service or maritime service, except that—

"(1) any Federal service performed outside the United States, and any Federal service or maritime service performed as an officer or member of the crew of an oceangoing vessel engaged in the coastwise trade or in foreign trade, shall be deemed to have been performed in the District of Columbia;

"(2) where the Federal service or maritime service performed by an individual will not otherwise be treated, under the provisions of this section or an agreement thereunder, as if the same State unemployment compensation law were applicable to all of such service, the Director may by regulation or pursuant to agreements under this title provide for treating all of the Federal service or maritime service of such individual as having been performed in any State within which a substantial part of such service was performed during the base period prescribed in the unemployment compensation law of such State; and

"(3) the compensation to which an individual is entitled under such an agreement for any week shall be reduced by 15 percent of the amount of any annuity or retirement pay which such individual is entitled to receive, under any law of the United States relating to the retirement of officers or employees of the United States, for the month in which such week begins, unless a deduction from such compensation on account of such annuity or retirement pay is otherwise provided for in the applicable State law.

"(c) If in the case of any State an agreement is not entered into under this section or the unemployment compensation agency of such State fails to make payments in accordance with such an agreement, the Director, in accordnace with regulations prescribed by him, shall make payments of compensation to individuals on a basis which will provide that they will be paid compensation in the same amounts, on substantially the same terms, and subject to substantially the same conditions as though such agreement had been entered into and such agency made such payments. Final determinations by the Director of entitlement to such payments shall be subject to review by the courts in the same manner and to the same extent as is provided in title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, with respect to decisions by the Social Security Board under such title.

"(d) All executive agencies shall furnish to individuals who have been in their employ, to the appropriate State agency, and to the Director such information with respect to wages and salaries as the Director may determine to be practicable and necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(e) The Director may require employers to furnish such information with respect to wages and salaries of individuals who have been employed by them as may be necessary to determine the amount of compensation payable to such individuals under this title or an agreement thereunder.

"(f) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Director, he, and any State agency making payments of compensation pursuant to an agreement under this section, may—

"(1) to the extent that the Director finds that it is not feasible for executive agencies or other employers to furnish information necessary to permit exact and reasonably prompt determinations of the wages or salaries of individuals who have performed Federal service or maritime service, determine the amount of and pay compensation to any individual under this section, or an agreement thereunder, as if the wages or salary paid such individual for each week of such service were in an amount equal to his average weekly wages or salary for the last pay period of such service occurring prior to the time he files his initial claim for compensation within a benefit year; and

"(2) to the extent that information furnished by executive agencies or other employers is inadequate to assure the prompt payment of compensation authorized by this section (either on the basis of the exact wages or salaries of the individuals concerned or on the basis prescribed in clause (1) of this subsection), accept certification under oath by individuals of facts relating to their Federal service or maritime service and to wages and salaries paid them with respect to such service.

"NO REDUCTION OF BENEFITS

"SEC. 704. No agreement under this title for payment of compensation by a State agency shall be valid if compensation payable to any individual under the law of such State is less than it would have been under such law as it existed on September 1, 1945.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 705. (a) Determinations of entitlement to payments of compensation by a State unemployment compensation agency under an agreement under this title shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent.

"(b) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, administration by the unemployment compensation agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this title shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment compensation law.

"(c) The State unemployment compensation agency of each State shall furnish to the Social Security Board, for the use of the Director, such information as the Director may find necessary in carrying out the provisions of this title, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Social Security Board for the purposes of section 303 (a) (6) of the Social Security Act, as amended.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 706. (a) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the total of all payments of compensation made under and in accordance with an agreement under this title.

"(b) In making payments pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Director, such sum as the Director estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this title for each calendar quarter; reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Director finds that his estimates for any prior calendar quarter were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. The amount of such payments may be determined by such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Director and the State agency.

"(c) The Director shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment, at the time or times fixed by the Director, in accordance with such certification, from the funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act.

"(d) All money paid to a State under this section shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned to the Treasury upon termination of the agreement or termination of the reconversion period, whichever first occurs.

"(e) An agreement under this title may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Director may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from appropriations for carrying out the purposes of this act.

"(f) No person designated by the Director, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this title, as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this title.

"(g) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in subsection (f).

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 707. (a) Whoever, for the purpose of causing an increase in any compensation authorized to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder, or for the purpose of causing any compensation to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder where none is authorized to be so paid, shall make or cause to be made any false statement or representation as to any wages paid or received, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any claim for any compensation authorized to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with such claim, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or compensation under this title, or an agreement thereunder, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud the United States, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(c) Whoever willfully fails or refuses to furnish information which the Director requires him to furnish pursuant to authority of subsection (e) of section 703, or willfully furnishes false information pursuant to a requirement of the Director under such subsection, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both.

"TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

"SEC. 708. In order to assist individuals who have been engaged in activities essential to the national defense or to the war effort at places away from their former homes, and who have left their homes since December 7, 1941, to engage in such activities, to return to their former homes or to go to places where employment is available, the Director, subject to regulations and limitations prescribed by him, is authorized to pay a part or all of the cost of transportation, including transportation of dependents, for any such individual (1) back to his former home, if within the United States or (2) if the Director finds that suitable employment is not available to him in the locality where he applies for such transportation, to some other locality (not farther distant than his former home) where the Director finds that suitable employment is available for such individual: *Provided*, That the amount paid under this section with respect to such transportation shall not exceed $200 for any one worker and his dependents, and shall not exceed the amount allowable in the case of civilian employees of the United States in the Standard Government Travel Regulations: *Provided further*, That no such cost of transportation shall be paid by the Director for an individual if the employer, former employer, or prospective employer of such individual has entered into an agreement or arrangement under which such transportation is provided for. No transportation shall be provided under this section after June 30, 1947."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 603 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (relating to the termination date of the provisions of such act), the provisions of title VII of such act, as amended, shall not terminate as provided in such section 603.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the committee amendment be now considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that as there is only one commitee amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute, amendments should be offered to the committee amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Chair very much for the suggestion. I thought that in this important matter the substitute measure might well be treated as the original bill, so far as amendments are concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is, under the practice of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. I should have asked unanimous consent that that be done, if it were not the practice.

Mr. President, I have no lengthy statement to make regarding this bill. I should like to make——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator from Georgia think we ought to have a quorum call before the Senator makes his statement?

Mr. GEORGE. I think perhaps there is a quorum present, but I acquiesce in the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The CHIEF CLERK called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Andrews	Hart	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hatch	Overton
Bailey	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Buck	Knowland	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Taylor
Capehart	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Cordon	McMahon	Wagner
Donnell	Magnuson	Walsh
Downey	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Mitchell	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murdock	Young
Green	Murray	
Guffey	Myers	

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to discuss at length the bill before the Senate. The bill is a very simple one, and can be very easily understood.

In the first place, let me say that it is an amendment to the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944. The amendment is by way of an additional title designated as title VII of that act.

The bill is to be effective only during reconversion period, and under the terms of the bill the period covered ends on June 30, 1947. There is inserted in the bill a savings provision, chiefly for the purpose of preventing the termination of the legislation from interfering with adjustments between the Federal Government and the States which may act under the terms of the bill if it should become law, and to which the Federal Government may be indebted. However, as I have already stated, the period covered by the substantive provisions of the proposed law ends on June 30, 1947.

The bill as originally drawn, and the substitute which has been approved by the committee as an amendment to the bill, both proceed upon the basis that State unemployment compensation laws should stand. There is therefore properly no issue here between those who believe in a Federal system of unemployment compensation, and those who believe in a State system of unemployment compensation.

It will be recalled that Congress enacted the Social Security Act in 1935. At that time, as I recall, only one State, namely, the State of Wisconsin, had an unemployment compensation act. Since 1935, in cooperation with the Federal Government, the various States have enacted social security laws, including in every instance provisions for unemployment compensation.

In the act of 1935 the Congress imposed a 3-percent tax upon certain employers, but provided that a credit against the tax, up to 90 percent of the amount thereof, would be allowed to employers in States which have approved State unemployment compensation laws.

Some classes of employers are not subject to the Federal tax, and in most instances the States have exempted such employers from making contributions under the State unemployment compensation laws. Consequently, their employees are not covered by such laws. The employees who are thus left outside the coverage of the State unemployment compensation laws are principally agricultural workers, domestic workers, Government employees, seamen, and persons employed by employers who have fewer than 8 employees.

In this connection, Mr. President, the report on the bill has been prepared with a considerable degree of care. It will be found to cover the bill as reported to the Senate; but it will also be found to cover a great deal of material which is necessary to a clear understanding of the State unemployment compensation acts. Various exhibits are attached to the report, and I believe that the report is well worth reading by Senators who are deeply interested in this subject.

The bill now before the Senate proposes to aid in the orderly transition from our wartime economy to a peacetime economy during the period ending June 30, 1947, first, by supplementing the unemployment compensation payable under State laws so as to extend the duration of the period for which such compensation is payable; second, by paying unemployment-compensation benefits to Federal employees and maritime workers; and third, by providing transportation allowances, within the discretion of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, from the place where the worker has been engaged in war work or essential defense work back to his home or, at his election, to some other place where a job opportunity exists, provided that in the event of his election to go to some other place than his home, the place shall not be at a greater distance from where he is presently located than the distance to his home.

It will be noted that the bill covers Federal employees. That means, by the definition contained in the bill, all the civil employees of the Federal Government, and it also includes maritime workers, seamen, not now covered by State laws. By reference to the definition, it will be seen that the bill does not undertake to pay compensation to maritime workers for service actually covered by State laws. Some of the States have covered maritime workers. The committee was not able to get a very accurate statement of how far such coverage extended or to whom it was actually applicable, and therefore the maritime workers are included along with all civil Federal employees, except to the extent that provision has been made for unemployment compensation for unemployed maritime workers or seamen under State laws.

Mr. President, it will be seen by examining the bill that the scheme followed by the committee in the measure now before the Senate is to accept the State unemployment compensation laws as they stand but to extend the duration of the period for which such compensation is payable, generally to 26 weeks in any benefit year. There is a qualification to that general statement, inserted largely for the purpose of preventing the payment of the benefits for the full 26 weeks to casual or part-time workers or seasonal workers who perhaps are not in the labor market after they have performed certain seasonal work.

Federal employees will be paid compensation as if they had been covered by the laws of the States where they performed their services. It is estimated that there are now 3,000,000 Federal employees who will be covered under this bill if it becomes law. They include, of course, the temporary employees in all agencies of the Government, as well as the other civilian employees of the Government. The committee especially thought that workers in arsenals and shipyards and, generally, all workers who are on the Federal payroll, not upon the payroll of private contractors or employees, should be included and covered—including, as I have already said, the maritime workers.

The transportation allowance provided under the bill is not to exceed $200 or the amount paid under the standard schedule to Federal employees who change their place of domicile under direction of the Federal Government. It will be recalled that when the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 passed the Senate, provision was made for the payment of unemployment compensation to Federal employees, although perhaps not as fully as will be done under the terms of the pending bill. It will also be recalled that provision was made for transportation allowances. Provision also was made under which the State unemployment compensation funds were in effect guaranteed by the Federal Government. When the bill went to conference, the Senate conferees were unable to persuade the House conferees to accept the provision for the payment of unemployment compensation to Federal employees or to accept the provision for transportation allowances to workers who had left their homes in response to the call of duty and the invitation of employers to go elsewhere to engage in necessary defense or war work. At that time the bill did not provide for an extended period for which unemployment compensation benefits should be paid. The committee was then of the view that the provision which really guaranteed

the solvency of the State unemployment funds would be sufficient in that regard.

Attached to the report is a statement of the funds, now held by the various States, available for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits. It will be found that the aggregate of such unemployment compensation funds is approximately $6,800,000,000 at this time. In table A, on page 16, the fund is broken down State by State. The committee was convinced that no State was unable to meet, under its own laws, its full responsibilities to its unemployed workers. Indeed, practically all the States, if not all of them, are able on the basis of their present funds, without regard to the Federal guaranty of the solvency of those funds, to go very much beyond the actual legal obligation resting on them under their unemployment compensation acts.

But be that as it may, the whole philosophy of the pending bill is the acceptance of the State systems as such, and is the mere addition of workers who are not covered by the State systems, of course, at Federal expense. The bill as reported does not add a dime to the cost to any State. The cost of unemployment compensation for all civil Federal employees, including arsenal workers, shipyard workers, and maritime workers, will be borne by the Federal Government. The cost of extending the period in which weekly payments of unemployment compensation will be made will be borne entirely by the Federal Government. The transportation allowance will be entirely borne by the Federal Government.

The committee was of the opinion that existing State systems should not be interfered with, and that the States themselves should not be coerced or forced, by any kind of Federal grant or the promise of a grant, actually to change their laws.

I may say that while there may be, and is, a divergence of views within the committee respecting the merits of State systems as against a central Federal system, the committee perhaps as a whole took the view that in emergency legislation such as this, covering a limited period of months, no effort should be made to coerce the States or induce them to modify or change their basic unemployment compensation laws. At least, that is the theory upon which the bill has been wrought.

I do not believe that the occasion will arise for any pertinent discussion of the merits or demerits of the State unemployment compensation systems, and the merits or demerits of a Federal system in connection with this legislative proposal. Of course, such a discussion may arise, but there is little occasion for it, because if we are to do anything effectively for those who may become unemployed during the transition period from war to peace, we must of necessity base our action upon the existing State systems. That has been recognized in every message of the President upon this subject, and it was recognized by the authors of original Senate bill 1274, known as the Kilgore bill, before it was amended by the committee. The committee has proceeded upon that basis.

Mr. President, the issue involved here is not one of States' rights. Some of the newspapers are very fond of saying that the issue is one of States' rights. That is not true. It is more an issue of good faith in recognizing the systems which the States themselves have established, induced by legislation which was enacted by Congress. Congress has at no time gone beyond the requirement of minimum standards in State laws. Since 1935 it has undertaken the task of cooperating with the States in enacting their unemployment-compensation laws, and in their development.

Mr. President, too many loose statements have been made in respect to this matter. The States have made marked progress in the development of their unemployment-compensation acts. Notably has that been true during the past year. The improvements which have been made, both with respect to maximum payments and the duration period of payments, are shown in an appropriate table attached to the report on this bill.

It is a fact worthy of notice that approximately 80 percent of the war workers, those who have engaged in direct war work, at least, or primarily in war work, have performed their labors in States which have provided for a maximum weekly payment of $20 or more for 20 weeks or more.

Inasmuch as the debate will concern certain provisions in the bill, or certain omissions from the committee substitute, I beg leave of the Senate to forego further discussion until those particular provisions or omissions are actually reached by the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent the remainder of the afternoon to attend a meeting of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation dealing with the Missouri River Valley development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Without objection, consent of the Senate is given.

TREATMENT OF JAPAN UNDER SURRENDER TERMS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the wave of wild rejoicing which swept our country at the glad tidings that the war was over is now subsiding. Victory on the field of battle is an accomplished fact. With the lifting of fears which had shadowed almost every heart for the safety of loved ones, the American people are now turning their minds to the problems of peace. The desire to get the boys home from their far-flung stations is universal and almost overwhelming. Everyone seems to be trying to forget about the war. The atmosphere which pervades the country today is strikingly reminiscent of that which prevailed after November 11, 1918.

The great ideal which steeled the American people to carry on to victory was the thought of achieving an enduring peace. "It must not happen again" was the thought uppermost in the minds and hearts of all of our citizens. In the Nation-wide confusion which is unavoidably incident to reconversion, we must not lose our determination to make this peace stick. If we fail we cannot have the golden age of permanent peace which has been promised the men who have made the sacrifices, as well as all the peoples of the earth.

I shall not recount all the losses which we sustained in winning the war. It is well known that we suffered a million casualties. Approximately 15,000,000 American men and women have had their lives and careers interrupted by service in the armed forces. We have sadly depleted the natural resources of our Nation. We have poured almost four hundred thousand million dollars, most of which must be paid by future generations, into the consuming maw of destructive war. The fact that if war should come again the creation of the atomic bomb threatens the very existence of humanity on this planet must be apparent to the simplest mind. The prevention of war is no longer merely desirable in our civilization. It is essential if the race is to survive.

The American people, therefore, will do well to examine carefully all postwar policies which may affect the future. We should study and discuss them with the same intense interest as that which we displayed in connection with our military operations in the war. The question of whether or not we can permanently preserve the peace of the earth will be largely determined within the next 5 years, even though the outbreak of war may be postponed for a generation.

Many persons are sorely disturbed by the tenor of most of the news which comes to us from Japan. Nearly every report, whether over Radio Toyko; through the Domei News Agency; from American newspaper correspondents on the scene, or from our returning military men, seems to indicate that the people of that country, of all classes and positions in life, regard the present situation as a mere armistice or interlude in warfare rather than the utter defeat calculated to convince them of the necessity of forever abandoning their dreams of world domination.

I have endeavored to read carefully most of the articles from both Japanese and American sources carried by the press since the Japanese agreed to send their envoys to Manila. None of them bear any evidence of sincere contrition for the many sins committed by the Japs in their lust for world power. There are only apologies for failure this time, with promises that they will not fail the next, accompanied by threats, either direct or veiled, as to when we may expect the next outburst of bloody war in the Far East.

These articles all confirm the impression that the average Japanese has no comprehension that his country has been completely defeated. The news about the movements of our occupying troops has a strange air of unreality. It almost causes one to wonder whether our troops landed as conquerors who had gained an unquestioned victory or whether the Japanese were receiving a large group of tourists who were to be tolerated for a short time, during which it would be necessary for the Japanese people to bear with them and their peculiarities.

A newspaper article which was carried by the Washington Post on September 4 last sets forth the result of a survey, which had been made by United Press correspondents, of Japanese opinion on the outcome of the war. The article states that the correspondents interviewed workers, businessmen, journalists, and influential leaders. The following is in part the result of the survey:

SURVEY SHOWS JAPS UNAWARE OF THEIR DEFEAT

(By Richard W. Johnston)

TOKYO, September 4.—The Japanese people do not know they lost the war.

The Japanese Army is relatively intact and has no awareness of defeat.

The Japanese Navy virtually ceased to exist, but its officers excuse the debacle on the basis of maladministration by the Army.

Japanese intellectuals criticize the military—but not for taking Japan into war—only for failing to win it.

The mass of the Japanese people believed the war was halted by the magnanimous gesture of the Emperor rather than as a result of Allied force.

DO BETTER NEXT TIME

This is the Japanese attitude in a nutshell:

"We are embarrassed at the failure of the Army and Navy to triumph for the Emperor—next time we will do better."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the remainder of the article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The remainder of the article is as follows:

United States forces are regarded by most Japanese as slightly unwelcome guests who must be tolerated for a time. There is none of the abject subservience of a badly beaten people, nor the bitter resentment of the unyielding last-ditch guerrilla fighter.

Instead, the Japanese are acting as though this were only a recess between two antagonists who will resume the fight—presumably when and if Japan obtains the secret atomic bomb or other equalizer.

ONLY REST PERIOD

As far as the Japanese are concerned, the existing peace is only a tactic in the eternal war for world domination.

One of Japan's leading journalists, formerly stationed in New York and Washington, sorrowfully reported that the army and navy were constantly at odds. In a discussion of specific campaigns, he never conceded that the Japanese garrisons had been beaten by the superiority of Allied arms—but only by preventable failures.

I have asked fifty-odd Japanese in all walks of life: "Why did you quit fighting?"

The answers invariably have been: "Because the Emperor told us to"—not "because we were licked."

The only Japanese I have met who are willing to admit that Japan could not have won the war are better educated Niseis born and bred to the realization of America's potential.

SILENT IN PUBLIC

They are careful, however, not to voice this view in public.

Japanese have assured me that the morale of the people is high despite the raids, bombings, and bombardments, and that if Hirohito had so decreed they would have fought to annihilation.

The same Japanese express polite doubt that the United States ever actually would have dared attempt a seaborne invasion.

Japanese intellectuals say that without the atomic bomb the war probably would have ended in the same way within a few months—but again only as a tactic to preserve the nation and the people. Not because of awareness, either on the part of the Emperor or his cabinet, of the futility of fighting the Allies now or in the future.

On the basis of these extensive conversations, we have reached the disagreeable conclusion that unless our military government somehow manages to impress the Japanese with the fact that they were vanquished, our efforts to reducate them to democratic ways may be in vain.

Our present policy of politeness and respect for the individual's property and security of person, while admirable, is tending to confirm the Japanese belief that they have not been conquered. After all, the Japanese are well aware how they themselves behave as conquerors—and the Japanese believe there is no more perfect standard of conduct than their own.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the policies we are pursuing in Japan cause me many misgivings. I am thoroughly convinced that unless the Japanese people—all of them from top to bottom—are shown beyond question that they have really lost the war and that the way of the aggressor is hard this time and will be much harder in the case of future aggression, we shall lose the peace in the Pacific. This war has been a grim and costly affair. If we follow the easy course of a soft peace, we are simply courting the disaster of a more terrible war in the future.

In the case of Germany, we learned through our sad experiences since 1918 that, where an entire people have been thoroughly indoctrinated with the idea that they possess some sort of superiority over all other peoples which destines them to rule the world by force and violence, they cannot be purged of such philosophy by weak and half-hearted methods. After a second bloody lesson on the battlefield, we are trying a harsh peace in Germany in an effort to teach them that aggression does not pay. If we are to avoid the second costly lesson to Japan, we should profit by past experiences in the case of Germany to guide our dealings with her criminal Axis partner. There is no sound reason to believe that considerate treatment or appeasement will cause the Japs to see the error of renewed attempts at world conquest. If a harsh and retributive peace is proper in the case of Germany, it is likewise proper in the case of Japan. Any differentiation between them is illogical and fraught with danger. At the risk of being misunderstood as seeking to mitigate the German terms in any comparisons I may draw, which is far from my purpose, I assert that if there must be a difference in the treatment accorded Germany and Japan we should be sterner with the Japanese. I do not consider the slogan "Remember Pearl Harbor" as a mere catch phrase to keep people on their jobs during the war.

Holding these views, Mr. President, I was naturally concerned when I read the Potsdam declaration and saw the loopholes which that document knocked in our previously announced and oft-reiterated policy of unconditional surrender. On August 7, before the Japanese had ever offered their conditional acceptance of the Potsdam declaration, I telegraphed the President from my home in Georgia to enter my vigorous protest against accepting any conditions offered by Japan in derogation of unconditional surrender which might be likely to allow the well-known aggressive spirit of the Japanese people to retain a breath of life.

I wish to read the pertinent parts of that telegram:

WINDER, GA., *August 7, 1945.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

Permit me to respectfully suggest that we cease our efforts to cajole Japan into surrendering in accordance with the Potsdam declaration. Let us carry the war to them until they beg us to accept their unconditional surrender. The foul attack on Pearl Harbor brought us into war and I am unable to see any valid reason why we should be so much more considerate and lenient in dealing with Japan than with Germany. I earnestly insist Japan should be dealt with as harshly as Germany and that she should not be the beneficiary of a soft peace. The vast majority of the American people, including many sound thinkers who have intimate knowledge of the Orient, do not agree with Mr. Grew in his attitude that there is something sacrosanct about Hirohito. He should go. We have no obligation to Shintoism. The contemptuous answer of the Japs to the Potsdam ultimatum justifies a revision of that document and sterner peace terms.

If we do not have available a sufficient number of atomic bombs with which to finish the job immediately, let us carry on with TNT and fire bombs until we can produce them.

* * * * *

This was a total war as long as our enemies held all of the cards. Why should we change the rules now after the blood, treasure, and enterprise of the American people have given us the upper hand. Our people have not forgotten that the Japanese struck us the first blow in this war without the slightest warning. They believe that we should continue to strike the Japanese until they are brought groveling to their knees. We should cease our appeals to Japan to sue for peace. The next plea for peace should come from an utterly destroyed Tokyo.

I believe that telegram expressed the views that the great majority of American people held at that time. Since President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill had announced the policy of unconditional surrender at Casablanca, this demand had been debated throughout the country. The majority of the people had accepted the thesis that unconditional surrender was necessary if we were to secure the blessings of a permanent peace. This was true, although everyone knew that these drastic terms meant a longer war and greater losses than would a negotiated peace with either Germany or Japan. We were willing to take those losses now to avoid having to make all the sacrifices involved in preparing for and fighting an entirely new war in the next generation.

When the Japanese finally submitted their counter-proposals and conditions with respect to retaining their Emperor and form of government, the idea was generally disapproved. Reference to the newspapers of those days will show many editorials in leading publications warning against the dangers of keeping Hirohito. Our allies in the struggle, with the exception of England, were quoted as opposing any conditions in the Japanese surrender. The wounded

in the hospitals and the men in the service, including many on their way overseas, were interviewed by newspapermen, and the majority were opposed to accepting the conditions. Here are a few headlines taken at random from a daily newspaper of August 11, just after the Jap offer was announced:

"Russia and China Frown on Jap Offer."

"Australians Oppose."

"Romulo Calls for Elimination of Hirohito."

"Servicemen Want Emperor Hirohito Deposed."

"'Blast Him Off Throne,' Say Wounded."

Admiral Halsey was quoted as saying that the terms of the peace were a political question on which military men should keep quiet, but that it was his own personal view that it would be a mistake not to hang the Emperor.

We were, at that time, in a position to enforce any demands made on Japan at comparatively little cost. The Japanese Navy was destroyed, and our fleets roamed the home waters of Japan with impunity, bombarding shore installations with their guns. What was left of the Japanese Air Force was grounded. Our planes could carry their deadly cargoes of bombs and drop them without seeing any opposing craft. We had, at great expense, developed the atomic bomb, and, with it, could have laid waste to all of Japan. As a result of 4 years of sacrifice, we had forged such terrible instruments and forces of destruction that the Japanese could not long refuse to accept any terms we desired to impose. Our forces were finally assembled for the last blows. However, it was seen fit to accept the Japanese conditions and retain the Emperor for the time being, with all of his hold on the minds and imaginations of the Japanese people, both as a supreme ruler and deity.

I do not think that anyone would dispute the fact that every trend since we entered into the negotiations with the Japs for their surrender has demonstrated that Japan is to be dealt with in an entirely different fashion than Germany, and that the Japanese people are to be dealt with far more liberally and generously than the Germans. The iron hand applied in Germany threatens to become the velvet glove in Japan. Many news articles on the Japanese peace bluntly state that it is infinitely softer than that imposed on Germany. I have yet to hear the first reason advanced from any source, official or otherwise, as to why this distinction should be drawn. If any such reason exists, there are millions of people in this country, who would like to hear it.

Let us consider just a few of the many glaring comparisons which can be made between our treatment of the people of Germany and Japan. In the case of Germany, we brushed aside all peace feelers and continued the war until we had utterly destroyed the German armies and wiped out the last trace of the Nazi Government. Air power made a shambles of all their towns and cities, and the whole country was made a battleground. The German people are ruled by the iron hand of the Allied military government. Large portions of their territory have been awarded to the victors, and from ten to twelve million German people are being uprooted from the only home they have ever known and crowded into a much shrunken area. There is no village in Germany, however remote, that has not experienced occupation by Allied soldiery. Defeat has been properly brought home to the German people in a way seldom known by any nation.

In the case of Japan, their government showed much procrastination and delay about even sending their envoys to receive the terms of peace. They have over them no Allied military government. Every order issued to the Japanese people to guide their daily conduct goes out under the name and seal of the only government they have ever known. The Emperor still reigns, and is treated with great deference. All their public functions continue. The banks, stores, steel mills, other industries, and schools never ceased operation. The Japanese newspapers and the radio have representatives to cover the landings and every movement of our troops and officials. In their news casts they have anticipated and successfully predicted every movement of our occupying forces before it was known to our own press and radio representatives. The Emperor, in his various messages to his people, has never used the word surrender or defeat. In his message to the Diet, he spoke only of the extraordinary measure. The Premier of Japan assured the House of Peers that the war ended "solely through the benevolence of our Sovereign." The Japanese people are being told on every hand that they have not been defeated, and the impression is being created that the Emperor has done the Allies a great favor by stopping the war.

In Germany, the troops of the Allied Nations disarmed every German soldier and sailor and put them in barbed-wire pens as prisoners of war. In Japan, the huge home army, amounting to millions of men, is, in its own time, turning in their arms and equipment to their own officers. The majority of them will return to their homes without ever having seen an Allied soldier or having experienced the ignominy of surrender and confinement.

In Germany, we have taken any property that we have seen fit to take. Their great industrial establishments have been seized. The best of their industrial machinery has been awarded to Russia and our other allies. Where necessary, troops are quartered in private homes with the occupants being ejected to the streets. In Germany, we are enforcing labor of men, women, and children at the command of our armed forces. If they do not work, they can get no food. In Japan, announcement has been made, coming first, mind you, through Domei News Agency, that the people need not fear that there would be any interference whatever with their individual liberty and property rights. These are to be held inviolate. The Foreign Minister announced to the world that Japan's industries will be reestablished on a wide scale immediately.

In the German peace it was provided that Germany should not be permitted to retain even one airplane or one ship of any kind or character. I understand that in Japan the commercial air lines are continuing to operate, and I have even seen news articles speculating on the amount of American tonnage we would find it necessary to turn over to the Japs. It is not stated whether it would be a gift or under some lend-lease arrangement.

We have denounced the great German industrial combinations and their cartels and we have set about destroying them. In Japan, industry is as closely held in a few hands as has ever been in Germany, or anywhere else, but, if we adhere to the announced policy, we will be powerless to take any steps to dissolve the giant Japanese trusts. It must be borne in mind that Emperor Hirohito is probably the wealthiest individual in Japan and owns thousands of shares of stock in these great trusts and combines. So generous has been the outline of our treatment of Japan that it is not surprising to note a news dispatch from London that—

JAP AND FAR EAST SECURITIES SOAR

LONDON, September 3.—Speculators and investors celebrated the sixth anniversary of the start of World War II and the formal signing of the Japanese surrender today by scrambling to buy Japanese sterling loans. * * *

On the London Stock Exchange Japanese sterling bonds of 1924 spiralled up 6½ pounds sterling to 38; the Jap loan of 1930 advanced 6 pounds to 39, and the loans of 1910 and 1907 advanced 5¾ pounds each to 32 and 36, respectively. South Manchurian 5s ran up 8½ pounds sterling to 63 and in the Chinese sterling group the Boxer loan advanced 3½ pounds to 92, while the loan of 1913 gained 3½ to 75.

According to another press account, we must be trying to punish the Japs with consideration and kindness. We had scarcely commenced the occupation of Japan before we started distributing food to the Japanese people and candy and chewing gum to the Japanese children. Let me read from the United Press dispatch of September 5. It is entitled:

YANKS BEGIN TO FEED YOKOSUKA CIVILIANS—EVEN CANDY IS GIVEN TO JAP CHILDREN AS FOOD TRUCKS ARRIVE

American occupation forces have begun to distribute food among the civilian residents of Yokosuka naval base. * * *

Twenty trucks carrying flour, wheat and canned goods arrived at the Yokosuka municipal office yesterday for distribution. Another 16 truckloads of medicine, blankets, tea, and dried edible seaweed were distributed today, and other vehicles distributed chocolate, biscuits, chewing gum, and candy drops to Japanese children in various parts of the city.

It is ironical to note, Mr. President, that the adjoining column to this article is headlined:

Jap cruelty kills 20,000 prisoners.

It starts by saying:

New stories of fantastic cruelties, starvation, and disease which caused the deaths of 20,000 out of 56,000 Allied prisoners in Burma were revealed yesterday.

And at the bottom there is a short article from Yokohoma which states that some high unidentified competent military official has expressed grave doubt that we would ever be able to bring to justice the perpetrators of all these terrible atrocities.

The extreme deference to Japanese sensibilities and the lengths to which our occupation forces are going to avoid offense is to me in some cases humiliating. The most striking example can be seen in the long-awaited and much publicized occupation of Tokyo.

Our soldiers, sailors, and marines had fought their way from the steaming jungles of Guadalcanal and New Guinea through the islands of the Pacific and across the blood-bought soil of Okinawa, looking to that day when American military might would take over the city of Tokyo.

What happened when our troops arrived? In the first place the commanding officers of the Japanese forces in that area demanded that the entry of the American troops be postponed 72 hours beyond the time planned and announced. After acceding to this demand, the First Cavalry Division, a crack outfit that had proven itself in many battles, started to move into Tokyo to occupy the city with their flags and unit pennons flying. An order came down the line to furl all flags and pennons and to leave them behind.

Mr. President, when I was in Australia in 1943 on a trip which I was privileged to make around the world to all the various theaters of military operations, I visited with the First Cavalry Division. It was one of the finest outfits I have ever seen. It was trained in Texas and about half of its personnel was from that State.

The division had a Lone Star flag which they carried ashore with them on every flaming beach they wrested from the Japanese. In the thousands of foxhole and campfire bull sessions that these men had had on the thousand-mile bloody path to Tokyo, they had talked of the day when this Lone Star flag would wave triumphantly over Tokyo. The press accounts of the occupation state that, as soon as the flag made its appearance, the men were ordered to furl it and get it out of sight immediately.

You can realize, Mr. President, the thoughts which must have raced through the minds of these men who had seen that this flag was good enough for their comrades to follow to their death in jungles and sandy atolls throughout the Pacific area while they were in combat, but its exhibition in Tokyo was forbidden for some reason with which I am not familiar, but apparently for the purpose of not offending the Japanese.

This division left its tanks outside the city and quietly and inconspicuously, almost surreptitiously, without flag or pennon, made its way into Tokyo as conquering troops to occupy the city.

Where did they go to enact the ceremonies which solemnized the taking over of this city by a conquering army? The newspapers had previously said that the American flag would be unfurled over the government building in Japan which housed the Diet, or Parliament of Japan. Instead, the flag was raised over the American Embassy, an American building, bought with American money, where the American flag was entitled to fly under international usage under any circumstances except in time of war. The whole scene was more like the Dutch capturing Holland than a triumphal entry of American troops into a conquered capital. Instead of getting any inspiration from the accounts of this proceeding, Mr. President, they brought to me a feeling of shame. It was said that a dignified occupation of Tokyo was desired. In my judgment it would have done more to improve Japanese mental attitude and caused them to accept defeat if we had ordered Admiral Halsey to ride the Emperor's white horse down the streets of Tokyo behind a brass band, even though it had been necessary to have four strong marines there to keep him in the saddle.

I read the dispatch in the New York Times that the flag did not wave when it was raised, but it hung limply to the flagstaff, and I saw something in that statement that could be fearfully prophetic.

We have pursued these soft, punish-with-kindness-and-consideration policies despite repeated warnings from the men who have led our forces into war as well as from the keen-eyed junior officers and men of the rank and file who have observed and dealt with the Japs, both during the war and after the signing of the agreement on the *Missouri*. The Australians, who have been in constant danger from the Japs, have been highly critical of what they call our soft-peace policy. The Chinese, who perhaps know the Japs better than anyone else, have insisted on a rigorous occupation. Former Japanese leaders, native Japanese of education and experience who have been driven from their homeland, have pointed out the folly of an easy peace. I shall read a number of statements from those who should know which have appeared in the press in the last several days. They come from men who should have knowledge of the facts, and they are convincing to me that if we continue our present policies we are headed for complete failure and another war. Practically all of them stress the importance of bringing home to the Japanese people the realization that they have been defeated.

General Chennault, who is one of the great heroes of this war, whatever may befall him in the War Department, is quoted in an Associated Press dispatch as looking with satisfaction on the dead war in Asia, but seeing danger in what he terms the Japanese "crossed-finger peace."

"The Japs are spiritually undefeated," said the founder of the Flying Tigers and commanding general of the succeeding China Air Task Force and Fourteenth Air Force. "They realized after the atomic bombings that they didn't make proper preparations for the war. They feel they won't be defeated again."

General Chennault, once in first place on the Japanese list of war criminals with President Roosevelt as No. 2, declared the greatest potential danger was in leaving the Japanese Emperor in control.

An article in the New York Times of September 1, 1945, is headed "Halsey cites peril of leniency to foe. Warns of another war 'from mawkish sentiment'—Japan's complete defeat stressed":

Too lenient treatment of Japan will "Sure as death and taxes lead to another war," the admiral said in a speech broadcast to the naval aviation anniversary dinner in Washington.

Here is a statement from this morning's New York Times, quoting Major Devereux, the gallant commander of the United States marines in the historic defense of Wake Island, as warning the United States about Japan. The headline reads "Foe 'Bowing and Scraping,' He Says at Tokyo, But Is Different When 'On Top.'"

Here is a statement from Admiral Carney, who is not the best known of our naval and military commanders, but is certainly one of the ablest. He was chief of staff for Admiral Halsey in all the operations in the southwest Pacific. It was my privilege to meet and know Admiral Carney when I was visiting with Admiral Halsey at his headquarters in New Caledonia in 1943. He is a man of unusual ability. The headline of this statement reads, "United States Must Prepare to Watch Japan for Years, Admiral Says."

Carney, chief of staff to Admiral William F. Halsey, commander of the Third Fleet, also believes there is no indication that Japan is undergoing or contemplating any spiritual reform.

"The terriers have got to stay at the rat-hole—since we didn't kill the rat," Carney said. "These people think in terms of their grandchildren, and so must we."

Then he makes this very significant statement:

Carney said he believed the prosecution of war criminals "should be conducted the same way as in Germany."

Here is a statement from a man who gave his life in his Nation's service, Admiral McCain, one of the great heroes of this war, who finally succumbed to the exhaustion resulting from his heroic efforts as commander of Task Force No. 38:

PEARL HARBOR, September 4.—"Japan's war lords are not half-licked yet and are going to take a lot more killing in the future," Vice Adm. John S. McCain, commander of Task Force 38, said today.

"I don't like to look in their eyes," the explosive leader of the Navy's fast-striking carriers said as he recalled the surrender ceremony aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay.

"They were just measuring us—just like you measure a man when you're going to hit him the next minute. They don't know they're licked yet. They don't know we are better men than they are."

Here is another article which appeared in the New York Times, which quotes an officer at Singapore:

SINGAPORE OFFICER WARNS JAPANESE ARE STILL PERIL

SINGAPORE, September 9.—The Japanese are trying to pretend to themselves and to others that they were not beaten, Lieut. Col. Frank Owen, press officer for the Southeast Asia Command said today.

"The Japanese have got to be shown they were beaten even if it means stamping on their toes in the peace or truce or whatever it is that has broken out in these parts," Colonel Owen said.

Japanese impudence was manifest from the start of the surrender he said and he pre-

dicted that it would get worse if they were not humbled.

"These people are saving face by spitting in ours," he said.

Unless the Japanese are made to realize their defeat and acknowledge it before the world and their own race, "then our sons also will pass into the furnace," Colonel Owen concluded.

Here is a statement from Gen. William C. Clement, commander of the marine forces occupying the Yokosuma area. The article is entitled "Yanks Too Kind to Japs, General Clement Complains."

It is unnecessary to quote from General Wainwright's warning that it was necessary for us to be firm with these truculent men, because all the members of this body heard his warning when he delivered it here in person.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I heard General Wainwright on the radio last night. Did the Senator hear him?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did.

Mr. HATCH. Did the Senator hear what he said about occupying Japan?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did; and I heard what he said about pursuing a firm policy toward Japan, in addition to his recommendation as to the length of time Japan should be occupied.

Mr. HATCH. If I correctly remember what the General said, he said that we would have to occupy Japan for at least 20 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. I so understood him. I am not enough of a military man to know about the details of the occupation. We have advice on that subject ranging from that of General Eichelberger, who is in command of the occupation forces, who says that he thinks the troops should all be out in 1 year, to that of General Wainwright and others who, as indicated in these news articles, believe that the occupation should last over a long period of years. I can not qualify as a military expert, but I have very definite convictions as to the steps we should take to convince the Japanese people that they have been defeated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What would the Senator think of employing some Chinese troops in connection with ours in the occupation of Japan?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is my opinion that it would be a terrible mistake not to employ some Chinese troops in the occupation of the Japanese homeland. That would certainly assist in bringing home to the Japanese people the fact that they have been defeated. It would also enable us to bring home American soldiers, whose places the Chinese could take.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thoroughly agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. Several divisions of Chinese troops were trained and equipped by the Americans at Ramgarh, in India. The planes which flew over the hump carrying cargoes of war materials were loaded on the return trip with Chinese soldiers who were brought out to be trained. All who have seen those troops in action say that they are well disciplined and well trained, and the equal of almost any other troops. Certainly Chinese troops should be employed in the occupation. For my part, I should be perfectly willing to have our Russian allies furnish some troops for the occupation of the mainland of Japan. I should also like to see some Filipino troops, who fought so heroically on Bataan, and who suffered with our men in the march of death, form a part of the occupation forces. I should like to see some of the Australian troops used in Japan. It would be nothing but poetic justice if we were to train and equip several divisions of Koreans and let them go into Japan and form a part of the armies of occupation. That would show the Japanese that the defeat of such governments as they have had in the past was not wholly an American movement but that the whole world was determined to put down banditry and brigandage among nations and punish attempts to overwhelm people by force in a lust for world power and world conquest.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to say that I agree with the sentiment the Senator has expressed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I had not concluded the warnings. I hold in my hand a statement from London, quoting from the British press, expressing alarm at the tone of Japanese broadcasts informing the Japanese people of their defeat. I have already said that Emperor Hirohito has never used the words "surrender" or "defeat" in any of his statements, nor did the Japanese Premier in addressing the House of Peers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the distinguished Senator concludes his statement about the use of Chinese and Korean troops to police the Japanese—with which statement I wholly agree, and I think that the sooner that is done the more quickly it will help us with our demobilization problems—I should like to ask whether the Senator cares to express an observation whether that could be done at a rate relative to the desired speed of demobilization, or does the Senator care to express his views regarding the number of American soldiers it would take within a reasonable time over there to accomplish our purpose, namely, to get the boys home?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is a military matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder whether the Senator cares to make any statement regarding it, in view of General MacArthur's statement published this morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am familiar with General MacArthur's statement. While it is gratifying to me, I must say that this statement about the use of 200,000 of our troops in Japan is very startling. I hope he will agree to use in Japan, Chinese, Korean, Australian, and English troops, to show the people of Japan that the whole world has condemned and continues to condemn the horrible crimes they have committed and their inexcusable aggressions.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator agree that the occupation probably could be carried out by policing by Chinese soldiers and the soldiers of other of our Allies, just as well as by our own soldiers?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am in favor of using other soldiers so far as possible, because any Member of the Senate cannot fail but be impressed with the overwhelming desire of the people of this country to get the boys back home, and any Member of the Senate can tell from his mail each morning that the boys themselves are just as enthusiastic as are their families, if not more so, that they be returned home.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the statement to which I referred, from the British press, quotes the Japanese statements as follows:

We have lost but this is temporary. Our mistake was lack of material strength and necessary scientific knowledge and equipment—this mistake we must amend.

I read further from the article:

The Yorkshire Post detected in Emperor Hirohito's speech "a double meaning," and called it "in fact an apologia of that regime which is now supposed to have come to an end. Early ground is already being prepared for the resurgence of the old aggressive Japan," the Post added.

In Australia a broadcast by the Department of Information called Emperor Hirohito's radio address to the Japanese people the first threat to peace. I read from the broadcast:

It is not the speech of a defeated man leading a defeated nation. It is the speech of a defiant man leading a defiant nation, conscious that he and the militarists he represents retain intact their whole apparatus. * * *

The speech was diabolically clever. It is the beginning of a flood of open and secret propaganda whereby the imperial household, generals, admirals, and the rest will try to convince the Japanese people the war was never really lost, but merely an unfortunate episode in carrying out the eternal policy of Japanese aggrandizement, which will be resumed very soon.

Here is an article from a Japanese, a man who was born in Japan, a member of one of the three leading families of the Japanese Empire. His name is Mattsuo Suzuki, and this interview was given in Boston:

Mr. Suzuki, whose forbears have held the most prominent positions in the Japanese Government, pointed out that Japan, the Emperor has intimated, believes that she surrendered to the atomic bomb rather than to superior military force. This face-saving technique, he said, may cause dire trouble for the Allies' occupation and the future of Asia.

A Christian who believes that he can never return to his native land, Mr. Suzuki said: "Look at the Emperor's proclamation, which declares that Japan has given in for the sake of humanity. He makes no mention of surrender. He cannot do so, because he is looked upon as a god, and gods do not surrender. Mere men do, but the deity cannot. So his people will continue to revere him as a great savior of mankind."

Mr. Suzuki added that it must be kept in mind that Japan's official Shinto faith had the sword as one of its three symbols, and that a tenet of the Japanese educational system regarded revenge as virtually a duty.

"Unless Japan is strongly handled," he said, "the people will say that they were never defeated and that they can work with chemicals and atoms, too, for the next war."

Mr. President, I have before me an article by Maj. George Fielding Eliot quoting Owen Lattimore, a distinguished expert on far eastern affairs, and a Maj. Thomas Mesereau, who did not claim to be an expert on Japanese affairs, but gave his first-hand impressions, namely, that the Japanese mentality is very far from accepting the fact of defeat. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FALSE FACE

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

We were given some good advice yesterday about our policy toward Japan, and we had some concrete evidence that this advice was really very good indeed.

The advice came from two very different sources.

In Baltimore, the distinguished and experienced expert on far eastern affairs, Owen Lattimore, warned us that the objectives of the Japanese industrialists and court advisers are the same as the objectives of the militarists.

"The only difference is," said he, "that the civilians and industrialists are the go-slow crowd about aggression, while the militarists are the go-fast crowd." He said that no real democracy in Japan would be possible until the grip of this gang was broken, but that once this was done there exist in Japan the elements of "a genuine, spontaneous, and thoroughly Japanese movement which would substitute for the Emperor a real republic."

He warned that this will take time, and that we should be careful because the industrialists and their friends "are better prepared for defeat than we are for victory. They already have put their collaborationist team in the field," he said. "They are going to be awfully good boys with the Americans" and thus they hope to be left in power under the cover of a pseudo-democracy along the lines of the existing constitution, with all real power left in their hands.

Meanwhile, in Washington, a young American officer arrived after a record flight from Japan. He was Maj. Thomas A. Mesereau, 23 years old, who commanded the first battalion of American troops to land on Japanese soil (the Third Battalion, One Hundredth and Eighty-eighth Parachute Regiment of the One Hundred and Tenth Airborne Division). I am sure Major Mesereau would not claim to be an expert on Japanese affairs, but he gave his first-hand impressions, which seem to point in the same direction as Mr. Lattimore's warning. The Japanese, he said, bowed and smiled and complied with all requests. They acted about the way they would if they'd just lost a ball game, he said. "In my opinion," he added, "If we want to change the Japanese to our way of thought, occupation may have to last 20 years."

As to the evidence, it is contained in a United Press dispatch from Tokyo which tells us that "the Japanese people will vote in a general election January 12 to 31, 1946, to satisfy the terms of the Potsdam declaration calling for a freely elected democratic government in Japan."

The pattern is very clear.

The same old gang around the Emperor are hard at work trying to make fools of us. The civilian ministers and the industrialists—the go-slow boys—have for the moment gotten the upper hand and are pushing their military colleagues into the background temporarily, of course. The present purpose is a nice job of window-dressing, of winning sympathy, of "being awfully good boys," so as to get this unpleasant occupation business over with as quickly and painlessly as possible.

They actually appear to think that we will believe that democracy can be born in Japan by next January, and that being born, it can exist and flourish under the terms of the present constitution. We are to be persuaded that just as the imperial authority was necessary to get the Japanese armed forces to surrender, so the imperial authority can next be used to establish democracy in Japan by a rescript from the throne.

It cannot be done that way and if we allow ourselves to be persuaded that it can—in order to bring our boys home and get a tedious burden off our shoulders—we shall be throwing away all that we fought for and that many thousands of young Americans died for: The chance that victory has given us to make a better, more peaceful world. It will take longer than from now to next January, by a good deal, to enable the "democratic potential" which (as Mr. Lattimore assures us) does exist in Japan, to organize itself, to formulate a really substantial program, and to lay the foundations for a trustworthy Japanese democracy. The present leaders of Japan do not wish to see this happen. If it does, the whole system under which the few have, for their own advantage, ruled the many in Japan throughout all recorded Japanese history will be swept away.

Let us make no mistake about this matter. The Emperor, as an individual, hardly counts at all. What does count is the group about him, the barons of great wealth, the military leaders, the court advisers with their inheritance of rigid tradition. They are all part of a system inherently military and feudal in its nature, under which nothing which could be called a true democracy can exist.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I also have before me a United Press dispatch from San Francisco regarding a broadcast from Tokyo. It says that an underground movement exists in Japan. The article quotes Radio Broadcaster Norman Paige, and it reads, in part, as follows:

"There is an underground movement here in Japan," Paige said. "Presumably it is being developed by the former war lords."

Paige, who is living in Yokohama with a family of so-called liberal Japanese, said they were continually warning him that the United States must be more stern with the Japanese, must oust the present political regime and the military-minded who do remain in power in Japan.

"Through sources not now disclosable," Paige said, "I have learned that this clique has no thought of accepting defeat. Its course is an underground idea not yet including sabotage of bridges, depots, garrisons, or of inflicting physical harm on Americans. On the contrary, it is stipulated that the members will give every sign of obedience now."

Mr. President, I could read any number of similar statements, but I think that those which I have read are sufficient to establish the fact that there are grave apprehensions in the minds of thousands of well-informed and intelligent persons who are dealing with this question that most drastic steps must be resorted to in order to convince the Japanese of their complete defeat.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not believe the Senator could have more nearly calculated to satisfy the desires of poetic justice than by his suggestion that there should be an increasing infiltration into Japan of representatives of some of the occupied countries of the Orient, such, for example, as China, the Philippines, and Korea, in particular, and that their troops might be associated with ours in the occupation of Japan in order that those who are familiar with the problems of occupation at first hand, as the countries to which I have referred have been familiar for the past 3 or 4 or 8 years, may be able to measure out justice in connection with the problem with which they are faced.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have already expressed my whole-hearted approval of the use of troops of the nationalities referred to by the Senator from Maine, such as troops of the Philippines, Russia, and England, in the occupation of Japan.

Mr. BREWSTER. The ones which are being used comprise only a few divisions of Chinese, a few Filipinos, and perhaps some of the Koreans.

Mr. RUSSELL. To use the exact phrase of the Senator from Maine, it would be poetic justice for the Koreans, in particular, to take part in the occupation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to associate myself completely with that idea, and at the same time impress every Member of this body with the necessity of giving encouragement to the return of our youth. Two purposes would be accomplished at one time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Georgia for having made a worth-while and an able speech upon this subject. I agree with the sentiments which have been expressed by him.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator have anything to say with reference to the treatment of the Zaibatsus?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not intend to go into that subject in any detail.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask the Senator if, during any of his research which he has made, he has seen any evidence of a policy on our part of eliminating control of the Zaibatsus in perhaps the same way as we will eliminate control of the so-called war criminals. I am referring to the elimination of their actual physical existence.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have seen no evidence whatever that the Zaibatsus were being designated as war criminals. I may state that some of the citizens of Germany, such as Hugo Stinnes and other industrialists who forged tools of war to be used by the German people, have already been arrested, and some of them are being placed on trial. However, if there has been any designation of their counterparts in Japan as war criminals, I have not discovered it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have not seen any such designation either.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe it would be a terrible mistake not to place them on trial.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator recall how many persons MacArthur has already designated as war criminals?

Mr. RUSSELL. The first list which he furnished contained the names of 47 persons, and yesterday's newspapers stated that approximately 29 on that list had been arrested.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator believe that it is important that Japan should be included in our policy of elimination so far as its Emperor is concerned? He is merely the leader of the Government, and when we speak of the Emperor we mean the whole Japanese system of government which centers around him.

Mr. RUSSELL. In my discussion on that subject I referred to the entire system of government centering around and functioning through the Imperial household.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Emperor should be dealt with in the treatment which is to be accorded the government as such.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. President, I had reached the point in my remarks where I was saying that while it seems that a slightly stiffer policy has been put into effect in Japan we have undertaken to censor the Domei News Agency. Of course, the Germans are not allowed to have any newspaper, much less a news agency, since our forces invaded and took control of Germany. We have taken other steps as well, which indicate some tightening of the policy originally established. However, in my judgment, the feeling has been nurtured in Japan that the present occupancy of that nation is merely an armistice, and that they have not been defeated, that the only step which will bring home to them in convincing terms that their armies have been defeated, that their navy has been destroyed, and that they, in common with all other aggressors, must pay for their aggressiveness, is to put Emperor Hirohito on trial as a war criminal. That is what I am advocating in my remarks as the step which the Allies should take. Failure to put the Emperor on trial would be a tragic mistake. Hirohito is the head and heart of Japanese imperialism. He is one of the greatest aggressors of history. Innumerable crimes of indescribable horror against the helpless and the inoffensive have been committed in his name and for his sake. He is the symbol of state and church used by the war lords in generating Japanese fanaticism. He is the god-Emperor, in the direction of whose imperial palace millions of Japanese faced and prostrated themselves in the dust in abject apology for their failure to kill enough Americans to win the war. The Japanese newspapers said that the tears flowed unchecked as they sought forgiveness because their efforts were not enough.

If we are to bring home to the Japanese the error of their ways and the magnitude of their defeat, it is imperative that Hirohito be tried as any other human who has sinned against humanity. In this way we can use the blind worship of the Emperor, as a god, studiously cultivated for some 80 years, to lay the foundations of a lasting peace. His trial as an ordinary human will strip him of the false divinity with which he has been cloaked, and the Japanese people can see how they have been duped in having sacrificed themselves for a power-seeking tyrant posing as a god. If we were to leave this arch criminal upon his throne without even trying him for his crimes, we will forever perpetuate the fiction of his godliness and the myth that he is the Son of Heaven.

No public announcement as to our intentions has appeared in the press, but radio broadcasts have stated that a decision had been reached to make no charges against Hirohito. The fact that his name does not appear on the first announced list of Japanese war criminals, and the circumstances surrounding our general policy in Japan, indicate that there is a grave danger that Hirohito may be absolved of his guilt without a trial. This must not happen. If we fail to try Hirohito we will surely sow the seed of a future war. The inconsistency of such a position would brand us as a nation of hypocrites if we try, convict, and punish any lesser war criminal anywhere else. Surely, no reason remains for us to pursue such a policy of folly.

Every word and every act of Hirohito since the start of the negotiations to end the war has been skillfully designed to achieve two ends. The first has been to strengthen the myth of his divinity and the other is to lay the groundwork for the belief throughout Japan that Japan did not lose the war. He and his ministers in their talks to the Japanese people have attributed the end of the war solely to his great magnanimity and benevolence. They have stated that only these fine attributes of character caused him to order his people to desist from the slaughter of their enemies. We have done little or nothing to discourage or to disprove this propaganda. While the war was in progress we were careful not to bomb the Imperial Palace, or say an unkind word about the Emperor in our propaganda. Since the so-called surrender we have treated him with the greatest delicacy and respect. No accursed foreign unbeliever has been permitted to even fix his eyes upon his sacred being. None has been allowed in his heavenly presence. His sacred fortune, reputed to be the largest in the Japanese Empire, is apparently not to be touched by profane hands. No order has been issued to the Japanese people except under his seal and in his name.

If Hirohito is not dealt with as the ordinary war criminal in Germany and Japan, it will be accepted history in Japan within the next 5 years that the great Japanese Army was on the verge of overwhelming all its adversaries, and would have shortly done so but for the benevolence of the son of heaven.

The German armies of 1918 had suffered greater losses by far in men than the Japanese have lost in this war, and the Germans are certainly as intelligent as the Japs. It took only a few years for a corporal to convince the German people that their armies had never been defeated. Can we fail to heed the warnings found in almost every word and act of the military leaders of Japan that they intend to attack us again as soon as they catch their breath? How can we expect the average Jap, steeped as he already is in the invincibility of the god-Emperor system, ever to accept defeat, if it is to be constantly dinned in his ears that the whole world arrayed against the Emperor accepted the theory of his divinity, and that, despite the advantages of overwhelming force and the atomic bomb, none had dared to profane the person or the prerogatives of the Son of Heaven? Japanese faith in all the mummery and hum-buggery attached to Shintoism would then be made complete. Japanese determination to bring the whole world under his imperial domination, and get revenge on those who had troubled him, will be revived and strengthened if we allow this to occur.

We cannot except Hirohito from trial as a war criminal and maintain our prestige abroad or retain our self-respect at home. The Government of the United States has been more insistent upon the trial and punishment of war criminals than any of our allies have been. We called Justice Robert Jackson from the highest court of our land and commissioned him to prosecute the war criminals of Germany. There was delay and disagreement in reaching an agreement with our allies as to methods and policy. Justice Jackson threatened that the United States would pursue the prosecutions alone if our allies did not collaborate. This finally brought about a solemn agreement between the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and France, signed August 8, which defines the various acts which constitute crimes and the classes of persons the Tribunal shall try.

I wish to read a few excerpts from the Constitution of the International Military Tribunal, which cast some light upon the case of Hirohito. The constitution undertakes to define what are international crimes subjecting a person to trial before the International Tribunal. I read now from the Constitution of the International Military Tribunal, agreed to by the four powers:

> The following acts, or any of them, are crimes coming within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal for which there shall be individual responsibility:
>
> (A) Crimes against peace: Namely, planning, preparation, initiation, or waging of a war of aggression, or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements, or assurances, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing.
>
> (B) War crimes: Namely, violations of the laws or customs of war. Such violations shall include, but not be limited to murder, ill-treatment, or deportation to slave labor or for any other purpose of civilian population of, or in, occupied territory, murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war, or persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns, or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity.
>
> (C) Crimes against humanity: Namely, murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, before or during the war; or persecutions on political, racial, or religious grounds in execution of, or in connection with, any crime within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, whether or not in violation of the domestic law of the country where perpetrated. Leaders, organizers, instigators, and accomplices participating in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing crimes are responsible for all acts performed by any person in execution of such plan.

It is readily apparent, Mr. President, that tens of thousands of indictments

based on these criminal statutes, to which our country is a party, if not the author, could be brought against Hirohito for crimes against the peace, for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

These definitions have been solemnly agreed to on the part of the Government of the United States. We have appointed a judge to sit upon this tribunal in Germany and prosecute crimes. What a travesty on justice it would be to apply one policy in Germany and an entirely different policy in Japan.

Hirohito is not exempt because of his official position, because in the writing of this constitution, in article VII, our country has solemnly agreed:

The official position of defendants, whether as heads of state or responsible officials in Government departments, shall not be considered as freeing them from responsibility or mitigating punishment.

I ask that article VIII be printed, because it provides that the fact that a man may have acted under orders of his government is no excuse in a prosecution under this criminal code.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ART. 8. The fact that the defendant acted pursuant to order of his Government, or of a superior, shall not free him from responsibility, but may be considered in mitigation of punishment if the tribunal determines that justice so requires.

Mr. President, many of the witnesses against Hirohito who could testify to these thousands of indictments have had their voices stilled by death, but there are other thousands, and we read their reports ir every newspaper, who are still alive and who should be permitted to deliver their testimony upon a trial of this man. He has been a superaggressor and has violated many international treaties. I have little patience with those apologists for the Emperor who state that he is a mere figurehead, a kindhearted man who has been victimized by the Japanese war lords. I have even less with those who claim that he should not be disturbed because he is the Japanese god.

This man is no simple dupe who has been used by bad men. He is the supreme power in Japan. The Japanese people have demonstrated that they follow him, either into war or from war to peace, with the same unquestioning obedience. His status as head of the state is fixed by the Constitution of Japan, and the international code says that the head of the state shall not escape responsibility by virtue of that fact. This basic law, which has been in force since 1889, confers almost unlimited powers and makes him the absolute arbiter of all Japanese policies, both foreign and domestic. Article IV of the Constitution of Japan declares:

The Emperor is the head of the Empire, combining in himself the rights of sovereignty and exercises them according to the provisions of the present constitution.

Article XI of the constitution says:

The Emperor has the supreme command of the Army and Navy.

Article XII provides that—

The Emperor determines the organization and standing of the Army and Navy.

This is article XIII:

The Emperor declares war, makes peace, and concludes treaties.

And article XIV:

The Emperor declares a state of siege.

No more absolute power can possibly be vested in any ruler than that which was possessed by this man.

No one can deny he is the head of the Japanese state.

Article 7 of the Constitution of the International Military Tribunal reads as follows:

ART. 7. The official position of defendants, whether as heads of state or responsible officials in Government departments, shall not be considered as freeing them from responsibility or mitigating punishment.

If we are not to make ourselves ridiculous, we cannot excuse Hirohito from trial. He is the head of a state.

I would refer those American apologists for the Emperor who seek a soft-handed and soft-headed policy toward him on the theory that he was a kindhearted man who merely did what he was told to do to article 8 of the same constitution:

ART. 8. The fact that a defendant acted pursuant to order of his government, or of a superior, shall not free him from responsibility, but may be considered in mitigation of punishment if the tribunal determines that justice so requires.

So, even accepting the arguments of these apologists, which to me has utterly no validity, Hirohito should be tried as a war criminal.

Now, let us examine briefly some of the record of this man who is now seeking to escape the consequences of his acts by posing as a great humanitarian who ended the war solely on grounds of benevolency. I shall not restate them all. These are all matters of common knowledge throughout the world. Hirohito was the head of the Japanese state when Japan began her most recent career of aggression in 1931 by snatching Manchuria from China and setting it up as the puppet state of Manchukuo. No word or action of his indicated any criticism of this act of unprovoked aggression. On the contrary, he approved of it and benefited personally in prestige and financial gain from the seizure of Manchuria.

He was Emperor during the period when his long career of aggression against China culminated in 1937 with the manufactured incident which resulted in the invasion of that unhappy land, with the accompanying murder and torture of uncounted millions of the peaceful Chinese people. He publicly supported this policy of ruthlessness against China, and, in the military uniform and regalia of commander in chief, reviewed and encouraged the Japanese troops who were being directed to a campaign of unspeakable barbarism.

He was the head of the Japanese state in September 1940 when Japan entered into the Axis with Italy and Germany, binding all three of these brigand states to stand together and collaborate in their unholy attempt at world conquest.

He was the absolute ruler of Japan and the director of the destiny of the Japanese people in 1941 when envoys were sent to the United States in the false guise of peace, but with the purpose of lulling us into a false sense of security so that the armed forces he commanded could strike with impunity the foul blow at Pearl Harbor. This man, whom we are now told loves peace, followed the treacherous attack of his armed force by an imperial rescript, declaring war on the United States of America and the British Empire, in the following far-from-peace-loving words:

We, by the grace of heaven, Emperor of Japan, seated on the throne of a line unbroken for ages eternal, enjoin upon ye, our loyal and brave subjects:

We hereby declare war on the United States of America and the British Empire. The men and officers of our army and navy shall do their utmost in prosecuting the war, our public servants of various departments shall perform faithfully and diligently their appointed tasks, and all other subjects of ours shall pursue their respective duties; the entire nation with a united will shall mobilize their total strength so that nothing will miscarry in the attainment of our war aim.

In this hour of charges and recriminations in Japan it was interesting to note this morning that in their effort to defend Tojo it was stated that the rescript was signed by the Emperor several days before the attack on Pearl Harbor, and was only issued after that attack had been accomplished. So much for whether or not he is an aggressor.

Coming now to the other crimes which are defined in this international constitution. During the course of the war, both before and after we became involved in it, the Japanese forces under his supreme command pursued a policy of unparalleled barbarism against those people he had designated in his imperial rescript as enemies. It is needless, Mr. President, to recount all the horrors of Bataan and Corregidor and the March of Death. All of us who listen on the radio or read the newspapers at any time could not fail to know these stories of the cruelties and brutalities committed there.

Not a single American, whether soldier or civilian, captured by the Japs, has failed to report acts of diabolical and shocking cruelty practiced without discrimination on all who were so unfortunate as to fall into their hands.

These outrages were so numerous and so shocking that during the course of the war, the United States alone found it necessary to direct to Hirohito and his government 240 different protests against acts of brutality and bestiality practiced against our citizens. Since the pestilential Japanese prisons have given up their maimed, beaten, and brutalized victims, we know that the acts protested constitute only a small part of the outrages perpetrated upon American citizens in Hirohito's name. Not a single reply from these 240 protests to Hirohito's imperial government display the great humanitarian qualities which Hirohito's defenders now attribute to him. When the Japanese soldiers stuck their

bayonets in the bellies of wounded marines, they shouted "Blood for the Emperor!" That battle cry resounded on many bloody fields. Never once did Hirohito disclaim this American blood or assert his love for peace until the forces of vengeance closed in to threaten his safety, his vast personal fortune and his throne.

Tojo has been denounced as the essence of evil. We are even now undertaking to save him from his attempted suicide to try him as a war criminal. I would be the last to delay for one second the punishment he richly deserves, but Tojo was acting for Hirohito and in his name.

We are told that the Japanese people openly express their contempt for Tojo. This is because he did not kill himself when Hirohito took his portfolio after the capture of Saipan. Be it remembered that Tojo was dismissed in disgrace by Hirohito not because he was a criminal, blood-thirsty beast, but because he had failed in his objective. The objective in which he failed was to carry out Hirohito's imperial command ordering him to bring the United States and Great Britain to their knees in ignominious defeat.

With the announcement of the Constitution of the International Military Tribunal, Justice Jackson issued a statement on the general policies of the Government of the United States with respect to war criminals. I wish to read certain extracts from that statement:

> For the first time, four of the most powerful nations have agreed not only upon the principle of liability for war crimes and crimes of persecution, but also upon the principle of individual responsibility for the crime of attacking the international peace.
>
> Repeatedly, nations have united in abstract declarations that the launching of aggressive war is illegal. They have condemned it by treaty. But now we have the concrete application of these abstractions in a way which ought to make clear to the world that those who lead their nations into aggressive war face individual accountability for such acts.
>
> The definitions under which we will try the Germans are general definitions. They impose liability upon war-making statesmen of all countries alike. The actions of masses of men are the result of their thinking. If we can cultivate in the world the idea that aggressive war-making is the way to the prisoner's dock rather than the way to honors, we will have accomplished something toward making the peace more secure.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We must not allow ourselves to be drawn into a trial of the causes of the war, for our position is that no grievances of policies will justify resort to aggressive war. It is utterly renounced and condemned as an instrument of policy.
>
> I therefore want to make clear to the American people that we have taken an important step forward in this instrument in fixing individual responsibility of war mongering, among whatever peoples, as an international crime.

If that statement be true as to the policy in Europe, it should be all the more true in the Far East; and a consistent policy demands that this court proceed to try Hirohito. It would be the greatest mistake in this Nation's history to leave this man on the throne, retaining in defeat the prestige and deification that was his in victory. He must be haled before an honest court for a fair trial. If we fail to try Hirohito and would be consistent, we would have to look up Hitler to apologize to him for the destruction of Berchtesgaden and the chancelery, and restore to Goering and the lesser lights their freedom, their baubles, and their batons.

It is my judgment that, if we fail to bring Hirohito to trial as a common war criminal, any steps we may take to create a democracy in Japan are doomed to failure. It is impossible for a democracy to grow and flourish in an atmosphere of absolutism that is embroidered with the myth of divinity which has been attached to him.

We have demonstrated that we are the most powerful Nation on earth in waging war. We are now faced with the test as to whether or not, after the victory has been won, we can use our strength and prestige in the cause of insuring a permanent peace. We must not fail to measure up to our responsibilities in assuring that the world will be spared the catastrophe of another and more horrible war.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have concluded my remarks, but I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am very glad that I have been privileged to hear this very able and thorough analysis and discussion of one of the most vital issues which now confronts this Government. I wish to commend the Senator from Georgia for this timely and forceful address, and for the counsel that has been given not only to the membership of this body, but to the Nation. I wholeheartedly agree with every conclusion and every sentiment expressed by the Senator from Georgia. Mr. President, I believe that the press of this Nation could render no better public service to the American people than to print tomorrow the full text of the Senator's remarks. The American people are much concerned about this question, and rightly so.

Inasmuch as the Senator has made such a thorough study of the subject and has given us such a complete analysis of the situation, I should like to ask him if, in the review and examination of the documents which passed between this Government and the Japanese Government, from the Potsdam ultimatum until the final consummation of surrender, the Senator has found anything in those documents which would amount to a commitment on the part of this Government not to prosecute Hirohito if he is found to be a war criminal.

Mr. RUSSELL. In my judgment there is nothing which would exempt him from trial as a war criminal, as an individual. Our Government has made certain commitments as to the form of government in Japan; but I understand that it is the view of the State Department that up to the present time we have done nothing which would deprive us of the right to proceed to try this man before a court of competent jurisdiction on the many charges which have been made against him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was very much concerned about this question during the period of negotiation, and before the final surrender. I gave a statement to the press on the 12th of August in which I took the position that any terms with Hirohito which precluded us hereafter from trying him as a war criminal would not be keeping faith with the soldiers of America who have given their lives to preserve and defend this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. I entirely agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The blood of American boys who have made the supreme sacrifice in this total war cries out today for total victory. There is no total victory, and there will not be total victory until Hirohito has been brought to the bar of justice, and the condemnation of civilization has been placed upon him and the full penalty exacted for the crimes which he has committed. That is the view which I take.

It is claimed that we negotiated with Hirohito under the conditions which prevailed because he was the only person in Japan who could bring the war to an end. If he was the only person who could bring it to an end, under his powers as Emperor, and by virtue of his supposedly exalted position in the Japanese religion, then he had the power to prevent the war from starting. The manner in which this war was conducted and fought by Japan is the most barbarous and outrageous crime that has ever been committed in the days of our civilization. Hirohito is responsible and any compromise which will prevent Hirohito from standing trial will never bring complete victory. Neither will it destroy the military imperialism which is deeply rooted in Japan. We shall simply be inviting that nation and that Government to reconstruct their militarism, revitalize it, and get ready for the next war in which they say they do not intend to fail.

I wish to express my personal thanks and appreciation for the very able address delivered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I also should like to add my congratulations to those of other Senators to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. At the time when negotiations were being conducted I felt very strongly that of all the things we should do, we should humble Hirohito personally to demonstrate beyond all doubt to the Japanese people that they have been defeated. Like so many others, I was, of course, especially glad to see the war come to an end. The Senator from Georgia has done something which I felt an urge to do, and he has done it better than I could have. I wish to say that I am in total sympathy with the sentiments expressed in the very fine address he has made.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that I was not able to hear all the Senator's address. I wonder whether he quoted from the Japanese Constitution relative to the responsibility of the Emperor of Japan.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did. I undertook to do that and to show that he could not be absolved of responsibility.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator did so. Last night I was reading an article regarding the history of Japan and the assumed divinity of Hirohito as the Emperor, and so forth and so on.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish I had had the advantage of that. I had to refer to the Japanese Constitution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I add my congratulations to those which other Senators have expressed to the Senator from Georgia. Of course, I, too, think he has done a very great service to the Senate and to the Nation.

The thing which has bothered me ever since I have been a Member of the Senate is the question how we can translate into our actions just such policies as the one the Senator has expressed which I am sure represent the dominant thought in the minds of the people of the Nation. I am very much bothered by the separation which seems to me to exist between our military, the Executive, and the Senate. That has bothered me in many other fields, but it is peculiarly important in connection with the field now under consideration. I wonder whether the Senator has any thoughts on that subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, Mr. President, that is one of the points which always plagues those of us who live in a democracy. There is no short and easy way to enforce what we believe to be the views of the majority of the American people. We all know that while our system of government is the best ever known anywhere, nevertheless there are defects in it. At times they are apparent, particularly in the powers of the legislative branch of the Government. I have prepared a resolution declaring it to be the policy of the United States that Hirohito, the Emperor of Japan, be tried as a war criminal. I intended to introduce that resolution before the day was out. There is no question about the power of the Congress of the United States to declare such a policy and to direct the commander of our forces and the representatives we may have on any international body to take steps to effectuate such a policy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, that is the only means we have, it seems to me. This brings to my mind a suggestion which I made some time ago, and which was also made in the House of Representatives by Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. This seems to me an excellent illustration of the benefit the Congress, the executive branch of the Government, and the country would reap by having the Secretary of State appear before the Congress. He should come here to discuss this very important problem. I cannot understand why either body of the Congress refuses to give him an opportunity to defend that policy. Perhaps there is a defense to be made of it, and if there is we should know it. However, here we sit and talk about it, but on the whole we accomplish nothing. However, Mr. President, I should be glad to have the resolution introduced.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to introduce the resolution.

There being no objection,

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) declaring that it is the policy of the United States that Emperor Hirohito of Japan be tried as a war criminal, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1274) to amend the war Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee substitute. All in favor of the committee substitute will signify by saying "Aye."

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McMAHON. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute. [Putting the question.]

The Chair has put the question, and the committee substitute is adopted.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Andrews	Hart	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hatch	Overton
Bailey	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Buck	Knowland	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Taylor
Capehart	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Cordon	McMahon	Wagner
Donnell	Magnuson	Walsh
Downey	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Mitchell	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murdock	Young
Green	Murray	
Guffey	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, did the Chair rule a moment ago that the committee amendment was agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure that Senators are not aware of the question that was voted upon, because they are several amendments which Senators wish to offer to the committee amendment in the form of a substitute. I ask that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered so that Senators may have an opportunity to offer their amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote will be reconsidered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 15, lines 5 to 17, inclusive. The amendment which I offer is to strike out lines 5 to 17, inclusive, and to insert the amendment which I ask the clerk to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 15, in lieu of the provision on lines 5 to 17, inclusive, it is proposed to insert the following:

(B) the total amount of wages upon which was based the determination of the total amount of compensation payable to such individual under the State law for such benefit year; except that such total amount of compensation shall be subject to the same reduction or cancellation as if such total amount of compensation (whether payable under the agreement or under the State law) were compensation payable under the State law.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall offer just a word of explanation. The committee, in considering the bill, was of the opinion that the benefits should be extended to 26 weeks. Technically it is stated in the bill as a period of 26 times the weekly benefit payment.

The amendment just offered makes one change. The committee was disturbed because of evidence before it relating to part-time workers, or seasonal workers, who worked only 2 months in a year, for example, November and December, as is the case in some of the department stores throughout the country. For the remainder of the year they are not really in the labor market.

The compensation received by such a worker during the 2 months, or the season, or short period, is, of course, not great in the aggregate, but is great enough under several of the State laws to qualify the worker, when he becomes unemployed, to receive benefit payments. The committee was seeking to avoid the extension of the period of payment up to 26 full weeks in that kind of an extreme case, and therefore the provision in the bill which I now move to strike out was inserted.

Under the amendment, in lieu of the language stricken out, language is to be inserted which means that the unemployed worker will receive no more than his earnings in the previous base period year, but will receive up to the full earnings he received in the base period year, if he becomes unemployed and remains unemployed. The amendment will have the effect of giving to more workers 26 weeks of benefit than would receive it under the language of the bill.

It will also have one other effect which I think is desirable and proper. It will

tend to equalize the weekly payments of workers who, when employed, were receiving substantially the same weekly or annual wage. In that respect it seems more equitable. I have offered the amendment to the language on page 15 for the purpose of slightly increasing the period of weekly benefit payments, and somewhat more equitably apportioning the payments as between the workers, that is, those formerly employed but who have now become unemployed, and other workers.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I understand, however, that under the amendment a worker may receive from the Federal Government a good deal more than he gets from the State, providing he comes within the 26 weeks' period. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. In some cases that would be true, but, generally speaking, in those States which provide 16 weeks of benefit payments—and there are several of them, 13 or 14 of them providing 16 flat weeks—it would not affect the worker at all, and would not affect the payments at all.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that there may be many workers who have not worked a sufficient time during the previous year to entitle them to receive 16 weeks of benefits? A worker may get only 10 weeks' benefits.

Mr. GEORGE. There are 13 States which pay for 16 weeks all those who qualify for any benefits, so it does not affect the status of the workers in those States. In another State, for instance, in Michigan, a worker may qualify who earned as much as a hundred dollars in his previous base period year, and he may draw $4 or $5 a week until he draws about $80. The effect of the proposed amendment would be to permit him to draw four or five weeks longer than he otherwise would.

Mr. TAFT. He would draw a hundred dollars, the limitation on the total amount of wages upon which was based the benefit to such individual under the State law.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. So that since the State payment of $80 was based on a base period pay of $100, the Federal Government then, under the proposed amendment, would pay him a hundred dollars spread over a number of weeks—I do not know how many.

Mr. GEORGE. It would pay him up to the amount of his earnings in the base period. It would pay him $20 additional measured in weekly payments, and that would be the extension he would receive, rather than the 26 flat weeks' benefits which we originally proposed to give anyone who had qualified for any payment. Most workers who earned approximately $1,500 or more in the base period would not be affected by the amendment. That is to say, the worker who earned approximately $1,500 in any State, so far as I know, would receive the maximum benefits under State law, and under the committee bill or this amendment would continue to receive compensation of he remained unemployed for 26 weeks.

Mr. TAFT. It strikes me as rather peculiar. The committee studied all this matter, and this proposal was never made before the committee, so far as I know. Certainly I am unable, without a complete study of State laws, to know exactly what it means. It reads:

> The total amount of wages upon which was based the determination of the total amount of compensation payable to such individual under the State law for such benefit year.

Mr. GEORGE. As the Senator knows, the State provisions vary, but, by and large, the State bases the weekly payments upon the accumulated credit of the individual worker, so that a simple illustration is that in my State, if a worker during the base period earned only $100, he would qualify, if he became unemployed, for a payment of $4 a week until he got about $80 out of the fund. That is my recollection. This amendment would give him the extension, but not beyond the number of weeks that would exhaust the sum equal to his earnings in the previous base period of his employment. It would have the effect of increasing the number of weeks' benefits the worker would obtain in the average State. More workers would have a coverage of 26 weeks than under the committee bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand the amendment, it somewhat liberalizes the duration in certain States in respect to casual workers, but it preserves the basic purpose of the Finance Committee, which was to keep casual workers out of the complete 26 weeks' coverage under the general rule which is to be applied.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator has correctly analyzed it. It liberalizes it, and it gives more unemployed workers a longer period—not to exceed, of course, 26 weeks in any case—than the committee amendment gives, but it relates the period of weekly benefit payments to the whole amount of the earnings of the worker in his base year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, the sort of a case which we were trying to reach would be typified, I suppose, by a million women workers who go into the retail stores for 6 or 8 weeks at Christmas time. They go in annually and they retire annually. They are not a part of the regular labor force at all. Their standard service would average 6 or 8 weeks a year. Yet under the original proposition, although their standard wage or activity a year was only 6 or 8 weeks they would have been allowed compensation benefits up to 26 weeks. What the Senator is now proposing is in line with the purpose of the committee substantially to confine the benefits to an equivalent duration or benefit to the wage drawn.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. It is more liberal, however, than the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Federal Treasury bear this cost?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes. The total cost of this bill falls on the Federal Treasury.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Was an effort made to determine whether the respective States would have the power to make contracts with the Federal Government to accept the additional funds which would exceed State funds for this purpose? As I recall there was discussion in the committee with Mr. Murphy, the legal counsel, as to whether the State could enter into such a contract with the Federal Government. I was wondering whether that question has been determined.

Mr. GEORGE. No, I do not know whether it has been definitely determined, and I do not know whether the States could do so. Some of the States might possibly take the position that under their laws they cannot receive the fund for the extended coverage. But that will depend of course upon the law of the State and the construction of the law placed upon it by the State authorities.

Mr. LUCAS. As I recall, it was first determined that it might be done because the same kind of contracts had been entered into with the States under the GI bill of rights.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Later on the legal counsel, after making thorough examination of the subject matter, determined that there might be very serious question as to whether or not certain States at least under their laws could enter into a contract with the Federal Government to accept this additional amount of money.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the statement was that there might be a question, but that it was a rather remote possibility. Certainly, the question is not so serious here as it is in connection with supplementing the weekly amounts.

Mr. LUCAS. To that I agree.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me to offer an amendment to the amendment which he has just offered? It is a clarifying amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me ask the Senator from West Virginia whether his amendment is an amendment to the text of the amendment I just offered.

Mr. KILGORE. It is to the text of the amendment the Senator from Georgia offered to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a period, and to strike out lines 13 to 17 inclusive.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Is the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia an amendment to that offered by the Senator from Georgia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it to be an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Then it is not an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it is so offered, and it strikes out a part

of the language which the Senator from Georgia strikes out by his amendment. The Senator from Georgia strikes out all the language from line 5 through line 17.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I did not have the advantage of a copy of the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia when I drafted my amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated again? I did not catch the significance of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a period, and to strike out lines 13 to 17 inclusive.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from West Virginia wishes to address himself to the amendment before the vote is taken on my amendment, very well. The language which the Senator is proposing to strike out is in the committee amendment, which I also offered to strike out, but which I was going to reinsert. I presume the Senator's amendment may be offered to the amendment which I have suggested, since I am offering to reinsert the language as it appears in the bill from line 13 down to the period in line 17.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to keep that stricken out. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is trying to strike it out. I should have to oppose that amendment. That would change the whole effect of what the committee has attempted to do.

Mr. KILGORE. I grant the statement that it changes somewhat the effect.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the occupant of the chair if he will inform the Senate what the Senator from West Virginia has offered as an amendment. What does he propose to strike out, and what does he propose to insert, and in what lines and on what page?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would insert a period in lieu of the semicolon in line 12 on page 15, and strike out everything in lines 13 through 17. The amendment would not insert anything. It would simply strike out everything after the semicolon in line 12, through the remainder of the section.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the amendment which is being offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, that language was stricken out and reinserted at another point, and I am seeking to keep it stricken out by offering an amendment at the point where it was reinserted. At that time I did not have the advantage of having the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Let me state briefly the purpose of my amendment. Under State laws there is a varied group of disqualifications which would not only affect the payment of State money, but, under the extension, would also affect the payment of Federal money.

As I understand, the general purpose of unemployment compensation is to assist a worker who, through no fault of his own, has ceased to have employment, although previously he was lucratively employed. Under some of the State laws, a person may be driven out of employment, with no recourse, although he is not formally discharged. My amendment would prevent such a person from being excluded from the benefit of Federal funds. In some of the States, through persecution or through absolutely intolerable working conditions in a plant, a person might be forced to quit, and under the State laws he would be precluded from certain unemployment benefits. In January 1938, 8 States had laws under which, in one or more ways, a person could be precluded from unemployment benefits. In January 1940, there were 14 States, and in January 1944, 27 States, which had passed such laws under which a worker, because of mistreatment, could be forced to resign and have no recourse of any kind. If the Federal Government is to make payments in States where such laws do not exist, it seems to me that the same rule should apply in States where such laws are in force, inasmuch as the money comes from the same source. In other words, the method of dealing with extended payments should be uniform, not as to the amount of payment but as to the extension of payments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator take the position that all the disqualifications in State laws are unsound and inequitable?

Mr. KILGORE. No. We originally had a uniform system, under which a man had a right to be heard. Now, however, the situation is quite different. For example, on the west coast recently one State arbitrarily said to employees who were laid off, "You have 3 weeks. If you do not find a job in 3 weeks, you are out," no matter how much they were entitled to by reason of the money which they had paid in. Freak rulings such as that can preclude a worker who is entitled to something from obtaining his rights under the act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Am I correct in understanding that the Senator's amendment would strike down the State restrictions——

Mr. KILGORE. It would strike out these words:

> Except that such total amount of compensation shall be subject to the same reduction or cancellation as if such total amount of compensation (whether payable under the agreement or under the State law) were compensation payable under the State law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator would strike down the State restrictions, regardless of whether or not they are sound.

Mr. KILGORE. Only with respect to the extension.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is to make the determination? Is the responsibility to be placed on the State authorities to make decisions with respect to the various matters about which the Senator has been talking?

Mr. KILGORE. No. They will be specified in the contract. If a State does not sign the contract, the Social Security Administration will have to administer the fund.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the Senator's amendment, two different systems would be set up in the States. The Senator says that if the fund is not administered by the State, it will be the duty of the Federal Government to administer it. That is the very thing which we have discussed all the way along. Either we must have one system, and recognize the States, or we must do something else, and that something else is for the Federal Government to take over the whole operation.

From what I have heard of the argument, it seems to me that, as the Senator from Michigan has said, the Senator from West Virginia would destroy the organizations in the various States so far as the particular workers are concerned, and would tell the workers that they must follow the formula laid down by the Congress in order to receive benefits. I do not believe it would work.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The most common form of disqualification is the rule which provides that if a man is offered a job and refuses to take it, he shall then be disqualified for 2 weeks, 3 weeks, or 4 weeks, from drawing unemployment compensation. That is the best protection against the abuse of unemployment compensation. As I understand the Senator's amendment, he would destroy that rule, so that after the time specified by the State had gone by, if a job were offered to a man and he refused to take it, the State law would bar him for several weeks from drawing unemployment compensation, having refused to take a job which the State board had found to be suitable. Nevertheless, the Federal Government would have to pay him, although he might be offered a perfectly good job. Am I correct in thinking that that would be the effect of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. KILGORE. No.

Mr. TAFT. That is one of the reasons in every State law for the reduction or cancellation of unemployment compensation. The fact that a man will not take a suitable job when it is offered to him is one of the disqualifications in every State law. The Senator proposes to strike down that rule.

Mr. KILGORE. No.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that if we strike down the State rules, we must write Federal rules providing when unemployment compensation may be reduced or stopped.

Mr. KILGORE. The amendment would not operate so long as the State was paying up to the limit; but it would preclude the State from depriving a worker of something to which he is entitled under the act.

Mr. TAFT. While he is receiving 16 weeks' compensation from the State, he

must take a suitable job if it is offered to him; but the moment the 16 weeks have expired, he may be offered any number of suitable jobs, but he can draw 10 weeks' more compensation from the Federal Government.

Mr. KILGORE. That could not be the effect.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that that would be the inevitable effect. I do not see how there could be any other result, unless the Senator proposes to write Federal limitations on the right to draw unemployment compensation during the extended period.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this amendment is only technically in order, because the amendment which I have offered could well have stopped by striking the language from line 5 to line 12, and leaving the other language. However, the amendment as drawn struck out all the language from line 5 to line 17, but reinserted at another point the provision which the Senator from West Virginia is now seeking to amend.

The effect of this amendment would be virtually to give every one in covered employment 26 weeks' compensation, of course, the extended period would be at the cost of the Federal Government. This is how it would work:

If, for example, John Smith were entitled to benefit payments for 16 weeks, based upon his prior earnings in his base period in a State, and he should voluntarily quit his job, in all the States he would be disqualified from receiving a certain part of the benefit payments. Notwithstanding the fact that that would happen under the State law, the Federal Government would add the same number of weeks of which he had been deprived by his own conduct. So the practical effect would be to extend all payments to 26 weeks. That is precisely what the committee did not wish to do in the case of employees who were occasional employees, or part-time or seasonal employees.

We have submitted a very liberal proposal in the amendment which I have offered, namely, that the worker, when he becomes unemployed, shall have the period of his weekly payments extended until he has exhausted a sum equal to all that he earned in the prior base period. That is a most liberal provision; in fact, it is more liberal than any provision any State has. But since we are dealing with unemployment in the reconversion period if the worker is unemployed and inasmuch as we desire to be liberal, my thought in offering the amendment is that the worker at least should have an extension of his weekly payments so long as he is unemployed, until he has exhausted all his earnings in his base-period year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if the committee became convinced from its consideration of this whole subject matter that the written request of the Governor, without any action on the part of a State legislature, should be sufficient to make it possible for the law to take effect in any State. If the answer to that question is in the affirmative, then I should like to ask whether that also covers the provisions under section 702 (b) (2) which says that it will be under the same conditions. In other words, in Massachusetts a worker eligible for unemployment compensation has a right to appeal to a board of review, and if he is not satisfied with the recision of the board of review he has certain rights in the courts. Can the Governor by written request give an applicant all those rights in the State courts without an act of the legislature? Is the committee convinced of that?

Mr. GEORGE. I am obliged to answer in the negative, rather than in the affirmative the question the Senator first propounded, namely, that relative to the written request of the Governor of the State, the committee was merely acting so as to protect the States against having forced upon them something they might not have wished. That came in by way of an amendment offered in the committee by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. However, it is not intended to suggest that the written request of the Governor would give the State any right that it does not now have to accept money even for an extended period of coverage.

In answer to the question last propounded by the Senator from Massachusetts, let me say that it was not intended. All we are saying here is that if in Massachusetts the law is as the Senator has described it, then if the period of weekly benefit payments is extended by the Federal Government, the Congress itself says that the payments are extended under the same conditions, subject to the same regulations, and so forth, that existed with reference to the original period of payments under the Massachusetts law. In other words, it leaves it right back with the State. But that is the contract of the Congress, and that does not grow out of merely the written consent of the Governor of the State to the extended period of payments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So it was the thought of the committee to put on the Governor, before he made his written request or in conjunction with making his written request, the obligation that all the provisions of the State law be complied with and be broad enough to cover the provisions of this act; is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct.

So, Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia. I might offer the amendment which I have previously offered by merely moving to strike out the text from line 5 down to line 12 and inserting so much of the language that is pertinent to those particular lines. But since I did move to strike it all out, and since technically the Senator from West Virginia has a right to offer his amendment, and since we have argued it, we might as well dispose of it at this time.

I wish to say definitely, however, that the amendment, if adopted, would become a departure from established State law, and its effect would be to give to every worker, for every week for which his compensation under State laws is canceled, an additional Federal week of benefit payments. That is not what the committee desired to do. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I should like to ask a question of the Senator from West Virginia. I am slightly confused about whether the amendment the Senator has offered applies only to what the Senator calls casual workers, or whether it applies to all who are unemployed.

Mr. KILGORE. No; it does not affect casual workers.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand. Reference was had to casual workers. Of course, I assume that no one would want a temporary employee, one who was working only for a few weeks at Christmas time, for instance, and not working or desiring to work at any other time in the year, merely because of such temporary work, which he performed in order to make a little extra money for some purpose, and probably so as to be able to buy his Christmas presents at a discount during the time of such temporary employment, to be placed on the permanent unemployment compensation rolls, so that he would be eligible to receive 26 weeks of unemployment-compensation payments, although during the time of his employment he had no intention of working for 26 weeks, inasmuch as he was working only at Christmas time. That case is used only as an illustration, of course.

The suggested provision might also apply to seasonal or casual workers in the fields, harvesting crops—for instance, school boys working during their vacation. Someone told the committee about a State in which certain young men worked during the harvest, for 2 or 3 months of the summer, and then returned to college, and were placed on the unemployment compensation rolls and were paid sufficient money as unemployment compensation to enable them to pay their tuition. They received those payments under a State law. I do not see how that could happen unless the administrator of the State law was very lax in the administration of the law.

But what we are seeking to do here is to provide for bona fide unemployment, and we are seeking to provide for it in such a way that no one can take advantage of the law by which we seek to be generous. At least, I hope we may be generous in this respect. We do not wish to make it possible for advantage to be taken of such a provision by simply temporary, casual workers who are not legitimately in the employment field, but who work only temporarily during a seasonal period. That is why I asked the Senator from West Virginia whether his amendment would apply only to seasonal workers or whether it has application to all unemployed in a State, under the State law.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me say that the amendment does not apply to seasonal workers at all. That is taken care of by paragraph (B) of the committee amendment, in which a strict limitation is applied.

My amendment applies only to a worker who during a preceding period has earned enough to be entitled to the compensation; in other words, his earnings have been such that, but for the arbitrary ruling of the State, he would be entitled to receive the compensation. For instance, in one State there was a ruling that nonresident workers, who for 3 weeks could not find work would then be stricken from the unemployment compensation rolls. A migratory worker who had gone into that State to work might find himself off both the State and Federal rolls by reason of such a ruling. He would be held unemployable, and would be ineligible in that way. I fear that we would have cases of that sort.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator another question. Take the case of a State which has made provision for 20 weeks of unemployment compensation payments. A worker would go on the rolls for the 20 weeks, subject to the restrictions and cancellations which would be in effect under the State authority. Then when the 20 weeks were up, or whatever the period might be, he would then be free from the cancellations or restrictions which were in operation under the State law for the period during which he had drawn compensation under the State law. In that case, what would be substituted for the State law as to cancellations or any other conditions under which he would either go off the rolls or fail to get on it?

Mr. KILGORE. He would be picked up and carried with Federal funds.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know that he would be carried with Federal funds, but would he be subject to any regulation which would drop him down if during the period he was being carried he had been offered what might be regarded as suitable employment and had refused it? In other words, would he have the right to remain on the roll during the entire remaining period up to 26 weeks without authority in the State or Federal Government to determine whether he had been offered a suitable job, and whether he had declined it so that he might draw compensation for the entire period regardless of his own action?

Mr. KILGORE. I believe unquestionably that if a job were offered him he would go off the rolls under the State and Federal law.

Mr. BARKLEY. What Federal law would that be?

Mr. KILGORE. I mean that under this proposal, if he refused to accept any employment offered him, under the State law, he would go off the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's amendment lifts the State law from this situation after the period under the State law had expired. During that additional period, if the beneficiary did not come under his State law what would regulate whether he would remain on the roll? If he should determine not to accept a suitable job, who would determine what was suitable in the event that the State had no authority under the theory of this bill to make such determination? Of course, the Senator knows that I do not agree with the theory of the bill as reported by the committee. I voted in the committee, as I shall vote on the floor, for the substance of the original bill offered by the Senator from West Virginia. But since the committee has reported the amendment to the bill eliminating altogether $25 a week in supplementing the State compensation, and since we are dealing now with the bill on the theory of this amendment that it follows State regulations, if we lift them so that they do not apply beyond the duration period fixed by the State, I wonder what authority there may be in the bill to say to any man, "You have been offered suitable employment and have refused to accept it, and therefore we will not compensate you."

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that I shall ask to withdraw the amendment at this time and will take it up later. I believe that in so doing confusion will be reduced.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator had dealt with the matter in his substitute which I understood he would offer.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia withdraws his amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] a question. A few moments ago he made a statement to the effect that the total cost of this bill would fall on the Federal Government. I should like to know if the committee ascertained, or if the Senator can give any opinion as to what the estimated total cost of this bill to the Federal Government for the period covered by the bill will amount to. I have not had an opportunity to read the hearings, and the information for which I ask may have been developed in the testimony.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that the estimate which was made by the Social Security Board for the total cost of this bill in its present form is based upon three assumed levels of unemployment. First, there is the low unemployment which is taken as 1,100,000 in June 1945; 5,500,000 in December 1945; 6,000,000 in June 1946; 4,500,000 in December 1946; and 3,000,000 in June 1947; the expiration of the life of the act. I have given the figures for low unemployment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is to be the total cost?

Mr. GEORGE. The cost has been estimated at $360,000,000 on low unemployment. The cost on high unemployment has been estimated at $745,000,000. Those costs apply to the life of the act, or 21 months. The estimates, of course, are based on certain assumptions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A moment ago I thought the Senator spoke of three levels of unemployment.

Mr. GEORGE. It has been estimated that the intermediate unemployment will range from a low of 1,100,000 in June of this year to 4,000,000 and up, and that it will go up to 8,000,000 and fall to 4,000,000 in June 1947. The Board assumes a high unemployment ranging from 1,100,000 in June of this year up to a top of 10,000,000 in June 1946, and a recession to 6,000,000 in June 1947.

Based upon the assumption of unemployment, the Board estimates that the cost of this bill, as reported by the committee, if enacted into law, will be for low unemployment, $360,000,000; medium unemployment, $530,000,000; and high unemployment, $745,000,000. Thos figures would include all the cost which has been estimated by the Board. However, the amendment which I now offer would slightly increase the cost because it would liberalize the bill with respect to workers who are given benefits for a limited number of weeks.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator answer another inquiry for me?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be pleased to answer it if I can do so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is there anything in the bill as reported by the committee which restricts persons eligible for the extended benefits under the bill beyond those benefits which are already provided for by State law which respect to whether the applicant for unemployment compensation is able financially to support himself during the period involved?

Mr. GEORGE. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, would a man be entitled to draw the extended benefits from the Federal Government at the expense of the taxpayers if the applicant were unemployed and unable to find, as we assume, suitable employment, notwithstanding the fact that he might have a substantial income from other sources, or have a substantial reserve of cash and other property on hand with which to provide for his own support during the period which the Federal Government now proposes to pay unemployment compensation under this measure?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, my answer to the distinguished Senator is in the negative, because no need test is applied in the bill for any of the benefits. It is merely a question of whether a worker is unemployed and cannot obtain suitable employment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, assuming—and I do not think it a reckless assumption—that during the period covered by the bill, and the gap we are trying to bridge, the revenues of the Government are inadequate to meet the costs of the Federal Government during that period of time for this and all other purposes, it would merely resolve into a situation whereby the Federal Government would be taxing its people, and also charging a deficit to present and future taxpayers, in order to pay unemployment compensation to a man who might himself be able to take care of his own needs, just because for a period of 26 weeks he found he was unable to obtain what the law terms "suitable employment." Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. I assume I should be obliged to answer "Yes", but the theory of the committee in reporting the bill is that there will be unemployment in the reconversion period, much of which will be absolutely unavoidable, because there will be a period between actual cancellation of war contracts and reconversion of the plants to peacetime operation in which many workers will be out of employment. It was and is the view of

the committee, and my view as well, that that is a part of the general war cost, and we have felt that 26 weeks would probably be sufficiently long, in the case of any one worker, to get us over that hump.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is also true, is it not, that in the States, under their own laws, there is no test which requires the State to determine whether a man is in need or not?

Mr. GEORGE. That is true. There is no need test applied in any of the States, so far as I know, although there may be need tests in certain instances.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I recall, the situation described by the Senator from Arkansas, of a man who had independent income or property, would not deprive him of compensation under the State laws, if he were unemployed.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Kentucky is correct, because the need test with respect to unemployment compensation is not applied by any State. The need test is applied with respect to certain other benefits, such as the old-age benefits.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true, but with regard to the present financing of unemployment compensation now being paid by the State, the money was provided by a tax on pay rolls and wages.

Mr. GEORGE. That money is provided by such a tax.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wanted to clarify these matters.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator has the facts correct; but there is no need test applied by any State, and all the bill does is to fix the eligibility of the unemployed person on the basis of State standards, and the amount of payment on the basis of what he is entitled to under the State law. When he has exhausted those payments, the Federal Government steps in and merely extends the period during which he will receive the same compensation, and on the same basis, subject to the same conditions as he receives benefits under the State law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, the real effect of the bill is to continue on to the limit of 26 weeks the same benefits which an unemployed worker may now be entitled to under his State law, and the cost of such extension will be borne by the Federal Government?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And subject to all the State regulations?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, subject to all the State regulations. That was the reason why I was compelled to resist the amendment just offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, because it would have altered the rule.

Mr. President, since the estimated cost of the bill has been brought into question, I should like to repeat that, based upon low employment, medium, and high, certain estimates have been submitted by the Social Security Board. I shall give the estimates under high unemployment, and will offer the others for the RECORD.

It is estimated that the total cost under high unemployment will be $745,000,000, under the bill as reported to the Senate. There will be some slight increase in that estimate if the amendment I have just offered shall be approved.

The cost, under high unemployment, due to the extension of the duration, which is the matter now in controversy, will be $415,000,000, which of course will be borne by the Federal Government. The cost due to coverage of Federal and maritime workers, under high unemployment, will be $270,000,000, as estimated. Costs due to travel allowances, under high unemployment, will amount to $60,000,000.

All those items of course will be chargeable to and borne by the Federal Government. Though the States in the first instance make the payments, in some cases, the States will be entitled to reimbursement.

I ask that the communication from the Social Security Board, with the accompanying estimates, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and estimates were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,
Washington, September 17, 1945.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: The enclosed table contains the estimates of the cost of S. 1274, as amended (Rept. No. 565), requested by Mr. Jacobstein.

These estimates are based on the assumption that all States would agree to extension of duration of benefits as provided in the bill. To the extent that States do not participate, the enclosed cost estimates will be overstated. The economic conditions assumed in preparing these estimates are the same as those upon which we based our estimates for the original version of S. 1274.

If there is anything else you wish please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. ALTMEYER,
Chairman.

Estimated costs payable by Federal Government under S. 1274 as amended (Rept. No. 565),[1] for selected unemployment assumptions,[2] Oct. 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947

[In millions]

Period	Unemployment benefits payable by States	Costs payable by Federal Government				
		Total	Unemployment benefits			Travel allowances
			Total	Extension of duration for presently covered workers [1]	Federal and maritime employees	
I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1. LOW UNEMPLOYMENT ASSUMPTION						
October 1945 to June 1946	$700	----------	$150	$50	$100	----------
July 1946 to June 1947	1,000	----------	195	110	85	----------
Total	1,700	$360	345	160	185	$15
INTERMEDIATE UNEMPLOYMENT ASSUMPTION						
October 1945 to June 1946	900	----------	205	80	125	----------
July 1946 to June 1947	1,250	----------	295	190	105	----------
Total	2,150	530	500	270	230	30
3. HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT ASSUMPTION						
October 1945 to June 1946	1,100	----------	315	165	150	----------
July 1946 to June 1947	1,500	----------	370	250	120	----------
Total	2,600	745	685	415	270	60

[1] These estimates are based on assumption that all States agree to extension of duration provided in the bill.
[2] The unemployment patterns assumed are identical with those used in estimating the cost of the original bill, S. 1274.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after line 10, on page 12, through page 25, line 9, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

"(d) The term 'adjusted weekly benefit amount' means the sum of (1) the State weekly benefit amount of an individual increased by (2) any supplementary compensation payable with respect to a week of total unemployment under an agreement pursuant to section 702 (c) of this title.

"(e) The term 'benefit year' means the benefit year prescribed in the applicable State unemployment compensation law; except that, if such State law does not prescribe any benefit year, such term means any period of 52 consecutive weeks specified in an applicable agreement made under this title or, if there is no such applicable agreement, then any period of 52 consecutive weeks prescribed by the Director.

"(f) The term 'Federal service' means service performed as a civilian in the employ of the United States, including any wholly owned instrumentality thereof; except that such term does not include service performed by an individual outside the United States, unless such individual is a citizen of the United States, or resided therein on December 7, 1941.

"(g) The term 'maritime service' means service performed, in employment as defined in title II of the Social Security Act, as

amended, as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel.

"(h) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii.

"(i) The term 'United States,' when used in a geographical sense, means the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

"EXTENSION OF THE DURATION OF BENEFITS

"SEC. 702. (a) The Director is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with such State, or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency (1) will make, as agent of the United States, payments of compensation to supplement the duration of compensation payable under the law of such State with respect to unemployment occurring in the reconversion period, and (2) will otherwise cooperate with the Director and with other State unemployment compensation agencies in making payments of compensation authorized by this title.

"(b) Any agreement made under this section shall provide—

"(1) for paying compensation with respect to unemployment occurring in the reconversion period in cases where compensation is not payable under the State law because of the exhaustion, reduction, or cancellation of benefit rights under such law for a benefit year;

"(2) that compensation with respect to such unemployment will be payable under such agreement at the same rates, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as the compensation which would be payable under the State law (including any compensation payable under an agreement under section 702 (c) of this title) with respect to such unemployment except for the exhaustion, reduction, or cancellation of such benefit rights; and

"(3) that compensation will be payable under such agreement to any individual for any benefit year in such aggregate amount that compensation with respect to unemployment occurring in the reconversion period will not be denied such individual, by reason of the exhaustion, cancellation, or reduction of his benefit rights, until the total amount of compensation paid to him for such benefit year (including compensation paid under the State law and compensation paid under the agreement) is equal to 26 times his adjusted weekly benefit amount, except that, in the case of any individual who during his base period has earned less than 26 times his adjusted weekly benefit amount, such total amount shall be equal to 160 percent (adjusted to the next higher multiple of $1) of the aggregate amount of compensation payable to him for such benefit year under the State unemployment compensation law (such aggregate amount of compensation payable under the State law being computed for this purpose without any deductions on account of any reduction of his benefit rights under State law).

"(c) Any State which enters into an agreement to pay compensation in accordance with subsection (a) of this section may include in its agreement provision for—

"(1) payment of compensation to individuals on the basis of adjusted weekly benefit amounts which do not exceed 60 per centum of the individual's previous weekly earnings, as defined and determined by the State unemployment compensation agency, and (exclusive of any amounts payable with respect to dependents) do not exceed $25;

"(2) payment of compensation to any class or classes of individuals who would be entitled to compensation under the State unemployment compensation law except for existing or prior exclusions from the definition of employment in such law, or except for existing or prior limitations of coverage in such law based on the amount of pay roll or number of employees of, or the duration or frequency of employment by, the employing unit, such compensation to be in the same amounts, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as are provided in such law (including payments thereunder with respect to dependents), together with supplemental payments made in accordance with subsection (a) of this section and paragraph (1) of the subsection.

"COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND SEAMEN

"SEC. 703 (a) The Director is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State, or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency will make, as agent of the United States, payments of compensation, on the basis provided in subsection (b), to individuals who have performed Federal service or maritime service.

"(b) Any such agreement shall provide for the payment of compensation to any individual who performed Federal or maritime service equal to the compensation which would be payable to such individual under the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended (as supplemented under section 702 (b) of this title and as if it were supplemented under section 702 (c) of this title), as if such services had been performed in the District of Columbia and had not been excluded from the definition of employment in such act; and

"(c) If in the case of any State an agreement is not entered into under section 702 (b) or 703 or both or the unemployment compensation agency of such State fails to make payments in accordance with such an agreement, the Director, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, shall make payments of compensation to individuals on a basis which will provide that they will be paid compensation in the same amounts, on substantially the same terms, and subject to substantially the same conditions as though such agreement had been entered into and such agency made such payments. Final determinations by the Director of entitlement to such payments shall be subject to review by the courts in the same manner and to the same extent as is provided in title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, with respect to decisions by the Social Security Board under such title.

"(d) All executive agencies shall furnish to individuals who have been in their employ, to the appropriate State agency, and to the Director such information with respect to wages and salaries as the Director may determine to be practicable and necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(e) The Director may require employers to furnish such information with respect to wages and salaries of individuals who have been employed by them as may be necessary to determine the amount of compensation payable to such individuals under this title or an agreement thereunder.

"(f) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Director, he, and any State agency making payments of compensation pursuant to an agreement under this section, may—

"(1) to the extent that the Director finds that it is not feasible for executive agencies or other employers to furnish information necessary to permit exact and reasonably prompt determinations of the wages or salaries of individuals who have performed Federal service or maritime service, determine the amount of and pay compensation to any individual under this section, or an agreement thereunder, as if the wages or salary paid such individual for each week of such service were in an amount equal to his average weekly wages or salary for the last pay period of such service occurring prior to the time he files his initial claim for compensation within a benefit year; and

"(2) to the extent that information furnished by executive agencies or other employers is inadequate to assure the prompt payment of compensation authorized by this section (either on the basis of the exact wages or salaries of the individuals concerned or on the basis prescribed in clause (1) of this subsection), accept certification under oath by individuals of facts relating to their Federal service or maritime service and to wages and salaries paid them with respect to such service.

"NO REDUCTION OF BENEFITS

"SEC. 704. Any agreement under this title shall provide that compensation otherwise payable to any individual under the State's unemployment compensation law will not be denied or reduced for any week by reason of any payment made pursuant to such agreement. No agreement under this title for payment of compensation by a State agency shall be valid if compensation payable to any individual under the law of such State is less than it would have been under such law as it existed on September 1, 1945.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 705. (a) Determinations of entitlement to payments of compensation by a State unemployment compensation agency under an agreement under this title shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law except as the Director may otherwise prescribe, by regulation, for Federal and maritime employees.

"(b) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, administration by the unemployment compensation agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this title shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment compensation law.

"(c) The State unemployment compensation agency of each State shall furnish to the Social Security Board, for the use of the Director, such information as the Director may find necessary in carrying out the provisions of this title, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Social Security Board for the purposes of section 303 (a) (6) of the Social Security Act, as amended.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 706. (a) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the total of all payments of compensation made under and in accordance with an agreement under this title.

"(b) In making payments pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Director, such sum as the Director estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this title for each calendar quarter; reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Director finds that his estimates for any prior calendar quarter were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. The amount of such payments may be determined by such statistical sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Director and the State agency.

"(c) The Director shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment, at the time or times fixed by the Director, in accordance with such certification, from the funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act.

"(d) All money paid to a State under this section shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned to the Treasury upon termina-

tion of the agreement or termination of the reconversion period, whichever first occurs.

"(e) An agreement under this title may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds, pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Director may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from appropriations for carrying out the purposes of this act.

"(f) No person designated by the Director, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this title, as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this title.

"(g) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in subsection (f).

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 707. (a) Whoever, for the purpose of causing an increase in any compensation authorized to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder, or for the purpose of causing any compensation to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder where none is authorized to be so paid, shall make or cause to be made any false statement or representation as to any wages paid or received, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any claim for any compensation authorized to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with such claim, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or compensation under this title or an agreement thereunder, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud the United States, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(c) Whoever willfully fails or refuses to furnish information which the Director requires him to furnish pursuant to authority of subsection (e) of section 703, or willfully furnishes false information pursuant to a requirement of the Director under such section, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both.

"TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

"SEC. 708. In order to assist individuals who have been engaged in activities essential to the national defense or to the war effort at places away from their former homes, and who have left their homes since December 7, 1941, to engage in such activities, to return to their former homes or to go to places where suitable employment is available, the Director, subject to regulations and limitations prescribed by him, is authorized to pay a part or all of the cost of transportation, including transportation of dependents and household effects, for any such individual (1) back to his former home, if within the United States, or (2) if the Director finds that suitable employment is not available to him in the locality where he applies for such transportation, to some other locality (not farther distant than his former home) where the Director finds that suitable employment is available for such individual: *Provided*, That the amount paid under this section with respect to such transportation shall not exceed $200 for any one worker and his dependent and household effects, and shall not exceed the amount allowable in the case of civilian employees of the United States in the Standard Government Travel Regulations: *Provided further*, That no such cost of transportation shall be paid by the Director for an individual if the employer, former employer, or prospective employer of such individual has entered into an agreement or arrangement under which such transportation is provided for. No transportation shall be provided under this section after June 30, 1947."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 700 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended by striking out the word "weeks" which occurs after the word "fifty-two" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "times his allowance for a week of total unemployment."

(b) Section 900 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 900. (a) The allowance for a week shall be—

"(1) $25, plus—

"(2) $5 if the claimant has one or more dependents: less that part of the wages payable to him for such week which is in excess of $3: *Provided*, That where the allowance is not a multiple of $1, it shall be computed to the next highest multiple of $1; and

"(b) As used in this section the term 'dependent' means any dependent as defined in the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, who, in the week for which an allowance is claimed, has not received $5 or more either as wages, or as an allowance under this title, or under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law;

"(c) The Administrator may find an individual to be a dependent of the claimant if the claimant has certified the facts required by the provisions of this section."

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 603 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (relating to the termination date of the provisions of such act), the provisions of title VII of such act, as amended, shall not terminate as provided in such section 603.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The amendment is rather long and goes through the entire bill. I wonder whether we will have time to print it so every Senator will have a copy before we discuss it. I am perfectly willing to discuss it without having it printed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. To what extent does the Senator's substitute deviate from his original bill which was stricken out by the committee?

Mr. KILGORE. There are some deviations. The mandatory clauses are stricken out completely. The payments are left to the discretion of the State again as is done in the committee amendment now before the Senate. The Federal Government merely holds itself out as willing to reimburse if the State elects to accept the additional money up to the $25 a week.

Mr. GEORGE. Is this a substitute for the entire committee amendment, or a proposal to amend certain sections?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from Georgia that it is a substitute for everything in the entire committee amendment except the 8 lines on page 11 and the first 10 lines on page 12. I had to make it as an amendment because it was drafted that way. I intended to draft it as a substitute, but I offer it as a substitute for the entire committee amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is offering it as a substitute?

Mr. KILGORE. It really amounts to a substitute, except that a certain small portion of the committee amendment is left, that is the first part of it.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator is offering it as a substitute to the committee bill or amendment I think it is necessary that it be printed so that the Senate may have it before it and be able to understand it.

Mr. KILGORE. That is why I raised the question.

Mr. GEORGE. But if the Senator is offering an amendment to some portion——

Mr. KILGORE. It presents a slightly different theory from the committee amendment, and I think the Senate would like to study it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think from a reading of it so far it is a substitute for that part beginning in line 11 on page 12, and from then on to the end. The Senator leaves in section 701 (a), (b), and (c) which are definitions, as I understand.

Mr. KILGORE. It is a substitute for all that part of the committee amendment beginning in line 11 and going on through to the end.

Mr. GEORGE. To the end of the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. To the end of the bill, yes. Beginning in line 11 on page 12.

Mr. GEORGE. In effect it is a general substitute.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; in effect it is a general substitute.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that being the case, I think it will be necessary to request the Senator to offer his substitute for printing so that we may have the advantage of it by tomorrow morning. The amendment raises important issues. In the meantime, however, there are other amendments to the committee text. I should like to dispose of them this evening, if possible.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] will be printed and lie on the table.

Are there any further amendments to be offered?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have no amendments to the committee text, but I offer an amendment which I should like to have the clerk read at the present time. I have sent it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The Employment Service facilities, property, and personnel loaned by the States to the United States Employment Service, shall be returned to the States not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this act. The War Manpower Commission is authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire briefly to address the Senate upon this exceedingly important amendment to the bill. I am satisfied that the impact of

reconversion has struck many communities throughout America. I distinctly recall that when the act was passed in 1935 the Federal Government encouraged the States to take on the program of unemployment compensation. Since that time each and every State in the Union has adopted a definite and distinct program of its own to handle unemployment compensation.

When the great war came on, the President of the United States by an Executive order directed that all employees in the State unemployment agencies be loaned to the Federal Government during the emergency with the express understanding, so I am told, that when the emergency was over the services would be returned to the States. It is my understanding that the present President of the United States has said that sooner or later they would be returned.

The point I want to make is this: After listening for some 2 weeks to all the testimony which was given to the Finance Committee on the bill now pending before the Senate I reached a very definite conclusion that today there exists a definite divided responsibility between the Federal Government and the State governments in the administering of unemployment matters. One witness after another so testified. Every time the question was raised there was always a passing of responsibility from the Federal Government to the State or from the State to the Federal Government, as to what agency was, in the final analysis, to make the determination respecting what a suitable job should be.

There should not be any divided authority at this particular time. Unemployment is here. We all recognize it or we would not now be discussing the pending bill. I consider this measure of tremendous importance in orderly procedure insofar as men obtaining unemployment compensation is concerned. We ought to say definitely whether or not we want the States to administer it or whether we want the Federal Government to administer it. There cannot be divided authority when so many individuals are losing employment, without adding chaos and confusion to an already chaotic condition, and there should not be any buck-passing with respect to where the responsibility lies.

The people of America, the taxpayers, who have built up this tremendous reserve fund, have a right to point the finger to those responsible for either doing a good job or a bad job, so when John Jones in my community is placed on the unemployment compensation rolls the community will know and be able to judge whether he is entitled to the money, or whether he is not entitled to it, by fixing responsibility on the State agency. That is where it belongs so long as it is under State administration. Until the time comes when we pursue some other course, I submit when we get the complete and full administration of unemployment compensation back into the States we will have orderly administrative procedure because we will then be able to fix responsibility. It cannot be done too soon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not quite gather from the Senator's amendment whether he proposes to return the employment services to the States. Throughout his remarks the Senator refers to unemployment compensation. The States are administering that. I presume that what the Senator is driving at is the return of the employment services to the States.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. They were loaned to the Federal Government as a war measure.

Mr. LUCAS. Precisely so.

Mr. BARKLEY. That has no relation to unemployment compensation.

Mr. LUCAS. I disagree with the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does have an indirect relationship, in the sense that if a man is unemployed he may be entitled to compensation; but the responsibility of trying to find a job for him at this time is on the United States Employment Service, which is a Federal agency.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. I am speaking of the divided responsibility, proof of which can be found in the committee hearings. As was testified by several witnesses, the United States Employment Service certifies certain persons on the rolls for suitable jobs. Then it is up to the State unemployment services to find jobs for such persons. If no suitable job is available, an unemployed person receives unemployment compensation.

But, Mr. President, the witnesses who testified in favor of the return of the employment services definitely stated in their testimony that at the present time the Federal Government has the manpower. It does the certification. The States do not have the manpower at the present time to make the proper investigation to determine whether or not suitable jobs are available. As I see it, it is a question of passing the buck from one agency to the other.

It seems to me that the time is now—not 60 days, 90 days, or 6 months from now—to turn the employment services back to the States. Let the States immediately put their houses in order for the payment of unemployment compensation through the proper administrative officials. It can be done only by turning the employment services back to the States.

I submit with all sincerity that the emergency is over. The emergency required borrowing these services for Federal work, for the purpose of recruiting manpower, and it was perfectly logical that that should be done at that particular time. I am sincere in presenting this amendment, honestly believing that it will definitely aid in helping to clear up a great deal of confusion which exists in a number of communities at the present time.

I have received many letters—and I suppose every other Senator has received similar letters—inquiring why this person or that person is drawing unemployment compensation when there is a job waiting for him. When we try to inquire into the subject and fix the responsibility, we cannot do it, because at the present time there is a dual authority, as between the Federal Unemployment Service and the State unemployment services. All I wish to do is to place the burden on the States, where it belongs. I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment briefly. It was not offered in the committee, and was not considered by the committee. I doubt the wisdom now of providing that the employment services now under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government shall be returned to the States within 90 days from the date of enactment of the proposed law. We established the United States Employment Service prior to the war. We established it during the depression, years ago. It was charged with the duty of trying to coordinate the efforts to obtain employment for people who were out of work. The States also provided their employment services; so there were two agencies operating in that field.

When the war came along, and it was necessary to look upon the problem as a national one because of the necessity for obtaining workers in war plants and inducing them to go from place to place in order to produce the things necessary to equip our Army and Navy for the war, certain agencies were loaned to the Federal Government by the States. So it became, in fact, the United States Employment Service, as a war measure.

In a recent statement the President indicated that he thought that at an appropriate time these services should be returned to the States. I doubt whether that time has arrived. I believe that the problem of undertaking to adjust our employment situation to a normal condition is a responsibility which the Federal Government cannot evade. The condition was brought about by the war effort and the war necessity, which were Federal responsibilities.

The United States of America declared war against Japan. Kentucky, Michigan, and Pennsylvania did not declare war against Japan. It was the Government of the United States which, by persuasion and by every other possible effort it could exert, induced millions of our people to move from one place to another so that they might make their contribution to the war effort. Some of them may have been lured by higher wages. That is a legitimate objective. However, millions of them who could not go into the Army or Navy felt a patriotic urge to help in this great effort, regardless of the fact that they were physically disqualified from entering the armed services. They went from place to place.

In this bill we are recognizing the problem as a national obligation, not to the extent which I should like to recognize it, but we are recognizing it. Otherwise we would not be legislating upon the subject. We are providing out of the Federal Treasury for the transportation of those people back to their homes, or

to new jobs, because we recognize national responsibility as a part of the war effort. We must get out of the war and away from the war as a national problem, just as we got into the war and fought it as a national problem. I believe it would be unfortunate if we should require, in this temporary legislation, that the employment services should be returned to the States within 90 days after the enactment of the proposed law.

Officially, of course, the war has not terminated. In his message the President took note of the fact that it would be unfortunate for many reasons to declare the emergency terminated merely because the fighting has ceased. Many problems remain to be solved. This condition must be allowed to adjust itself, not overnight, but in a period of months. The President did not suggest that the employment services be returned to the States immediately. He did suggest that at a suitable time later it might be proper to return them to the States—not to abolish the United States Employment Service, which was established before the war, but to return to the States such agencies as they loaned the Federal Government as a war measure. We are still in the aftermath of the war; we are still trying to adjust the conditions arising as a result of the war. We have been at it only about 3 days, and certainly we should not be in too great a hurry to dismantle everything we have done. If we proceed in too great a hurry we shall have chaos and disorder.

For that reason, Mr. President, I am not able to support the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, and I hope it will be rejected. The pending bill is a temporary measure, to apply for only a few months. All the functions under the bill will expire on June 30, 1947. No matter what the bill provides it will end then, and I doubt whether we should proceed as proposed by the amendment; in fact, I am convinced that we should not now provide for so hasty a return to the States under the conditions which exist.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I concur in the sentiments which have just been expressed by the distinguished majority leader. We must remember that more than 7,000,000 Americans have moved from one State to another during the period of the war emergency. There have been concentrated in a few States a tremendous number of persons who now are superfluous workers. It seems to me to be highly unreasonable to expect that the State of California, for instance, may, without any connection with the other States and without any cooperation on the part of the other States be able to handle the hundreds of thousands of superfluous workers who may be presently in California. If ever there was a national problem, the maldistribution of our surplus industrial workers is one. We recognized the necessity of national consideration and national treatment at the outset of the war, and far more today is needed a national consideration and national treatment of the unemployment problem.

I realize that the State directors of unemployment compensation came before the Finance Committee and laid great stress on the fact that there seemed to be some confusion because they did not control the State employment service, and in one case the State director of unemployment compensation insurance—the director for the State of Wisconsin, as I recall—said 3,000 cases had been certified by the Federal unemployment service and they did not have time to check them. Of course, it is quite obvious that if the State unemployment agencies do not have time to check them, they would not have checked them in the first place if they had been filed with them, if they had had the surplus.

So, Mr. President, the argument which is made for the immediate return to the States is a bludgeon, if you will, which has been suggested by the State directors of unemployment compensation insurance, who seize on this opportunity to get it back now, and they do not care what kind of chaos is created in the labor markets of this country. I say it would be doing a disservice to our national economy, and it would be destructive of national morale in the case of the unemployed, if we were to attempt to separate this whole problem into 48 separate parts. I urge upon the Senate deep consideration and delay for the time being, until committee hearings can be held and until this matter can be properly considered.

Therefore, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the importance of this amendment and in view of the fact that it was not considered at all in the committee, I think it should be given some consideration before we vote upon it. Inasmuch as we must let the substitute go over until tomorrow in order to have time to have it printed, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Illinois to do so, I should like to have his amendment go over until tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have no objection to having my amendment go over until tomorrow, if the Senator from Kentucky desires to have that done.

Mr. BARKLEY. If there are any other amendments to be offered to the text, Senators desiring to offer them might do so now, if the Senator from Illinois will agree to suspension of the consideration of his amendment. I do not know that there are other amendments to be offered.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to take up at this time a matter about which I think there will be no controversy, and about which I have had discussion with the majority leader. I send to the desk an order for committee service which I submit, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the order will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] be excused from further service on the Committee on Interstate Commerce and be assigned to membership on the Committee on Foreign Relations; that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be excused from further service on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and be assigned to membership on the Committee on Naval Affairs; and that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] be assigned to membership on the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Immigration, and the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me say that these are all recommendations coming from the minority conference for the filling of vacancies caused by the death of the late Senator Johnson of California. They fill only vacancies caused by his death.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the entering of the order. I wish to explain that there has been some confusion in regard to the ratio of membership on the Committee on Commerce. One member from the minority was placed on that committee at a time when probably the ratio did not justify doing so. But in order that there may be suitable adjustment without doing injury to anyone, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be amended so as to provide that the Committee on Commerce shall be composed of 21 Members, instead of 20. That will give the majority one more member on that committee, and that will then just about adjust the ratio as it should be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I assume that these designations of committee members are for the present Congress only, and that the Senator's request for adjustment of the size of the Committee on Commerce would apply only for the present Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, Mr. President, each Congress fixes its own rules. We always bring in a rule at the beginning of each Congress fixing membership on the committees. Although I see no objection to a permanent membership of 21 on that committee, I would hope that its membership would be resumed at 20 when the present Congress ends. But I do not wish to state that as an understanding. I make the request in order to cure a temporary situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wonder whether the Senator would wish to defer his request until he considers that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] will now retire from the Commerce Committee. Accordingly, it might be possible to achieve the purpose the Senator has in mind without increasing the membership of the committee. Personally, I dislike to see the membership of committees increased.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps that will take care of the situation. In view of the fact that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has been nominated to be a Justice of the Supreme Court, and will retire from the committee, I shall defer the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question then is on agreeing to the order submitted by the Senator from Maine. Without objection, the order is agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting several nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the present situation, I think we might as well suspend for the day. Therefore, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William E. Orr, of Nevada, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, vice Curtis D. Wilbur, retired;

Delbert E. Metzger, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii;

Martin Pence, of Hawaii, to be a judge of the Third Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Ray J. O'Brien, resigned;

Thomas J. Morrissey, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado;

John P. Cowart, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Georgia, vice T. Hoyt Davis, resigned;

Malcolm E. Lafargue, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the western district of Louisiana;

David E. Henderson, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina, vice Theron Lamar Caudle, resigned;

Joseph A. McNamara, of Vermont, to be United States attorney for the district of Vermont;

Edward B. Doyle, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Georgia;

Joseph Henry Young, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia;

H. Chess Richardson, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana;

Louis E. LeBlanc, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the western district of Louisiana;

Ben H. Rice, Jr., of Texas, to be United States district judge for the western district of Texas, vice Walter A. Keeling, deceased;

Stanford C. Stiles, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas; and

Guy McNamara, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George Earl Hoffman, of Florida, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Florida; and

Herbert S. Phillips, of Florida, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Florida.

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Maj. Gen. Robert Walter Crawford (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States, to be member and president of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of law;

Brig. Gen. Philip G. Bruton, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as president, California Debris Commission, under the provisions of law;

Col. Lester F. Rhodes, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as member and secretary of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of law; and

Several employees for promotion in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Joseph H. Lyons, of Mobile, Ala., to be collector of customs for customs, collection district No. 19, with headquarters at Mobile, Ala.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc, and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Samuel L. Howard to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from March 30, 1942.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 19, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 18 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The following-named persons for appointment to the offices in the Department of State to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, as follows:

TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Dean G. Acheson, of Maryland.

TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Frank McCarthy, of Virginia.

TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Spruille Braden, of New York.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Maxwell M. Hamilton, of Iowa, now a foreign-service officer of class 1, serving as representative of the United States in Finland with personal rank of Minister, to be Envoy Extraordinar, and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Harold H. Burton, of Ohio, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Hon. Owen J. Roberts, resigned.

WAR DEPARTMENT

Robert Porter Patterson, of New York, to be Secretary of War.

SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

W. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, to be Surplus Property Administrator.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

John C. Lehr, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan. (Mr. Lehr is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 26, 1944.)

Edgar H. Rossbach, of New Jersey, to be United States attorney for the district of New Jersey, vice Charles M. Phillips, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Everett M. Evans, of Idaho, to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho, vice Edward M. Bryan, resigned.

James Joseph Gillespie, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa. (Mr. Gillespie is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 17, 1945.)

Hubert J. Harrington, of New Jersey, to be United States marshal for the district of New Jersey. (Mr. Harrington is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 20, 1945.)

Chester M Foresman, of North Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota. (Mr. Foresman is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires November 19, 1945.)

Robert Grant, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois. (Mr. Grant is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires December 16, 1945.)

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Francis P. Dayton, a warrant officer of the Marine Corps, to be a captain in the Marine Corps, from the 9th day of June 1945.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of August 1944:

Walter S. Metzger, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Arnold B. Capps, a citizen of North Carolina.

William H. Rankin, a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of February 1944.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy:

Paul K. Blesh	Alfred D. Morgan
Arthur F. Farwell, Jr.	Malcolm S. Ragan
Isaac J. Heizer, Jr.	Howard S. Roberts
John V. Hewitt, Jr.	Harwill E. Robinson
Glen Jacobsen	William M. Romberger
Hugh K. Laing	Joseph W. Runyan
Henry T. Loehr, Jr.	

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be ensigns in the Navy:

John E. Adams	George D. Anderson, Jr.
Harry W. Alcorn	Leo V. Andrecht
Ralph Alford	John H. Andrews
Ralph M. Alford	Thomas L. Andrews, Jr.
Walter W. Alldredge	Dan P. Appleby
Niels K. Allerup	
William T. Amen	

Thomas E. Armour
John G. Armstrong
Radford K. Arner
Eric Arnholdt
Jack Arnold
David A. Arrivee
Marvin M. Arthurs
Randal N. Atkinson
John W. Aulson
William R. Austin
Arnold W. Ayers
Haakon A. Bach
Sverre O. Bach
James G. Bagot
George O. Baldock
James F. Barfknecht
Arthur Barker, Jr.
Floyd "M" Barkley
Frank D. Barlow
Jerry M. Barlow
William G. Barnes
James W. Barnitz
John J. Bartholdi, Jr.
Watson Bartholome
William H. Bartles
Richard C. Bartlett, Jr.
Kenneth LeR. Bass
Hugh N. Batten
Richard K. Batten
Leonard "A" Batterson
William C. Baumgardner
James L. Baxter
Roy N. Bean
Maurice E. Beaulieu
Joseph L. Beery
William E. Behringer
John K. Beling
Earl C. Bell
Darrell "C" Bennett
George C. Benoit
Howard G. Bentall
Robert F. Bergeron
Greenville R. Berkeley, Jr.
Arnold A. Berner
Frank A. Biancha
Herbert E. Biedebach
LaVell M. Bigelow
Wayne R. Bise
Gary W. Bishop
James B. Black
Sherman C. Black
Harry J. Blakely
James McN. Blakeman
Laccie W. Blevins
William F. Bley
Stanley H. Blumenthal
Samuel D. Blythe
Virgil R. Bonnette, Jr.
Ivor C. Bouchard, Jr.
Edgar J. Boudinot, Jr.
Frederick W. Bowen
Charles R. Bradford
Francis L. Brady, Jr.
Virgil R. Brasher
Harold A. Bres, Jr.
Benjamin F. Briant
Harvey Broadbent, Jr.
Edwin D. Brock
Wilber A. Brock
Charles L. Brooks
Billy F. Brown
Carl A. Brown, Jr.
Edgar C. Brown
Keith C. Brown
Melvy M. Brown
Robert N. Brown
Orville S. Brownlee
Joseph D. Brummett
Theodore G. Buckenmier
George E. Buker
Frank C. Bunker, Jr.
Louis R. Burnett
Robert G. Burnett
Hugh B. Burris
Herchel W. Burson
John H. Burton
George T. Butcher
David S. Butler
George K. Bywater
John W. Cadle, Jr.
John F. Caffey
Sherman C. Cagle, Jr.
James B. Cain
John L. Cain
Robert T. Caldwell
David K. Callow
Charles E. Carpenter
Charles A. Carr
Charles I. Carter
Harold A. Carter
John L. Carter
Terence P. Cassidy
Jesse LeR. Caton, Jr.
Lawrence M. Cauble
Robert B. Cavanaugh
Robert M. Chamberlin
Alfred W. Chandler, Jr.
Melvin LeR. Chapman
John F. Charles
Harlan R. Cheuvront
Robert B. Choate
Elmer J. Chubb
Sidney F. Cichy
Bryce L. Clack
Murray P. Clark
Robert A. Clarke
Marvin L. Claude
Jesse S. Cleveland
Robert L. Cliett, Jr.
Robert J. Clinton
William P. Cloyes
Paul W. Cobb
Albert L. Cock
Gerald A. Coeur
John S. Cole
Robert A. Cole
Joseph L. Coleman
Robert G. Coleman, Jr.
Lawrence E. Colgrove, Jr.
James R. Collier
Francis L. Collins, Jr.
Vincent W. Collins
Samuel E. Commella
Eugene V. Conklin
Lee T. Conklin
Raymond F. Conkling
Edward A. Conlon
Ralph R. Conner
James S. Cooper
Paul Cordray
Kenneth "J" Cory
Hubert P. Cottrell
Granville W. Cowan
Robert F. Cox
James R. Craig
Charles Z. Crain
Clark "E" Crain
Joseph A. Crampton, Jr.
Ray I. Crandall
Don G. Crane
David H. Crist
Robert W. Croman
Robert H. Cron
John T. Crosby
LaVerne W. S. Cummins
Hector C. Cyr
Philip Daly
James R. Danielson
Herbert W. H. Dankert
Ralph Dannettell, Jr.
Merl W. Davenport
Daniel K. Davis, Jr.
Douglas C. Davis
Jack J. S. Davis
Richard L. Davis
Orville F. DeMoulin
George W. Denby
Robert R. Dennes, Jr.
Reyburn H. Dennis, Jr.
Allan A. Deverick
Alphonse E. DeWachter
Richard G. Dickerson
John P. DiMarchi
Marvin LeR. Doliana
Omer J. Donahoe
Landis E. Doner
B. Russell Dooge, Jr.
John J. Doolan
Patrick C. Dorsey
Benjamin T. Douglas
William E. Dowdell
James T. Doyle
Robert W. Drewelow
Robert F. Duffy
Harvey K. Dunning
Charles O. Durocher
Dick W. Dutton
William R. Eason
Gordon K. Ebbe
Howard B. Eddy
Emory H. Edwards, Jr.
George R. Edwards, Jr.
Arthur G. Elder
Theodore Elefter
Albert M. Ellingson
Clyde A. Elliott
Homer S. Elliott
Ralph E. Elliott, Jr.
Jack E. Elizey
Clayton M. Emery
Donald D. Engen
Raymond K. Engle
Robert C. Engram
Howard G. Ervin, Jr.
Virgil A. Erwin, Jr.
Virgil J. Evans
Harold T. Ewing
James W. Ewing
Clifford E. Fanning
Robert A. Farnsworth, Jr.
William W. Feaster
Arthur C. Feiler
Charles G. Feist
Santa A. Felice
Caesar Fernandez, Jr.
Richard V. Fertal
Herbert T. Fichman
Leslie R. Fickes, Jr.
Stanley C. Fierstein
John G. Fifield
William M. Finck
Kenneth B. Finka
Delbert N. Fisher
James J. Fite
Donald W. Fledderjohn
Lloyd C. Flynt
Frank E. Foltz
Edward J. Foote
Orin N. Ford, Jr.
Frederick D. Forger
John F. Fottrell
Harry Fox
Thomas E. Franco
Charles S. Frantz
Grover A. Frater
Rowland G. Freeman 3d
Charles H. Freer
Charles T. Frohne, Jr.
Howard Frost, Jr.
Robert M. Frye
Charles R. Fuller
Louis K. Furst
Fred H. Gage, Jr.
Francis E. Gahagen
William R. Gaines
Robert E. Gallatin
Roy F. Gallon
Wesley T. Gandy
Robert C. Gardemal
William L. Garlic
George M. Gauen
John A. Geddes
Harold R. Gentry
John K. Gentry, Jr.
Robert B. Giblin
Olen G. Giles
Clyde Gilmore
Edward F. Glaze
John J. Goebel
Donald E. Gonya
Arthur R. Goodall
Henry G. Goodloe
William D. Gordon, Jr.
Ranald F. Graham
William J. Graham
Harry S. Graves
John R. Grieve
Ainslee A. Gruen
William J. Guntner
Steven B. Hagadorn
Robert J. Haggerton
Herbert O. Haley
James A. Halford
Paul DeM. Halpin
Walter Hamilton, Jr.
Weaver F. Hamilton
Eugene R. Hanks
Bruce Hanna
Earl W. Hansen
Thomas H. Hardy
George M. Harlan
Manford B. Harland
Monte D. Harouff
Albert R. Harrison
Herbert B. M. Harris-Warren
Paytor O. Harwell
Rolland L. Hastreiter
Francis "J" Hawley
Albert W. Hayward
Charles R. Heatherly
Robert P. Heekin
Walter H. Heider, Jr.
Henry P. Heisig
Daniel G. Helms
Andrew H. Henderson, Jr.
William J. Hendrick
Joseph J. Hennessey
Paul V. Hennessy
William D. Henry
William E. Henry
Douglas K. Herbert
Louis D. Herman
William A. Herpich
Quentin Herring
William S. Hertig
Jack M. Hestilow
Robert D. Hilbish
Hubert J. Hillesheim
Arthur L. Hirsbrunner
Gordon S. Hodgson
Thomas H. Hogan
Billy D. Holder
Edward B Holley, Jr.
Keith M Hollingsworth
Raymond E Hollomon
Harold E. Holly
Robert C. Holmes
Evald Holmgaard
Bill Brien Holt
Russel E. Holt
James A. Homyak
Kenneth C. Hooper
John P. Hopkins
Samuel Hopkins, Jr.
Robert T. Hoppe
Benjamin C. Horton
Vaughn Hubbard
Raymond W Hudeck
Jesse C. Huggins, Jr.
Howard A. Hughes
John F. Humphrey
Robert F. Hunt
James A. Huser, Jr.
Glen C. Hutchison
Richard W. Huxford
Charles R. Ibach, Jr.
Charles T. Idle, Jr.
James D. Ingram
Donald K. Issitt
Edouard V. M. Izac, Jr.
Harry B. Jackson
Robert C. Jackson
Rolf E. Jacobsen
William H. Jakes
John C. James
Joseph W. Janecky
William N. Janes
Gilbert B. Jansen, Jr.
Sutton "L" Jaynes
Thomas E. Jenkins
Donald T. Jensen
Gordon J. Jesmer
Jack Jeter
George H. Jewett, Jr.
Robert John
Charles R. Johnson
Dwight F. Johnson
John E. Johnson, Jr.
Robert F. Johnson
Silas R. Johnson
Frederick J. Johnston
Harold E. Johnston
William S. Johnston
Loring A. Jones
DeForest Q. Joralmon
Dallas F. Jordan
Edmond D. Kemp
James P. Kennedy
John E. Kennedy
Duane S. Kephart
Edward F. Keyser
Robert R. Kidwell
Roe C. Kincannon
Benjamin B King, Jr.
Geoffrey B. King, Jr.
Ralph M. Kingsley
Frank G. Kingston
Orson A. Kinney, Jr.
Donald Kirk, Jr.
Robert "L" Kirk
Kay L. Kirven
Richard C. Knoeckel, Jr.
Bernard H. Knoth
William A. Knouff
Richard C. Knowles
George Koen
Arthur Krakoff
Michael H. Krouse
Edward Kubicki
Melvin M. Kuhn, Jr.
George A. Kunberger
Frank M. Lacey
Charles C. Ladenberger, Jr.
Armond J. LaMarre
Kenneth "E" Lampkin, Jr.
Frank L. Lane
Stanley H. Lane
Paul E. Lanham
Conrad S. Larson
Robin E. Larson
Henry S. Laurinat, Jr.
Emmett B. Lawrence
Clyde J. Lee
Charles D Leeper
Robert B. Leitch
Thomas M. Lemon, Jr.
William S. Lewis, Jr.
Harvey L. Lively
Theodore L. Locke, Jr.
Edson G. Loftus
Douglas W. Logan
William H. Looney, Jr.
Sidney S. Lotz
Warren H. Love
Richard R. Lowman, Jr.
Emmert E. Ludeman
Robert T. Lynn
Jack M. Lyons
Robert F. Lyons
James McAulay
Robert McBride
Thomas D. McBride
Elmer R. McClay
William R. McClendon
Norman H. McClevey, Jr.
Robert L. McClure
John J. McCoy
Shannon W. McCrary
Fred P. McDaniel
Bernard F. McDermott
William R. McDowell, Jr.
Joe M. McFadden
Edwin McGinnis
John F. McGinnis
William G. McGinty
Franklin O. McGuire
John H. McIlomil
Ralph E. McIntosh
Bruce B. McKaig
Thomas R. McKelvey, Jr.
George W. McKenzie
Douglas C. McLaughlin
Eugene M. McLean, Jr.
Gregory T. McLean
Thomas R. McLenaghan
Robert "J" McMahon
Joseph E. McManus
Franklin B. McMillan
John P. McNeela
Wallace E. MacDonald
Clarence E. Mackey
Stanislaw Mackey
William A. Mackey
Thomas L. Macleod, Jr.
Lawrence M. Madden
Robert J. Maghan
Alvin N. Main
Joseph Maloof
Edmund J. Mansueto
Gordon W. Martin, Jr.
John R. Martin
John W. Martin
William Martin
Donald P. Matheson
John R. Mathews, Jr.
Richard F. Matthews
Ralph J. Matuszewski
George T. Maxwell
William C. May
Albert J. Mayer
Robert W. Mead
Henry T. Meador
Bert L. Means
Joseph V. Meigs
Jesse A. Merwin
Allen C. H. Merz
William F. Middagh
Stanley M. Miklebost
Duane C. Miller
Melvin L. Miller
Ralph "H" Milleson
Alvah V. Mills, Jr.
William C. Mitchell
Ernest P. Mittenmaier
Leroy R. Mix
James A. Mohlman
Alfred E. Monahan
John S. Moore, Jr.
Laird W. Moore
Richard S. Moore
Laurence A. Moran
Roy F. Morgan
Hubert Morrison
Glenn M. Morton
Marvin A. Mosely, Jr.
Milo W. Mosser, Jr.
Daniel J. Murphy
Daniel J. Murphy
Pleasant L. Murphy
Robert E. Murray
William J. Murray
Harold E. Myers
George F. Nasworthy
Carlton F. Naumann
James A. Nelson
Roger DuB. Nelson
John W. Nevins
Floyd A. Newell
Torrey A. Newton
Philip W. Nicholas
Harold F. Norman
Thunnison H. T. Norris
Louis Noss
Edward J. Nugent
Harry N. O'Connor
William T. O'Dowd, Jr.
Otto A. Ohland
Robert C. Olive
Joseph J. Oliver
Edward V. Olson
Paul O'Mara, Jr.
Vernon P. O'Neil

Martin G. O'Neill
Winfield S. Orndorff, Jr.
Rodney G. Orr
William F. Ostendorff, Jr.
Sidney R. Overall, Jr.
Robert I. Owens
Calvin W. Ozier
Harold E. Padgett
William S. Palmer
Jacob S. Paretsky
Clarence L. Parsley
Emanuele Passanisi
Donald G. Patterson
George W. Peck
John R. Peck
Russell Peck
Joe Pedigo
Edward W. Peeler
Samuel R. Pepe
Harry W. Peterson
Lester W. Peterson
Frank P. Petrik
Rudolph L. Pettiet
Robert F. Pettitt
John H. Pfeil
Glenn E. Phillips
Morris G. Pickard
Evan W. Pickrel
Max A. Piper
Shelly B. Pittman
Ferdinand J. Plumer
Arthur G. Pollasky
Albert J. Pope
John E. Porter, Jr.
Carol W. Powell
Rolan D. Powell
Winfred R. Prescott
Howard W. Price
Warren R. Prosser
Russell K. Prout
Paul E. Pugh
Robert W. Ramey
Bob Randle, Jr.
William A. Rawls
John E. Raymond
Thomas F. Reddy
Jack W. Redmond
Robert W. Reeve
George J. Reeves
Daniel R. Rehm, Jr.
Maynard A. Reid
Ralph M. Reimer
Mehl B. Renner
Thomas T. Reyburn
Claude M. Reynolds
Adrian B. Rhodes, Jr.
Robert L. Rice
John D. Richardson
Nelson W. Richardson
Maurice H. Richey
Warren C. Richison
Richard H. Ridgway
George B. Riley
Peter Rippa
John D. Robb
Jack H. Robcke
Carlton B. Roberts
Kester M. Roberts
Oliver W. H. Robertson, Jr.
Elwood H. Robinson
Bob J. Robison
Allen R. Rogers
Robert K. Rosemont
Edwin R. Ross
John M. Ross
Walter L. Roth
William E. Roy
Paul L. Ruch
Edward J. Rucinski
Chester E. Ruffin
James F. Rumford
"J" "B" Louie Runyon
George R. Rymal
Asbury H. Sallenger
Hugh D. C. Saltsman
John W. Samson
Eutimio E. Sandoval
Joseph M. Scarborough
"J" "W" Scharpf, Jr.
Charles F. Schlegel
David N. Schroer
Henry A. Schulze, Jr.
Peter A. Schwartz
Benedict J. Scott
Bob Scott, Jr.
Jack Scott
Walter A. Scott
William J. Scott
Arthur W. Seaman
Bernard Sevilla
Richard M. Shay
Wesley R. Shaw
Donald H. Sherlock
Robert A. Shields
William T. Shipes
William G. Shores
James E. Shortall
Frank S. Siddall
James D. Sidwell, Jr.
Orville S. Sigurdson
Arthur R. Siirola
David Silver
Paul H. Simdars
Russell W. Sims, Jr.
William H. Skinner
Bayard K. Smith
Franklin L. Smith
George N. Smith
John C. Smith
Alvin A. Sobel
Willis L. Somervell, Jr.
Richard L. Soncrant
Frank H. Sonntag
Samuel A. Sparks
Norman W. Spurgeon
James M. Stacy
Leonard M. Stafford
Sam D. Stafford
Donald C. Staley
Charles E. Standard
Robert Stanek
David S. Stear
DeWayne H. Stegner
Charles F. Steineger, Jr.
Joseph E. Stenstrom
James C. Stevenson
James E. Stevenson
Clark Z. Steward
Donald J. Stewart
Graham D. Stewart
Jamie "B" Stewart
Marlar E. Stewart
Ramsey McD. Stewart
Melvin O. St. John, Jr.
James F. Stone
Monte E. Stone
Harry J. Stoner
Robert A. Straub
Edward J. Sullivan
James M. Sullivan
Robert C. Sullivan
Harry J. Sundberg
Donald A. Swanson
Allen W. Sweeten, Jr.
Harry W. Swinburne, Jr.
George Swint 3d
John E. Swint
Alfred Taddeo
Sam Takis
Carl B. Tanner, Jr.
Hugh J. Tate
Neal M. Tate, Jr.
Gordon LeR. Taylor
James D. Taylor
Robert E. Taylor
Robert P. Taylor
John E. Tefft
Sylvan L. Tenberg
William P. Terrill
Ray F. Thiele
John E. Thigpen
Charles J. Thornton
Arthur R. Thorp
Albert R. Tiffany
William W. Timmis, Jr.
John K. Titus
James F. Todd
Elsworth B. Tojek
John A. H. Torry, Jr.
Eugene P. Townsend
Frederick J. Tuck
Nimrod H. Tucker
Jack A. Turner
James F. Tuttle
John E. Tuttle
Robert J. Underwood
Allan R. Vaatveit
Edward P. Van Hise, Jr.
Thomas Van Inwagen
John W. Vaughn
Ray A. Volpi
Harold K. von Egger
William J. Wacker
John R. Wagner, Jr.
Delmar Walker, Jr.
Gwin L. Walker
Ralph LaR. Walker
Howard K. Wallace
Ralph McE. Wallace
Milton K. Walsh
Harold Walsweer
Herbert N. Walters
Horace B. Walton
Edward M. Ward
Marshall B. Ward
Gerald B. Wardlow
Wilbur W. Warlick
Richard Wathall
Jack O. Watson
Nathan G. Watson
Paul R. Watters
Herbert C. Weart
Raymond D. Webb
Richard E. Webb
Eric H. Weiland
Richard McM. Wenzell
Ira B. West
William J. Westmoreland
Thomas R. Wheaton
Jack E. Whillans
Stewart F. White
Ciro N. V. Whited, Jr.
Ralph S. Whitworth, Jr.
William L. Wilkinson
Clement G. Williams
Henis J. Williams
Henry J. Williams
Richard Williams
Robert E. Williams
Thomas St. C. Williams
David S. Williamson
Harry A. Wilson, Jr.
Paul E. Wilson, Jr.
Warren W. Winberg
Ralph K. Wines, Jr.
Benjamin G Wisner
Francis J. Wolf
Stanley A. Wood
Edward C. Woodward
Robert C. Woolverton
John D. Working
Richard L. Wright
Robert C. Wright, Jr.
Vernon M. Wright
Elmer G. Yesko
Ralph J. Zender
Eugene J. Zepp
John A. Zink

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 18 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Col. Samuel L. Howard to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from March 30, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Adolph N. Goetz, Pine Meadow.
Mary H. Kennedy, Suffield.

GEORGIA

Nelda Pate, Arabi.
Hugh Henderson, Brooks.
Minnie C. Lanier, Martinez.
Lucy H. Cochran, Meansville.
Mellie Pitts, Newborn.
Mattie M. Pope, Omaha.
Edith D. Patrick, Pulaski.
George D. Walcher, Rincon.
Louie O. Meadows, Shiloh.

TEXAS

Irma J. Harris, Almeda.
Robert L. Hext, Bon Wier.
James B. Abell, Josephine.
James H. Brannen, Peacock.
Lura Johnson, Sabine Pass.
Agnes Z. Wakefield, Saginaw.

WEST VIRGINIA

Lucy J. Weaver, Edgarton.
Richard I. Hargett, Elkridge.
Alexander McDarmont, English.
Lee O. Blain, Gallipolis Ferry.
Miller Thomas, Greenville.
Bert Cook, Hatcher.
Lena W. Keesling, McDowell.
Victor M. Osbourn, Shenandoah Junction.
Mabel C. Hensil, Tioga.
Sue B. Lilly, Winding Gulf.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art perfect in power, in love and purity, we would believe in Thy fatherhood, wherein men may build their institutions and perfect their inventions and achieve federations and liberties for the good of humankind. We praise Thee that through the ages runs one increasing purpose and the thoughts of men are widened with the progress of the suns.

Heavenly Father, as we bare our hearts before Thee, help us to clear up the errors and choose the way that leads to the garden of the soul, where flowers bloom for burdened hearts and wounded feet. In our appointed service, help us to be courteous to our fellows, cheerfully revealing consideration for others in every task. Remove from the portal of every heart the barriers of doubt, of fear and impatience, that brotherly trust may enter in. Bless us with the serene and silent strength of a good life, which is the most powerful influence in all the world.

Have in Thy special care those who are called to positions of great power; may they administer the sacred trust committed unto them in the fear of God and the love of man. In the name of our Elder Brother and the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM GEN. JONATHAN M. WAINWRIGHT

The Speaker laid before the House the following letter, which was read by the Clerk:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAYBURN: The distinguished honor accorded my comrades and me in being invited to the floor of the House of Representatives on Monday will never be forgotten. I am also deeply grateful for being permitted to address the House of Representatives as the spokesman for my group. Thank you for this courtesy and great honor.

The overwhelming welcome that has been given those of us who have returned from Japanese prison camps is ample evidence that the people of the United States are determined to maintain freedom for themselves and all other people of this great country.

I would be grateful if you will convey my thanks to the other Members of the House of Representatives for the honor they have accorded us.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN M. WAINWRIGHT,
General, United States Army.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech he delivered on Sunday over WBZ and WBZA on the CIO program in Boston.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the mystery of demobilization deepens.

Now you see it and now you do not. The point systems shift as erratically as a gambler's stock market. The American public, worn by the sacrifices they patiently endured in war, are disappointed and irritated by the confused handling of this problem by the experts. For it appears that peace caught the service heads unprepared.

Men were taken into the service on a uniform basis that won the confidence and support of the American people. They are being discharged on an uncoordinated basis. Army, Navy, and Marine Corps employ separate and entirely different methods, and individual cases are subject to discretionary veto by the commanders. The people follow the play-by-play account of the ups and downs of the point systems in the newspapers with a mounting suspense that has reached the breaking point. And the morale of the men and women in the armed services is deteriorating rapidly.

Resentment toward this confusion and discrimination is growing rapidly, both in and out of the armed services.

I submit that this is a matter of pressing concern which the Congress should handle. The bill to encourage voluntary enlistments should be passed at once so that those who have served may come home. Give young Americans the proper incentive to serve in our peacetime military and naval establishments. The security needs of the Nation will be met, the discharge of veterans will be speeded up, and the President will be in a position to stop the draft by proclamation.

In all fairness to the American people, we should do this at once.

THE LATE MONSIGNOR JOHN A. RYAN

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who knew and valued the great qualities of mind and heart of the beloved Msgr. John A. Ryan, news of his passing came not only as a shock but also carried a sense of deep personal loss.

It can truly be said of him that he was a great teacher, logical in his pursuit of activities—religion, country, charity in its broadest sense, all appealed to him and enlisted his quick sympathies and intelligence. Through all the years of his long useful life he fought to improve the condition of the underprivileged. He believed in the dignity of labor and fought for better understanding and justice. He believed in democracy.

Trained in rational thinking, ready in debate, always convincing in his appeal to the intellectual as well as the human side of his audiences, he was master of those arts of speech by which men move their fellowmen to great causes. His courage, his humility, his faith in humanity, all found expression in his writings and in his discussions on the public platform.

No words of mine can do justice to this great churchman and great American but may I express the conviction that his whole life was consecrated to insure to humanity that right declared by our forefathers to be inalienable, and so perfectly expressed in their phrase "the pursuit of happiness." May his great soul rest in peace and may the recording angel write him down as one who greatly loved his fellow men.

FINANCIAL AID TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believe that we have to aid Great Britain out of her present economic embarrassment but that aid should be coupled with an enlightened self-interest; that aid should be given under the conditions, first, that England dissipate her so-called sterling area bloc pool; second, that she end all imperial preferences under the Ottawa agreements, which preferences discriminate against American traders; third, that she give assurance that she will not devalue the pound; fourth, we must find out what the dominions and the condominiums and colonies of Great Britain will do with reference to England's debt to them. It is idle to ask us to cancel debts unless the children, as it were, of the mother country are willing likewise to come to the aid of Britain. Unless these four conditions are met I am unalterably opposed to any aid to Britain. I believe Britain in her wisdom finally will satisfy these conditions. Aid for Britain, accordingly, must be forthcoming regardless of her leaders' political ideology. Whether the government be labor or conservative, if the aforesaid conditions are met, let us help.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two particulars.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and a short telegram.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address he delivered over Station WOL in Washington, D. C., on Friday, September 14, 1945, at 8:15 p. m. in the time of Mr. Richard Eaton.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances: In one to include a statement by Mr. C. W. Harter, president of the National Federation of Small Business; second, to include a statement by Mr. C. E. Weddington in the States Graphic of Brownsville; and, third, to include two editorials from the Chattanooga Times.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject of demobilization.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter addressed to the editor of the Herald Tribune by Captain Bosler.

THE HEBREWS IN GERMANY

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PRICE of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article written by me for the Southwest Review.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of yesterday on the subject Only Clogs the Wheels, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Luke H. Spooner, on the subject of the atomic bomb.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

UNEMPLOYMENT CLAIMS FILED AGAINST STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HILL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF ARTIFICIAL ARMS AND LEGS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances: To include in one a radio address delivered by L. J. Melrose, director of publicity, Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation; in one, to include an article by Wilbur J. Brons; and in the other, an article by George Rothwell Brown.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Hanson W. Baldwin appearing in the New York Times August 22.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: to include in one an editorial, and in the other an article.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Bristol Courier of September 14, entitled "Perfectly Silly."

ARMY RECRUITING

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, when General MacArthur announced that he would need about 200,000 men to handle Japan, it caused considerable consternation down in certain departments in Washington. They were disappointed. The Washington arm-chair generals and State Department officials have their eyes set on a permanent large Army. General MacArthur wants no draftees. That again strikes at the selective service and the continued use of the draft. It defeats the idea of compulsory universal military training.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Navy has indicated its desired size, 500,000 men, and also indicated that after the first of the year that this number will be made up by voluntary enlistments. Is it not about time that the Army gave this Congress some idea of the size of the Army they desire? Is it not time that the Congress took some hand in directing, if the Army does not do it? The Army can get men in the service just as the Navy by voluntary enlistments. The bill the House is about to pass will encourage enlistments. It is time this House takes definite action to get the Army demobilized—limit its size and get the country out of the grasp of the military clique and Washington bureaucrats.

BRASS HATS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is an unpleasant duty that we have to kick the brass hats around every day, but they beg for it. For instance, a soldier sent me a card reading like this:

We landed in the United States 31st of July. Had our furlough and are now on a sightseeing tour. Left Pennsylvania for California. Left California for Kentucky. Where do we Pennsylvanians go from here and when do we get out?

NINETY, EIGHTY-SEVEN, EIGHTY-FIVE POINTERS.

Surely this calls for severe criticism.

CHILD WELFARE CENTERS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WELCH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ADMIRAL CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce that Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz will visit the Capitol on Friday, October 5, 1945, and will be received by the Members of Congress at a joint meeting of the two Houses in the Chamber of the House of Representatives at 12:30 p. m. on that date.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Friday, October 5, for the Speaker to declare a recess, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on Monsignor Ryan.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure."

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HEALTH PROGRAMS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have applied for a rule on this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

COMPLIANCE WITH STATE INSPECTION LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3321) to provide that the several States shall continue effective measures of control and protection against the importation, introduction, and spread of noxious weeds, injurious insects, and animal and plant diseases, and to guarantee that purchasers or recipients of seeds, livestock, and poultry feeds, nursery stocks, fertilizers, and other agricultural chemicals shall have the protection guaranteed them under the laws enacted by the several States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3370) to provide assistance to the States in the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of school-lunch programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection?

SETTLEMENT OF RETURNING VETERANS ON FARMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 520) to facilitate settlement of returning veterans on farms in projects constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a rule has been granted on this bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR DISCHARGED PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3345) to provide for pay and allowances and transportation and subsistence of personnel discharged or released from the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard because of under age at the time of enlistment, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1045, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may discharge or release from the Navy, Marine Corps, and the reserve components thereof, with pay and allowances and discharge certificate found appropriate for their service after enlistment, enlisted persons who heretofore have secured or hereafter may secure enlistment by reason of false statement of age on their applications for enlistment and have therefore been enlisted while under the minimum statutory or administrative age limit. When so discharged or released such enlisted persons shall be furnished transportation in kind and subsistence from the place of discharge to their home.

SEC. 2. Whenever the Coast Guard is operating as a part of the Navy the provisions of this act shall be applicable to personnel of the Coast Guard, exclusive of temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve on active duty without full military pay and allowances. When the Coast Guard is operating under the Treasury Department, the powers conferred upon the Secretary of the Navy in section 1 of this act shall be vested in the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 3. Appropriations available for pay and allowances, subsistence, and transportation of enlisted personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be available for the payment of pay and allowances, subsistence, and transportation authorized by this act.

SEC. 4. All payments heretofore made of a character authorized under the provisions of this act, if otherwise correct, are hereby validated.

SEC. 5. The act approved July 1, 1944 (Public, No. 398, 78th Cong.), entitled "An act to provide for the transportation to their homes of persons discharged from the naval service because of under age at the time of enlistment," is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3345) was laid on the table.

PRESENTATION OF MEDALS TO MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION OF 1939–41

The Clerk called the bill (S. 397) to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939–41.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to cause to be made at the United States mint such number of gold, silver, and bronze medals of appropriate design as he may deem appropriate and necessary, to be presented to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939-41, in recognition of their valuable services to the Nation in the field of polar exploration and science.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 319) to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE HIGHWAY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2840) to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION OF LABOR LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 525) to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining safe and proper working conditions in industry and in the preparation, promulgation, and enforcement of regulations to control industrial health hazards.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3437) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider certain claims arising after January 1, 1926, out of the Tariff Act of 1922.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

USE OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIAL IN SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 538) to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil and water conservation work and to distribute such material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies, and for other purposes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill takes the heart out of the Surplus Property Act. If this bill and other bills that have been introduced should pass, we may just as well repeal the act. The House, by a very decisive vote, defeated every amendment that was offered to the surplus-property bill which provided for giving away surplus property. We have given preference to the States and subdivisions of the States to buy this property. If you should take all this machinery and give it to the Department of Agriculture to loan, until it was absolutely worn out, to State soil-conservation agencies, you would be depriving the veterans of their preference to secure farm machinery of every type and also tractors, bulldozers, and so forth.

There are a number of bills pending providing for donations of surplus property and each and every one of them should be defeated. If we open the door in passing this legislation, I predict that many other bills will be passed and there will be little left to sell of surplus property. Let us stand by the provisions that are in the law that will require even a Federal agency to buy surplus property.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

CHIEFS OF BUREAUS IN NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION OF STOLEN MOTOR VEHICLES IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 374) to amend the act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2, subsection (a), of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act (41 Stat. 324; 18 U. S. C. 408), is amended by adding the following new language at the end thereof: "and the term 'aircraft' means any contrivance now known or hereafter invented, used, or designed for navigation of or for flight in the air."

SEC. 2. Sections 3, 4, and 5 of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act are amended by adding after the words "motor vehicle" wherever they appear therein, the words "or aircraft."

SEC. 3. The title of the act of October 29, 1919, is amended to read "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles or aircraft in interstate or foreign commerce."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATION OF REGULAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1128) to incorporate the Regular Veterans Association.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-named persons, to wit: William M. Floyd, Alaska; Robert T. Secrest, Ohio; Anthony Fleger, Ohio; George A. Williams, Virginia; Frank E. McClernan, Maryland; Arthur L. McLaughlin, Colorado; Ellis L. Bubb, Maryland; Stanley Wandle, New Mexico; Lloyd

Wright, Texas; Otto Wolford, Texas; Randall Webbs, Wyoming; John Higgs, Kentucky; Jess Musgrave, Virginia; Edgar L. Lockman, Utah; Robert W. Scherer, Arizona; William H. McCormick, Arizona; Calvin S. Peeples, Montana; Henry E. Altiere, Florida; James C. Davis, Mississippi; Robert E. McElhaney, Nevada; Edward W. Haskell, Connecticut; Charles A. Wickliffe, District of Columbia; George C. Richardson, Wisconsin; Edward P. Kitzinger, North Dakota; Maurice Hotz, Michigan; John W. Hazard, Michigan; Richard A. Koenig, Nebraska; Joseph B. Konrady, South Dakota; James Quinn, New York; Everett G. Mays, North Carolina; Edgar J. Langdon, Pennsylvania; John H. Dryer, Illinois; Ray J. Bergeron, Illinois; and their associates and successors are hereby created a body corporate of the name "Regular Veterans Association" (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation").

SEC. 2. That the purpose of the corporation shall be: To promote loyal and unselfish service to the United States of America and to bear true faith and allegiance to its Constitution; to assist in the promotion of adequate and efficient national defense; to maintain and extend the institution of American freedom of speech, press, and religion; and to serve active, retired, disabled, and honorably discharged personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, their widows, widowers, children, and other dependents, in accordance with the provisions of this charter.

SEC. 3. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall be determined according to the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

SEC. 4. The persons named in section 1, or their successors, are hereby authorized to complete or revise the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 5. The corporation shall have perpetual succession and power—

(a) To sue and be sued;

(b) To take, hold, and dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary for its corporate purposes;

(c) To accept gifts, bequests, legacies, and devises which will further the corporate purposes;

(d) To adopt and alter a corporate seal;

(e) To adopt and alter its constitution and bylaws not inconsistent with law;

(f) To use in carrying out the purposes of the corporation such emblems and badges as it may adopt;

(g) To establish and maintain offices and branch offices for the conduct of the affairs of the corporation;

(h) To establish, regulate, or discontinue subordinate State and Territorial subdivisions and local units; and

(i) To do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry into effect the objects and purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 6. Said corporation and its State and local subdivisions shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and to use in carrying out its purposes the name "Regular Veterans Association" and the sole and exclusive right to the use of its corporate seal, emblems, and badges as adopted by said corporation.

SEC. 7. The right of the Congress of the United States to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

SEC. 8. The corporation may acquire any or all of the existing assets of the organization known as "Regular Veterans Association" upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all its liabilities.

SEC. 9. The said corporation shall, on or before the 1st day of January each year, make and transmit to the Congress a report of its proceedings for the preceding calendar year, including a full and complete report of its receipts and expenditures.

SEC. 10. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the filing in the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, of affidavits signed by the incorporators named in section 1, or their successors, to the effect that the corporation of the District of Columbia known as the "Regular Veterans Association" has been dissolved in accordance with law, but only if such affidavits are filed within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED NATIONS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 204) requesting the President to use his good offices to the end that the United Nations invite Italy to be a signatory to the United Nations agreement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN AGE LIMIT OF APPOINTEES TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1123) to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the effect of this bill is to increase the upper age limit of candidates for West Point from 22 to 24 years, and to apply only to candidates who have served for 1 year during the war in the armed services.

I have prepared an amendment making a corresponding increase of 2 years to apply to the upper age limit of candidates entering Annapolis, raising the upper age limit from 21 to 23.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it carry the same provision, that it is to apply only to those who have served 1 year in this war?

Mr. COLE of New York. Exactly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1318 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 10, sec. 1094), is amended by striking out "twenty-two" and by inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this act shall not be effective with respect to appointees to the United States Military Academy for any academic year following the second academic year beginning after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 1318 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of March 30, 1920 (41 Stat. 548), is amended to read as follows:

"'Appointees shall be admitted to the United States Military Academy only between the ages of 17 and 22 years, except in the following case: Any appointee who has served honorably not less than 1 year in the armed forces of the United States during any of the present wars, and who possesses the other qualifications required by law, may be admitted between the ages of 17 and 24 years: *Provided*, That whenever any member of the graduating class shall fail to complete the course with his class by reason of sickness, or deficiency in his studies, or other cause, such failure shall not operate to delay the admission of his successor.'"

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: Add a new section:

"SEC. 2. Section 1517 of the Revised Statutes as amended (34 U. S. C. 1045) is amended to read as follows:

"'Candidates allowed for congressional districts, for Territories, and for the District of Columbia, must be actual residents of the districts or Territories respectively from which they are nominated. All candidates for admission to the Naval Academy must be not less than 17 years of age nor more than 21 years of age on April 1 of the calendar year in which they enter the Academy.

"'*Provided*, That any candidate who has served honorably not less than 1 year in the armed forces of the United States during any of the present wars, and who possesses the other qualifications required by law may be admitted between the ages of 17 and 23 years.'"

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CADETS AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 320), to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (57 Stat. 306).

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CADETS AT UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1591), to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the number of cadets authorized by law enacted prior to the enactment of this act at the United States Military Academy, and the number of midshipmen authorized by law enacted prior to the enactment of this act at the United States Naval Academy, are each hereby increased by such number as may be appointed by the President from the United States at large from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded a

Medal of Honor in the name of Congress for acts performed while in any of the armed forces of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENTS OF SONS OF MEMBERS OF LAND AND NAVAL FORCES WHO WERE KILLED IN ACTION TO UNITED STATES MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1868) authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I simply wish t state that I make my appointments entirely by examination, and the man who makes the highest grade receives the appointment. How will this bill affect my system of making appointments?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It will not have the slightest effect whatever upon your system of making appointments. Since World War I, for some years, the same provisions have been extended to sons of veterans of World War I. That has about run out. This is simply an extension of the same thing.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. So that it will not affect my system of appointments?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. In no way whatsoever, nor of any other Congressman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of the act of June 8, 1926 (44 Stat. 703, 704), as amended by the act of December 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 1024), is amended to read as follows:

"The number of cadets now authorized by law at the United States Military Academy and the number of midshipmen now authorized by law at the United States Naval Academy are each hereby increased by 40 from the United States at large, to be appointed by the President from among the sons and members of the land or naval forces (including male and female members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of all components thereof) of the United States, who were killed in action or have died, or may hereafter die, of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, or preexisting injury or disease aggravated, in active service during World War I or World War II (as each is defined by laws providing service-connected compensation or pension benefits for veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents): *Provided*, That the determination of the Veterans' Administration as to service connection of the cause of death shall be binding upon the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 4 OF THE PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2525) to include stepparents among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Alabama who reported this bill an explanation of the meaning of the expression:

A person standing in the place of a parent in loco parentis to the person concerned at any time will be considered as a blood parent.

Does that mean that the individual must be in the position or have the status of loco parentis during the soldier's minority? Or may that period of loco parentis run after the soldier becomes 21 years of age?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Answering the gentleman from New York, it seems to me that would be wholly a matter of legal interpretation. To my own mind a person could not become in loco parentis to an adult. The relationship must exist at a time when the child requires the protection of a parent; in other words, during the infancy or minority of a child.

Mr. COLE of New York. I understand that is the view that has been taken by the Veterans' Administration in interpreting certain Veterans' Administration laws, but some cases have come to my attention where an adult has actually fulfilled the status of loco parentis to a soldier who was over 21 years of age, providing a home for the young man, and caring for him the same as any mother would. It was my thought that it might be the intention of the gentleman's committee that this 5-year period of loco parentis status might be applied to a case such as I have just mentioned where the status did not begin until after the person concerned was over 21 years of age.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In my opinion it could not.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice. I believe there are some phases of this question with which the gentleman from Alabama is not familiar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3772) to prevent a point system for the release of conscientious objectors performing assigned work under civilian direction pursuant to section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, from being put into effect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OPTOMETRY CORPS IN THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3755) to establish an Optometry Corps in the Medical Department of the United States Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 10 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed. title 10, sec. 81), is amended to read as follows:

"The Medical Department shall consist of one Surgeon General with the rank of major general, four assistants with the rank of brigadier general (one of whom shall be an officer in the Dental Corps), the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, the Veterinary Corps, the Medical Administrative Corps, the Pharmacy Corps, the Optometry Corps, a number of enlisted men the authorized maximum of which shall be in each fiscal year such number as shall equal 7 percent of the average annual pay strength of the active list of the Regular Army and the average strength of all other military personnel on extended active duty with the Regular Army during such fiscal year, the Army Nurse Corps as constituted by law, and such contract surgeons as are authorized by law: *Provided*, That in event of actual or threatened hostilities involving the United States the President may, within the limit of the total authorized strength of the Regular Army, authorize additional enlistments in the Medical Department to such number as he may deem necessary."

SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the Optometry Corps. The Optometry Corps shall consist of 60 commissioned officers in grades from colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive.

SEC. 3. To be eligible for appointment in the Optometry Corps, a candidate must be a graduate of an accredited optometry school or college, approved by the Council on Education and Professional Guidance of the American Optometric Association, and have been engaged in the practice of his profession for at least 2 years subsequent to graduation.

SEC. 4. Officers of the Optometry Corps shall be assigned to optometrical duty or to administrative duty in connection therewith. When assigned to optometrical duty, an officer of the Optometry Corps shall perform optometrical work determined upon by the appropriate medical officer, who shall be an ophthalmologist.

SEC. 5. (a) An officer of the Optometry Corps shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (b), be promoted to the grade of first lieutenant after 3 years' service, to the grade of captain after 6 years' service, to the grade of major after 12 years' service, to the grade of lieutenant colonel after 20 years' service, and to the grade of colonel after 26 years' service.

(b) Officers of the Optometry Corps shall be examined for promotion in accordance with section 5 of the act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Army", approved April 23, 1908 (U. S. C., 1940 ed. title 10, secs. 101 and 102), and with the proviso in the paragraph providing for the pay of officers in the Medical Department of the Army contained in the act entitled "An act making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910," approved March 3, 1909 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 10, sec. 103), and such examination shall be conducted by examining and review boards consisting of one officer of the

Medical Corps (who shall be an ophthalmologist) and two officers of the Optometry Corps.

(c) The act entitled "An act to extend the provisions of the act of November 29, 1940 (Public Law 884, 76th Cong.)", approved May 15, 1945, is amended to read as follows:

"That for the duration of the wars in which the United States is presently engaged and for 6 months thereafter, the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, dispense with any part of the examination for promotion in the Regular Army of officers of the Medical, Dental, Optometry, and Veterinary Corps, except those relating to physical examination."

SEC. 6. The right of officers of the Optometry Corps to command shall be limited to the Optometry Corps and the Medical Administrative Corps.

SEC. 7. The first and second provisos of section 47c of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed. Supp. III, title 10, secs. 383, 384, and 387a), are amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That any medical, dental, pharmacy, veterinary, or optometry student may be admitted to a Medical, Dental, Pharmacy, Veterinary, or Optometry Corps unit of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for a course of training at the rate of 90 hours of instruction per annum for the 4 college years, and if at the end of 2 years of such training he has been selected by the professor of military science and tactics and the head of the institution for advanced training, and has agreed in writing to continue in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for the remainder of his course at the institution, and has agreed in writing to pursue the course in camp training prescribed by the Secretary of War, he may be furnished, at the expense of the United States, with commutation of subsistence at such rate not exceeding the cost of the garrison ration prescribed for the Army, as may be fixed by the Secretary of War, during the remainder of his service in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, not exceeding 2 years: *Provided further*, That any Reserve officer who is also a medical, dental, pharmacy, veterinary, or optometry student may be admitted to such Medical, Dental, Pharmacy, Veterinary, or Optometry Corps unit for such training, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe:".

SEC. 8. The act entitled "An act to amend section 10, National Defense Act, as amended, with relation to the maximum authorized enlisted strength of the Medical Department of the Regular Army", approved May 14, 1940, is repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 49, proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TO INVESTIGATE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL PARK IN PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2851) to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the city of Philadelphia, for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings therein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the information of the House I believe it might be well to have this bill explained by some Member who is acquainted with its purposes and provisions.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am in position to explain the bill. I sat on the subcommittee and was chairman of the committee that reported the bill out.

The purpose of the bill is to set up a commission for the purpose of studying the grouping of the historical buildings, including Independence Hall and the old Congress, for the purpose finally of establishing a national historical park. It is rather strange that the greatest historical spot in the country, the place where the Nation was born, is not owned by the Federal Government. For a long period of time the city of Philadelphia had maintained that it should be owned by the city. On the other hand there are those who believe it should be owned by the Federal Government and the city is cooperating, and this is a proposal which enables cooperation with the local authorities and the working out of an orderly plan. Rather than specifically enacting a bill making it an historic site we felt that we should create this commission to work out the details. That has been done in certain other instances, such as in the case of the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, where commissions have been set up previously. It was the unanimous opinion of our committee that this bill should be passed. There is a provision authorizing an appropriation of only $25,000 for the purpose of having the commission make a study and Congress will have the right to speak again after the report has been made.

Mr. RANKIN. There is no provision in here for removing the original Constitution or the Declaration of Independence from Washington, is there?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No.

Mr. RANKIN. We ought to keep them here.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. There have been several occasions when the original Independence Hall has been greatly endangered by fire. There is no question in my mind but that this bill should be passed and that was the unanimous decision of our committee. The gentleman from Iowa is familiar with that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is a fact that the city of Philadelphia, holding this invaluable property, is offering it to the Government absolutely free?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. That is right.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The only appropriation that will be necessary, if the commission recommends taking it over and making it a memorial, is for the purchase of adjoining land. The city of Philadelphia is not asking for any appropriation for the Memorial Hall and Constitutional Hall now vested in the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. Cannot this be accomplished under the Historic Sites Act?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The Park Service and the committee felt it would be best to work out the details under this commission rather than under the Historic Sites Act because if we specifically attempted now to do it under the Historic Sites Act we would have to fix the boundaries. We do not know whether some of the buildings will have to be destroyed or razed or cleared away and we figure this would be the cheapest way to do it and all concerned seemed to think that is the best way.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas thousands of residents of the city of Philadelphia, comprising part of the Third Congressional District of Pennsylvania, have petitioned their representatives in the Congress of the United States upon the matters more fully hereinafter set forth; and

Whereas the petition of the residents of the city of Philadelphia calls attention to the existence of many shrines hallowed in American history, as well as several modern buildings owned by the Federal Government, in the area of the city of Philadelphia, beginning at the southeast corner of Sixth Street and Chestnut Street and proceeding southwardly to the northeast corner of Sixth Street and Walnut Street; thence proceeding eastwardly to the northwest corner of Fifth Street and Walnut Street; thence proceeding northwardly to a point on the west side of Fifth Street which would be made by extending the north line of Sansom Street to the east side of Fifth Street; thence proceeding eastwardly along the north line of the said Sansom Street to a point in the east side of Fourth Street which would be made by extending the north line of the said Sansom Street to the east side of the said Fourth Street; thence southwardly to the northeast corner of Harmony and Fourth Streets; thence eastwardly to the northwest corner of Harmony and Third Streets; thence northwardly to a point at which a line extended perpendicularly from the east side of Third Street would meet the angle created by the lines forming the northeast corner of Third and Dock Streets; thence eastwardly along the northerly line of said Dock Street to the northeast corner of Dock, South American, and Moravian Streets; thence eastwardly to the northwest corner of Moravian and Second Streets; thence northwardly to the southwest corner of Second and Chestnut Streets; thence westwardly to the southeast corner of Sixth and Chestnut Streets, to the place of beginning; and calls attention to the fact that much of the area above described is run down, some properties are demolished, and others are in such dilapidated condition as to constitute a serious fire hazard of such proportions as to endanger Independence Hall, Carpenters' Hall, the Old Custom House, and the First Bank of the United States, as well as other landmarks and shrines of patriotism, and that such unsightly condition is not conducive to a proper respect and reverence for those American ideals which are symbolized by those shrines; and recommends that the Federal Government establish a national park in the above vicinity and also in the area bounded by Fifth Street on the east, Race Street on the north, Sixth Street on the west, and Chestnut Street on the south, which will assure at once a beautiful setting for those shrines and maximum protection against fire or other disaster; and

Whereas during these troubled times it is desirable to augment the defense effort of our Nation not only with arms but with proper emphasis on spiritual values; and

Whereas an attractive and inspiring setting will create a stronger sense of reverence for American institutions, laws, and order, which had their beginnings, in large part, in this group of shrines in the formative years around 1776; and

Whereas it is proper, fitting, and desirable that the United States of America should properly enshrined these jewels of democracy, so that all who visit these hallowed places from the far corners of this glorious democracy and the four corners of the world may be stirred with a feeling of patriotic reverence: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That a commission is hereby created for the purpose of investigating the matter of the establishment in the city of Philadelphia, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, of a Federal area to be called Philadelphia National Shrines Park, or by some other appropriate name, to encompass within its area the buildings of historical significance in the old part of the city of Philadelphia, and to be operated and maintained by the National Park Service, for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings in the said area and to provide for the enjoyment and appreciation thereof in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall be known as the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission, and shall be composed of seven individuals, who shall serve without compensation, to be appointed as follows: One Member of the United States Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; one Member of the United States House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House; one member to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, and four persons, one of whom shall be a resident of the city of Philadelphia, to be appointed by the President of the United States. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall meet for the purpose of organizing within 30 days after the enactment of this act. Rooms shall be provided for the use of the Commission in the New Customhouse at Philadelphia. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and executive secretary from among its members.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall make a study of the historic area and the area surrounding and contiguous to the locality involved, the buildings now in existence there, comparative real estate costs, the advisability of condemnation of all or any part of the said locality and area, which of the present buildings should remain privately owned, if any, and shall prepare a report on all phases of the problem Such report shall be transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior not later than February 1, 1946. Upon submission of the report to Congress, the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 5. The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold hearings and sit and act at such places and times, require by subpena the attendance of such witnesses other than persons engaged in essential war industries as defined by the War Manpower Commission, and the production of such books, papers, and documents, administer such oaths, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission and shall be served by any person designated by him. For the purposes of the exercise of the functions, powers, and duties conferred or imposed by this act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 15, secs, 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable so far as is consistent with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary of the Interior may appoint and fix the compensation, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of such experts, advisers, and other employees, and may make such expenditures, including expenditures for actual travel and subsistence expense of members, employees, and witnesses (not exceeding $15 for subsistence for any one person for any one calendar day), for personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, and for printing and binding, as are necessary for the efficient execution of the functions, powers of the Commission, and duties under this act. The Commission is authorized to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services for the purposes of this act. Any appropriations for the National Park Service and moneys which may be donated for the purposes of this act shall be available for the necessary expenses of such investigation.

(b) The Commission shall have the same privilege of free transmission of official mail matter as is granted by law to officers of the United States Government.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 11, strike out "February 1, 1946" and insert "January 3, 1937."

Page 6, line 18, strike out "of the Commission" and after the word "duties" insert "of the Commission."

Page 6, line 22, after the word "service" insert "not exceeding $25,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REEMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1645) to preserve the reemployment preferences of members of the armed forces who, after discharge therefrom, become employed in essential activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was introduced in January and reported in July of this year by the Committee on Military Affairs. As indicated by the title it relates to reemployment preferences given to members of the armed forces who become employed in essential war industries. I raise the question as to whether this type of bill is necessary in view of the fact the war is no longer with us and presumably there are no essential war industries.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this kind of legislation is still necessary because under the reemployment feature the veteran had to apply for his old job within 90 days. Regardless of when he got out of the service, if he went to an essential job, a war job, whereas his job may have been nonessential, after the expiration of the 90 days, he lost his reemployment rights in his old job. For some time the man would still be affected and it seems to me we still need the legislation.

Mr. COLE of New York. This is necessary for the protection of the veterans who became employed in essential industry before the hostilities ceased?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after paragraph (C) thereof a new sentence reading as follows: "If such position is in an activity not designated by the War Manpower Commission as essential to the prosecution of the war, and if—

"(i) such person, within 90 days after being relieved from such training and service or from such hospitalization (whether before, on, or after the date upon which this sentence takes effect), becomes employed in an activity which is so designated; and

"(ii) such person continues to be employed in an activity which is so designated until (a) section 3 (a) of this act ceases to be operative (disregarding any period not exceeding 15 days between leaving one such employment and entering upon another such employment), or (b) he has secured a determination by his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), that it is no longer essential to the prosecution of the war that he continue to be so employed, whichever is the earlier;

the period beginning with the date upon which he first becomes employed in an activity which is so designated and ending with the date on which section 3 (a) ceases to be operative, or with the date of such determination by his selective-service local board, whichever is the earlier shall be disregarded in computing the 90-day period within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF THE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) providing for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Crugers Park, Peekskill, N. Y., as "Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Veterans' Committee what the general policy is with reference to naming these hospitals? It seems peculiar to pick out one hospital and name it the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital. I understand that another one is called the Hines Hospital, and the other 92 hospitals have no names at all. If they are going to be named, I should think it would be a very good thing to name them after, for instance, holders of Congressional Medals of Honor who have been killed in the service in the past or other people whose names appeal to the veterans' patriotism.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from New Jersey that he is laboring under a misapprehension as to the Hines Hospital. The Hines Hospital in Chicago was named after Edward Hines

back, I believe, during the Harding Administration, because of the fact that the property was obtained from Edward Hines.

Mr. KEAN. As a gift?

Mr. RANKIN. No; not as a gift. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Do not let me have to go into that now, because it would probably stir the indignant spirit of Senator CARTER GLASS, who went through some of the fights with me at that time, not on naming of the hospital, but with reference to some other phases of the question. But it was not a gift.

I was just running through my mind the names of other veterans' hospitals. As you know, we have 84 of them. Recently we named one in South Dakota the Royal Johnson Hospital. I supported that measure because Royal Johnson was not only a very able Member of this House, but he was a disabled World War veteran and was the first chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the position I now occupy.

We had a bill before the Rivers and Harbors Committee this morning to name a dam in California after the distinguished gentleman from California, our former colleague Mr. Englebright. That measure has my support. I can remember when Boulder Dam was called Hoover Dam. Some bureaucrat changed it. I am in favor of changing it back, I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey, because that distinguished gentleman, who was once President of the United States, was more responsible for the building of that dam than probably any other man alive.

I can see no reason why these hospitals should not be named after men who have served here and whose influence was felt in either the creation or the promotion of the policies for which they stand.

We had this matter up before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and Gen. Frank T. Hines wrote us this letter. He wrote it to the President of the Senate and sent me a copy of it. He says:

SIR: There are forwarded herewith two copies of a draft of a proposed joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for designation of Veterans' Administration hospital at Crugers Park, Peekskill, N. Y., as 'Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital'" with the request that same be introduced and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The President has recently approved a project authorizing the Veterans' Administration to acquire a tract of land containing approximately 383 acres as a site for the proposed new Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospital to serve the metropolitan area of New York City. This particular hospital will be initially designed for 1,492 beds and will be located upon a site known as Crugers Park property at Peekskill, N. Y. Its location is approximately 35 miles south of Hyde Park on United States Highway No. 9. The site is one that has been occupied since the earliest days of our country. At the present time there are located thereon a modern bathhouse, a stone shelter house, and the Boscobel Mansion, which was built in 1795.

During his lifetime the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt took a continuous and deep interest in the program of the Veterans' Administration hospitals. It is recalled that on the occasion of the dedication of the hospital at Roanoke, Va., President Roosevelt said: "* * * let this great monument—the veterans' hospital and the other institutions of their kind throughout the country—serve as a symbolic and bold denial of any careless statement that the United States does not take care of those who have served it in war—" and it would appear that a most appropriate memorial to President Roosevelt would be the naming of this new hospital in the general area of his home at Hyde Park the "Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital."

With the exception of the Edward Hines Junior Hospital, at Hines, Ill., near Chicago, all Veterans' Administration hospitals, some 84 in number, are called Veterans' Administration facilities, and it is considered that legislation is required for the naming of a hospital for any particular individual.

Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the presentation of this report to the Congress for its consideration.

Respectfully,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

That letter is dated June 8.

No matter what you call this hospital, I presume the services will be the same. Look at Mount McKinley, in Alaska, one of the most glorious pictures on the face of the earth. As much as I admire President McKinley, I must admit that the mere fact that it is named McKinley neither adds to nor detracts from its majestic beauty.

This measure will have no effect on the efficiency of the hospital.

Mr. KEAN. I am not objecting to the name; I am asking the gentleman whether it is going to be the policy of the Veterans' Administration in the future to name these hospitals.

Mr. RANKIN. It has always been the policy of Congress——

Mr. KEAN. The Veterans' Administration made this recommendation, not Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. KEAN. The movement to name a hospital for Royal Johnson was initiated right here.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. I was one of the men who initiated the movement to name the Royal Johnson Hospital after that distinguished gentleman.

Mr. KEAN. What I am interested in is this: Is the Veterans' Administration going to start recommending names for hospitals? If it is going to follow that policy, I think we ought to know about it.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not suppose it will be made a general practice, but, of course, the naming of each individual hospital will be left up to the Congress. As far as I am concerned, I can see no objection to it.

Mr. KEAN. I can see no objection to it, either. I think it is a picturesque thing to name hospitals after people. I think it gives personality to the hospitals, and I approve of the idea.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope it will be a long time before we have to name one in memory of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. I hope it is a long time, too.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the proposed Veterans' Administration hospital at Crugers Park, Peekskill, N. Y., shall be known and designated on the public records as the "Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Crugers Park", and insert "Crugers-on-Hudson, near."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Crugers-on-Hudson, near Peekskill, N. Y., as 'Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital.'"

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MISS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2842) for the relief of Montgomery County, Miss., districts 2 and 3.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $40,227 to Montgomery County, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the roads in supervisors districts numbered 2 and 3 resulting from the use of said roads by military personnel of Camp McCain, between December 1942 and September 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRENADA COUNTY, MISS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3195) for the relief of Grenada County, Miss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $47.65, to Grenada County, Miss., in full settlement of the county's claim against the United States of America for damages sustained by the county roads in the use of said roads for maneuver and other purposes by military personnel of Camp McCain, Miss., from December 1942 to September 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIMS INCIDENT TO ERADICATION OF FRUITFLY IN FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3760) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill is similar to one which was on the consent calendar at the last Congress and to which objection was made for the reason that it authorized the appropriation of approximately $10,000,000 to settle claims for damages caused by the campaign for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida some years ago.

Word was sent out at that time that it was the minority Members of Congress who had blocked the passage of that bill. I undertook at that time to explain that my opposition to its passage by unanimous consent was not because of the merits or demerits of the bill but because of a general understanding in the House of Representatives that bills carrying an authorization for an appropriation of an amount of money of this size, in this case amounting to $10,000,000, should not be passed by unanimous consent, however meritorious the bill may be. I take the occasion at this time to explain my reason for again asking that the bill be passed over without prejudice with the assurance to the people of Florida that I do so after consultation with some Members of both the majority and the minority who are interested in this subject and who agree that as a general principle at least bills of this size should not be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The gentleman has been always fair. I understand his position. While I do very much wish that the bill could be passed by unanimous consent, I realize the gentleman's responsibility and I know it is not a partisan matter with him. I have dealt with the gentleman with reference to many unanimous-consent matters and I have a high regard for the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of New York. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Florida very much.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ALASKA REAL PROPERTY LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3686) to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the registers of the land offices in Alaska to perform functions under the Alaska real property ownership declaration law.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the registers of the land offices in Alaska are hereby authorized to perform the functions assigned to them by the act of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska entitled "An act to require declaration of the ownership of land, to impose a penalty for noncompliance, and to dispose of the proceeds of such penalties," approved March 24, 1945.

SEC. 2. The said Commissioner and the said registers shall not be entitled to receive any additional compensation for the performance of the said functions and no expense incurred by them in connection therewith shall constitute an obligation of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to designate, in his discretion, any other officers or employees of the Department of the Interior to perform the said functions upon like conditions.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3466) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 409 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1171; 55 Stat. 743; 56 Stat. 779; 58 Stat. 747; 8 U. S. C. 809), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 409. Nationality shall not be lost under the provisions of section 404 or 407 of this act until the expiration of 6 years following the date of the approval of this act: *Provided, however*, That a naturalized person who shall have become subject to the presumption that he has ceased to be an American citizen as provided for in the second paragraph of section 2 of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1228), and who shall not have overcome it under the rules in effect immediately preceding the date of the approval of this act, shall continue to be subject to such presumption for the period of 6 years following the date of the approval of this act unless it is overcome during such period."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the bills on the Consent Calendar.

RELEASE OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Calendar No. 207 the bill (H. R. 3772) to prevent a point system for the release of conscientious objectors performing assigned work under civilian direction pursuant to section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, from being put into effect.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. I believe objection was made to its consideration at the time it was called on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Calendar No. 206 the bill (H. R. 2525) to include stepparents among those parents with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes, which was objected to by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, after discussing this matter with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] I have decided to withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"As used in this section, the terms 'father', 'mother', 'parent', and 'parents' shall be held to include stepfather, stepmother, stepparent, and stepparents."

SEC. 2. Any person who, prior to the date of enactment of this act, has received allowances under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 because of the relationship of stepfather or stepmother, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the amount of such allowances. Any amounts heretofore credited to any such person or refunded by him to the United States on account of such unauthorized payment to him shall be repaid to him out of any money available for the payment of allowances with respect to members of the services coming within the provisions of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amount of all allowances paid under such act because of such relationship of stepfather or stepmother.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 4 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 361), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'As used in this section, the terms "father", "mother", "parent", and "parents" shall include a stepparent, a parent by adoption, and any person, including a former stepparent, who has stood in loco parentis to the person concerned at any time for a continuous period of not less than 5 years: *Provided*, That a stepparent-stepchild relationship shall be deemed to be terminated by the stepparent's divorce from the blood parent.'

"SEC. 2. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month occurring after its enactment. No pay or allowances for any period prior to the effective date of this act shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech of General MacArthur.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a certain newspaper article.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

ARMED FORCES VOLUNTARY RECRUITMENT BILL OF 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 3951, to stimulate volunteer enlistment in the regular military and naval establishments of the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 3951, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, section 3 of the bill had been read and is now open for amendment. Are there any amendments to section 3?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, just before the Committee rose yesterday evening, I offered an amendment which was adopted, in line 9 on page 2, which reduced the age of the men to be inducted into the Regular Army to 17 years.

I now offer a further amendment as a proviso to that amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 2, line 11, before the period insert ": *Provided further*, That no person under the age of 18 years shall be enlisted without the written consent of his parents or guardians, and the Secretary of War shall, upon the application of the parents or guardians of any such person enlisted without their written consent, discharge such person from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of such person, after enlistment, shall entitle him."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to make an inquiry.

Will this amendment affect the amendment which the committee inserted yesterday with reference to discharging the boys under 21 years of age, upon application of parents for such discharge, where they did not have the consent of the parents to enlist?

Mr. MAY. This merely protects those who are under 21 years of age in their enlistment without the consent of their parents, and provides that where they do so enlist the parents can apply to have them discharged, if they wish to do so, and when so discharged they shall be honorably discharged, or shall have such discharge as their service entitles them to receive. In other words, it protects their infancy and does not allow them to remain in the Army unless they have the consent of their parents.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. From a reading of the amendment I thought it applied only to 17-year-old persons.

Mr. MAY. It applies to all men under 21 years of age.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. So that this does not modify the amendment that was inserted yesterday by the gentleman from Kentucky relating to this subject?

Mr. MAY. No; it does not at all. It simply strengthens it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Whenever any enlisted man of the Regular Army shall have completed not less than 20 or more than 29 years of active service, he may upon his own request be retired, with annual pay equal to 2½ percent of the average annual pay (including longevity pay) he was receiving for the 6 months immediately preceding his retirement multiplied by a sum equal to the sum of the number of years of his active service performed not in excess of 29 years. The number of years of service to be credited in computing the right to retirement and retirement pay authorized by this section, or any other provision of law providing for the retirement of an enlisted man of the Regular Army, shall include all active Federal military service performed in the Army of the United States, the Navy, or the Marine Corps, or any component thereof, any fractional part of a year amounting to 6 months or more to be counted as a complete year: *Provided*, That in time of peace all enlisted men retired pursuant to this section may be required, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, to perform not more than 2 months' active duty in each 4-year period and shall be examined physically at least once during each 4-year period.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: Page 3, line 6, to strike out "retired with" and insert "transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps (to remain a member thereof until his active service plus the period of his membership in such corps equals 30 years) and at the same time be retired from the Regular Army. An enlisted man so transferred and retired shall receive, except with respect to periods of active duty he may be required to perform, until his death"; and strike out the proviso beginning in line 19.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment clarifies what seems to me to be a confusing condition in section 4. Section 4 actually sets up an unnamed reserve in the group from 20 to 29 years, which is separate and distinct from the regular Enlisted Reserve Corps.

What my amendment seeks to do is to make these two reserve corps the one acknowledged Enlisted Reserve Corps which now exists. Another thing my amendment does is to prevent the retired man from being called up for 2 months' service in each 4-year period after the end of his 30-years' service. It is the opinion of the legal counsel that the way the section is now written, the provision at the end would be of unlimited duration, the man could be called up for 2 months' service in each 4-year period for an unlimited time. The way it is now in the Army and Navy at the end of 30 years the man is free from further call for the 2 months' service each 4 years. They are all, of course, subject to call for a national emergency.

I understand there is no objection on the part of the committee.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, my understanding of the amendment is that it puts them back in the reserve; for instance, a man who retires at the end of 20 years' service goes into a Reserve Corps for 10 years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. MAY. The only thing this amendment does is to prevent his being called up for refresher training after 30 years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. MAY. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 3, line 17: Strike out the words "or the Marine Corps" and insert in lieu thereof "the Marine Corps or the Coast Guard."

Mr. MAY. We have no objection to that amendment. It was a mere oversight of the committee that it was not included in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the things that causes much confusion is the fact that notwithstanding all the fine things that have been said by those in high military places their statements are made somewhat confusing by the things they do. You will recall that recently the order came down to the effect that an enlisted man would not be sent overseas but would be retained in active duty in the continental United States if he was 34, 35, or 36 years old and had 1 year of honorable military service; or if he was 37 years old; or if he had 45 points or

more under the May 12 computation. Immediately upon that order coming down a great number of boys who had served in the Aleutians, which is technically within the continental limits of the United States, were told that if they had a sufficient number of points or came within the age limit they would not be sent back there. This morning an enlisted man from my State, taking the chance of being court martialed, had the effrontery to call his Congressman and say that just today his group located out in South Dakota were going to be sent back in airplanes within 4 days. They had been told after this order came down that they would not have to go back. The whole group had more than 45 points and several of them had been up there for 3 years. They were told that this did not apply at all, that they were now overseas, notwithstanding the fact they are out in South Dakota. They were here only temporarily, they were told, and, hence, technically, they were still overseas.

I asked the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Naval Affairs how the Aleutians were considered by the Navy and I was informed that the Navy considered the Aleutian Islands overseas. Is it any wonder that these young men who spent 3½ years up in the iceberg country, who have 60 and 70 points, get dissatisfied? Do they have any right to appeal to Congress or to anyone else to find out what their status is? I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs how he interprets this order? Does it apply to the men in the Aleutians?

Mr. MAY. The Aleutians, as I understand it, is territory within the United States. It belongs to the United States, therefore it is within the United States.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman say why there should be a different rule for the Navy than the Army?

Mr. MAY. I do not know what their rules are and I am not trying to enforce their rules. The Aleutians, however, is counted as overseas service for the purpose of allowing an enlisted man to receive the 20 percent extra pay.

Mr. RIZLEY. Absolutely.

Mr. MAY. We can hear all kinds of rumors around here about regulations and a lot of talk about the brass hats, but if we let them alone they will take care of these problems in due time.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am not going to let them alone as long as I am a Member of Congress and these young boys who have been up there three and a half years receive this sort of treatment. I have some responsibility in the matter and I say to you now that it is a disgrace, an outrage, and a shame that you count the Aleutian Islands outside the United States for certain purposes and not outside for other purposes. When this order came down fixing the elegibles to be retained in the United States it should apply to the Aleutians as well as other overseas points.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is opposed to allowing the Army to demobilize?

Mr. RIZLEY. No, I am not opposed to having the Army demobilize. I want these boys demobilized and I have as many as anybody else who ought to be at home. I want to give the boys with the long-time service the first chance at it.

Mr. MAY. That is what they are getting now.

Mr. RIZLEY. Here are men with 3 years' service in the Aleutians. Now, the gentleman takes me to task because I have the effrontery to bring this matter up.

Mr. MAY. I am not taking the gentleman to task for anything, but I have a flock of close relatives overseas and I am not going to malign the Army because they are not brought home first.

Mr. RIZLEY. I have two sons and three sons-in-law, if you want to get personal. I want them out, of course, but I say to you right now that these men in the Aleutians who have been considered overseas for certain purposes ought to have the same break on this point system as any other overseas veteran.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE of Florida: After the period, line 24, page 3, add the following:

"Every person having had 1 year or more of service as a member of the armed forces of the United States during this war shall be allowed to enlist or reenlist for a period of 1 or 2 years. Every person with a year of service thus joining our armed forces shall receive double the amount of pay now being paid the members of our armed forces for like ratings provided they are below the rank of commissioned officers. The method of payment to every person enlisting or reenlisting under these provisions shall be as follows: While in the service the pay will be at the reguar rate of pay now prevelant in our armed forces with the further provision that upon honorable discharge of a person so enlisting or reenlisting, he shall receive the same amount of pay each month, beginning with the first month following honorable discharge, as he received during his term of enlistment and shall continue to receive this payment for a number of months equal to the number of months served during the period of enlistment or reenlistment."

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Kilday amendment increased the incentive for enlistments and most of the arguments used for its passage are appropriate for the amendment I now offer. However, in my estimation a much greater incentive is needed if we hope to secure the necessary number of enlistments. Do you think all the men we need can be provided by this bill as it now stands? If you do, I know a big load must have been lifted from your shoulders and I feel sure that you must have gotten a good night's sleep last night. Have you begun to so answer the many wives, fathers, and mothers who are so anxiously calling on you to help send their loved ones home? If you feel that all the men needed for our armed forces will come forward and enlist, then you certainly are not interested in my amendment, but if you are in doubt please give me your attention for just a few minutes.

Right away I can hear objections because this would be paying our boys more than was paid during the war. That is true, but it would give these same boys a chance to reenlist and receive this extra pay. We all know that during the war money was not the consideration for which our boys were fighting. We also know that the boys who would be influenced to reenlist under the provisions of this amendment are the ones who were deprived of the opportunity of earning big pay in defense plants. The Government had no objection to paying $75 to $150 per week to workers in defense work while the boys I am trying to help were fighting and risking their lives for $50 per month.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it simply doubles the pay of those who enlist in the Regular Army as against those who are serving in the Army of the United States now. For instance, a private receives $50 a month. Under the gentleman's amendment the man who is inducted into this peacetime army will receive $100 a month.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman believe that we ought to pay men for peacetime service double the amount we are paying them for fighting?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. I would appreciate if the gentleman would let me continue my statement.

A great many Members of Congress are strongly advocating paying $25 per week to those who received this $75 to $150 per week for a period of 26 weeks out of each year while they are not employed. If you figure that out you will see that it amounts to over $54 a month for 12 months out of each year and I want to give the boys who enlist for our armies of occupation less than that for each month they serve in our armed forces; that is, the great majority of them will be privates and draw only $50 per month. Is this asking too much in order that we may get our boys back home? Does this seem ridiculous to you?

I believe this method of payment would attract many men who are already trained and fully equipped because the guaranty of a small income for 1 or 2 years would help banish that fear and uncertainty which they dread to face on returning to civilian life. Many men in our armed forces had no job when they were inducted, therefore, they are naturally dubious about returning to civilian life. It will be possible to get all the men we need, provided we give them some real inducement.

If you really want to get our young boys back into school; if you want to get the older men with families and dependents back to their homes and businesses; if you really think those with actual combat service are entitled to release; if you think those with years of service deserve to get out; then let us pay a fair wage for the job. During peacetime, remaining in our armed forces is a job and the United States Government is well able to pay a decent wage to get the job done.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Has the gentleman calculated what under his amendment would be the pay for a first sergeant, including quarters and the other perquisites for himself and his family, if the enlistee in the professional Army were married?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. I am sorry I cannot give the gentleman that information.

Mr. MOTT. What would be the pay in similar circumstances of a 17-year-old boy who enlisted for the first time?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. He could not enlist under this provision unless he had had 1 year's service in the armed forces during this war.

Mr. MOTT. Make it 19, then. What would his whole pay be?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. It would be double the amount he is receiving now.

Mr. MOTT. I know it would be double the amount he is receiving now, but I should like to know how many dollars a month this private in the professional Army would receive under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. He would receive around $100 a month.

Mr. MOTT. That would be his base pay?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. But the gentleman must remember that we are getting rid of a lot of privates with 5 or 6 children, who are costing the Government now $150 to $200 a month.

Mr. MOTT. That is not my question. For the information of the House, I am asking what the total pay of say a 19-year-old boy enlisting as a private in the professional Army would be.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. I cannot answer that.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this demonstrates the fact that you cannot write a pay bill on the floor of the House. It happens that when the present Pay Readjustment Act was written I served as a member of the subcommittee along with a number of other members still sitting. I doubt if we have ever tackled anything more complicated than adjusting the pay throughout the grades of the Army.

It is obvious what this would do, as the gentleman from Oregon has indicated. I think I can answer his question. The first sergeant would draw in cash approximately $312 a month. That would be his pay plus his quarters allowance, and he would still be entitled to his clothing, medical attention, hospitalization, food, and what not.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman will yield, that is very informative, but I would suggest that you would have no trouble under that amendment in recruiting a very large number of sergeants.

Mr. KILDAY. Of sergeants, yes; but we are going to have to have some buck privates in this Army.

I agree that we are going to have to reorganize the military set-up, and that must come when we rewrite the National Defense Act. It is strange that the average parent in the United States is ambitious for his boy to be a commissioned officer, but the same is not true with reference to enlistment. I believe it is possible so to revise our military set-up as to make it comparably attractive so that we can maintain whatever number we decide to maintain in our Regular Army, but you are not going to do it by saying that you will start by paying $100 a month. You are going to have to sit down and figure it out very carefully and make the compensation in accordance with the service and the responsibilities assumed.

As long as a man who enters the Army and becomes a professional member of it is 18 or 20 years old, his pay need not be too high, but give him the assurance that by the time he gets married and is raising a family he will have a sufficient income to maintain them decently and educate them properly. Then you will be giving him an incentive. But to come here on the floor of the House and automatically double the pay for a peacetime soldier over that of a wartime soldier certainly is not the type of amendment that will be adopted to this bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. MAY. Let us take the case of a staff sergeant who served 3 years in the Army, part of the time overseas. He reenlists at a camp in this country. His home is 1,000 miles away. He is given a furlough allowance of 5 cents a mile. He goes home and returns under his orders to a base 500 miles from where he was furloughed. He would receive a total travel allowance of $75, then mustering-out pay of $300, and a reenlistment allowance of $150, which would make a total of $525.

Mr. KILDAY. But suppose that man, instead of having served 3 years, had some "fogies" attached to it. Then you are getting into the higher brackets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to make a few observations, some of them somewhat reminiscent in character, because the offering of this amendment demonstrates in a way the problem that will confront eventually the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs. I say my observation will be somewhat reminiscent. In 1922 after the National Defense Act which effected the reorganization of the Army of the United States was passed in 1920, and the Navy also had by appropriate legislation and regulations settled down to what might be termed a peacetime basis, it became perfectly apparent to the Congress that the pay rates of 1908, which were automatically restored after the war against Germany came to an end, were utterly inadequate to meet the cost of living. During World War I our Army pay and Navy pay was raised above the rates which prevailed in 1908. With the termination of the war, the pay rates automatically went back to those of 1908. When they were applied to the conditions in 1922, practically the entire officer personnel of both services and all enlisted men in the services who had taken on any obligations of a domestic character found themselves literally on the verge of starvation. It was deemed important at that time that while a revision of the schedules had to be made, it had to be made in such a fashion that the corresponding grades or ranks in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard would all be treated alike. It was quite impossible for the Committee on Military Affairs of that day to draft skillfully not only a pay schedule for the Army but also a pay schedule for the Navy and the Marine Corps. A like difficulty would have confronted the Committee on Naval Affairs of either House. Therefore, to meet the situation, a joint congressional committee was appointed, composed of members of both of the standing committees. They went to work to draft the pay schedules over this very wide field. There resulted then the act of 1922 which provided for the new pay schedules. As a result of that act, the pay schedules were brought up to date and the officers and men were given a fair chance to live decently. All men in corresponding ranks or grades in all the services were treated exactly alike. It occurred to me that that event in 1922 might be borne in mind now because, as the gentleman from Texas said, our committees, no matter what committees tackle the job, are going to be faced with an exceedingly difficult task in rewriting the pay schedules, Any number of technical considerations come into the picture and new estimates have to be made as to the cost of living in 1945, 1946, or 1947, as compared to the cost of living before the war came upon us.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I have thought in recent months it may be advisable for Congress now to do the same thing it did 23 years ago, to create a joint committee for that same purpose. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on the necessity and the advisability of such action?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I believe that I have already indicated that the only way we could tackle it in 1922 was to appoint a joint congressional committee to which Members of the Senate and the House, largely from the standing committees, were appointed to study the problem.

I suspect we would better resort to that device now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the fact that the purpose of this amendment is to try to induce a larger number of men to come into the Army. I recognize that what we want to do is to tide us over the emergency and to immediately obtain a sufficient number of men by volunteer means to take care of the commitments this country has made.

The difficulty with the present suggested amendment is that it brings about a raise in pay which in the long run must continue for many years. You cannot start out a young soldier at a hundred dollars a month and then 5 years after he has been in the service

reduce him to $50 a month. I would approach this problem in a little different way. It seems to me that since we are in the present emergency what we want is a present inducement to get men in during the next year or two by volunteer means. My thought in this respect is that we should increase the bonus or the pay for reenlistment. In other words, a youngster is taken into the Army. He serves a year. Why not let him have a little more money for reenlisting, and then he will know at the moment of reenlistment that he is being induced by virtue of this increased payment to reenlist voluntarily in the armed forces.

My colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], has said he is going to present such an amendment on page 6 of the bill. I may present an amendment likewise. If the bonus or payment he would receive for that particular enlistment is made large enough we can get a far larger number of volunteers to come into the Army and relieve the men who want to go home right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of H. R. 3951, a bill to induce volunteers, but there is a lot more that the Congress must do in the transition from war to peace.

It is getting warm—in fact, it is getting hot for Members of Congress. Infuriated mothers and fathers, and desperate wives are bombarding them with telegrams and letters demanding that their sons or husbands be discharged. The wives want the daddies to see their babies. They demand that the Government keep its word. These men were drafted for the duration and 6 months thereafter.

The world knows that the war is over. It ended when Japan surrendered. To delay making a formal declaration to that effect is not only dishonest, but is breaking faith with the servicemen. To pretend that the war is not over is a hypocritical camouflage. You will not be permitted to put that over on our armed forces.

Now that the war is over, there must be prompt demobilization. Unless this is done the Nation will virtually lose a generation. It is not only foolish but expensive to keep the boys longer in the armed forces. On an average it costs the Government approximately $200 a month to keep a person in the armed forces and care for the dependents.

These boys are all grown up now. Some are getting along in years. They should be promptly discharged so that they can rejoin their families and adjust themselves into civilian life. There is plenty for all in this Nation.

A member of the War Department is reported to have said that it is all right to discharge the boys if you do not want as large an army as Russia. Well, if our Government has to arm against Russia, we had better scrap the United Nations' Charter—or has it already been scrapped?

The statement by the War and Navy Departments that we need a large force in Japan and another in Germany is false. These nations have been so thoroughly whipped, and are being so completely disarmed, that they will be no threat to peace for a thousand years. Generals MacArthur and Eisenhower, within a short time, can teach and compel these people to do their own policing. Then, all they will need is 200,000 servicemen between them to supervise the policing.

We have everything we need at our fingertips. Our problem is not production but distribution. Let us see to it that the new wealth created each year is more equally distributed. Our future is secure if we have the intelligence and integrity to face it the American way, unhampered by foreign ideologies.

There are breakers ahead—storm clouds are gathering. The veterans are returning. Unemployment looms on the horizon. All these danger signals can be avoided if Congress and the people use their vision and detour in time.

If Congress will stop the bureaucratic squandering of the Nation's resources, if it will do justice to the veterans, if it will give labor a square deal—employment assurance rather than unemployment insurance—then we will have run the gauntlet. Then we will have the greatest permanent prosperity this Nation has ever known.

Some of the loud superpatriots who clamored for this war, but always at a safe distance, now feel insulted if you suggest that the man in the service should be given the same compensation as those who stayed at home. They feel hurt if you suggest that those who were discharged because they were 38 years old or over should receive the same mustering-out pay as those who were discharged for physical disability.

We fought and won this war for other nations. We went $300,000,000,000 in the red. That is more than all the other 49 nations associated with us went into debt. We kept them out of debt by lend-leasing them. We raised and spent more money than the whole outfit put together. Outside of Russia, we did more fighting than all the other nations combined.

We have done enough for other nations. We are not going to ask our servicemen alone to police Germany and Japan for them. We are not going to give Halifax another two or three billion. Let Britain pay back the five billion she still owes us from World War I. Let her pay back that part of lend-lease that she did not use for the war effort.

If we want a better world, let us stop promoting hatred. Let us reestablish the "four freedoms." Let us at least give the servicemen who won this war one freedom—the freedom of coming back to their homes, to their fathers, mothers, wives, and children—the freedom to live a civilian life.

It took us 3 years to get into this war. It took our armed forces 4 years to finish the job for other nations. The time has come for official Washington to proclaim to all the world that, under the United Nations Charter, there must be no fraud or deception. That there must be no grabbing of smaller nations' territories—no further robbery or murder on the part of any government or its army of other people's people.

It has been billions for destruction, billions for foreign nations, millions for cost-plus contractors and interest for bond buyers. But when it comes to appreciating the sacrifices our boys have made on foreign battlefields in order to save the honor and the glory of our Nation, then we hear talk about red-blooded Americanism and patriotism not being for sale. No; not for sale, but it can at least be appreciated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, persons enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Military or Naval Establishment shall be enlisted or reenlisted in such grades or ratings as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively.

SEC. 6. Every person discharged or released from the military or naval forces on or after June 1, 1945, who forthwith enlists or reenlists in the Regular Military or Naval Establishment (irrespective of the service from which discharged or released), and who is granted a reenlistment furlough or leave, shall be paid in advance, at the time such furlough or leave becomes effective, a furlough travel allowance at the rate of 5 cents a mile for the distance between his home or such other place as, subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Department concerned, he may select, and the place at which he is stationed when the furlough or leave becomes effective, and for the distance between his home, or other place so selected, and the place at which he is ordered to report for duty at the termination of the furlough or leave. If, in order to reach his home, or other place so selected, or to reach the place at which he is ordered to report for duty at the termination of the furlough or leave, sea travel is necessary, he shall be furnished for such sea travel transportation in kind and subsistence en route, and the distance thereof shall be excluded in computing the monetary allowance under the preceding sentence. No monetary allowance shall be paid under this section if travel allowance at least as great has been paid under section 126 of the National Defense Act upon the discharge or release immediately preceding the enlistment or reenlistment, and if travel allowance in a lesser amount has been so paid under section 126 of the National Defense Act, the monetary allowance provided for in this section shall be reduced by that so paid under such section 126. Any appropriated funds available to the Department of War or the Navy to defray the cost of travel of military or naval personnel shall be available to defray expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of this section.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: On page 5, line 12, after the period insert the following: "*Provided*, That such person may at his option elect to take his furlough at the end of the period for which he reenlisted, and in such event he shall receive at the time of such election the furlough travel allowance authorized by this section."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was drawn before the Kilday amendment was agreed to authorizing 1 year enlistments and since the adoption of that amendment I think my amendment becomes doubly important.

May I say, first, that under present regulations when a soldier enlists he is entitled to a 90-day furlough. The section we are now considering provides that he shall be given an allowance at the rate of 5 cents a mile for travel on his furlough, from his station to his home and return. Let us take the case of the boy in Germany or Japan. Under the present provisions of the bill, if he reenlists he may come home immediately for 90 days and his expenses—not across the ocean because that is done by the services—in the United States to his home and back to shipside are to be paid at the rate of 5 cents a mile.

My amendment provides that if the young man there on duty and in the service so elects he may say, "I will not go home now; I will take my 90-day furlough with pay at the end of my period of service. I will stay on duty if you will pay me the travel allowance."

I have great hope for this bill if it is made attractive enough. Fortunately my amendment will not cost one additional penny. It simply provides that instead of the boy taking his travel allowance and using it he may elect to stay on the job. He may say, "I will not take my furlough if you will pay me the travel allowance that you otherwise would have to pay."

I have talked with a number of members of the committee who have expressed their willingness to accept the amendment, although I have not had an opportunity to discuss it with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am just thinking out loud, but it seems to me that a man would get his travel allowance whenever he took his furlough anyway.

Mr. PACE. I think not. After his period of enlistment has expired the Army or Navy has to return him home.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. He is still entitled to a 90-day furlough during enlistment. He may not get it at the start, but if and when he does get the furlough he is paid the 5 cents a mile. Why pay him that amount at the start?

Mr. PACE. The purpose of my amendment is to make reenlistment more attractive. Here is the way it would work: A boy is in Japan. We will say he reenlists for a year or 2 years. He is entitled to come home for 90 days but he says, "I will not do that. I will let my furlough ride and just take the travel allowance at this time." You give him a check for the travel allowance in exactly the amount you would have to advance him to go home and back for the 90-day furlough. It does not cost the services or the Government an additional penny, but does offer an attractive inducement to him to reenlist when he is offered his furlough travel allowance if he waives his furlough.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Where is the rate to start on the mileage—over at Weisbaden, Germany?

Mr. PACE. The bill expressly provides that if there is any sea travel he shall not be paid for that. That is furnished by the services. His travel allowance would start at New York, if he lands in New York. If he lives in my State, for example, his travel allowance would start at New York to his home in my State, then back to New York again.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The evil effect of the gentleman's amendment, as I see it, is the fact that it leaves to the soldier the time of granting the furlough instead of leaving that to the services. In other words, he can say when he will take a furlough under the gentleman's amendment; is that not right?

Mr. PACE. It is to the interest of the services under the purposes and spirit of this bill for him to continue in the service and not take the 90-day furlough. The only choice the soldier would have is whether or not he will take his furlough at the start or at the end of his enlistment period. Under the bill as now drawn, he must take it before his reenlistment begins, while I am convinced the military authorities would prefer that his service be continuous and his furlough delayed until his period of service has expired. This is merely an inducement to persuade him to do that.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. In other words, the gentleman is proposing to pay for travel that is not travelled.

Mr. PACE. If he so elects not to travel but to stay on the job. The cost to the Government is exactly the same in both cases.

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. PACE. What is the harm in that?

Mr. MAY. The harm is that you are paying the man for something that he does not do.

Mr. PACE. But it does not cost the Government one penny more.

Mr. MAY. It costs the amount of money that his mileage costs.

Mr. PACE. He is entitled to a 90-day furlough and he is entitled to travel allowance, and this simply pays it to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If the bill goes through as it now stands, the man in foreign service, or wherever he is, will get two things: His furlough and his travel pay.

Mr. PACE. That is right; travel allowance.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. He can take his furlough now and in that way disrupt the service.

Mr. PACE. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Or he can defer it, as the gentleman says.

Mr. PACE. Until he gets home.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But if he accepts the furlough, which he can do, he will get the travel allowance.

Mr. PACE. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman's proposal is that he get that travel allowance now just as he would anyhow, and then that would give the Army this advantage when right at this particular time you need the men to stay.

Mr. PACE. That is exactly right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And it would permit him to stay now.

Mr. PACE. One of the arguments against the Kilday amendment was that it would mean that the man would have a 90-day furlough and then go back and serve 1 year. Under this amendment he would waive his furlough until the end of his period.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. In other words, in lieu of his coming home and causing the expense to the Government, he pockets the expense but remains in uninterrupted service.

Mr. PACE. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. And is in place and we do not have to send some one else to take his place while he is on furlough.

Mr. PACE. That is exactly right.

Mr. DINGELL. I think this is a good amendment.

Mr. PACE. It helps the service. It gives him continuous service and it does not cost the Government one penny more.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. And by waiving his furlough he will have an opportunity to get out 90 days sooner.

Mr. PACE. By waiving his furlough he gets out sooner. You pay him his mustering-out pay when he reenlists. When he gets back home he may not have a dime, but he would still be on a pay basis for 90 days during the furlough period. It would at least give him a little money to live on during the time he is looking for a job, because his mustering-out pay may have already been expended.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I think it is a very good amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I agree with the gentleman that we should do everything we possibly can to make it more attractive so that these soldiers will reenlist.

Mr. PACE. That is the sole purpose of my amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. But I just cannot see how this can be worked out for the simple reason that the soldier is to get this travel pay before he does any traveling, and no one knows ahead of time where he is going to travel to or from, or if they know one end they do not know both ends. The soldier might move around during his period of enlistment.

Mr. PACE. I do not find any difficulty there. If the boy is in Japan or in Germany and he reenlists, he would certainly know where he was going home on his furlough, and the bill now expressly provides that this is all subject to regulations of the War and Navy Departments.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. But suppose he is in the United States.

Mr. PACE. If he is in the United States, then he goes to his home and is paid to where he is going to be ordered to report at the end of his furlough. That is also controlled by regulations.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Suppose his station moves two or three times in that 1-year enlistment?

Mr. PACE. It is a fact that when his furlough begins he will carry with him orders to report back on a certain date to a certain station. That thus determines what his travel allowance is. There is no difficulty there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia it seems upon its face to be rather attractive, but there is this vital difference. The gentleman argues that it will be an inducement to a fellow who is overseas and enlists there to not go home for 90 days on a furlough because he was paid mileage for not going. There is a vital item there that the House Committee on Military Affairs discarded. The question arose in the committee as to whether he ought to have mileage or mileage and expenses. Expenses would include his food and other legitimate expenses while he was home. We figured that his mother would be happy enough to see him come home on a furlough that she would feed him. But now, if he stays and does not go home, and is induced to stay by drawing 5 cents a mile for the travel he does not take, it costs the Government just the same plus his keep for the 90 days or the 3 months, and that difference will probably mean $50 a month for his keep while he is in the service.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. But during that 90 days he is over in Japan or in China and in service, so he is worthy of his keep.

Mr. MAY. If he stays over there in service, if he is an overseas soldier, all right, but if he is in the United States where he is not serving except in the routine duties of a peacetime Army, then he ought not to have both mileage and food and other expenses.

Mr. DINGELL. He very likely will take the furlough and not the mileage if he is in the United States. This will be particularly attractive where the mileage is longest, if it is from Japan, Okinawa, and way points.

Mr. MAY. He is not paid for overseas mileage, of course, if he is overseas.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. What is the allowance now per man for feeding that soldier?

Mr. MAY. That is not disclosed in the record.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. It used to be 28 cents a day. I wonder how much it is now.

Mr. MAY. It is not 28 cents a day; it is about $1.25 a day.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I am referring to the allowance to the mess of each company for each soldier in that company.

Mr. MAY. They are giving rations now, but it changes from time to time according to the standard of living and the cost of living.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I respectfully suggest that possibly the chairman is confused about the 3 months. If the man enlisted for a year, he would have 3 months' furlough and a year's service. Under my amendment he would have a year's service and then his furlough if he so elects. The Army would still have to feed him a year in either event, not a day longer than a year. It would just be a question of whether or not at the end of his 90 days' furlough they would begin feeding him for a year or whether they would feed him for the year and then let him go home.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman's amendment would make the soldier serve 15 months instead of 12 months.

Mr. PACE. No; it would not. The amendment states that he may, instead of taking his 90-day furlough upon enlistment, wait and take it after the service of the period for which he is reenlisted.

Mr. MAY. Under the Kilday amendment that does not count in his service if he has had 6 months' training. The gentleman is talking about the man that is overseas now.

Mr. PACE. The Kilday amendment is for 1 year and the furlough period. That is exactly what my amendment is for. They are identical. I think if the gentleman will study the Kilday amendment he will find that my amendment is really needed to keep the boy in service from coming home right at the time he is needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 40, noes 41.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) The first sentence of section 2 (b) of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 is amended to read as follows: "Each person eligible to receive mustering-out payment under subsection (a) (1) shall receive one-third of the stipulated amount at the time of final discharge or ultimate relief from active service or, at the option of the person so eligible, at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in the Regular Military or Naval Establishment; and the remaining amount of such payment shall be paid in two equal installments—1 month and 2 months, respectively, from the date of the original payment."

(b) Section 3 of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or, at the option of such member, for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in the Regular Military or Naval Establishment".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable, in the case of the Naval Establishment, with respect to enlistments, reenlistments, and appointments on or after February 1, 1945, and in the case of the Military Establishment, with respect to enlistments, reenlistments, and appointments on or after June 1, 1945.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 5, strike out lines 13 to 24, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 2 (b) of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Each person eligible to receive mustering-out payment under subsection (a) (1) shall receive one-third of the stipulated amount at the time of final discharge or ultimate relief from active service or, at the option of the person so eligible, at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in the Regular Military or Naval Establishment; and the remaining amount of such payment shall be paid in two equal installments—1 month and 2 months, respectively, from the date of the original payment. Each person eligible to receive mustering-out payment under subsection (a) (2) shall receive one-half of the stipulated amount at the time of final discharge or ultimate relief from active service or, at the option of the person so eligible, at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in the Regular Military or Naval Establishment; and the remaining amount of such payment shall be paid 1 month from the date of the original payment. Each person eligible to receive mustering-out payment under subsection (a) (3) shall receive the stipulated amount

at the time of such discharge or relief from active service or, at the option of the person so eligible, at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in the Regular Military or Naval Establishment.' "

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, under the bill as drawn section 7 covered only the $300 mustering-out payment as provided for in the Mustering-Out Payment Act. It overlooked entirely the payments of $200 and $100. This amendment takes care of that situation and provides for the payment of all of them. That is the only purpose of the amendment.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE to the May amendment: At the end of the May amendment before the quotation marks, insert a new sentence as follows:

"A person entitled to receive the first installment of the mustering-out payment at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in the Regular Military or Naval Establishment, shall, at his election, receive the whole of such payment in one lump sum, rather than in installments."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment that will not cost one penny, but which I think will add a slight inducement for reenlistment. Under the amendment which the gentleman from Kentucky has offered, he still preserves the installment payments for mustering-out pay, both for those who are discharged finally and for those who reenlist. My amendment provides that if a boy reenlists, instead of getting his mustering-out pay in three installments, by the month, he may, if he elects, draw it all in one lump sum. I think it will make the bill more attractive in this respect. The young man may want to get married. He may have some other plans during the 90-day furlough period. It will save bookkeeping. Instead of making three monthly installment payments, he simply receives upon his discharge, when he signs up for reenlistment, his mustering-out pay in full. Of course, if he has only $100 coming he gets that in one payment anyway. But if he has $200 mustering-out pay or $300 mustering-out pay, he may receive it all in one lump sum at the time he signs up for reenlistment, to have available for his expenses or other purposes during the furlough period. I understand the amendment is entirely acceptable to the committee.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief explanation as to the action of the committee on the matter involved in the preparation and enactment of the Mustering-Out Pay Act. It was the argument in the committee at that time that we should put these payments on a deferred status of so much when they are discharged, so much in 30 days, and so much in 60 days, because we felt it was to the interest of the soldier himself; that he would, under some influences, spend or waste his money. We thought we would let him have an opportunity to settle down. As far as the amendment is concerned, I am not opposing it. I simply wanted to state my position and the position of the committee in writing the act.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Suppose he does waste it and squander it. It is his. He has earned it. Why not give it to him? I am in favor of giving it to him.

Mr. PACE. I see nothing to be gained by keeping it 30 or 60 or 90 days. It is his money. He is entitled to it under the law. When he agrees to reenlist, let him have it. As I said before, I have great hopes in this bill, and I believe if we can make it more attractive without additional expense, we should do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that if he gets $300 all at one time he is more likely to save part of it than if he gets a hundred dollars at three different times?

Mr. PACE. That is human nature. Yes. Of course this amendment is not so vitally important, but I feel it is just one more little thing, with no costs, to make reenlistments more attractive. Our obligation to the men now in the service is such that we should bring them home as quickly as possible. Those needed for important military service cannot return until they are relieved by other troops. If we can send volunteers in sufficient numbers then it will not be necessary to extend the Selective Service Act when it expires next May. In fact if a sufficient number volunteers under this bill the President may be able to suspend inductions before next May. I hope so, but of course inductions cannot be entirely suspended until this volunteer plan is tried and has produced sufficient volunteers to meet our essential military requirements.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the May amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON to the amendment offered by Mr. MAY, as amended: On page 5, line 13, after the words "section 7 of the May amendment", insert the following:

"(a) Section 1 (b) of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out paragraph (3) and by redesignating the succeeding paragraphs as paragraphs (3) to (7), respectively.

"(b) A person entitled to mustering-out pay must by reason of the enactment of this act who shall have been discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces under honorable conditions prior to the date of enactment of this act shall be paid such mustering-out payment if application therefor is made within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Payment by the Navy Department or the War Department shall be made within 1 month after the approval of such application."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the one to which I referred in the course of my remarks in general debate on this bill. Six different Members of Congress have introduced bills to accomplish the very purpose outlined in this measure. This particular amendment is based upon one which was drawn by our colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

The purpose of the amendment is to permit those men who served in the United States Army honorably and were discharged presumably to obtain jobs or to return to farm work to receive the mustering-out pay to which they are entitled, and of which they are deprived by the existing mustering-out pay bill, paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of section 1.

The situation at the present time is this: Many men were in the Army but got out because their officers went to them and told them they were needed at home in different industries. I have here an affidavit from one young man from Springfield, Mass., who, after serving from September 30, 1942, was honorably discharged on January 22, 1945, 2 years and 4 months later. He was called into the office of his commanding officer and told they wished to transfer him to the Enlisted Reserve since he had been in the heavy-tire industry. He was shown an order with a list of names, including his. He refused to be transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps. His commanding officer told him he would have to go. He was sent to Atlanta Ga., where he was interviewed by an industrial-relations man of the Firestone Rubber Co. This man told the industrial relations person that he did not wish to make any application for a discharge from the Army. He was sent to Akron, Ohio, over his protest where he worked just 1 week and then requested that he go back in the service. He then went back to Fort Devens, Mass. You cannot by any stretch of the imagination say that this man was trying to get out of the Army—and all this is in affidavit form. When he gets back there they reject him and discharge him from the service, but they give him $100 mustering-out pay. He has been in 2 years and 4 months. He was entitled to $200 on his prior service if he was entitled to anything and they endorse on the face of his discharge:

"Soldier entitled to mustering-out pay of $200. First installment of $100 settled on final statement. Mail check for further installment" to his home

That young man was sent back home and he is disgruntled. He has had 2 years and 4 months' service. There are from four to six hundred thousand of these men who have been discharged, many of them to go to jobs which were found for them by the United States Army or the United States Government or by third persons.

This is recognized by Secretary of War Stimson who said in regard to these six bills:

For the foregoing reasons the War Department recommends the enactment of legislation designed to accomplish the purpose of these bills.

Secretary Stimson recognizes that the Army was doing this by saying:

It is considered that a consent to release from active service to accept employment in essential war industry when a request is initiated by a third person precludes the receipt of mustering-out payment.

In other words the Fisk Rubber Co., or the United States Rubber Co., or the Akron Rubber Co., or anybody can call up the Army and say they need some men, to send them some—and that is what they did. These fellows were taken out of the Army and now they are without any mustering-out pay. It certainly is not fair to them, and Secretary of War Stimson says that in his opinion this legislation should be passed. I believe that this constitutes a big reservoir. I thought there were only about 400,000, but our chairman has stated this afternoon in conversation that there are about 600,000 of them.

This is a matter that has been looked into carefully by Members of Congress and six or more bills have been introduced on the subject. It has been covered by Secretary Stimson and is something that ought to be passed. My amendment should be agreed to now in view of what happened to the young man from Springfield, Mass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] insist on his point of order?

Mr. MAY. No. I withdraw it. But I want to be heard on the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, several months ago I introduced a bill covering the subject matter of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, which bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Up to this time I have heard nothing from it. The gentleman from Massachusetts introduced an identical bill and has described the situation quite thoroughly and accurately.

This is a very important matter because so many men are affected, and in fairness to these 600,000 men who have been affected as explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts, this amendment should be agreed to. It is a good amendment and in all fairness to the men in the service it should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I would like to ask either the gentleman from New York or the proponent of the pending amendment a question. Supposing a soldier in the service heard of a job in the rubber industry and he went to his superior officer and stated: "I am going to make application for a discharge." Under the policy of the War Department at that time it would give him a discharge. Now, would that person get this $200 mustering-out pay when he voluntarily asks to get out of the service?

Mr. CLASON. Yes. As Secretary Stimson said, there is no equitable reason why a soldier getting out of the service and accepting such employment should not receive this mustering-out pay. I think we ought to follow the Secretary's recommendation. These 600,000 men have not received fair treatment.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, last spring I introduced a bill after conversation with the War Department, following its recommendation, the wording of which would correct the injustices of the Mustering-Out Pay Act as it was passed. I understand from the gentleman from Massachusetts that the wording of his amendment is substantially, if not entirely, in agreement with the report to the Military Affairs Committee by Secretary of War Stimson recommending favorable action in this direction. But that report has only been before the Military Affairs a reasonably short time and so far the Military Affairs Committee has not had occasion to act on the recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendment on two grounds. First, there is an identical bill, which means exactly the same as this amendment, pending in the Committee on Military Affairs of the House and on which the War Department has only recently made a report. I have not had time since I was called here by the President on the 27th day of August to give consideration to the matter. I discussed it with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], author of the bill. I regret this method of coming to the floor of the House to deal with legislation pending in a committee, which is in the nature of going around the committee, by a member of that committee. I doubt the propriety of it coming from a high ranking member of the committee himself. I think that the committee ought to have an opportunity to take up the report of the Secretary of War, hear testimony and study the matter and bring back to the House whatever recommendation they have to make, if any.

In the second place it is an effort to pay mustering-out pay to a lot of men who secured good jobs. I think the evidence showed, when we considered the Mustering-Out Pay Act, that there were about 630,000 of them. These were the men who asked to be discharged on their own account from the Army of the United States for the purpose of accepting these fat war jobs. They did accept them. Some earned as high as $300 a month. If you adopt this amendment they can come back into the Army on this attractive program that is provided in this bill after the shooting is all over, and after they have had an opportunity to earn big money while the other boys were bleeding and dying and fighting.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. May I ask the gentleman in what way this amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts would stimulate volunteers in our Army?

Mr. MAY. I do not know, other than I believe it allows them mustering-out pay of $100 if they are in the minimum time.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Is it not true that this amendment has to do only with mustering-out pay and has nothing to do with volunteering?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I have the same feeling as the gentleman for those who took those jobs, but I want to say to the gentleman that I have a man in my district who was 44 years of age when the Army put out the rule to get rid of these older men, and only after the third time he had been ordered to apply for his discharge, and was told he had to, did he take it. He is eliminated. He was a good soldier. He had been promoted to a noncommissioned officer rank. At the same time he was discharged another sergeant and the first sergeant of his outfit were discharged because they were in this over-age bracket. I think we do an injustice to those men.

Mr. MAY. Those men probably will not be acceptable to the Army as a peacetime army to begin with. The vital thing involved here is that they are waiting until the shooting is over to get back in.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY.]

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY.]

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 6, line 6, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(c) Any person barred from receiving mustering-out pay by reason of section 1, subsection (b) (3) of such act, shall be eligible to and shall be paid mustering-out pay under such act upon his or her enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in the Regular Military or Naval Establishment after June 1, 1945, and shall receive the stipulated amount at the time of final discharge or ultimate relief from active service."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been drafted to meet objections such as that brought forward by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS]. In other words, assuming that there are 400,000 to 635,000 persons in this pool, as mentioned by the chairman of the committee, this would give them an inducement to enlist at this time. Many of them have had 2 and 3 years of

service. Many of them are young men between the ages of 20 and 30 who believe they have been unfairly treated. I feel that if they do now come forward and reenlist, having served before anywhere from 2 to 3 years, they are entitled to get the mustering-out pay just as much as the man who has been in only 6 months at the present time, and asks a discharge in order to reenlist in the Regular Army. These men have to enlist in the Regular Army. In many cases they have given far more service than we are asking of the persons to whom we are awarding this mustering-out pay under the present bill.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. As I understand, the gentleman's present amendment applies only to those men who come under the same classification as the gentleman's other amendment had to do with, but who now volunteer.

Mr. CLASON. They actually enlist.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Yes, that is right; they actually enlist just the same as the men who actually enlist under the rest of the bill.

Mr. CLASON. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I think that is a good amendment.

Mr. CLASON. I believe it is fair. It certainly is not anywhere near as broad as that suggested by Secretary of War Stimson. It seems to me that if any man has served in the armed forces and is willing to go back in now and serve again, in many cases even after he has been ordered out of the service by his commanding officer, as in the case of the man from Springfield to whom I referred, he is entitled to the money, and I hope that the committee so feels.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to only one thing in reference to this amendment. This amendment means the same thing the other one meant in one particular, that the men who got out in order to take industrial jobs and stayed out until now or even hereafter—of course they could not enlist under this bill until it becomes law, which may be several months yet—come back in and get the same rate that the men got who were in the fighting Army. There are two armies, the Regular Army and the Army of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLASON) there were—ayes 33, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most pressing questions before the country and the Congress is the release or discharge of men in the service and their return home to civilian life. The pending bill is meritorious and should be approved. It does not, however, meet the pressing problem of a hasty return of the men in service to their homes and their families. This bill, when enacted into law, should furnish sufficient men in our armed services to provide troops for our forces of occupation. It should eliminate the need for the continuance of the draft. It should permit an early release of men and women who have served within the confines of the United States and are desirous of returning to school, their homes, their families, or their occupation.

Every Member of Congress is familiar with men who are being retained in the service regardless of points, family ties, age or hardship cases. In order to get immediate action in these cases permit me to suggest that the War and Navy Departments work out a policy of extended furloughs for these cases. It would greatly relieve a serious situation.

Let us insist that the military authorities take immediate action for the release of our men as rapidly as possible.

There are hardship cases that should have immediate attention. For instance, the following extracts are from a letter I received from a wife and mother in my district:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing this to you to see if you can please do something about getting my husband released from the Army for I need him at home very bad. I am a mother with five children and their ages range from 6 to 13. We live on a small farm about 3½ miles from town. I have been trying to keep up the farm while my husband has been in the Army. You see I am in very poor health. Also, this fall I had to dig 27 bushels of potatoes just with a potato fork. After that I got very sick. And now I have sweetpotatoes to dig. We have plants that need to be mulched before the winter freeze. You see with all this extra work and beside my own house duties and getting up and taking care of children at night, it is making me very sick. And the other reason we need him home so bad is that we have no way of getting back and forth from town in bad weather, and I have no way of getting the children back and forth to school, as I do not drive a car.

I am also including extracts from a letter received from an overseas veteran.

Well, so time drags on, and we sweat out coming home, knowing if we do that it would probably be the Pacific for us. Incidentally, there's a helluva lot of men who are getting —— bitter over the treatment the people back home are letting the Army give the GI who is over 30 years of age and has dependents. We pick up the paper and see pictures of men being released from induction centers without ever serving in the Army, because they are over 26 years old. * * * It's darn hard to understand why some men are expected to give up home, family, and life work, while others never feel the effects, and knowing —— well after this has been done that only a few people care whether we ever get back. In the Yank magazine there's an article of a man who was inducted at the same time that I was, 37 years old, 8 children, and has been dead since last January. Yep, all that was left when he came into the Army was the infantry which meant he had about a 10-percent chance of getting home alive. And similar cases are still in the Army. Men like myself, pre-Pearl Harbor fathers—have the least chance of getting out, for the 12 points we get for a child really just make up for the extra year or so we got while Congress was making up its mind whether or not to draft us. They finally decided they needed us for the emergency—now the emergency is over, and we're stuck in the Army because we haven't been in long enough to get the required number of points. Enough of that, but mark my words, there's going to be trouble if this Army doesn't begin to release a lot of men—you know, of course, if this draft is discontinued, my chances of getting out soon are nil.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me since the military authorities have announced the size of the occupation forces we need, under this recruiting bill, which should provide us with a large enough peacetime Army to carry out our commitments and obligations for national and international security, every effort should be made by the military to speed the demobilization of our armed forces.

We all know what a great debt of gratitude we owe to the military leadership for its wonderful conduct and the overwhelming victory it achieved in winning the wars in Europe and the Pacific. The equal response from the men who patriotically stepped into their military tasks assured this triumph. Now these same men are anxious to get back home, if it is practical and sensible to our national security and the preservation of the international peace. The military leaders have said that they need only 700,000 men for the occupation forces. General Eisenhower has asked for 500,000 in Europe and General MacArthur has said that 200,000 can do the job in Japan. With General MacArthur's reduction in his estimated force from 900,000 to 200,000, it means that on the basis of our military leaders' plans our peacetime Army will consist of less than 2,000,000 men. This figure, of course, is exclusive of the Navy's plans. So far, these Army leaders have not explained satisfactorily the need for nearly a million men on our home soil. Can it be to meet the administration's problem of assisting in solving the unemployment question by further regimentation of our young men, similar to the old New Deal Civilian Conservation Corps? Why the delay in returning the servicemen to their sorely needed civilian duties? School started throughout the Nation this month with a great shortage of teachers. Surely there are thousands in the service who could be released to start training and educating our children for peace and their important duty of maintaining our international security. In many instances, farm crops will not be harvested this year because of the lack of sufficient farm labor. In many places we are still using war-prisoner labor.

I wish to ask our military leaders on the basis of the demands from the public why cannot the farmers who are idling around the camps in this country be released to help with this important job? More food means greater supplies for the hungry of the world. Those that are fed in Europe will not be eager for the radical doctrines that breed on hungry stomachs and bitter minds. Why cannot the military let the miners, who are needed for mining coal to erase the predicted shortage at home and abroad, be sent back digging coal? Secretary of the Interior Ickes has seen fit to frighten the American people with a national magazine article, sounding off on the terrible consequences in Europe if we do not provide them with fuel. What

has been done by this same administration agency to expedite the mining of coal and the filling of the empty bins of this Nation, let alone those of the world? The only answer has been the administration's usual policy of adding on more control over our civilian life, and cutting our supplies instead of developing a program that will mean more coal, food, and supplies for everyone.

The quick response the American can make when they are able to use their energy and initiative is clearly manifested in the end of slaughtering controls. Reports have been made that our processed meat supply is now one-third greater than at any previous period. Is not that strong enough evidence to convince our leadership that many of our ills and mythical fears can be dispelled by providing the proper manpower and freedom to do the job.

The Army has bragged about the splendid job of redeployment it has done since the end of the war. The military authorities announced that nearly 1,000,000 men have been brought back and discharged from service since VE-day. That is a wonderful record—particularly when looked at under this light. The war in Europe ended nearly 4 months ago. Three months of that time the troops were being redeployed, not primarily for discharge but for their brief furlough in the States, before being sent on to continue the victorious march against the Japs. Why is it not reasonable to presume, then, that this effort can be doubled or tripled now that there is no occasion to worry or face the complex problem of shipping the men back to the United States on the basis of their ability, training, and experience in the European battles? The objective should be to get those with the heaviest service records home first, and the others as quickly as possible, who want to come back. Surely 1,000,000 out of the 5,500,000 General Eisenhower had over there is a good-sized step along that road.

If the Army was able to return one million in 4 months under wartime conditions, the next four millions could be shipped home as fast, if not faster. At that rate, the four millions could be sent home in less than a year. With all of the added shipping facilities and air transportation which is available since the end of the war, this time should be cut immeasurably shorter. Part of the load could be carried by our British allies who certainly want to speed up their recovery and economic health. The goods they could return in their ships after delivering a shipload of GI's to our home shores would alleviate their shortage of supplies. This same plan could be applied to our other allies. The Department of Agriculture has forecast certain food surpluses that we have on hand. Why not divert them to the highly essential task of feeding the mouths of the war refugees?

The military also has not explained its reasons for clamping down on our servicemen and denying them the right to write their Congressmen. I have received letters protesting this un-American attitude, sent to me by the surreptitious means of having a serviceman inform his parents, and ask that they contact me to see that his views are presented fairly and honestly. This is a sad commentary on our military authorities in times of peace when military security is not involved. It can only add to the suspicion and distrust of our military leadership. Certainly we are, the men in service are, and their families are entitled to know how soon the boys can be sent home.

Many of the servicemen are getting the jitters over their inactivity in camps. They are drumming up all kinds of fears either real or imaginary concerning their chances for a job and the future of their families while they are helplessly confined to military rules and regulations. I should like to ask our military leaders to make an earnest effort to determine the response they could get for future enlistments placed on a voluntary basis. Particularly, if this recruiting program was properly presented and with attractive and worth while considerations like sufficient compensation, choice of theaters of occupation, limited tenure and the other security inducements which are offered to civilians. I firmly believe that an adequate response would be immediately forthcoming and that sufficient personnel would be obtained to fulfill all of our commitments now and in the future to assure the peace and meet our international obligations.

Obviously the married men in service would, to a high percentage, drop out. There are younger men who would like to remain in, if they realized that their period of service would not be spread over too many years, and the younger volunteers would step into their shoes. I would like to invite our military leaders to conduct a poll of the camps on this question. The Army has set its figure on the number of men it wants; now let's find out how many men it can get from the volunteers.

Or can it be that the Army's demobilization plan and desire for the continuation of the draft dovetails with the administration's idea of effecting a stalemate which will mean that we shall have to continue to follow the pattern of regimentation under compulsory military training?

There are many experienced technical and professional men in service with families who left highly specialized jobs through the draft. They feel that they have done their part in winning the war and would like to get back to civilian life. Under the Army's discharge point system, because many of these men are in limited service, they will have to remain in the Army for years to qualify for release, even if a drastic reduction was made in the point discharge system.

Considering the men receiving their discharges, I also wish to call their and their parents, or relatives, attention to one very important fact. When the serviceman is obtaining his separation, in his haste to get home he must not overlook the importance of obtaining a final physical check-up. While it does not seem so necessary to the man leaving the Army for home, many years from now if he finds it necessary to ask his Government for a pension because of a physical disability which was caused by his war service, the substantiating evidence of the record of his final physical check-up will be of the utmost importance. It is of especial interest to all men leaving the service to remember this fact.

If we are to stop the bugaboo of unemployment which certain elements insist is just around the corner, this Nation is going to have to get on the job and produce. There are great stores of wealth bulging in our banks and under the family mattresses. All were accumulated during the war years. This money is ready to be turned into buying channels, if the goods are available. The long unfilled demand for goods is within the grasp of everyone, if we go about the business of producing the goods. It is our greatest means of controlling inflation, but it cannot be accomplished if we start trying to set up a 30-hour week for our workers and keep some of our potential working strength bottled up in camps and foreign cantonments. The farmers have demonstrated their capacity to produce under wartime handicaps and controls. Industry has done the same. Think what they can do under peacetime conditions. Our national expenditures for civilian goods have never been greater than $100,000,000,000 a year until the war. If we can turn our energies and resources into fulfilling the demands of our countrymen for bathtubs, houses, new cars, and radios we can help lick the inflation and unemployment problem. Besides we all know of the great rehabilitation problem of the rest of the world which was greatly destroyed by war. This Nation was the only one—with inestimable latent production powers—not bombed out and destroyed by shells and military combat. We have an unpredictable amount of goods to produce to help rebuild these countries. It will take labor, ingenuity, and materials to do the job. It cannot be done if this Nation works at it half-time and half-heartedly. It is a big challenge to the American people. As big as defeating the foes of liberty—the Nazis and the Japanese. Because it represents doing a job to create a better standard of living for our own people, raising the hopes and living of the war-torn and oppressed peoples, and holding out more freedom and security to everyone.

It can all start with an ambitious and enlightened plan of getting all of the men, except those essential to our national and international security, out of the army and on the job. The fire of enthusiasm and desire of keeping the world headed toward greater self-betterment—with the United States in its new role—will stimulate many young men to enlist in our peacetime Army, I believe. They realize our new responsibility, the same as the rest of us are keenly aware of the job ahead to keep our peace and freedom, we have so dearly won. It is the most that we can all do for those who so gallantly gave their lives in this war.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill (H. R. 3951) to aid the volunteer recruiting program of the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, is in keeping with the wishes of the people.

The people insist that their sons, brothers, and husbands be returned home and the men in service who have won the wars and made so many sacrifices are anxious to be released from service so they may return to civilian life. By offering the opportunity for a volunteer army the men now in the armed forces can be more readily released.

The provisions of this bill with its compensation and other incentives should make voluntary enlistments attractive and provide a sufficient number of men for occupational forces. It should then not be necessary to maintain the draft and the boys in the teen ages will be permitted to continue their education in the traditional American manner.

The establishment of a standing volunteer army will enable those in the armed forces whose occupations and educations have been interrupted by their service to return and resume their pre-induction status.

As previously stated, this is in accordance with the wishes of the people and I am glad to give my support to this legislation.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. Section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting before the last paragraph thereof a new paragraph reading as follows:

"The amount of the enlistment allowance payable to persons enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Military Establishment on or after June 1, 1945, or in the Regular Naval Establishment on or after February 1, 1945, shall be based upon the highest enlisted grade held at the time of discharge or release from their last period of active Federal military or naval service, without regard to the permanent or temporary character of such grade. For the purpose of determining the eligibility of any person enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Military Establishment on or after June 1, 1945, or in the Regular Naval Establishment on or after February 1, 1945, to receive the enlistment allowance, and in computing the amount thereof, all continuous active Federal service in the Army of the United States, or any component thereof (if enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Military Establishment), or in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or any reserve component thereof (if enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Naval Establishment), whether in enlisted grades or in commissioned, commissioned warrant, or warrant officer grades, shall, if honorably performed subsequent to the payment of the last previous enlistment allowance, be credited as a period of active enlisted service. In determining whether active Federal service is continuous, any interruptions, of not more than 90 days each, between periods of such service shall be disregarded. Every person entitled to receive an enlistment allowance based wholly or in part upon commissioned, commissioned warrant, or warrant officer service shall receive such allowance in an amount computed at the rate prescribed for enlisted men of the first three grades."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPARKMAN, of Alabama:

On page 6, line 18, strike out beginning with the word "based" down to the period in line 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Computed at the rate prescribed for enlisted men of the first three grades."

And on page 7, line 15, strike out beginning with the word "every" down to the period in line 19.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and I have no objection to it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. SPARKMAN: Page 6, line 22, before the period insert ", except that in the case of persons enlisted or reenlisted on or after June 1, 1945, and prior to the expiration of 1 year from the date of the enactment of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, the rate of the enlistment allowance shall be $100 for all grades in lieu of the $25 and $50 rates provided for in the preceding paragraph."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], is simply to give these men a $100 bonus instead of a $50 bonus for reenlistment. Ninety-five percent of the men we want make a bid to retain in the Army are men who constitute the civilian army and plan on returning to their homes. Most of those men have served only a year or perhaps 2 years. The inducement of giving those men $50 for each year they have served during their current enlistment as a bonus to reenlist is not sufficient. In the case of a man who has served only 1 year especially is it not sufficient to justify him to reenlist, and a great many of these men fall in this category. The proposition presented to these men to reenlist is a business proposition. It is not predicated on high patriotic grounds, such as we had during the fighting in the war. It is purely a business proposition with them.

We ask them to enlist in the Army during this critical time when we need an army of occupation. We are anxious to build up our Army so that we can release millions of men and let them go home if they want to. We are anxious to build it up by voluntary enlistments.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentleman's amendment provide that a man who is now serving in the Army, upon reenlistment will draw $100 as a bonus for reenlistment?

Mr. BROOKS. One hundred dollars for each year of the prior enlistment during his current enlistment period.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Suppose he has had 5 years' service in this war in the Army of the United States, how much would he get for reenlisting for 1 year?

Mr. BROOKS. The most I figure he would have in the way of prior service, if he was a Regular Army man and had enlisted in 1939 and served 3 years of his enlistment, that would bring us up to 1942. Then he finished up the war as a hold-over. He would have 5 years, or a bonus of $500 for reenlistment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. For 1 year?

Mr. BROOKS. For 1 year. I am glad my colleague asked that question. If such a man with $5 years' war service reenlists, although he reenlists for 1 year he is likely to stay in the Army. With this great exodus of men from the Army, it is that type of men we want to save—the type who will probably make a career of it. When it comes to reenlistment after the 1-year period, he will go back on the regular bonus that we pay normally for reenlistment for a period of 1 year.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. A man who has had 3 years' enlistment up to 1939 and then has served during the war, will get $100 a year for enlistment for 1 year, plus a 90-day furlough, plus 5-percent travel expense, plus $300 discharge pay. That is $800 for enlisting for 1 year.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me answer the gentleman from Indiana. Yes. That is substantially correct, but this bill gives to this man that we want to enlist voluntarily in the Army, very little additional to what he would have if he accepted immediate discharge. You say you retire them in 20 years under this bill. What interest has a boy who is serving only 1 year in the Army in retirement 19 years from now? You say, "We will give them the benefit of the GI bill of rights." He would have that benefit if he came out. You say, "We will give him $300 mustering-out pay." He will have that benefit if he comes out, regardless. He even has travel pay to his home. He has those benefits, regardless of whether he stays in or comes out. What I want to do in this amendment is to show these men some incentive for staying in, when they otherwise would leave and draw high wages and get fine jobs in civilian life. I want to give them a real incentive to stay in the Army, so that we can release the men who want to come home.

I submit that a boy who has gone in under the draft, has served a year or a year and a half, as the bill presently provides, is not going to be moved by this pittance of $25. To give him $50, as the Sparkman amendment would provide, is still not a sufficient inducement to get that boy to volunteer for even one single year. Certainly a bonus of $100 is as little as we can offer that boy as a business proposition, to get him to reenlist at a time like this.

The War Department says that the terms of the present bill will only bring 300,000 men into the Army. That is the estimate of the Department. We need more than a million men. We must have a greater inducement. We must have a better and stronger bill. We must "sweeten it up" if we are going to get the men we need. If you want a real strong bill to get these men in, you must give them some incentive, something in

addition to what they have if they accepted a present discharge.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. As I understand, under the amendment that has already been offered they will receive $50, and your amendment simply increases it to $100?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] makes reference to the cost. My amendment would temporarily double the cost of the bonus to the Army and it would only last for 1 year. The Sparkman amendment will mean a permanent increase, and over 5 or 10 years may cost the War Department a great deal more money than my amendment would cost.

My amendment gives the increase of pay when we want it to serve as an incentive, at the very time when we are asking them to reenlist so as to permit us to let these boys come home. I submit if you want men to reenlist in the Army you have got to give them a financial inducement to do it, and this comes closer than anything that has yet been tendered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have not had the opportunity of reading the substitute amendment offered, but from what I have heard I think I understand it except as to one thing and that is the time limitation.

The amendment I offer simply does this, and I should like to explain it to you. Take the law as it stands now and as it is carried forward in this bill, reenlistment bonus is to be calculated at the rate of $50 a year for the top three grades, that is, master sergeant, first sergeant, and technical sergeant; and $25 a year for each grade below that, that is $50 a year or $25 a year for each year of active duty since the last enlistment. In this bill we are making that applicable to these boys who have been serving in the Army of the United States.

My thought in making the $50 uniform for all grades was as I explained during general debate on the bill, that we are not going to have any difficulty in getting master sergeants, first sergeants, and technical sergeants; the boys we are going to have difficulty in getting in sufficient numbers are going to be those fellows without any stripes and those fellows with one stripe or two stripes, the fellows in the lower grades; and it is for that reason I offered my amendment to make the payment uniform for all grades $50 a year. As I said a moment ago, this applies to these boys who are serving in the Army of the United States. Take the case of the longest service that would be possible to be rewarded under this plan, that of a man who was serving in the Regular Army at the time of Pearl Harbor and whose enlistment expired that day or the next; that would give him 3 years' service up to that time and 4 years since. That would be 7 years. Under my amendment the most he could get—and that is just about an outside case—would be $350. Under the Brooks amendment he would get $700 and would get it whether he reenlisted for 1, 2, or 3 years.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In addition to that, he would get his $300 separation pay.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly; he is going to get that anyway.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And he could reenlist under the option granted so far for 1 year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He may; that is true.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. So one fellow might get $1,050 to enlist for 1 year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is possible.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Under the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; under my proposal he might get $350 for prior service plus $300 separation pay.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. But under the Brooks proposal he would get $750 plus $300.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My proposal does not change the basic law except to lift the lower grades; in other words, I am making them uniform with the higher grades.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I might say to the gentleman that I agree with him.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I understand; I wanted to make that clear.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am just as anxious as anybody in this House to make these inducements such as to get men into the Army. I agree with the gentleman's amendment except that it strikes me that we have made a mistake in allowing 1-year enlistments with large bonuses.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That has been done, of course; and remember this, that bonuses are calculated on the basis of service prior to that time and not on the length of service that the man enlists for subsequently.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does not the gentleman believe it is good business to be conservative in the matter of inducements now? Because Congress can always raise them but cannot lower them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think perhaps we are going to have more trouble in providing what we might call our transition Army than we shall in establishing and maintaining our permanent Army. I think when the time comes for us to decide what is to be our permanent Regular Establishment we must come in and have a complete overhaul. We are not trying today to enact permanent legislation that is going to last down through the years; we are trying to take care of the transition period; trying to decide the kind of inducement we ought to offer so far as the reenlistment bonus is concerned.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment just presented, and also in support of the amendment offered just previous to that if the last amendment does not prevail. Both amendments seek to give a bonus for reenlistments, the latter being greater than the former. I prefer the latter amendment, for it gives far more inducement to those wishing to reenlist and will come nearer getting the voluntary enlistment which we need and must have to meet a present critical situation.

Mr. Chairman, we might as well face the fact that we must get some men in the Army. We must do this in order to expedite the early discharge of men and women brought in through selective service.

The drafting of the 18-year-old boys should be discontinued. Congress was urged by our highest military authorities to permit drafting of 18-year-old boys to save our Nation in its greatest peril. Now that the great peril is over I hope that the Selective Service System will not continue to draft them. I understand the matter is before the Military Affairs Committee.

Of course, the bill now before us is intended to help expedite the recruitment of new men so that the problem of demobilization can be solved more easily. In order to do that we should make this bill attractive for reenlistment. We must acknowledge that.

The Kilday amendment did just that and the Pace amendment would have done more of it. The Sparkman amendment will do some of it and the Brooks amendment will do still more. If we will adopt these amendments we will probably get the men, and I hope we will get them within a reasonable time. We must face the fact, however, that we are passing this legislation at a time when men are war weary. They want to get out, they are tired of war, they are tired of the service and they want to go back home. Of course, many men will no doubt elect to remain in the service. The more attractive this bill is made the more men will enlist or reenlist. Our great objective right now is to get enough men to voluntarily enlist so that we may be able to release those who are hard pressed in the service now so they may go to their homes if they wish, and most of them wish to get out. Certainly the bonus as proposed in the two pending amendments will go far to stimulate reenlistment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say that under the amendment which I have offered the only ones drawing any larger amount will be those few who constituted the core of the Army prior to this emergency. Ninety-five or ninety-eight percent of them will be in that category and we are looking to them and want to induce them to enlist voluntarily. They will receive relatively small amounts and if we are going to get them in we will have to pay them more in the way of an inducement and bonus.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman. On the question of the cost of this bill to promote voluntary enlistment and reenlistment I wish to say that, in my opinion, it is much cheaper to give them a bonus and the other features of

this bill than it is to take 18-year-old boys out of their homes, away from school, and send them to Japan and Germany to police those countries. In view of the statements of General Eisenhower and General MacArthur, it is not going to require anything like as large armies to police Germany and Japan as had formerly been supposed. I want them policed for many years to come, as long as may be necessary, and I am glad to note that General MacArthur in his statement yesterday expressed the opinion that he could send the draftees home in around 6 months. Let us pass this bill to stimulate voluntary enlistment and reenlistment so that we can make it possible to do all that General MacArthur has suggested, and more, if possible. Let us do all possible to bring the men and women back home and get them restored to normal civilian life just as speedily as we can.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Brooks substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the Sparkman amendment. I am against the Brooks substitute. I have heard it said around here a time or two that the public debt of the United States is somewhere between two hundred and seventy-five and three hundred billion dollars in money, but I have not seen a mathematician who has figured out exactly what it means.

It is awfully easy to be liberal, especially when you are handing out somebody else's money. May I suggest to my Louisiana friends, both of whom are personal friends, and I am very fond of both of them—one is a member of my committee—that this matter of demobilization is like running into a nest of live hornets. If you run into the north side you are stung; if you run into the south side you are stung; if you run into the east or west side you are also stung. So we better get down to business here and find out whether we are going to completely wreck the Treasury and whether we are going to discriminate unusually in favor of peacetime soldiers as compared with wartime soldiers.

The Sparkman amendment appealed to me for this reason: You have heard of the name of a trooper in the armed forces called a buck private.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not believe the gentleman would want it to appear that I am trying to wreck the Treasury of the United States. I offered simply to double the bonus that you have already agreed to and which has been very modest in the past.

Mr. MAY. I do not think we have to wreck the Treasury of the United States. Perhaps it is already done. I am sure my genial colleague and friend does not desire to wreck the Treasury. But I am trying to admonish my colleague that when you multiply $100,000,000 by 2 you get exactly $200,000,000. The point I am trying to make is that these low-grade soldiers, these buck privates, under the Sparkman amendment, are raised to the equality on the bonus question with the first sergeant and the staff sergeant and the first three grades as provided for in the bill.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the chairman has given any thought to making this increased bonus applicable only to those who enlist for 2 or 3 years to encourage them to enlist for at least 2 years. Anybody who knows anything about the military organization knows that if you have 100,000 enlisted men it will take at least 60 to 90 days to get them organized, to ship them abroad, considering the time for transporting them back and forth. You would not have an army of occupation for 3 or 4 months at the most. We want men to serve in this army of occupation as professional soldiers.

Mr. MAY. We have to consider the amendment before the House now as it is offered with the substitute, and for that reason I am not in a position to modify it as suggested by the gentleman from Indiana, although I agree that we ought to hesitate in these things and think for a while before we vote.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It looks to me as if the gentleman has not had any experience with these matters. It looks like perhaps it is good the way you have it, and then if it is not enough, you can add to it later. Can that not be done?

Mr. MAY. Of course, we can raise it any time Congress desires. I think that the bill as written by the committee is a good measure and it ought not to be amended by these proposals without consideration ever having been given to them by the committee that wrote the bill to which they are proposed as amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana because I strongly feel we should do everything that we can here in Congress to create a volunteer army so that the men in the armed forces who were drafted and enlisted during the wartime can be discharged. It appears as though we have gotten into a sort of dilemma with reference to demoblization. It is said that if we stop the draft, then the men in the service cannot get out, and consequently the draft continues and still the men stay in the service, and most of them have little or nothing to do. The gentleman from Kentucky has mentioned that this amendment may break the United States Treasury. If we continue to keep as many men in the service who are unoccupied and not being discharged, we will be spending possibly $100,000,000 a day, and if we can create this volunteer army and make special inducements, it occurs to me that we will be saving billions of dollars and we will get the boys back home much quicker to their families and to their civilian occupations. All of us are having tremendous pressure brought to bear from the men in the service, and from their families, to get them out of the Army and Navy. I believe that this bill, as amended by the Brooks amendment will go far in getting them out much more rapidly than at the present time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. My amendment will actually save the Treasury money in the long run.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am satisfied that it will.

Mr. BROOKS. The other is a permanent proposition. My amendment would be for only 1 year, when we must have these men for the Army.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If we get the men into the volunteer forces within the next 60 days it means that the men who are now in the service and who want to get out will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the war is over. The war emergency should be declared to have come to an end, and the men in the armed forces should be discharged at the speediest possible rate, taking into consideration combat service and dependency obligation. It does not help the morale of the men or their respect for their Government to be compelled to remain in the Army or Navy when they have nothing to do. These men and women who have done their job to win the war should now be discharged without any stalling on the part of the authorities, and permitted to return to loved ones and to be given a break to become reestablished in civilian life. They are entitled to such consideration at the hands of their Government.

I am convinced that a volunteer army and navy can be raised for the permanent defense establishment, which can be used as the occupation force, provided we make volunteer service attractive enough. This bill is a step in the right direction. The objective will succeed unless the Army authorities discourage volunteer enlistment. I know that many of our military leaders prefer a drafted army.

I have said that the war emergency should now be terminated. The President has the authority to issue such a proclamation, and if he does not do so within a reasonable time, I will urge that Congress pass a resolution terminating the emergency. It is about time for Congress, as representatives of the people, to take the leadership for action to determine the future policy for our country, and particularly the welfare of millions of American men and women who have achieved such a brilliant victory in all parts of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]

to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. (a) Section 108 (b) of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents authorized by section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, shall not be payable for any period, with respect to which family allowances to dependents of enlisted men of the first, second, or third grades are being paid. An enlisted man of the first, second, or third grade may at his option receive either the monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents or have his dependents become entitled to receive family allowance, except that payment of the monetary allowance shall be made only for such periods, from the effective date of this act, as the enlisted man has in effect an allotment of pay, in an amount not less than the amount of such monetary allowance, for the support of the dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed. No dependents of any enlisted man shall be entitled to family allowance for any period for which such monetary allowance is paid to the enlisted man. The Secretary of the department concerned is authorized to exercise the option on behalf of the enlisted man in any case in which he deems it desirable and finds it impracticable for the enlisted man to exercise his option, subject to termination at a later date upon specific request of the enlisted man. Whenever any option under this subsection is exercised, payments pursuant thereto shall begin at a date to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Department concerned. The monthly pay of any enlisted man of the first, second, or third grade who is provided with public quarters for his dependents and any of whose dependents is receiving a family allowance shall be reduced by, or charged with, 90 cents per day."

(b) The exercise of an option under the amendment made by this section to receive the family allowance shall in no event have the effect of entitling the enlisted man to continue to have such family allowance beyond the expiration date of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942.

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the cost of inducing men to reenlist under the provisions of this bill. To me the cost is inconsequential compared with the total cost of the war. There are other factors which are much more important and one which I believe will be a greater inducement to reenlistment than anything else, is that we should permit our servicemen who desire to reenlist to select the theater of occupation in which they desire to serve.

I am satisfied that many of those who have gone through the tortures of hell in the Pacific are so sick and tired of that area that no amount of money would induce them to reenlist even for a year in the occupation forces, yet they might be willing because of the educational value to serve a year in the European theater. And what goes for the boys in the Pacific would likewise be true of those who served in the European theater. I sincerely hope that when this bill goes to conference as I am sure it will, that serious consideration will be given to this matter.

I believe that the best interests of our country will be served by having our occupation forces, to a degree at least, contented with their assignment. We may have our ambassadors and consulates in foreign countries but the people of the occupied countries will obtain their lasting impression of this great country of ours by the attitude displayed by our occupation forces toward their own Government. It is my opinion that we cannot convince the people of these countries that we have a great democracy which our people love and cherish if the representatives of our Government whom they contact are discouraged and dejected because of the treatment they receive at the hands of this great democracy

The major objective of this bill is to get all of our people in the service home just as rapidly as possible without the necessity of inducting any more teenage boys. This can only be accomplished by making the enlistment plan as attractive and pleasant as possible. The other results will be a much better opinion of the United States by the people of occupied countries and last, but not least, is to have our boys in the right frame of mind when they do return home by having kept faith with them in the former promises made to them.

It is significant that in its Orientation Fact Sheet No. 37, issued by the War Department on September 16, 1944, a significant promise was made to the Army's personnel. This pledge was made without qualification at a time during which America was still fully engaged in war with both Germany and Japan. Stated verbatim, this assurance reads:

No soldier who is not needed will be retained, except those who desire to remain in service and can be used.

If the Army felt justified in making such a pledge to its personnel while still employed in an all-out effort to achieve victory, victory which was calculated by some in authority to be as far away at that time as 2 years, then it is committed by every code of honesty to make that promise good, now that the victory has been won. Furthermore, any attempt to vacillate or to equivocate in the bringing about of the earliest possible fulfillment of that pledge can only cause the Army to stand convicted of sincerity. It is inconceivable that it would be found guilty of this sort of deception. The War Department must certainly realize that to persist in any such perverse and unwarranted action will have a disastrous effect upon public opinion. Even now the open charge is being made that it is deliberately maintaining a size far beyond requirements justified by need in order to perpetuate the positions of its officers of higher rank. This is not an indictment to inspire public confidence. But it, and any other of similar inference, can be readily proved false if the Army will institute immediate action which will lend conviction to its promise that "no soldier who is not needed will be retained."

An arbitrary statement of need, unsubstantiated by actual facts, will never suffice. The elements involved are accompanied by consequences too grave to permit public contentment with declarations unsupported by logic. Statements of so much importance must be the result of care and reason, stripped of all ambiguity and irrelevance.

The most important factor to be considered in reducing the current size of our Army to an absolute minimum must be based upon the determination of what the strength of our occupational forces shall be. Bring the size of our overseas armies to the lowest level necessary for security and, naturally, the reduction in domestic military strength will follow proportionately. Or, stated differently, as many soldiers can be discharged with safety as will not be needed to constitute and to maintain our occupational forces. This reasoning brings us right back to the Army's own discharge pledge.

Our armies of occupation should and can be reduced. We did not fight this war alone. We had gallant and courageous allies. And these allies, whose homelands were ruthlessly devastated by the enemy, are the most logical countries to take over these duties of occupation. America, without in any way jeopardizing our security and interests, could readily assume a role of continued and interested cooperation under such a policy. General Eisenhower and General MacArthur could still effectively retain their present positions as our supervising representatives with their administrative, advisory, and technical staffs, along with what rank and file personnel that would be necessary for their maintenance.

The drastic curtailment of our present policing duties, and the transferral of these routine details to our allies, would allow the Army to reduce its size far beyond any computations it has yet made public, and would eliminate any needless excuse as to why it could not make good, in fullest measure, on its discharge promise.

What really sane objection can there be to allowing the Chinese to carry out the occupation of Japan? Along with the assistance of the Australians, if necessary, who could be expected to render a more efficient job than these people who for many a long, bitter year bore the full brunt alone of Japanese conquest and brutality? Who can understand the peculiar psychology of the beaten enemy far better than could ever be expected of us? Are the British, French, and Russians, fortified as they are with the evidence of ruin and destruction wrought upon their countries, less apt to keep Germany under control than we would be? Which will cost the taxpayers of this country more in the final analysis, to help underwrite the material maintenance of our allies' armies of occupation or to tie up a huge pool of our own manpower in a large peacetime Army, costly, maintained thousands of miles from home with an expenditure of materials which should be channeled into the manufacture of sorely needed domestic goods? The pursuit of the first of these courses will materially alleviate the unemployment problem of our allies

in their provision of military manpower in place of our own. And then there is still another important consideration in accepting the choice of occupational policy. It will prove to be a cheaper and far more expedient procedure to get these men of our allies' armies home on the frequent leaves which, for the good of their morale, should be granted occupational forces than it will be to ship our men back and forth across the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans.

To request our allies, far more conveniently situated from a geographical standpoint than we are, to take over the policing job does not imply by any means that we are attempting to shirk a solemn responsibility. The proposal is based upon the soundest kind of reasoning. Our allies are already knocking at our door, pleading for financial support with which to set in motion their economic reconversion programs. We certainly do not wish to deny them this support, insofar as it is compatible with our own economic security. We did not fight the most terrible war in our history to emerge victorious therefrom in a world beset with economic chaos and all its frightful potentialities. Certainly we want to help them. But the degree and haste in which we shall be able to render that urgent aid is directly contingent upon our ability first to provide ourselves with a full-blown program of security. The sooner we can accomplish this, the better it will be for our allies who are so urgently seeking and who are entitled to our assistance. But to establish and place in successful operation such a program demands as a very first requisite that every possible man and woman now in uniform make the earliest transition into a civilian income earner in order that our own national economy can be brought to the highest possible level. The significance of this irrefutable fact will not be lost upon our allies when the proposal is advanced that they and not ourselves shall undertake the provision of occupational forces, while we throw the full weight of our vast resources in manpower and wealth behind an all-out world economic progression. It will not take much argument to make them realize that it would be only under these conditions that we could either afford or guarantee the very assistance they so urgently ask.

In the same Orientation Fact Sheet No. 37, the War Department states that actual surveys taken at that time revealed that 3 percent of the Army's personnel had expressed a desire to remain in uniform, and that this desire, even then seemed to be increasing. If this was true under war conditions, it is logical to assume that the tempo of the desire has increased since peace. Bearing this very pertinent point in mind, if we adopt the sensible policy of turning the policing of enemy territory over to our allies who have suffered so tragically and whose willingness to take over the job has already been indicated, then the last vestige of necessity for keeping the present millions of our men under arms will have vanished. The way will be left absolutely clear for the Army to live up to its pledge.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I would be lacking in duty to my district if I did not take the floor during this debate to say that I think the boys ought to get home just as quickly as possible. The dairy farmers of upstate New York are in a critical condition. In spite of the fact that the war is over and that some people are coming out of the armed forces, there is just as much of a problem in getting help on the farm and particularly on the dairy farms of my district as there ever has been since the war began. If you doubt the veracity of that statement, I invite your attention to the figures which have been compiled by authorities in upstate New York who know what they are talking about, and the testimony which I have received in the form of letters from individual farmers in my district, who state that the situation is even more critical now that the war is over and peace has come than it ever has been.

I also call your attention to this fact. The triple-cities area, Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott, which I have had the privilege of representing in Congress for the past 4 terms, is in a critical conditions as far as fuel and the necessary amount of coal for furnaces are concerned. We are near enough to the coal fields of Scranton, Wilkes-Barre and other points of Pennsylvania to realize that a serious shortage of men to mine coal exists. I have received information from the public officials of the cities I represent that unless some coal miners are available to mine coal in Scranton and the surrounding territory, the upstate cities of New York State will suffer from cold this winter. I think it is time we take action to get these boys out of the Army so they can go back into the coal mines and on the dairy farms and into the various lines of endeavor in which we need them so badly.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman expect the soldiers to come back now after they have been fighting the war and join the unions and do the mining when the miners go on strike and will not mine coal? How do you expect the soldiers to take their places?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am not getting into that subject, but I am telling you this. A lot of boys in the armed forces are needed on the farms, in the mines, and all over the country. There is a dearth of men in all sections of the country and in all fields of endeavor.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Why does the gentleman think the administration did not deal with absenteeism in these coal mines this summer? If the administration would have taken that labor situation over the way they should have, we would have coal, would we not?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. According to opinion in my district, there is a labor shortage in the mines as on the farms because so many were taken in the draft. Now the war is over, I think we should consider bringing them back.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman not figure that the administration is having plenty of trouble today? They expect to come out at 4 o'clock this afternoon with an announcement to the newspapers. They have been waiting all day until 4 o'clock before they are going to say how they are going to reorganize the Labor Department and get men back to work. It is about time they did something.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is high time we did something in order to get these fellows back on the dairy farms and everywhere else they are needed.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Did I understand the gentleman to say he wanted to get the boys home?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is perfectly correct, and in view of the statement which General MacArthur made I think we can all go along with such a position.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see this bill passed, but I question whether the bill is going to be quite as good as it ought to be in order to get all the men that are necessary to enlist voluntarily. I realize you cannot do the impossible, but we have got into a discussion here this afternoon which is just about as important as it can be in trying to get these men who have been drafted back home and who want to get out of the Army. If the Members of Congress would read the letters that I receive from a lot of my constituents in and out of the Army they would realize the importance of the situation. These constituents in the Army, say they have not been able to do anything for a month, ever since VJ-day. They just sit around, nothing to do, its nerve racking. They want to get out and go home to their families. There are men back home who have sons in the Army and need them to help them in their business and on the farms. That will create jobs for others as well as the soldiers. That is the most important thing we have to do in this country today. It will save the Government money to get them off the pay roll. We have to get jobs for the people who want to work, but we also have the condition today where a great many people do not want to work. They want to strike, they want unemployment compensation, if it continues I fear the results of what is going to happen and unless the President and the Secretary of Labor get busy this afternoon and try to remedy the condition under which these strikes are caused. It is a serious condition we are facing in America when some men want to work, and others keep them from it. I have talked to a lot of them who say they do not want to strike, but because of certain conditions and a lot of people in labor unions demanding that they strike, these

strikes occur. That is causing a great deal of trouble and furor in America when the Nation so badly needs all the industries to create jobs and when the businessmen of this country are trying their best to keep their plants going. Conditions are such that certain labor leaders refuse to let their men work and when that is the situation, you are in a pretty bad state. Many of the radicals in labor want to break up private industry and they are using this means to throw our Government into communism. They want the Government to take over all industry. This situation has been created by the New Deal. Now President Truman, it is in your lap and I am sorry for you but you must handle it; it is a hot potato but it is in your lap. What will you and the Secretary of Labor do? Your action will guide the destiny of private enterprise; it will determine the future freedom of American business, agriculture, and liberty of our people. Let us retain the capitalistic system; it is the one thing that made America great.

I know that all men in industry, who promised the soldiers when they were drafted that they would have their jobs back, want to give them back their jobs and they are holding the jobs open for them. Yet there are men who are striking and wanting to go to another industry and get a job where they do not have to strike and where they are not compelled to be thrown out of work. If this is not a serious condition I do not know. Why should we wait until 4 o'clock this afternoon to have an announcement made when it could have been made at 6 o'clock this morning, if they knew what they were going to do? They announced in the papers last night that there would be announcement made today at 4 o'clock. Why wait all day? Put men to work at once. That is what private industry wants to do.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Do you not think it will be better now since Harry Bridges has received his naturalization papers?

Mr. RICH. Well, it is a good thing for Harry but it may be a bad thing for America. If he is as radical now as he was before, God save America from such people as Harry Bridges. But, even though we took him in, we expect something of Harry Bridges from now on and I hope I will never have to mention his name again on this floor as being a radical, because he should have learned his lesson, he should try to be a good industrious American citizen. The people of this country do not want Communists or radical people in the Nation—the kind of people who created the turmoil and strife that Harry Bridges created on the west coast several years ago. It does not make any difference who they are. I think the time has come for all good thinking men to try to settle their differences across the conference table, and arbitrate whatever questions there are between them. Let us get back to work in industry and let us get the men out of the Army and do it quick. No fooling.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 9, beginning in line 6, strike out "the expiration date of" and insert "the period during which family allowance payments are authorized to be made under."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a brief explanation of this amendment. Under this particular section as contained in the bill, an enlisted man may, at his option, receive the monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for dependents, as set forth in the Pay and Allotment Act, which authorizes, as you know, $30 for the first child and $20 for each subsequent child. We give him that option. But the committee wanted it specifically known that we were not offering that inducement for any period beyond the existence of the Pay and Allowances Act; that is, the Dependency Allowance Act. This amendment merely provides that these family allowances shall be for the period during which the family allowance payments are authorized to be made under that act.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have expressed myself on the pending measure. I wanted to speak to the House briefly as to how this whole problem looks to me. I hope and I believe I am going to express the sentiments of more persons than myself.

I think obviously in this bill we are doing the first and most necessary and most logical and most fundamental thing that needs to be done in the present situation. This is the right approach to the raising of men for the army of occupation. In my judgment, it is also the right approach to the future raising of a standing army for the United States.

It is perfectly true, as the gentleman from Missouri said in his speech the other day, that it is impossible for anybody—Congress, the Army, the Navy, or anyone else—to handle this problem without working some injustice or without a good many people thinking that they have not been altogether fairly dealt with. It is also true as was said by another Member yesterday that it ill behooved us so soon after the war to bitterly criticize the people who have led our armed forces during the war. But it also seems to me that we have a certain basic duty to the rank and file of the men who fought this war that we should fulfill in the name of democracy. I believe that there has been enough evidence of a reluctance on the part of the armed services to speed up the discharge of men they do not need to keep—enough of a reluctance to put forth every effort to hasten the discharge of every man who is not necessary—so that we would be justified in taking the position that it is the will of the Congress that the armed services shall hasten this process of discharge and demobilization to the very greatest possible extent. We have confidence that they will do so but if they do not, we realize that the ultimate responsibility rests here upon us, and Congress stands ready if necessary to pass such legislation as will secure the speediest demobilization consistent with proper military policy in the existing conditions. Mr. Chairman, I feel that is the way we ought to leave the thing.

I am sure every one of us will go to hear General Marshall speak to us on Thursday next. In the last analysis, however, as I say, the responsibility in this matter does rest with the Congress; and I believe I speak the will of Congress when I say that we are prepared to exercise it in such manner as we may be called upon to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto may close in 5 minutes.

That was agreed to.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration will probably help to encourage enlistments in the Regular Army. I do not think we are offering enough incentives to veterans to reenlist, but perhaps that opinion is wrong. Anyhow, one-half a loaf is better than none and with that in mind I feel this legislation should pass.

We have heard much about demobilization and our people back home all want their sons and daughters to return to them as soon as possible. We are told that shipping is the bottleneck. There are hundreds of thousands of men in the service today in the continental United States awaiting their turns in the separation and discharge centers. Shipping is not the bottleneck there.

Why cannot these men receive an indefinite furlough without pay and be allowed to go home and wait their turn instead of being forced to stay in an Army camp, impatiently waiting for the day they can go home and be with those dear to them.

I believe if there is one thing we should do, it is to see that these boys who have the necessary points for discharge and are other wise qualified to be sent home should be discharged as soon as possible. Every possible facility should be used to give to these men their final physical check-up and speed them on their way home. I repeat, let us give them furloughs while they are waiting to go through this very necessary final step toward discharge. We know from previous experience how important is this last detailed examination and completion of service records as far as the veteran is concerned.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is expressing sentiments in

line with my own thinking. Will he yield for a question?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, once district commander of the Legion, and a man for whose judgment the House has much respect.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman agree with me that we should do as we did after the last war, make every post, every Army installation a separation center?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], is one of the men in our section of the country best qualified to speak on that issue, and I agree with him entirely. Let us get this job done as soon as practical and consistent with the best interests of the men involved. I cannot see why we should force these boys to stay in camp any longer than necessary when they want to get home. They also want to be anywhere but in the camps while waiting their turn to be officially separated from the service. It will do more good to restore morale and keep morale up than any one thing that could possibly be done right at this time. Put yourselves in their shoes and we all would almost give our right arms to get back to the people and the homes we love.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. Any first-class letter mail matter admissible to the mails as ordinary mail matter which is sent by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States (including the United States Coast Guard), while on active duty or in the active military or naval service of the United States, to any person in the United States, including the Territories and possessions thereof, shall be transmitted in the mails free of postage, subject to such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe. This section shall cease to be in effect after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 11. (a) Part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a) (added thereto by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph reading as follows:

"12. For the purposes of this part, the present war shall not be considered as terminating, in the case of any individual, before the termination of such individual's first period of enlistment or reenlistment contracted within 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945."

(b) Section 50 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(d) For the purposes of this title, the present war shall not be considered as terminating, in the case of any individual, before the termination of such individual's first period of enlistment or reenlistment contracted within one year after the date of the enactment of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945."

(c) Section 700 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(c) For the purposes of this title, neither the present war nor hostilities therein shall be considered as terminating, in the case of any individual, before the termination of such individual's first period of enlistment or reenlistment contracted within 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945."

SEC. 12. Section 2 of the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out ": *Provided further*, That this section shall be effective from December 7, 1941, and shall cease to be in effect 12 months after the termination of the present war is proclaimed by the President."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 11, after line 3, insert a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. Wherever the terms 'Navy' or 'Naval Establishment' are used in this act the terms shall be deemed to include the Coast Guard, and wherever authority is given to the Secretary of the Navy similar authority shall be deemed given to the Secretary of the Treasury to be exercised with respect to the Coast Guard at such time or times as the Coast Guard shall be operating under the Treasury Department."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]. It merely brings the Coast Guard under the provisions of the bill. Since under the law they will be under the Treasury Department upon termination of the war, the purpose of this amendment is to include them and give them the benefits of this bill, to which I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to propound an inquiry of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs concerning the section just read, beginning line 16, page 10, and also line 7 of the same page reading as follows:

(c) For the purposes of this title, neither the present war nor hostilities therein shall be considered as terminating, in the case of any individual, before the termination of such individual's first period of enlistment or reenlistment contracted within 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945.

Does that mean for the man who is in the service, now that the war shall not be terminated, and consequently the 6-month-thereafter provision does not take effect unless he reenlists in the service, or what does it mean?

Mr. MAY. No; it does not mean that. The purpose of these several provisions here is to extend the statute to these people who would otherwise be prejudiced by the termination of the war and provides that they can have the benefit of the GI bill of rights.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wanted to make sure about that, because it has been said that it might affect the men presently in the service.

Mr. MAY. The right to an education under the GI bill of rights, as I understand, is terminated within 7 years after the war. This provides that the 7 years cannot begin to run until his discharge.

Mr. HINSHAW. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, for whatever it may be worth, I would like to comment, as an ex-serviceman myself, on the thought that if what you want to do is to have reenlistments and have men in the service who are really worth while in the Army, you must do something like they do in the Navy, and that is, give them an opportunity to learn something while they are in the service instead of merely being on a police detail some place. They must have an opportunity to learn trades and study, and so forth, and improve their condition while they are in the service. One of the reasons why the Navy has had very little trouble in obtaining sufficient recruits is because they offer something to them while they are in the Navy, and they can use that training when their service period is over with. I hope the Army will do the same thing when the time comes. That applies to foreign service as well. Give these men an opportunity to learn something for their benefit so that they will be in a position to do something after the war is over.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The War Department assured us that they are going to do just what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this measure is a necessary part of the over-all demobilization program because it provides for the stimulation and encouragement of voluntary enlistments. As General MacArthur states, occupational duties can be performed by Army and Navy volunteers. The number which he fixes at 200,000 in the Asiatic theater is far below previous estimates of those who seek to maintain large peacetime military establishments and will come as welcome news to the mothers and fathers of all our young men, particularly those of tender years who now comprise our armed forces. This announcement and the factual situation that lies behind it cleared the decks for the speeding up of the entire demobilization process.

Let me reiterate some observations that I have heretofore made in substance on the floor of this House and which are germane to the subject matter of this bill. Let me say to begin with, that I am vigorously disapproving of the policy pursued here by those in charge of this measure of not permitting it to be amended fully and freely. The public is hopefully looking to Congress to solve the great demobilization problems. In fact, the public expects Congress to resume its traditional constitutional functions with respect to all governmental matters. To block and obstruct those who sincerely desire to deal with the whole demobilization program at this time and lay down rules and policies by which it may be effectuated is, in my humble judgment, to run counter to the overwhelming public sentiment of this country and as a member of the House Military Affairs Committee, I want entirely to disassociate myself from any such an attitude. I say this with full respect to those on the committee who differ with me and who believe that they are sincerely striving for equitable results for our boys and their parents.

In my opinion the draft should be suspended at once. It was justified only in a national emergency. It is militaristic, undemocratic, and contrary to all our American traditions. Moreover it is not at all necessary to insure the return of our boys to their homes. We have over 11,000,000 in our armed services and out of these we certainly can select a sufficient number, on a voluntary basis preferably, to complete the work of demilitarizing our enemies.

The Army, yes all our armed forces, have done a magnificent job and I would be the first to compliment and thank them for their great and victorious efforts. There have been mistakes and blunders, to be sure, but these have merely served to accentuate the illustrious achievements of our armed services in the cause of our country and in the quest of freedom and peace.

I note many current observations concerning the benefits of Army life which emanate from those who urge peacetime military conscription, but I do not believe in compulsion and, therefore, do not believe that any young boy should be dragged away from his home and forced to serve in a military organization during peacetime contrary to his wishes and the plans of himself and family for his development, education, and career in life. I have seen many boys who have benefited from their Army training and I have seen others who have been irreparably damaged by it. In any event, believing as I do in the dignity and value of the individual, I could not subscribe to any system of coercion in peacetime that constitute so flagrant an interference with the lives, needs, and desires of millions of decent human beings, fathers, mothers, and families, as well as young sons.

We should have it clearly in mind that if we start bringing the boys back from the Pacific right this very moment, it will be a very long time, because of the transportation realities involving many ships and long distances, before all of them could come home.

Let me reiterate, as apparently General MacArthur's estimates prove, the draft is not at all necessary to make up the Army of Occupation or to return long-service men to their homes. The program I am striving for in Congress is—and I believe it has preponderant public support and to ignore it is to reject the popular will:

First. Immediate suspension of the draft so we may reappraise our full peacetime military needs.

Second. The abolition of the complex and confusing point systems which have worked and are presently working injustices and inequities upon many groups and classes including married men with children and 18-year-olds seeking a college education.

Third. The creation of an adequate voluntary Army and Navy to fulfill the needs of our occupation forces which this bill is designed to accelerate, and to provide for the national defense.

Fourth. The return as soon as practicable, and consistent with the national interest, of all the other boys in the armed services to their homes and families. Millions and millions can be discharged at once.

To revert for a moment to the draft, let me give the House a concrete example of how the present draft system works in peacetime. In my own district last week a young man, 23 years of age, twice previously rejected for physical reasons, with a wife and 2 children, one less than 5 days old, was ordered to report for induction in peacetime. Does any American think that that is the kind of a system that we want here in our democratic America? I believe that such a situation meets with the almost universal and bitter disapprobation of our people, and I demand as a Member of this House and a representative of my people that the system that perpetrates this kind of a situation which we have patiently endured during the national emergency now be suspended. If we must ultimately have the draft as a measure of national security, it certainly must be greatly restricted to prohibit the drafting of married men and 18-year-old boys.

There is no logical reason why Congress cannot give its earnest attention to these matters now and try to work out a just system for dealing with all of our demobilization problems. In a democracy arbitrary control over the individual such as the draft contemplates, and such as the continued military service of millions of our fellow citizens contemplates, is justified only by national emergency.

Now that the war is over, it becomes the sworn duty of Congress to reassert its prerogatives and enact laws to bring these boys back home. If we fail in that duty, we will receive, as we will deserve, speedy public repudiation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3951), to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to find passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 341, not voting 90, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—341

Allen, Ill.	Doyle	Kilday
Allen, La.	Drewry	Kinzer
Andersen, H. Carl	Durham	Kirwan
Anderson, Calif.	Dworshak	Knutson
Andresen, August H.	Earthman	Kopplemann
Andrews, Ala.	Eaton	Kunkel
Andrews, N. Y.	Eberharter	LaFollette
Angell	Ellis	Landis
Arends	Ellsworth	Lane
Arnold	Elston	Lanham
Auchincloss	Engle, Calif.	Larcade
Bailey	Ervin	LeCompte
Baldwin, Md.	Fallon	Lemke
Barden	Fellows	Lesinski
Barrett, Pa.	Fenton	Lewis
Barrett, Wyo.	Fernandez	Link
Bates, Mass.	Fisher	Luce
Beall	Flannagan	Ludlow
Beckworth	Flood	Lyle
Bell	Folger	McConnell
Bender	Forand	McCormack
Bennet, N. Y.	Fulton	McCowen
Bennett, Mo.	Gallagher	McDonough
Biemiller	Gamble	McGehee
Bishop	Gardner	McGlinchey
Blackney	Gary	McGregor
Bland	Gathings	McKenzie
Bloom	Gavin	McMillan, S. C.
Bonner	Gearhart	McMillen, Ill.
Boren	Geelan	Madden
Boykin	Gibson	Maloney
Bradley, Mich.	Gillette	Manasco
Bradley, Pa.	Gillie	Mansfield, Mont.
Brehm	Gordon	Mansfield, Tex.
Brooks	Gore	Martin, Iowa
Brown, Ga.	Gorski	Martin, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Gossett	Mason
Brumbaugh	Graham	May
Bryson	Granahan	Michener
Buffett	Granger	Miller, Calif.
Bulwinkle	Grant, Ala.	Miller, Nebr.
Bunker	Grant, Ind.	Mills
Burch	Green	Monroney
Burgin	Gregory	Morrison
Butler	Griffiths	Mott
Byrne, N. Y.	Gross	Murdock
Byrnes, Wis.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Murphy
Camp	Gwynne, Iowa	Murray, Wis.
Canfield	Hale	Neely
Cannon, Mo.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norton
Carlson	Halleck	O'Hara
Case, N. J.	Hancock	O'Konski
Celler	Harless, Ariz.	O'Neal
Chapman	Harness, Ind.	O'Toole
Chelf	Harris	Outland
Chenoweth	Hart	Pace
Church	Hartley	Patman
Clark	Havenner	Patrick
Clason	Hays	Patterson
Clements	Healy	Peterson, Fla.
Clevenger	Hedrick	Peterson, Ga.
Cochran	Henry	Philbin
Coffee	Heselton	Phillips
Cole, Kans.	Hess	Pickett
Cole, Mo.	Hill	Pittenger
Cole, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Ploeser
Combs	Hobbs	Poage
Cooper	Hoch	Price, Fla.
Courtney	Hoeven	Price, Ill.
Cox	Hoffman	Priest
Cravens	Holifield	Quinn, N. Y.
Crawford	Holmes, Wash.	Rains
Crosser	Horan	Ramey
Cunningham	Howell	Ramspeck
Curley	Hull	Rankin
Curtis	Izac	Rayfiel
D'Alesandro	Jackson	Reece, Tenn.
Daughton, Va.	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.
Davis	Jennings	Rees, Kans.
Dawson	Jensen	Resa
De Lacy	Johnson, Calif.	Rich
Delaney, James J.	Johnson, Ind.	Richards
Delaney, John J.	Johnson, Luther A.	Riley
D'Ewart	Johnson, Okla.	Rizley
Dingell	Judd	Robertson, Va.
Dirksen	Kean	Robinson, Utah
Dolliver	Kearney	Robsion, Ky.
Domengeaux	Kee	Rockwell
Dondero	Keefe	Rodgers, Pa.
Doughton, N. C.	Kefauver	Roe, Md.
Douglas, Calif.	Kelley, Pa.	Roe, N. Y.
Douglas, Ill.	Kelly, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
	Keogh	Rogers, Mass.
	Kilburn	Rogers, N. Y.
		Rooney

Rowan	Spence	Towe
Russell	Springer	Traynor
Ryter	Starkey	Trimble
Sabath	Stefan	Vinson
Sadowski	Stewart	Voorhis, Calif.
Sasscer	Stigler	Vorys, Ohio
Savage	Stockman	Vursell
Schwabe, Mo.	Sullivan	Wadsworth
Schwabe, Okla.	Sumner, Ill.	Weaver
Scrivner	Sumners, Tex.	Weichel
Shafer	Sundstrom	Welch
Sheppard	Taber	West
Short	Talbot	Whitten
Sikes	Talle	Whittington
Simpson, Pa.	Tarver	Wigglesworth
Smith, Maine	Thom	Wilson
Smith, Ohio	Thomas, N. J.	Winstead
Smith, Va.	Thomas, Tex.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Smith, Wis.	Thomason	Woodhouse
Sparkman	Tolan	Worley

NOT VOTING—90

Abernethy	Hare	Plumley
Adams	Hébert	Powell
Baldwin, N. Y.	Heffernan	Rabaut
Barry	Hendricks	Rabin
Bates, Ky.	Herter	Randolph
Bolton	Holmes, Mass.	Reed, Ill.
Buck	Hook	Rivers
Buckley	Hope	Robertson, N. Dak.
Campbell	Huber	Sharp
Cannon, Fla.	Jarman	Sheridan
Carnahan	Johnson, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Slaughter
Chiperfield	Jones	Snyder
Colmer	Jonkman	Somers, N. Y.
Cooley	Kerr	Stevenson
Corbett	King	Taylor
Dicksteín	Latham	Tibbott
Elliott	Lea	Torrens
Elsaesser	LeFevre	Walter
Engel, Mich.	Lynch	Wasielewski
Feighan	Mahon	Weiss
Fogarty	Marcantonio	White
Fuller	Merrow	Wickersham
Gerlach	Morgan	Winter
Gifford	Mundt	Wolcott
Gillespie	Murray, Tenn.	Wolverton, N. J.
Goodwin	Norrell	Wood
Hagen	O'Brien, Ill.	Woodruff, Mich.
Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodrum, Va.
Hand	Pfeifer	Zimmerman

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Adams.

Mr. King with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Tibbott.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Norrell with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.

Mr. Wood with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Rabin with Mr. Jones.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Jonkman.

Mr O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill (H. R. 3951) just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

CRIME AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 348, Rept. No. 957), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure." That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HEALTH PROGRAMS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 349, Rept. No. 958), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 350, Rept. No. 959), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2948) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COFFEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include excerpts from newspaper articles in each.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the president of A. and M. College in his State.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SITE FOR WORLD SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Charter, drawn up at the historic meeting in San Francisco this year, has been ratified and the World Security Council is now a going concern, a potent force in the affairs of this troubled globe. That great organization represents 50 countries making up what we call the United Nations, and will eventually comprise 70 nations. It is obvious to all that it must have a home, a permanent administrative center from which to conduct its international affairs. This center will be, in effect, the capital of the world, because what we are setting up is in reality a world government, or at least the initial steps toward a world government.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree that the seat of this world capital must be in the United States. This is a new country, and it is the most powerful, vigorous and forward looking of all the countries making up the United Nations. I submit that if we are going to have the world capital in this new and vigorous country, we should locate it in a new, vigorous and forward-looking part of the country, namely the Pacific coast, which looks youthfully toward the future. And if we are thinking of the Pacific coast, we must think of San Francisco Bay, which stands about midway of that great western coast line, a place so important in the present and future affairs of men that it was chosen as the site of the great conference which drew up the Charter. The choice was made on the basis of careful, objective thinking which led the world leaders to the conviction that San Francisco was what we call a natural.

The city of San Francisco sits majestically on its seven hills facing a bay 540 square miles in extent, dotted with islands. It is one of the distinctive, different, and still unstandardized cities of the world, and it made a tremendous impression on the delegates who attended the Conference. It would be wonderful

to establish the world capital right there. But you cannot do that. There is no room. San Francisco has only 43 square miles of territory, and it is all built up. The most ardent San Franciscans do not visualize the world capital in their own city, but they do picture it in the immediate vicinity, and I assure you there is a marvelous site so close that it might as well be inside the city limits.

I know something about this site because it is within the confines of Contra Costa County, on the east shore of the bay, which is one of the counties I have the honor to represent. This site is in what we call the Moraga Valley, an area of valleys and rolling hills, directly east of the bay of San Francisco, and only 10 or 12 miles inland, connected with the great metropolis by already developed fast highways and by the world-famous San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, the greatest structure of its kind on the planet, carrying six lanes of traffic and interurban trains.

The Moraga Valley is part of an old Mexican land grant given to Don Joaquin Moraga and Don Juan Bernal in 1841 by Governor Alvarado. It comprised over 13,000 acres, and for generations was used as grazing land for huge herds of cattle which formed the basis of the economy for these early Mexican settlers who found California, the paradise of the earth, before it was part of the United States. In recent generations the area was developed with orchards and for other agricultural purposes, and a sparse population found life good in that favored spot. A few years ago it became apparent that many persons would like to build suburban homes in that wonderful back country, and a modern low-level tunnel was constructed, linking it to the metropolitan centers of the bay with only a few minutes driving.

Before this movement could gain impetus it was stopped by the war, and so today the great Moraga Valley, one of the most delightful places in the whole world for abundant living, is still sparsely populated. One of the important things to remember is that about 3,500 acres are available under one ownership. This greatly simplifies the problem of acquiring the necessary land and is a condition which will not be found elsewhere in the San Francisco Bay region. Other large tracts under single ownerships are available. As many square miles as are needed would be available for the establishment of the world capital and the erection of all necessary structures without displacing any large present population or removing any major buildings. The entire surrounding countryside offers wonderful opportunity for the placing of public buildings, legations, or private residences needed in connection with this great administrative center. I feel safe in saying that there is no other place on the Pacific coast where this great venture could be so certain of success, no other place offering the ideal conditions for the establishment of a new and planned city to serve these particular needs.

For my part, I should like to see the component parts of this new city scattered far and wide over that fascinating countryside. I should like to know that our foreign residents at the world capital could enjoy living, for example, on the slopes of the great mountain which we have in that vicinity—Mount Diablo. While this peak is a little less than 4,000 feet in elevation, and is therefore not high as we rate our western mountains, it so happens that it rises abruptly from flat land with no other mountains nearby; and, therefore, it gives the observer one of the world's most sweeping views. On clear days one can catch glimpses of 35 out of California's 58 counties. This is roughly 40,000 square miles, or about the same area as the seven New England States. Mount Whitney is visible 400 miles to the south, and Mount Shasta 250 miles to the north, as well as the great Sierra Range to the eastward. The upper part of the mountain is a State park, but the lower slopes would be open to any kind of development, and it is difficult to imagine a grander place for anyone to live. If the administrative center or world capital were established in the Moraga Valley, it would be possible to drive to any of these residential sites in from 12 to 15 minutes.

The general appearance of this Moraga Valley area is most appealing. There are no high elevations and there is nothing rugged about it. It is a gently rolling landscape at sea level, and where it is not under cultivation with pear orchards and the like, it is covered with oak, manzanita and many kinds of shrubs which prosper in our wonderful California sunshine.

The sunshine is something worth thinking about. You may know that while California is known as the land of sunshine and flowers, the climate varies tremendously between one section and another. There is a very interesting climatic situation in the region of the bay of San Francisco. The Moraga Valley has a different climate from the city of San Francisco, though it is only a few miles away. It is warmer because the range of hills, 1,000 feet high, seem to cut the winds and fog from the ocean. As soon as one passes through the low-level tunnel which cuts through these hills one finds sunshine, an absence of wind and fog, and conditions which can best be described as air conditioned. In the winter also the climate is mild and there are no extremes. It never snows in this favored region. The rainfall is approximately 20 inches a year. It falls between November and April. There is never any rain during the summer months. Many varieties of evergreen plants flourish the year round.

We can almost say that all problems of transportation in connection with this site are already solved. A four-lane highway, a low-level tunnel cutting through the hills, and a giant bridge spanning the bay, bring the proposed world capital site in Moraga Valley within 30 minutes of San Francisco by automobile. From San Francisco ships radiate to all ports of the globe. Travel to distant places in our postwar era will be by air, and here again the Moraga Valley is advantageously placed. There is already a partially developed airport—Buchanan Field—property of Contra Costa County, which would be available to the world capital. It seems likely that this great administrative center would want its own airport in the immediate vicinity of the new city that would be built around it, and for this there is ample opportunity. There are numerous ideal pieces of land which will provide runways capable of handling the largest ships of the present and the future. Flying and landing conditions are excellent. There are no high winds in this region, and as I said before it enjoys a much greater number of fog-free days than the cities facing directly on the bay.

For esthetic reasons if for no other the site of the world capital should be somewhat removed from any zone of manufacturing operations. Contra Costa County is a large industrial county, but the industries are along the bay shore many miles to the north and west, and the Moraga Valley is pleasantly isolated from them. Industries in California use oil and natural gas as fuel, and not coal as in other sections, and there is no pall of smoke and no soot or dirt emanating from their operations.

Central California produces an immense amount of foodstuffs and other supplies necessary for the maintenance of a much greater population than we now find in the area. Inland from this Moraga Valley site is what we call the Great Valley, which means the twin valleys of Sacramento and San Joaquin, constituting one of the greatest of all agricultural empires. The Sacramento River flows south, the San Joaquin flows north, and they meet at the town of Antioch, in Contra Costa County, to pour their combined waters into the bay. Out of these valleys comes a colossal flood of products of every conceivable kind useful to man and there will never be enough population to consume them all. The waters of both these rivers have in recent years been harnessed for man's uses by what is called the Central Valley project, one of the large United States Government water and power projects, and one of the greatest engineering projects of the entire world. Through construction of the Shasta Dam on the Sacramento and the Friant Dam on the San Joaquin, waters are stored, floods eliminated, power created, and life-giving moisture brought to sections which were nonproductive. The great valley will now support many times the population it could carry in the past, and the prosperity of the State is greatly enhanced. The San Francisco Bay area benefits most from this tremendous development. The products of the two valleys must flow into this region to be consumed, processed, and shipped.

Construction of Shasta Dam so equalized the flow of the Sacramento that the Contra Costa County conduit could be constructed to bring water from the river to the communities and farming districts in the county which were greatly in need of it. The most important water supply for the world capital would be through the East Bay Municipal Utility District, which distributes water to the East Bay cities through public ownership. Its supply comes from the western watershed of the Sierra Nevada Range which reaches an elevation of

more than 10,000 feet. It is impounded in Pardee Reservoir, 93 miles northeast of the bay cities, and brought down to the consumers through a steel and concrete aqueduct. Water from this system now reaches consumers only a few miles from the site of the proposed world capital, and the entire Moraga Valley would be certainly annexed and service provided if it was decided to establish the new city there. That would mean an abundance of the very finest domestic water—every drop chlorinated and filtered, and carrying a very low mineral content. No community anywhere could provide a more satisfactory water supply.

Recreation is always important. The territory immediately contiguous to this site, as well as the bay region in general, and in fact all of central and northern California constitutes a playground of unparalleled magnitude, beauty, and diversity. The bass fishing in waters touching the county shores is known everywhere to anglers. The county is developing trails and facilities for horseback riding, and will go much further along this line. There are many swimming pools, golf clubs, and other sources of recreation. San Francisco, of course, which is nearby, is rich in recreational assets. Lake Tahoe, the lake of the sky, elevation 6,000 feet, is 180 miles distant, and world-famous Yosemite is about the same number of miles. Some of the world's largest redwoods are in the northern-coast counties, easily accessible by motor over modern roads. Even Moraga Valley is joined by famous Redwood Canyon only 1 mile away. This is to mention only a few of the outstanding attractions which would draw the residents of this new world capital.

Educational and cultural development in this area is on a remarkably high level. The University of California at Berkeley is one of America's best and largest colleges occupying a campus of surpassing beauty, and housed in buildings of enduring granite, the whole dominated by the 300-foot bell tower modeled after the ancient campanile at Milan. Directly in the area proposed for the site of the world capital is St. Mary's College, which has already brought fame to Moraga Valley, which has great value as it stands now and is capable of much development and expansion. The bay region has all the needed theaters, churches, museums, parks and lecture halls. Famed throughout the world is Golden Gate Park in San Francisco, 1,000 acres in extent. Contra Costa County has the Tilden Regional Park consisting of 2,000 acres, with a lake for swimming and boating.

I think we can summarize by saying that the region in general has everything, and the site we propose is ideally situated in relation to the region. It lies just a short distance inland from the Pacific Ocean, the area of the greatest development and progress in the period just ahead of us. It is in the new world and in a new part of that world. It is young enough and vigorous enough to look to the future and to deal with the problems of the future. Let no one raise the question of its vulnerability to enemy attack in case of a war. The atomic bomb has changed all our ideas of isolation or protection of any part of the country in case of attack. This site is just as safe in case of another war as any site could be in the heart of this great country.

And let no one object because the Moraga Valley is removed from the more populous parts of the country which are supposed to have so much influence on our affairs. The same cry was raised by some parts of the country when it was decided to establish Washington and the District of Columbia on the shores of the Potomac River. But we see now how wise that choice was. Australia went 80 miles inland and some 200 miles from Sydney to create its new capital city, Canberra. You will get some idea of the magnitude of a really planned city when I tell you that when they decided on the Canberra site they acquired over 900 square miles of land. A very large area will certainly be needed for this new world capital of ours, and it is generally believed a city of at least 100,000 persons will spring up around it. I assure you there is ample room in the Moraga Valley for such a project. There are no real problems in the way of carrying it out. I urge you to give your support to this site and to use your influence to see that it is chosen for the capital of the United Nations. Posterity will certainly vindicate your wise decision.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the administration is attempting to discredit General MacArthur by disputing his statement that it requires only 200,000 men to occupy and control Japan. It is my firm belief that the administration has sought to keep as many men as possible in the service both here and abroad. General MacArthur from the day he left the Philippines and said he would return to liberate them has made good. He has done so with a minimum of men, planes, and ships, until the close of the European War. Why is an effort being made to keep a huge army of occupation in both Europe and Asia and also in the United States?

The administration has never had a practicable plan of reconversion. It never has had the ability to create jobs through the private enterprise system, but from 1933 to the present time it has sought to replace private enterprise through doles, WPA, and other programs of makeshift expedients.

The administration does not want the soldiers released because it would be offensive to radical labor leaders who do not want job competition from returning soldiers.

On September 12, 1945, I introduced H. R. 4010, a bill to direct the discharge of all members of the armed forces who have served at least 18 months or more since September 16, 1940.

I believe that in doing this I am representing the sentiments of the sovereign citizens of the United States. I believe that I am representing 90 percent of the people of the United States in their desire to have the boys back home in jobs or looking for jobs or taking up the jobs which they left, just as rapidly as possible. There must be reconversion in this country and there must be reconversion without delay. The people realize that.

I want to read just a few letters into the RECORD, if I may without causing too much impatience on the part of the House. This letter is one I received from a corporal in England. It is dated September 12, 1945:

HON. REPRESENTATIVE REED: I have just heard about your very timely suggestion that a bill be proposed which would discharge servicemen with more than 2 years of honorable service. As one of the thousands of present servicemen, with close to 3 years of service, let me congratulate you on this work and hope that some action is taken along these lines in the not-too-distant future. The point system has definitely, in my opinion, proved ineffective, as it doesn't handle those many, many individual cases that warrant discharges. Speaking for myself, I am married, have been in service since January 1943, although being overseas but 6 months. Nevertheless, I have done my bit, but with 36 points I cannot see myself back to a normal life, even in the immediate future. This disparaging thought confronts many other servicemen whom I know, and concrete suggestions such as yours is the only hope that can bring us back to our families.

I call attention to another letter from a businessman in Philadelphia. I have simply hundreds of these, as you all have. This is dated September 12, 1945. He says:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: Like many others, my son has been in the Army going on 3 years, having been taken out of college when he was 18. There are 5,600,000 in the Army who served more than 2 years; 2,500,000 who have served less than 2 years.

The occupation forces can be readily obtained from those who have served less than 2 years, plus volunteers, new draftees, Regular Army, and our so-called allies.

Those who have served more than 2 years, whether officers or enlisted men, whether overseas or here, have done their share. The others should carry on the burden.

It is up to the Congress to give our boys a fair deal. We want them home. If necessary, Congress should promptly pass a concurrent resolution terminating the emergency; that would automatically release these men in 6 months.

We are vitally interested in this subject, and expect a fair deal from Congress. We can hardly depend for fair treatment from the War Department, which is interested in continuing to have millions of men under its control.

As a matter of fact, the Regular Army could be greatly enlarged if the enlistments were for short periods and the hours of work, pay, and housing put on a basis commensurate with the workers in industry.

I hope you will put forth your strongest efforts to achieve the desired results.

This next letter is from a prominent executive in New Hampshire:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1945.

Congressman DANIEL A. REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: I note from the newspapers that you are suggesting a bill to release all men who have had more than 2 years' service. May I congratulate you if you really mean it, as I feel that such a bill will be a fair one. The present point system is a farce, everybody gets out but the young

unmarried man of 21 to 25 who have served 2 or 3 years. They are the forgotten men.

I have a boy, age 21, in the Navy, who has served nearly 3 years, part of that time in the Pacific. I don't know if you are a Democrat or Republican, but I am a Democrat who should have taken heed of Governor Dewey's warning, that the Democrats plan to keep the men in the Army and Navy after the war. In 1946 and 1948 I shall vote against the present democratic President, Senator and Republican Congressman in my district.

I am in a job that I can sell this idea to plenty of people and from the present feelings of the public not many will have to be sold. There are also many Republicans that do not seem to be doing anything about it either and will have to go, unless they wake up and realize how the home front feels.

Why don't you fellows in Congress vote the duration over so the boys can get home in 6 months? The families of the boys won't forget and unless you fellows get on the ball there will be a lot of changes in Congress next year both Democratic and Republican. Talk is cheap, give us action!

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

I received the following letter from a corporal who is stationed on Guam:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1945.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. REED: I wish to concur with you on your recent proposal of an Army discharge plan based upon the completion of 2 years of military service.

The announcement of your plan brought unanimous acclaim and cheering from the hundreds of soldiers who heard the news broadcast from our theater area last night. It is my belief, along with many soldiers, that in men like yourself, Senator TAFT, Senator MEAD, and others, we have a champion of the basic democratic freedoms for which we have been fighting and sacrificing years of our life.

Now that military censorship has been lifted, we can feel free to express ourselves more completely than before. The point system of the War Department, based on mathematical confusion, along with its reluctance to release soldiers for any number of reasons, has become a gigantic bureaucratic military power dedicated to the purpose of self-perpetuation. In military life this type of thinking is in evidence almost everywhere.

In taking cognizance of the fact that the demobilization of millions of men is a huge job, I also think of the traditional way Americans do things—bigger, better, and quicker than they have ever been done before.

Your fundamental understanding of the soldiers' problem is heartening, and we look to your leadership for a solution based on human understanding and justice.

The thoughts contained in this letter are also those agreed to by 20 other fellow soldiers.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

This next letter was written in the service club at Camp Cooke, Calif., and signed by 59 servicemen:

SEPTEMBER 13, 1945.

DEAR SIR: This letter represents a consensus of opinion in our particular battalion of the Thirteenth Armored Division and, I'm certain, indicative of soldiers' opinions in the rest of the division.

We have been, and still are, forever discussing our Government's consideration for us after our average of 2½ years' service with 6 months overseas with an average of 45 to 49 points as of VJ-day.

We believe that we are entitled to more lenient consideration concerning the recent demobilization and occupation. We enlisted men have all to lose by being deprived of our homes and people we love. None of us quit in the very thick of combat, and now that we have won we are low-down quitters according to so-called leaders. We GI's and American citizens are getting tired of this bunk. We were asked to fight for something and now we want that something.

We are told it would be easy for us now to occupy Japan. If it is so easy, why not send men who have not seen combat or who are new in the Army? They share as much a part in the United States of America as we do.

This, then, Representative REED, represents how we think about this matter. We feel you should appreciate our opinions and you are our only means of being heard where it counts most—in Congress.

Finally, we thank you and back you for your stand for the GI in Congress, and hope this letter strengthens your convictions. More power to you.

(Fifty-nine boys signed this letter.)

The following letter is one I received from the wife of a serviceman in my own State:

SEPTEMBER 13, 1945.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My husband has been a soldier in the United States Army for a period of 3 years. At the present time he is in France with no prospects of coming home. In spite of the fact that he has been in the Army 3 years, he still has only a total of 36 points. We have been married 5 years and I feel that we are entitled to start our lives.

The emergency is over now and the Army still does not want to let men out because if too many soldiers are discharged the Army Officers Corps will revert to their permanent r ting and they are afraid they might lose a little rank. If the people listen to what the Army says the soldiers will be in for the next 10 years.

I read in the paper about your idea for introducing a bill to discharge men with at least 2 years service and I think it is an excellent idea and the only fair one I have heard so far.

I feel very strongly in this matter and I know I speak for thousands of American wives and mothers when I say that if you, as our Congressman, don't do something immediately to get our husbands home, the Army certainly will never do it.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

I had a case come up today where they turned down one of my boys who has only one eye. He is trying desperately to save the other. He is indispensable to a manufacturing plant at home. His father has tried to carry the load and is now in bed with a very serious heart trouble. When the papers came through he was recommended for discharge, and somebody, who apparently was peeved or did not like it, decided to send him down near Cairo, Egypt. They sent him down there where the light would ruin his other eye. That is the kind of consideration they get.

There is another case where a man tried to save his comrades. There was an explosion and this man had one side of his face destroyed, one ear was lost, and both hands. They have sent him to the Pacific. When questioned by a Representative from Texas the colonel said he could not farm with his hands and he might as well be over there. That was the substance of what he said. This gentleman said, "We do not farm with our hands in Texas. We have managers who direct the work. This man is skilled in the handling of a farm." But he was sent, without any hands, with one side of his face blown off and one ear gone, to the Pacific. The boys and the people are just not going to stand for that sort of thing. It just does not make common sense.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you learn what they were going to use that man for?

Mr. REED of New York. No, I do not have any idea what they will use him for in the Pacific. I know that a man like that who has rendered such service belongs back in his own home where he may at least begin to build himself up even if he has no hands. If he can direct the operation of a farm without his hands, that is where he should be, and not out in the Pacific where he must be absolutely useless to the military in that condition.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What do you say about the propositions that I get in so many letters, that by keeping these men in the service who cannot really render any further useful service, both the Army and the Navy are building up a backlog of resentment which is going to hurt the service in the years to come?

Mr. REED of New York. I agree with the gentleman absolutely. These boys have rendered such service, there have been so many hundreds of thousands of heroes who are practically unsung and unheard of, those boys, after rendering such service to their country and to the foreign countries, can properly resent it if the Army does not deal fairly with them and let them get started in life. Hundreds of thousands of those boys have not finished their education. We are in a scientific era when a boy must complete his education. A great many of them will find it necessary to go through college in order to capitalize their talents, but if kept in the Army too long their opportunity will be lost. They have great potential possibilities which should not be destroyed just to please a certain bureaucratic set-up.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Of course, most of us realize the necessity of having a force in Japan and in Germany for police purposes, but that leaves some ten or eleven million outside of Germany and Japan. It seems that there is no excuse for keeping the other ten or eleven million in the service—10,000,000 at least. I want to quote briefly from a letter I have here, written by a constituent who is in the Persian Gulf Command. He writes:

Everything closed down on the 1st of May.

He says:

The heat is 120 in May and it gets up to 160 in August.

He says they have been there all these months now, 4 months or more in that

heat with nothing on earth going on except to sit there. Then he winds up by saying:

Of course, our post commander, a colonel, expects to make brigadier general before leaving here, I understand; but why should one high-ranking officer keep a few thousand enlisted men in that hot climate there doing nothing and under those conditions?

He goes on to say:

It is true the officers have air-conditioned billets to live in, an air-conditioned mess and bar, and all the nice things.

Yet, those men are being kept there in Iran and in different parts of the world which we certainly are not policing. What excuse is there for not bringing them home?

Mr. REED of New York. I cannot see any excuse. If I thought it was absolutely necessary to keep these 10,000,000 men under arms now that combat is over, and if I did not have the statement of General MacArthur that he could get along at the present time with 200,000 men over there as against what was estimated previoulsy, 500,000 men, I would not say a word; but all I can see in this whole program is an absolute injustice toward the boys we sent out to battle for our country and our allies. And they have done a job and the countries which they fought are absolutely defeated, completely crushed. No man, I think, could be trusted to give us a fairer estimate on the number of men he needs than General MacArthur. He said 200,000. I dare say that within a reasonable time he will probably reduce that number to perhaps 100,000. In the meantime, knowing that he needs only 200,000, the only honorable and sensible thing we can do is to expedite this work of getting these men home and these boys in schools and colleges which are right now about to open. They should be given a chance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RESA for 10 days on account of important business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 241. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruby H. Hunsucker;

H. R. 799. An act for the relief of the estate of Stanley E. Smallwood; to the legal guardian of Frank Carter, Jr., minor; to the legal guardian of Donald R. Keithley, a minor; to Keithley Bros. Garage;

H. R. 999. An act for the relief of Lily L. Carren;

H. R. 1057. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Margaret Hockenberry, a minor;

H. R. 1257. An act for the relief of George C. Tyler and Doris M. Tyler;

H. R. 1456. An act for the relief of George E. Baker;

H. R. 1564. An act for the relief of William W. Maddox and the legal guardian of Donna Sue Maddox and Saddie Inez Maddox;

H. R. 1634. An act for the relief of the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa;

H. R. 1713. An act for the relief of Canal Dredging Co.;

H. R. 1882. An act for the relief of R. L. Whittington, Mrs. R. L. Whittington, and Mrs. J. B. Whittington;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Aloysius G. Miller;

H. R. 1975. An act for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson and Young;

H. R. 1992. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of Alaska in trust for the Roman Catholic Church;

H. R. 2028. An act for the relief of John Visnovec, Rose Visnovec, and Helen Visnovec;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Edmund F. Danks, as administrator of the estate of Edna S. Danks, deceased;

H. R. 2163. An act for the relief of Teresa Tine.

H. R. 2511. An act for the relief of Patricia M. Kacprzyk and Alex D. Leontire; and

H. R. 2641. An act for the relief of Frank Glen.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 19, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Thursday, September 20, 1945, Subcommittee No. III of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue the hearings on H. R. 2357, to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended. The hearing will be held in room 346, House Office Building, and will begin at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m., on Tuesday, September 25, 1945, on H. R. 2202, in room 362, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, September 27, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1751, to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Merchant Marine Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 888. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands in the vicinity of the War Department Pentagon Building in Arlington, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 954). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 4083. A bill authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 955). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 3870. A bill to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, the "Harry L. Englebright Dam"; without amendment (Rept. 956). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 348. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2200, a bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure"; without amendment (Rept. No. 957). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 349. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2716, a bill to provide for health programs for Government employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 958). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 350. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2948, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; without amendment (Rept. No. 959). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4098. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4099. A bill to aid in the development and manufacture of improved prosthetic appliances; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 4100. A bill to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4101. A bill to authorize the President to retire certain officers of the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4102. A bill to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 4103. A bill reducing certain appropriations available in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 4104. A bill to direct the Secretary of War to arrange for the policing of Japan and other territory in the Far East by Chinese military forces under supervision of United States Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. R. 4105. A bill to direct the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4106. A bill to stop inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 4107. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene literature in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 4108. A bill to increase the pension of certain totally disabled veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. R. 4109. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4110. A bill to amend the act of June 15, 1943, relating to the training of nurses, to prohibit the admission of any person for training under such act after October 15, 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 4111. A bill relating to the Board of Parole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., as "Edward H. O'Hare Hospital"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Res. 347. Resolution to create a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate all court-martial and other sentences by the Navy Department since December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. Res. 351. Resolution directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives certain information relative to surplus aircraft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. Res. 352. Resolution directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish the House of Representatives certain information relative to surplus aircraft; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

H. Res. 353. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXVII of the Rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 4112. A bill for the relief of Donald D. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUNKER:

H. R. 4113. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain land to Mrs. Estelle M. Wilbourn; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4114. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Alice Scott White a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 4115. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eleanor Doris Barrett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 4116. A bill for the relief of M. R. Stone; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4117. A bill for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 4118. A bill for the relief of Axel H. Peterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 4119. A bill for the relief of Charles D. Butts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 4120. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 4121. A bill for the relief of Augusta Board of Education; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. R. 4122. A bill for the relief of Guy B. Slater; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VORYS of Ohio:

H. R. 4123. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Everett V. Lawrence; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1163. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Frank G. Harrington and other residents of Baldwinsville, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1164. By Mr. LANE: Memorials of the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans' Association of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1165. Also, memorials of the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans' Association of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Rules.

1166. Also, memorials of the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans' Association of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Rules.

1167. Also, memorials of the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans' Association of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1168. Also, memorials of the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans' Association of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1169. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition signed by Mrs. Jessie M. Stewart and other citizens of Thomaston, Maine, deploring the shipping of malt beverages and other liquors into our fighting areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1170. Also, petition signed by Charles F. Kimball and other citizens of Androscoggin County, asking for a quick and complete hearing on the Townsend measures by the Ways and Means Committee and then by the Congress as a whole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1171. By Mr. SUNDSTROM: A resolution protesting the permanent appointment of temporary civil-service employees in Federal jobs without due regard to the rights of veterans, submitted by the membership of Post No. 302, American Legion, Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1172. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of the City of Oakland, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for continuance of child-care centers provided for under the Lanham Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1173. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Hammond, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to reconversion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, September 10, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the light of man's mind, with eyes of wonder we have greeted again the eternal miracle as dawn has conquered the darkness; so rise with the morning upon our souls. Let the effulgent noontide of Thy enlightening grace make clear our paths. Lead us along these treacherous and tortuous ways by Thy unfailing love into more abundant life for all the world until it shall be daylight everywhere. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, September 18, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 374. An act to amend the act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce";

S. 397. An act to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939–41; and

S. 1045. An act to provide for pay and allowances and transportation and subsistence of personnel discharged or released from the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard because of under age at the time of enlistment, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Crugers Park, Peekskill, N. Y., as Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1123. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy;

H. R. 1128. An act to incorporate the Regular Veterans' Association;

H. R. 1591. An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor;

H. R. 1645. An act to preserve the reemployment preferences of members of the armed forces who after discharge therefrom become employed in essential activities;

H. R. 1868. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2525. An act to include step parents among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2842. An act for the relief of Montgomery County, Miss., districts 2 and 3;

H. R 2851. An act to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the city of Philadelphia, for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings therein;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Grenada County, Miss.;

H. R. 3466. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad;

H. R. 3686. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the registers of the land offices in Alaska to perform functions under the Alaska real property ownership declaration law;

H. R. 3755. An act to establish an Optometry Corps in the Medical Department of the United States Army; and

H. R. 3951. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1123. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy;

H. R. 1591. An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor;

H. R. 1645. An act to preserve the reemployment preferences of members of the armed forces who after discharge therefrom become employed in essential activities;

H. R. 1868. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in active service during the present war, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2525. An act to include stepparents among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3755. An act to establish an Optometry Corps in the Medical Department of the United States Army; and

H. R. 3951. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1128. An act to incorporate the Regular Veterans' Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2842. An act for the relief of Montgomery County, Miss., districts 2 and 3; and

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Grenada County, Miss.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2851. An act to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the city of Philadelphia for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings therein; and

H. R. 3686. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the registers of the land offices in Alaska to perform functions under the Alaska real property ownership declaration law; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 3466. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; to the Committee on Immigration.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

THE ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General transmitting, pursuant to section 205 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, Public Law 458, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved October 3, 1944, a survey entitled "The Aluminum Industry" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twelfth annual report of the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, which were referred as indicated:

A petition of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, requesting that the results of the investigation of the naval board of inquiry with reference to the attack on Pearl Harbor be made public; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A resolution adopted by Federal Employees' Union, No. 1, National Federation of Federal Employees, of San Francisco, Calif., paying tribute to the memory of the late Senator Hiram W. Johnson, of California, for his public service; ordered to lie on the table.

FEDERAL FINANCES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter sent to me by Mr. R. M. McDill, teacher of mathematics at Hastings College, Hastings, Nebr., relating to Federal finances. While I have the floor, I wish to call attention of the Senate particularly to the following statements in Mr. McDill's letter:

I do not believe 1 person in 2,000 realizes the seriousnc 3 of the public debt. For 12 years borrow, borrow, spend, spend, spend has been the idea. In wartime, thrift and economy are considered unpatriotic. To pay the debt with dollars of the present value will be a terrible load. To repudiate directly seems unthinkable for a government which can print legal tender. An inflated currency really is a repudiation, but it looks as though that is what we are coming to. Yet there are many would continue to borrow.

I agree with Mr. McDill that it might be a very good idea for the Congress to shut its ears to some of those who would have the Federal Government continue to spend and borrow, borrow and spend, without any regard to the consequences. This reckless spending program should be stopped.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HASTINGS COLLEGE,
Hastings, Nebr., September 3, 1945.

Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: While I do not live in Kansas I do frequently hear your radio addresses. I like particularly what you have to say along the line of Federal finance. I do not believe one person in 2,000 realizes the seriousness of the public debt. For 12 years borrow, borrow, spend, spend, spend has been the idea. In wartime thrift and economy are considered unpatriotic. To pay the debt with dollars of present value will be a terrible load for a generation. To directly repudiate seems unthinkable for a government which can print legal tender. An inflated currency is really a repudiation, but it looks as though that is what we are coming to. Yet there are many who would continue to borrow.

What work there is should be divided up among all and monopoly crushed. Short hours of labor may be a partial solution. Temperance of all kinds would be a help, but the tide seems to be going the other way.

Keep up the good work.

Most sincerely,

R. M. MCDILL.

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting letter from the Reverend S. Ben Finley, of Luray, Kans., in which he calls my attention to a letter he has written to Maj. Gen. Edward F. Witsell, of the War Department, in opposition to peacetime conscription. I ask unanimous consent to have the letters printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1945.

MR. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: Enclosed is a copy of a reply to a letter received from the War Department. I believe that it explains my position and feeling toward peacetime military conscription. I am a veteran of the present war, and I think I speak the mind of most of the men of this section of the country. I know there are a few industrialists who are sponsoring peacetime conscription, and it is obvious for their doing so. Viz: Fleecing their pockets at the cost of the lives of our young men. I am sure that you are not in accord with peacetime conscription and am hoping that you will do all you can to prevent any such catastrophe to come to our

Nation, so I am asking you as a friend, and a representative of the enlisted man, to not only vote against peacetime military conscription, but that you will raise your voice in opposition to it on the Senate floor.

Very truly yours,

S. BEN FINLEY.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1945.

To the WAR DEPARTMENT,
Adjutant General's Office,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Edward F. Witsell, Major General.)

GENTLEMEN: I'm not surprised, in your thought, that voluntary enlistment cannot meet the Nation's need for an adequate military establishment, for two reasons. First of all, because you are a militarist and have made that your career, and so you would like to see a larger military establishment. Secondly, because you are an officer and being an officer, receive an adequate living wage and you have little conception of the meagerness of the enlisted man's wage, as well as knowing very little about the requirements of the enlisted man. If you would consent to give the enlisted man your salary, your sustenance, and your standing in the military establishment that you speak about, I'm sure that you would have all the volunteers that you need for an adequate Army and Navy.

Neither the Army, nor the Navy enlisted man receives an adequate living wage that will support themselves and a family in peacetime. Likewise the enlisted man is counted by the officers as just another piece of property belonging to the Government. Our national military academies, during peacetime, refuse to accept a great percent of their applications to enter. If our enlisted men were paid an adequate living wage, as they should be paid and not spend it all on the officers, we would have an adequate number of men volunteering for military duty. I don't blame any young man for not entering military service until he is forced to as an enlisted man.

In the third paragraph of your letter you spoke about maintaining the peace which we had secured at so great a cost. I know something of that cost, as I have served time in the Navy, in the Medical Corps, and have seen the real cost of the war in the wreckage of human lives. And there is no one that hates war more than I do. But you cannot educate patriotism, nor drill into our younger generation loyalty to the American flag and our country in the Army camps. When compulsory military training is enacted in our Nation we have lost "the peace which we have secured at so great a cost."

In your third paragraph, as well, I note that you say, "For the future, universal military training is considered desirable." The only ones that I know of that consider it desirable is the War Department and the officers who make military their career. One year of military training for an 18-year-old for future military service is the most absurd thing I can think of. It is not only a waste of Government money, but is likewise a waste of the 18-year-old's time and money. For you know better than anyone else how often military tactics change and how soon present-day tactics become obsolete. A boy taking 1 year of military training this year would have it all to learn over again 6 or 7 years hence.

It only takes from 30 to 90 days to train a young man in basic and fundamental military tactics so that they may be efficient soldiers. If we have a good skeleton military force that is adequately paid, we will have men who are interested in military tactics and will do more than the young man who is conscripted and forced into military duty against his consent.

Very few officers know the mind of the enlisted man and the handicaps under which they work. Likewise very few of them care very much. When it comes to the place where enlisted men and officers are put on the same level as far as understanding is concerned, we will have an adequate volunteer Army to maintain the peace that we have bought.

You can rest assured that not only my vote will be cast against peacetime conscription, but I will also do all in my power to hinder the enactment of any such bill.

Very truly yours,

S. BEN FINLEY.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a plea by 38 enlisted servicemen now assigned to Fort Sheridan.

It will be noted that none of these men has been able to accumulate sufficient points to authorize his discharge under the point system. Many of them, according to their recorded sight, should not have been inducted into the service in the first place. Few of them are beyond the age of 38 and, therefore, they are unlikely to be discharged on account of age. Some of them were volunteers. They feel that in view of their inability to accumulate sufficient points to justify their discharge, because they have been stationed in this country the greater part of the time, some provision should be made by which their service can be recognized and an opportunity be given them to obtain their discharge.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT SHERIDAN, ILL., *September 10, 1945.*

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: In the many discussions Congress, the War Department, radio commentators, and newspapers have recently had concerning discharges of servicemen, little or nothing has yet been said of releasing limited-service men, who, despite three or more years' service, have been unable to gather points toward discharge because their disabilities prevented them from going overseas.

Furthermore, several thousand of these so-called limited-service men, among them the undersigned, never qualified under Army induction standards in the first place, but were accepted back in the grim days of 1942 and 1943 to do clerical and other noncombatant work because of the crying need the Army then had for manpower. A notable example of such men are those who, with 20/800 or even 20/1000 vision, were erroneously inducted and listed on the Form 221 (Army induction physical examination) as having 20/400 vision, which was the standard set by the Army as minimum requirement for eyesight.

Most of us never complained about this "erroneous induction," because we knew that a man with 20/1000 vision, corrected to 20/20 or 20/40, could perform as efficiently behind a desk as one with 20/400 vision properly corrected. We knew that the Army needed men, and that it was only manpower needs which forced induction centers to falsify our eyesight tests. Now, however, when the war is over, and the War Department is hurriedly making plans to drastically cut the number of men and women in the armed forces, we feel that there is no longer a need for holding men who, according to medical-department standards, never should have been in service in the first place. We feel, in fact, that we cannot look forward to separation in the near future, because through no fault of our own, few of us have been able to acquire more than 30 or 40 points toward discharge, for whether we wanted to go overseas or not, we never were given the opportunity to do so. Under the present plan of 80 points required for discharge, a limited-service man without dependents would have to serve 6⅔ years in the Army.

If a check were made of the personnel of this post, it would undoubtedly be found that a large percentage of men here are below minimum physical standards for induction. Are we to be penalized on the point system for not going overseas, when we weren't given a chance to go overseas? Are we to be left to rot here, while others, better equipped for jobs through their own physical superiority, are discharged to accept the limited number of positions left open in reconversion employment?

We suggest that some consideration be granted what might be called the limited-service man in the War Department's priority-for-discharge schedule: A limit of 2 years or 3 years be placed on length of service required of men who, by War Department standards, should never have been in uniform in the first place—men who are not physically qualified for officers' candidate schools, had no opportunity for earning awards or decoration, and who were given few or no promotions.

Very truly yours,

FORT SHERIDAN LIMITED-SERVICE MEN.

Soldier	Length of service (months)	Demobilization points
Bryon H. Sistler	38	38
Louis G. Geannporler	29	29
Edward J. Proppi	31	31
Earl McMunn	39	39
Nels W. Swanson	37	37
Robert F. Scott	38	38
Norman J. Buechaer	27	27
Gilbert T. Le Tourneau	26	26
Bruce W. Barker	38	38
Lewis F. Caruso	32	32
Sherrill C. Passage	38	38
Charman N. Seifert	38	38
Alan J. Walker	20	20
Egan A. Ringwall	37	37
William V. Walsh	30	42
Eldon R. Wax	22	34
William H. Byrne	27	27
Frank J. Powers	30	30
Edgar F. Runnim, Jr	38	50
Kennedy E. Carker	30	42
Richard J. McGinn	30	30
Rex L. Hendrix	30	30
Alvin W. Trenpey	30	30
C. R. Nordbuy	33	45
Norman A. Johnson	40	51
Harold C. Shank	21	33
Leland B. Hill	18	36
Myron Susser	32	32
Raymond H. Karsten	35	35
Donald A. Nelson	32	44
Richard G. Forton	23	23
John I. Fitzsimmons	27	27
William J. Griffin	31	31
Robert J. McKinsey	27	27
Ralph E. Tanzer	34	34
William E. Bartz	27	27
Claude G. Metzler	36	36

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3686) to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the registers of the land offices in Alaska to perform functions under the Alaska real property ownership declaration law, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 568) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1409. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Cynthia Hartman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1410. A bill to provide for the release of all fathers from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1411. A bill for the relief of Alfred Osterhoff, doing business as Illini Reefer Transit, Champaign, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 1412. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1413. A bill to exempt veterans from certain provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities" approved August 2, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

(Mr. McKELLAR introduced Senate bill 1414, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George Catlett Marshall and to the officers and men of the Army who served under him during World War II; and providing for the procurement of a gold medal to be presented to General Marshall in the name of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON THE COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVERS, OREG., WASH., AND IDAHO

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated December 2, 1944, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Columbia and Snake Rivers, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho, for further improvement of the river in the vicinity of The Dalles, Oreg., and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KILGORE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ADJUSTMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL SALARIES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for proper reference a concurrent resolution calling for the appointment of a joint committee, to be composed of 15 Members of the Senate and 15 Members of the House of Representatives, to make a full and complete study and investigation regarding the adequacy of the salaries paid under existing law to civilian officers and employees in or under the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government. In my work upon the Appropriations Committee it has become my conviction that an over-all committee which will cut across the various committees in studying the salaries now being paid is most necessary. I believe the appointment of such a committee is a step in the right direction. We have coming to the Committee on the Judiciary resolutions requesting increases in salaries in the judiciary. We have other measures requesting increases in congressional salaries. We have requests for increases in the salaries of civilian employees. We have many resolutions and bills along that line. I have a list of them before me. I shall not take the time to read it into the RECORD at this time, but I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. It bears the title "Bills Relating to the Compensation of Civilian Officers and Employees of the Federal Government," and it relates to the compensation paid in both the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the list presented by the Senator from Nebraska will be printed in the RECORD, and the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The list presented by Mr. WHERRY is as follows:

BILLS RELATING TO COMPENSATION OF CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

S. 1125. Messrs. OVERTON and BRIDGES; June 8, 1945 (Appropriations). Increases salaries of Vice President and Speaker of the House to $25,000 and of Cabinet Members and Members of Congress to $20,000.

S. 1222. Mr. LANGER; July 3, 1945 (Civil Service). Maintains salaries of wage board employees at rates in effect on June 1, 1945, plus amounts equal to overtime which would be payable on a 48-hour week.

H. R. 174. Mr. CELLER; January 3, 1945 (Judiciary). Increases compensation of President to $100,000; Vice President, Speaker, and Cabinet members to $20,000, and Members of Congress to $15,000.

H. R. 620. Mr. VINSON; January 3, 1945 (Judiciary). Increases compensation of President to $100,000; Vice President, Speaker, and Cabinet members to $20,000, and Members of Congress to $15,000.

H. R. 2353. Mr. VINSON; February 26, 1945 (Judiciary). Increases compensation of President to $100,000; Vice President, Speaker, and Cabinet members to $20,000, and Members of Congress to $15,000.

H. R. 176. Mr. CELLER; January 3, 1945 (Judiciary). Increases salaries of Members of Congress to $12,500.

H. R. 397. Mr. DIRKSEN; January 3, 1945 (Judiciary). Creates a commission to determine salaries of Members of Congress, to be composed of 18 members to be appointed as follows: 3 by the Speaker, 3 by the President of the Senate, 6 by the President of the United States, 6 by the Chief Justice of the United States, each appointing officer to select his appointees in equal numbers from outstanding leaders in each of 3 groups; viz, labor, business, and professional. There would also be 6 advisory members who would be selected from among Members or former Members of Congress, 3 to be appointed by the Speaker and 3 to be appointed by the President of the Senate.

H. R. 3582. Mr. EBERHARTER; June 25, 1945 (Judiciary). Authorizes appointment of a committee of outstanding citizens who are not officers or employees of the Government to make recommendations with respect to compensation of the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and Cabinet members.

H. R. 1520. Mr. LANE; January 6, 1945 (Civil Service). Provides a system of longevity pay for Federal employees.

In addition to the above bills, which are pending at the present time, the following statutes relating to salaries of Federal officers and employees have been enacted during the Seventy-ninth Congress:

Public Law 2, approved February 13, 1945, provided for increasing the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange.

Public Law 106, approved June 30, 1945, provided overtime compensation and increases in basic pay for Federal employees generally.

Public Law 122, approved July 3, 1945, provided increases in salaries of members of the District of Columbia Fire Department.

Puclic Law 151, approved July 14, 1945, provided increases in the compensation of members of the Police and Fire Departments of the District of Columbia.

Public Law 158, approved July 21, 1945, provided increases in the pay of teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia.

Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945, provided for increases in the pay of postal employees.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33), submitted by Mr. WHERRY, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint committee to be composed of 15 Members of the Senate (not more than 9 of whom shall be members of the same political party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 15 Members of the House of Representatives (not more than 9 of whom shall be members of the same political party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee shall (1) make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the adequacy of salaries paid under existing law to civilian officers and employees in or under the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, including elected officials and judges, (2) shall consider all measures pending in either House, which provide for increasing the compensation of such officers and employees, and (3) shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid one-

half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

APPOINTMENT OF LESLIE R. GROVES A MAJOR GENERAL IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 175), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Resolved, That in recognition of his outstanding services to the Nation and particularly the planning, organization, magnitude of work and risks demanded by his contribution in the development of the atomic bomb, the President is hereby requested to appoint Leslie R. Groves, now a major general, Army of the United States, a major general of the line in the Regular Army of the United States.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT HOSPITAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Crugers Park, Peekskill, N. Y., as "Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital," which were, in line 4, to strike out "Crugers Park", and insert "Crugers-on-Hudson, near", and to amend the title so as to read: "A joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Crugers-on-Hudson, near Peekskill, N. Y., as 'Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital'."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. The only thing the amendments do is to correctly state the location of the hospital. It was stated in the Senate joint resolution as "Crugers Park," whereas the real name seems to be "Crugers-on-Hudson."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

THE GERMAN SETTLEMENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE LONDON ECONOMIST

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The German Settlement," published in the London Economist and subsequently republished in the United States Daily for September 14, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

OCCUPATION OF JAPAN—ARTICLE BY SUMNER WELLES

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Occupation of Japan," written by Sumner Welles and published in the Washington Post of September 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] adding at the end of the committee amendment, as amended, a new section.

The amendment proposed by Mr. LUCAS is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Employment Service facilities, property, and personnel loaned by the States to the United States Employment Service, shall be returned to the States not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this act. The War Manpower Commission is authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Andrews	Hart	Overton
Austin	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hawkes	Reed
Ball	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Brooks	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	Knowland	Taft
Byrd	La Follette	Taylor
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McCarran	Tobey
Chandler	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	McMahon	Walsh
Donnell	Magnuson	Wheeler
Downey	Mead	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Willis
George	Morse	Wilson
Gerry	Murdock	Young
Green	Murray	
Guffey	Myers	

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained attending to public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will permit me, in connection with the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], which is the pending question, I should like to read at this time what the President of the United States had to say on this subject 2 weeks ago in his message to the Congress on its reassembling. I read from the message:

Placing demobilized veterans and displaced war workers in new peacetime jobs is the major human problem of our country's reconversion to a peacetime economy. It is imperative that this work be done swiftly and efficiently, and that men and women lose a minimum amount of time between jobs.

The next few months are crucial. What we do now will affect our American way of life for decades to come.

The United States Employment Service has an important responsibility in the performance of this task.

At present this agency operates as a national and centralized system, with a free flow of information among its offices. Under the 1946 appropriation act the offices are to be turned back to the 48 States within 90 days after the cessation of hostilities.

Shortly after the declaration of war the Government realized that the manpower of the Nation could be mobilized more efficiently if the United States Employment Service were centralized under Federal control. Hundreds of thousands of workers had to be recruited from all parts of the country. Often they were wanted in regions far from their homes. Certain areas had surpluses of labor; others were desperately in need of more workers. This situation could be met only through a centrally operated employment service that covered the entire Nation.

Now we are faced with this problem in reverse. Hundreds of thousands of men and women will want to seek jobs in towns and cities other than those in which they worked during the war. They may want to return home, or they may want to strike out in search of new opportunities in new surroundings. Millions of veterans also will be coming back in search of peacetime jobs. They will want to know where such jobs can be found, not only in their own areas but also in other parts of the land.

The task of helping this vast army of job seekers to fit themselves into peacetime economy is fully as difficult as the mobilization of manpower for war. To make any decided change in the machinery to handle this problem now would cause unnecessary hardship to workers and veterans. It would slow down the entire process of reconversion.

I urgently recommend that the Congress do not yet return the Employment Service to the States. Ultimately it should be so returned. However, it should be continued under Federal control at least until the expiration of the War Mobilization Act—June 30, 1947.

In another paragraph the President recommends an additional appropriation of $10,000,000 for the United States Employment Service.

Mr. President, in view of this very clear, and, it seems to me, logical statement on the part of the President dealing with the reverse situation, and the obligation upon our Government to help the returning veterans and all unemployed persons in finding jobs wherever they can, it would be most unfortunate now to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to return this agency to the States within 30 days after the enactment of the law. Under the law as it now exists it would be returned within 90 days after the cessation of hostilities. The President is asking us to extend it during the life of the War Mobilization Act, until June 30, 1947.

For these reasons I hope that the argument of the President and the situation which he so clearly sets forth will have influence with the Senate, and personally I hope that the Senator from Illinois will not press his amendment, under the circumstances.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know the date of the cessation of hostilities?

Mr. BARKLEY. The fighting quit, I think, on the 14th of August, but I do not know whether officially that is the date which the law would be interpreted to mean when it said "the cessation of hostilities."

Mr. LUCAS. Will Congress have to declare the date of the cessation of hostilities?

Mr. BARKLEY. The President set out in his message also the situation with respect to the termination of the emergency under which the war was conducted, and there is a difference, apparently, between the actual, physical cessation of hostilities and the termination of the emergency as it relates itself to the war powers which Congress conferred upon the President.

I also wish to say that in a conference recently held between the President and a committee of governors, the President pledged himself to recommend at a suitable time the return of the agencies to the States, but I think he made it plain to them that he did not believe that now was the time, but that there should be a period in which the United States Employment Service could continue to function on a Nation-wide basis because the problem of finding jobs for returning veterans and other unemployed persons cannot be confined to an airtight compartment within the boundaries of any State, but must be looked upon as a problem which faces the whole country.

I am not able to answer the Senator from Illinois with any final word as to what the law would be interpreted to be as to the actual date of the cessation of hostilities. The cessation of hostilities and the termination of the war, either by proclamation of the President or by a resolution of Congress, are two different things. But actually the hostilities ceased officially when the terms of surrender were accepted. I think that was either on the 14th or the 20th of August. I have forgotten what date it was.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not agree with the Senator that by the cessation of hostilities the war has ceased as it is applied to the language in the appropriation bill which was passed some time ago by the Congress. I think there has to be some sort of a declaration from the President or by the Congress with respect to that before it can be applied to the language as it found in the appropriation bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. But regardless of the language in the appropriation bill, which would terminate the war automatically 90 days after the cessation of hostilities, by whatever means that date is determined, I feel that we ought not now to adopt an amendment which would terminate it even sooner than the termination date fixed in the appropriation bill, because while no one knows when the pending measure will become law, if it is to be of any value it ought to become law rather early, and if we are to have only 30 days under the Senator's amendment to readjust the unemployment situation——

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator that I am going to modify my amendment to make it 90 days. That is one of the things I want to discuss briefly before any further argument is presented in behalf of the measure. I want to say, Mr. President, if I may take a moment or two, that I can understand the force and the logic of the President's message in respect to the returning veterans and in respect to the Federal Government aiding the unemployed. But the measure now pending before the Senate is based upon the fact that the 48 States of the Nation are going to take care of the unemployed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield in one moment. The Kilgore bill was emasculated by the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee said that this was not the duty of the Federal Government, in view of the respective laws of the various States of the Union. The State representatives of 24 States definitely told the committee that under no circumstances could they legally accept any sums of money from the Federal Government in addition to the unemployment compensation their States give to the unemployed during the period of duration. Over and over again before our committee those who were representing the States consistently and continuously told the committee that it was their problem, and that they had the means to care for it, and that they could do it and would do it if the services were returned to the States.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion, if we wait until 1947 before we return the services to the States, it will be too late to avoid the confusion and the duplication of effort and the passing of responsibility which is now going on in the State of Illinois and other States between those who are charged with the enforcement of the Unemployment Compensation Act in the States and those who have the Federal responsibility working practically side by side with them.

Mr. President, I cannot reach any other conclusion, after listening to the testimony for some 2 weeks before our committee, than that we are going to help unemployment in the 48 States of the Union the moment we finally lodge responsibility in one agency or the other, and I am frank to say that if I had a chance to vote today I would vote for federalization of the entire program in view of what I saw and heard before the Committee on Finance. I have never known of so many complications, so many problems, so many inconsistencies and inequities in any piece of legislation, so far as human beings are concerned, as were brought out before that committee with respect to what the States are doing for unemployed persons. I say that with all sincerity. But this is a State proposition.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. In one moment. This is a State proposition for the moment at least, and the Congress from the beginning has encouraged the States to take over the matter of unemployment compensation and conduct it.

Mr. President, I know what is going on in these agencies in my State and other States, and I know that at the present time there is no fixed and definite responsibility as to who should certify or as to who has the power to determine what is a suitable job. In other words, the definite and uniform statutes we need in the respective States to bring a certain amount of order out of the chaotic condition that is bound to exist during the next 12 months are not there, and will not be there so long as the present conditions of duplication exist.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield and, if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to inquire of the Senator what facility or authority has the State unemployment service to do anything beyond its own State boundaries? If a veteran who returns to the State of Illinois or the State of Kentucky, or if an unemployed person who has been working in a war plant returns to one of those States would accept a job in California, how can a State unemployment service know anything about a job in California or certify anything as to a job in California or in any other State beyond its own borders? How can any agency do that or know anything about it, except the over-all agency, which is the Employment Service of the United States?

Mr. LUCAS. My answer to the distinguished leader of the majority party is that they will do the same thing that they did before the Federal Government took the service over in the emergency. The States undoubtedly had arrangements, and the testimony shows that there were such arrangement among the States with respect to certain unemployed individuals whose residence might be questioned, or whose place of work might be challenged.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I call attention to the fact that in all the hearings before the Finance Committee there was no testimony that I heard—and I certainly attended as diligently as did the Senator from Illinois—respecting the relative worth of the State and Federal unemployment services. We heard no testimony on that subject. We heard one witness or two witnesses who stated that in their opinion they thought it was time that the service should be returned to the States. But that is not the kind of testimony I want before I am willing as a Senator to turn over to 48 separate and distinct States a problem which has been created by the Federal Government.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the basic thing at issue is what is best for the United States, and what is best for the unemployed. Senators cannot convince me that 48 separate States can make conditions fluid and can transfer workers from one State to another as well as can the centralized employment

service, and it is because the leaders of the great national labor organizations realize this, it is because the President of the United States realizes this, that they ask and beg for delay. Why should we precipitately do something which may result in destruction of the rights of returning veterans and the rights of people who have moved into a few States, to have job opportunities in other States where they might arise? If we turn the operation over to 48 States, the unemployed will never hear about the job opportunities, and will not get the jobs.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that I cannot agree with my distinguished friend.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think there is a misconception on the part of the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Kentucky as to what will happen when we turn the employment services back to the States. We shall not thereby destroy the United States Employment Service. We established the United States Employment Service, and it operated before the war. It is authorized. It actually helps to finance State employment offices. They are required, as a condition for receiving money for part of their expenses, to cooperate with the United States Employment Service. The United States Employment Service places a representatives in every State office. He gathers information from all the other States, and makes it available to the State office. So today the State offices have available, through the United States Employment Service, all the information as to jobs in other States. We are not destroying the service. Before the war we established a coordinated Federal-State employment service, and we return to that service when we return the actual operation of the local offices to the States.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Ohio is eminently correct. I hope that it will not be inferred that I am attempting through this amendment to destroy the Federal Employment Service, which, as the Senator from Ohio says, was created long before the war emergency. The only thing I am attempting to do is merely to place it back within a period of 90 days from now, in the same position the State service occupied before it was taken over during the emergency.

With respect to returning veterans and returning war workers, does any Senator feel that the Federal Government is in a better position to handle the problem of a veteran in Illinois than are the Illinois authorities, especially in view of the fact that the Finance Committee has taken the position that this is a State matter?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate Committee on Finance has not done exactly that. The State authorities who appeared before the Finance Committee urged that no part of this problem was a Federal concern; that it was all a State problem. They did not want the Federal Government to put its hands on it; and wherever the Federal Government had its hands on it they wanted its hands removed. To what extent they were actuated by an interest in unemployed veterans, or by a desire to retain or recapture power, I do not know. I do not pass upon that question. But they did not want any extension of the duration of payments. They did not want any additional money paid to the unemployed. The Senate committee accepted that theory only so far as it affected the increase in payment of monthly or weekly allowances, but it did not accept it so far as the extension of time was concerned. So the Finance Committee did not accept the theory that it was not a Federal problem, because it recognized it as a Federal problem by providing that whenever the time limit established by the State expires, the Federal Government will continue the payments out of the Federal Treasury at the rates provided by the State.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me make my position perfectly clear. I had hoped that the Senate Committee on Finance might report the Kilgore bill. I definitely favor the $25 weekly payment, but Democratic governors and Republican governors in the 48 States are unalterably opposed to Federal intervention. When every governor tells the committee, through his representative, that he does not want any part of the appropriation which we are willing to give to the States for the unemployed, then I say that in view of the fact that the States have $6,800,000,000 in their reserve funds, if they take that position in the beginning, the States are legally and morally bound to carry on through the period of unemployment, until that fund is exhausted. The testimony shows that in most States there is a reserve fund which would carry the State through two or three periods of unemployment. Illinois has more than $500,000,000 in the reserve fund, Pennsylvania $600,000,000, and New York $700,000,000. The States do not want this money under the Kilgore bill, and they have said so even though I think they should do otherwise. Let it be understood that if they do not want any part of this money now—if they do not want any help from the Federal Government in the beginning, I am not one who will gratuitously force upon the States additional money when they still have billions of dollars left in their reserve funds.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Illinois has understated rather than overstated the confusion which now exists. I believe that the debate during the past few minutes has gone astray from the main question.

This proposal does not involve the amount of the payment. In every State, as a prerequisite to qualifying for unemployment compensation, there must be a determination as to whether or not the applicant has refused suitable employment. The confusion which exists today arises from the fact that the United States Employment Service handles the employment, and issues certificates. On the other hand, the State employment service makes the payments. On my vacation I visited Kansas, and discussed this question with the State employment compensation director. He is not accepting certificates of the United States Employment Service. After the United States Employment Service has handled the employment question, the unemployment compensation director in Kansas then makes his own independent investigation as to whether or not the applicant has been offered suitable employment, and whether he has refused it or accepted it.

Mr. President, manifestly any proper administration of these questions should be in a single authority, the authority which makes the payment or the determination as to whether or not the prerequisite of suitable employment has been met. Today that is a very different question, which produces exactly the confusion to which the Senator from Illinois has referred.

This whole determination might be made, under proper circumstances, either by the United States Employment Service or by the States. We cannot transfer that function to the United States Employment Service. Under the present set-up—and there is nothing in the bill which would change it—the State makes the payment of unemployment compensation. Therefore the only practical thing to do is just what the Senator from Illinois proposes. We cannot transfer to the United States Employment Service the function of payment. There is no way to do it. The only thing we can do, as a practical matter, is to do what the Senator from Illinois proposes.

With the indulgence of the Senator from Illinois I should like to read subparagraph (b) of paragraph 4 of the Executive order of the President issued this morning:

> The United States Employment Service and all functions in the Department of Labor relating to employment service, the National War Labor Board and its functions, and the Retraining and Reemployment Administration and its functions shall be administered as organizational entities within the Department of Labor.

There is no doubt that there is a Federal function in this employment question. The Senator from Ohio very correctly described how that function can be carried out. Let me read the remainder of the paragraph in the President's order which takes care of that situation:

> All other functions transferred to the Department of Labor by this order shall be administered, and the internal staff and service activities relating to the aforesaid agencies may be administered, by such agencies in the Department of Labor as the Secretary may designate or establish for the purpose.

That is in the President's order issued this morning, terminating the War Manpower Commission and transferring not only the powers but the unexpended appropriations to the Department of Labor. So the Secretary of Labor will have in his hands full authority, full power, full personnel, and a sufficient amount of money to carry this out in a proper way. I think by all rules of practical common sense the amendment of the Senator from Illinois should be adopted.

NOMINATION OF HAROLD H. BURTON TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask the Senator to yield in order that I may report and request unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate consider a nomination made by the President. In that respect, if I may have the permission of the Senator from Illinois, I should like to state that yesterday the President nominated a Member of this body to the highest court in the land. He nominated the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] to be a member of the Supreme Court of the United States. The Committee on the Judiciary, at a specially called meeting this morning, authorized its chairman to report and ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Senator BURTON may be now considered and confirmed by the Senate.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, I now report favorably the nomination of HAROLD H. BURTON, of Ohio, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. President, speaking for the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the Senator from Ohio has been a member for a number of years, let me say that no other Member of this body has shown more zeal, diligence, and devotion to the work of the Senate of the United States than has Senator BURTON. A brilliant mind, a well-rounded sound lawyer, and a great American has been nominated by the President of the United States to be a member of the court of last resort.

Not only is Senator BURTON to be congratulated, but America and the American Government are to be congratulated on the President's action in nominating Senator BURTON. The court of last resort, the Supreme Court of the United States, will in the years which are just ahead of us be called upon to render vital and far-reaching decisions, and it is indeed a most consoling and splendid thing that the President of the United States has seen fit to select a man of Senator BURTON's ability, attainments, and integrity. He will be a credit to the Supreme Court, a credit to his country, and a credit to the world.

Mr. President, now speaking for the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Senator BURTON be confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the nomination, as in executive session?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words regarding the nomination. Of course, there is no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination of Senator BURTON to be a member of the Supreme Court of the United States is considered and confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I thought the unanimous-consent request was for the consideration of the nomination, but, of course, I would just as soon speak following the confirmation of the nomination as before.

Let me say that the State of Ohio is certainly greatly honored by the appointment of Senator BURTON. I do not know anyone who is better qualified for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. I believe the President is entitled to the highest credit for choosing a man so well qualified. I went to Harvard Law School with HAROLD BURTON; he was a year ahead of me. He was an outstanding student in the law school; he was an outstanding lawyer, first in the West and then in Ohio, for some 30 years. I think he is one of the best lawyers I know. He was in the legislature shortly after I was there, but, of course, membership in the legislature does not interfere with the practice of law. He left the practice of law to become mayor of the city of Cleveland, in which position he served 5 years. Then he was elected to the Senate of the United States. The Members of the Senate know that no one has been more diligent in the work of the Senate, and no one can possibly be more diligent in the work of the Court to which he has been appointed. He will be the best possible judge because there are few men who are naturally so impartial, few who are more willing to hear both sides and weigh the evidence and decide the issue in accordance with the principles which apply to the particular facts. No man whom I know has higher ideals respecting every aspect of government and a higher standard in the consideration of public questions.

Mr. President, I am delighted that the nomination of Senator BURTON has been confirmed. The Senate is honored, the country is fortunate, and the President is entitled to the highest commendation for his selection.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate for a moment, although I cannot qualify, I am sure, in any judicial or legislative capacity to pass upon this nomination, because of the long and intimate association which has made it quite impossible for me to be impartial or impersonal. It was exactly 40 years ago this week that I found myself in a college dormitory in a little New England town, and across the corridor was he who has served with us here as the junior Senator from Ohio. Through the sudden departure of both our roommates within a week, we joined drives as roommates, and that has continued through a very long and happy association, first in Bowdoin College, later in Harvard Law School, and then in association in various ways throughout our succeeding years, until we had the unique opportunity of marching down this aisle together to enter this body.

So, Mr. President, while I cannot qualify in any sense as a judge to pass upon my friend, I can qualify as a witness to his character throughout this entire period. I think it is perhaps exemplified by what I learned about him in those very early years when his gospel was John Halifax, Gentleman. I do not know whether many Members of the Senate are old enough to have remembered what was a classic of our youth, exemplifying the ideal of a gentleman. That portrait of the perfect man was the inspiration of his youth and of his adult years.

As the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has said, there are few who approach problems with greater diligence or more complete impersonality. That is a quality the need of which we recognize both in this body as well sometimes, judging from the rumblings we hear from across the park, perhaps in the body to which he has just been appointed. Perhaps it will be a not inconsiderable contribution to the harmony of the Court. I am sure it will be impossible for anyone to classify him in any category other than a man devoted to the highest principles of government and of American ideals.

So, Mr. President, I join in congratulations to the President upon this selection, and in congratulations to the Senate for its prompt and unanimous confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Committee on the Judiciary for its prompt action in reporting the nomination to the Senate. When the nomination came to the Senate yesterday it was referred in the ordinary routine way to the Committee on the Judiciary. I was asked this morning why a request had not been made that the nomination be confirmed immediately without reference to the committee. I believe the Senate is entitled to know why that was not done.

It has been the custom to confirm Members of the Senate upon being appointed by the President to other positions. It has not been a universal custom, but I think the custom has prevailed for a great many years that Senators, upon being appointed to executive or judicial positions, were confirmed without having their nominations referred to a committee.

Following the last confirmation by the Senate in that manner I was advised by at least two Senators that they thought that by handling the confirmation in that manner we were establishing a bad practice and that a Senator should not enjoy any privilege that was not enjoyed by any other citizen. It was stated that if a request should be made thereafter to have a nomination confirmed without first referring it to a committee, an objection would be made. I think it would be unfortunate if a request were objected to on the part of any Member of the Senate, and for that reason, in connection with this nomination, no such request was made. I am glad the committee acted promptly and reported the nomination to the Senate.

While I am on my feet I wish to say that I always regret seeing an able Senator taken from the Senate and appointed to some other position. I make that statement not only with respect to Senator BURTON, but with respect to other Senators who were appointed to various positions and who had been valuable in our legislative work. Nevertheless, I ap-

preciate the fact that the man who justifies his election to the Senate may have admirable qualifications for other positions. I have admired Senator BURTON. I have noted his fairness here in the Senate and his judicial approach to problems of legislation, attributes which no doubt have for a long time reflected the qualities of his mind. While I regret to see the Senate lose his services, I congratulate the President, the country, and the Supreme Court upon his accession to that high judicial body.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois has the floor. The Chair understands the Senator from Illinois does not desire to discuss the nomination. Does the Senator from Vermont desire to express any views at this time with respect to the nomination?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, Mr. President. That is what I wish to do.

I desire the Senate to know that I wholeheartedly congratulate our colleague and friend from Ohio upon his important appointment. I want to express publicly my entire confidence in his character, in his ability, and in his wonderful personality. I predict that he will have a distinguished career in which he will serve his country even better than he has served it in the United States Senate. We all recognize his superior contribution to the public welfare while he has been a Member of the Senate. I wish him a great career in his new opportunity to serve.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator's amendment propose to return the employment services to the States at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have provided in my amendment that the Employment Service facilities, property, and personnel loaned by the States to the United States Employment Service shall be returned to the States not later than 30 days after the enactment of this act. Upon further consideration I shall modify my amendment so as to provide for a period of 90 days instead of 30 days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois modifies his amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. While I am on this subject, I desire to further modify the amendment, in the fifth line thereof, by striking out the words "War Manpower Commission" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Labor."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Upon reading the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Illinois, I find myself in sympathy with its general purpose. I could not, however, find myself in sympathy with the length of time which was to be provided for the return of the USES to the States. Now that the amendment has been modified to provide for 90 days, instead of 30 days, it is satisfactory so far as I am concerned.

I believe that each Senator understood that we were under obligation to return this agency to the States within 6 months after the end of hostilities. It did not occur to some of us at the time that the declaration of the end of hostilities might take place a great many months after the actual fighting had stopped. However, VJ-day having occurred in August, and this amendment designed to take effect 90 days after the act itself becomes law, it would appear that 6 months will probably have elapsed between the time fighting actually stopped in Japan and the time this agency will be returned to the States. In view of the fact that the amendment has been modified to read "90 days" instead of "30 days," it seems to me that we are only making good our obligation to return the USES to the States within a 90-day period of time.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I was curious to know what is going to happen in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and other Territories. Will the Federal Government, under this amendment, continue to have charge of employment in those Territories?

Mr. LUCAS. All I am attempting to do is to return the Employment Service to the status quo which existed previous to the time the President took control of the agency. What is taking place in Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the other Territories to which the Senator has referred, I am unable to state.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, there are employment services in Hawaii and Alaska, and under the provisions of the Federal Employment Service Act those Territories will be considered in the same way as would any of the States. I understand that Puerto Rico is handled entirely by the FES itself.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure that the testimony corroborates the Senator's position.

Mr. TAFT. The status in Puerto Rico will not be changed.

Mr. LANGER. Am I to understand that the Puerto Ricans are in a different class from citizens of the States?

Mr. LUCAS. Puerto Ricans have always been in a different class.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, the Federal Government will have charge of employment in Puerto Rico?

Mr. LUCAS. Whatever the Federal Government has been doing with respect to employment in Puerto Rico, I presume will be continued in the same way. How long the Federal Government has been engaged in that activity, or what it has been doing, I cannot tell the Senator because I am not acquainted with the facts.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in order to keep the record straight, I may say that the Senator from Ohio stated that he thought the Senator from Kentucky and I had misconceived what the situation would be if this proposed action were taken. Certainly we knew what the situation would be. A situation existed on December 7, 1941, of 48 separate systems existing under which our manpower could not properly be employed during the war emergency without Federal action. I believe that we will be unable properly to use our labor force in the demobilization and reconversion period with 48 separate systems in existence. So I again urge on the Senator from Illinois that he withdraw his amendment and introduce a bill to cover the situation. I might be in favor of the bill after hearing some sensible testimony that it will work.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois is not going to withdraw his amendment because he is as convinced that it will work as the Senator from Connecticut seems to be that it will not work.

At the present time I have in my office letters showing that in a certain city there are 2,500 persons out of employment. There are 1,500 jobs available and they have not been filled. Yet there is a line as long as from here to my office for unemployment compensation.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion, if we place the responsibility on the States where it belongs that agency will be fastened with a responsibility it cannot escape. Unemployed workers will be compelled to take suitable jobs or not obtain unemployment compensation. Thus we will be taking a long stride toward solving a serious problem confronting the Nation because of the present passing of responsibility from one agency to the other as to whether or not workers should or should not get unemployment compensation, whether they should or should not take jobs, and whether the jobs available are or are not suitable. There is the line of demarcation which now exists, which is causing much confusion and chaos and which will continue to do so unless we lodge the responsibility where it belongs.

I should like to see the Federal Government have all the responsibility. I think it could do a better job under the complicated conditions that exist in all the States, but that is not the question before the Senate; it will not and it cannot be before the Senate for some time. The unemployment situation is developing rapidly, and the sooner we can get these agencies in the hands of the States, and let them give orders and mobilize personnel and make them responsible for doing the job, the sooner we will clear up many serious problems that now exist in connection with unemployment.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. I desire heartily to approve all that the Senator from Illinois has said. I have a letter in my hand from the Governor of North Carolina

asking that this transfer be made. He sets forth the confusion which has arisen and will continue to arise, just as the Senator from Illinois has stated, so long as there are two agencies handling this matter, one of which does the paying and the other does the certifying of eligibility, functions which ought to be placed in the hands of one agency. I think as a matter of good faith we owe it to the States to comply with the authority granted and with the understanding at the time these agencies were taken over by the Federal Government, which was that they were to be returned to the States within 90 days after hostilities ceased. The Senator from Illinois has modified his amendment to comply with that, and I believe that the amendment should be adopted. I think it would make for effectiveness in controlling the unemployment situation and that it would go far toward solving the problem and relieving the confusion which now exists.

I wish to read the letter of the Governor of North Carolina:

DEAR SENATOR HOEY: I do not wish to add to your legislative burdens, which I know are heavy these days, but I am deeply concerned personally and officially, about a matter that only the Congress can help us with. I am enough concerned to take this up with you on my own initiative but there is also the mandate of our general assembly that I do something about it.

We are faced with problems of reconversion in North Carolina and there is prospect of widespread unemployment. To deal with this we have a State unemployment compensation commission, with an adequate reserve fund (more than $105,000,000), but minus its right arm. That right arm is the employment service, which we loaned to the Federal Government, on the request of the President, on January 1, 1942. Up to that time our agency had two coordinate divisions, the unemployment compensation division and the employment service division, each supplementing and supporting the other. It was a duration loan and there was definite promise of its return when the war was over.

It does not take an expert to realize the situation our unemployment compensation commission is in. The unemployed file claims for benefits with the unemployment compensation commission, but the agency has no control over registrations for work and the job placements. Except in 32 of the 115 offices in the State, the commission does not even take the claims. All of the employment service employees are Federal employees, owing no allegiance to our State agency and, except as it pleases them, obeying no orders from our State officials.

Our general assembly of 1945, in H. B. 98, a copy of which is enclosed, demanded the return of the employment service to the State and directed that I bring the matter to your attention. This resolution and the developments of the past few weeks, constrain me to write you now. I sincerely hope you will feel disposed to take early action in this matter. We don't want any break-down of our reemployment machinery in North Carolina, or even any slowing up, in the emergency that is upon us.

* * * * *

R. GREGG CHERRY,
Governor.

Governor Cherry sent both to Senator BAILEY and myself a copy of the joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of North Carolina urging the return of this agency to the State. I ask that there may be printed in the RECORD a copy of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 18

Joint resolution of the General Assembly of North Carolina memorializing the Congress of the United States to retain and to continue unemployment compensation as a State government function and to resist any further Federal encroachment in this field

Whereas the committee on economic security, which made an exhaustive study of North Carolina prior to the passage of the Social Security Act, recommended in its report to the President of the United States that the States administer unemployment compensation with a minimum of Federal guidance and assistance; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, when it passed the Social Security Act in 1935, provided for State administration of unemployment compensation under limited Federal guidance; and

Whereas the State of North Carolina, through its general assembly, established in December 1936, an unemployment compensation program for its citizens in conformity with the Social Security Act; and

Whereas during the more than 8 years since December 1936, the unemployment compensation program in North Carolina has been administered by State officials and State employees with increasing efficiency, and in a manner satisfactory alike to those entitled to benefits and to its citizens generally; and

Whereas during this period the State of North Carolina has built up and accumulated an unemployment compensation fund of more than $91,000,000 for the benefit of its workers who may suffer unemployment; and

Whereas the established and proven State machinery for administering unemployment compensation, together with the State's unemployment compensation fund, constitute North Carolina's most important bulwark against the economic uncertainties and hazards that lie before us in the postwar period of readjustment; and

Whereas, during the past more than 8 years, the States have established State unemployment-compensation programs and have accumulated experience not available elsewhere in administering them, and have built up unemployment compensation reserves totaling in the aggregate more than $6,000,000,000; and

Whereas during the same period the States generally have expanded and broadened their unemployment compensation programs so as to make them more effective in meeting the needs of unemployed workers and can be expected further to broaden and expand their programs as the need for such action develops; and

Whereas job-placement machinery is essential to the proper administration of an unemployment compensation program in order to insure that every claimant is given every opportunity for suitable work; and

Whereas in accordance with a request made by the President of the United States, North Carolina's job-placement machinery—the employment service division of the Unemployment Compensation Commission—was loaned to the Federal Government on January 1, 1942, for emergency use; and

Whereas the Governors' Conference at its thirty-sixth annual meeting held in Hershey, Pa., on May 31, 1944, adopted resolutions urging and supporting the continuance of State administration of unemployment compensation and the return of State employment services to their respective States as soon as practicable; and

Whereas His Excellency, R. Gregg Cherry, Governor of North Carolina, in his inaugural address, emphasized his belief that unemployment compensation is properly a State function and recommended that the general assembly, if it shared his views, so express itself by resolution to this State's delegation in Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of North Carolina hereby expresses and earnestly asserts its agreement with the Governor of this State in his belief that unemployment compensation is properly, and should remain, a State function.

SEC. 2. That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from North Carolina be, and they are hereby, requested:

(1) To devote their influence, energy, and resources to the continuance of unemployment compensation as a State function; and

(2) To oppose with all possible diligence and force any attempt to centralize and federalize the administration of unemployment compensation; and

(3) To institute and support any measures necessary to insure the return of these State employment services as soon as practicable.

SEC. 3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State of North Carolina to the Senators and Representatives who compose this State's congressional delegation.

SEC. 4. That the Governor of North Carolina and the Unemployment Compensation Commission of North Carolina are hereby directed and requested to join and act in concert with all other States, officials, and organizations in all their activities for the purpose of continuing unemployment compensation on the basis of a State system and in resisting Federal encroachment or federalization of such State systems; that the Secretary of State of North Carolina is directed to send copies of this resolution to the Governor of each State, and to the executive officer of all territories and possessions operating unemployment compensation systems.

SEC. 5. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly, read three times and ratified, this the 28th day of February 1945.

L. Y. BALLENTINE,
President of the Senate.
O. L. RICHARDSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, I think the Senator from North Carolina unintentionally erred in stating that when the agencies were taken over by the Federal Government it was agreed that they should be returned within 90 days after hostilities ceased. That was provided by an amendment in an appropriation bill, and, as I understand, there was no particular time fixed by agreement. The 90-day period was provided in an appropriation bill, instead of being a part of an agreement.

Mr. HOEY. But it was understood that they would be returned after the war was over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, and it is still understood that they will be. The only difference is as to when it will be done.

Mr. HOEY. The trouble is if they are retained until 1947, then they will never be returned, and I think good faith demands that they be returned within 90 days.

Mr. BARKLEY. They would be unless Congress itself by legislation continued indefinitely the Federal exercise of this power.

Mr. HOEY. The difficulty about it is that if the Federal Government gets control of an agency and holds it 2 or 3 years, it is almost impossible to pry it

loose. I believe these agencies ought to be returned to the States within the time provided.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator from Illinois will suspend a moment, the Chair desires to make an explanation.

The Senator from Kentucky was on his feet a few moments ago and there ensued a colloquy between the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Illinois, because of which the Senator from Illinois took the floor.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] was on his feet before the Senator from Illinois, and the Chair is put in rather an embarrassing situation. Before the Senator from Illinois continues his speech, the Chair must recognize the Senator from New York who was first on his feet. The Chair knows the Senator from Illinois understands the situation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I would not want to embarrass either the distinguished President pro tempore or my good friend the Senator from New York, but, under the circumstances, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New York although I have not quite finished.

Mr. WAGNER. I shall be glad to wait until the Senator finishes.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to comment briefly on the statement made by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina and the letter from the Governor of that State which he read. The Governor of North Carolina is on the ground and understands what is going on in his own State, and he definitely says in the letter which has been read that if the Federal Government continues to hold on to the Federal Unemployment Service there will be a "break-down" and "a slowing up" in his State—those are the words used—in connection with orderly payments of unemployment compensation and in connection with orderly progress in getting men back to work. Getting the men back to work is the important thing in the unemployment problem; and when dual authority exists confusion and chaos will continue because of the squabbling and the quarrels and the duplication of effort.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Kilgore substitute for the pending bill.

I am proud of the fact that I am one of the sponsors of S. 1274, the temporary reconversion unemployment bill, as it was introduced last July in the Senate before VJ-day. As a result of our victory over Japan I had hoped that the Finance Committee would have the courage and wisdom to report out a bill which would deal adequately with the human side of reconversion. I had hoped that the Finance Committee would recognize the tremendous contribution which war workers made to our victory; that they would report out a bill according our war workers as generous treatment as we have given to business in contract termination and surplus-property legislation, and the carry-back provisions of our tax laws. But instead, the bill as reported out by the Finance Committee is a watered-down version of the original bill. It is completely out of keeping with the great tradition of the Senate as the guardian of human rights. It seems rather to follow the principle of billions for defense, but only a few cents for tribute to those who made victory possible.

EXISTING STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE LAWS INADEQUATE

In considering the bill before the Senate today, I hope that Senators will not base their action on the hope that by passing this inadequate bill this is the last they will hear of the subject of unemployment insurance in Congress. This is not the first time the Senate has had before it proposals dealing with unemployment insurance and it will not be the last time.

I am proud to say that, as a minority of one, I advocated unemployment insurance in the United States Senate some 15 years ago; and that I introduced the original social-security bill in the Senate containing the unemployment-insurance provisions of the existing Social Security Act. But I am also frank to admit my disappointment in how the unemployment-insurance provisions of the existing State laws have worked out in actual practice, as has already been stated.

Bitter experience has proved that the present State-by-State system has not measured up to its potentialities. The present State-by-State system as it now operates is so complicated and so inadequate that sooner or later the Congress will be faced with overhauling the entire program. The American people will not be willing to permit retention of an unemployment-insurance system with the many discriminations and inequities which now exist.

Why did we enact unemployment insurance into law in 1935? Was it merely to build up the huge fund of $7,000,000,000 which now exists only to keep those funds in cold storage so that unemployed persons would not receive adequate benefits? Was it to provide jobs for State administrators so that they could rush down here to the Congress to oppose improvements in the unemployment-insurance legislation? Was unemployment insurance set up in this country so that it would become so cumbersome and complicated that workers could not understand how to get their benefits? Was it set up so that workers would have to stand in line only to be denied benefits because of the harsh and restrictive disqualification provisions?

EXISTING STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE LAWS COMPLICATED

No; these were not the reasons why the Congress of the United States enacted unemployment insurance legislation. The reason was very simple—to pay persons benefits when they became unemployed.

But the States seem to have forgotten that purpose. In most States an employee is presumed to be ineligible for his benefits until he has gone through a complicated process of proving his rights under the law. The result is to delay payment of benefits to discourage the unemployed worker, and to defeat the basic purpose of the legislation which was to give the workers some assurance of security during periods of unemployment. It is easier and quicker for an unemployed worker to go to any bank and get a character loan of $150 than it is for him to get the $15 due him under his State unemployment insurance law as a matter of right. It is easier for a corporation to get a loan of $15,000,000 from the R. F. C. than it is for a worker to get $15 in unemployment insurance.

ORIGINAL S. 1274 SHOULD BE PASSED

I am supporting S. 1274 in the form of the substitute being offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. I am going to be in favor of every amendment made from the floor of the Senate to liberalize and improve the bill reported out from the Finance Committee.

S. 1274 was designed as a temporary bill to deal only with the emergency, consequently, it dealt with only three aspects of unemployment insurance—the maximum amount of benefits to be paid, the maximum duration of benefits, and the coverage of the system. But on each and every one of these three simple but essential points the bill as reported out contains crippling amendments.

The committee deleted entirely from the bill the provision dealing with the maximum amount of benefits so that in some States unemployed workers will continue to receive only a maximum of $15 a week.

The committee amended the provision in the bill relating to duration of benefits so that it did not guarantee 26 weeks of benefits to all unemployed persons. I am glad, however, that the chairman of the Finance Committee has agreed to an amendment to this provision which improves the bill.

The committee also deleted the provision in the original bill which gave the Federal Government authority to make the supplementary payments if the State was unwilling or unable to do so. I am in favor of the restoration of this provision. It is perfectly proper to give each State the choice of whether it wishes to administer the provisions of the bill. But if a State does not wish to do so, we should protect the worker by making the supplementary payments through Federal machinery.

The committee dropped from the bill the provisions extending coverage to agricultural processing employees, small firms, and other groups not now covered.

Finally, the committee changed the provision extending unemployment insurance to Federal employees by putting them under the laws of the various States rather than under one simple and uniform law such as that of the District of Columbia.

This means that Federal employees in some States will be entitled to only 10 weeks of benefits at $15 a week while in other States they may receive as much as $28 a week for 26 weeks.

All these changes are undesirable

ORIGINAL BILL DOES NOT PROVIDE FLAT $25 TO ALL

When the original bill was first introduced there was a good deal of misinformation circulating about it; some of it prompted by persons who should know better, but who were anxious to do everything in their power to prevent the bill's passage.

It was said that the bill would federalize the State laws. But it does not. It was said that it provided a uniform $25 a week to everyone from the janitor to the skilled machinist. But it does not. It merely insures that the higher paid worker, those earning $50 a week or more, can get $25 instead of the maximum provided under State laws. This is a modest figure considering what it costs to raise a family in accordance with our American standard of living. Five States now provide a maximum of $25 or more in benefits, two of which go as high as $28 for a worker with dependents.

For these reasons I am in favor of restoration of the $25 maximum provision in the bill. I cannot in good conscience justify a total payment of $15 a week to an unemployed man for himself, his wife, and children by appealing to the irrelevant doctrine of States' rights. I believe that human rights come before all other rights.

DURATION OF BENEFITS SHOULD BE FOR FULL 26 WEEKS

The bill, as reported out, did not provide that all individuals who lose their jobs will receive benefits for a maximum duration of 26 weeks. I am glad that the chairman of the Finance Committee has agreed to the deletion of the 60-percent limitation. This limitation would have made unemployment insurance even more complicated than it already is.

I believe that all workers should be entitled to the full 26 weeks of benefits if they remain unemployed that long. In Great Britain, the maximum duration of benefits is 30 weeks for everyone. In Canada, the maximum duration of benefits is 52 weeks.

We ought to be able to do as well as Great Britain or Canada. In the GI bill of rights we provided 52 weeks of benefits to our unemployed servicemen. Certainly the full 26 weeks to our civilian war workers is only fair and reasonable.

STATE LEGISLATURES WILL NOT HAVE TO MEET

As I said before, some of the objections to the original Senate bill 1274, did not go to the merits of the proposal at all. The most irrelevant objection to the bill was that made on the grounds that special sessions of the State legislatures would be needed to take advantage of any Federal legislation increasing the maximum payment. This was a bluff designed to block congressional action on this provision. But it worked.

The Finance Committee voted to drop the provision relating to the maximum amount of benefits. But if the committee had really been sympathetic to the provision they would have at least given an opportunity to each State to elect whether it could take advantage of such a provision. And if they had done so—and I hope the Senate will vote to do so—I predict that the Governors and State attorneys general will find a way to take advantage of the provision without calling special sessions of their legislatures. I cannot see, however, what is wrong with a State having to call a special session to take care of human rights—the rights of unemployed workers who produced the weapons of war which made victory possible.

Here in the Senate we should call the bluff. We should give every State the option of increasing its maximum payments if it can do so. Twenty States replied to the telegram sent by the Finance Committee that they would have to call special sessions because they interpret their laws as denying benefits to persons eligible for Federal benefits. But 19 other States disagreed with this strained interpretation and said they would not have to call special sessions because they clearly recognized that the Federal benefits were supplementary benefits—not duplicate. Among the 19 States that said they would not have to call special sessions were 14 States with language in their laws almost identical to the 20 States which said they would. Why did the 14 States say they would not deny benefits and the 20 say they would when they all have identical language in their laws? I think the States proved too much in their replies. They showed the complete confusion and discrimination which exists in a State-by-State system of unemployment insurance. They proved to me their unwillingness or inability to meet an emergency—an inflexibility that is completely out of harmony with the objective of unemployment insurance. These replies show the basic weakness in the system—interpretation of exactly the same provisions in different ways—resulting in discrimination, variation, and inequity.

UNIFORM COVERAGE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Now I want to say a word about the provisions in the bill relating to coverage of Federal employees. Last year the Senate included in the war mobilization and reconversion bill provisions for the coverage of this group but these provisions were deleted in conference. The issue before the Senate today, therefore, is not whether to include this group since we have already gone on the record to that effect. The real problem before us is on what simple and equitable basis should unemployment compensation be paid to these groups.

S. 1274, the Kilgore bill as introduced, provided that Federal employees should be covered under the law of the District of Columbia.

The bill as reported out by the Finance Committee places one group of Federal employees—that is, maritime employees—under the law of the District of Columbia, but all other Federal employees under the various State laws. Such discrimination is, in my opinion, absolutely unwarranted.

Here is what the bill does: A Federal employee earning $30 per week would receive a benefit of $12 in Kentucky, $13 in Maine, $15 in Georgia, $16 in Wisconsin, $17.39 in Iowa, $18 in Rhode Island, $20 in California, $21 in New York, $24 in Nevada, and $25 in Utah.

These are not adjustments to local conditions. They are nothing other than haphazard variation and discrimination. Any unemployment-insurance system worthy of its name should provide that workers in similar circumstances should receive similar benefits; if a worker earns $30 in Kentucky or California, he should receive benefits at the same rate regardless of the State in which he worked.

I believe that all Federal employees should be covered under some kind of simple and uniform law like that of the District of Columbia.

I am opposed to putting Federal employees under 51 different varieties of State provisions with not a single protection against the harsh and discriminatory provisions in existing State laws. If this proposal should be enacted into law it will be the first time that a matter affecting Federal employees and involving millions of dollars of Federal money is turned over to the States lock, stock, and barrel. This provision in the bill as reported out seems to me unsound and to constitute an undesirable precedent.

Another result of this bill is to leave Federal employees at the mercy of the varied disqualification provisions of State laws. This means that in 18 States individuals will lose benefits if they cannot find a job after taking care of a sick husband or child. It means that Federal employees who leave Michigan and Alabama will lose their benefits entirely. It means that married women in the Federal service will be subject to disqualification in many States. It means 51 different standards for testing the suitability of work to which a Federal employee may be referred. It means 51 different standards for testing "good cause" for refusal to accept suitable work.

I have not heard anyone suggest that the pay of Federal employees ought to vary in accordance with the State in which they are employed. Why then vary the unemployment pay of Federal employees? Nor have I heard any suggestions from the Finance Committee that the income tax of the Federal employees should vary with the State of their employment or residence. Why then should we provide that the unemployment insurance of the Federal employees should vary with the laws of the States?

I want to show the Senate how inequitable the present provisions of the bill will be. Let us consider three men living in the same boarding house in the District of Columbia. All three of them work for the War Department but one works in Maryland, the other in Virginia, and the third in Washington, D. C. Assuming that all three were earning $40 per week, the man from Virginia would receive $15 per week in benefits for nearly 26 weeks, or a total of $385, while in Maryland and Washington, D. C., the other two individuals would receive $20 for 26 weeks or a total of $520, a difference of $135 in total benefits.

There are similar situations, like in Camden, N. J., and Philadelphia, Pa.—Newark, N. J., and New York City—where individuals living next door to each other will receive different amounts of unemployment benefits, although they have both worked for the Federal Government and earned the same amount in previous wages. Under the Pennsylvania law a man will receive $20 per week, but his next-door neighbor who worked in New Jersey will receive $25 per week. Of course, the basic reason for this discrimination among persons in similar circumstances is that we have this hodgepodge of 51 different varieties of State laws. But now the Finance Committee

recommends that we compound the felony by making more persons subject to this discrimination. Never before in the history of our country have we subjected Federal employees to such variation and discrimination.

Those who believe, however, that such variation and discrimination can be justified on the ground that people who live next door to each other should receive the same benefits will find that this will not be true under the provisions of the bill as reported by the Finance Committee.

A Federal employee who has worked in Arizona and returns to the State of New York will find that he can receive only $15 a week for a little more than 22 weeks, or a total of $337, while if his home State should be Connecticut or Michigan and he returns home, his next-door neighbor may be receiving as much as $28 for 26 weeks or a total of $728—more than twice as much. There is no rhyme or reason to this type of variation.

I urge the Senate to restore the provision covering all Federal employees under the District of Columbia law.

WHY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SHOULD BE ON A FEDERAL BASIS

Senate bill 1274 provides a modest and temporary program lasting only until June 30, 1947. If no serious unemployment develops, it will cost very little; if reconversion does not proceed as swiftly as we hope, we will be ready to perform the necessary job of protecting workers during their periods of unemployment. The pending bill should not be confused with, nor does it in any way take the place of, the permanent program incorporated in Senate bill 1050, which the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I introduced last May. This bill of ours provides that unemployment insurance should be operated on a Federal basis as part of a permanent unified social insurance system which includes permanent and temporary disability old-age and survivors insurance, medical care, and a national system of public employment offices. It eliminates all the inconsistencies, inequities, discriminations, and complications which now exist under the various State laws.

Our experience this year, just as last year, proves that merely trying to patch up the holes in our present unemployment system will never make a satisfactory program. Eventually unemployment insurance must be a Federal responsibility. This does not mean that day-to-day administration of unemployment insurance will all be centralized and handled from Washington. But it does mean that the Federal Government will see to it that equity and simplicity are established in the basic policies to be followed in the administration of the unemployment insurance program.

Anyone who has followed the hearings before the Finance Committee can find ample evidence in those hearings for the need of establishing a Federal unemployment insurance program, as we have heard from a number of Senators today.

I do not intend today to go into all the reasons why I believe there should be a Federal unemployment insurance system. The bill now pending before the Senate does not federalize the program. But by the very passage of this bill Congress recognizes the inability of the States to deal satisfactorily with the unemployment insurance problem.

The inadequacies in our present system of unemployment insurance which should be corrected are:

First. The eligibility requirements, the disqualifications, and the amount of benefits provided by State laws vary widely so that the present plan fails to meet the fundamental test of all social legislation, that is, similar treatment of individuals in similar circumstances.

Second. The disqualification provisions of most of the State laws are too severe, resulting in the cancellation or postponement of benefits to many individuals.

Third. Because of the great variation in eligibility requirements, disqualifications, and benefit provisions, it is impossible to assure prompt and uniform treatment of individuals who work in more than one State or who move from one State to another.

Fourth. The widely varying basis for determining employer contribution rates provided in State laws results in employers in the same competing lines of business in different States, with exactly the same employment and unemployment experience, paying different contribution rates, and thus results in discriminatory treatment of employers.

Fifth. Employers are subject to duplicate reporting on unemployment-insurance matters from both the Federal Government and the State government; and, in addition, employers in many States are forced to make out complicated forms and reports which differ from State to State.

Sixth. Many of the administrative provisions of State unemployment-compensation laws are so complicated that it is difficult for workers to understand their rights and to obtain the benefits due them promptly.

Seventh. There is no equalization between States of the cost of providing benefits. At the present time each State must finance the total cost of its own benefits, thus placing a heavy handicap on States with heavy unemployment and giving a substantial advantage to States with low unemployment.

These basic weaknesses in our unemployment-insurance system need correction. They can be corrected only if the Finance Committee gives consideration to proposals for drastic revision of the whole set-up.

In the meantime, we should pass a strengthened and improved bill dealing with temporary reconversion unemployment benefits. We should amend and correct the pending bill before it is passed by the Senate. In its present form, the bill reported by the Finance Committee does not deal adequately with existing needs.

TERMINATION OF THE WAR—DEMOBILIZATION OF MILITARY FORCES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, yesterday, on the Senate floor, I stated that—

I have a profound respect for General MacArthur, his policies and judgment.

I went on to say:

If we can maintain and police Japan and the Southwest Pacific areas with 200,000 men, we ought to do the same with less men in the European theater.

I further said:

If we can police both theaters with not more than 200,000 men in each, that will take only 400,000 men.

This figure means that we have the first suggestion of a peacetime Army which quite generally meets with the approval of the people throughout the country.

At the same time I asked members of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, on the basis of General MacArthur's declaration, to report to the Senate a resolution to terminate the war, and the draft, and bring about a demobilization of the military forces as rapidly as possible.

After the discussions we have had today on the floor of the Senate on the pending amendment, it seems to me that such a resolution should be reported immediately because we should know when the war terminates, so far as it affects the purposes and life of scores of acts and scores of agencies which depend upon the termination of the war. I am not speaking from an international standpoint. When the peace treaty is signed, will that be a termination of the war? The President in his good judgment can delay it as long as he cares to. So I think the Congress of the United States should now have before it a resolution declaring the war terminated as of a certain date for the purposes of the acts under which many Government agencies are operating and under which many of them probably should fold up, and will fold up unless they can come before the Congress and justify their continuation.

I also said yesterday that I thought the time had come when we should be thinking about the end of the draft and about bringing about the demobilization of our armed forces as rapidly as possible. I am glad to say to the Senate that last night, on my way back to my office, I learned that the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] introduced Senate bill 1408, which has to do with demobilizing members of our armed forces who have been in the service 2 years or more.

So today I repeat on the floor of the Senate that I request the Committee on Military Affairs to adopt the suggestions which I put forward yesterday because I find in the Baltimore Sun of September 19, 1945, a statement that President Truman backed up General MacArthur's plans to slash the size of the occupation Army in Japan. The President is quoted in the article as saying that—

He was glad to hear that 200,000 Regular Army men could do the job.

The article further quotes the President as follows:

If Japan can be occupied with fewer troops, so, too, probably, can Germany.

That statement verifies the declaration made by General MacArthur. It verifies the statement I made on the floor of the

Senate yesterday, and I am very thankful that the President apparently sees eye to eye with General MacArthur.

Mr. President, I am convinced that my request of the Senate Military Affairs Committee reflects the overwhelming desire of the American people to conclude a just and decent peace, to bring their boys home, and to end the conscription of their youth. If General MacArthur believes he needs only 200,000 men to finish the job he has been assigned in the Pacific, the American people—I among them—believe him.

There are seventy or eighty million Japanese whom General MacArthur says can be set on the road to peace under the effective control of 200,000 American troops. The American people must realize that in the area under American occupation in Germany there are only 11,000,000 Germans; and certainly our memories are not so short that we cannot recall that following the last war the major victor powers believed all that Germany needed to police her 70,000,000 people was 100,000 men, which were provided for in the Versailles Treaty.

Certainly the vast disparity between the number of troops which are being asked by General MacArthur to occupy Japan and the 400,000 to 500,000 troops which have been asked to occupy the American zone in Germany ought now to be apparent to every American.

Furthermore, in the light of these figures, all the talk about compulsory peacetime military training or about extending the present Selective Service Act, regardless of how we may feel about it, in order to meet our military needs at home and abroad, is now premature.

In saying this, I wish again to pay my respects to the magnificent job that has been done by the armed forces of this country, and I wish to go just as far as any Member of the Senate in the effort to insure the peace. Yet, at the same time, I continue to believe that the genesis of the American way of life lies in the fact that a free people with a civilian Army is our strongest defense.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the Chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] as modified.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if there is to be no further discussion on the amendment, I suggest the absence of a quorum. If any other Senator wishes to discuss the amendment I will withhold the suggestion for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any Senator wish to discuss the amendment?

Mr. TAFT. I wish to discuss the amendment, but I prefer waiting until after a quorum call.

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Murray
Andrews	Gurney	Myers
Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoey	Shipstead
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Byrd	Knowland	Taylor
Capehart	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Carville	Lucas	Tobey
Chandler	McCarran	Tunnell
Chavez	McClellan	Vandenberg
Connally	McFarland	Wagner
Cordon	McKellar	Walsh
Donnell	McMahon	Wheeler
Downey	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Mead	White
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Mitchell	Willis
George	Moore	Wilson
Gerry	Morse	Young
Green	Murdock	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the Lucas amendment.

In 1933 the Congress established a national system of public employment offices. The act of June 6, 1933, established the United States Employment Service. It provided for aid to States in establishing State employment services. The United States Employment Service then proceeded to coordinate the operation of the various State employment offices. The language of the act is very definite. It states in part as follows:

> The bureau shall also assist in coordinating the public employment offices throughout the country and in increasing their usefulness by developing and prescribing minimum standards of efficiency, assisting them in meeting problems peculiar to their localities, promoting uniformity in their administrative and statistical procedure, furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and other information of value in the operation of the system, and maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States.

In other words, we had a complete system. The Federal office had the right to put men into each State office. If they found a number of jobs in one city for which they needed people from other cities, they sent word, a general bulletin, to their representatives in each State, and their representatives brought the bulletin to the attention of the local State employment offices. That was the system.

It continued to operate satisfactorily until the day after Pearl Harbor, and on the day after Pearl Harbor the President sent a telegram to every governor throughout the United States demanding that in the interest of the war activity he turn over the State employment offices to the Federal Government. I say that was the day after Pearl Harbor. Many governors were very much opposed to the idea, but they did not feel that they could properly at that time, in the midst of war excitement, refuse to comply. However, most of them attached strings saying that just as soon as the war was over they wanted the offices back.

Since that time the USES has operated. There have been many controversies as to the merits of which I do not know enough about the facts to express an opinion. I know many people feel that there has been no improvement in efficiency, that everything that was done could have been done if the responsibility had been left in the State employment offices, where it was originally lodged. What was actually done was to increase tremendously the expense of operating all the State offices. Three or four times as many men were engaged in the work as there had been previously, and all sorts of restrictions were imposed on employers as to the kind of men who would be certified for employment and those who would not be certified. I do not know the merits of that.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator from Ohio state the authority for the claims he is making? Are these the Senator's own observations?

Mr. TAFT. No; they are the result of letters I have received, and I am not purporting to pass on the merits of the controversy. I merely say there has been a controversy. Some have maintained that there was no need for the Federal service, that all they have done has been, so to speak, rather in the nature of regimentation than otherwise. Others have maintained that during the war it was necessary and proper to exercise greater control over where workers should go, and what sort of restrictions should be imposed, than when there was no war. I do not purport to pass on the merits of the problem as a war problem.

I yield further to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. In view of the Senator's last statement, does he not think it would be well if we had some testimony as to what the facts are, instead of depending on the letters and hearsay the Senator has been receiving?

Mr. TAFT. No. The question now is merely one of going back to a status of peace. We are now under peace conditions. We are now in a situation in which we want to find men jobs. The sole problem is to find men jobs, and in that the USES has had no experience. It has not been trying to do that. It has been trying to find people for jobs, and now the problem is to find jobs for people. I say that whatever the merits of this controversy may be during war, we have now gotten beyond that point, and we must now consider what must be done in peacetime.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator know that the millions of people who have been transported across State lines, on the inducement of the United States Employment Service, have not been transported home miraculously in the last few days?

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator knows, does he not, that the millions of people who have been transported across State

lines have not suddenly found themselves transplanted back to their former places of employment?

Mr. TAFT. The evidence before the committee showed that thousands have been transferred back, that many have taken their cars and families and moved back to the places whence they came. We had evidence from a Tennessee man that some of the leading hotels in Tennessee were filled with people moving into Tennessee or out of Tennessee. He said, incidentally, they were paying hotel charges which he himself never would pay unless he had been on a State pay roll.

Mr. McMAHON. Thousands have returned, but millions are still where they went during wartime to do war work. We have to get them back, too.

Mr. TAFT. However, the point I am trying to make is that the Federal-State system is fully equipped to do that. The USES still exists, it still has employees. It had employees throughout the Nation before Pearl Harbor. It has an office of its own, which often is located in the State office, though sometimes not located in the State office. We are not asking that the USES be abolished. So far as there is any interstate job to be done, they are supposed to do it.

As a matter of fact, unemployment is first a local problem. We had evidence before the committee over and over again that there were so many jobs and so many unemployed; that in Worcester, Mass., we will say, 2,000 people registered as unemployed, and that also 2,000 jobs were registered with the USES, but that very few of the unemployed were taken, although, of course, if there had been proper coordination, they should have been made to take the jobs.

Primarily, if we are to cure unemployment, the first task is to do the local job. The Committee on Economic Development has gone to every employer in all the localities and organized committees in order to cure the local problems of unemployment, to put people to work from the local standpoint. That is the first care. People do not want to move away from their homes, and it is better not to move away from their homes, if that can be avoided. The problem, I repeat, is primarily a local one, and we should solve the unemployment problem just as soon as possible within a city, and we should not move its people somewhere else until we have to. It is a residual problem, which it is proper for the USES to handle, and which they should handle under the act of 1933, which they can do after the State offices are returned to the States, which actually have operated them and can operate them, and must operate them.

I certainly second 100 percent what the Senator from Illinois has said, that under an unemployment compensation system, the same people who receive the applicants for unemployment compensation should be able to say, "Here is a list of jobs, and here is one which should suit you. Go and take it." Today there are two separate offices, often working at cross purposes, which is inevitable if it is a State and Federal concern. It seems to me obvious that they should be together. We certainly are not going to federalize the State system of unemployment compensation. The bill does not propose to do so, and it seems to me this is the proper time to return these offices to the States.

Incidentally the whole USES has just been transferred to the Secretary of Labor. What will happen? If we do not turn the agencies back to the States, he is going to reorganize the whole program. Every new Cabinet officer has a new plan for operating this kind of work. The Secretary of Labor will reorganize it, and just at the time when he has it reorganized, it will go back, under the existing law, to the various States. If we are to make the change, now is the time to make it, when the President himself has undertaken to transfer the service from the Social Security Board to the Secretary of Labor.

For the information of Senators on this side of the aisle, I might read the plank on security in the Republican platform of 1944. It reads:

> We pledge our support for the return of the public employment office system to the States at the earliest possible time, financed as before Pearl Harbor.

It seems to me that is an obvious necessity, if we are to have State systems of unemployment compensation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], adding at the end of the committee amendment, as amended, a new section.

Mr. TAFT. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I, therefore, withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BREWSTER (after having voted in the affirmative). There was a possible understanding about a pair, and in order to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding I will consider myself paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and so I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are detained from the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness. If present, both of these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—56

Aiken	Gerry	Robertson
Andrews	Gurney	Saltonstall
Austin	Hart	Shipstead
Bailey	Hawkes	Smith
Ball	Hickenlooper	Stewart
Bilbo	Hoey	Taft
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Briggs	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	La Follette	Tobey
Butler	Langer	Vandenberg
Byrd	Lucas	Walsh
Capehart	McCarran	Wheeler
Capper	McClellan	Wherry
Carville	McKellar	White
Chandler	Millikin	Wiley
Cordon	Moore	Willis
Donnell	Morse	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Young
Fulbright	Reed	

NAYS—23

Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Chavez	Kilgore	Myers
Downey	McFarland	Radcliffe
Green	McMahon	Russell
Guffey	Magnuson	Taylor
Hatch	Mead	Tunnell
Hayden	Mitchell	Wagner
Hill	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—17

Bankhead	Eastland	Overton
Brewster	Ellender	Pepper
Buck	George	Revercomb
Burton	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Maybank	Tydings
Connally	O'Mahoney	

So the modified amendment of Mr. LUCAS to the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

USE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY IN SOIL CONSERVATION AND WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce a bill and have it referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The title of the bill is, "To assist in soil conservation and water conservation work by making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for such work through the distribution thereof, by grant or loan, to public bodies organized under State laws, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, after hearing the title of the bill read, it seems to me that the bill should go to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. I may be in error.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will leave that to the Parliamentarian. I cannot say as to that. I would have to look into the question.

Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief explanation. I have the consent of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in charge of the pending bill, to make a brief statement about the bill which I am introducing.

The first section of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition any materials, equipment, or supplies which constitute surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and are suitable for use in carrying out erosion control and soil and water conservation works. It further provides that upon receipt of such requisition the Government agency controlling such

property shall transfer it to the Secretary of Agriculture without reimbursement or deposit.

Section 2 provides that the materials thus requisitioned shall be distributed through the Soil Conservation Service by grant or loan to soil conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing, and other districts and public bodies organized for the prevention of soil erosion in this country under such rules and regulations that may be established by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, this is not the first effort that has been made to prevent soil erosion, fill up gullies, build ditches, and save the lands of this country. As I remember, Senator Gillette introduced a bill while he was a Member of the Senate having the same purpose and along the same lines.

The Soil Conservation Service, according to a House report on a similar bill, has estimated that we need terraces on 100,000,000 acres of land. Forty million acres are in need of improved or new drainage; 10,000,000 acres need repair or improvement of farm irrigation systems; 376 000 soil-saving dams are needed. About 1,000,000 acres of stream banks should be stabilized and 1,200,000 stock water developments should be built.

In some States erosion has taken place to such an extent as to form in many places huge gullies which should be leveled down and put in shape so as to prevent further erosion.

In the late war we manufactured all kinds of machinery for uses in that war. The war is over and this machinery is surplus. What better uses could the machinery be put to than to save the farm lands of the country from further erosion?

Districts have already been formed in 45 or 46 of the States for the purpose of doing this work. These districts are not able to do it unless they get from the Government this surplus machinery. This machinery could not be used to better advantage. It would insure the building up and protection of the soil of the country. What could be more important to this country as a whole? To my mind it is an ideal way to use this machinery and to my mind the plan of having the work done by State districts is the best possible plan of getting it effectively done.

Nor will it hurt the machinery manufacturers. This surplus machinery if put on the market and sold would hurt the machinery manufacturers a great deal more than if it were used for this purpose.

I take this occasion to urge the chairman and members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to consider this bill at an early date, have hearings on it if necessary, and report it favorably to the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD in full at this point as a part of my remarks; also to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a report made by the House Committee on Agriculture on a similar bill now pending in the House. The report was made on June 23, 1945. I do not know whether or not the bill has been considered in the House.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article on this subject, published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on September 12, 1945. The article contains an interview with Hon. Edward H. Crump, of Memphis, urging Government action along this line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1414) to assist in soil conservation and water conservation work by making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for such work through the distribution thereof, by grant or loan, to public bodies organized under State laws, and for other purposes was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to requisition any materials, equipment, or supplies which constitute surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and are suitable for use in carrying out erosion control and soil and water conservation works and operations in furtherance of the act approved April 27, 1935, entitled "An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes." Upon receipt of such requisition from the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to any such property, the head of the Government agency having control of such property shall transfer such property to the Secretary of Agriculture without reimbursement or deposit.

SEC. 2. Material, equipment, and supplies requisitioned by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1 shall be distributed, through the Soil Conservation Service, by grant or loan, to soil conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing, and other districts and public bodies organized under State laws with powers to promote and carry out soil and water conservation operations and related public purposes. Such distribution shall be made in accordance with such standards, conditions, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The material submitted by Mr. MCKELLAR was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of September 12, 1945]

CRUMP URGES ACTION TO PREVENT EROSION—GOVERNMENT HAS MACHINERY TO LEVEL DITCHES—LIKE CONTAGIOUS DISEASE

Now that the war is over, the Government can find no better use for surplus machinery than in preventing further erosion of the soil, E. H. Crump, Shelby County political leader, said yesterday.

Mr. Crump said, "Erosion is playing havoc in many States. It is like a contagious disease—it spreads—does not stop—offers no armistice. One acre of washed gullies will wash another acre—a bad apple in the box will eventually ruin all.

"PRAISE FOR KERR

"Shame is on the whole country—not on these unfortunate individuals who have these deep gullies. Local and national governments must be convinced of the necessity of doing something.

"Now that the war is over the Government has all kinds of machinery to level these ditches off—much has been done in the way of soil conservation to preserve declining land. Shelby County, under the direction of Leonard Kerr, has done much in treating sick soil. E. D. Schumacher, president of Friends of the Land, hac been active. I refer to the abandoned, dead, forgotten gullies that have been with us for years. It will cost any farmer more than the land is worth to redeem it. The counties and the States might assist some—something should be worked out. The Federal Government has all the necessary machinery.

"This country in the beginning had so much land, when washes occurred and the land seemed to be getting poor, instead of trying to do something with it, the thought was to clear up new ground—cut the timber and burn it. The timber has been slaughtered. I recall when a boy we would cut a tree to get a coon, yet no one would eat the coon.

"LAND NEEDS HELP

"The planners of the soil should get busy. Members of Congress can undoubtedly get the machinery. It may be someone with creative ability can devise some plan. All the old abandoned, gully washed land needs help. Also, the appearance of the country will be improved and will make a better impression on those who are traveling through.

"The Federal Government made a wise move when it entered soil conservation back in 1930, establishing 10 experiment stations to study ways of halting erosion. In 1935 the Soil Conservation Service was established as a part of the Department of Agriculture—it supplies technical advice to farmers. Erosion control should have started 50 years ago. Farm owners can ditch and deal with top soil. The question is how to deal with the old ditches, dead land. It has been said repeatedly throughout the world that no nation has full prosperity if it ignores the land."

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 538) to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil- and water-conservation work and to distribute such material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports thereon with a recommendation that it do pass, with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 9, strike out the period and add the words "or deposit."

STATEMENT

This legislation will permit the employment of surplus materials, equipment, and supplies in carrying out erosion control, soil- and water-conservation works and operations which otherwise would not be so employed. The effective and rapid prosecution of such works is greatly in the public interest and is in furtherance of the act of April 27, 1935, entitled "An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes."

Until very recently the United States has ignored the problem of soil erosion. As one farm lost its productivity, the farmer moved on to a newer farm. As a community found itself incapable of supporting its population, new communities were established and old fields were turned back to weeds and brush. Sometimes nature was able to check the destructive forces of erosion which had been set in motion when man broke the long established balance. Sometimes the destruction went on. At least enough of it went on to cause our springs and even wells to fail as the water table fell and to cause our streams and lakes to fill with silt as floods moved the most productive soil particles toward the sea. At least enough erosion went on to largely counteract the benefits of the dams and levees man built and

the channels he dredged. Certainly prior to 1933 we fought a losing fight with the forces of erosion. The Department of Agriculture estimates that approximately 100,000,000 acres of land have suffered such erosion as to make it useless for further agricultural use, and that an additional 100,000,000 acres have been so damaged as to require the most careful treatment if they are to continue as producing units in the agricultural economy of the Nation.

In 1933 the Soil Erosion Service was established and began its work of holding the topsoil in place, thereby saving the productivity of our farm lands as well as saving our streams, lakes, and harbors from filling with silt. In 1935 the Soil Conservation Act was passed, declaring in part—

"That it is hereby recognized the wastage of soil and moisture resources on farm, grazing, forest lands of the Nation, resulting from soil erosion, is a menace to the national welfare, that it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide permanently for the control and prevention of soil erosion and thereby to preserve natural resources, control floods, prevent impairment of reservoirs, and maintain the navigability of rivers and harbors, protect public health, public lands, and relieve unemployment."

Since the passage of the act, Nation-wide programs authorized by the Congress have awakened the public conscience to an understanding of the public interest in the proper stewardship of land, and suitable control measures have been applied on 90,000,000 acres of the farm and ranch lands of the country. Forty-five States have passed laws governing the formation of soil-conservation districts, locally created, locally organized, and locally directed by farmers and ranchers for the purpose of combating the destructive effects of erosion and of establishing sound use of land in accordance with its needs and adaptabilities, to the end of permitting permanent agriculture. The widespread need for the programs of conservation carried forward by the soil-conservation districts under the various State laws is demonstrated by the fact that in 8 years 1,299 districts have been organized including an area of over 700,000,000 acres of agricultural land and involving three and one-third million farms. This latter factor constitutes more than half the farms of the Nation.

In spite of the remarkable progress made, it cannot be said that we have reversed the trend, but surely we have checked it. We have checked this dangerous trend only by the cooperation of every friend of the soil from the farmer to the engineer. In this fight against the forces of nature we have used not only the Soil Conservation Service, which has supplied much of the technical supervision, but we have also appropriated vast sums of Federal money for "soil-conserving practices," most of which has been paid to cooperating farmers through the AAA. We have spent other hundreds of millions in the erection of flood-control structures and doubtless even more on the improvement of our rivers and harbors. Not all of this money has been spent as a result of soil erosion, but certainly most of these vast expenditures have become necessary as a direct result of the erosion or removal of our topsoil from its natural location.

Soil-conservation districts have been established under State law in 45 States of the Union. These districts are public agencies. They are the agencies that deal directly with the farmers. They are the agencies that must put the plans of the Soil Conservation Service into practice. They are the agencies on which the AAA must depend for actual physical aid to farmers who are cooperating with the soil-conserving practices. While these districts are agencies of the several States, they do not (except in two States) have any taxing power. Their ability to purchase needed machinery has therefore been very circumscribed. In fact, it has been and still is practically nonexistent. In a few cases, districts have acquired some old CCC equipment, and, in some cases, the directors of the districts or some farmers' cooperatives have pledged their personal credit to secure equipment that can be used by the district, but, on the whole, they are without the tools necessary to do the great job of soil conservation that confronts us. They have not in the past supplied an important market for equipment manufacturers, and unless some change is made, they hold out no promise of a worth-while market in the future. No manufacturer could be hurt by the diversion of surplus war equipment to these districts. On the contrary, such a diversion would only serve to take such equipment out of channels competitive with the manufacturers.

At the same time, any program that would enable these districts to build up funds with which to make a down payment on new machinery in years to come would open the door to the largest peacetime market that the manufacturers of dirt-moving equipment could hope to reach. One of the byproducts of this bill should be the opening of a vast new market for new dirt-moving equipment in years to come. This in addition to the movement into noncompetitive channels of vast quantities of second-hand equipment that must otherwise ultimately come in competition with the regular production of our factories.

Therefore, instead of interfering with the manufacture or sale of heavy equipment, this bill should be of substantial benefit to the manufacturers, the laborers who produce the soil-conserving equipment, as well as to the dealer who sells this machinery.

Its greatest and most direct benefits will, however, accrue to the farmer who needs heavy equipment to properly protect his farm from the dangers of erosion. Whether he is attempting to terrace a hillside as a part of a comprehensive farm plan worked out for him by the Soil Conservation Service, or whether he is attempting to dig a tank for stock water as one of the soil-conserving practices for which the AAA partly reimburses him, or whether he plans to cut a drainage ditch or build a levee as part of a drainage-district program, the average farmer will find the lack of efficient equipment to be his most serious problem. Obviously no ordinary farmer can buy a bulldozer, much less a dragline. And if one farmer were to buy such equipment, he could not employ it more than a few days per year. Yet without this kind of equipment much of the soil-conserving work that farmers want to do and that should be done must go undone. Farmers cannot pay and should not pay the costs of doing this work with antiquated, inefficient equipment. The effective prosecution of the work program in many districts therefore rests upon the possibility of the districts being able to secure the initial complement of needed equipment and materials. Once the additional units can be provided, their use can be made self-sustaining, by rental charges to the farmers utilizing the equipment, sufficient to pay operation and maintenance costs and at the same time create a reserve toward the purchase of a replacement.

As previously pointed out, very little of this work will be done if we insist on the purchase of this heavy equipment by farmers individually or by soil-conservation districts. Neither the farmers nor the districts have the money. Soil-conservation districts do not have the taxing power, and if they had it, few communities, especially few of the districts that need it most, could pay the taxes that would be necessary to buy in the open market. It must be remembered that the rule is the greater the need for soil conservation, the less the ability to pay. Rich valley districts can, however, take little comfort from this fact because a large part of the flood damage that has been visited with increasing frequency and violence on these areas has had its origin on the eroded hillsides upstream.

The Soil Conservation Service has estimated that we need terraces on 100,000,000 acres of land; 40,000,000 acres are in need of improved or new drainage; 10,000,000 acres need repair or improvement of farm irrigation systems; 376,000 soil-saving dams are needed. About 1,000,000 acres of stream banks should be stabilized and 1,200,000 stock-water developments (ponds, springs, etc.) should be built. This will require a tremendous amount of equipment, but we are confronted with a tremendous job. Not only is this a job of staggering size, but it is a job that must be done quickly. Each year we wait we lose thousands of acres of irreplaceable topsoil, and we add to the intolerable flood conditions in the stream valleys of the country. No longer can we content ourselves with simply building higher and higher levees along streams whose beds are filling up with soil that should be a part of our cropland. We must stop the movement of this silt at its source, and we must stop it now. To do this job with the dispatch it demands will require great quantities of modern equipment. Fortunately, we have much of that equipment on hand, and shortly we will have no use for it. This bill provides that as soon as this equipment has ceased to serve the armed forces that it may be used to aid in the preservation of our soil. The people of the United States have paid for this equipment. They bought it to render a public service. When its need for that purpose (the prosecution of the war) has passed, there seems to be no reason why it should not be used to serve a further public purpose. Under the terms of this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to requisition "so much of this equipment as might be suitable for use in carrying out erosion control and soil- and water-conservation work."

The effect is to transfer title from the War or Navy or other department to the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture is then authorized to make the equipment available to "soil conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing, and other districts and public bodies organized under State laws with power to promote and carry out soil- and water-conservation operations and related purposes."

In a letter dated June 1, 1945, addressed to Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., chairman, Committee on Agriculture, the War Food Administrator, Hon. Marvin Jones, stated in regard to this bill:

"Large amounts of equipment and materials will be required in establishing sound soil and water conservation in the United States. The Soil Conservation Service estimates, for example, that 100,000,000 acres of land need terraces or diversions; 40,000,000 acres are in need of improved or new drainage; 10,000,000 acres need repair or improvement of farm irrigation systems; 376,000 soil-saving dams are needed; about 1,000,000 acres of stream banks should be stabilized; and 1,200,000 stock-water developments (ponds, springs, etc.) should be built. It is estimated that farmers may be expected to meet, through private contractors and otherwise, only approximately 70 percent of the total equipment needs.

"The establishment of these and other needed conservation practices is clearly in the public interest. It would also be in keeping with the purposes expressed by the Congress in Public, 46, Seventy-fourth Congress, to provide for the protection of land resources from soil erosion and for other purposes.

"All but two States have State soil conservation districts laws. Already 1,245 districts have been organized including approximately 688,000,000 acres and over one-half the farms of the Nation. Experience has shown that where districts have had available some

equipment and materials: (1) They have made these serve the initial needs of a large number of farmers; (2) they have helped meet a need that the farmers could not have met otherwise; (3) they have created jobs for private contractors in many cases by demonstrating to a large number of farmers the effectiveness and practicability of conservation practices, such as terracing, land leveling, ditching, construction of farm dams and the like; (4) they have established standards of high quality work which when followed by the farmers or private contractors result in most effective use of the resources put into the job; and (5) they have established the cost per unit of doing certain jobs by charging the farmers the actual cost of operations plus a charge to build up a replacement fund—thus furnishing local experience which both farmers and private contractors can consider in arriving at fair and reasonable prices.

"Success in achieving these results rests upon districts being able to secure the initial complement of equipment and materials. Since the State laws, in all but two States, provide no powers of assessment for soil-conservation districts, their cash purchases can be expected to meet only a small portion of their needs. If these needs can be more nearly met, not only would accelerated progress of the district programs result but it would afford large markets and consequent employment in postwar years arising from the replacement of such initial equipment, since the district by renting equipment to the farmers can accumulate funds for purchasing its replacement.

"We believe that the use of surplus equipment and materials in soil- and water-conservation work would result in great public benefit and that some provision for such use should be made."

It is true that the War Food Administrator stated that the Bureau of the Budget, which last year had approved an identical bill, did not at this time approve the bill as a result of "the position taken by the Surplus Property Board," but on June 9, 1945, the Chairman of that Board wrote to the author of this bill, as follows:

"I have your letter of June 4, 1945, enclosing a copy of H. R. 533. This is the measure which you introduced and is in substantially the form of a bill which I introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress, and its purpose is the same I note that you wish some comment from me with reference to the measure. You speak of a favorable report from the Department of Agriculture and of objections by the Bureau of the Budget. There was no report accompanying the bill which you transmitted to me, and I do not know what viewpoint was taken. You speak, however, of your understanding that the objections of the Bureau of the Budget are based upon their interpretation of the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

"You will have in mind, I am sure, that I am heartily in accord with the purposes and goals of the proposed legislation, and I do not see how it would be inconsistent with the provisions of the Surplus Property Act. On the contrary, it would seem to strengthen the position of the Secretary of Agriculture as a claiming agency under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act. The principal difference would be in the matter of compensation for the property.

"As you recall, the Surplus Property Act created two priority groups as claimant agencies for property declared surplus to the needs and responsibilities of owning agencies. Section 12 (a) of the act enjoins the Board to facilitate the transfer of surplus property from one Federal agency to another, and gives this type a first priority over all other provisions. The act also defines a Government agency as any 'executive department, board, bureau, commission, or other agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any corporation wholly owned by the United States.' The same section 12 enjoins all Government agencies to continuously consult records of surplus property available and try to fill their requirements from this property, and also requires these Government agencies to submit to the Board estimates of their needs as necessary to promote the fullest utilization. It also gives a mandate to the Board to see that these Government agencies are acquiring surplus property to the fullest possible extent. Subsection (c) of section 12 requires that the disposal agency handling surplus property shall transfer it to the claiming agency 'at the fair value of the property as fixed by the disposal agency under regulations prescribed by the Board, unless transfer without reimbursement or transfer of funds is otherwise authorized by law.' You will note that under this subsection (c) there is full authority for the provision in your bill relative to compensation for transfer without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

"Section 13 of the Surplus Property Act sets up the second priority group as comprising States, political subdivisions thereof, and instrumentalities thereof and also certain tax-supported and nonprofit institutions. This, of course, would include soil-conservation districts and irrigation districts and similar entities as you envision as the final recipients of the aid under your bill. While this group has a priority secondary to the Federal agency group, yet there is nothing in the Surplus Property Act which would prevent a claimant Federal agency from disposing of the property after acquiring it in any manner carrying out their obligations and duties as such Federal agency. It would seem a reasonable conclusion, then, that while a bill to give this second group a priority as a claimant equal to a Federal agency would run counter to the Surplus Property Act, yet it would seem equally clear that after a Federal agency has exercised its claimant priority, it would not contravene the purpose of the Surplus Property Act in that there is no duty or obligation on the part of the Board to follow surplus goods after they have been acquired by a proper claimant agency of the Government and determine whether they are violating the provisions of other laws in their disposition of the property after it becomes subject to their ownership and control.

"It would seem to me that there is real merit in the purposes of your bill and I cannot see how it would hamper the administration of the Surplus Property Act.

"With personal greetings, I am

"Sincerely yours,

"GUY M. GILLETTE,
"Chairman."

The committee recommends that at the end of line 9, page 2, the bill be amended to strike out the period and by adding the words, "or deposit." The effect of this amendment is simply to make perfectly clear the intent to transfer this equipment from one department of the Government to another without the necessity of the transfer, appropriation, or payment by any department of any Government funds. The justification for the transfer should rest on the greater public benefit that will come from the use of the equipment for a public purpose.

This legislation, by authorizing transfer of materials, equipment, and supplies which constitute surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to the Secretary of Agriculture without reimbursement, for the purpose of loaning or of granting the property to soil conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing, and other districts and public bodies organized under State laws with powers to promote and carry out soil- and water-conservation operations and related public purposes, will make available the needed initial complement of equipment and materials, the items that are beyond the resources of the individual farmer or district. The effect of the legislation will be to assure that these items of equipment, materials, and supplies, already the property of the Government, will be continued in use on work of lasting public benefit.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 16, in the committee amendment, after the word "law", it is proposed to insert "(as supplemented pursuant to section 703)."

On page 15, it is proposed to strike out line 3, and insert the following:

(A) the sum of the amount of any supplemental compensation payable to him under authority of section 703, plus 26 times his weekly benefit amount.

On page 15, between lines 17 and 18 it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SUPPLEMENTING WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNTS

SEC. 703. (a) Any agreement under section 702 may also provide that the compensation payable to any individual with respect to unemployment occurring within any week during the reconversion period (whether such compensation is payable under the State law or pursuant to section 702) will be supplemented by any amount which, together with his weekly benefit amount under the State law, does not exceed $25 and does not exceed two-thirds of his previous weekly wage.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the previous weekly wage of an individual shall be deemed to be—

(1) in any State in which such individual's weekly benefit amount is determined on the basis of wages in a selected calendar quarter, one-thirteenth of the wages used in making such determination; and

(2) in any State in which such individual's weekly benefit amount is determined on some other basis, an amount determined by a method agreed upon by the State unemployment compensation agency and the Director.

On page 16, line 13, after "made", it is proposed to insert "and as supplemented pursuant to section 703."

Also it is proposed to renumber the present section 703 and succeeding sections, and correct cross references to section numbers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have his amendments considered en bloc or separately?

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to have them considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this amendment restores to the bill the provision for supplementing, in all the States, the amounts payable for unemployment compensation to the extent necessary to bring the uniform payment up to $25 a week for the duration of 26 weeks provided in the bill.

I wish to recount very briefly the history of legislation with respect to reconversion, as we have understood it and dealt with it in the Senate.

The Senate will recall that more than a year ago the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, of which the Senator From Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is chairman, held extensive hearings on the whole problem of reconversion. More than a year ago there was reported to the Senate a bill dealing with the question of physical reconversion. The bill provided for prompt payment of the amounts due to corporations which had engaged in contracts for the manufacture of war materials. It provided for aid to what we called small business corporations. When that bill was brought up on the floor of the Senate, I recall that the question of the human element involved in reconversion was raised, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and I, as well as other Senators, said that while we did not in that bill deal with the human element of reconversion, we pledged ourselves to deal with it immediately upon the reconvening of Congress, which was to be in the fall of 1944. We recognized the deficiency of that bill in dealing with the human element of reconversion. We reconvened, and I believe we reconvened in good faith, with the purpose of undertaking to deal with the individual, human elements involved in reconversion which are not of less importance than the financial and physical reconversion of our wartime economy. The committee held hearings on the subject. During those hearings State organizations, governors, and representatives of governors came before the committee and presented a situation which I think I may say changed the view of the Committee on Finance. We had said we would deal with the problem as a national problem. State organizations and State administrations presented facts showing that they had in their treasuries reserves sufficient to deal with unemployment and unemployment compensation within the States, and that showing probably caused a change in the attitude of the committee and the attitude of the Congress upon that subject.

The result was that what we got through the Senate at that time was a measure which only provided that the Federal Government would loan to the State governments whatever amounts might be necessary to supplement their payments for unemployment compensation from the period of the expiration of their term of duration, so that there might be what we call financial stability and solvency in the State unemployment compensation funds.

Now we are confronted with a situation which, it seems to me, presents what I feel very strongly is a national obligation and a national condition. In his message to the Congress, President Truman recommended that we supplement State provisions so that there would be a maximum of $25 a week for a maximum period of 26 weeks of unemployment compensation. When the Finance Committee took up the matter and held hearings, the same State organizations, either through representatives of the governors or through representatives of the State unemployment compensation agencies, came before the committee and took the position that this problem was not a Federal one, that there was no Federal obligation involved in it, that it was entirely a State proposition, and that the States as a whole had in their treasuries sufficient reserves, which had been conserved during the war period, to meet the obligation of the States, under their laws, to provide for unemployment compensation under the provisions of their laws, and that therefore the Federal Government should keep its hands off the question of unemployment compensation.

The original bill introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] provided for integrating the unemployment compensation laws of all the States with the objective of providing for benefits of $25 a week, as a maximum as recommended by the President, for a maximum period of 26 weeks. During the consideration of the bill in the committee, provision for the supplementation of the amount paid per week was entirely eliminated. In other words, the committee decided by majority vote that, without regard to the differences in the weekly compensation of unemployed persons, without regard to the restrictions imposed by State laws or State administrative agencies, there should be no addition to the weekly compensation provided for in the States to be received by any unemployed person. The committee did decide, and in the bill it is so provided, that there should be added to the period provided in the State law compensation, based upon the laws of the State, up to 26 weeks.

The amendment which I have offered provides that in addition to the 26 weeks' duration provided in the State laws, which, of course, vary as to terms, there shall also be provided a payment in supplementation of the State payment for unemployment compensation an amount sufficient to make the weekly allowance $25 instead of whatever the amount may be under the laws of the State. In other words, if the State allows $16 a week, the amount shall be supplemented by the Federal Government so as to make the compensation $25 a week, with a provision that in any case there shall not be allowed more than two-thirds of the amount of the wage received during a basic period.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that during the reconversion period, during the period of readjustment from war to peace, we cannot escape our obligation as a nation to those who, without any fault of their own but because of conditions over which they had no control, find themselves unemployed.

I believe it is accurate to state that in all the States the question of the need is not a test of the right to receive unemployment compensation. In all the States there is recognized the right of every unemployed person, whether needy or not, to receive a stipulated amount, depending upon the interpretation and administration of the law of the State by the State authorities.

Mr. President, I happen to be one of those who believe that the question of unemployment in America, and the question of unemployment compensation in America, is a problem which must appeal to the entire people of the United States. The President of the United States recognized it as such when he recommended to Congress, before we adjourned for our recess in July, that we should take into consideration the entire problem and provide for a maximum of $25 a week for a maximum period of 26 weeks. During the hearings before the Committee on Finance in connection with this bill, which was introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], we heard testimony with regard to the probabilities of unemployment during the next year or two in the United States. No one has the last word on that subject. No one can be meticulously accurate with respect to the number of workers who may be unemployed, whether men or women, at any given time during the reconversion period. Therefore, the Members of the Senate are compelled to take what I might call a general average of the estimates of unemployment. They range all the way from low unemployment through medium unemployment to high unemployment. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has given to the Senate an estimate of the cost of this bill as reported by the committee on low, medium, and high unemployment.

The committee decided to strike completely out of the bill all the provisions which added to the weekly compensation of unemployed persons any Federal supplementation of the amount which they receive each week from the States, but the committee also decided to add to the duration of the time during which unemployment compensation might be received, to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States, amounts sufficient to increase the duration in the States, whatever such duration might be, whether 14 weeks, 16 weeks, 20 weeks, or any other number of weeks. The payments would carry the unemployed up to a maximum of 26 weeks.

Mr. President, according to our pledges made more than a year ago on the floor of the Senate, we obligated ourselves, insofar as we could, to provide for the prompt payment by the Federal Government of whatever might be due to private corporations upon the termination of their contracts in order to aid them in reconversion. Not only did we provide that we would make loans out of the Federal Treasury to what we call small business in order to enable it to reconvert and to begin anew the production of goods for the people of the United States, but we pledged ourselves, as I conceived it—I was one of those who did so—that as soon as Congress reconvened we would deal with the problem of the human element involved in reconversion. It is in part because of that pledge that I offer this amendment today.

The State of Vermont did not declare war against Japan; the State of Kentucky did not declare war against Japan; the State of Pennsylvania did not declare war against Japan; and no other State declared war or could have declared war against Japan, or Germany,

or any other nation. War was either declared or accepted as a status already in existence by the Congress of the United States representing all the people of the United States, as only it could do.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have no idea of entering into a debate on this point, but I cannot sit here and not mention the fact that the Legislature of the State of Vermont did, by vote, recognize that the United States was in a state of war before the United States declared that it was so, because the State of Vermont wanted to pay its National Guard the additional per diem or monthly pay to which they would be entitled whenever the United States was in a state of war.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that. What I had in mind was that no State could declare war against a foreign country, that it was a national action.

Mr. AUSTIN. I recognize that, but when the Senator said the State of Vermont did not declare war, I wanted to set the record straight.

Mr. BARKLEY. I congratulate Vermont on being a little ahead of the Congress of the United States in that regard. [Laughter.]

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There was one point in the Senator's chronology which I think he should have amplified for the sake of the record of the Senate, but he undoubtedly forgot to do so. He said that pledges were made on the floor of the Senate a year ago, after we completed consideration of the contract termination bill, that we would promptly deal with the problem of the human element. I remind the Senator that, so far as the Senate is concerned, we did try to redeem that pledge forthwith. We passed a bill which included many of the features of the pending bill, which provided compensation for Federal employees, which provided compensation for maritime workers, which provided migratory transportation. We went a very long way in that direction, but we collided with an immovable body at the other end of the Capitol. It is not to be said that we did not make a very sturdy effort to redeem the obligation to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that. What I had in mind was that after we made our pledges on the floor of the Senate, and the Committee on Finance began hearings and presented a situation which probably we had not contemplated in our pledges here, the Committee on Finance, and evidently the Senate, were persuaded by the State authorities that we should not go so far as we had pledged ourselves to go. When we were finding reasons why we should enact the reconversion bill for corporations and for the physical reconversion of properties, we were not dealing with the human element, and we pledged ourselves to deal with it later, when Congress reconvened. I think we made the pledge in good faith, but the Committee on Finance was persuaded by the State administrations that they had ample funds and were amply qualified to deal with the subject. To that extent we modified the bill we had even reported to the Senate. It was modified and watered down considerably at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator refers to the contract termination bill constantly as having been passed for the corporations. Would not the Senator upon reflection agree that the contract termination bill was of utterly vital importance to labor and to every factor involved?

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with that. I was for the bill. I supported it actively in the committee and on the floor of the Senate, and in anything I said I would not in any way wish to reflect upon the sincerity of any Senator who was for the bill. But, in explanation of the fact that we were not including in the bill what we then termed the human element of reconversion because of the emergency, we pledged ourselves to deal with it a little later. As I recall, I think we were on the verge of a sort of recess, and we promised to deal with it when we got back, and we started out to do so. Then the State administrations came before the committee and presented the facts with respect to their reserves for unemployment compensation, and the committee as a whole promptly changed its views with regard to its original feeling of obligation as a national obligation, by providing only for lending money to the States when they ran out of money before the expiration of the term of duration under which they could pay unemployment compensation. Even that was objected to at another place.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is quite correct. My only thought was that I was sure the Senator would not care to associate himself with the prejudicial criticisms which have been constantly leveled at the Senate, that we were thinking only about the corporations when we passed the contract termination legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I join in the thought that at that time we felt we were compelled to deal with an emergency which seemed just around the corner. We all felt we had to deal with the problem, and that we were not in a position at that moment to deal with the other problem, but we did pledge ourselves to deal with it immediately upon the reconvening of Congress, and when we reconvened, a new situation was presented to the committee and to the Senate in regard to an element which we had not previously considered. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Since the Senator has mentioned small business, should it not also be said that his observation is applicable to small business? I am a member of the Small Business Committee, and it has always been my desire to cooperate and help to get loans for small business where justified as the Senator has said, and that has been our function and purpose, but in so doing it was not only our desire to help those who went into business, but it was just as important to create labor and work in connection with the new business, and in helping to rehabilitate an old business which might need aid.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, they were all associated. In other words, the extent to which we aided business, big or little, we helped employment, and therefore encouraged the desire of all of us to provide, so far as Government could do so, for a condition, economical and otherwise, which would encourage and provide for employment of labor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have had several inquiries from my State regarding the proposed Federal legislation of which the Senator from Kentucky has made a study. The State of Washington is foremost in unemployment compensation legislation. It pays $25 a week for 26 weeks to all who qualify. How would the pending bill affect payments in the State of Washington; which pays the maximum which is provided for?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, in the State of Washington or any other State——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Ours is the only State which provides the maximum, as I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. In any State in which the maximum of 26 weeks' duration is provided for, and where $25 a week is provided for, the amendment I offer would have very little effect, but, so far as I know, Washington is the only State in the Union which provides for a maximum of 26 weeks and a maximum of $25 a week.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill would have little or no effect in our State?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would have little or no effect, probably, but in my opinion that should not prejudice anyone against it, because in the 47 States which have not been as liberal as the State of Washington, there should be provision not only for a maximum of 26 weeks, but a maximum of $25, and we should not militate against that. I congratulate the Senator from Washington and the State of Washington on being more liberal in that regard than any other State of the Union.

Mr. KILGORE and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. In line with what was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Washington, is it not a fact that the money which is paid out for unemployment compensation is derived from pay-roll taxes?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. And a large part, if not all, of the pay-roll tax eventually is paid out of the United States Treasury, and States, like the State of Washington, which were foresighted and progressive, were able to build up their funds to meet the situation by increasing the pay-roll

taxes to such an extent that they were able to take care of unemployment payments. Whereas other States which were not so farsighted left their pay-roll taxes at a very low figure, and as a result did not build up the necessary reserve. Is not that a fact?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a fact.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I confess I am not altogether familiar with the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. We discussed the amendment in the Finance Committee. The effect of the amendment I have offered is that there shall be a supplementation out of the Treasury of the United States, in those States which do not pay up to $25 a week, of a sufficient amount to make the maximum $25 a week for unemployed persons according to the recommendation of the President in his message to the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. I was sure that that was what the amendment provided. In line with what the Senator from Washington has said, I am wondering how the amendment would affect a worker in his State who, for instance, was drawing unemployment compensation at the rate, we will say, of $16 a week.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator speak a little louder, please?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] called attention to the fact that his State was the only State in the Union that had the maximum benefit of $25 for 26 weeks. I am wondering how the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky would affect the worker who, under the laws of Washington, is drawing only, let us say, $16 a week as compensation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course there is a difference, as the Senator understands, from having attended the hearings before our committee, between the maximum amount that anyone can draw and the average payment of unemployment compensation a week. The amendment I have offered does not change the basis of payment according to the State laws, but it fixes the maximum under the interpretation of the State laws at $25 instead of whatever the amount may be under the State laws. In my State it happens to be $16 a week for 20 weeks. We have provided in the bill that that may be extended for 26 weeks. My amendment provides that there may be a maximum of $25 above the $16 provided in the laws of my State, under the regulations and the operations of the laws of the State which determine, by reason of previous credits and previous employment and previous wages and so forth, what any given person may be entitled to. But it provides also that in no case shall the unemployed person receive more than two-thirds of the amount he received as a salary in the base period provided in the law.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it not a fact that the worker who is receiving $16 a week under the unemployment compensation laws of Washington would be definitely benefited by the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the worker who is entitled to the $25 would not be entitled to any benefit at all under the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the individual who was receiving $25, of course, would receive no benefit. But the individual who, under State law, by reason of credit or by reason of any other provisions of the law, is receiving only $16 or $20, would be benefited by my amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Up to the maximum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Up to the maximum, of course, always provided that what he receives is not more than two-thirds of the wage he received during the base period.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. What would be the procedure for getting this money to the unemployed person in a State? Would the State have to make application for the funds, and if the State declined to make the application for the funds, how could the unemployed person get the additional compensation?

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment, I will say to the Senator from Vermont, is framed purely on a voluntary basis. In the original Kilgore bill there was a mandatory provision with respect to additional compensation, but my amendment is purely on a voluntary basis. If a State through its proper authorities decides that it cannot accept this additional compensation there is no way by which it can be forced upon the State. As a result of the testimony of the commissioner, or whatever his title might be, from the State of Texas, representing the Texas unemployment compensation agency, who stated that there were a number of States in the Union which under their laws could not accept any additional payment without being compelled to reduce the amount of their State compensation by whatever amount they received from any other agency, and that some States would be compelled to deny compensation entirely to an unemployed person, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia, sent telegrams to all the States to determine whether under their laws they could accept this additional payment. I think out of the 48 States some 24 or 25 replied either that the amount by which the Federal Government supplemented the payment would have to be reduced or subtracted from the State payment, or that the unemployed person could not receive any State payment at all. With practically half of the States having replied that they would either have to subtract the amount from the State compensation or deny altogether State compensation, the committee felt that under that situation it would go no further than adding to the maximum duration of the period during which unemployed persons could draw compensation, and that that additional period would be paid for by the Federal Government.

My amendment is voluntary. It does not require any State to agree to accept the additional compensation. But if there are 24 States, or any number of States, which under their own interpretation of their own laws cannot accept it, personally, I feel that other States which can accept it and will accept it ought not to be denied the opportunity to do so simply because there may be in some States laws which prevent it.

Furthermore, the adoption of my amendment may induce legislatures to be called into extra session by the governors of the States in order that they may provide laws amending their own State laws which would obviate that difficulty and enable their own unemployed to receive, under this amendment, the maximum of $25 a week.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, a good many States have called special sessions of their legislatures for less reason than the one now under discussion. I recall that most of the States were obliged to call extra sessions of their legislatures to take advantage of the Social Security Act when it was first enacted by the Congress. Suppose States should call extra sessions of their legislatures to adopt legislation which would enable them to take advantage of the proposal contained in the Senator's amendment, would it be possible for the Federal Government, then, to make contributions to the State treasury or to the State unemployment-compensation agency, and then have the money passed on to the unemployed persons in the usual manner?

Mr. BARKLEY. The theory is that an agreement will be entered into between the State unemployment authorities and the Federal Government under which the amount may be paid by the State and the State will be reimbursed by the Federal Government for whatever the amount may be, so as to enable the State to carry out the provision without any hiatus as between either the amount it pays or the duration of the time, so that any State that is willing to or can agree to accept this additional compensation, either in the form of an extension of time or an increase in the amount, may proceed and make the payment and be reimbursed by the Federal Government out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. AIKEN. And there would be no change in the present procedure of the States in making the payments.

Mr. BARKLEY. There would be no change in the present procedure. Really, there would be no effective change in the State law. Payments would be made under the provisions of the State law. We provided in the bill for an extension of the time. In my State the extension would be from 20 to 26 weeks. In other States it would be from 16 weeks to 26 weeks. The extension would vary in the different States. We made the provision 160 percent of the time provided in the State laws, so as to approximate 26 weeks, because without such a provision some States would not receive the extension to 26 weeks. It would be 24 weeks, 22 weeks, or some other figure. So we made it in the bill 160 percent, so as to approximate 26 weeks in all the States. My amendment simply adds to the amount paid during that period of 26 weeks sufficient unemployment compensation from the Federal Treasury to provide, under

the regulations of the State laws, a maximum of $25, or two-thirds of the wage received by the unemployed persons during the base period fixed under the State law.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. As I recall, Mr. Williams, from Texas, started the discussion as to the meaning of the disqualification statute. It seems to be identical in all the States, but it is very differently interpreted. Does the Senator know whether or not the Governor of the State of Texas has overruled Mr. Williams in his interpretation of the Texas law? It will be remembered that Mr. Williams said that in Texas the amount which was paid by the Federal Government would have to be deducted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Frankly, I do not know whether the Governor of Texas has overruled the decision of Mr. Williams or not. Mr. Williams presented to the committee his view, that if we adopted the bill providing for an addition out of the Federal Treasury to the amount provided by the State law, that addition would have to be deducted from whatever was paid by the State government. In that connection, in my judgment the laws adopted by the various States did not contemplate this situation in the remotest degree.

Mr. McMAHON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. What they were attempting to do was to prevent duplication of payments in the States from various agencies. A man might be drawing compensation from the State, and at the same time drawing compensation from some other agency within the State, which would duplicate the payments which he might receive. In my judgment no one contemplated the emergency in which we now find ourselves. No one contemplated the possibility that the Federal Government would recognize this as a national problem, in view of the fact that under the influence and persuasion of the Federal Government millions of people went from place to place as a patriotic duty to help out in the various war plants. I do not believe it was contemplated that we would be faced with the problem of dealing with this subject as a national question, and undertaking to provide a maximum of uniformity. Take two men in Detroit, working at the same machine, one of them living in Kentucky and the other in Arkansas. When they returned to their respective States they might receive an entirely different compensation for unemployment from that which they would receive if we undertook to establish a uniform maximum for payment of unemployment compensation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator leaves that point, I happen to have the record before me, and I thought perhaps the Senator from Connecticut would like to have specific reference to the Governor of Texas. He is quite correct in his statement. Governor Coke Stevenson replies that Federal supplementary payments under the Kilgore bill would not result in payments by the Texas Unemployment Compensation Commission being partially or wholly reduced by the amount of the payment from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had not seen that reply. Of course, that contradicts the statement of Mr. Williams before the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is in contradiction of the viewpoint of Mr. Williams.

Mr. McMAHON. To my way of thinking, it points out how spurious the interpretation of the statute of disqualification has been by the 20 authorities who have answered that it would make necessary a mandatory reduction. I predict that if the Senator's amendment is adopted, there will be plenty of special assistants to the Governors, in the way of retired Supreme Court judges, who will render opinions to the effect that such payments can be received without the necessity for one penny reduction.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, under the terms of the laws of many of the States, an interpretation could be rendered on either side of the question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I complete the record?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Inasmuch as I associated myself with the Senator from Kentucky in getting the record straight with respect to Texas, I should like to disassociate myself from his observation that all the opinions rendered officially by the governors and the attorneys general of their States are spurious. I attach the same validity to them that I insist upon attaching to the opinion of the attorney general of Texas.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not use the word "spurious." I assume that all the attorneys general and all the Governors have been sincere in their replies, which were probably made on the spur of the moment. I doubt whether many of them had given any previous consideration to the question. The laws of the States were enacted for an entirely different reason and to accomplish an entirely different purpose from that which we contemplate in this legislation. They were called upon by the committee to render a rather sudden opinion with respect to the interpretation of their laws. I believe that their interpretations would be entitled to some modification based upon further deliberation on the subject. When the Congress of the United States calls upon an attorney general to render an opinion on the spur of the moment, I should not call such an opinion spurious or insincere. Far be it from me to do that. They thought they were required to answer on the spur of the moment. Such opinions might be regarded as curbstone opinions rather than spurious opinions.

Mr. McMAHON. I accept the Senator's amendment, if I used the word "spurious." I think the point is well taken. Such an opinion would be a curbstone opinion. However, I suspect that the wish was father to the thought.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I think we must take into consideration the fact that all the testimony which came from the States and the State administrators and the State unemployment compensation agencies was unanimous in the recommendation that the Federal Government keep its hands entirely off this whole problem. That was the theme song of all of them. I can understand that theory and that approach to the subject, and I do not in any way impugn their sincerity. If I were a State officer in charge of unemployment compensation in a State, I might take the same view—I am not saying that I would or would not—but the unemployment situation in the United States is not a situation which applies simply to one State. It is a national problem, as I see it, and, sooner or later, we, as Members of Congress, if we stay here long enough, will be compelled to meet head-on the problem whether we regard unemployment as a national problem or whether we are going to divide ourselves into 48 airtight compartments and decide to deal with it on the basis of what we can do with it in our own States.

As I said a while ago, no State created this problem. No State declared war. No State induced men or women within its borders to go elsewhere and work in war plants in California or Detroit or Akron or anywhere else. It was the Federal Government that caused this situation by creating a war condition which we could not avoid; and when we began to consider the drafting of men into the Army and the Navy and when inducements were held out to men and women to go from one place to another to seek employment to carry out the program of the Government to provide the instruments of warfare, we recognize no State lines. People from all States engaged in such work. Men who were unable to serve in the Army by reason of physical disability or other restrictions and women and people of all classes went into war work. Perhaps some of them were induced by higher wages, but that is not altogether a consideration which we detest. Others were actuated by the desire to aid in the war effort; they got a certain satisfaction out of the fact that they were helping to produce the things with which their sons would be able to fight the enemy. We regarded all that as a national problem.

Now when the war is over and when the millions of people who have migrated from one section of the country to another to help in the war effort find themselves confronted with unemployment during this temporary period—and it is a temporary period; we have made provision for the bill to terminate on the 30th of June 1947, which is about 21 months from now—the problem should be regarded as one which faces the Nation as a whole. I do not see how we can escape that view of it; frankly, I do not. While the committee decided, under the influence of the State representatives, that the States had sufficient money to deal with the problem, because of their reserves which had been accumulated during the war period, because of full employment and the fact that the States have not been required to pay out the money for unemployment compensation in their treasuries, inasmuch as every-

one was employed as a result of the war, yet I say to the Senate that if it is a national responsibility to provide an extension of the time or duration of the payment of benefits from whatever time is fixed by the State laws to a maximum of 26 weeks, it is no less a national responsibility to supplement the payments unemployed persons shall receive during the 26 weeks. In other words, if we have a national obligation, as I see it, to add to whatever number of weeks was provided for in the State law, in order to continue the payment of compensation, there is no difference between doing that and adding to the amounts which unemployed persons are to receive during that period of time. If the problem is entirely a State problem, if the Federal Government should keep its hands entirely off, then it is logical to defeat this bill entirely insofar as the extension of time is concerned, because I myself cannot justify an extension of the time during which compensation shall be paid and at the same time, on the ground of States' rights, refuse to provide that during that time no additional compensation shall be paid to persons who are unemployed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the statement of one of the witnesses which indicated a difference between increasing the amount and increasing the duration. The Senator will recall that one of the witnesses described the rates in some of the States as being slow starvation. In other words, by the bill which has been reported by the committee we would be increasing the period of slow starvation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I recall that some of the witnesses who came before the committee made such a statement. I think they probably did so in response to a question I asked regarding the difference between increasing the amount paid during the time, whatever it might be, and extending the period of time, at the various rates paid by the States. I asked the witnesses which they would prefer. They said emphatically they would regard the extension of the time without any increase of compensation as a method of slow starvation.

Mr. President, if the problem is a national one—as I regard it, because it was created by action of the National Government, by a war condition which was national, not local—for the life of me I cannot see the distinction, either technically or locally or from the standpoint of the rights of any State, between extending the time beyond the period provided in the State laws and increasing the amounts which shall be paid to unemployed persons during the time provided for in the State laws, as provided by the amendment I have offered.

I regard the problem as a national one. I shall not go into the question whether ultimately we must face this situation as a Nation, although personally I feel that the time is bound to come when we must consider this question from the standpoint of America as a whole. I feel that very deeply. I have felt it for a long time. I felt it when we inaugurated our social security law providing for old-age pensions and old-age assistance. I then regarded the problem as a national one. But I shall not go into that issue now. We may have to face it head-on some day, and whenever we do I shall be ready to meet it.

I regard this situation as an emergency. Under the terms of the bill, it will end on the 30th of June 1947. During that period of time, if I am correct in my analysis, we must deal with the problem as a whole. There should be uniformity, or as near uniformity as possible.

For instance, let us consider two men working on the same machine in Detroit, Mich., and receiving the same wages. Let us assume they went there as a patriotic duty, and that they could not enter the armed services because of physical or other reasons; or let us assume, to take a selfish view of it, that they went there to improve their compensation, to receive higher wages. The result was that they aided the Government of the United States. They were induced, persuaded, and urged to go there. So there they were, two men working on the same machine, receiving the same compensation. Then the war ended or the contracts were terminated. One of the men, let us assume, went back to Kentucky with his family, if he had moved from there. The other man went back to Connecticut with his family, if he had moved from there. Living conditions in those two States are not very different. In one State a man may draw a maximum of $16 a week in unemployment compensation. In the other he may draw a maximum of $28 a week, I believe, under certain conditions and circumstances.

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct, provided the man has three dependents.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I understand it depends on the number of dependents a man has.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator identify those two States, so that we may have the benefit of that information?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly; I am not undertaking to confuse Senators as to the situation. In my State provision is made for the payment of $16 a week, as a maximum, for 20 weeks. In Connecticut, I believe possibly $28 a week is paid, if there are dependents. If there are no dependents, I think the payment is $22.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Michigan rate is $28.

Mr. BARKLEY. I see. I was not speaking of Michigan, but I am glad to associate Michigan with Connecticut in that connection. I am simply seeking to illustrate the lack of uniformity and what I think is the injustice because of the lack of uniformity. If the problem is a national one, if we owe anything to unemployed people as a nation because we called them into service as a nation, then I think during this temporary reconversion period we should deal with the problem as a national one, and in view of any inconsistencies or divergencies which may exist because of the differences between State laws, we should add a sufficient amount of money during the period of reconversion, which ends on the 30th of June 1947, to provide for a maximum of $25 a week, of course, subject to the laws of the States, including the laws providing for cancellation and the elimination of persons from the unemployment rolls if they do not comply with the laws of the States. Such laws also vary. The laws of some States are very rigid with regard to getting off the rolls. In Michigan, I believe, a person must be available for a period of 72 hours from the time a job is found for him which would be regarded by the authority as suitable. If during those 72 hours the unemployed person is not available, he goes off the list. In other words, if he has moved to Michigan from any other State, and is not in Michigan during the 72-hour period following the location of a job for him, he is eliminated. If he has gone back home, for example, he is eliminated providing that he has been determined to be available for the job. It is within the province of the State authorities to interpret the word "available."

The question of suitability is involved in the laws of all the States. In many cases war workers may have previously gone from the farms into some other occupation, such as into a factory. That may have taken place during the past 3 or 4 years and during that time they have become efficient in some other line than the one which they left. When they become unemployed it is up to the State authority to determine whether a particular job is suitable for the person involved. A man or woman who is seeking employment probably cannot, under the law, determine whether the job is suitable to him or whether it is in accordance with his qualifications. The determination of that question is within the State authority. The question is not one of whether the job suits the person, but whether it is suitable and appropriate according to his qualifications. The State authorities have the right to determine whether the job is suitable. If they offer him an appropriate job under the determination which they make, a job which is in accordance with the applicant's qualifications and experience, and he does not accept it, either under the State law or under my amendment he would go off the roll. He is no longer registered. So all the protection which would seem to be necessary is provided in the State laws and in my amendment.

Mr. President, I feel that we cannot consistently extend the time of the State laws for the duration of unemployment compensation and then say that because of the doctrine of States' rights, or some other reason, we cannot increase during that time the amount which shall be received by the unemployed person. This measure is purely a temporary one and involves the reconversion period. I say that with no prejudice, because I voted for all the aid we could give to business during the reconversion period in order to help it get on its feet and reconvert its plants. I feel that we can do no less for the millions of people who will need help during the 6, 8, or 18 months, or whatever the time may be, up to the 30th of June 1947, which, when we began to consider this bill, was estimated to be 21 months. We ought to be consistent

by adding sufficient compensation under the restrictions and regulations of the States in order to enable unemployed persons to receive an adequate amount of compensation during the period of not to exceed 26 weeks.

It has been argued that if we do this we will never end it. Such an argument is, in my judgment, an indictment of the courage and discretion of the Congress of the United States. We are dealing with an emergency which we ourselves have created. If we are willing to say that we do not have the courage to end the payment of compensation when the emergency is over, we are indicting the entire legislative process as well as the entire legislative theory. I do not believe that the Congress of the United States would not have the courage to end this legislation at the time fixed in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Did we not hear the same argument advanced when the employment services were taken over by the Federal Government? Have we not demonstrated earlier today that the Senate had the courage to transfer the services back to the States from the Federal Government, even though the Senator from Kentucky objected to the action?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. The Senate had the courage to do it, if that is what the Senator calls courage. I am not certain that that is the proper term to be applied, but whatever the term may be, we did it. [Laughter.] It was done by probably a 2 to 1 vote. The Senate turned back to the States the employment services. I am not willing to admit that Congress is supine and does not have the courage to do what it thinks it should do when the proper time arrives. We have fixed June 30, 1947, as the termination date of this proposed legislation. I am not willing to say that when that time arrives the Congress will not have the courage to do what it conceives its duty to be.

Mr. REED. I am sure that I will not be misunderstood when I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that none of us require courage to "rough-house" with the able majority leader. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. REED. I said that it would not take any courage on the part of other Senators here to "rough-house" with the majority leader. We do so every once in a while.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say to the Senator from Kansas that if I were not now and then "rough-housed" with I would lose the affection and respect of the Senate. As a part of the legislative process I respect it and welcome it.

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whether I like it or not, I get it. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have said all I wish to say on this subject. I hope that my amendment will be agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 397. An act to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Exposition of 1939–41; and

S. 1045. An act to provide for pay and allowances and transportation and subsistence of personnel discharged or released from the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard because of under age at the time of enlistment, and for other purposes.

GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to speak on a matter which is not directly before the Senate, but it is one which I feel is the concern of almost every citizen of the United States.

During the last 2 days General MacArthur has been widely charged with mixing politics with statesmanship. All Senators know that he made a statement last Monday to the effect that, unless unforeseen factors should arise, within 6 months, the forces occupying Japan would probably be reduced to 200,000 in number. General MacArthur had originally estimated that it would require 500,000 soldiers to occupy Japan under the circumstances then existing. He later reduced the figure to 400,000. Then after having actually occupied Japan, and learning more about the circumstances existing there, he indicated that 6 months hence 200,000 men would do the job unless some unforeseen circumstances should arise in the meantime.

I do not think it is becoming to the American press, the American public, or any individual citizen of this country under the circumstances, to criticize Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the face of his record. As a member of one of the Senate committees which visited with him in New Guinea, I had an opportunity to observe the difficult circumstances under which he and his soldiers were fighting.

I recall that he was ordered by the President of the United States to leave Corregidor and Bataan and proceed to Australia. The first utterance he made to the Australian people upon his arrival there was, "I have been ordered by the President of the United States to leave my post, but I shall return."

Persons who know of the fight which was waged by Douglas MacArthur, and the circumstances surrounding that fight, and who watched him go from Port Moresby in New Guinea up to Lae and Salamana through the Markham Valley, thence around Wewak and on to Hollandia, know what a small amount of material he had to operate with, and are bound to realize that he was able to take his objectives with the loss of the fewest number of men of any general who had ever led American soldiers in war.

Douglas MacArthur got his just reward from the President of the United States when he was named by the President to receive the surrender of Japan. Until he has gone through a surrender, as Wainwright had to surrender, and as MacArthur had to retreat from Bataan and Corregidor, no one can understand what a humiliation it is. On the porch of a little cottage in New Guinea, MacArthur spoke of his inability up to that time to go back to the Philippine Islands and relieve the Filipino people who had fought so bravely and against such tremendous odds, and he said, with tears in his eyes, that if he were not going to be able to go back, and if he were not going to be able to have the materials and the men with which to go back, he would have preferred to remain and suffer and perhaps to die with them. He had no thought of public office and no thought of interfering with the domestic affairs of the people of this country.

MacArthur is a soldier. He was first in his class at West Point. He was the youngest Chief of Staff the American Army ever had. He was given the Distinguished Service Cross on the field of battle in France because General Pershing issued an order to him, and then said, "I know you are going to carry this out," so he took the Distinguished Service Cross from around his own neck and put it on the neck of Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. President, this view is not shared by all people in this country, but I believe Douglas MacArthur to be the greatest military genius ever produced by the United States. And there is nothing political in that statement at all.

General MacArthur knows the Japanese. He knows how to fight the Japanese, as he has proved. He knew how to plan a campaign against the Japanese, and for a long time he fought them with only the meager forces which were placed at his disposal. Later the Navy and the Air Force were built up. I do not want a word I say to be taken as a criticism of any other arm of the service, or to take one iota of credit from Nimitz, or Halsey, or any other officer who has contributed to the campaign, but I cannot for the life of me understand why MacArthur should be criticized, now that he has occupied Japan, now that he has won after taking a big gamble, as he has said, perhaps the biggest gamble in history, now that the Japanese Fleet is wholly destroyed, now that the Japanese Air Force is wholly destroyed. Pictures I have seen of Tokyo, Osaka, Hiroshima, Nagoya, and other cities, indicate that they are almost entirely destroyed.

When the Japanese soldiers have their weapons taken from them, they cannot make war. MacArthur says that unless some unforeseen circumstance arises in the next 6 months he can occupy Japan with 200,000, presumably Regular Army soldiers. MacArthur implies—and he is criticized for it—that perhaps some of the citizen soldiers who have fought so long in those mean, dirty, hot, steaming jungles, against overwhelming odds, with little food and sometimes with no support, can be relieved and sent home, perhaps. What is wrong with that?

MacArthur fixes the figure at 200,000 to occupy the home islands of Japan.

People do not seem to realize we are going to occupy Okinawa, Saipan, Tinian, Guam, and many other bases without which Japan could not reprepare for war unless we permitted her to do so, and it is inconceivable to me that anyone would suggest that we would permit Japan to make war again, or have the industries or the materials to enable her to do so. She has not the materials with which to make war now, and MacArthur would be the last man to advocate that we go away and leave Japan with insufficient policing or guarding to the point necessary, absolutely, to insure our victory, and there is no suggestion in the statement General MacArthur has just issued that he intends to do it.

MacArthur knows as much about the Japanese as Chennault knew about the Chinese, if not more, and it is a sad commentary on American military performance that General Chennault was forced to leave China and lose face, when, in my opinion, he is the most distinguished and beloved and most influential American citizen who ever was in China. Yet the Army arranged to have someone else take his place at the first opportunity when he had something with which to fight.

When our delegation was in China in 1943, 4,000 tons of supplies with which to fight were being flown into China over the Burma hump. Chennault needed badly two squads of P-54's with which to combat the Japanese air force. When the time came when 100,000 tons of supplies were getting through, a new commander, who knew nothing about conditions, was put in charge, and Chennault had to come home. The American people do not understand, but an American soldier who is a commander, and who has authority, cannot continue to serve in Asia if he loses face. When the natives lose face, they kill themselves. When an American officer loses face, he has to come home; he cannot remain there. So Chennault had to come home, and now MacArthur, although playing a strong hand, is criticized in the American press, and widely among the public, for playing politics.

When such a charge is made I wish to associate myself with the other side. I do not believe any such thing. It may be that the Japanese invasion should be conducted from the offices of some newspapers. Perhaps the generals should be taken out and the editors put in charge. It is like putting baseball umpires in the grandstands. There has been a great movement to put the umpires in the grandstands on the theory that they could call the plays better than on the field. It would never succeed. But we have in General MacArthur a military genius, one who has carried the long fight up through the Pacific islands to a successful conclusion, and he is now occupying Japan.

The President of the United States said he welcomed the statement MacArthur made. I have talked with him. It is said Congress is seething with demobilization ideas. We seethe all the time. It does not take a demobilization problem to make us seethe. I recall many occasions when we were seething more than we are now. I do not know of a single Member of the House or Senate who does not want every mother's son to be returned home at the earliest possible moment, and I do not know of any one of them who is not courageous enough to stand up and say that some of these places have to be occupied by American forces until the peace we have won is made secure.

Mr. President, I wish to associate myself on the other side of this criticism of Douglas MacArthur. First, I think he knows what he is doing. I think he is brave enough to do his duty, and if he is let alone, he will gloriously succeed. If he does not need more than 200,000, the rest of the men can be sent home.

Occupying Japan is the Regular Army's job. It is the job of those who make soldiering their career. That is their job. Douglas MacArthur wants to relieve some of those who have fought. Australia is concerned about his statement. Australia made a wonderful contribution to winning the victory. In the Pacific area, they made almost the total contribution of the British Empire. But if it had not been for Douglas MacArthur and his meager forces, Australia would not be free today.

MacArthur has made good in everything in which he has ever taken part. He has been superior, and as I have said, I wish to associate myself with the public opinion in the United States which approves of the good service of this outstanding military genius the American people have produced. We educated him at the West Point Military Academy. We operate that Academy in order to train soldiers, to teach men army strategy so that they can make plans for war and execute them. It is just too bad General MacArthur is accused of mixing in politics. I have an idea he had no thought of politics. He does understand justice, he knows what the men who have served their country are entitled to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Speaking of the judgment MacArthur displayed, I should like to ask the Senator, with whom I totally agree, if it is not a fact that he went into Tokyo with odds of over a thousand to one against him, took possession of Tokyo, and has not had any difficulty whatsoever. That took courage and judgment did it not?

Mr. CHANDLER. He occupied it, after he had made the plans for the occupation. I applaud the President of the United States for having made the appointment. He could have appointed someone else. I have no doubt pressure was used on him to have him to appoint someone else, but he appointed MacArthur. I commend him for it, and give him great credit, because I do not know of a man who could have done a better job.

He has not had much trouble. When he gets the Japs wholly disarmed and he has in Japan 200,000 American soldiers fully armed, with warships completely surrounding the Japs, with airfields an hour's flying distance from Japan, and when the Japs are without any weapons I do not see how they are going to make much trouble for the American people.

MacArthur was finally ordered out of the Philippine Islands, though he felt he was bound to stay there and save the noble Philippine people, 90,000 of whom fought side by side with a few companies of American boys. I talked with "Skinny" Wainwright a few days ago, and he said, "MacArthur is a great general, a great genius." MacArthur did not complain. He stayed there and suffered with his men, until finally ordered to leave the Philippines.

Is anyone now justified in saying that MacArthur would not do everything humanly possible completely to prevent an opportunity from arising in the future for Japan again to do to the American people what she did when she started the war in the Pacific? I am willing to trust MacArthur. We have got to trust him. If we do not, we have no one else we can trust. The criticism we have heard lately cannot do any good.

Of course, Mr. President, the War Department will have to revise its plans for sending the boys home. The War Department has revised its plans several times. There are some fellows down there who do not have anything else to do but to revise plans. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.] If there ever comes a day when plans will not have to be revised many of those fellows will have to go home. [Laughter.] Let them revise the plans.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the judgment of General MacArthur is to be taken as final—and the President has corroborated the General's statement as to the number of troops required in that theater of the war—and if we can police Europe with the same number of men or less than the number proposed to police Japan, why should not the War Department revise their figures and revise them now, so the men in the Army may be demobilized as fast as can be?

Mr. CHANDLER. I know the President wants to demobilize the Army. I talked with President Roosevelt about demobilization of the Army before his death. I talked with President Truman since he became President of the United States, and I assert there is not anyone more anxious to get the boys home than he is.

Mr. WHERRY. He said so.

Mr. CHANDLER. But General MacArthur, if let alone, will use thousands of Chinese and thousands of Koreans and thousands of our allies who are over there or who have not done very much fighting, and they can help out in the occupation of Japan once the Japanese soldiers are completely disarmed.

Mr. President, I want to express my regret over much of the criticism we have recently heard. We have a way of building up our heroes and then at the least provocation, and sometimes without any provocation, tear them down. We can do so for a good reason or a bad reason or no reason at all. Perhaps some individuals are afraid that MacArthur will

come home pretty soon and receive a great welcome from the American people. That does not concern me. I have helped to welcome every one of our great heroes who have come back. The American people have a welcome in their hearts for every hero of this war. And every GI and everyone who has carried this burden during these tragic days is entitled to such a welcome. General Wainwright said he considered that the fine welcome he received in this country was a direct tribute to every one of the men who had suffered so much with him and who had endured so many hardships during those tragic days.

Let General MacArthur come home, and then read the record, and a grateful country will give him his due. He deserves the highest praise of the American people.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Statesman MacArthur," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 18, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATESMAN MAC ARTHUR

Throughout much of the war a group of MacArthur haters in this country and abroad sniped at the general. They said he didn't understand modern combat, called him a braggart, and accused him of selfish concern for his own campaigns. Those of us who rose to his defense take justified pride in having done so, but in truth, it was not difficult to rally public opinion to his side. The American people instinctively recognized MacArthur's competence and, of course, the time came when nearly everybody saw that he was the only first-rank strategist that this war produced among the generals on either side. There were other talented leaders, but his achievements with the most limited means marked him as among the great captains.

Now the anti-MacArthur campaign is being renewed in slightly different form. His management of the Japanese occupation is being criticized as too gentle, too considerate of Japanese sensibilities, too lacking in zeal for punishment of the men who led Japan into the war and were responsible for mistreatment of prisoners.

In truth, MacArthur's handling of the occupation has been an extraordinary achievement. If what has taken place in Europe since the German surrender is to be regarded as the norm, then surely MacArthur must be credited with a masterpiece of statesmanship.

When the German surrender came Allied armies were fully deployed on German soil and the German armies were already disintegrated in rout and surrender. Disarmament of the enemy was well advanced. There was no government left in Germany that had more than a tenuous claim to the loyalty of the army and the people.

In Japan the situation was vastly more difficult for the victor. Japan still had millions of well disciplined and well armed soldiers in the home islands and we had to start our occupation with a handful. Plans for this operation had to be improvised hastily on the basis of necessarily inadequate information on the state of mind of the Japanese. Quick decisions had to be taken. In spite of these difficulties, the occupation has proceeded smoothly, although at no time have there been as many American soldiers in Japan as there were armed Japanese in the islands to cause trouble. The record is truly an amazing one, particularly in view of the intensity of feeling which existed between the Americans and the Japanese.

In Europe the seeds of the next war are being sown. The Allied Armies have indulged in widespread looting at the expense of civilians and now the Russians are engaged in looting American military supplies. The German people are being told that nothing they may do can save them from permanent misery. The fact that the destruction of their economy will mean the disorganization of the economy of all Europe is obvious, but is being ignored. The armies of occupation are eating up the food reserves, with all that that implies of hunger and pestilence in Europe in the months ahead. In short, the European occupation is calculated to prolong the era of hate, prolong the disorganization, and to do everything that can be done to create social unrest and abiding resentments. Conditions are being created which will necessarily extend the period of occupation into the indefinite future, because, if the present policies are persisted in, the time will never come when the Allied forces can leave Germany without danger.

The contrast with MacArthur's Japan is striking. The Japanese have been given assurances that they need only abandon their conquests, and their political superstitions, and disarm to be restored to national dignity and independence. The Japanese are showing clear signs of having accepted these terms in their hearts as well as in the formal paper of surrender. No doubt they have been helped in this direction by the assurance given the other day that if all goes well the occupation can be ended in a year, and by the later intimation from MacArthur himself that in 6 months the occupation army can be reduced to 200,000 regulars. Needless to say, looting and other crimes against civilians by our forces have been effectively discouraged. The American Army is eating its own food, not that of a population already underfed. In short, MacArthur's army is behaving with the decency and discretion which ought to be expected of an American Army.

The result to date has been good. The Japanese disarmament is proceeding rapidly. The Japanese themselves are surrendering their men accused of war crimes to us. No needless provocations are being given to be remembered for generations to come and to demand revenge.

Nevertheless, General MacArthur is being accused of incompetence. His course is being condemned as a "kid glove policy." That's pretty funny. It assumes that it is better to get what you want from the other fellow by socking him than by persuading him. The truth is that there was a time when we had to sock the Japs, and MacArthur did that. Now it is no longer necessary, but the general's critics want him to go on socking anyhow. It is odd that the people who are screaming loudest about MacArthur's kid gloves are those who are most certain that the era of universal peace is upon us. Maybe they think that peace is promoted by a victor nation throwing its weight around.

We hope that General MacArthur will not be dissuaded from his sensible and statesmanlike course by those who are clamoring against him. We hope so because this Nation has reason to take pride in his policy of decency; because he is supplying the world with an example of how the victor should behave toward the vanquished, and especially because, if he is allowed to have his way, the American Army will be brought home promptly. The pity is that his plan is not being followed in Europe. Because it isn't, we ought to take our Army out of Europe at once, not only as a lesson to our allies, but also out of consideration for our soldiers in Europe and their families.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, apropos of the remarks made by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], it appears from the morning papers that the President backs General MacArthur. I notice also that there is a release in the papers to the effect that the President gives full backing to MacArthur's Korean policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Mac Knows What He's Doing," from the Washington Times-Herald of this morning, be printed in the RECORD following the insertion placed therein by the Senator from Nebraska.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MAC" KNOWS WHAT HE'S DOING

General MacArthur day before yesterday issued a statement which has thrown the State Department into something of a pet. What MacArthur said was that the allied occupation of Japan has gone with amazing smoothness to date; that it now seems most unlikely that large numbers of soldiers will be needed to occupy Japan for a long time to come; that the occupation force can perhaps be cut to 200,000 Regular Army men within 6 months, permitting "complete demobilization of our citizen Pacific forces which fought so long and so nobly through to victory."

ADVICE THAT ISN'T NEEDED

Of course, we wouldn't put it past "Emperor Mac" to make such a statement with view to inducing the Japanese leaders and people to be even more polite and cooperative toward the occupation forces than they have been up to now, in the hope of shortening the occupation.

But whatever MacArthur's reason for saying what he did say, the State Department is hardly the agency to tell MacArthur how to run his occupation show. That is a military job, primarily.

The same goes for a lot of other people in this country who have appointed themselves advisers to MacArthur. Really, MacArthur has done remarkably well with the occupation up to now, and does not seem to need much advice from anybody else.

A couple of months ago Americans were gritting their teeth in expectation of invading Japan, which would cost us perhaps a million casualties. It did not happen. We are now peaceably invading Japan, under MacArthur's guidance. The Japanese people are agreeably surprised to find that our troops are not murderous rapists, as Japanese propaganda had painted them. No incidents between Jap citizens and American soldiers have been reported as yet. Japan's leaders, though undoubtedly hating their defeat and hoping for revenge some day, are at this time cooperating with MacArthur.

So let's call off a lot of official and unofficial advice from this country to MacArthur. He is the man to whom the President entrusted the job of occupying Japan. How about trusting him to handle that job at least as well as he handled the long haul from Australia to the Philippines to Okinawa to Japan?

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peace time economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] to the pending bill, and to state

that I differ, as does the Senator from New York also, with the position taken by the Senate Finance Committee in its preparation of the pending bill.

Under the bill as reported by the committe Federal workers and maritime workers would be paid under the laws in effect in the State in which they worked. The committee, I believe, based upon representations made to them by the Governors of the various States, sometimes in contradiction to the representations made by the attorneys general of the same States, has failed wholly to recognize the fact that the large working centers incident to this war were built up by migrant workers, who in peacetime largely would have no place there. That applies to Federal and maritime workers just the same as it applies to other workers for allegedly private industries whcih, however, met their pay roll from the Government Treasury.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a rather peculiar situation which would arise if we accept the interpretation of the committee. Two Federal workers, shall we say, are living side by side in the District of Columbia. Both of them are machinists first class. Both were employed at the Washington Navy Yard in the middle of the war, and one of them was transferred to the torpedo works at Alexandria, Va., just across the river. That is a Government necessity, is it not? He was not asked if he could be transferred. But when the emergency is over and the personnel of the Government installation is reduced back to a peacetime basis, those two workers find themselves in a rather peculiar situation, both being paid out of the Federal Treasury. The worker who continued to work at the Washington Navy Yard will receive $20 a week under the committee proposal. The man who is his next door neighbor, who helped out the situation, and at the order of the United States Government, went to the torpedo plant at Alexandria, Va., will receive $15 a week for doing the same or possibly a higher quality and more precision type of work. That is the situation we are faced with all over the country. We are faced with a varied system of payments for Federal workers and maritime workers.

So in defense of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York I think those things should be brought home to the Senate of the United States, and if we are to take the dollars of the taxpayers of the United States to pay this bill, I think in fairness to the whole proposal we should consider that matter very seriously.

Let me cite a few of the divergent laws about which the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] spoke a short time ago. It has been said that each State is able to take care of its own problems and knows best what to do with them. Let us take the first two States alphabetically in the list of States.

Let us first take Alabama. In 1944, according to the records in the Census Bureau, the average weekly earnings of a citizen of Alabama were $33.38. The State of Alabama fixed the unemployment compensation ceiling in that State at $20 a week.

Let us go next to the Territory of Alaska. In 1944 the average weekly earnings of a citizen of the Territory of Alaska were $93.45. I think that is about correct, because when I was up there a haircut cost $3, a shave cost a dollar, and the cost of meals and everything else was commensurate, so I suppose the average weekly earnings were about that much. Yet the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska saw fit to fix the ceiling, subject to all reductions, at $16. Is there anything sensible or uniform about a program of that kind?

Let us go next to Arizona. Arizona, with average weekly earnings of $40.10 in 1944, fixed the ceiling at $15 a week.

Arkansas was optimistic. It had average weekly earnings of only $26.99, and it fixed the ceiling at $15 a week, which I think we will agree was much more nearly in line than some of the others.

On the other hand, California, with average weekly earnings of $51.97, fixed a ceiling of $20. Colorado, with average weekly earnings of $37.12, fixed a ceiling of $15. Delaware, with average weekly earnings of $45.83, fixed the ceiling at $18.

Let us go to the Territories. This is amusing. As I have previously stated, the Territory of Alaska, with average weekly earnings of $93.45, fixed the unemployment compensation ceiling at $16 a week. In the District of Columbia, where the average weekly earnings are $36.43, the unemployment compensation ceiling was fixed at $20 a week. In the Territory of Hawaii, where the average weekly earnings are $40.85, the unemployment compensation ceiling was fixed at $25 a week.

That, I think, is the thing aimed at, the thing sought for in the amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader. Let us get a little uniformity based upon earnings. Let us consider where the funds came from. I admit that the State of Michigan has amassed a huge fund, as have the State of Illinois, the State of Pennsylvania, the State of New York, and the State of California, as well as other States. Whence came those funds? They were built up during long-continued periods of steady employment—on what? Eighty-five percent of it on Government contracts. So it came out of the Treasury.

I am not condemning those States. I congratulate their legislatures for adhering to the Scriptures. Senators will remember the old story of the seven fat cattle and the seven lean cattle. Those States were taking care of their postwar situations during the time when it was possible to collect the funds to take care of them. But in the great majority of cases—I believe in all of them—the Federal Government furnished the money. I do not believe there was a cent of independent income in the United States on which taxes were collected. The only industry we had was war. We shipped great quantities of materials to our Allies. We shipped a great amount of lend-lease materials. We did not get the benefit of much of such production within the United States. Our Army did not use all of it. But for whom was the clerk in the corner grocery working? He was working for his boss, who in turn was working for his customers. Who were the customers? They were people either directly or indirectly on the Federal pay roll, or people on pay rolls of concerns the prices of whose items were fixed, based upon the cost of production, and in the cost of production was an item for pay-roll taxes to take care of this situation.

It is said that the States can take care of their own situations. I ask, How are workers to be induced to return from Michigan and go to work elsewhere when they cannot leave the State of Michigan for more than 72 hours? They are like persons in Reno, Nev., seeking a divorce. They must establish venue and keep it in order to receive a cent. If they go back to their home States to try to find a job, and remain away for 72 hours, they are out of the picture. There are many such freak laws in the various States.

We are trying to reorganize this country and get it back to where it was. We placed it in the condition in which it now is. How did we do it? By causing the greatest migration of workers the world has ever seen. We did it by building huge plants such as Willow Run, which were designed by our war agencies. I offer no criticism on that score. Such action was forced upon us by the conditions of war, in which there was a minimum of supervision and a maximum demand for production. We had to take maximum advantage of the technical skills and supervision available, build huge plants, and induce people from all over the country to come and work in them. Now it is said that the problems should be left to the individual States, to deal with as their directors of unemployment compensation may deem best.

Let me give a few illustrations. First, let me quote from the statement of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], on page 362 of the unrevised printed record of the hearings before the Committee on Finance:

> Senator TAFT. Is it not very difficult to do this on a State basis?

He was speaking of payments to maritime workers and Federal workers—particularly maritime workers—and the basis on which they should be paid.

> I mean one shipowner owning one ship would have to report to a dozen States perhaps, from which the men came. It seems to me your argument for a Federal system is very persuasive.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] that there must be some uniformity. That was the purpose in the drafting of the original Senate bill 1274. The purpose was to have a reasonable degree of uniformity during the emergency period only, if possible without coercion, if possible without taking over State systems. The condition was to be uniform, brought about by a one-issue and one-objective program, which the Federal Government had to put into effect. That was our problem.

The Treasury has either directly or indirectly paid the money which the States have. It is proposed to augment

that fund, and attempt to obtain a reasonable balance as between the ridiculously low amount of $15 a week in some States, and the reasonable amount of $25. The State rates run from as low as $15 to as high as $28.

That is the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. The amendment is also intended to permit the Government to augment the State funds if the State will accept the augmentation. It is not proposed to force it on any State government, if it feels that such payments should not be made. It is not intended to force the States to change their rules as to payment. It is not intended to say to a State, "You must pay $25," if the State feels that the limit should be $20. It is intended only to hold out to the States this offer, and to say to them, "We have paid only up to $20. We will pay up to $25 if you wish to accept it. We will reimburse you for the amount which we failed to give you based upon pay rolls during the earning period in which your workers were employed." That is all that is offered.

It is sometimes said that there is some question about the law. The law only forbids an employee receiving compensation from two different sources during the same week. I have sat in this Chamber hour after hour, and in court rooms day after day, listening to lawyers and judges discuss legislative intent. Not one opponent of this proposal has ever questioned the legislative intent of that part of the law. That, I say, is the governing factor.

For that reason, Mr. President, I think unquestionably we should add the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the committee version of the bill as originally introduced.

At this time I also wish to offer, in addition, another amendment which I think would make the law workable. I wish to explain why I offer it. For some reason—and frankly, Mr. President—I cannot determine the reason; I have discussed it with some of the members of the committee, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] cannot understand it either—there was placed in the bill a provision to the effect that the governor, before accepting any of the money, must make application to the Federal Government. In other words, if the governor fails to make application to the Federal Government, all the people of his State who might benefit would suffer, despite the fact that the Federal Government desires to let the people of the State have the benefit of the provisions. When we proposed the insertion of a clause which would avoid that situation, we were told, "No; the governor of each State must personally apply to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion before the Director can take up the matter with the State."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. I do not yield at this time, because I wish to conclude the remarks I am now making.

Therefore, Mr. President, I offer and send to the desk an amendment which would delete the part of the bill requiring the governors to make application, and also making certain other minor provisions so as to implement the amendment, in order that the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may negotiate with the State agencies and ascertain whether the particular States elect to cooperate with the Federal Government, as agents of the Federal Government, in carrying out the terms of the bill and seeing that they are complied with insofar as such States are concerned.

Mr. President, I most seriously urge that the workers be spared the injustice which would result from the payment of various piebald unemployment compensation benefits, one man who lives on one side of the river being paid $15 a week and another man, who formerly did the same work and who live only spitting distance away on the other side of the river, being paid $20 a week. Probably he did not have to travel so far to do the work for the Government, and probably he went there under the orders of the Government to do that work. I do not wish to have a man kept in the State of Michigan or any other State for the entire period and prevented from going to some other place and seeking work there, because of a provision that if he does go elsewhere he must give up any claims he may have had for unemployment compensation. Such a provision would prevent him from finding lucrative employment, possibly in his own home State. I do not wish to have workers who were sent to various places by the Government differentiated between in respect to the amounts of unemployment compensation payments, the duration of payment of unemployment benefits, the terms under which the benefits are paid, and so forth. I refer to the Federal workers, the civil-service employees, the workers who went where they were sent and who moved when they were told to move. I ask the Senate to make the provisions uniform as between the various States, and to do so in accordance with the terms of a law enacted by Congress governing the situation in the District of Columbia. At the time that law was passed the Congress considered it a fair one, and certainly at this time we cannot consider it unfair.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. A short time ago, as I entered the Chamber, I heard the Senator from West Virginia state that if a worker left a State for 72 hours he would be deprived of some of the benefits.

Mr. KILGORE. That happens to be the law of the State of Michigan on this subject; at least I was so informed at a Finance Committee hearing.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understood the situation a year ago when the original Kilgore bill was under discussion, if a worker had been earning good pay in one State and then returned to his home, in another State, where the unemployment compensation payments were very low, he could still collect his unemployment compensation from the State in which he had been working for, let us say, a quarter of a year, and that would be used as a basis for figuring the amount of the compensation he would receive. Now the Senator from West Virginia says that if the worker leaves a State for 72 hours he will be deprived of some of his privileges. Will the Senator explain that point further?

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that under existing State laws the State of Michigan forbids a worker to leave the State for as much as 72 hours after registration if he still desires to draw unemployment compensation. In other States there are comparable provisions. Attempts have been made to rectify the situation by means of reciprocity agreements between the individual States, very much like treaties between individual nations. I know that my own State is now having trouble with the State of Michigan in that connection, and we have been contesting the correctness of such a restriction.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that if Michigan has such a law it would likely result in retaining in Michigan all the Democratic voters who have gone there from West Virginia, Kentucky, and other States.

Mr. KILGORE. That might be a help to Michigan, but we would like to get them back home. Perhaps their short stay up there might be enlightening, of course.

But, politics aside, let me refer to a publication issued last night briefing many of these laws and various other matters, including certain tables which I have had on my desk, and to which I have been referring.

Mr. AIKEN. Frankly, Mr. President, I am surprised to learn that any State has had such a provision in its law.

Mr. KILGORE. That requirement is made in connection with the State law relating to registration for employment. A worker must report back to the registration office every 3 days or 72 hours. If the worker does not do that, he goes off the list. Other States have provisions not quite so bad. We are having trouble regarding reciprocity between the States in that connection. That is why I think there should be uniform provisions for all the States relative to Federal and arsenal and maritime workers. That is why we selected the provisions of the District of Columbia law.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. It has also been said today, in opposition, that last year the Senate tried to have a bill on the same subject enacted, but the House of Representatives declined to pass it. Mr. President, if I promise my constituents to do something, and simply introduce a bill on the subject and try to have it enacted and then quit because someone whips me, and then when the next year comes around I promise it again, and again fail to secure action, I doubt if I will get very far. If we are going to do that, we

might just as well adopt a unicameral legislative system. In other words, when the Senate believes something is right, it is no excuse to say that the House of Representatives does not believe it. We do not know what the House of Representatives will do now since an election has intervened. I do not believe we can shirk our responsibility by saying that the committee and the other House could not agree on certain points at the time they were last considered. If we are going to leave such matters entirely to them, let us leave all legislation to them, abolish the Senate, and have only the House of Representatives. To do that would be demonstrating the theory of a defeatist. I, for one, never have and never shall subscribe to a theory of defeatism. If Senators feel that we should correct a group of existing misapprehensions and mistakes—if I may call them such—which have resulted in a very serious situation of unbalance during a very crucial period, I think we as a Senate must take care of the situation by the necessary corrections, and return it to a proper state of balance. We cannot shirk our responsibility. If we do so and tihngs crash down upon our shoulders we will have another WPA, another CWA, another RFC, and other alphabetical agencies wished upon us by the same States which say that they need and desire no help. Just so soon as they find they have made a mistake in not asking for help, do not believe that we can shirk our responsibility or that we will do so.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the one which I have just offered, all three of which, I believe, go a long way toward clarifying the present situation.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, during the wartime emergency this country mobilized its manpower, its capital, and its machinery, in order to wage war. We waged that war which was gloriously won and finished. In a very real sense the industrial workers of this country were working for Uncle Sam, the Federal Government. The time has now arrived for them to disperse, and Senators who vote against this amendment will be saying to the workers, "Disperse all ye faithful and take as little as the State for which you did not work is willing to give you."

In cases of industrial plants we have terminated the contract of the contractor in Tennessee, the contractor in Arkansas, and the contractor in Mississippi on the same basis as we terminated the contract of the contractors in Michigan, Connecticut, and New York. I assert, Mr. President, that the workers who have labored to bring about our victory, and who worked to produce for Uncle Sam the machinery with which the war was won, are entitled to treatment at least equally as good as the treatment which we accord to contractors.

I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Murray
Andrews	Guffey	Myers
Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	Knowland	Taft
Byrd	La Follette	Taylor
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McCarran	Tobey
Chandler	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	McMahon	Walsh
Donnell	Magnuson	Wheeler
Downey	Mead	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Willis
George	Morse	Wilson
Gerry	Murdock	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the series of amendments offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to be voted on en bloc.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I prefer to yield to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] if he desires to present the viewpoint of the Committee on Finance, or I shall briefly state my interpretation of the attitude of the Finance Committee, as he may wish.

Mr. GEORGE. It is quite agreeable to me to have the Senator from Michigan speak. I doubt our ability to reach a vote tonight. I should like to put into the RECORD some telegrams, but I can do that at a later time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to proceed only briefly, but I should dislike to have the RECORD fail to disclose the fact that the Senate Committee on Finance, with votes upon both side of the aisle, thought it had a very sound reason for the report which it has made. I continue to believe that it was a sound reason.

Mr. President, I completely agree with what the able Senator from Kentucky has said about the presence of a Federal obligation in respect to an unemployment emergency which arises from reconversion. In order that my position may be perfectly clear in this respect so that there can be no honest excuse for further misrepresentation of it, I emphasize the fact that I am supporting Federal compensation for Federal employees. I think it is perfectly obvious that their war employer was the Government of the United States, that we have failed to care for them up to date, and it is our obligation to do so in the pending bill.

I am voting to provide compensation for maritime workers. It is perfectly obvious that they should have been covered before. The Government was their employer in this war, and they have a right to look to their employer for their unemployment compensation.

I am voting to support the proposed allowance to transfer migratory workers back either to their homes or a comparable distance to a waiting job. Again, it is perfectly obvious to me that this migration of workers occurred under the impact and the impulse of a Federal demand that, as a patriotic duty, they should travel to war-production centers and should there engage themselves in war work, and I recognize the obligation of the Federal Government to return them to the place whence they came. That was my position 1 year ago. I voted in that fashion 1 year ago. I vote in the House and Senate conference in that fashion 1 year ago. I shall do so again now.

Mr. President, I further recognize—and I think the Senate Finance Committee majority recognized—a Federal obligation in respect to all other workers. The question is where that obligation exists, in what form it is best answered, and what our obligation is in respect to it.

As the bill came to the Senate Finance Committee it contained substantially the provision which the able Senator from Kentucky now seeks to reintroduce into the bill, namely, a flat uniform payment from the Federal Treasury, added to the payments of State unemployment compensation, to make a uniform total of $25 a week for 26 weeks.

The Senator from Kentucky says that if one recognizes the obligation to extend the duration, one then must, in consistency, recognize the obligation to increase the rate. I am not prepared to agree with that so-called logic. On the contrary, Mr. President, I respectfully submit that every theory upon which we enlist Federal aid recognizes the importance of duration of benefits far more than it recognizes the importance of the rate of payment. Why is that?

The States have provided their own rates of payment for unemployment compensation for whatever period they have deemed to be wise, and it is a widely differing range of dates. I submit that if the reconversion unemployment emergency goes beyond the time which is contemplated by the State systems as set up to meet economic reversals rather than war conditions, it is then that the Federal Government must pick up its responsibility. In other words, I submit that we meet our obligation, which the Senator from Kentucky has described, when we deal solely with duration instead of with rates.

Now let me point out to the Senate that more than 80 percent, I think it is 82 percent, of all the war workers in this country are employed in States which themselves provide $20 or more a week in unemployment benefits. I submit that we cannot make a crisis out of a situation in which unemployed workers draw $20 a week, but that the crisis comes when such workers draw nothing a week when the duration has expired. It is on the theory of meeting that emergency that the Senate Finance Committee has

dealt solely with duration instead of with rates.

I remind the Senate that in the Senate Finance Committee I offered an amendment to increase the State duration straight across the board by 50 percent. That would have meant, for example, in the State of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], which has gone further in establishing its duration than any State in the Union, namely, 26 weeks, that the State of Washington and the workers in it, workers who get nothing out of this measure because of the mere fact that their State has been progressive in writing its State law—workers in the State of Washington would have received the benefit of an additional 50 percent of duration, or 13 additional weeks.

In my own State of Michigan, where the duration is 20 weeks, the workers would have had a duration of 30 weeks, and the cash value of these two Federal rights under the proposal which I submitted would in most instances have been greater than those which are proposed in the pending amendment.

The committee declined to accept my amendment. But what I am trying to say, and what I know I am proving, is that I was not dealing with this subject and I do not deal with it now for any mere purpose of trying to economize at the expense of the war worker. The proposal I submitted in respect to duration would have been worth more in dollars and cents in the long run to the war worker.

The committee declined to accept that amendment, but it did adopt the philosophy that the obligation of the Federal Government in respect of this emergency relates to the duration of the emergency rather than to the rate of payment.

Mr. President, that being the philosophical background of the approach of the Senate committee, I come to the fact that the committee itself discovered finally that it confronted not a problem in philosophy but a problem in cold hard reality, namely, that in 26 States of this Union not $1 of the additional Federal benefits proposed in the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky can be drawn by a single worker in any one of those 26 States, including practically all of the great war-production States—no worker can draw one penny of these increased benefits except as the governor of the State calls a special session of the legislature of the State and a majority of the special session of the legislature agrees to accept the Federal bounty.

Under the existing law in all these 26 States, as interpreted either by their governors or by their attorneys general, a worker who accepted one penny of the Federal benefits proposed in the amendment submitted by the able Senator from Kentucky would either have such Federal benefits deducted from his State benefit payments or he would be prohibited from accepting any State payments at all.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator calls attention to the fact that that money would have to be accepted directly from the Federal Government in order for that prohibition to go into effect. If the State took the money and then as an augmented benefit turned it over to the workers themselves it must be from two sources. It that not right?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to follow the Senator's question. All I know is that we submitted categorical questions to the governors of all the States, and the responses from the governors, as classified by the staff of the Senate Finance Committee, indicate that 26 States are not in a position to subscribe to the proposal.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator, I know, is proceeding upon the questionnaire propounded by the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to the several governors.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Which was based upon the original draft of Senate bill 1274, which provided that in the event the State did not use or did not elect to utilize the money, the Federal Government could proceed to pay it anyway in augmentation. That is not included in the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky. It is left clearly discretionary in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there ought not to be any misapprehension about the facts. Actually there are 28 States which say they cannot accept the money. Generally the same States say that if the money is paid by the Federal Government they must, pro tanto, reduce the payments made by them to unemployed workers.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with that statement. That is in case the money is paid by the Federal Government to the workers. Is not that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. But it is more than that. I will have to place the telegrams in the RECORD. The governors take the flat position that they cannot accept the money, that is, they cannot enter into the agreement to take the money and pay it out. They go further than that and say that in many of the States if a worker seeks or accepts any part of the Federal money he is entirely disqualified either for a week or for a longer period.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee if he will place in the RECORD, not only the telegram he sent to the governors but also the replies of the governors and the attorneys general of the various States. I think all of them should be placed in the RECORD for the benefit of the record.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the Senate is entitled to have that record.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, he wants the Senate to have the complete record. And certainly I wish to be absolved from any purpose of distorting the record in any way whatever.

Mr. KILGORE. I apologize to the Senator from Michigan if anything I said may be interpreted in such a manner. What I was trying to do was to have a correct picture of the legal situation which exists.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the legal situation exists as I presented it, Mr. President.

The questions asked of the governors and the Attorneys General of the country were:

(1) Can your State enter into such agreement with Federal Government without resulting in the State payment being partially or totally reduced by the amount of the supplementary Federal payment?

(2) If your State does not enter into such an agreement would Federal supplementary payments result in reduction of the State amount?

Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia is entirely correct in saying that the governors and the Attorneys General were responding to those questions in the light of the bill as originally presented. I agree with the Senator. But what the amendment of the able Senator from Kentucky now seeks to do is to set up a sort of an option to the State to do precisely the same thing which was proposed in the original Kilgore bill, if they are willing to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if under their own interpretation of their own law they cannot do so there would be no compulsion upon them; not only would there be no compulsion upon them to do it, but if they decided they could not do it they, of course, would not do it. But the theory of my amendment is that those States which can accept, even assuming there was no amendment of the State law, if no legislature were to meet to amend it—if they can accept they ought not to be denied the opportunity to do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that is the Senator's position. I submit this by way of critical reply to the Senator's position. If his amendment is adopted, we shall be enacting a Federal law creating a Federal bounty which 16 States in the Union have said they can take advantage of under their existing legal situations. Some of them will and some of them will not. We shall also be creating a situation in which 26 States—and, I repeat, they include States representing the major portion of war employment in this country—assert that they cannot operate under the proposal which the Senator from Kentucky presents.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Just a moment. Therefore, in 26 States, if anything happens as a result of this amendment, it can only happen if each Governor is willing to call his legislature into session, and a majority of the legislature is prepared to vote in the affirmative.

Mr. President, I submit that that is not the way in which the Federal Congress should legislate in respect to the States of this Union in regard to a matter which up to this hour has been considered primarily a State function. It seems to me that the whole process would take time. It would create a situation of uncertainty

and discrimination, and it is not the sort of a situation which would contribute to the stability which is so essential in this country at the present time if we are to proceed with reconversion.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator has stated, as I wished to have him state, that there was a way out of this difficulty if the legislatures in the States should finally determine that the law could be changed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, yes.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator and I differ as to the seriousness of that situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I volunteered that information. Of course, that is so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to get something clear in my mind. I thought it was clear in my mind, until I heard the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Assume that a man was recruited in Kentucky to work in the Willow Run factory in Michigan, and that he moved his family there and earned $60 a week, and was then laid off. If he should go back to Kentucky with his family, would he collect $22 a week unemployment compensation from Michigan, or the $16 a week allowed by Kentucky, and who would pay the amount?

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand the situation, that particular worker, if he were registered with the Michigan State Unemployment Compensation Board, would be entitled to compensation at Michigan rates, so long as he made himself available for reemployment. Suppose he should move back home, as the Senator suggests. He would still be entitled to draw compensation from the State of Michigan at Michigan rates. The difficulty is that since all unemployment compensation is based upon the theory that a worker must hold himself eligible for reemployment if suitable employment is available, the worker who moved to Kentucky, let us say, could not continue to draw benefits in Michigan if the Michigan commission should certify that it had a suitable job for him.

A further difficulty arises because of the fact that, as I understand, under the Michigan regulations he has only 72 hours in which to take the new job. I quite agree with the Senator from Vermont that that presents a rather serious inequity, but I submit to the Senator that that inequity exists under the present system, and the proposal which is pending is simply an extension of the existing system. Therefore, as I see it, there is no way to cure the situation to which the Senator refers, except by tearing up all the State laws and all the Federal proposals, and writing a straight-out Federal unemployment compensation law.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not such a law make it difficult for the workers who came from all over the United States to work in Michigan to go back home again when their jobs gave out, unless they could be assured of substantial unemployment compensation in the States to which they returned?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That may be; but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that that situation is not cured in any fashion by the proposal upon which the Senate is about to vote.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I believe that is all I have to say. I agree that it would be a fine thing if we could pay a straight unemployment compensation of $25 a week to everyone across the country so long as he remains unemployed, but I do not see how it can be done under existing conditions. We confront a condition and not a theory. I do not believe that the Federal Government wishes to put itself in the position of dangling a bait before the States and seeking their assent to the acceptance of a Federal subsidy. I am unable to believe that the extension of duration is not of far greater importance to the average war worker in the States where most of the unemployment occurs than is any other phase of the unemployment problem.

So far as the State of Michigan is concerned, where the benefits range from $20 to $28, varying with the number of dependents, and where the term of payment is 20 weeks, I should greatly prefer to vote for an amendment extending the duration by 50 percent, to 30 weeks. Under those circumstances I should feel that I had really rendered some service to the worker. Certainly I can render no service to him in my State under any circumstances until after the Governor has called a special session and a majority of the legislature has voted to do that which it declined to do within the past year, and which most other State legislatures have declined to do within the past year.

Under the circumstances, knowing as we do—and we might as well be perfectly frank about it—that we confront a very strong resistance from the other end of the Capitol against all parts of this legislation, it seems to me that if we could agree upon a program such as the Senate Committee on Finance has submitted, we would be rendering the greatest service available to us at the moment.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize again my belief that there is a sharp distinction between duration of benefits and rate of benefits. I believe that the President of the United States himself has recognized that distinction. I refer only to what I have read in the newspapers. I refer to nothing else; but I have read about a White House memorandum which has indicated that from the White House standpoint the provision as to duration of benefits is of indispensable importance, whereas the provision as to rate of benefits, while desirable, is not indispensable. I join myself with that reported memorandum in respect to the relative importance of an extension of the duration as the primary contribution which the Federal Government can make in respect to the unemployment situation. If any Senator wishes to propose a further extension of the duration, I shall be glad to support it, because if an emergency in respect to duration confronts us—I care not whether it is 20 weeks, 30 weeks, or 50 weeks—there is no way, when the time comes, that we can escape our share of the responsibility. Therefore I submit that the theory upon which the Senate Finance Committee, by a bipartisan majority, has reported the pending bill to the Senate is a sound approach to the problem which we confront.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the debate. I am anxious to have a vote on the amendment this afternoon.

I wish to refer for a moment to the allusion by the Senator from Michigan to a so-called White House Memorandum. I think I ought to say that that memorandum is not from the President of the United States. So far as he is concerned, he has not deviated from the position which he took in his message, and which he has taken from the start, that this is a Federal obligation, and that it is just as much a Federal obligation with respect to the increase in the amount to be paid as it is in respect to increasing the time during which payments shall be made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not think I attributed the statement to the President.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but the Senator said "the White House"; and ordinarily when we say "the White House," we leave the impression, perhaps unintentionally, that it was from the President. The memorandum was not from the President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Perhaps it was unintentional when the memorandum was reported as coming from the White House, but I simply indicate that I read that a memorandum came from the White House, and it is that memorandum to which I referred.

Mr. BARKLEY. It came from someone associated with the White House, but not from the President himself.

Mr. President, I merely wish to reiterate that, from the standpoint of principle, there is no more obligation on the part of the Federal Government to increase the time than there is to increase the amount. If the committee had followed the recommendation and request of the State authorities, it would not have done either, because the theme song of the State authorities was that the Federal Government should keep its hands entirely off this situation and should leave it to them.

I intended awhile ago to call attention to some figures, and I shall ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD in connection with assertions relative to the proposed increase of the amount under the amendment I have offered, which would be voluntary, not compulsory. I do not know whether it would result in the calling of a special session of the legislature by a governor in order to enable him or the State to accept it. But even if it did not result in that, the States which could

accept it should be permitted to do so, it seems to me; and if legislatures have enacted laws which prevent them from permitting employees who have been shifted around over the United States in connection with the war effort to receive a little more unemployment compensation, that is their fault, not the fault of the Federal Congress.

It has been asserted that to do this will encourage idleness. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered accepts the provisions of the State laws with respect to qualifications to draw unemployment payments, whatever they may be. I wish to call attention to the fact that the average weekly pay or wages in the United States in 1944, throughout the country, was $44.21. There is no State of the Union which provides for the payment of more than $26 a week as unemployment compensation, except one or two States where dependents are taken into consideration. The State of Washington provides a maximum of $25 a week. That is the maximum, not the average. The average is made up of credits which are allowed because of length of employment and wages received in previous periods or a base period, dependent upon the law of the State. But the maximum is not the average which is received. However, the average wages received in the United States in 1944 amounted to $44.21.

In the State of Alabama the average wage in 1944 was $33.38, but the maximum payment under the laws of Alabama for unemployment compensation is $20. I cannot be convinced that the people of Alabama are so indigent and careless and lazy that, having received an average of $33.38 a week during 1944, they would remain idle, even if they could do so, in order to be paid unemployment compensation of $20 a week. Of course, we all know that, under the law, if they are offered suitable jobs—a matter which is to be determined by the State authority—and if they refuse to accept them, they will go off the rolls. So it is idle to assume that anyone who has received an average of $33.38 a week during 1944 will stay out of work, even if he can receive $20 a week as unemployment compensation.

In Alaska the average wages paid in 1944 amounted to $93.45, and the maximum payment for unemployment compensation under the laws of the Territory of Alaska amounts to $16. I cannot be convinced that any people as a whole who have been drawing average pay amounting to $93.45 will remain idle, even if they can do so under the laws of the State or Territory in which they reside, in order to be paid unemployment compensation amounting to $16 a week.

In Arizona the average weekly wages in 1944 amounted to $40.10. The present maximum weekly unemployment benefit payments in Arizona amount to $15.

In California the average weekly wages in 1944 amounted to $51.97, and the maximum payment under unemployment compensation is $20.

In Connecticut the average weekly wages paid in 1944 amounted to $50.31, and the maximum payment under unemployment compensation is $22, subject to an increase up to $28 in the case of dependents.

In Colorado the average weekly wages paid in 1944 amounted to $37.12, and the maximum payment for unemployment compensation is $15.

If we go down the list of States, we find that the average wages paid in all the States amount to more than twice as much as the maximum unemployment compensation benefits which would be drawn under State laws by unemployed persons. Let me point out that I refer to the average wages, not the maximum. Yet an attempt has been made to create the impression that men would remain in idleness in order to draw the unemployment compensation provided by the State in which they lived—even if the State authorities would permit them to do so—rather than go to work. I do not believe the American people are so idle or indigent or careless or indifferent regarding their own welfare and the welfare of their families that they would deliberately, even if they could do so, remain on unemployment compensation for the limited number of weeks provided for in the State laws, rather than go to work and receive what in 1944 amounted to $44.21, on the average. Of course, we all recognize that in 1944 the average wages probably were higher than in normal years, and probably amounted to more than the average will be during the postwar period. But the wages paid in 1944 were not sufficiently higher, in my judgment, to induce men who have the responsibility of families, who have patriotic desires, and who have coordinated and worked together and sacrificed in order to help win this great war, now that it is over and they find themselves compelled to shift from one part of the country to another in order to get work, to deliberately remain idle in order that they may draw a pittance from a State or even from the Federal Government, under the maximum provisions of the bill or even under my amendment. I do not believe our people would do that, even in order to draw for a temporary period an amount which would be less than half the average wages in 1944.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is not responding to anything I said; I made no such charge.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; I am not responding to anything the Senator from Michigan said. I am responding to an assertion which has been made generally here that what we are doing is to encourage idleness and to encourage men to stay out of work in order that they may draw unemployment compensation. We all know that, if a State authority does its duty, that will not happen, because if men are offered jobs which are determined to be suitable for them—the determination is not to be made by the men themselves but by the State agencies—and if they do not accept such employment, they will be taken off the unemployment compensation rolls. I refer to work suitable to the men, work determined by the State authorities to be appropriate, based on their experience and qualifications.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that under the Senator's amendment, there could not be any idleness unless the State board certified that the men would not accept employment?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct. In other words, if a State board, whatever it may be called, certifies any individual for an identified job which the board which passes upon the matter regards as suitable in view of his qualifications, and if that man refuses to accept the job, he then will go off the rolls. He may remain idle, but he will not draw any compensation under the laws of his own State.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire list to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD. The figures show the average weekly wages paid in 1944, and the maximum unemployment compensation benefits which any person can draw under the State laws. Of course, most of them would not draw that much, because the maximum is reduced as it is integrated with the credits and the wages and the amount of work and the amount drawn by the individual in the base period fixed by the State. A majority of them do not draw the maximum. Most of them draw less than the maximum. However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this table showing the average wages in all the States, together with the maximum which any unemployed workers could draw, to show that no one would deliberately remain idle, even if he had the power to do so, because of a desire to draw unemployment compensation instead of working in a respectable and suitable position.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT IV.—*Average weekly wages of workers covered by State unemployment compensation laws—estimated percent of covered workers entitled to present State maximum weekly benefit amount and percent who would be entitled to a $25 maximum under extension of State formula* [1]

State	Average weekly wages in 1944 [2]	Present maximum weekly benefit amount	Percent of covered workers entitled to present maximum	Workers entitled to $25 maximum as percent of—	
				Workers entitled to present maximum	All covered workers
United States	$44.21	-------	44.9	75.9	34.0
Alabama	33.38	$20	23.0	66.5	15.3
Alaska	93.45	16	75.1	86.4	64.8
Arizona	40.10	15	48.1	55.1	26.5
Arkansas	26.99	15	25.4	34.2	8.7
California	51.97	20	60.3	84.2	50.8
Colorado	37.12	15	45.1	46.9	21.2
Connecticut	50.31	[3] 22	[3] 49.9	84.0	[3] 41.9
Delaware	45.83	18	56.2	69.5	39.0
District of Columbia	36.43	20	35.1	69.5	24.4
Florida	36.69	15	38.9	50.3	19.6
Georgia	31.48	18	20.6	56.4	11.6
Hawaii	40.85	25	30.1	100.0	30.1
Idaho	34.00	18	27.6	40.2	11.1
Illinois	46.59	20	55.0	79.7	43.9

EXHIBIT IV.—*Average weekly wages of workers covered by State unemployment compensation laws—estimated percent of covered workers entitled to present State maximum weekly benefit amount and percent who would be entitled to a $25 maximum under extension of State formula*—Con.

State	Average weekly wages in 1944	Present maximum weekly benefit amount	Percent of covered workers entitled to present maximum	Workers entitled to $25 maximum as percent of—	
				Workers entitled to present maximum	All covered workers
Indiana	$46.70	$20	47.5	74.0	35.2
Iowa	36.02	18	36.9	55.8	20.6
Kansas	43.51	16	47.6	56.8	27.1
Kentucky	36.82	16	26.0	38.4	10.0
Louisiana	37.19	18	33.7	64.7	21.8
Maine	40.89	20	23.9	68.6	16.4
Maryland	43.57	20	56.0	79.5	44.5
Massachusetts	41.41	21	51.2	82.0	42.0
Michigan	55.18	[3] 20	[3] 68.5	[3] 88.5	[3] 60.6
Minnesota	39.09	20	29.7	69.0	20.5
Mississippi	27.91	15	24.1	38.7	9.3
Missouri	38.96	18	39.3	57.6	22.6
Montana	36.74	15	47.5	62.1	29.5
Nebraska	38.24	18	36.1	57.3	20.7
Nevada	45.02	[3] 18	[3] 57.5	[3] 76.6	[3] 44.0
New Hampshire	33.52	20	17.2	50.5	8.7
New Jersey	50.18	22	54.3	87.4	47.5
New Mexico	31.31	15	35.2	48.0	16.9
New York	47.11	21	47.2	80.9	38.2
North Carolina	28.87	20	8.2	57.7	4.7
North Dakota	31.50	20	23.3	70.6	16.4
Ohio	48.78	21	41.5	76.7	31.8
Oklahoma	39.90	18	46.5	70.3	32.7
Oregon	48.51	18	46.4	79.3	36.9
Pennsylvania	42.75	20	45.7	72.8	33.3
Rhode Island	42.14	18	65.2	70.2	45.7
South Carolina	26.69	20	12.1	56.9	6.9
South Dakota	30.01	15	37.8	43.5	16.4
Tennessee	35.66	15	36.5	39.0	14.2
Texas	39.19	18	33.9	65.5	22.2
Utah	39.41	[4] 20	[4] 49.8	[4] 84.9	[4] 42.3
Vermont	37.06	20	26.7	62.8	16.7
Virginia	35.34	15	42.0	42.9	18.0
Washington	48.74	25	31.1	100.0	31.1
West Virginia	42.89	20	35.4	61.8	21.9
Wisconsin	44.08	20	40.2	93.9	37.8
Wyoming	39.02	20	42.7	85.0	36.3

[1] "Covered workers" include all workers who earned wage credits under the State law during 1943. The percentages are based on data for all such workers, including those with insufficient earnings to qualify for benefits. If data for the ineligible workers were eliminated and the proportions of eligible workers at the State and $25 maximums computed, the percentages would be higher than those shown; the percentage of workers entitled to the State maximums who would also be entitled to the $25 maximum would probably remain unchanged.

[2] Based on average weekly wage of estimated number of workers in covered employment in last pay period of each type (weekly, semimonthly, etc.) ending within the month, and estimated total wages earned in covered employment during all pay periods ending within each quarter. Estimates are based on coverage provisions in effect during fourth quarter of 1943.

[3] In Connecticut, Michigan, and Nevada, the maximums shown are the highest benefit amounts to which workers are entitled on the basis of past earnings alone. Workers with dependents in these States can receive benefits as high as $28 in Connecticut and Michigan and $24 in Nevada.

[4] The statutory maximum of $20 is raised to $25 when the cost-of-living index is at or above 125, and reduced to $17 when the index is 98.5 or below.

Source: Program Division, Bureau of Employment Security, Social Security Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I wish to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of the telegram which, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and under the direction of the committee, I addressed to the Governors of all the States. I also wish to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of the answers of the Governors of all the States who responded. If I am not in error in counting the telegrams, 45 replies were received. Approximately 27 or 28 Governors have said definitely that they cannot accept additional payments from the Federal Government. They have also said that if such payments were received they would result in the reduction pro tanto of the payments made by the State to the unemployed in the State, or would result in the disqualification of the workers who received or who applied for payments.

Mr. President, I do not wish to make any invidious comparisons, but I believe that every Senator who faces this issue is entitled to have a few of the facts stated. I therefore read the answer of the attorney general of my State, which will illustrate exactly what would happen if we were to increase the payments made by the State. Governor Arnall instructed the attorney general of Georgia to answer the telegram. The reply is in part as follows:

Section 5 F of the Georgia unemployment compensation law provides as follows: "An individual shall be disqualified for benefits: (F) For any week with respect to which he has received or is seeking unemployment compensation under an employment compensation law of another State or of the United States."

Accordingly, it is my opinion that if the Georgia benefit allowance were to be supplemented by additional Federal allowance, a claimant would be disqualified from receiving benefits from the Georgia unemployment compensation fund under the terms of section 5 (F) of the Georgia law.

So regardless of the amount that might be paid by the Federal Government, not a single worker in Georgia would receive a penny, and if he accepted anything from the Federal Government, he would actually receive less than he would otherwise receive.

Mr. President, I am making merely a factual statement. I do not need to read a list of the States from which I have received replies, but 27 or 28 of them have replied substantially as the attorney general of my State has replied. I will read the reply from Idaho, which, in part, is as follows:

Have been advised by attorney general that any payments received under the Federal law would be deducted from payments payable to benefit recipient under the Idaho law, and it would make no difference if the supplemented amount should come by reason of an agreement entered into between the State of Idaho and the Federal Government or a voluntary payment made by the Federal Government.

That telegram was signed by the Governor of Idaho.

I shall not read any of the remaining telegrams, but I ask unanimous consent that all of them, including the telegram of inquiry, be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEGRAM SENT TO GOVERNORS OF ALL STATES

The bill S. 1274 provides for Federal Government supplementing amount and duration of State unemployment benefits by means of voluntary agreement between State and Federal Government. If State does not wish to enter into such agreement, the Federal Government will make such supplementary payments directly. Would appreciate your immediate reply as to how your attorney general or legal department construes your State law: (1) Can your State enter into such agreement with Federal Government without resulting in the State payment being partially or totally reduced by the amount of the supplementary Federal payment? (2) If your State does not enter into such an agreement would Federal supplementary payments result in reduction of the State amount? In brief, will your State under existing law be required to credit any payments made by Federal Government against the unemployment compensation benefits paid under your State law? Please advise by telegram collect.

REPLIES TO ABOVE TELEGRAM

MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Re telegram September 4 I am advised by the attorney general of Alabama that under the provisions of Alabama unemployment compensation law, section 214 (G), title 26, Alabama Code of 1940, the answer to question one set out in your telegram is "No" and the answer to question two is "Yes."

CHAUNCEY SPARKS,
Governor.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Governor Osborn has referred your telegram of September 3 relative S. 1274 to this commission for answer. Attorney for commission advises it is his opinion Arizona employment security act authorizes commission to enter into reciprocal arrangement with Federal Government to utilize Federal benefit rights without State payment being partially or totally reduced by amount of supplementary Federal payment. If State does not enter into such agreement and payments are made directly to claimants by Federal Government, Arizona statute prohibits payment of benefits from State funds for each week claimant is seeking or has received Federal benefits consequently State fund would be relieved of all payments until claimants exhaust Federal credits. Special session Arizona Legislature convening September 10 is being requested to increase maximum benefit amount from fifteen to twenty dollars per week and to extend 14-week individual duration to 16-week uniform duration.

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
COMMISSION OF ARIZONA,
BRUCE PARKINSON, *Director.*

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Section 5-F of Arkansas employment security act provides that an individual shall be disqualified from drawing unemployment compensation for any week with respect to which he has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under unemployment compensation law of another State or of the United States. Under this act any payment made under the proposed bill pending would disqualify an individual from receiving compensation under our act.

BEN LANEY,
Governor of Arkansas.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

Am advised by Robert W. Kenny, attorney general of the State of California, that the California Unemployment Insurance Agency can execute agreements called for in Senate bill 1274 and can cooperate with Federal Government to the fullest extent and that any failure on the part of California to so cooperate would place the California

law out of conformity with Section 303 (c) of the Federal Social Security Act.

JAMES G. BRYANT,
Chairman, California Employment Stabilization Commission.

DENVER, COLO.

Re telegram September 3 concerning unemployment compensation, chapter 224, session laws of Colorado 1941, provides in part as follows: "For any week with respect to which or a part he has received, or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of another State of the United States, provided that if the appropriate agency of such other State of the United States finally determines that he is not entitled to such unemployment benefits. This disqualification shall not apply." In my opinion, the answers to your questions are as follows: Question No. 1. "No." Question No. 2. "Yes." Question No. 3. Payments made by Federal Government would be credited against claimant and he also would be totally disqualified from receiving State benefits for any week in which he receives Federal benefits.

JOHN C. VIVIAN,
Governor of Colorado.

HARTFORD, CONN.

Re your telegram September 3 and questions therein contained—one, after conferring with attorney general it is our opinion that Connecticut could legally enter into an agreement with the Federal Government re payment of unemployment compensation benefits without resulting in the State payment being partially or totally reduced by the amount of the supplemental Federal payment subsection F of section 1334E, chapter 280A of the 1939 supplement to the General Statutes. Two, there is grave doubt in our minds under existing law as to whether or not Federal supplementary payments would result in the reduction of the State amount if Connecticut did not enter into such an agreement section 1339E, subdivision 4-A, chapter 280-A, 1930 supplement to Connecticut General Statutes.

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Governor of Connecticut.

WILMINGTON, DEL.

Gov. Walter W. Bacon has asked me to answer your wire of September 3 in respect to bill S. 1274, providing for the Federal Government supplementing the amount and duration of State unemployment benefits by means of voluntary agreement between State and Federal Government. Under existing law Delaware cannot enter into such an agreement with the Federal Government. Also under existing law an individual will be disqualified for any benefits under Delaware law if he receives any amount from the Federal Government intended to supplement State unemployment benefits.

C. J. KILLORAN,
Attorney General, Delaware.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA.

Re your telegram S. 1274. Section 443.06 (5) of Florida law disqualifies for benefits "any individual for any week with respect to which or a part of which he has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of another State or the United States." It is our opinion that said portion of our disqualification section may have reference to complete separate unemployment compensation program of another State or of the United States as distinguished from supplementary program as proposed in S. 1274. However, since said section has not been construed by Florida courts, possibility exists that claimants under Florida law would be totally disqualified thereunder for any week in which they were claiming or receiving benefits as proposed in S. 1274. Therefore there is some doubt as to authority of Florida agency to enter into agreement guaranteeing that State benefits not be reduced or denied by reason of payments made pursuant to S. 1274.

MILLARD F. CALDWELL,
Governor.

ATLANTA, GA.

Re your telegram September 3, State unemployment benefits. I am referring questions involved to Hon. Eugene Cook, attorney general, and requesting Mr. Cook to furnish you reply as expeditiously as possible. Regards.

ELLIS ARNALL,
Governor.

ATLANTA, GA.

Re telegram September 3 to Governor Arnall re State unemployment benefits. Section 5 (F) of the Georgia unemployment compensation law provides as follows: "An individual shall be disqualified for benefits: (F) for any week with respect to which he has received or is seeking unemployment compensation under an employment compensation law of another State or of the United States." Accordingly it is my opinion that if the Georgia benefit allowance were to be supplemented by additional Federal allowance a claimant would be disqualified from receiving benefits from the Georgia unemployment compensation fund under the terms of section 5 (F) of the Georgia law.

EUGENE COOK,
Attorney General.

BOISE, IDAHO.

Re your wire of September 4 unemployment compensation. Have been advised by attorney general that any payments received under the Federal law would be deducted from payments payable to benefit recipient under the Idaho law and it would make no difference if the supplemented amount should come by reason of an agreement entered into between the State of Idaho and the Federal Government or a voluntary payment made by the Federal Government.

CHARLES C. GOSSETT,
Governor of Idaho.

CHICAGO, ILL.

As to increased weekly benefit amount: One "Yes" but only if the bill is amended to eliminate provision for payment of unemployment compensation to individuals directly by Federal Government. Two, if not so amended Senate bill 1274 might be construed as "an unemployment compensation law of the United States" and the provision in section 7E of the Illinois unemployment compensation act which disqualifies an individual from receiving benefits "for any week with respect to which he has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment conpensation law of the United States" might be applicable. As to increased duration Illinois could enter into the agreement and payments made by Federal Government would not be credited against benefits under Illinois law.

DWIGHT H. GREEN,
Governor.

DES MOINES, IOWA.

Iowa Senators WILSON and HICKENLOOPER are thoroughly familiar with provision of our unemployment compensation law and can furnish you information.

ROBERT D. BLUE,
Governor.

TOPEKA, KANS.

Re your telegram September 3, have had matter checked with the attorney general and he advises me as follows: This State has no authority to enter into an agreement with the Federal Government on the provisions of S. 1274 as to supplementary unemployment benefits without reducing the amount of the State payment as provided in subsection (F), Section 44-706, 1943 supplement, and this maintain the requirements of subsection (B), section 44-704, 1943 supplement. Compliance with the two subsections mentioned would bring the same reduction in the State payments, if Federal supplementary payments are made without any agreement with this State. Regards.

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Governor of Kansas.

FRANKFORT, KY.

Re telegram September 3 relative to Senate bill 1274 the attorney general advises that his answer to question No. 1 in telegram is "No" answer to question No. 2 in telegram is "Yes."

SIMEON WILLIS,
Governor.

FRANKFORT, KY.

In receipt your telegram September 3 reply pending opinion Kentucky attorney general. Will wire immediately.

RALPH A. HOMAN,
Executive Secretary.

BATON ROUGE, LA.

Reference S. 1274: Louisiana's unemployment compensation law permits full utilization of Federal supplementation without deduction from State benefit allowances. Section 4E, Act 160 of 1944 Louisiana Legislature. Louisiana attorney general has so advised me.

JAMES H. DAVIS,
Governor of Louisiana.

AUGUSTA, MAINE.

Have been advised by attorney general that State cannot enter into agreement for supplementary unemployment benefits and extending the duration of payment of benefits without State legislative action if the State could enter into such an agreement Federal supplementary payments would result in reduction of amount State would pay under our State law. Our State under existing law would not be required to credit any payments made by the Federal Government against the unemployment compensation benefits paid under our State law.

HORACE HILDRETH,
Governor of Maine.

ANNAPOLIS, MD.

In re telegram concerning supplementary unemployment compensation benefits on advised by State law department as follows: Section 5 (F) of the Maryland unemployment compensation laws reads as follows—an individual shall be disqualified for benefits for any week with respect to which or a part of which he has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under any unemployment compensation law of another State or of the United States. We feel that under the above section five of our States will be required to credit during the period within which the State is making payment any payment made by the Federal Government under S. 1274 which the telegram of Senator WALTER F. GEORGE says provides for Federal Government supplementing amount and duration of State unemployment benefits State cannot enter into voluntary agreement with Federal Government without resulting in the State payment being partially or totally reduced by the amount of the supplementary Federal payment.

HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Governor.

LANSING, MICH.

Copy of Michigan Attorney General's opinion on unemployment compensation with reference to bill S. 1274 is as follows: "This is

in answer to your inquiry with special reference to two telegrams, one from Senator A. H. VANDENBERG and one from Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, under dates of September 1 and September 3, respectively, both with reference to bill S. 1274. Both of these telegrams, in substance, present two questions:

"1. Can Michigan enter into a voluntary agreement with the Federal Government increasing the weekly unemployment compensation pay and/or extend the period during which payments may be made?

"2. If Michigan has no statutory authority to enter into any such agreement would supplementary payment by the Federal Government result in a reduction of the State payment; that is, would any Federal supplementary payment have to be included in the maximum weekly allowance under Michigan statute?"

In answer to the first question please refer to section 17.511, Michigan Statutes, Annotated Supplement, being section 11 of the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended. Subsections (C) and (F) particularly of this section 11 grant broad powers to the Commission as to reciprocal agreements. However, section 27 of the act (sec. 17.529 Mich. Stat. Ann. Supp.) expressly provides "That no individual shall receive for any week of total unemployment a primary benefit which is greater than $20." See also subsection (D).

It is the opinion of this office that because of the limitation as to maximum payment the Michigan commission could not make any reciprocal agreement increasing the weekly payment nor extending the payment period if such increase or extension involved the expenditure of any Michigan unemployment funds.

Briefly the commission may make no agreement with the Federal Government to "match funds."

In answer to the second question please refer to section 61 of the Unemployment Compensation Act, being section 17.565, Michigan Statutes, Annual Supplement. We quote therefrom:

"An individual shall be disqualified for benefits: (A) for any week with respect to which or a part of which he has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of another State or of the United States."

We understand that in some opinions in support of the conclusion that the statutes of certain States necessitate deductions of Federal payments from the statutory maximum of any compensation payments made by the State, statutes are cited nearly identical with the Michigan statute (sec. 29 of the Michigan Act, being sec. 17.431, Mich. Stat. Ann. Supp.), reading as follows:

"An individual shall be disqualified for benefits: (E) for any week with respect to which he is receiving or has received payments in the form of:

"3. Compensation for temporary partial disability under the workmen's compensation law of any State or under a similar law of the United States, or old-age benefits under title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended, or similar payments under any act of Congress: *Provided*, That if such payment is less than the benefits which would otherwise be due under this act, he shall be entitled to receive for such week, if otherwise eligible, benefits reduced by the amount of such payments."

However, it is our conclusion that the words "or similar payments under any act of Congress" should be construed to refer only to old-age benefits or workmen's compensation benefits.

Because of the above quoted section 61 (sec. 17,565, Mich. Stat. Ann. Supp.) it is the opinion of this office that one receiving "unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of the United States" is not entitled to receive compensation under the State unemployment compensation act.

Conclusion: The answer to question 1 is that Michigan may not enter into a reciprocal agreement with the Federal Government which would increase payments or the period of payments if such increase or extension involved expenditure of Michigan unemployment funds.

The answer to question 2 is that the receipt of Federal compensation would make the receiver thereof disqualified from receiving compensation under the Michigan act.

HARRY F. KELLY,
Governor of Michigan.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Re your telegram third instant. There is no State authority to enter into agreement under S. 1274. If Federal act is an unemployment compensation act recipient of Federal payments thereunder is barred from receiving benefits under State acts for same period. If Federal aid is in form of gift there would be no deductions of State benefits.

EDWARD J. THYE,
Governor.

BOSTON, MASS.

Relative your telegram Bill 1274 Attorney General advises me answer to question number one is in the negative and answer to question number two is in the affirmative. As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts I stand ready to use my emergency powers to suspend the operation of any State law or laws which interfere with making Federal supplemental benefit payments as to amount and duration available to Massachusetts unemployed workers, would also recommend to incoming Legislature in 1946 to modify State laws to make these Federal benefits available to Massachusetts workers for the duration ending May 1947.

MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Governor of Massachusets.

JACKSON, MISS.

Re your telegram of September 3, am advised by attorney general and unemployment compensation legal department that claims for or receipt of supplementation as proposed would disqualify benefit claimants under Mississippi unemployment compensation law. Disqualification would be accomplished whether State entered into agreement or supplementation resulted from direct payment of supplementation by Federal Government. Understand that laws of 47 other States, including District of Columbia and Hawaii, contain similar provisions. For foregoing reasons Mississippi could not legally enter into such agreement.

THOMAS L. BAILEY,
Governor.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO.

Re telegram while the Missouri law authorizes agreements between the State and Federal Government as to unemployment compensation, our benefit sections seem to prohibit payments of benefits from both sources in the following language: "An individual shall be disqualified for benefits for any week with respect to which or a part of which he has received o is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of another State or of the United States."

PHIL M. DONNELLY,
Governor.

HELENA, MONT.

Under existing State laws extremely doubtful whether Montana could enter into agreement with Federal Government increasing amount and extending duration State unemployment benefits. If supplementary payments are made by Government individual would be disqualified receiving benefits under State law. State would not credit payments made by Federal Government against unemployment compensation benefits received by State but individual receiving payments from Federal Government would be disqualified for benefits under our law.

SAM C. FORD,
Governor of Montana.

LINCOLN, NEBR.

Relative to employment service: It appears that unemployment compensation is to continue to be administered by the States. If the States are to have a decent opportunity to do a good job it seems necessary that the employment service also be administe ed by the States as they require complete coordination and should be operated as a unified employment program. I can see no emergency existing during the next 6 months which will not be existing 2 years from now and I am certain that an immediate return of the employment service to the States would be beneficial to the unemployed. Early action on this matter and on bills relating to unemployment compensation benefits is necessary in order that unemployed may know exactly where they stand, permitting them to adjust themselves accordingly.

DWIGHT GRISWOLD,
Governor.

LINCOLN, NEBR.

Replying on S. 1274 question: Nebraska attorney general advises: One, under our law Nebraska can enter into such agreement with the Federal Government without resulting in the State payment being partially or totally reduced by the amount of the supplementary Federal payment. Two, if Nebraska does not enter into such agreement Federal supplementary payments would result in reduction of the State amount.

DWIGHT GRISWOLD,
Governor of Nebraska.

CARSON CITY, NEV.

Re your wire September 3, opinion attorney general if interpreting employment security laws of Nevada relative question No. 1: If State of Nevada entered into an agreement with Federal Government under present State law, it would result in State payment being partially or totally reduced by amount of supplementary Federal payment. Question No. 2: If State of Nevada does not enter into such an agreement the Federal supplementary payments would result in reduction of State amount. It appears very clear that present State law would require the State to credit any payments made by Federal Government against the unemployment compensation benefits paid under the State law.

VAIL PITTMAN,
Governor of Nevada.

CONCORD, N. H.

New Hampshire cannot enter into agreement with Federal Government resulting in payments in excess of $20 per week for 20 weeks from State unemployment funds without additional legislative authority. Supplementary payments by Federal Government whether paid directly or through the unemployment compensation division would have no effect on amount of employment paid by this State.

CHARLES M. DALE,
Governor.

TRENTON, N. J.

Acknowledging your telegram, this will advise you the attorney general of New Jersey has ruled that this State may enter into an agreement with the Federal Government for additional payments to unemployed in New Jersey above our statutory maximum and that such payments by the Federal Government of these additional sums will not in any way reduce the amount which is due to these employed workers under State laws.

However, New Jersey Legislature last March increased maximum payments from $18 to $22 per week and extended the duration payments from 18 weeks to 26 weeks, thus placing New Jersey in second position in the Nation for total benefit payments and along with four other States in the very top position for duration of payments; in addition, New Jersey law has been broadened to include employers of four or more workers and provided coverage for maritime workers.

WALTER E. EDGE,
Governor.

SANTA FE, N. MEX.

Re your telegram, Attorney General Clyde McCulloh cites the section of our law which reads "An individual shall be disqualified for benefits: For any week, with respect to which, or a part of which, he has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of another State or of the United States; provided, that the appropriate agency of such other State or of the United States finally determines that he is not entitled to such unemployment benefits, this disqualification shall not apply." Regarding this the attorney general says, "The State could not agree with the Federal Government to continue paying State benefits if a person receives supplementary benefits from the Federal Government nor could such State benefits be paid if any Federal benefits are sought or received by the person."

JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Governor.

ALBANY, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: On behalf of Governor Dewey, I acknowledge your telegram of September 3, 1945, relative to bill S. 1274 and certain provisions of the New York State law relating to unemployment benefits. I am transmitting your telegram to the attorney general, from whom, I am sure, it will receive appropriate consideration and atttention.

Sincerely yours,
LAWRENCE E. WALSH,
Assistant Counsel to the Governor.

ALBANY, N. Y.

Answering your telegram to Governor Dewey in reference to S. 1274, which has been referred to me as attorney general, I desire to advise you as follows:

(1) If the New York State statute be liberally construed, it would appear to permit the State industrial commissioner to enter into an agreement with the United States on terms "fair and reasonable to all affected interests" for payment of supplementary benefits provided by possible Federal contributions, and the benefits under State law would not be reduced thereby. New York now provides unemployment insurance up to a maximum of $21 per week for 26 weeks of unemployment. Before entering into agreement, industrial commissioner would have to determine whether the Federal statute contributing greater proportion of maximum benefits to other States than to New York is fair and reasonable.

(2) In the absence of such agreement, New York law as amended at suggestion of Federal Social Security Board presently provides that claimant receiving benefits under unemployment-insurance law of the United States can receive no State unemployment compensation for same period.

NATHANIEL L. GOLDSTEIN,
Attorney General, State of New York.

RALEIGH, N. C.

Answering your telegram of September 3, 1945, to Governor Cherry re Senate bill 1274, the legal department of the Unemployment Compensation Commission of North Carolina is of the opinion:

(1) The State of North Carolina has the right under the law to enter into agreement with the Federal Government by which the Federal Government supplements payment of benefits and duration of period without the payments being partially or totally reduced by the amount of the supplementary Federal payment.

(2) In the absence of any agreement between the State of North Carolina and the Federal Government and the Federal Government pays unemployment benefits directly to an individual, such individual, under the North Carolina statute, is disqualified for benefits during the period in which he has or asserts any right to such Federal benefits.

(3) This is answered in (1) and (2) above.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION COMMISSION,
CHARLES U. HARRIS,
Acting Chief Counsel.

BISMARCK, N. DAK.

Our statute would permit Federal supplementary payments under voluntary agreement without resulting in State payment being reduced. Without agreement, State payments in question apparently would be reduced.

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Governor of North Dakota.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

In re your telegram to Frank J. Lausche, Governor of Ohio. Attention is directed to section 1345-7, general code of Ohio, which provides "No benefits shall be paid for any week with respect to which or a part of which an individual has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of any other State or of the United States." Letter will follow.

HUGH S. JENKINS,
Attorney General of Ohio.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

DEAR SIR: Your telegram of September 3 to Governor Lausche, wherein you inquire whether the enactment of S. 1274 will operate to reduce the amount of unemployment compensation benefits paid by the State of Ohio, has been referred to this office.

In regard thereto, I might submit the following: The Kilgore bill proposes two modes of procedure whereby the unemployment compensation provided by the laws of the several States may be supplemented (1) by an agreement between the Federal Government and the State, whereby the United States will pay over to the State the difference between the amount allowed by the State law and the amount proposed by the Federal law, and the State will distribute it to the individuals entitled thereto under its laws. (2) If the State fails to enter into such an agreement, then the Federal Government will make supplementary payments to individuals for a period and in amounts substantially equivalent to payments which would have been made from Federal funds had the State entered into such agreement.

It seems evident that if the first-mentioned procedure is to be followed, some officer of the State would have to be given authority by the legislature to enter into such agreement.

If such authority were given without an express declaration on the part of the legislature, it would be doubtful whether one who accepted such supplementary benefit from the Federal Government through the agency of the State would be relieved from the conditions of section 1345-7, General Code of Ohio, which provides:

"No benefits shall be paid for any week with respect to which or a part of which an individual has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of any other State or of the United States."

If the State should enter into such agreement, it is possible that a claimant's benefits would not be limited by the provisions of section 1345-7, General Code. However, this is not without some question, and if the legislature sees fit to give such authority it should do so in clear language, which leaves no question of its intention to relieve such recipient from the condition expressed in the statute above quoted.

If the execution of such contract is not authorized and payments are received from the Federal Government by way of supplementary benefits, as contemplated by the Kilgore bill, then it appears that the recipient would automatically cut himself off from the right to receive the unemployment compensation provided by present laws to be paid by the State of Ohio.

Very truly yours,
HUGH S. JENKINS,
Attorney General.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

Replying to your telegram you are advised attorney general of Oklahoma advises that under Oklahoma Unemployment Compensation Act supplementary payments by Federal Government under S. 1274 would not result in reduction of compensation paid by State. State agency could enter into reciprocal agreement with Federal Government for such supplementary payments without reduction of amount paid by State agency. Attorney general advises that while there is considerable question in regard to the matter the above are his views.

ROBERT S. KERR,
Governor of Oklahoma.

SALEM, OREG.

State legal department advises under Oregon statutes State has authority to enter such unemployment benefit agreement with Federal Government described your wire. Also advises laws expressly disqualify workers in this State from receiving State unemployment compensation if for any time he receives benefits from other States or Federal Government.

EARL SNELL,
Governor.

HARRISBURG, PA.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your wire is acknowledged, and the attorney general's department advises me as follows:

Answer to question No. 1: If the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania should enter into an agreement with the Federal Government to pay $25 for 26 weeks, payments would still be limited by section 404 of the Pennsylvania Unemployment Compensation Act as last amended by Act No. 408 approved May 29, 1945, to $20 for 20 weeks. Amendments to existing law would be necessary to increase weekly payments to $25 for 26 weeks.

Answer to question No. 2: Under section 402 (c) an employee is ineligible for compensation if he receives unemployment compensation benefits under the unemployment compensation law of any other State or of the United States. Hence, if a claimant would receive additional benefits directly from the Federal Government, under our law he would be disqualified.

Very sincerely,
EDWARD MARTIN,
Governor.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Public Laws of Rhode Islands, 1940, chapter 812, reads in part "an individual shall be disqualified from receiving benefits for any week of his unemployment occurring within any period with respect to which such individual is currently receiving or has received, remuneration in the form of (C) benefits under

an unemployment compensation law of any State of the United States." Accordingly, unless Rhode Island State law is amended, benefit payments under unemployment compensation law of the United States either by way of direct supplementary Federal payment or through agency of State by way of voluntary agreement totally bars benefit claimant from any benefits under Rhode Island State law.

J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Governor.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

Re telegram September 3, answer to first question "Yes." Answer to second and third questions "No."

RANSOME J. WILLIAMS,
Governor.

PIERRE, S. DAK.

Re your telegram: Have submitted request for official opinion to attorney general on unemployment compensation and will advise you as soon as opinion received.

M. Q. SHARPE,
Governor of South Dakota.

NASHVILLE, TENN.

Re telegram Federal supplementation of State unemployment compensation payments under S. 1274. It is permissible under our State law for Tennessee to enter into an agreement with the Federal Government without resulting in the State benefit payment being partialy or totally reduced by the amount of the supplementary Federal payment.

If this State should not enter into such an agreement Federal supplementary payments would not occasion a reduction in the State benefit amount. In response to your last question this State under existing law would not be required to credit any payments made by the Federal Government against the unemployment compensation benefits paid under our State law.

The majority of States have specific provisions on the subject in their law dealing with unemployment compensation payments under other jurisdictions. This is not true in Tennessee.

JIM MCCORD, *Governor.*

AUSTIN, TEX.

Re your telegram September 3 requesting legal opinion on S. 1274, opinion of attorney general of Texas answers both questions 1 and 2 negatively: That is, Federal supplementary payments under the Kilgore bill would not result in payments by the Texas Unemployment Compensation Commission being partially or totally reduced by the account of the Federal payment.

COKE STEVENSON, *Governor.*

STATE OF UTAH,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salt Lake City, September 8, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: After receiving your telegram of September 3, I asked the attorney general to construe the laws of Utah with respect to workmen's compensation, particularly as they might be affected by S. 1274. For your information, I am quoting herein the opinion of the attorney general.

"You request advice as to whether or not an otherwise eligible individual can legally be paid unemployment compensation benefits under the provisions of the Utah Employment Security Act while seeking or receiving benefits pursuant to the provisions of H. R. 3736, Seventy-ninth Congress. This bill proposes to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 by establishing a new title, title VII—Temporary Reconversion Unemployment Benefits. By its terms, this proposed Federal bill provides, among other things, that the Federal Government, through the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion will, for each week of total unemployment, pay each individual who is eligible for the State maximum weekly benefit amount, supplemental benefits equal to the difference between the State maximum weekly benefit amount and $25. Individuals eligible would be paid supplemental benefits proportionately. The act further provides that eligible individuals will be paid extended benefits, that is, a number of weeks of benefits which, when added to the total weeks of benefits to which an individual is entitled under the provisions of the State act, will equal 26 The act defines "supplemental benefits" as a supplementary amount payable with respect to a week of total unemployment. It further provides that the several unemployment compensation agencies of the United States, that is, the several States, shall act as agents of the Federal Government for the payment of these Federal benefits.

"The Utah Employment Security Act, section 42-2a-5 (f), Utah Code Annotated, 1943, provides that an individual shall be ineligible for benefits or for purposes of establishing a waiting period:

"'(f) For any week with respect to which or a part of which he has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of another State or of the United States, *Provided*, That if the appropriate agency of such other State or of the United States finally determines that he is not entitled to such unemployment benefits, this disqualification shall not apply.'

The intent of the Utah Legislature, as evidenced by the mandatory language of the above-quoted subsection, was to prevent the payment of benefits from the Utah employment compensation fund for the particular week during which an individual was seeking or receiving benefits under any other unemployment compensation act, either State or Federal. H. R. 3736 clearly is an unemployment compensation act and must be so construed. You are advised, therefore, that an individual who is seeking or receiving benefits for a week of unemployment pursuant to the provisions of H. R. 3736 will be disqualified from receiving benefits under the Utah act for such week.

The Utah act does not prohibit the paying of extended benefits as an agent for the Federal Government under the provisions of the proposed Federal act since these extended benefits would be paid after the individual had exhausted his rights under the Utah act. Sections 42-2a-11 and 42-2a-18, Utah Code Annotated, 1943, authorize the industrial commission to enter into arrangements with agencies of other States or of the Federal Government so as to afford cooperation in the administration of any unemployment insurance law provided, however, that such law does not specifically violate other provisions of the Utah act such as the above-quoted section 42-2a-5 (f), Utah Code Annotated, 1943.

If you desire additional information, I shall be glad to supply it.

Yours truly,

HERBERT B. MAW,
Governor.

MONTPELIER, VT.

I am advised that the State of Vermont cannot enter into agreement referred to in recent telegram with Federal Government without resulting in State payment being partially or totally reduced by the amount of the supplementary Federal payment. Vermont does not enter into such an agreement; Federal supplementary payments would result in reduction of the State amount.

MORTIMORE R. PROCTOR,
Governor of Vermont.

RICHMOND, VA.

Referring to your telegram of September 3 to Hon. Colgate W. Darden, Jr., Governor of Virginia, you are advised that under the provisions of S. 1274 now being considered, it is my opinion that the Unemployment Compensation Commission of Virginia does not have the power under the Virginia Unemployment Compensation Act to enter into any such agreement as contemplated in question No. 1 of your telegram. With respect to question No. 2, I am of the opinion that should Congress provide for supplementary payments, claimants for benefits under the Virginia State law could not be paid benefits under such State law for any week with respect to which or a part of which he has received or is seeking such supplementary payments.

KENNETH C. PATTY,
Assistant Attorney General of Virginia, Counsel for Virginia Unemployment Compensation Commission.

OLYMPIA, WASH.

Re your telegram S. 1274 and State of Washington. Attorney general advises our State can enter into voluntary agreement re Federal supplementary amount and duration of State unemployment benefits. Should Federal Government increase either amount or duration of benefits under agreement or otherwise would not result in Washington State payment being totally or partially reduced by amount of Federal supplementary payment. State not required to credit any payments made by Federal Government against State unemployment compensation benefits. For any further details please contact John Davis, commissioner of Washington State Unemployment Compensation, Washington Hotel, room 528. He is appearing before Senate Finance Committee.

MON C. WALLGREN,
Governor.

CHARLESTON, W. VA.

Re telegram September 3. Attorney general advises: To question 1, "Can your State enter into such agreement with Federal Government without resulting in the State payment being partially or totally reduced by the amount of the supplementary Federal payment?" Answer, "No." To question 2, "If your State does not enter into such an agreement, would Federal supplementary payments result in reduction of the State amount?" Answer, "Yes." To question, "Will your State under existing law be required to credit any payments made by Federal Government against the unemployment-compensation benefits paid under your State law?" Answer: "Individual receiving benefits under any other State or Federal law ineligible for benefits under law of this State."

CLARENCE W. MEADOWS,
Governor of West Virginia.

MADISON, WIS.

Re your telegram unemployment benefits reply to first question is "Yes;" second question "No."

WALTER S. GOODLAND,
Governor.

CHEYENNE, WYO.

It is the tentative opinion of attorney general receipt of supplemental benefits as proposed by Senate 1274 would bar compensation benefits under Wyoming act also that it is very doubtful whether State may legally enter into agreement with Federal Government as proposed in bill.

LESTER C. HUNT,
Governor.

Mr. KILGORE subsequently said: Immediately following the letters of the various governors, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD extracts from the laws of the various States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT XI. STATE DISQUALIFICATION PROVISIONS FOR RECEIPT OF FEDERAL BENEFITS

The disqualification provision in Alabama reads as follows:

"SEC. 6 B. An individual shall be disqualified for benefits for total or partial unemployment—

"(g) For any week with respect to which, or a part of which, he has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment-compensation law of any State or of the United States: *Provided*, That if the appropriate agency of such other State or of the United States finally determines that he is not entitled to such unemployment benefits this disqualification shall not apply." (General Laws of Alabama (regular session, 1935), Act No. 447, effective September 14, 1935, as amended.)

Alaska, Georgia, and New Hampshire merely omit the proviso in the Alabama law which has no significance for the purposes of this statement. Alaska differs from Alabama:

"SEC. 5. An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

"(e) For any week with respect to which or part of which he has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment-compensation law of another State or of the United States." (Extraordinary Session Laws of Alaska, 1937, ch. 4, approved and effective April 2, 1937, as amended.)

Georgia: Section 5 (e) (4), Laws of 1937, Governor's No. 335, approved and effective March 29, 1937, as amended.

New Hampshire: Section 4 (f): "An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

"(f) For any week or a part of a week with respect to which he is seeking to receive or has received payments in the form of unemployment compensation under an unemployment-compensation law of any other State or under a similar law of the Federal Government." (Ch. 99, Public Laws of 1935, approved May 29, 1935, and became Public Laws, ch. 179-A, as amended.)

Arizona: Same as Alabama except that the words "for total or partial unemployment" were omitted, the word "ineligibility" is substituted for the word "disqualification," "another" for "any other." (Sec. 56-1005 (f), Special Session Laws of 1936 (first special session), ch. 13, approved by the Governor on December 2, 1936, effective February 23, 1937, as amended.)

Arkansas: Same as Alabama, except that the words "for total or partial unemployment" are omitted, the word "ineligibility" is substituted for the word "disqualification," "another" for "any other." (Sec. 5 (f), General Acts of 1937, Act No. 155, approved and effective February 26, as amended.)

California: Same as Alabama, except that the words "for total or partial unemployment" are omitted, the words "the provisions of this section shall not apply" are substituted for the words "this disqualification shall not apply." (Sec. 57.5, Session Laws of the State of California, regular session, 1935, ch. 352, approved June 25, effective August 14, 1935, as amended.)

Colorado: Same as Alabama except that the words "for total or partial unemployment" are omitted. (Sec. 5 (f), Laws of Colorado (extraordinary session) 1936, ch. 2, approved and effective November 20, 1936, as amended.)

Connecticut: Connecticut differs substantially from Alabama:

"SEC. 1339 E (b) An individual shall be ineligible for benefits

"(4) during any week with respect to which the individual has received or is about to receive remuneration in the form of

"(A) wages in lieu of notice of dismissal payments or any payment by way of compensation for loss of wages, or any other State or Federal unemployment benefits, or * * *." 1937 Supplement to General Statutes, ch. 280a, secs. 803d-819d, enacted and approved on November 30, 1936, as ch. 2, Public Acts of November, special session, 1936, as amended.

Delaware: Same as Alabama except that the words "for total or partial unemployment" are omitted. (Sec. 5 (c) (1), ch. 258, Laws of 1937, approved and effective April 30, 1937, as amended.)

District of Columbia: Same as Alabama except as noted for Arizona. (Public Law 386, 74th Cong., H. R. 7167, as amended.)

Florida: Same as Alabama, except that the word "another" is substituted for the words "any other." (Sec. 6 (e), acts of 1937, ch. 18,402, approved and effective June 9, 1937, as amended.)

Hawaii: Same as Alabama, except that the words "for total or partial unemployment" are omitted, the word "another" is substituted for "any other," and the word "ineligibility" is substituted for the word "disqualification." (Sec. 5 (f), Session Laws of Hawaii 1937, Act 243, approved and effective May 18, 1937, as amended.)

Idaho: Substantially the same as Alabama. The reference to section 11 (f), is to a section on State-Federal cooperation and reciprocal agreements:

"SEC. 5. A benefit claimant shall be disqualified—

"(f) For any week with respect to which, or a part of which, he has received, or has made a claim for, benefits under an unemployment compensation law of another State or of the United States, except as the board shall by regulations otherwise prescribe pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f) of section 11 of this act: *Provided*, That if the appropriate agency of such other State or of the United States shall finally determine that he is not entitled to such unemployment benefits, he shall not, by the provisions of this subsection, be disqualified." (Extraordinary Session Laws of Idaho, 1935, ch. 12, approved August 6, 1936, effective September 1, 1936, as amended.)

Illinois: Same as Alabama, with the exception of the word "ineligibility" being substituted for "disqualified," the omission of the words "for total or partial unemployment," omission of the words "or a part of which," and substitution of word "ineligibility" for "disqualification." (Sec. 7 (e), the Unemployment Compensation Act, L. 1937, p. 571 (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1937, ch. 48) (secs. 217-250), as amended.)

Indiana: Same as Alabama, except that the word "ineligible" is substituted for "disqualified,' omission of the words "for total or partial unemployment," insertion of the words "receives, is receiving," immediately before the words "has received:" (Sec. 6 (f) (6), acts of 1936, ch. 4, approved March 18, 1936, as amended.)

Iowa: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," and the word "another" substituted for "any other." (Sec. 1551.11 (f), Code of Iowa 1939, ch. 77.2, Code, 1939, as amended.)

Kansas: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment." (Sec. 44-706 (f) ch. 44, art. 7, G. S. 1937 Supp., as amended).

Kentucky: Same as Alabama, except as otherwise provided by an arrangement between Kentucky and such other State of the United States.

"SEC. 4748g-9 (b). * * * No workers may serve a waiting period or be paid benefits for any period of unemployment with respect to which the Commission finds that:

"(2) He has received or is seeking unemployment compensation under an unemployment-compensation law of another State or of the United States, except as otherwise provided by an arrangement between Kentucky and such other State or the United States: *Provided, however*, That if the appropriate agencies of such State or of the United States finally determine that he is not entitled to such unemployment compensation, this paragraph shall not apply." (Kentucky unemployment-compensation law, ch. 50, acts of the 1938 regular session, codified as sec. 4748g-1 to 4748g-22, inclusive, Carroll's Ky. Stats., Baldwin's 1938 Supp., approved and effective March 5, 1938, as amended.)

Louisiana: Same as Alabama, except for substitution of words "not be eligible" for "be disqualified," omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," word "another" substituted for words "any other." (Sec. 4 (e), act 97 of 1936, approved June 29, 1936, effective November 3, 1936, as amended.) Louisiana's provision permits the acceptance of supplementary Federal benefits without disqualification.

Maine: Same as Alabama, except that the language reads as follows:

"An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

"(e) For any week with respect to which he is receiving or has received remuneration in the form of paragraph N (4) benefits under the unemployment-compensation law of any State or similar law of the United States. (Sec. 5 (3) (4), Public Laws of 1935 (special session of 1936), ch. 192, approved by governor, December 18, 1936, as amended.)

Maryland: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment" the word "another" substituted for the words "any other." (Sec. 5 (f), ch. 1, Laws of 1936 (extraordinary session), effective December 16, 1936; as amended.)

Massachusetts: Same as Alabama, except that the words "No benefit shall be payable under this chapter to an individual" replaced "an individual, etc.," and the words "this subsection" displace "this disqualification." (Sec. 16 (g), acts of 1937, ch. 421, approved May 29, 1937, effective January 1, 1937, as amended.)

Michigan: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," the word "another" substituted for "any other." (Sec. 61 (a), Public Acts 1936 (extra session), House enrolled No. 1, as amended.)

Minnesota: Substantially similar to Alabama:

"No week shall be counted as a week of unemployment for the purposes of this section:

"(3) With respect to which he is receiving, has received, or has filed a claim for unemployment compensation benefits under any other law of this State, or of any other State, or the Federal Government, including readjustment allowances under title V, Servicemen's Readjustment Act, 1944: *Provided*, That if the appropriate agency of such other State or the Federal Government finally determines that he is not entitled to such benefits, this provision shall not apply." (Sec. 268.08 subdivision 2, Minn. Stat., 1941, as amended by laws of 1943, ch. 650, as amended.)

Mississippi: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," and the word "another" substituted for "any other." (Sec. 5 (e), General Laws of Mississippi (regular session, 1936), ch. 176, approved March 23, 1936, effective April 1, 1936, as amended.)

Missouri: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," substitution of word "another" for "any other," and the proviso reads as follows: "*Provided*, That if it be finally determined that he is not entitled to such unemployment benefits, his disqualification shall not apply." (Sec. 10 II (d), Laws of Missouri, 1937, p. 574, approved and effective June 17, 1937, as amended.)

Montana: Differs from Alabama; it reads as follows:

"SEC. 5. An individual shall be disqualified for benefits—or has received payment in the form of—

"(4) Benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Act or any State unemployment compensation act or similar laws of any State or of the United States." (Sec. 5 (e) (4), Session Laws of Montana, 1937, ch. 137, approved and effective March 16, 1937, as amended.)

Nebraska: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment." (Sec. 48-705 (f), ch. 48, art. 7, Nebr. C. S. Supp. 1939, as amended.)

Nevada: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," substitution of word "another" for "any other." (Sec. 5 (e), Stat. 1937, ch. 129, approved and effective March 23, 1937, as amended.)

New Jersey: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment." (Sec. 43; 21-5 (f); ch. 21 of title 43 of the Revised Statutes, 1937, or ch. 270, Laws of 1936 (special session), approved and effective December 22, 1936, as amended.)

New Mexico: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment" substitution of word "another" for "any other." (Sec. 5 (f), Special Session Laws of New Mexico, 1936, ch. 1, approved and effective Decmber 16, 1936, as amended.)

New York: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment." (Sec. 503 (3), Consolidated Laws, ch. 31 (labor law), art. 18, secs. 500 539, as amended.)

North Carolina: Differs from Alabama. This section reads:

"An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

"(g) For any week after June 30, 1939, with respect to which he shall have or assert any right to unemployment benefits under an unemployment-compensation law of either the Federal or a State government, other than the State of North Carolina." (Sec. 5 (g), Public Laws of 1936 (extra sess.), ch. 1, ratified and effective December 16, 1936, as amended.)

North Dakota: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," the word "another" substituted for "any other," and the words "ineligibility condition" substituted for "disqualification." (Sec. 7 (f), ch. 232 of Session Laws of North Dakota, 1937, as amended.)

Ohio: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment." (Sec. 1345-7b, 116 O. L., pt. 2 (1935), first special sess., p. 286, as amended.)

Oklahoma: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," substitution of word "another" for "any other," and word "ineligibility" substituted for "disqualification." (Sec. 5 (f), Sessions Laws of Oklahoma (extraordinary sess.) 1936, ch. 1, approved and effective December 12, 1936, as amended.)

Oregon: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," substitution of the word "another" for "any other," omits the words "or is seeking." (Sec. 126-705 (g), Oregon Laws, special session, 1935, ch. 70, effective November 15, 1935, as amended.)

Pennsylvania: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment." (Sec. 402 (c), acts of 1936 (second extraordinary session), No. 1, approved and effective December 5, 1936, as amended.)

Rhode Island: Differs from Alabama. The section reads as follows:

"An individual shall be disqualified from receiving benefits for any week of his unemployment occurring within any period with respect to which such individual is currently receiving, or has received, remuneration in the form of—

"(c) Benefits under an unemployment compensation law of any State or of the United States;" (sec. 7 (7) (c), Public Laws of 1936, ch. 2333, effective May 5, 1936, as amended).

South Carolina: Same as Alabama, except omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," substitution of word "another" for "any other." (Sec. 5 (e), laws of 1936, No. 946, (768), approved and effective June 6, 1936, as amended.)

South Dakota: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," substitution of word "another" for "any other." (Sec. 17.0830 (7), Revised Code, ch. 17-08, and ch. 17.99, as amended.)

Tennessee: No provision.

Texas: No provision.

Utah: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," substitution of word "another" for "any other." (Sec. 5 (f), Laws of Utah (special session) 1936, ch. 1, approved and effective August 29, 1936, as amended.)

Vermont: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," substitution of word "another" for "any other." (Sec. 5 (f), No. 1, acts of the special session of 1936, approved and effective December 22, 1936, as amended.)

Virginia: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment." (Sec. 5 (f), ch. 1, acts of General Assembly of Virginia (extra session, 1936), approved and effective December 18, 1936, as amended).

Washington: No provision.

West Virginia: Differs from Alabama in that its law refers to unemployment-compensation benefits under the laws of the United States, instead of under an unemployment-compensation law of the United States. West Virginia also omits the proviso in the Alabama law, which omission has no significance for the purpose of this statement. West Virginia also omits the reference to "or is seeking":

"Upon the determination of the facts by the director an individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

"(5) For a week with respect to which he is receiving or has received:

"(d) Unemployment-compensation benefits under the laws of the United States or any other State." (Art. VI, sec. 4 (5) (d), Code of West Virginia, ch. 21-A (acts of 1936, second extraordinary session, ch. 1, approved and effective December 16, 1936, as amended.)

Wisconsin: No provision.

Wyoming: Same as Alabama, except for omission of words "for total or partial unemployment," substitution of word "another" for "any other." (Sec. 5 b IV, Sessions Laws of Wyoming, 1937, ch. 113, approved and effective February 25, 1937, as amended.)

RECIPROCAL ARRANGEMENTS STATUTES COMPARED

The reciprocal arrangements provision in Alabama is provided in section 12 (a) of the Alabama unemployment-compensation law (General Laws of Alabama Regular Session 1935, Act No. 447).

"The director is hereby authorized to enter into arrangements with the appropriate agencies of other States or the Federal Government whereby individuals performing services in this and other States for employing units under circumstances not specifically provided for in section 2 (f) and 2 (g) of this act or under similar provisions in the unemployment-compensation laws of such other States shall be deemed to be engaged in employment performed entirely within one of such other States and whereby potential rights to benefits accumulated under the unemployment-compensation laws of several States or under such a law of the Federal Government, or both, may constitute the basis for the payment of benefits through a single appropriate agency under terms which the director finds will be fair and reasonable as to all affected interests and will not result in any substantial loss to the fund."

The variations from uniformity in the statutes of the 51 jurisdictions upon the subject of reciprocal administration among themselves and with the Federal Government are so few as to reinforce the argument for reciprocal administration by agreement.

As the most graphic manner in which to present this phase of the general subject of unemployment compensation, a tabular analysis has been prepared and is hereinbelow set out, after the next two paragraphs which call attention to the specific variations in legislative policy.

The following variation should be noted, however. Idaho provides for reciprocal treatment of individuals who have acquired potential benefit rights under the Idaho law and under an unemployment compensation act of Congress. The Kentucky and Wisconsin provisions authorize administrative arrangements for the purpose of assisting in the payment of benefits.

Indiana, Missouri, Montana, and Ohio authorize the agency to enter into arrangements with Canada as well as with other States and the Federal Government; Washington authorizes such arrangements with agencies of foreign governments. Wisconsin specifies "any agency similarly charged with the administration of any other unemployment-compensation law," instead of other States or the Federal Government.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Georgia has referred to telegrams which he received in answer to inquiries sent to the governors of the various States. I notice that among the replies which he has received, the reply from my State comes first on the list which the Senator from Georgia has asked to have printed in the RECORD. The Governor of my State replied in part as follows:

The answer to question 1 set out in your telegram is "No," and the answer to question 2 is "Yes."

Question 1 was as follows:

Can your State enter into such agreement with Federal Government without resulting in the State payment being partially or totally reduced by the amount of the supplementary Federal payment?

The second question was:

If your State does not enter into such an agreement would Federal supplementary payments result in reduction of the State amount? In brief, would your State under existing law be required to credit any payments made by Federal Government against the unemployment compensation benefits paid under your State law?

I assume that under the decision of the attorney general of Alabama, even if this amendment is adopted, no worker in Alabama may receive $25. He may not receive more than the maximum amount now allowed under the Alabama statute. Am I correct?

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is entirely correct, unless the legislature of his State meets and changes the existing law.

Mr. HILL. A change in the existing law of Alabama would be necessary.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; according to the construction which governors or their attorneys general have placed upon the question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I raise no question at all with respect to the replies made by the governors or the attorneys general of the various States. I am a member of the committee, and I know that the matter was submitted to

the committee. The Senator from Georgia as chairman, and under the directions of the committee, sent in good faith the inquiries to which he has referred. I assume, also, that the replies were sent in good faith. My conviction is that the particular provisions of the laws of the various States were enacted in order to prevent duplication on the part of unemployed persons in the States which would result in drawing compensation at the same time from State and other sources. There was probably no contemplation of the emergency growing out of the war situation which we face today. Assuming that those answers are all correct, and that the States from which they were received—26 or 27 of them, whatever the number may be—could not accept additional compensation from the Federal Government, it would not in any way, of course, prevent the legislatures of those States, under calls of their respective governors, from meeting and amending their laws in the light of the emergency which we face, and it would not prevent other States which do not have such provision from receiving the additional compensation provided for in the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Kentucky is quite correct, but to give some of the States additional compensation would make bad matters worse. It would increase whatever inequalities now exist. Whatever retarding effect any State law may have upon the redistribution of labor in the United States, the condition will be increased and aggravated by an increase in payments in approximately 17 States. Approximately 27 or 28 States, according to statements which have been received from them, cannot accept the money, or, if it is accepted, it will not benefit the workers. That, of course, is subject to the qualification that the States may, by their legislatures, change their laws. However, I am obliged to state to the Senate as a matter of fact that the legislatures in about 45 States were in session in 1945, and that a measure providing substantially for a $25 weekly payment under the unemployment compensation laws of the respective States was submitted to nearly all those legislatures. While many of the States increased their benefit payments, they did not accept the provision which is now before the Senate.

(At this point Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the RECORD extracts from the laws of various States, to follow communications from State governors inserted on request of Mr. GEORGE.)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the only thing I have to say about the extracts presented by the Senator from West Virginia is that it does not matter how we differ with the attorneys general of the States or the governors. They have the right and the power to construe the laws of their own States, they have construed them, and I think it would be most unfortunate if the Senate did not look at the facts as they are, to wit, that by increasing the benefits in a relatively few States, the very situation that is earnestly desired to be corrected will be aggravated, because in so many of the States it is impossible to handle the matter in this way.

Mr. President, there is another State whose reply has just come in, which is not included in the list I have handed to the Official Reporter. It is a reply from the Governor of the State of Indiana, to which is attached a brief of the attorney general of the State. According to the Governor's statement, Indiana must be added to the list of those States which could not accept benefits of supplemental payments, whether voluntarily made or not. I ask that the letter and brief be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and brief, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF INDIANA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Indianapolis, September 13, 1945.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senator,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Please excuse my delay in answering your telegrams of September 3 and September 10, in which you ask that I advise you as to how S. 1274 would be affected by our State laws. However there seemed to be involved many technical questions of law which would need to be determined before proper answer could be given your request.

In view of the seriousness of this matter, and the many thousands of workers in Indiana who might be caused to suffer should a hastily drawn and erroneous answer be made to your inquiry; I submitted the questions to our attorney general and State legal staff. You will find enclosed herein a copy of their opinion to me covering the questions you submitted. After carefully reading the same, I wish to make the following observations.

Answering questions contained in your telegram I am advised by the attorney general of Indiana that section 7 (f) (6) Indiana Employment Security Act makes any claimant ineligible for State unemployment compensation benefits with respect to any week for which he receives or seeks unemployment benefits under the law of another State or the United States. His further opinion that reciprocal coverage enabling provisions in other sections of statute do not nullify this disqualification and that legislative amendment is necessary to enable Indiana agency to enter into agreement provided for in S. 1274. Proposed plan of supplementing present State benefit amounts is unfair, however, for largest supplements will go to States with lowest benefit amount and duration. This penalizes forward States like Indiana which have liberalized benefit structures. Earnestly suggest plan equally fair to all States. I also consider inequitable and discriminatory any plan to pay benefits entirely from Federal funds to employees of private employers presently excluded by size of firm and other limitations while continuing to pay presently insured workers from funds built by tax on employers. I want Indiana to continue as one of most progressive States in giving workers fullest protection and benefits and I also want Indiana employers treated fairly. Our general assembly is determined to enact all needed legislation for those purposes and I am willing to call special session of general assembly to consider changes necessary to allow Indiana to enter into agreement but I cannot permit execution of agreement when legal right to do so is uncertain and obscure.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

RALPH F. GATES,
Governor.

STATE OF INDIANA,
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Indianapolis, September 12, 1945.

Hon. RALPH F. GATES,
Governor, State of Indiana,
State House, Indianapolis, Ind.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: At your request I have carefully compared the provisions of the Kilgore bill (S. 1274) with the Indiana unemployment compensation law with a view to answering the following specific questions:

"1. If the Kilgore bill is enacted by Congress in its present terms will the Indiana Employment Security Division be authorized under existing laws to enter into an agreement as therein contemplated for the administration of the provisions of that act?

"2. Will the payment of increased weekly benefits amounts under the Kilgore bill as presently written in any way deny or reduce the benefit payments payable under Indiana law?"

At the outset of any discussion of these questions it is well to note that any harmony between these enactments would be purely coincidental as the general assembly could not have anticipated the proposals of the Kilgore bill at the time our law was enacted and the authors of that bill do not appear to have considered the problem of correlating the Federal and State laws.

Briefly, the Kilgore bill provides for an agreement to be executed by each State with the Federal authorities which must provide:

1. For supplementing State unemployment compensation benefits to the extent that the total maximum benefit will equal $25.00 for 26 weeks.

2. For the payment by the States from Federal funds of dismissal wages to Federal civilian employees, and maritime workers equal to unemployment compensation benefits payable under District of Columbia laws.

3. For like payments to food processing employees measured by Indiana benefit payments. (These employees are not exempted from our unemployment-insurance plan by virtue of Federal rulings.)

4. That State benefit payments will not be denied or reduced by reason of any such payments.

In addition, the State may include optional provisions at the expense of the Federal Government which would:

1. Increase the State benefit amount to two-thirds of weekly earnings (but not in excess of $25.00).

2. Extend benefit payments to any employees not now covered by redefining employment. (Presumably the State could include either elected or appointive State or local officers and employees.)

In the event that the State fails to enter into such an agreement, the law requires the Federal authorities to make those which are required direct to the employees involved, otherwise, the administration of the law is largely in State hands, subject to Federal supervision.

The most striking divergence of the Kilgore bill from our State law is the complete departure of that bill from the system of unemployment insurance established by our State law. That system, as constituted by our legislature, provides for the payment of unemployment benefits from reserves created out of compulsory employer contributions in the nature of premium payments. It is founded upon the principle that a fund be created in times of full employment to relieve the workers from the consequences of involuntary unemployment. This principle is expressed in section 1 of our act as follows:

"SECTION 1. Declaration of public policy: Economic insecurity due to unemployment is declared hereby to be a serious menace to the health, morale and welfare of the people of this State and to the maintenance of public order within this State. Protection against this great hazard of our economic life can be

provided in some measure by the required and systematic accumulation of funds during periods of employment to provide benefits to the unemployed during periods of unemployment and by encouragement of stable employment. The enactment of this measure to provide for payment of benefits to persons unemployed through no fault of their own, to encourage stabilization in employment, and to provide for a State employment service is, therefore, essential to public welfare; and the same is declared to be a proper exercise of the police powers of the State."

The Kilgore bill, on the other hand, is founded upon the contrary principle of Government responsibility to relieve from financial hardship by means of gratuitous relief payments without any insurance features. It cannot be expected, therefore, that legislation which is so opposite in principle will be harmonious in detail.

Our unemployment-compensation laws provide that:

"Each eligible individual who is totally unemployed * * * shall be paid * * * benefits at the rate of 4 percent of his wage credits * * * but not more than $20 per week * * *" (sec. 6, b, 1)."

The maximum total amount of benefits payable to any eligible individual during any benefit period shall not exceed 20 times his weekly benefit amount (sec. 6, c) and in section 7 (f) it is provided:

"An individual shall be ineligible for waiting period or benefit rights:

* * * * *

"(4) For any week with respect to which the individual receives, is receiving, or has received remuneration in the form of: * * * any payment by way of compensation for the loss of remuneration; * * *

* * * * *

"(6) For any week with respect to which or a part of which he receives, is receiving, has received, or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of another State or of the United States."

Thus, the explicit terms of the law are that benefits paid from the employment security fund as benefits under the State law shall not exceed $20 for 20 weeks and that these benefits shall not be payable if the eligible person is receiving any benefits from any other jurisdiction under its laws. If, then, the payments under the Kilgore bill are to be considered as payments made under and by virtue of the Indiana law they cannot exceed the legislative limitation as to the amount and duration of those payments. If, on the contrary, they are to be considered as payments made by virtue of a Federal unemployment compensation law, they fall within the category of those payments which, if received, will render the recipient ineligible for any State benefits.

I am not unmindful of the opinion of the general counsel of the Social Security Board in which he arrives at the conclusion that the quoted provisions of section 7 (f) refer only to duplicate and not to supplemental payments. The language is clear and explicit and I can see no such distinction either latent or patent in that language. In fact, our employment-security division advises me that they have always considered that a person receiving compensation under the Indiana law would be rendered ineligible if he applied for a supplemental payment under the law of another State which had a higher benefit payment to which he was eligible even though the payment by the other State was limited to the remainder of its benefit after deducting the Indiana benefit amount. In any event, it is obvious that competent lawyers are in serious disagreement as to the proper interpretation of this section which has received no judicial construction. Large sums of money and the eligibility of thousands of persons who can ill afford litigation are involved. I cannot believe that I can with propriety assure you, under the circumstances, that it is legally safe to accept the construction of the general counsel. This is particularly true when it is realized that it is to the financial advantage of every covered employer in the State to compel the application of a contrary construction in order to avoid diminution of his reserve or experience account.

Proceeding to the powers of the State authorities to enter into the agreements specified in the Kilgore bill, several provisions of our law are urged as being pertinent. I shall discuss each in order.

Section 10 (a) provides in part:

"Whenever the board believes that a change in contributions or benefit rates will become necessary to protect the solvency of the fund, it shall promptly so inform the governor and the general assembly, and make recommendations with respect thereto."

Since the present change in benefit amounts is not necessary to protect the solvency of the fund, this provision is not strictly in point, but some indication that the general assembly reserved control over the benefit amounts.

Section 10 (g) provides:

"(g) State-Federal cooperation. (1) In the administration of this act the board shall cooperate to the fullest extent consistent with the provisions of this act with the Social Security Board, created by the Social Security Act of the Congress of the United States of America approved August 14, 1935, or any amendments thereto; shall make such reports, in such form and containing such information as the Social Security Board may from time to time require and shall comply with such provisions as the Social Security Board may from time to time find necessary to insure the correctness and verification of such reports; and shall comply with the regulations prescribed by the Social Security Board governing the expenditures of such sums as may be allotted and paid to the State of Indiana under title III of the Social Security Act, or any other act of the Congress of the United States of America, for the purpose of assisting in the administration of this act.

* * * * *

"(4) The board may afford reasonable cooperation with every agency of the United States of America, or with any State charged with the administration of any unemployment compensation law."

Such cooperation is limited to that which is consistent with the provisions of our law, and since the agreement under the Kilgore bill would require payment of benefits in violation of sections 6 (b) and (c) and 7 (f), supra, it would not be consistent with the provisions of our law. The powers of the board here granted cannot be construed as authorizing it to contract away a legislative disqualification for benefits.

Section 10 (i) concerns reciprocal arrangements. Paragraph (1) is limited to those instances where individuals perform services for a single employing unit in this and other jurisdictions and is not therefore relevant. Likewise paragraph (2) is not relevant as it deals with arrangements concerning employment not localized within this State. Paragraph (3) concerns agreements for the transfer of wage credits accruing under the law of another jurisdiction and reimbursements in such instances. It is designed to meet the situation where the employee does not have wage credits in any one State sufficient to qualify him for benefits but whose aggregate wage credits in two or more States will entitle him to benefits if they are transferred into one of the several States in which they were earned. Paragraph (4) concerns agreements for reciprocal collection of employers' contributions. Thus none of these sections cover the case here in question.

Section 10 (j) authorizes the board to make its services and facilities available in the administration of any other unemployment compensation law. Under this section the board could in all probability administer any Federal unemployment compensation law, but is not here empowered to waive a disqualification arising by reason of any payments under any such Federal law.

Section 23 (a) provides:

"SEC. 23. Federal acts: (a) It is declared to be the purpose of this act to secure to the State of Indiana and to employers and employees therein all the rights and benefits which are conferred under the Social Security Act of the Congress of the United States, or any act which may hereafter be conferred by any amendment to said Social Security Act or by any act in lieu thereof enacted by Congress, and to coordinate the provisions of this act with the provisions of aforesaid Social Security Act. Whenever the board shall find it necessary, it shall have power to formulate rules after public hearing and opportunity to be heard whereof due notice is given as is herein provided for the adoption of rules pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10 of this act, and with the approval of the Governor of Indiana, to adopt such rules as shall effectuate the declared purpose of this act. More particularly said board is authorized to formulate rules as aforesaid to synchronize the tax liability of employers operating within the State of Indiana with the liability under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act in the event the tax rate or base in said Federal statute is altered, increased, or decreased as the case may be."

The Kilgore bill is in respect to our present investigation an amendment of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 and is neither an amendment of or in lieu of the Social Security Act.

I am, therefore, compelled to the following conclusions:

1. Only by a very strained interpretation of our Employment Security Act can it be said that the officers of this State are presently authorized by law to enter into an agreement under the terms of the Kilgore bill as presently written.

2. Only by a similar strained construction can it be said that the ineligibility provisions of section 7 (f) will not apply where payments are made under the Kilgore bill as presently written.

3. In all probability such constructions will be promptly challenged by litigation instituted by employers who are financially interested in preventing dimunition of their reserve or experience accounts.

4. The danger of injury to the employment security system and to the rights of employees to benefits does not warrant the taking of the risk that is implicit in such strained constructions of the act.

5. If the Kilgore bill is enacted in its present terms the matter should be submitted to the general assembly for specific authorization.

I do not here intend to indicate any opinion as to the policy of the Kilgore bill. My inquiry is restricted to the legal effect of that bill when comared with the Indiana Employment Security Act.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES A. EMMERT,
Attorney General.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not care to argue this matter; I wished merely to make the statement that I came to Washington with the announced hope that I might be able to vote for the liberalization of unemployment compensation. But I am bound to say that what is proposed is not the way to do it, because if it is done this way every existing inequality, every existing inequity

between workers, will be aggravated rather than relieved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] as consolidated. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. On this vote the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is absent on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], which I transfer to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to announce that on this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness. If present both these Senators would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—29

Aiken	Kilgore	Murdock
Barkley	La Follette	Murray
Briggs	Langer	Myers
Carville	Lucas	Taylor
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Downey	McFarland	Tunnell
Green	McMahon	Wagner
Guffey	Magnuson	Walsh
Hatch	Mead	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	Mitchell	

NAYS—51

Andrews	Ellender	Radcliffe
Austin	Ferguson	Reed
Bailey	Fulbright	Robertson
Ball	Gerry	Russell
Bilbo	Hart	Saltonstall
Brewster	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith
Brooks	Hill	Stewart
Burton	Hoey	Taft
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Knowland	Vandenberg
Capehart	McClellan	Wherry
Capper	Millikin	White
Chandler	Moore	Wiley
Connally	Morse	Willis
Cordon	O'Daniel	Wilson
Donnell	Overton	Young

NOT VOTING—16

Bankhead	Gurney	Revercomb
Buck	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Maybank	Tydings
George	O'Mahoney	
Glass	Pepper	

So Mr. BARKLEY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader if it is his purpose to keep the Senate in further session?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from West Virginia advises me that he is perfectly willing to have a vote on his amendment without further discussion. If we can do that, and dispose of it quickly, very well.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has another amendment which I think should be passed upon before my amendment is acted on.

Mr. WAGNER. Does not the Senator from West Virginia think we ought to get on his amendment first?

Mr. KILGORE. I think we had agreed, I will say to the Senator from Georgia, that any amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, should be acted upon before we proceeded with any other matter. I believe the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has an amendment which goes only to the question of the uniformity of payment of Federal employees.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to keep the Senate much longer unless we can conclude consideration of the bill. I do not know what the Senator's amendment is.

Mr. WAGNER. The amendment is now included in the Kilgore substitute, so that it could not be dealt with unless we have a vote on the Kilgore substitute first.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's proposal is included in the Kilgore substitute?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; it is included in the Kilgore substitute.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from New York does not wish to offer his amendment now?

Mr. WAGNER. I cannot offer it now, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then we might vote on the Kilgore substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KILGORE. To which one of my two amendments is the Presiding Officer now referring?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The substitute amendment, which would strike out all after line 10 on page 12 and insert other language.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia to the committee amendment, as amended.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand the Senate is now ready to vote on the committee amendment, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If no further amendments are offered, yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, there are still to be offered two more amendments to the committee amendment, as amended. I have one and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has another. My amendment deals with the provision that none of the benefits shall accrue unless the governors shall request them in writing. The amendment of the Senator from New York relates to the question of uniformity of payment of certain employees. The two amendments have not yet been acted upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They have not been offered as yet. It is in order to offer them now.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in view of the situation arising from the votes which have just been had on other amendments, I do not propose to offer the amendment I had in mind to offer.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move to strike out section 708 of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas moves to strike out section 708 of the bill, which is to be found on pages 24 and 25.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I think the amendment is worthy of some discussion. I do not know how long the Senate wants to stay in session. I am perfectly willing that the amendment go over until tomorrow, and that we proceed to a discussion of it at that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. The motion of the Senator from Arkansas is to strike out the section providing for transportation allowances. That is all that is involved in the Senator's motion. I do not know that it would be necessary to discuss it. I have no objection to its going over until tomorrow, although if that is all that is left for consideration, and if we can dispose of it in a reasonable time, I would be willing to continue for a while longer.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from West Virginia was going to offer an amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. My amendment would strike out the requirement that the Governors must request the benefits in writing. I have sent a copy of the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk advises the Chair that the amendment was sent out for printing, but will be returned in a moment.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say for the benefit of the Senate that my amendment——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. One moment. The amendment now before the Senate is that of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who has moved to strike out section 708, beginning on page 24.

Mr. KILGORE. The amendment to which I refer is on page 13.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Another amendment is pending. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I want to be heard on my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not know that any agreement was made, but it was my understanding that after disposing of the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] the Senate would probably take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to that course. I thought if we could run on until 6 o'clock and dispose of the bill we might do so, and not have a session tomorrow. But I am aware of the fact that the amendment suggested by the Senator from West Virginia with respect to the requirement in the bill as reported by the committee, that none of these benefits shall accrue unless the Governors shall request them in writing, will probably cause some debate. I am perfectly satisfied to let the whole matter go over until tomorrow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that ought to be done.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of F. Shirley Wilcox, of New Albany, Ind., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Wilbur K. Miller, of Kentucky, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Fred M. Vinson, resigned.

By Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Bennett Champ Clark, of Missouri, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Thurman W. Arnold, resigned;

E. Barrett Prettyman, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Justin Miller, resignation effective October 1, 1945;

Alexander Holtzoff, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Bolitha J. Laws, elevated;

John A. Carver, of Idaho, to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho;

Whitfield Y. Mauzy, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma;

Granville T. Norris, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma; and

Dave E. Hilles, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the western district of Oklahoma.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Dean G. Acheson, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of State;

Frank McCarthy, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State; and

Maxwell M. Hamilton, of Iowa, now a foreign-service officer of class 1, serving as representative of the United States in Finland with personal rank of Minister, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Finland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William E. Orr to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Delbert E. Metzger to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ben H. Rice, Jr., to be United States district judge for the western district of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Martin Pence to be judge of the Circuit Court for the Third Circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas J. Morrissey to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining nominations under the heading of the Judiciary be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the remaining nominations under the heading of the Judiciary are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified in all cases.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. I notice that under the heading "The Judiciary" on the calendar there is listed the nomination of Joseph H. Lyons to be collector of customs at Mobile, Ala. Was that nomination confirmed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is very happy to state that that nomination has been confirmed. A number of nominations under the heading of the Judiciary were confirmed en bloc, including nominations in the Mississippi River Commission, the California Debris Commission, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, September 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received September 19 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

F. Shirley Wilcox, of New Albany, Ind., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana, in place of Will H. Smith.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 19 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Harold H. Burton to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

William E. Orr to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Delbert E. Metzger to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii.

Ben H. Rice, Jr., to be United States district judge for the western district of Texas.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Martin Pence to be a judge of the third circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Thomas J. Morrissey to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado.

George Earl Hoffman to be United States attorney for northern district of Florida.

Herbert S. Phillips to be United States attorney for southern district of Florida.

John P. Cowart to be United States attorney for middle district of Georgia.

Malcolm E. Lafargue to be United States attorney for western district of Louisiana.

David E. Henderson to be United States attorney for western district of North Carolina.

Joseph A. McNamara to be United States attorney for district of Vermont.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Edward B. Doyle to be United States marshal for the middle district of Georgia.

Joseph Henry Young to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia.

H. Chess Richardson to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana.

Louis E. LeBlanc to be United States marshal for the western district of Louisiana.

Stanford C. Stiles to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas.

Guy McNamara to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Joseph H. Lyons to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 19, with headquarters at Mobile, Ala.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Maj. Gen. Robert Walter Crawford, Army of the United States, to be a member and President of the Mississippi River Commission.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Philip G. Bruton, United States Army, to be President of the California Debris Commission.

Col. Lester F. Rhodes, United States Army, to be a member and secretary of the California Debris Commission.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Marvin T. Paulson to be a junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from August 9, 1945.

John O. Boyer to be aide, with rank of ensign, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

POSTMASTERS

LOUISIANA

Celia Reilly, Paulina.

MAINE

Bela H. Edwards, Crescent Lake.
Charlene F. Tebbetts, Readfield.

NORTH DAKOTA

Elizabeth S. Karp, Epping.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Lt. John J. Daly, Chaplain Corps, Naval Research Laboratory, offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, look down upon us in Thy tender mercy as we undertake the tasks of this day. Bless these proceedings. Enlighten the minds and strengthen the hearts of the Speaker and the Members of this House that they might deliberate well and settle wisely the great problems of this postwar world that are theirs. Enable them to bear courageously the tremendous responsibilities that rest on their shoulders. Upon their wisdom and judgment depends the future of our country. All citizens of our beloved country, the poor and rich, the learned and unlearned, the weak and strong, all look to them for the enactment of just laws necessary to turn this land from war to peace. Grant, O Lord, that through their untiring efforts peace and prosperity and contentment may be the happy condition of the people of this, our time, and of the future generations of Americans. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the Boston Sunday Post; to include in one an article appearing in the Lawrence Sunday Sun; to include in one an address delivered by Thomas Dorgan, clerk of the superior civil court, Boston; and to extend in one his own remarks on the subject End Meat Rationing.

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement issued by him entitled "Purging Philippine Collaborationists."

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill relating to the St. Lawrence seaway project. A similar bill has previously been introduced in this Congress. I believe this is one measure that will make successful the policy of full employment in this country and assist in preparing this country to take care of business in the future. I am one of the authors of the full employment bill. The best argument advanced for the St. Lawrence seaway project was made by a Member from New York. He stated that if this measure were adopted there would not be enough labor available to build veterans' hospitals. I do not believe it would go that far, but I do believe that is one of the most important measures toward providing employment for our returning veterans and would go a long way toward full employment in this country.

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BIEMILLER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of the week during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the editor of the Washington Star on the career of Gen. George C. Marshall.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GIBSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BLACK DRAGON SOCIETY

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, press accounts reveal that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is daily rounding up more and more of the members of the Black Dragon Society, this with a view to placing them on trial as the arch war criminals of the Japanese war. For this activity he is entitled to the gratitude of the liberty-loving people of the world.

Unfortunately, all of the members of this infamous society are not resident in Japan. According to information already made available to the American people, many of these crafty conspirators have throughout the war pursued their evil machinations within the boundaries of continental United States, flagrantly violating the hospitality of our country, but residents here nevertheless.

Mr. Speaker, why has not the appropriate arm of our Government thrown out the dragnet and gathered in these persistent violators of humanity's code and long ago deported them to the country of their origin? No one will have any doubt but that MacArthur will know what to do with them when they arrive. Let us leave it to him.

For once let the sob-sisters and blubbering-brothers who always think their country is wrong hold their tongues. We have a job to do. Let us do it.

ADDRESS BY GENERAL MARSHALL ON DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, an impression has gotten around, not by reason of the remarks I made the other day in announcing a meeting to be held tomorrow at which General Marshall will make an address on demobilization, that the public is invited to the meeting. This meeting is to be confined to Members of the House and Senate and to the press. Of course, the meeting is public when members of the press are included, but the general public cannot be invited to that meeting because of the lack of seating facilities. I make this announcement because there has been an honest misunderstanding in the minds of some to the effect that members of the fam-

ilies of Members and the general public were invited to attend.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Some do not know what time this meeting will be held, and where. Can the gentleman repeat that information?

Mr. McCORMACK. The meeting will be at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning in the auditorium of the Library of Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will there be an opportunity to present questions, either written or oral, to General Marshall?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer that question. I will be frank with the gentleman. I certainly do not want to make a statement one way or the other about that because I have no knowledge about it now. I would prefer that the gentleman try to get that information tomorrow.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I may say that I have written a letter to the general, asking five or six questions that I hope he will answer.

Mr. McCORMACK. My offhand impression would be that if every Member were to ask a question it would present a rather difficult situation. I hope the questions the gentleman asked in his letter will be considered, but, without passing on it definitely, I may say that I think it might be unwise if Members were allowed to ask questions on this occasion.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think perhaps it might be a very good idea if General Marshall might be ready to answer questions of Members of Congress? There is a great deal of difference of opinion and some of this clouded atmosphere might be cleared up if he answered questions.

Mr. McCORMACK. That raises a different question which is not presented at this time, so far as tomorrow is concerned. If it is brought to my attention later on and I am asked to pass upon that question, the views of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will, of course, receive my serious consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Eve Garrette which appeared in This Week magazine.

OPA CONTROL OVER FOOD

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, we have a profound duty to do everything we can to help avert starvation and misery in war-torn countries this winter, but the administration must not use the pretext of sending food abroad as an excuse to continue the bureaucratic OPA in this country.

OPA control over food should be eliminated and necessary food-price control administration transferred to the Department of Agriculture, where it has always belonged.

The American public has had enough of OPA in its control of food. Its methods and practices created our wartime scarcities and black markets. Its continuation will create peacetime scarcities and black markets.

There has been altogether too much secrecy about shipment of American foodstuffs abroad. If the administration wants the cooperation of American citizens in this relief program it must render truthful and immediate accounting for all food shipped overseas.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include some quotations and an editorial and to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in another instance and to include an article by a gentleman by the name of Leffingwell.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced, and I feel certain that most of the Members of the House share the same view, that the average citizen is not properly informed on how, when, and where to buy United States surplus property. The Nation is divided into 11 regions. In each region there are 9 disposal agencies each operating as a separate independent unit. Even Mr. Symington testifying before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments had difficulty in remembering and naming all of these disposal agencies. This indicates how little the average citizen would know of how, when, and where to buy surplus property.

We must make it easy and simple for all interested citizens to buy in order to obtain the widest distribution, and also to prevent a few well-financed syndicates from monopolizing the market. We must provide for the disposing of these surpluses quickly in order to prevent interference with the national reconversion program.

The simplest and most direct way to reach the public is by radio. I recommend that the Surplus Property Administrator be given authority to use the radio to advertise what is for sale and when and where the auctions are to be held in each region and by each disposal agency, and that he seek the cooperation of the radio networks for free time as a public service.

The United States Government is in business, big business, the people's business, and the quicker we give everyone a fair chance to buy surplus property, the quicker we will dispose of the tremendous stock of surplus material.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXCESS PROFITS DURING WARTIME

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the press of Sunday and in subsequent issues has carried the statements of responsible labor leaders that during the war certain corporations made an excess profit of $2,000,000,000. Then they proceed with the statement that that money should be paid to the members of their unions. If it is true that these corporations have made an excess profit of $2,000,000,000 or any other sum, that money belongs to the United States Treasury, and not to these workers.

It is an odd position to take, that it is all right to cheat the United States Government by not returning proper income tax returns, to cheat the taxpayers by overcharging during the war, if they will divide the spoils with members of a labor union. I do not follow that. It is like the fellow who says, "It is all right to steal chickens if you give me my share."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. HOFFMAN], has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Walter Lippmann.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the boys returning home.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post on the atomic bomb.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD regarding veterans' legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on universal military training.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today following the legislative business and any other special orders that have been heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LOANS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we should reaffirm the law—

No funds shall be expended from the Treasury of the United States to any foreign country without specific authority of the Congress.

Congress should know for what purpose this money is to be used.

The Bretton Woods plan was endorsed by the World Conference in San Francisco, and the Bank and Stabilization Fund was set up with the approval of the House and Senate. This was for the sole purpose that countries of the world needing funds might go to the Bank and borrow. We also have the Export-Import Bank.

Now the papers carry the headlines that Stalin wants $6,000,000,000 from the United States, and I ask the question, Who does not? Great Britain wants three to six billion dollars from the United States. Where are you going to get the money? With a $275,000,000,000 debt, a $25,000,000,000 annual expenditure in this country, foreign countries will have to use their own resources for we have none to give away. We have a $6,000,000,000 interest rate alone, and how are you going to protect the 80,000,000 bondholders; or will you ruin them? Do your constituents want to be taxed further? Can they pay more; are they willing to pay more?

It is time the people of this country are permitted to have a say, and they should have that say through the medium of their Congressmen. I for one shall not obligate my people, without their consent, to pay more out of their pockets than they are paying now.

Business operation of government, where have you gone? Has business operation of the Government forever disappeared?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the outstanding responsibility of the Congress respecting the future welfare of our people is the maintenance of the value of the dollar. This overshadows all others. An absolute requisite for preserving the value of the dollar is a balanced National Budget. There is no hope whatever of preserving it unless expenditures can be brought within the income of revenue derived from taxes.

It is no longer a question of whether we can afford to dispense with this or that governmental function. It is a question rather of cutting our cloth to the measure of our ability to pay. Demobilizing our Army and stopping war expenditures is one of the two critical items for consideration. Pruning the bureaucracy by beginning at the roots is the other.

Congress should stand up and tell the bureaucracy what it can have and not ask it what it wants, as has been the practice.

The soundness and durability of our whole economic structure, of production and employment, depends primarily upon the integrity of the Federal finances. The surest way to further destroy real employment opportunity is for Congress to continue to shirk its responsibility in straightening out our finances. Congress must change its course and do so quickly to preserve the fullest measure of real employment. Our very form of government and way of life may well depend upon what this Congress does about the matter. We must not falter in fulfilling the trust placed in it. Individually and collectively we must strive to meet the obligation we assumed when we were elected to this body. To do this we must be willing to make some genuine sacrifices and exhibit some real courage.

POLLUTION OF STREAMS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of last week I introduced H. R. 3972. The object of this proposed legislation is to secure immediate improvement in the intolerable condition of pollution in the Nation's streams. This legislation will have the unanimous backing of the health departments of the 48 States, the conservation departments of the 48 States, the national sportsmen's organizations, the National Manufacturers' Association; and I commend it to the careful consideration of Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by including therein a splendid tribute paid the late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, by Hon. Charles S. O'Connor, of Boston; and also to extend my remarks and include an article by James Morgan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Military Affairs is divided into 12 subcommittees. This morning I directed the chairman of each of those subcommittees to select two or three members of his committee and proceed to go to the separation centers where the Army is being demobilized—on the ground, you might say—and to make report to the committee as soon as they are able to make the rounds. After that I believe we shall be able to give you a very fair picture of what is actually occurring in the demobilization program of the Army.

MACARTHUR'S STATEMENT ON THE SIZE OF THE JAPANESE OCCUPATION FORCE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to insert a statement by General MacArthur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FACILITATING SETTLEMENT OF VETERANS ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 343.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 520) to facilitate settlement of returning veterans on farms in projects constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I observe my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is waiting for me to yield to him. I shall of course yield the usual 30 minutes to him after I have explained the rule and to some extent the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the bill H. R. 520, which I am informed was reported unanimously by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. It provides for facilitating the settlement of returning veterans on farms in projects constructed or to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation. The rule provides for 1 hour's general debate after which the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this legislation is a step in the right direction because it will provide thousands and thousands of farms on reclamation lands for the returning boys. I know it is the aim of the Members of this House that everything possible shall be done to aid returning veterans and I hope, incidentally, that these veterans will continue to return more speedily than they have been returning up to now.

I am mighty pleased that tomorrow General Marshall will explain to the Members of the House the action which he has taken, because I feel that it will be in accordance with the wishes of the President, who has several times urged and requested that the boys be sent home as quickly as possible. Unfortunately, however, it is believed by a very large number of Members as well as the people of the country that such has not been the case; therefore, I was immensely gratified when the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, explained that arrangements are being made for the discharge of some of the returning veterans when they reach the point of debarkation in the United States.

I regret that I am obliged to call attention to this situation because there has been much criticism of the War Department and I feel a great deal of that was unnecessary. However, I have heard of several situations in the last few weeks, criticism of which in my opinion was justified. From many boys who have returned I have received information that they have been shunted from one camp to another instead of being released at the port of arrival or the nearest separation center. I can appreciate that due to lack of facilities at ports of debarkation or due to the arrival of a large number of returnees which the port facility could not handle due to lack of space may make it physically impossible to effect discharges at the port of debarkation, yet it was suggested to me some time ago that the immigration stations at Boston, Ellis Island, N. Y., Philadelphia, and Baltimore might be taken over and with the facilities at these stations many thousands of returnees could be discharged within 2 or 3 days and furnished with transportation direct to their homes. The criticism to which I desire to direct attention is that in the cases of veterans who on arrival at ports of debarkation are sent to camps, reshipped to another camp, and finally to another camp, all covering a period of weeks, when they are finally discharged and furnished with transportation to their homes. This procedure delays the discharge of these men and is costing the Government untold millions of dollars. It is my opinion that if the release of veterans cannot be effected at the port of embarkation through lack of facilities, then they should be sent to a camp nearest the port of debarkation with separation facilities and their discharge effected, from which point they should be furnished with transportation direct to their homes. If separation centers have not been established in the camps nearest to the ports of embarkation the War Department should undertake to do so immediately, transferring the separation center personnel from inland camps where discharges are being effected. This transfer of separation personnel could be effected at small cost and the War Department can undertake to close emergency camps which will mean a savings of millions of dollars to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that General Marshall on the occasion of his visit to the House tomorrow will explain what has been done, what is being done, and what is intended to be done in bringing about the early discharge of our veterans. I hope they will not continue to be held in camps here and abroad with nothing to do. Judging from the complaints which I have received there are thousands and thousands of men who are in service with no duties to perform, who fret and wonder why it is necessary that they be held.

I realize that perhaps we do not have enough ships to bring the overseas veterans home as speedily as they would. Nevertheless, we can set a good example right at home and begin to discharge those here and eliminate the discord and dissatisfaction within our armed forces. These boys are entitled to fair treatment and we should see to it that everything humanly possible is done so that they can soon reach their homes, their dear ones, and again start anew.

I do not wish to detain the House much longer with the exception of saying I believe this bill is in the right direction. I was pleased that a unanimous vote was had on the voluntary enlistment bill which passed yesterday. It was an important piece of legislation and I hope that it will do what it aims to do, namely, bring about an increase in the number of those who are ready and willing to serve our Nation. I believe that that legislation will prove of great value. I hope that it will, and I hope that it will not be necessary for us to continue to draft young men, boys of 18 and married men with four and five children, as has been done up to a few days ago. I think that in all instances where men have been drafted during the last few weeks or last few months, men with three or four children, they should be released, as well as all married men over 26 years of age and those who have served 2 years abroad. Personally I do not think we will need a large number of men for occupational service in policing the occupied countries. I am pleased to agree with the statement of General MacArthur that he may not need more than 200,000 men. I feel that the moment that Japan and Germany will have been disarmed and the industrial and military leaders and others responsible for the war are brought to justice, the actual policing of the occupied countries should be left to the military forces of the countries of our allies in closest proximity to the occupied countries. There is Great Britain, Russia, France, Belgium, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Netherlands in Europe, and there is China, Russia, Australia, New Zealand, Holland, and the Philippines in the Pacific. All of these countries have plenty of available men and all we should do is to supervise the proper policing of our conquered foe. I think the countries which I have named will be glad to undertake the policing, and if this procedure is adopted, it will permit the speedier release of our forces and will save our Government millions of dollars considering that the pay of soldiers of other countries does not near compare with that of our armed forces. I feel that the military forces of other countries will not be as soft as has been reported our forces have been to the Japanese and Nazi gangsters, torturers, and murderers who have been responsible for the killing of millions of innocent men, women, and children and who have been guilty of the most terrible atrocities inflicted upon American prisoners of war and those of our allies.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr McCORMACK. In connection with General MacArthur's statement we are justified, as I see it, in giving the greatest consideration to what he, as our commander in chief and of the United Nations in that area, has stated. His opinion as a military leader is entitled to the greatest consideration by the people of America, and the Congress of the United States. For anyone to just rule out or attempt to rule out what General MacArthur says seems to me to be taking a position which is contrary to common sense and good judgment. Furthermore, as I interpret his statement—and certainly I have to give what he says the greatest consideration—he is our military leader over there and he is on the ground, and I assume he has considered all elements before he makes a statement of that kind, and it is quite probable that in connection with this statement he has in mind a larger army of occupation. But some portion of the army of occupation might come from China, for example, or from other countries.

In any event, it seems to me that, having in mind General MacArthur's position, his years of experience, and the fact that he was commander in chief of our land forces in the retaking of many of the islands and in the Philippine campaign, and that he is the man who I understand planned and sold the Philippine campaign, the Congress of the United States and the people are justified in giving full and serious consideration to any views he might express along such lines or any other military lines.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with the statement the gentleman from Massachusetts has made. I hope that General MacArthur also will not omit in proceeding against the Japanese industrial leaders, taking over the plants, and destroying the country's fortifications, so that Japan will not in the future threaten the peace of the world. I feel that he had these considerations in mind when he made the statement that occupation will not require more than 200,000 men. I am of the opinion that it will not even require that number if he will use the Filipinos, the Chinese, the Russians, the Australians, the New Zealanders, and others in that area to do the policing. I hope he will proceed strenuously in arresting and bring to trial not only the top-notchers responsible for the war, but the thousands of others who have been

guilty of the terrible atrocities committed on prisoners of war and civilians as testified to by General Wainwright and hundreds of other prisoners of war.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does not the gentleman believe we are making a great deal out of a little? I do not believe the War Department or General MacArthur has erred. Some papers would lead one to believe that there is a controversy on between the War Department and General MacArthur regarding these figures. Is it not natural that when General MacArthur took over those islands he and the War Department were justified in believing that it might require 900,000 men, but now, after they have gone in there, from experience they find that it will require perhaps 200,000 men. I believe anyone who would say the War Department and General MacArthur are engaged in a controversy is in error. I personally do not believe either one of them is making a mistake, and I do not believe we can find any fault if later experience has shown that those figures should be lowered.

Mr. SABATH. I fully agree with the gentleman, but of course it is very easy to find fault and criticize. I sincerely believe and am confident that General MacArthur and General Marshall are endeavoring to carry out the wishes of the President, who has stated frequently that it is his aim and desire to bring about as early release of as many of our boys as is humanly possible. I feel that these men will carry out his orders.

Although I do not like to mention this matter, my attention has been called to the action of some officers who are not carrying out the separation orders as speedily as possible in order that they may retain their high rank which calls for a certain complement of men under their command. I appreciate that some of the boys from whom I have heard may be bitter; nevertheless, that condition may obtain because so many of these charges have been made. I have called attention to this situation merely because it has come to my knowledge through so many letters and telegrams that I have received in the last few weeks that I have felt I should make my position clear, and at the same time call to the attention of General Marshall and the others in charge of demobilization that something should be done to discontinue, as I have stated, the sending of boys from one camp to another unnecessarily, thus delaying their discharge and causing undue expense to the Government. I want these boys discharged as soon as they can be discharged without any unnecessary delay and trouble.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is one of the distinguished Democratic leaders in this administration. I am wondering if he could not prevail upon the administration to permit the Australian, New Zealand, Filipino, and Chinese troops to come in and assist in the occupation of Japan.

Mr. SABATH. I have done so. I thank the gentleman for the undeserved compliment that I am one of the leaders. I am just one of the Members who happens to have been here many years. My memory is fairly good, notwithstanding my age, and from time to time I feel I owe it to the House and to the country to give you my views and to impart information that has come to me.

Permit me to say that some weeks ago I took up this very matter with the President, with the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, because I felt then that the countries which you have mentioned, together with the English, Russians, and forces of some of the smaller countries, should be called upon to furnish the necessary men to police Japan, and I feel they will do it with pleasure. They are not as soft hearted as we are, and I believe they will see to it that nothing is done by the conniving Japs and Nazis which may be detrimental to the future peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have digressed from speaking on the subject matter of the legislation before us, but the matter of discharge of members of our armed forces is of concern to a great number of our people as well as to the veterans themselves, and I hope I may be pardoned for taking up the time of the House. Reverting to discussing the rule under consideration, I do not believe there is any opposition to its adoption, although I have been informed that there is some difference of opinion as to the provision in the bill pertaining to the administration or jurisdiction of the settlement of veterans on reclamation projects—whether it should remain with the Department of Agriculture or be transferred to the Department of Interior. However, I shall leave the determination of that to the membership. I am just reporting the rule to make the bill in order because I know you all feel the same as I do that legislation should be enacted which would provide perhaps thousands upon thousands of farms for our returning boys who, I hope, will shortly be with us and their dear ones.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURLEY. I believe General MacArthur's estimate when he announced 200,000 American soldier officers serving in a supervisory capacity will be needed is wrong. There is no group in the world which would make better soldiers under General MacArthur's direction than the people and soldiers of China, to the number of 5,000,000, with a reserve army of 15,000,000 who have been fighting in that part of the world for nearly 8 years. I do not believe he needs more than 100,000. If necessary, he should induce or request that China contribute whatever men are required to do the policing of Japan and let our boys come home. It is not a white man's country. One out of every five who return have some form of tropical disease or illness which will stay with them for life. It is about time that the people who are used to that climate were induced to do the policing work. The Chinese and the Filipinos are able to do it in the Far East, and thus our boys will be able to come home.

Mr. SABATH. I will say to the gentleman that I have been advocating that which he suggests for some time, and I am very glad that so many of you gentlemen agree with my views. I know that not only the Chinese but the Filipino people will police the country if they are asked to, and they will do a pretty good job. The same is true of the Manchurians, the Australians, New Zealanders, and others. I think when the time comes we will not even need as many as General MacArthur has stated. I feel that we should only have as many men there as is absolutely necessary to see that the policing is done as it should be.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks and yield 30 minutes to my colleague the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The able chairman of the Committee on Rules has fully explained this bill. The bill H. R. 520 is designed to facilitate the settlement of returning veterans on farm lands. There is no controversy on this side of the aisle as to soldier benefits. I think every Member of Congress, irrespective of party, wants the returning soldier to be benefited in every way. As I see it, the controversy is as to who shall have supervision of the work, the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture. I understand there is no objection to this rule. I know I am not opposed to it. I think the rule should be passed and the House should have this bill brought before it. The bill provides for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The rule should be passed and the bill should be brought before the full membership in order that they may determine whether the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior should have jurisdiction in regard to these settlements.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has stated the main purpose of the bill, but let me add, this deals with irrigated lands in the public domain. The main objective of the bill is to give veterans a preference of 90 days to have selection before others come in to select these particular irrigated lands. There is no disagreement in giving the veterans that preference. As the gentleman has already stated, the objection to the bill is the question of jurisdiction, as to which department will have jurisdiction. I understand one of our colleagues will offer an amendment so as to remove that feature from the bill, and the main objective of the bill will no doubt stand.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is my understanding.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In using the words "jurisdictional difference" I would not have it understood by the gentleman or

any other Member of the House that this is simply a controversy between two departments as to who shall have a certain amount of power. A great deal of this is already being done, and it is desired by those of us who would amend the bill that there shall be no question of a duplication of effort between the departments. To that extent it is a jurisdictional matter.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Let me ask the gentleman from California this question: The gentleman says an effort will be made to prevent any duplication of effort. Does that mean that that will be accomplished by taking it away from the Department of Agriculture, which now has jurisdiction over the matter, and giving it to the Department of the Interior?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No. Since those functions rest today in the Department of Agriculture, it means that this section shall be removed from the bill so that there will be no question but that is where it shall remain.

Mr. JENKINS. I think that is the proper attitude. The Department of Agriculture has had that activity for years. Why transfer it to somewhere else?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, to my mind the whole premise of this bill boils down to one thing. It is not a controversy between two departments. To my mind it is a controversy between two distinct personalities, the Interior Secretary, on the one hand, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, on the other hand. For my part I believe the Secretary of Agriculture, who has been a Member of this House and who enjoyed the confidence of each and every one of us for several years, is in a much better position to administer to the veterans than anybody else.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I should like to make this observation in connection with what the gentleman has said with reference to the controversy. It really is not a controversy, because an existing agency in the Department of Agriculture is now performing the service; but the Department of the Interior is trying to set up a new organization within the Department to give the same type of service that is already performed by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In my estimation, I may say to my friend from Minnesota it is another scheme to give the Department of the Interior more power; and I am against it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Department of the Interior now deals with public lands. Would the gentleman now propose that we take that function away from the Department of the Interior and give it to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. As the gentleman from Minnesota said, I believe it is a duplication of authority.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me answer the gentleman. This does not take away, nor does it propose to take away, from the Department of the Interior its functions over the public domain in irrigated land; that is left in the bill, and we are all agreeing that that shall be left in the Department of the Interior as it has always been. It simply gives the veterans a preference of 90 days in selecting land.

The objectionable feature is that in setting up the provisions of this bill in the Department of the Interior it is attempting to take away things that the Department of Agriculture is now performing, and it enlarges the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation by allowing them to perform the same services rendered by the Department of Agriculture in this respect.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I hope the gentleman will point that out in the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Committee on Expenditures has been meeting for weeks trying to carry out the request of the President in regard to a reorganization bill, a bill permitting him to consolidate and coordinate activities and eliminate duplication and waste; we are ready to report that bill to the House and in comes this legislation setting up in the Department of the Interior a function to do work that has heretofore never been performed by that Bureau but which is now performed by the Department of Agriculture. What is the use of passing a reorganization bill if the Congress itself is going to create functions for the Interior Department when the Agriculture Department is already performing them? I care not what agency performs certain functions but I do not want two agencies doing the same type of work. Why not let Interior handle the land and Agriculture perform the other functions?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri. As far as I could I have tried in every way both as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and as a Member of the House to see that the veterans got a square deal in matters relating to the farm. I think the GI bill should be overhauled very drastically and revised so that a veteran could get a loan.

The sooner this is done the better off the country will be because somebody at the present time has let the veteran down and he just has not any opportunity to get what he ought to under the GI bill of rights. We owe it to him to see that he gets hold of some of the rights and privileges we gave him under that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I believe the gentleman will find when the bill is explained that there is no duplication of work and that this bill does not take anything away from the Department of Agriculture. If he finds that I am sure he will support the bill for I take it that is his only objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I raised an objection a little earlier in my discussion which I believe the gentleman will recall. I will put my faith in the Secretary of Agriculture before anyone else on that particular matter; and certainly as far as the head of some other department goes I do not believe the homecoming veterans should be faced with the tragedy of an administration at his hands of any of their affairs at all; and for that reason I am absolutely opposed to the idea of letting him have anything to do with it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If the gentleman will yield further, I agree with the gentleman that it is necessary to do more than just pass the GI bill. This bill proposes to implement the GI bill's provisions, as will be explained later, so as to make it effective in the purchase of lands and the building of homes.

If the gentleman when the bill is explained finds that that is what is being done and that the Department of the Interior has always had control over these lands, the gentleman would not propose, would he, that we take it away from them and give it to another department?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman should certainly support an amendment which I am considering, taking the power from the Secretary of the Interior and putting it in the hands of our Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I will be glad to consider it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Just before the recess the House passed a revised GI bill that does everything the gentleman suggests.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is also aware of the fact that there is a lot of dissatisfaction on the part of veterans back home about the loan features of the GI bill, about the lack of consideration these boys are getting as they come home, and about the raw deal they think they are getting. As Members of this body, the only thing we can do to right ourselves with the veterans is to see that action is taken so that they can get a break against red tape.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman is not talking about the last bill we passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, is would be a great mistake to pass this legislation in its present form. When it was brought to the attention of the members of the Committee on Agriculture I called a meeting of that committee for the purpose of seeing what effect, if any, the legislation would have upon the Department of Agriculture. We first met yesterday and after some discussion decided that we would give the membership an opportunity to make a thorough overnight study of the bill. The meeting was adjourned until this morning at 10 o'clock, at which time we met and had a free and full discussion of the provisions of this bill.

By unanimous vote of the Committee on Agriculture, not a dissenting vote being cast, it was agreed that I should offer an amendment striking out all provisions in the bill after section 1, except the last section, section 6, and that subsection (c) of section 6 should also be stricken.

It was then brought to the attention of the committee that a member of the Committee on Reclamation should be given the opportunity, if he so desired, of offering the amendment and we agreed that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL], should offer such an amendment. The amendment has been prepared and the gentleman from Colorado, [Mr. ROCKWELL], will offer it at the proper time.

We have no objection to section 1 of the bill. We are all in accord that the veterans should be given preference in the purchase of this reclaimed land. Section 1 gives the veteran that preference, but after you leave section 1 we find that the bill attempts to duplicate over in the Department of the Interior the same character of work that is now being done by the Department of Agriculture. If I read you an excerpt from a letter of Secretary Anderson, in my opinion, you will have a clear understanding of just what section 2 and the remaining sections of the bill would do to the Department of Agriculture.

After approving section 1 of the bill, Secretary Anderson has this to say:

> But the provisions of section 2, which bear no legislative or logical relationship to section 1, have no precedent in the post-war era of previous national conflicts and are without foundation in our pattern of administrative government. By this section it is proposed that a substantial part of the functions traditionally performed by the Department of Agriculture for all the farmers of the Nation are to be performed for the first time by the Department of the Interior for that small group of farmers living on irrigation projects.
>
> The farmer who is now or may hereafter locate upon lands irrigated by a Federal reclamation project would, under the terms of this bill, receive his agricultural guidance, advice, and information from an organization to be newly created in the Department of the Interior, while his neighbor across the road on irrigated or nonirrigated lands would receive his agricultural guidance, advice, and information from the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the various State agencies through the Extension Service, Agricultural Research Administration, the experiment stations, and the regular county agent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. As I understand, this report was written by former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hill, before the bill was revised by this committee, and most of the provisions in the bill which were objected to have been eliminated.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. May I say to the gentleman that the letter I read is from the present Secretary of Agriculture, Clinton Anderson, and bears date September 17.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I know. But it is a copy of the original letter.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. If all of this bill except section 1 is not stricken, we are setting up over in the Department of the Interior just a little Department of Agriculture. It is a duplication, pure, and simple, and it has no place in this legislation. I believe that the committee will support the amendment that my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] will offer.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is no opposition to the rule and to the bill, with the exception of section 2, and there are no other requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 520) to facilitate settlement of returning veterans on farms in projects constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 520, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 520, has been carefully considered by the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. We began our hearings on this measure early last spring. As early as March I asked the Bureau of Reclamation to present us a program or inventory of feasible projects which might be worked on immediately after the close of the war. They have done a magnificent job in furnishing us such an inventory. Some of the projects listed have already been authorized and some work done on them. Other projects have not been authorized yet, but they have been investigated, so that they are pretty well known. Still other projects are in the early study stage. That report gave us an idea of what the Bureau of Reclamation could do in the immediate future if given authorization and appropriations.

Incidentally, I have been working for some time myself on the idea of legislation giving veterans preference on irrigated lands. I introduced a bill in the Seventy-eighth Congress, 2 years ago, the number of which I believe was H. R. 3179, and which embodied the main idea essential in this bill. Before that, in the Seventy-seventh Congress, I introduced a bill giving preference on newly irrigated lands to veterans of World War I and World War II. The idea is not merely of recent origin.

The first hearings on this bill were held on April 12, this spring. Secretary Ickes made a statement, as did Commissioner Bashore and others. This bill has the distinction, by the way, of having been the subject of such extensive hearings that the hearings are printed in two parts and they are available here. It also has the distinction of having been the subject of statements by two Cabinet officers, Secretary Ickes and Secretary Wickard. It has the further distinction of having the approval of two Presidents.

Our first hearings were held on April 12. On the morning of April 12 I received this letter which I hold in my hand dated April 10 and sent from Warm Springs, Ga. It is I believe the last official communication to be received by any congressional group from our late beloved President Roosevelt. This is the original. You will see that it is in 2 pages, and you will note the signature of a very weary man about to lay down the working tools of life, the signature of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. This letter was read into the record and made a part of the hearings on this bill. President Roosevelt, mindful as he always was of those who bore the heavy burdens, asked that legislation be prepared to help the veterans in their adjustment to civilian life. We believe this measure is a partial answer to his last request.

This matter was not only the subject of the last official statement of the late President Roosevelt but also was included in one of the first messages of President Truman. I refer to President Truman's message of September 6, section 16, which deals with veterans. Let me read just a word or two from that message:

> Favorable consideration should be given by the Congress to Federal reclamation projects as outstanding opportunities for returning veterans. The great Columbia Basin project in the Northwest, the projects in the Missouri River Basin, and others of equal significance will bring into existence many thousands of new family-size farms upon which returning veterans can secure a livelihood for themselves and their families and create new wealth for the Nation. A number of farms can be made ready for veterans rapidly if legislation now pending is enacted without delay. This legislation would authorize necessary and proper assistance to veterans who seek to develop farm homes on irrigated lands in Federal reclamation project areas.

The President has more to say, but when he speaks of pending legislation he

is referring to this particular bill which was before our committee and had been reported on prior to September 6.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Is it the intention of the gentleman and his committee to resist the amendment that has been discussed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], and which would be offered at the suggestion of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. MURDOCK. As chairman of the committee, I cannot accept it. I would not be disposed to accept it even if I had authority. I am opposed to it. I think it would be a harmful amendment if adopted. The proposed amendment would strike out language needed in this as law to implement the Bureau of Reclamation so it can perform its obligations. The intent of section 2 is not to take anything away from the Department of Agriculture but to provide even better cooperation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Is it not the position of the committee that we are not resisting the argument of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], but the situation is that we merely have already corrected the objections which are raised by them. The amendments which are in the bill fully take care of that. Therefore, we will resist striking out section 2 which carries along with the portions which are objected to, some very important provisions.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from New Mexico is quite correct. We feel that this bill has been amended and in its final draft takes care of all logical objections that have been raised of a jurisdictional nature.

In Congress we have been talking a long time about helping veterans. Now is the time to act. I, for one, have said a lot about what we are going to do for veterans, and what I would like to do for them. This bill would not benefit many relatively and there are other steps which ought to be taken in other parts of the country. I want eligible veterans to get good farm homes and in part do it by this bill. I want to assure the Members that the veterans of this war, as of all other wars, have gone to school. They know how to read. When the veterans come back and see what is in this bill, they will pronounce judgment upon it and say it is good. I sincerely believe that. They are asking what has been done and they are not concerned about the possibility of one department stepping on the toes of another.

Let the opponents of this plan show what plan they have. This bill was reported out last June. We should have had action on it long before this. We should at least have had some action. I am not saying this bill is perfect. I believe it could be amended. There are certain amendments I would like to offer myself, one particularly with reference to a typographical error, but we want action. We want this bill put on the statute books. If it is not right, let us make it right. That is my plea to you. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has had a very rough and rugged road to travel ever since it first came out. It has been stated that in the committee it was unanimously reported out. I believe probably that was so. But so far as I was personally concerned, it was a misunderstanding on my part. We had offered so many amendments to this bill, to sections 2, 3, 4, and 5, that it was difficult to tell what was in the bill and what was not in the bill. Therefore, it was suggested by members of the committee that we have a clean bill written up. I voted for a clean bill thinking it would mean the bill would be printed as amended and come back to the committee for further discussion. I was surprised, but probably it was my own lack of knowledge, that the bill appeared on the floor right at that time. In other words, it did not come back to the committee. I wish to very briefly give you a little history of this bill, if I may. As the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] has said, it was introduced a long time ago. For a considerable period, matters of reclamation projects in the future were taken up.

There was one section of the bill that everyone agreed to. That was the section that Chairman MURDOCK wanted. It is a section I think we could all agree to, namely, section 1, which provides that veterans shall have a 90-day preference to the taking up of any land under reclamation. The rest of the bill is a new reclamation law which was written into the bill by the Department of the Interior. It had been amended many times in the committee, but as is shown here today and as will be shown during the debate, there are still many who are not convinced that there is not considerable conflict between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture over the supervision of some of these new reclamation projects as to how they shall be handled.

I took the position that I did, that this bill should come back to the committee, because about the time we completed hearings we had a new Secretary of Agriculture. Secretary Wickard and the Department of Agriculture has opposed certain provisions of this bill from the very beginning. They offered amendments and all of them were turned down by the committee. We have never had an opportunity to hear Secretary Anderson. Secretary Anderson was a former member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. He is a former colleague of this House. It seems to me that we would have saved time and confusion if we had postponed action on this matter until Secretary Anderson had taken office and had had time to review it and appear before us.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me say to the gentleman that, after repeated attempts last June to reach our new Secretary of Agriculture, I finally telephoned Secretary Anderson and he said he had some matters to suggest with reference to this bill on his desk which he would send to me, and he did so. But I found that those suggestions were exactly the recommendations made by Secretary Wickard weeks earlier and had been considered by our committee. Thus Secretary Anderson did in that way present his side to the committee.

I have in my hand now copy of a letter, dated June 27, from myself to Secretary Anderson, calling on him for further views with regard to the matter. So that the new Secretary, even after he took office under the heavy load he carried, has had an opportunity to speak.

Mr. ROCKWELL. What the gentleman has said is entirely true. I do know, however, that Secretary Anderson told me personally, and I communicated his views to the chairman of the committee, that he did not care to testify personally until after he had been sworn in in his new position, and had had a little time to go over the matter with his Department. That is what I referred to, because we did not give him that time in order to go over the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in that connection I wish to say I have a letter, dated September 17, from Secretary Anderson, which I shall read into the RECORD.

It reads as follows:

DEAR BOB: As you may know, I was a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House of Representatives and usually find myself in support of its recommendations. However, I cannot follow the committee's approval of H. R. 520. The enclosed copy of a letter to EVERETT DIRKSEN states my position.

I understand that there is a feeling that the Department of Agriculture does not understand the problems of irrigated agriculture. Specifically, I would deny that and point out that I am engaged in irrigated agriculture—the first Secretary of Agriculture from an irrigated valley. I would be deeply disappointed if the Department of Agriculture should be excluded from the planning and development of the agricultural phases of Federal irrigation projects or from assisting and aiding the settlers with all of the facilities that it now makes available to farmers on the bulk of the irrigated lands and all the nonirrigated lands of the country as is permitted by this bill.

Sincerely yours,

CLINT.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Being a member of the committee, does not the gentleman feel that Secretary Anderson is assuming too much when he says that somebody concerned with reclamation thinks the Department of Agriculture does not know enough about irrigated farming? Does the gentleman recall that anything like that appeared in the hearings? I do not recall that sort of expression. Far from it. I certainly do not feel that the present Secretary of Agriculture or the Agriculture Department does not know enough about irrigated farming.

Both he and the Department know much and have done miracles in development of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 147]

Abernethy	Hall,	Powell
Allen, Ill.	Leonard W.	Quinn, N. Y.
Baldwin, Md.	Hand	Rabaut
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hare	Randolph
Barry	Hart	Reed, Ill.
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	Resa
Beall	Hendricks	Rivers
Bender	Herter	Robertson,
Bolton	Holmes, Mass.	N. Dak.
Brumbaugh	Hope	Roe, N. Y.
Buck	Howell	Rogers, Mass.
Buckley	Huber	Rogers, N. Y.
Campbell	Jarman	Shafer
Carnahan	Johnson, Okla.	Sharp
Case, S. Dak.	Jones	Sheridan
Chiperfield	Jonkman	Short
Clason	Kerr	Simpson, Ill.
Colmer	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	King	Slaughter
Corbett	Kirwan	Snyder
Cravens	Larcade	Somers, N. Y.
Davis	Lea	Stevenson
Dawson	LeFevre	Sumners, Tex.
Dickstein	Luce	Talbot
Eaton	Lynch	Taylor
Elliott	McGregor	Thomas, N. J.
Ellsworth	Mahon	Tibbott
Elsaesser	Merrow	Towe
Engel, Mich.	Morgan	Vinson
Feighan	Mundt	Vursell
Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.	Weiss
Fuller	Norrell	White
Gamble	O'Brien, Ill.	Wickersham
Gerlach	O'Brien, Mich.	Winter
Gifford	O'Neal	Wolcott
Gillespie	Pfeifer	Wolverton, N. J.
Goodwin	Philbin	Woodruff, Mich.
Granger	Ploeser	Woodrum, Va.
Hagen	Plumley	Zimmerman

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 520, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 314 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona yield the gentleman two additional minutes?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I will simply summarize by saying there is no objection by anybody—in fact, everybody is in favor of section 1 of this bill which has to do with veterans' preference. There is a very decided difference of opinion regarding other sections which have to do with the new reclamation law. Because there is this difference of opinion and because I am personally afraid, along with others, that the bill may be lost, I shall at the proper time offer an amendment to strike out all except section 1.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, in nothing that I may say here during the debate do I mean to impugn the sincerity or motives of those who oppose this bill or any portions of the bill.

They have received a letter from the Department of Agriculture in which the Secretary claims that the bill as drawn takes away some of the powers of the Department of Agriculture. The bill as originally written might have been considered to do that, but we have changed that, and I will go into that a little later.

I want to refer again to the GI bill which was mentioned by the gentleman from New York. Unless we pass a bill such as this, the provisions of the GI bill will not be of much avail to the soldiers desiring to go into the irrigated farming business. We had a 90-day-preference clause in the old law after the last war, and it did not work. The sole purpose of this bill is to implement the provisions of the GI bill to the veterans who will settle in the West.

If that section and other sections of this bill are stricken out then we will offer the soldiers nothing but an empty shell, a preference of 90 days which we gave after the last war and which was of very little use. We come here with a program, a program which has not been adopted in haste. We started on this bill way back in April. We have had long and extended hearings. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture came before the committee and set out their views at length. We had representatives of the Veterans' Administration and other veterans' agencies. We had representatives of the Department of the Interior. Long and extended hearings were had on the bill, and the bill as the result of the hearings was changed completely until we have what the committee considers a good sound bill to which all members of the committee with very few exceptions agreed. Some of the members made objection to one or two provisions. I made objection to one provision which is in the bill now; but, after all, we have to give and take in trying to make a program, we cannot all have everything we want. I may say however that some of the members of the committee who opposed the bill vigorously when we started it are now its most ardent supporters. On the other hand, the Committee on Agriculture has received this bill and glanced over it. According to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee they held a meeting on it. I should like to have attended that meeting but it was an executive meeting.

The Committee on Agriculture feels that the bill takes something away from the Department of Agriculture but they cannot tell us what excepting one thing, as the letter from Secretary Anderson states, and I will read a portion of it:

> The farmer who now or who hereafter locates upon such irrigated parts of a Federal reclamation project would under the terms of this bill receive his agricultural guidance, advice, and information from an organization to be newly created in the Department of the Interior, while his neighbor across the road, on irrigated and nonirrigated lands, would receive his agricultural guidance, advice, and information, from the Department of Agriculture.

As the bill was originally written that might have been the case, but after the Department of Agriculture called that to our attention we changed the bill so that the bill now recites with respect to that:

> The Department of the Interior shall obtain through or in cooperation with the State colleges and appropriate agencies of the Government guidance and advice for settlers of lands within the project in matters of irrigation and shall disseminate information by proper means and methods.

The authority to provide guidance makes it mandatory upon them to provide guidance through the Department of Agriculture, through the agricultural extension colleges and agents and through other agents of the Government and not directly by them, which is a thing they are already doing, because the Department of Agriculture does not have enough money to hire men to go in on irrigated lands. There is a hiatus there. But irrigated lands and reclamation projects are under the Department of the Interior and always have been. The Department of Agriculture has other lands. The Department of the Interior does not have the authority to provide this guidance and assistance, and so on. This bill does not give it to them. It merely requires the Department of Agriculture to work with the Department of the Interior in that respect.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I believe the RECORD should show that the gentleman from New Mexico offered that same amendment in committee which he has just called our attention to and which now appears in the revised form of the bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes; and it has never been the intention of the committee or even of the Department of the Interior to take any of those things away from the Department of Agriculture.

I wish to quote from the statement of Mr. Warne, of the Department of the Interior:

> Now, another question which has been raised dealt with the problem of whether there was the desire and intention under this or any other authorization to duplicate the work of the Department of Agriculture. We have no desire and no intention, and do not hope to duplicate the general programs of the Department of Agriculture. We hope that the Department of Agriculture does not have such intentions toward us. I think the amendment that was suggested by Mr. FERNANDEZ might very well eliminate any fears that we do want to or could, under this bill, infringe them.

If my amendment as in the bill does not cover it, we are perfectly willing to have the Department of Agriculture write its own language to see to it that that provision remains with the Department of Agriculture, but if you strike all the

rest of the section you will strike some very important things out of the bill.

Those important things provide that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior shall help the soldier, when he wants it and only when he wants it, to level the land which is sold to him. It provides that the Department of Agriculture may sell the land to the soldier on a long-time contract. It provides—and this is an additional provision—that the Department of Agriculture may purchase lands of adjacent property owners to include in the project to be sold to the soldiers.

In the Columbia River Basin project, under present law, that provision is there, but the provision requires that the farmers themselves having land over and above 160 acres shall sell to others the land they have in excess, and this they find most difficult to do in any satisfactory manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the Department has no authority to purchase it for sale to settlers. Under this bill the Department itself may buy from the farmer, limited only by the appropriations that you gentlemen of the Congress shall give them, and put that land in the project, then parcel it out to the veterans or to other applicants.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I may inform the gentleman, if he does not already know it, that the Subcommittee on Appropriations having to do with the Department of the Interior refused to appropriate $2,000,000 for this very item last year. We considered the matter fully and it was the censensus of opinion in the committee that more land should not be purchased by the Government, so we turned down an appropriation of $2,000,000, and it might well be we will do the same thing again.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The Appropriations Committee has the right to limit the amount they can expend for that purpose, and properly so, but in working out a program for the veterans it may find it necessary and advisable to provide such appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has again expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the district I represent has in it a great deal more irrigated land than it has land which is watered in any other way. There is certainly no feeling on my part of preference for the Department of the Interior as opposed to the Department of Agriculture nor for the Department of Agriculture as opposed to the Department of the Interior and I would like to impress upon every Member of the House that in these areas where the Department of the Interior has developed land under irrigation and the Department of Agriculture has come in with those services which it offers, they now work in every case known to me in complete harmony and cooperation. It is my opinion this House desires to avoid any change in that situation rather than we should be discussing today this bill as if it were a highly controversial bill regarding some jurisdictional dispute.

When the point of no quorum was made a while ago the ranking minority member of the committee had just explained that this bill had a rather rocky time through the committee itself and that there was certainly some misunderstanding on the part of certain members of the committee about returning the bill to the committee for further discussion.

It has seemed to me that the bill can be divided into two parts. In one part there is the splendid idea of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], that veterans shall be given a preference on irrigated lands set aside for farming which have been developed by the Department of the Interior. I have no opposition to that. The gentleman from Arizona, in my opinion, is to be congratulated and we all want to support that part of the bill. I was under the impression that the amendment shortly to be offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] which would strike out those parts which should have further discussion, and which might be considered controversial, also included in it an increase in the length of time from 90 days to 180 days, and observing that it does not have that increase in it, I have sent to the desk an amendment, thinking that that at least will bring it before this House for discussion. At the proper time I shall discuss that if the opportunity offers itself I think the time should more properly be 180 days than 90 days. But those other parts of the bill which have seemed to Members here and there or to members of the departments of government to be controversial, can be considered as part 2 of the bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Ninety days does seem somewhat short, but it must be remembered that before notice of opening of the land for filing, ample time and notice and opportunity to view the land will be given.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman retain that until it comes up, because I am short of time. I am only putting the amendment in so that it will be discussed. The gentleman from New Mexico is probably right.

There are certain sections of the bill which appear, at least to those of us who are members of the committee—and I am a member of the committee as well as the Committee on Agriculture, and certainly there is no controversy there—to have some conflict with the activities of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. I believe that this House would do well today to adopt the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] which will begin with section 2 of the bill, to strike from there those provisions in the bill which should have further discussion.

Let me give you an illustration of what I mean. I know that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is in agreement with me relating to the language on page 15, lines 6 to 13, regarding the clearing of the land before these men get on the land. I think we are all in agreement, yet I point out to you that some of the finest work in my area is being done under the soil-conservation program, and if that work were continued under the soil-conservation program, from the very beginning, then there would be a continuity of effort which would not only level the land but carry it through to the actual harvest.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very happy that the committee has brought in this legislation. I shall support it. The development of the West through irrigation is the only new frontier available for our returning veterans.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, there are about 370,000,000 acres of farm land in the United States. About 22,000,000 acres is irrigated land. The Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior has had charge of pioneering and developing irrigation projects. The bill before you gives the veterans a preference on irrigated lands. This bill was considered very carefully by your committee. Hearings of some 6 weeks in length were held. We had the members of the Department of Agriculture as well as the Department of the Interior before us. We also had the veterans' organizations before us, and they generally pretty well agreed upon the bill. There were objections from the Department of Agriculture on the provisions of the bill having to do with the dissemination of information to the veterans, and it is my understanding that in the revised bill those objections were taken care of.

A few days ago Secretary Anderson sent a letter to many Members of Congress in which he pointed out that the bill contained some objectionable features. That was the old bill. The new bill, as I read it, takes care of the objectionable features which Mr. Hill of the Agriculture Department thought ought to be removed. Certainly none of us wants a duplication of effort between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Agriculture.

It appeals to me that here is a bill where we are trying to do something for the veterans, and now we have two departments of Government jealous of their prerogatives, jealous of what they might be permitted to do now under the law, quarreling with each other as to who is going to have jurisdiction. Perhaps it is time to knock the heads of some of these Government departments together if it is going to interfere with the veterans coming back on some of the land that is being made available to them.

The bill as amended, and it was amended since the objections were first voiced by the Department of Agriculture, is designed to follow in general the well-beaten paths that have led through more than 40 years of experience with Federal reclamation to generally successful and prosperous settlement and development of farms within the service areas of Federal reclamation projects.

I think that if there is any question of jurisdiction or if there is a thought of setting up a duplication we ought to have some amendments to the bill. I am willing to accept them. I am convinced that in the revised bill that you now have before you that is taken care of, because on page 14 we have this provision:

to obtain through, or in cooperation with, the State colleges and appropriate agencies of the Government guidance and advice for settlers on lands within the projects on matters of irrigation farming; and to disseminate information by appropriate means and methods.

That was the amendment that was finally put in, to satisfy the Department of Agriculture.

Your committee has had this matter under consideration for 6 weeks. We heard all of these witnesses. I hope this committee will see fit to follow the advice of the committee that has held long hearings on this important bill to make it possible for the veterans of this country to settle upon some of the available public lands under the Bureau of Reclamation and bring this land under cultivation.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am not particularly interested in any jurisdictional fight between bureaucracies, but I am deeply interested—and I have not heard the question discussed—in why they should open up new lands and give the veterans a very expensive procedure when with the other hand the Government is limiting contracts and giving these same veterans and every other citizen subsidies in order to limit the amount of land that is already open. I do not understand the policy.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Bringing new lands under cultivation adds new wealth to this country. The pioneers of the West have settled new lands, raised their families, provided churches, schools, and homes, and that is America. This Congress should provide every opportunity to returning veterans who may wish to settle on public lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, being the only member of this committee from east of the Mississippi River, I have a considerable responsibility which I cannot shirk at this time. I am interested in helping these veterans. I am not particularly interested in developing the West. But I do think this, and I am very serious about it, too, that with regard to these veterans who come back from the wars and have given the best they have, several years of the best period of their lives, many of them will have aged 10 years, to induce them now to go out into the West on new lands, where rattlesnakes might bite their children and coyotes and wolves endanger the lives of their wives, and where their greatest asset is sunshine, which never pays mortgages or educates their children, and where foxes will kill their chickens and crows pick the eyes out of any livestock that is born outside, is just not right. These veterans will never live to clear their claims and see their families grow up. They ought to be located east of the Mississippi River, where there is enough rainfall, where there are a lot of cheap farms with good buildings in good communities, where there are schools and churches, good highways, and so forth, where there is a mighty population demanding the products of their soil, and where in their spare time, if they are hard up, they can go into industry and earn money to carry on.

There is such a thing as applying common sense to this thing of settling the veterans on these lands. I have been out in that country and looked it over.

When homesteading was good and free lands were available, when Horace Greeley in his newspaper said to every young man, "Go west," those homesteaders did not make good. It was about the third generation of them that made good. The first generation suffered and died and the land passed into the hands of speculators or to those who had more stick-to-itiveness than anybody else. It was about the third generation that came along and made good. Here you are putting these men who have spent so many years in the service of their country, you are putting them in an impossible situation when they could settle in the East, as I said, where you can get good cheap land. Why, you can buy good land in the East where you can grow 100 bushels of shelled corn per acre at $50 an acre. It will be cheaper for the Government to give the soldiers title to a farm in the East than to develop these dry lands; lend them the money to help the soldiers waste their lives out there in the sagebrush and rattlesnakes, tumbleweeds, thistles, and jackrabbits, where high winds are blowing all the time and where they do not have water. We had these hearings. The Secretary of Agriculture was there. He told the committee they had about 23 agencies in the Government waiting to give those poor beginners advice and help them along. He did finally admit that what they needed above all was water, and we have that in the East. Forty-two inches of rainfall and everything that makes life worth living and an opportunity to make good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the veterans are again being made the football by Members of Congress and by two departments of the Government, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. This bill was brought out after thorough and serious consideration.

I have been a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation for many years and no bill has ever received more consideration than this bill. I have never known a bill where more opportunity was given to parties opposed to it, or who wanted to be heard. At the request of a Member we held delayed hearings so that a witness could be heard. There were different people, such as Judge Wilson, one of the most eminent authorities on irrigation, who appeared before the committee and gave their views and as I understand were satisfied with the bill as amended. The bill was finally amended in such a way as we thought would meet the views of everybody concerned, except the former Secretary of Agriculture. Unfortunately, I believe unknowingly the present Secretary has assumed that what that Secretary objected to in the beginning still is in the present bill. It is not. The bill has been amended.

Something has been said about politics. This is no place for politics. I challenge any Member on this floor who has any knowledge of irrigation and of the Bureau of Reclamation to name me an irrigation district wherein there has been one single complaint made by people living in that to the effect that the Bureau played politics.

I challenge any person who wants to transfer the supervision of these irrigated lands to the Department of Agriculture to name me a single agricultural precinct in the United States of America where there has not been complaint made as to political activity on the part of the former Secretary of Agriculture. Let us be honest with ourselves and look at this matter as we ought to look at it. Let us not give the veterans a mere empty shell.

There is nothing in the bill that prevents the Department of Agriculture from making loans through its 19 agencies to any person or veteran who has been put on this land. All this bill says is that the Secretary of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, may level these lands and get them ready so that if you put veterans on them they will have water west of the Mississippi River. We have been told that they had all the water they needed, through rainfall, east of the Mississippi River. But in many places east of the Mississippi River nothing worth while grows even if they have water.

Under the present law, the Department of Agriculture may loan its engineers to farmers for leveling land for irrigation, but under this bill the Department of the Interior will level it for the veterans.

There is no conflict in this bill with anything that the Department of Agriculture now does or has a right to do. It takes nothing from the Department of Agriculture. It leaves its power intact. It simply provides the machinery to the Bureau of Reclamation, which enables it to get water on the land for the veterans. It gives the authority to prepare

these farms so the veteran may make a success.

You who know something about irrigation know that you can spoil an irrigated field and have the soil soured by not knowing how to keep the water sweet. After that takes place, the farm will not produce anything for several years. What does the Department of Agriculture know about irrigation? Why have we the Bureau of Reclamation if we are going to turn its functions over to the Department of Agriculture? Of course, the Department of Agriculture would like to extend its program of regimentation to the irrigated districts. That would be in keeping with the performance of the Department.

Remember that irrigated projects repay the Government the money appropriated for their development. The Department of the Interior is responsible for collecting the money that was put into these projects. Should we not permit it to have complete control over the farming operations, especially so far as supplying the water and leveling the land is concerned. Why divide the jurisdiction with a department that has never had and real experience in irrigation.

What would you think of me as a businessman if I sold you a piece of land and then let some other fellow that wants to build a political machine in every precinct tell you how to farm, and regiment you and keep your land out of production, and I, who sold it to you, have nothing to say about it? It does not make common horse sense.

I am perfectly willing that the Department of Agriculture shall not be interfered with, but I do not believe you should put the Department of Agriculture into the irrigation business. You and I know that irrigation, ever since we started it, was under the Bureau of Reclamation. You know that that Bureau has added billions of dollars of new wealth to the Nation by the development of these projects. You know that they know how to handle an irrigation project.

There is nothing in this bill that prevents the Secretary of Agriculture making loans or giving livestock to these people. There is nothing in the bill that interferes with any of the functions of the Department of Agriculture. This is clearly shown in the hearings and by the report if you will read them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time, 8 minutes, to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, now that we have been edified about the expanses of the great West, I think we ought to isolate and discuss the issue that is involved here. I should observe in reply to my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] that a trip through the West changes your mind about what they have out there, and it should be developed.

Nobody quarrels about giving the veterans preference in this bill. I expect if there should be a showing of hands in this Chamber right now it would be absolutely unanimous as to whether or not we favor giving veterans preference in moving upon these lands. But that is not the issue here. The committee that reported this bill developed a collateral issue, and that issue is whether you are going to have two Departments of Agriculture or one.

We have been laboring in this Government for a long time to bring agencies that have kindred functions under the jurisdiction of a single Cabinet member. Let me illustrate. A long time ago the Rural Electrification Administration was an independent agency of government. I used to sit down here in the Independent Offices Appropriation Committee and take testimony with respect to its appropriations. At the time I thought, "Why is not this agency in the Department of Agriculture, because it is dealing with rural electrification lines?" In the independent offices bill many years ago we used to have an agency known as the Commodity Exchange Administration, dealing entirely with commodities upon the commodity exchanges of the country. I raised the question at that time, "Why is it not in the Department of Agriculture?" Finally we got it there.

If you are going to have an integrated agency that can integrate its various programs, bring them all together and move toward a common objective, then obviously you have to have administrative control. But what is proposed here in this bill in aiding the veterans in securing preference? It is proposed that this authority be reposed in the Secretary of the Interior. Now, my good friend the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] quotes from the bill to show the authority that the Secretary of Agriculture still has. I will take the same language and prove to him that he is wrong. He quoted from page 14 of the bill. This is the way it reads:

> The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to obtain through, or in cooperation with, the State colleges and appropriate agencies of the Government guidance and advice for settlers on lands within the projects in matters of irrigation farming; and to disseminate information by appropriate means and methods.

What does that do? The Secretary of the Interior goes to the Secretary of Agriculture, perhaps, or to the land-grant colleges, secures the information, and then sends it out under his own frank. Thus the Secretary of Agriculture is absolutely right when he says one farmer may receive a packet of information on agricultural practices from the Department of Agriculture and across his street his neighbor will receive an identical packet from the Secretary of the Interior; and so at once you set up two informational services when we are already appropriating hundreds of thousands of dollars for that purpose.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not for the moment. I assume some responsibility for evoking this controversy on the floor, for when I went through H. R. 520 and saw section 2, I called up the Secretary of Agriculture and asked him whether it had come to his attention and whether he could provide me with an opinion. He called me back and asked: "Do you mind if I send a memorandum to you and also send it to other Members of the House?" It was done at my specific instance because I do believe in a coordination of these programs, and those things that are germane to our agricultural domain and our agricultural program ought to be left in that Department if we are going to get any kind of unified administration.

I now yield to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman knows, does he not, that the Department of the Interior is doing that very thing today? They employ men who are under the Department of Agriculture to give this guidance, to help them out in fixing their ditches, and so forth. That is exactly what is intended. They are not going to have supervision over it, they are just going to cooperate with the Department of Agriculture and they will work with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me answer my friend. That is exactly one of the things to which we have been devoting much attention for many years, to eliminate duplications in the whole Federal structure. Now they come along notwithstanding that provision in the President's message in which he wants to reorganize the executive branch in the interest of efficiency and they propose to disorganize some of these functions and to set up in two different agencies of the Government identic functions when one will be enough. It is the very thing we have been dealing with for a long time, and it is high time that we go through these agencies with a fine tooth comb and that Congress be the last to disorganize the Federal structure of Government and to impair its efficiency. Look at the programs with which the Department of Agriculture will have to deal: Soil conservation, farm practices, farm marketing, farm production. If you are going to get results on it and bring them all under one administrative head do not scatter them through another Cabinet department of the Government.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I wish the gentleman would turn his talents to explaining how it could be efficient to have the Agriculture Department cutting down acreage and the Department of the Interior opening up thousands of acres in the West?

Mr. DIRKSEN. People in the West have got to live, it is a part of our domain. There is fine land there that needs water and it needs people in order to make it bloom. If anybody has any doubt about it he ought to hop in a plane sometime and cover that whole western territory and see what a fruitful thing it can be. At some time or other in the life of this country it is going to have to be developed. Our population is growing, so that in good time this area has got to be

brought within the tillable domain of the country and we might just as well start now as any other time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We do not produce more than the people need, we merely have produced at times more than it has been easy to get to them. The trouble is one of distribution, not of production.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To get back to the thesis, an amendment will be offered to strike out section 2. That is the objectionable section. The Committee on Agriculture had a meeting this morning, as I understand, and concurred in the kind of action that should be taken and will recommend that kind of action. I commend to the House the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] that will strike out section 2. It will meet this problem efficiently and it will keep in one department of the Government the practices that properly should remain there and that we intended to be there since Abraham Lincoln signed the bill creating an agency of agriculture in 1862.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, there is very little disagreement in the House on this bill. Every Member here wants to do what should be done for the veterans. I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact, however, that by striking out all after section 1 we will do nothing at all for the veterans, not a thing. We are holding out high hopes but not one thing will be accomplished. If we cut out all after section 1 we might just as well, in my opinion, kill the bill and tell the veterans that we are doing nothing for them, and be honest and fair with them.

I call your attention to the fact that this bill has been before the committee and has been given very serious consideration. It was reported out by that committee practically unanimously, both Republicans and Democrats voting for the bill. The only dispute in the committee arose over a few words that were inadvertently placed in the bill originally. Those words appear on page 4 of the bill, and read as follows:

to extend guidance and advice to settlers on lands within the projects in matters of irrigation farming.

The Department of Agriculture assumed by those words that the Interior Department wanted to take away from it the jurisdiction it had under Farm Security Administration to furnish information, research, and lending facilities, as well as various other things, to farmers. There was no intent to do that. So the committee immediately went to work to amend that part of the bill in a manner it thought would be entirely agreeable to the Department of Agriculture. The bill was amended and from that time until within a very few hours ago we have heard nothing at all from the Department of Agriculture and therefore we had assumed that it was entirely satisfied with the amendment that had been placed in the bill.

I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that we should have each department operating its own affairs and we should keep everything we can within the department operating those various affairs. Let us look at the picture for a moment and see what we have here. We are passing a law that provides for reclamation projects. That is the purpose of the bill. We are dealing with public land. We are taking a piece of public land and making an irrigation project out of it. Then after we create that project we say to the veteran: "You may have the first opportunity of anyone to take a piece of land not to exceed 160 acres and settle on it."

In order to do that under this bill we provide for leveling of the land, for taking care of the land and for looking after the veteran as best we can. In connection with that, we have given the Secretary of the Interior the right, and I repeat the words of the bill, "to obtain through or in cooperation with the State colleges and appropriate agencies of the Government guidance and advice for settlers on the land within the project." So that all we have done is give the Secretary of the Interior the right to go to the Department of Agriculture or to the State colleges or wherever he wants to go to get information and disseminate it to the settlers on these projects that he already has under his control.

Mr. Chairman, when we get right down to brass tacks, you do not want to have one department of the Government in charge of the land, and in control of the land and have another department of the Government telling the veteran how to farm the land and make contracts with the various veterans who reside on the land. The making of contracts with each veteran and everything pertaining to this land up to now, has been done by one department—the Department of the Interior, and this Department under the Bureau of Reclamation has done a very satisfactory job.

So far as these small tracts are concerned, and that is all they are, I think the Department is straining at a gnat. I do not think there is any intention and there never has been any intention on the part of the Department of the Interior to take anything away from the Department of Agriculture. Far from that. We think that the Department of Agriculture will have all the rights and all the privileges and all the duties to perform for these veterans on irrigation and reclamation projects that they have on any other land; just the same. But in addition to that we fix the obligation on the Secretary of the Interior to do certain things to protect these veterans in their rights on the lands. If you strike out everything after section 2 you give the veteran absolutely nothing but a piece of raw land, with no one to do any thing for him on that land, and he just takes it as is, and there is no obligation on anybody's part to help him in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I say, therefore, that I think we are in complete harmony here. Surely the Department of Agriculture does not want to step into a proposition like this and deprive the veterans of the rights that we have given them under this bill. I caution the Members who are so strong for the veterans that in the opinion of the committee, if everything after section 1 is stricken, you leave a hollow shell for the veterans, and that you are helping them with one hand but with the other you are taking everything away that was given them by a committee that studied this bill for 3 or 4 weeks. The committee had everybody before it who wanted to speak on the subject, and they made only one objection, but that objection has been wiped out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has again expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) for a period of 20 years following the effective date of this act, veterans shall have a 90-day preferred right of purchase as provided in this section, with respect to lands when made available by the Secretary of the Interior for purchase on projects constructed, operated, or maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

(b) When the Secretary determines that any tract or tracts of land owned by the United States on projects constructed, operated, or maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation are available for purchase for irrigation farming, he shall announce their availability, and shall immediately furnish copies of the announcement to veteran agencies.

(c) The Secretary shall, in accordance with the provisions of subsection C of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 672, 702), determine the qualifications to be required of veterans and other applicants for the purchase of acquired or public lands. In determining whether a veteran applicant possesses funds sufficient to meet the capital requirements prescribed pursuant to said act, moneys advanced to veterans as operating capital shall be deemed acceptable as a substitute for all or a portion of the capital requirements so prescribed.

(d) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the heads of other Federal agencies which are now or hereafter authorized to make provision for the reestablishment of veterans in civil life (herein called veterans' agencies) shall inform veterans of settlement opportunities on projects constructed, operated, or maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation. The veterans' agencies are further authorized and directed to exercise the authority with respect to veterans' assistance now or hereafter conferred upon them by law, to the fullest extent consistent with the general policies and procedures governing the exercise of such authority in the case of other veterans, for the extension of such assistance, subject to the applicable legislative or administrative restrictions, in furtherance of the following ends:

(1) That qualified veterans desiring to settle on lands within any project constructed, operated, or maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be afforded through such agencies financial assistance for the purchase of land, for the acquisition or erection of housing, farm buildings and adjuncts, improvements, equipment, chattels, and operating capital, and for transportation to the project;

(2) That banks shall be encouraged to make loans on reasonable terms to veterans

for the purchase of land within any such project, and the acquisition or erection of housing, farm buildings and adjuncts, improvements, equipment, chattels, and operating capital; and

(3) That the Secretary may be enabled to extend guidance and advice to veteran settlers on lands within the project in matters of irrigation farming.

The veterans' agencies shall, to the fullest extent practicable, cooperate with the Secretary in all activities now or hereafter authorized by this act or other applicable law that are related to the accomplishment of the foregoing ends. Nothing contained in this act shall be deemed to confer upon the Secretary jurisdiction over the operations of the veterans' agencies in extending financial or other assistance to veterans.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That (a) for a period of 20 years following the effective date of this act, after reasonable public and other notice, the veteran shall have a 90-day preferred right of purchase as provided in this section, with respect to lands when made available by the Secretary of the Interior for purchase on projects constructed, operated, or maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

"(b) When the Secretary determines that any tract or tracts of land owned by the United States on projects constructed, operated, or maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation are available for purchase for irrigation farming, he shall announce their availability, and shall immediately furnish copies of the announcement to the Veterans' Administration.

"(c) The Secretary shall, in accordance with the provisions of subsection C of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 672, 702), determine the qualifications to be required of veterans and other applicants for the purchase of acquired or public lands. In determining whether a veteran applicant possesses funds sufficient to meet the capital requirements prescribed pursuant to said act, moneys advanced to veterans as operating capital shall be deemed acceptable as a substitute for all or a portion of the capital requirements so prescribed.

"(d) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall inform veterans of settlement opportunities on projects constructed, operated, or maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Administrator is further authorized and directed to exercise the authority with respect to veterans' assistance now or hereafter conferred upon him by law, to the fullest extent consistent with the general policies and procedures governing the exercise of such authority in the case of other veterans, for the extension of such assistance, subject to the applicable legislative or administrative restrictions, in furtherance of the following ends:

"The qualified veterans desiring to settle on lands within any project constructed, operated, or maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be afforded through the Veterans' Administration financial assistance within the limitations of laws administered by such Adminstrator, for the purchase of land, for the acquisition or erection of housing, farm buildings and adjuncts, improvements, equipment, chattels, and operating capital, and for transportation to the project.

"The Administrator shall, to the fullest extent practicable, cooperate with the Secretary in all activities now or hereafter authorized by this act or other applicable law that are related to the accomplishment of the foregoing ends. Nothing contained in this act shall be deemed to confer upon the Secretary jurisdiction over the operations of the Veterans' Administration in extending financial or other assistance to veterans. The provisions of this subsection shall also extend to any Federal agency other than the Veterans' Administration now or hereafter authorized to make provision for the reestablishment of veterans in civil life. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may extend guidance, supervision, and the benefits of on-the-job training to such veteran settlers as may be entitled to vocational rehabilitation or educational benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary is authorized to administer the public lands of the United States within any such project and the lands acquired under this act; to sell, exchange, or lease to prospective settler purchasers such public or acquired lands; to accept donations of real or personal property for the purpose of this act; to acquire by purchase in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, lands or improvements or interests in lands or improvements within any such projects for the purpose of providing farm units: *Provided*, That authority hereby conferred to acquire lands shall not include the acquisition of irrigated lands other than excess lands covered by recordable contracts prescribed by section 46 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636); to improve any such lands or other lands by contract with the owners, within the projects by clearing, leveling, and preparing them for the handling of irrigation waters; to make provision for domestic water for farms within the projects; to sell, exchange, or lease property being administered under this act; to obtain through, or in cooperation with, the State colleges and appropriate agencies of the Government guidance and advice for settlers on lands within the projects in matters of irrigation farming; and to disseminate information by appropriate means and methods. Any moneys realized on account of donations for the purposes of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as trust funds.

"(b) Contracts, exchanges, and leases made under the authority of this section shall be on terms that, in the Secretary's judgment, are in keeping with sound project development and business principles, and shall be subject to the express requirements hereinafter prescribed. Leases of lands shall be for periods not exceeding 10 years.

"(c) Contracts for the sale of land shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, will provide the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and the improvements thereon. Lands acquired by the United States, pursuant to this act and public lands of the United States within the projects may be disposed of in farm units of such sizes as the Secretary determines to be adequate, having in mind the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other factors as the Secretary regards as relevant: *Provided*, That the area disposed of to an individual shall, so far as practicable, not exceed 160 acres. Sales to any individual shall be of no more than one farm unit.

"(d) Contracts for the clearing, leveling, and preparing of lands for the handling of irrigation water and for providing domestic water supplies may be made with individual water users or water users' organizations satisfactory to the Secretary, and shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, will provide the return in a reasonable period of years of the costs incurred by the United States for the performance of the work involved.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to the State within which a project is located or to political subdivisions thereof with respect to any real property situated therein after acquisition pursuant to the authority of this act by the United States and at any and all times during which such real property is not covered by a contract of sale. The amount so paid for any year shall not exceed the taxes that were assessed by the State or subdivision, as the case may be, upon the property involved for the year immediately preceding its acquisition under the authority of this act.

"(b) Any public lands within the project and any lands or interests in lands acquired by the United States under this act, beginning as of the date of execution by the United States of a contract of sale covering them, shall be—

"(1) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State in which the project is located relating to the organization, government, and regulation of the respective irrigation, reclamation, conservancy, drainage, or similar district in which the lands are included;

"(2) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district and to liens for such assessments and taxes and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands of like character; and

"(3) subject to taxation by the State in which the project is located or political subdivisions thereof in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands of like character: *Provided*, (i) That the United States assumes no obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed, pursuant to this section; (ii) that liens duly acquired under the laws of the State in which the project is located for taxes validly so assessed shall be superior to but shall not extinguish any liens in favor of the United States for balances due on the purchase price of lands acquired by the United States and sold pursuant to this act or for improvements thereon; and (iii) that the holder or holders of a valid tax deed or tax title resulting from proceedings duly had in accordance with the laws of the State in which the project is located shall succeed to the rights, privileges and obligations arising out of the contract theretofore entered into by and between the United States and the individual or individuals theretofore in possession of the land with respect to which such tax deed or tax title has issued.

"'SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in the contracts hereinbefore authorized such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act. In connection with sales or exchanges of lands acquired by purchase, he is authorized to effect conveyances without regard to the law governing the patenting of public lands. Wherever in this act functions, powers, or duties are conferred upon the Secretary, or the head of any veterans' agency, these functions, powers, or duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by the duly authorized representatives of the Secretary or the head of such other agency, as the case may be.

"SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, to be reimbursable to the extent herein required. All net revenues, as determined by the Secretary periodically received in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"SEC. 6. As used in this act—

"(a) The term 'Federal reclamation laws' means the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

"(b) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

"(c) The term 'appraised value' means appraised value as determined by the Secretary.

"(d) The term 'veteran' means any person who served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than

dishonorable. It shall extend also to all persons who have served in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps during World War I and who have been honorably separated or discharged therefrom or placed in the Regular Army or Navy Reserve.

"SEC. 7. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby. This act shall not be construed as repealing or amending any provision or provisions of the Reclamation Town Site Act of April 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 116), as amended, the acts of February 2, 1911 (36 Stat. 895), May 20, 1920 (41 Stat. 605), May 16, 1930 (46 Stat. 367), or Columbia Basin Project Act (57 Stat. 14). Provisions of this act not in conflict with said Columbia Basin Project Act or with the act of September 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 745), shall be deemed supplementary thereto.

"SEC. 8. This act is declared to be a part of the Federal reclamation laws. It may be cited as the 'Reclamation Soldier Settlement Act of 1945.'"

Mr. MURDOCK (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. When may amendments be offered to the committee amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Amendments to the committee amendment must be offered before the vote is taken on the committee amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. The committee has three amendments to offer, and I wish to offer them at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not yet concluded the reading of the committee amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to know, as I think the chairman wants to know, if amendments to all sections are to be offered at once, or if they are to be offered section by section following the reading of the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The entire committee amendment will be open to amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As a whole?

The CHAIRMAN. As a whole.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, because the issue is clear before the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 14, line 7, strike out the semicolon and insert a comma in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 11, line 2, after "notice", strike out the comma and add "by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is no objection to that, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: On page 11, line 7, strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the words "and also, so far as practicable, preference shall be given to veterans in all construction work on such projects."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, after giving the 90-day preference to the veteran under the terms of the bill, the only thing my amendment does is to also give a preference where practicable to veterans who will be working on the projects. This is nothing new. The committee itself discussed this amendment although it was not framed in words. But they discussed the advisability of giving that kind of preference. I believe the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] first brought it up in the committee and it met with the favor of the entire committee. But in redrafting the bill, I think it was overlooked. This amendment simply gives the same preference on all projects which was given to veterans of the last war on the Boulder Canyon project. In fact, my amendment is word for word the same as the provision contained in that act.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the gentleman's amendment refer just to veterans of this recent war?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It refers to veterans as defined in the bill, to veterans of this war and the last war.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has asked a question that I have been trying to ask for a long while. If you read the title of this bill, it refers to "returning veterans." May I inquire of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], does this bill give preference only to veterans of World War II or does it give preference to all veterans, including veterans of the First World War, the Spanish-American War, and so on?

Mr. MURDOCK. It gives preference to veterans of World War I and World War II, including the Coast Guard.

Mr. STEFAN. Does it include Spanish-American War veterans?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; it does not include them.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. May I add another word respecting this amendment. Under section 4, if it is not stricken out, it is provided that the Secretary is authorized to perform such acts and to make such rules and regulations and to include in the contracts hereinbefore authorized such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act. Therefore, the Secretary would also be authorized to provide such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this amendment giving the soldiers this additional preference.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am authorized on behalf of the committee to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROCKWELL, of Colorado: On page 13, line 11, strike out sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the bill, beginning at page 13, line 11, and extending through page 18, line 3, and renumber sections 6, 7, and 8 of the bill as 2, 3, and 4.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been pretty well discussed. I think any neutral person will feel there is certainly a difference of opinion about the authority of the Reclamation Service and the Department of Agriculture as to carrying out the work on these projects. This matter should be taken up in committee. It is a duplication of effort, in my opinion. I have offered this amendment together with another which I propose to offer next for the purpose of saving section 1, because I believe that otherwise the bill will be defeated. There is a no man's land between the authority of the Department of Agriculture and the authority of the Department of the Interior in many of these western projects. I think that should be taken up in the committee. I do not think this is the time to do so. Therefore I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Will the gentleman explain further just what it is that he intends to strike out of the bill?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Strike all of sections 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is not limited to section 2, then?

Mr. ROCKWELL. No, it covers them all.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Does the gentleman intend to strike section 5? That is the section which authorizes money to be appropriated for this work. Does the gentleman intend to strike that?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Yes. With sections 2, 3, and 4 out I do not see the need for section 5.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want it distinctly understood that I personally have a high regard for the Department of Agriculture, as I do for the Department of the

Interior. I have more than respect for my former colleague, Clinton Anderson. I am proud of the fact that we have a man from the irrigated part of the country as Secretary of Agriculture. No better could have been found. I think agriculture will make great gains under his leadership in all sections of the country. I want to help him, and I am convinced that this measure properly administered as law would greatly bolster agriculture.

The new Secretary has taken the wrong road in regard to this bill.

As one of my colleagues said a moment ago, he has simply repeated what his predecessor said and taken the same attitude. If you will turn to part II of the hearings, pages 365, 366, you will find a letter from Under Secretary of Agriculture Grover Hill, under date of May 29, which uses the same expression in regard to the attitude of the Department of Agriculture as Secretary Anderson has more recently used. Undoubtedly the heavy duties falling upon our new Secretary of Agriculture have prevented his giving adequate, independent study to this matter. He, of all western men, must realize the necessity of close cooperation between these two great governmental agencies dealing with agricultural production. This bill, as is, would provide that cooperation.

I will admit that section 1 embodies the nub of the bill as far as I am concerned. As I said earlier, I have tried to get veterans' preference on irrigated lands. I introduced a bill 2 years ago and I introduced a bill 4 years ago with this intent. But in spite of that, I am not satisfied to see this bill emasculated by the adoption of the amendment just offered. The preference without anything to get a preference on could be a mockery.

My colleague from New Mexico says if this amendment is adopted it will leave this bill a hollow shell. I want to give these veterans something more than words. You can give them preference in words. They have before been given preference. Secretary Anderson himself said, "Why not leave this as it was after the other World War?" God forbid. After the other World War Congress talked and talked and they proposed at one time to appropriate $200,000,000 for the purpose. However, Congress then did nothing. Yet Woodrow Wilson favored it. Theodore Roosevelt favored it. Franklin K. Lane favored it. I know there were a few projects started in the West which had a pathetic experience, but these were not projects under the Bureau of Reclamation. While the Bureau had some successful projects after World War I, its great opportunity was largely lost through talk and delay.

I will admit that the powers of the Bureau of Reclamation are somewhat extended by the terms of this bill, but I feel that such must be done. Why? The more easy projects have been completed. From this time on we must develop the more difficult projects. Not only desert lands on the public domain remain to be watered but old irrigation projects, like the one in the valley around Phoenix, Ariz., where I live, need supplemental water. We are dealing with delicate questions of property rights and increasingly difficult engineering problems. What we want to do is to bring supplemental water to some of these lands as well as develop new lands. I think we probably hereafter will spend as much time and energy in the Bureau of Reclamation putting supplemental water on existing projects as upon the development of new land. Be that as it may, I want the whole program done with existing rights protected, and at the same time give the veterans every chance to make good in new homes. Toward that end we have shaped this legislation in all of its parts.

I trust this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I have a perfecting amendment on the Clerk's desk, and I am a member of this committee. When may I be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized to offer his amendment in due course.

The gentleman from Minnesota will proceed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this bill, it contains two provisions. The one I am primarily interested in is to give veterans preference in acquiring these irrigated lands. The other provision of the bill, which is advocated by the chairman of the committee, is to the effect that this legislation is to provide additional funds and means to create other projects and purchase additional land. I am sure there is no understanding, as far as the minority is concerned, that this is the intent of the bill. Our primary objective is to let veterans acquire this land and have 90 days' time in which to express their preference, and to come under existing laws in order to get funds to buy the land. The amendment strikes out section 5 providing for an appropriation. You will not need an appropriation to give the veterans' preference. Therefore, the striking out of section 5 is properly in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the bill contained a provision for the buying of additional lands to be put under irrigation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is my understanding that the primary objective is to give veterans preference. The other proviso that the gentleman from Colorado is striking out stops the acquisition of new lands and new projects.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I believe the gentleman is misinformed on that point. I wish he would point out that provision of the bill providing for the acquisition of new projects.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is what I understood the chairman of the committee to say just a few moments ago—that they had to have more projects which were more difficult and expensive in order to get more water on this land. If I have misunderstood, I am sorry.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am just going by what the chairman of the committee said a moment ago.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I do not want to make a speech in the gentleman's time, but as I understand it these projects are going to be let to somebody, and the purpose of this bill is to see that these projects that are going to be let to somebody are let to veterans on a preference. Is not that right?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is the first purpose of the bill.

Mr. REED of New York. The thing that disturbs me very much is the fact that it was not so long ago that we took about 50,000,000 acres of land out of production and paid people for not raising crops.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Forty million acres of land were taken out of production.

Mr. REED of New York. When the demand from Europe ceases the question will be whether or not there will be an attempt to take more land out of production and pay people for not raising things and leave our soldiers on the hooks.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That may be in the picture.

Section 2, appearing in line 16 on page 13 of the bill, which is being stricken out by the gentleman's amendment, provides the following:

> To acquire by purchase in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, lands or improvements or interests in lands or improvements within any such projects for the purpose of providing farm units.

That is definite authorization for the acquisition of new land.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Read the whole proviso; the gentleman has not finished the main proviso.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I read enough to show they have this authority.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is limited.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There should not be any dispute over the question of giving veterans preference, and I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:
>
> On page 14, line 4, after the word "obtain", insert the word "only."
>
> In line 5, strike out the words "appropriate agencies of the Government", and insert in lieu thereof the words "Department of Agriculture."
>
> In line 7, after the word "and", insert the words "through such arrangement to cause to be disseminated."
>
> Line 7, strike out the words "to disseminate."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. Let me state at the outset that the controversy that has arisen here today comes, not from the veterans nor from the people of the West who are primarily interested in this legislation but rather from the fact that two great departments of our Government are contesting for the extension of their powers.

For the past century the Department of the Interior has been charged with the administration of our public lands. Under the Homestead Act of 1862, the great Middle West was settled and developed. Under that great agrarian law, 160-acre homesteads were settled out beyond the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. At the turn of the century the wave of settlement reached out to the great State of Wyoming and other Western States. To meet the situation they changed the law to provide for stock-raising homesteads of 640 acres. Very early it became apparent that if we were to provide an opportunity for settlement on the public domain in the arid and semiarid States of the West that it had to be based on irrigation. The Congress, in its wisdom, passed the Reclamation Act to meet that situation. And so it is self-evident, Mr. Chairman, that over the years the Congress has changed the pattern of settlement of the public domain only to meet different conditions as the movement spread to the West. The underlying purpose was to give each section of our great country an opportunity to develop its own domain in its own way and to give the settlers of today somewhat of an equal opportunity with their forebears who settled the great Middle West. It must be borne in mind that at all times the Department of the Interior had the sole jurisdiction over the administration of these public lands, and consequently it was inevitable that the conservation of our water resources and the development of irrigation on the public domain should be left to the Bureau of Reclamation set up under that Department.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that there have been many changes in the policy adopted by this country in the settlement of the public domain. Up until the time when the first 26 States were taken into the Union, the Congress had uniformly followed the policy that the Federal Government was the trustee of the public domain and that it should be held only until such time as settlers claimed the land. The Federal Government claimed no proprietary rights in the public domain. When 160 acres were filed upon, the homesteader, upon complying with the law, received a patent not only for the surface but for all the minerals under the land. A much different policy was followed years later when my State and the West was settled. Today the Federal Government owns outright 51 percent of the area of Wyoming. They own the surface and the minerals underlying the land. Also the United States owns the minerals under an additional 30 percent of the area of Wyoming. They allowed the homesteader to file on 640 acres of land for stock-raising purposes but they gave him a patent only to the surface and retained the ownership of the minerals in the United States. So it happens today that the United States owns the minerals under 81 percent of the lands of Wyoming. Great quantities of oil have been produced from the public lands of Wyoming. Why, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the Government of the United States has received such tremendous royalties from the production of oil on our public domain in Wyoming that the reclamation fund has received over $42,000,000 from the oil produced on the public domain in Wyoming. On the other hand, the Bureau of Reclamation has only expended $40,000,000 for the development of irrigation projects in our State. Now it must be borne in mind that this fund is reimbursable and that the settlers on reclamation projects are required to repay that money over a period of 40 years. So, I think it must be apparent to any fair-minded person that the people of my State and the people of the West are entitled to the benefits of reclamation legislation.

It is estimated, Mr. Chairman, that there are over 1,200,000 farm boys in the armed forces. Hundreds of thousands of them came from the West. They love the West and they want to settle there. During the next 10 years the Bureau of Reclamation will open 100,000 new farms. During that period 12,000 new farms will be opened in Wyoming. That will mean much to the growth and development of our great State. The pioneers builded the West. Their sons now in the service are entitled to the benefit of this legislation. Water is our greatest resource. When properly applied, sage brush flats become rich irrigated farm valleys. This legislation gives the returning veteran who is experienced in irrigation farming an opportunity to purchase reasonably priced irrigated lands and to build a home.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] which strikes sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 from the bill. I am advised that the principal objection of the Department of Agriculture to the bill comes from that provision on page 14, which reads as follows: "To obtain through, or in cooperation with, the State colleges and appropriate agencies of the Government guidance and advice for settlers on lands within the projects in matters of irrigation farming, and to disseminate information by appropriate means and methods."

Let me make my position absolutely clear. I have fought for the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture on the floor of this House on many occasions. I shall do so in the future. I think the Soil Conservation Division of the Department of Agriculture has been doing a good job, and I have no desire to take any of its duties from them. My amendment clarifies the language and leaves no doubt whatsoever that the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture shall continue the same work in the same way that it has always done. If my amendment is adopted it will read as follows:

> To obtain only through or in cooperation with State colleges and the Department of Agriculture guidance and advice for settlers on land within the projects in matters of irrigation farming and through such arrangement cause to be disseminated information by appropriate means and methods.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, the chairman of our committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. We have discussed that same matter in the committee and I congratulate the gentleman on offering the amendment to clarify that point. The language as you would amend it does not take Agriculture out of the picture of furnishing information to farmers on irrigated lands, because it still devolves upon the Department of Agriculture to furnish that information all over the country as it has been doing.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman. I am glad the committee will accept the amendment.

I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that is precisely the method in which it is handled in several places in my own State at the present time. When Secretary Wickard appeared before our committee he made the following statement as may be found on page 245 of the hearings:

> There is now in force an agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture under which the Bureau of Reclamation provides the financing for a limited number of assistant county agents who are located in county agents' offices serving a few of the Federal irrigation projects.

At page 292 of the hearings, I questioned Mr. Will of the Department of Agriculture in regard to the matter of cooperative efforts between the Department of the Interior and the Extension Service in the matter of guidance and advice to settlers, and in response to a question from me, Mr. Will made the following statement, and I quote:

> You are referring to an agreement which exists between Interior and Agriculture whereby certain Interior funds are made available to employ qualified men to work in county agents' offices in the Extension Service. That work is all administered by and is under the direction of the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment merely gives effect to the present agreement existing between the Department of the Interior and the Extension Service in this respect. That is precisely what is being done at the present time. The county agents are overworked. Under my amendment, the Department of the Interior is authorized to get qualified county agents from the Extension Service

for the purpose of giving veterans a little extra service in the matter of guidance and advice on these projects.

I do not think that the Department of Agriculture wants to strike out section 2, Mr. Chairman.

If you read the hearings, you will find that Mr. Will, who is the Director of Water Utilization of the Department of Agriculture, was before our committee, and he discussed section 2 particularly. He was asked the question:

Do you think section 2 ought to be stricken out?

Here is his answer, which I quote from page 290 of the hearings:

If section 2 were taken out entirely there are parts of these functions that could be carried on by the Department of Agriculture under existing law, such as education, dissemination of information; but there are other functions which could not be, and I have reference there to the acquisition of land, the development, the subdivision into farms, and the sale of these farms, the settlement features. There would be no authority to do those things on these reclamation projects if section 2 were stricken out, except as the Wheeler-Case law might apply. Under Wheeler-Case the Secretary of Agriculture can come in at the bidding of the Secretary of the Interior. He is not authorized by law to go in under his own power, so to speak.

Reference has been made by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] to the authority given here to acquire land within these projects. That provision is vital and necessary. The Department of Agriculture says that power must be there and I will tell you why it must be there. Suppose we have a project with 15,000 acres of public land, and in the middle of that tract we find 1,280 acres privately owned, belonging to one man. Under the Reclamation Act that man can get water for 160 acres and no more. Obviously he would want to sell all but the 160 acres that he could get water for. So that authority must be there and that is precisely what the Department of Agriculture said when they came before the committee. They want that power left in there.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It seems to me this is playing a dirty trick on the veterans by putting them on this new land. Why not give them the money to buy land that already has a building on it, improved land? I think this bill is a fraud on the veterans.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I think my good friend, the gentlewoman from Illinois, is entirely mistaken in her position for the reason, that under this bill the veteran who does not have a great deal of capital, has the privilege and preference of coming in and filing on one of these tracts, and by perseverance and hard work he can build a home and rear a family in the traditional American way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two addi-

you withhold from them the informational service of the Department of Agriculture. Men in the Department of Agriculture have been trained in agriculture and trained to do this work. They are experienced men. Under the present law, they are at the service of the veterans. We want the law to remain as it is so that these veterans when they come back and when they go upon reclaimed land or other land will still have the benefit of the advice of the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a great deal of interest in this bill on the part of the Department of Agriculture. I thought the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation had charge of the bill, but the Agriculture Committee seems to get recognition ahead of the committee in charge. I hope, Mr. Chairman, you will be able to recognize the members of the committee who spent 6 weeks holding hearings upon the bill and who probably should be in a position to know something about the bill. I rise to support the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. When we had hearings on this bill, the representatives of the Department of Agriculture came before us.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that the amendment striking section 2 and subsequent sections from this bill has been offered by the distinguished ranking minority member of the very committee you are speaking about, namely, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL]?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I will let him explain that.

The amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] to the committee amendment takes out all of the sting and all of the objections the Department of Agriculture made to the bill. I am sure that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] who offered the amendment, did not realize he was striking out section 5 and that it would take all of the money out of the Department and that there would be no money left to make the bill effective. Section 5 authorizes the appropriation of money. The Reclamation Bureau has dealt for many, many years in the irrigation of land and the development of land. If you strike out everything after section 1 of this bill, you give the veterans nothing. We are trying to make provisions in this bill so that the veteran can go out on some of this irrigated land and make a home. I am not sure but what you should kill the bill if you strike out all of sections 2, 3, 4, and 5. The bill, so amended, leaves little for the veteran. It is possible, of course, that when it goes to the other body they will, in the exercise of their wisdom, put back these sections. I refer to page 4 of the old bill. I had objection to that part of the bill. Page 4 dealt with the Reclamation Bureau disseminating farming knowledge, which the Department of Agriculture is now doing.

If you will turn to page 14, which is the new bill on which we are working at this time, you will see it takes out the objectionable features. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] further clarifies the objection that the Department of Agriculture had to this bill.

I hope the committee in its wisdom will realize that the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation did spend a great deal of time on this bill. We started our hearings on April 12, and we did not finish until May 22. We heard the Bureau of Reclamation; we heard the Department of Agriculture; we heard from the veterans' organizations, and others interested in the bill. This bill as amended should be adopted and sent on its way. It does give some help and preference to the veteran.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said, "Do we want two Departments of Agriculture?" We might also say, "Do we want two Bureaus of Reclamation?" Some of the land that is being worked under the Reclamation Bureau is the best soil of the country. Some of the best apples and other crops of that Nation are grown on some of the irrigated land which, without irrigation, is hardly fit for jack rabbits. But there is room there for many of the new families of the servicemen who will be coming back. We will need a lot more food in the West, too, because many people came out there to work in the war effort and say they like that part of the country and are going to stay.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is all right. It further clarifies the section as to the exact meaning. But the Rockwell amendment certainly would create a great deal of confusion. In the first place, a great amount of the land that is being considered for irrigation is already under the Bureau of Reclamation. There are some projects where the land is in connection with a large dam. In one case nearly $200,000,000 has been spent on the dam. The Bureau of Reclamation is working to develop that land. So far no water has been put on it, but we believe it will be done in time to help the veteran.

With this amendment we would be giving the veterans preference, but there is nothing on which to give them preference. There are two services here. The bill provides that the Bureau of Reclamation can make contracts with veterans, but they can still get their agricultural information, they can get seed corn, and everything elese they want from the Department of Agriculture.

The Bureau of Reclamation is authorized to make contracts with the veterans, obtain land, and turn it over to the veterans. Actually there is no conflict with the Department of Agriculture in the work that the Bureau of Reclamation is doing, because I am sure the veterans will not want information on how to raise crops until after they get the land. That is the job of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The bill provides, as it now is, that the Bureau of Reclamation reclaim or obtain the land, and much of it it already has, prepare it, put water on it, and sell to veterans on contract. Then when the buyer is ready to produce, is when the Department of Agriculture will step into the picture. There is not necessarily any duplication. Each Department will be performing a different function. I think the main purpose of the Rockwell amendment is to knock out of the bill the machinery for obtaining the land to sell to the veterans. We will spoil the bill entirely if we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE] has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree on time to close debate on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 15 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does that mean on all amendments or just the amendment before us?

The CHAIRMAN. The Barrett amendment is now before the Committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman confine his request to the Barrett amendment or to all amendments?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am referring to the Rockwell amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I suggest 15 minutes would not be sufficient.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first we should be clear as to what section 1 will do. Our good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] said if you have only section 1 it is as good as no bill at all. Our good friend from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] says the same thing, but it is only a few moments since the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] said that section 1 is the nub of the bill. That is the term he used and that is the thing in which he is interested. We are all interested in it. There is complete unanimity on that point.

So then the second issue arises: Who shall administer this matter? It is rather strange that the Committee on Irrigation takes a rather inconsistent stand on this matter. If you look for instance at the protection of the Veterans' Administration they bend over backward in order to make sure that Veterans' Administration authority

would not be impaired. You would find that it reads like this:

Nothing contained in this act shall be deemed to confer upon the Secretary—

Meaning the Secretary of the Interior—

jurisdiction over the operation of the Veterans' Administration extending financial or other assistance to veterans.

And so forth. They protected them in the entirety, and there is reason for it and a good reason for it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot in 5 minutes, if the gentleman does not mind.

The very reason is that long ago we had a number of agencies dealing with veterans. Right after the last war Congress undertook to bundle them up and put them in one agency, and all of them are there today.

In the next breath, however, the committee impairs the position of the Secretary of Agriculture in administering these many programs that have been a part of our whole agricultural policy for a long time. As to the attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture, here it is expressed in a letter to me much later than was read from the hearings. This letter is dated September 17—that was Monday of this week.

Secretary Anderson said:

Obviously I am wholeheartedly in favor of the intent and purpose of section 1.

Secondly, he said about section 2:

But the provisions of section 2 which bear no legislative or logical relationship to section 1 have no precedent in the postwar era of previous national conflicts and are without foundation in our pattern of administrative Government.

He is exactly right. You propose to disorganize an agency of Government when we have labored for years to bring everything agricultural within the purview of that agency and make it efficient and economical, and eliminate waste, and extravagance and duplication. Are you going to undo that work? That is the reason for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] who is the ranking Republican member of the committee which brings the bill to the floor and is the reason it should be adopted, to strike out section 2. Then you leave section 1 which no less an authority than the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] says is the nub of the bill.

What we are dealing with here today is a question of administrative policy and it seems to me that every dictate of reason and common sense should suggest that we wholeheartedly support the amendment that is offered by the gentleman from Colorado to strike out section 2. The remaining section, the nub, as the chairman says, will still be there.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What is the gentleman's opinion about section 5 which authorizes the money necessary for the operation of the act?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would be administrative funds and that could be cured at any time. As a matter of fact there are administrative funds in the Bureau of Reclamation already. They have had some national defense funds. It may be that as our deficiency subcommittee gets around to it they may find they can take part of those funds to supply the money they need for the purpose of administering what functions they would have.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This section does provide the funds necessary for the carrying out of the provisions of the act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But you are dealing with the Bureau of Reclamation; so if they have administrative funds, that situation can easily be cured, and it may require no additional funds.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has correctly quoted me as saying that section 1 is the nub, but I also at that time said that to strike out all after section 1 would emasculate this bill and leave it a hollow shell.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have an entirely different opinion about the matter.

One other thing deserves comment. On several occasions today it has been stated that what is involved here is jurisdictional conflict between two departments of Government based on jealousy of their prerogatives. That is definitely not the case. The interest of the Secretary is no different from my own interest in the matter, namely, that I cannot stand idly by after belaboring the issue of the duplication of functions for so many years and see this provision remain in the pending bill. There is so definitely involved here a fundamental principle of administration of a Federal function, and I know from examining the memorandum which the Secretary sent to me on my specific request places it on that high ground.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the main thing we must do is let the veteran know the facts. Every Member of Congress wants that done, first of all. I am not going to oppose anything that will give the veteran something. Possibly this bill does, but I do not think it gives him very much.

The fact of the matter is that because of low commercial power rates charged by some of our Federal power where we have irrigation projects in connection, electric energy is sold so cheaply that it does not pay operation, maintenance, and amortization of the loan, so it is necessary to charge the farmer $85 an acre for the water to irrigate his land. Then the land will cost around $15 or $20 an acre. In addition to that, you have your buildings, which will cost at least $4,000 on 160 acres. Then he must pay every year from 2 to 4 dollars for the right to use the water. You also have the leveling of the land, which is taken care of in the bill, and I am glad to see that it is; but, anyway, before you get through, you add up the amount the land is going to cost the veteran and it will run from $125 to $175 an acre. That is going to be his total investment, and you cannot get away from it.

I want the veteran to know the truth before he takes on the obligation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the able gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman's first statement was that it cost $85 an acre for water.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman point that out?

Mr. JENSEN. That is the law. They charge of $85 an acre over a period of 40 years.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is over a period of 40 years.

Mr. JENSEN. Is that not a charge against the land? It is a lien against the property.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman think if a man can get irrigated land for $125 or $150 an acre, it is a pretty good investment?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; but we want the boys to know the truth. I am not going to oppose the bill on that ground but I want the veterans to know the truth.

I have in my district over 100,000 acres of the finest land that lays outdoors along the Missouri River. It is laying fallow right now and has been for the most part of the past several years. Of course, we would like to have something done for that land. The Missouri Valley development we hope in time will solve that problem. I trust every Member of Congress will remember that the Government has been supporting these great power projects with your money and at the same time the Government has been charging a rate to the users of the power that is so low it can never, in my studied opinion, pay off the debt that is charged against these big power projects that the Government has lent money on. I hope that we will finally get down to the point where we will charge a rate large enough for the power that is used so that we can cut down this charge against the veterans who will have to pay $85 an acre for the water to irrigate his land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. May I say to my colleague that I think he unintentionally misstated the facts in connection with the cost of this land to the veterans. Their payments for this land may total $125 to $175 an acre, but is it not true that this extends over a period of 40 years without interest, and that if you reduce it to its present-day value it

will be approximately $90 to $100 an acre?

Mr. JENSEN. I do not like to take issue with the gentleman. I just want to state the facts so that the veterans will know what they are going into.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my good friend the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. May I ask the gentleman if he is not interested in maintaining the integrity of the Government investments out along the Columbia River?

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly am, and I am fighting for them and have been for about 3 years, trying to get this thing on a sound business basis.

Mr. HORAN. As long as we can sell power from the Grand Coulee Dam we can pay out and the Government will not lose the money invested there, but if we hamper the sale of that power in any way by slowing up needed reclamation so that new farms can use this power, we will lose money on our investment out there. It is true also, in addition to that, that if we can develop the land out there we will continue to safeguard a project that has saved the taxpayers of America over $200,000,000 in the purchase of aluminum for war purposes alone. That figure is based upon the comparable costs of aluminum from the Columbia River plants and that from Shipshaw in Canada. Aluminum from Spokane was lowest in cost of all.

Mr. JENSEN. I appreciate that, and I have been pounding, pounding, and pounding for 3 years, ever since I became a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, to have the Department of the Interior get these rates on power up where they will pay maintenance, operation, and amortization of their loans, so we can continue to do the things you folks out there are entitled to and deserve.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 13 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the parliamentary situation, it is this: The amendment introduced by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is an amendment to the committee amendment, or a clarifying amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And therefore will be voted upon before the amendment introduced by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the Members of the House should understand that the two amendments are neither in conflict nor are they substitutes for each other. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is intended to make sure that certain of these functions are performed by the Secretary of Agriculture. It does not, however, entirely meet those objections or questions regarding the bill, such as the question which I raised on the floor which will be found on page 17, subdivision (d), which I feel is confusing and possibly to the detriment of the veteran, in that there should be a continuity of effort in the leveling and grading and soil-conservation measures. I still feel that even if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming is voted upon, and whether or not it is adopted, that the amendment introduced by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] is still the major issue and is still to be voted upon, and I hope it will carry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have been in committee and have not heard the debate on this bill but I take for granted every Member who has spoken has prefaced his remarks with the statement that he favors anything that can be done for the veterans in the way of providing homes and farms and businesses, as proposed in this bill. And I am in hearty agreement with that proposal. The veterans are entitled to anything the Nation can offer—and especially to any facilities for establishing permanent and profitable business connections.

Although I want to suggest to my friend, the veteran, that he will do well to look all such gift horses carefully in the mouth. Some are not as good as they look. After the last war a lot of our veterans came home and invested what little they had in a farm and lost the farm and everything they put into it. Giving a veteran the opportunity to buy a farm may not be such a great favor after all. Whether or not it is a favor, depends on a good many things which should be taken into consideration. And I earnestly urge every boy back from the front to consider carefully every phase of such propositions before he signs on the dotted line.

With the drop in farm prices which will inevitably follow the close of the war, in spite of all we can do to keep floors under farm prices, it is possible that the veteran, unless he is careful about the land he gets and the conditions under which he operates, will find himself without a shirt, and his farm in the hands of the sheriff. That is exactly the way it worked out in the 1920's.

May I say, too, that it is difficult for a consistent Member of the House to understand why we should open up new land when in the past, and immediately prior to the war, it was necessary to adopt a policy of rigid crop control. Undoubtedly in the near future we must again resume the practice of acreage limitation. You cannot guarantee prices unless you couple acreage limitation with the guarantee.

There is a little shortage of food now, but there are vast mountains of food in Army and Navy warehouses both at home and abroad, and the farmer is being urged to produce bumper crops in time of peace with the deliberate purpose of producing a surplus. Beginning next year we will have more than the country can consume and more than it will pay for at an equitable price. It is merely a question of time before we must resume acreage control under the old system of AAA allotment and admeasurement. Again we will start paying farmers not to use their land. So it is a little inconsistent for us to be legislating here to open up new land at a big expense, putting more acreage into cultivation, at the very time we will be paying farmers to take acreage out of cultivation.

Certainly this proposition as proposed in section 2 of this bill, to turn over to the Department of Interior the work and functions of the Department of Agriculture, is without justification. If there is anything we must avoid in the years now immediately ahead of us, it is duplication of work, duplication of overhead, and duplication of expense. We are not going to have money enough in the United States Treasury to do the job the first time, much less money enough to pay fellows to do the same job in the same way the second time. I am astonished that we would have to even consider a proposition under which we would establish a new Department of Agriculture under the administration of my friend Secretary Ickes. Much as I admire him and as admirable as has been his administration of the Department of the Interior, we should lay no further burdens on his capable shoulders. We should leave him to look after the business of his Department, and leave the Secretary of Agriculture to look after the business of his Department.

One of the important and imperative duties now awaiting the urgent attention of the House is to go painstakingly through all the departments of the Government establishment and cut out conflicting and overlapping duplication and lost motion of every character. The proposition here is just the reverse. Instead of eliminating duplication it proposes to establish duplication. God forbid.

Unfortunately, I was not on the floor and did not hear the amendments read, but it is my understanding that an amendment is pending to strike out section 2 of the bill. I earnestly hope the members of the Committee of the Whole, in the interest of Government economy, as well as orderly departmental procedure, will eliminate that particular section. On the face of it, it is Clint Anderson's job. Let him attend to it. No one else can handle it as well or as economically.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The amendment is not to strike out section 2, as has been stated here, but to strike out all the rest of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As long as it takes out section 2 with the rest of it, I shall not quarrel with the gentleman who wrote the amendment. The thing for us to do is to eliminate all unnecessary cost of Government and get rid of further duplication.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know when I have heard so many alibis offered to a meritorious bill. I do not know when I have listened to so much lip service to the veterans. There is nothing in the world to this bill, if you will study it and read the report, except to give the veterans preferential rights on public lands in the West. They want no favors, but they are entitled to justice.

The first alibi is, "Oh, well, we do not like Mr. Ickes and we do not want the Department of the Interior to have anything to do with it." The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], together with his entire committee, has accepted the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming permitting the Department of Agriculture to run it, in effect, so that is out of the window, if you want to be fair about this thing.

Then somebody raises the question, "Well, we have to settle this question of power on reclamation projects in the West." That question is not in the bill and is not under consideration at this time.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman think we have to do that?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; but that is not involved in this bill and that is a matter to be determined later.

Mr. JENSEN. It certainly is. It has a direct bearing on this bill.

Mr. THOMASON. No; it does not.

If any new reclamation projects are to be brought in later, they have to be authorized by Congress. That does not have a thing in the world to do with this bill. That is just an alibi. Now, we hear the cry from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, "Oh, well, you are going to have a big depression in farm prices before very long. We do not want to bring under cultivation any new land." In that connection I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] some time would make a visit to the great West. I wish he would see some of the great projects in southern California, Washington, Oregon, Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Arizona, west Texas, and all over the West. He might then appreciate the beautiful homes and farms that have brought happiness and prosperity to untold thousands of American citizens who went to that part of the country with nothing except faith in their Government. He might learn of the millions of new tax dollars these fine citizens have paid our Federal Government. He might get educated and find that the land owned by these pioneer citizens is assessed for the construction charges of the dams and ditches, and they eventually pay for every cent the Government spent. I do not share in the prejudice that is so manifest here against the West, because the West has added billions to our national wealth and paid untold millions in taxes. Reclamation means homes and better citizenship.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. No; I regret I cannot yield to the gentleman now as the time is limited. The gentleman needs some enlightenment about the West. His charges and sarcasm was unfair. He ought to see America and get educated. The West is part of this country and this Nation of ours. It has sent its sons to every part of the world to defend our flag, the same as the people in the East have done. This is a united country. These are the United States. This is a bill which was studied for months by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. If the amendment of my friend from Colorado should prevail, you have absolutely gutted this bill. There will not be a thing in the world left to it except a little soft soap. What ought to be done is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], to leave it with the Department of Agriculture, should be adopted. Nobody wants to set up a new department. There was just an honest misunderstanding about that. Then we should go ahead and leave the balance of the bill in and keep faith with the veterans whom we promised to help acquire homes. There are literally millions of acres of public lands in the West that need development. All it needs is water to make it a garden spot. I live in the beautiful El Paso Valley that 30 years ago was largely desert land worth $4 an acre. That is now the Rio Grande project, which takes in part of southern New Mexico and the extreme western part of Texas. That land is now in the highest state of production and has added millions of dollars to our national wealth. It has also brought happiness to thousands of home-loving farmers. I hope and plead that you will accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming as the chairman of the committee has already done and then defeat the other amendment and give this bill a chance. I beg of you to lay aside your prejudice against the West—against Secretary Ickes and the Bureau of Reclamation—and let us do something to provide farm homes for the veterans, as we have promised them we would do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROCKWELL) there were—ayes 67, noes 64.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. ROCKWELL to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 76, noes 68.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS to the committee amendment: On page 11, line 3, strike out "ninety-day" and insert "one hundred eighty-day."

Mr. PHILLIPS. The amendment is self-explanatory.

I have had a great deal of experience as have other Members of Congress with the opening of land and other opportunities offered by the Government, finding that after the designated period was ended, men came in saying they had been unable to take advantage of the opportunity because of the shortness of the time. My feeling is that the time should be at least 6 months. If the chairman of the committee feels it should be 5 months I will not quarrel with him but I feel that it should be longer than 90 days.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ], whom I was compelled to cut short when he was talking on this subject before.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, 90 days does seem to be short, but it must be remembered that before the 90 days begins to run and before the land is opened everybody will be given an opportunity to look the land over, because announcement will be made early. The Department because of that felt that 90 days was sufficient, which is the time we have had in the past. Since, however, we have cut out all of the things that are worthwhile in the bill and it is just an empty gesture, let us make it 180 days. It is nothing but an empty gesture now.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to say. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona desire to be heard on the amendment?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the committee amendment?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROCKWELL: On page 18, lines 10 and 11, strike out subsection (c), and reletter subsection (d) as (c).

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a clarifying amendment, because there is no need for subsection (c) with sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 out.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is acceptable.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS: Page 13, line 10, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. Contracts for the sale of land shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, will provide the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and the improvements thereon. Lands acquired by the United States pursuant to this act and public lands of the United States within the projects may be disposed of in farm units of such sizes as the Secretary determines to be adequate, having in mind the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other factors as the Secretary regards as relevant: *Provided*, That

the area disposed of to an individual shall, so far as practicable, not exceed 160 acres. Sales to any individual shall be of no more than one farm unit."

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane to the bill as it stands with sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 cut out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that the amendment is offered as a part of the committee amendment stricken from the bill on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado. It therefore appears to be germane and in order.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to reclaim from the material stricken out one provision that did not seem objectionable, and I hope the gentleman from Colorado will not oppose it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. First of all, in offering that amendment, what is the gentleman's definition of the word "appraisal"? That was one of the controversial points.

Mr. HAYS. My amendment adopts the language of the committee amendment appearing on page 14.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is the same thing?

Mr. HAYS. Exactly. I have used the idea that the gentleman expressed. He will find that the language of my amendment is lifted bodily out of the committee amendment appearing in line 17 on page 14 to line 5 on page 15 and the purpose of it is to give some legislative expression to the idea that has often been sanctioned here that we must take proper precautions against price inflation of the land and must see to it that economical units are provided for the veterans so that we will really be doing them a favor in making this land available. That is the only object of the amendment. It is a signpost, it is a mandate to the Secretary that he might follow this standard in determining the sales policies, that he avoid inflationary practices that might come out of indiscriminate sales to the veterans.

Mr. PHILLIPS. What is in the gentleman's amendment that is not in the reclamation law at the present time?

Mr. HAYS. If it was necessary in the committee's mind to reassert it, then I should think it would be necessary here as an addendum. From the standpoint of the gentleman's position, it seems to me it would be unobjectionable.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There are members of the committee who did not feel this necessary in this bill. Will the gentleman also tell me on what basis the appraisal is to be made? I refer to the appraised value of the land.

Mr. HAYS. That is a matter still within the discretion of the secretary.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That was stricken from the bill by the last amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado. If the gentleman will turn to page 18, lines 10 and 11, he will find that was stricken from the bill. On what basis does the gentleman offer appraisals?

Mr. HAYS. My purpose here is not to prescribe any elaborate method of determining the appraisal. My purpose is to see that sales shall not be for a larger number of acres than the standards provide, as embodied in the paragraph the gentleman is discussing. Perhaps the most important sentence in my amendment is the last one:

Sales to any individual shall be of no more than one farm unit.

The real purpose of the amendment is to provide a criterion so that sales do not become speculative.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that is already in the law.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I think the amendment is subject to a point of order that the House or the committee has already voted on it. We warned you that if you agreed to the amendment you would strike out the important things that were in the bill. The committee struck out everything. The committee has acted. By itself now it does not do any good.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman in his disappointment over the striking out of part of the bill would not want to object to reclaiming a part he is in favor of?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am not objecting.

Mr. HAYS. It seems to me that the gentleman in opposing the Rockwell amendment would be heartily in favor of what I am trying to do here.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am not objecting to it.

Mr. HAYS. I hope the gentleman will not object. What I am trying to do is reclaim a part of the amendment that was stricken out by the Rockwell amendment, to which there seems to be no objection by either side.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Does the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] desire to be heard?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] desire to be heard?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, just to call the attention of the Members to the fact that this is part of the wording previously stricken out by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 520) to facilitate settlement of returning veterans on farms in projects constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to House Resolution 343, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have five legislative days to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OUR TRADE RELATIONS WITH BRITAIN

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, England is paying the price of empire. For scores of years she drained her far-flung dominions of their raw materials which she manufactured and reaped huge profits in selling the finished products back to the original producers. Lancaster and London and other British ruling families flourished.

The war came. It was costly enough to defend the heart of the Empire—England. But the cost of defending India, Egypt, Hong Kong, Singapore, Iraq, Gibraltar, Malta, and so forth, was beyond compare. The figures became astronomical. England is now a debtor nation. But she has saved the Empire, and she means to hold it "come hell or high water." But she is holding a lion by the tail.

Exclusive of lend-lease, she has incurred an external debt of over $14,000,000,000. She also drew down capital assets of eight billions. She is stone broke. She will be forgiven lend-lease indebtedness to us of approximately $18,000,000,000.

We can recall it took us a long time after the last war to realize we were not going to collect the $11,000,000,000 we lent our allies, largely in the form of goods. Of course, we will again talk settlement. Lord Halifax and Lord Keynes are now in the United States to do some more talking. We are having a repetition of the stewing around and palaver we had the last time. The debt will not be paid in full. Have no doubts on that score. As a mad wag put it, "It's better to give than to lend. It costs the same in the end."

England needs American help. She covets American dollars and/or goods. Call it "lend-lease," "export-import shekels," or "Bretton Woods timber"—it is all the same. But with England—under Tory or Labor government—it is only "take" with no "give."

She needs to earn money to pay off her staggering external war debt—her Empire debt. To obtain the money she must export and continue to export. That would be O. K. But England would elbow and jostle America off the sidewalk of international commerce. She would stop our exports entering her far-flung dominions, condominions, protectorates, mandated territories, and colonies. She warns that trading with America in those lands is verboten. They have dollars or gold (as in the case of South Africa). But Mother England corrals these dollars and that gold and says to her children, "Don't touch." Then she freezes those dollars and changes them into pounds. Finally she says, "Children, you must buy only from Mother England and with your new toys (sterling pounds) you can't play with those Americans."

The new international financial wizardry is called the sterling area bloc pool. It has become bigger than Bretton Woods itself. It is more formidable than any international bank of settlement that Bretton Woods envisages, because locked up in this pool is probably sixteen or seventeen billion dollars and other currencies. It is a mighty weapon and Britain is using it to block American traders.

American traders find Indian, South African, Iraqi, and Egyptian markets closed to them. Our trade suffers.

Recently an American trader came to me. He represented a well-established American manufacturer. He had obtained an American passport to go to various countries in the Levant for the sale of American goods. He applied to the British for a visa and was flatly turned down with the curt remark that "the people of Syria, Palestine, Lebanon, Iraq, and Transjordania can buy English-produced goods. There is no need for you there."

I am going to read to you a communication I have received from a famous American perfume and soap manufacturer. It is dated August 29, 1945. It is from M. Michelon, vice president of Pinaud.

We beg to call your attention to the difficulties which American exporters are encountering in attempting to sell and export into the so-called sterling areas controlled by Great Britain. We have found, specifically, in Surinam and in Jamacia, two territories taken by way of concrete examples, the following obstacles in our path which have nullified all our efforts:

(1) Surinam, a Dutch territory, has little dollar exchange, but it has English pound exchange at its disposal and also has a so-called Dutch pound. We have sold to Surinam only to find that besides the impossibility of getting paid in dollars, we could be paid in British pounds at Paramaribo, but these pounds would be frozen there. They would not be accepted in England in a bank there for our account, even if we, as we would like to do, apply these pounds to purchases there.

This first situation regarding English pounds proper is utterly unfair.

We could be paid also in Dutch pounds but these pounds are not accepted in Great Britain and are not negotiable, naturally, in dollars, in view of the shortage of dollar exchange and are not negotiable either into British pounds, thereby putting another stop into transforming this money into a purchase in England for importation back to the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. These restrictions and discriminations were provided for in the Bretton Woods agreement specifically. If I am not mistaken, the gentleman voted for Bretton Woods.

Mr. CELLER. Bretton Woods, if carried out, would be inconsistent with these discriminations. I might say to the gentleman that in the beginning it was the studied purpose of the American delegates at Bretton Woods to have considered in the Bretton Woods set-up this so-called sterling area bloc pool arrangement as well as other discriminations. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury White wanted that discussed. For some reason beyond my ken and comprehension, the British delegates apparently sold a bill of goods to former Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. White, and it was finally agreed that there would be no consideration of the so-called sterling area bloc pool when there was the consideration of the various projects involved in Bretton Woods. Bretton Woods in and of itself is a splendid proposal. Its purpose would preclude any such sterling pool. I voted for Bretton Woods and I would vote for it again. The question now is, Is England going to kick Bretton Woods in the slats? She cannot have her cake and eat it too. If she is going to maintain a sterling area bloc pool which is utterly inconsistent with the very purposes of Bretton Woods, then she is not going to accept Bretton Woods. England has not definitely disclosed to us what her plans or her purposes may be. It is hoped she will accept Bretton Woods, but from the way she is acting since the conference at Bretton Woods, I am having my doubts. If I had known that she would not accept Bretton Woods, I certainly would not have voted for it in this Chamber.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Bretton Woods specifically legalizes all of these discriminations and restrictions.

Mr. CELLER. No; I disagree with the gentleman. It does not legalize these discriminations. It seeks to level out all these barriers. If the purposes of Bretton Woods are carried out, there will be no such thing as imperial preference and no such thing as the sterling area bloc pool. You cannot have a sterling area bloc pool and a Bretton Woods stabilization fund. The very idea of Bretton Woods is to do away with a sterling area bloc pool. Because if England continues such a pool, Russia could maintain one and France would do the same within her Empire. America would follow suit. Then we would have confusion worse confounded.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. MASON. When Great Britain signed and agreed to the Bretton Woods set-up, she had an agreement on the side, as the gentleman has pointed out, that it should not handicap her in some of the methods that she expected to carry on. But she was glad to accept all the fine things and benefits of Bretton Woods but none of the handicaps. That was what her signature meant.

Mr. CELLER. Apparently, as time goes on, what the gentleman say is absolutely proven. England seeks to look in two directions at the same time.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It seems to me the most peculiar thing in the United States today is this: Great Britain led the fight for Bretton Woods. Lord Keynes led the fight over here. Now they want us to bribe them to accept it. Does it not seem that way to the gentleman?

Mr. CELLER. There are so many inconsistencies in what England has done, quite inconsistent with the Bretton Woods proposal. If I have an opportunity, I shall try to unfold those inconsistencies.

Now, to go on with the communication from Pinaud, this perfumery company:

On the other hand, we find in the same territory that the firm of Yardley & Co., Ltd., New York, exporting American-manufactured items into Surinam has no difficulty in receiving English pounds and handling such money. The net result is that a Dutch territory like Surinam and, no doubt, other Dutch territories, are effectively reserved for the exclusive importations for American goods under the name of Yardley & Co., Ltd.

We are compelled to cite a name in this instance as it provides a usual type of obstacle in the path of American exports.

Jamaica—a British colony—we find the same type of obstacles. Firstly, no dollar exchange available. Our recent sales made by our salesman (United States citizen) from Puerto Rico have been refused, due to the fact that our permit was denied, although the permit had been promised when our salesman was there last month.

Secondly, in Jamaica, due to the lack of dollar exchange, we are also barred from selling in English pounds and of transferring same to London for the purchase of materials that we need from England. In other words, whether we choose to trade in dollars or pounds and to repatriate either dollars or merchandise, the arrangements made by the British are such that the territory is also completely closed to American export.

We have not been able to ascertain whether in Jamaica, Yardley, New York, would have free play against shut-out competitors; no doubt, what occurred in a Dutch territory controlled by the so-called sterling area is being repeated in Jamaica, but we have not checked this particular point. We have checked it, however, in Surinam as we have battled against it—to no avail.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. You are telling about the experience of somebody in this country who wants to trade in Europe?

Mr. CELLER. Who wants to trade in Surinam and in Jamaica. I have indicated one instance where a man wanted to get a visa to proceed to the Near East and there sell American goods. He was

told by the British that he could not get a visa because the people in those lands, Lebanon and Syria, could get British goods and therefore he should stay over here and not attempt to sell American goods.

Mr. PITTENGER. And that same thing will happen if Great Britain accepts the Bretton Woods agreement that we passed?

Mr. CELLER. I hope not. What I am trying to develop, if I am given an opportunity, is that we should not under any circumstances go to any extremes in rendering aid to England unless she agrees to stop these practices that I am instancing.

Mr. PITTENGER. The gentleman will recall we were told that in order to make the world safe and be a bunch of "do-gooders" we had to pass Bretton Woods or else everything was going to be all busted to pieces.

Mr. CELLER. I am not responsible for everything that has been said in this Chamber. I think Bretton Woods could so develop as to be a boon to the economy of all nations that are signatory to the Bretton Woods arrangement, what I am trying to point out here, is that the very author of Bretton Woods, England, is doing things which are quite inconsistent with the plan and scope and purpose of Bretton Woods. These examples I have given can be repeated a hundredfold throughout the British Empire. In that way England may eventually free herself of her debt at our expense. Shall we supinely gaze at the spectacle?

She cannot go through with her grandiose performance of a sudden. She needs time. The curtain falls upon a tragic note after the first act, as it were. Uncle Sam withdraws lend-lease. The second act must develop intense sympathy. Churchill and Attlee wring their hands. There cannot remain a dry eye in the audience. The atmosphere of anguish must be maintained. Uncle Sam relents and offers loans. The interest is low and the duration is as long as 30 years. But England calls him "Shylock," nonetheless, because he demands, as she says, a pound of flesh. But all Uncle Sam wants is that Britain as a condition for the loans break up the sterling area pool and permit free flow of trade to allow American goods to go to Empire and sterling countries. The play is now in rehearsal. Whether the plan will actually end that way depends upon the administration. But it must end that way, else it will be a flop to any full-blooded American audience. Otherwise, England could say, "Heads I win, tails you lose."

Furthermore, England has other cards up her sleeve and "sur la table." She may devalue the pound. She has her imperial preference trade barriers which stymie our exporters. By imperial preference, each British area mutually gives to each other lower tariff rates than those imposed on American goods. It is a swanky club from which Americans are barred. Of course, these British trade manipulations are not new. The sharp trading practices of the England of George VI are no different from those of the England of George III.

We set up the Bretton Woods currency stabilization fund as the quickest way to international financial stability. We want a firm relation between the dollar and the krone, between the peso and the rupee, between the drachma and the gulden, the lire and the franc. But England apparently now does not want that stable relation between the dollar and the pound sterling.

England's chauvinism and selfish imperial interests may lie in cheap and increasingly cheaper money. If she refuses to stabilize her currency she knocks the idea of Bretton Woods into smithereens. Bretton Woods was her idea first. We embraced it. But now she may jilt it.

Surely, it is difficult to satisfy all the demands of England. She is like the maladjusted crochety old gentleman who has had a very heavy lend-lease meal with much port, but refuses not only to pay for the food and the wine, but will not even pay for the bicarbonate of soda.

This question might well be asked: How does the sterling-bloc pool work? Answer: I think by giving you a concrete example the operation of the sterling-bloc pool will be more readily understood. India, for instance, has been selling and shipping to us jute, mica, manganese, and other strategic war materials. India's excess exports to the United States over imports has resulted in a net dollar balance in India's favor to close to a billion dollars. England took the surplus dollars due India and placed them in the sterling-bloc pool. In other words, the surplus dollars were placed absolutely under British control. Britain then gave India credit in pounds and then froze such pounds. For example, an Indian merchant sells a shipment of jute to a United States firm. It is paid for by dollar draft on a New York bank. The Indian merchant turns the dollars over to his bank in India which then turns the dollars over to the British Treasury. Now, for instance, another Indian merchant wants to buy goods from the United States; he must apply for an import license permitting him to make payment in dollars. This license will not be granted by the British. This precludes India from buying American goods.

I have asked for the policy of our State Department on this matter but it has not as yet been forthcoming. Information reaches me through the grapevine that England may continue this freezing of dollars of India for several years after the war. Lord Keynes in a memorandum I have discovered to Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau in October last said that the sterling-bloc pool should be maintained for 3 years after the war with Japan. That observation seems to be in line with the statement made by former Prime Minister Churchill who said not long ago: "Everything will be done to promote international trade, but Britain will not give up its right to safeguard her balance of payments by whatever means are necessary."

This means we would be deprived of a fertile Indian market for our goods and will mean the loss of good will for decades to come.

England, it can readily be seen, will be unable for a considerable period to supply India's demand for capital and consumer goods. I am sure the Indians do not ask for charity. They have the dollars but cannot buy. It is interesting to note that the India Supply Mission in this country had been buying in America until recently about $9,000,000 worth per month, but these purchases with the exception of a mere trickle of goods have been summarily stopped. I have before me a clipping from the Hindustan Times which reads as follows:

> Mr. K. O. Mahindra, head of the India Supply Mission, is en route to Washington to wind up his duties and await replacement before returning to India, but it is reported in Washington that the Viceroy is not in accord with his ideas of increased postwar Indo-American trade.

That clipping is highly important for what it admits as well as for what it omits.

In other words, because this Indian in his wisdom felt more goods should be purchased in the United States he was promptly asked by the British authorities to resign through the British Embassy, presided over by the same Lord Halifax who is now pleading for aid to Britain.

Very likely, Mr. Mahindra was forced to resign because he wanted to use India's surplus dollars to buy American goods.

Prior to the war, Japan was a big reservoir upon which India drew for goods and supplies. America might well be a splendid substitute after the war for that market. This is certain. England cannot supply goods to India for a number of years to come. Why should American traders in India be precluded?

What is the present position of the State Department with reference to this so-called sterling-bloc pool? I do not know. The present conferences may give as the answer.

The question might be asked, Should we offer help to the English? Answer: By all means we should offer and give help to the English, but that help must be with enlightened self-interest. There is an old saying, "Love thy neighbor, yet pull not down your hedge." We have a right to expect them to break up the sterling bloc pool that bars our trade; we have a right to ask England to dissipate her imperial preferences before she partakes of our largess and that largess should not be forthcoming unless England beyond question agrees to do those very things. If she does not do that, if she does not give us absolute assurances, I want no aid whatsoever given to Great Britain.

I think former President Hoover the other evening made a statement which it is well worth repeating with reference to Britain.

Mr. Hoover, after making 12 specific suggestions, summarizes as follows:

> We must help. We should use common sense. We should limit our help to what our taxpayers can afford. We should consider our own employment situation. We should limit our aid to the minimum necessary; we should limit it to the direct purpose of restoring their domestic needs through commodities; we should organize it so as to minimize the ill will over repayment. We should do it with the knowledge that we are doing it at a loss to ourselves but to aid

mankind to recover from the greatest disaster of all history.

In general, it seems to us, the results will be best if gifts are limited to emergency human relief and all other credits are on a fair but realistic business basis in which the borrower puts up assets.

Throughout the British Empire the casualties have been greater than ours. The figures are as follows: Britain suffered 1,427,634 casualties. Our casualties were 1,070,452. She was indeed our outer bastion. She held the fort, as it were, for several years until we were ready. I think she has a right to ask aid of us. I think we have the duty to give her aid, but I repeat that it must be done with an enlightened self-interest and on a business basis.

Frankly, the abrupt announcement by President Truman of the $42,000,000,000 lend-lease debt cancellation was generous, but was far from adroit. At one fell swoop we cast away tremendous bargaining power. Our babes-in-the-woods attitude must have made the realistic Churchill and Attlee rub their hands in glee.

But in all our enlightened generosity, call it lend-lease cancellation and all the other good things that we have in contemplation, have we not the right to expect a recognition in return. For instance, is it fair dealing for Britain to exact from the start of the war to January 1945, $11,345,390 as Suez Canal tolls on American ships redeploying fighting men and equipment to the Pacific? During the same period the United States lend-leased $9,000,000 in Panama Canal charges on British ships. That is certainly taking a nip out of the hand that feeds one. The excuse offered by Britain is lamentably weak. She seems to exculpate by saying that the canal is owned by a French company but she fails to state that Britain is the principal stockholder. A slight oversight. She begs off also by saying that the tolls must be paid in Egyptian pounds and she lacks such currency, an excuse which will not wash when one recalls, as it is inevitable, that England owns Egypt, body and soul. She could easily secure the Egyptian pounds through the sterling bloc pool.

My remarks may cause quite a fluttering in the dove-cotes but I shall not be ruffled. I am reminded of Samuel Butler's remark when criticized for his random passages. "I have left unsaid much that I am sorry I did not say, but I have said little that I am sorry for having said—and I am pretty well on the whole, thank you."

I feel the air should be cleared if we are to reach an understanding.

Someone once said Britain, in a football match, always plays courageously and fairly, but she always has her eye on the box-office receipts.

The cost of lend-lease to date is about 15 percent of the war's total cost. Lend-lease to our allies runs up to $45,000,000. Much of it has been shot away, destroyed, or consumed, but portions remain intact and will have potential peacetime value. The value of lend-lease machine tools to date has been six hundred and seventy-five million. The United Kingdom received two hundred million thereof. Their use will have a marked effect upon our future exports. We still have title to them and the right to reclaim what remains—or ask for compensation.

Much of the lend-lease goods that England now has consists of locomotives, transportation equipment, road-building apparatus, chemicals, mining machinery and planes that can be converted to civilian use. Some 58,000 machine tools were sent to Britain under lend-lease. They were later sold outright to that country at a discount and under circumstances that caused quite an outcry in Washington. The Kilgore committee has expressed marked disapproval, because it has been discovered that for a cash payment of $31,500,000 Great Britain secured these machine tools which cost $166,000,000. England found the dollars for this purchase with amazing alacrity.

We must find foreign customers to buy the products of our vast industrial machine. Ten percent of our goods must be exported, otherwise we face ruinous unemployment. We cannot do so unless the trade barriers erected against us by England and others are destroyed. England has made bilateral trade agreements with Argentine, Portugal, Denmark, Sweden and other countries and has thereby again hurt many of our exporters. She deliberately forestalls our exporters in her colonies and protectorates. These possessions and countries have sufficient dollars but England has frozen them through the medium of the sterling-bloc pool. This pool was proper during the war, but we are now at peace. In any postwar era it is as fake as the Indian rope trick.

If conditions continue, our foreign commerce will melt away. It is silly to talk of full employment if our exporting is hamstrung. Now, with President Truman's announcement, England knows our game and can checkmate us. Our pawns are gone. The administration should have known the shrewdness of the English as traders. It has been said they play the game fairly and squarely, but they are very shrewd nonetheless.

I have offered a resolution, House Resolution 341, urging the representatives of the United States now discussing financial aid to Britain with the Earl of Halifax and Lord Keynes to insist on fair practices in British trade as a condition precedent to the granting of any kind of help. I have asked that England satisfy four conditions precedent:

First. Dissolve the so-called sterling area bloc pool.

Second. Abrogate the so-called imperial preference trade barriers whereby the sterling areas are given preference-duty rates which are discriminatory against United States exporters in such areas.

Third. Give assurances there will be no devaluation of the pound sterling.

Fourth. Negotiate with its dominions, protectorates, and colonies which are now her creditors either to cancel the debts in whole or in part, thus cooperating in an effort to realize a stable world economy.

Of course, England could make it very easy for herself by devaluating the pound. She could thereby reduce to a very material degree her external debt, but it would have very serious repercussions on all those who hold English pounds. Many of our GI's in London are very fearful the pound will be devaluated and that the value of those pounds will vanish in their hands to a material degree. We want some assurance from Great Britain that she will not devaluate the pound. Furthermore, how do we know unless we are vigilant and careful but that England will take some of the money we may give to her and pay interest to her colonies on the indebtedness that she owes? We could not tolerate such a situation. We must be sure that England will call in the representatives from her dominions, codominions, protectorates, and colonies, like Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and so forth, and say to them, "We are trying to get aid from the United States. We owe you a vast sum of money. What are you going to do to help the mother country? America cannot be expected to aid without your help."

America has a right to expect, nay, America has a right to demand that Canada, South Africa, New Zealand, and the various other regions of the far-flung empire come to the aid of England. We have a right to ask England to make arrangements in that direction.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a timely editorial by Mr. I. F. Stone, which appears in today's PM under the title "Are We Dozing Off for the Next Pearl Harbor?"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OUR GI'S ABROAD

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, today I do not propose to make an official report of the overseas trip recently completed by the 11 members of the joint House committee because, in due time, I feel reasonably sure that such will be done most ably by either the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM, or the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman GEORGE DONDERO, who were unanimously elected as chairman and vice chairman, respectively, prior to our departure from Washington on July 20 to make a study of European conditions. However, in view of the current and serious problem of the demobilization of our armed forces in which we Members are vitally interested and, also, due to the fact that I served as a member of our Army during World War II, I, frankly, feel that I would be derelict in my duty to my constituents, to you, and to those millions now in our armed forces, were I not to give to you, at this time, some of our servicemen's thoughts, ideas, grievances, criticisms, and suggestions pertaining to demobilization.

Woodrow Wilson once stated:

In time of war we should not only have criticism but more criticism.

He was right about the matter. During the conduct of this war just ended, there was well-timed criticism aimed at our various constitutional departments which, in all probability, did an awful lot of good. This criticism helped to act as a balance wheel and to keep the functions of our war effort spinning in rhythm and in harmony. Along the same line of reasoning, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said:

> We do not lose our right to condemn either measures or men because the country is at war.

This was excellent and sage counsel learned over a long, useful, and illustrious life. Herbert Hoover also made the statement that:

> No public servant can be free of criticism if democracy is to continue to live.

And Jean Louis Delolme is accredited with the additional expression that:

> Sometimes a citizen by the force and perseverance of his complaints, opens the eyes of a nation.

So we must readily admit that these eminent men not only understood human nature but that they most certainly were in unanimous agreement in just what was best for our democratic form of government and our American way of life. Since there has been ample precedent established, concerning constructive criticism, I sincerely believe that it will not be out of place here for me to convey to you Members the most persistent complaints and criticisms of our War Department which have been made to me by our men in the service.

Among other things, the joint House committee which has just returned from overseas, wanted to get from the men in the service their version so as to compare it with that which was furnished to us by their commanding officers. As a result, our committee visited camp after camp, installations, posts, docks, airfields, and bases. In London, for example, we visited the Red Cross Mostyn Club which especially catered to the enlisted men. While there, on Sunday night, July 22, between the hours of 7:30 to 11:30, we made ourselves available to every enlisted man who cared to get anything off his chest. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman JAMES FULTON, a member of our committee and who served in the Navy during this war, took to a soap box and after speaking to the boys for approximately an hour, threw the meeting into an open forum to the men. While this meeting was in progress, the other members and myself talked to group after group of the boys clustered around the various parts of the assembly room. It was a real sight, if not a rare one, to see so many Members of Congress gathered into one large hall conducting, as it were, separate meetings and going all out to get the GI's slant. That such efforts upon our part were appreciated was thoroughly evidenced by the fact that we were given loud and prolonged applause and cheers from these hundreds of our overseas veterans when we finally had to break up our meeting. Not a member of the committee really wanted to leave these boys but due to the arduous itinerary scheduled to begin early the next morning, we had to get a bit of sleep.

One group with which I went into a huddle included a sergeant who made this statement: "I don't get it, sir. I've been in the Army almost 3½ years and never before has a Congressman thought enough of the GI and his problems to come and visit with us here. Generally, all you big shots go visit the officers' clubs and think you have seen our slant. Do you mean, sir, that you all came to see us because you really wanted to?" When I answered in the affirmative, another lad replied: "Thank God, we do have all right guys in Congress, after all, so help me, we do." While still another boy chimed in with: "I feel better about the whole thing, just wait until I tell this to my outfit." From these boys' own lips, I learned that they were generally displeased with the point system. I had many to tell me that they had been in the Army all the way from 2½ years to 4 years and had been overseas, in some cases, around 2 to 3 years. A vast number of these had been in many combats. This was borne out by the large number of combat stars upon their ribbons. Although this particular visit was 23 days before VJ-day had been announced officially, the all-important and unanimous question put to us was: "When do we get home?" Those over 40 wanted to get out immediately; those married desired preference; those with long service wanted priority for discharge; those with points from many combat stars advocated their immediate release. Obviously, it would be unwise to make any specific group preference as to attempt to do so would, no doubt, vastly affect the entire Army's general morale which, even then, was lower than a well digger's feet.

My many contacts with our boys have convinced me that the War Department ought to lower the present point score to 35, with no mention of age. By such action every enlisted man who, personally, complained to me throughout all of Europe and those from whom I have received letters either directly or indirectly from the Pacific would be far more pleased. Such a move, if made immediately by the War Department, in my judgment, would act as a shot in the arm to the present critically ill morale of the men in the services. A reduction to 35 points would recognize those unfortunate lads who were wounded in action and, as a result, through no fault of their own, have not been able to accumulate sufficient points for release. My attention was called by one veteran to a case wherein one boy had been wounded three times in actual combat. Notwithstanding this he was sent back to the front lines twice. The third time he was hit by the enemy and when he had recovered sufficiently to leave the hospital his physical condition necessitated his assignment to first echelon or light work to the rear of the lines. As a result all of his buddies in his old outfit who were physically able to carry on in further combat acquired enough points to be eligible to come home, while that three-times wounded American boy was forced to remain overseas with his thoughts. Of course our Army gave this boy the finest treatment known to medical science while he was wounded; such speaks for itself when he was able to survive three separate wounds, but the fact remains that such a man should not be penalized by being denied extra points or a reduction in needed ones when he has spilled his blood three times for you and for me. By the same token, lowering the points to 35 would help those men who were forced to suffer not only the deep humiliation of surrender but who had to live in the hell holes of the prison camps of Germany and Japan. This reduction in points would not only be justice to these gallant boys but would be received, likewise, as a little ray of sunshine into their troubled hearts and minds.

In agreement with my conviction that the point system should be lowered, came a long, well-written letter to my office, dated September 5, signed by a group of young pre-Pearl Harbor draftees. This letter consisted of five typewritten pages but can be summed up by stating that their unanimous belief was that the many present inequities in the point system could be eliminated by lowering the critical point score. They much preferred this method to any further lowering of the age bracket, and went on to say:

> A considerable number of us young men who have served 4 and 5 years in the Army and who have served overseas for over a year do not have enough points to be eligible for early release. Many of us have served more than 4 years overseas and as a prisoner of war under conditions almost unbearable. Yet our point score, without dependents, is such that we are ineligible for release for some time.

Therefore, gentlemen, we can see that there is every reason and need to demand that the War Department lower the bracket on points immediately. The present critical point-score system is far too slow, wholly inadequate, and, according to the men themselves, most unsatisfactory.

In all fairness to the War Department, I believe that you are entitled to know that our men, wherever they were seen on this recent trip, were obviously well fed, clothed, and kept. The fact of the matter is, our boys stood out like the Washington Monument in comparison with other Allied soldiers in their dress and appearance. Our inspection of the many camps, posts, air fields, and bases convinced me at least that the War Department had done a magnificent job in caring for the men as they had in winning the war itself. Upon this matter of food, quarters, and care, I am happy to report to Congress that I did not receive one single complaint or criticism from any enlisted men. If the War Department would tackle demobilization in the same zealous manner, and with the same determination, this job of returning the veterans would not be half so difficult. Frankly, I am not yet convinced that the War Department wants to be in any hurry about reducing our present Army of over 8,000,000.

In order to give you Members of Congress additional information as to just how low the morale overseas is, for instance, in Belgium, I met with an old friend of mine whom I had known for

years. He was a sergeant and he told me that the men had nothing to do but loaf. He said to me: "If you could be here and could be freed from your heavy schedule prepared by the Army, I could play golf with you every day, all day long, and never be missed from the outfit." Many in his outfit have been in the service since 1940, having come in with old National Guard units. Quite a few had been overseas from 18 months to 3 years and had an excess of the required number of points. He told me, in all sincerity, that one-quarter of the then present strength could do the necessary job assigned to his organization.

On September 10 I received from a GI pal of mine in the Army here in the States a letter in which he cited present conditions in an Army post office. This friend, a private, first class, went on to say that the boys worked only a 3-hour tour of duty. I took the following paragraph from his letter, in which he said:

> The officers always seem to know when an inspector is coming around and will let the mail accumulate for 2 tours of duty so that the day tour will always be caught busy. They are even sending about 100 men weekly to Fort ——— for basic training in order to get them out of the way of each other.

A Wave, lieutenant, junior grade, from my district, came into my office last week and told me that she had applied for a discharge. She advised me that her job had been completed and that she had nothing to do. Nevertheless, she said that her application had been denied by the Bureau of Navy Personnel. What need do we now have for the services of these fine young girls whose sole purpose of induction was to release a man for combat? Many with whom I have talked want to get back home, and, notwithstanding the fact that they are no longer needed, their requests for release are being daily denied. The men whom these girls replaced are now either picking up cigarette butts or cutting grass with bayonets.

GI's assigned to those many overseas camps also told me that their promotions had been frozen and that there was no opportunity for them to acquire an additional stripe, whereas, on the other hand, increases in rank among the officers were still most prevalent. I had many of these boys to tell me that inasmuch as the war was over they thought that if a policy were adopted to reduce rank among officers rather than to promote them the brass might not be so anxious to remain in the service themselves and would therefore expedite the release of the men under them.

Having served as an enlisted man myself, some 21 years ago in the Navy, and having been an officer in the Army in World War No. 2 I can readily appreciate the fact that none of our enlisted men have the right, due to Army regulations, to voice their grievances in regard to any policy adopted by the War Department. In other words, they cannot knock on doors or ring bells to seek an audience with the appropriate brass in order to express their objection to the multiplicity of Army red tape and to make known their many complaints and criticism of conditions which are peculiar to a GI only.

On Monday of this week, I received a letter from an overseas GI who is from my home town and, among other things, he went on to say that:

> Our Army headquarters is in ——— Germany, and you ought to see the big fine cars and high and mighty brass hats here. It will tickle me and all the rest of us GI's when they all get back to their filling stations. You can bet they will try to keep their jobs as long as possible regardless of how many men they have to hold over here to make their job legitimate.

This lad complained that the Army had just issued a regulation stating that GI's would be entitled to only one trophy firearm per individual, notwithstanding the fact that thousands of the other men had been allowed the privilege of taking several German-make pistol home with them. His remarks upon this were:

> I suppose they think that they are preventing future crime but they should take the individual into consideration. Being a gun collector myself, I believe that I have earned this addition to my collection, especially when they were bought and paid for by me.

There is, at the present time, a critical shortage of doctors in my district and throughout the Nation. I have several towns which are wholly without medical aid. Midwives are being used to bring babies into the world and, yet, while I was in Italy recently, I had several friends of mine who are in the Medical Corps to tell me that they have nothing to do now that the sick and wounded have been evacuated to the States, but to sit and twiddle their thumbs. In England, our committee visited one hospital which had a full staff of nurses and doctors, but not one patient. It was explained to us that all had been transferred away and that the hospital building was being turned over to the British and that the entire staff was to be transferred to another assignment. No doubt this was true; I do not deny that it is, but there is no earthly reason now why the Medical Corps should hoard so many vitally needed doctors. A surgeon friend recently called me by long distance and told me that his little staff of three doctors had been struck like a cyclone, in that one had suffered a stroke, the other had just dropped dead in his tracks at the office, and that he himself had been cautioned to quit or he, too, would suffer the same reward. He was begging me to help him get out of the service a young major who had served with him prior to his induction into the Army. I immediately wrote to the Surgeon General about the matter, giving the true facts in the case and, to date, I have heard nothing.

Another doctor friend of mine whose discharge had been approved had to wait for weeks to have his separation from the service effected simply because of the indifference of the commanding officer. He advised me that there were doctors throughout the States who have just returned from combat and who are in reassembly areas, bases, and posts just sitting around cooling their heels, either waiting to get new assignments or to be discharged. He said that some of the docs were so thoroughly disgusted and discouraged that several had actually become patients themselves. This particular doctor is unassuming, quiet, and conservative, and when he says that the thing reeks of putrification, I want you to know that it really must.

At the outset of my talk, I stated that I thought that constructive criticism was good if used in the right manner. In furtherance of just that attitude upon my part, I believe that you will be interested in a letter which I received only yesterday from a friend of mine whom I had the pleasure of chatting with in Europe recently. He is an officer in the Adjutant General's Division. Among other things in his letter, he made the following very pertinent remark:

> We all have been very busy here in the Adjutant General's section with redeployment, as they are now going after it here in this theater tooth and tongs. With all the men having to go back who have in excess of 80 points and Wacs with 41 points and over, besides all those over 35 years, we are really on the run but it is the only way to get the thing done and to get the boys out of here. It seems to me that some pressure has been brought to bear since you and your joint committee Members of Congress came over here and proved to them that you meant business.

After our group had reached Berlin and had received the glorious news of VJ-day, then the complaints "When do we get home?" really started to pour in upon us.

Many boys literally covered over with combat ribbons and stars made it very plain to me that prior to VJ-day they had been willing to accept additional responsibility by going to the Pacific. They said, however, that inasmuch as the war had ceased, they resented the redeployment which was then taking place daily. They gave as their reasons their long and numerous battle participations and the vast number of points which they had accumulated. Incidentally, it was quite common to find boys who had from 126 to 153 points.

With this in mind, immediately upon my return from overseas, on August 25, I wrote to the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War, stating that the morale of the men was very low and I strongly urged that, in view of such violent reaction among the men, such practice should cease. I am happy to call to your attention that his good letter, dated September 10, in answer to mine, contained the following paragraph:

> With regard to the Ninety-fifth Division, you unquestionably are familiar with the announcement made on September 6 that, in conformance with a recommendation received from General MacArthur, no divisions, as such, will be sent to the Pacific theater except the Eighty-sixth and Ninety-seventh, which are already at sea, and the Thirteenth Air-Borne Division. The movement of other units affected, including the Ninety-fifth Division, has been canceled.

I am very happy to know that the War Department has now decided that it will not be necessary in the future to ship any more of our battle-weary veterans from one theater to another. They are to be congratulated upon this splendid service which they were able to work out in just 16 days, and I sincerely hope that this job of demobilization will receive the

same amount of time, energy, concern, and results.

There was one feature of my letter to Secretary Stimson, pertaining to selective service which was not answered to my satisfaction. My complaint was that farmers were still being drafted in complete violation and disregard of the Tydings amendment which specifically reads that no farmer shall be drafted if he is: First, necessary to an agricultural occupation; second, regularly engaged in it; third, it is necessary; and fourth, replacements cannot be found. Mr. Stimson merely stated in regard to this particular paragraph of my letter that:

> With respect to the induction of farmers, also mentioned in your letter, this concerns the Selective Service System, an agency entirely independent of the War Department, I therefore cannot properly comment on this aspect of your letter.

Technically this may be an independent agency of the War Department, but the gentleman who is in charge of it is a major general of the Regular Army by the name of Hershey, but whose disposition toward the farmers of America belies the sweet connotation of his name when it comes to any attempt on his part even to try to understand the problems attendant upon the severe shortage of our farm manpower.

Due to this extremely serious problem of lack of manpower on farms, I again wrote Secretary Stimson, under date of September 6, requesting that emergency furloughs of 60 to 90 days be granted to farmers in the armed forces so that the present crops which are in actual jeopardy could be harvested. I explained that our farmers were really suffering untold hardships as a result of insufficient farm labor. I cited cases where the farmers of my district in Kentucky were physically unable to cope with the necessary farm work. That many were ill, some needed operations, while others had suffered strokes due to long hours and constant overwork. I tried as best I could to paint the true picture as it now exists, saying that all-out production on the farms was quite necessary at this time, so that we here in America could do what we could toward selling food to hungry Europe in an effort to help alleviate the present suffering, misery, and hunger found in that part of a war-torn world. I stated further that unless the American farmer is given manpower relief and food is made available, we will surely fail miserably in our contribution toward a lasting peace. I even expressed the fear that in some of those countries which had been overridden by Germany someone else might come along with a loud, hoarse voice and a big bass drum and organize in such a way that would put Hitler and Mussolini to shame, because it is a known fact that we simply cannot teach the American way of life or democracy on an empty stomach and expect them to understand.

I wish to make public, at this time, the fact that the requests of servicemen for furloughs to return to their farms for emergency crop harvesting have been denied even without consideration. Recently, a farmer in my district wrote me that his son had filed application for a discharge, supporting his claim with affidavits proving that his father had, not one, but three farms consisting of 670 acres, with over 100 head of cattle, 150 head of hogs, and that, further, the father was in poor health and had spent the greater part of last year in the hospital. When this evidence was presented to the commanding officer, the GI was told to tell his dad that if he could not get help to sell his farms.

Many of our farmers concluded their letters explaining their pitiful plight to me by saying: "If some relief is not granted to us immediately, we will be forced either to sell or abandon our farms completely." Yet, with all of this shortage of farm labor, I have veterans coming into my office telling me that they are forced to walk around in our camps here in the States and pick up cigarette butts in order to occupy their time.

By the way, did any of you gentlemen ever have to pick up cigarette butts other than possibly in your own home? Well, I have. I was forced to do it in the Navy as an enlisted man back in 1924 and, frankly, I did not like it. No self-respecting man would like doing this because it rather hurts one's pride. It did mine, even as a kid 16 years old. Notwithstanding the fact that such is bad for morale, especially when you are not doing it as punishment, the War Department continues to let this thing go on.

Gentlemen of the House, if this speech will aid just one deserving boy to get home 1 hour earlier or help one farmer to get back to the farm on leave, or procure for just one town that badly needed doctor, I shall rejoice.

According to recent press reports, the War Department has released figures estimating that approximately 500,000 men will be needed for policing Germany and Europe, 900,000 for Japan, and 600,000 for reserves here in the United States. For the sake of argument, let us then assume that these figures, totaling 2,000,000 men, are correct. If this be true, then the difference between the 8,000,000 men now in the Army and the 2,000,000 needed by the War Department leaves us 6,000,000 which can justifiably be recognized as surplus on hand. Even as late as yesterday morning there were headlines in the Washington Post stating that word had just been received from General MacArthur that only 200,000 men would be required to occupy Japan, inasmuch as the job there was progressing so well, due to the fact that the Japanese people were far more inclined to cooperate than was originally anticipated. Should this report materialize, then there would be an additional 700,000 extra strength, or a total of 6,700,000 surplus men in the Army who should be discharged and sent home. In yesterday's press release, dealing with this additional contemplated reduction of men in the Pacific, it was revealed that the State Department was startled and apparently somewhat confused. If the State Department is confused, then I wonder in what sort of a dilemma this leaves the American public—knowing that there are now 6,700,000 surplus men in the Army, according to War Department figures.

At the present time, according to figures brought out in a Senate committee hearing by Senator JOHNSON through General Henry, of the War Department, 600,000 men have been discharged by the Army since VE-day, but some 300,000 have been drafted right back into the service, and our veterans are not any nearer home.

I get a smile out of some of the press releases which state that the Army considers the job of immediate demobilization impossible. During the war, there was a very appropriate motto adopted in many headquarters throughout the Army which displayed their determination to win the war and to get the job done. As I recall, this slogan of which they were so proud, ran something like this: "The difficult we do immediately; the impossible takes a little time." With all fairness to the War and Navy Departments—this spirit which was manifested upon their part won the war. Nothing was impossible for them to do. For that reason I am now convinced that if they set their heads to speed up this job of demobilization, it could be done in short order. I believe the difficulty lies in the fact that they really have not set their heads to do it.

The argument is advanced that there are not enough ships available. If this is true, then why not use and convert a few of the now idle battleships, destroyers, cruisers, carriers, and other Navy vessels to be found in the Pacific and elsewhere? We probably would be told that this could not be done due to the huge complement of Navy men now aboard such craft. Well, the answer to this, no doubt, is to encourage a little discharging in the Navy also, and we probably would then have room on these ships to use them as temporary transports. We might be able to use a few of those Navy air transport command planes which are now hauling sand bags back and forth across the continent in a desperate effort, due to lack of passengers, to maintain their schedule of 13 regular daily flights from New York through Kansas on to California. Then, too, we might have been able to use some of those fifty-odd American B–24's, B–25's, and B–17's which I saw with my own eyes at Prestwick, Scotland, but which, unfortunately, had been allowed to remain on the ground at that airport in the open weather for over 14 months. As a result of this neglect, these American planes had rusted and rotted away to such an extent that when our joint House committee came back through that airport only a few days later men were actually breaking these planes up and throwing them into a scrap heap. If there was an excuse for these planes, costing from $500,000 to $750,000 each, or a total of over $25,000,000, being allowed so wantonly to disintegrate, then I should like to know what it is. Incidentally, I wonder just how many more of our planes were in the same condition on the hundreds of other British airfields.

In order to expedite the immediate release of the some 6,000,000 men now in the service, I would suggest that if the Army does not have sufficient personnel to complete their discharges, that the men who would be eligible with the 35

points advocated herein, be given indefinite leaves of absences or be immediately placed in an inactive reserve status until such time as the necessary red tape could be wound up sufficiently to make possible their final discharge. Likewise, I would like to advocate that the War and Navy Departments release forthwith all men who have served as prisoners of war and who received wounds in action for which they have been awarded the Purple Heart, regardless of the number of points which these particular men may now have.

It would be a pity if our War and Navy Departments, after having done such a magnificent job in winning the war, were to place themselves, at this time, in a position to further justify the adverse criticism now being leveled at them by the American people.

This is not a militaristic nation and it is not a healthy condition for a democracy to allow any one organization to become too powerful. This very thing folded up Germany, Japan, and Italy. Most assuredly, we should have a sufficient Army for protection but let us be careful that it is not overdone—because overstrength could develop into as serious a hazard as an inadequate Army. Let us balance the scales.

To sum up my remarks, I would like to give you a little parody of mine which seems pertinent to the subject:

I

Workin' in my office,
I lathered into a foam,
Readin' letters from GI's
Entitled to come home.

II

Made a trip to Europe
Which started lots of noise,
But came back with the facts
Gathered from the boys.

III

The war is over, Congress;
That I shall repeat—
Grab the reins from the brass,
Climb in the driver's seat.

CHORUS

Ship the millions home, Judge,
Ship the millions home;
Order the chair-borne divisions
To ship the millions home.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I certainly am very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the constructive stand taken by my distinguished colleague from Kentucky on the speedy demobilization of our Army and Navy forces. I agree with him heartily.

It is a pleasure to have the former servicemen of this war like the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] rise to the occasion, and assume the responsibility when the servicemen and their families and communities need a champion.

As a Navy serviceman from this war, who is a member of the opposition party, I support the gentleman from Kentucky in his efforts, and will be glad to assist him in his fine work toward efficient and fair demobilization.

Mr. CHELF. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman for his very excellent speech. It seemed to me to be very logical and well thought out. There are many suggestions contained therein which I believe ought to be carried out as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. CHELF. I appreciate the kind statement of the gentleman from California and thank him very much.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], in saying that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] made a very fine and excellent speech.

Mr. CHELF. I thank the gentleman.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me for today be vacated and that I be granted the same time for Friday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me for today be transferred to Friday to follow the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the war has ended. Except for the small number of men needed for occupational purposes, all armed forces created under the Selective Service Act should be immediately demobilized and returned to their homes as quickly as possible.

The emergency upon which the Conscription Act was predicated has disappeared, for both Germany and Japan have been utterly crushed and have unconditionally surrendered. Therefore, there is no reason why the Congress should not immediately declare the war ended and proceed with legislation to establish a volunteer Regular Army and Navy of sufficient size to meet our occupational requirements in the conquered countries. Certainly occupational military duty in conquered countries is a responsibility of a regular standing Army and Navy rather than the duty of a conscripted Army. And I believe there are sufficient patriotic men and women in the United States to meet these needs if there is any merit to the proposition of our occupying these conquered countries.

If this Government cannot raise such a voluntary Regular Army and Navy, the country and the soldier should be made to realize as soon as possible the true facts of the situation confronting us.

Without doubt a strong effort is being made by certain powerful groups to retain the so-called Selective Service Act and permanently force conscription upon the Nation. To conscript our young men for occupational duty in the defeated countries, or to in any manner police the world, is slavery of the worst sort and certainly is unconstitutional. The American people must firmly set themselves against the continuation of such policy.

General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, is reported to have publicly stated: "It is cheaper to keep men in the Army than it is to set up an agency to take care of them when they are released."

General Hershey could have made this statement only on the basis that he fears the ending of the war will bring great unemployment and that he believes the men should be forced to stay in the Army in order to ameliorate this situation. Though he stated this to be his personal opinion it is hardly likely that any high ranking military officer would utter such an expression without the sanction of the powers above. Also, over a year ago Secretary of the Interior Ickes recommended to the President a plan to reemploy returning soldiers on a public works program. Hitler used precisely the tactics suggested by General Hershey and Secretary Ickes to relieve unemployment in Germany.

In my opinion only the growing demand by the soldiers, their wives, parents, and the public in general, for the immediate demobilization of the armed forces will prevent the powers that be in Washington from putting this alien policy into effect.

I have introduced two bills—H. R. 4105 and H. R. 4106: One to put into operation immediately a program for demobilizing the armed forces created under the Conscription Act and to replace such personnel as may be temporarily needed in occupational zones with volunteers; and the other to terminate immediately the Conscription Act of 1940 as amended and to stop further induction under this act.

H. R. 4105, which does not apply to the Regular Army and Navy, provides for the discharge of all married persons from the military and naval forces of the United States as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit; of every soldier who has any person wholly dependent upon him for support; of any soldier who has attained the age of 26 years; of every soldier who has served in combat; of every soldier who has served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska for 6 months or more.

H. R. 4105 reads as follows:

A bill to direct the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be discharged from, or released from active duty in, the military and naval forces of the United States, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit, every member of such forces who—

(a) Has on the date of enactment of this act a wife or a child or children with whom he maintains (or would but for his service maintain) a bona fide family relationship in his home;

(b) Has on the date of enactment of this act any person wholly dependent upon him for support;

(c) Has attained on the date of enactment of this act or shall hereafter attain the age of 26 years;

(d) Has been officially credited with participating in combat service during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945; or

(e) Has performed active service outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska for 6 months, and ending September 2, 1945.

This section shall not apply to members of the Regular Military and Naval Establishments.

SEC. 2. Not later than 6 months after September 2, 1945, all persons serving with the forces of occupation maintained by the United States in either the European or Pacific area shall be members of the Regular Military and Naval Establishments.

H. R. 4106 reads as follows:

A bill to stop induction under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That after the date of enactment of this act no person shall be inducted for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] be permitted to address the House tomorrow for 30 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

OUR GI'S ABROAD AND THE BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we have listened to two very fine speeches here, one by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF]. I undertook to say so a few minutes ago. I am sure all of us have benefited by the remarks that these gentlemen have made. The other talk to which I was privileged to listen was by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I found that highly interesting because there was a lot of propaganda carried on to have this Congress pass the Bretton Woods agreement and pass it promptly. We were assured that the salvation of the world would be guaranteed when that was done. I want to say the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] indicated that some of us may have been fooled very, very much when the time came to act on that measure. I was really amazed at the statements that he had to make. I hope that every Member who was not present and did not have an opportunity to hear the discourse of the gentleman from New York concerning the way that Great Britain is trying to have this country continue to act as Santa Claus will read his challenging remarks. I am sure the statements he made are true. I would make the very mild suggestion to those in authority that they had better tell the people in the European theater, the Far East, and other war theaters that this war is over; that the United States of America in full measure has done everything she could to win the war, and that the time has passed when other countries, Allies or otherwise, can expect the American people to act as Santa Claus in the future as this country has always acted in the past.

I do not mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that we should not extend sympathy and that we should not extend relief to the suffering people and to the unfortunate people across the water in the European area and in those other countries. Certainly we should do all we can do. But, while we are doing that, and while we are listening to the voices of the "do-gooders," those people who would give America away in order to make somebody else happy, and forget all about the American people, the problems in this country, the problems of our people, and the numerous things that take place here to make life a burden to many of the American people, we should say to those "do-gooders" who forget all those things: You had better begin to give consideration to the fact that the American people want to live their own way of life. They want to preserve and protect their own economy. They do not want to give away our own resources or shoulder the burdens of the rest of the world. Great Britain take notice. Our people do not want to interfere in the lives and habits and economies of other people who have different standards of life, different ways of living, different problems which require solution, different from the problems that confront the American people."

So I say, read the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and then ask yourselves the question if we had not better examine all these legislative proposals very, very carefully.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] has expired.

IMPROVEMENT OF CERTAIN HARBORS IN THE INTEREST OF COMMERCE AND NAVIGATION

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4083) authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following works of improvement for navigation are hereby adopted and authorized, to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans recommended in the reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth in said documents, and also subject to the proviso in section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, relating to the time when appropriations shall be made for the prosecution of the projects adopted in said act:

Savannah Harbor, Ga., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 227, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session;

Two Harbors (Agate Bay Harbor), Minn., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 805, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of all business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, my colleague the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 397. An act to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939–41; and

S. 1045. An act to provide for pay and allowances and transportation and subsistence of personnel discharged or released from the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard because of under age at the time of enlistment, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Thursday, September 20, 1945, Subcommittee No. III of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue the hearings on H. R. 2357, to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended. The hearing will be held in room 346, House Office Building, and will begin at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m., on Tuesday, September 25, 1945, on H. R. 2202, in room 362, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, September 27, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1751, to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Merchant Marine Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

682. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

683. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

684. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Twelfth Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration covering its operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 268); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

685. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a survey entitled "The Aluminum Industry"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4103. A bill reducing certain appropriations available in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. R. 4124. A bill to provide for approval of the United States-Canadian agreement dated March 19, 1941, for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4125. A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 4126. A bill to stop for 90 days inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and require certain surveys by the Secretaries of War and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4127. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 4128. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 3-cent piece; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 4129. A bill to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 4130. A bill to increase the minimum wage rate under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to 65 cents an hour; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 4131. A bill designating the 2d day of September in each year as Victory Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 4132. A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of those members of the armed forces desiring to resume their education or training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4133. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, to aid reconversion and stimulate employment of younger persons by encouraging older employees to retire; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 4134. A bill to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, to provide space at the central and field offices of the Veterans' Administration for paid full-time representatives of organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McGLINCHEY:

H. R. 4135. A bill to provide for the discharge of fathers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution to establish the Peace Division in the Department of State with an Assistant Secretary of State for Peace at the head thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. J. Res. 243. Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George C. Marshall, and the members of the Army of the United States, who have fought under his direction during the wars; and providing that the President of the United States shall cause a medal to be struck to be presented to General Marshall in the name of the people of the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGLINCHEY:

H. J. Res. 244. Joint resolution to provide for the discharge of members of the armed forces who have served 18 months overseas and those who have had three consecutive years of service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4136. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award a Congressional Medal of Honor to Maj. Gen. Claire Lee Chennault of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4137. A bill for the relief of Olympia F. Kern; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4138. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Gordon; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4139. A bill for the relief of John J. Noonan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VORYS of Ohio:

H. R. 4140. A bill for the relief of Matt E. Saylor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4141. A bill for the relief of Piombo Bros. & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN:

H. R. 4142. A bill for the relief of Johnnie V. Nations; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1174. By Mr. GEELAN: Resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of New Haven, Conn., urging immediate congressional adoption of a reconversion and postwar program; the passage of the Murray-Wagner full employment bill; the Kilgore emergency unemployment compensation bill; the Wagner-Murray health and social security program; a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee; and liberalization of the GI bill of rights; also, the maintenance and more rigid enforcement of price and rent control until goods which are now scarce become adequate in supply; a reduction of taxes on lower incomes; inauguration of a national program of low-cost housing and public works. Resolution submitted by Charles Henchel, city clerk; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1175. By Mr. IZAC: Petition to Members of United States Congress of both Senate and House of Representatives from citizens of San Diego, Calif., to pay tribute to veterans of the Civil War and to honor our new heroes who gave their lives for our country by voting for the purchase of Temple Heights as set forth in House bill 2210 and Senate Joint Resolution 35; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, September 10, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who commandest the morning, into whose merciful and guiding hand we commit our wills and our work in confidence and calm, open our ears, we beseech Thee, to hear the call of far horizons and the stirring trumpets of challenge sounding the advance to a new era for mankind. Make us alive and alert to the spiritual values which underlie all the struggle of these epic days. With a sense of empty futility, we confess our utter inability to save our souls and our world by our own lifting.

In these exhausting days, replenish the secret springs of our parched hearts with the water of life, expand our understanding and our sympathy until the whole earth is our fatherland and all humanity our care. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, September 19, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 520. An act to facilitate settlement of returning veterans on farms in projects constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation; and

H. R. 4083. An act authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 374. An act to amend the act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce"; and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Crugers-on-Hudson, near Peekskill, N. Y., as "Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital."

RECORDING OF REAL PROPERTY OWNERSHIP AND TRANSFER IN ALASKA

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, before the Senator does that I should like to have the attention of both the majority and minority floor leaders in order that I may propose a unanimous-consent request and ask permission to have considered a bill which relates to the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the reason I am making this rather extraordinary request is that there is a deadline which will expire on the 22d of this month, and if the bill is to be passed it must be acted upon before that time.

Briefly, in explanation of the bill, I will say that there has never been a system of indexing or recording titles in the Territory of Alaska. The Territorial Legislature at its last session provided for such a system, but it also requested the utilization of the existing Federal facilities in the Territory under the General Land Office until such time as the Territory of Alaska could set up its own system. That is briefly what the bill proposes. It affects only the Territory of Alaska. The Delegate from Alaska is very anxious that the bill be acted upon, and the deadline of 6 months fixed by the Territorial Legislature will expire on the 22d of this month. I may say that it is a House bill and has passed the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3686) to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the registers of the land offices in Alaska to perform functions under the Alaska real property ownership declaration law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Mexico if the bill has come with a report from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs?

Mr. HATCH. It has been reported by the Committee on Public Lands, and it is approved and recommended by the Department of the Interior, which is in charge of the office which will be affected. The bill will involve no cost to the Federal Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Andrews	Hart	Myers
Austin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hawkes	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Capehart	La Follette	Taylor
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McCarran	Tobey
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Connally	McFarland	Vandenberg
Cordon	McKellar	Wagner
Donnell	McMahon	Walsh
Downey	Magnuson	Wheeler
Ellender	Maybank	Wherry
Ferguson	Mead	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Mitchell	Willis
Gerry	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MEMORIAL TO FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution in the form of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, drafted by Mrs. Jesse Andrews, committeewoman from the Sixteenth Senatorial District of the Texas Democratic Executive Committee and adopted at the meeting of the Texas Democratic Executive Committee held in Austin, Tex., August 18, 1945.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is an aristocracy of democracy. It was from this aristocracy of democracy that Franklin Delano Roosevelt came forth.

All truly great men are aristocrats. They are nobly born. Indeed, they are born of spirit. Really great men are humble men, and their rare gifts and talents do not set them apart from their fellows; rather, have they learned to find their own in another's good. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was one of this world's truly great and noble men.

During 12 soul-trying years our brave captain was seeking to build an ever stronger and stronger bulwark of American democracy. He knew he must follow the way of progress that a changing world and a fast growing Nation demanded.

Some of our people were unwilling and afraid to travel uncharted seas but our captain steered us through dark and turbulent waters into calm seas and a safe haven.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt early learned to listen and listening he heard the heart beat of humanity. Every man was his brother, and he called all men "My friends."

We who knew the real measure of this true lover of democracy take comfort in the thought that Franklin Delano Roosevelt's ceaseless labors for the "forgotten man" in our own and every land were fitting him to dwell in the company of those immortals—Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson—who before him had dedicated their lives to the mighty tasks of this great Nation of free people.

America's great war President was a truly devout man—a firm believer in prayer. His D-day prayer for his country's fighting men on land and sea, like Lincoln's address at Gettysburg, will be remembered for all time.

Because he was a God-loving man Franklin Delano Roosevelt loved his brother also. With deep human understanding hope kindled in his breast and grew ever brighter and brighter as he worked for the liberation of oppressed peoples wherever they might be in the world.

His body encased in steel, enduring great suffering with patience, fortitude, and a joyous heart, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, America's stanch advocate of peace, held to his high purpose with little thought that he was spending himself.

It is written: "Rest is not quitting the busy career. Rest is the fitting of self to its sphere." Franklin Delano Roosevelt's life and work fitted him for immortality and our gallant leader has now entered into his perfect rest.

Whereas our beloved Commander in Chief has passed beyond our mortal sight and the "kindly light" of a tender loving Father has gently led him through the gloom and into the glorious company of the immortals: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of this executive committee who loved him and now mourn for him, join with the lovers of peace in our own and every land to bless the name of America's great builder of peace and God's noble son, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1129. A bill for the relief of Willie H. Johnson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 569);

S. 1231. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Tacy; without amendment (Rept. No. 573);

H. R. 1089. A bill for the relief of Albert Cantalupo; with an amendment (Rept. No. 570);

H. R. 1849. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ora R. Hutchinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 574);

H. R. 2545. A bill for the relief of Florida Rhone Burch; with amendments (Rept. No. 571); and

H. R. 2737. A bill for the relief of Clara Black; with amendments (Rept. No. 572).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 801. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon; with amendments (Rept. No. 575); and

H. R. 2317. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia M. Kiser; without amendment (Rept. No. 576).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 779. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells; with an amendment (Rept. No. 577);

H. R. 213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth C. Stone; without amendment (Rept. No. 578); and

H. R. 3081. A bill for the relief of August Svelund; without amendment (Rept. No. 579).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Michael C. Donatell; without amendment (Rept. No. 580); and

H. R. 1958. A bill for the relief of L. A. Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 581).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. II OF REPT. NO. 565)

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I have prepared minority views in connection with the pending bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes. Unfortunately, they were not filed. I now ask unanimous consent to submit them and that they be printed together with a technical supplement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the minority views submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be received and printed as requested.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1415. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1416. A bill for the relief of Sherman W. White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1417. A bill to protect trade-mark owners, producers, distributors, and the general public in the District of Columbia against injurious and uneconomic practices in the distribution of competitive commodities bearing a distinguishing trade-name, brand, or name, through the use of voluntary contracts establishing minimum resale prices and providing for refusal to sell unless such minimum resale prices are observed; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 1418. A bill to authorize the payment of certain sums to jobbers in connection with their logging of timber for the Menominee Indians on the Menominee Reservation during the logging season 1934–35; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. McMAHON (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. TUNNELL) introduced Senate bill 1419, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1420. A bill to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MEDIATION AND ARBITRATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill which seeks to reduce industrial strife between management and labor by the extension and strengthening of the principles of free collective bargaining and the voluntary mediation and arbitration of labor disputes. I am happy to say that I have the honor to be joined in the introduction of this bill by the distinguished senior Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL]. I think this morning's newspaper, with its stories of impending strikes in the auto industry, makes clear the importance of the question dealt with by this bill. Clearly, Congress must make sure it has provided every possible aid in the settlement of labor-management disputes without imposing a strait-jacket equally abhorrent to labor and management. Were this bill in effect today, and the means it provides for the settlement of disputes were available now, I would expect and hope that the Detroit strike situation would not have its present serious potentialities.

It was because I saw such disputes in the offing as that in the auto industry that I began the intensive study of this question last spring. The bill which we have introduced grew out of a series of discussions with leading governmental, labor, and management officials. In the several weeks prior to the adjournment of the Senate I had thorough discussions of the problems of industrial relations with George Taylor, chairman of the War Labor Board, with the members of the National Labor Relations Board, with the officials of the War Production Board's Labor Division, with Frances Perkins when she was still Secretary of Labor, with Paul McNutt, chairman of the War Manpower Commission, with William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, and with Ira Mosher, of the National Association of Manufacturers. Philip Murray, of the CIO, and Eric Johnston, of the Chamber of Commerce, were invited to these discussions but were unable to attend. These discussions were held as executive hearings before a Subcommittee on Labor Management Relations of the Senate Small Business Committee. They were held as closed sessions because I felt that this problem needed quiet study and reflection—that if agreement were to be achieved it could best be done in informal discussions rather than in open hearings where the participants would be considering carefully the public positions they were assuming.

Nothing of a revolutionarily new nature will be found in this bill. It does not seek to achieve the utopia of industrial peace overnight. It does not establish a totalitarian framework of compulsions within which to bury the American traditions of freedom cherished by labor and management alike.

The first principle of the bill which we have introduced is that the vast majority of labor disputes can be settled through the free exercise of collective bargaining. Nothing should be done which would impede this process and force disputes into bureaucratic channels for settlement. The docket of the War Labor Board, piled high with an accumulating load of unsettled disputes, should serve as a warning to us of the dangers of a too rigid government machinery replacing free collective bargaining. Therefore, the bill which we have proposed introduces no new hurdles to labor-management agreement, and assumes that the vast majority of the disputes which arise will be settled through the agreement of the parties without recourse to strikes or lockouts.

But the bill does leave to chance alone the settlement of that minority of disputes which threaten to flame into prolonged strikes or lock-outs. Rather it establishes a Division of Mediation and Conciliation in the Department of Labor, where it properly belongs, to use its offices in the conciliation and mediation of labor-management disputes. Our bill would elevate the United States Conciliation Service to a new dignity and emphasize its importance as a major function of the Department of Labor. As a further step in this direction, the bill transfers the experts of the War Labor Board Disputes Division to the Division of Conciliation and Mediation, thereby salvaging in the interests of postwar harmony the splendid experience gained in the settlement of wartime disputes. Moreover, the bill frees the Department of Labor from the salary restrictions of the Classification Act in the hiring of expert conciliators and mediators. The salaries paid conciliators should be high enough to attract personnel capable of dealing effectively on a basis of mutual respect with executives of billion-dollar corporations and leaders of powerful national unions. Penny pinching which may impair the Government's ability to settle strikes and lock-outs and thereby lose millions in purchasing power is false economy of the worst kind. This bill provides the basis for a strong Division of Conciliation and Mediation capable of aiding the parties to settle many disputes.

However, many disputes cannot be settled by the techniques of conciliation and mediation. Accordingly, the bill provides for the establishment of a United States Board of Arbitration, whose services will be available whenever both parties to a dispute find it desirable to submit their case. In many instances, conciliation and mediation will reduce the area of conflict to one or two points which can then be referred to this Board by the voluntary action of the disputants for final settlement.

No shotgun marriages between labor and management are provided by this bill. However, once there has been a voluntary marriage through voluntary arbitration, there is no provision for easy

divorce. Arbitration is to be followed through for better or for worse, and the arbitration boards' awards will have the force of law.

This board of arbitration will have the prestige incident to Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of its members. I think that will assure the appointment of prominent citizens of unquestioned objectivity and fairness. The board is to be given the power to establish a roster of arbitrators, so that the board or the disputants may choose men familiar with the industrial problems of the locality in which the dispute arises.

The board will be an independent agency, thereby assuring judicial objectivity; and it will be housed in the Department of Labor, thereby encouraging close cooperation with labor policies formulated by the Secretary of Labor. The Division of Mediation and Conciliation and other bureaus of the Labor Department will cooperate in the preparation of background material for the use of this board in its arbitration decisions. The Division of Mediation and Conciliation and the United States Board of Arbitration will be the only avenues for the settlement of disputes in which the Federal Government is interested.

The enactment of this bill will mean the end of special channels for particular disputes, the end of random intervention by officers of the Government outside the Department of Labor. I feel that many disputes which might otherwise result in strikes or lock-outs either will be settled through the process of conciliation and mediation or will be voluntarily submitted to the board of arbitration or to one of its panels established under this bill. After all, neither workers nor management deliberately seek the economic loss associated with a prolonged strike or lock-out. Proof of this is the steady trend toward increasing acceptance of arbitration as the last step in the settlement of grievances or disputes relative to the interpretation of a contract. This type of arbitration is the fruit of sound agreement between labor and management which develops with the passage of time and the growth of mutual confidence. In the past, such voluntarily-agreed-to, compulsory arbitrations of grievances and disputes arising in the course of a contract were found in a minority of cases. However, a recent Labor Department study of 1,254 contracts in 14 important industries revealed that three out of every four union agreements provide for arbitration as the last step in the grievance machinery. Over 90 percent of such agreements providing for arbitration specify that it may be invoked at the request of either party.

This trend toward the voluntary acceptance of arbitration might be reversed if we tried to hasten the process of enacting laws requiring compulsory arbitration. If Congress provides adequate means for voluntary settlement of labor disputes, it will have done its part.

Finally, the bill empowers the President to appoint boards of inquiry to hold hearings on disputes which vitally affect the public interest. The bill makes it plain that this should not include any effort to halt the dispute or to interfere with any steps undertaken by either of the parties. The hearings provided for by this section of the bill could quite possibly be held in the middle of a strike. The objective of these hearings would be solely to provide a public forum, so that the factual argument of each side would be available to the public. After all, a prolonged strike either succeeds or fails on the basis of the public support it commands. Certainly, it is no invasion of the Bill of Rights to require both parties to come in and tell their stories.

On August 1, in a speech before the Senate, I summarized what I had learned from conferences with officials of labor, management, and Government, and I indicated that the bill which we have introduced today would be forthcoming when the Senate reconvened. However, I knew at that time and I know now that legislation is not an adequate substitute for agreement between labor and management. At that time, in speaking with reference to the problem of postwar industrial peace, I said the following:

I am sure that industrial peace must grow out of agreement between labor and management. Certainly, our leading industrialists and labor leaders hope with equal force for the postwar expansion of our country's employment opportunities. This desire has had concrete expression recently in the labor-management charter signed by Eric Johnston, of the Chamber of Commerce, and by the presidents of two great houses of labor—William Green, of the A. F. of L., and Philip Murray, of the CIO. Along that road lies our hope of industrial peace.

I think that the experience of the San Francisco Charter provides us with a valuable guide to the solution of the problems of industrial relations. The San Francisco Charter did not spring full blown from the brow of some disinterested expert. Rather, it was born from the iron necessity of agreement and compromise between the Allies. It was a product of a meeting of minds of men from 50 nations with many vital and frequently conflicting interests. In the same way, I believe that there is no simple and pat solution for the problems of industrial peace.

Certainly, Mr. President, the best way to achieve the agreement between labor and management which I referred to on August 1 is a conference of labor and management. I was, therefore, glad to learn on the following day that Secretary Schwellenbach had agreed to the desirability of such a conference. I feel sure that our hopes for industrial peace must rest on the free agreement which labor and management achieve at such a conference. I believe the bill we have introduced forms a basis for such agreement, insofar as it can be encompassed in legislation on labor disputes. However, I think it is also clear that this conference must deal with other subjects than the mechanics for the settlement of industrial disputes if it is to be successful. No machinery, however well contrived, and no strait-jacket which we might seek to impose on labor and management, can avert industrial strife in the absence of agreement on the necessary measures to preserve consumer incomes and pave the way for national prosperity.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1419) to protect interstate and foreign commerce by providing means for the prompt and orderly settlement of controversies between employers and employees, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McMAHON (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. TUNNELL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 520. An act to facilitate settlement of returning veterans on farms in projects constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 4083. An act authorizing the improvement of certain harbors in the interest of commerce and navigation; to the Committee on Commerce.

MONSIGNOR RYAN

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by the late Monsignor Ryan on the subject of fair-employment practices, an article by Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, and an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Monsignor Ryan," which appear in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND THE SERVICEMAN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from a soldier, Mr. Herschel Laskowitz, of Fargo, N. Dak., which appears in the Appendix.]

RETIREMENT OF COL. EDWIN N. HARDY, UNITED STATES ARMY—EDITORIAL FROM BISBEE (ARIZ.) DAILY REVIEW

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Colonel Hardy Retires," published in the Bisbee (Ariz.) Daily Review of September 4, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRAYERS FOR A JUST WAGE FOR ALL—EDITORIAL FROM MADISON (WIS.) CAPITAL TIMES

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Prayers for a Just Wage for All," published in the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

INFORMATION SOUGHT BY AMERICAN CITIZENS OF RELATIVES IN GERMANY—LETTER FROM VAL J. PETER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point of my remarks, a letter written to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives by Hon. Val J. Peter, of Omaha, Nebr., an outstanding, fearless, patriotic publisher, dealing with a question which is of tremendously vital concern to every American citizen of German descent who has relatives in Germany. I hope that the Secretary of the Treasury will take immediate steps to end this almost unbelievable situation, and I commend Mr. Peter for bringing it to our attention.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

To the Honorable Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

DEAR SIRS: Our newspaper in recent weeks has received a great number of inquiries from subscribers and others desiring to obtain information as to whether their parents, brothers and sisters, or other relatives in Germany have survived the war. Most of these Ameri-

can citizens have sons in the United States Army and a good number of them have fought throughout the entire European war and are now stationed in Germany.

As you are aware, Treasury Department regulations pertaining to communications with the enemy continue to prohibit all communications to residents of Germany.

Termination of our so-called nonfraternization policy as regards our occupying forces now permits members of our Army to visit German towns—where our boys look for their missing relatives. Army censorship seems to entirely approve a soldier writing his father, "I visited such-and-such a town and saw Grandma. She is alive but quite sick," which is the first word received by a worried American citizen that his old mother is still on earth. The father in his anxiety over the welfare of his mother decides to write to the son as follows: "I enclose $25 for Mother. See that she gets medical attention or gets into a hospital and let me know." * * * As he starts to write he realizes that he has run into a stone wall of Treasury regulations which prohibits him under penalty of $10,000 fine and 10 years imprisonment from thus writing his son and from enclosing the money * * * for that would be "trading with the enemy." If his GI son writes that he has visited such-and-such a town and "I could find no trace of Grandma (or Uncle Louie)" the anxious father or mother, as the case might be, is again up against the noncommunication section of the Trading with the Enemy Act which prohibits him from writing to his son suggesting persons in Germany he should contact, who might know something regarding the whereabouts of the particular missing relative. If under the circumstances the father does write as set out above, both he and his son do so in violation of the act, for his son acts as his agent. Of course, any American citizen who attempts to write his mother or other relative or any person directly or through friends in neutral countries also violates the act. This is a situation that calls for immediate corrective measures.

There are some 10,000,000 American citizens who have relatives in Germany. These 10,000,000 have heretofore set an unprecedented and unexcelled record of loyalty and devotion to our country throughout the long years of war against the country of their forebears. Regardless of what regard individual policy makers of the Treasury Department may have toward the people of defeated Germany, the interests of American citizens should be the sole consideration now that the need for such restrictions, which were imposed solely for the defense of our country and for the successful prosecution of the war, no longer exists. The failure to now permit communications for a nonpolitical and noncommercial nature is a punishment not of the German people but an improper and unwarranted punishment of American citizens.

During the past 6 months the Treasury Department has issued general licenses permitting communications of a noncommercial nature and permitting the sending of "support money" to all European countries, including all our former European enemies except Germany. There is no reason why a general license cannot be granted now by the Treasury Department permitting American citizens to ascertain facts regarding their relatives in Germany and restoring to them their human family rights to alleviate the suffering of their parents and relatives by permitting the sending of "support money."

Your good offices in personally contacting Mr. Fred Vinson, Secretary of the Treasury, to the end that this distorted situation be terminated immediately will be in the service not only of those with kin in Germany but of the entire American people, whose tolerance of others and principles of fair play have demonstrated to the world the solidarity and complete loyalty of all the American people, one to another, and to their Government during these terrible war years.

We would like to publish the results of your efforts on behalf of your many constituents directly interested in this matter and will appreciate being informed of any representations or steps taken in this regard.

Very truly yours,

VAL J. PETER, *Publisher.*

CRITICISM OF BOOK STRANGE FRUIT AND OPINION OF MASSACHUSETTS SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, although much damage has already been done, I want to join with the decent people of America in congratulating the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court on a recent opinion upholding the conviction of a Cambridge book-store proprietor for selling Strange Fruit, by that strange-minded lady of the deep South, Miss Lillian Smith.

It is regrettable that hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of the pure-minded white people of America—men, women, boys, and girls—have already been polluted and corrupted by the reading of this dirty and obscene book, which is an indictment against the South, a gross misrepresentation of facts, and a puny attempt to integrate the American Negro into the social life of the white people. The only other book which is worse is Black Boy, by Richard Wright, a Negro who is living in New York with a white wife.

Of course, it is a well-known fact that Miss Lillian Smith, the author of Strange Fruit, is the idol—the pin-up girl—of every Negro organization in the United States that is seeking social equality with the white race. With a few exceptions the right-minded, the straight-thinking, and decent-minded white people of America who have any regard for the integrity of the blood of the white race have absolutely no respect for her.

I ask unanimous consent to have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a portion of the opinion of the court in this instance, as reported from Boston on September 17 by the special reporter to the New York Times.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUILT AFFIRMED IN SALE OF STRANGE FRUIT AS BAY STATE HIGH COURT DEEMS IT OBSCENE

BOSTON, September 17.—Declaring that Strange Fruit, the novel of racial conditions in the South by Lillian Smith, could be found to be obscene, indecent, and impure, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court upheld today the conviction of a Cambridge book store proprietor for selling the book.

In a dissenting opinion, Justice Henry T. Lummons asserted that while the majority opinion seemed to construe the statute rightly, he did not believe the evidence warranted a finding of guilty.

"Under normal conditions, I think the book could do no substantial harm to the morals of youth, for few juveniles would ever see it, much less read it," he stated.

The opinion of the six other justices upheld the action of Judge Edward F. Hanify, who found Abraham A. Eisenstadt guilty of possessing an obscene book with intent to sell and selling an obscene book. He was fined $100 on each of the two counts on December 4. His sale of the novel was made, for a test case, in March 1944, to Bernard De Voto, the literary critic, in the presence of representatives of the Civil Liberties Union.

In the 17-page majority opinion, written by Justice Stanley E. Qua, the court's majority said:

"Regarding the book as a whole, it is our opinion that a jury of honest and reasonable men could find beyond a reasonable doubt that it contains much that even in this post-Victorian era would tend to promote lascivious thoughts and to arouse lustful desire in the minds of substantial numbers of the public into whose hands this book, obviously intended for sale, is likely to fall."

The majority further stated that "the matter which could be found objectionable is not necessary to convey any sincere message the book may contain and is of such character and so pervades the work as to give the whole a licentious quality calculated to produce the harm which the statute was intended to prevent."

For the same reasons, the majority said, an honest and reasonable judge and jury could find that the book "manifestly tends to corrupt the morals of youth," the words of the statute.

RELEASE OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—LETTER FROM OMAHA SERVICEMAN IN GERMANY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a photostated copy of a letter from an Omaha serviceman who is now in Germany. It expresses the views of a great number who are still in service abroad.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOF, GERMANY, *September 7, 1945.*

DEAR DAD AND GANG: Received a few letters from you yesterday, so will now take time to put a few lines together.

I suppose the main item is, when I'm coming home. To tell you the truth I don't have the slightest idea. It may be this year or next, but you can actually quote me—I don't know.

Everybody in the outfit with 85 points or more has been transferred out and most of them have gone home, but there are 38 of us who are still here and looks like we will be for a long time.

I still have 96 points but that don't mean a damn thing. If I don't get out of here this month I'm going to write to Washington for an investigation as they have taken men home in our outfit with 88 points, who flew home. But I still sit here and have been working every day. Our big loud-mouth colonel doesn't want to see anyone go home.

There have been plenty of new ratings in the unit, but me and two other fellows didn't get one because we told the colonel we didn't care if he stayed over here for 5 years, we wanted to go home. So to make a long story short everyone got promoted a grade but three of us. They made a Pfc a T/Sgt. So you can see where I stand in the stinking outfit. I didn't like the outfit when I came in it and still don't but that is beside the point. I want to come home, but they won't let me.

They talk about 85 points coming home soon; sure hope they do, but I've seen too much stuff going on to count on it.

If they were going to go by the point system, all well and good, but I had 96 points on May 12 and still don't know when my turn to go home will come. And have talked with fellows with 74, 75, and 76 points, who were going to the States in a few days. This point system is a lot of bologna. The 38 fellows who are left are really blowing their tops. Can't blame them a bit. Sure wish someone would look into that.

Would like to see my Congressman in person for about 15 minutes, I'd sure tell him

about this point system. Or particularly, our outfit, where points don't mean a thing.

The colonel is holding us back, but can't find out why, can you?

For your information Dad, I've seen service in England, Africa, Sicily, Italy, France, Germany, and Austria, with a total of 37 months overseas, four battle stars and a bronze star, and still can't get home, what the hell is going on? Sure wish someone would tell me.

I still say it is not fair.

The fellows who are stuck with me have the same thing, and we are all going to find out why, if we aren't on our way by the 25 of this month.

Well, Dad; that is all for now so I hope to see you this year, I will remain

Your loving son,

BILL.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] to strike out all after line 2, on page 24, down to and including line 4, on page 25, relating to transportation allowances. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 24, after line 2, it is proposed to strike out the following:

TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

SEC. 708. In order to assist individuals who have been engaged in activities essential to the national defense or to the war effort at places away from their former homes, and who have left their homes since December 7, 1941, to engage in such activities, to return to their former homes, or to go to places where employment is available, the Director, subject to regulations and limitations prescribed by him, is authorized to pay a part or all of the cost of transportation, including transportation of dependents, for any such individual (1) back to his former home, if within the United States, or (2) if the Director finds that suitable employment is not available to him in the locality where he applies for such transportation, to some other locality (not farther distant than his former home) where the Director finds that suitable employment is available for such individual: *Provided*, That the amount paid under this section with respect to such transportation shall not exceed $200 for any one worker and his dependents, and shall not exceed the amount allowable in the case of civilian employees of the United States in the Standard Government Travel Regulations: *Provided further*, That no such cost of transportation shall be paid by the Director for an individual if the employer, former employer, or prospective employer of such individual has entered into an agreement or arrangement under which such transportation is provided for. No transportation shall be provided under this section after June 30, 1947.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment which I shall desire to offer after the pending amendment has been disposed of, in the event the amendment now pending does not prevail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator states the amendment will be offered later?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. The amendment will be offered when the pending amendment is disposed of, that is in the event the pending amendment does not prevail.

Mr. President, before discussing directly the amendment which I have offered and which is now pending, I wish to take occasion to make some comments with respect to the bill as a whole. When the original bill was introduced, and before the Committee on Finance made the substantial amendments it did make, or rather substituted for the original bill another measure, I could not have supported the bill. With the modifications which have been made, if the committee amendment, as amended, should be adopted, then I can give some consideration to voting for it on final passage. I can do that because of the change which has been made by simply extending the time benefits may be paid, rather than not only extending the time but increasing the amount to $25 a week. I think the changes which have been made thus far, both by the committee and by the amendments, adopted on the floor yesterday, and also by those rejected yesterday by the Senate, have gone a long way toward making the measure more in keeping with the needs of the country, and with what is justified, than was the original proposal.

Mr. President, whether the bill passes as now amended, or whether the original bill should be enacted, or if the measure should be defeated and never become a law, I want to point out and express the view that the Congress of the United States is proceeding to encourage and promote unemployment and the necessity for paying unemployment compensation, rather than taking the initial steps necessary to lessen the amount of unemployment and to proceed with things of first importance first. I make that statement because we keep talking about the Government furnishing every one a job. It is proposed that we follow this measure with a so-called full employment bill, a measure which, as I read it, says a great deal and actually means nothing except to create an erroneous impression in the minds of the people. That is the truth about it. I read that bill last night again, and actually I cannot see that it accomplishes anything except to create another committee to work with other committees and to make reports to Congress, without providing any authority or doing anything on earth except to hand out a lot of soft soap to the country, and make people think that the Government is going to provide a job for everyone.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. If I understand the purport of the Senator's remarks, it is simply this, that the so-called full employment bill then commits a fraud upon the American workman and upon the American public. Am I correct in my interpretation?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I have not said that any measure commits a fraud. I said the full employment bill as originally introduced is an illusion which is held out to the American people, that everyone is going to have a job; and actually the bill does nothing to give anyone a job, as I interpret it.

Mr. WILEY. In order to make my position clear, let me say that undoubtedly the Senator has received a great deal of mail from his State, as other Senators have from their States, which would imply that the so-called full employment bill provided a sort of a magic formula whereby jobs would be created. The Senator has said that it does not do that; that it gives the impression that it is something it is not. I ask if that is not a fraud?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. The Senator can make his own interpretation and use his own words. I am not questioning the sincerity of anyone who favors the bill, but I do question what the result will be, and what the bill will actually accomplish. I mention that bill only incidentally, because if it has any purpose at all, and if it is directed at any objective that I can see, it is that ultimately the Government shall spend money for public works and other projects of various kinds in order to take up the slack in employment and provide people jobs, but it does nothing concretely to that end except authorizes to be done only that which is already authorized and can be done. The bill winds up by saying that it does not authorize any appropriation by Congress. Every study it proposes to be made and every recommendation it proposes that the President may make can now be made under existing law. That is the point I am making with reference to the so-called full employment bill. I do not want to take the position that it is vicious legislation, assuming we are all anxious to see full employment. What I say about the full employment bill is that if it has any purpose on earth, it is to try to create the impression that there will be set up the mechanism, if possible, to create Government jobs so as to take up the slack in employment in private industry.

With that in mind as being the objective of that bill, and with the unemployment compensation measure which is now before us, I want to call to the attention of the Senate, the Congress, and the Nation that all that is lacking to start to work many of the men to whom it is now proposed to pay unemployment compensation, is for Congress to make appropriations for projects which have already been authorized and are today awaiting construction.

Mr. President, in that connection I desire to call to the attention of the Senate to the fact that the postwar construction program of the Corps of Engineers in the interest of flood control, navigation and related water uses, amounts to a total of $3,500,000,000 for projects adopted by Congress, for projects which have already been authorized by the Congress, which have already been examined, the economic justification of which has been determined, and the

merits of which fully established. Furthermore, the Congress has said they ought to be constructed, and has authorized an appropriation for them. $3,500,000,000 worth are already the reserve or backlog of public improvements now available and awaiting appropriations. That is why I am saying to my colleagues that we ought to be making those appropriations and put people to work.

Mr. President, I care not what kind of an unemployment or full employment measure Congress may pass; we are not going to set up any more worthy projects than are the projects which are authorized now in the flood control and the river and harbor programs. When I say "worthy projects" I mean projects which actually contribute something to the capital wealth of the Nation, something that will mean progress and improvement in the development and utilization of the natural resources of the United States.

Mr. President, I am informed by competent authority that the $3,500,000,000 worth of projects of this character already approved by Congress would produce 1,610,000 man-years of labor in the form of direct employment on those projects. The indirect labor which would result from those projects is incalculable. I believe that it is safe to say that if we start the projects, make the appropriations, and get them under way, taking the Nation as a whole, we could put to work within the next 12 months more than 2,000,000 of those who are now potential clients on the unemployment rolls and for whom we are undertaking to provide by the pending legislation.

Of course, there are all kinds of people in the Nation and in the world; but I believe that most of those who are going to be placed in the position of drawing unemployment compensation would rather have a job. I do not mean a leaf-raking job, as work under WPA was sometimes referred to, but a job in constructive enterprise, in industry, where we are building, where we are doing something constructive. These projects would provide jobs under private enterprise, although they are Government projects, financed at Government expense.

The projects to which I refer are widely distributed throughout the river basins of the United States. They are not confined to my section of the country, or any other section. There is possibly no greater distribution of public works than can be found in this program. The individual projects fit into comprehensive, integrated plans for the fullest ultimate use of the water resources of our Nation. We have a job to do as a Government to develop our water resources and our valleys, and to utilize to the maximum extent possible within our wisdom the great benefits available to us, and the great undeveloped resources which we still have.

I believe that what we ought to be doing at this hour is passing appropriation bills to set in motion the machinery which would provide jobs for the people and keep them off the unemployment compensation pay rolls.

The program includes dams, reservoirs, levees, flood walls, check dams, channel improvements, locks and dams, canals, river regulation works, revetments, breakwaters, and other related works. It includes every character of river and water development.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to comment on the statement which the Senator has made. There is proposed a Missouri River development program which covers the upper reaches of the Missouri River. If that stream were developed, not only would desirable jobs be furnished for returning servicemen, but thousands of acres of land would be reclaimed. Moreover, such a program would, by producing feed in dry years, provide stability for that entire western area which is subject to drought.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. That is the very thing I am trying to emphasize. The expenditure of the money which Congress has already determined may be expended is economically justified, because the benefits which would be derived from the improvements would be greater than the cost to the Federal Government.

Preparation of detailed plans for postwar construction is now in progress for projects totaling slightly more than $1,500,000,000. That would produce 690,000 man-years of labor. At the present time detailed plans are ready for construction to be started on projects with a total cost of $750,000,000, which would produce 345,000 man-years of labor. In other words, we could start now with the immediate employment of 345,000 people. The plans already prepared would give work to that many people for the next year. By the summer of 1946, this shelf of planned projects will be increased to a total of $1,150,000,000, an amount which would produce 529,000 man-years of labor.

I asked particularly for information regarding some streams in my State, and two valleys in my State where a number of projects are located in which my people are particularly interested.

Let me refer first to the Arkansas River Basin. We have heard a great deal about the Arkansas River Basin. Incidentally, Arkansas is not the only State affected by projects authorized in that valley. A number of other States in that valley would be directly affected. I am not sure as to the number of projects, but I should say that more than half the cost represents projects which are located on that stream and its tributaries outside the State of Arkansas. In the Arkansas River Basin, projects adopted by Congress for flood control and other water uses, for which appropriations have not as yet been provided, total approximately $150,000,000. This would provide 69,000 man-years of labor. With respect to these projects, plans are now ready for construction to be initiated on some of them totaling nearly $70,000,000, which would provide 32,000 man-years of labor. Additional projects, amounting to $40,000,000 in this valley and providing 18,000 man-years of labor, will be planned by the summer of 1946.

The other valley is the White River Basin. Projects adopted by Congress but not as yet appropriated for, total $135,000,000. I am speaking now of the valleys in my State. There are others, but the two important ones which the Congress has considered are the ones which I have mentioned. We have tried to develop a program for the projects and improvements needed to take care of conditions in the White River Basin. In the White River Basin, projects adopted by Congress but not as yet appropriated for, total $135,000,000. This would produce 62,000 man-years of labor. The cost of the projects now planned and ready for construction is slightly more than $100,000,000, which would provide 46,000 man-years of labor.

Various projects are ready. They are planned. The blueprints are made. We are ready to go to work to the extent indicated by the figures which I have given.

Mr. President, I have pointed out these facts because I feel that most of the American people, those who have been laboring in our war industries and others who are potential clients on the unemployment compensation rolls, would rather have a job. The Congress has determined the merits and worthiness of these projects, and all it is necessary to do to get work started is to make the appropriations. Bear in mind, too, that large numbers of trained personnel are now being discharged from the military service. Never before was there a time when the Corps of Engineers could be better equipped and better staffed, so as to be ready to begin the planning and construction of these projects. As Army engineer personnel are released from the Army there is no reason why they could not fit into a development program of this character and find employment suitable for them, in view of their training and experience.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am very much pleased to hear the Senator's statement. The underlying importance of what he has said is that if extensive plans for public improvements are inaugurated and if such works are subsequently constructed, not only shall we provide employment but we shall have permanent and valuable improvements of a public character. Sites for the kinds of public works the Senator has referred to can be found all over the country.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. One of the greatest would be the St. Lawrence waterway. If it were constructed, there would be something to show for the money expended. The theory of unemployment compensation is to pay money to those who are unemployed so that they will be able to buy something to eat. The trouble is that a year or two after they spend the money there is nothing to show for it.

The plan the Senator has been discussing would call for the expenditure of

money on public projects, and the result would be that the money would be earned by those needing employment and also valuable public works of a permanent character would be constructed. So employment would be given to labor and there would be valuable public works to show for the money expended. Such projects would be of value to the entire country.

Let me also say in that connection that in addition to considering the development of waterways, we should consider the subject of the bill introduced yesterday by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. His bill relates to soil conservation and the prevention of erosion and depletion of the soil. A great many persons can be employed on such work. Since the beginning of our country, soil erosion has destroyed enough of our soil or territory to amount, in terms of area, to approximately 10 States the size of Pennsylvania. Our soil is being washed away in the gulleys. First the topsoil is washed away, then the subsoil goes, and then desert conditions ensue. We can spend money to far better advantage on such projects, rather than on mere unemployment benefits. Money spent for soil conservation will be used much more wisely than money spent in paying doles of $25 for unemployment. The development of such a soil conservation or public-works program will give employment to labor and with the money earned the workers will be able to support their families. In addition, we shall have permanent improvements which will be worth billions of dollars, whereas the same amount of money spent on mere unemployment compensation would result in nothing of permanent value. I thank the Senator for bringing up the point.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I very much agree with what the Senator from Arkansas has said regarding the necessity of the work he has described, such as flood control. Let me add to that irrigation and reclamation. I was a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee which held hearings on the rivers and harbors bill dealing with irrigation, reclamation, and navigation. My recollection is that the authorizations made at that time and also, I believe, those made in the flood-control bill of December 1944, were subject to the limitation that the authorizations should not be made until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities or until by proclamation the President declared the emergency ended. Does the Senator know whether that is the fact?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think there is some condition with respect to the ending of the emergency; but if the Congress ever had in mind anything except the need for raw materials and manpower with which to win the war, I cannot conceive what it was. If this is not an emergency, I do not know what one is. Here we are undertaking to pass a law to provide for unemployment compensation. We need to get people to work and we need to have construction of this reservoir of projects begun. Certainly this is the time to remove such limitation or restriction if any exist and Congress can remove them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. My understanding is that it would require a proclamation by the President declaring that the war or the war emergency had terminated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the Senator will agree with me that the emergency referred to in the condition which was imposed in the legislation has certainly passed, and now we are trying to deal with another one, unemployment, just the reverse of the former.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think the emergency referred to in the legislation was the war emergency.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We agree that that has passed, especially as it relates to the need for manpower and materials required for the conduct of the war.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas is a lawyer, and I am not; but I think he will agree that until an act of Congress declaring the termination of the emergency is passed or until a proclamation to that effect is issued by the President, such a restrictive clause remains in effect.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Well, Mr. President, the Senator and I know that we can take steps to remove the application of that clause or condition.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to yield at this time, inasmuch as he has already been interrupted. I do not wish to ask a question in connection with the line of thought the Senator has just been discussing. Prior to his last remarks, I understood the Senator to interpret the proposed Unemployment Act as one which would not accomplish the purposes set forth, especially in the case of small towns or small businesses which are seeking employees at this time. Many newspaper publishers and proprietors of small businesses who have written to me have said that it has been most difficult for them to get men to go back to work. I wonder whether the Senator cares to express himself on that point. In my State very few concerns which come under the provisions of the Social Security Act, for a business must have eight or more employees in order to come under its provisions.

In Nebraska our difficulty is to get back to work those who have returned and who can receive compensation because they worked in some other State in a war factory. I should like to ask the Senator what will be the effect on them if they receive the proposed unemployment compensation over a period of 26 weeks. What will be the effect on getting them to return to work, so that there can be full employment in our sections of the country?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe, as I have already said, that in some cases some few unemployed will not want to go back to work; they will prefer to draw their unemployment compensation. But in view of the Lucas amendment which was agreed to yesterday, and in view of the fact that control is to be retained by the State authorities, I believe that if a State board permits men to remain on the unemployment rolls who do not belong there, only the State authorities will be to blame. We are merely saying by the pending measure that if a man is found by the State authorities to be entitled to receive unemployment compensation, and he continues to receive it for 16 weeks, or whatever period the State provides, and he is still unemployed, and the State certifies him to be eligible to receive compensation, he will continue to draw the same rate of compensation he had been drawing under the State law up to a limit of 26 weeks.

I supported the Lucas amendment. I believe the responsibility should be placed upon the authorities at home where the unemployed persons are known, and not upon an agency in Washington. The authorities at home know best the conditions which exist, and they know the training and experience which each individual may have and whether the job available is suitable. I believe the responsibility belongs there, and we have placed it there. That is why I can now support the bill.

Mr. President, I have referred only to projects which have already been approved by the Congress. I believe there are many other flood control and related projects, including irrigation, soil conservation, and other public works of that character, which can be justified as Federal responsibilities. We could very well implement the program for which we have already provided by continuing further studies and enacting legislation authorizing further projects along these lines as the Congress might find advisable. By so doing, instead of merely passing a bill and saying that it is the policy of the Federal Government that every man shall have a job, we would say that it is the policy of this Government to see that the jobs are provided. Of course, we already know that everyone wants full employment. The point I am making is that merely to say that we want full employment, or that the Government should provide full employment for everyone, will not in itself provide jobs. However, the projects to which I have referred will provide jobs. They will reduce the expenses of the Federal Government and the States by reducing the necessity of paying unemployment compensation. As the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] pointed out, the payment of unemployment compensation may be of service and benefit to the individual who is not employed and needs to be assisted during a period of unemployment. To that extent the Nation is served by maintaining purchasing power. But so far as creating anything of material value is concerned, it would not be accomplished. The expenditure of public funds in the way I have pointed out would not only create something of value, but would maintain purchasing power by providing employment and preventing the necessity of having to pay unemployment compensation.

Mr. President, I hesitate taking so much time of the Senate and I shall hurry on. There are two other things which I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate, one of them being the subject of a public roads construction pro-

gram. We have authorized for the next 3 years a Federal expenditure of $1,500,000,000 for a public roads construction program. This expenditure must be matched by the States. It will result in providing tremendous opportunities for employment. It will be spread all over the Nation. I know that the highway department of my State is ready, insofar as it can meet the terms of the Federal legislation, to proceed and is anxious to begin construction. In most States of the Union I am confident that the highway departments are able and ready to proceed. We are trying to pass laws for the purpose of paying money to certain persons while they are not working. I am not opposed to that. I believe that a man who is out of a job and cannot obtain employment should be paid unemployment compensation. But, Mr. President, I believe the responsibility of Congress is to make possible jobs for unemployed workers by putting into effect the construction program which we have said is a sound program, and for which the Government should spend money. Let us make the necessary appropriations and start unemployed men to work. By so doing we will save a great deal of money by making it unnecessary to pay out so much in unemployment compensation.

In my State I do not know what the situation will be in the future. But I have before me a telegram which is a sample of others which I have been receiving. I have been in my own State recently and I know what the conditions are there. During the summer I spent 2 weeks there. Here is a telegram which gives some idea of our situation with respect to labor conditions at the present time. The telegram reads:

> Already we are seriously handicapped for labor. Any legislation designed to pay employees to sit down will further aggravate this condition. There is much work available here if labor will accept these jobs. We are ourselves in the market for 100 and more men, and cannot get any.

That has to do with the rice milling industry, and I know that in my home town there is an International Paper Co. mill, and throughout the paper industry an effort is being made to secure laborers. Workers are needed; the jobs are there. I can say that is true with reference to the cotton compresses in my State. They are crying for labor; they need labor; the jobs are there.

Someone may say they are not suitable jobs. I know they were suitable up to the time of this war. Perhaps we have set up a different standard or are creating a different standard of suitability, but prior to the war those jobs were suitable for many men to work at and earn a living. Whether the wages are all they ought to be I do not know, and I am not going into that phase of it. Certainly, the employers are paying the wages fixed by law; I know these industries are not paying below the minimum.

There are other industries that also need labor. I know the farmers in my State are eager for men to help get in the crops. I may say that I have never seen more bountiful crops than are being grown in Arkansas. It looks as if we are going to have a banner year. We have been blessed with bountiful production, and now to get in the crops labor is needed. War prisoners have been utilized there for such work, but they are going to be removed.

So I say that in my State apparently the situation is not such that people cannot find employment.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point—I shall not take the time to read it—a memorandum or an analysis of the prospective employment situation in Arkansas and in the prospects of full employment in that State in the future. The memorandum has been prepared by a group of men in my State. I will read the first paragraph to give the foundation of it:

THE AMERICAN WAY

Two years ago, in March 1943, a handful of Arkansas' business leaders met in the Albert Pike Hotel, in Little Rock for the purpose of discussing the question "What can Arkansas' business leaders do now to plan for jobs and development in the postwar years." There was plenty of discussion, but this meeting did not find the answer to the question. It was decided, however, that a committee be set up to devise an organization through which Arkansas could plan to meet two objectives: First, to provide jobs for the returning servicemen when the war was over and likewise jobs for war workers who have left our State for war plant jobs. The second objective was to promote a basically sound economic climate, wherein the State might realize a progressive utilization and development of the many resources of Arkansas to the end that her people might have more jobs that are better jobs and thus a higher standard of living.

Those plans were referred to as postwar planning.

Mr. President, that group of men made a survey of the State, and I may say that one who participated in it is the former national president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I know that those citizens went into the problem of trying to meet postwar conditions. I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the memorandum be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. I do not desire to take the time of the Senate to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The remainder of the memorandum is as follows:

WHAT HAPPENED?

Since September 7, 1945, postwar is now. Let us see what we have achieved.

The Arkansas Economic Council-State Chamber of Commerce is the result of that preliminary meeting back in March 1943. Today there are organized groups of business leaders in all but three counties of the State who have pledged their thoughts and efforts in the promotion of this development program in their respective counties.

Already industries have been established and are underway. Literally hundreds of new small service and manufacturing institutions are being planned and designed.

SURVEYS REVEAL JOBS

Surveys have been made in many of the counties to determine how many jobs there are in the business establishments of today and how many jobs the operators of those businesses anticipate they will provide in the postwar years. These surveys while not 100 percent complete for the State, do cover about 40 percent of the jobs which exist in Arkansas, and therefore are a very representative sample. The Arkansas Economic Council with especially valuable assistance from the Bureau of Research at the university, have analyzed in detail, these industrial, commercial and farm questionnaires, county by county and have expanded these figures to cover the State of Arkansas. Here are the figures on jobs:

	Jobs in 1940	Jobs in 1945	Jobs in 1946 and 1947
Industry (manufacturing, mining, war plants)	63,618	94,112	104,600
Business and service (services, personal; finance; transportation, communication, and utilities; wholesale and retail trade)	152,541	164,683	211,600
Agricultural, forestry, and fishing	301,535	210,000	241,500
Other (professional, construction, miscellaneous industries)	66,250	83,400	103,300
Total	583,944	552,195	661,000

These figures reveal that while we had in 1940, 583,900 jobs and in 1945, principally because of a loss of agricultural jobs, a shrinkage to 552,000 jobs, we can reasonably anticipate that the business and agriculture of Arkansas will provide in the postwar years in 1946 and 1947, about 661,000 jobs. Now how many people will want jobs?

Arkansas' labor force

	1940	1945	Expected postwar, 1946 and 1947
Population	1,949,387	[1] 1,725,000 [2] 1,800,000	[1] 1,902,000 [2] 2,032,000
Population 14 year old and over.	1,387,930	[1] 1,224,750 [2] 1,278,000	[1] 1,350,420 [2] 1,442,720
Labor force	678,859	[1] 603,750 [2] 630,000	[1] 665,700 [2] 711,200

[1] From.
[2] To.

It can be readily seen that there will be no unemployment in Arkansas in the postwar years. It looks like there will be 661,000 jobs and about 665,000 to 700,000 people available as a labor force.

Insofar as planning is concerned the handful of businessmen who set out 2 years ago to help plan to have jobs for the people of Arkansas who would want jobs in the postwar years, have been 100 percent successful.

When we consider that the figures developed have been checked against available data from the census, from the War Manpower Commission, the Arkansas Agricultural Extension Service, and when we consider that the estimates of postwar jobs are based upon literally thousands of estimates each made about his own business by the man who operates it, we can readily feel a confidence in the soundness of these conclusions as to our postwar job picture.

If Arkansas people work now as successfully as they have planned during the war, we will see growth and development which our State has long deserved, and which, best of all, will provide a better standard of living for all her citizens. Truly this is concrete evidence of the ability of Arkansas' people to work out their own solutions to their economic problems. What a fine example of democracy at work in the American way.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I desire to make this comment on the memorandum: I am not vouching for the accuracy of the figures embodied in

it. Some of them, of course, are bound to be estimates, and, of course, no one can be certain that the prophecy or prediction that Arkansas will have practically no unemployment in the postwar period will be realized, but that is the hope, and it expresses, so far as I know, some of the best judgment on that problem.

Mr. President, I am sincere about the matter of the Congress making appropriations and getting this work program under way in order to minimize unemployment and in order to bring about the developments and improvements that should be made.

Now with reference to the amendment. I have moved to strike out that section of the bill which provides for travel pay to workers who have worked in war plants. I feel justified in doing this for two reasons: First, from an economic standpoint. I have not had time to read thoroughly and fully all the testimony developed at the hearings, but, Mr. President, I do not know where there is any need for such legislation. I have had no request from constituents from my State asking me to use my efforts to have Congress enact legislation providing that the Federal Government shall pay their expenses home. Other Senators may have had such requests, but I have had no request of that character.

Mr. President, there is another reason why I think this provision should be stricken from the bill. If we pass this bill with this provision in it we are certainly going to discriminate against a large number who have been away at work and who have already returned home at their own expense. Is it right that they should be penalized because possibly their work ended and they reached home sooner or because, through their own industry or through choice, they have returned home sooner?

I should like to inquire, if I may, of the chairman of the Finance Committee as to what evidence is in the RECORD showing the need for this provision? Upon what is it based or predicated? If the distinguished Senator from Georgia will give me his attention and answer some questions I should like to ascertain, if I may, upon what evidence or conditions need for this legislation is predicated. I should like, furthermore, to inquire how many people it is estimated will be affected? Does the evidence as disclosed in the hearings show what number would be affected by this provision of the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that, so far as I recall the testimony, it indicated no particular number who would be affected by this provision of the bill. The Social Security Board has estimated that the probable maximum cost of this provision under the highest unemployment that is assumed by them as the base of an estimate would be approximately $60,000,000. That, of course, would not indicate the exact number of people who might be affected by the provision, because some might get $200, some might get $50, and some might get $25. It would indicate, however, that a considerable number of workers would be affected if unemployment should run by December of this year to a number of approximately 10,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the able Senator indicate why the volume of unemployment has any particular bearing on this phase of the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. I think it would have some effect on it, because if people were employed at acceptable wages and did not wish to change their employment they would not, of course, apply for transportation costs. In other words, so long as they were employed in satisfactory jobs they would not apply to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion for any transportation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, anyone might quit his present job and return home and be entitled to this travel pay.

Mr. GEORGE. He might, it is true, and he would be entitled to return home, or to some place where a suitable job was open, not at a greater distance from his place of employment than his home.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the able Senator advise me whether there was anything developed in the hearings to show the possible number of war workers who would come in this category, but who have already returned to their homes at their own expense?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not recall that there was any testimony which would indicate the number. There was some evidence indicating that quite a number of people who had gone away to engage in war work had returned to their homes. Two or three witnesses testified that the migration back to the home had commenced immediately after the cancellation of war contracts, but, as I recall, there no over-all picture was given in the record of the number of those who have gone back, and no very careful estimate was undertaken as to how many would go back. It is simply problematical, so problematical in the first place that the Social Security Board did not estimate the probable cost under this section of the bill, because of the fact that it was uncertain as to how many would apply, and so on.

There were witnesses who testified as to the desirability, and, as they put it, the necessity of providing transportation costs back to the homes. A number of witnesses called attention to the heavy congestion of war workers in certain areas, and other witnesses testified to the desirability of redistributing the workers of the country, and that was one of the causes which led me to favor this provision in the bill. I think it highly important that workers be redistributed so that the general economy may begin to function as soon as possible. If in areas shortages of workers still continue, although there may be congestion in other areas, the whole economy is not going to operate, but will rather stagnate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand the provision, it applies to all those who have not yet gone home.

Mr. GEORGE. That is quite true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But one who has possibly been more diligent, or whose work happened to terminate a little earlier than that of the others, and who himself has already gone to the expense of paying for his transportation, is not provided for, but is, in effect, under the present provisions of the bill, penalized.

Mr. GEORGE. The bill is not retroactive, and this particular provision of the bill is not based on a showing of need or necessity affirmatively; but that is the clear intimation of the section; I may say to the Senator, because if a former employer, or prospective employer, or a future employer, has already arranged or is willing to arrange the transportation costs of the worker to a place where suitable employment exists, the Director of Mobilization and Reconversion is forbidden, in that instance, to allow any travel pay or allowance.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, as I understand the provision of the bill, no test of need is applied at all.

Mr. GEORGE. No test is affirmatively stated, but there is the implication in this particular section of some necessity or need, because in the first place it is not a mandatory section; it grants a purely discretionary power to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Mr. Snyder. Under the limitations of the section, he may allow travel pay or allowances. He is not required to do it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I ask whether the Senator is implying that Mr. Snyder, as Director, could either put the whole section into operation, or could refuse to put it into operation?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think he could refuse to put it into operation, but I think he is vested with a broad discretion, and I think that in any case he could inquire into the necessity.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As to any individual?

Mr. GEORGE. As to any individual who might apply, because he is authorized, in his discretion, to pay a portion of the transportation costs or all of them, provided they do not exceed the limitations fixed in the section; but there is no affirmative requirement that he find that a need exists, or that a necessity exists; it is left very largely in his discretion. I would not undertake to say that he would deny transportation costs even though no need were apparent, and even in cases perhaps where no need actually existed. I do not speak for the Director, and would not undertake to do so, but I say that there is the implication in this section that some showing must be made by the worker who makes an application. He cannot merely as a matter of right demand the allowance, and there are certain conditions under which he cannot receive it, if those conditions exist.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask a question, and I presume the Senator from Georgia may have the answer to it. Is it not true that when workers were recruited in certain sections of the country for work in industrial plants considerably removed from the State in which the workers were recruited, in a contract between the worker and the company for which the employee worked there was a proviso for paying transpor-

tation to the plant and back to his home after the work was over? I have heard that was true of some of the shipyards on the Pacific coast, which recruited as far east as New York and New England. In that case the cost of the travel was undoubtedly considered in figuring the cost of fulfilling the contract, and in effect the Government would be paying the transporttion home for certain groups of workers who were recruited under such considerations. Is that true?

Mr. GEORGE. No, that is not true. Under an amendment offered in the Finance Committee by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] the section is not applicable if a former employer, or present employer, or prospective employer, has entered into any obligation to pay the transportation costs of the worker.

Mr. AIKEN. That is not exactly what I meant. What I meant was that the Government has already in effect paid the transportation home for certain groups of workers who may have had such a proviso written into their contracts.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true, because the Government is actually making payments on all cost-plus contracts including transportation, where the employers included t ansportation in the contracts.

Mr. AIKEN. There are, however, thousands of others who have perhaps gone a thousand or two thousand miles to work who have no such assurance that they will be reimbursed for the cost of travel.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; that is true, and some of whom have gone back to their homes at their own cost.

Mr. AIKEN. The proviso which the Finance Committee has written into the bill covers that class of workers who have no guarantee that they can return home except under their own power, at their own expense.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like first to ask the able chairman of the Finance Committee a question, and then I shall ask the Senator from Vermont a question. If it be true that we have already committed ourselves by actually having paid the cost of transportation of thousands of war workers who worked, say in private enterprise under cost-plus contracts, then does not the Senator think that by enacting the proposed legislation we fail to do justice by not making the legislation provide for those who have returned home whose expenses were not paid? Does not the Senator think that we should include them as a matter of justice?

It strikes me that this section as it is now is quite loosely drawn. I do not know exactly what conditions a man would have to meet, and no one else does. In other words, as a matter of simple justice, if the Government has done as the Senator has just implied, and as may be true, if we are now going to provide for those who have not yet gone home and to leave out those who have, on their own, already taken care of their travel expenses themselves, I think an injustice will be done. As a matter of justice the latter class should also be included.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say that the bill does not make the section retroactive. Had the Senate view on this subject prevailed and had the bill which the Senate passed a little better than a year ago been acceptable to the House and become law, a provision would have been inserted providing for transportation. But with respect to the workers who have actually returned home, or who have gone to a suitable place of employment where they are now employed, there is not the full problem which exists respecting those who are still at the place where they were engaged in war work.

There are two considerations which I think, and I believe the committee thought, ought to be kept in mind. First we have a social problem. In any place where congestion exists, where war workers were concentrated, where they were invited and urged to go day after day over the radio, through the public press, by the Government itself in many instances, it is socially desirable that they should be able to return to their homes when their jobs are finished.

Second, there is the very strong economic consideration about which I spoke a little while ago, that one of our problems in reconversion is to bring about a redistribution of the necessary labor in all sections of the country in order to sustain and carry on the general economy, taken as a whole.

There is still on the west coast and at other places in the United States a heavy congestion of the war workers who patriotically responded to the call of duty. It is true they were offered attractive wages, but, nevertheless, some of them went because they were urged to go, and felt the urge to go. We still have that congestion; we still confront that problem, which has an important economic aspect, as well as an important social aspect. So we were led to believe that it was wise and desirable to include section 708 in the bill, leaving it in the discretion of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, within the limitations prescribed, to provide a part or the whole of the cost of transportation home for the worker and his family.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator. I wanted to explain the reason I offered the amendment in committee which is found at the bottom of page 24, and reads:

Provided further, That no such cost of transportation shall be paid by the Director for an individual if the employer, former employer, or prospective employer of such individual has entered into an agreement or arrangement under which such transportation is provided for.

The reason I offered that amendment was on the basis the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has mentioned, plus one other consideration. In many cases I know that employees were taken all the way from the eastern seaboard to the western seaboard under contracts to pay them a greatly increased wage and their transportation to the West and back to their homes when their job was through.

Whether that sum went into a cost-plus contract or whether it went into the concern's regular business, where it dealt with the Government on the basis of an ask-and-bid quotation, I felt was beside the question. Of course, if the Government had paid it in the one case, it should not have to pay it again, and, of course, if the employee had received it, plus a substantial wage, he should not be reimbursed again by the Government unless we want to give special grants to a few.

It seems to me that the Senator from Arkansas has made a very good point. I made the same identical point in the Finance Committee he is now making that there is an injustice done to those individuals who have ceased to have their jobs on the Pacific coast and elsewhere away from home because they were industrious enough and courageous enough to take their families and their automobiles and on their own go back to the place of their home or where they are now working. If the bill becomes a law, on the one hand, those who have paid their own transportation costs will not benefit, while, on the other hand, the fellow who sits there and waits to have the bill go into effect and waits for somebody to provide suitable work for him profits under section 708.

I have an amendment I am going to suggest to the Senator from Arkansas. I will give the reasons why I think there is some justice in paying transportation costs. There is great justice in some cases. What we should try to avoid is having this provision used as a carry-all for traveling around the United States. It seems to me that the man or the woman who had a job at high wages for 4 years—and that is what this bill virtually provides, because the date fixed in the section is December 7, 1941—in most cases left his home and took the job because it was a lucrative one. Such individuals are well able to pay their expenses back home. But when a man left his home and under urging went elsewhere—and I call the Senate's attention to the fact that committees were established in various communities to urge individuals to do their patriotic duty and take jobs away from home after December 7, 1943—and has only had 1 year or a year and a half away from home and has not had enough time to use his lucrative job to justify him in paying his expenses back home, he is entitled to our consideration. So I am going to offer an amendment to the Senator's amendment, unless the Senator objects to it.

In line 7 on page 24, in the committee amendment, I would amend by changing the date to December 7, 1943.

Also in line 9, after the word "available" in the sentence "to places where employment is available", I would add these words, and I offer them as an amendment—"because their war job is completed and no further suitable work is available at the point of their present location."

Mr. President, I offer that——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I doubt if that would be in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, amendments are not now in order.

Mr. HAWKES. No; I realize that it is out of order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would be out of order at the moment.

Mr. President, I do not want to take more time of the Senate, although I desired to discuss other aspects of the proposed legislation to which I referred earlier in my remarks with reference to providing employment.

I moved to strike out this section so that we might examine into the proposal to pay transportation costs. If there is any obligation on the part of the Government to do it, then certainly there is an obligation on the part of the Government to treat all the workers alike. We are not doing that. As has been pointed out, a man who has gone back home on his own initiative and has spent his own money is as much entitled to be reimbursed as is the man who is still at the plant waiting to go home. If we are to adopt the policy of paying transportation costs, I feel that this whole section ought to be revised and rewritten so as to do justice to all alike. If we are committed to that policy, if the section were rewritten to accomplish that and do justice, and not discriminate, I should be more inclined to favor it.

Mr. President, if this amendment to strike out the whole section is rejected, I have another amendment. If there is real justification for the payment of this money, I hope that a better provision will be written. I did not have time to try to write something better so as to do justice to all the workers, but I am sure there will be opportunity in the House for the section to be rewritten.

If this amendment fails, I shall offer the other amendment which I have on the desk. I am sorry to have taken so much time. I am not trying to keep someone from getting anything he is entitled to. That is not the spirit of my amendment. But I say to my colleagues that the only way we can ever balance the income and outgo of the Government, and the only hope of ever beginning to reduce the public indebtedness is for the Congress to be more diligent in the matter of expenditures of public funds. That is our responsibility, and we ought to examine more carefully and scrutinize more diligently proposals to spend money. With the present high rate of taxation and the anticipated high national income, and with the ever-increasing demands made on Congress for public expenditures, we owe, Mr. President, a duty to our Government, to our veterans and to the people as a whole, and all these should be considered as we legislate and spend money that must be included in deficits we are now unable to pay. I do not believe that it will be possible within the next few years for the Government to meet its operating expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). A few moments ago the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] offered an amendment, and some discussion was had on it. Does the Senator wish to press his amendment? An amendment has precedence over a motion to strike out.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I will withdraw my amendment for the present.

Mr. CAPEHART obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Indiana desires to speak at this time on the pending measure.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to speak on another subject.

Mr. GEORGE. I wonder whether the Senator will permit a vote to be taken on the pending amendment. I should like very much to have that done, although I do not see the proponent of the amendment on the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I just met the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] in the hall, as he was going to lunch, and he said he would like very much to have an opportunity to be present when the vote is taken on his amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Andrews	Hart	Myers
Austin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Butler	Kilgore	Smith
Byrd	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Langer	Taylor
Carville	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tobey
Connally	McFarland	Tunnell
Cordon	McKellar	Vandenberg
Donnell	McMahon	Wagner
Downey	Magnuson	Walsh
Ellender	Maybank	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mead	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	White
George	Mitchell	Wiley
Gerry	Moore	Willis
Green	Morse	Wilson
Guffey	Murdock	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

OPA PRICE-FIXING POLICIES

Mr. CAPEHART obtained the floor.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. For what purpose?

Mr. BILBO. I wish to make a speech.

Mr. CAPEHART. I prefer not to yield.

Mr. BILBO. Very well.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, much has been said and written during the past 2 or 3 weeks concerning the subject of unemployment. I wish to take only a few minutes of the time of the Senate to talk about employment.

On July 5 of this year the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and myself submitted a resolution to investigate the price-fixing policies of OPA, and on that occasion I addressed the Senate concerning the resolution. I doubt if any other resolution or statement could be more sincere in its intentions or purposes. I stated that the purpose of the resolution was not to indulge in a witch hunt but that it was the responsibility of the Congress to ascertain upon what basis the OPA was fixing maximum ceiling prices. Nothing was done about the resolution. Since then the war has ended. I wish to go on record as saying that, to my mind, the OPA, because of the absence of a sound and practical policy in fixing ceiling prices, is doing more to retard reconversion, is doing more to put men out of work, and is doing more to keep men from securing jobs in private industry today than is any other one agency or factor in our national economy. It is my opinion that while we are discussing unemployment—and rightfully so—the time has arrived when this body should ascertain on what basis OPA is fixing price ceilings.

Mr. President, I am highly in favor of price ceilings. I know no other way to avoid inflation than by fixing maximum ceilings, and, by virtue of the same consideration, I know of no better way to encourage unemployment than by permitting OPA to continue the policy they are following at this moment. To my mind, unemployment and OPA's price-fixing policies go hand in hand. While we are passing legislation to help those who are unemployed, OPA every hour of the day is adopting policies and doing things which are either throwing men out of work or denying workmen the right to return to work.

Mr. President, I have an example in my hand. I have a case here affecting the Meyers & Son Manufacturing Co., of Madison, Ind., a small industry employing about 80 people. This company on August 29, 1944, asked for a price on a certain one-piece work suit. On February 9, 1945, 5 months later, they were given by OPA a price which was $1 below the manufacturing cost of that one-piece suit.

This company has been completely canceled out in the manufacture of war goods. They are now asking for a new price, and the president of the concern is in Washington at the moment. He had a conference yesterday with a Mr. Allen and a Mr. Hollander, of the OPA. Mr. President, what do you suppose Mr. Allen and Mr. Hollander told this gentleman, who employs 80 people? They told him that they did not know when they could give him a price, that they hoped they would be able to give him one by January 1. The president of the company asked them this question: "Am I to close my factory? Do you recommend that I wire my factory at Madison, Ind., to close down?" The answer was that that was his business, and not theirs, that they would try to get him a price, but they would not promise to get it to him before January 1.

Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD following my remarks the correspondence between Mey-

ers & Son Manufacturing Co., of Madison, Ind., and the Office of Price Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have another case in my hand, of the Marion Tool Corp., of Marion, Ind., manufacturers of small tools. This company filed a request for a maximum ceiling price in March of this year, 1945. To date they have not received a selling price. They are asking for 15 percent over their prewar prices. However, last September they asked for a 10-percent increase in selling price, and OPA granted them a 5-percent increase.

Mr. President, I have in my hand and shall ask to have printed in the RECORD the profit and loss statement of this manufacturer, showing that during the last 5 months they lost $1,595.56, and unless this company gets relief, they tell me they will have to suspend business.

Mr. President, I should like to have unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the correspondence between the Marion Tool Corp., of Marion, Ind., and the Office of Price Administration, and likewise the profit and loss statement of this concern for the past 5 months.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator familiar with the pamphlet just issued by the Brookings Institution in which the conclusion is reached that price control should now be entirely abandoned, with some very limited exceptions?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not.

Mr. TAFT. I think the resolution to investigate OPA which the Senator is urging should be adopted. I think it is doubtful whether price control should be continued, though personally I should be willing to continue it in the case of perhaps ten or a dozen basic products. I am absolutely certain, however, that the present policy being enforced by the OPA is interfering with employment, is discouraging people from proceeding to expand their production, and is checking home construction. We hear of all limits being taken off the construction of houses, but that means apparently "all limits" except price control, and price control on building materials today as enforced by the OPA is such that those who manufacture building materials are not going ahead to manufacture them, because the more they manufacture the more they lose.

I believe we could make no greater contribution to full employment than by the adoption of the Senator's resolution to investigate the whole problem of price control and to eliminate just as much control as can possibly be eliminated.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Indiana. We have to ask ourselves, in the case of this problem, what is the cause of unemployment? The Senator has struck on one important cause, and we can remedy that if we follow the course the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Ohio have suggested.

Another cause is the unwillingness of labor, as everyone knows, to accept the pay which the manufacturing concerns can afford under restricted OPA ceilings. All over America that is inevitable. We are talking about providing jobs. The jobs are here. The men are not willing to work, in places. In every community throughout the Nation there are advertisements in newspapers calling for men to work. The reason is very apparent. There is no willingness to readjust from the wages paid in war industries to the wages which industry can afford to pay under restricted OPA ceilings.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. GEORGE and Mr. BILBO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it will take me only a moment to conclude, and I should like to proceed.

I am thoroughly convinced that OPA, in their price-fixing policies, are retarding reconversion. I want it definitely understood—and I want no mistake about it—that I am in favor of maximum prices, but I am in favor of and I am urging that the Congress investigate, not for the purpose of embarrassing OPA, not on a partisan basis, but that the Congress investigate OPA's price-fixing policies, because I say that OPA is confusing and retarding reconversion and employment.

Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD a telegram addressed to me from Noblitt-Sparks, Inc., of Columbus, Ind., one of our large manufacturers, as follows:

COLUMBUS, IND., *September 19, 1945.*

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building:

Suppliers of radio parts and OPA appeared to be deadlocked over pricing. Result is that we as manufacturers of radios are unable to obtain parts from suppliers. It now appears that radio production will be delayed another month or 6 weeks at least. Many of our employees are on lay-off because of this situation. Understand Mead committee is investigating. Any help you can give to get this matter settled so we can begin production radios will be greatly appreciated.

NOBLITT-SPARKS, INC.,
FRED E. DANIEL,
Secretary.

Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "First Conversion Task," published in the Farmers' Guide of Huntington, Ind., under date of September 15, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST CONVERSION TASK

Bill Jones has the facilities for the production of drain tile. He burned tile before the war but when the draft board took his employees away from him he shut down his plant. Now, there is labor available and he would like to put his plant into full production, offering jobs to a number of men who have recently been released by war production plants.

Farmer Smith needs tile. He and his neighbors have had to buy high-priced and unsuitable sewer tile with which to repair field drains because there was no more field tile available. Farmer Smith now has the money to buy a lot of drain tile and he can get some help in laying it.

Obviously, all that is necessary to create new jobs, get Bill Jones back into production and satisfy Farmer Smith's desire to improve his acres and production is agreement on the part of Farmer Smith to pay Bill Jones enough money for tile to induce Bill Jones to start his plant again.

Farmer Smith isn't going to gage the amount he is willing to pay for tile by the prices he paid in 1941. He is ready to pay for tile a price that will enable him to get what he wants when he wants it. He is no fool. He will not pay more for tile than tile is worth to him.

But the OPA, that great bureau which was created as a wartime emergency agency, is now looking around for some way to continue its free ride on the public's back, so it decides that Farmer Smith must be protected against Bill Jones' natural desire to make tile at a profit.

Under the very dubious authority which it pretends to have obtained from Congress, the OPA tells Bill Jones that he can charge Farmer Smith only as much for tile as he charged him in 1941.

Bill Jones does a little figuring and finds that he must pay higher wages to his helpers, more for fuel and other supplies, more for taxes and transportation. He concludes that he cannot make tile and sell it at 1941 prices without taking a loss on his producion.

So Bill Jones determines that he might just as well not make the tile that Farmer Smith wants.

So, there are no jobs at the tile factory, Farmer Smith does not hire help to tile his fields. The Government does not collect as much tax as it could collect. There is less production on Farmer Smith's farm. No one is happy except the little bureaucrats of the OPA.

The OPA has justified its existence! It has prevented the sale of tile at inflated prices and demonstrated that it is necessary to the protection of Farmer Smith, who (it reasons) would not have had sense enough to refuse to pay Bill Jones more for tile than the tile was worth to him.

The foregoing is an entirely fictitious illustration of just what is happening today all over the United States—possibly not in the tile industry, but certainly in the washing machine, electrical appliances and hundreds of other industries.

There are enough manufacturers in this country who have been relieved of war work to manufacture all the many things the Nation has gone without during the war and now demands in large quantities. These manufacturers will open their plants and give employment to those who have been working in war industries whenever the Government ceases to interfere with them in their ability to manufacture at a reasonable profit. That profit should be measured by the willingness of their consumers to pay it, not by a formula conceived in the office of some bureaucrat who doesn't know the difference between a washing machine and a cultivator.

The war is over but the scarcities created by the OPA during the war remain with us.

When there are scarcities prices are high. When commodities become plentiful competition brings down the price level. That is the law of economics under which this Nation developed the ability to whip Germany and Japan and carry Great Britain on its shoulders at one and the same time.

But it is not the law under which OPA would have us operate. They would attempt to make tile and other things cheap by making it a crime to pay as much for them as they are worth to the man who wants to use them. They would cure scarcities by distributing the few articles available over a wider territory and limiting the number that can be built. They would compel Farmer Smith either to go without his tile or to buy it from some manufacturer who has the guts to tell the OPA to go to hell and will sell tile at a profit, regardless of OPA snoopers.

The first step toward conversion in this country must be the conversion of OPA and kindred organizations into scrap.

In the words of Senator E. H. MOORE, OPA "has become a monster of oppression, a vehicle for crime, the instrumentality of destruction, the breeder of greed, and the perpetuator of shortages and hardships."

When you get tired of its interference with your liberties and prosperity, your jobs and your profits, you might try telling your Congressmen what to do about it—or else.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have in my hand a number of letters—and I am certain there is not a Senator who has not received numerous similar letters—from manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, little businessmen and big businessmen, complaining that they are unable to operate and live under present conditions, that they are unable to put back to work millions upon millions of Americans who are entitled to jobs, all on account of the price-fixing policies of OPA. I am confident there is not a Senator who does not have similar letters on his desk at this very moment.

I again make the statement that OPA price-fixing policies are retarding reconversion and recovery. I make the prophecy, Mr. President, that unless we in the Congress do something about it, not too many months from now many millions of men will be unemployed. The bill the Senate will pass today is not sufficient in scope to take care of the unemployed. Millions of men will be unemployed unless something is done by Congress respecting OPA's price-fixing policy.

Mr. President, I have in my hand four letters from very reputable firms complaining about OPA price-fixing policies. One is from the Magnavox Co., of Fort Wayne, Ind., the employer of hundreds of men. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAGNAVOX CO.,
Fort Wayne, Ind., September 18, 1945.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HOMER: I don't imagine it is necessary for me to arouse your interest in connection with the arbitrary position which the Office of Price Administration has taken in connection with the establishment of price ceilings on radio components.

But I do think you might be interested in knowing what it will specifically mean to our operation involving the production and sale of loud speakers and electrolytic condensers.

If we were to proceed to ship speakers and condensers on the basis of the interim price ceiling of 9 and 7 percent, respectively, the loss we would sustain in the first year of operation, based on the volume realized in 1941, would amount to $1,127,600.

We as a company have determined that we will not ship any loud speakers and condensers until such time as the Office of Price Administration recognizes the seriousness of the situation and affords us some relief.

If relief is not given us and reconversion is thereby delayed, the importance of our production capacity to the radio industry and its reemployment contribution will account for upwards of 30,000 people who will not be reemployed.

It is my considered opinion that price ceilings on radio components should be entirely eliminated for the following reasons:

1. There can be no price pattern established for the component industry as such. Each manufacturer presents a different problem in terms of increased costs and production efficiency.

2. There is absolutely no need for the establishment of a price ceiling on radio parts or, so far as that is concerned, ceilings on radios or radio-phonograph combinations because the capacity of the industry is such that within 6 months to a year of competition—represented by all the companies engaged in the production of this type of equipment prior to the war, plus the many who are entering the market for the first time—will automatically assure a fair and reasonable price to the consumer and a fair profit to the producer.

3. The inertia represented in the administration of the Office of Price Administration with particular regard to price relief in those cases where price relief will be sought (and this would have to be obtained in the instance of practically every manufacturer) is such that the relief could not possibly be processed rapidly enough to meet the fast-moving character of our industry. In other words, there would be dislocations in the manufacturing activity if the manufacturer was obliged to wait any period of time for OPA relief.

4. The present uncertainty confronting all of us in respect to increased labor costs, makes it impractical for price ceilings to be periodically adjusted unless a simple, common-sense formula is resolved which will permit the manufacturer to determine his own price on the basis of a given profit percentage based on some previous experience.

May I respectfully urge that you give some thought to the serious predicament in which our industry finds itself, as otherwise serious economic dislocation of a far-reaching effect may result.

With every good wish,
Sincerely,

DICK,
RICHARD A. O'CONNOR,
President.

Mr. CAPEHART. Likewise I have a letter from Electric Appliances, Inc., of Indianapolis, Ind., dealing with the same subject. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTRIC APPLIANCES, INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind., September 18, 1945.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPEHART: Recently reported actions by the Reconversion Pricing Committee of the OPA make it apparent that the distributing field—both wholesale and retail—is one which the OPA seems to believe operates through mysticism or magic. Certainly they should realize that distribution exists solely through earnings produced from essential services.

An abundance of data is already in their hands to support that fact. If OPA could be made to realize that distributing services are essential services, they would adopt quite different pricing policies than the ruinous ones now pursued.

Electrical specialty appliance distributors and apparatus and supplies distributors are invited by OPA to meet at Washington on September 19 and 20 to submit further concrete facts. However, in view of recent experiences of the retailing trades, under similar circumstances, not much can be hoped for in the way of reconversion pricing relief. A real effort will be made, notwithstanding. It is our opinion that congressional action will be required.

Government policies which threaten the very survival of merchants throughout the United States, who have long performed, both in war and in peace, vital essential services, is a most serious danger to be avoided.

A tremendous task of reabsorption of wartime manpower lies immediately ahead. The wholesale and service trades are expected, and they have so planned, to be a large factor in creating jobs. It is our understanding that 10,000,000 salesmen will be required for postwar American prosperity. These salesmen cannot be employed unless manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers have adequate compensation to pay for their employment. That entire postwar rehabilitation plan is seriously threatened by present OPA policies.

We are bringing this information to your attention as the welfare of our community is involved. Indianapolis is the largest distribution center in the State of Indiana.

Your consideration of this problem will be sincerely appreciated.

Cordially yours,

WALTER I. HESS,
President.

Mr. CAPEHART. I also have a letter from the General Furniture Co., Inc., of Terre Haute, Ind., and a letter from Edgar Morris Sales Co., of Washington, D. C., dealing with the same subject, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL FURNITURE CO., INC.,
Terre Haute, Ind., September 18, 1945.

Senator HOMER CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In our opinion and in the opinion of other furniture and appliance dealers OPA's present attitude toward reconversion prices is a serious threat to our business and our future.

OPA has already granted increases in prices to the manufacturers of certain appliances. At the same time it is their intention to hold resale prices of the October 1941 level. This means that we and other businessmen are going to be called upon to absorb these increases and it just cannot be done without sustaining a loss. In the first place there has never been a huge mark-up on electrical appliances. The percentage of profit has usually run from approximately 18 percent to 40 percent and on this, before the war, a very small net profit was all that was ever made in the appliance department. Now with an dditional increase in the cost to the retailer and retailer not being allowed to have a higher selling price it will result in a direct and definite loss in as much as the retailer expenses have steadily climbed and will climb still further. We certainly expect many strikes which will increase operating expenses due to our being compelled and forced to pay higher salaries in all departments of our organization.

The above matter is causing consternation amongst all retailers and their organizations and will require the serious consideration of OPA, otherwise it will result badly for all concerned.

I will appreciate personally your thoughts on this matter and what you think might be done regarding it.

Yours very truly,
GENERAL FURNITURE CO., INC.,
M. BROWN.

EDGAR MORRIS SALES CO.,
Washington, D. C., September 20, 1945.
Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: The Edgar Morris Sales Co. is a distributor or wholesaler of gas and electrical appliances and radio.

From 1939 to 1942 inclusive our gross annual sales averaged $1,043,000.

From 1943 to 1944 inclusive our gross annual sales averaged $431,500.

These figures are cited for these reasons:

1. War greatly reduced the sales and profits of businesses of our type because the products we distributed were not being manufactured.

2. Our company reduced its personnel by 66⅔ percent in the war years under what it was in 1940 and 1941.

3. Appliances manufacturers are now reconverting to resume manufacture of their prewar products. It is necessary for us now to rebuild our organization, train them anew and aggressively promote the items we sell. This is expected to be an item of considerable expense to us. Furthermore we are having to pay our employees at a higher rate of pay than in 1939 to 1942.

4. We, as every other wholesaler of appliances, have the opportunity and feel an obligation to contribute our respective part to the problem of maximum employment during the months and years ahead of us.

We therefore wish to call your attention to the declared policy of OPA, to force the wholesalers of appliances to absorb part of the increases in price which OPA is granting to appliance manufacturers so that the retail prices may not be increased. We consider this policy to be unfair and detrimental to our future existence.

If the manufacturers' costs have increased, isn't it obvious to OPA that our costs have increased also?

Our sales figures given above are proof that we did not profit by this war and cannot therefore be fairly expected to operate on still lower margins of profit.

If full employment is to be accomplished, selling of the products produced must become an important factor. If the thousands of distributing and selling firms, such as ours, are to be forced by OPA to operate on a reduced margin, our selling activities must of necessity be reduced. In our opinion, that situation will materially slow up the normal resumption of peacetime production and employment.

We ask your careful consideration of this matter

Very truly yours,
EDGAR MORRIS,
President.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I will close with just one further word. I think we can no longer evade the responsibility of finding out how and why OPA is arriving at maximum ceiling prices. That, Mr. President, is our responsibility. Again I wish to go on record as saying that unless we do something about the matter, or unless OPA itself does something about it, the unemployment compensation measure which we are passing today will be far too small in scope to take care of the millions who are going to become unemployed.

EXHIBIT A

MADISON, IND., *August 29, 1944.*
OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Apparel and Textile Branch, Manufactured Articles, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We have been referred to your office by the district office, OPA, Indianapolis, Ind., for the purpose of establishing a ceiling price on one-piece work suits that we manufacture. Prior to 1943 we have never manufactured this item or any item closely comparable. We have studied diligently MPR 208 and now have the new RMPR 208 and have consulted your district offices at Cincinnati, Ohio, and Louisville, Ky., in addition to Indianapolis, Ind., in an effort to obtain the necessary information, detail, and requirements necessary for us to establish a ceiling price on this garment we now manufacture. It will be necessary for us to have a ceiling price for jobbers in large quantities and a wholesale price for a small percentage of our sales.

We can submit complete details and unit cost of manufacture of this garment from our records during the past few months.

Please furnish us with a form, or questions necessary for your office to arrive at our ceiling prices.

Thanking you for your prompt attention, we are,

Yours very truly,
MEYERS & SON MANUFACTURING CO.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., September 1, 1944.
Mr. P. W. MCCAULEY,
Meyers & Son Manufacturing Co.,
Madison, Ind.

DEAR MR. MCCAULEY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 29, 1944, in which you inquire as to the information needed for the establishment of an authorized price for a one-piece work suit, pursuant to rule 5 of RMPR 208.

Please be advised that we will need the following information:

1. A sample of the garment. Please indicate the size range; the sample should be firmly tagged with your name and address.

2. A statement of the reasons why this garment cannot be priced under any of the other pricing rules of RMPR 208.

3. A detailed cost break-down, specifying—

(a) Body material, weight, and finish. Cost per yard and yardage per dozen.

(b) Principal trimming materials and their cost.

(c) Direct labor, exclusive of make-up and overtime.

(d) Make-up.

(e) Overtime premium.

(f) Indirect labor and manufacturing expense.

(g) General and administrative expense.

(h) Selling expense.

4. Requested prices to each class of trade, as well as your customary terms and allowances to each class.

5. Your competitor's prices for similar garments, made of the same material. In each case please state the name of the competitor, and his lot number for the garment cited.

6. Your profit and loss statements for the years 1939 through 1943.

Immediately upon receipt of this information we will be happy to give your application every attention.

Very truly yours,
HORACE L. ALLEN,
Head, Men's Clothing Section,
Consumer Goods Price Division.

SEPTEMBER 19, 1944.
OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.
Attention Mr. Horace L. Allen, Men's Clothing Section, Consumer Goods Price Division.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: In reply to your letter of September 1 requesting information necessary for the establishment of an authorized price for one-piece work suits, pursuant to rule 5 of RMPR 208. We are herewith offering the following information.

1. A sample garment sent today, under separate cover to your attention. Size range of this garment is, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, and 46.

2. This garment cannot be priced under any of the first four pricing rules of RMPR 208 because we have not manufactured this garment or any similar garment prior to 1943.

3. Detailed cost break-down, as follows—per dozen:

(a) Body material: 28/29" 8 oz. # 1 Bluserge denims sanforized at 23½ cents per yard plus ½ cent per yard freight, requiring 70 yards per dozen	$16.80
(b) Trimming materials: 5¼ yards pocketing and inside banding, 30 inch 2.50 drill at $0.1620 per yard plus—	
½ cent per yard freight	.83
Snap fastener and buttons	.38
Thread	.43
Size tags and labels	.12
Packing and banding	.18
Total trimming and packing	1.99
(c) Direct labor exclusive of make-up and overtime	4.04
(d) Make-up	.30
(e) Overtime premium	.06
(f) Indirect labor and manufacturing expense	2.21
(g) General and administrative expense	1.98
(h) Selling	1.70
	29.03

4. Requested price:

Jobbers and mail-order houses, $34 per dozen, less 15 percent, terms 30 days net, f. o. b. Madison, Ind. $28.90

Wholesale price to retailers $34. Net terms 30 days net, f. o. b. Madison, Ind.

5. Competitor's price. Frankly we do not know our competitor's prices for a similar garment, other than H. D. Lee Mercantile Co., South Bend, Ind., Lot No. 211 at $33.80. We have manufactured this garment for a chain store and a mail-order house, selling them practically all our production and we have no way of knowing what our competitors are receiving for this garment.

6. Profit and loss statements. We have not manufactured any civilian goods for several years, giving 100 percent of our production to the United States Army; therefore we do not see how our profit and loss statements could be of any benefit to you in approving a ceiling price on this garment. For this reason we have not enclosed the profit and loss statements requested.

Trusting this information is sufficient to enable you to give our application prompt consideration, we remain

Yours very truly,
MEYERS & SON MANUFACTURING CO.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1945.
MEYERS & SON MANUFACTURING CO.,
Madison, Ind.

GENTLEMEN: This is in reference to your application, filed August 29, 1944, in which you request that we establish maximum prices for certain one-piece work suits under Section 2.6 of Revised Maximum Price Regulation 208.

In your application you state that during and prior to March 1942 you were engaged in the business of producing and selling staple work clothing, but that you did not manufacture garments which are the "same" as the garments for which you now request maximum prices. You state that you are unable to determine your maximum prices for these work suits under any of the automatic pricing rules of the regulation, and request that your maximum price be established by specific authorization from this Office pursuant to Section 2.6 of Revised Maximum Price Regulation 208. You have submitted information relating to the fabrics you intend to

use in these work suits, their costs and other costs entering into the production and sale of these garments, and your requested maximum prices.

An analysis has been made of the information which you have submitted and of the maximum prices of competitive sellers of the same class with regard to garments made of the same or similar fabrics. The maximum prices established herein are in line with the maximum prices for similar garments sold by competitive sellers of the same class. Three ceilings are authorized; the first for garments sold prior to August 16, 1944, the second for garments not sold prior to that date and made of denim purchased prior to June 30, 1944, the third for garments not sold prior to August 16, 1944, and made of denim purchased on or after June 30, 1944. The higher ceilings for the latter garments reflect the increases in the cost of denim to you under amendments 19 and 20 to Revised Price Schedule 35.

After due consideration of the foregoing, and pursuant to Section 2.6 of Revised Maximum Price Regulation 208, It is Ordered:

(a) Meyers & Son Manufacturing Co., Madison, Ind., may sell and deliver, and any person may buy and receive from it, its one-piece work suit, consuming not less than 70 yards of 8 ounce sanforized denim in sizes 34 to 46, made with 2 swing pockets, 2 hip pockets, rule pocket, 2 breast pockets, 5 metal front buttons, 1 front snap, at or below the following ceiling prices:

	Maximum price (per dozen)	
	To group II retail sellers	*To all other purchasers, including wholesalers and group I retail sellers*
Suits sold prior to Aug. 16, 1944	$27.50	$25.00
Suits not sold prior to Aug. 16, 1944, made of denim purchased prior to June 30, 1944	28.00	25.50
Suits not sold prior to Aug. 16, 1944, made of denim purchased on or after June 30, 1944	28.75	26.25

(b) The maximum prices set forth in paragraph (a) are net 30 days f. o. b. factory, and are subject to all trade practices, including practices with regard to shipping charges customarily used by Meyers & Son Manufacturing Co. during March 1942.

(c) In selling and delivering the garments described above, Meyers & Son Manufacturing Co. must comply with all provisions of Revised Maximum Price Regulation 208, including those relating to marking, disclosure, wholesale percentage quota, ceiling price lists, and records.

(d) The definitions in Revised Maximum Price Regulation 208 shall apply to this order.

(e) All prayers of the application not granted herein are denied.

(f) This Order No. L–21 may be revoked or amended by the Price Administrator at any time.

A copy of this order has been filed today with the Secretary of the Office of Price Administration at Washington, D. C., where it is open to inspection by the public.

This order shall become effective immediately.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

EXHIBIT B

VAN ATTA, BATTON & HARKER,
Marion, Ind., September 17, 1945.

Hon. HOMER CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HOMER: This will recall to your mind our brief discussion of the Marion Tool Corp. situation with regard to OPA while you were in Indianapolis last week. I have a further letter from FOREST HARNESS inviting your assistance in this matter, which has now been on file for many, many months with OPA. The application for price relief was filed in March of this year, and there have been all sorts of excuses and reasons for delay but no relief. They now advise FOREST that there is a new regulation which will give Marion Tool Corp. relief and that OPA had communicated with Marion Tool to file a new application, all of which is false as they have not communicated with the company and made a request for anything. Not only that, but their old application has now been pending for 6 months or more, and why should they be required to start all over and go through another period of 6 months' losses?

Mr. HARNESS has all of the details on this matter and has suggested that you call him in order that you, RAYMOND WILLIS, and he join efforts in bringing about some conclusion of this matter at an early date. I know that you will put forth your best efforts in this matter, and I want to take this occasion to again compliment you on your performance to date and thank you for anything that you are able to do for Marion Tool Corp.

Sincerely yours,

AL HARKER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1945.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART.

DEAR HOMER: Pursuant to our conversation, I am sending you by messenger copy of a letter from the Marion Tool Corp., Marion, Ind., to the Office of Price Administration, together with statements showing the increase in cost of material and the company's losses of operation.

Just a glance at these statements will give you all the information necessary to show what has happened to this country through OPA control.

You will note that the latest application was filed in March 1945, and up to this date they have been given no relief.

FOREST A. HARNESS.

MARION TOOL CORP.,
Marion, Ind., March 27, 1945.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

Attention Durable Goods Division, Price Branch Office.

On September 8, 1943, we filed with you our application for price increase, being Docket No. 3188–208. After several supplemental filings, on September 22, 1944, we received your final order No. 58. Our original request asked for 10 percent increase, but your final order only granted us a 5 percent increase.

It is now necessary for us to petition for a further price increase. We are filing this request pursuant to MPR 188, section 1499.161, subsections 2 (i), 2 (iii), 3 (ii), and 3 (iii), for a 15 percent increase on our present prices. Said sections read as follows:

"2 (i). That there exists or threatens to exist in a particular locality a shortage in the supply of a commodity which aids directly in the war program or is essential to a standard of living consistent with the prosecution of the war."

"2 (iii). That such adjustment will not create or tend to create a shortage, or need for increase in price, in another locality, and will effectuate the purpose of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 as amended."

"3 (ii). That the maximum prices established by this regulation do not permit the recovery of total costs."

"3 (iii). That the operations of the company are currently being conducted at a loss."

To substantiate our request for price increase under this regulation, we may advise with regard to subsection 2 (i) that there exists a shortage of a number of items, which we manufacture, which aid in the war program and are essential to the standard of living consistent with the prosecution of the war. We refer particularly to such items as lifeboat axes, pick-head fire axes (Maritime Commission), short-handled hand axes (Navy), nail hammers, magnetic tack hammers, shoe hammers (Army), for which we have substantial orders issued on WPB ratings. Numerous items in our line are also supplied nationally to the farm trade in substitution for higher quality mechanic's tools now in such demand for the armed forces and war plants. Our inability to continue to furnish this trade due to our price situation will only increase this shortage. At this very moment we have approximately $230,000 worth of WPB rated orders for domestic and foreign trade.

We may advise with regard to subsection 2 (iii) that such adjustment as is requested here will not create a need for increased prices in other localities or by our competitors inasmuch as our chief competitors now sell at a sufficiently higher price that the increase requested would not affect them if granted. In our last application, which I presume you have on file, we submitted to you a complete brief on the matter of price comparison with competitors which we would appreciate your referring to as we believe it gives you a complete picture of that situation.

We may advise with regard to subsection 3 (ii) that we believe the requested adjustment to be necessary inasmuch as the maximum prices established by this regulation do not permit the recovery of total costs and subsection 3 (iii) that the operations of the company are currently being conducted at a loss. To demonstrate this situation, we submit an operating statement for the period of 5 months from October 1, 1944, which was the first month after your previous order had been granted, to February 28, 1945, which shows an operating loss for the 5 months of $1,595.56. In further support of this proposition, we submit statements for the months of January and February 1945, which show losses of $770.14 and $1,170.18, respectively, indicating that the loss is becoming increasingly great with each month of operation. It is true that the increase granted by your former order helped us momentarily, but it was short-lived due to two reasons:

(1) The drop in volume of business; and

(2) Further and additional increase in the cost of our raw materials.

With regard to the first reason, we submit that at the time you were determining our former application, our volume was running from $20,000 to $25,000 per month, all of which figures are obtainable from our former briefs, while for the months of January and February 1945, our volume was $14,000 and $12,000, respectively. This diminution of volume in our business is partly due to the fact that we are not able to pay market prices for raw material, particularly handles and castings, and still maintain our ceiling prices. To demonstrate this we are attaching a comparative schedule of castings and handle costs from March 1, 1942, until March 1, 1945. You will note in some instances there is as much as 100 percent increase in price, while our price has only increased 5 percent. Even some of these prices are below quotations from many available sources. We know that materials—castings and handles—are available at the market price.

We are also attaching a comparative schedule for representative items, based on current costs of raw materials, showing percent of profit during March 1942, profit and loss during March 1944, and loss during March 1945. The largest portion of loss during March 1945 is caused by the increase in prices for raw materials, handles and castings mostly.

Since these raw material advances were authorized by OPA, we feel that you should be cognizant of the resulting injustice imposed on our business, as it is impossible for us to absorb these advances.

Under subsection 3 (iii), we note the following provision:

"Adjustment in price may be made to an extent sufficient to enable the manufacturer to cover total costs on the article, together with a profit. In a proper case the manufacturer may charge a price equal to the price requested in the application, provided that he has received a letter from the Office of Price Administration stating that his is a proper case. Such price shall be tentative and refund shall be made to each purchaser in the event that the application is denied in whole or in part."

The former application heretofore referred to required almost a year for processing and while we are not being critical of this situation, nevertheless you can see that we would soon be out of business if this situation were to continue. Profit and loss statements for January 1945 show an operating loss of 5.2 percent while in February this loss was almost doubled and increased to 9.6 percent. We may say further that not all our increased costs for raw materials (especially handles) are reflected in these statements as these costs are increasing materially daily.

This request is for permission to add 15 percent to our present prices. We believe that we are within the provisions of subsection 3 (iii) and should be granted this price increase immediately, subject to further action, in order that we may recover our total costs plus a small profit.

We also attach hereto a synopsis of our WPB rating, which is self-explanatory and which we believe will indicate to you that we are considered to be essential by WPB and that a cessation of our operations will materially affect the effective prosecution of this war. In view of the urgency of our position due to steadily increasing losses, early action is most necessary.

It seems evident from the statements above that we completely qualify under paragraphs 1499.161, subsection (3) (ii) and (iii), and relief can therefore be granted immediately. Prompt action will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

A. H. NOTSINGER,
President.

Marion Tool Corp., Marion Ind.—Profit and loss statement for 5 months ending Feb. 28, 1945

Income from sales:	
Gross sales	$76,852.02
Less freight on sales	2,873.07
Less returns and allowances	6.70
Total	2,879.77
Net sales	73,972.25
Cost of goods manufactured (exhibit 11A)	62,336.99
Gross profit from sales	11,635.26
Operating expenses:	
Administrative:	
Association dues	160.90
General expenses	401.49
Office salaries	4,912.48
Office supplies	145.44
Bank-handling charge	22.50
Postage	134.10
Telephone and telegraph	126.99
Donations	15.00
Total administrative expense	5,918.90
Operating expenses—Continued	
Selling expense:	
Advertising	$3.40
Attorney fees	78.70
Commercial ratings	125.00
Commissions	5,631.28
General expense	5.86
Export expense	141.36
Total selling expenses	5,985.70
Total operating expenses	11,904.60
Net loss from operations	269.34
Nonoperating income: purchase discounts earned	364.98
Gross income for the period	95.64
Nonoperating expenses: Cash discount allowed	1,691.20
Net loss for the period	1,595.56

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the language which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has moved to strike is language approved by the Senate Finance Committee. The committee, of course, is opposed to having the language stricken. I ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the Senator's motion to strike.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Chair state the pending question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], to strike out all after line 2 on page 24 of the bill down to and including line 4 on page 25, relating to transportation allowances. If the language is stricken there will be no provision for transportation allowances.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOORE (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 65, as follows:

YEAS—14

Andrews	Gurney	Overton
Bailey	Hickenlooper	Stewart
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Wherry
Chandler	McClellan	Wilson
Ellender	O'Daniel	

NAYS—65

Aiken	Hatch	Myers
Austin	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Briggs	Kilgore	Smith
Butler	Knowland	Taft
Capehart	La Follette	Taylor
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Tobey
Cordon	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Green	Morse	Willis
Guffey	Murdock	Young
Hart	Murray	

NOT VOTING—17

Bankhead	Connally	Pepper
Brewster	Eastland	Revercomb
Brooks	Glass	Russell
Buck	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Moore	Tydings
Bushfield	O'Mahoney	

So Mr. MCCLELLAN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I previously sent to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 24, line 11, after the word "authorized", it is proposed to insert "in any case where it is shown to the satisfaction of the Director that the individual concerned is in need of such assistance."

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, the amendment is self-explanatory. It provides some measure or test of need for this expenditure. I have pointed out my objections to the general provisions of this section. It either does not go far enough, or goes too far, as it is written at present. If we are not going to take care of individuals who have already gone home at their own expense, then I believe that in justice to them we ought not to pay the expenses of the others unless some need is established for the assistance. If we are not to do at least that, in my judgment we ought to revise the whole section and make it applicable alike to all workers who have gone away from their homes to work in war plants.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AS AFFECTING AGRICULTURE

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, on this occasion I wish to do what is not often done, and that is to brag about the United States Senate.

When I came to the Senate in 1935, the Congress was still pursuing a policy of enacting temporary and emergency relief measures to keep the American farmer's head above the water—a policy which had been adopted at the beginning of the Roosevelt administration in 1933 to save the farmer from the utter ruin and bankruptcy which had been brought about by possibly the worst panic in the history of the American people, a panic that was even worse than the one in 1837.

All that was being done at that time and all that had been done prior to that time was necessary, and those efforts did save the farmer. However, such treatment for the farmer's problems amounted to mere "shots in the arm," and it was evident that a permanent program must be adopted.

Before coming to the Senate I had given much thought and investigation to a permanent program which would raise the farm life of America to its proper place and standard—making agriculture not only the great life that it is and should be, but making it the most satisfactory and lucrative life that a citizen could pursue.

Mankind's dependence upon the products of the soil is one of the fundamental laws of nature. When man learned the domestication of plants and animals and began to practice the art of agriculture, a new era on this earth began and civilization dawned. In modern times, the history of our own Nation illustrates from the very beginning the primary importance of the tilling of the soil. Year after year, in season and out, the American farmer has gone forward, progressing steadily, ever mindful of the knowledge that his task has always constituted the very basis of our economic life.

With the coming of the machine age, agriculture was revolutionized. However, the great emphasis during this era was on the development of outstanding industries in this Nation. The products of our mines, the resources of our great forests, power, steam, and electricity, and the inventions which steadily flowed from ingenious minds combined to present to American industry the opportunity to expand until it would lead the world in manufacture and production. With the great strides which industry was making and with the rapidly diminishing raw materials in the forests and the bowels of the earth, before many decades had passed it did not take a prophet to foresee and to know that our rapidly expanding industries were consuming the supply of raw materials and soon it would be exhausted. Here was presented a serious and perilous problem to which an answer must, of necessity, be found.

We began to realize that farm output must equal mineral output, that industry and agriculture must be balanced, if we were to have a stable economy. We knew that the raw products of industry must increasingly flow from the farmers' fields in order that agriculture might furnish the raw materials which would pass through the revolutionary and wonder machines of a new day. It was necessary for us to make preparations so that when the other supplies of raw materials were exhausted, the harvests from the farmers' crops could meet the demands of the most highly developed civilization in all the world.

An invention by Haber and Bosch in 1913, usually described under the title of "fixation of atmospheric nitrogen," gave to agriculture the key to increased plant growth. Here was opened the field of organic chemistry. Science could find the answer to our problem because organic chemical processing contemplated an unrestricted utilization of nature's renewable resources. Improvement of the manufacture and the supply of mechanical power had characterized the machine age. The chemical age began to concentrate upon the supply from organic life of better source materials for mechanical power and industrial use.

By 1938 science and chemurgic research in private industry had wrought wonders in the way of obtaining substitutes for food, shelter, clothing, and many more articles of an expanding and higher civilization. Those substitutes began to take the place of the trees of the forests and the metals of the earth. It was then I began to sell my colleagues in the Senate and in the House of Representatives the idea that because of the usable and marketable byproducts which could be developed through chemurgic research from the commodities that could be produced on the farms and fields of America, the prices of the farmer's crops could be increased many, many times, thereby bringing within a short period of 10 or 15 years the greatest era of prosperity ever known to the American farmer. By the way, that was one bill which passed the Congress without a vote against it.

Pursuing that dream of a permanent service to the agriculture of America, I introduced a bill to erect and equip four great research or chemurgic laboratories to be built in the four great agricultural areas of the United States. Let it be said to the credit of this body that the Senate passed the bill. That measure authorized an appropriation of $4,000,000 for the inauguration of this campaign, and it provided for an annual appropriation of $4,000,000 more to maintain and operate the laboratories, giving $1,000,000 to each of the four.

The bill passed the House and was signed by the President. Since that time the laboratories have been located, built, and equipped, and for the past 3 or 4 years almost a thousand employees, chiefly scientists and chemists, have been engaged in the greatest research in the interest of agriculture in all history.

As you know, Mr. President, one of these plants is located at Peoria, Ill.; one at Philadelphia, Pa.; one at New Orleans, La.; and the fourth at San Francisco, Calif. The work progressed steadily from the very beginning, and many important discoveries had already been announced when this Nation was plunged into the Second World War. The efforts of those thousands of men and women, with the facilities of the four great laboratories, were promptly and properly directed to the war effort. But notwithstanding that necessary interruption so far as the peacetime program was concerned, we have continued to reap the harvests of the work which has been done in those research centers.

It is not my purpose here to discuss the many experiments, processes, and successful results which have come from the tireless efforts of our great scientific minds working in those laboratories. However, I wish to mention two of the recent discoveries. The first of these was made during the war, at the chemurgic laboratory located at Peoria, Ill. It will a thousand times justify all the effort and every cent which has been invested in the entire project. Dr. Coghill, the mold expert at Peoria, found a process by which the wonder drug of all the ages, penicillin, could be made on a wholesale basis. As a result of that discovery, 19 factories in the United States and 3 in Canada are today producing enough penicillin to supply practically the entire world. By that discovery alone, the lives of hundreds of thousands, yea, millions of our battle casualties were saved, the wounded were restored to health and lives of usefulness, and at the same time penicillin has been made available in such quantity and at such a price as to enable it to be used to save the lives of tens of millions of persons in the civilian world today and in the years to come. This has been brought about and made possible by the cooperation of Congress in the program of chemurgic research, which is the greatest of all attempts to provide a permanent solution to the problems of the most important occupation on which the whole world depends—agriculture.

As a result of the war-time research the Southern Regional Research Laboratory at New Orleans has made available to the world a process for the treatment of cotton fabrics which will prevent mildew and rot. This is the other discovery which I wish to mention. This is no longer an experiment; it is an accomplished fact. In further explanation of this wonderful discovery made in one of our four research laboratories—a process that will greatly expand the consumption and use of cotton which is the money crop of so many millions of our farmers—I wish to read a recent release from the United States Department of Agriculture, Research Administration:

NEW COTTON FABRIC RESISTS MILDEW AND ROT

A new modified cotton fabric that will not mildew nor rot and that has withstood burial in the ground for more than 6 months with insignificant loss of strength, has been developed by scientists of the United States Department of Agriculture.

This new material has the strength and appearance of ordinary cotton, plus the ability to resist the attack of rot-producing micro-organisms. It is partially acetylated cotton which is somewhat related to rayon made by the acetate process. In contrast to the use of the usual preservative finishes on cotton, this new process does not cause discoloration of the fabric. It does not produce an odor or cause the fabric to be sticky, and it does not make the fabric toxic, a great advantage where it is used for food sacks.

This new development promises to be useful in at least two general fields which

consume large amounts of cotton, says Dr. O. E. May, Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry. First, the modified cotton cloth, yarn, and sewing thread should be satisfactory for making clothing that will not mildew; tents and awnings that will not rot in damp climates, and fish nets that will not rot if put away wet. It is also promising for use in making rot-resistant bags for the packaging of fruits, vegetables, and other food products.

An engineer told me last week that he had just thrown out 8,000 cotton sacks which had been used for only a short while. They had rotted. This discovery is important.

I continue reading:

To test the rot resistance of this material some of the treated cloth and thread were buried in the ground and in especially prepared soil beds teeming with micro-organisms of the kind that would have rotted ordinary cotton cloth within a week. The results showed that the treated cotton could remain buried under these conditions from 6 months to a year with very little loss of strength. Sandbags made from the acetylated cloth, sewed with similarly treated thread, and piled outdoors on the ground, were still intact after 2 years.

The wartime research which led to this accomplishment was undertaken because of war needs for more resistant threads and fabrics, particularly in the Tropics where ordinary cotton cloth deteriorates rapidly. It is the result of work by Charles F. Goldthwait, James McLaren, Samuel T. Voorhies, Jr., and others at the Southern Regional Research Laboratory in New Orleans.

This one discovery is worth untold millions to the cotton growers of America as well as to the users of cotton.

Mr. President, if ever before in the history of mankind it could be said that the world had entered a new era, it can surely be said today. With all the knowledge which we have gained from the greatest war in history out of which we have just so recently victoriously emerged, with all the discoveries and inventions culminating in the atomic bomb which have come from the mind and skill of man, we are now entering upon a new day. Let us look to the future with faith, and with the firm belief that the problems of our Nation can and will be successfully met and solved.

The problems of agriculture are of primary importance, and as such they cannot be overemphasized. A permanent solution has been found in the field of organic chemistry, and we must look to the research scientist to lift one by one the veils from the face of nature, and show us through the on-flowing years the sources of a fabulous wealth that lie concealed in the organic products of the soil.

When I spoke at the dedication of the Southern Research Laboratory at New Orleans on December 29, 1939, I said:

We stand, as it were, tiptoe upon a lofty eminence, supported by four chemurgic columns of herculean strength—the four chemical laboratories that rest on the four corners of the Nation—and behold the rising sun of this new day making purple glory in the east.

My belief that chemurgic research to be conducted in these laboratories was the way to solve permanently the problems of agriculture has today been more than justified. The future holds even greater promise.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder why one of those laboratories was not located in the middle Northwest?

Mr. BILBO. I shall have to refer the Senator to former Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, who made the decision as to where the laboratories should be located. I have often wondered why one was not located in Mississippi.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator believe that there should be one in the Northwest?

Mr. BILBO. I believe that we now have plenty of laboratories for the benefit of agriculture because the present laboratories cover the four great agricultural areas of the United States. The one at Peoria, Ill., deals with the crops which are suitable for growth in the section of the country from which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] comes.

Mr. LANGER. Peoria is nearly a thousand miles away from my State.

Mr. BILBO. That does not make any difference. What the scientists ascertain in Illinois with reference to wheat, corn, rye, and the other crops which the Senator grows in his State, will do him just as much good as if the information were obtained at his front door.

Mr. LANGER. What about flax?

Mr. BILBO. The same statement applies.

Mr. LANGER. There is no flax grown in Illinois.

Mr. BILBO. No; but the Senator can send samples of flax to Peoria and have experiments made there. Take Pennsylvania for example; there are not many apples grown in Pennsylvania, but instead they are grown in Virginia. Virginia is the greatest apple-producing State in the country. Apples are also grown in Northwestern States such as Oregon and Washington. The scientists are specializing on the apple at the Pennsylvania laboratory because apples are grown in this area. However, what is ascertained with respect to apples in Pennsylvania will also apply to apples grown in Washington, Oregon, or in other States on the Pacific coast.

By the way, it has been discovered that the sirup which can be made from the core of the apple is a perfect substitute for glycerin which was used heretofore in the manufacture of tobacco and cigarettes, and today apple honey is better than glycerin for the manufacture of tobacco.

Mr. LANGER. I compliment the distinguished Senator on what he has accomplished.

Mr. BILBO. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I believe, however, that one of the laboratories should be located at some place in the Middle Northwest.

Mr. BILBO. If the Senator will prepare a bill and have it referred to the committee, as well as sending a copy of it to the Department of Agriculture, and it receives an O. K., I shall support it.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator very much for his promise, because we need a laboratory established in the Northwest to be used in connection with the growth of crops.

Mr. BILBO. These laboratories are the one ray of hope for the future of this country.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1274) to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplemental unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] to insert certain words on page 24, line 11, of the committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to speak with respect to the subject of transportation allowance in connection with the individuals who are to be dealt with under the pending measure.

What we are trying to do in this bill is to get the workers back from places to which they went temporarily as a result of the war. We wish to get them either to their homes or elsewhere for employment. Under the State laws the question of need is not a factor which enters into the right of any individual to receive unemployment compensation. None of the States has fixed need as being the test insofar as this bill affects the extension of the term of duration to be taken care of by payments by the Federal Government in addition to the time provided in the State statutes. So, neither in the State laws nor in the bill before the Senate is the question of need to be regarded as a fair test in determining a man's right either to unemployment compensation or to travel allowance. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas would be impossible of administration. The Director of Demobilization and Reconversion would be required to pass upon every individual applicant's need for a transportation allowance. It would be impossible of enforcement by the administration. Moreover, it is within the discretion of the Director in any event to determine whether any person shall receive travel pay. In view of that, and in view of the fact that it injects into the whole picture the test of need, which is not recognized in the bill now pending, or in any of the State laws, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. I think I may say that I speak for the committee in hoping that it will not be agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If this provision is to remain in the bill, does not the Senator feel that, in justice, we should take into account those who have returned

home at their own expense, some of whom perhaps were in need of assistance, but managed nonetheless to get home, as well as others who returned but who did not need assistance?

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee discussed that, and we thrashed that out in the committee, and it was decided practically by unanimous voice of the committee that we could deal only with those who are yet remaining away from home. If anyone has been fortunate enough to get back home, perhaps under an arrangement between him and his employer—and there have been many such arrangements by which expenses to and from the place of employment would be borne—he is just that much more fortunate than those who are still remaining in the places to which they went for employment. The committee felt it could not make the bill retroactive so as to pay the expenses of those who had already gone home; and, the object being to return to their homes those who are still away from them or to redistribute over the country where there are jobs those who are in the centers of employment without jobs, that there was no sufficient element of unfairness or discrimination that would justify the committee in making it retroactive so as to reimburse those who had already gone to their places of residence or to other jobs.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Senator feel that if we leave it as it is now, without taking into account those who have paid their own travel expenses, without giving them an opportunity to file claims for reimbursement, it will somewhat penalize those who have already paid their own expenses? I am merely trying to find a fair solution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it would be penalizing them. If we made the bill retroactive, so that every one who had gone to a job during the war and had returned home could file a separate claim against the Government, there would of course be practically hundreds of thousands of individual claims filed. The object of the bill is to get back to either their homes or to other places of employment those who have not been able to find jobs. I do not think there is sufficient discrimination or injustice between those who have already returned, and those who may for one reason or another have not been able to return, to justify making the bill retroactive, or putting a test of need into the calculation of anyone in drawing transportation expenses, either back to his residence, or to some other place not more distant than his residence. If we apply the need test to the transportation item, we almost automatically bar those who have already gone home, because they have already gone.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Some of them may have borrowed the money with which to go.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not see how the Government can go into an investigation to ascertain whether anyone borrowed money in order to get back home, or to obtain some other job. We are bound to assume that those who have gone back have returned without the need of help from the Government. The inconsistency of the whole thing is that there is no need test provided in the bill, or in any State law on the subject, although the question of transportation is not involved in the State laws.

Mr. McCLELLAN. On the same theory, I assume, everyone who has gone back was able to get back, but I assume that 99.99 percent of those who have not returned are able to return. I think that by the section in the bill as it is we simply favor the group who, because of their situation, remained where they were by choice, and will remain until the bill goes into effect, and are showing them special favors over those who have, possibly through circumstances, been compelled to return home sooner, or have found it advisable to go home sooner.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, many of those who have returned to their homes or have gone to other places probably have found employment, and it was more to their advantage to go to those places and seek and obtain the employment than it was to wait around in the places where they were in the hope that they would either find jobs there or that someone would pay their expenses to some other place. They have taken time by the forelock, and probably have gotten employment. They have gotten compensatory advantage by being able to go where there were jobs, and getting work sooner, than those who will be taken care of under the bill. So that it probably works out fairly, on the average.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It strikes me that what we are trying to do now is to help the man who has not found employment by paying him unemployment compensation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if he has returned home and has not obtained a job, he is entitled, if he qualifies, to unemployment compensation. That, of course, is based upon the requirements of the State law, as the bill is written. So I think that adoption of the amendment would throw into the situation an element of confusion, and require the Director to make a personal investigation of every person, as to whether he had the money to get back home or to get to another job, and that would involve the question whether he had any money at all, or whether he had enough to buy a railroad ticket, and how many persons he had in his family. It seems to me when we have fixed a limitation of $200, and provided he shall not be paid for railroad fare to a point more distant than his home, and left it in the discretion of the Director under regulations which he will provide, we have thrown around the case all the restrictions which should be thrown around it, if we are to make any travel allowance at all, and the Senate has overwhelmingly decided to allow travel allowances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. [Putting the question.] The noes appear to have it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask for a division.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Myers
Andrews	Hatch	O'Daniel
Austin	Hawkes	Overton
Bailey	Hayden	Reed
Ball	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	Knowland	Taft
Byrd	La Follette	Taylor
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McCarran	Tobey
Chandler	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Cordon	McKellar	Wagner
Donnell	McMahon	Walsh
Downey	Magnuson	Wheeler
Ellender	Maybank	Wherry
Ferguson	Mead	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Mitchell	Willis
Gerry	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	
Gurney	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] on page 24, line 11, after the word "authorized", to insert certain words. A division has been requested.

Mr. HAWKES and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the roll call is begun may I ask Senators to remain on the floor. We are reaching the conclusion of the pending measure, and if Senators will remain in the Senate so we will not have to indulge in the necessity of quorum calls I think we can conclude consideration of the bill shortly. I hope it is not asking too much of Senators to remain in the Senate Chamber after the present roll call is concluded.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency has been in executive session, and a number of Senators have just returned to the floor from that committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that, but all committees are not now in session. That is a legitimate excuse for the Senator from Arkansas and other Senators who are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am also a member, and the meeting of which I should like to have attended, but that does not apply to every Senator who has been off the floor for the last few minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Chair to state the pending question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] on page 24, line 11, after the word "authorized", to insert certain language. The language proposed to be inserted will be read by the clerk.

CHIEF CLERK. On page 24, in line 11, after the word "authorized", it is pro-

posed to insert "in any case where it is shown to the satisfaction of the Director that the individual concerned is in need of such assistance."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, during the absence of some Senators the amendment was explained. It requires that only in cases where the Director finds that the individuals are in need of transportation shall it be granted. Neither under the laws of the States nor under the pending bill is the test of need applied in any case. The Director is given the discretion to determine whether any person shall be paid his expenses either back to his home or to a new job. The amendment would be impossible of administration because the Director would have to have a personal investigation made of every individual who sought transportation either home or to another job, and inasmuch as the need test is not applied anywhere, and it is all in the discretion of the Director anyway, the committee feels that the amendment ought not to be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays having been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—24

Andrews	Fulbright	O'Daniel
Bailey	Gerry	Overton
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Butler	Hawkes	Revercomb
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Chandler	McClellan	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	Wilson

NAYS—55

Aiken	Downey	Kilgore
Austin	Ferguson	Knowland
Barkley	George	La Follette
Bilbo	Green	Langer
Bridges	Guffey	McCarran
Briggs	Hart	McFarland
Burton	Hatch	McKellar
Carville	Hayden	McMahon
Chavez	Hill	Magnuson
Cordon	Hoey	Maybank
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Mead
Millikin	Smith	Walsh
Mitchell	Taft	Wheeler
Morse	Taylor	White
Murdock	Thomas, Utah	Wiley
Murray	Tobey	Willis
Myers	Tunnell	Young
Saltonstall	Vandenberg	
Shipstead	Wagner	

NOT VOTING—17

Bankhead	Connally	Radcliffe
Brewster	Eastland	Russell
Brooks	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Capper	Pepper	

So Mr. McCLELLAN'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 15, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "Upon the written request of the governor of any State (or, in the case of the District of Columbia, upon the written request of the Commissioners of said District), the" and insert in lieu thereof "The."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this amendment would strike out, in section 702, that part of subsection (a) which reads "upon the written request of the governor of any State (or, in the case of the District of Columbia, upon the written request of the Commissioners of said District), the" and insert "The", so as to read:

> The Director is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with such State, or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State—

And so forth. The bill as now written, the increase in the amount of payment of weekly unemployment compensation having been eliminated, and the bill having been restricted to the extension of the term or duration of unemployment compensation payments under the State law, it is purely voluntary on the part of the State unemployment authority as to whether it shall enter into an agreement with the Director of Mobilization and Reconversion under which agreement the United States will continue weekly payments of unemployment compensation for the period set out in the bill, not to exceed 26 weeks.

The language which I seek to strike out was inserted by the committee after a very close vote, on motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. So no unemployment compensation agency of any State could enter into any agreement with the Director of Mobilization and Reconversion, although that is the basis upon which the bill is founded, unless the Governor of that State should make a request in writing that such agreement be entered into. No matter how willing the unemployment compensation agency in the State might be to enter into the agreement to act as the agent of the United States in paying additional compensation for the lengthened duration, no matter how strongly the State authority might desire it, and even though it felt that under State law it could enter into such an agreement, unless the Governor of the State himself should write a letter requesting that the agreement be entered into, or the additional payment made, the State unemployment compensation authority of no State could enter into the agreement provided for in the bill.

As I have understood, we are trying to do something for unemployed people. The bill as it is now written is based upon the willingness of the State to agree voluntarily, through its unemployment compensation authority, with the Director of Mobilization and Reconversion. We superimpose upon that willingness the whim of a Governor, or his willingness to write a letter in addition, without which neither the Director of Mobilization and Reconversion nor the unemployment compensation agency of the State could enter into an agreement by which the extended payment could be made.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Is this amendment the one which was added to the bill by the committee by a majority of one vote at a time when some members of the committee, including myself, were absent; and is it the amendment as to which those of us who were absent wished to be recorded in favor of the position the Senator from Kentucky has taken? If so, if we had been present, the amendment would have been defeated; would it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct; this is the amendment which was added by a majority of one vote in the committee, in the absence of a number of members of the committee, including the Senator from Massachusetts, who was absent upon important naval matters at the time. Later he came into the committee room and announced that if he had been present he would have voted against the amendment. His vote would have defeated it. There were other members of the committee who also would have voted against it if they had been present. Of course, that is only a circumstance to show how the amendment got into the bill in the first place.

Mr. WALSH. It does not affect the soundness of the measure at all, of course.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but if the Senator from Massachusetts and other Senators who were called out of the committee meeting had been present at that time, the amendment would not have been agreed to. That is merely an illustration of the old story that if something had happened, something else which happened would not have happened.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator's amendment is agreed to, would it not require a further amendment in lines 19 and 20, striking the word "such", and inserting in lieu thereof the word "any"?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; that is true.

Mr. WHITE. And that would also occur in line 21, I believe, and possibly in line 24 the word "any" would have to be inserted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; those technical changes would have to be made.

Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the vote on the amendment. The point I make is that the bill is based upon voluntary agreement between the unemployment authorities of a State, through their regularly constituted unemployment agencies; and those unemployment agencies are not the governors of the States. They are set up by legislative enactment, and their members hold office for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the State laws on this subject. It seems to me that it would be imposing on the people of the State an unreasonable handicap to require that before the State unemployment agency can begin to carry out an agreement or before it can begin the negotiation of an agreement, the governor of the State must write a letter requesting the aid. As I have said, Mr. President, the whole thing is voluntary, anyway.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The effect of the provision in the bill would be to give the governor of a State the power to veto the will of Congress; would it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not only would it give the governor the power to veto the will of Congress, but it would give him the power to veto the will of his own State unemployment commission, if it desired to enter into such an agreement. I think we can rely on the unemployment compensation agencies of the States to determine whether they wish to join with the Federal Government in an agreement by which they would simply act as the agents of the Federal Government in providing the extended payments.

Mr. President, I am looking toward the welfare of the people. I am not interested in the power of some man who happens to be the governor of a State to determine whether thousands of the people of his State shall be able to receive this extended unemployment compensation, and I do not believe any one man should be given the power to determine whether the Federal Government shall aid in the extension of the payments which we seek to provide for in the pending measure. That is a simple question, Mr. President. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the representatives of State after State appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and testified that the States are able and willing to take care of their own unemployment-insurance problems and were insistent upon doing so.

The testimony is overwhelming to the effect that if it should be considered necessary, the States, through the action of their own legislatures and governors, and out of their unemployment-insurance reserves of almost $7,000,000,000, could increase the benefits and lengthen the duration without impairing the soundness of their own reserves.

In this connection I remind you that last year a Federal law was passed making Federal funds available to maintain the solvency of the unemployment-compensation reserves of the States.

The representatives of State after State declared that if their own systems should be unable to stand the strain of any emergency that may develop during the reconversion, special sessions of their legislatures could be called and the States, out of their own resources, could meet any deficiencies.

Forty-five State legislatures met this year. It may be fairly assumed that every one of those legislatures was conscious of the reconversion problems. The testimony shows that in 1945, 25 States increased their weekly benefit maximums; that 28 States increased the period of duration for maximum benefits; that 21 States increased both the benefits and the periods of duration; that 32 States increased one or the other. A maximum benefit duration of 20 or more weeks applies in 33 States, which have more than 81 percent of all covered workers.

Viewing at grass roots the same problem that we are viewing at this distance, the States have declared their own policies in the way provided under their own constitutions and in the way induced and encouraged by our Federal social security law. They have fitted their systems to meet their own conceptions of the reconversion emergencies that may arise in their own States. Strong argument is available that it is nothing less than swollen presumption for us to sit here and superimpose our own judgment, to act as a court of review on those State legislatures, to intervene gratuitously with Federal bait.

The duration of payments and the amount of payments are matters which are decided in the States after consideration of a complex of intricate and difficult and delicate factors. There are human elements. The fund must help its beneficiaries to tide over a tough period. There are actuarial considerations. The fund, if it is to accomplish its objectives, must be kept sound. There are work-incentive considerations.

If the fund is to accomplish its objective the incentive-to-work factor must be preserved.

The job-seeking initiative of the beneficiaries should not be dulled.

When we intervene, we interfere with the deliberate policies on these complex and delicate matters of the State legislatures, as represented by their laws, and of the governors who approved those laws. I repeat, Mr. President, that when we intervene, we interfere with the deliberate policies of the governors who approved those laws.

We raise questions of jurisdiction and responsibility, questions as to the relations of the States to the Federal Government, and questions of good faith, whether we meant what we said when we asked the States to set up their own systems and determine their own problems within the framework of certain Federal standards.

But despite the solemn judgment of the States as to what is best for them as expressed in their unemployment-compensation laws, despite the assurances that they can take care of their own problems, it may nevertheless develop that they will want or need Federal aid so far as duration of benefits is concerned.

Should some subordinate agency of the State be in position to tamper with the deliberate and solemn judgment of the legislature and the governor as to what is best for that State?

If, therefore, it should be concluded that Federal aid is wanted, and the acceptance of it is not inconsistent with State law or policy, or for whatever the reason, the question then is, How shall this important decision on high State policy be determined? Shall such a decision be made and ushered into being through backdoor negotiations and agreements of subordinate Federal and State officials?

I urge that the power should be lodged in the governor, because he is supposed to symbolize, embody, and reflect by his actions the executive policies of his State, the voice of his legislature, and the sentiments of his people.

Mr. President, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky. I found myself in a minority in the Finance Committee during the consideration of the pending legislation, and I have also found myself in a minority in the Senate during the time the bill has been considered here.

It seems to me that the arguments presented by the able Senator from Colorado must logically lead to the conclusion that there is no justification for any action by the Federal Government in relation to the question of unemployment compensation during the reconversion period.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I must respectfully assert that that conclusion is not at all warranted. This bill recognizes a Federal responsibility in respect to transportation of migrant workers. It recognizes a Federal responsibility in connection with maritime workers. It also recognizes a Federal responsibility in connection with Federal employees, and I approve all of those provisions. It is somewhat beside the mark to say that in a part of the bill where we have agreed, at least so far, that if there is to be Federal aid to the States it shall be on a voluntary basis, that I have not recognized any Federal responsibility for helping this reconversion situation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall not modify my comment upon the arguments of the Senator from Colorado, and Senators who care to do so may read the statement of the Senator from Colorado and my comment in the RECORD and draw their own conclusions as to whether the comment was justified. I think that the position of the Senator from Colorado with regard to the Federal Government's responsibility in the field of unemployment compensation during the reconversion period leads to the inescapable conclusion that the Federal Government should not propose to go even as far as the majority of the Finance Committee was willing to go,

namely, to extend the benefit period to a maximum of 26 weeks after the unemployed in the States had exhausted their rights under the State laws. If we are justified at all in discharging a responsibility to the unemployed in the event of a prolonged period of mass unemployment, we are not justified, in my opinion, in allowing the whim of any man, be he a governor or other official, to stand in the way of the extension of the benefits which the majority of the Members of Congress are prepared to extend in this situation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the committee substitute leaves it to the whim of a State unemployment compensation insurance agency.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; it does so at the moment, because by a majority vote of one in the committee, subsection (c) was stricken from the bill. But an amendment will be offered shortly by the Senator from Kentucky to restore that subsection. That subsection provides that if a State cannot enter into this agreement, the Director shall be authorized to make payments under the same terms and conditions of the respective State laws as are provided for in this bill. It seems to me that that is the only logical position any person can take who recognizes any measure of responsibility on the part of the Federal Government to the unemployed people of this country in the event of a prolonged period of mass unemployment.

In other words, the able Senator from Colorado, by the two amendments which he offered in the committee, was able to force the Finance Committee to report to the Senate a measure which is absolutely illogical if the Senate determines that any action shall be taken by the Federal Government in this field.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, are we interested in what is the opinion of the governors of the 48 States, or are we interested in the plight of unemployed persons in the event of a prolonged period of mass unemployment? Either the Federal Government should take action on the theory that it has a responsibility following a great war, and following the shifting of populations which has taken place as a result of the war, or else it should not act at all. Therefore, I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will prevail, and that the amendment which he will subsequently offer to restore subsection (c) of the bill will also prevail. Then we shall have a bill which, while it will not go as far as I should like it to go, and as I voted to go, will be an effective measure to carry out on a Nation-wide basis the discharge of whatever responsibility a majority of Members of Congress are willing to assume insofar as unemployed persons in this country are concerned. If those two amendments are not agreed to we will then have the illogical legislative result, it seems to me, of the Federal Government pretending to acknowledge that it has a national responsibility in the event of a period of prolonged mass unemployment, and leaving it up to the governors of the 48 States to determine whether in each of their respective States persons who are unemployed are to receive benefits which the Congress has decided they are entitled to receive.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Wisconsin has spoken of the logic, or, in his view, the lack of logic of the two parts of the bill to which he has referred. I submit that it is entirely logical that the Federal Government should assume responsibility for migrant workers, and I have so voted. I submit that it is entirely logical that the Federal Government should assume responsibility for Federal employees, and I have so voted. I also submit that it is logical for the Federal Government to assume responsibility for merchant seamen, and I have so voted. I have not assumed that it is the burden of the Federal Government at this time to step into the established State systems, under their established coverages, in view of the fact that they have a $7,000,000,000 reserve and are ready, able, and willing to meet the problem. There is a logical distinction between both parts of the bill which the Senator is discussing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, when it comes down to the question of whether the Federal Government is going effectively to grant an extension as is proposed in the bill, up to 26 weeks of unemployment compensation under the terms of the respective State laws after the unemployed person has exhausted his rights under the State laws, the Senator from Colorado says it shall then be up to the Governor to say whether or not the unemployed person in a particular State is to get the benefit which Congress is willing to provide in the circumstances. I say, Mr. President, that that is illogical, that it simply is an indirect way of defeating in certain States the national legislative policy if the Finance Committee bill eventually shall become law.

Mr. President, I am interested in this situation, as I tried to indicate by the votes which I cast in the committee and on the floor, to liberalize and extend the bill. Those efforts were defeated and now that we are reduced to the proposition of the extension of the duration as the sole thing which the Federal Government is going to do for unemployed persons generally, I am interested in seeing that we shall not pass a law the benefits of which any Governor or group of Governors can deny to unemployed persons in their States.

I say that that would be an ineffective and illogical position for the Federal Government to take, and I repeat, the logic of the position of the Senator from Colorado is that he does not want to see any duration of unemployment compensation extended, but instead of defeating the bill, as the logic of his position should lead him to do, he leaves it up to the Governors, first of all, to have to sign a written statement that they desire it, and then he eliminated the provision, by one vote in the committee, which would have permitted the Federal Government to make the payments under the State laws for the maximum duration, in those States that were unable, because of their State laws, or the State interpretation of the State law, to enter into this agreement.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REED. May I inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin whether or not, in order to make the provisions of the proposed bill effective, it will be necessary to make agreements with the States?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As the bill came from the committee, it would have been necessary, and I am complaining of that as much as I am of the affirmative amendment which the Senator from Colorado secured in the committee. He did two things; he got an affirmative amendment making it necessary for 48 governors to sign a written statement that they desired that the agreement be entered into, and then he secured a negative amendment by striking out subsection (c), which was contained in the subcommittee's draft when it was presented to the committee, and which provided that in the event any State could not, because of its interpretation of its law, enter into an agreement with the Federal Government, the Director should have the power to make the payments in that State under the terms of the State law. That was a logical legislative proposal.

As I have said, the bill does not go as far as I wanted it to go, but at least it was an effective piece of legislation which would have resulted in uniform treatment, State by State, of unemployed persons, subject to the further limitation that the State laws must prevail; but at least each State would have had up to 26 weeks of additional duration paid by the Federal Government, whether the States entered into the agreement or not. Forty-eight States would have had this Federal program in operation, assuming that a prolonged period of mass unemployment should occur.

I ask Senators to remember that all provisions have been eliminated from the bill which have anything to do with the question of rates, which have anything to do with the question of taking away or changing the State standards or State disqualification provisions. All that is left, so far as the great body of the workers are concerned, is the proposition that once a person in a State has exhausted his unemployment benefits under the State law, the Federal Government will pick him up, when he has exhausted those rights, and extend those benefits under the terms of the State law for a maximum of 26 weeks, but not to exceed his earnings in the base period.

Mr. President, unless we close up the hole which the able Senator from Colorado blew in the bill in the committee, we will be passing an ineffective piece of legislation. In my opinion, the Senate will be doubly ridiculous. It will be passing a bill which pretends to discharge

some portion of the Federal Government's responsibility to the unemployed in the event of a long period of mass unemployment, but when the unemployed come to look at it they will find that the Senator from Colorado has left it up to their governors to say whether or not they shall get the benefit. He has also eliminated the provision which would have made it possible to get the prolonged duration, by eliminating the provision that where a State law cannot permit an agreement between the director and the State agency, the benefits will be paid by him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to interject that, while it is true that twenty-odd States reported to the Committee on Finance that they could not accept the increased weekly benefits without interfering with the administration of their laws, as I recall, not a single State took the position that we could not add to the term of duration under the State law in a way that did not affect what they did under their law for the duration provided in their law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. My recollection is that the question with regard to the extension of the duration was not even asked of the governors, but I may be in error about that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The question was asked several times. I think the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky is totally correct. I think there is no question raised whatever regarding our right to deal with duration as we are dealing with it, without colliding with State authority in any manner whatever, and that is one of the chief reasons why I was so insistent on duration as the major factor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thought it was the theory of the Senator from Michigan, and others who sponsored this idea, that when the committee abandoned any proposal to interfere with the rates, and when they abandoned any proposal to interfere with the disqualifications, there was, in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan and others who supported his position, the idea that we were not in any way interfering with the State laws, when the proposal was simply that the Federal Government would come in at the end of the exhaustion of the unemployed's rights under the State law and would pick him up after he had been taken off the State unemployment roll.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is my theory, and on that basis, of course, I shall vote to restore section 6.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As a matter of clarification as to the extension of time, of course the whole time during which payments may be made for unemployment, both the State and the extended time under which Federal aid may be paid, is 26 weeks.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Waving aside now the point we have been discussing about the two amendments offered in the committee by the Senator from Colorado, if the bill becomes law, and the Governor of the State of West Virginia finds that under the law of his State the payments of compensation can be accepted in his State, and he signs a letter of request, an unemployed person in the State of West Virginia would first of all have to comply with the West Virginia unemployment compensation law, and when he had exhausted his benefits under that law, whatever they might be, then he would be entitled under this bill to a maximum of 26 weeks, but not exceeding his earnings in the base period under the terms of the West Virginia law.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me ask the Senator this question: Suppose the position upon the question here taken by the Senator from Wisconsin prevails, and there is no necessity of a request being made by the governor of the State, but automatically if the State, for instance, pays the unemployed for 21 weeks, would an additional 5 weeks to the 21 weeks be granted, or an additional 26 weeks to the 21 weeks be granted?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Additional payments would be made by the Federal Government under the terms of the West Virginia law to bring the maximum up to 26 weeks in all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In all total, 26 weeks, including both payments under the State law and the Federal act.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No unemployed person, under the terms of this bill, can receive more than 26 weeks of unemployment compensation, whether he receives it from the States or from the Federal Government or from both combined.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the point I wanted clarified. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have some concern over the language of section 702 which gives permission to the governor to make request, and I should like to ask the Senator a question. Suppose the law of the States does not authorize the governor to make such a request, could he not then say that he could not legally make this request, and therefore this law could not apply?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly that is so. It merely provides opportunity for another nice legalistic argument as to whether or not the Governor has the power to make a written request. But the essence of the thing as I see it—and I do not wish to take any more of the Senate's time—boils down to this: Does the Federal Government, as a result of this war, have any responsibility to the unemployed persons of the United States in the event of a mass unemployment over a long period of time? If the answer is in the affirmative, then I think that in all honesty and sincerity we should pass an effective statute, and one as liberal as a majority of the House and Senate are willing to write. If the answer is in the negative, then let us not go through a hokus-pokus proceeding and appear to have discharged at least a measure of the Federal Government's responsibility, and then write into it provisions which make it inapplicable either upon the whim of a governor or a group of governors, or make it inapplicable because the State law is interpreted by the law enforcement officers of the State to be such that they cannot enter into an agreement with the Director to give the same benefits in their States which are extended in other States by the Federal Government.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. With reference to the question of the distinguished junior Senator of Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the way the bill stands under the Committee version the governor can make the request for any reason that is sufficient to him, and if that language were stricken out the unemployment compensation agency in the State could or could not rule that it is competent to make an agreement. So the point made by the Senator from Michigan does not change the situation one way or the other.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not sure what the lawyers who are opposed to the Federal Government doing anything in this situation in the event we have mass unemployment over a prolonged period will be able to find to argue about, and I would be the last to venture to predict. But I know that the Senator did not desire this amendment for the purpose of facilitating the ready and easy operation of this proposed law. I do not criticize the Senator's position at all. I understand the logic of his position, but I do not want him to carry it into this bill in an illogical manner, and have it result in our passing a law which may be ineffective in a great many States in the Union and result in an even more gross discrimination than will exist if the Federal Government does not act to pass legislation in this field at all.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, ordinarily I would feel bound by the decision of the Finance Committee, and the only exceptions I ever make or have ever made have been in those cases where I voted the other way in the committee, and where reservations were made by one or more Senators that the issue might be again raised on the floor.

In this instance I voted in the Finance Committee against the amendment which resulted in the insertion of the language which the majority leader has now moved to strike. I thought it was an unwise amendment.

Logically this amendment is connected directly with the other amendment which the majority leader has already indicated he would offer, because the adoption in the committee of this particular language requiring the Governors to make request in writing before these agreements could be made was at least partially controlling, if not directly controlling, upon the subsequent actions taken by the committee in striking subsection (c) of section 702 from the bill as it was written in the committee print which was under consideration by the committee.

Mr. President, I have very great respect for the logic and for the ability of the distinguished Senator from Colorado who offered the amendment, and I can appreciate the strength of his reasoning in presenting this particular provision. But I think it is a mistake, for this reason: The committee was careful not to coerce or to attempt to corrupt the States. We respected the States. I think we should, and, without any apology I assert here and now that I shall continue to respect the States in this important and intimate matter which so vitally affects their economy.

I know there are groups in this country who take the contrary view, but that does not persuade me that they are correct. There are distinguished Senators here who take a contrary view. While I respect their judgment, I nevertheless dissent from them.

At any rate, the committee was careful not to attempt to coerce the States or to corrupt the States by offering them any inducements that might persuade them to change their laws contrary to their own judgment.

With full respect for the States, we simply proceed to say in this section of the bill, which was amended, that if after John Smith has exhausted all the benefits which he is entitled to receive under the State law, he is still unemployed in the definitely circumscribed period of 21 months which we call the reconversion period, the Federal Government will step in and extend the period of his weekly payments, under the conditions fixed by the State, and precisely as limited and controlled by the State, until he receives such payments for a total of 26 weeks, or, under the bill as it is now amended, until he has received as much as he earned in the base period upon which the State computed his right to weekly benefits.

So there is no interference with the State. There is no attempt to superimpose the will of the Congress upon the State. When the unemployed person has exhausted the benefits which he is entitled to receive under State law, the Federal Government, during this limited period, simply proposes to step in and extend those payments, if the State has not already made payments for 26 weeks, to a total period of 26 weeks, or at least for a length of time sufficient to exhaust a sum equal to his earnings in the base year.

That does not seem to me to be interfering with the States at all. The States have fixed the period of weekly benefit payments, not with reference to an emergency such as we may have, or a condition such as we may face in the reconversion period. The whole theory of the unemployment-compensation laws adopted in all the States is that industry as a whole should make provision for the temporary unemployment of workers. The State laws were never designed to take care of a great emergency or a prolonged depression resulting from war or from other causes.

If the Congress of the United States will identify itself with constructive programs, I do not think we shall run into a period of great and prolonged unemployment. If we identify ourselves with unsound fiscal policies and unsound legislative programs, then surely we shall bring about, or at least induce, a period of great and prolonged unemployment.

Mr. President, I believe that we should look at facts as they are. The facts are these: Notwithstanding the interruption of work during the war period, sometimes by strikes, sometimes by labor disputes, sometimes by controversies between labor unions, on the whole a great over-all job was done by American management and American labor. Why? Because they had faith in the Government, because a spirit of unity was fostered and developed as the result of that faith. The workers of the country may well look with trepidation and fear upon unemployment in the period of reconversion. They may be hopeful that it will be temporary, as I think it will be, and as many of us think it will be. Nevertheless, the workers, who have done a great job in preparing, developing, and manufacturing the tools with which we won a great war, may well look with fear and trepidation upon what lies ahead of us.

The spirit of unity is even more essential—if it be possible to conceive of that fact—during the reconversion period than it was during the war period. The war gave everyone one great objective. Now everyone is disposed to look after his own and go his own way to accomplish his own objectives. Sometimes those objectives are selfish. But the spirit of unity which characterized all America, including businessmen, management, and especially the great host of American workers, is absolutely essential in the reconversion period if this Nation is not to face a prolonged period of deep depression as a result of unemployment.

Why can we not anticipate the possibility of unemployment? Why can we not say that we have no desire to interfere with the States? We have no disposition to say that we will increase the amount of payment provided by the States, because that affects their economy. If wages or unemployment compensation are raised too high in some of the States, the result may be a complete unbalancing of the economy of the State. But, respecting the right of the State to determine that important question, respecting its power to prescribe the conditions under which weekly benefits shall be paid, why can we not simply say that, anticipating the possible continuance of unemployment beyond the period of duration fixed by the several States, we will step in and make those payments until they have reached 26 full weeks, or until the recipient has exhausted a sum equal to the amount of his earnings in the base period?

That is all that this amendment does. Therefore I believe that the question of the Governor's request is immaterial. As I interpret this provision of the bill, there is no real infringement on the right of the State in any proper sense. Nor do I think it harmful, if the State cannot or will not, acting as the agent of the Director of Mobilization and Reconversion, make these payments for the extended period, to let the Director himself make the payments on the same basis and in the same amounts as though the State was willing to administer the law, and was actually administering it.

I say that I think we should not only adopt this amendment but we should restore the stricken subsection (c) which gives to the Director the power to make the payments for the additional number of weeks, if the State does not agree to do so. The State laws on this question may influence some of the governors to decline to make written requests. I do not think the State laws would prevent the governors from making such requests in any instance, but I am aware of the feeling on the port of some of the States that they may not be able to make this request. That position is taken upon a very farfetched and highly technical legal basis, and I do not anticipate that many, if any, of the governors would decline to request the extension of the period of benefit payments, if unemployment were prolonged.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the Senator a question. If the governor of a State were embarrassed by the laws of the State insofar as making the request was concerned, is it not entirely likely that the State agency would likewise be embarrassed in making that request?

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is true. Therefore, Mr. President, I think the more important part of the amendment is the part not yet actually presented to the Senate. I think the important part is subsection (c), which would empower the Director to make the payments during the extended period, even though the State had not requested it or was not in a position to request it. But if the State agency administering unemployment compensation can enter into the agreement to act merely as the agent of the Director in making the payments, I think the State should have the right to do so.

I have no fear that the governor probably would not do so, unless he felt embarrassed by reason of his own State law. He might not actually be controlled by that law, but he might feel some embarrassment. For that reason he might hesitate to make the request.

Mr. President, I think the important feature of the amendment is the portion of it which the Senator from Kentucky has already announced he would offer, to wit, the language which would give to the Director the authority to step in and pay the same weekly benefits for a period up to 26 weeks.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Under the complexion of the bill as reported by the committee and as it is now before the Senate, which would leave the request for this particular assistance up to the States, the amendment which is being attacked, namely, the provision that the Governor shall make the request, would not serve to defeat that part of the bill; would it?

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President; I do not think it would; and I do not think

it is very material whether this language remains in or out of the bill if the stricken subsection (c) is restored.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So, Mr. President, if we decide—and we must decide in our own minds right now—that we are not going to authorize the Federal Government to set up a system of its own in the States if the request is not made, then the amendment which is now under scrutiny does not do violence to the theory of the bill now before us, does it?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I do not think it does. I am frank to say to the Senator that if the question were simply one of striking out that language, I would not be much interested in it. I am interested in the restoration of the provisions found in the stricken subsection (c), and consistently I can see that it might be better to permit the arrangement to be entered into, even though the Governor were not willing to make a written request because he might have some legal difficulties, at least in his own mind, which might be controlling upon him.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks about the situation which has developed in the last half hour here in the Senate Chamber. It completely changes the picture, if what has been indicated shall be realized.

First, however, I desire to compliment the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] upon the strength, power, and ability with which apparently he has manipulated the premier committee of the Senate, the Finance Committee, and has persuaded it to do violence to its own convictions, in response to the sweet will of the Senator from Colorado.

Then Mr. President, I wish to say that the situation which has developed here in the last few minutes may completely change my attitude toward the pending measure, although I do not wish to say that it has changed it. I came into the Chamber expecting to support the bill. If the bill is to provide for setting up a Federal unemployment compensation system in the States, without regard to the States or their policies or their payments, I am not so sure now that I wish to promote such a plan. I asked the Senator from Wisconsin whether, even if this provision were stricken out of the measure, an agreement would still have to be made with the States. The answer was, "Yes." I then intended to ask the Senator from Wisconsin what authority in a State can represent the will of the State as fully as can the Governor. If the President of the United States is the embodiment of the will of the Nation on all matters within his power which he may determine, as he is, in the same sense the governor of a State is the final executive authority of the State.

Mr. President, I myself have been a governor. I see in the Chamber a number of Senators who formerly were governors of States; some 25 of my colleagues have formerly been governors. Having been both a governor and a Senator, I have not found that the Senators of the United States are entitled to place themselves upon any higher plane of integrity, ability, and patriotism than that of the governors of the States. I do not like the imputations which have been made here this afternoon to the effect that the governors of the States cannot be trusted to do their full duty both by the unemployed and by the States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly it is an offensive anachronism if the governor of a State, through his agents, comes before the Finance Committee of the Senate and says "We do not want this assistance; we have our own funds to take care of the problem; we shall do whatever is necessary to meet the emergency," and then, in the face of that expression of executive and, presumably, legislative policy, some subordinate State agency of that State were to be in a position to make an agreement entirely to the contrary.

Mr. REED. If I may say so to the Senator from Colorado, I think the answer is that the Governors of all the States, so far as I know, select the directors of unemployment compensation, so that the directors are politically and officially servants and creatures of the Governors. I think it is an insult to the States and an insult to the Governors for us to stand here on the floor of the Senate and express distrust of the integrity and patriotism of the Governors, and to say, "We will go ahead and make arrangements and agreements, whether you like it or not, with some subordinate agency within the State."

Mr. President, I think perhaps I have made a closer examination of my State with regard to this particular question than most Senators have had an opportunity to make concerning their States. I spent about a week in Kansas, and during that time I talked about the question of unemployment compensation more than anything else.

The present system of unemployment compensation and the apparent policy of its administration has become so offensive to the people of Kansas—I believe my statement applies as well to the general run of people of other States in the Midwest—that if today a popular vote were taken on the question I believe the vote in my State would wipe out entirely any unemployment compensation policy. I do not want that to take place. I am an early and earnest advocate of unemployment compensation.

When a man or a woman devotes his or her life to a trade, business, or vocation, and then by some accident due to no personal fault there comes a period of enforced idleness, the hardship involved in such a situation is one which should not be imposed upon the individual. I have been a constant supporter of the theory and philosophy of unemployment compensation. But the question now is whether the system being followed, and its application at the present time does not produce unemployment and continue it to a greater degree than the degree to which distress is alleviated. I wish to refer to that subject as briefly as I can.

It should be borne in mind that unemployment compensation is not a wage. It is a subsistence payment to aid the worker in tiding himself over a period of enforced unemployment. Obviously it should not be so large as to be inducement or encouragement to the person to continue his period of unemployment. That was the reaction of the country to the suggestion of President Truman that the maximum payments should be lifted to $25. For the weifare of the country from the standpoint of reducing unemployment, I think that the President's statement was a psychological mistake. I think it has done injury to the country. I am sure the President had no intention of anything of that kind, but I fear that the effect is as I have stated. Allow me to give some examples.

When I came back from my summer vacation, having spent a part of it in Colorado, I drove across the State of Kansas. Kansas is 400 miles in length. I went from one end of the State to the other. People were talking about the statement which the President had made more than they were talking about anything else.

I wish to read a few letters which have been written to me touching on the phase of the question to which I have just referred. I happen to know the writers of all of these letters. I have the originals in my files. Here is a letter from a man who lives at Wichita, Kans. I know him very well. He is engaged in the oil business, and owns a ranch. He wanted to cut and harvest his hay crop. He wrote me on September 8, as follows:

> In the past few weeks some 30,000 people have been terminated at the war plants in and around Wichita. At the United States Employment office, one block from my office, people stand in line day after day to register in.
>
> The latter part of August I was seeking a crew of about 10 men to help harvest the last hay crop and put feed in the silos at my ranch about 35 miles southeast of Wichita. Knowing of the many unemployed workers here I assumed it would be an easy matter to obtain as many men as I wanted.
>
> I went to the United States Employment office and after working my way through the crowds finally found someone in authority to talk with. The woman who took the information regarding my need for workers was very polite and tried to be helpful. I advised I would furnish transportation, room and board and pay 75 cents per hour, but when she learned I wanted them for farm work she said there was no use of my talking with them further. She referred me to the county farm agent but I had no more success there. Later I was told that the people standing in line day after day at the employment office were not seeking jobs altogether but were there to collect unemployment compensation.

Here is a letter from a man engaged in the poultry industry in Kansas. He wrote me, as follows:

> The help problem at poultry and dairy products processing plants is more serious now than it was a year ago. Operators of these plants are terming the situation critical. This situation exists notwithstanding the fact that thousands of men and women have been released from their wartime jobs.
>
> The trouble is that these workers are applying for and receiving unemploymnt compensation when they could be taking jobs in private industry. They seem to be perfectly satisfied to do nothing as long as they can receive this compensation.
>
> The Unemployment Compensation Division is handicapped because of the attitude of the USES as now set up and functioning.

Of course, if followed through, the Lucas amendment, which was agreed to

by the Senate yesterday, will change the USES situation.

I have a letter from a man at Buffalo, Kans., dated September 6, 1945, which was written in explanation of why an order had not been filled. The letter reads, as follows:

When we were unable to tell you anything definite on same we have been withholding any answer. The labor situation is "up in the air" just now, as we are losing nine high-school boys and we have only one "defense worker" put to work to take their places. These so-called defense workers just don't seem to be applying for jobs. We have a standing order for 15 men and so far the United States Employment Office has not sent us one single man.

We expect to keep plugging away, and sooner or later we will be able to ship your order, and in the meantime please bear with us, as we are going to hire additional labor just as soon as it is possible.

I have another letter from a friend of mine at Wichita, Kans., dated August 27, 1945, and reading as follows:

Last night I visited with a friend of mine who is one of the biggest farmers in Sedgwick County. He told me he had offered $5 a day, room, board, and laundry for farm help and could get no one to work. He was told that they had been in war work for about 3 years and felt they were entitled to a vacation and were waiting to see what the Government was going to do about giving them $25 a week. It seems to me, and to a good many people with whom I have talked, that this $25-a-week proposition is just going to encourage a lot of loafers if it goes into effect.

I have a letter dated September 4, 1945, signed by the county commissioners of a community near Lawrence, Kans. The community is located next door to a large powder plant. The letter reads as follows:

In our community here, which is next door to the Sunflower Ordnance Works, we find such proposed legislation creates idleness, and we would like to go on record opposing paying unemployment insurance to anybody, when work is plentiful.

A friend wrote me on September 6, 1945, from Dodge City, Kans., as follows:

I personally have talked to several war workers at Denver that worked at the Kaiser plant. Each one I asked what they were going to do—being in business for myself and hiring men I was interested in knowing their ideas about returning to work—they stated they hadn't any plans; they thought Washington was going to vote some sort of an unemployment compensation and if they found jobs they couldn't get this money, so they guessed they would just rest.

Mr. President, I completed my visit to Kansas in conference with the Governor of the State, and later on the same day in conference with the unemployment compensation director of the State. It is my judgment that there are 50,000 available jobs on the farms, in factories, and in packing houses, as well as in the stores, hotels, and restaurants in the State of Kansas. Attempts are being made to obtain workers to fill those jobs. However, the workers are not obtainable. It is true that the jobs do not pay wartime wages. There is no chance of that class of people getting wartime wages, and I think anyone who holds out that illusion to them does them an injury.

Let me give two or three personal experiences. When I reached home I went into the barber shop, as usual, and while I was lying back in the chair someone came in and spoke to the barber. The barber said, "Tom, have you found a job?" Tom said, "No. I don't know whether I want one yet." The barber said, "What are you going to do?" Then apparently the man recognized me in the barber's chair, and he said, "Well, I am going to wait to see what Washington does. Senator REED, there, can help us when he gets to Washington."

One of my very close personal and political friends runs a large ice cream business. A girl who had worked for him a long time went to work in the munitions plant, which was just outside of Parsons, my home town, and when that plant closed down, as it did finally, she went to a dress store in Parsons and wanted to open a charge account. The owner said, "Are you still working for the ice cream company?" She said, "Oh, no, I haven't worked for them for a year. I have been out at the ordnance plant, and now that they have shut down, I have been laid off." The dress shop proprietor said, "That's not a very good time to open a charge account." "Oh, well," she said, "it's all right; I am going to draw my unemployment insurance for a long time."

Mr. President, I happen, along with some others, to have a rather heavy investment in a dairy farm—one of the important dairy farms of Kansas. At one time we had 140 purebred Guernsey cattle on the farm. It has been so hard to secure labor that we have reduced the number of cattle to 70. Instead of having 40 or 45 cows in the milk line, we have 20. So I went out to visit the dairy farm. There was no help there. The manager and his wife were doing virtually all the work. I said to the manager, "This ordnance plant which employed, as a maximum, 7,000 people—men and women—has shut down. Dozens and scores, and perhaps hundreds, of farmers who went to work in the ordnance plant are not working there now." He said, "They won't work until they settle this question of unemployment compensation, and how long they can draw it." I said, "What did you pay the farm hand who lived in the house across the road?" He said, "A hundred dollars a month in money and a house to live in, which we are renting now for $25 a month, which would make it the equivalent of $125 we were paying him, plus a gallon of milk a day and some other small items, so that his pay aggregated $140 a month." That was for a farm hand on that dairy farm. With hundreds of farmers coming out of that ordnance plant, we have been unable to get a single man on that farm. That experience can be repeated a thousand times in Kansas. I think it can be repeated a thousand times in every other State.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCMAHON in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me at this point put a question for clarification. Does the Senator understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky would, for the extra period of extended time, pay the unemployed just the amount that would be paid under the State law?

Mr. REED. I am not a member of the Committee on Finance, and I am not an expert or an authority on this kind of legislation, but I have tried to understand the bill, and this is my understanding of the situation: The pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, is to strike out the language which would provide that assistance would be furnished upon written request of the governor. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct; it strikes out the language which provides that on the written request of the Governor this assistance, which may be the subject of an agreement between the Director and the State agency, may be rendered, but it is at the same rate, and on the same conditions, as under the State law.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, if under the State law the payment range was from $8 to $20 a week, depending on the income for the base period, then during the extra weeks beyond the maximum weeks of the State law the same rule of payment which exists under the State law would be used in making Federal payments?

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely.

Mr. REED. I do not understand there is any question about that at all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wanted to clarify it, because there is some "two-thirds" statement in it.

Mr. REED. I do not want my time taken up in clarifying a thing which I think is clear and which I did not remotely refer to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think it is clear now.

Mr. REED. I went to Topeka, where I was to remain overnight and have a conference with the Governor the next morning. The manager of the hotel said: "Wait a minute. I don't know whether I am going to let you have a room or not." I said: "How do you get that way?" He replied: "I want to know what you are going to do about that damned $25 a week when you get to Washington." I said: "I can tell you very quickly. I am going to vote against it." He said: "Very well; you can have a room."

Mr. President, that is a pretty good-sized hotel. I said: "How many people would you take on to fill out your staff all the way through your hotel, if they were available and if you could find them. He said: "Twenty-five."

I spent part of a day talking to the Governor, and it is my judgment—and I think he would agree, although I would not want to commit him—that there are 50,000 jobs available in the State of Kansas, and unemployment claims are being filed at the rate of more than a thousand a week. So far as I know, no one has yet been able to get anyone from the employment office.

My own newspaper is running short-handed. I have talked with other newspapermen, and they are all in the same position. Every newspaperman in this country knows that newspapers are running just as short-handed as they can

be. They are all looking for help and for some reason do not get it.

Mr. President, what startled me was the attitude of the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Kentucky. I thought this was to be a voluntary cooperative movement with the States. I find that if the pending amendment shall be agreed to, and the amendment then to be proposed by the Senator from Kentucky shall be agreed to, it will no longer be a voluntary arrangement; the Federal Government is going to move in, whether the State wants it to or not. That is what creates a serious doubt in my mind as to whether I shall follow the intention I have carried through, up to now, of voting for the bill. It is my belief that the administration of an unemployment compensation system in the United States must, of reasonable necessity, be with the States.

Wages and working conditions are not the same in Alabama and Pennsylvania, in Kansas and Massachusetts; and in every State the unemployment system and payments must be, in order to work at all, adjusted to the conditions in the particular State. Wages are not the same everywhere, and the same rate of payment is not needed everywhere if the payments are to be based upon wages.

At the present time the unemployment compensation payment is based upon past earnings. I think as a matter of fact, Mr. President, this being what is in effect a proposal for relief for the unemployed worker, the rate of earnings might be disregarded and a flat rate be paid to all persons who are unemployed, regardless of what they earned in the past. After all, the need for subsistence does not vary with the rate of pay one receives. One needs as much food, as much clothing to wear, and as much fuel to keep him warm, whether he earns $20 a week or $100 a week. So an argument could be made for a level amount of payments regardless of past earnings. But whatever basis is used—and I am not suggesting a change—the unemployment compensation system ought to be kept on a State basis, and so far as I have given the matter consideration—and nothing that I have heard so far has changed my mind—I am unqualifiedly opposed to the Federal Government imposing its will upon a State, regardless of whether the State wants it to enter into it or not.

I am not unmindful of the fact that there may be a national responsibility for unemployment, a national liability to do something, but after all we have operated this system on the basis of the States. I do not believe that the States are less mindful of the needs of their citizens than is the country as a whole.

If the amendment is adopted, and we proceed to disregard and bypass the supreme authority of any State and every State, then the next thing will be to provide for the arbitrary entrance of the Federal Unemployment Director into a State regardless of State desire, State rules, State policy, or State authority.

I think the Senate should very earnestly and carefully consider that question before it takes final action.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio permit me to make a brief statement before he proceeds?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The subsection (c) to which allusion has been made during the debate was eliminated from the bill in committee in consequence of the adoption of the amendment which I have offered to strike out. They are related to each other, and I have conferred with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] with the purpose of modifying my amendment so as to insert subsection (c) so that we may obtain a vote on them both at one time as one amendment. I ask that that be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may the amendment just now offered by the Senator from Kentucky be read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) If in the case of any State an agreement is not entered into under this section or the unemployment compensation agency of such payments. Final determinations by ance with such an agreement, the Director, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, shall make payments of compensation to individuals on a basis which will provide that they will be paid compensation in the same amounts, on substantially the same terms, and subject to substantially the same conditions as though such agreement had been entered into and such agency made such payments. Final determinations by the Director of entitlement to such payments shall be subject to review by the courts in the same manner and to the same extent as is provided in title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, with respect to decisions by the Social Security Board under such title.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the question involved in this amendment is whether we will pay the extended compensation for the additional weeks regardless of the attitude of the State, that is, whether we shall pay it even though the State for some reason cannot make an agreement, even though the governor shall not request it, even though the State objects to the payment. It seems to me that we are here assuming a Federal responsibility, and that it should in no way, therefore, be dependent on the action of the governor of the State or the State itself.

Representatives of almost all the States appeared before the committee and said, "We do not need any Federal assistance. We will handle this problem." They felt that, if the time ran out, they would call their legislatures together and provide additional payments from the State funds. We accepted in general the principle that we did not desire to interfere with the State employment system, but the governors said, "If you are going to do anything, the least interference is a simple extension of time. After the State gets through, if you want to go on, well, that is a very minor interference with the State system and does not mean any tendency toward the federalization of that system," as a flat $25 would, in my opinion, clearly have brought about.

What we are doing here is saying that, in spite of the opinion of the States that they do not need this, nevertheless, because we think there is a Federal obligation, because we think there may be an unusual period of unemployment brought about by Federal action in the war and by the cancellation of war contracts, we propose on our own responsibility, in spite of the States' opinion, to assume a Federal responsibility.

If we are to do that, I think we ought to do it unequivocally. I do not believe we ought to say that it is to be dependent on what some States may think or may not think.

I do not believe we ought to go to the governors who said, "We will handle it; leave us alone," and say to them, "You have got to repudiate, if you please, that position or else go without Federal money," and insist "your State must take out of the Federal Treasury a lot of money which the Federal Government is perfectly willing to give you."

Many governors certainly might feel embarrassed, and might feel strongly on the subject. They might say "No; we took that position before the Senate committee and we will not take this money." In that case the people in the States would not have the benefit of what we have assumed to do, as the Federal Government, to make up this difference.

It seems to me that the argument of the distinguished Senator from Colorado is an argument against any extension at all. I admit there is a sound argument against any extension at all; I think it is a debatable question whether we should assume this Federal responsibility.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The argument of the Senator from Colorado does not go to the question of extension at all. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado which is reflected in the committee's version is directly attached to and does not conflict with an extension of duration.

Mr. TAFT. However, my statement was not about the Senator's amendment. My statement was about the very effective argument he made. It seemed to me to be an argument against extension, not an argument in favor of imposing a condition that the State itself should repudiate the position it had taken before the Finance Committee and voluntarily agree to take the Federal payments.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. My argument in no particular goes against extension of duration if that be necessary to meet a Federal emergency, or if it be necessary to meet a State emergency. My argument is simply that, since the States have the money under a system which we induced and encouraged them to accept, since they say that they will use that money to meet the emergency the Senator from Ohio is talking about, the Federal emergency does not arise unless the States themselves under the voluntary provisions of this bill are willing to admit there is a Federal emergency and to ask

for help in the way this measure provides.

Mr. TAFT. Are we, therefore, to offer to bribe a State into repudiating a position in which it really believes and which it presented to the Senate committee, or are we to insist that its citizens pay the cash with which to make the payments instead of getting it from the Federal Government as other States do?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As a matter of fact and in real substance these reserve funds have reached enormous proportions, not through State money, but through Federal money. That comes about through the pay rolls in the States of the war industries. With that money, which in substance is Federal money in those State reserves, I am heartily in favor of putting those reserves to the test before we force a State to accept further Federal money.

Let me say further that there is no bribery involved. The way the bill now stands, a State can take it or leave it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. If I correctly understood the reading of the amendment, if a State, through its Governor or one of its agencies, did not make an agreement with the Federal Government, the Federal Administrator could proceed anyway. Is that a correct understanding of the amendment?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. The bill originally provided that if the State did not enter into an agreement, if, because of some legal restriction, or because its policy was against it, it could not enter into such an agreement, still the Federal Government could say, "We are going to make these payments." That is the substance of the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky. It seems to me that if we are to assume any Federal responsibility at all, we ought to assume that Federal responsibility. The State funds are large, but whether they would be sufficient to meet a period of severe unemployment, I do not know. The general opinion is that if we encounter anything like the depression of 1930, the funds will be wiped out within 2 years. Of course, we shall not have such a depression, because we are going to pass a full employment bill which will insure against such a condition. But if in spite of such a bill we should have another depression of that kind, the State funds would be wiped out certainly within 2 years.

Our position is that we are not going to interfere with the State system. We think it is a good system; but we believe that the Federal Government, by reason of the war activity and the cancellation of contracts, has brought about such a condition that it is not fair to burden State funds any further with this special emergency. Let those funds be kept for the kind of emergency which was contemplated when the unemployment-compensation system was established, and not a war emergency.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe that the Senator is entirely correct when he says that if we had a real emergency the State funds would be seriously impaired if not wiped out. I remind the Senator that we have already guaranteed the solvency of the State funds in that contingency.

Mr. TAFT. We have guaranteed that we will lend the States enough money to comply with their obligations under the unemployment-compensation laws.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I accept the correction. If a real emergency would wipe out $7,000,000,000 of reserves, then what a piddling, petty thing we are doing here by adding an amount which it is estimated may range from $350,000,000 to $750,000,000 a year.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator makes a good argument against doing this at all; and I agree that it is a debatable question; but that is not the question in connection with this amendment. The question is, If we are going to do it, are we going to make it contingent on the States repudiating the position which they took by holding out a money bait to the States in order to induce them to take Federal funds and put themselves on record as accepting Federal money, which they know very well they should not accept, but which the exigencies of politics and common sense usually lead people to accept?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if it is not a fact that in the event the Barkley amendment were adopted, and the bill on page 6 restored substantially as it was, we would then have a Federal unemployment compensation policy and system operating in all the States, parallel with the State systems?

Mr. TAFT. I would not say that, because what we are doing is making payments which depend in each State on the laws of the particular State. It is not a Federal unemployment compensation system. Certainly it is a supplemental Federal unemployment compensation payment. There is no doubt about that. I should not say that it would amount to a Federal system, because, as I say, it is dependent upon the laws of the States. In every State we follow the laws of the State. The provision with respect to an agreement is in the bill really for convenience, so that the State may handle the money, and so that we may avoid a duplication of force. But if we do have to duplicate the force because the State laws in some way prevent the State from acting, I assume that the Federal Government will place a Federal man in the State office, with Federal funds, and that he will use the State records and pay the same persons whom the State would pay under the State system.

Mr. REED. That is not the point, as the Senator will recognize. The point is that the Federal Government goes in regardless of the State. Is not that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. REED. I cannot carry in mind the language of the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. TAFT. It will be found in section 703 in the early part of the bill.

Mr. REED. The original language is on page 6 of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. REED. In section 703. If a State fails to enter into an agreement with the Director, or fails to make the payments, then the Director, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, makes payments to individuals, regardless of the policy of the State. That is the only point I was trying to establish.

Mr. TAFT. Not regardless of the policy of the State. He makes them beyond the time limit imposed by the State; but that is true whether we adopt this amendment or not. That would be the the result of the bill in any event. It would to a certain extent change the policy of the State. It may be that the States may not desire it. I think probably the majority of the governors would be against even this extension, although they say that it is the least possible interference with the State system, if we are to do anything.

Mr. REED. Let me say further to the Senator from Ohio that my main concern is to maintain the integrity of the unemployment-compensation system as administered by the States. Under the terms of the bill, in a certain contingency the Federal Government comes into the State, regardless of the desire of the State. Can the Senator tell me, by reason of his wisdom, ability, and long experience, how long the Federal Government will stay out of the tent after getting its nose under it in connection with unemployment compensation?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator makes an argument against any extension at all.

Mr. REED. No.

Mr. TAFT. So far as the amendment is concerned, I say that if the basic issue before the Senate is between a State system and a Federal system, this amendment will be very embarrassing to the advocates of the State system, because when that question arises every governor who comes before us and says "Let the State system alone" will be asked, "Did you not take this Federal money? You said you did not want it, but you took it anyway, did you not?" So I say that, so far as I am concerned, I believe that the adoption of the Barkley amendment would be a very substantial aid to the advocates of maintenance of the State unemployment-compensation system when the basic issue arises, as it is bound to arise. Some of the advocates of this amendment in the Committee on Finance voted for it in order to embarrass the State system, and others for the reasons stated by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. REED. I disagree with the conclusion stated by the Senator from Ohio. The only point I make is that under the terms of this bill the Federal Government may go into a State regardless of the will of the State, which is an entrance into and an interference with the State unemployment-compensation system. In this case it interferes only in the matter of duration; but the next time the Federal Government may want to enter the picture, it may assign any reason it wishes.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that I have been a governor. In my judgment, under the terms of the bill with the amendment offered in the committee by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], I do not believe there is a governor of a State in the country who could refuse or fail to ask for assistance. That is the way it ought to be done.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator up to the point where he says that is the way it ought to be done. I do not think that is the way it ought to be done. I think we are assuming a responsibility over the opposition of the Governors. We have no right to say to them that they must repudiate their position in order to obtain this money.

Mr. REED. I wish to make my position clear. I think this should be worked out in agreement with the States, not contrary to their will or their authority or their policy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. On the question of embarrassing the Governors by having them make the request, let me say that of course the only governor who would be embarrassed by making the request would be a governor who had not taken steps to secure a proper utilization of the reserves of his own State.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested in the two systems which were mentioned a moment ago. If the amendment of the distinguished majority leader is adopted and if the Federal Government is given the right to continue the payments, will that call for more machinery? Will Federal machinery be required in order to pay out the money, or could it be paid out through the State systems?

Mr. TAFT. No. Federal machinery might be required.

Mr. WHERRY. That point is very important.

Mr. TAFT. I should hope that it could be done by putting a Federal paymaster in the State office, so that he could dispense the money through the State machinery. However, I should hope that the States would be able to find a way to handle the clerical work. I think it would be a very technical objection to hold that the States could not do the clerical work; and I think the fact that the work could be done without their assistance would almost inevitably lead them to say, "Oh, yes; we will handle the clerical work of paying the checks, if the Federal Government provides the money."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REED. Let me ask when in the past almost 13 years has the administration failed to create new machinery when it had an opportunity to create it?

Mr. TAFT. I do not remember any. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator said the objection he mentioned would be a technical one. I should like to know just how technical it would be. I should like to get the facts; I think they are fundamental. If it is necessary to set up Federal machinery in each State, will that mean that there will be continued operation of such machinery in the States?

Mr. TAFT. Let me suggest that Federal officials or employees could not operate in any State which agreed to handle the money. Federal officials or employees could operate only in States which refused to handle the money. Federal machinery could not be set up in any State unless the State refused to handle the money.

My suggestion was that only a technical lawyer would tell a State that the State employees could not handle the Federal funds for dispensation to unemployed persons in accordance with the State law. But there might be such technical lawyers in a few States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection let me say, if the Senator from Ohio will permit me, that the State unemployment agency employees are full-time workers. They work the year round. They are not employed for a brief period when someone is receiving unemployment compensation, because someone is receiving it all the year. So the States would not be required to take on additional forces to handle the money for the extra number of weeks provided for in the bill. As the Senator from Ohio has said, even if there were some technical lawyer who was the advisor of a State administration and even if he held that the State employees could not handle the clerical work incident to paying out the Federal money, in all likelihood the Director would put in the State capitol or in whatever office the State was using for the purpose a force of workers to render the technical assistance necessary in connection with handling the money.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to say that, of course, I supported the view that the States should handle these matters and the Federal Government should let them alone. If the pending amendment is adopted, a State will be forced, as the Senator from Ohio has said, to abandon the position it took when it said it could handle its own affairs, because the Federal money will be available to the State; and if the governor did not take the money and if, as a consequence, the people of the State did not receive the money they otherwise would be paid if the State accepted the additional compensation, the people of the State would force the governor to abandon the position that the State could handle its own affairs.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the amendment is adopted, a State will be required to enter into the agreement through its own officials. If the State does not do so, the director will proceed to set up the necessary machinery, and then there will be two systems.

Mr. TAFT. There will not be two systems in operation at the same time. No Federal money will be paid to any unemployed person until his rights under the State law are completely exhausted.

Mr. CHANDLER. But after they are exhausted, the Federal Government will make additional payments in accordance with the new program. Is not that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. But the new program will be under the State law. The unemployed person will receive payments in exactly the same amount, but he will receive them for an additional period; if he was receiving them for 20 weeks under the State law, he will henceforth receive them for an additional 6 weeks, from the Federal Government.

Mr. CHANDLER. But will not the governor of the State or whoever handles it for the State be required to abandon its position?

Mr. TAFT. No; they will not have to abandon their position at all. Their answer will be, "These people are going to get this money anyway, so we might as well handle it." They will not abandon their position.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection let me say that the objections of the States really went to the question of increasing the amounts of the weekly payments. When the inquiries went out to them, they were not asked about the question of extending the duration. The question was whether under their laws the acceptance of any Federal assistance by way of an increase in the amounts of weekly payments would affect the right of unemployed persons to draw compensation, or whether a deduction in the amount of those payments would be made from whatever funds such persons might otherwise get from the State. None of the inquiries went to the question whether the States would object to having the duration of the payments extended. So far as I recall, no one testified before the committee that the States could not enter into agreements for an extension of the duration, although someone may have hinted that that might be embarrassing.

But, Mr. President, as the Senator from Ohio has said, inasmuch as the Director will be given the authority to pay the money anway, in case the State does not or cannot enter into the agreement, I think the chances are that all the States will cooperate with the Director to see to it that during the additional period, under the regulations and restrictions of the State laws, unemployed persons will receive the payments through the State authorities.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to suggest to the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio and to the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky that if the pending amendment is adopted the thing which will be abandoned will be the incentive of the States to improve their own systems.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr.

BARKLEY], as modified. [Putting the question.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. WHERRY, and other Senators requested the yeas and nays, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent on account of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are absent on public business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is unavoidably detained. He has a pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. I am informed that if present and voting the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is detained on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is absent on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—61

Aiken	Hatch	Myers
Andrews	Hayden	Radcliffe
Austin	Hill	Revercomb
Ball	Hoey	Saltonstall
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bilbo	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Briggs	Kilgore	Stewart
Capehart	Knowland	Taft
Carville	La Follette	Taylor
Chavez	Langer	Tobey
Connally	McCarran	Tunnell
Cordon	McFarland	Vandenberg
Donnell	McKellar	Wagner
Downey	McMahon	Walsh
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wheeler
Fulbright	Maybank	White
George	Mead	Wiley
Gerry	Mitchell	Willis
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	
Hart	Murray	

NAYS—16

Bailey	Hawkes	Reed
Butler	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Byrd	McClellan	Wherry
Chandler	Millikin	Wilson
Ellender	Moore	
Gurney	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—19

Bankhead	Capper	Russell
Brewster	Eastland	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Glass	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Buck	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Burton	Overton	
Bushfield	Pepper	

So Mr. BARKLEY's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15 of the committee amendment, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "(A) twenty-six times his weekly benefit amount," in lieu thereof to insert the following:

(A) Twenty-six times his weekly benefit amount, or 150 percent of the aggregate amount of compensation payable to him for such benefit year under the State unemployment compensation law, whichever is the greater.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, yesterday the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] stated that he would offer an amendment to the committee substitute providing for further extension of the duration of unemployment benefits. My amendment is designed to increase the benefits by 50 percent. As I understand, that is in line with the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. It seems that in the State of Michigan, for example, where the duration is 20 weeks, the period could be extended by 10 weeks.

In the States of Washington and New York, which get nothing under the proposal of the committee in its present form, the duration would be extended from 26 weeks to 39 weeks, or an addition of 13 weeks.

The other provisions in the bill will remain exactly as they are at the present time. Under the committee substitute every State will be able to extend the duration benefits to 26 weeks. Under my amendment the duration provisions would be liberalized above the 26 weeks' maximum in States such as Michigan, Washington, and New York. Altogether, 37 States would be able to extend the duration of benefits under my amendment. In no case would the total duration benefits exceed 39 weeks, because at the present time the State having the most liberalized benefits is limited to 26 weeks.

So, Mr. President, my amendment would add 50 percent to the duration of the period for which benefits could be paid as now defined in the bill. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Am I to understand that the Senator's amendment is, in effect, precisely the same amendment which I offered in the Senate Finance Committee, and succeeded in getting for it three votes? The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] was one who voted in favor of it, and another Senator is an unsung hero. I still believe the proposal to be a sound one, and I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. The amendment which I have offered is similar to the amendment which the Senator from Michigan offered in committee.

Mr. President, I ask for the consideration of the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I dislike to make a point of order, but I desire to bring the consideration of the bill to a conclusion. The subject matter of the amendment has already been passed on, and certainly this proposed amendment is not now in order. But I shall not insist upon the point of order, although I think perhaps I should do so in order to bring the debate to an end.

The pending proposal was made in the Committee on Finance and was overwhelmingly voted down. To give an extension of 39 weeks in any State at the high rates paid by that State would simply mean that the concentration of unemployed workers would remain right there, and States which needed workers, which needed a redistribution of the labor forces of the country, would not get them at all. This would retard reconversion, definitely slow it down, definitely militate against it.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not at this late hour consider seriously an amendment which has been proposed and considered by the committee and which now would really open the bill to further consideration, if the amendment should be adopted, and would prolong its consideration for a long time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, has the Senator from Georgia any idea how much additional expense the adoption of the amendment would involve?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; no one has figured that at all, but it certainly would involve a tremendous increase in the cost to the Treasury.

Mr. TAFT. In a State which now gives 18 weeks benefits, unemployed persons would get 27 weeks; in a State in which 20 weeks are allowed, there would be 30 instead of 26; in a State which gives 22 weeks, there would be 33 instead of 26; in a State which gives 25, there would be 37½; in a State which gives 26, there would be 39.

Mr. GEORGE. All at the expense of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. TAFT. Has it not been generally agreed that 26 weeks is about the limit of safety under unemployment compensation?

Mr. GEORGE. It has been generally agreed, and that is all that has been proposed by the author of the original bill. It is all that has been recommended by the President, and generally the leaders of labor throughout the country have insisted that that was the maximum which should be allowed.

Mr. TAFT. In addition to that, the GI bill of rights gave the veterans only 52 weeks in 2 years, or an equivalent of 26 weeks a year.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is quite correct, 52 weeks in a period of 2 years, and here is a proposal which might give

as much as 36 or 39 weeks in 21 months, because the life of the proposed law will be only 21 months, and it would mean a tremendous increase in cost to the Treasury.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, this is not exactly the same question that was presented in the Committee on Finance by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, because at that time the cash benefits were higher than they are now as a result of an amendment adopted on the floor of the Senate. As the bill now stands, it does absolutely nothing for the workers in the State of New York, so far as this provision is concerned, and with the reduced cash benefits, I am asking only that we extend the duration. It occurs to me, in view of the fact that this proposal was rejected in the committee because it was assumed, I dare say, by some of the Members, that the cash benefits were too high, that the situation now is different. The cash benefits have been reduced, and it seems to me it would be only in order to consider extending the duration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and let my vote stand.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—18

Downey	McMahon	Murray
Ferguson	Magnuson	Myers
Guffey	Mead	Taylor
Kilgore	Mitchell	Vandenberg
Knowland	Morse	Wagner
McCarran	Murdock	Walsh

NAYS—61

Aiken	Barkley	Byrd
Andrews	Bilbo	Capehart
Austin	Bridges	Capper
Bailey	Briggs	Carville
Ball	Butler	Chandler
Chavez	Hoey	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Donnell	La Follette	Stewart
Ellender	Langer	Taft
Fulbright	McClellan	Tobey
George	McFarland	Tunnell
Gerry	McKellar	Wheeler
Green	Maybank	Wherry
Gurney	Millikin	White
Hart	Moore	Wiley
Hatch	O'Daniel	Willis
Hawkes	Radcliffe	Wilson
Hayden	Reed	Young
Hickenlooper	Revercomb	
Hill	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—17

Bankhead	Eastland	Russell
Brewster	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Overton	Tydings
Bushfield	Pepper	

So Mr. MEAD's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment which I thought had been offered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. It appeared on my desk, and it is an amendment which I think should be considered, and yesterday I spoke on it. I should like to offer it at this time, and have a vote on it. It goes to the question which I discussed yesterday, having to do with Federal maritime workers. I have been informed that in Wisconsin and Michigan such a situation exists that a man on one side of the Potomac River would get $20 and one on the other side, doing the same kind of work, would get $15.

With permission granted to me by the senior Senator from New York, I offer the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, line 5, of the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out all of section 703 (b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) Any such agreement shall provide for the payment of compensation to any individual who performed Federal or maritime service equal to the compensation which would be payable to such individual under the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended (as if it were supplemented under this title), as if such services had been performed in the District of Columbia and had not been excluded from the definition of employment in such Act.

On page 20, line 9, of the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out all after the word "law" and insert "except as the Director may otherwise prescribe, by regulation, for Federal or maritime employees."

On page 13, line 6, of the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out in section 701 (f) the comma after the word "vessel" and the remainder of the words in that sentence and insert in lieu thereof a period.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from West Virginia desire that the amendments be voted on en bloc?

Mr. KILGORE. I do; because the latter parts are simply perfective of the first part.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator does not desire to discuss the amendment I should like to discuss it for a minute. In covering the Federal employees we have covered them in the States where they performed their services. That is precisely what every State law does. Here is no test between the States and a Federal system. The district of Columbia is regarded as a State under the Social Security law. So here is the selection of one State and the setting up of its system to the exclusion of all the other States notwithstanding the fact that the worker actually worked in another State. If it were a conflict between a Federal system on the one hand and the various State systems on the other there would be another issue. But here the District of Columbia, which is raised to the dignity of a State under the social-security system, is exalted and its law must become controlling on all the other States.

Mr. KILGORE. Only as to Federal workers.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, I understand, as to Federal workers, without regard to where they worked. All the State laws and the District of Columbia law provide the same thing. The District of Columbia does not cover any worker who does not work in this District. The system in this District is not a Federal system. It is a State system. Yet it is desired to bring all the State laws under that of the District of Columbia.

I wish to suggest another thought. I wonder how many of those who are advocating this proposal have thought it through? More than 60 percent of the workers are working in States which pay as much or more than the District of Columbia. The Federal workers are not favored by this proposal. Those who make the proposal are hurting the Federal workers. The State of New York pays more than does the District of Columbia. Sixty percent of the workers are in States which actually furnish equal or greater benefit to the unemployed workers than does the District of Columbia.

What is the trouble about it all? Why not let them go back to the State in which they performed their services? There are more persons on the Federal pay roll in New York and in California than there are in the city of Washington. We do not stop to realize that this is a proposal which would hurt more than 60 percent of the workers. Why is the proposal made? All because some individuals want a straight Federal system, and rather than approach it frontally and directly they keep on with subterranean attacks on the State system.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to vote this amendment down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement lest there be some confusion as to interpretation of my vote. I fear that in the future someone might think that I voted against the bill as proposed by the committee because I would rather have the bill as it was originally introduced. Personally I would rather vote to appropriate a dollar to provide a

job than I would to vote for unemployment compensation, which I believe can be handled very effectively by the State funds as they now are. In my opinion an unemployment emergency does not confront this country. Therefore my vote will mean that I am against the payment of any Federal funds for unemployment compensation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1274) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TERMINATION OF DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 3974) to provide for termination of daylight-saving time, and I submit a report (No. 582) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understand the bill to which the Senator refers is a House bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that the Committee on Interstate Commerce has considered it, and that more than 15 members of the committee have given approval to it.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3974) to provide for termination of daylight-saving time, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the act of January 20, 1942, entitled "An act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight saving time," at 2 o'clock antemeridian on Sunday, September 30, 1945, the standard time of each zone established pursuant to the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended, shall be returned to the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing the standard time for such zone as provided in such act of March 19, 1918, as amended.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say that several bills dealing with this subject were introduced and came to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The first one was that introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Similar bills have been introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and by several members of the Senate on the Democratic side. In view of the fact that the House had passed H. R. 3974, which under its provisions is to go into effect on September 30, 1945, the committee decided to report the House bill so action could be had quickly in order that it might take effect on the 30th of September.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say that I appreciate very much the statement made by the senior Senator from Montana. Those of us who introduced measures dealing with this subject have given way to consideration of the House bill because we can adopt it quickly and expedite the matter. We appreciate very much the courtesy extended us by the distinguished Senator from Montana and also the fact that he mentioned at this time on the floor of the Senate the introduction of other measures.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 3974) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPORT BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY OF FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL, MINORITY REPORT, AND PRINTING OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency has authorized the reporting of the so-called full employment bill.

Mr. WAGNER rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I see the Senator from New York on his feet now.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I was about to ask that the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized to file a report on the full employment bill during the recess of the Senate following today's session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say that it is contemplated the bill will be taken up for consideration by the Senate on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will take note.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that permission be granted to file a minority report on the full employment bill during the recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. I also ask unanimous consent that the various amendments which are to be proposed to the bill may be submitted and printed during the recess, so that they may all be available to Members of the Senate as soon as possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TOWARD JAPAN

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, supplementing my remarks of yesterday relative to General MacArthur, I was amazed to read in this morning's Washington Post that Acting Secretary of State Acheson, by openly rebuffing General MacArthur for his statement that he needed only 200,000 American troops to build the foundations of a just and decent peace in Japan, has contributed further to the confusion that already exists in the public mind on this matter.

The Washington Post called Mr. Acheson's rebuff "a statement more pugnacious than diplomatic," and the Post went on to say that Mr. Acheson was criticizing General MacArthur for modifying this Government's established policy toward Japan.

But even more amazing to me is the fact that Mr. Acheson asserted that so far as this Government's policy is concerned, it would not be changed and would be carried out regardless of cost.

Certainly the American people will not stand for such a stubborn refusal to recognize the changing requirements resulting from changed conditions from day to day. That they are changing is very obvious, according to General MacArthur's statement, and is the basis for his declaration. I say that the American people will not for one moment support or tolerate a blind and unyielding adherence to a preconceived occupation policy which is based upon neither moral principles nor common sense. Such a view was expressed by Mr. Acheson in yesterday's Washington Post.

I agree with Mr. Acheson's statement that the United States Government, and not the occupation forces under General MacArthur, has determined the American policy toward Japan; but the United States Government is still a people's government, and I believe that General MacArthur, in acting as a representative of the American people, has the wholehearted support of a grateful Nation. He continues to have my admiration and support. In order further to strengthen his position and justify his wisdom, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, September 16, 1945, entitled "MacArthur Moves Cautiously To Reform Japan."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR MOVES CAUTIOUSLY TO REFORM JAPAN—USE OF EMPEROR TO BRING ABOUT CHANGES WE DESIRE WILL BE TRIED

(By Frank L. Kluckhohn)

TOKYO, September 15.—There are two carefully protected retreats in Japan which hold the answers to Japan's future course and destiny. One is the imperial palace in Tokyo, where, surrounded by high walls with specially uniformed police at each gate, Emperior Hirohito dwells in utmost aloofness. The other is a sizable private home in Yokohama where, until he moves to the Tokyo American Embassy next Monday, Gen. Douglas MacArthur is ensconced. If what Hirohito intends to order his people to do, whether he is seeing anyone or not, is a mystery to everyone it can be said with equal certainty that the Japanese are talking for perhaps the first time in their history about "the inscrutable western mind" when their thoughts or eyes turn toward Yokohama.

HIROHITO HESITANT

As relays of Japanese men in uniform—soldiers and officers—move in groups toward the imperial palace, stand outside the walls, bow from the waist stiffly, then looking neither to right nor left turn away, it seems increasingly that Hirohito is not prepared to take the lead in establishing the new Japan which his imperial rescript ending the war placed him in position to do.

If anyone is seeing Hirohito and knows what he is thinking, it is a carefully guarded secret. This, it might be said, is about the only mystery in this part of the East where the Japanese generally are acting with all the subtlety of a steam roller.

But it may well be—and it would be in line with his policy—that General MacArthur, by dealing directly only with Mamoru Shigemitsu, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and one or two Japanese signers of the surrender instrument, is deliberately keeping the Japanese guessing while he develops his policy for dealing with a situation unparalleled in history. For General MacArthur is standing over the whole government of a people who were not beaten by a foreign army, who feel that peace was brought by the desire of an Emperor who rules by means of a queer religion and secret police.

DISARMING FIRST

Let it be said to start with that General MacArthur's first task has been to occupy Japan and disarm the Japanese. He landed in a country, never before defeated, with a handful of soldiers and the disarming of millions of men is just beginning. Thus far his troops have been moving into key spots all over the Japanese home islands. The Japanese have been rapidly disarmed by their own Government without a single major incident of any kind. A week ago there were 2,000,000 armed and organized Japanese men. Today that figure probably has been about halved, and our forces have increased.

General MacArthur this week promised stern and uncompromising enforcement of the surrender terms. His policy has been clear so far as his immediate acts are concerned. He is allowing the Japanese to disarm themselves without supervision. He is permitting them to police themselves, which military experts estimate is saving us fifteen to twenty divisions. He is issuing orders through his chief of staff to the "Central Liaison Office," to which Japanese officials and officers and American officers are cooperating. He has announced that American troops are present to enforce his orders if necessary. He has "cracked down" on Domei, the official Japanese news agency, and established a censorship over the Japanese press, which until several days ago was "needling" the Americans and threatening to run wild.

This week he issued the initial list of 40 war criminals, ordered breaking up of the Black Dragon Society and formally abolished the Imperial Staff.

These moves (perhaps dictated by pressure of public opinion at home) have not yet had much effect. Only a few of the 40—most of them have been mentioned prominently in recent news dispatches—were arrested and word has gone around that we want the Japanese to arrest and proceed against their own war criminals. Those who felt inclined to commit suicide have had ample chance. Thus far the Black Dragon is still functioning, so are the army and navy general staff.

DICTATED FROM WASHINGTON

Before discussing General MacArthur's actions and possible future policies it should be emphasized that the general course of American action in Japan on behalf of the Allies is being dictated from Washington, and particularly by the State Department. General MacArthur entered Japan under Secretary Byrnes' pledge to maintain the Emperor until the Japanese people decided upon their future government in elections. His primary task has been not to start another war, as many people even in his forces here seem to desire, but to occupy the country and see that Japan does not make another war.

In fairness it should also be noted that he has inherited one of the most amazing situations any man in supreme authority has had to meet—nominal control of a country defeated by air attacks and blockades, whose social system, built upon the combination of a queer religion (Shinto) and streamlined feudal controls, is as intact as its physical plant is devastated. Everyone here has recognized from the start, as people at home could not, that we have been sitting on dynamite. A bull-in-a-china-shop type of man in command could easily have caused an explosion.

For instance, it is the considered opinion of a large majority of the correspondents here that if the Emperor had been forcibly removed the inadequate number of American troops would have faced a terrific battle against odds, if not a massacre. For MacArthur is compelled to deal with what the organized forces of the country at least, and probably the people also, think is a living god.

General MacArthur has seen fit to sit back quietly and temper the affairs being relayed to his austere retreat by a multitude of nerve centers. To date this policy has probably been the most sensible one to follow, but matters are reaching a stage where he will soon have to recommend or decide upon one of two policies.

THE ALTERNATIVES

One of these is to show the iron hand, strike ruthlessly and smash the existing Japanese system to pieces; the other is to force the Emperor and his leading minions to take the lead through the existing machinery in Japan to change the whole system of thought and way of life of the Japanese people.

To those who have suffered or read of Japanese atrocities upon war prisoners and civilians like the Filipinos under Japanese control—and General MacArthur has dealt with these at first-hand—the temptation is strong to use the mailed first. But if he should choose that way General MacArthur would be likely to raise resentments which would smolder until changing world affairs made possible a move for revenge.

When feelings engendered by the war, maltreatment of prisoners, and treachery exhibited by the ruling military caste of Japan are discounted, a policy of persuasion and of inducing self-change appears to offer many benefits. The question is whether this nation, with its inherited complexes and tendency toward violence, can be changed without a shattering blow which would smash the whole present system apart and make possible the foundation of a new one. If General MacArthur started using the strong-arm method, could he count upon support and sufficient troops to carry an obviously long job through?

Matters seem boiling under the surface toward a climax. Many members of the Government say frankly that they cannot change Japan unless General MacArthur firmly crushes the military caste himself, that they would very likely be killed if they moved against it themselves.

Let us put it bluntly. General Tojo, who botched the job of shooting himself this week, ran a system which in many respects made Hitler's look like the work of a novice. Behind him he had not only the military extremists with their assassins banded in such organizations as the Black Dragon with its secret-language signs and so on. He had not only the military police force, the Kimpei, which was as extensive and used the same methods of imprisonment, torture, and observation as Himmler's Gestapo.

PROBLEM OF TRADITION

He had not only the system known as hoko, whereby every Japanese spies upon every other Japanese, not so much with regard to what he does as to what he thinks. Tojo had also behind him the tradition of acceptance of this kind of thing extending back into the dark reaches of Japan's long history and gradually perfected since 1853 until Tojo brought it to the ultimate point of universal conformity.

While the top layer of this national organization is being removed or in danger of being eliminated through court martial of war prisoners and the like, there are younger men—plenty of them—who regard the American occupation and the present plight of Japan as purely transitory.

To smash these groups General MacArthur would need a tremenodus intelligence section to track down all the ringleaders, for there are hundreds of thousands rather than tens. He would probably need a far larger occupation force than the 300,000 to 400,000 now arriving in Japan. In all likelihood he would have to police the entire country with his own men. He would have to supervise the school system directly and probably keep the jails full.

ECONOMIC QUESTIONS

He would have to be prepared to meet guerrilla warfare of a bitter, unending nature. The guerrilla problem would be particularly difficult in view of Japan's impoverished condition and the fact that millions of men overnight are being demobilized and thrust back into civilian jobs for which many are untrained, while many of Japan's factories are destroyed and the remaining economic machine through lack of materials is at a standstill.

If the Emperor's authority could be directly exerted to force a basic change in Japan's education and social system as well as methods of thought, obviously the task would be easier. Although far above politics in the Japanese conception, Hirohito by his rescript ending the war put himself in a position to initiate and insist upon basic reforms if he could be induced to do so. Also he is the only Japanese in a position to do this without personal danger.

Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is Acheson doing criticizing MacArthur? Has he made plans, or has he been trying to help him occupy Japan? What does he know about the occupation?

Mr. WHERRY. He has not tried to help him. He has made the statement that MacArthur's job is to occupy; but he made the further statement that MacArthur has nothing to do with declaring the policy of the American people toward Japan. My contention is that while it is true that MacArthur is to occupy, policy making is left to the people of the United States, and not to a man like Mr. Acheson, acting so stubbornly upon the policy which he has adopted.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is Mr. Acheson's position with the American Government?

Mr. BARKLEY. He is Under Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. He is Acting Secretary of State, speaking for the United States Government at this time. I say that he does not reflect the sentiment of the people of the United States toward the policy which General MacArthur is employing in Japan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not care to enter into a discussion about General MacArthur's policy in Japan. I suppose it is

agreed by all that the Government of the United States, as a government, will settle our policy toward Japan. I do not suppose that General MacArthur can settle the policy of the American Government toward Japan, any more than General Eisenhower can settle it with regard to Germany.

Mr. WHERRY. That is beside the point.

Mr. CHANDLER. Can Acheson settle it from the State Department?

Mr. WHERRY. He cannot. The only ones who can settle that policy are the people of the United States, acting through their representatives in Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Acheson, acting as Secretary of State, occupies the same position which Mr. Grew occupied during the absence of Secretary Stettinius and other Secretaries of State. He is the spokesman of the State Department in the absence of the Secretary of State.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. I make the point of order that the rules of the Senate require Senators to remain seated; and that when any Senator has the floor, before another Senator may interrupt he must address the Chair and obtain permission from the Senator who has the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is well taken. Senators will take their seats.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is my understanding that Mr. Acheson's name is now on the Senate Calendar for confirmation to some position in the American State Department. I think perhaps we had better back up and examine Mr. Acheson's qualifications, because if he is undertaking to make American policy, it seems to me a little premature for him to undertake to make it at the expense of a man who has demonstrated, in his official capacity as a general of the Army——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me finish.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Before Mr. Acheson undertakes to upbraid a man who has made a very fine record leading American soldiers to reconquer lost territory in the Philippines, and who has actually successfully invaded Japan and occupied it with practically no loss, it seems to me that the Senate might inquire into his qualifications before giving approval to the nomination of Mr. Acheson, and determine just what his views are on this question. Perhaps we will not want him. We have made many mistakes in our State Department recently, and the result has been that we have got rid of some of our officials. Some of us rose on the floor of the Senate and complained when other appointments were made.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true.

Mr. CHANDLER. They had to be disposed of in a hurry. It had to be done speedily. There was some emergency. There is no emergency now. The war is over. We are undertaking to make plans for peace. Perhaps we had better not hurry. Perhaps we had better let Mr. Acheson rest in cold storage for awhile and examine his qualifications.

Mr. WHERRY. So far as this Government's policy is concerned, he is speaking for the Secretary of State. He has stated that the policy would not be changed and would be carried out regardless of cost. That is in direct contradiction to what General MacArthur is doing in the Pacific area. If it be in order, I shall ask that this nomination go over. We ought to have much more information about Mr. Acheson, and what his policy is going to be if he speaks for the American people. I make the request that the nomination go over for the time being.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request is not now in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no occasion to create friction between the State Department and General MacArthur. We all admire and respect General MacArthur, and acknowledge his great ability as a soldier and as a leader of American forces.

This situation arose, apparently, over General MacArthur's statement a few days ago that only 200,000 American soldiers would be required in the occupation of Japan. Senators who were at the Library this morning and heard General Marshall explain the situation with respect to that matter were benefited by the frank and candid explanation made by General Marshall that there had been constant reduction in the number of soldiers that it was first thought would be necessary in the occupation of Japan. At first General MacArthur requested 17 divisions. He later reduced it to 6 divisions. Then he reduced it from 6 to 3; and last night or this morning he reduced it to 2.

General MacArthur stated, and General Marshall now agrees with the statement, that for the occupation of Japan and Korea, beginning next July—not now, but next July, which is the point at which the occupation army of 200,000 is to begin—200,000 soldiers for Japan and Korea will be sufficient. That does not include the forces necessary in the various islands of the Pacific, or in Alaska, or the forces which may be necessary along the coast of China. It is for Japan and Korea alone.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the statement which came from General MacArthur with respect to the policy which would be adopted toward Japan, there was not only discussion on the part of the Under Secretary or Acting Secretary of State, but there was considerable discussion in the newspapers, including the newspapers of Washington, as to the propriety of that policy. I raise no question about it, and do not discuss it.

Mr. Acheson was appointed Under Secretary of State during the recess. He received a recess appointment. He is still Under Secretary of State, notwithstanding the fact that his nomination is now on the executive calendar. What Mr. Acheson undertook to do was to make it plain that the policy of this Government toward Japan—the political policy as well as the question of the size of the occupation army—would be determined by the Government of the United States. Of course, under the advice of General MacArthur, because it is not proposed by anyone, so far as I know—either the President, the Chief of Staff, or anyone else—that more soldiers be kept in either Germany or Japan than the generals in charge of the occupying forces deem necessary to have there.

Therefore, it does not seem to me that there is any occasion to try to create friction between the State Department, the War Department, General MacArthur, or anyone else, and Mr. Acheson, who is one of the most distinguished public servants, in my judgment, and one of the ablest men who have ever served in the State Department, and he has been recognized as such by all those who have come in contact with him. He was merely undertaking to make it clear that the policy which is adopted toward Japan will be fixed by the Government, not by the Army or the Navy, or any officer of the Army or Navy. That is all he intended to do, and I think that is all he did.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I think Acheson's statement was unfortunate. I think it went further than it should have gone in criticism of General MacArthur. Apparently it was made at a time when criticism was being widely circulated against General MacArthur and when charges were being freely made that he was mixing statesmanship and politics with the war. I do not know why Mr. Acheson made the statement, but he did make it, and, in my judgment, it went further than it should have gone in order to make an objection. If I correctly understand the present situation, General Marshall has said that General MacArthur is correct in the estimate he has made. General MacArthur simply said he hoped to use 200,000 men instead of the 500,000 originally estimated. Of course, later, in the early stages of the occupation, the estimate was reduced to 400,000. He said he hoped that if no unforeseen circumstances arose he would be able to do the job with 200,000 troops in 6 months, and I understand that General Marshall has said that is all right.

Then, Mr. President, I cannot understand why there is this criticism of General MacArthur, unless Dean Acheson wants to take up the burden of certain newspaper editorials and join in a general all-round clubbing of General MacArthur, who is doing a fine job in Japan.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the statement went further than it should have gone, and if someone starts a row between the State Department and the Army the State Department will be responsible for it because Acheson made the statement when it was not called for, in my opinion.

Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. RADCLIFFE, and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia, and then I shall yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland, and then to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a further point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. I make the point of order only in the interest of orderly procedure. I do not recognize that under the Senate rules a Senator can hold the floor and can yield indiscriminately to Senators, no matter how he may name them. A Senator may yield for a question, but for nothing more.

In justice to the Senator from Nebraska, I must say that if he yields for any purpose other than a question, I shall make the point of order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from West Virginia to wait until the Chair rules on the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair assumes that the Senator from Nebraska intends to yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, but I must say that I am indulging in a traditional courtesy which has been extended ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. I shall yield to the Senator from West Virginia; I assume that he wishes to ask me a question, and therefore I yield to him.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I shall try to put what I shall say in the form of a question, namely, does the Senator from Nebraska realize that after General MacArthur made the statement that only 200,000 troops would be needed for the occupation of Japan within 6 months after he made the statement—not by the middle of next year, as I believe was stated by the majority leader. In hearings held within the same week before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, General Henry, of the Army staff, said they wanted 900,000 troops as of the 1st of July 1946, for the Pacific area? I further wish to ask this question: If for the Pacific area they will need only 200,000 men 6 months from this date, where would they use the other 700,000 troops? Does the Senator from Nebraska also realize that this whole business of releasing soldiers is in terrible confusion and is away behind the schedule which it should be following?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland for a question.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he feels that in view of the long and distinguished service of Mr. Acheson, the statement said to have been made by him is sufficient justification for holding up confirmation of his nomination. I most assuredly think not. Of course, we are familiar with Mr. Acheson's record in public office. We know he has been Under Secretary of the Treasury; we know he has been Assistant Secretary of State; we know he has acted in many other official capacities, and in each one he has served the Government conscientiously and very successfully. He did not seek any of those positions. I have never before heard a word of criticism of him. I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he thinks we should hold up confirmation of the nomination simply because of the statement referred to, even though Mr. Acheson may have been mistaken in making it—an assumption which I certainly do not make. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska does not know what all the facts are. He does not know how many men are necessary for the occupation of Japan, and I do not know how large an armed force is needed for that purpose.

I shall not transgress upon the time of the Senator from Nebraska by attempting to go into the merits of the question at this time, and its determination should not control our action on his nomination.

However, in view of the excellent record of Mr. Acheson, which is so well known to all of us, I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he does not believe that the statement referred to is quite inadequate justification for holding up confirmation of the nomination. It seems to me that a sense of proportion of relative values should prevent us from letting our impression of Mr. Acheson's statement control our vote on this matter, especially since at this moment an Under Secretary of State is needed as much as ever before in our history.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in reply I should like to say that I appreciate very much what the distinguished Senator from Maryland has offered to the Members of the Senate. I myself have no antagonism toward Mr. Acheson. I have heard him testify before many of the Senate committees. I think he is a very brilliant man, and I am not in any way censuring his record. I am saying that in view of the statement he made, namely, that so far as the policy of the Government is concerned, it will not be changed, but it will be carried out regardless of cost; if he made it inadvertently, if he made it in the heat of anger, if he wished to have publicity and wished to try General MacArthur in the newspapers, that is another matter. But as regards the question of confirming the nomination this afternoon, I wish to say that I think I have gone along almost always in the matter of the confirmation of nominations, and I have always respected the judgment of the majority leader regarding them and the endorsement he has given to any of them. I did not rise to speak particularly on that point.

My position is that if we can possibly delay action on the nomination until we can get Mr. Acheson to clarify the statement, I shall appreciate it, because if Mr. Acheson expects to attempt to set the policy of the American people on these matters, I should not wish to vote to confirm the nomination. That is the way I feel.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask a question. Major General Henry estimated that 900,000 men were necessary in the Pacific; he made that statement to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. When did he make that estimate? Did he make it when General MacArthur sent word that he needed 17 divisions; or did General Henry make the estimate when General MacArthur sent word that he needed, as I think the majority leader said, 6 divisions; or did General Henry testify to that effect after General MacArthur said he needed only 200,000 men?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. General Henry made that statement last week.

Mr. McMAHON. That was after General MacArthur said he needed three divisions, not two divisions.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont for a question.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I shall not ask a question. I rise to try to correct the RECORD and keep it straight. The estimate of the larger number of men was made when we were working on the basis of preparing to whip Japan. We must not forget that. The change or reduction has been made since that time, and gradually, until today, when General Henry appeared on the same platform with General Marshall, they both agreed that it would be possible to take care of the occupation of Japan and Korea with 200,000 men, but that that number would not be adequate to take care also of the occupation of the Philippines, the Hawaiian Islands, Alaska, the Aleutians, and the bases which they did not name but which are scattered over the Pacific area.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. CHANDLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield and, if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia for a question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was not fortunate enough this morning to hear General Henry. I heard him last week before the committee. When the estimate of 900,000 men was made for the Pacific area for July 1, 1946, it was made last week, and not on the basis, as I understand, of plans for invading Japan.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for a question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. I have no desire to take the Senator from Nebraska off his feet, but the rules of the Senate have been violated in yielding for other than questions. My only point is that I feel that in the interest of orderly discussion, Senators should take the floor in their own right. The Senator from Nebraska has been very courteous, but I believe business would be expedited if Senators would take the floor in their own time. I think that sometimes we have been too lax in enforcing the rule.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator may recall that on yesterday I expressed the view that when General MacArthur made the statement that by the end of 6 months, if nothing unforeseen should occur, he could occupy the islands of Japan with 200,000 men, he most certainly did not mean that 200,000 men would be sufficient to occupy also Okinawa, Saipan, Tinian, Iwo Jima, and all the other islands which our forces have taken. Does the Senator recall that yesterday I made that statement?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe that the Senator from Colorado will recall that originally it was estimated that as many as 1,900,000 men would be necessary to wage the fight against Japan. General MacArthur, who is in charge of the forces in the Pacific, has handled the situation.

For the State Department, Mr. Acheson, or anyone on behalf of the State Department, to lend aid and comfort to the fight which is now being made against General MacArthur, is to me absolutely unthinkable. It was out of place and should not have been done. If there is any fight between the State Department and the Army, it has been started by Mr. Acheson in the State Department. The President of the United States said very promptly that he would be very much pleased if General MacArthur could do what he had indicated he could do. General MacArthur said in effect, "We should like to occupy this country with men of the Regular Army so that citizen soldiers who fought a long and terrific battle may go home." I am sure the Senator from Colorado will agree with me when I say that our soldiers fought the battle against Japan with very little relief. They are very tired and should come home. If General Marshall agrees, and if the President of the United States agrees, it does not become Mr. Acheson, or anyone else in the State Department, to start a row and try to be mean, as they have already done in connection with General MacArthur.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished majority leader if there is any objection to allowing this nomination to go over until next Monday. I do not want to cause any friction at all between the State Department and the military department. I have no objection to Mr. Acheson personally. If he can clarify his statement for me, and show me that he does not want to cause any difficulty, that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the first place, the Senate is not yet in executive session.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to make a statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I certainly do not intend to get into any controversy as between General MacArthur and Dean Acheson. I have great respect and regard for both of them. However, it may have been that General MacArthur's statement originally was one which he gave out to the press. It was not an official statement which was sent through official channels to the War Department. I believe that therein lies the mistake originally. In his talk this morning, General Marshall said that only last night or this morning he had received the official recommendation of General MacArthur with respect to the number of troops which would be needed in the occupation of Japan or Korea. I assume that the statement of General MacArthur which aroused some discussion throughout the country was given out in Tokyo. I think there was some feeling that, instead of announcing the number of troops required in the way he did, our military commander in chief in the field should have made the announcement through the War Department. That may be a meticulous matter which should not have involved any criticism. It is likely that in view of the fact that the information came out in the way it did, and did not come officially through the War Department, as General Marshall said in his talk to us this morning, it was looked upon as an effort by General MacArthur to decide the policy of this Government toward Japan. We all know that the policy of this Government may not be decided either by General MacArthur in Japan, General Eisenhower in Europe, by General Hodges in Korea, or by any other General, without first consulting his Government.

I think it would be most unfortunate in view of the situation which has developed, to postpone consideration of Mr. Acheson's nomination. I do not know whether he was premature in the statement which he made. I do not know the basis of what he said. He was speaking not without consultation, I assume, with the Secretary of State in the matter. While it would be no tragedy for the nomination to go over for a day or two, in view of the discussion which has taken place, it would undoubtedly do Mr. Acheson grave injustice in connection with the performance of his duty if the nomination should be postponed. I hope the Senator will not insist upon postponement of the nomination.

Allow me also to state, in connection with the military situation, that there should be no unfavorable deduction drawn from the fact that the commanding officers in the field have reduced the estimate of the number of soldiers which they had previously thought would be needed. We did not know how many men would be needed in Germany. When I was in Germany earlier in the year my recollection is that General Eisenhower said that from 500,000 to 600,000 soldiers would be needed in Germany. He later reduced that number to 400,000, and that is his latest figure. It may be reduced, depending on the fluctuating conditions. It is not strange that General MacArthur, even after the surrender of Japan, said that he would need six divisions. It was impossible to know how the occupation would progress, whether there would be any friction or whether it would be necessary to occupy other territory by the actual presence of soldiers. The original estimate was subsequently reduced to three divisions, and later to two. The more that all generals in occupied zones can reduce the number of men necessary, the more we will be pleased and the more the American people will be pleased.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to ask him a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did Mr. Acheson's statement contain any reference to what the size of the Army should be?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know.

Mr. MAYBANK. My reason for asking the question is that, as I understand, the discussion has centered around the number of men who may or may not be needed in the armed forces insofar as the subject under discussion is concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to answer the distinguished Senator. I do not know Mr. Acheson. He just took exception to an estimate of General MacArthur; and the statement he made was that the policy of this Government, so far as demobilization and carrying out the occupation of Japan was concerned, would not be changed, regardless of cost. The military figures which have been used have gone, as I take it, to half a million men.

I wish to state, as Senator from Nebraska, that I think the time has come when Congress should have something to say about the size of the military forces and the size of the occupation forces, so that we can demobilize the Army just as quickly as possible. I am not fixing the number, but I think the attitude of Mr. Acheson is one which is a direct contradiction of the good judgment and policies of General MacArthur, who is one of the outstanding generals of our Army. That is the way I feel about it.

Mr MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly no one in this body would take issue with the Senator regarding the great ability of General MacArthur. What I want to know is what policy Dean Acheson suggested so far as the number of men in the Army is concerned, as to redeployment, as to handling selective service. Was any policy mentioned?

Mr. WHERRY. According to this article I am quoting he took exception to General MacArthur's statement, and some other things were said, something about the way it was released, and other things. I am not interested in that, and I do not wish to create friction between the Department of State and the Army, but the one thing which it seems to me we should consider is the fact that he said that they are not going to change their present policy, no matter what may happen.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield again to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. The question I wish to ask is, What is this policy which seems to be condemned by so many? Very frankly, I should like to know what is being condemned.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to talk a little about that policy.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr McFARLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield. I shall let the Senator from Arizona answer the question.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am just as anxious as is any other Senator to see our boys come home at the earliest possible moment, and I hope the number of the occupation forces can be reduced from 200,000 to 100,000. But there is another thing about which I am anxious, and that is the speech which was made by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in which he urged that the Japanese be made to realize that they are a conquered nation. If Mr. Acheson had in mind a policy which would make them fully realize that, then I praise him for having spoken out and assured the American people that the Japanese would be made to realize that they had tortured our boys in the death march after the fall of Corregidor, that they had tortured our fliers who had been unfortunate enough to drop in Japan. If that is what he had in mind, we should be singing his praises that the State Department was willing to establish such a policy and carry it out.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his contribution, but that is beside the question. That is not the point at issue at all. Mr. Acheson did not announce his complete policy. I do not know what the Under Secretary of State wants, but I know he made the statement to which I have referred, and it is to that I am taking exception.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The question is, Who objected to whose statement? General MacArthur made a statement that he could occupy Japan after 6 months with two hundred thousand.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. What objection did that call for Mr. Acheson to make? And what contribution has Mr. Acheson made to whipping the Japs? Did Mr. Acheson have to leave the Philippine Islands under the direction of the President, and leave his own boys there to surrender and starve? Who is more anxious to whip the Japs than is MacArthur? Whom have they punished and humiliated more than MacArthur and Wainwright? The question is, who started the fight? MacArthur did not say, "I think we should change the policy toward Japan." MacArthur said, "I want to use 200,000 Regular Army troops after 6 months to occupy this country." Acheson says that is a horrible thing, that MacArthur is meddling in politics. He did no such thing.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand the statement made by Mr. Acheson to have referred to the military policy, but I think there has been in the minds of a great many of us some question about our policy with regard to Japan along the lines of the speech of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] a few days ago. I think the real explanation of Dean Acheson's statement was with reference to that, that this does not mean that we are pulling out and are not going to do anything to Japan. I do not think he for a moment intended to meddle in the question as to how many men MacArthur is to have, but I do think that because of criticism, some of it on this floor, of our policy toward Japan which indicates a soft peace, to sum it up, he has been led to reaffirm that it is not going to be a soft peace.

It seems to me it would be a gratuitous insult to a man of Dean Acheson's standing and reputation to have his nomination go over. This is not an ordinary political appointment, and I am quite confident Dean Acheson did not seek this position. In fact, he is anxious to retire because of his own personal well-being, and I think he has assumed this place and has consented to act purely out of his desire to serve the country. It seems to me it is just this sort of thing which discourages the best type of men we have from ever serving the Government, when, through a misunderstanding, which I think is probably at the root of this matter, they are paraded before the public as having indulged in something that is discreditable.

Dean Acheson is a man of long experience in government, and I am quite confident he did not have in mind trying to dictate how many men MacArthur should have. He is very much concerned, as I am, and as I know many other Senators are, with regard to whether our policy in Japan is to be effective in preventing another war. I am sure that if he were here and could testify he would say that is what he had in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his contribution.

Now that we have all these answers and have had this discussion about the nomination, it seems to me there is ample evidence that there is so much confusion that the nomination should go over until Monday.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There has been no executive session yet. The Senate is in legislative session.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Action on a nomination can be taken only out of order and by unanimous consent.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, notwithstanding the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], Dean Acheson's statement went further than it should have gone, and added to the gratuitous insults delivered against General MacArthur, and if his nomination is presented today, I shall ask that it go over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to keep the Senate longer. I did not rise, I want the majority leader to know, because of any friction in regard to this nomination. If anyone injected any argument about the policies of the military, it has been Mr. Acheson.

I should like to stay to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that Dean Acheson did not use very good judgment in the statement he made and in the way he treated the statement of General MacArthur. General MacArthur was the man who was being disparaged, he was the man who, according to Mr. Acheson, was lacking in judgment. He went so far as to say that, regardless of General MacArthur, "this is the way it is going to be."

I did not rise with the idea of helping anyone. I am not carrying any portfolio for Mr. Acheson, and I have not any quarrel with him. I shall be the first man to vote for him if we can ascertain what he means when he refers to his policy, and what he expects to do if he is writing the policy. But I still insist, and I think I am right, and I believe the American people will agree with me, that if there is any policy to be adopted as to Japan, the American people will have just as much to say about it as Mr. Acheson will. I think I have something to say about it. I might have my opinion about a soft peace or a hard peace.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. If this man will not back up from his policy, whatever it is, is not going to be yielding under any conditions, I think the only thing to do is to carry this nomination over, when it is presented, until we can get a clarification of his statement, and to that I think every American in this country will agree.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. I want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator favor a soft peace?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that I should like to see secured the peace which the American people would like to have secured so far as Japan is concerned. I do not know just what we should exact. I have not yet made up my mind whether Hirohito should be brought to trial as a war criminal. That is something for further consideration. But I will go as far as the Senator from Arizona in seeing to it that the peace in the Pacific shall be as permanent and lasting as we can make it. I have greater faith in the judgment of a man like General MacArthur, who has been in the Pacific area and has dealt with the Japanese, respecting the question of what sort of peace there should be, than I have in the judgment of Dean Acheson, who makes such a statement as he did.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not talking about General MacArthur. I am not casting any reflections on General MacArthur. I also think he is a great general. But I do want to see a firm peace established. I want to see established a peace which will be lasting. I do not believe we can have a lasting peace if we allow the Japs to mouth around and say that the situation is only temporary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, did the Senator from Arizona ask me a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to say to the Senator from Arizona that I think he should be satisfied to let General MacArthur run things in the Pacific area, because I think he can definitely put the Japs in their place.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall yield the floor in a moment. Before I do, I wish the distinguished majority leader to know that I did not arise with any intention of creating any friction, but as an American citizen, and speaking for the people of Nebraska, and, I think for the people of America, I say that we have a right to know what Mr. Acheson meant by his statement. I think his statement went too far. I think it blackened the name of one of the greatest generals the Army of the United States has ever had.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it is utterly ridiculous to say that the name of General MacArthur was blackened. No one has attempted to blacken his name. No one has offered a gratuitous insult to him on the floor of the Senate, in the State Department, or anywhere else.

In the statement which Mr. Acheson gave out the other day he did not mention General MacArthur's name. He did not say he was fixing the policy. He was not changing the policy of the Government of the United States. But he said, as Acting Secretary of State, that whatever that policy is—not to be determined by him but to be determined by the Government of the United States—it would be adhered to without regard to cost.

I think the American people, insofar as our dealings with Japan are concerned, by a vast and overwhelming majority desire to see us adopt and carry out an attitude toward Japan that will convince the Japanese that they have been defeated. That was one of the troubles after the last war. The Germans were never convinced that they were defeated in 1918, and because they were never convinced of it, they were easily persuaded that they could conquer the world if given another chance.

I do not want, and I do not think the American people want, that same situation to arise in Germany, in Japan, or anywhere else in the world. We are occupying Japan, and we are doing so without having defeated all the Japanese Army on Japanese soil, consisting of two and a half million well-armed, well-equipped, well-fed, and well-trained men. It would be easy for the Japanese leaders to persuade those men that they were not defeated, and therefore, not being defeated in actual battle, that a little later on they might revive so they could undertake to do what they were not able to do this time.

I think the American people would be greatly disappointed and disillusioned if our Government were to pursue a policy toward Japan that would result in anything like that happening, from the psychological standpoint of their own belief and their own attitude toward our victory and toward the peace which we hope to impose upon them.

As I understand Mr. Acheson's statement, it was not made with any view of reflecting upon General MacArthur or with any view of attempting to change the policy of the Government, but the statement was that whatever the policy toward Japan is, our Government would carry it out.

Mr. WHERRY. I respectfully wish to state to the majority leader, in view of his remark that my statement was ridiculous——

Mr. BARKLEY. If that word offends the Senator from Nebraska——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will leave that question to the American people to settle. I will leave to the American people whether in his statement Mr. Acheson was not speaking about General MacArthur.

Mr. BARKLEY. Even if he had MacArthur in his mind there was certainly nothing in it that would convey the gratuitous insult which the Senator said it conveyed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have not seen the original Acheson statement, but as printed in the press it mentioned MacArthur, and certainly was insulting to General MacArthur, and in my opinion it could not have been taken in any other way. That is the way I read it. Does my colleague have any doubt about General MacArthur's determination to make the Japanese feel fully that they were defeated?

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I have not the slightest doubt about it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am sure my colleague has the greatest confidence in him.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am one of General MacArthur's greatest admirers. I have been for a long time. When he was Chief of Staff, I was one of his greatest admirers. There are other personal reasons why I feel close to him which I do not have to reveal on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Notwithstanding any personal reasons, but on the basis of his record and his determination to whip the Japs, and to demonstrate to them conclusively by force that they are a defeated nation, does not my colleague have absolute confidence in him; and, realizing how difficult it is to operate in a country like that when one loses face, what would be the effect of Acheson's statement if it caused General MacArthur to lose face in the Japanese area?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it would result in anything of that kind.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it did, it would be disastrous, would it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is always an "if" or a "but" or a "whereas."

Mr. CHANDLER. I am not assuming any "ifs" or "buts" or "whereases," but they do exist.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not going to assume that any statement given out by the Acting Secretary of State, or by the Secretary of State had he been at home, would operate to cause General MacArthur to lose face in Japan because I think General MacArthur's reputation throughout the Pacific area, in Japan, in China, and all over the world, is such that a mere disagreement, if that is what it was, as to the policy that would be adopted by this Government toward Japan could not cause loss of face for General MacArthur or any other distinguished American officer.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in my own right. I merely wish to say that the discussion this afternoon has contributed nothing to either the stature of General MacArthur or to that of Mr. Acheson. General MacArthur will live in the history of this country by reason of the acts he has performed as commander of our armed forces in the Pacific area, as history is written in the Philippine Islands, in Japan, and on all the islands of the Pacific, and as it is being written today in Japan.

Nothing any Senator may say will add anything to General MacArthur's reputation. He is making it on the battlefields and in the conquered countries. General MacArthur will live in the history of America according to his merits as he performs his services. Thus far he has performed them magnificently, and the country is proud of him.

Dean Acheson, to my knowledge, has performed a worth-while service to the United States of America in his branch of Government. He is performing worth-while services today. No criticism of him will detract from the work he is doing. He also will be measured by his actions. I am sure that history will accord to both men an honorable place.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with the appointment of Mr. Acheson as Under Secretary of State, I think I ought to say a word in addition to what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has said. Mr. Acheson for a long time sought to retire from public office. He was at one time Under Secretary of the Treasury, and voluntarily retired from that position because he did not agree with a certain policy of the administration with respect to financial matters. He remained in private practice—and he had a lucrative practice—until he was asked to take the position of Assistant Secretary of State. Months ago he desired to retire from that position and return to his law practice. He resigned, and was on his way toward a vacation preliminary to returning to the practice of law when the Secretary of State, our former colleague here, James M. Byrnes, and the President of the United States asked him to accept the appointment as Under Secretary of State, which he has done at a great sacrifice so far as his personal interests are concerned.

It seems to me that we ought not to say anything here which would reflect upon the official conduct or the good faith of anyone—either General MacArthur, Dean Acheson, or anyone else. These are difficult times. They are times when it is easy for us to become frustrated and annoyed at something which someone else says or does. But of all the times in the history of the country when we ought to keep our heads, this is the time when, if we lose ours here, we cannot blame other men if they lose theirs elsewhere.

I hope that the discussion of this matter and the airing of views of Members of the Senate has been sufficiently comprehensive to allow us to proceed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In view of the lateness of the hour, what does the Senator think of postponing the entire Executive Calendar? There are many important nominations on the Executive Calendar. It is quite long, and it seems to me that we could well postpone its consideration until Monday, when there will be no other official business.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that a while ago I was about to move that the Senate take a recess as in legislative session, and let all the nominations on the calendar go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator mean as in executive session?

Mr. BARKLEY. No. A while ago I was on the verge of moving that the Senate take a recess as in legislative session. We must meet on Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in legislative session.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate is in legislative session. We are compelled to meet on Monday because we cannot adjourn from now until Tuesday. A while ago I was about to move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, as in legislative session. We can devote the entire day, if we wish to do so, to discussing nominations on the Executive Calendar.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, SIGN BILLS, ETC.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator make a request for authorization for the Secretary of the Senate to receive messages from the House, and so forth?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and that the President pro tempore of the Senate be authorized to sign bills and resolutions during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Gilchrist Baker Stockton, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as naval aide and liaison officer to the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, to rank from the date of confirmation by the Senate.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, September 24, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of all comfort, we would be mindful each day that thou art a strong tower of defense unto all who put their trust in Thee. Thou dost assuage the grief of them who mourn, and with heavenly compassion dost look upon those who are stricken and confused. As Thou hast delivered us from those perils which encompassed us, we yield to Thee our humblest gratitude.

As Thou hast given us the victory over our enemies, give us now the wisdom and the vision to measure up to the magnitude of our responsibilities. O Lord God, help us to work for and win that national character without which our form of government cannot be permanently maintained. In the days of our triumph, as we turn our eyes unto the hills which giveth strength, we give homage to our heroic dead and living; also to those public officials who have given honorable service through long and arduous years; bless them with a rich portion of Thy peace. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Crugers Park, Peekskill, N. Y., as "Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative program for the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next following the special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD under the title "Managing Our Economy." I am advised by the Public Printer that the article I wished to extend would cost $169. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of Czechoslovakia and the anniversary of the death of Thomas G. Masaryk, and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a commencement address delivered by a former colleague, the Honorable Francisco A. Delgado, of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial appearing in the Fairfield Times, of Fairfield, Mont.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by the Postmaster General.

THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement of the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman, House Naval Affairs Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE SO-CALLED EFFICIENCY SYSTEM OF THE BOSTON NAVY YARD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have until midnight Saturday

to file a report on the bill (H. R. 4129) providing for reorganization of agencies in the executive department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SAVAGE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Daily Item, Sunbury, Pa.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph entitled "Speak Up, America."

PANGBORN-HERNDON NONSTOP FLIGHT

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the achievement of the three B–29's in flying nonstop from Japan to Chicago is indeed a true landmark in the history of aviation. I hope, however, that it will not obscure the achievement of Clyde Pangborn and Hugh Herndon, Jr., who, in October 1931, made the first true nonstop flight from Japan to the United States. Due to the fact that they had to save weight they dropped their landing gear when two-thirds of their way across the Pacific and landed on a mountain top in western Washington in that condition. Despite the absence of landing wheels Pangborn and Herndon landed with very little damage—some torn fuselage and a bent propeller. That feat has never been recognized officially by the United States. I introduced a bill—H. R. 2778—on March 26 to achieve that result. I hope that this Congress will properly recognize that first nonstop flight from Japan to the United States in October 1931.

VALUE OF THE AMERICAN DOLLAR

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard considerable discussion about reestablishing private enterprise in this country. That is what should be. Private enterprise made this country the greatest country on the face of the earth. Fifteen years ago we had a dollar that looked like our regular dollar and it was worth a dollar the world over. Today we have seen things change and change so rapidly until we have tried to take that dollar and make it stretch like this rubber dollar. As you look at the dollar today, it is about this size, four times the amount of the former dollar, and worth one-half as much, but as you go along socializing America you discover that the dollar that the American people are going to have is going to look like this big worthless-looking dollar, 10 times the size of a regular dollar, but it will not be worth anything. That is where we are heading for by 10 years of putting the Government in all kinds of business. We have too many people who want the Government to do everything when we ought to try to have the American people do things for themselves to protect our citizens and give them their liberty, their freedom, and their independence. If we do not stop this business of trying to make this Government communistic and let the people of this country have their freedom, you are going to rue the day. It is up to Congress to remedy this situation. I think it is about time we act. Why not encourage private enterprise in furthering the capitalistic system to do business for the benefit of all our people and continue to have a great country and less telling those who would have communism to go to work and earn their living rather than to get on the Government for a livelihood by doing nothing. Wake up America before the radicals destroy private industry and ask that the Government take over all forms of business and this communism.

GOVERNMENT TOOLS BEING DESTROYED

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Lansing State Journal, Lansing, Mich., announces that—

Thousands of dollars worth of tools used by Lansing factories in war production are being destroyed by Government order.

The Journal did not disclose its source of information, but it published a photograph of damaged tools which it said a factory employee brought to the Journal office.

"Cutting tools that cost six to eight dollars each," the Journal said, "are taken from original boxes, lined up on a steel-topped table, and a workman with a welding torch moves down the line. Cutting edges, under the blue arc, run like wax over a match.

"Hammers, wrenches, screw drivers, and countless other tools are lined up in similar fashion and the knife-flame is turned on them. Many are new, from original packing cases. Heavy-duty vises, in the original crates, are ripped open enough for the blow torch to cut off a lip or weld the screw into a shapeless mass."

The paper said "this program of destruction is directed by Government ordnance men."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two addresses, one delivered by British Air Marshal Collyer and the other by Hon. Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech he made recently.

QUIETING TITLE TO LANDS BENEATH TIDEWATERS AND NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 344, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 225) to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles. That, after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of the bill, the consideration of which the pending resolution is intended to make in order, is the tidewater lands and the lands covered by navigable streams in the country. The bill is made necessary because of the recent assertion of the right of Federal control made by the Department of the Interior, and in response to which suit was filed by the Attorney General against a citizen in the State of California, which cast a cloud upon a title which has never heretofore been questioned by the Government.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Is there any opposition to this resolution?

Mr. COX. I know of no opposition. I am confident there is not a Member of this body who, having taken the pains to examine this question, entertains the slightest doubt as to the merits of the proposal.

Mr. RANKIN. The reason I asked that question is that I can see no reason for opposing it, and I was wondering why it is necessary to have 3 hours of general debate on it?

Mr. COX. Considering the bill under the pending rule affords opportunity to many Members of this body to get off their chests good speeches which they have prepared. It at least gives opportunity to Members to preach a good doctrine.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman mean they have some submarginal speeches in their system to get off?

Mr. COX. I can think of nothing that oppresses one more than missing the opportunity to deliver a speech which has been carefully prepared.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am for States' rights and everything that belongs to the States, but I am thinking this in my own mind and I wonder if the gentleman can enlighten me on it. Insofar as the coast line of our country is concerned, is there anything in this bill that will cause the Federal Government to be prohibited in any way from exercising its rights now along our coast line?

Mr. COX. Not the slightest. The bill recognizes the right of control in the Federal Government of all the tidewaters and all the navigable streams for the purposes of commerce and navigation.

Mr. RICH. Then the bill would not in any way interfere with the rights of the Government?

Mr. COX. The bill does not deprive the Government of any right or control of ownership over any waters, tidewater or navigable streams, which it has enjoyed since the formation of the Government.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, as I understand it, this measure does not in any way, interfere with the Government's present rights to dredge harbors or deepen water courses leading into those harbors.

Mr. COX. Not at all. The sole question is who owns the bed of the navigable streams and the soil beneath the tidewaters. That is the only question which is involved.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Will this bill affect the title to oil lands under the water along the coast line of California?

Mr. COX. Not at all; except that it recognizes the ownership of States to lands beneath tidewaters and the right of the States to make disposition of their own property in their own way.

Mr. STEFAN. Will it result in quieting some of the controversies in connection with the oil?

Mr. COX. The purpose of the legislation is to remove the cloud upon title raised by the assertion of the right of Federal interest made by the Department of the Interior, and made, I concede, in good faith.

Mr. STEFAN. It does have reference, however, to that controversy which was reported in this House from year to year concerning the oil lands along the coast of California?

Mr. COX. The bill would remove the cloud that rests upon the title to tidewater lands to which the gentleman refers, as well as upon the exercise of ownership which has been made by the State of California in making leases of such lands to oil interests or to others.

Mr. STEFAN. Is this bill recommended by the Department of Justice?

Mr. COX. I would say "No." Yet, I do not know. I would think that the Department of Justice—that is, the Attorney General—having filed suit, to which reference has been made, would feel somewhat disinclined to recommend the adoption of the bill. But if the gentleman will examine the brief report filed by the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill, which report is very clear, he will recognize that the States since the formation of the Union have not only asserted but have exercised, without challenge from the Federal Government, ownership to all of the lands in question.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will be so kind as to yield further, may I make the observation that this is a most important bill. I notice in the list of State attorneys general favoring this legislation the name of the attorney general of the State of Nebraska.

Mr. COX. Yes; it is.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. In referring to the report of the committee, the gentleman failed to mention that 46 States have approved this plan as contained in the bill.

Mr. COX. That statement is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. The attorneys general of 46 of the States have joined in the assertion that the law is with the proponents of this bill.

Mr. COX. That is a correct statement.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TOLAN. May I inform the Members of the House that when we held extended hearings there was not a single department of the Government which appeared in opposition to the bill.

Mr. COX. I believe that the record shows that only one witness, appearing before the Committee on the Judiciary in behalf of an individual or resident of the State of California, contested the proposal.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. It is true also, is it not, that since the formation of the Union the courts of the United States, including the Supreme Court, have recognized the title to these lands to be vested in the States?

Mr. COX. That is correct. All the courts have uniformly held title to these lands to be in the States.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] has made a general explanation of the bill. The bill is most important. Extensive hearings were held by the Committee on the Judiciary as far back as 1937; weeks of hearings. The bill is technical, yet realistic. The whole matter will be fully explained—in the time allowed for general debate—by members of the Judiciary Committee and the subcommittee best able to speak.

Since the bill was reported by the committee, certain interested parties have expressed fear lest there should be some indefiniteness with reference to one provision, and I am advised that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the committee, will offer a perfecting amendment. I am not completely familiar with the Lewis amendment but such casual study as I have been able to give it convinces me that it is desirable. At first blush, there is doubt in my mind as to the necessity for the amendment. However, if there is no necessity then the amendment would be but surplusage. Therefore, in the interest of certainty, I shall support the Lewis amendment. With that amendment, I believe the bill should pass.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include excerpts from the committee report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I was not present when the remarks were made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], but I understand the Committee on the Judiciary has gone into this very extensively.

Mr. MICHENER. The committee has. It is a committee bill.

Mr. JENKINS. It is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. MICHENER. It is. I do not think any member of the committee will oppose the bill.

There are no requests for time on this side. The report explaining the bill, made by the Committee on the Judiciary, is comprehensive and in a brief way analyzes the bill, explains its objective, and the reasons why it should be placed on the statute books. The pertinent part of the committee report is as follows:

SYNOPSIS OF RESOLUTION

House Joint Resolution 225 recognizes that the titles of the several States to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters vested in the respective States on July 4, 1776, or upon their formation and admission to the Union and renounces and disclaims any right, title, or interest of the United States in and to such lands. The resolution further, in recognition of the States' titles, releases, remises, and quit-

claims all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such lands.

The release and quitclaim run to (1) each of the respective States; (2) the grantees or successors in interest of each State (which includes all those who have acquired title by operation of State law); and (3) others who have title which has been confirmed by official action of the United States. (This is to apply to persons who received grants from former governments prior to the formation of the State, but only if such prior grants have been confirmed by the United States. Such persons stand in the same legal position as grantees of a State.)

There is excepted from this release and quitclaim all lands beneath tidewaters and all lands beneath navigable waters which have been acquired by the United States by cession or other transfer from a State or from the grantees or successors of a State or by condemnation. The United States, of course, retains all of its constitutional powers of regulation and control for the purposes of commerce, navigation, and the national defense.

The definitions of tidewaters are such as to limit the release to lands wholly within the boundaries of each State. Within these boundaries the release is complete and includes lands formerly submerged but which have been reclaimed and filled. The resolution does not define or fix any State boundary and no question of the location of any boundary is involved. Likewise, the release affects no land external to the boundary of any State.

The total effect of the measure is to clear the title of the States and of those who stand in the same legal position as the States with regard to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters from any claims which have been or may be asserted to such lands by the Federal Government or its officials.

THE LAW

The committee has investigated extensively the legal questions involved in this measure. The controlling legal principles may be summed up as follows:

The Thirteen Original States, when they achieved their independence, became, as successors of the Crown of England, the absolute owners of all lands beneath tidewaters and navigable waters within their respective boundaries (except those previously granted by valid grant of a former sovereign). This principle applied equally to coastal waters and inland navigable waters. These lands have never been surrendered to the Federal Government, either by the Constitution or otherwise. (This is subject to the exceptions wherein States have voluntarily ceded specific lands to the Federal Government for public purposes such as forts, arsenals, etc.)

All new States, regardless of the manner in which they came into the Union, so far as the ownership of the beds of their tidal and navigable waters is concerned, are on an equal footing with the Thirteen Original States.

The ownership by the States of these lands as above stated is coextensive with the States' boundaries, which in the case of the coastal States is in no instance less than 3 miles from the coast line. In the case of the States bordering on the Great Lakes it extends to the international boundary. In all cases it includes lands beneath all navigable waters wholly or partially within the boundary of any State. The title of the States and of their grantees, and of those who under State law have become the owners of such lands, is full and complete and extends to the soils and to all minerals and other products of the soil.

There are many decisions of the United States Supreme Court which fully support the above propositions of law. The following excerpts from three leading cases are typical of these decisions:

"*Martin* v. *Waddell* ((1842) 41 U. S. 366, 410): '* * * For when the revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters, and the soils under them, for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government.' (Namely, the rights of regulation incident to the regulation of commerce and navigation.)

"*Knight* v. *U. S. Land Ass'n* ((1891) 142 U. S. 161, 183): 'It is the settled rule of law * * * that absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over, the soils under the tidewaters in the original States were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction.'

"*Illinois Central R. R. Co.* v. *Illinois* ((1892) 146 U. S. 387, 435): 'It is the settled law of this country that the ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by tidewaters, within the limits of the several States, belong to the respective States within which they are found.'"

The above basic and governing principles of law were set forth and agreed to in a joint brief filed in support of this legislation by the attorneys general of 46 States.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION

Prior to 1937 no claim was made by the Federal Government or by Federal officials to the lands described in the proposed resolution. The principles of law above set forth had been applied and followed by the United States Supreme Court in at least 50 cases and were universally accepted as binding and conclusive. In reliance upon those principles and the long-settled recognition by the Federal Government that it had no title in such lands, enormous improvements worth billions of dollars have been made throughout the Nation on tide and submerged lands both on inland waters and in the ports and harbors of the coastal waters of the Nation.

Likewise, the States have for a great many years leased these lands for a variety of purposes to private individuals and corporations. The great oyster and shrimp industry in the Eastern and Southern States is carried on largely in lands leased by the States. States have also leased these lands for the production of oil, coal, iron, sand, and gravel, and other mineral products. All these private lessees have invested large sums of money in reliance on the Supreme Court decisions above mentioned and upon the long recognition by the Federal Government of State titles.

The principles of law above stated have become and now constitute a rule of property upon the faith of which all States, municipalities, port authorities, and private interests have long relied and now have a right to rely.

In 1937 several resolutions were introduced into Congress designed to challenge and, if possible, reverse this long-settled rule of property. The resolutions failed of passage but caused agitation which clouded the titles of all submerged lands throughout the United States. The cloud on these titles has been aggravated by continuous agitation on the part of individuals seeking to obtain rights to submerged lands under Federal laws. The Interior Department, reversing its long-settled policy, has refused to deny these applications and has continuously threatened to grant them, further clouding all titles to submerged lands.

PETROLEUM DEPOSITS

Assertions have been made that the claims of Federal officials relate only to oil. It is the opinion of the committee, supported by the brief of 46 attorneys general and by counsel for numerous port and harbor authorities, that there is no valid legal theory upon which Federal ownership of the petroleum deposits can be claimed without claiming ownership of the lands within which they lie. In other words, the Federal Government cannot maintain a claim for oil without asserting title to the land itself. It is equally the committee's opinion that the assertion of title to submerged land in any one State is in legal effect an assertion of title to submerged lands in every State in the Union.

Furthermore, the committee find no justification for the Federal claim to oil in submerged lands. Of the 22 coastal States, 4 are now producing oil from offshore lands—California, Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. California began oil production from tidelands in 1921 in reliance on the rule of property above mentioned. It has produced oil continuously under State law since that time. Louisiana commenced oil production from tidelands in 1915 and has likewise continuously produced oil under State law since that time. The same is true for varying lengths of time in Mississippi and Texas.

These States have leased their tidelands to private lessees who have invested large sums of money therein in reliance on the rule of property above set forth. Oil has been produced as above stated for these long periods, without question by Federal officials prior to 1937. It is the belief of the committee that there is no justification for the assertion by the Federal Government of a claim to the submerged lands of those States which produce oil therefrom, any more than the submerged lands of any of the other States. Nor is there any more basis for claiming oil than for claiming coal, iron, or oysters, or shrimp. The evidence before the committee is that these oil-producing States are administering their submerged lands in accordance with State laws and that the proceeds from the State leases are used for public purposes within the States.

PENDING LITIGATION

On May 29, 1945, while the proposed legislation was pending before Congress, former Attorney General Biddle caused a suit to be filed in the Federal district court of southern California against Pacific Western Oil Corp., claiming on behalf of the Federal Government certain lands below low-water mark off the cost of California. Pacific Western Oil Corp. is the lessee under an oil lease executed by the State of California under the State Leasing Act. The claim asserted in the complaint was not limited to oil but included the claim to title and ownership of the land itself.

In view of the settled rule of property previously mentioned, it is the opinion of the committee that there is no justification for subjecting the States and their successors who have long had the ownership and possession of their tide and submerged lands to the expense and vexation of litigation.

The highest court in the land has already passed upon these questions numerous times. There is no certainty that another decision would be accepted as final by those who continue to agitate this question. Furthermore, the litigation recently filed would undoubtedly not settle the question, but would be only the beginning of litigation which might last for many years. In the meantime, needed developments both in ports and harbors and elsewhere in the coastal and submerged lands would be definitely retarded.

CONCLUSIONS

As a result of the agitation during the past 8 years, and of the filing of the recent suit, uncertainty exists throughout the country which already has tended to retard port and harbor and other developments of coastal and inland submerged lands.

Proponents of this measure assert that they have no doubt as to the validity of their titles, but that the cloud which has been placed upon these titles is serious and will affect postwar financing and construction

programs unless promptly removed by congressional action.

The conclusions of the committee are—

(1) The enactment of the proposed legislation will not divest the United States of any property right to which it has any legitimate claim, or of any land in which it has any legal interest.

(2) The question whether the agitation over long-recognized State titles should be set at rest in the manner proposed is a question of congressional policy.

(3) This legislation is necessary to remove the cloud which has been cast upon the titles of enormously valuable lands throughout the United States and to prevent the similar clouding of these titles in the future.

Attached hereto as an appendix is a list of the various public officials from many parts of the country who appeared before the committee in support of this legislation. There was no opposition to the legislation presented at the hearing with the single exception of Mr. Raymond M. Hudson, an attorney, who appeared on behalf of E. F. Dunn and certain unnamed citizens.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of merit in this bill, but I must solemnly call the attention of the House to the necessity of an amendment, as I see it, else it is calculated to do irreparable injury to the United States under its war powers.

Unless this bill is amended so as to assert the claim of the paramount right of the United States to take and use whatever may be necessary in the submerged lands underlying its territorial waters, specifically petroleum, we will be recreant to our trust, in my humble opinion.

War now, aside from the atomic bomb, depends for its success or its failure more upon oil than any other one thing.

It is not generally known that the Army has more vessels on the waters of the world than the Navy, but it is true; and we need it to propel our ships, to propel our jeeps, to propel our tanks, to propel our argosies of the air. When therefore without due consideration we fail to assert that right which is inherent in the Federal Government and which was in the Federal Government before the Constitution, long before the Constitution, for the treaty of peace after our Revolution was not made with separate States, but with the United States of America, as an entity.

Much has been said in this debate seeking to establish the contention that each of the Original Thirteen Colonies or its successor State took immediately from the Crown of England all of the sovereign powers that theretofore had been vested in the King. These arguments overlook entirely the distinction between external and internal powers of government and the fact that the treaty of peace with Great Britain following our War of the Revolution was made with the United States of America and not with the several States separately. Of course, therefore, the United States as an entity long antedated the Constitution of the United States. These facts are not open to argument; they have been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Case of *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corp.* (299 U. S. 304, 315–317):

It will contribute to the elucidation of the question if we first consider the differences between the powers of the Federal Government in respect of foreign or external affairs and those in respect of domestic or internal affairs. That there are differences between them, and that these differences are fundamental, may not be doubted.

The two classes of powers are different, both in respect of their origin and their nature. The broad statement that the Federal Government can exercise no powers except those specifically enumerated in the Constitution, and such implied powers as are necessary and proper to carry into effect the enumerated powers is categorically true only in respect of our internal affairs. In that field, the primary purpose of the Constitution was to carve from the general mass of legislative powers then possessed by the States such portions as it was thought desirable to vest in the Federal Government, leaving those not included in the enumeration still in the States. *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.* (298 U. S. 238, 294). That this doctrine applies only to powers which the States had, is self-evident. And since the States severally never possessed international powers, such powers could not have been carved from the mass of State powers but obviously were transmitted to the United States from some other source. During the colonial period those powers were possessed exclusively by and were entirely under the control of the Crown. By the Declaration of Independence, "the Representatives of the United States of America" declared the United (not the several) Colonies to be free and independent States, and as such to have "full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce and to do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do."

As a result of the separation from Great Britain by the Colonies acting as a unit, the powers of external sovereignty passed from the Crown not to the Colonies severally, but to the Colonies in their collective and corporate capacity as the United States of America. Even before the Declaration, the Colonies were a unit in foreign affairs, acting through a common agency—namely the Continental Congress, composed of delegates from the Thirteen Colonies. That agency exercised the powers of war and peace, raised an army, created a navy, and finally adopted the Declaration of Independence. Rulers come and go; governments end and forms of government change; but sovereignty survives. A political society cannot endure without a supreme will somewhere. Sovereignty is never held in suspense. When, therefore, the external sovereignty of Great Britain in respect of the Colonies ceased, it immediately passed to the Union. See *Penhallow* v. *Doane* (3 Dall. 54, 80–81). That fact was given practical application almost at once. The treaty of peace, made on September 23, 1783, was concluded between his Britannic Majesty and the "United States of America" (8 Stat.; European Treaties, 80).

The Union existed before the Constitution, which was ordained and established among other things to form "a more perfect Union." Prior to that event, it is clear that the Union, declared by the articles of confederation to be "perpetual," was the sole possessor of external sovereignty and in the Union it remained without change save insofar as the Constitution in express terms qualified its exercise. The Framers' Convention was called and exerted its powers upon the irrefutable postulate that though the States were several their people in respect of foreign affairs were one. Compare the *Chinese Exclusion Case* (130 U. S. 581, 604, 606). In that convention, the entire absence of State power to deal with those affairs was thus forcefully stated by Rufus King:

"The States were not 'sovereigns' in the sense contended for by some. They did not possess the peculiar features of sovereignty—they could not make war, nor peace, nor alliances, nor treaties. Considering them as political beings, they were dumb, for they could not speak to any foreign sovereign whatever. They were deaf, for they could not hear any propositions from such sovereign. They had not even the organs of faculties of defense or offense, for they could not of themselves raise troops, or equip vessels, for war" (5 Elliott's Debates 212).

And so it is that from that early date down to the present there is no more doubt as to the rights of the United States Government to exercise its constitutional powers in this field than there is in the proposition that the title for municipal purposes is in the States. In other words, as was settled long, long, long ago in a case involving lands in Mobile Bay, there is no question but that the right of the States has been extended into salt water. But, quoting the Supreme Court, it is there, as on the shore, but municipal power, subject to the paramount rights of the Federal Government for the constitutional purposes that I have named. So while it is all right to quitclaim our title—which we never had—to the sovereign States, we should at the same time not overlook the paramount right of the United States to exercise its constitutional powers for the protection of this Nation in peace and in war.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I shall be so happy to yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Under this resolution which is now before the House does my distinguished friend contend that this would take away any of the powers of the United States Government in time of war?

Mr. HOBBS. Answering the distinguished gentleman's question, I emphatically say "No," but I also say just as emphatically—and I want everyone of you who will lend me his ears on that point to listen—it will not do that which is our duty by our Government for the purposes of national defense.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. I am not opposing the bill except to try to remedy this great deficiency. You do not have to have title to the so-called lands now in question in order to protect this Nation. There is not a man in this room who has title to the breath he breathes or the use of the air, but so firmly has the law fixed that right and protected it that when it is violated we call it murder. If I deprive you of the right to use the air necessary for your breathing long enough, it is murder. So it is here; we have no title as a Federal Government to the so-called lands involved in this bill, but we have the right to build and maintain navies and armies—and they need oil.

I introduced Resolution 176 in 1939 to stop Japan and her 16 tankers from taking 156,000 barrels of oil a day from off

the shores of California where there is the biggest deposit of oil ever known in the history of the world, $4,000,000,000 worth. We threshed the matter out at length, but Japan went on and secured their stock of oil to wage her part of the global war just ended.

The United States under its constitutional powers ought to assert its right to that oil and to any other thing that is in the submerged land.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Assuming that the Congress did the thing that the gentleman recommends and then after the Government acquires protection with respect to the title to this oil it is the policy of the Government to permit such export; what is our remedy?

Mr. HOBBS. You have none. In my judgment, if you do not do that all at one time, if you quitclaim all right, title, interest and claim, I do not think that you can thereafter effectively exercise your constitutional power or powers until we have repealed this law and enacted a new one.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to ask the gentleman a question, when he speaks about the Japanese getting the oil, if it is not a fact that oil could have been bought anywhere in the United States at that time? They did not own the oil and the oil produced from the submerged lands on the Pacific coast.

Mr. HOBBS. No; they got it through bootleggers.

Mr. RUSSELL. They bought it?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes. You can buy bootleg stuff now. I solemnly warn this body that we ought to perform our duties as a Congress to protect the Nation's rights.

Please let me call your attention to the brief I wrote in 1939. I invite your earnest consideration:

BRIEF OF THE AUTHOR IN ADVOCACY OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 176

PROLOGUE

1. Acknowledgment

Before beginning my statement proper, please allow me to make grateful acknowledgment of the help which has been given me so generously in the study of the law involved, by the attorneys of the Navy, Justice, and Interior Departments, and particularly Hon. Philip Buettner, of the office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

2. History

Senate Joint Resolution No. 208 was introduced by Senator Nye in the Seventy-fifth Congress, third session. It passed the Senate. It was amended by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and as amended was favorably reported on May 19, 1938 (Rept. No. 2378). Its passage was recommended by the Departments of Justice, Interior, and Navy. It failed of enactment.

In the Seventy-sixth Congress Senate Joint Resolution 208 was, in substance, reintroduced in the Senate by Senator Nye as Senate Joint Resolution 24 and in the House of Representatives by Mr. O'Connor of Montana as House Resolution 181. The substance of the amended resolution favorably reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary was introduced in the House by me and is House Joint Resolution 176. This resolution has the expressed approval of the Departments of Justice, Interior, and Navy, and is certified as being in accord with the program of the President.

3. What House Joint Resolution 176 is not

The passage of this resolution would not affect in any way "tidelands," nor any improvements between low-water mark and the shore. Its passage would not disturb in the slightest degree either river or harbor devolpments.

It is not retroactive.

4. What House Joint Resolution 176 is

This resolution seeks to conserve petroleum deposits underlying the bed of the Pacific Ocean off the coast of California as a naval petroleum reserve, subject to any outstanding, lawfully vested, superior, adverse right, title, or interest. It would cover the petroleum deposits underlying submerged lands below the low-water mark and under the territorial waters of the United States. By it, Congress, under and in accordance with powers granted by the Constitution of the United States, asserts a claim of right on behalf of all of the people of the United States to conserve and use such petroleum deposits for national defense, maintenance of the Navy, and regulation and protection of interstate and foreign commerce. Congress is asked to assert this claim of right by virtue of national sovereignty.

The proposed legislation does not involve the issue of fee simple title or ownership of the submerged lands, nor does it seek to take away any superior vested right, title, or interest of any person, partnership, association, corporation, or of the State of California, or any municipality or local subdivision thereof. It is the exercise of a constitutional function and a declaration of public policy by the Congress in behalf of all the people of the United States to conserve the aforesaid petroleum deposits for national need. It would invoke the decision of the courts upon the validity of such claim. If California or any municipality or person has superior right, the courts would so adjudge and settle and establish the rights involved in the conflicting claims.

Congress, and Congress alone, may assert the claim here presented. Under the Consttiution, there are only three branches of our Government. If our national right is to be asserted, it must be done by one of these. The authority of the executive department is, essentially, to execute the law. The authority of the judicial department is, essentially, to interpret and enforce the law. The authority of the legislative department is to make the law and such declarations of public policy and claims of right in behalf of the people as may from time to time seem necessary. Therefore, neither the executive nor the judicial branch of our Government may with propriety assert the people's claim of right to this oil nor take steps to enforce such right in the absence of the assertion thereof by the Congress. As was said in *Gilman* v. *Philadelphia* (3 Wall. 713, 732)—

"Until the dormant power of the Constitution is awakened and made effective, by appropriate legislation, the reserved power of the States is plenary, and its exercise in good faith cannot be made the subject of review by this court."

The resolution would set aside such deposits as a naval petroleum reserve and authorize the Attorney General to maintain the same and the right of the Nation to take and use petroleum therefrom and to stop the taking of petroleum therefrom except by authority of the United States, and to eject trespassers.

From Teapot Dome through Elk Hills, and now out into the Pacific Ocean, the fight for oil goes on with increasing fury.

The United States needs oil vitally. Now that almost every vessel of the Navy, the Coast Guard, and merchant marine is driven by oil, the powers conferred by the Constitution of the United States "to provide and maintain a Navy," and "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States," can best be exercised only if we assure an adequate supply of oil. Serious depletion or extinction of our oil supplies would be a national tragedy.

5. Why California alone?

This resolution relates to territorial waters of the Nation off the coast of California alone, because of the fact that there are some 80 companies extracting petroleum or engaged in drilling operations in that particular area—many thousand barrels of oil a day are being taken by private interests, and the need of conservation of those petroleum deposits for national need under and in accordance with the constitutional powers of the National Government is there most acute. There are no such extensive operations proceeding elsewhere.

THE LAW

1. Who owns the oceans?

The Oceans, Including Their Beds, Are the Common Property of the Family of Nations and the Exclusive Property of None

"In modern times no nation claims any jurisdiction over the ocean which will exclude an equal jurisdiction by every other nation. The ocean is regarded as a common highway for mankind. Everyone is free to go and come as he chooses unless interdicted by his own sovereign, or unless he interferes with some power which has been conceded to each nation because it is necessary for its self-protection. (International Law, page 186.)

"The high seas are the common property of all nations where each has concurrent, and none exclusive, jurisdiction. (*Francis* v. *Ocean Ins. Co.* (6 Cow. 404).)

"A claim of sovereignty of the English kings over the British seas was asserted by Gentilis in 1613, and by Selden in 1635.

"But such claim seems never to have been made by the Government, and when it came before the courts it was properly repudiated.

"These extravagant claims, however, have been long since abandoned, and the freedom of the high seas for the inoffensive navigation of all nations is firmly established, and England, and most, if not all, maritime states have been content to limit the claim to advance their frontier seaward to the extent of 3 miles. That limited extent, however, of maritime territory has been in modern times with remarkable unanimity recognized by the English courts.

"Cockburn, Ch. J., says in the same case that the vain and extravagant pretensions which had been formerly made to sovereignty over the narrow seas have long since given way to the influence of reason and common sense. A claim to such sovereignty, at all times unfounded, has long since been abandoned. No one would now dream of asserting that the sovereign of these realms has any greater right over the surrounding seas than the sovereigns on the opposite shores; or that it is the especial duty and privilege of the Queen of Great Britain to keep the peace on these seas; or that the court of admiralty could try a foreigner for an offense committed in a foreign vessel on all parts of the channel. Indeed it is because this claim of sovereignty is admitted to be untenable that it has been found necessary to resort to the theory of the 3-mile zone.

"The question being settled that a nation has no exclusive jurisdiction over the high seas or over the narrow seas which other nations are bound to respect, the question at once arises, 'Is there no water along its coast over which a nation may assert jurisdiction, or does the common right obtain even to dry land?' It is apparent that it is to the interest of every nation to assert jurisdiction over the water along its coasts to some distance from the shore. Absence of such jurisdiction would involve great inconvenience, if not hardship. So, such jurisdiction has been universally conceded. The question has been, What is its extent? The earlier jurists were able to perceive no definite rule, but asserted a definite number of miles, as 100, or as far as a ship could sail in a certain number of days, or as far as one could see. But these were all unsatisfactory, and were not adopted. Finally Bynkershoek suggested a rule which was so reasonable that it has been generally adopted. That rule was that a nation has jurisdiction to such distance from the shore as can be defended from the shore. At the time of his writing this distance as represented by the possibility of propelling a cannon shot was about 3 miles. So that distance was adopted. Since certainty is much more necessary than scientific accuracy in the law this distance has never been changed. But in view of the greatly increased range of modern cannon, and of the fact that injury to coast cities by stray shots from belligerent vessels engaged in combat 10 miles from the coast is as great today as it was then when they were 3 miles away, a nation should now have a right to insist on a much wider neutral zone.

"The writers on the subject do not agree, not only as to the extent to which the jurisdiction should extend, but also as to whether it is absolute property or merely police jurisdiction, nor do they in general fix any definite rule as to the limit, purpose, or effect of the claim to territorial jurisdiction over the sea.

"Manning, Law of Nations, p. 119, limits the purposes of the jurisdiction over the sea—the regulation of fisheries; the prevention of frauds on customs laws; the exaction of harbor and lighthouse dues; and the protection of the territory from violation in time of war between other States.

"Merlin, in an article on Mer, in Rep. de Juris, vol. 11, p. 135, contends that the privilege of the 3-mile belt is granted for the purpose of self-defense against attacks in war and smuggling in peace.

"And Ortolan, Diplomatic de la Mer, liv. ii, chap. 8, states that the right to the territorial sea is not a right of property; it cannot be said that the state which is the proprietor of the land, is also proprietor of this sea. With him agrees Calvo, Droit International, liv. V, pp. 199–201.

"The 3-mile limit has been generally recognized and acquiesced in by the courts whether it has been formally anounced by the executive or not.

"In *Reg.* v. *Keyn* (L. R. 2 Exch. Div. 63, 13 Cox, C. C. 403, 46 L. J. M. C. N. S. 17), Brett, J. A., says: 'There is no reason founded on the axiomatic rules of right and wrong, why the 3 miles should or should not be considered as a part of the territory of the adjacent country. They may have been so treated by general consent; they might equally well have not been so treated. If they have been so treated by such consent, the authority for the alleged ownership is sufficient. The question is whether such a general consent has in this case been proved by sufficient evidence. * * * A general consent of recognized writers of different times and different countries to a reasonable proposition is sufficient evidence of a general consent of nations to that proposition. * * * There is a general consent to a proposition with regard to the 3 miles of open sea adjacent to the shores of sovereign states. * * * The dispute is whether, by the consent of all, certain limited rights are given to the adjacent country, such as a right that the waters should be treated as what is called a neutral zone, or whether the water is, by consent of all, given to the adjacent country as its territory, with all rights of territory, it being agreed by such country, with all others, that all shall have a free right of navigation or way over such waters for harmless passage and some other rights. If the first be true, it is impossible * * * that it can be properly said that the adjacent country has any proprietary right in the 3 miles * * * or any sovereign jurisdiction. If the latter be correct, the adjacent country has the 3 miles as its property, or under its dominion and sovereignty. * * * I am of opinion that it is proved that, by the law of nations made by the tacit consent of substantially all nations, the open sea within 3 miles of the coast is a part of the territory of the adjacent nation, as much and as completely as if it were land a part of the territory of such nation.'

"Sir R. Phillimore said there appears to be no sufficient authority for saying that the high sea was ever considered to be within the realm, and notwithstanding what is said by Hale in his treatises De Jure Maris and Pleas of the Crown, there is a total absence of precedents since the reign of Edward III, if indeed any existed then, to support the doctrine that the realm of England exists beyond the limits of counties. But Lindley, J., said: 'It is laid down in English law books of the highest authority that the seas adjoining the English coast are part of the realm of England, and are subject to the dominion of the Crown. Indeed, there is considerable authority for saying that those seas are to some distance part of the property of the Crown, subject to the right of the public freely to navigate them. And he states that it appears to him to be now agreed by the most esteemed writers on international law that, subject to the right of all ships freely to navigate the high seas, every state has full power to enact and enforce what laws it thinks proper for the preservation of peace and the protection of its own interests, over those parts of the high seas which adjoin its own coasts and are within 3 miles thereof. But that beyond this limit, or, at all events, beyond the reach of artillery on its own coasts, no state has any power to legislate save over its own subjects and over persons on board ships carrying its flag.'

"The right to the soil of the fundus maris within 3 miles below low-water mark and to the fishery in it, though granted before Magna Carta, is undoubtedly subject to the rights of all subjects to pass in the ordinary and usual course of navigation and to take the ground there, and to anchor there at their pleasure free from toll, unless the toll is imposed in respect to some other advantage conferred upon them or at least on the public. (*Gann* v. *Free Fishers of Whitstable*, 11 H. L. Cas. 192, 20 C. B. N. S. 1, 35 L. J. C. P. N. S. 29, 12 L. T. N. S. 150, 13 Week. Rep. 589.—L. R. A., vol. 46, pps. 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270.)

"Upon the ocean, then, in time of peace, all possess an entire equality. It is the common highway of all, appropriated to the use of all; and no one can vindicate to himself a superior or exclusive prerogative there.

"It has been argued that no ship has a right to approach another at sea; and that every ship has a right to draw round her a line of jurisdiction, within which no other is at liberty to intrude. In short, that she may appropriate so much of the ocean as she may deem necessary for her protection, and prevent any nearer approach.

"This doctrine appears to us novel, and is not supported by any authority. It es to establish upon the ocean a territorial jurisdiction, like that which is claimed by all nations within cannon-shot of their shores, in virtue of their general sovereignty. But the latter right is founded upon the principle of sovereign and permanent appropriation, and has never been successfully asserted beyond it. (Mr. Justice Story, in the *Marianna Flora case.* (11 Wheat. 1, 41; 6 Law Ed. 405, 415).)

"Congress has power 'to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes' (Const., art. I, sect. 8), but it has nothing to do with the purely internal commerce of the States, that is to say, with such commerce as is carried on between different parts of the same State, if its operations are confined exclusively to the jurisdiction and territory of that State, and do not affect other nations or States or the Indian tribes. This has never been disputed since the case of *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1).

"The contracts sued on in the present case were in effect to carry goods from San Francisco to San Diego by the way of the Pacific Ocean. They could not be performed except by going not only out of California, but out of the United States as well.

"Commerce includes intercourse, navigation, and not traffic alone. This also was settled in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, supra. 'Commerce with foreign nations,' says Mr. Justice Daniel, for the Court, in *Veazie* v. *Moore* (14 How. 568), 'must signify commerce which, in some sense, is necessarily connected with these nations, transactions which either immediately or at some stage of their progress must be extraterritorial' (p. 573).

"The Pacific Ocean belongs to no one nation, but is the common property of all. When, therefore, the *Ventura* went out from San Francisco or San Diego on her several voyages, she entered on a navigation which was necessarily connected with other nations. While on the ocean her national character only was recognized, and she was subject to such laws as the commercial nations of the world had, by usage or otherwise, agreed on for the government of the vehicles of commerce occupying this common property of all mankind. She was navigating among the vessels of other nations and was treated by them as belonging to the country whose flag she carried. True, she was not trading with them, but she was navigating with them, and consequently with them was engaged in commerce. If in her navigation she inflicted a wrong on another country, the United States, and not the State of California, must answer for what was done. In every just sense, therefore, she was, while on the ocean, engaged in commerce with foreign nations, and as such she and the business in which she was engaged were subject to the regulating power of Congress.

"Navigation on the high seas is necessarily national in its character. Such navigation is clearly a matter of external concern, affecting the Nation as a nation in its external affairs. It must, therefore, be subject to the National Government. (Mr. Chief Justice Waite, in *Lord* v. *Steamship Co.* (102 U. S. 543, 544).

"It now is settled in the United States and recognized elsewhere that the territory subject to its jurisdiction includes the land areas under its dominion and control, the ports, harbors, bays, and other enclosed arms of the sea along its coast and a marginal belt of the sea extending from the coast line outward a marine league, or 3 geographic miles.

"The jurisdiction of the Nation within its own territory is necessarily exclusive and absolute. It is susceptible of no limitation not imposed by itself. Any restriction upon it, deriving validity from an external source, would imply a diminution of its sovereignty to the extent of the restriction, and an investment of that sovereignty to the same extent in that power which could impose such restriction.

"All exceptions, therefore, to the full and complete power of a nation, within its own territories, must be traced up to the consent of the nation itself. They can flow from no other legitimate source. (*Cunard S. S. Co.* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 100, 122, 124).)

"This right of eminent domain over the shores and the soils under the navigable waters, for all municipal purposes, belongs exclusively to the States within their respective territorial jurisdictions, and they, and they only, have the constitutional power to exercise it. To give to the United States the right to transfer to a citizen the title to the shores and the soils under the navigable waters, would be placing in their hands a weapon which might be wielded greatly to the injury of State sovereignty, and deprive the States of the power to exercise a numerous and important class of police powers. But in the hands of the States this power can never be used so as to affect the exercise of any national right of eminent domain or jurisdiction with which the United States have been invested by the Constitution. For, although the territorial limits of Alabama have extended all her sovereign power into the sea, it is there, as on the shore, but municipal power, subject to the Constitution of the United States, 'and the laws which shall be made in pursuance thereof.' (*Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan et al.* (3 How. 212, 230).)"

A fair summation of the effect of the authorities seems to be that while there is a conflict of opinion as to the title in the littoral nation to the 3-mile zone, the weight of authority is as set forth by Justice Story in the *Marianna Flora case* (11 Wheat. 1, 41); that the 3-mile zone is a part of the territorial jurisdiction of the nation in virtue of its general sovereignty. This right of absolute and exclusive control, subject to the common use of all nations for the purpose of navigation, "is founded upon the principle of sovereign and permanent appropriation, and has never been successfully asserted beyond it."

There is no case, nor respectable authority, which asserts the exclusive, fee simple title in any state or nation to the 3-mile zone either as to water or bed.

There is no case, nor respectable authority, which denies the jurisdictional right in the littoral state or nation to that segment of the 3-mile zone abutting its shore.

The preponderating weight of authority and sounder reasoning holds that this right of jurisdiction and control is an attribute of national sovereignty and paramount and exclusive.

2. California versus United States as to the area in question

A Clear Perspective Is Desirable, Focused on the Conflicting Claims

The ownership of the title to the submerged lands in which the petroleum deposits are located, as between the United States and the State of California, has not been judicially determined. There never has been presented to the Supreme Court of the United States any issue between the United States and the State of California involving the title to the submerged lands, and no such issue ever has been decided.

It is argued by many interested parties that the United States now owns the submerged lands and, therefore, is entitled to use and control the petroleum deposits that are contained therein. The basis for this contention is that the ownership of the submerged lands became vested in the United States in 1848 through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo by which Mexico ceded California to the United States, and that Congress never has passed any act granting such submerged lands to California.

It is also argued by many interested parties that the United States by any special or general laws never has granted or relinquished to California title to minerals, including oil in the submerged lands, and that California as a sovereign State obtained no ownership or title to minerals by virtue of its statehood or sovereignty. This contention is based on the holding of the Supreme Court of California in *Moore* v. *Shaw* (17 Calif. 199, at 218–219), wherein Chief Justice Field (later an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States) said:

"It is undoubtedly true that the United States held certain rights of sovereignty over the territory which is now embraced within the limits of California, only in trust for the future State, and that such rights at once vested in the new State upon her admission into the Union. But ownership of the precious metals found in public or private lands was not one of those rights. Such ownership stands in no different relation to the sovereignty of a State than that of any other property, which is the subject of barter and sale. Sovereignty is a term used to express the supreme political authority of an independent State or Nation. Whatever rights are essential to the existence of this authority are rights of sovereignty. Thus the right to declare war, to make treaties of peace, to levy taxes, to take private property for public uses, termed the 'right of eminent domain,' are all rights of sovereignty for they are rights essential to the existence of supreme political authority. * * * When we say, therefore, that a State of the Union is sovereign, we only mean that she possesses supreme political authority, except as to those matters over which such authority is delegated to the Federal Government, or prohibited to the States; in other words, that she possesses all the rights and powers essential to the existence of an independent political organization, except as they are withdrawn by the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. To the existence by this political authority of the State—this qualified sovereignty, or to any part of it—the ownership of the minerals of gold and silver found within her limits is in no way essential. The minerals do not differ from the great mass of property, the ownership of which may be in the United States, or in individuals, without affecting in any respect the political jurisdiction of the States. They may be acquired by the State, as any other property may be, but when thus acquired she will hold them in the same manner that individual proprietors hold their property, and by the same right; by the right of ownership and not by any right of sovereignty."

The issue as to the ownership of minerals, including oil, in the submerged lands also has never been presented to the Supreme Court of the United States for decision, and no such issue ever has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Whatever the final ruling of the courts may be on the issues as to the ownership of these submerged lands or of the petroleum deposits contained therein, the proposed legislation does not involve such ownerships, is not dependent upon such ownerships, nor is the authority of the United States to use the petroleum deposits of the submerged lands governed by such ownerships. Therefore without taking issue in any way as to such ownerships, and regardless of their authenticity, the United States, in its sovereign capacity, has the paramount right to use the petroleum deposits to carry out its sovereign constitutional functions.

This paramount sovereign right is based upon governmental powers and jurisdiction and not upon any grant of title or proprietary rights. The governmental powers and jurisdiction arise under the national sovereignty of the United States as expressly provided in the Constitution. As an attribute of that sovereignty under the powers granted in the Constitution, Congress has ample authority to conserve the petroleum deposits for the national purposes specified in the proposed legislation, namely, national defense, maintenance of the Navy, and regulation and protection of interstate and foreign commerce.

The State of California pursuant to constitutional provisions also has laid down its territorial boundaries in the Pacific Ocean 3 miles off the line of low-water mark. This extension of territorial dominion and political jurisdiction of the State of California could only have been legally made in order that California might perform certain municipal functions in the interest of the general public of that State such as inspection, quarantine, promotion and protection of public health, and public morals, and the exercise of the other police powers.

This brings us to the question as to whether the United States or the State of California has the superior right to use the petroleum deposits in the submerged lands within the 3-mile zone.

Since our common law was taken from the common law of England our inquiry is directed to that source for information as to their respective rights. In the case of *Broward* v. *Mabry* (50 So. 826, 829), the Court summarized these rights as follows:

"Under the common law of England, the Crown in its sovereign capacity held the title to the beds of navigable or tide waters, including the shore or the space between high- and low-water marks, in trust for the people of the realm, who had rights of navigation, commerce, fishing, bathing, and other easements allowed by law in the waters. This rule of the common law was applicable in the English colonies of America. After the Revolution resulting in the independence of the American States, title to the beds of all waters, navigable in fact, whether tide or fresh, was held by the States in which they were located, in trust for all the people of the States, respectively. When the Constitution of the United States became operative, the several States continued to hold the title to the beds of all waters within their respective borders that were navigable in fact without reference to the tides of the sea, not for purposes of disposition to individual ownerships, but such title was held in trust for all the people of the States, respectively, for the uses afforded by the waters as allowed by the express or implied provisions of law, subject to the rights surrendered by the States under the Federal Constitution. The rights of the people of the States in the navigable waters and the lands thereunder, including the shore or space between ordinary high- and low-water marks, relate to navigation, commerce, fishing, bathing, and other easements allowed by law. These rights are designed to promote the general welfare and are subject to lawful regulation by the States, and such regulation is subordinate to the powers of Congress as to interstate commerce, navigation, post roads, etc., and to the constitutional guaranties of private property rights."

The foregoing summary, in general, is followed and approved in *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367); *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212); *Howard* v. *Ingersoll* (13 How. 391); *Smith* v. *Maryland* (18 How. 71); *Mumford* v. *Wardwell* (6 Wall. 423); *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. 57); *Barney* v. *Keokuk* (94 U. S. 324); *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391); *Illinois Cent. R. Co.* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387); *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1); *Morris* v. *United States* (174 U. S. 196); *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240); *Port of Seattle* v. *Oregon & W. R. R. Co.* (255 U. S. 65, 63); *Borax Consolidated Ltd.* v. *Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10, 15–17); *Mann* v. *Tacoma Land Co.* (153 U. S. 273); *Hardin* v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371, 381); *The Abby Dodge* (223 U. S. 166); *Louisiana* v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1, 52); *Humboldt Lumber Manufacturers' Association* v. *Christopherson* (73 Fed. 239, 244–247); *Coburn* v. *San Mateo County* (75 Fed. Rep. 520); *United States* v. *Ashton* (170, 509, 513).

The States retained only municipal sovereignty and police power within their respective limits. The new States admitted into the Union since the adoption of the Constitution have the same rights as the original States in the tidewaters, and in the lands under them, within their respective jurisdictions (*Cincinnati* v. *Louisville, etc., R. Co.* (223 U. S. 401); *Escanaba, etc. Transportation Co.* v. *Chicago* (107 U. S. 689); *Huse* v. *Glover* (119 U. S. 546); *Sands* v. *Mainstree River Improvement Co.* (123 U. S. 296); *Willamette etc. Bridge Co.* v. *Hatch* (125 U. S. 8); *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212)).

What are the rights surrendered by the States under the Federal Constitution? An examination of that document discloses inter alia the following:

"Article 1, section 8, clause 1: The Congress shall have power to * * * provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; * * *

"3. To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States * * *;

"13. To provide and maintain a navy; * * *

"18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution all * * * powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or office thereof."

The so-called title or control of the navigable waters and submerged lands of the Pacific Ocean is not of the same character of tenure as, and is not comparable to, a title in fee simple in uplands, which are part of the public domain. It is a public interest in common for certain public purposes or uses relating to commerce and the rights of navigation, fishing, bathing, etc.

Beyond the 3-mile zone it is an interest in common vested in the public represented by the sovereign nations. Within the 3-mile zone off the coast of California it is an interest in common vested in the public of the United States for the purposes of executing the national powers surrendered to the General Government by the Constitution and also an interest in common vested in the public of the State of California for the purposes of executing the reserved municipal powers of the State, and the State may so use them so long as such use does not conflict with a national use under the powers delegated to the Congress. Within the 3-mile zone other nations may navigate in peaceful commerce, subject to the right of the littoral nation to regulate such use.

The United States and the State of California acquired this concurrent right to control and use the navigable waters and submerged lands in the public interest as an attribute of their sovereignty and not by virtue of grants. The national power lies dormant until awakened and called into action by legislation of Congress. In the meantime until Congress acts, the right vested in the State is plenary and it apparently is this situation that has given rise to the decisions of the court that the title to the navigable waters and submerged lands within its boundaries is vested in the State in trust for the public but subject to the rights surrendered to the General Government under the Federal Constitution.

Except so far as Congress may see fit to interfere for the regulation of interstate or foreign commerce, each State has exclusive jurisdiction over the navigable waters and submerged lands lying within its territorial limits, and may pass such laws regulating their use as it may deem wise. Until Congress acts upon the subject, a State has plenary power over navigable waters and submerged lands which are entirely within its confines, although connecting with waters beyond its boundaries (*Wilson* v. *Black Bird Creek Marsh Co.* (2 Pet. 245); *Lake Shore, etc., R. Co.* v. *Ohio* (165 U. S. 365); *United States* v. *Bellingham Bay Boom Co.* (176 U. S. 211); *Ormerod* v. *New York, etc., R. Co.* (13 Fed. 370); *Leovy* v. *United States* (177 U. S. 621); *The W. H. Beaman* (45 Fed. 125)).

In the case of *Illinois Central Railroad* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387, 435), it was said:

"It is the settled law of this country that the ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by tidewaters, within the limits of the several States, belong to the respective States within which they are found, with the consequent right to use or dispose of any portion thereof, when that can be done without substantial impairment of the interest of the public in the waters, and subject always to the paramount right of Congress to control their navigation so far as may be necessary for the regulation of commerce with foreign nations and among the States. This doctrine has been often announced by this court, and is not questioned by counsel of any of the parties. (*Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212); *Wever* v. *Harbor Commissioners*, 18 Wall. 57).'

Thus the States conferred national sovereignty upon the general government and retained only municipal sovereignty and police power within their respective limits (*Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212)). With the creation by the sovereign States of "a more perfect union" and a national sovereignty for "the common defense and general welfare of the United States," the theretofore sovereign States stripped themselves of the right of exclusive control and proprietorship over the 3-mile zone separately and severally, and granted to the National Government the exclusive control and proprietorship over the whole of the 3-mile zone, retaining only a subordinate and limited right of municipal supervision for the exercise of their police power. They surrendered to the general government, inter alia, the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, the power to provide for the national defense, and the power to provide and maintain a Navy. These powers when exercised by Congress carry with them the authority to regulate and control for those national purposes, and to the extent necessary, the navigable waters and submerged lands within the 3-mile limit off the coast of California. The State of California under its reserved power may regulate and control the navigable waters and submerged lands only to an extent that will not conflict or interfere with these national purposes as declared by Congress.

3. The only limitation upon "the freedom of the seas" is that the littoral sovereigns have exclusive rights—as an attribute of sovereignty—to control the waters off their shores, below low-water mark and within a marine league (3 miles), for purposes of national defense and the regulation of commerce

The power conferred by the Constitution of the United States upon Congress "to regulate commerce" comprehends the control for that purpose, and, to the extent necessary, of all the navigable waters and submerged lands of the United States which are accessible from a State other than those in which they lie. For this purpose they are the public property of the Nation, and subject to all the requisite legislation by Congress. This necessarily includes the power to keep such waters open and free from any obstruction to their navigation interposed by the States or otherwise; to remove such obstructions where they exist, and to provide, by such sanctions as they may deem proper, against the occurrence of the evil and for the punishment of the offenders. For these purposes Congress possesses all the powers which existed in the States before the adoption of the national Constitution (*Gilman* v. *Philadelphia* (3 Wall. 713); *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1); *Willson* v. *Black Bird Creek Marsh Co.* (2 Pet. 245); *South Carolina* v. *Georgia* (93 U. S. 4); *Wisconsin* v. *Duluth* (96 U. S. 379); *Newport, etc., Bridge Co.* v. *United States* (105 U. S. 470); *Miller* v. *New York* (109 U. S. 385); *Gloucester Ferry Co.* v. *Pennsylvania* (114 U. S. 196); *New York, etc., R. Co.* v. *Ohio* (165 U. S. 365); *Gibson* v. *United States* (166 U. S. 269); *Texarkana, etc., R. Co.* v. *Parsons* (74 Fed. Rep. 408); *United States* v. *Moline* (82 Fed. Rep. 592); *United States* v. *North Bloomfield Gravel Min. Co.* (81 Fed. Rep. 243, 88 Fed. Rep. 664); *United States* v. *Romard* (89 Fed. Rep. 156); *Jaycox* v. *United States* (107 Fed. Rep. 938); *Randall* v. *United States* (107 Fed. Rep. 935)).

4. As far as the United States is concerned, this sovereignty was originally that of the King of England.

The American Revolution changed this status and vested this sovereignty in the several States as separate sovereignties.

In and by the Constitution of the United States these States conveyed this sovereignty to the Federal Government, reserving in themselves only municipal control for the exercise of their police power, subject to the Federal authority granted by the Constitution.

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises * * * and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States * * *;

"To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States * * *;

"To provide and maintain a Navy; * * * and

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

(See authorities cited in last preceding paragraph.)

5. The power to regulate commerce having been granted in full to Congress, there is no residuum. The grant of the whole power to Congress leaves nothing in that particular field which may be exercised by another.

What Mr. Chief Justice Marshall wrote in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1, 195) with reference to the power to regulate commerce applies with equal force and effect to each of the other powers:

"It is the power to regulate; that is, to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed. This power, like all others vested in Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations, other than are prescribed in the Constitution. * * * If, as has always been understood, the sovereignty of Congress, though limited to specified objects, is plenary as to those objects, the power over commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, is vested in Congress as absolutely as it would be in a single government, having in its constitution the same restrictions on the exercise of the power as are found in the Constitution of the United States."

Of course, each sovereign State when it came into the Union retained all sovereign powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government by the words of the Constitution or by necessary inference therefrom. Among these retained powers are the police powers. For the purpose of exercising these retained police powers the States have control over the shores and the soils under the navigable waters within their respective territorial jurisdictions, but in the hands of the States this power can never be used so as to affect the exercise of any national right.

"For, although the territorial limits of Alabama have extended all her sovereign power into the sea, it is there, as on the shore, but municipal power, subject to the Constitution of the United States, 'and the laws which shall be made in pursuance thereof.'" (*Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan*, supra.)

The exercise by the States of their municipal power of police conflicts in no way with

the paramount and exclusive rights of the Federal Government. "Inspection laws, quarantine laws, health laws of every description, as well as laws for regulating the internal commerce of the State," are some of these. "No direct general power over these objects is granted to Congress; and, consequently, they remain subject to State legislation." (*Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 203).)

But neither the police powers exercised for municipal purposes by the States nor the paramount and exclusive rights of the Nation under the Constitution amount to title in any part of the 3-mile zone. The title to all of the oceans, including surface, body, and bed, is in the family of nations—it belongs to the world.

6. In the exercise of its constitutional powers, the Federal Government may take and remove the soil under its territorial waters. Since the soil itself may be taken, certainly one of the minerals found therein—petroleum—may be conserved for national need in the fulfillment of its constitutional duties, and taken when needed

In the case of *Greenleaf Lumber Co.* v. *Garrison* (237 U. S. 251), there appears a further extension of this paramount power of Congress to limit or defeat under the commerce clause the property rights of private individuals in the soil under the navigable waters of the United States. While the court uses as the basis of its decision the right of Congress to control navigation under the commerce clause, nevertheless, the facts of the case show that, irrespective of the language used, the taking of property in that case was only incidentally for the purpose of regulating commerce. It was a taking in fact under the constitutional provision "To provide for the common defense" or "To provide and maintain a navy."

The lumber company had, under a grant of authority from the State of Virginia, established certain fills in the Elizabeth River, opposite the Norfolk Navy Yard at Portsmouth, Va., for the purpose of impounding logs for its mills. These fills were within the navigable waters of the United States and the harbor lines then established by the Secretary of War.

The War Department, at the suggestion of the Navy Department for the improvement of the river opposite the navy yard, changed the harbor lines. The sole purpose of the change in harbor lines, under the stipulation in the case, was the fact that the United States moored its war vessels in front of the navy yard so that they project out into the channel. Changing the harbor lines, as was done by the Secretary of War in such a manner as to cut off about 200 feet of the lumber company's fill, and dredging up to the new harbor lines, afforded more space to moor naval craft. The United States Supreme Court held that the power of the States over navigable waters is subordinate to that of Congress and the State can grant no right to the soil of the bed of navigable waters which is not subject to Federal regulation or change. The United States was not liable to compensate the owner for the removal of the structure.

And in reference to previous decisions it was said:

"*Philadelphia Co.* v. *Stimson* (223 U. S. 605) is directly to the effect that Congress may establish harbor lines, and is not precluded thereby from changing them. There was action by the State and twice by the United States and the relation of such actions and the rights derived therefrom were considered and determined. Rights under the action of the State were asserted by the Philadelphia Co. and assumed to exist by the court in determining the power of Congress. It was said (p. 634): 'The exercise of this power (that of Congress) could not be fettered by any grant made by the State of the soil which formed the bed of the river, or by any authority conferred by the State for the creation of obstructions to its navigation.' And again, 'It is for Congress to decide what shall or shall not be deemed in judgment of law an obstruction of navigation. * * * The principles applicable to this case have been repeatedly stated in recent decisions of this court.' * * *

"*Philadelphia Co.* v. *Stimson*, supra, is an epitome of all prior cases. Indeed we might have relied upon it as furnishing all of the elements of decision of that at bar. It expressed the subordination of the power of the States to the power of Congress, that one exercise of the power by either does not preclude another exercise by either, and that the State can grant no right to the soil of the bed of navigable waters which is not subject to Federal regulation. There was a repetition of this doctrine in *United States* v. *Chandler-Dunbar Co.* (229 U. S. 53)."

That the United States may exercise paramount rights in the soil under navigable waters of the United States "to provide for the common defense" or "to provide and maintain a Navy" is even more forcibly demonstrated in the case of *Luther J. Bailey and James E. Fulgham* v. *United States* (62 Ct. Cl. 77). In this case the Navy Department, in pursuance of an act of Congress and a proclamation of the President, was given authority to condemn, for the purpose of establishing a naval base, the site of the Old Jamestown exposition at Hampton Roads, Va. Prior to this time the plaintiffs had leased from the State of Virginia some 26 acres of submerged land under tidewater adjoining this site for the purpose of maintaining oyster beds. The United States by virtue of the authority of establishing the naval base was authorized to condemn land above the low-water mark only. In establishing this base the Navy Department drove a line of piles out into the water, and, by means of suction dredges, pumped a fill between this line of piles and the shore line, thereby cutting off and filling in some 10 acres of the plaintiff's leasehold with this fill. At the same time it cut a channel outside this line of piles for the purpose of affording a channel for operating seaplanes and other naval craft. This channel, together with the fill, occupied and destroyed a large portion of the plaintiffs' oyster beds, for which they sought compensation. The Court of Claims held that the right of the United States to utilize submerged lands below low-water mark to provide facilities to maintain the Navy existed to the full extent of the determined necessity therefor and did not amount to a taking of private property for public use for which the lessees would be entitled to compensation. The Supreme Court of the United States denied certiorari in this case (273 U. S. 751).

Furthermore, Congress also has authorized the establishment of anchorage areas and regulations in navigable waters in certain specified localities (26 Op. Atty. Gen. 258). In like manner provision has been made from time to time for the location of buoys, lights, cable landings, piers, wharves, and other uses of the submerged lands "to provide for the common defense" and "to provide and maintain a Navy," as well as to regulate commerce. These facilities were provided without payment of compensation.

The cases thus far discussed definitely establish the rule that the ownership of the navigable waters and the submerged lands under them is in the public represented by the sovereign States and that the States may control and use them in the public interest subject to the paramount right of the United States to control and use them under the powers granted to Congress under the Constitution. When Congress, under its constitutional power, enacts legislation in the public interest that requires the control and use of the navigable waters and submerged lands, that control and use by the United States is paramount and exclusive and may extend to the actual appropriation or removal of the submerged land itself. If Congress can appropriate the submerged land for national purposes, a fortiori it may appropriate any part thereof, or any mineral therein—such as petroleum.

In the case of *United States* v. *Brewer-Elliott Oil and Gas Company* (249 Fed. 609, 615, affirmed 260 U. S. 77), it was said:

"If the river is not navigable at these locations, then the tribe, as riparian proprietor, owns the bed to the middle of the main channel, and by the terms of the Osage Allotment act of June 28, 1906 (ch. 3572, 34 Stat. 539), the minerals therein belong solely to the tribe, and are subject to lease only for its benefit. But if the river is there navigable, then by the general rule invoked by the interveners and defendants, as broadened in this country and in force in Oklahoma, the title to the bed was held in trust for the State, and inured to it when admitted, on an equality with the others, subject to the paramount authority of Congress in the control of navigation to the end of regulating interstate and foreign commerce (*Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367); *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212); *The Genesse Chief* (12 How. 443); *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1); *McGilvra* v. *Ross* (215 U. S. 70); *Scott* v. *Lattig* (227 U. S. 229); *United States* v. *Cress* (243 U. S. 316)). And the power of the State would then arise to appropriate and dispose of the oil and gas found in such lands, consistently with the above limitation (*Weber* v. *State Harbor Com'rs* (18 Wall., 85 U. S. 57); *Hardin* v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371); *Wood* v. *Fowler* (26 Kans. 682, 40 Am. Rep. 330); *State* v. *Akers* (92 Kans. 169, 140 Pac. 637, Ann. Cas. 1916 B. 543); *State* v. *Nolegs* (40 Okla. 479, 139 Pac. 943))."

In the case of *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. 57, 65), it was said:

"Although the title to the soil under the tidewaters of the bay was acquired by the United States by cession from Mexico, equally with the title to the upland, they held it only in trust for the future State. Upon the admission of California into the Union upon equal footing with the original States, absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over, all soils under the tidewaters within her limits passed to the State, with the consequent right to dispose of the title to any part of said soils in such manner as she might deem proper, subject only to the paramount right of navigation over the waters, so far as such navigation might be required by the necessities of commerce with foreign nations or among the several States, the regulation of which was vested in the general Government."

In the case of *Hardin* v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371, 381), it was said:

"With regard to grants of the Government for lands bordering on tidewater, it has been distinctly settled that they only extend to high-water mark, and that the title to the shore and lands under water in front of lands so granted inures to the State within which they are situated, if a State has been organized and established there. Such title to the shore and lands under water is regarded as incidental to the sovereignty of the State—a portion of the royalties belonging thereto and held in trust for the public purposes of navigation and fishery—and cannot be retained or granted out to individuals by the United States (*Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212); *Goodtitle* v. *Kibbe* (9 How. 471); *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall 57)). Such title being in the State, the lands are subject to State regulation and control, under the condition, however, of not interfering with the regulations which may be made by Congress with regard to public navigation and commerce. The State may even dispose of the usufruct of such lands, as is frequently done by leasing oyster beds in them, and granting fisheries in particular localities; also, by the reclamation of submerged flats, and the erection of wharves and piers and

other adventitious aids of commerce. Sometimes large areas so reclaimed are occupied by cities, and are put to other public or private uses, State control and ownership therein being supreme, subject only to the paramount authority of Congress in making regulations of commerce, and in subjecting the lands to the necessities and uses of commerce." (See *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240); *Smith* v. *Maryland* (18 How. 71); *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391); *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367); *Den* v. *Jersey Co.* (15 How. 426).)

In the case of *Wood* v. *Fowler* (26 Kan. 682, 40 Am. Rep. 330) the action was to restrain defendants from cutting and removing ice formed on the surface of the Kansas River within certain described boundaries. It involved the title of the riparian owner who claimed to own to the center of the stream. The court held that a riparian owner owns only to the bank and not to the center of the navigable stream and that the State holds title to the beds of the navigable streams in trust for all the people subject to the right of the Federal Government with respect to navigation. The court said, in part:

"The riparian proprietor would have no more title to the ice than he would to the fish. It simply is this: That his land adjoins the land of the State. The fact that it so joins gives him no title to that land, or to anything formed or grown upon it, any more than it does to anything formed or grown or found upon the land of any individual neighbor."

The case of *State* v. *Akers* (92 Kan. 169, 140, Pac. 637, Ann. Cas. 1916B, 543) was brought to test the constitutionality of an act of the legislature attempting to regulate the sale and taking of sand and other natural products from navigable rivers and streams for commercial purposes and to provide for payment to the State of royalties for such sand and other products. The court held (quoting from the syllabus):

"In Kansas all the legislative power that the people possess is vested in the legislature, and it is within the power of the legislature to conserve the use of the products of the public streams for the benefit of all the people by imposing a royalty upon the taking therefrom of sand for commercial purposes, so long as it does nothing either to violate the duty to hold the title as trustee for the benefit of the people, or to interfere with the superior rights of Congress to control navigation."

It is well settled that persons who place improvements on such submerged lands, either as riparian owners or under authority of the State, do so with due notice that whatever rights they possess in the land below the mean high-water line are subordinate to the public rights of navigation and to the power of Congress to employ all appropriate means to regulate and protect those rights. Those improvements are not "private property" for which compensation must be made by the United States under the fifth amendment of the Constitution in the event they are injured or destroyed through the exercise of such power by Congress, and such injury or destruction is not the result of the taking of private property but the incidental consequence of the lawful and proper exercise of a governmental power. (*Gibson* v. *United States* (166 U. S. 269); *Scranton* v. *Wheeler* (179 U. S. 141); *Philadelphia Co.* v. *Stimson* (223 U. S. 605); *United States* v. *Chandler-Dunbar Co.* (229 U. S. 53); *Lewis Blue Point Oyster Co.* v. *Briggs* (229 U. S. 82); *Greenleaf Lumber Co.* v. *Garrison* (237 U. S. 251); *Willink* v. *United States* (240 U. S. 572).)

In *Stockton* v. *Baltimore & N. Y. R. Co.* (32 Fed. 9), it is said:

"It is significantly asked, Can the United States take the statehouse at Trenton, and the surrounding grounds belonging to the State, and appropriate them to the purposes of a railroad depot, or to any other use of the General Government, without compensation? We do not apprehend that the decision of the present case involves or requires a serious answer to this question. The cases are clearly not parallel. The character of the title or ownership by which the State holds the statehouse is quite different from that by which it holds the land under the navigable waters in and around its territory."

In the case of *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1) the court had before it acts of the Legislature of the State of New York, enacted for the purpose of securing to Robert R. Livingston and Robert Fulton the exclusive rights of navigation in the navigable waters of that State, with boats propelled by fire or steam. In that case Chief Justice Marshall, speaking for the court, laid broad and deep the foundation for Federal control over navigation and the navigable waters of the Nation. He said:

"Commerce, undoubtedly, is traffic, but it is something more—it is intercourse.—It describes the commercial intercourse between nations, and parts of nations, in all its branches, and is regulated by prescribing rules for carrying on that intercourse. * * * The power of Congress, then, comprehends navigation within the limits of every State in the Union; so far as that navigation may be, in any manner, connected with "commerce with foreign nations, or among the several States, or with the Indian tribes." It may, of consequence, pass the jurisdictional line of New York, and act upon the very waters to which the prohibition now under consideration applies."

In *Gilman* v. *Philadelphia* (3 Wall. 713, 724) the court said:

"Commerce includes navigation. The power to regulate commerce comprehends the control for the purpose, and to the extent necessary, of all the navigable waters of the United States which are accessible from a State other than those in which they lie. For this purpose they are the public property of the Nation, and subject to all the requisite legislation by Congress."

One of the early Federal cases is *Hawkins Point Lighthouse case* (39 Fed. 77). The action was ejectment. Plaintiff claimed title to the submerged soil of the Patapsco River by grant from the State of Maryland; defendant was the keeper of the lighthouse and was defended by the Government, the basis of defense being that the right of the United States to the submerged land and its use to erect a lighthouse upon it in aid of navigation was paramount to the right of plaintiff under his grant. The defense was sustained and no compensation was allowed.

But it remained for the case of *United States* v. *Chandler-Dunbar Water Power Co.* (229 U. S. 53) to fully put at rest the rights of riparian owners on navigable streams as against the sovereign. This case was a condemnation proceeding instituted by the United States Government against the Chandler-Dunbar Water Power Co. and others in the district court for the western district. The company was the owner of lands bordering on the St. Mary's River. Appurtenant to such lands was a valuable water power, which had been but partially developed by the defendant. Congress, by section 11 of the act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 815, 820), had declared that all the lands between the ship canal and the international boundary line were necessary for the purposes of navigation. The company, insisting upon its rights as riparian owner to the submerged lands and the flow of the stream, insisted upon compensation in the sum of $3,450,000 for the taking of such rights, which it claimed were its private property and could not be taken without just compensation. The Government insisted upon its paramount title, upon its right as sovereign to take without compensation all the submerged lands, together with the flow of the stream for purposes of navigation. It conceded its obligation to pay for fast lands taken, but denied its liability for taking the submerged lands and the flow of the stream appurtenant thereto, and insisted that Congress was the sole judge of the necessity and that such necessity was not for judicial inquiry. The trial court awarded $550,000 for the undeveloped water power taken, and both parties appealed. The award was set aside and the court set at rest for all time the claim of riparian owners that as against the Government's needs of navigation their rights in the navigable waters of the Nation and the submerged lands over which they flow were not subservient. Mr. Justice Lurton, speaking for the court, said:

"This title of the owner of fast land upon the shore of a navigable river to the bed of the river is at best a qualified one. It is a title which inheres in the ownership of the shore and unless reserved or excluded by implication, passed with it as a shadow follows a substance, although capable of distinct ownership. It is subordinate to the public right of navigation, and however helpful in protecting the owner against the acts of third parties is of no avail against the exercise of the great and absolute power of Congress over the improvement of navigable rivers. That power of use and control comes from the power to regulate commerce between the States and with foreign nations. It includes navigation and subjects every navigable river to the control of Congress. All means having some positive relation to the end in view which are not forbidden by some other provision of the Constitution are admissible. If, in the judgment of Congress, the use of the bottom of the river is proper for the purpose of placing therein structures in aid of navigation, it is not thereby taking private property for a public use, for the owner's title was in its very nature subject to that use in the interest of public navigation. If its judgment be that structures placed in the river and upon such submerged land are an obstruction or hindrance to the proper use of the river for purposes of navigation, it may require their removal and forbid the use of the bed of the river by the owner in any way which in its judgment is injurious to the dominant right of navigation."

The case was followed in *Lewis Blue Point Oyster Co.* v. *Briggs* (229 U. S. 82, 232). In this case the plaintiff held title to shallow submerged lands in Great South Bay in the State of New York. The foundation of its title was a royal grant when New York was a dependency of Great Britain. The Government in aid of navigation arranged to cut a channel across this shallow land, thus destroying plaintiff's oyster beds. The State court sustained such right of the Government. This judgment was affirmed, and no compensation was allowed.

The foregoing amply demonstrate that navigation is an incident of commerce. It must also be, to the same extent, an incident to national defense and maintenance of the Navy. As stated in *Gilman* v. *Philadelphia* and affirmed in the other cases herein cited, commerce includes navigation and the power to regulate commerce comprehends the control for the purpose and to the extent necessary of the navigable waters and submerged lands of the United States; and for this purpose they are the public property of the Nation and subject to all the requisite legislation by Congress. The control to the extent necessary means paramount control. It can mean nothing less. The 3-mile zone off the coast of California is part of the navigable waters of the United States, and therefore Congress has paramount power to control and to appropriate its bed or any other part thereof, if and when such power is by it asserted.

Navigation is an incident to national defense and maintenance of the Navy. It cannot successfully be maintained that navigation is not as essential to national defense and maintenance of the Navy as it is to commerce. The fact that most of the

cases were decided under the commerce clause of the Constitution does not justify an inference that the decisions of the courts would have been different if they had been predicated on the powers to provide for the national defense, and maintenance of the Navy. The powers to regulate commerce, to provide for national defense, and to provide and maintain a Navy are so correlated that the exercise of one usually includes or fulfills the requirements of the others.

History has amply demonstrated that the Navy has served, and is now serving, in a large measure as an instrumentality to protect and regulate commerce and navigation. It can also be shown beyond peradventure that various provisions that have been made for national defense have assisted materially in improving navigation, regulating commerce, and maintaining the Navy, and improvements for navigation were provided for warships as well as for commercial ships.

CONCLUSION

Summary

The so-called title or ownership of the navigable waters and the submerged lands under them within the 3-mile zone off the coast of California is in the national public and the United States has the paramount sovereign right to conserve and use the petroleum products in those submerged lands to regulate commerce, to provide for national defense, and to provide and maintain the Navy whenever the Congress by appropriate legislation exercises the powers delegated to it by the Constitution for those purposes. This right is not dependent on any grant or title, but it exists as an attribute of sovereignty conferred by the Constitution.

By the common law, both the title and dominion of the sea, and of the rivers and arms of the sea, where the tide ebbs and flows and of all lands below the high-water mark to a distance of three geographic miles from the coast are in the King.

Upon the signing of the Treaty of Paris at the close of the American Revolution, each of the Thirteen Original Colonies became an independent nation possessed of all sovereign rights therefore possessed by the King in internal municipal affairs.

Upon the adoption of the Constitution of the United States the Original States by that document conferred national sovereignty upon the United States by specifically relinquishing and granting to the Congress certain national powers, among which are the power to regulate commerce, the power to provide for national defense, and the power to provide and maintain a Navy.

The execution of these sovereign powers carries with it as an attribute of sovereignty the paramount right to control and use the navigable waters and submerged lands within the 3-mile belt.

This control and use includes as an incident the right to appropriate or remove the submerged land itself if deemed necessary, or to conserve or extract the petroleum products therefrom, for the constitutional purposes mentioned.

The paramount control and use for such purposes can only be exercised by Congress. No other department of the Government can do so unless authority is delegated by Congress.

The Original States retained only municipal sovereignty under the Constitution which carried with it the right to control and use the navigable waters and submerged lands within their territorial limits subject to the paramount right of the United States. Until Congress exercises that paramount right on behalf of the United States the States' right to such use and control is plenary in their municipal capacity.

Each State admitted thereafter subscribed to that Constitution and consequently was admitted on an equal footing with the Thirteen Original States.

In view of the foregoing it would appear that since California has extended her geographical boundaries into the ocean to the 3-mile limit, that State may exercise plenary control and use of the navigable waters and the submerged lands within the 3-mile limit for such municipal purposes as do not conflict with any law of the Congress to enforce the national sovereignty of the United States.

Congress has taken no action to conserve the petroleum products in the submerged lands off the coast of California in the interest of commerce, national defense, or maintenance of the Navy. Until such a right is asserted by Congress there seems to be no way to stop the exploitation and depletion of the petroleum deposits, to the detriment of the United States and the 130,000,000 people for whom the Federal Government is trustee.

Be it not thought, because there is no specific grant conveying fee-simple title into the people of the United States, that their right to conserve, take and use the petroleum in question is less clear or strong. This right is inherent in the sovereignty of the Federal Government created by the Constitution. The exercise of that right is declared by the resolution to be essential "for national defense, maintenance of the Navy, and regulation and protection of interstate and foreign commerce." Under those paramount and exclusive powers of sovereignty Congress can and should pass this resolution.

No one has title to the air, nor a grant of the right to use any of it; but so fixed and recognized is the right to breathe the air that when one deprives another of that right we call it murder. The right of all the people of the United States, acting through their Government, to use this oil is like their right to breathe the air—necessary to the maintenance of constitutional vigor.

The Departments of the Navy, the Interior, and Justice are one in requesting that this resolution be passed, so that the courts may determine the questions involved while fully protecting by their decrees all lawfully vested rights. This resolution has Budget approval and is certified as being in accord with the program of the President. There seems to be no good reason to deny their reasonable request that they be thus permitted to have the courts decide whether or not the Nation has a paramount right to conserve, take, and use the oil in question in the performance of the duties enjoined by the Constitution, for the benefit of all the people.

Most respectfully submitted.

SAM HOBBS.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include excerpts from certain documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that we all have great respect for the opinion of the gentleman from Alabama, but may I assert that in my judgment there is not the slightest basis for the fears which he seems to entertain. The bill infringes upon no right of the Federal Government. The Federal Government assumes only the right to exercise complete control over all of the waters in question.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill House Joint Resolution 225, to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 225, with Mr. HAYS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution has been explained very well. The reason why this proposed legislation is before us today was given by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] in his statement prior to the adoption of the resolution. This is to settle a controversy, as has been explained, with reference to submerged lands, both along the shores and lands under the navigable streams. It is known, of course, that prior to the establishment of our independence these lands were held by the Crown of England. They belonged to the King. When the Thirteen Colonies established their independence they became possessed of that title. The Thirteen Colonies became the owners of the land along the coast and under the navigable streams. I believe California is the only State that came into the Union as a State. Texas came in as an independent Nation. But these other States, carved out of the public domain since the beginning of the Government, have been possessed of the same title that the Original Thirteen Colonies were possessed of. So that removes any question as to the relationship of the Thirteen Colonies and the other States with reference to the isues involved in this controversy out of which this legislation has grown.

The importance of this legislation can be appreciated when it is recognized that all the ports and harbors in the United States are involved in this controversy. Much of the land under cities like Boston and San Francisco also is involved because much of those cities have been builded on what has been submerged land.

The language of this bill is very clear. It is to be observed that it quiets the title of all the lands that are within the boundaries of the States, 3 miles from the shore with reference to most of the States, as to some of the States along the coast, a greater distance, but it matters not wherever the State line extends, the title is to be quieted by this legislation.

The only exception has been incorporated to relieve any doubt as to what would happen as to certain lands that have been withheld for purposes of administration for certain Indian tribes, and that is specified in the bill.

Then there is language in the bill which is not necessary, important to be considered in view of the statement just made by my distinguished friend

from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] and that is to be found at the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3, "retaining, however, to the United States of America its present powers of regulation and control for the purposes of commerce, navigation, and the national defense."

That language would not be necessary, of course, because we could not by statute deprive the Federal Government of any constitutional powers it has.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does not my chairman believe that with that language in the bill which he has just quoted, and with the general powers the National Government has, there is no doubt but that the National Government would have all the war powers it might possibly have under any circumstances?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. You could not deprive the National Government of a war power which it holds under the Constitution. You could not deprive it of that power by anything the Congress could do.

Unless there are some other questions, I will conclude, I believe. There is a disposition on the part of the members of the committee not to hold the House unnecessarily long.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. In line with the question just asked, the National Government has the same relative war powers as to land which generally is privately owned throughout the country as it does to this land in question.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It is coextensive with the country, as far as this whole Nation is concerned. The war powers of the Government are not local in any particular part of this country; or property.

Mr. BROOKS. It is the general power that permits the United States to utilize the necessary property for the waging of war in the event it is necessary?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. When the country goes to war, the Federal Government is clothed with all the powers necessary properly to conduct it. Of course, it has to respect the rights of the individuals insofar as the provision of the Constitution which makes certain that private property shall not be taken for public use without fair compensation is concerned.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Where under the laws of some of the States, and I am speaking from general recollection, the title of the riparian owner on a navigable river and particularly other stream extends to that part of the land under the waters which goes to the thread of the stream, and assuming for the sake of argument that that owner now has improved or has disposed of land under the waters of this navigable river another river or stream to the center or to the thread of the stream, would the language of this bill conveying title unto the States or to those who have acquired from the States, deprive that present owner of his title in any way, assuming that his title was acquired from the Government?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not see how it could because what you do here is to withdraw the claim of the Federal Government from any lands which are within the boundaries of the States.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And even those streams or rivers that are boundaries between the States?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. So that as matters stand the purpose of this legislation generally is that the Federal Government will not hereafter assert title to those lands under navigable waters, rivers, and streams where that title has not been heretofore asserted and maintained?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think that is a fair, general, comprehensive statement of the purposes of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I assume absence in such large numbers this morning indicates lack of opposition. I do not intend to take very much of your time because I feel this is a bill that should be and will be passed promptly. I cannot agree, however, with the statement made by one of the previous speakers that this is not an important bill. This is a bill which involves a fundamental question and hundreds of millions of dollars invested by States and the grantees and licensees of the States. As the chairman has said, it has been the settled law with the Anglo-Saxon people for centuries that the title to submerged lands, including the lands under the navigable streams, is vested in the crown or the sovereign. When we declared our independence in 1776, title to those lands and the rights thereunder passed to the independent sovereign States. Every State subsequently admitted to the Union came in as an equal partner with the same rights and the same title to the submerged lands and other public lands which were vested in the Original Thirteen Colonies. Under the Constitution, the States surrendered to the Federal Government the power to regulate commerce and navigation, but they never ceded title to tidelands or uplands.

I wish to speak just for a moment from the standpoint of the interest of the State of New York; although our interest is no different from that of any other of the 48 States. This morning I received a telegram from the attorney general of the State of New York, Hon. Nathaniel L. Goldstein, which reads as follows:

> Federal Government's claim in recent years to lands under tidal and navigable waters necessitate definite disclaimer of Federal title to such lands within boundaries of the States. New York has claimed title to such lands since the Revolution, with uniform policy under both Republican and Democratic administrations. Millions of dollars have been invested by public corporations and private owners in reliance on grants of land under water from New York State.

Now the Federal Government has always recognized and acquiesced in that claim by the State of New York. The Federal Government has applied to the State of New York and was granted land under water at West Point, Governors Island, Ellis Island, Bedloe Island, Davids Island, Fort Lafayette, Fort Hamilton, Fort Wadsworth, Fort Schuyler, many lighthouse sites and others too numerous to mention.

Clearly, that is a recognition by the Federal Government that the State of New York has title to these submerged lands and an estoppel against claiming them now. In this connection, the attorney general of the State of New York calls our attention to the fact that the people of the State of New York first declared their original absolute ownership to such lands by an act of legislature passed in 1779. Subsequent acts to the same purport were passed by the legislature in 1828 and in 1846. The Constitution of the State of New York adopted that year included such a provision.

If the Federal Government can take 1 square yard of the tidal lands of the State of California, they can seize the tidal or the submerged lands of every State and every port authority in the United States, including many million dollars of investments in reclaimed land and improvements thereon along the water fronts of our coastal cities. There can be no distinction between title to submerged oil lands, the submerged shrimp and oyster beds, and reclaimed and filled lands that we have in the harbors of all our great coastal cities. If the States have title to the tidal lands they own the soil and everything it contains including petroleum, minerals, gas, sand, and gravel.

It is worthy of note that the attorneys general of 46 States have joined in the brief in support of this measure. It is a scholarly document and contains a wealth of authority in support of the bill. The only opposition that appears in the hearings at all is from an attorney representing private interests, in which he claims that this matter should be left to the courts; that it is a judicial matter rather than a legislative matter. With that I thoroughly disagree. There is a question of policy involved. It is a question of vital interest to the States we represent. Furthermore, we have learned in recent years that there is no permanency in the decisions of the Supreme Court. As Justice Roberts said of a modern decision, "It is like a ticket on an excursion train; good for this trip and this day only." Some say the bill is an attempt to interfere with the judicial function of the Court. The shoe is on the other foot. The Court has repeatedly interfered with the legislative functions of the Government and changed long standing policies by judicial fiat.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Early in the days of the New Deal one of the high prophets said; "It will be necessary for us New Dealers to lay rough and unholy hands on many sacred precedents." They have done that, but I have constantly opposed destroying those

holy precedents, and I have never upheld their rough and unholy hands. I never shall. If that makes me a Tory or a Reactionary or an ultra-Conservative, as the New Dealers like to call their opponents, then I plead guilty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the pending legislation. Months ago I introduced a resolution to quiet the title to the submerged lands along the coastal areas of the several States and forming the floor of many of our navigable streams. This resolution was considered by the Judiciary Committee, along with a number of other resolutions of similar import. I want to commend the committee for its exhaustive study of this rather troublesome legal problem. Faithful in the performance of its duties, the Judiciary Committee, headed by its able and distinguished chairman, Judge SUMNERS, of Dallas, Tex., carefully considered these resolutions, including my own, and has brought to the floor House Joint Resolution 225. This resolution should pass unanimously.

Within the last few years disturbing reports affecting the title of millions of acres of submerged coastal lands and submerged bottoms of many navigable streams have been circulated throughout this country. Some of the land, because of its location near great cities or because of its mineral properties have become very valuable. These rumors and statements of Federal officials made from time to time have served as a cloud upon the title to these lands. It is therefore proper that this Congress should set the entire matter at rest and establish beyond doubt title to properties which as time goes on will become more important and more valuable. The State of Louisiana has for many years appreciated the value of its submerged coastal lands. A great drainage program is even now being planned to drain the waters off millions of acres of land and make them suitable for cultivation. Drilling and prospecting for oil among these lands has become a common practice. Louisiana is therefore very much interested—in fact, concerned—with the passage of this resolution and I hope there will be no opposition whatsoever to the passage of this legislation.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I introduced on January 15, 1945, House Joint Resolution 67, which has for its purpose a declaration of the policy of the Government of the United States in regard to ownership and title to tide and submerged lands. I introduced similar resolutions in previous Congresses. We are now considering House Joint Resolution 225.

There is also pending the following resolutions introduced in March 1945—House Joint Resolutions 118, 119, 122, 123, 124, 125, 128, 129, 130, and 134, which, I understand, are identical in language. The purpose of all of these resolutions as stated therein is "To quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to the lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the States and to prevent further clouding of such titles."

GENERAL STATEMENT

While it is true that oil deposits in submerged lands have given rise to this legislation, the principle involved is applicable to all interests in such lands and is equally applicable to every State in the Union having submerged lands and particularly to those States bordering upon the ocean. Oregon has no commercial oil fields, but is interested in the broad question involved as it is equally applicable to docks and to the structures over waters adjacent to the shoreline, as well as to mineral deposits under the waters.

PROPONENTS' CONTENTIONS

The contention has been raised by certain officials and by the institution of a suit in the courts that neither the individual States nor the United States has title to the submerged lands below low-water mark and extending out to the 3-mile limit, but that the United States, by virtue of its power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce and to provide for the national defense and maintain a Navy, and by reason of its national sovereignty, has a right to appropriate petroleum products in the submerged lands below low-water mark and within the 3-mile limit.

PROPOSITIONS MAINTAINED

Mr. Chairman, I maintain the following propositions:

First. Title to the submerged lands in question is owned by the State in whose territory the lands lie.

Second. The United States has no title of any kind in and to these lands or to the petroleum products or minerals under the soil. Its only rights therein are such as are given to it by the Constitution, extending power over interstate and foreign commerce.

Third. Under the Constitution the United States is a government of delegated powers and has only such national sovereignty as is given to it by the Constitution. The States retain all the sovereign powers they originally had before the compact was entered into in establishing the United States, and all of these residuary powers are still held by the States, except the powers delegated by the Constitution of the United States.

Fourth. The National Government has the right to provide and maintain a Navy and to provide for the national defense, but in doing so it is subject to the provisions of the Constitution and cannot deprive a State or an individual of its property or rights without due process of law, including just compensation.

TITLE TO SUBMERGED LANDS

I call attention to the act of Congress admitting the State of Oregon into the Union, wherein it is provided in section 1:

Admission of State—boundaries—That Oregon be, and she is hereby, received into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever, with the following boundaries: In order that the boundaries of the State may be known and established, it is hereby ordained and declared that the State of Oregon shall be bounded as follows, to wit: Beginning one marine league at sea, due west from the point where the forty-second parallel of north latitude intersects the same; thence northerly, at the same distance from the line of the coast lying west and opposite the State, including all islands within the jurisdiction of the United States, to a point due west and opposite the middle of the north ship channel of the Columbia River; thence easterly, to and up the middle channel of said river, and, where it is divided by islands, up the middle of the widest channel thereof, to a point near Fort Walla Walla, where the forty-sixth parallel of north latitude crosses said river; thence east, on said parallel, to the middle of the main channel of the Shoshone or Snake River; thence up the middle of the main channel of said river to the mouth of the Owyhee River; thence due south to the parallel of latitude 42 degrees north; thence west along said parallel to the place of beginning, including jurisdiction in civil and criminal cases upon the Columbia River and Snake River, concurrently with States and territories of which those rivers form a boundary in common with this State.

There are two provisions of this act that are important in considering this legislation: First, Oregon was admitted into the Union on an equal footing with all other States in all respects whatever; second, it is recognized that the territorial boundaries of Oregon extend one marine league at sea. From this specific provision it was recognized by the United States in its compact in admitting the State into the Union that the submerged lands in question are a part of the territory of Oregon. The rule with respect to ownership of the submerged lands lying above low-water mark and those lying outside of the low-water mark and to the 3-mile limit is the same. The courts have made no distinction with respect to such submerged lands.

The question of the title and ownership to these submerged lands in Oregon has been adjudicated by the United States Supreme Court on two separate occasions. The cases to which I refer are *Shively* v. *Bowlby*, decided March 5, 1894 (152 U. S. 1), and *United States* v. *Oregon*, decided April 1, 1935 (295 U. S. 1). It is submitted that the principles of law enunciated in these two decisions determine definitely that the title to the submerged lands under consideration is vested in the State, and the Federal Government has no title therein or any interest or control over them other than such rights as have been given to the United States by the Constitution with respect to interstate and foreign commerce.

The Court in Shively against Bowlby said:

(P. 11.) I. By the common law, both the title and the dominion of the sea, and of rivers and arms of the sea, where the tide ebbs and flows, and of all the lands below high watermark, within the jurisdiction of the Crown of England, are in the King. Such waters, and the lands which they cover, either at all times, or at least when the tide is in, are incapable of ordinary and private occupation, cultivation, and improvement; and their natural and primary uses are public in their nature, for highways of navigation and commerce, domestic and foreign, and for the purpose of fishing by all the King's subjects. Therefore the title, jus privatum, in such lands, as of waste and unoccupied lands, belongs to the King as the sovereign; and the dominion thereof, jus

publicum, is vested in him as the representative of the nation and for the public benefit.

(P. 13.) In England, from the time of Lord Hale, it has been treated as settled that the title in the soil of the sea, or of arms of the sea, below ordinary high watermark, is in the King, except so far as an individual or a corporation has acquired rights in it by express grant, or by prescription or usage. * * *

It is equally well settled that a grant from the sovereign of land bounded by the sea, or by any navigable tidewater, does not pass any title below high watermark, unless either the language of the grant, or long usage under it, clearly indicates that such was the intention. * * *

By the law of England also every building or wharf erected without license below high watermark, where the soil is the King's, is a purpresture and may, at the suit of the King, either be demolished, or be seized and rented for his benefit, if it is not a nuisance to navigation.

(P. 15.) The English possessions in America were claimed by right of discovery. Having been discovered by subjects of the King of England and taken possession of in his name, by his authority, or with his assent, they were held by the King as the representative of and in trust for the nation; and all vacant lands, and the exclusive power to grant them, were vested in him. The various charters granted by different monarchs of the Stuart dynasty for large tracts of territory on the Atlantic coast conveyed to the grantees both the territory described and the powers of government, including the property and the dominion of lands under tidewaters. And upon the American Revolution, all the rights of the Crown and of Parliament vested in the several States, subject to the rights surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution of the United States. *Johnson* v. *McIntosh* (8 Wheat. 543, 595); *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367, 408–410, 414); *Commonwealth* v. *Roxbury* (9 Gray, 451, 478–481); *Stevens* v. *Paterson & Newark Railroad* (5 Vroom (34 N. J. Law), 532); *People* v. *New York & Staten Island Ferry* (68 N. Y. 71).

(P. 26.) IV. The new States admitted into the Union since the adoption of the Constitution have the same rights as the original States in the tidewaters, and in the lands below the high watermark, within their respective jurisdictions. * * *

(Pp. 26, 27, and 28.) In *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (1844), this Court, upon full consideration (overruling anything to the contrary in *Pollard* v. *Kibbe* (14 Pet. 353); *Mobile* v. *Eslava* (16 Pet. 234); *Mobile* v. *Hallett* (16 Pet. 261); *Mobile* v. *Emanuel* (1 How. 95); and *Pollard* v. *Files* (2 How. 591), adjudged that, upon the admission of the State of Alabama into the Union, the title in the lands below high watermark of navigable waters passed to the State, and could not afterward be granted away by the Congress of the United States. Mr. Justice McKinley, delivering the opinion of the court (Mr. Justice Catron alone dissenting), said: "We think a proper examination of this subject will show that the United States never held any municipal sovereignty, jurisdiction, or right of soil in and to the territory of which Alabama or any of the new States were formed; except for temporary purposes, and to execute the trusts created by the acts of the Virginia and Georgia Legislatures, and the deeds of cession executed by them to the United States, and the trust created by the treaty with the French Republic of the 30th of April 1803 ceding Louisiana. When the United States accepted the cession of the territory, they took upon themselves the trust to hold the municipal eminent domain for the new States, and to invest them with it to the same extent, in all respects, that it was held by the States ceding the territories. When Alabama was admitted into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, she succeeded to all the rights of sovereignty, jurisdiction, and eminent domain which Georgia possessed at the date of the cession, except so far as this right was diminished by the public lands remaining in the possession and under the control of the United States, for the temporary purposes provided for in the deed of cession and the legislative acts connected with it. Nothing remained to the United States, according to the terms of the agreement, but the public lands (3 How. 221–223). Alabama is therefore entitled to the sovereignty and jurisdiction over all the territory within her limits, subject to the common law, to the same extent that Georgia possessed it before she ceded it to the United States. To maintain any other doctrine is to deny that Alabama has been admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, the Constitution, laws, and compact to the contrary notwithstanding. Then to Alabama belong the navigable waters, and soils under them, in controversy in this case, subject to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the United States" (3 How. 228, 229. * * *).

(Pp. 29 and 30.) In *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners*, it was held that a person afterward acquiring the title to the city in a lot and a wharf below high-water mark had no right to complain of works constructed by commissioners of the State, under authority of the legislature, for the protection of the harbor and the convenience of shipping, in front of his wharf, and preventing the approach of vessels to it; and Mr. Justice Field, in delivering judgment, said: "Although the title to the soil under the tidewaters of the bay was acquired by the United States by cession from Mexico, equally with the title to the upland, they held it only in trust for the future State. Upon the admission of California into the Union upon equal footing with the original States, absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over, all soils under the tidewaters within her limits passed to the State, with the consequent right to dispose of the title to any part of said soils in such manner as she might deem proper, subject only to the paramount right of navigation over the waters, so far as such navigation might be required by the necessities of commerce with foreign nations or among the several States, the regulation of which was vested in the general government" (18 Wall. 65, 66).

In the very recent case of *Knight* v. *United States Land Association*, Mr. Justice Lamar, in delivering judgment, said: "It is the settled rule of law in this court that absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over, the soils under the tidewaters in the original States were reserved to the several States: And that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possess within their respective borders. Upon the acquisition of the territory from Mexico, the United States acquired the title to tidelands equally with the title to upland; but with respect to the former they held it only in trust for the future States that might be erected out of such territory" (142 U. S. 183). In support of these propositions he referred to *Martin* v. *Waddell*, *Pollard* v. *Hagen*, *Mumford* v. *Wardwell*, and *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners*, above cited.

The Court, after reviewing the law in its former decisions, specifically held with respect to the title to the submerged lands in Oregon that the title was vested in the State, saying:

(P. 52.) By the law of the State of Oregon, as declared and established by the decisions of its supreme court, the owner of upland bounding on navigable water has no title in the adjoining lands below high-water mark, and no right to build wharves thereon, except as expressly permitted by statutes of the State; but the State has the title in those lands, and, unless they have been so built upon with its permission, the right to sell and convey them to anyone, free of any right in the proprietor of the upland, and subject only to the paramount right of navigation inherent in the public. *Hinman* v. *Warren* (6 Oreg. 408); *Parker* v. *Taylor* (7 Oreg. 435); *Parker* v. *Rogers* (8 Oreg. 183); *Shivley* v. *Parker* (9. Oreg. 500); *McCann* v. *Oregon Railway* (13 Oreg. 455); *Bowlby* v. *Shively* (22 Oreg. 410). (See also *Shively* v. *Welch* (10 Sawyer, 136, 140, 141).)

The Court's conclusions are significant:

(P. 57 and 58:) Lands under tidewaters are incapable of cultivation or improvement in the manner of lands above high-water mark. They are of great value to the public for the purposes of commerce, navigation, and fishery. Their improvement by individuals, when permitted, is incidental or subordinate to the public use and right. Therefore, the title and control of them are vested in the sovereign for the benefit of the whole people.

At common law the title and the dominion in lands flowed by the tide were in the King for the benefit of the nation. Upon the settlement of the Colonies, like rights passed to the grantees in the royal charters, in trust for the communities to be established. Upon the American Revolution, these rights charged with a like trust, were vested in the original States within their respective borders, subject to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the United States.

Upon the acquisition of a Territory by the United States, whether by cession from one of the States, or by treaty with a foreign country, or by discovery and settlement, the same title and dominion passed to the United States, for the benefit of the whole people, and in trust for the several States to be ultimately created out of the Territory.

The new States admitted into the Union since the adoption of the Constitution have the same rights as the original States in the tidewaters, and in the lands under them, within their respective jurisdictions. The title and rights of riparian or littoral proprietors in the soil below high-water mark, therefore, are governed by the laws of the several States, subject to the rights granted to the United States by the Constitution.

The United States, while they hold the country as a Territory, having all the powers both of national and of municipal government, may grant; for appropriate purposes, titles or rights in the soil below high-water mark of tidewaters. But they have never done so by general laws; and unless in some case of international duty or public exigency, have acted upon the policy, as most in accordance with the interest of the people and with the object for which the Territories were acquired, of leaving the administration and disposition of the sovereign rights in navigable waters, and in the soil under them, to the control of the States, respectively, when organized and admitted into the Union.

Grants by Congress of portions of the public lands within a Territory to settlers thereon, though bordering on or bounded by navigable waters, convey, of their own force, no title or right below high-water mark, and do not impair the title and dominion of the future State when created; but leave the question of the use of the shores by the owners of uplands to the sovereign control of each State, subject only to the rights vested by the Constitution in the United States.

The donation land claim, bounded by the Columbia River, upon which the plaintiff in error relies, includes no title or right in the land below high-water mark; and the statutes of Oregon, under which the defendants in error hold, are a constitutional and legal exercise by the State of Oregon of its dominion over the lands under navigable waters.

It is submitted that this holding by the Supreme Court definitely establishes that the ownership, sovereignty, and control of all of the submerged lands within the territorial boundaries of Oregon which extend out 3 miles from the shore line on the Pacific Ocean are vested in the State of Oregon; that the United States has no ownership, control, or dominion over the same; that such powers as are delegated to it by the Constitution with respect to navigation and commerce are not to be construed as ownership and do not give to the Federal Government any indicia of ownership; that the sovereignty with respect to such lands is vested in the States and not in the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court in the later case, in which the State of Oregon was a party—United States against Oregon—reexamined this same question and again laid down this definite rule, the Court speaking through Mr. Justice Stone, said:

(P. 6.) The State of Oregon was admitted to the Union on February 14, 1859. At that date the area within the meander line was a part of the public domain of the United States. No part of it has ever been disposed of, in terms, by any grant of the United States. Decision of the principal issues raised by the pleadings and proof turns on the question whether the area involved underlie navigable waters at the time of the admission of Oregon to statehood. If the waters were navigable in fact, title passed to the State upon her admission to the Union. *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 26–31), *Scott* v. *Lattig* (227 U. S. 229, 242, 243), *Oklahoma* v. *Texas* (258 U. S. 574, 583, 591), *United States* v. *Utah* (283 U. S. 64, 75). If the waters were nonnavigable, our decision must then turn on the question whether the title of the United States to the lands in question, or part as of them, has passed to the State.

(P. 14.) Dominion over navigable waters and property in the soil under them are so identified with the sovereign power of government that a presumption against their separation from sovereignty must be indulged, in construing either grants by the sovereign of the lands to be held in private ownership or transfer of sovereignty itself. See *Massachusetts* v. *New York* (271 U. S. 65, 89). For that reason, upon the admission of a State to the Union, the title of the United States to lands underlying navigable waters within the States passes to it, as incident to the transfer to the State of local sovereignty, and is subject only to the paramount power of the United States to control such waters for purposes of navigation in interstate and foreign commerce. But if the waters are not navigable in fact, the title of the United States to land underlying them remains unaffected by the creation of the new State. See *United States* v. *Utah* (supra, 75), *Oklahoma* v. *Texas* (supra, 583, 591). Since the effect upon the title to such lands is the result of Federal action in admitting a State to the Union, the question, whether the waters within the State under which the lands lie are navigable or nonnavigable, is a Federal, not a local one. It is, therefore, to be determined according to the law of usages recognized and applied in the Federal courts, even though, as in the present case, the waters are not capable of use for navigation in interstate or foreign commerce. *United States* v. *Holt State Bank* (270 U. S. 49, 55, 56); *United States* v. *Utah* (supra, 75); *Brewer-Elliott Oil Co.* v. *United States* (260 U. S. 77, 87).

It is submitted that, as shown by the holdings of the Supreme Court in the two cases in which titles to Oregon lands were involved, which cases follow the uniform rule laid down by the Court, the titles to the submerged lands under consideration are vested in the respective States within whose boundaries they lie, and, therefore, the contention by the proponents of the legislation that the title is vested in no one is untenable. The title being in the State, it follows that the United States does not have any jurisdiction or control over the lands themselves or the petroleum products or minerals that may lie beneath the soil.

POWER TO PROVIDE NATIONAL DEFENSE AND MAINTAIN A NAVY

It remains to consider the question as to whether or not the powers of the National Government to provide and maintain a navy and provide for the national defense gives the Government the power to take the petroleum products in question. Having reached the conclusion that the title to these lands is vested in the States, and that under their sovereign powers they have the right not only to hold and control the land but also to dispose of the title, it necessarily follows that the Federal Government in attempting to acquire these lands must do so under the same rules and principles of law as obtain with respect to its dealings with other property not owned by the Federal Government. It does not follow that because the United States is empowered to maintain a navy and provide for the national defense it can appropriate to itself private property owned either by one or more of the States of the Union or owned by individual citizens. Under the law if these properties are essential for governmental use with respect to the national defense or the maintenance of a navy, the Government has the right to acquire them by condemnation under eminent domain, which involves due process of law and compensation. The Federal Government has no more right to take these privately owned properties, many of which have now been disposed of either by outright sale or lease by the State of California, than it has to take the Capitol Building belonging to the State of California, the State University buildings at Berkeley, or other properties owned by the State. Such powers are only held by a totalitarian state and not by a constitutional democracy such as the United States.

CONCLUSION

In the State of Oregon the commission of public docks, a municipal corporation, has through authority vested in it by the State made extensive improvements and has erected docks, grain elevators, and other dock facilities involving large expenditures on these submerged lands. Other municipal corporations in the State have erected on such lands flour mills, wharves, and docks, and issued bonds thereon for the payment of same. If the contention advanced by the Government as set forth in the suit instituted by its officials is sustained it will deprive the States of the vested titles they now hold in these submerged lands, which property rights have been recognized by the courts for over a century as shown by the cases I have cited.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution should be enacted into law without further delay and I trust it will receive the unanimous vote of the committee and the House.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California, the author of one of the resolutions on this subject [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the importance of House Joint Resolution 225 and the need for speedy favorable action on it, cannot be overemphasized. It is almost identical and similar in purpose to House Joint Resolution 148, which I introduced, and several other Members of Congress, recognizing the importance of this matter have also introduced similar resolutions.

The Secretary of the Interior has unsuccessfully attempted to have legislation enacted during the past several years giving the Federal Government control over various submerged oil-producing tidelands in southern California. The passage of such legislation, according to the finest legal counsel available, would bring into question the validity of ownership of all submerged tidelands in every section of the United States. Surveys indicate that there are more than 65,000 square miles of such tidelands, thousands of square miles of which have been reclaimed and now include industrial, commercial, and residential properties, as well as wharves and harbor facilities in every seaport city of the Nation.

The Secretary of the Interior has failed to secure such legislation from the Congress. However, the Attorney General, representing the Department of the Interior, has brought action to accomplish the same purpose by filing a suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, entitled "The United States of America against the Pacific Western Oil Corporation—4493-b-Civil. What the outcome of this litigation, without the passage of this House joint resolution, will be, no one at this time can say.

Few people realize the tremendous significance of this effort. If a judgment was rendered in favor of the contentions of the Departments of the Interior and Justice, chaos would be created in every seaport city of the Nation. The problems that would arise are amply illustrated by the property which would be adversely affected in the city and county of San Francisco. In this single seaport city the Federal Government would come into possession of approximately 600 city blocks, all of the connecting streets and highways, with all public utility facilities, including street railway transportation, water mains, gas mains, electric and telephone conduits, street lighting systems and sanitary facilities such as sewage. Likewise, it would bring into the possession of the Federal Government the entire State-owned harbor facilities, with all wharves, docks, and appurtenances, which have a book value of close to $100,000,000. The Federal Government would acquire a section of the main line of the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., the Santa Fe Railroad Co. and the Western Pacific Railroad Co., terminals, freight and switch yards. The greater part of San Francisco's commercial district, including some of the

largest banking institutions in the west, with office buildings, hotels, and every kind of business establishment to be found in a large and thriving seaport city—all would become property of the Federal Government—and without obligation to pay 1 cent for all this property.

Mr. Chairman, multiply this by the number of seaport cities there are in the United States, and the chaos that would be created staggers the imagination.

The passage of this House joint resolution will prevent such chaos, for it will quiet title of the respective States, cities, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and it will prevent clouding of the title to all these properties.

I trust the House of Representatives will unanimously pass this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 5 minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN].

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, it might be well briefly to tell the Members of the House, especially the new Members, the history of this legislation.

In 1937 resolutions were introduced in both the Senate and the House to quiet title in the Federal Government to tidelands and submerged lands. Lengthy hearings were held, but no favorable report was given in either House. Nothing after that was heard of the matter; it just lay dormant until this year. I might say in passing that for many years individual applicants would make application to the Secretary of the Interior to drill for oil on these submerged lands and were repeatedly turned down by the Interior Department, giving as the reason in writing that the Federal Government did not own these lands but the States did, and those letters were introduced in the hearings of 1937.

We heard nothing more about this matter until this year, when Secretary Ickes stated he was going to grant these individual oil applications. Then in May, before Attorney General Biddle retired, a suit was brought in California to quiet title to these submerged lands off the coast of California. They not only wanted the oil, but they wanted title to the land, as the complaint alleges. So the situation presents itself as a cloud on the title to these submerged lands, and there will always be a cloud on the title every time a Secretary of the Interior or Attorney General gets it into his head that the Federal Government owns these submerged lands. So I say to the Members, now is the time for this Congress to adopt a policy that the ownership of these lands is in the several States. I do not want to tire you at all, but I would like to read one decision which states the entire law. It is the case of *Knight* v. *United States Land Association* (142 U. S. 161), as follows:

> It is the settled rule of law in this court that absolute property in and dominion and sovereignty over the soils under the tidewaters of the original States were reserved to the several States and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction.

Of course, that is true. Every new State is admitted on the same basis. That decision states that all States are admitted on the same basis as the original Thirteen Colonies and no one questions the right of the original Thirteen Colonies to these submerged lands.

Not only the decision I have read but there are 50 other decisions right down the line to the same effect. I have read every one of them and I do not know of a single decision ever handed down by any court, from the Supreme Court of the United States on down, which holds that title to these tide submerged lands was in the Federal Government—not one. Still, in the face of that they are still picking at us all the time, casting a cloud on the title. You cannot get any title insurance on harbor improvements.

How can the Federal Government for a period of over a hundred years, under these decisions, permit the States to spend between six and seven billion dollars in harbor improvements on the inland rivers and lakes, the Gulf and the coasts? How can it do that? Yet along comes some Attorney General or some Secretary of the Interior stating, "Why, the Federal Government owns these lands," in spite of every decision of the United States Supreme Court that the title is in the States.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this is the most important piece of legislation we will be called upon to consider in this session.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I want to call attention to the exception on page 2, beginning in line 12, for the purpose of asking a question, which exception reads as follows:

> Excepting therefrom such lands beneath tidewaters and such lands beneath navigable waters as have been lawfully acquired by the United States of America by a clear and complete title from any State, its grantees—

And so forth. Is not the language there "by a clear and complete title" a little too restrictive, a little more restrictive than is necessary to carry out the purposes of this bill?

Mr. TOLAN. It might.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I have in mind a situation where the Government has bought lands but to which it does not have very clear title.

Mr. TOLAN. I see.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If that situation should happen out in the tide lands, I can see where we might be quit-claiming lands that we should not quit claim and that that could be left out without in any way affecting the bill.

Mr. TOLAN. That is probably true. I wish the gentleman would discuss that with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I say that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is interested in this legislation. We have docks in Erie, Pa., we have docks along the Schuylkill River and the Delaware River at Philadelphia, also coal mines submerged under the high Alleghenies and adjoining rivers and also rivers of the east. We are vitally interested in this proposition and the attorney general of Pennsylvania has joined in the brief favoring the passage of this bill.

Mr. TOLAN. I thank the gentleman. May I repeat that this bill was sent to every attorney general in the United States, together with a brief, and 46 attorneys general out of the 48 have approved this bill. I know of no other bill that has had such wonderful support.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Those 48 attorneys general have not forgotten that the bill is up today, because I think every Member of Congress has received a wire from his attorney general urging support of the bill.

Mr. TOLAN. I thank the gentleman. May I also say that separate bills were introduced by the following Members: HÉBERT, Louisiana; BROOKS, Louisiana; DOYLE, California; BOYKIN, Alabama; CELLER, New York; TOLAN, California; BENDER, Ohio; REED, Illinois; HAVENNER, California; ALLEN, Louisiana; COLMER, Mississippi; HALE, Maine; PATTERSON, California; WELCH, California; PHILLIPS, California; JOHNSON, California, and HEALY, California.

So you see that right across the aisle we are pretty well in agreement on this legislation.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. I am interested in this joint resolution and I will support the measure. In my home city of Erie, the Presque Isle Park and Harbor Commission has made road improvements and constructed protective works that cost approximately $2,000,000. The city of Erie receives no revenue. The dock is privately owned. The commission receives annually a minimum of $800 from tugs and pleasure boats and $11,000 for concessions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. TOLAN. If Congress passes this bill, then we have adopted once and for all legislation concerning which the Supreme Court cannot touch. It is a political question and it is about time to pass it, because any time a new Attorney General or old Attorney General or Secretary of the Interior get it into their heads that they are going to start a suit of this kind it casts a cloud on the title, and the people do not know what to do; you cannot get a bond issue through; you cannot get title insurance, and it is not fair in the face of the unbroken line of Supreme Court decisions, and I think now is the time to settle it once and for all. I hope this extremely important bill will receive your unanimous support.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor this resolution. I offered a similar resolution. It is a matter of paramount importance to Louisiana. Our fiscal system has been built to a great extent upon revenues which we receive by reason of having title to submerged lands, and for the Federal Government to take title or have Congress assert title in the Federal Government would simply disrupt our plans and disrupt the economy of most of the States. I hope that it receives favorable consideration at an early date in both Houses of Congress.

The register of the State land office of the State of Louisiana presented to the Judiciary Committee when this bill was under consideration some facts that will show at a glance just how important it is for our State to own and control these lands. That official advised that Louisiana has collected in excess of $27,000,000 for oil and gas alone from these lands. The State has given more than 650 leases and 95 percent of them were given on lands under navigable streams or in tidewater areas.

This question should be settled permanently and it should be settled by the Congress. There should be no doubt about whether the Federal Government or the State Government owns and controls the land under navigable streams and other submerged lands. Since the earliest history of our country the States have been exercising every right of ownership over these lands and the Federal Government has not questioned it until recently. Someone has said that the matter ought to be decided by the courts, but the answer to that is that the courts by a long line of decisions have already decided the matter—that ownership was in the States. This question is before us now only because an effort is being made upon the part of some to upset this long line of decisions. The Supreme Court of the United States in the last few years has upset so many long-standing decisions that I think it is right and proper that the Congress should now step in and once and for all settle this question of ownership of submerged lands in the various States. Moreover, it is a question of policy to be established by Congress more than it is a legal question to be determined by the courts. At this late date, for the Federal Government to come in now and get title to all of this land in the various States would be inequitable, unjust, and upsetting, and, as I pointed out a moment ago, would disrupt the financial set-up of every State. Such is unthinkable, and I hope that this issue will be settled now, forever, by quieting title to the submerged lands in the various States.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, as was so well stated by the gentleman from Georgia when he was speaking on the rule, this matter has been brought up by reason of the fact that a suit has been instituted against some citizens of the State of California to quiet title in submerged lands in the Government and this raises directly the question of the title in our submerged lands, and in navigable streams. This legislation has been presented in order to clarify that situation.

To my mind, this is very important legislation because there are not alone a few millions of dollars involved in improvements which have been made in navigable streams and along our coast lines, but this expenditure extends into the billions of dollars.

During the hearings which were held on this measure, and those hearings were rather extensive, a very large number of city attorneys and attorneys general from various States appeared and testified. I recall one bit of testimony introduced with reference to the State of Ohio. I was deeply interested in this because they have 184 miles of shore line along the south shore of Lake Erie, to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RODGERS] referred to just a few moments ago.

The Honorable Hugh S. Jenkins, attorney general of the State of Ohio, testified:

> Investigation discloses that improvements on this submerged land within the boundaries of the State of Ohio are valued at approximately $500,000,000.

This is a huge sum of money. We find that same condition obtaining throughout the Nation.

That is just one instance, and that relates only to the improvements along the south shore line of Lake Erie. Throughout the length and breadth of the Nation these extensive improvements have been made by municipalities, by States, and by individuals who have acquired title to land from the States, and they are entitled to some protection at the hands of this Congress in the face of this litigation which has been instituted to the contrary.

I think that perhaps it might be well to refer to some of the authorities upon this particular question, and I call the attention of the House to an extract from the case of New Mexico against Colorado, a case which was decided in the year 1924, reported in 267 United States Reports, in which the Court said:

> The right of a State, upon its admission into the Union, to rely upon its established boundary line cannot be impaired by subsequent action on the part of the United States.

Then I desire to call to the attention of the Members extracts from the case of Martin against Waddell, which was decided in 1842, in which it is stated:

> For when the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters, and the soils under them, for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the general Government. (Namely, the rights of regulation incident to the regulation of commerce and navigation.)

Another case to which I desire to call the attention of the Members of the House is that of *Knight* v. *U. S. Land Ass'n*, decided in One Hundred and Forty-two United States Reports 161, 183, in which the Court said:

> It is the settled rule of law * * * that absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over the soils under the tidewaters in the original States were reserved to the several States and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty and jurisdiction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, under the authority of this decision there can be no question about the rights of the citizens and the rights of the States with regard to these submerged lands under the tidal waters and under navigable streams.

There is another case to which I would like to call the attention of the Members, that of the *Illinois Central Railroad* v. *Ilinois* (146 U. S. 387), in which the Court says:

> It is the settled law of this country that the ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by tidewaters, within the limits of the several States, belong to the respective States within which they are found.

It is my hope that the House will pass this legislation unanimously and forever settle this question regarding the title to the submerged lands.

The question which was raised by my distinguished friend the gentleman from Alabama with respect to war powers has no application here, because that is a right inherent in the Government under the Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is a source of gratification for me to support House Joint Resolution 225, to quiet the titles of the respective States, especially New York State, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the States. This resolution also will prevent the clouding of these titles in the future. This resolution, in effect, confirms opinions of the law as it applies to New York State from the very inception of the State. There has never been a minute since the creation by the people of the State of New York as a sovereignty that the State has not claimed and exercised ownership, full dominion, and absolute jurisdiction over land under the ocean seaward a distance of 3 miles, and over lands under all tidal and navigable waters within its boundaries. The title to lands under Lake Erie is vested in the

State of New York. The people of New York State proclaimed their original and absolute ownership in all such land by enacting chapter 25 of the laws of 1779 of New York. Section 14 of that act reads as follows:

> That the absolute property of all messuages, lands, tenements, and hereditaments * * * and all right and title to the same, which next and immediately before the 9th day of July 1776, did rest in, or belong, or was due to the Crown of Great Britain be, and the same and each and every of them hereby are declared to be, and ever since the said 9th day of July 1776, to have been and forever after shall be vested in the people of this State, in whom the sovereignty and seigniory thereof, are and were united and vested, on and from the said 9th day of July 1776.

I am glad to see the title to the land along our Great Lakes cleared of the cloud which recent Federal bureaucrats unfounded claims have befogged the titles to lands under water, clearly within the jurisdiction of the States.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am the author of House Joint Resolution 130, which was introduced in the House of Representatives on March 19, 1945. This resolution, which is similar to the one now under consideration, would quiet title of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States, and prevent further clouding of such titles.

I introduced this resolution because my attention had been directed to the fact that litigation was imminent in the Federal courts which would have the object of establishing the titles to all these tidelands and lands beneath navigable waters in the Federal Government. If such a determination were made by the courts vast investments of capital by the State of California, the city and county of San Francisco, and private interests in my district in San Francisco might automatically be turned over to the Federal Government.

Similar situations would occur in other cities and counties of California and in every State in the Union which has tidelands and submerged lands under navigable waters within its boundaries.

It is my understanding that the courts have already held that tidelands are determined by the original mean high water line, regardless of the fact that large areas of such lands may have been reclaimed by public or private interests and improved at great cost for governmental, industrial, commercial, or residential purposes. In my own city of San Francisco, for instance, there are very large areas of reclaimed tidelands which have been improved by enormous investments of State, municipal, and private capital.

By way of illustration, all of the property along Market Street from the Ferry Building to First Street, and extending southerly from Market Street along Fremont Street to Howard Street, and along Beale, Main, Spear, and Steuart Streets to points beyond Folsom Street are in the category of reclaimed lands. North of Market, from a point opposite the intersection of Second Street, the original mean high-water line extends in a northwesterly direction to a point on Jackson Street midway between Montgomery and Kearny, and thence moves in an irregular direction eastward to Battery near Broadway. All of the very valuable and highly improved business and industrial property between the line above described and the present bay front would be subject to seizure by the Federal Government if title were vested in it. The Ferry Building, the Southern Pacific Building, the Matson Navigation Building, and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. building are notable examples of property that would fall into this category. Part of the Southern Pacific freight yards between Third and Fourth Streets, south of Townsend, would be involved, and all of the improved industrial property extending on both sides of Channel Street, from one-half block south of Bryant to the Central Basin, would also be included. All of the reclaimed lands on both sides of Islais Creek, including Butchertown and India Basin, out to Hunters Point, would be affected, as well as all of the South Basin area.

On the north bay shore the original main high-water line touches Jones and Francisco Streets and the tideland area in that section would include all of the Aquatic Park, Fishermen's Wharf, and all of the residential section in the marina lying north of Francisco and Scott Streets and embraced in an irregular triangle between the Fort Mason docks and the Presidio Wall. All of the piers on the San Francisco Bay front which have been constructed by the State of California with a tremendous expenditure of the taxpayers' money could be claimed by the Federal Government.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the title to submerged oil lands in other sections of the country, which is the motivating interest behind the litigation to which I referred at the outset, is by no means the most important consideration involved in this alarming question. Indeed, I believe that the value of the improved tidelands in many cities throughout the Nation is far greater than that of presently submerged lands which are believed to be capable of producing oil.

I am gratified to observe that 46 of the 48 States of this Union have officially endorsed the pending bills to establish the titles to these tidelands and submerged lands in the several States of the Union. I earnestly hope that the House will promptly pass this resolution and remove all question as to the permanent title of the States in these lands.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the State administration in West Virginia, through our distinguished attorney general, Hon. Ira Partlow, has communicated with the Members of our congressional delegation. There has been an indication of strong support for this legislation and it is my belief that the House will almost unanimously approve the bill. The purposes of the measure are worth while and I am glad to vote for House Joint Resolution 225.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCKENZIE].

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General of the State of Louisiana, Hon. Fred S. LeBlanc, and the registrar of the land office of the State of Louisiana, the Hon. Lucille May Grace, have filed briefs and have appeared at the hearings in Washington endorsing the objects of this resolution. I want to say I am in unanimous accord with the position they have taken. I certainly hope that this bill is passed unanimously and the question of States' rights settled beyond all doubt.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent in this Congress, has within it the great municipality of Long Beach with its estimate of well over 300,000 people. No congressional district in this Nation has contributed more in human endeavor and resources to the winning of this war, than the Eighteenth District of my native State.

First, I wish to emphasize that this is not merely an oil matter as has been indicated. The great public interest of the city of Long Beach caused the able city attorney to fly here yesterday to be present during this debate, which is so important not to my city of Long Beach, but to the State of California and to every State in the Union. There are admittedly many resources other than oil, that are vitally concerned and involved in this proposed legislation. The fact that 46 out of 48 attorneys general of the 48 States constituting the United States, have joined in the law brief which was filed before the distinguished Judiciary Committee of this great House, is ample proof of the fact of the Nation-wide interest and importance of this bill. Therefore, I think I am free to say that it is a fact that this legislation before us today has a wider support from more States in the Union, than there has been for any other legislation since the commencement of the Seventy-ninth Congress that I now think of. This, gentlemen, is not because all these 46 States have oil deposits off their shores, or within their boundaries, because we know they have not. It is because of other fundamental rights and other valuable assets which they have within their boundaries or within their 3-mile coastal boundary that this great number of States is so vitally concerned. It is also because, fundamentally, these States recognize that the great body of the law, as well as the actual practice and usages for over a hundred years, have vested title, use, and possession of these lands and deposits and properties in the States themselves, and not in the Federal Government.

Furthermore, I exhibit to you the map prepared for the American Association of Port Authorities of the United States entitled "Maps Relating to Reclaimed Tide and Submerged Lands," and I hold it here before you, exhibiting the map in this book of maps entitled "Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor" which is the

seventh map in the book. I call your attention to the portion thereof in red, both in the Los Angeles-San Pedro area of the map and in the Long Beach area thereof, and you will note that much of Terminal Island and much of the inland harbor built and constructed by municipal funds of Long Beach and also the outer harbor improvements in the Long Beach end of the map are in red, indicating tidelands or refilled lands.

This book of maps graphically portrays that many of the great harbors of our Nation are vitally concerned in this proposed legislation because their harbor improvements, costing millions and millions and millions of dollars, are on tidelands or refilled in their respective States.

This book of maps is prepared by the American Association of Port Authorities because their harbor lands and harbor installations are involved; not bethey have oil income from their tidelands. For, gentlemen, most of the other great harbors of the Nation do not have oil income from tidelands within their harbor boundaries—none at all; but my home city of Long Beach for years has received a great oil royalty income from the orderly leasing of its tidelands. The city of Long Beach was granted these tidelands by the State of California in good faith, and the State of California made that grant to the city of Long Beach for harbor, road, and recreation and park uses in good faith.

One of the gentlemen mentioned that the suit that was filed in Santa Barbara County by the Department of Justice, was filed before this legislation was proposed. But, the gentleman is in error because the fact is, that the suit was not filed in California by the Department of Justice, claiming fee title to the land therein involved, until May 29, 1945, which date is more than 2 months after the resolutions were first filed in this Congress.

Every State in the Nation has navigable waters, either coastal or inland waters, and the States are owners of these respective lands. Hence the threat of Attorney General Biddle's suit now on file in California, is an open threat to the ownership of every State in the Union. And while it is true that California has 1,000 miles of coast line, and all of which is affected, there is only about 15 miles of this coastline where oil wells presently exist. Oil is in reality a minor factor in this whole legislation, but I admit it is one of the larger factors in this legislation insofar as my congressional district in my native State is concerned. The total picture, gentlemen, involves in actual dollars worth in properties other than oil, far more valuable assets than is the oil income or assets in California. For instance, California has six major harbors in which the public has already expended over $200,000,000; they have relied on the settled rule of State ownership to make this great investment. The estimated revenues from these harbors to the State and to the cities of California exceeds $10,000,000 annually, entirely apart and separately from oil. It is important to realize that in practically every harbor there is necessarily large areas of filled tidelands, but filling thereof does not affect the tideland thereof nor the nature thereof—they still remain and continue tidelands in the legal sense after they are filled and reclaimed.

Also, the States in reliance upon their good-faith titles, have filled large areas and sold or leased them to private companies or to private citizens. Thus, as the gentlemen from San Francisco and from Oakland, Calif., have already stated, in their cities most of the improvement on their harbor frontage has been erected at the cost of great many millions of dollars on tidelands which have been sold to private citizens of the State who have relied in good faith on making their investments of many millions of dollars on these improved tidelands, on the title derived from the State or the municipality. In California, gentlemen, the municipalities derived their title to their tidelands for harbor, park, road, and other purposes from the State. The State of California admittedly reserved unto itself these tidelands, when it was admitted to the Union of States. But the claim of Attorney General Biddle in the suit recently filed, and the asserted claim by Secretary Ickes a few months ago made to me personally and to others, have resulted in clouding the title to all this publicly or privately owned and highly improved property. Therefore, unless this important question is promptly settled, postwar financing by municipalities, by people, by States, is definitely retarded.

There are eight United States Supreme Court decisions pertaining to California tidelands specifically holding that these tidelands vested automatically in the State by virtue of the State sovereignty thereof. These cases are:

Mumford v. *Wardwell* ((1867), 6 Wall. (73 U. S.) 423, 435, 436); California, navigable waters and soil under same.

Weber v. *Board of Harbor Commissioners* ((1873), 18 Wall. (85 U. S.) 57, 65, 66); California, shore of the sea, and of the arms of the sea.

San Francisco v. *LeRoy* ((1891), 138 U. S. 656, 670–672); California, tidelands, San Fransico Bay.

Knight v. *U. S. Land Association* ((1891), 142 U. S. 161, 183, 201); California, San Francisco Bay.

United States v. *Mission Rock Co.* ((1903), 189 U. S. 391, 404); California, submerged as well as tidelands, San Francisco Bay.

Borax Consolidated v. *City of Los Angeles* ((1935), 296 U. S. 10, 15, 16); California, tidelands, San Pedro Bay.

United States v. *O'Donnell* ((1938), 303 U. S. 501, 519); California, San Francisco Bay.

Donnelly v. *United States* ((1913), 228 U. S. 243); California, Klamath River.

These cases are set out in the brief of the attorneys general in support of the joint resolutions which were heard by the Judiciary Committee of this Congress on pages 13, 14, and 15 thereof, and this great committee reported favorably this resolution, House Joint Resolution 225.

Not only did the United States Government neither make nor allege any claim to these tidelands for over a hundred years, but the Secretary of the Interior on December 22, 1933, wrote a letter which is set forth on pages 17 and 18 of the brief of the attorneys general heretofore referred to, and part of which letter I quote as follows:

As to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over lands bordering on tidewater, the Supreme Court of the United States has held in the case of *Hardin* v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371), as follows:

"With regard to grants of the Government for lands bordering on tidewater, it has been distinctly settled that they only extend to high-water mark, and that the title to the shore and lands under water in front of lands so granted inures to the State within which they are situated, if a State has been organized and established there. Such title to the shore and lands under water is regarded as incidental to the sovereignty of the State—a portion of the royalties belonging thereto and held in trust for the public purposes of navigation and fishery—and cannot be retained or granted out to individuals by the United States."

The foregoing is a statement of the settled law, and therefore no rights can be granted to you either under the Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), or under any other public-land law to the bed of the Pacific Ocean either within or without the 3-mile limit. Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State. * * *

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Why, then, does the Secretary of the Interior now claim that there is legal ownership or right in these tidelands? Tidelands are not classified legally as public lands, for public lands are uplands subject to appropriation, homestead, or other rights under United States land laws. No; the tidelands within the 3-mile limit for 100 years have been considered and admittedly the sovereign lands of the respective States. Several decisions of the United States Supreme Court have so held—see *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. —); *Mann* v. *Tacoma* (153 U. S. 273); and *Hardin* v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371). Therefore, the rule that tidelands and lands beneath navigable waters are sovereign lands applies with equal force to every State in the Union. Likewise, the ownership of the beds of navigable waters is a necessary incident of State sovereignty over its tidelands. I do not mean by this to say that the United States has no constitutional rights within the 3-mile limit, because it does by virtue of constitutional right and power to regulate commerce within this limit; but this right gives the United States no title to the fee ownership of this land beneath the water within the 3-mile limit. And because the United States has no right to ownership to the lands beneath the surface of the waters within the 3-mile limit, the United States has no right to the oil or other mineral deposits within this 3-mile limit of the States or under the navigable waters within the States.

Also, the Supreme Court of the United States has many times said that the ownership of the tidelands within this limit of all States are on an equal footing and basis, and these cases so deciding by the Supreme Court are found on

pages 13 and 14 of the brief of the Attorneys General that I have heretofore referred to.

If it be argued that the United States Constitution reserves unto the Federal Government the right to wage war and to declare war, to provide and maintain a navy, and to raise and support armies, that fact is well known and cannot be denied by the very text of the Constitution of the United States itself. But this constitutional and exclusive right and responsibility, I believe, does not allow the Federal Government to appropriate minerals or other deposits under the surface of the soil, beneath the surface of the tide waters of our States, unless the Federal Government compensates in a reasonable price the States or other owners of these mineral deposits or other deposits or other properties involved within the harbor areas or 3-mile coastal areas or navigable waters within our States. Furthermore, whatever constitutional right the Federal Government was expressly entitled to under the text of the Constitution originally, whatever constitutional right the Federal Government has been given by amendment thereof, the Federal Government still has that right. And, gentlemen, it cannot be taken away, modified, enlarged, or lessened by any action of this Congress. The only process by which that constitutional right can be changed is by the processes provided in the Constitution itself for the changing thereof.

The city of Long Beach voted $11,000,000 of municipal bonds for the initial development of the port of Long Beach. In addition to this, approximately $15,000,000 in public funds of the city have been expended in development of the city's harbor and the construction of public municipal port facilities. The development of the harbor is being carried on by the harbor department of the city in accordance with a master plan which calls for the ultimate expenditure for harbor improvements in the amount of approximately $52,000,000.

The municipal wharves, docks, and other harbor facilities are served by all three of the transcontinental railroad systems—that is—the Union Pacific, Southern Pacific, and Santa Fe system.

In addition to the aforesaid harbor facilities which are constructed, and which are to be constructed, upon city-owned reclaimed tide and submerged lands, the city owns approximately 6 miles of the finest public recreational beach and playground area situated along the entire ocean front of the city. Millions of dollars of public funds have been expended, and will be expended, in the development pursuant to the shore line master plan of the city in carrying out the ultimate development of these reclaimed tide and submerged lands for public park and recreational use. At present, under a contract with the Standard Dredging Co., a beach area several hundred yards wide is being reclaimed from the city's tide and submerged lands in furtherance of the aforesaid park and beach development.

The city has heretofore acquired over 70 percent of the upland adjacent parcels of land along its public beaches, and proposes in furtherance of the shore line master plan of development to acquire a balance of the upland parcels adjacent to its public beaches in order that the city will completely control and carry out the further development of its public beaches.

The development of the city's harbor and shore line public recreational and park facilities have been under way for a number of years, and at this date has progressed to a stage where the ultimate plan of development is foreseeable in the very near future. Furthermore, the city has millions of dollars in reserve for this development as well as adequate income and revenues available or to be available to insure the completion of its master plan of both its harbor and public beach areas.

I respectfully call your attention to my remarks under date of Friday, February 16, 1945, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, entitled "Federal Government To Claim Tide Lands and Submerged Lands." I made these remarks after I had twice conferred on this important subject with Secretary of the Interior Ickes, and I admit that it appears to be the fact that I was the first Representative to discover and also state the seriousness to this Congress, of the alleged claim by the distinguished Secretary.

A distinguished Member of this House, a few minutes ago, asked me a question as to whether or not this bill we are now debating was an oil-company bill. I stated to him then, and I again state now, that the initiatory and all work I did as an author of one of the resolutions, and have also done since March 16, 1945, had no connection, as far as I am concerned, directly or indirectly in any way with any oil company interest or effort. That my home city is vitally concerned with matters other than just oil income involved is evidenced by fact of the great public interest in Long Beach and California demonstrated by the fact that our able city attorney of Long Beach flew to Washington yesterday to be personally present in the gallery at this debate and decision. No, the public has interests in this bill of greater value in actual dollars than just oil-valued dollars.

Another Member of this House, not a lawyer, asked me as a lawyer why we are asking the Federal Government to quitclaim, if it was true that the States had all the claim to ownership and the Federal Government had no legal claim. Perhaps it is now appropriate for me to say to this House, as I did to him, that a quitclaim or disclaim does not admit any right or claim or ownership in the person or governmental unit from whom a quitclaim is being asked. But, a quitclaim is a legal fiction or phrase which is commonly used in such instances and cases, for the purpose of disclaiming or renouncing or releasing over a person's signature any possibility of any claim; even though it is admitted that there is no valid claim either by the person asking the quitclaim or the person executing it. So may I make it clear, that in asking that this resolution be today unanimously passed or because we ask this legislation, we do not admit that the Federal Government has any valid claim. We will merely once and for all settle an untimely and unfortunate controversy in favor of the established law of the land.

In closing, I sincerely urge that this bill be voted unanimously and that its progress be energized to the United States Senate; that it be enacted into law at the earliest possible date. This, gentlemen, will for once and all settle the controversy. This, gentlemen, will give security where there is now insecurity to postwar expenditures. This, gentlemen, will be a just and sound step in legislative policy and objectives.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the Committee on the Judiciary for bringing this bill up for consideration. It is a matter that has been in controversy since 1937. House Joint Resolution 225 undoubtedly will clarify the atmosphere and protect all of the States that have been previously involved and especially the great State of California.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is a subject that has been before the House Committee on the Judiciary for some years, and I believe it has been very carefully considered.

The bill presents a very narrow legal question: Who owns title to the land beginning with the high-water mark and running out to the 3-mile limit? And who owns title to the land under the various navigable rivers throughout the country? In my opinion, the title belongs to the States for two reasons: First, I believe by well-established principles of law the title is already settled in the States. In the second place, even if that were not true, I believe the Federal Government and the State governments have engaged in such a course of conduct for over 150 years as to make that position binding upon the courts that the title is in the States.

Under international law, of course, it was held that no one owned the ocean. As modern nations grew and modern means of national defense grew with them, the rule was adopted that for 3 miles off shore title to the ocean bed belonged to the King, the sovereign. So, at the time of the Thirteen Colonies the King owned the land in question so far as the bed of the Atlantic Ocean was concerned. After the winning of the Revolutionary War, all the title the King had in those lands devolved upon the Thirteen Colonies. The Thirteen Colonies then met and created a new government under the Constitution. They gave up to the new government certain things; they gave up, for example, to the Federal Government the right to control navigation; and if it should ever be necessary in the control of navigation to interfere with these oil wells, the Federal Government certainly would have that right. Everything not given up remains with the respective States. So the right, title, and interest belong to the States.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I take it the gentleman believes, then, that the jurisdiction of the States is coextensive with the jurisdiction of the United States?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. No; not necessarily.

Mr. HINSHAW. In area. I am speaking, for instance, of a state that borders on a lake or river. In general, wherever the Federal Government sets its boundary as far as the boundary is concerned that boundary exists likewise for the State.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. As I understand it, the Federal Government does not own any title to any of the tide lands in question, or title to the beds of navigable rivers; it belongs entirely to the States, but the Federal Government has the right to control navigation on the waters in question.

Mr. HINSHAW. I get that point. But the point I was thinking of was the geographical boundary. For example, in the gentleman's own State of Iowa, the geographical boundary of the State of Iowa is some point in the Mississippi River.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. So far as the land under the river is concerned, all of the jurisdiction of the State extends to that boundary limit?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Yes. That is fixed in our Constitution. It was fixed in the Constitution when we came into the Union.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. The Federal Government only has title to such land as has been granted or ceded to the Federal Government by the States through lawful processes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. Who owns the land consisting of an island within a navigable stream, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. When you get into the question of who owns the beds of the various rivers of the country you need to consult the law of the particular State. In Iowa I believe the beds of navigable waters are up to the point where the river has been meandered, the property of the State. Beyond that title is in the owner of the land. What I am getting at is this: Whatever rights there may be as between the owner of the land and the States depends upon the law of the States.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I have read over the brief and I cannot see where very much time has been devoted to the question of title to the lands under the water of the Great Lakes. Did you go into that?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Yes. That was considered in the hearings and the same rule applies.

Mr. REED of New York. It applies from the low or high watermark?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The high watermark.

Mr. REED of New York. The high watermark. That is something I would like to see in the record and I would like to have seen more of it in these briefs. If I may interrupt a little bit further, a very interesting question arises. So far as the Great Lakes are concerned there is the greatest degree of erosion along the shores of Lake Erie of any place in the country, or any other lake in the whole group. It is eating in all the time. It is eating away the highway, it is eating away the land on which houses are located, great houses that have been built. It has eaten into that rock, it might be called a sedementary rock, almost a slate rock. It is just chewing that off constantly. The result is that the surveys of farm lands which start with the lake are constantly being moved back. I remember one place on our farm where there were eight rows of apple trees. They are all gone now. It is right up to the highway. It is a big problem and that is why I think it should have been gone into very thoroughly. I am for this bill, however.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Yes; I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, there is a second reason why I am convinced that title is in the States. Many times in the past individuals have made application to the Federal Government for permission to build a wharf, dock, or something of that character on these lands in question and the Federal Government said it had no title and has referred the applicant to the State. On the other hand, the various States have given permission and have in effect transferred title to these applicants. Where two sovereigns have acted as though a certain line were the boundary, the courts will take them at their word and enforce that. I think that would be a conclusive answer to any claim being made that the Federal Government has title.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TOLAN. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that is reinforced by condemnation proceedings instituted by the Federal Government. For instance, out on submerged lands in California they put up a $40,000,000 naval supply depot. Their complaint was predicated upon the proposition that the State of California owned that land and it was so alleged in the complaint. There are thousands of those instances on both coasts, the Great Lakes, and along the Gulf where they assert title is in the State.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is entirely correct. There are many instances where the Federal Government has taken title to this land in question either by condemnation or by transfer from a State or by transfer from a grantee of the State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, since I was one of the Members who introduced one of these resolutions, I feel bound to say a few words about it, although I think I shall probably not add very much to what has already been said. My State has a very definite interest in this matter. We have in the State of Maine, I regret to say, no submerged oil lands, nor do we make the imperial claims to submerged lands that are made by the imperial State of Texas. But we do have in the State of Maine a very heavily indented coast line. We have very large areas of land between the fauces terrae, and if the submerged lands under our bays and between the points of land are not owned by the State, it will throw into confusion a great many titles. Many of our coastwise cities have been built upon reclaimed land; lands that were formerly submerged. Many piers and recreational facilities extend out over these submerged lands, and every year the selectmen of our coastwise towns in Maine grant rights for the erection of fish piers and other structures on these submerged lands. If the title to these lands is not in the State, great confusion would arise. I think nothing could be more impressive than the hearings on these resolutions. There is a very expensive collection of authorities contained in the hearings. The authorities are substantially all one way, not only the old English cases, but the American authorities, both in the State and Federal courts. Litigation is now pending with respect to the title to submerged lands which was instituted by the former Attorney General of the United States. There is no reason to suppose that if this litigation is prosecuted to a conclusion the courts would not follow the precedents that have been laid down. But as there seems to be no necessity for subjecting litigants to the expense and uncertainties of litigation, and since the whole matter can be settled here, I think this legislation is entirely appropriate. I hope that it will pass by a unanimous vote.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. This legislation is in the nature of a proceeding that we sometimes have in courts to quiet title to land, as I understand.

Mr. HALE. Precisely.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It is a declaration of policy on the part of the Congress applicable to all States so that there shall be no question raised with reference to where these titles in submerged lands are. As the gentleman has well said, this will prevent multiplicity of suits and litigation in the determination of titles.

Mr. HALE. I think the gentleman's statement is entirely correct, and I thank him.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I find a rather unique coincidence in the rise of Ed Pauley in the Democratic Party and the removal of Mr. Biddle and the naming of Mr. Clark. I am wondering if the Republican Members have made appropriate arrangements for their share of any campaign funds that may arise out of the passage of this legislation.

Mr. HALE. I am unable to give any authoritative answer to that question. I doubt if the gentleman can.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I will be very disappointed if we do not get some.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I think it is fine for the committee to bring this resolution to the floor for passage, to settle a question that has been very irritating and agitating for a number of years. I certainly support its passage because of the effect it will have on the tide lands in my State and the county that I am here to represent, especially because the Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbor area is largely submerged land reclaimed and put into useful operation for harbor facilities.

The claim that oil is the one thing we are seeking is very definitely unfounded and unfair, but it seems to be a popular issue that the opponents of this resolution might use effectively.

I think the conclusions of the committee are the most positive evidence of the necessity of its passage. Let me read them:

> The enactment of the proposed legislation will not divest the United States of any property right to which it has any legitimate claim, or of any land in which it has any legal interest.

There is nothing lost insofar as the United States is concerned, therefore, by the passage of this joint resolution?

> The question whether the agitation over long-recognized State titles should be set at rest in the manner proposed is a question of congressional policy.

That is correct, because here is the place we should settle legal difficulties we have had, in the various coastal States, especially. Of course, this also will be beneficial to the States not only along the coast but along the great riverways and other waterways of the United States.

> This legislation is necessary to remove the cloud which has been cast upon the titles of enormously valuable lands throughout the United States and to prevent the similar clouding of these titles in the future.

We have had unending litigation in the State of California on account of this very thing not having been settled. Therefore, I urge that this resolution be unanimously passed by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That, in recognition of the title in the several States since July 4, 1776, or since their formation and admission to the Union, the United States of America hereby renounces and disclaims any right, title, interest, or claim in and to all lands beneath tidewaters and all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of each of the respective States; and in further recognition of such sovereign title in the several States since July 4, 1776, or since their formation and admission to the Union, the United States of America hereby releases, remises, and quitclaims all right, title, interest, claim, or demand of the United States of America in and to all lands beneath tidewaters, and all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of each of the respective States, unto each of such States and unto the respective grantees or successors in interest thereof, and unto the respective present lawful owners of such lands of which title has been confirmed by official action of the United States of America; excepting therefrom such lands beneath tidewaters and such lands beneath navigable waters as have been lawfully acquired by the United States of America by a clear and complete title from any State, its grantees, or successors in interest, by cession, grant, quitclaim, or condemnation, or from any other owner or owners thereof by conveyance or by condemnation, providing such owner or owners had lawfully acquired the right, title, or interest of any such State; and excepting therefrom such lands beneath tidewaters and such lands beneath navigable waters, if any, as are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians; retaining, however, to the United States of America its present powers of regulation and control for the purposes of commerce, navigation, and the national defense.
>
> As used in this joint resolution, the phrase "lands beneath tidewaters" shall include (1) all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and oceanward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coast line and to the boundary line of each respective State where in any case such boundary line extends oceanward beyond three geographical miles, and (2) all lands formerly beneath tidewaters, as herein defined, which have been filled or reclaimed; the phrase "lands beneath navigable waters" shall include (1) all other lands covered by waters which are navigable under the laws of the United States, and (2) all lands formerly beneath navigable waters, as herein defined, which have been filled or reclaimed.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS:
>
> In line 3, page 1, after the word "title", insert "and interest."
>
> In line 3, page 1, after the word "States", insert ", and in others as hereinafter mentioned."
>
> In line 6, page 1, after the word "claim", insert ", except as hereafter excepted and retained."
>
> Line 1, page 2, after the word "such", insert "titles and interests."
>
> Strike out of line 1, page 2, the words "sovereign title in the", and strike out all of line 2, page 2.
>
> Strike out of line 3, page 2, the words "and admission to the Union."
>
> In line 8, page 2, after the second word "States", insert "or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the law as established by the decisions of the courts of such State."
>
> In line 15, page 2, after the word "State", insert "or from any person in whom title had vested under the decisions of the courts of such State, or their respective."
>
> In line 15, page 2, strike out the following: ", its."
>
> Insert in line 22, page 2, after the word "waters", the following: ", and such interests therein, as the United States is lawfully entitled to under the law as established by the decisions of the courts of the State in which the land is situated, or."
>
> In line 22, page 2, strike out the first comma and the words "if any."

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, it was the belief of the Committee on the Judiciary when the bill was reported out that the interests of all who have property were protected. That is shown in the statement on page 1 of the committee report. May I say right here parenthetically that I am for the bill wholeheartedly? I am offering this amendment merely to effect the purposes which the committee had in mind in reporting the bill. I was deeply outraged by the knowledge that the Attorney General of the United States had seen fit to question the established law of the United States for more than 100 years with respect to these submerged lands. I am offering this amendment merely for the purpose of correcting the bill and making it certain and sure that these lands and titles thereto are protected.

The language in the committee report to which I have referred reads as follows:

> The release and quitclaim run to (1) each of the respective States; (2) the grantees or successors in interest of each State (which includes all those who have acquired title by operation of State law).

A question has been raised whether those who now hold title under the established legal rules in the States in which their property is located are, in a legal sense, successors in interest of the State. Obviously, titles so held should be protected by this legislation. The amendment, therefore, simply adds language which makes it perfectly clear that the quitclaim runs not only to the States and those who are successors in interest, in the technical sense of the word "successors" but also to the States and all those who may have become owners of lands by operation of State law, as established by the decisions of the respective State courts.

This is what was intended by the bill but it is important to the States and to their citizens and to the United States as well, that this may be made perfectly clear. The amendment which I am proposing for this purpose has been reviewed by quite a number of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and, as far as I know, not one of them has expressed opposition to the amendment.

The language, as I have said, is merely clarifying language that makes it perfectly clear that under the laws of the respective States the ownership remains in the people who now hold title.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. No doubt the gentleman's amendment is very proper and I expect to support it because I expect to support the bill, but I wish the gentleman would give me an example, if he has time, of just what his amendment does.

Mr. LEWIS. In some of the States the titles were acquired by private citizens previous to the admission of the State to the Union. For instance, in our own State of Ohio, titles to our lands were

acquired in many cases prior to the admission of Ohio as a State. So that a quitclaim to the State means nothing, because the State never was in the chain of title. That is true, I think, in perhaps every State constituting the Northwest Territory.

Mr. JENKINS. Let us take the Ohio River. For instance, we who live on the Ohio River—and the gentleman's district abuts the Ohio River for 100 miles—were always given to understand, and it is the law, that the States south of the river own the bottom of the river.

Mr. LEWIS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. To the low-water mark on the Ohio side?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes; that is right.

Mr. JENKINS. But, of course, the Government controlled the water in the river.

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Neither Kentucky nor West Virginia would have any right to put any obstacle in the river, like building a bridge, without having the authority of the Federal Government. But the title belonged to the State of Kentucky and the State of West Virginia because the ordinance of 1887 provided that the land ceded was north of the Ohio River.

Mr. LEWIS. That is true.

Mr. JENKINS. As I take it, this law will apply more to the counties on the Ohio side of the river and the lakes?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. What effect will this have on the land under the Ohio River?

Mr. LEWIS. Nothing; except that it simply confirms title where the title was before this legislation was passed. But the amendment is for the purpose of making clear that these titles remain as the courts of the various States have always held them to be. Therefore, it seems to me important that the language be amended in this bill so as to effectuate that purpose, and make it perfectly clear that where a State never was in the chain of title the ownership should, nevertheless, be confirmed as it now stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand, this whole program has been given some acceleration by reason of the fact that oil may be present off the Pacific coast.

Mr. LEWIS. Off the coast of California.

Mr. JENKINS. Suppose oil or some other commodity of value should be discovered under the Ohio River; up to now we would assume that the States of Kentucky and West Virginia would control that activity. Would the passage of this bill have any effect on that?

Mr. LEWIS. It would have absolutely no effect on that title at all, because it simply confirms that title in the States that now have it. This does not disturb any title, this merely makes it clear that the Federal Government shall not now, over a hundred years after the formation of the Union, for the first time assert title to lands it has never claimed before and that historically do not belong to the Federal Government.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well, what effect would it have then on submerged lands off the coast of California, for instance?

Mr. LEWIS. It simply confirms what has always been the law, that is, that the boundaries of the State where they are along the seashore run out to the 3-mile limit, which is the limit generally recognized under international law, and that those lands are lands of the States and not of the Federal Government.

Mr. JENKINS. Let me ask the gentleman, then, suppose the Federal Government controls the river as we agree the Federal Government controls the waters of the Ohio River, and it controls the approaches on either side; a man who owns land along the Ohio River cannot plant certain vegetation or cut the trees off if it is going to endanger navigation or cause any undue erosion.

Mr. LEWIS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Suppose it should come to pass now that the State of Kentucky or the State of West Virginia should take something from the bed of the river that would any way infringe or impose upon or endanger those bridges or abutments, would this law change that title in any way?

Mr. LEWIS. It would change none of it.

Mr. JENKINS. It does not change it at all?

Mr. LEWIS. It does not change the title at all. It simply reasserts the title in the States that the States have always had.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I want to be sure I understand this amendment. Take this illustration from my own State: Here is a man who has bought a farm from the Federal Government in Iowa bordering the upper reaches of the Cedar River.

Mr. LEWIS. Is that a navigable river?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. No; it is on the part that is not navigable. The State has recognized that the man owning that land owns the bed of the river. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment, as I understand, is to make it clear that that man's title is quieted even though Iowa was never in the chain of title. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWIS. That is right, that is it exactly; and that situation obtains in many places in this country. Under the language of the bill as it was introduced and reported out of the committee that contingency was not envisioned, and we did not discover until later that there was that "blind spot" in the bill. It is simply to take care of that blind spot and to be sure that the title of existing owners is made entirely clear by this bill that this amendment is offered.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand the amendment the gentleman has offered it is to clarify the matter and place the title in an individual if the individual acquired title before the State became one of the sovereign States of the Union.

Mr. LEWIS. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. And where the title vested in the State itself then the gentleman's amendment would not in any way interfere with the bill as originally drawn.

Mr. LEWIS. It does not affect that at all; it simply confirms existing titles as they now are and covers that blind spot in the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. In the gentleman's State does the title and the surveyors' calls in a nonnavigable stream run to the middle of the stream?

Mr. LEWIS. It does.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Do not your patents also run to the middle of the streams?

Mr. LEWIS. They do.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. In your nonnavigable streams?

Mr. LEWIS. No; I will take that back. I answered too quickly on the question; I do not know.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not think they do.

Mr. LEWIS. I cannot say as to that, whether patents from the Federal Government run to the middle of the stream or whether they run to the shore, but under the State law of Ohio the riparian owner, the one who owns the shore, owns to the middle of the stream.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, in view of the fact that a very large part of the shore line of the United States was at one time under the jurisdiction of Spain. That land begins south of the State of Georgia and runs clear around Florida to the Gulf of Mexico, and likewise the entire west coast of the United States. There were certain Spanish grants made along those shores to persons in very large acreages which were not recognized when the lands were taken over by the United States. Controversies have arisen in the courts of the various States in the United States concerning these old Spanish grants. Would the gentleman's amendment in anywise confirm any of those grants that have been disallowed?

Mr. LEWIS. Oh, no; not for a minute. It does not change the title to any land. It simply recognizes existing titles and would not recognize those old Spanish grants that the courts have refused to uphold. It simply makes it certain and plain that the laws of the

several States and the decisions of the State courts shall govern.

Mr. HINSHAW. I just wanted to make certain of that fact because, of course, there are a lot of people in the United States who are extracting money from the pockets of unsuspecting people by going around and getting them to subscribe to funds to protect some ancient Spanish grant that has long since been disapproved or that has never been recognized. I hope there is no intention either in the bill or in the amendment offered by the gentleman to give title or to pass on the legality of any of those ancient grants.

Mr. LEWIS. No; not in the slightest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I should make a statement to the members of the committee with reference to this matter. The bill as it was read to you was examined by a great many people, including, I assume, since they signed the brief, the attorneys general of 46 States. This amendment was suggested to individual members of the Committee on the Judiciary day before yesterday for the first time.

We were not able to get the Committee on the Judiciary together in order to consider these amendments offered now by the able and popular Member the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS]. Conditions obtained which made that impossible.

From a casual examination of the amendment, to be candid, I cannot appreciate its necessity, assuming its purpose is to effectuate what has just been stated by my distinguished colleague who just spoke, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Let us see where we are. This statement I think is true everywhere; that is, that nonnavigable lands are included in the land titles and in the deeds as a part of the land. Where the stream borders a farm, the title usually goes to the middle of the stream; in other words, there is no public land in nonnavigable streams. That would make this amendment apply only to navigable waters. This is the language, and I think it is important that we understand its meaning before voting on the amendment. This is the effective part of the bill:

> That, in recognition of the title in the several States since July 4, 1776, or since their formation and admission to the Union, the United States of America hereby renounces and disclaims any right, title, interest, or claim in and to all lands beneath tidewaters and all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of each of the respective States.

When that renunciation is made then the Federal Government has no title reserved to itself. Again I read:

> The United States of America hereby renounces and disclaims any right, title, interest, or claim in and to all lands beneath tidewaters and all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of each of the respective States.

That same thing is in effect repeated on page 2:

> The United States of America hereby releases, remises, and quitclaims all right, title, interest, claim, or demand of the United States of America in and to all lands beneath tidewaters, and all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of each of the respective States, unto each of such States and unto the respective grantees or successors in interest thereof.

I think the Committee on the Judiciary should have an opportunity thoroughly to examine the proposed amendment. Why not present the matter to the Senate, and if there is a sound basis for it, there would not be any difficulty at all in having it put in the bill in the Senate? The House would agree if the amendment is sound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. There would not be any difficulty in having the House agree to it if the Senate puts it in.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman state to the House whether he sees in any respect whatsoever that this amendment would weaken the bill?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I have not examined the language sufficiently to express an opinion about it. I cannot see any need for this language in the bill, but there might be. Upon examination I might be convinced of the need and the Committee on the Judiciary might be convinced of the need, but there are too many words contained in this amendment to be offered to this important bill that has so long been considered, and only offered on 1 or 2 days' notice. I am trying to protect the Committee on the Judiciary in its absence properly to consider items of legislation with regard to which it has responsibility.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Is it not true that amendments offered on the floor, and not given careful committee consideration, from the gentleman's long experience, sometimes have a different effect than intended at the time the amendment was offered?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not think it is good legislation. That is what I think about it. I regret to have to make this statement in view of the study that the distinguished gentleman who offered the amendment has made of the matter. I do not think it is good legislation. I do not think this bill ought to be amended as proposed. If the amendment is needed, the Senate would certainly put it in and the House would certainly agree to it. If this were the only opportunity to consider this proposed amendment, I would hesitate to ask for this consideration, in effect, be postponed here. If the Senate agrees, the House would then have a chance through its committee to give the usual consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise both in opposition to and in favor of the resolution. I am strongly in favor of this legislation at this time, but I cannot say that I favor the principle involved in legislation of this kind. However, the conditions of the times have brought about a circumstance which I think makes it necessary to pass this legislation, and I support it.

I have listened attentively to the amendment offered by our colleague from Ohio. To be frank with you, I cannot see from my limited consideration of it that it adds to or takes away anything from the joint resolution with this possible exception, that in the passage of Federal laws or even local or State laws it is always good policy to leave out useless words. Sometimes verbiage not intended in the law later gets us into deep water. As the Chairman has so appropriately said, verbiage in amendments should have more consideration than we are able to give it at this time.

I listened attentively to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio, and I believe the fundamental principle of law, taken with the resolution as prepared, cures every anticipated defect that might arise in this State without the use of the amendment. I join with the Chairman in hoping the gentleman will withdraw his amendment. If he decides to offer it in the Senate when this resolution goes there, there will then be ample time and opportunity to consider it and discuss it from all angles.

The specific cases presented by the gentleman from Ohio and by his colleague from Ohio questioning him convince me that the fundamental principle of law everywhere, even in the State of Ohio, together with the passage of this resolution as presented to us, will protect titles of long standing to the lands they describe.

I say in closing, as I did in the beginning, I do not think the language in the amendment either adds to or takes away from the resolution, but it might do it. It is always dangerous to put in a lot of useless words unless they cover a visible defect in the bill. I believe it would be better to eliminate the amendment at this time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss certain provisions of this bill with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, because I think it is very important in view of his own remarks. As I read the language in the various places on page 2 of the bill, it refers almost exclusively to those who are successors in interest to a State or the interest of the State. Of course, it is quite true that in the State of Texas, from which the distinguished gentleman comes, as well as in other States; and in practically all of the States, except perhaps the Original Thirteen Colonies, there were prior own-

ers and prior occupants of the property whose titles have been recognized by the States when formed. I do not see anything in the bill at the present time that would confirm those titles, because, as the gentleman from Ohio has said, the States never entered into the chain of title and consequently had no right, title, or interest in the land at the time the States became a part of the United States. Will the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee in the Judiciary [Mr. SUMNERS], explain to the Committee why it was that lands in which the States had no interest or position in the chain of title were left out of the bill?

On page 2 of the bill there are several places in which the confirmation of title is through a State. In other words, if the State made a grant to some individual, then, of course, the title would be approved. But in each case, as I read the language, there is no mention whatever of the titles which existed prior to the time the State was formed and became a part of the Union. In the gentleman's own State, for example, the State of Texas, there are a great many waters, both tidewaters and navigable waters, in which the right, title, and interest was held by some individual prior to the time that the State of Texas became a part of the United States.

On page 2 of the bill, line 17, the language, for example, reads as follows:

> Or from any other owner or owners thereof by conveyance or by condemnation providing such owner or owners have lawfully acquired the right, title, or interest of any such State.

Of course, they might have had a right, title, or interest prior to the time a State became a State.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I say, so far as my own State is concerned, to which I believe the gentleman is making reference, that we acquired title in my own State by conquest. We won it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I merely mentioned the gentleman's State as one of those States which came into the United States after 1776.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. We came into the Union as an independent nation, as the gentleman recalls.

With regard to the Thirteen Original Colonies, they acquired these titles which are now being considered from the Crown when they acquired their independence. These lands belonged to the Crown and when they acquired their independence they acquired title through the Crown.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would say that would be acquiring title to the lands by conquest from the Crown just as well as in the case of the State of Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. With reference to the States which were carved out of the Territories, they have been held to have come into the United States with title to the land, which includes title to those submerged lands and navigable rivers which the Thirteen Original Colonies had. Therefore, they all stand on the same footing.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct, but in those cases in which the land was owned and occupied prior to the time that the States became a part of the Union, those titles may have been granted, for instance, by the Colony of Connecticut when it owned what was called "The Western Reserve"; or it might have been owned by the State of Virginia which at one time claimed everything as far as the horizon—and, of course, that meant the west coast, and so forth. What I am trying to get at is that no one knows exactly where those titles may rest.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think we do know where they rest.

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. I think the question the gentleman has in mind is settled by lines 10, 11, and 12 on page 2, where the title to lands is confirmed in respect to the present lawful owners of such lands of which title has been confirmed by official action of the United States of America. That in turn would be governed by the organic act which annexed the State of California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. What do you mean in the bill by the words "by official action of the United States of America"? Do you mean by patent granted by the Secretary of the Interior, or by an act of the United States pursuant to a statute, or something else?

Mr. HANCOCK. Very likely by the act which admitted California to the Union; but you certainly cannot claim title to lands that are not lawful either by act of the United States or the individual States. They are both taken care of.

Mr. HINSHAW. Suppose the Secretary of the Interior granted a patent to some individual on land which is now claimed by the State. Under this bill would that legalize the patent?

Mr. HANCOCK. It would legalize patents under the Homestead Act; but that is an entirely different proposition. Those lands belong to the Federal Government. We are talking about submerged lands.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly what I am talking about. The right may have been granted to someone to dig a gold mine under navigable waters, for example.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think if the gentleman will look into the organization of statehood, and the annexation of the States in the Union, you will find that in each and every instance those titles are taken care of. In the organization of the Republic of Texas those titles were validated. Then again, when they organized into statehood, again by authority of the State, those titles were all validated. I think if the gentleman will look into the situation in California he will find the same conditions existing, that California validated all such. It would have to, even by implication if not by express action.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman very much. I shall vote for the Lewis amendment and for the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary a question or two along the line discussed by my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. California came into the United States by virtue of a treaty with Mexico called the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. In that treaty the rights of owners of property, as they were held under the Mexican law, were confirmed.

For instance, the city of Stockton, where I live, was a part of a 48,000-acre grant from Mexico to a man by the name of Weber. The title to land under the navigable streams was held by the private owners adjacent to the navigable stream under the Mexican law of that time. The land under the navigable streams outside of those grants, on the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River, is held in fee by the State of California. My question is, Will this law in any way affect the titles of private owners at that time that were confirmed by the treaty between the United States and Mexico that made California a part of the United States?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I may say to the gentleman that very good lawyers from California have examined this bill very carefully and they do not seem to have any apprehension about a disturbed condition obtaining there after this bill is passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, I did not think this bill would disturb those titles, but I have not examined the question for a long time. However, where I live, we have recognized, within the past year, the title of private owners under navigable streams of our rivers, because their titles came under the provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo from a Mexican landowner in the beginning.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I might ask the gentleman this question: The Spanish land grants in California have been respected in your whole history, have they not?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This would not disturb it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Very well.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. The amendment I have just offered I believe will answer the gentleman's question and clear up any possibility of doubt in the mind of anyone, that the title is confirmed now by this act of the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There was not any doubt in my mind, but we were talking about it and I wanted the assurance of the chairman of this committee that these titles which we have respected for almost a century would continue to be respected. I am willing

to take the chairman's word for it that they will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what we are undertaking to do here is to quiet forever the title of every State to submerged lands within its boundaries and the title of every city or every subdivision of a State and of every corporation, firm or individual who has acquired title to these submerged lands within the respective States.

The language in this amendment might not be necessary, but it certainly does not impair the title of any State or any subdivision of a State or of any individual in a State. In other words, it just undertakes to make doubly sure what we are undertaking to do here.

It is said that on one occasion a workman came to Abraham Lincoln and told him that Mrs. Lincoln had ordered him to cut down the only shade tree in the yard of his home in Springfield, Ill. Mr. Lincoln asked:

"Did Mrs. Lincoln tell you to cut down that tree?"

"Yes," the fellow said, "she did."

"Well," Lincoln said, "for God's sake! Go back and not only cut the tree down, but dig up all the roots."

Let us just dig up all the roots of a possible controversy and, as suggested here, if this amendment is necessary let us adopt it. I never like to pass the buck. When you start to do a job, do the job. Let us just dig up all the roots and fix it so the Federal Government, through some bureaucrat in Washington, cannot go snooping around in some of the States harassing the States, the cities, the counties, the individuals there who are going along in the possession and enjoyment and ownership of submerged lands that once belonged to the State.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The Lewis amendment, as I understand, does not do anything but strengthen the bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. It just strengthens the purposes of this bill. When you undertake to get rid of possible litigation cut it out by the roots so that the owners of these lands may have peace from now on. Let us so write this bill as to make it, as they say down in my country, "mule-high, bull-strong, and pig-tight."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas) there were—ayes, 45, noes, 36.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 3, line 2, after the word "defense", change the period to a comma and insert the following: "Which powers (as well as the right to conserve and appropriate for any constitutional purpose any mineral deposit, including petroleum, in any submerged land within the Territorial waters of the United States of America) are hereby claimed, asserted, and recognized as paramount powers of sovereignty of the United States of America for such purposes."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in the debate on the rule, I wish everyone would have at his fingertips the latest case on this subject decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, namely, *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corp.* (299 U. S., p. 304), from which I quoted in my remarks.

As I stated before, 156,000 barrels of oil a day have been abstracted from California petroleum deposits in the floor of the Pacific Ocean, or, at least, they were until Japan got all she needed to make war, then did so.

We should protect this Nation's oil supply. No other nation was as good a right to that. No question of title is involved. But the right of the Nation is dormant until asserted and Congress is the agent that can do it and should do it. That is the whole purpose of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not there is a single person in this Congress who votes with me on this makes little or no difference, but you cannot read Gilman against Philadelphia, nor the other cases cited in my brief, and come to any other conclusion than that which is asserted in Pollard against Hagen, which is the supreme law of the land with regard to this matter, and although the title in the submerged lands that we are talking about in this bill belongs to the State, it is subordinate to the paramount right, not title, of the United States for the four constitutional powers—including the power to build and maintain armies and navies—to utilize so much of the contents of those lands as may be necessary in the execution of those constitutional powers.

Vote as you please. You undoubtedly have the votes, but you have no right to shut your eyes, as I see it, to this plain duty which the Congress ought to perform.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. If I understand, a person who has title to land, or the State if it has title to land, owns all of the minerals under it as well as a full and complete complement of title; is that not correct?

Mr. HOBBS. Under the old doctrine of ownership of realty extending from hell to heaven you may so argue if you overlook or deny the well-recognized exception which I pointed out that such ownership of submerged lands by a State is absolutely subject to the paramount right of the Nation to exercise its constitutional powers. That has been held not once but 40 times by the Supreme Court of the United States, and that is the law.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman will admit that if the title to the oil or the other deposits might be included under his amendment, you cannot, by this sort of an amendment, deprive the State of its title in those minerals without compensation or by the enactment of the amendment which the gentleman proposes.

Mr. HOBBS. I do not agree with the gentleman, as much as I esteem his ability.

Mr. GEARHART. How about the constitutional provision providing for the taking of property by eminent domain requiring compensation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. I am going to let the Supreme Court answer that. I am reading from the case of Pollard's Lessee against Hagan:

> This right of eminent domain over the shores and the soils under the navigable waters, for all municipal purposes, belongs exclusively to the States within their respective territorial jurisdictions, and they, and they only, have the constitutional power to exercise it. To give to the United States the right to transfer to a citizen the title to the shores and the soils under the navigable waters, would be placing in their hands a weapon which might be wielded greatly to the injury of State sovereignty, and deprive the States of the power to exercise a numerous and important class of police powers. But in the hands of the States this power can never be used so as to affect the exercise of any national right of eminent domain or jurisdiction with which the United States have been invested by the Constitution. For, although the territorial limits of Alabama have extended all her sovereign power into the sea, it is there, as on the shore, but municipal power, subject to the Constitution of the United States, "and the laws which shall be made in pursuance thereof."

You cannot make anything any clearer than that. Alabama's sovereign right goes into the sea, but it is mere municipal power and subject to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hobbs amendment. If the Hobbs amendment is adopted, the issue before the House on this whole question will have been clarified to a very great extent, in my judgment.

The concern of cities, municipalities, private citizens, and so on, over the possibility, remote, I believe, but over the possibility that Federal jurisdiction over that land might be asserted, has been a concern which everyone could recognize. The even remote possibility that there would be a cloud upon the title to lands which have been held for long years by private parties or by States or cities or municipalities would, of course, be a most

undesirable result. That is part of the purpose of this bill, an altogether good purpose, I believe. But involved in this question from the very beginning, as every Member of this House knows, has been the question of oil, the question of whether the control over that oil resource should be asserted by the Federal Government or by the States.

The Hobbs amendment, it seems to me, gives us an opportunity, if we will only adopt that amendment in the House, to vote for a bill where the element of desire to get the control of that oil out of the hands of the Federal Government will have been removed from the picture, and where the whole issue will be upon these surface rights in lands, where I think it belongs.

I am frank to say that one reason I am going to support the Hobbs amendment is that I do not believe that by and large the States have successfully or effectively protected the public interests of the American people in those oil resources which lie in these submerged lands.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TOLAN. Of course the gentleman knows the constitution of our State provides that the State of California owns 3 miles oceanward, and that constitution was approved by the Congress of the United States. How are you going to separate the oil from the land?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The Hobbs amendment does it by asserting the basic constitutional rights of the United States of America. I am not a lawyer, as the gentleman knows, and I am not prepared to argue with the gentleman on all the legal issues involved, but I am prepared to stand before the House and say that I believe the public interest is the paramount interest. No Member of this House can contend that some of the things that have gone on with regard to slant drilling, with regard to the paltry royalties that have been collected by the States for the people when oil has been drained from these lands by private companies, no one can contend these things have been in the public interest. It is my humble opinion that we shall be serving the interest of the United States far better in the passage of this legislation if it has the Hobbs amendment in it than we shall if it does not have the Hobbs amendment in it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman stated that certain people have been draining that oil from these submerged lands. They did it only with the authority and sanction of the gentleman's State, did they not?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is correct. That is one of the things I am complaining about.

Mr. RUSSELL. Why does not the gentleman go back to his State legislature, then, and condemn them and get it corrected at the proper place?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think this is the proper place. I cannot control what the State legislature does, as the gentleman well knows. One of the things about which I am complaining is the fact that I do not believe the public interest has been adequately protected in this matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. The royalties go to the State. If this amendment is adopted, it will be like giving the horse a bale of oats and tying it up so high it cannot reach it. You are saying you are doing this, and in the next breath you are just killing the bill, that is, as far as the title is concerned for that purpose.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman is stating precisely the point I wanted to make, that the issue over the lands in the cities, the issue over what is going to happen to the port of Chicago or New Orleans or the port of San Francisco, and the filled-in lands, and all that, is not the main issue. The main issue here is the oil issue, and on that issue I believe the gentleman from Alabama is absolutely correct.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the question here is the title to the submerged lands. The proponents of this bill claim it is vested in the States, always has been, and we believe it always should be. If the States have title to the lands, then they have title to everything within those lands including the oil, minerals, gas, sand, gravel, and the oyster and shrimp beds under water. We all know it is perfectly possible to sell land, reserving the mineral, petroleum, and gas rights. It is done repeatedly in States such as West Virginia and Pennsylvania where there are minerals and petroleum. We also know it is possible to reserve the mineral, oil, and gas rights and sell the surface. That could not be done if the owner of land did not also have title to everything in it.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to say that the title to submerged land belongs to the States but that the petroleum in the soil belongs to the Federal Government. It is entirely contradictory to well established law and defeats the purpose of the measure. If such a theory is applicable in the case of oil, it can be made applicable to shrimps, clams, oysters, and everything else on the bed of the land under the sea. This amendment will make the bill entirely ineffective. It is a corollary, if it is not the identical language, of the Nye and Hobbs bills which were before our committee several years ago but which we rejected. This amendment will absolutely destroy the purpose of the bill. It is not necessary because if the Government has the constitutional right to seize State or privately owned oil in time of war, we cannot take that right away by a simple act of Congress.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. What is the object of this bill?

Mr. HANCOCK. It has been repeated here many times this afternoon.

Mr. GALLAGHER. It is to allow the oil companies to exploit the country.

Mr. HANCOCK. It is to quiet title and permit title to remain where it has always been, in the States. If the gentleman does not understand that, evidently he has not heard the debate here this afternoon.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill does nothing more than reassert a right which has been recognized since the formation of the Government. The Hobbs bill is as useless to the pending measure as would be a second tail to a hummingbird. Gentlemen favoring the Hobbs bill say they have the feeling that the national interest has not received proper consideration. Yet no one makes a disclosure or asserts in what particular respect there has been the slightest transgression upon the rights of the Federal Government. They speak of endangering the constitutional rights of the Federal Government. Why everyone recognizes that the action that might be taken by the Congress to effect a breach of the Constitution would be binding upon no one. If there is an element of selfishness in the bill let it be so. But there is a predominant public interest, and that is making clear that lands under navigable streams and under the tidewaters of this country belong to the States and not to the Federal Government. To me it is perfectly absurd to try to draw a distinction between lands and the oils or minerals in such lands. The Federal Government has no more interest in the oils that underlie these lands than it has in the land itself. The courts, as has been so correctly stated, have since the beginning of the Government uniformly held that all these lands belong to the States. It is unfortunate that a conflict of sovereignty should be raised by the assertion of a claim of right of control or ownership in the Federal Government. I can understand how some people feel. I felt the same way for a number of years. Those who were interested in the assertion of a Federal right have been seeing me for a long time and had me believing that this slant drilling was taking from land, over which the Federal Government rightfully exercised control, oil that lay within its bosom.

If this bill should be adopted and there should be transgression upon Federal rights, the courts are open to the Federal Government—its own courts—where it can assert and have maintained all rights which it has. The States are right in asserting ownership to the land under these waters, and the people who brought this bill here for consideration are right in insisting that the whole question be settled by law.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. Does not the bill by its very terms protect, among other land owners, the rights and title of the Federal Government itself?

Mr. COX. Of course it does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has the support, so far as I know, of every State

in the Union. The attorneys general of every State were heard or filed their positions before the committee. The truth of it is, if you want to get a little history, prior to the adoption of the Constitution the Federal Government was not in existence. Title to all these submerged lands was in the Thirteen Original States. The Federal Government has only such powers as were delegated to it. Each and every one of these powers is enumerated and each and every one of them is limited.

I am a State's-right Republican, if you want to know where I stand, and I am not up here to undertake to say that my State and the people of my State and the government of my State are going to sell its interests or give them away in derogation of the public welfare. I have seen enough of this common country of ours to know that the people of all the States are patriotic.

I hold no brief for the State of California. Anybody from California who wants to join the covey of unclean birds and befoul his own nest, that is up to him; but it seems to me the State of California is certainly going to look after its interests, as a component part of this Nation.

This Hobbs amendment, with all due respect to its author, would absolutely scuttle this bill. We, of the Judiciary Committee, held long and exhaustive hearings on this bill. If we adopt this amendment we march up the hill and then march down again. As has been suggested by the gentleman from Georgia, Judge Cox, the rights of the Federal Government remain just as they were before the passage of the bill. This bill is designed to protect the rights and titles of the States, the counties, the cities, and the citizens of the States who, upon the faith of the State's grants have gone out and spent untold millions of dollars in building docks and facilities in the harbors of the country, the title to which might be challenged by the Federal Government if we follow off on a wild goose chase and adopt an amendment that will submarine the purposes of this bill and destroy it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Why will the Hobbs amendment affect these land rights?

Mr. JENNINGS. The Hobbs amendment, in my opinion, cuts the heart out of this bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman has a different conception of the Hobbs amendment than I have.

Mr. JENNINGS. I have different conceptions from my friend on a good many things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to ask a couple of questions of members of the committee, if I may. Did the Secretary of the Interior appear before the committee at any time and advance his ideas on this resolution?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; he did not.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Did the new Attorney General from Texas appear and express his opinion?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. He did not appear. This suit, it should be stated, was instituted by the predecessor of the present Attorney General just before he retired from office.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The gentleman will find in the hearings a letter from the present Secretary of the Interior in which he states that the Federal Government has no title to these lands.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. That is one of the questions I am interested in. I confess very openly that I have been quite remiss in not having read the hearings, but it is rather difficult to read them so shortly before the bill is taken up for consideration.

Now, may I ask eminent counsel who have studied this bill—because frankly I do not know—this question. At the present time, under international law, we consider that the jurisdiction of the United States in its capacity as a sovereign Nation extends to the 3-mile limit offshore. What would be the effect of this legislation if through the progress of international law or by agreement with nations the Federal authority and jurisdiction should be extended from the 3-mile limit, say to a 12-mile limit?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is a very interesting question, and I think no one can attempt to answer it.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Does the gentleman feel that this resolution would place title in the States to the new land should the limit be extended from 3 to 12 miles?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I shall have to answer that in the same way. I would not attempt to answer it, and I would not pay very much attention to anyone else's answer.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I am not going to answer it either. If the gentleman from Texas cannot answer it I am sure no one else in the House can.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe the State of Texas under its original organic act lays claim to a 12-mile off-shore limit; and I am sure that the extension of the United States jurisdiction to the 12-mile limit could only extend the limits of the States, because, after all, the United States is merely an aggregation of States.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I believe I can add something to that.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. The 3-mile limit is established by international law.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. International law is established by the common consent of the vast majority of the nations of the world.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GEARHART. Should all the nations of the world agree, or tacitly accept the principle that the line should be extended to 12 miles, it would be. It would be just as though an act were passed by Congress and then later amended and changed.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. That is right.

Mr. GEARHART. International law can be amended by common consent the same as the State or National laws within a country can be changed.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. That I quite understand. None of us, the eminent chairman said, and I too am of that opinion, are quite sure what would happen under the provisions of this bill if by subsequent agreement the off-shore limits of national sovereignty should be extended. To me, that is a condition that certainly requires some clarification. Certainly if that jurisdiction is extended it would be by the power and the action of this Nation as a whole, and any rights acquired either in fee or otherwise would inure to all the people of this country and not to those States which happen to be on the coast.

I do not believe this legislation in its present form, in the light of the answers we have received and given here, should be passed at this time until we know what is going to happen.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman is absolutely right. We ought to have the entire picture. Mississippi, of course, has extended her boundaries 18 miles into the Gulf.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yet, it would take the United States Navy to defend that claim, since Mississippi has no power to defend it herself.

Mr. HOBBS. And I believe Louisiana has extended hers about 2 miles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, the State of West Virginia is vitally interested in this legislation, it is vitally interested in seeing to it that the Hobbs amendment is not approved. The State of West Virginia fell heir to control over the Ohio River bed through heirship from the mother State of Virginia, when Virginia reserved the right to control over the Ohio River at the time she ceded the Northwest Territory to the new Federal Government. Under that authority the State of West Virginia through its public land corporation has for years past entered into contracts with private individuals. Today we have contracts for the removal of sand and gravel from the river bed, we have contracts for the extracting of oil and gas and we have contracts for coal stripping from the beds of the rivers.

Mr. Chairman, I trust it will be the pleasure of the committee to defeat the Hobbs amendment and approve the legislation in its present form.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] made a very per-

tinent statement a moment ago when he said in effect that under no consideration could it be reasonably claimed that the Federal Government has any interest whatever in ownership of any of the coastal lands; that the pending bill does not deal with State boundaries, but if at a subsequent date control should be extended to the 12-mile limit or any other limit, the coastal lands would belong to and the title to them would be in the adjacent State.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. It seems to me that the questions that have been propounded have raised a matter of history that ought to be put in this RECORD right now as far as the State of Texas is concerned. The Republic of Texas, following the Spanish law, claimed sovereignty for 3 leagues from her shores. No one ever contested this claim prior to the time the Republic became a State of the Union. Whatever sovereignty the United States has off the Gulf coast of Texas comes through the ownership of the Republic of Texas. If the Republic of Texas had 9 miles or 3 leagues, then we still have 3 leagues, and there is not any way to increase or decrease that today as far as the rights of sovereignty of the United States off the shores of Texas are concerned. The United States has not any greater sovereignty than the Republic of Texas had. Nor did the United States acquire any property rights other than such as might have been conferred by the annexation resolution.

This Congress refused to accept the ownership of the public lands of Texas and to assume with it the duty of paying the public debt of the Republic, but specifically changed the proposal of the Republic so that the United States would never take title to them and that the State of Texas retain title to all lands in the State of Texas and should in turn pay the public debt. The State has paid that public debt. Surely, no one could now contend that my State does not own these lands. The United States cannot show that it ever acquired any title to these lands. The State of Texas was the only source through which the United States could have acquired any title. It acquired none. It did acquire sovereignty but only that previously held by the Republic of Texas whether it is 3 miles, 3 leagues, or 12 miles from the coast of Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to have the gentleman's observations.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman explain to me how the Hobbs amendment would have any effect on the State of West Virginia?

Mr. BAILEY. I think that question can be answered by saying that if the Hobbs amendment is approved there will be some question as to the right of West Virginia to continue leasing these river beds for oil and gas development, or coal development, and the excise tax we are collecting on sand and gravel taken from the river beds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, if I understand the Hobbs amendment correctly, it will completely emasculate this bill. It is my understanding that this bill proposes to restore unquestionably to the States the right in that domain which these States had when they came into the Union.

Let us take for example, the great city of New Orleans. Canal Street in New Orleans is below sea level. It is built-up land. If this amendment is adopted, the title there would not be worth 5 cents. Certainly it is not our purpose to take property rights away from these people; a city which was established 100 years before it ever came into this Union. The same thing would be true all along the Gulf coast. It would be true in the great city of Miami and Miami Beach or wherever there was built-up land.

When you speak of the rights of these people, bear in mind that they have been paying taxes on this land in the marshy sections of Louisiana for centuries. You are taking from them something that they brought into the Union, which is theirs, and from which the entire Nation will benefit if it is properly developed. But take away the minerals, what have you left? Sand is a mineral, clay, gravel, salt, as well as oil and gas and coal, are all minerals. Do you mean to tell me a man cannot use his own sand or clay? Why even the water itself might be termed a mineral—take that and you have nothing. I urge the Members to face this objectively and defeat this amendment.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, from the earliest days of the Republic the States were admitted to be the owners of all of the lands adjacent to their shores out to the 3-mile limit. There was no question in anybody's mind until about 3 or 4 years ago, perhaps 5, when some very active and very bright and very energetic bureaucrats conceived the idea that it might be a good thing for the Federal Government to assert ownership over these submerged lands lying just off the shores of our States. The very assertion of Federal ownership immediately threw the titles to all of these lands into confusion. Clouds were cast upon them as title experts referred to the situation which developed. During these years when the title was supposed to be vested in the State of California, in the State of Texas, in the State of Massachusetts, and all the rest of them, great harbor improvements were built. Bonds were issued and sold to the public. As a consequence of this cloud upon the title, those bonds are clouded and they are no longer selling in the public market, and the title and ownership to those improvements is now in hopeless confusion as a consequence of what a few bureaucrats thought was a bright idea.

The resolution before us today is brought in for the very purpose of clearing away those clouds. The purpose of the legislation is to declare officially that the United States Government does not own those lands; that is the purpose of it; and as soon as the measure is passed that cloud will be done away with, the present-day impossible situation corrected.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman is talking about clouds upon titles, and so forth. Of course, the so-called bureaucrats want to know where they stand on this. They want to know whether the Federal Government owns this land or whether it is the property of the States. As I understand this bill it is to settle this matter once and for all. But it appears to me that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is adopted, we are in just as much confusion as we have ever been.

Mr. GEARHART. I thank the Speaker for his contribution, timely and convincing that it is.

To emphasize the necessity of forever settling the confusion into which land titles have been thrown, which the Speaker advocates, permit me to pursue the subject further. If the States own this land, as we are now prepared to admit that they do, the States own all of the elements that go to make up that land title, including the minerals and the oils which are contained within the soil itself.

The Hobbs amendment is clearly unconstitutional because it attempts to seize title to the minerals that lie under the surface of State-owned land, to seize them and vest that title in the Federal Government without compensation. The Federal Government, perhaps, if the properties had passed into private ownership, could acquire those minerals and vest title to them in itself, provided, of course, it proceeded in a constitutional way. It could be done by instituting eminent domain proceedings, and paying the ascertained value of the minerals to the private owners, compensating them for what they were giving up.

When you take submerged lands and fill them in so they become no longer submerged but take on visibility above the water, you do not change the legal characteristic of that land at all. It still remains in the contemplation of law submerged land. There is very much very valuable filled in formerly submerged land all over the United States. Canal Street in the City of New Orleans has been referred to. Over half of the downtown business district of San Francisco is submerged land filled in, the character and appearance of which

has merely been changed by the filling in process. Some of the greatest buildings in San Francisco have been built on that submerged land. This amendment would give the Government of the United States the right to go into the City of San Francisco or the City of New Orleans, as the case may be, and sink oil wells right in the middle of the city, close streets, move buildings away, in order to capture the oil this amendment would confiscate. The possibilities are fantastic, absurd, and ridiculous. It will lead to preposterous conclusions—situations beyond the imagination of man.

This amendment must be defeated.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my colleagues in opposing the amendment of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. It is my opinion that the arguments made against this amendment by the gentlemen who have preceded me, especially the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] and my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCKENZIE] have covered the situation fully, and therefore, I do not feel it necessary to reiterate the arguments which they have advanced.

Mr. Chairman, my district is intensely interested in the passage of the legislation under consideration, as well as the entire State of Louisiana, and since 46 of the 48 States have manifested their interest in the passage of this bill under consideration, I do not fear that the Members of this House will fail to approve the measure.

My district is one of the largest and most important districts in the State of Louisiana, as I have pointed out here many times before, and several of the parishes of my district touch upon the Gulf of Mexico in the southwestern portion of the State of Louisiana.

My district is one of the largest oil producing sections of the State of Louisiana, and aside from other considerations, this fact alone dictates that I should support the measure. In my district we have several oil fields which extend into the tidal and submerged lands of the Gulf of Mexico, and certainly there never has been any question as to the ownership or title of the same, and millions of dollars have been spent in oil exploration and development in the tidal and submerged areas of Louisiana, and for the future development of this area it is essential that this matter be settled. Reference to the map prepared by the American Association of Port Authorities will disclose that Louisiana has 7,629 statute miles of submerged lands in the Gulf of Mexico area, and most of this land touches my district.

I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, ask the Members of the House to give us their support in the enactment of this legislation in order that this question may be decided and the future development and exploration for oil, sorely needed, will not be retarded.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has already spoken on this amendment.

Mr. COX. I trust the gentleman will not insist on his point of order.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman asks me to withdraw the point of order, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to point out that there are no hard feelings here on my part or on the part of anybody else. The fact that they call me an imbecile and say I do not know anything about anything pertaining to this matter is perfectly all right.

Nobody is going to take anything that belongs to anybody else. If you read this bill you cannot possibly conceive of upsetting Canal Street. What you are worried about is that you have extended the boundaries of Louisiana 27 miles out into the Gulf. That is what is worrying you. It is not Canal Street, and it is not San Francisco. What you are worried about is what you are doing when your supreme court has held that your State of California, if I am correctly informed, does not have as good a title as the city of Long Beach, and neither has as much proprietary right, evidently, as the bootleggers who sold much of that subocean oil to Japan.

Some of the Members from West Virginia were upset about the oil that underlies their land. Of course, the Federal Government has no more right to take West Virginia's oil than it has to take the house of the gentleman who made the inquiry or to take any other piece of real property. But here we have something which the resolution itself says underlies the territorial waters of the United States. It is part of a gulf or ocean. That is what we are talking about here. I wish I had time to read this case which is the latest case, the United States against Curtiss-Wright Corp.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Gladly.

Mr. HEDRICK. It does not apply to rivers then?

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, it does not in the sense here used. The Army engineers have always had the right to control navigable streams for the purpose of regulating the building of bridges and that sort of thing. The Nation is specifically given the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce whether on rivers or otherwise, and has been exercising that power since 1787. But that is not worrying anyone. Oil-bearing sands are usually deep—hundreds of feet below the bed of a river or even the ocean.

If this bill becomes law the Nation will have lost its right to subocean oil because that right is dormant until asserted by Congress. This bill, without my amendment, kills any right that would be activated by assertion. I beg of you that you think twice before you wipe out so much of our national-defense potential.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GALLAGHER) there were—ayes 17, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: On page 2, line 15, after the word "America" strike out the words "by a clear and complete title."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, my State does not have any tide lands, and although it has been stated that the Rio Grande in my State is navigable for certain purposes, they cannot make me believe it. But we do have in the State of New Mexico some lands which the Federal Government has bought during the depression, and to which it does not have a clear and complete title.

This Congress just before the recess passed a bill giving authority to the department in charge of those lands to settle disputes about that land to which the Government does not have a clear and complete title. Now, if the Government happens to have bought tidelands to which it did not acquire a clear and complete title, as was the case in my State, this exception with these words in it would not save them, and we might be quitclaiming some of those lands inadvertently, when we know that the intention of the bill is not to do so.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As I understand, the gentleman's amendment proposes to strike out on page 2, in line 15, after the word "America" the words "by a clear and complete title."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is correct.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I have consulted a number of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, and insofar as I have consulted them there is no objection to those words being stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the resolution, House Joint Resolution 225, pursuant to House Resolution 344, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GEARHART) there were—ayes 108, noes 11.

So the resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO MAKE PERMANENT AN ADDITIONAL JUDGESHIP IN MISSOURI

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 342 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1196) to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri", approved December 24, 1942. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be nothing very complicated about this bill. Ample time is provided under the rule for debate on the bill itself. I hope argument on the rule may be expedited in order that we may get into the consideration of the bill as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 25 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

THE ATOMIC BOMB IS HERE TO STAY, BUT ARE WE?

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, today there is distressing confusion in high places and low about what should constitute an adequate regular military establishment for the United States, that is, an establishment which would assure the defense of our country in the foreseeable future.

The confusion, God knows, is understandable enough. In times past, the size of a nation's military establishment has generally been arrived at by measuring it and matching it against the military establishment of the nation's avowed, or potential enemy, and by the nation's best calculations about when, how, where, and why that avowed or potential enemy might strike.

Today, it has become politically inexpedient for any public servant of this Nation openly to speculate on the size of our armed forces in relation to those of other nations, except those of the defeated Axis Powers. Popular presumption is that the members of the United Nations Organization will always stay united, from which it will follow that there will not be another world war, in our time, and that we have no enemies, avowed or potential, except those we have already licked. For a Member of this House to suggest that this may not be the case is honestly considered by many men of good will an international political indecency.

And yet every American citizen with a smattering of historical knowledge knows that United Nations Charter or no, the continuance of peace depends on many unpredictable factors. National prejudices and prides, fears and grievances, the hunger for land, the greed for trade, the thirst for power or revenge, the natural pressures of populations, the passionate desire for freedom among colonial peoples, and the natural wish for a greater share of the world's resources among the backward or have-not countries—all have engendered conflicts among sovereign nations in the past, and may again. Sovereignty itself is a most fertile condition of war, if indeed it is not the prime cause of war itself. And add that today the proselyting by some powers of new political ideologies has vastly stimulated explosive, revolutionary trends everywhere.

Let us suppose our statesmanship—or that of other sovereign nations fails in the days ahead. Suppose that the United Nations Organization does break up and war comes. Is there a man in this House today who can say—or who will dare say—against what nation or constellation of nations we will be fighting, on what terrain, in what climate, on what oceans? No. Then there is not a man in this House who can estimate anywhere near accurately the size of the Military Establishment this Nation will need to overwhelm our unknown or unnamed enemy or enemies.

This is the dilemma that faces the White House, the War Department, the Congress, and the people. We are constrained from discussing in any public forum what enemies we might make or meet in the event that the United Nations Organization splits on the rocks of sovereign disputes. And yet we dare not stake our Nation's destiny on the proposition that it will not.

What is our present intention then, as a nation, in the face of this uncertain future, which may hold for us and the world increasing peace and prosperity, if the United Nations Organization does hold together, but will certainly inaugurate a third world holocaust, if it does not?

Our true intention is plain for every nation to see. We intend to strive for peace through the framework of the United Nations Organization, and to be prepared for war, in the event that organization fails us, or we fail it.

The plain evidence of this intention is our unanimous desire as a people to retain an adequate military establishment.

The argument about a military establishment in America today is directed only to the size, composition, and equipment of that establishment, and toward certain relevant questions such as compulsory military training.

We know that the Navy today is asking for a peacetime Navy at least two-thirds as large as our present Navy, which is the greatest armada ever under one flag. It is possibly greater than all other combined navies of the world. We know that the Army will soon present its plan for land and air forces far in excess of the 280,000 which was our authorized prewar establishment. May we not safely infer that the Army and Navy are by no means certain that peace is a certainty for the next quarter of a century or that the United Nations Organization will, as the expression goes, "click"? And if the White House and the State Department back the Army and Navy in their requests, may we not also infer that those in charge of our foreign policy share their mournful judgment? Yes. For Army, Navy, State, and the White House know, whether they publicly say so or not, that the United Nations Charter, with its paralyzing veto power, its important "adequate force," and total absence of enforceable control of new weapons or national military establishments, cannot really prevent war among the great signatory nations if any of them should desire it.

What we do not know, and what even the Army, Navy, White House, and the State Department may not know, is whether they are really asking for too much or too little.

They will certainly be asking for too much, if as President Roosevelt said repeatedly during the last Presidential campaign, and as President Truman has said since, and many another high administration member at San Francisco said, the United Nations Organization ushers in a long and lasting peace. But they are certainly asking for too little if all the high hopes held out for that organization should be dashed by the greeds and fears, doubts, and suspicions, and other causes which are wont to drive sovereign nations to war.

Your guess as to whether they are asking for too little or too much is as good as mine. And be sure that whichever way you guess, you will be bitterly attacked for it. If your guess is that a long peace is certain and that the Army and Navy are asking for too much, you will be called, in all sincerity, by many patriotic citizens, a pacifist, an ostrich isolationist, a star-gazing sentimental, muddy-minded idealist, a fellow traveler, or even a traitor to your country.

If, on the other hand, you guess that peace is by no means certain among the great powers and that our Army and Navy are asking for too little, you will be called by equally patriotic citizens a militarist, a warmonger, an imperialist, a cynic, a chronic interventionist, and most certainly the left-wing press of this country will dub you a Fascist.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, we must all give grave thought to this question of defense of our country. Let us, then, concentrate on what we do know and what it is currently permissible to discuss.

Is there anything we do know that we have learned in this war which will give us a real clue to precise measures we may advocate? I believe that there is something that we have learned, and that we do know. We know about the atom bomb.

Last week on the floor of this House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER] addressed us on the subject of the atomic bomb. He began his speech by noting, with commendable prudence, that he was not the wisest man in the world. He instantly proved that by saying that, as far as the atomic bomb is concerned, he did not believe that the Members of Congress were competent to talk about it—I quote him "or what the atomic bomb is, or what it can do, or what it would do if it were let loose." And he wound up by saying that we should stop talking about things that we know nothing about in Congress. But it so happens that among the many things we Members of Congress do not know about in the year of our Lord 1945, the atomic bomb is not numbered. We know exactly what the atomic bomb can do when it is let loose. As also would the able gentleman from Minnesota if he took the trouble to read the daily papers.

We know from newspaper pictures and eyewitness accounts that one atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima by one plane killed 40,000 people in 30 seconds, and completely razed every structure over an area of four and a half square miles. We know that this one bomb did more damage to life and property than 2,000—some say 5,000—long-range bombers had done over Japan on previous missions. We know that subsequently many, many more people died of burns, injuries, and strange causes related to that hellish explosion. That is what we know beyond any peradventure of a doubt one atomic bomb can do when let loose. Do we not also know, from this experiment, that 100 similar bombs dropped on the main industrial cities of America—Bridgeport, Detroit, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and so on—would kill and wound upward of a million people and all but obliterate the industrial capacity of the United States of America?

We know other significant things about the atomic bomb that dropped on Hiroshima. We know that it was, by the War Department's own account, a small bomb and that it is possible to manufacture far larger ones and more destructive ones. It is estimated by the scientists who are familiar with atomic power that 100 atomic bombs three times larger than the ones dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima might easily destroy 40,000,000 Americans and raze industrial America from the map in 1 day. That is a fact, and not a fancy.

The gentleman from Minnesota who would have this Congress ignore the atomic bomb and the measures we should take to defend ourselves against it will have to quarrel first with this reporting, these facts, and these statistics.

We also know that the secret of atomic power, which is currently ours, will not long remain ours. The scientists of other sovereign nations are already working on it. We may be sure that they will solve it, maybe in 2 years, or 10. But they will solve it.

There are many plans and proposals for "outlawing" the atomic bomb as an instrument of war. Those which are most realistic, such as Ely Culbertson's quota force plan, Emery Reves' the Anatomy of Peace, Clarence Streit's Union Now, all recognize the principle of unlimited sovereignty as the greatest force for war. In a world of sovereign nations, nations motivated by greeds, hates, fears, and suspicions, who in his heart really believes that such an overwhelmingly decisive weapon can be internationally outlawed? An international outlaw predicates international law, and international law predicates international government, to enforce that law.

Mr. Speaker, there is no international government. Therefore, no nation or group of nations can enforce international law on any other nation or group of nations who do not choose to obey, except by war itself. There are only sovereign nations, and any sovereign nation, bent on war or aggression, will use, in the face of any agreement it may currently make, this decisive weapon, if and when the use of it will achieve its sovereign ambitions.

We used the atomic bomb on the Japanese, even though we were certain in the end to win the war without using it. Who shall make a case, then, against another nation's using it on us, if that nation could not win or survive otherwise? And even if there were not the atomic bomb, there now exist V–1 and V–2 weapons, pilotless, radio controlled and detonated missiles with powerful explosive warheads which can be sent thousands of miles through the stratosphere. Shall we also outlaw these? Why then not outlaw long-range bombers, and while we are about it, naval guns? Or, why not proclaim that henceforth wars between industrial nations will be fought with bows and arrows and pea shooters? Or, why not go the whole hog, and outlaw war itself? But again I ask, how can you outlaw anything internationally when international law as it now exists is only an amiable international fiction, because international, or world, government does not exist to enforce it when it is broken?

Alas, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER], and anyone who feels as he does, must face the facts. We know exactly what the atom bomb does when it is let loose. And the chances of keeping it secret or outlawing it are not very brilliant. We know something else, too. We know that any industrial nation with the necessary raw resources and a sufficiently large interior can surely manufacture 100 such bombs in secret, and in defiance of any international agreement.

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable that democratic countries, owing to the very nature of their political systems, will ever launch a surprise atomic bomb attack in initiating a war. There has been intense moral indignation in the democratic western world at our use of it, even to shorten a long and costly war.

But it is conceivable that dictatorial countries, or totalitarian regimes which are not responsible to Christian opinion, would launch a surprise attack with the atomic bomb, an attack so sudden that whatever methods of defense we might have to intercept unidentified missles or planes streaming through the stratosphere could only prevent a portion of the bombs from landing.

The Patterson paper, the Daily News, is currently pleading for three atomic bombs for one. However much the knowledge that we had three bombs for its one might deter any nation from starting a war, if it decides to do so, that knowledge would encourage that very nation to launch its atomic attack as a complete surprise. The Daily News 3-to-1 proposal does not, alas, answer the question of where we would be if that first surprise wave destroyed millions of our workers and our entire industrial potential, and, with it, our 3-to-1 atomic arsenals.

The atomic bomb is here to stay, but are we? That is the question, ladies and gentlemen.

The primary obligation imposed on the President of the United States by the Constitution is to safeguard the Nation against the ravages and harms of war; or in the event that war comes, to take those measures which will assure victory with the least cost in blood and treasure.

We have seen how difficult it is, in the current world situation for the President to demand armed forces of an adequate size. But surely it is possible for the President to advance suggestions now, and then to take measures to protect our Nation against 100 surprise atomic bombs.

We know precisely what such an attack would do. And we also know what the protection against a surprise attack—the only protection—is. For we know that the atomic bomb destroys for miles around every living human being, and razes every factory and building aboveground. Therefore, the protection—perhaps the only one—is to go underground in advance. If we believe, as many of our military leaders claim to believe, in a surprise atomic bomb attack, we must begin now to take thought for providing underground shelters for our people, for decentralizing our vital war-potential factories, and putting many of them underground.

Perhaps this logical conclusion to the threat of atomic bombardment strikes you as either too fantastic, or too troublesome. If it does, then, if another world war comes, this Nation may be licked, before it begins to fight.

Mr. Speaker, when I returned from Nordhausen, the German town infamous for two things—its vast hideous concentration camp and its vast underground V–2 factory—I told this House that the Nazi nation had toward the war's end begun underground to manufacture, with slave labor, its new diabolic instruments of warfare. And I tried to emphasize then, even before the first atom bomb

had been dropped, that this technique could be copied, and would be copied, by totalitarian nations of tomorrow. Dictatorial and totalitarian nations can begin now, yes now, to put their factories and laboratories, and the housing for their workers on atomic bombs and other destructive stratospheric weapons underground. Then, even if their atomic bombs did not totally destroy overnight our whole overground industry, our retaliatory bombs could not do any equivalent damage, for their war industries would be dug in.

Let us face this fact for our country's sake.

The construction today of vast air-raid shelters, the reclamation of mining shafts, natural caves, and so on, for this purpose throughout the land, the installation of many of our factories underground is the only logical conclusion to the facts we know about the bombs we dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Incidentally, would this not be a far more useful public-works project than leaf raking? We must remember when we get into a great debate, as we will here, about the size of the Army and Navy, that a Navy, and an Air Force, and an Army 10 times as large as those we are being asked for today would be of little use to us, standing offshore, sitting on airfields, barracked in Army posts, or garrisoned overseas, if overnight atomic bombs destroyed millions of our citizens and wiped out all our factories and assembly lines. What demands national defense priority in an atomic age is the protection of factory and citizen. Let us now ask the President and the Secretary of War what measures they intend to take to protect the heart of our Nation—its industry and its citizens—against a surprise attack of many such atomic bombs as were dropped on Hiroshima. Until we hear the answer to that question it is vain to grow too heated about the future size of the Navy and Army and the Air Forces, or so-called striking forces. For how shall the mailed fist strike if the body be paralyzed and the heart torn out? What use to the Nation will be vast fleets and swift armies of sea and air if millions of our people, men, women, children factory workers, are killed and our hospitals are glutted from Frisco to Bridgeport with the dying, and our vital industries are destroyed?

The totalitarian nation Germany had already—but thank God, too late—gone underground against our bombs. Other totalitarian nations will, if war is in their hearts, or even if the fear of war is in their hearts, go underground against our bombs of the future. Such nations alone can afford to take the initiative in any atomic war of the future.

What are we going to do, Mr. Speaker? What are you going to do, Mr. Secretary of War and Mr. President?

The answer is the signpost on the crossroads of our national destiny.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield with pleasure always to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am in full accord with what the gentlewoman from Connecticut is saying. I want to pay her the compliment of saying that she has a masculine mind. Before I take my seat, may I ask to whom the gentlewoman was referring when she spoke of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mrs. LUCE. I referred to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, that exempts eight of us, anyway. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. LUCE. And I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. I know that he is constantly preoccupied with this very important problem of the atomic bomb, and the answers to it. But I must refuse the compliment which he so graciously paid me by saying that I think like a man. Thought has no sex. One either thinks or one does not think.

Mr. KNUTSON. I insist that the gentlewoman keep the compliment.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday is District of Columbia Day. There are four bills which I understand are noncontroversial, H. R. 3868, H. R. 3867, H. R. 3873, and H. R. 3636.

On the same day, a bill from the Civil Service Committee, H. R. 2716, which provides for the health program for Government employees.

On Tuesday, H. R. 1270, the Carden claims bill. If that is disposed of, H. R. 2948 from the Committee on the Civil Service, to exempt annuity payments from taxation. If that bill is not reached on that day, then it will be dispensed with and I will call it up later. I cannot tell just when.

If business in order on Calendar Wednesday is dispensed with, the reorganization bill will be taken up on Wednesday. A rule has not yet been reported on that but it is hoped that a rule will be reported on Tuesday. If Calendar Wednesday business is not dispensed with, then the reorganization bill will be taken up on Thursday and consideration of that bill will be continued until it is disposed of. If any time remains so that another bill can be taken up, House Concurrent Resolution 81, removing restrictions on road construction will be taken up.

I understand there is a resolution from the Committee on Appropriations to recapture certain appropriations. A rule is necessary and it has not yet been reported out. If a rule is reported on that, the probabilities are that that will be given the right of way during the early part of next week.

With that one exception, the program I have announced is substantially the program for next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What will we do tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be nothing tomorrow. If we dispose of the bill on which we are considering the rule now, I shall ask unanimous consent to adjourn over until Monday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to debate. I made a remark the other day that none of us knows anything about the atomic bomb or what kind of legislation should be passed here. I do not believe the Members of Congress are capable of considering this matter.

There is one thing about our Army and Navy, they are good at keeping secrets. The atomic bomb has been developed by scientists, men who know what it will do. It is not only a question of the use to which the atomic bomb may be put in time of war, but it may be toned down and used by the criminal class in our country. I maintain now, as I maintained the other day, that this matter of suggested legislation should come from the people who know, and the President of the United States. In other words, it is an executive function at the present time, because we are not capable of handling it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in yesterday's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 225

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on House Joint Resolution 225 just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TO MAKE PERMANENT AN ADDITIONAL JUDGESHIP IN MISSOURI

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1196) to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1196, with Mr. GOSSETT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to make permanent a Missouri judgeship which we created and to which was appointed our colleague, Dick Duncan. By an amendment which was tacked on during the consideration of the bill the judgeship was made temporary, whereas the conference of senior circuit judges has, I believe, three times certified that it should be permanent because of the importance of the litigation that grows out of the two great cities of Missouri—Kansas City and St. Louis—to say nothing of the capital, Jefferson City, and of Columbia, St. Joe, and other great cities of that State.

The Senators from Missouri supported an amendment to this bill in the Senate creating this a permanent judgeship in accordance with the recommendation of the conference of senior circuit judges, twice made. So amended it passed the Senate. The Department of Justice recommends it as a permanent judgeship. There is no question but that the six permanent judges who would be serving the great State of Missouri if this bill passes are needed.

The Judiciary Committee recommends your favorable consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I am doing for an absent colleague that which I would gladly do for any of you under similar circumstances.

The pending resolution was sponsored by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER], who finds it impossible to be present. After the rule was taken up I had a communication in which hope was expressed that the consideration of the bill be delayed until he could arrive. Of course, his concern was to contribute his part in the effort to have it adopted. I make bold to appeal personally to my friends that they give this bill their support. Any judgeship bill that can get by the Judiciary Committee must be a meritorious one. During my membership in this House a large part of the time during which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has presided over the Judiciary Committee as its chairman, great care has been exercised with respect to the reporting of these judgeship bills. The committee has been reluctant at all times to report out anything that was not demanded by the necessities of the situation.

The gentleman from Alabama made the disclosure in his remarks that the bill under which the temporary judgeship was established was a bill sponsored by the present President of the United States. It has been revealed that the Department of Justice and others who have examined this measure recommend its passage. In that I find justification and I also find justification in the additional fact it is recommended by the Judiciary Committee of the House for accepting upon basis of merit, and there is the additional reason that it is a measure sponsored by one for whom I hold a very deep personal affection, and in whose judgment I have implicit confidence.

Mr. Chairman, I hope therefore that the Committee may find it agreeable to adopt the bill.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I want to make it clear that in my remarks they were not intended to indicate that Senator Truman was the author of the bill. I think it was introduced at the request of the Justice Department by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary; however, he sponsored and actively supported the measure.

Mr. COX. Very well. I am not going to invoke his support as a reason why it should be adopted. Probably he would prefer that this not be done. There are other reasons as well as strong personal ones that impel me to make this personal appeal to my friends to support the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want it understood at the outset that I never oppose the appointment of a judge, or the making of permanent judges, where it is necessary and where they are needed.

This particular matter came before the Judiciary Committee some time ago when they sought to secure a temporary judge in the State of Missouri. They already had five judges, all permanent, in that State at that time. Provision was made by the Committee on the Judiciary for a temporary judge in that State, thus making six judges for Missouri. They have an eastern and western district. They have two permanent judges in the western district and two permanent judges in the eastern district. Judge Collett was a roving judge, but permanent, and when this temporary judge was appointed, he also acted as a roving judge, making six judges in that State.

I want it understood that at that time it was stated that a request would not be made to make this a permanent judgeship. That was the understanding we had; that when this judge occupying this temporary position stepped out, and Judge Duncan, who was in the House, had been appointed to that judgeship, that he was to serve until he reached the age of retirement or serve until he died. We hope he will serve many years, but that place would not be filled when that appointment was terminated. But there is that judgeship, as a temporary one. Now it is sought to make this judgeship permanent. These are the circumstances which confront us as we listen to this debate on this measure.

The State of Missouri has a population of 3,784,664 people. They have six Federal district judges. Up in Iowa, just adjacent, with a population of 2,558,268 people, they have but two Federal district judges. The State of Kentucky, with a population of 2,845,627 people, has but two Federal district judges. The State of Nebraska, with a population of 1,315,834 people, has but one Federal district judge. That is adjacent to Missouri. My own State of Indiana, with a population of 3,427,796 people, has but two Federal district judges.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. The gentleman was speaking of populations. Recently in Missouri we had occasion, because of a redistricting bill that was up, to get the latest census estimate of population from the Bureau of the Census, and we found that since 1940 the population of Missouri decreased from 3,700,000 and some to 3,500,000 and some.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is in the State of Missouri?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. When this judgeship was created, as I recall, there were some reorganization cases pending in the courts out there?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct. There were many of that type of cases, but most of those cases have now been disposed of.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. And that was used as an excuse; that the load was so heavy they needed an additional judge.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is entirely correct.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. That is now being cleared up; is it not?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is being cleared up, and that work is very nearly completed.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. May I ask the gentleman another question, if I may, as to what the practical effect of this would be if we made this position permanent?

Mr. SPRINGER. It would mean that Missouri would have six permanent Federal district judges and they do not need six Federal district judges in that State. The facts will not justify that number of Federal district judges. I am greatly surprised that the request is made to make this a permanent judgeship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

In the State of Kansas with a population of one and three-quarter million people they have one Federal district judge. That is immediately adjacent. In the State of Colorado, with a population of one and one-half million people, they have just one Federal district judge.

Let us look a little further into the reasons why this judge should be made permanent. In both the eastern and western districts in Missouri, with all of these judges serving, the number of cases filed in 1941 amounted to 2,165; criminal, civil, and every type of case. In 1942 that was increased just a little, until there were 2,758 cases filed. They did not all come to trial. Some were dismissed. Many of the criminal cases were disposed of on pleas of guilty and it took but very little time to handle them.

In 1943 the number went to 2,815, and all of these 6 judges were operating at that time. In 1944 you will note the decrease in the number of filings of cases, a reduction down to 2,122. That made less than 350 cases for each one of those judges, if the cases were all disposed of. I reflect back to the time when I was sitting on the State circuit court bench when I personally, and alone, was disposing of and trying more than 2,800 cases a year. Here are 6 judges out in that State of Missouri where in 1944 were only 2,122 cases filed; that is less than 350 cases for each one of those judges.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Included in that 350 were many cases in which pleas of guilty were entered, and naturalization cases that were dismissed without any argument whatsoever.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. Many of those cases required very little, if any, time or consideration on the part of those judges.

I hold in my hand an article written by Merrill E. Otis, formerly a judge of that court in Missouri. He speaks of the eastern and western districts of Missouri. He says that in those districts four judges did the work in the two districts when the work was at the maximum. They handled all the court matters in that State, just four of them. Then he says another judge was appointed, making five judges for those two districts, and now a sixth judge is proposed. But he goes back to the first statement and he says that four judges did all the work in those districts in that entire State when the work was at its maximum. He was unfavorable to adding any additional judges in Missouri.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. In view of the facts the gentleman has presented, has the committee given any consideration to abolishing one or two judgeships in Missouri?

Mr. SPRINGER. Personally, I think one or two judgeships ought to be abolished in that State because they have more judges than they need. Many other States need additional judges much more than does the State of Missouri.

Now let us refer to the bankruptcy cases. A Federal judge has but little to do with that character of business because he has a referee in bankruptcy to handle all administrative matters connected therewith. In 1941 there were 56,335 bankruptcy cases all over the United States; in 1942 that was reduced to 52,109 in the entire country; in 1943 it was reduced to 34,711; in 1944 it was reduced to 19,533 in the entire United States of America.

The only thing a Federal judge has to do in bankruptcies is the final approval of reports of his referee in bankruptcy.

I ask the Members of the House to take into consideration the question of whether or not the making of this judgeship permanent is necessary in the State of Missouri, and I ask that this measure be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly cannot understand why it is necessary to make this judgeship permanent in order to take care of the business of the courts of Missouri. Whether or not this legislation is enacted, there are six judges functioning in that State. Contrary to the belief of my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, nothing can be done about it because when a judgeship is created that judge serves for life or until he resigns or is removed. That is why during the period it has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary I have always taken the position that we should never create a permanent judgeship. Our population is constantly shifting. Today there might be need for an additional judge in a section of the United States where tomorrow he could not justify his existence. Unfortunately, when we create a permanent judgeship, that man is so affixed to the Federal pay roll that he never gets off. Sometimes they stay even after they are eligible for retirement. I could not imagine any reason at all for this bill. The business of the court is being conducted satisfactorily. There have been no complaints by the bar associations. We are the first ones to find out when a court is not able to keep abreast of its work. Bar associations do not hesitate for a moment to call the attention of our committee to the fact that the calendar is falling behind. My distinguished friend the gentleman from Alabama has mentioned the fact that the judicial conference has recommended that this judgeship be made permanent. I have never felt bound by a recommendation of the judicial conference of senior circuit court judges. I have never felt bound by the recommendations of the Attorney General. After all, what they say is merely advisory in my judgment, because who are they that they can tell us what the business of the courts is going to be years hence? That is a matter which should be dealt with as the conditions change; and as the business increases, then we should increase the judgeships.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I add something which I know has simply slipped the gentleman's mind—that Judge Duncan, when he testified before the committee, stated:

> The dockets in Missouri are current now, or practically so. We are keeping them entirely up.

Mr. WALTER. Well, I suppose further evidence of that is to be found in the fact that Judge Duncan has been able to leave his post in Missouri and serve in the District of Columbia in order to assist in relieving the congested docket here. There is no reason for making this judgeship permanent. I trust that the bill will be defeated.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. If this bill is passed, will it have any effect on the seniority of the judges in the Kansas City district?

Mr. WALTER. I am inclined to believe it will.

Mr. HANCOCK. That may be one reason for the bill.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this bill is to make permanent a temporary judgeship in Missouri. The office was created to take care of a so-called emergency. The office should not have been created but it was done. Now I am informed that this judge occupying this temporary judgeship wants to be appointed to a vacancy that exists in a permanent judgeship. Under the terms of the act creating the temporary office, when the present occupant dies or resigns to take another judgeship, the office is at an end. This judge, I am informed, wants to be appointed to take a position in a permanent judgeship which was made vacant by the death of Judge Otis. Now, the Congress of the United States is asked to stultify itself by extending and making permanent this temporary judgeship, thus giving to the State of Missouri six permanent judges, a Federal district judge to every 500,000 of population of the State, a thing that has not been done heretofore in the history of this country.

Judge SPRINGER, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, has just brought to the attention of the House the amazing fact that Missouri, with a population of 3,784,664, has 6 Federal district judges; Iowa, with a population of 2,558,268, has only 2 Federal district judges; Kentucky, with a population of 2,845,627, has 2; Nebraska, with a population of 1,315,834, has 1; and Kansas, with a population of 1,700,000, has only 1 Federal district judge. In Colorado, with a population of 1,400,000, there is only 1 Federal district judge; Indiana, with a population of 3,427,796, has but 2; and, by a recent census estimate, the population of Missouri has decreased 200,000 since the census of 1940. In 1942 there were 2,758 cases filed in all the district courts of Missouri; in 1944 the number of cases filed in all these courts dropped to 2,122, making only 350 cases for each of these 6 judges to handle. Many of these cases were disposed of on pleas of guilty, many were naturalization cases, and but few of them were actually tried.

Each lawyer knows that the jurisdiction of the Federal court is limited. It has bankruptcy cases, most of which are handled by the referees. It has naturalization cases which are pro forma. The only other cases it has, as a rule, are cases that grow out of the fact that the parties litigant are citizens of different States and the amount involved is more than $3,000.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. COX. With the assurance given that this proposal will not be brought back again during the present session, which means it will not be brought back

at all, I wonder if it would not be acceptable to the gentleman that a motion that the Committee rise be entertained?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is all right. I agree to that. I would rather talk when there are more people present.

Mr. COX. This will be the end of it.

Mr. JENNINGS. I agree with that. I am already ready to entertain a proposition from my distinguished friend.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman proceed with his argument?

Mr. JENNINGS. As I said, litigation in the Federal courts is restricted, and, in addition to that, I know, as a lawyer, that litigation in all the courts is constantly decreasing. Most of the litigation in all the States is in the State courts.

Let me say something else to you. I am talking for the people back on the farms and the little businessman and the white-collar class and all the people who must bear the ever-increasing cost of Federal Government in this country. We have a debt of $300,000,000,000, equal to the value of every dollar's worth of property within the confines of this Nation. We have passed beyond the shearing stage with the taxpayer. When you skin a sheep you can skin him but once. You can shear him once a year if you forego the skinning. It is not right to fasten upon the backs of the taxpayers of this country the cost of this unnecessary judgeship.

When this judge dies or resigns, this office dies. I hope he lives a long time. In consideration of matters of this kind we should determine it with an eye single to the welfare of all the people, and not for the purpose of giving to a party or to a faction in a party an unnecessary judgeship. Recently, when a question came before the Committee on the Judiciary, where a judge up in Pennsylvania had done wrong, the Judiciary Committee of this House without regard to party lines acted as one man in ridding the country of an unworthy judge. By the same token, I am opposed to making permanent a temporary judgeship that was not needed in the first place, and certainly is not needed now. It will cost the taxpayers of this country at least $20,000 a year to create this sinecure.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am going to take issue with the gentleman on the statement that it was not needed in the first place.

Mr. JENNINGS I thought you wanted to ask me a question. I do not yield for a speech.

I go back to my original proposition. I say this judgeship was not needed in the first place and it is certainly not needed now, because the emergency, in the name of which it was created in the first place, did not in fact then exist, and certainly is nonexistent now.

This bill should be defeated. The sordid methods of the Pendergast machine of Kansas City, Mo., should not be extended to the Federal judiciary. The effort to perpetuate this unnecessary office, if it succeeds, will give notice to the country that though Boss Pendergast may molder in the grave, his spirit and methods are marching on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I had no idea this bill was to be called up today. I was for the creation of this judgeship when it occurred. However, when the gentleman from Tennessee says that this judge was not needed in the first place, then he is taking issue with the judicial conference. Circuit judges, meeting in the Supreme Court Building on four different occasions, recommended the creation of this office, and on each occasion submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary a statement with reference to the situation concerning the docket in that State. As the gentleman said, the present occupant is a young man. He was a former Member of this House. I believe the great majority of the Members of this House served with him. He was a member of the Ways and Means Committee. He has made an excellent judge. I am frank to say I do not know what the situation is out there in reference to the docket because I have not been home for a year, but I do take issue when anyone says that the creation of this judgeship was a mistake.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. How will the tenure of the present holder of the judgeship, for whom we have a great deal of regard, be affected through the enactment of this legislation?

Mr. COCHRAN. None whatever, none whatever. The only way that I know it might be affected or could be affected—I want to be honest with the Members of the House—is that should there be a vacancy in either the eastern or western districts of Missouri it might be he could be nominated to fill the vacancy and then someone else nominated to fill the position as the roving judge. If this present judgeship were made permanent that is the only way I know it could be affected.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1996, providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri, is in my opinion, virtually "carrying coals to Newcastle."

Missouri, with a population of 3,700,000, has at the present time a Federal district judge for each 625,000 of population. By comparison Wisconsin, with a population of 3,100,000, has only two Federal district judges, or one for each 1,550,000 of population.

Recent revelations in Wisconsin indicate that the stress of Federal judicial business is not too great, even with the representation Wisconsin has, since, along with his other duties, one of our Federal judges finds time to be engaged in a lucrative private business. In this connection permit me to read an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of Saturday, September 15, 1945, entitled "A Judge, a Referee, and a Postmaster":

A JUDGE, A REFEREE, AND A POSTMASTER

It was a distinct shock to most Milwaukeeans to learn, as they did from a story in Friday's Journal, that Federal Judge F. Ryan Duffy and Postmaster John A. Fleissner have for several years been associated with Thomas F. Millane, recently retired referee in bankruptcy, and a few others in a closely held and highly profitable corporation, which has reaped most of its profits from Federal war orders.

That three top Federal officials in the city should be thus associated in business and that their firm should do business with the Federal Government is, of course, not contrary to law. But when government expects even field workers in the Internal Revenue Department to keep out of businesses in which they may have the slightest managing hand, it looks anything but good to have a Federal judge and his referee intimately involved in such a business. It does not look too good to have a full-time postmaster so involved.

The emoluments of Referee Millane as president of the Taylor Co. exceeded his earnings as referee. Postmaster Fleissner, who has an $8,000 full-time job with Uncle Sam, also had a $3,780 part-time job as Taylor Co. vice president and treasurer. The secretary was Mrs. F. Ryan Duffy. Judge Duffy himself held no office in the company, but along with Mrs. Duffy, was a stockholder. It is clear from all this that the Millane-Duffy-Fleissner group have been associated in a personally directed commercial enterprise of considerable proportions, an enterprise which started on a shoestring and waxed big largely through war orders.

It would seem that Congressmen of Wisconsin's Eastern Federal Judicial District might wish to inquire into some of the details of the business of this enterprise and into how the three Government officials first entered into it.

We have had many evidences in the past 12 years, following the defeat of Democratic candidates for public office, in which they were guaranteed perpetual care by appointment. Are we now to have the same kind of lame-duck appointments in the Federal judicial system? It must be remembered that H. R. 1196 is intended to make permanent an office which heretofore has been only temporary and which, according to testimony, has automatically been terminated by virtue of the fact that the business involved has been concluded.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 18 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, those who wish may laugh at the conference of senior circuit judges of the United States, but when they do they are laughing at

the highest judicial opinion that can be brought to bear upon this problem. If they do not know what is necessary for the administration of justice in Missouri and every other State, who does?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. WALTER. I wish the gentleman would show me where in their recommendations, made at a time when there was an unusual situation, they said that the judgeship ought to be a permanent judgeship. I read those recommendations every time they were made, and they were made because there was an unusual situation existing, condemnations of land, railroad organizations, long-drawn-out trials that took the time of the sitting judges to an extent they could not hear the cases that were on the calendar, but nowhere in the recommendations has there ever been a word said about the need for a permanent judgeship.

Mr. HOBBS. I will be so delighted to answer the distinguished member of our committee, one whom we all love. You do not talk about a permanent judgeship when you recommend the creation of a judgeship, you do not use that word, and neither do you when you recommend a temporary judgeship use the word "temporary." You tack on an amendment, as was done in this case, which says that where there is a vacancy in this judgeship it shall not be filled. That is why we call it temporary. If you omit that proviso then it is permanent. Not only in 1940 but my recollection is in the session prior to that, the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges of the United States unanimously recommended the creation of this as a permanent judgeship. Again in 1940 they used the same language without any reference to whether permanent or temporary and that is known to everyone, especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. What they did was to recommend a judgeship.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. WALTER. They based their recommendation on an unusual, an extraordinary, situation.

Mr. HOBBS. If that be true then why have they done it year in and year out and have since then renewed the recommendation? That is the record, that is the fact, and it cannot be disputed. At least three times the highest judicial body that has jurisdiction of such matters made this recommendation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman recall the testimony of Judge Duncan before our committee in which he stated that the dockets of their courts in Missouri were current and they are keeping up very well in their work?

Mr. HOBBS. I certainly do and I thank the gentleman for that word, because the undisputed evidence before our committee has been all the time that until the sixth judge was put there, and put his shoulder to the judicial wheel, they were running behind. We now have in this record the undisputed proof that since the sixth judge is on the job the dockets are current.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman will recall they still have six judges there. At that particular time one of the judges was ill and was not able to participate. The gentleman remembers that?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not recall that fact. It may be true and if you say so it is so.

Mr. SPRINGER. That judge has since died because of his illness.

Mr. HOBBS. I do not recall that, but if the gentleman says so, it is. When they had five judges they lagged behind. When they got the sixth judge they became current.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill does not add an extra judge in any way to the State of Missouri?

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. But gives them what they have already?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. RUSSELL. I join the gentleman in supporting this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always so happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand it, the recommendations have been made by sources from which recommendations are sought and looked for and respected?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. We know the legislative history of the bill in relation to the temporary judgeship, it being a temporary position. Someone has spoken about a sinecure. Nobody knows who is going to be the beneficiary of that, as we are sitting here today, because if it is made permanent the vacancy will occur in the future and what political party will be in power then nobody can tell now. Furthermore, the argument was made about this being temporary and the incumbent would be in there for life, the position terminating at his death. That argument might apply to every temporary Federal judgeship.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. It is a pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. As I understand, in the event of vacancy in this judgeship which is now filled by our erstwhile colleague, Mr. Duncan, then the position would lapse.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Duncan is now a judge in Missouri, and the President of the United States is an inhabitant of the State of Missouri. Therefore, if he were to get an appointment and were to accept it, with the need for this court shown, then this judgeship would be at an end; is that right?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATRICK. I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. HOBBS. Thank you, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. In reply to a question asked by the distinguished majority leader, that in the event that a judge died, the vacancy could not be filled, the gentleman replied in the affirmative.

Mr. HOBBS. I mean if Judge Duncan died, or some other temporary judge. That was my understanding of the question or statement.

Mr. WALTER. No. The distinguished majority leader asked the question about all judges.

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir; this judgeship or other temporary judgeships, as I got it.

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. WALTER. Then I was in error.

Mr. McCORMACK. What I said was any judge appointed to a temporary position is there for life so far as he is concerned, and I said the argument against the passage of this bill could be advanced against having any permanent judges.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right, and it would apply just the same. Now let us get right down to brass tacks. What is the milk in this coconut? There are many good reasons for the passage of this bill. At the present time you have a man who lives in St. Joseph, Mo., who is being brought 300 miles every week end across the State to sit because of the need in St. Louis, at a per diem and traveling expense allowance on the part of the Government. If that could be changed, you would save that money. Of course, that is not a great deal of money, but it is some money. There is a genuine economy, therefore, to make him a permanent judge so that he can be assigned where he should be and some other judge put in St. Louis.

Now, then, they talk to me about the number of cases. Take the number of cases in Iowa, take the number of cases in Nebraska, take the number of cases in those other Midwestern States, they do not begin to compare with the dockets in Missouri. They do not compare in the quality of the cases. It takes longer by months to try one case of the kind they have so many of in Missouri since the war came on—just as happened here in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, within your recent memory—than it does to try a few dozen of the rank and file short cases that come up in these other States.

I want to add this piece of testimony without any hesitation or possibility of challenge, that the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives has laid down this rule, that unless the creation of a judgeship is recommended by the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges we will not recommend the creation of that judgeship. We consult three agencies: The Conference of Senior Circuit Judges, the administrative officer of the courts, and the Department of Justice, and all three of those agencies recommended that Dick Duncan's judgeship be made permanent. They recommended its creation twice before that. Now they are back of this bill. I cannot see any reason why, with the record of this body being 90 percent in favor

of wiping out the temporary judgeships and making them permanent when the incumbent has justified the appointment by making good, we should hesitate to pass this bill. There is no reason for hesitation or question. We are asking as your committee here that you come into the picture with your votes and back up your committee and those who favor this bill, because it is nothing but right. Dick Duncan has earned a promotion to a permanent judgeship. We can save the taxpayers money, a small amount, it is true, every week, but we can save money by it. We have the indisputable proof here that, since you put him on, the dockets in the eastern and western districts of Missouri have become current, when they were not so before. So there is no argument contra.

They talk about railroad reorganizations and they talk about business corporation reorganizations. Some of them take months and months. They talk about the condemnation of land, and such cases always take months. Those cases still are on the docket undisposed of. We are keeping up because we have six good judges in Missouri to handle the great and growing business of that great and growing State. We ask for the vote that will put this measure over.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. If there were a vacancy on the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals, which I understand is the case at this time, and our President should see fit to appoint the incumbent, Judge Duncan, who I understand is a roving judge in Missouri, is it not a fact that the roving judgeship would cease to exist on the resignation of Judge Duncan?

Mr. HOBBS. Of course that is true.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman just mentioned the growing business in Missouri. The record shows that Mr. Chandler testified that in 1944 there were only 2,122 cases filed in all the districts of Missouri, and that was some 600 less than had been filed 2 or 3 years before.

Mr. HOBBS. I realize that, and I realize why. The gentleman brought it out when he cited the bankruptcy docket. In the prosperity that has attended our war effort, and all the things that went with it, there were practically no bankruptcies. Therefore, the total number of cases on docket almost everywhere has shown a decrease. A Federal judge has practically nothing to do with bankruptcy. That is done by referees, and they are about to starve to death. That is why we have a referees' bill in here to be considered in the very near future, we hope. But that does not mean that the real work of a Federal judge is less; in fact, it is growing, and the testimony in that record proves it.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, gladly.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman knows, as do all those who have served, as I have, in the district courts, that there is a rise and fall in litigation. The war has greatly stymied litigation. We all know that with the war over litigation will tend to pile up in this Nation. This is no time to bring about fewer judgeships in the United States.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman is exactly right. Not only that, but the total cost of the judicial set-up in the United States is less than one-tenth of 1 percent. We do need this judgeship made permanent. Missouri is too great a national center to lose its business volume or take a slump otherwise. The dockets of Missouri's Federal courts will inevitably grow heavier, rather than lighter, and this Congress must not make the mistake that might slow the dispatch of court business. We should see to it that the dockets in every State are kept current.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that this is not recommended by the judicial council and is it not also a fact that at least two of the judges from this district have spent months on assignment in the District of Columbia away from their own districts?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir.

Mr. TABER. Is not that a fact?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir. I say categorically that is not a fact. Judge Duncan testified when he was before the committee that he spent his vacation of 2 weeks here in the District to help out. He said Judge Collett had been here for I do not know how long.

Mr. TABER. For several months.

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir; I do not think so.

Mr. TABER. That is what I understand is a fact. I am advised that is the fact.

Mr. HOBBS. You may be correct, sir. If you say it "on your own," I will admit it.

Mr. TABER. I do not; but I have been informed to that effect by what I regard as a very reliable authority.

Mr. HOBBS. My recollection is otherwise, but you may be right.

I want to say that the testimony before our committee is absolutely unequivocal and unquestioned that the passage of this bill is needed. It is necessary to take care of a contingency which men who are best suited to gage judicial dockets regard as certain. It ought to be done and we urge you to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942 (Public Law 837, 77th Cong.), is amended by striking out the following: ": *Provided*, That the first vacancy occurring in said office shall not be filled."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GOSSETT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1196) to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri, approved December 24, 1942," pursuant to House Resolution 342, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 46, noes 54.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 146, nays 108, not voting 177, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—146

Allen, La.	Forand	Marcantonio
Andrews, Ala.	Gallagher	May
Bailey	Gardner	Mills
Baldwin, Md.	Gary	Monroney
Barden	Gathings	Murdock
Barry	Geelan	Murphy
Beckworth	Gibson	Neely
Bell	Gordon	O'Toole
Biemiller	Gorski	Outland
Bland	Gossett	Patman
Bonner	Granger	Patrick
Bradley, Pa.	Grant, Ala.	Patterson
Brooks	Green	Peterson, Ga.
Brown, Ga.	Gregory	Pickett
Bryson	Harless, Ariz.	Pittenger
Bulwinkle	Harris	Poage
Bunker	Hart	Price, Fla.
Burch	Havenner	Price, Ill.
Burgin	Hays	Priest
Camp	Healy	Rains
Cannon, Mo.	Hébert	Ramspeck
Chapman	Hobbs	Rankin
Chelf	Hoch	Richards
Clark	Holifield	Riley
Clements	Hook	Rivers
Cochran	Izac	Robertson, Va.
Coffee	Jackson	Rogers, Fla.
Combs	Johnson, Luther A.	Rowan
Cooper	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Russell
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Savage
Crosser	Kee	Sikes
D'Alesandro	Kefauver	Sparkman
Daughton, Va.	Kelley, Pa.	Spence
Davis	Kelly, Ill.	Starkey
Dingell	Kilday	Stewart
Domengeaux	Lanham	Stigler
Douglas, Calif.	Larcade	Sullivan
Douglas, Ill.	Lesinski	Sumners, Tex.
Doyle	Link	Thomas, Tex.
Drewry	McCormack	Thomason
Durham	McGehee	Tolan
Earthman	McKenzie	Trimble
Eberharter	McMillan, S. C.	Voorhis, Calif.
Engle, Calif.	Madden	Wasielewski
Ervin	Manasco	Weaver
Fallon	Mansfield, Mont.	Whitten
Fisher	Mansfield, Tex.	Winstead
Flannagan		Woodhouse
Flood		Worley
Folger		

NAYS—108

Adams	Arends	Bennet, N. Y.
Andersen, H. Carl	Arnold	Bennett, Mo.
Andresen, August H.	Auchincloss	Bishop
Angell	Barrett, Wyo.	Blackney
	Bates, Mass.	Brehm
	Beall	Brown, Ohio

Buck	Hancock	Phillips
Buffett	Hedrick	Ramey
Carlson	Henry	Reece, Tenn.
Chenoweth	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Church	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Clevenger	Hoeven	Rees, Kans.
Cole, Mo.	Holmes, Wash.	Rizley
Cole, N. Y.	Howell	Rockwell
Cravens	Hull	Rodgers, Pa.
Crawford	Jenkins	Schwabe, Mo.
Cunningham	Jennings	Schwabe, Okla.
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
D'Ewart	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Ohio
Dolliver	Kearney	Smith, Wis.
Doughton, N. C.	Knutson	Springer
Dworshak	Kunkel	Stefan
Ellis	LaFollette	Stockman
Ellsworth	LeCompte	Sumner, Ill.
Elston	Lemke	Sundstrom
Fellows	Lewis	Taber
Fenton	Ludlow	Talbot
Gavin	McCowen	Talle
Gillette	McMillen, Ill.	Thom
Gillie	Martin, Iowa	Vorys, Ohio
Graham	Martin, Mass.	Vursell
Grant, Ind.	Michener	Walter
Gwynne, Iowa	Miller, Nebr.	Weichel
Hale	Mott	Whittington
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.	Wigglesworth
	O'Konski	Wilson

NOT VOTING—177

Abernethy	Hagen	Pfeifer
Allen, Ill.	Hall, Leonard W.	Philbin
Anderson, Calif.	Halleck	Ploeser
Andrews, N. Y.	Hand	Plumley
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hare	Powell
Barrett, Pa.	Harness, Ind.	Quinn, N. Y.
Bates, Ky.	Hartley	Rabaut
Bender	Heffernan	Rabin
Bloom	Hendricks	Randolph
Bolton	Herter	Rayfiel
Boren	Heselton	Resa
Boykin	Hinshaw	Rich
Bradley, Mich.	Hoffman	Robertson, N. Dak.
Brumbaugh	Holmes, Mass.	Robinson, Utah
Buckley	Hope	Robsion, Ky.
Butler	Horan	Roe, Md.
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Roe, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jarman	Rogers, Mass.
Campbell	Jensen	Rogers, N. Y.
Canfield	Jones	Rooney
Cannon, Fla.	Jonkman	Ryter
Carnahan	Judd	Sabath
Case, N. J.	Kean	Sadowski
Case, S. Dak.	Keefe	Sasscer
Celler	Keogh	Scrivner
Chiperfield	Kerr	Shafer
Clason	Kilburn	Sharp
Cole, Kans.	King	Sheppard
Colmer	Kinzer	Sheridan
Cooley	Kirwan	Short
Corbett	Kopplemann	Simpson, Ill.
Courtney	Landis	Slaughter
Curley	Lane	Smith, Va.
Dawson	Latham	Snyder
De Lacy	Lea	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney, James J.	LeFevre	Stevenson
Delaney, John J.	Luce	Tarver
Dickstein	Lyle	Taylor
Dondero	Lynch	Thomas, N. J.
Eaton	McConnell	Tibbott
Elliott	McDonough	Torrens
Elsaesser	McGlinchey	Towe
Engel, Mich.	McGregor	Traynor
Feighan	Mahon	Vinson
Fernandez	Maloney	Wadsworth
Fogarty	Mason	Weiss
Fuller	Merrow	Welch
Fulton	Miller, Calif.	West
Gamble	Morgan	White
Gearhart	Morrison	Wickersham
Gerlach	Mundt	Winter
Gifford	Murray, Tenn.	Wolcott
Gillespie	Norrell	Wolfenden, Pa.
Goodwin	Norton	Wolverton, N. J.
Gore	O'Brien, Ill.	Wood
Granahan	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodruff, Mich.
Griffiths	O'Hara	Woodrum, Va.
Gross	O'Neal	Zimmerman
Gwinn, N. Y.	Pace	
	Peterson, Fla.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Heselton against.

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Keefe against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Kinzer against.

Mr. O'Brien, of Illinois for, with Mr. Brumbaugh against.

Mr. Resa for, with Mr. Dondero against.

Mr. McGlinchey for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Sheridan for, with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts against.

Mr. King for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Hare for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Fulton against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Horan against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Ploeser against.

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey against.

Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Latham against.

Mr. Sasscer for, with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky against.

Mr. Torrens for, with Mr. Goodwin against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Jones against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Case of New Jersey.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Rogers of New York with Mr. Jonkman.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.

Mr. John J. Delaney with Mr. Tibbott.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Clason.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission, first, to extend his own remarks; second, to extend his remarks and include an editorial; and, third, to extend his remarks and include therein an article.

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend her own remarks.

Mr. KNUTSON (at the request of Mr. COLE of Missouri) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial by Arthur Krock.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain excerpts and court decisions.

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein an article from the Lutheran Magazine published by the Walther League of Organized Labor; and also to extend his remarks and to include therein a radio address which he made on the subject of the minimum wage.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Welfare Department."

Mr. GARDNER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on labor management policies.

Mr. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order which I have for today be transferred to next Wednesday and that I be permitted to address the House on that day for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE THE SUGAR SITUATION

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Agriculture or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof to investigate the diversion of sugar, whether imported or manufactured in the United States, to foreign and domestic brewers for use in the production of malt and malt beverages, and the amount of sugar being used in current domestic production by the brewers of this country. This committee is also authorized to investigate the question of quotas of sugar that are being diverted to breweries in this country.

Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called from time to time to the shortage of sugar in this country under the rationing system, and my attention has been directed particularly to an acute situation that has arisen during the summer and fall of this year when the need for sugar for canning has become more acute. According to an editorial in Brewers' Journal for July 1945, 34 brewers in this country consumed 184,690 pounds of rationed sugar. This editorial further states that brewers used approximately 2,209,200 pounds of rationed sugar annually. This, of course, is rationed sugar.

During July 1945, according to a Treasury Department statement, the breweries used 23,767,325 pounds of sugar and sugar sirups. These figures do not include, of course, corn sugar used from 92,842,000 pounds of corn and corn products consumed during the same month of July this year.

By way of comparison, sugar and sugar sirups, according to this report, consumed in July 1944 was 18,022,000 pounds and corn and corn products was 81,008,000 pounds. These tables also show an increase of 25 percent in the

use of sugar and sirups as well as corn and corn products by the brewers of this country.

On examination of these reports by the brewers and by the Department of Agriculture, 2,209,200 pounds of rationed sugar is used annually, but according to the Treasury Department's tables approximately 285,000,000 pounds of sugar and sugar sirups is consumed annually by the brewers of this country, making a total of 287,207,000 pounds of sugar and sugar sirups used by the brewers.

Think, if you will, the amount of fruits and other food products that could have been preserved by the people of this country and for those with whom we may want to share abroad if that sugar supply or even a good percent of it could have been used for food and food products on the family table.

According to figures submitted, the brewers will increase their output about 25 percent and the allocation of sugar for the family table will be reduced accordingly. The problem involved, in my opinion, is whether the American people want more sugar on the family table or whether it is to be consumed by the breweries.

FASCISM

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, we have learned many things in this war. We have seen fascism grow from beer hall to international proportions. It crept into every corner of the world. In America, fascism became silent after Pearl Harbor. The first phase of this job was done. The Fascists were driven underground during the war.

Gerald L. K. Smith was one who spewed venom in Detroit against minorities; we had the Detroit riot. Similar riots occurred across the country, causing disruption of war production and disunity throughout the land. Now, after the war, the same evil tactics of disunity are at work. If we fail to speak out now, fascism may sweep the United States.

The American Nazi, Gerald L. K. Smith, who styles himself a Nationalist, as Hitler did, has announced that he intends "to take over in November." The methods by which Hitler achieved power in Germany are being used by Gerald L. K. Smith. The same kind of hate-baiting of Jews, Negroes, Catholics, and other minority groups, the same technique that Hitler used. Smith intends to originate an investigation of the motion-picture industry through the red-baiting tactics that Hitler resorted to.

Unity is what we desire in this great motion-picture industry. We recognize that a smear of Hollywood is always good publicity. Much of the motion-picture industry is in the district which I represent. It is wrong to persecute this industry. I hope that all such attacks will be rescinded.

We in the Congress here are struggling with the problems brought about by the immediate ending of the war. We are struggling to bring orderly reconversion from war to peace. We are attempting to aid in full production, full employment, and a fuller life for all of our people. In order to bring this about, it is going to require the greatest amount of unity and orderly readjustment possible. We hope to achieve these objectives in our Nation so that we will have prosperity at home and peace in the world. But if our people's minds are confused and twisted by vicious propaganda against religious, racial, and minority groups, it makes our task much more difficult. If we permit this to grow as Gerald L. K. Smith would have it, we will not have provided for the general welfare of our people, as is demanded by our Constitution; nor will we have aided our desire for a strong and properous democracy.

I hope that we Members of the Congress will see to it that the nature of the activities of Gerald L. K. Smith and his ilk will be exposed. We must prove to these demagogues that the American people are not the emotionally insecure Germans nor the superstitious Japanese who fell under the influence of fascism and its forces. We are equipped in the Congress to expose these Fascist forces in America, and I cannot see how we can fail. It is the duty of the Un-American Activities Committee to investigate the forces of fascism and disunity in this country, or any other forces that would bring about religious, racial, and national intolerance upon the part of our people.

Freedom of speech, of press, of religion, and one's right to petition his Government are guaranteed to us under our Constitution, and this we do not wish to curtail in any way whatsoever. I hope that the educational processes of our people are strong and rapid enough to conquer religious, racial, and national intolerance and bigotry. But, if the wheels of education move too slowly, then must not we pass laws preserving these cherished rights that our Constitution guarantees to us before we destroy ourselves through disunity? The engines of destruction are so efficient, as indicated by late developments brought about in the war, that we must have unity on the part of our people at home and international understanding and good will so that we may have peace upon this earth. If we cannot achieve this, I fear another war which would almost destroy the human race.

Let us firmly resolve that we shall have unity, good will, and understanding with one another, to achieve the great objective of making democracy work in this Nation so that the nations of the world will adopt by choice our American democracy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Saturday Evening Post concerning the disposal of surplus property.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and other previous orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of critical illness in his family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 374. An act to amend the act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce"; and

S. J. Res. 78. An act to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Crugers-on-Hudson, near Peekskill, N. Y., as "Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 24, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in executive session, on Friday, September 21, 1945, at 10 o'clock, a. m., in the committee room 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m., on Tuesday, September 25, 1945, on H. R. 2202, in room 362, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, September 27, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1751, to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Merchant Marine Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, will meet at 10 a. m., Tuesday, October 9, to begin hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

Various groups who have representation in Washington will be heard during the first week, such as Members of Congress first, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Association of American Railroads, Railroad

Traffic Organizations, railroad labor, and truck and bus associations.

The second week will be devoted to various State commissions, agricultural associations, National Industrial Traffic League and various citizens' traffic associations and traffic boards and chambers of commerce.

It is going to be necessary to limit the time for this hearing if possible. It is also desired to avoid any repetition in statements before the committee.

The committee would be pleased to have those who are intending to appear to advise the clerk promptly the least amount of time they will need in which to present their testimony.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 961. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3636. A bill relating to the sale, in the District of Columbia, of certain small rockfish; without amendment (Rept. No. 967). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3867. A bill to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to the making and publishing of annual reports by trust companies; without amendment (Rept. No. 968). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3868. A bill to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the District of Columbia, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3873. A bill to provide for the opening of a road within the boundaries of the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MANASCO: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 4129. A bill to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 559. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service," approved October 27, 1943, so as to make the provisions thereof effective with respect to losses occurring on or after October 31, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3095. A bill for the relief of Ellis Duke, also known as Elias Duke; with amendment (Rept. No. 963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3987. A bill for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh; without amendment (Rept. No. 964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4018. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Hudson; with amendment (Rept. No. 965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4048. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decisions of the Court of Claims in two suits instituted by H. B. Nelson (doing business as the H. B. Nelson Construction Co.); without amendment (Rept. No. 966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENRY:

H. R. 4143. A bill to amend Revised Statutes 4921 (U. S. C. A., title 35, patents, sec. 70) providing that damages be ascertained on the basis of compensation for infringement, as in actions for infringement in the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 4144. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4145. A bill to authorize payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave to persons whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGLINCHEY:

H. R. 4146. A bill to direct the discharge of fathers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 4147. A bill to establish a Chiropody (Podiatry) Corps in the Medical Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 4148. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 4149. A bill to provide for the establishment of lawful entry into the United States of certain aliens not subject to deportation who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4150. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 to provide severance pay for employees whose employment has terminated by reason of cancellation or termination of Government contracts resulting from the cessation of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 4151. A bill to encourage the provision of useful public works, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. Res. 354. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the diversion of sugar to brewers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. Res. 355. Resolution authorizing report on Army demobilization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1176. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Petition of Ben. R. Simpers and 32 citizens of Park County, Wyo., in favor of H. R. 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1177. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. Claude A. Babb, What Cheer, Iowa, and other citizens of Thornburg and What Cheer, Iowa, urging that the draft be continued so that men now in service may be released; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1178. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Harley C. Rusk and other citizens of Jasper County, Mo., urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1179. Also, petition of C. S. Henry and other citizens of Joplin, Mo., favoring a 30-year-service retirement for rail workers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, September 10, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art man's unfailing friend, grant that in this moment of prayer we may enter the fellowship of all who are seekers and finders of God.

We pray that our spirits may be illumined by Thy spirit and touched to finer issues. Make us the beneficiaries of some new experience of divine wisdom and power with which to meet the tasks and responsibilities that challenge the consecration of our noblest manhood.

Emancipate our minds and hearts from doubt and fear and everything that is contrary to Thy holy will. Sustain us in fidelity to the lofty principles which Thou hast ordained. May we earnestly covet the benediction which Thou dost bestow upon the faithful.

Hear us in the name of the Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, September 20, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1196. An act to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled

"An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942; and

H. J. Res. 225. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on September 20, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 374. An act to amend the act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce";

S. 397. An act to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939–41;

S. 1045. An act to provide for pay and allowances and transportation and subsistence of personnel discharged or released from the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard because of under age at the time of enlistment, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Crugers-on-Hudson, near Peekskill, N. Y., as "Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital."

REPORT OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE DURING THE RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 20th instant,

Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. TOBEY), from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government, reported it with amendments on September 22, 1945, and submitted a report (No. 583) thereon.

CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, almost 2 months ago the first atomic bomb destroyed Hiroshima and a major part of its population—men, women, and children. Since that holocaust—the greatest in all history—there has been only one real question before the people of this world. Is atomic energy to advance the welfare of all humanity or is it to provide the means of global suicide?

Two alternatives, and only two, now confront us and we must soon choose between them. Is atomic power to be controlled by an international organization as its instrument for the guaranty of world peace and plenty, or are the nations to enter a race for the development of ever more horrible military instruments—a race which can end only in the annihilation of all the competitors?

Those alternatives the people of the United States and the rest of the world have had before them since August—those two and no others—a vicious, concentrated search for weapons of human destruction, or a plan for the peaceful sharing and the international control of the gigantic powers of nature. Have we brought to the consideration of these alternatives the qualities of concentrated clear thinking, candor, and courage? It seems to me we have not. After the first days of mingled wonder and foreboding, we have relaxed and are now dissipating our energies on unhappy controversies of very minor importance to the public welfare. But I cannot urge too strongly that we must not make a decision by default; that all is lost if we let the world drift into an era of intense, brutal competition at the conclusion of which looms catastrophe for all of us.

I would not be understood as implying that wise and just action by the Government of the United States would happily and forever settle the dangerous hazards involved. Most unfortunately, that is not true. The good will, the courage, the candor, and the cooperation of every other Allied nation, great and small, is necessary. These failing, nothing we can do will help divert world chaos. But, manifestly, the initiative to establish an international policy to control the atomic bomb must come from us. We built it; in its use we killed hundreds of thousands of human beings; we possess now its fearful mastery more than any other nation. No one else now has the power even to attempt to banish from this unhappy world the fear that our bomb creation has engendered.

I am, therefore, most happy that two Senate committees are now directing their attention to the atomic problem. The Military Affairs Committee—under the leadership of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]—has already favorably reported to the Senate a resolution providing for a commission to deal with the atomic bomb. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, whose leadership was so potent in perfecting our present international organization, now has pending a resolution for the creation of a special joint committee of the House and Senate to deal with this same question of our policy on the atomic bomb. I hope that any congressional committee handling this hazardous issue will have as members both the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]—two of our ablest and most philosophical statesmen.

For the benefit of any congressional committee which may be appointed, I should like to suggest that we must realize that the atomic bomb is only one of many dreadful engines of warfare now being perfected in secret workshops and darkened laboratories everywhere. Today our atomic bomb and other technological weapons may be the most fiendish; tomorrow they may be humane compared with the race-destroying instruments of other governments.

Who knows how soon—if it is not already accomplished—some scientist may breed a virulent germ to spread the black or scarlet plague that will end us all? Who knows how soon—if it is not already perfected—a poisonous spray of gas, as deadly to us as DDT to insect life, will be ready for our destruction? Who knows if some chemist in some other land is not, as I speak, learning how to unleash the titanic power of every element while our scientists are still using uranium atoms only? Who knows what miracle of radar, death-dealing rays, or other cruel and brutal methods of extinction may be now developing in this unhappy world?

So, Mr. President, I think that any committee appointed from the Senate to consider our atomic-bomb policy should be given power to inquire into and to report a policy on all the other potent instruments of mass destruction now developing in the arsenals and laboratories of our country.

Mr. President, somewhere along the road of competitive armament lies a catastrophe that will engulf and doom civilized man. We need not travel that road. There is no compulsion in our nature that compels it. But if we would avoid it, we had best begin to act. There are many of us here who feel as I do—who, doubtful of our wisdom, would prefer to go forward into a world organization at a slower pace, feeling their way through preliminary stages of experiments in cooperation, of widening regional agreements. But our preferences do not affect the atomic bomb. It demands international control, or it will mete out international chaos. Nor can we hope to stave off its insistence by prohibitions on atomic research. No other nation would agree to stop research as long as we—and we only—held the secret. If, on the other hand, we committed the secret to the World Council, then there would be every reason to encourage it, with the hope that atomic energy could be exploited and controlled for the good, and not the evil, of mankind.

We move forward, willy-nilly, into a furiously dynamic world—the atomic age. In it the life of man can be peaceful, free of poverty, and creative. Or, in the strident words of Hobbes, it can be "nasty, brutish, and short." Whether it shall be the one or the other depends on our decision to choose—international control of the atomic bomb, or international competition in carnage.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PAUL P. CRET

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, the special committee appointed under Senate Joint Resolution 31 to work with the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. David Lynn, and others for the reconstruction and repair of the Senate Chamber, recently engaged the services of Mr. Paul P. Cret, one of the outstanding architects and designers of the present age, as consulting engineer and adviser on the work contemplated.

A few days ago Mr. Cret passed away at his home in Philadelphia.

Some of the outstanding examples of his hand and brain are the Pan-American Building in Washington, the Detroit Institute of Art, the Federal Reserve Board Building in Washington, the Hall of Science at the Century of Progress Exposition in Chicago, and many others. The Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington is considered by many to be his greatest achievement. It has been pronounced by men who are qualified to know as "a pearl" among modern works of architecture.

Since his death the Commission of Fine Arts, composed of Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman, William F. Lamb,

Henry V. Poor 3d, Ralph Stackpole and David E. Finley, has volunteered its services to supervise the work on the Senate Chamber designs. The Senate special committee is to have a joint meeting with the Commission of Fine Arts on October 5, at which meeting preliminary plans will be considered along the line of suggestions which have already been made or will be made at the meeting.

I ask unanimous consent that a most interesting and able editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star of September 11, entitled "Paul P. Cret," be inserted at this point in the RECORD, where it may be read by future generations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAUL P. CRET

Few men of his time have left so many monuments as Paul P. Cret. He was an artist of the very greatest distinction, and he will be remembered as long as the structures he created stand—and longer, too, as they take their respective places in recorded history. The Folger Shakespeare Library undoubtedly was his greatest achievement. It is, as the donors always considered it, "a pearl" among modern works of architecture.

But Dr. Cret had accomplished many notable triumphs before he came to East Capitol Street. Born in Lyons, France, October 23, 1876, he was educated at the fine arts schools of his native city and of Paris and through those institutions received the discipline of the classic tradition to which, despit emore than a little pressure from the age in which he lived, he remained faithful all his life. From 1903 to 1937 he served as professor of design at the University of Pennsylvania. Meanwhile he was associated with Albert Kelsey in the execution of the drawings for the Pan American Building on Seventeenth Street here, with Zantzinger, Borie, and Medary in the Indianapolis Public Library and the Detroit Institute of Arts, and with Smith and Bassette in the County Building at Hartford. His independent designs included the Federal Reserve Board Building, the Central Heating Plant and the Calvert Street Bridge in Washington, the Valley Forge Memorial Arch and the Delaware Bridge in Philadelphia, the Hall of Science at the Century of Progress Exposition in Chicago, new buildings for the University of Texas and for the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis. The enterprises in which he probably found the keenest satisfaction were the Chateau Thierry, Bony, Waereghem, and Gibraltar war memorials, into which he put his love for the country of his birth as well as that for the country of his adoption.

No adequate conception of Dr. Cret's career, however, can be obtained from mere reading of a list of the projects to which he contributed his genius. In order to appreciate him fully it is necessary to consider the pure and lovely grace of the buildings he brought into existence. He was possessed of powers of imagination of the highest order, but he also was gifted with the force of character required for translating dreams into realities. Whatever he touched took on some element of the strength that was in him. Thus he left his mark on the whole world both directly and, as in the Federal Commission of Fine Arts, for example, through his influence upon others. No man could ask a grander privilege.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics for the calendar year ended December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Chairman of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice and the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending December 31, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions and a memorial, which were referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted by the American Geographical Union, Washington, D. C., favoring an appropriation for the making of maps for national planning and other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter in the nature of a petition from a member of the armed forces of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the prompt release of members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Arkansas Valley Ditch Association, assembled at Pueblo, Colo., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for the creation of the Missouri Valley Authority, the Columbia Valley Authority, the Ohio Valley Authority, and the Savannah Valley Authority; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

DISCONTINUANCE OF USE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter from the Wisconsin Motor Carriers' Association embodying a resolution adopted by the board of directors of that association at a meeting held in Milwaukee, Wis., on September 10, 1945, relating to the discontinuance of the $5 use tax on motor vehicles.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN MOTOR CARRIERS' ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., September 18, 1845.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We are pleased to advise you that at a meeting of the board of directors of the Wisconsin Motor Carriers' Association, held in Milwaukee on September 10, 1945, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Resolved by the board of directors of the Wisconsin Motor Carriers' Association, That the $5 use tax on motor vehicles should be abolished; and be it further

"Resolved, That the officers of this association be hereby instructed to take all necessary steps to bring this resolution to the attention of the Senators and Congressmen of this State and to other proper officials and organizations."

I am pleased to transmit this resolution to you and trust that you will give favorable consideration to the suggestion contained therein on any legislation that may be proposed on this subject.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE TIERNAN, *President.*
E. G. DOWE, *Secretary.*

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Superior, Wis., relating to the very critical coal situation.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution declaring the existence of an emergency with respect to the inadequate supply of coal now on the docks in the Head of the Lakes area, and requesting the Solid Fuels Administration and the proper agents and officers of the Government of the United States to take immediate steps to rectify the situation

Whereas the supply of coal presently on the docks in the Head of the Lakes area is entirely inadequate to care for consumers' needs and wants during the coming heating season; and

Whereas reliable figures and information show a deficiency on the docks in the Head of the Lakes area of approximately 6,000,000 tons, and all bituminous coal used by industrial plants and domestic consumers moves from these docks; and

Whereas it is imperative that coal should be carried by boats to such docks immediately in order to insure a sufficient supply to last until the opening of the 1946 navigation season, which will probably not open until late in April or early in May of 1946; and

Whereas the close of navigation in 1945 will be approximately on the 17th of November, but that date cannot be relied upon because of severe weather conditions which may cause lake shipments to cease earlier than November 17; and

Whereas a failure to have on hand a sufficient supply of coal on the docks in the Head of the Lakes area before the close of the present navigation season will create conditions fraught with imminent danger to the health, welfare, and good order of all of the communities in the Head of the Lakes area; and

Whereas this serious coal shortage was called to the attention of the Solid Fuels Administration officials at a meeting held in the mayor's office in the city of Duluth, Minn., on June 12, 1945, and the situation has not been rectified or in anywise made better since that date: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Superior, Wis., That an emergency is declared to exist, and that steps must of necessity be immediately taken to rectify that emergency for the preservation of the health, welfare, and good order of the city of Superior, Wis., and specifically on behalf of the citizens of the city of Superior, Wis., and generally on behalf of all neighboring communities, and that this resolution stand as a petition to the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, that the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government of the United States take immediate steps to insure at the Head of the Lakes area a sufficient supply of bituminous coal on the docks before the close of the 1945 navigation season, in order to prevent extreme suffering and hardship in this area during the coming heating season; and be it further

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Superior, Wis., That the Solid Fuels Administration be immediately requested to give every reasonable opportunity to provide, and that the said Solid Fuels Administration do provide No. 1-A priorities which will immediately facilitate the shipping of coal from lower lake ports to docks in the area served by the Head of the Lakes; and be it further

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Superior, Wis., That the city clerk be forthwith directed to mail a certified copy of this resolution to ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE and ALEXANDER WILEY, the Senators for the State of Wisconsin, to ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Congressman for the Tenth Congressional District, President Harry S. Truman, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, and Under Secretary of the Interior Abe Fortas, all at Washington, D. C.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1414. A bill to assist in soil-conservation and water-conservation work by making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for such work through the distribution thereof, by grant or loan, to public bodies organized under State laws, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 584).

From the Committee on Claims:

S. 998. A bill for the relief of Gregory Stelmak; with an amendment (Rept. No. 585), and

S. 1101. A bill for the relief of the estate of Manuel Rose Lima; without amendment (Rept. No. 586).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 865. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Allberry; with amendments (Rept. No. 587).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1233. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Kansas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 588).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 3951. A bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 589).

MANUFACTURE OF NITRATES FOR FERTILIZER FROM AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST PRODUCTS

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 176) which was ordered to be placed on the Calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested to make an immediate study to determine the advisability of continuing the operation of all federally owned plants and facilities which were used during the war for the exclusive processing of agricultural commodities and forest products or for manufacturing nitrates for fertilizer and to report to the Congress his findings and recommendations based thereon.

Until the report of the Secretary of Agriculture is received and considered by the Congress, all Federal agencies having jurisdiction over the above-mentioned plants are requested to refrain from leasing, selling, or otherwise disposing of, any such plants without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. Until such time as the Congress has had an opportunity to study the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture and formulate a policy with reference to the future operation or disposition of the above-mentioned plants, all Government agencies having jurisdiction over said plants are requested to continue the operation thereof, provided the products from such operation can be effectively used by the Federal Government, or provided the plants can be used to process surplus or perishable crops.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1421. A bill to authorize the appointment of William T. Bayley as an ensign in the United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1422. A bill to provide optional retirement for Government officers and employees who have rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1423. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Phillips; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1424. A bill to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1425. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.," approved June 8, 1940; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MCCARRAN (for himself, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. CAPPER):

S. 1426. A bill to provide for the replanning and rebuilding of slum, blighted, and other areas of the District of Columbia and the assembly, by purchase or condemnation, of real property in such areas and the sale or lease thereof for the redevelopment of such area in accordance with said plans; and to provide for the organization of, procedure for, and the financing of such planning, acquisition, and sale or lease; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1427. A bill to provide for insurance or annuities without cost to certain veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1428. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Meta D. Wippérling; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 1429. A bill to amend paragraph (3) of subsection (s) of section 75 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution to provide for replacement of medical personnel commissioned from civilian life with persons trained under the Army Specialized Training Program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1196. An act to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri", approved December 24, 1942; and

H. J. Res. 225. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles.

STATEMENT ON DEMOBILIZATION BY GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL (S. DOC. 90)

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement on demobilization made by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, delivered to Members of the Congress in the auditorium of the Library of Congress on Thursday, September 20, 1945, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the testimony given by him before the Banking and Currency Committee concerning the so-called full employment bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH—ARTICLE BY JACK H. POLLACK

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Labor Is His Business," by Jack H. Pollack, dealing with Secretary of Labor Lewis Schwellenbach, published in the This Week magazine of the New York Herald Tribune of September 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHICAGO AND THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO SUN

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Chicago and the St. Lawrence Project," published in the Chicago Sun of September 22, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CRITICS OF THE INDUSTRIAL SOUTH—STATEMENT BY E. H. CRUMP

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article based on a statement by Mr. E. H. Crump, of Memphis, Tenn., relative to attempts to prevent the postwar migration of industry to the South, published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal for September 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF THE ATOMIC BOMB SECRET

[Mr. BUCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. W. S. Carpenter, Jr., president of E. I. du-Pont de Nemours & Co., to the Secretary of State, under date of September 4, 1945, and a further letter from Mr. Carpenter to the stockholders of that company relative to the industrial development of the use of the atomic energy, which appear in the Appendix.]

SENIORITY CREDIT FOR SERVICEMEN—EDITORIAL FROM RAILROAD WORKERS' JOURNAL

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Servicemen Deserve Service," published in the October 1945 issue of the Railroad Workers' Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEST WE FORGET—EDITORIAL FROM STAMFORD (CONN.) ADVOCATE

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lest We Forget," published in the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate of September 4, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

USE OF NATIONAL GUARD TO TRAIN YOUTH—ARTICLE BY FRANCIS S. MURPHY

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Use National Guard To Train Youth," written by Francis S. Murphy, publisher of the Hartford Times, and printed in the Greenwich (Conn.) Time of August 8, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Myers
Andrews	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hawkes	Reed
Bilbo	Hayden	Revercomb
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hoey	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Taylor
Capehart	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McClellan	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	McMahon	Wagner
Cordon	Magnuson	Wheeler
Donnell	Maybank	Wherry
Downey	Mead	White
Ellender	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Mitchell	Willis
Fulbright	Moore	Wilson
George	Morse	Young
Gerry	Murdock	
Green	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that today we have no legislation program ready for consideration, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William C. Mathes, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

B. Howard Caughran, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana;

James Joseph Gillespie, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa; and

Chester M. Foresman, of North Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

W. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, to be Surplus Property Administrator;

Robert Porter Patterson, of New York, to be Secretary of War;

Brig. Gen. William Clayton Rose (colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States, to be a temporary major general in the Army of the United States; and

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dean G. Acheson, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is: Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. There was so much confusion in the Chamber that I could not hear the statement made by the President pro tempore.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senate now in executive session?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is now in executive session, and the subject under consideration is the nomination of Dean G. Acheson, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of State.

The question is: Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the nomination be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska has moved that the nomination be recommitted to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for further consideration. All in favor of the motion——

Mr. BARKLEY. On that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to supplement the remarks I made on the floor of the Senate Thursday afternoon relative to the nomination of Mr. Acheson to be Under Secretary of State, and to refer again to the statement Mr. Acheson is said to have made, as reported by the Washington Post on September 20, from which report I quote as follows:

The United States Government, not the occupation forces under General MacArthur, is determining American policy toward Japan.

Secondly, he stated that there was a decision on the part of the State Department for social and economic revolution in Japan.

And, thirdly, in speaking of this Government's policy toward Japan he said that the policy would not be changed, and that it would be carried out "regardless of cost."

Those statements were made by Mr. Acheson, as reported by the Washington Post, and which I read to the Senate last Thursday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am glad always to yield to the distinguished majority leader, and I think he knows that to be true. I respect him by reason of the office he holds, and I shall yield this time, but I ask that until I conclude my statement I be not further interrupted. I ask that I be given the opportunity to place in the RECORD a statement of what I interpret the situation to be, and then I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said he was reading from an article in the Washington Post what Mr. Acheson was said to have said. I wondered whether the Senator was going to read the statement that Mr. Acheson actually made.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is a stenographic report, an accurate report, of what he said.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; if the distinguished Senator will bear with me. I was simply bringing the Senate up to date respecting what had transpired. I shall not only ask that my queries submitted to Mr. Acheson be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, but I shall ask to have his reply thereto inserted in the RECORD. He has given me authority to do so. He has already released his answer to my queries, and his answer can be interpreted as Senators care to interpret it as it relates to his previous statement.

Mr. President, I think the Members of the Senate will recall that I asked that consideration of the nomination be delayed until Monday. I wish to remind Senators specifically that I also stated on the floor on Thursday that I had no intention, when I rose on the floor of the United States Senate, to ask that the nomination be delayed. Members who were present will recall, as I am sure the distinguished majority leader will, that I said I simply wanted to insert into

the RECORD further statements relative to the demobilization of our forces in Japan, a subject in which I am vitally interested, as well as the demobilization of our forces across the water in Europe, a subject in which I am also vitally interested. It was because of that statement of mine that the colloquy developed among Members of the Senate respecting Mr. Acheson's nomination, and before any Member of the Senate expressed opposition to the nomination last Thursday, I repectfully asked the majority leader if it were not possible to delay consideration of the nomination until Monday without any further argument. I wish to bring the Members of the Senate who did not hear the discussion Thursday up to date on the subject. There were not many Members present at that time. As I previously stated, I did not arise at that time to delay the nomination or to raise objection to the nomination, because up to that moment I had no personal objection to Mr. Acheson.

Mr. President, I am cognizant of the fact that the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously favorably reported his nomination. I realize how futile it would be to attempt to override the action of the Foreign Relations Committee and to have his nomination recommitted to the Foreign Relations Committee. But in view of the colloquy which developed Thursday in the Senate Chamber, and in view of the editorials I have read and the letters and telegrams I have received during the week end, I wish to make a presentation for the RECORD respecting the nomination of Mr. Acheson.

Although I may be alone in my vote, I want the RECORD to show that I do not support the nomination of Mr. Acheson. I have not solicited any support for the motion I have just made.

In view of the fact that the able junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] also made some remarks in line with those I made, I wish to say prior to the time he made them I did not know he intended to make any remarks relative to the nomination of Mr. Acheson. I acted solely upon my own motion. I presented my personal viewpoint. While I should like very much to be supported in the motion I have just made, yet, as I said, it still represents my personal viewpoint, and other Senators, of course, have the privilege of voting as they choose respecting recommittal of the nomination. I had hoped that over the week end the answers from Mr. Acheson would clarify the former statements which he is reported in the Washington Post to have made to the press, and that I would be enabled to know what his position or the administration's policy was toward Japan, and whether or not he was speaking for himself or for the State Department. I had hoped that Mr. Acheson would clarify his rebuke to General MacArthur and also the relationship which exists between the State Department and General MacArthur concerning our occupation of Japan.

At this point I should like to enter into the RECORD a list of the questions which I forwarded to Mr. Acheson on Friday afternoon. These questions were asked in good faith. I wish to read them:

1. Is General MacArthur acting as a representative only of the United States Government or of the Allied Governments as well in implementing the terms of the Potsdam agreement?

2. Do you know of any instance or instances wherein General MacArthur has evidenced any unwillingness to discharge his responsibilities as agent of the Allied Governments?

3. Are you wholeheartedly in agreement with the Potsdam Declaration?

I am speaking to Mr. Acheson personally. In view of the policy he has announced, I wanted to know whether it was his personal policy to foster a social economic revolution, paid for by the taxpayers of the country, or whether he was the "hatchet man" for the administration in announcing to the public that that was the administration's policy.

4. Are not our dealings with Japan already honor bound by our commitment to the Potsdam Declaration?

5. Is there anything in the Potsdam Declaration which requires the Allied Nations to deal with Hirohito any differently than General MacArthur is now dealing with him?

6. Is there any provision in the Potsdam Declaration for any one of the Allied Governments deliberately to foster a social and economic revolution in Japan?

7. In implementing the provisions of this declaration, do you believe that the judgment, the wisdom, and the magnanimity of spirit of General MacArthur's address aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri* could be surpassed when he said: "Nor is it for us here to meet, representing as we do a majority of the peoples of the earth, in a spirit of distrust, malice, or hatred. But rather it is for us, both victors and vanquished, to rise to that higher dignity which alone benefits the sacred purposes we are about to serve, committing all of our people unreservedly to faithful compliance with the undertakings they are here formally to assume."

8. Is not the real ground for any quarrel between the State Department and General MacArthur the fact that he did not use the normal channels through which to transmit to the American people his conclusions as to his future needs in Japan, and if he had used the normal channels, what guaranty is there that the American people would have been informed?

That is a very important question, because of the question which follows.

9. If, after the few weeks that General MacArthur has been in Tokyo he has been able to revise his estimate of future needs so drastically, are not we warranted in assuming that General Eisenhower has made a similar revision? Do you know whether such a revision has been made by General Eisenhower and transmitted to this country; and if so, whether or not the information has yet been given to the American people?

I expect to have something to say about the questions which he did not answer. This particular question was unanswered, and I should like to have it answered. Information has come to me from high military sources which I cannot reveal that there has been a revised estimate given by General Eisenhower to the high command, and that figure has not been made known to the American people.

Mr. Acheson has already publicly released the answers to my questions, and the answers do not contain any information which the public should not have. In all fairness to Mr. Acheson, I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD his answers together with all the accompanying exhibits, including the Potsdam agreement, together with the signatures, and the release made by the administration Saturday night, which sets forth the policy which this Government has and expects to maintain toward Japan in the future.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am reluctant to yield. I should like to comply with my colleague's request, but I asked the distinguished majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY], when he requested me to yield, to allow me to complete my statement without interruption. I told him that at the conclusion of my statement I would be glad to yield. I will yield to the Senator at this time, but I should like to complete my statement. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I rise only to ask the Senator to read the answer from the nominee.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator, and I shall be glad to read it. I shall have to send to my office for a copy of the answer. Evidently it is not among the papers before me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have a copy of the answer, which I shall be glad to lend the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I would appreciate the use of the copy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the letter and the exhibits which Mr. Acheson sent to me, including the Potsdam agreement, and also the release which was made Saturday night by the State Department relative to its policies in Japan.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1945.

The Honorable DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary of State,
State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The confirmation of your nomination as Under Secretary of State is to be called up on the Senate floor Monday. I am tremendously interested in the future policies of our Government which deal with demobilization and with laying the foundations for the restoration of peaceful relations among the nations of the world.

I was amazed to read in the Washington Post of Thursday, September 20, your rebuke of General MacArthur and your views relative to our future relationships with Japan. Inasmuch as I will be called upon to vote upon your nomination, I am anxious to know whether the following three statements from the Post are substantially correct in reflecting your views:

1. The United States Government not the occupation forces under General MacArthur is determining American policy toward Japan.

2. A decision on the part of the State Department for social and economic revolution in Japan.

3. In speaking of this Government's policy toward Japan, you said the policy would not be changed and that it would be carried out regardless of cost.

Mr. Secretary, do these statements reflect your attitude toward this Government's Japanese policy and toward MacArthur's administration of the task he has been assigned? Furthermore, I feel it my duty to direct the following questions to you and ask that you be good enough to forward your reply to me by Monday morning, at the latest, since my further interest in your confirmation will be largely conditioned by your answers.

1. Is General MacArthur acting as a representative only of the United States Government or of the Allied Governments as well in implementing the terms of the Potsdam agreement?

2. Do you know of any instance or instances wherein General MacArthur has evidenced any unwillingness to discharge his responsibilities as agent of the Allied Governments?

3. Are you wholeheartedly in agreement with the Potsdam Declaration?

4. Are not our dealings with Japan already honor bound by our commitment to the Potsdam Declaration?

5. Is there anything in the Potsdam Declaration which requires the Allied Nations to deal with Hirohito any differently than General MacArthur is now dealing with him?

6. Is there any provision in the Potsdam Declaration for any one of the Allied Governments deliberately to foster a social and economic revolution in Japan?

7. In implementing the provisions of this declaration, do you believe that the judgment, the wisdom, and the magnanimity of spirit of General MacArthur's address aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri* could be surpassed when he said, "Nor is it for us here to meet, representing as we do a majority of the peoples of the earth, in a spirit of distrust, malice, or hatred. But rather it is for us, both victors and vanquished, to rise to that higher dignity which alone benefits the sacred purposes we are about to serve, committing all of our people unreservedly to faithful compliance with the undertakings they are here formally to assume."

8. Is not the real ground for any quarrel between the State Department and General MacArthur the fact that he did not use the normal channels through which to transmit to the American people his conclusions as to his future needs in Japan, and if he had used the normal channels, what guaranty is there that the American people would have been informed?

9. If, after the few weeks that MacArthur has been in Tokyo, he has been able to revise his estimate of future needs so drastically, are not we warranted in assuming that General Eisenhower has made a similar revision? Do you know whether such a revision has been made by General Eisenhower and transmitted to this country, and, if so, whether that information has yet been given to the American people?

Because of the confusion which your statements have caused, you should have an opportunity to clarify them. I am sure there are a great number of American people who are as intensely interested in your answers as I will be. Therefore, I am making this letter public and trust you will do the same with your reply.

Very truly yours,

KENNETH S. WHERRY.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1945.

The Honorable KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: It is plain to me from your letter of September 21 that you have not had before you the statement which I made in response to a question from the press. I enclose the stenographic transcript of both question and answer. I also enclose a copy of the Potsdam proclamation, calling your attention specifically to paragraphs numbered 6 to 12, and the statement of general policy relating to Japan which has been released by the White House.

With the documents before you, you will have the exact text of my answer and also the official pronouncements of the Government on the same subject with which to test the correctness of my statement.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary.

Enclosures:

1. Excerpt from stenographic transcript of the Acting Secretary of State's press conference of September 19, 1945 (in duplicate).

2. Copy of Potsdam Proclamation (in duplicate).

3. Copy of statement of general policy relating to Japan (in duplicate).

ENCLOSURE NO. 1

Question. Sir, there were reports that you were disturbed over some of the recent statements made by General MacArthur. Do you have any comment to make on the occupation?

Answer. Well, I have not any comment to make on the state of my own being. That is not a very important matter.

I have no comment to make on the military aspect of what General MacArthur stated. That is a purely military matter with which the State Department is not properly concerned. I think I can say that I am surprised that anybody can foresee at this time the number of forces which will be necessary in Japan. That may come from my inadequate knowledge of the military field, however, and it is not very important.

The important thing is that the policy in regard to Japan is the same policy which has always been held by this Government and is still held so far as I know, and I think I know. In carrying out that policy, the occupation forces are the instruments of policy and not the determinants of policy and the policy is and has been that the surrender of Japan will be carried out; that Japan will be put in a position where it cannot renew aggressive warfare; that the present economic and social system in Japan which makes for a will to war will be changed so that that will to war will not continue and that whatever it takes to carry this out will be used to carry it out.

ENCLOSURE NO. 2

PROCLAMATION BY HEADS OF GOVERNMENTS, UNITED STATES, UNITED KINGDOM, AND CHINA

1. We—the President of the United States, the President of the National Government of the Republic of China, and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, representing the hundreds of millions of our countrymen, have conferred and agree that Japan shall be given an opportunity to end this war.

2. The prodigious land, sea and air forces of the United States, the British Empire and of China, many times reinforced by their armies and air fleets from the west, are poised to strike the final blows upon Japan. This military power is sustained and inspired by the determination of all the Allied Nations to prosecute the war against Japan until she ceases to resist.

3. The result of the futile and senseless German resistance to the might of the aroused free peoples of the world stands forth in awful clarity as an example to the people of Japan. The might that now converges on Japan is immeasurably greater than that which, when applied to the resisting Nazis, necessarily laid waste to the lands, the industry and the method of life of the whole German people. The full application of our military power, backed by our resolve, will mean the inevitable and complete destruction of the Japanese armed forces and just as inevitably the utter devastation of the Japanese homeland.

4. The time has come for Japan to decide whether she will continue to be controlled by those self-willed militaristic advisers whose unintelligent calculations have brought the Empire of Japan to the threshold of annihilation, or whether she will follow the path of reason.

5. Following are our terms. We will not deviate from them. There are no alternatives. We shall brook no delay.

6. There must be eliminated for all time the authority and influence of those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest, for we insist that a new order of peace, security and justice will be impossible until irresponsible militarism is driven from the world.

7. Until such a new order is established and until there is convincing proof that Japan's war-making power is destroyed, points in Japanese territory to be designated by the Allies shall be occupied to secure the achievement of the basic objectives we are here setting forth.

8. The terms of the Cairo Declaration shall be carried out and Japanese sovereignty shall be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku, and such minor islands as we determine.

9. The Japanese military forces, after being completely disarmed, shall be permitted to return to their homes with the opportunity to lead peaceful and productive lives.

10. We do not intend that the Japanese shall be enslaved as a race or destroyed as a nation, but stern justice shall be meted out to all war criminals, including those who have visited cruelties upon our prisoners. The Japanese Government shall remove all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people. Freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for the fundamental human rights shall be established.

11. Japan shall be permitted to maintain such industries as will sustain her economy and permit the exaction of just reparations in kind, but not those which would enable her to rearm for war. To this end, access to, as distinguished from control of, raw materials shall be permitted. Eventual Japanese participation in world-trade relations shall be permitted.

12. The occupying forces of the Allies shall be withdrawn from Japan as soon as these objectives have been accomplished and there has been established in accordance with the freely expressed will of the Japanese people a peacefully inclined and responsible government.

13. We call upon the Government of Japan to proclaim now the unconditional surrender of all Japanese armed forces, and to provide proper and adequate assurances of their good faith in such action. The alternative for Japan is prompt and utter destruction.

ENCLOSURE NO. 3

UNITED STATES INITIAL POST-SURRENDER POLICY FOR JAPAN

Purpose of this document

This document is a statement of general initial policy relating to Japan after surrender. It has been approved by the President and distributed to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers and to appropriate United States departments and agencies for their guidance. It does not deal with all matters relating to the occupation of Japan requiring policy determinations. Such matters as are not included or are not fully covered herein have been or will be dealt with separately.

Part I. Ultimate Objectives

The ultimate objectives of the United States in regard to Japan, to which policies in the initial period must conform, are:

(a) To insure that Japan will not again become a menace to the United States or to the peace and security of the world.

(b) To bring about the eventual establishment of a peaceful and responsible government which will respect the rights of other States and will support the objectives of the United States as reflected in the ideals and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The United States desires that this Government should conform as closely as may be to principles of democratic self-government but it is not the responsibility of the Allied Powers to impose upon Japan any form of government not supported by the freely expressed will of the people.

These objectives will be achieved by the following principal means:

(a) Japan's sovereignty will be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku and such minor outlying islands as may be determined, in accordance with the Cairo Declaration and other agreements to which the United States is or may be a party.

(b) Japan will be completely disarmed and demilitarized. The authority of the militarists and the influence of militarism will be totally eliminated from her political, economic, and social life. Institutions expressive of the spirit of militarism and aggression will be vigorously suppressed.

(c) The Japanese people shall be encouraged to develop a desire for individual liberties and respect for fundamental human rights, particularly the freedoms of religion, assembly, speech, and the press. They shall also be encouraged to form democratic and representative organizations.

(d) The Japanese people shall be afforded opportunity to develop for themselves an economy which will permit the peacetime requirements of the population to be met.

Part II. Allied Authority

1. Military occupation

There will be a military occupation of the Japanese home islands to carry into effect the surrender terms and further the achievement of the ultimate objectives stated above. The occupation shall have the character of an operation in behalf of the principal Allied powers acting in the interests of the United Nations at war with Japan. For that reason, participation of the forces of other nations that have taken a leading part in the war against Japan will be welcomed and expected. The occupation forces will be under the command of a supreme commander designated by the United States.

Although every effort will be made, by consultation and by constitution of appropriate advisory bodies, to establish policies for the conduct of the occupation and the control of Japan which will satisfy the principal Allied powers, in the event of any differences of opinion among them, the policies of the United States will govern.

2. Relationship to Japanese Government

The authority of the Emperor and the Japanese Government will be subject to the supreme commander, who will possess all powers necessary to effectuate the surrender terms and to carry out the policies established for the conduct of the occupation and the control of Japan.

In view of the present character of Japanese society and the desire of the United States to attain its objectives with a minimum commitment of its forces and resources, the supreme commander will exercise his authority through Japanese governmental machinery and agencies, including the Emperor, to the extent that this satisfactorily furthers United States objectives. The Japanese Government will be permitted, under his instructions, to exercise the normal power of government in matters of domestic administration. This policy, however, will be subject to the right and duty of the supreme commander to require changes in governmental machinery or personnel or to act directly if the Emperor or other Japanese authority does not satisfactorily meet the requirements of the supreme commander in effectuating the surrender terms. This policy, moreover, does not commit the supreme commander to support the Emperor or any other Japanese governmental authority in opposition to evolutionary changes looking toward the attainment of United States objectives. The policy is to use the existing form of government in Japan, not to support it. Changes in the form of government initiated by the Japanese people or government in the direction of modifying its feudal and authoritarian tendencies are to be permitted and favored. In the event that the effectuation of such changes involves the use of force by the Japanese people or government against persons opposed thereto, the supreme commander should intervene only where necessary to insure the security of his forces and the attainment of all other objectives of the occupation.

3. Publicity as to policies

The Japanese people, and the world at large, shall be kept fully informed of the objectives and policies of the occupation, and of progress made in their fulfillment.

Part III. Political

1. Disarmament and demilitarization

Disarmament and demilitarization are the primary tasks of the military occupation and shall be carried out promptly and with determination. Every effort shall be made to bring home to the Japanese people the part played by the military and naval leaders, and those who collaborated with them, in bringing about the existing and future distress of the people.

Japan is not to have an army, navy, air force, secret police organization, or any civil aviation. Japan's ground, air, and naval forces shall be disarmed and disbanded, and the Japanese imperial general headquarters, the general staff, and all secret police organizations shall be dissolved. Military and naval matériel, military and naval vessels, and military and naval installations, and military, naval, and civilian aircraft shall be surrendered, and shall be disposed of as required by the supreme commander.

High officials of the Japanese imperial general headquarters, and general staff, other high military and naval officials of the Japanese Government, leaders of ultranationalist and militarist organizations, and other important exponents of militarism and aggression will be taken into custody and held for future disposition. Persons who have been active exponents of militarism and militant nationalism will be removed and excluded from public office and from any other position of public or substantial private responsibility. Ultranationalistic or militaristic social, political, professional, and commercial societies and institutions will be dissolved and prohibited.

Militarism and ultranationalism, in doctrine and practice, including para-military training, shall be eliminated from the educational system. Former career military and naval officers, both commissioned and non-commissioned, and all other exponents of militarism and ultranationalism shall be excluded from supervisory and teaching positions.

2. War criminals

Persons charged by the supreme commander or appropriate United Nations agencies with being war criminals, including those charged with having visited cruelties upon United Nations prisoners or other nationals, shall be arrested, tried and, if convicted, punished. Those wanted by another of the United Nations for offenses against its nationals shall, if not wanted for trial or as witnesses or otherwise by the supreme commander, be turned over to the custody of such other nation.

3. Encouragement of desire for individual liberties and democratic processes

Freedom of religious worship shall be proclaimed promptly on occupation. At the same time it should be made plain to the Japanese that ultranationalistic and militaristic organizations and movements will not be permitted to hide behind the cloak of religion.

The Japanese people shall be afforded opportunity and encouraged to become familiar with the history, institutions, culture, and the accomplishments of the United States and the other democracies. Association of personnel of the occupation forces with the Japanese population should be controlled, only to the extent necessary, to further the policies and objectives of the occupation.

Democratic political parties, with rights of assembly and public discussion, shall be encouraged, subject to the necessity for maintaining the security of the occupying forces.

Laws, decrees, and regulations which establish discriminations on grounds of race, nationality, creed, or political opinion shall be abrogated; those which conflict with the objectives and policies outlined in this document shall be repealed, suspended, or amended as required; and agencies charged specifically with their enforcement shall be abolished or appropriately modified. Persons unjustly confined by Japanese authority on political grounds shall be released. The judicial, legal, and police systems shall be reformed as soon as practicable to conform to the policies set forth in articles 1 and 3 of this part III and thereafter shall be progressively influenced, to protect individual liberties and civil rights.

Part IV. Economic

1. Economic demilitarization

The existing economic basis of Japanese military strength must be destroyed and not be permitted to revive.

Therefore, a program will be enforced containing the following elements, among others: The immediate cessation and future prohibition of production of all goods designed for the equipment, maintenance, or use of any military force or establishment; the imposition of a ban upon any specialized facilities for the production or repair of implements of war, including naval vessels and all forms of aircraft; the institution of a system of inspection and control over selected elements in Japanese economic activity to prevent concealed or disguised military preparation; the elimination in Japan of those selected industries or branches of production whose chief value to Japan is in preparing for war; the prohibition of specialized research and instruction directed to the development of war-making power; and the limitation of the size and character of Japan's heavy industries to its future peaceful requirements, and restriction of Japanese merchant shipping to the extent required to accomplish the objectives of demilitarization.

The eventual disposition of those existing production facilities within Japan which are to be eliminated in accord with this program, as between conversion to other uses, transfer abroad, and scrapping will be determined after inventory. Pending decision, facilities readily convertible for civilian production should not be destroyed, except in emergency situations.

2. Promotion of democratic forces

Encouragement shall be given and favor shown to the development of organizations in labor, industry, and agriculture, organized on a democratic basis. Policies shall be favored which permit a wide distribution of income and of the ownership of the means of production and trade.

Those forms of economic activity, organization, and leadership shall be favored that are deemed likely to strengthen the peaceful disposition of the Japanese people, and to make it difficult to command or direct economic activity in support of military ends.

To this end it shall be the policy of the supreme commander:

(a) To prohibit the retention in or selection for places of importance in the economic field of individuals who do not direct future Japanese economic effort solely toward peaceful ends; and

(b) To favor a program for the dissolution of the large industrial and banking combinations which have exercised control of a great part of Japan's trade and industry.

3. Resumption of peaceful economic activity

The policies of Japan have brought down upon the people great economic destruction and confronted them with the prospect of economic difficulty and suffering. The plight of Japan is the direct outcome of its own behavior, and the Allies will not undertake the burden of repairing the damage. It can be repaired only if the Japanese people renounce all military aims and apply themselves diligently and with single purpose to the ways of peaceful living. It will be necessary for them to undertake physical reconstruction, deeply to reform the nature and direction of their economic activities and institutions, and to find useful employment for their people along lines adapted to and devoted to peace. The Allies have no intention of imposing conditions which would prevent the accomplishment of these tasks in due time.

Japan will be expected to provide goods and services to meet the needs of the occupying forces to the extent that this can be effected without causing starvation, widespread disease, and acute physical distress.

The Japanese authorities will be expected—and, if necessary, directed—to maintain, develop, and enforce programs that serve the following purposes:

(a) To avoid acute economic distress.

(b) To assure just and impartial distribution of available supplies.

(c) To meet the requirements for reparations deliveries agreed upon by the Allied Governments.

(d) To facilitate the restoration of Japanese economy so that the reasonable peaceful requirements of the population can be satisfied.

In this connection, the Japanese authorities on their own responsibility shall be permitted to establish and administer controls over economic activities, including essential national public services, finance, banking, and production and distribution of essential commodities, subject to the approval and review of the Supreme Commander in order to assure their conformity with the objectives of the occupation.

4. Reparations and restitution

Reparations: Reparations for Japanese aggression shall be made—

(a) Through the transfer—as may be determined by the appropriate Allied authorities—of Japanese property located outside of the territories to be retained by Japan.

(b) Through the transfer of such goods or existing capital equipment and facilities as are not necessary for a peaceful Japanese economy or the supplying of the occupying forces. Exports other than those directed to be shipped on reparation account or as restitution may be made only to those recipients who agree to provide necessary imports in exchange or agree to pay for such exports in foreign exchange. No form of reparation shall be exacted which will interfere with or prejudice the program for Japan's demilitarization.

Restitution: Full and prompt restitution will be required of all identifiable looted property.

5. Fiscal, monetary, and banking policies

The Japanese authorities will remain responsible for the management and direction of the domestic fiscal, monetary, and credit policies subject to the approval and review of the Supreme Commander.

6. International trade and financial relations

Japan shall be permitted eventually to resume normal trade relations with the rest of the world. During occupation and under suitable controls, Japan will be permitted to purchase from foreign countries raw materials and other goods that it may need for peaceful purposes, and to export goods to pay for approved imports.

Control is to be maintained over all imports and exports of goods, and foreign exchange and financial transactions. Both the policies followed in the exercise of these controls and their actual administration shall be subject to the approval and supervision of the supreme commander in order to make sure that they are not contrary to the policies of the occupying authorities, and in particular that all foreign purchasing power that Japan may acquire is utilized only for essential needs.

7. Japanese property located abroad

Existing Japanese external assets and existing Japanese assets located in territories detached from Japan under the terms of surrender, including assets owned in whole or part by the imperial household and Government, shall be revealed to the occupying authorities and held for disposition according to the decision of the Allied authorities.

8. Equality of opportunity for foreign enterprise within Japan

The Japanese authorities shall not give, or permit any Japanese business organization to give, exclusive or preferential opportunity or terms to the enterprise of any foreign country, or cede to such enterprise control of any important branch of economic activity.

9. Imperial household property

Imperial household property shall not be exempted from any action necessary to carry out the objectives of the occupation.

Mr. WHERRY. First I should like to read the letter:

MY DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: It is plain to me from your letter of September 21 that you have not yet had before you the statement which I made in response to a question from the press. I enclose the stenographic transcript of both question and answer. I also enclose a copy of the Potsdam Proclamation, calling your attention specifically to paragraphs numbered 6 to 12, and the statement of general policy relating to Japan which has been released by the White House.

With the documents before you you will have the exact text of my answer and also the official pronouncements of the Government on the same subject with which to test the correctness of my statement.

The enclosures include, first, an excerpt from the stenographic transcript of the Acting Secretary of State's press conference of September 19, 1945; second, a copy of the Potsdam Proclamation; and, third, a copy of the statement of general policy relating to Japan.

Relative to the first enclosure, I read the questions and answers:

Question. Sir, there were reports that you were disturbed over some of the recent statements made by General MacArthur, do you have any comment to make on the occupation?

He was speaking to the press on the 19th of September.

Answer. Well, I have not any comment to make on the state of my own being. That is not a very important matter.

Mr. President, I am standing in the rear of the Chamber. There was some comment the other day with regard to the fact that I went down to the front of the Chamber in what is called the well. I did so because of those whom I thought might be interested in hearing what I had to say. When we speak loudly we are accused of shouting. I do not wish to have too much competition. If I may, I should like to have order in the Chamber. I shall be glad to complete my statement as quickly as I can. The reason I stand back here is because this is my regularly appointed place, and there would be no significance today in my going down to the front of the Chamber. I would appreciate it if I could have the cooperation of the Members of the Senate until my statement has been completed.

I continue reading from Mr. Acheson's answer.

I have no comment to make on the military aspects of what General MacArthur stated. That is purely a military matter with which the State Department is not properly concerned. I think I can say that I am surprised that anybody can foresee at this time the number of forces which will be necessary in Japan. That may come from my inadequate knowledge of the military field, however, and it is not very important.

The important thing is that the policy in regard to Japan is the same policy which has always been held by this Government, and is still held so far as I know, and I think I know.

By the way, that is what I want to have clarified. I want to know what Mr. Acheson knows about our policy. That is the only reason I stood on the floor of the Senate last Thursday and spoke with regard to this nomination. I wanted to know what the social and economic policy might be to which Mr. Acheson was referring in his statement to the press.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. The Senator from Texas is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I do not wish to yield to only one or two Senators and not to any others who ask me to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I decline to go further.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I will yield if the Senator from Texas has something to say about this particular phase of the matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was about to ask the Senator a very polite question.

Mr. WHERRY. I will treat the Senator with respect. He may go ahead and ask his question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suppose the Senator will read on, will he not, concerning the——

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will give me sufficient time, I will put this exhibit, as well as the remainder of the exhibits which I have, in the RECORD. I do not wish to be unfair. Moreover, I will put into the RECORD copies of comments which have come to me from places in various States of the Union, so that the RECORD will show the reaction to this situation of some of the editors and other persons throughout the country.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has said that he wants to know Mr. Acheson's source of knowledge with regard to what the policy of the Government is. He quotes, does he not, in his statement, the Potsdam agreement?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator put that in the RECORD also?

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly will. I have already said that I will put into the RECORD not only this exhibit but also the Potsdam agreement and the statement that came from the administration last Saturday night. Does that fully answer the distinguished Senator's question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that it answers the question so far as the Senator wishes to go.

Mr. WHERRY. I will present the documents fully in order that all the answers will be contained in the RECORD. I thank the Senator for his contribution. [Laughter.]

I repeat from the answer of Mr. Acheson:

The important thing is that the policy in regard to Japan is the same policy which has always been held by this Government, and is still held so far as I know, and I think I know.

Those are the words of Mr. Acheson. I continue reading:

In carrying out that policy, the occupation forces are the instruments of policy and not the determinants of policy, and the policy is and has been that the surrender of Japan will be carried out; that Japan will be put in a position where it cannot renew aggressive warfare; that the present economic and social system in Japan which makes for a will to war will be changed so that that will to war will not continue and that whatever it takes to carry this out will be used to carry it out.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator read again that answer? It seems to me to be one of the most extraordinary statements on policy I have ever heard.

Mr. WHERRY. I have read from a copy of an excerpt from the stenographic transcript of the Acting Secretary of State's press conference of September 19, 1945, in which he sets out questions and answers. The answers are replies to questions which I put to Mr. Acheson in the letter which I wrote to him. I will read from the copy again.

The important thing is that the policy in regard to Japan is the same policy which has always been held by this Government and is still held so far as I know, and I think I know. In carrying out that policy, the occupation forces are the instruments of policy and not the determinants of policy and the policy is and has been that the surrender of Japan will be carried out;

Mr. TAFT. The remaining part of the statement is what I wanted.

Mr. WHERRY. It reads as follows:

That Japan will be put in a position where it cannot renew aggressive warfare; that the present economic and social system in Japan which makes for a will to war will be changed so that that will to war will not continue and that whatever it takes to carry this out will be used to carry it out.

Mr. TAFT. How does the Senator think he can change the social system of another country?

Mr. WHERRY. I have an answer to that in my direct statement. The only way by which to change it is to go into the country and upset the system there, and if that cannot be done politically, it will have to be done in some other way. What that other way is is something which I would like to have clarified, because it will involve not only the money of our taxpayers, but possibly hundreds of thousands of American lives. I am vitally interested in that matter. The policy to which Mr. Acheson has referred has not been made clear by the State Department?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have asked not to be interrupted. Does the Senator make his request for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator if he has read the entire memorandum?

Mr. WHERRY. I believe I have. I am trying to get it into the RECORD as fast as I can do so. I want to put into the RECORD the agreement which was signed, then the Potsdam agreement, followed by the State Department's reply which was placed in the newspapers last Saturday night.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator not think that his inquiry relative to what the policy may be is answered and clarified beginning on page 6 of the memorandum with the words "ultimate objectives"?

Mr. WHERRY. That seems to be one attempt to clarify the policy, but it is still not clear to me. I want to know how far the State Department wishes to go in adopting that policy.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what Mr. Acheson explained to the press.

Mr. WHERRY. I have read into the RECORD the answer which he made to the press. It was taken down by his own stenographer and is a part of the stenographic record. Regardless of what was quoted by the Washington Post, what I have read is the record of his statement. It was sent to me by Mr. Acheson in all good faith. I want to be fair to him. I do not want to misquote him or misinterpret what he means. Senators will have to interpret his statement for themselves.

This is of significance to me. It is the first information I have had and doubt if anyone has had it before. Possibly someone has had it. I read from the Potsdam agreement:

The attached proclamation by the heads of Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and China was signed by the President of the United States and Prime Minister of the United Kingdom at Potsdam and concurred in by the President of the National Government of China, who communicated with President Truman by dispatch.

There is not one word there about whether the Soviet Union either signed the agreement or permitted anyone else to sign for it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator wishes to be fair.

Mr. WHERRY. I do.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator will agree that when the Potsdam agreement was signed, the Soviet Union was not at war with Japan. Therefore, it would not have been proper for a country not at war with Japan to have joined in this agreement.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator permit me to continue for a moment.

Mr. President, to my knowledge there has been no agreement, supplementing the Potsdam agreement, which the Russian people have signed or by which they have an agreement with the United States which we know anything about.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is there any doubt in the Senator's mind that Russia had agreed to go to war with Japan at the time when we had the Potsdam meeting?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I am not disputing that.

Mr. CHANDLER. There was no meeting after that, was there?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that I be permitted to complete my statement. However, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. Since the Senator is yielding generally, I should like to ask about his statement that he has not heard of any subsequent agreement. The Senator will recall that the articles of surrender signed by Japan on the battleship *Missouri* were also signed by representatives of Russia, China, the United States, France, Great Britain, and possibly other countries. That is the later document which followed the Potsdam agreement which was not signed by Russia because, as the Senator from Maryland has said, Russia was not then at war with Japan.

Mr. WHERRY. Has any agreement been made with Russia since that time by which the United States has made definite commitments to Russia?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know.

Mr. WHERRY. No; and I do not know either. That is what I am trying to find out. We did not find out until Saturday night about the Government's policy, which apparently was determined in August, but was not released until Saturday night.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; the Government's policy was incorporated in the Potsdam agreement. Subsequently, Russia declared war against Japan, and subsequent to that the articles of surrender were promulgated and signed by all the governments involved.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr President, on the basis of the stenographic report which Mr. Acheson has forwarded to me, I submit that Mr. Acheson's rebuke of General MacArthur becomes all the more mysterious. In the stenographic report, there is the following comment, which, to me, is nothing more than completely ambiguous:

I have no comment to make on the military aspects of what General MacArthur

stated. That is a purely military matter with which the State Department is not properly concerned.

Mr. Acheson went on to say, however, in the same paragraph:

The occupation forces are the instruments of policy and not the determinants of policy.

If that was Mr. Acheson's position, why did he rebuke General MacArthur about his estimate of 200,000 men? Concerning General MacArthur's statement that he needed only 200,000 to occupy Japan, Mr. Acheson had already said:

That is a purely military matter with which the State Department is not properly concerned.

Yet, in the same paragraph, he rebuked General MacArthur for making that statement.

I still maintain, Mr. President, that there is more to this deliberate rebuke of General MacArthur by Mr. Acheson than appears on the printed pages of the current discussion of the matter.

I now wish to read an Associated Press dispatch of September 23, 1945, datelined Tokyo.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish to have the Senator yield unless he chooses to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to finish my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator, if he does not mind waiting for a few minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. This is exhibit 4, from the New York Times:

SEPTEMBER 23, 1945.—America's current long-distance discussion on occupation policy has produced genuine bewilderment among Japanese coupled with the opinion in some quarters that it further emphasizes potentially dangerous indecision among the Allies.

Some say that this situation has not made any difference, but that dispatch has come from Tokyo.

Mr. President, I also wish to place in the RECORD at this point a statement made by the president of the United Press, to be found in the New York Times for the same day—September 23—on the front page. In it the interview between General MacArthur and the president of the United Press is given in full, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR DECLARES JAPAN ENDED AS A GREAT POWER—ORDERS DOIHARA ARRESTED—RUIN IN WAR CITED—ALLIED CHIEFTAIN PLEDGES TO DESTROY WAR-MAKING ABILITY OF JAPANESE—SEES A LONG OCCUPATION—DENIES ARMS ARE BEING HIDDEN BY MILITARY—DISAVOWS ANY POLITICAL AMBITION

(By Hugh Baillie)

TOKYO, September 21.—Japan will never again become a world power, Gen. Douglas MacArthur said today in an interview.

"Japan industrially, commercially, militarily, and every other way is in a state of complete collapse," General MacArthur declared. "Her food supplies are scarce and she faces conditions in this emergency that may well become catastrophic. Her punishment for her sins, which is just beginning, will be long and bitter."

The supreme commander told me that war-criminal trials would commence very shortly. Japan's army will be absolutely abolished by October 15. The remnants of Japan's navy are doomed to destruction except "minor specimens which may be retainable for scientific or museum purposes."

ARMS PLANTS TO BE DESTROYED

All Japanese munitions and all munitions plants that survived the war will be destroyed, General MacArthur said. Japan will be kept on an austerity basis regarding sports, entertainment, and luxuries.

The Japanese are not being treated brutally but the surrender terms, no matter how harsh, are being rigidly enforced, General MacArthur emphasized. Furthermore, he said, Japan can expect no relief, no food, clothing, or supplies from the Allied Powers this winter.

General MacArthur pointed out that the complete execution of the terms imposed by the Allies was expected to take many years. He plans to remain personally on the scene enforcing, directing, and administering Allied rule over the Japanese.

Reiterating that he had no political aspirations, General MacArthur said that he started as a soldier and intended to finish as one.

LAST PUBLIC ASSIGNMENT

"I'm on my last public assignment, which when concluded will mark the definite end of my service," he said.

General MacArthur received me in his headquarters in Tokyo. My first question was: "In the occupation of Japan are the terms of the Potsdam Declaration being enforced to the letter?"

"Absolutely yes."

"There seems to be an impression in the United States that you are going to tolerate the existence of a standing army of Japanese who will do most of the policing of Japan," I said. "Would you care to comment on this?"

This query evoked an emphatic reply.

"There is no fabric of truth in this statement," General MacArthur said.

"The Japanese Army is being completely demobilized by October 15 and absolutely abolished."

I then asked what would be done with the remnants of the Japanese Navy.

He replied decisively, "All of it will be destroyed except minor specimens which may be retained for scientific or museum purposes."

Asked how long the occupation of Japan would be continued, General MacArthur answered, "I am sure it will take many years to fulfill the terms of the surrender."

Asked if he had any authenticated reports of concealment of weapons by Japanese soldiers or civilians, General MacArthur said, "None. I have no doubt that in the beginning in small isolated cases individuals have attempted to conceal arms, but it would be impossible in any degree."

There have been many reports regarding the numerical strength of the American Army at present in Japan and the future maximum that will be required for the occupation, so I asked General MacArthur for a statement on this.

"At the present time there are approximately 150,000 troops in Japan," he said. "The maximum figure will reach approximately 500,000."

He said that it was not planned to use American troops for any construction of housing for the Japanese and that there was no plan for importing food, clothing or supplies for the use of the Japanese population this winter.

"Will the demobilized Japanse Army in Japan be put to work under the supervision of American authorities?" I asked.

"They will be a responsibility of the Japanese themselves," he said. "They will be absorbed into the normal Japanese civil population."

Asked if there was any deterioration in the attitude of respect and cooperation shown by Japanese soldiers and civilians toward the occupation forces, General MacArthur replied, "None whatsoever."

"Is the retention of the Emperor serving a useful purpose?" I asked. General MacArthur said: "His retention during the surrender and demobilizing steps is serving its full purpose. An untold saving in American lives, money, and time has resulted."

Regarding reports in the United States that General MacArthur was not treating the Japanese with sufficient harshness, he commented:

"The Japanese are not being treated with brutality, but every step provided by the surrender terms, no matter how harsh, is being enforced. Their humiliation, their despair, and the hardships which they face cannot be overestimated."

Asked whether he believed the Japanese military elements and people realize their defeat, General MacArthur replied: "Completely, although there will always be the guardhouse type of lawyers who will present their own arguments. An educational campaign is planned further to drive home the realization of their complete defeat."

"Could our troops have safely entered Tokyo before they did?" I asked.

ENTRY TIED TO SAFETY

"I believe the entrance was made as soon as possible without taking unwarranted risks," General MacArthur replied.

"When the First Cavalry Division arrived it was pushed into Tokyo without delay. The only other troops available to me at the time was the Eleventh Airborne Division, which lightly held the Yokohama beachhead.

"It would have been foolhardy to push this division into Tokyo sooner."

I then asked, "Are discharged Japanese soldiers going into the gendarmerie in any numbers, so that Japan would continue to have a large disciplined force? Is the total strength of the gendarmerie to be controlled?"

General MacArthur replied, "The Japanese gendarmerie is strictly a police force composed solely of state and civil policemen. It has little or no basis of military training. Its strength is strictly controlled, and no discharged soldiers will be added to this force. The military police and the secret police are being abolished."

General MacArthur then stated, as supreme commander, that he was planning to keep Japan on an austerity basis, particularly in regard to sports, entertainment, and luxury of any nature.

Asked whether any Japanese munitions or arms had actually been delivered to the American occupation forces yet, General MacArthur said:

"Yes, and all arms and ammunitions being assembled for destruction."

Asked for the ultimate objective of the military occupation of Japan, he said: "The complete execution of the terms imposed by the Allied Powers is the ultimate objective. This is expected to take many years."

"None whatsoever," he said when asked whether there had been any "incidents" since our landing that would indicate that Japan had a tendency to become truculent.

"Why was the Japanese Diet permitted to meet?" I asked.

"The Diet was permitted to meet as the representative group of the people for the purpose of disseminating the surrender terms and directives."

General MacArthur said that the progress of the occupation had surpassed his expectations.

Asked whether he would refer to it as an invasion or as a pacification, he replied, "Neither. It is the occupation of a conquered country by the forces that defeated it."

Asked if he believed that Japan would ever become a world power again, General MacArthur said emphatically, "Never again when the terms of the surrender have been accomplished."

I asked the Supreme Commander whether he anticipated visiting the United States in the near future and he replied, "No, I regret to say. I feel the situation here will require my personal presence for some time to come."

I asked, "Now that the war is over, have you any political aspirations?"

General MacArthur replied, "None whatsoever. I have never entered politics and never intend to do so. I have stated before and reiterate now that I started as a soldier, and shall finish as one. I am on my last public assignment, which, when concluded, will mark the definite end of my service."

"What has been the conduct of American troops in Japan, General MacArthur?" I asked.

PRAISES TROOPS' CONDUCT

He replied, "They have been magnificent in every way. They have acted with dignity, with firmness, and with a self-restraint that has been admirable. Wherever they go, they are America's finest diplomats."

Responsible to an inquiry as to whether Japan's industries were generally operative, General MacArthur said, "Japan industrially, commercially, militarily, and in every other way is in a state of complete collapse.

"Her resources of every kind are absolutely exhausted. Her food supplies are scant, and she faces conditions of emergency that may well become catastrophic. Her punishment for her sins, which is just beginning, will be long and bitter."

Asked whether any fraternization was developing between American troops and the Japanese civilian population, General MacArthur said, "None. The general aloofness of the American soldier, based upon his innate self-respect, is one of the most noticeable characteristics of the occupation."

Asked whether he thought our troops enjoyed the occupation, General MacArthur replied, "I believe the predominant interest of our officers and soldiers is to do their duty wherever and however it may occur. Within this limitation, their burning desire is to return home."

"General, will the war criminals be brought to trial within a reasonable length of time?" I asked.

"Yes," he said. "Trials will commence very shortly."

"Will all Japanese munitions and munition-manufacturing plants be abolished?" I asked.

"Yes, entirely so," he said. "Many were destroyed during the war. All will be eventually."

In conclusion I asked General MacArthur whether the policies that governed a defeated Japan would be determined by him or by a higher authority.

He replied, "All major policies will be determined on the highest governmental levels by the Allied Powers and will be executed by me as their agent, as I may be directed."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the statements of Douglas MacArthur in Tokyo and Dean Acheson in Washington on enforcement of long-range peace controls have clouded rather than clarified policies for Japan.

Mr. President, I also wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the liberal press throughout the United States has attacked General MacArthur. I do not wish to dwell too long on this particular point, but I wish to say that over the week end I have received copies of statements or articles appearing in what I call the more liberal press. Some may go further and may call it radical, or some may go further and may call it communistic. Somehow they have gotten around into Dean Acheson's corner, judging from some of the statements they have made. Talk about beclouding General MacArthur's name or blackening his name! I shall not introduce them for the RECORD, but I shall call attention to some of them.

I submit, Mr. President, that it is not only the Japanese who are confused. There is an ever-growing number of Americans who find in the White House release of Saturday, September 22, concerning our occupation policy toward Japan, no reassurance whatsoever as to what our real policy toward Japan is.

To those who will be interested, I submit articles from the Saturday, September 22, edition of the Daily Worker, and the Sunday, September 23, edition of PM as the outstanding illustrations of the type of support Mr. Acheson is receiving and of the violent and abusive attacks of General MacArthur which are blackening his name and which cannot fail to cause him loss of face in carrying out his difficult task in Japan.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily Worker of September 22, 1945]

TORIES RALLY TO MACARTHUR—WHITEWASH MANIPULATED IN CONGRESS AND IN PRESS

(By Joseph Starobin)

A campaign to whitewash Gen. Douglas MacArthur was sprung on the American people yesterday.

Hugh Baillie, president of the United Press, which is under Scripps-Howard domination, interviewed the Allied supreme commander at his Tokyo headquarters. It was a transparent attempt to offset the growing popular anger with the dangerous prospect of a soft peace for Japan.

The specter that Japan's imperialist system would remain intact to make war upon another generation of Americans is so menacing that Dean Acheson, State Department Under Secretary, was compelled to rebuke MacArthur last Wednesday.

Prominent Republican reactionaries, like Senator KENNETH WHERRY, of Nebraska, and Alfred Landon, the repudiated GOP Presidential aspirant in 1936, came to MacArthur's defense. Similar support was heard from Democratic reactionaries like Senator ALBERT CHANDLER, of Kentucky.

And then the United Press interview popped up—as though by a careful prearrangement.

All yesterday afternoon United Press reporters were lining up congressional reactionaries, attempting to whitewash MacArthur. Even an ordinarily farsighted progressive like Elbert Thomas of Utah was hooked into the campaign.

MacArthur's interview with Hugh Baillie repeats—in words—what has already been promised many times, namely, that Japan is going to get a tough peace. But so far the actual deeds do not correspond with the promises.

As Representative ED. V. IZAC (Democrat, California) declared:

"The fact still remains that the American people are not convinced that we're harsh enough toward either Germany or Japan. The evidence still remains that we endeavor to be so fair that we are probably making it necessary to fight another war 24 years from now."

The political general, smarting under rising American criticism, had evidently been well prepared for the Baillie interview. As the UP president himself says:

"Occasionally he (MacArthur) fell silent to meditate, but mostly the answers came instantaneously. He senses the questions before the phraseology has actually been completed."

MacArthur's statements were largely a rehash of past official promises, with a few variations.

He repeated again that the retention of the Japanese Emperor was necessary "during the surrender and demobilizing steps."

When asked why the Japanese Diet was permitted to meet, the American general referred to it as a "representative group of the people." Its job, he said, "was to disseminate the surrender terms and directives."

MacArthur insisted that there was no anti-American guerrilla activity, that all arms were being turned in to the authorities and that these arms, together with munition-making plants, would be destroyed.

"Japan industrially, commercially, and militarily," he said, "was in a state of complete collapse." He painted a picture of exhaustion in Japan so grim that it almost causes sympathy, and said the "conditions of emergency were likely to be catastrophic."

He added that the punishment of Japan is just beginning, also declaring that he expected to remain in Japan for some time to come.

MacArthur, who was boomed as a GOP Presidential candidate in 1944 and is still looked upon as a possible reactionary choice for 1948, denied any political ambitions.

"I am on my last public assignment, which, when concluded, will mark the definite end of my service," he said.

As for the Japanese Army, which is supposed to be fully demobilized by October 15, MacArthur said it would be absorbed into the civilian population.

He denied that Army officers were entering the Japanese police and gendarmerie, and he claimed that the secret military and political police would be abolished.

Attempting to contradict Australian reports that the American Army was behaving as though it were a "tourist and shopping expedition," MacArthur spoke of the "general aloofness of the American soldier."

OMISSIONS

But the trouble with Baillie's questions, of course, was that they were not very searching or very important. In fact Baillie admitted in his own story that "my own observations are certainly in accord with his estimate" that is, with MacArthur's.

MacArthur declared, for example, that the war criminals' trials would start shortly. But whether any of the big industrial leaders, the Zaibatsu, would be included was not even touched on.

Nothing was said about the resumption of political liberties in Japan; the whole impression is that the existing Japanese feudal-Fascist system would simply be required to knuckle under to the United States, without any inner changes.

That, obviously, will not bring democracy in Japan at any time, and therefore means only the subordination of one imperialism to another.

Not a word was mentioned about the release of political prisoners in Japan—those who opposed the Fascists for years—or the beginnings of normal political parties, opposition newspapers, etc.

Nothing, also, on Japanese trade-union organization.

Nothing on agrarian reform, which is a critical precondition for democracy in Japan.

Nothing on the nationalization of the big industries under the auspices of a really democratic government.

IF MACARTHUR COMMANDED IN REICH

(By Alfred G. Larke)

TOKYO, September 21.—Adolf Hitler's greatest mistake was in fighting against Eisenhower, Zhukov, and Montgomery, instead of drawing MacArthur for an opponent. His ond biggest mistake was in not palming himself off as the religious leader of his Nation, as well as the political leader.

The United Nations would have won all the battles, just the same. But judging by what has happened in Japan, here is what Adolf could have brought about in Germany:

1. The United States, U. S. S. R. and Great Britain, having reached the Rhine and the Oder, would have quit fighting, largely at the insistence of the reactionary press in the United States, crying to "bring the boys home," and asking what other civilized nation would be left in Europe if Germany were destroyed.

2. Hitler would have fired his wartime cabinet and brought back the liberals and moderates who helped rule the nation when it was attacking only Austria and Czechoslovakia.

3. A few chiefs of staff would have had to commit suicide.

4. A campaign would be started in Germany and internationally to prove it was the militarists, not the industrialists, who forced Germany into war.

5. Hitler would be told he was going to be shorn of civil or temporal power but might remain as the spiritual leader of the Nazis and that all United States occupation orders would be issued to him, and through him to the German public.

6. The supreme commander of the Allied forces would bring occupation troops in as a personal guard of honor, explaining it would be violation of international law to call them occupation troops.

7. About the twelfth day of occupation, the supreme commander would announce how happy he was that the Fuehrer was obeying all commands, in contrast to the situation in other countries, where "the only leaders the people followed during the war were of necessity placed in jails." (MacArthur, regarding the Emperor, September 11, United Press dispatch.)

8. Thr e weeks after occupation the Gestapo would still be operating and Heinrich Himmler's lieutenants would be placed in charge of Belgium and Czechoslovakia because our Army couldn't locate native leaders and had to preserve law and order.

What difference does it make, so long as we beat the Japanese? A lot. If Japan keeps the same bosses it has had for the past 50 years, indeed the past 10 centuries, how are the people to learn how to run their own government? And if the people have no say, who will keep the peace?

Taking full advantage of public pressure created by his good friends and political backers, the Hearsts, Howards, Pattersons, and McCormicks, General MacArthur has gone out of his way, while slapping the Japanese Emperor's stooges around, to blow kisses to the Emperor himself—the man without whose authority everyone admits the stooges could never have hoodwinkled and bulldozed the Japanese people.

Lately the general has taken to announcing American policy in Japan without consulting either our State or War Departments. In Yokohama an American correspondent asked MacArthur's public-relations officer, a general, why the Japanese "thought police" were not put out of operation. He claimed he knew an American citizen in Tokyo who had been taken into custody by these police a week after occupation. What was MacArthur going to do about it?

The general hesitated a bit, then said: "We intend to maintain law and order. Any other questions?" Law and order. Where did you hear that last? During a strike? During the bonus march? In Greece?

[From New York PM of September 23, 1945]

APPROVAL OF ACHESON BY SENATE IS LIKELY—OPPOSITION TALKS LOUD, BUT IT LACKS SUPPORT

(By Alexander H. Uhl)

WASHINGTON, September 22.—The savage attack on Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson by the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald, as well as that by other MacArthur worshipers in the Senate, are not likely to get very far. As things stand now there is every indication that Acheson will be confirmed as Under Secretary of State, though there will be a lot of hot air let off before debate is over.

Acheson's confirmation, which was to have come before the Senate Thursday afternoon, will come up on Monday. It is likely that Senators WHERRY and CHANDLER, who rushed to the defense of MacArthur, will resume their attacks on Acheson, but indications over the week end are that the confirmation will go through. The Senate Foreign Affairs Committee approved it unanimously last Wednesday. And study of Thursday's debate indicated little support for any effort to oppose that recommendation.

CRITICISM VERBOTEN

Actually, neither WHERRY nor CHANDLER appeared to have any clear-cut idea of what Acheson had said and when you boiled down their remarks you didn't have much more than the broad and somewhat untenable statement that you must not criticize MacArthur.

Which, of course, is all right for fishers in troubled waters and hero worshipers, but is hardly likely to determine the Senate vote.

The debate, in fact, brought out what is obviously the feeling of the Senate that the peace with Japan must assure carrying out the Potsdam declaration. What is astonishing about the seven pages it occupies in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is how so many words could be used to say so little.

It is the line taken by the Patterson press that is far more revealing. To begin with, the Daily News editorial started off with a gross misrepresentation when it used the heading, "You can quote me on this," and later, in the body of the editorial, added:

"The Acheson statement was couched in terms which its author evidently considered tops in heavy sarcasm. To emphasize, he added: 'You can quote me on this.'"

EXPLANATION

The implication here is that Acheson deliberately volunteered direct quotation of his remarks. In reality, he was asked by reporters if they could quote him directly, something that frequently is done at the Department in the case of important statements, and Acheson granted the permission.

But the whole line of the editorial simply served to point up the desperate eagerness of the old isolationist, anti-Soviet crowd to build MacArthur up as the shining knight in armor who is going to tell the "liberals" where to head off some day.

They have been having their troubles doing this of late, for exactly the same people who have been screaming for the full truth of Pearl Harbor have been strangely silent when it comes to an investigation of what happened in the Philippines 12 hours later and their embarrassment is understandably acute. And now their hero has been catching some more hell and, of course they don't like it.

The "red herring" act by which the News seeks to smear everyone who has the audacity to criticize MacArthur, is pretty old stuff, but it is important as an indication of the line that has been increasingly bolder since the end of the war.

MACARTHUR'S HARD PEACE

It's good to know that the voice of the people—the essence of democracy—carries across the Pacific even faster than our three B-29's made it. It's even better to know that the voice is not only being heard, but apparently heeded by MacArthur. That's shown in MacArthur's interview with Hugh Baillie, president of United Press, and his order for the arrest of Gen. Kenji Doihara, the "Lawrence of Manchuria."

It's also good to know that MacArthur considers this his last assignment, and that he has no political plans for the future, probably meaning the Presidency. If he means it, it's a hard-headed realization that he can't win because of the handicap of the people on his side—the Hearst-Patterson-McCormick press and its followers and spokesmen in and out of Congress.

But while it has been proved that MacArthur is susceptible to democratic pressure by the people, there is still no proof that he has the know-how to bring democracy to Japan. There is not even proof that he understands what is wanted from him.

For instance, after the deluge of criticism, he denied a week ago that there would be a "soft peace" and now promises a "hard peace" for Japan; points that she is short of food and in a state of collapse, and says she can expect "no relief, no food, no clothing, or supplies from the Allied Powers this winter."

That's not a hard peace; it's a stupid one. Alexander H. Uhl answered that one in PM September 17: "A 'hard peace' for Japan must mean a just peace, a peace that is infinitely more than a punishment peace, but rather a peace that can hold hope of striking at the essential causes of war and the system that made war possible. Such a peace is vital to ourselves as well as for the Japanese people. Batting some Japanese on the heads with a brickbat isn't a 'hard peace.' Tearing power out of the hands of the Mitsubishis and Mitsuis and giving it to the Japanese people is * * *."

I can only add that the Mitsuis and Mitsubishis won't starve this winter; the people, the workers, and the peasants who could bring democracy to Japan, will.

There are some good points in the MacArthur interview: quick war-criminal trials are promised (but no assurance that the trials will reach beyond professional militarists), the army will be demobilized by October 15 and the navy destroyed, the military and secret police will be abolished. But the credibility of his forecast that Japan will never again become a great power must be judged in the light of a forecast he made in 1939, quoted by John McCarten in the American Mercury of January 1944:

"It has been assumed, in my opinion erroneously, that Japan covets these (Philippine) islands. Just why has never been satisfactorily explained. Proponents of such a theory fail fully to credit the logic of the Japanese mind. Strategically, possession of these islands would introduce an element of extraordinary weakness in the Japanese Empire. It would split that Empire militarily into two parts, separated by a broad stretch of ocean, and in between it would lie its present military enemy, China.

"Every reason that is now advanced as to the indefensibility of the archipelago by the United States, because of its distance therefrom, would apply in principle to this defense of Japan."

Ceiling zero, visibility zero.

RICHARD A. YAFFE.

PRESS AXIS SEES RED OVER ITS FAVORITE SON

MAC ARTHUR BACKERS, PRESS

It is interesting to watch the tactics of the newspaper axis in its defense of MacArthur. The Daily News lumps the Communists and the liberals and impugns their motives, the Journal-American inferentially smears all critics in a headlined red scare, and the Chicago Tribune distorts the meaning of a hard peace to make it appear that its real end is to hurt the Japanese people rather than to help them achieve democracy.

"Our 'liberals,' to whom Acting Secretary Acheson seems to be playing up, turned against MacArthur the moment the Japs surrendered. MacArthur's name is reported, for example, to have been booed and hissed at a big Communist pow-wow in New York Tuesday evening. 'Liberals' of other persuasions are just about as violently against MacArthur as are the Reds. Why?

"OUR LIBERALS VERSUS MAC ARTHUR

"Is it that MacArthur is not sharing the occupation job with the Russians? That arrangement seems to be all right with Stalin, however. Or is there some 'liberal' suspicion that the United States secretly intends to build up Japan as a future buffer against Russia?" (New York Daily News, September 21, 1945.)

"REDS FOMENTING MAC ARTHUR SMEAR FACE UNITED STATES PROBE

"(By David Sentner)

"WASHINGTON, September 21.—William Z. Foster and other Red leaders will be quizzed on the current smear campaign being waged by the Communists against General MacArthur when they are called as witnesses next Wednesday before the House committee." (New York Journal-American, September 21, 1945.)

"Nevertheless, General MacArthur is being accused of incompetence. His course is being condemned as a 'kid-glove policy.' That's pretty funny. It assumes that it is better to get what you want from the other fellow by socking him than by persuading him. The truth is that there was a time when we had to sock the Japs, and MacArthur did that. Now it is no longer necessary, but the general's critics want him to go on socking anyhow. It is odd that the people who are screaming loudest about MacArthur's kid gloves are those who are most certain that the era of universal peace is upon us. Maybe they think that peace is promoted by a victor nation throwing its weight around." (Chicago Tribune, September 18, 1945.)

MAC ARTHUR BACKERS, POLITICAL

Now look at a sampling of those pressing this line—Representative REED of New York, who voted against all defense measures; Senator WHERRY, antilabor reactionary; RANKIN, whose record you know:

Hon. DANIEL A. REED, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, September 19, 1945:

"Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the character assassins have ventured into the open, and from now on General MacArthur will be the victim. Why? Because he has dared to express his honest opinion with reference to the required number of men to occupy Japan, an estimate which is at variance with those who are opposed to the demobilization of our boys." (From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

"Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled 'Statesman MacArthur,' published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 18, 1945.

"There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"'STATESMAN MAC ARTHUR

"'Throughout much of the war a group of MacArthur haters in this country and abroad sniped at the general. They said he didn't understand modern combat, called him a braggart.'" (From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, September 19, 1945:

"Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, some newspapers, in particular the Washington Post and the Communist Daily Worker, have attacked General MacArthur for his statement to the effect that within 6 months he would probably need not more than 200,000 men in Japan. None of the papers which attacked General MacArthur have published his full statement. I got hold of it last night and I am inserting it in the RECORD this morning. It is absolutely unanswerable." (From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

MAC ARTHUR CRITICS, MILITARY

Again a sampling—the list is longer than this column. Here are opinions of ranking Pacific military leaders who don't follow the MacArthur line:

"'Vinwright says, 'Occupy Japan for 20 years.'" (PM, September 18, 1945.)

"'The Japs are spiritually undefeated,' said the founder of the Flying Tigers and commanding general of the succeeding China Air Task Force and Fourteenth Air Force. 'They realized after the atomic bombings that they didn't make proper preparations for the war. They feel they won't be defeated again.'

"General Chennault, once in first place on the Japanese list of war criminals with President Roosevelt as No. 2, declared the greatest potential danger was in leaving the Japanese Emperor in control." (Quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

"Too lenient treatment of Japan will 'Sure as death and taxes lead to another war,' the admiral said in a speech broadcast to the naval aviation anniversary dinner in Washington." (Admiral Halsey, quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

MAC ARTHUR CRITICS, PRESS

Now, some viewpoints from the non-Axis press. The Tribune is liberal-Republican, the Sun conservative-Republican, the Times conservative-Independent, and the World-Telegram is on a teeter weighted on the right:

"LORD HIGH EVERYTHING ELSE

"The general's actions so far have tended to strengthen the imperial institution of Japan, one of the world's worst political evils and thus to give more power to the rapacious oligarchy which controls the institution. The general's assertion that the occupation force in Japan probably could be cut to 200,000 within 6 months no doubt encouraged members of the oligarchy to believe that all they are required to do is bow low in the presence of the general until he gives them a good-conduct parole." (New York Herald Tribune, September 21, 1945.)

"TOKYO AND WASHINGTON

"2. While General MacArthur must decide the pace at which new policies are introduced, he cannot be left to determine what these policies themselves will be. The questions at issue here involve far more than the judgment and the purposes of the commander in the field. They involve the judgment and the purposes of the whole Government of the United States, acting in cooperation with its allies. Under Secretary of State Acheson is entirely right when he says that 'the occupation forces are the instruments of policy and not the determinants of policy.'" (New York Times, September 21, 1945.)

"MAC ARTHUR AND WASHINGTON

"As for the general, he was obviously in the wrong in announcing to the world that 'within 6 months the occupation force will probably number not more than 200,000 men,' when his latest official estimate to the President and War Department specified 500,000. This was generally though erroneously interpreted to mean a change in the American policy of a firm military occupation as long as necessary to enforce the surrender terms. It also raised false hopes of a faster demobilization of American troops than possible." (World-Telegram, September 20, 1945.)

"THE PEACE IS YET TO BE WON

"What has happened, of course, is that what General MacArthur said has been exploited by those campaigning so aggressively to halt the draft and bring the boys back home at once. They have been quick to jump at the 200,000 figure of the general as an over all requirement fixed definitely by the commanding officer in the field. Why, they ask, if 80,000,000 militant Japanese can be held in check by 200,000 men, cannot the cowed Germans in the section this country is occupying be controlled by a fraction of that number? To answer that, President Truman felt impelled to elaborate on his statement of the preceding day and back up Mr. Acheson by agreeing that, in respect to Japan, 'No one now can foresee what those needs are going to be.' That, of course, is sound. Clearly General MacArthur, in his enthusiasm over the smoothness with which the occupation is going, spoke with a definiteness which the uncertainties of the future may not justify. Neither in Tokyo nor in this country should it be forgotten that the peace has yet to be won." (New York Sun, September 20, 1945.)

THE REAL ISSUE

If a newspaper wants to defend MacArthur, that's its business, but when the press axis creates a witch hunt over criticism of MacArthur it becomes everybody's business. For if democracy dies stillborn in Japan, world peace may die with it.

R. A. Y.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we seem to be confronted in these attacks with an organized campaign to remove General MacArthur. As further evidence of the organized smear campaign which is now under way, I ask that an article entitled "Boos Hint Communists Plan MacArthur Smear Campaign," published in the Washington Times-Herald of September 24, be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPAGANDA WHEELS GREASED—BOOS HINT COMMUNISTS PLAN MACARTHUR SMEAR CAMPAIGN—DEMONSTRATION AT NEW YORK MEETING SEEN BUT START OF SCHEME TO DIM GENERAL'S STAR

(By Guy Richards and Russ Symontowne)

NEW YORK, September 23.—A few small boos—harbingers of bigger and better boos to come—greeted the name of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur at the Madison Square Garden meeting of 12,000 Communists and their sympathizers last Tuesday night.

The boos went almost unnoted against the background of tumultuous cheering for the early overthrow of capitalism and the quick rise of the socialist state, demanded by leaders of the newly reorganized party.

SEEN AS TEST BOOS

But it is almost certain these were test boos, little samples of a wide variety of boos and hisses, hoots and jeers soon to come rolling from the party's production lines.

In fact, we were told by Communists off the record, and it took little reading between the lines of party publications to assure us, the great Red propaganda machines are ready-greased for a full-scale smear campaign against the general who brought an end to the world's greatest war.

GROUND WORK DESCRIBED

Today we will describe how the ground work for this campaign to discredit MacArthur has been laid and what the Reds hope to gain by it in this country. In another article we will attempt to show how this get-MacArthur movement fits into the jigsaw picture of Moscow's plan for world expansion.

Before he left New York for Chicago, where he spoke tonight, William Z. Foster, national chairman of the party, gave us a quotation which broadly summarizes the party's new hatred of MacArthur.

"MacArthur's conduct in Japan," said Foster, "has been such as to require his correction by the President and by the State Department. His activity on behalf of a quisling regime in the Philippines, his methods in Japan and Korea, demonstrate that he is unfit to carry out the job of crushing Japanese fascism and its collaborators.

"It is no wonder that the reactionary, pro-Fascist press in America is grooming him for the Presidency in 1948."

A careful study of the columns of the Daily Worker, the Communist official organ, and talks with Communist leaders disclosed the party's alleged grievances against MacArthur.

MAC ARTHUR IS TARGET

But also it was revealed to us that the party is not hankering at this time for an out-and-out fight with the Truman administration and intends to use MacArthur as a convenient target for abuse it might otherwise heap upon the President and State Department.

"We may never learn to love Harry Truman but we may still wish to support him in 1948 against some greater reactionary," one Communist put it. "For the time being at least, MacArthur will serve our purpose very well."

Now, turning to the specific Communist "case" against the general, we found that until quite recently the party had very little against him.

BLASTS FROM DAILY WORKERS

Quite suddenly the Daily Worker began, shortly after VJ-day, to blossom forth with headlines, articles, and editorials blasting the general.

"As a reactionary military man he didn't matter so much to us," said one Communist high in the leadership. "But as a reactionary boss of Japan, playing with its Fascist elements, he matters a great deal."

The first thing griping the Reds is the fact that only American soldiers are occupying Japan.

"Instead of planning a joint occupation with our allies, as in Germany, the United States is making the job harder and costlier," a Worker editorial of last Wednesday read.

WANTED REDS IN JAPAN

"Of course we wanted Russian soldiers in Japan," a Communist leader told one of us. "We wanted the same quick and virtually bloodless revolution we had in European countries, in Poland, Rumania, and even France. We wanted the old Fascist leaders, not merely the military but the industrial war makers as well, turned out immediately and democratic elements installed in their places. As it is, every day MacArthur plays with these industrialists and politicians they entrench themselves and fix fascism's hold more tightly on Japan."

So, it is the party line to fix the blame upon MacArthur for the over-all occupation plan which was surely decided upon by the administration in agreement with the other Allies.

In many editorials in the last two weeks the Worker has harped upon MacArthur's continuance in office of Japanese officials.

"If we can raise enough heat we might be able to force the administration to withdraw MacArthur from Japan," a Communist told one of us. "Frankly, we are not very hopeful. But, it might be done. He's been spanked several times by the administration."

A series of articles, signed with a nom de plume and datelined from the Philippines, appeared last week in the Worker, purporting to show that under MacArthur's orders troops in the Philippines were working with Quislings and in some instances actually jailing Filipinos who worked in the underground.

RED FEAR CITED

Russia's mounting fear of American might peeps through the lines written by James S. Allen in the Worker September 16:

"It is well known," Allen wrote, "among those in close contact with MacArthur, and it has also been voiced in the press, that the commander views Japan as a base of reconnaissance against the Soviet Union.

The Daily Worker is seeking hard to make it appear that MacArthur is on the defensive. This is an old and familiar party tactic, used often before against its enemies. When MacArthur announced that he believed only 200,000 troops would be needed to occupy Japan, instantly the Worker declared this was bait to make American mothers and fathers of soldiers and sailors accept his soft handling of the Japanese.

NOT VERY HOPEFUL

But, while the party feels that abusing MacArthur as a Fascist is helpful and useful in restoring it to prewar vigor, one leader confided to us it really had little hope of altering the course of affairs in Japan.

"However," this man said, "we will certainly fix his wagon for the Presidency. You see, we dont really think he can be elected President. But you never can tell what will happen in politcs and it is a good thing to knock him out of the race now."

"However," he continued, "that isnt the main idea. Our real fear is that the reactionary and Fascist politicians and newspapers will build him up and then use him to force the nomination and election of some lesser known Fascist tool. If we can discredit him thoroughly now, he will lose his value to the American reactionaries long before 1948 rolls around."

It was a little boo for MacArthur at the Garden last Tuesday, but that little boo will soon become a great big boo, if the Communists can so contrive it. The party line says: "Get MacArthur!"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see where there is any rebuke involved. Exactly what language does the Senator consider a rebuke?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I refuse to yield any further for the Senator to make a speech. If he wants to make a speech in his own time, that is all right with me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was merely asking a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I am making a statement relative to the objections I have to confirming the nomination of a distinguished citizen. Mr. Acheson, at this time. I should like to complete my statement, and then if the distinguished Senator from Arkansas wants to take the opposing ground, as I know he will, that will be all right with me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I merely asked the question what language the Senator considered a rebuke. Can the Senator give the Senate his idea as to what constitutes a rebuke in that stenographic transcript of the interview?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will be patient with me, I think I can refer to many editorials outside of my own State which will convince the Senator that Mr. Acheson's statement was considered a rebuke by the American people and also by the people of Japan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not want to engage in discussion with the Senator——

Mr. WHERRY. I notice that no Senator wants to engage in a discussion, but Senators are attempting to prevent me from making a coherent statement, and they are doing a very good job of it. If they will bear with me, I shall be glad to finish my statement, and then they can ask any question. I shall be glad to yield to any Senator at any time if I may be permitted to complete my statement in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska does not have to emphasize that. I was wondering if he was going to put into the RECORD editorials from the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, the Washington Post, and other newspapers, since he has used the name of the Daily Worker and PM with some obvious aspersions upon those publications. If he is going to put them into the RECORD I would not want to do it myself.

Mr. WHERRY. I will say I am going to put in a number of editorials, including some from Texas and one or two from Kentucky. I have also a lot of correspondence to which I intend to refer, so that the Senate may be advised how the people feel about the matter.

I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point an article by Sidney Shalett, appearing in the New York Times of September 23, which I think will be highly informative to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. If he wants something placed in the RECORD from the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

OUR POLICY TOWARD JAPAN IS EXAMINED ANEW—CONTROVERSIES GIVE IMPETUS TO WORK ON A SOUND, LONG-RANGE COURSE

(By Sidney Shalett)

WASHINGTON, September 22.—The MacAruthr-State Department controversy over the long-range occupation of Japan produced, on the surface, a number of lively forensic reactions. Beneath the surface, however, the dispute served to heighten the serious concern in certain responsible official quarters here that our basic policies for the rule of conquered countries are by no means as firmly formulated as they should be.

Certain officials in Washington directly concerned with the keeping of the peace we have just won—and among them is at least one high War Department authority—were disturbed by the frictions. These sources have felt for some time that our long-range policies of occupation in Europe, as far as international agreement on the ultimate fate of Germany is concerned, are woefully weak; in fact, some say that there is no real long-range policy. They had been less pessimistic concerning Japan, since the United States was more completely in the saddle there and the international aspects were less complicated.

Nevertheless, the future of Asia is not an exclusively American show, and these observers feel that any display of lack of decisiveness on our part is not a good omen for keeping the peace.

To put it mildly, there has been a considerable degree of confusion concerning our policies in Japan. Much has been said by many authoritative officials, and they have not always agreed with one another.

SPHERES OF AUTHORITY

To set the record straight, so far as division of the conquered territories was concerned, there were certain agreements among the United States, Russia, Britain, and China; the spheres of these nations are generally defined now, and the authority of each nation within its sphere is clear-cut.

In the territory we are governing, principally Japan proper and part of Korea, the basic American policy is decided in Washington. These decisions are up to President Truman and the State Department under Secretary James F. Byrnes. The Joint (Army-Navy) Chiefs of Staff advise the President on military and naval matters. Theoretically General MacArthur is our chief of police in Japan, subject to the orders of the joint chiefs. He is on the scene and great authority has been vested in him, so naturally his recommendations carry great weight.

Military and diplomatic authorities here agree, however, that it is not up to General MacArthur to make the final decisions; he is the instrument, rather, to carry out Washington's policies.

The original basic policy for rule of Japan was outlined in the Potsdam Declaration, issued before the Japanese surrender. In this declaration the Allies promised to eliminate Japan's future ability to make war by dismantling her armed forces and her munitons industries, to punish her war criminals, and to occupy her soil as long as she could be considered a menace.

Then Japan surrendered and General MacArthur went in with his occupation forces. While he was establishing himself in an absolutely secure military position and commencing the dismantlement of the Japanese Army, the clamor on the home front for ultrarapid demobilization of our own Army began to assume irresistible proportions and the Congress went along with the popular sentiment.

Two significant statements soon came out of Japan. First, Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, commander of the Eighth Army in Tokyo, observed that "if the Japs continue acting as they are now, within a year this thing should be washed up." Then General MacArthur himself exploded his bombshell on the War Department and blandly forecast that he should be able to cut his Japan-Korea forces to 200,000 within 6 months.

A DIFFICULT PERSONALITY

It is common knowledge in military circles that the War Department has unbounded admiration for General MacArthur's military genius. It also is common knowledge that General MacArthur is regarded as a rather difficult personality. His independent actions on a number of occasions have embarrassed the General Staff back home. For instance, in the face of the cries for rapid demobilization, it embarrassed the War Department to justify General Eisenhower's need for 400,000 men in Germany when General MacArthur was talking of doing his job with 200,000.

Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, is polite and diplomatic. He did not criticize General MacArthur's statement; yet, he significantly dwelt, in his talk to the Congress on Thursday, on the fact that General MacArthur originally had asked for great numbers of men and that the War Department's original demobilization plans, now being speeded, had to be pegged on these early large demands.

Acting Secretary Acheson was less polite. In a statement that from a diplomat was positively fiery, he tartly declared that it was the United States Government, not General MacArthur, that was determining American policies in Japan. The State Department intends to see that Japan is socially and economically revolutionized and that her future war-making potential is destroyed, regardless of what military decisions General MacArthur may take, he averred.

While a number of congressional spokesmen stormed against Acting Secretary Acheson, he received unexpected support from a top-ranking spokesman of the Army Air Forces. Lt. Gen. Barney McK. Giles, formerly second in command of the AAF, and now deputy commander of the Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific, returned from his nonstop flight from Japan with some vivid ideas about Japanese policy.

ONE-HUNDRED-YEAR OCCUPATION

The Japanese were acting fine and peaceful, he observed, and General MacArthur was handling the situation beautifully. But, General Giles declared, the millions of Japanese soldiers who had had to lay down their arms without even fighting were convinced that they had not been defeated. If we got out too quick these sullen warriors would stir up another war, he declared; therefore, it was his opinion that we should occupy Japan for "not less than 100 years."

The final confusing element came Friday when General MacArthur, in an exclusive interview granted to Hugh Baillie, president of the United Press, placed himself unequivocally on the side of a long and severe occupation. The Allies must stay in Japan for many years, General MacArthur declared. His own intentions are to see that Japan is kept on an "austerity basis," that her war criminals are relentlessly punished and that every vestige of her ability to wage war is destroyed.

There was no more trace of softness in General MacArthur's sweeping declaration than there has been in the measures he is progressively putting into effect in Japan.

Asked if he believed that Japan would ever become a world power again, General MacArthur said: "Never again when the terms of the surrender have been accomplished.

"Japan industrially, commercially, militarily, and in every other way is in a state of complete collapse.

"Her resources of every kind are absolutely exhausted. Her food supplies are scant, and she faces conditions of emergency that may well become catastrophic. Her punishment for her sins, which is just beginning, will be long and bitter."

Asked whether he would refer to it as an invasion or as a pacification, he replied, "Neither. It is the occupation of a conquered country by the forces that defeated it."

Meanwhile, however, the State Department took steps to establish a closer liaison with the supreme military commander. It ordered Arthur B. Emmons, foreign service officer and a far eastern expert, to proceed to Tokyo to serve as its "link" with the general. Meanwhile a staff of State Department experts is being established in Tokyo.

NAVY BELIEVED PIQUED

Not much has come out to date about how the Navy feels about General MacArthur's policies in Japan. Diligent inquiries this week seemed to justify the impression that the Navy was sour over what one source referred to as "the whole deal." Rightly or wrongly, the Navy feels that it made the major contribution to victory in the Pacific and it undeniably feels that it should have had at least some share of governing Japan.

It is a relatively small matter, but some Navy authorities point to the fact that the Fifth Marine Division is doing occupation duty in Kyushu, but no publicity about its activities has been released by General MacArthur's organization.

It may be authoritatively said that the Navy definitely is against any "softness" or "briefness" in our occupation of Japan. The Navy feels that if there is another war in Japan it will have to repeat its difficult and costly role; it wants everything possible to be done to avert a return engagement in the Pacific.

It would be unwise to assume that, because of all the smoke, Washington is irrevocably gloomy on our prospects in Japan. To sum up, the feeling here is that the controversies are unfortunate, and that it would be better for the United States, both in the eyes of Japan and in the eyes of the rest of the world, to steer a firmer course with less squabbling in the Far East. There is no basic lack of confidence, however, that General MacArthur will rule Japan with firmness. It also is hoped that the Government eventually will work out its long-range policies for Japan, and see to it that they are carried out.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like also to put into the RECORD some letters I have received. I have not asked permission to use the names, but I am going to try to get it. If, however, any Senator would like to see the letters, I should be glad, indeed, to let them do so. They are responsive to the very question which the distinguished Senator from Arkansas asked, as to whether or not the statement of Mr. Acheson was considered a rebuke and in the nature of a smearing campaign.

Here is a letter which came from Tennessee:

NASHVILLE, TENN., *September 22, 1945.*

Hon. Senator WHERRY,
United States Senate Office Building.
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: Permit me to congratulate you upon the list of questions which you propounded to Dean Acheson.

Regardless of his answers, however, it seems to me that a man who gets peeved over a thing like MacArthur's statement of how many men he thinks will finally be needed to hold Japan in line is a small man.

Certainly, MacArthur has shown he possesses what it takes. If this is a sample of Acheson's caliber, he lacks a lot, in my judgment, and I hope enough Senators agree to hold up his confirmation.

Sincerely.

Here is one from Oklahoma:

ALVA, OKLA., *September 21, 1945.*

Hon. Senators WHERRY and CHANDLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATORS: I want to compliment you on your stand relative to the insulting attitude of Dean Acheson in regard to General MacArthur.

It is high time someone called a check on such high-handed egotism as is being manifest in some of our high places in Government.

It is astounding how men—and supposedly of high caliber—sometimes let their ignorance crop out.

Dean Acheson probably knows about as much about the military needs in Japan as a pig does about hip pockets. And to question as high an authority as General MacArthur is to but show his lack of intelligence.

I am only one of thousands of fathers who have boys in the service who are in sympathy with you in your stand.

Yours.

That is an answer to the Senator from Arkansas. As I have said, I am withholding the names until I can get permission to have them printed.

Here is a letter from Ohio:

NEW PHILADELPHIA, OHIO,
September 21, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator from Nebraska,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I write to commend you for opening your splendid defense of our splendid, glorious, unequaled General MacArthur. The campaign of vilification which has been studied, deliberate, and politically carried on against him is just one more disgraceful scandal in government.

Yours truly.

Here is a letter from a man who lives in Cincinnati, Ohio, who encloses an editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *September 21, 1945.*

KENNETH S. WHERRY, Esquire,
United States Senator.

HONORABLE SIR: I enclose editorial from today's Times Star, which may be of interest.

Where does this fellow Acheson come from and how does he get that way? Since when did the State Department become the Government of these United States?

Very respectfully yours.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Times-Star be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOULD ACHESON START SOMETHING?

General MacArthur's statement that, as things look now and barring unforeseeable factors, the forces occupying Japan can be reduced to 200,000 by the end of 6 months, was, on its face, a report of progress which the facts justified his making. Not so the public utterance of Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State, implying that MacArthur was endeavoring to modify the Government's policy toward Japan, and stating that the policy will be carried out whatever it takes. This will make the country wish that Secretary Byrnes was in Washington now, instead of London. The head of the State Department is not supposed to carry on a public debate with a commanding general in the field, and at least Jimmy Byrnes knows it.

The plain fact is that MacArthur has moved so swiftly and successfully that the Washington policy-makers have fallen as far behind him as war maps fell behind Patton in his dash across France. The occupation of Japan has taken a course unprecedented and unexpected. Indeed, it represents a new and refreshing sort of collaboration, to use a familiar word. The Japanese are complying, so far as can be seen, with all MacArthur's order, and seemingly going beyond them in bringing in men accused of being war criminals, in suggesting additions to the lists of the accused, and in even volunteering to undertake their trial and punishment. This never happened before anywhere. You might charge it all to a dark scheme or merely to the ways of an unpredictable people. But the apparent motive is just to clear up the wreckage of war speedily—as was done after the cataclysmic earthquake of 1923—and make the country again a going concern.

A prime factor, of course, has been MacArthur's complete compliance with the Allied terms of surrender as regards the Mikado, who in turn has been able to secure the complete compliance of his people. Meanwhile, flabbergasted Washington officials look on, and a few fatuous Senators talk of having Hirohito arrested. By and by, when the thinking of these officials catches up with swift-moving events, we may look for a policy as to Japan. There are rumors that it may mean the use of millions of soldiers in order to impose democracy there—which seems to be a contradiction of terms. We shall have to wait and see.

Mr. WHERRY. Here is a letter from Washington, D. C., written by a man who served with MacArthur in the First World War. He says this is a deliberate plan to blacken the name of MacArthur and remove him from his command.

I quote a letter from my own State, written by one of my very best friends:

The war is over. Why keep millions of our boys in the Army, while they ought to be at home preparing themselves for their future careers. And that is the way 99 out of every 100 feel about it.

The criticism of the State Department of the statement of General MacArthur as to the necessary size of the occupation army in Japan comes with very poor grace. General MacArthur knows more about it than all the departments in Washington.

Respectfully submitted.

Here is one from Kansas City, Mo.:

Acheson must go!

Missourians are proud that you and Senator CHANDLER have been quick to rebuke Dean Acheson for his impudent and unwarranted criticism of General MacArthur.

That is written by a consulting engineer.

Here is an article which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD. It is by Mr. W. R. Walton, managing editor of the South Bend Tribune, who comes to the defense of General MacArthur. Mr. Walton was out in the Pacific and had a long talk with the general before he returned to the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of September 23, 1945]

MACARTHUR ESTIMATED OCCUPATION ARMY SIZE EARLY, EDITOR REVEALS

(By W. R. Walton, managing editor, South Bend Tribune)

SOUTH BEND, IND., September 22.—How big a force will it take to occupy Japan?

The furore started early this week when General MacArthur, Allied supreme commander, said he could do it with 200,000 men.

To this writer, his announcement came as no surprise, because General MacArthur outlined his plan to three of us over the luncheon table in his Yokohama residence 2 days after the surrender ceremony on the battleship *Missouri*.

We were a little startled, too, and raised inquiring eyebrows, but when the supreme commander had finished, we were wholeheartedly with him. At that time, however, we couldn't tell the world about it because the general was talking off the record and insisted he had to remain loyal to the more than 100 other correspondents.

OCCUPATION CALLED GAMBLE

It seems that many Americans are willing to criticize the general for not being more ruthless from the start.

I wonder how many of them realize just what a gamble America was taking that day when less than 10,000 marines and bluejackets scrambled ashore at the Yokohama naval base, while airborne troops were landing at Atsugi air base outside Yokohama.

They were invading a country which had a fully armed and undefeated army of 4,000,000, at least 1,000,000 of whom were on Honshu Island. No one knew—not even General MacArthur or Admiral Nimitz—what the reaction would be. They had been assured by the imperial government that the occupation would be without resistance. But Japan is filled with fanatical young men—like those who piloted the kamikaze planes. That army is still being disarmed.

NO SYMPATHY VOICED

He went on to discuss his plans for Japan. There was no pity or sympathy in his voice. To put it simply, he means to incapacitate Japan so far as war is concerned for generations to come.

He means to bring every Jap back from China, and there are 4,000,000 of them, he says. In the future they're going to live on the four main Japanese islands. We asked if he thought the islands could support such an increased population.

"Well, they can die, can't they," General MacArthur replied.

That didn't strike me as the words of a man who intends to be soft.

Again, while driving through the ruins of Yokohama, he pointed to areas with such comments as "We killed thousands in that section." He might just as well have been speaking of cabbages.

TO AVOID HATRED

From what General MacArthur told us, it was apparent he does not want to build up hatred in the Japanese for Americans. He intends to break the military caste that has had Japan in its grip. He wants the people to have a taste of democracy, to break down some of the age old traditions.

He told us of his plans to extend suffrage to the women of Japan, who heretofore have raised their sons for one purpose only—that of serving in the armed forces.

He spoke of plans for handling the prisoners of war and they fit into the general pattern he has laid down. He said the Foreign Minister expressed incredulity at the atrocity stories told by allied prisoners. General MacArthur promised to provide conclusive proof.

MAY USE JAP COURTS

The general said he was considering having these prisoners tried in Japanese courts by Japanese judges and juries. In that way the Japanese would punish themselves and they could bear no grudge against the allies. I got the idea, however, that punishment would be severe.

We had an opportunity to observe the Japanese for ourselves. No one could deny that the Japs were docile, that they were whipped. What else was lurking behind their poker faces we could only guess.

But one thing was certain: From now on they're going to take their orders from the headquarters of General MacArthur. And so is Hirohito. If General MacArthur says he can rule them with 200,000 troops, he can do it.

Mr. WHERRY. Here is a letter from a certified public accountant who lives in Boston, Mass.:

BOSTON, MASS., *September 21, 1945.*

Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: I note that action on the nomination of Dean Acheson is scheduled for next week.

Robert Young, in his book Behind the Rising Sun, did not speak very well for Mr. Acheson's actions at the time Mr. Young was held in prison by the Japanese.

In view of Mr. Acheson's recent statements I wonder if he is the proper person to be delegated any authority in connection with the Japanese surrender. It would seem to me that authority in Japan should not be divided and that General MacArthur should have absolute authority unhampered by anyone from the State Department until such time as it is believed he is not doing the job as it should be done.

Very truly yours.

Here is a telegram from Huntington, W. Va. I presume I have received 150 telegrams. If Senators want to see them I shall bring them to the Senate Chamber. I am merely reading some of the communications I have received in order to give the viewpoint of a cross section of the country.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.,
September 24, 1945.

United States Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Met you when here. Dr. Logan, Presbyterian missionary to Japan, 39 years now located States. General MacArthur has not made a mistake yet in occupying Japan, congratulations on your stand.

Here is a telegram from Florida:

WINTER PARK, FLA.,
September 23, 1945.

Honorable KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Just returned from Pacific theater of war. As recent member of general headquarters special staff, strongly recommend Senate rejection of Dean Acheson as tactless, impetuous, illogical, immature, uninformed, and unfair candidate for State Department post. Nation can place implicit confidence in superb qualities of Douglas MacArthur, soldier, statesman, gentleman of honor, and master strategist. Identify sender in Who's Who.

Here is a letter from Eastland, Tex.:

EASTLAND, TEX., *September 21, 1945.*

Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: You are hereby petitioned to permanently block the nomination of Communist Dean Acheson as Assistant Secretary of State of the United States. The play is like this, for the Communist planners to get Acheson in office as Assistant Secretary of State for awhile, then get Jimmy Byrnes out of office, and, presto, the United States has a Communist, Dean Acheson, as Secretary of State of the Republic of the United States.

That as I said, is from Eastland, Tex.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I refuse to yield any further until I have finished my statement. When I have concluded I shall be glad to yield to any Senator. I want to put in the RECORD a letter from a man by the name of Smith, of Dallas, Tex., who encloses an article published in the Dallas Morning News.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me ask who wrote the letter?

Mr. WHERRY. It is from a man in Dallas, Tex., who has kindly sent me the article from the Dallas newspaper.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I have the floor and I refuse to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was merely asking the Senator who wrote the letter. I did not understand him to say who wrote it.

Mr. WHERRY. It is from a Mr. Smith, of Dallas, Tex., and this is what the writer says:

DALLAS, TEX., *September 21, 1945.*

Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Perhaps the enclosed has not come to your attention. This, we believe, echoes the sentiment of 90 percent of the people out here.

This outrage on General MacArthur is the evidence of the inefficiency of the man the administration is trying to place in the important position of Under Secretary.

If there is anyone in Washington or elsewhere better qualified to handle the Jap situation than General MacArthur, he should be there instead of the general, and certainly Acheson is not the man.

We are pleased to know that we have a few representative men in the Senate who have the courage to recognize the ability of men like MacArthur and General Wainwright and will protect them against the insults of such political parasites who have assumed authority in the bureaus in Washington.

Very truly yours,

WM. N. SMITH.

The article from the Dallas Morning News is by Mr. Ted Dealey, who by invitation was present at the surrender of Japan aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri.* I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHESON STATEMENTS CALLED INSULT TO GENERAL MACARTHUR; WRITER BACKS COMMANDER—OCCUPATION CHIEF DESCRIBED AS KNOWING SITUATION BEST

(By Ted Dealey)

One would have a great deal of temerity, after having spent only a week in Japan, to set himself up as an authority on the problem of how best to handle that conquered country.

But this writer cannot refrain, nevertheless, from siding wholeheartedly with Gen. Douglas MacArthur in his belief that only 200,000 American troops will be needed in Nippon for the army of occupation and against Dean Acheson, of the State Department, who has quite different ideas and who has not hesitated to express them.

In the first place, it might be asked with all propriety, What does Mr. Acheson know about Japan or the Japanese that General MacArthur is ignorant of?

It's entirely possible that Mr. Acheson has been in Japan some time or other, but even if he has, it's a lead-pipe cinch that he has not visited the country since Pearl Harbor days. And it is equally sure that General MacArthur knows what is what in the Pacific Ocean areas on the basis of his experience before and during the war.

The American people do not want their boys to be policing Japan for the next 20 years with a half million or a million men and their best chance that this does not come to pass is to leave policy making in the Nipponese home islands to MacArthur who is on the ground and who ought to know what methods are best to pursue.

If 200,000 men are not enough for a functioning army of occupation, then Japan and the Japanese people are a much tougher outfit than appears to a casual visitor in that country.

NIPPON SMALLER THAN TEXAS

After all, the Jap home islands, taken as a whole, are much smaller in area than is the State of Texas. Speaking in round figures, there are fewer than 150,000 square miles in the 4 home islands of Japan, while Texas can boast of an area 267,000 square miles in extent.

Doesn't it seem reasonable that 200,000 Texas Rangers could preserve order in this State, tough as we think we are?

If the conquered Japanese are looked upon as a sullen, morose, and hostile people who are only biding their time before starting another war, then perhaps the big occupation army proponents would be right.

But the Japs are not taking their defeat in this way. They are a regimented and a thoroughly docile people. They have been accustomed for so many years to rendering complete obedience to their war lords and their Emperor that it is easy for them to switch about and display this same spirit of cooperation and obedience to the Americans, now that our military leaders are in the saddle.

Several publishers had lunch with General MacArthur in Yokohama as recently as the 4th of this month, and on that occasion we asked the general how long the army of occupation would have to stay in Japan. This was the reply:

"Six months if we handle the Japs right, and by that I mean if we are not too ruthless and cruel; indefinitely if we do not handle them right."

STATEMENT IS SURPRISE

This rather floored us, because up until that time we had no idea that General MacArthur even remotely entertained the idea that all American troops could be removed from the Japanese home islands within a half year.

So the next question was a natural corollary. We inquired, "Well, if we do move out of Japan within the next 6 months, what is to prevent the Japanese from starting to build up for another war 25 years from now?"

"I'm going to fix things," replied General MacArthur, "so that the Japs will have a hard enough time eating for the next 25 years, much less having the leisure and materials to build up for another war. The Rising Sun is a setting sun. Japan is through forever as a military power."

And that stands to reason. Japan is an insular empire. Its agriculture is not sufficient without imports to feed its own people. It has no minerals, such as iron, sulfur, magnesium, aluminum, oil, or the like, with which to build ships of war, airplanes, or munitions factories. All these have to be imported, and yet today Japan has no navy and very little merchant shipping.

Of commercial ships it has left today less than 800,000 tons, and of this total only about 375,000 tons are in serviceable condition. How can Japan start another war, even if it wanted to, if we see to it that they build no new navy and if we watch over their imports, which we assuredly will?

WOMEN TO GET VOTE

MacArthur told us he planned to institute woman suffrage in Japan and that he planned also to encourage labor unions in the islands. The latter, he said, were just getting started before the war. In addition to these measures, he plans to seek out and strengthen and put eventually into power the antiwar party of Japan, which most certainly exists and which will flourish and grow powerful now that the war lords are either committing harakiri or are getting themselves ready to be tried before American courts as war breeders and criminals.

Thus, under the MacArthur policy, Japan will be ruled within a fairly short time by the better element of its own people—that element of the Japs that believes in democratic government, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and is motivated by a sincere desire to get along peaceably with the rest of the world.

General MacArthur and his staff know who these Japanese antiwar people are and have known for a long time. They are at the present time searching them out and preparing to put them in positions of power.

How much better this is, from our standpoint, than the forced contemplation of our sustaining a military government in Japan for several generations through a tremendous army of occupation?

The Japs we saw in Japan were not hostile or unfriendly. They were more apathetic and indifferent than anything else. They didn't seem to mind that they were now being

bossed by Americans rather than their own war lords. For untold generations they have been accustomed to being ground under the heel of their own ruling class.

It makes very little difference to them now that their war lords are passing out of the picture and a new bunch of bosses are coming in. As a matter of fact, a great many people in Japan are actually relieved that the Americans came into their homeland and are now in the process of emancipating them from the slavery that has been theirs almost from time immemorial. We received this impression from undoubted authorities.

When General MacArthur said we will not have to occupy Japan for more than 6 months "if we are not too ruthless and cruel," he was not indicating by that remark that he favored a soft peace for the Japs.

MacArthur will be plenty tough. But he knows the Jap psychology. He knows that to get cooperation from the Japs he has to treat them firmly but with strict justice and some consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to refer to the sentiment in another section of the country. I have picked out some editorials because I thought they were very important.

Here is one from Tucson, Ariz. I never met the writer of this editorial, but I have read many editorials, and this is one of the finest I have ever read in my life. It comes from a newspaper away down in the Southwest, the Arizona Daily Star, published every morning of the year by W. R. Mathews and Clare R. Ellinwood, Tucson, Ariz. I read:

Regardless of what opinions one may have on the occupation of Japan, one thing has become apparent from official statements. A struggle is going on within the State Department, within the White House, and within the War Department over the matter of official policy in connection with Japan. That Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson dares to rebuff General MacArthur—

That is what the press is saying—

dares to rebuff General MacArthur, would indicate that the so-called liberals who champion a policy of "Russia is always right, or Britain is always right, but America is always wrong" are winning out.

For instance, General MacArthur announces that 200,000 men will be sufficient to disarm Japan, and that the occupation need not be a prolonged job. General Eichelberger, another successful general, is on the spot and agrees with this estimate. After the successful campaign these men have conducted, it would seem that they are qualified to speak.

But no, they are not.

Instead of jubilation or relief back in Washington, General MacArthur's announcement brings anger and disappointment. The plans of some of the young liberals like Mr. Acheson have been upset. They want to reform Japan, as well as Germany and Italy. They plan for Japan an economic and social revolution.

That is their interpretation of the release. This is the editor of the Tucson paper speaking.

Mr. Acheson boldly says that "whatever it takes to carry out this policy will be used to carry it out"—

This is the editor of the Tucson, Ariz., paper speaking. This is not my interpretation, this is his interpretation, and editors throughout the country have interpreted it in the same vein—

and that "occupation forces are the instruments of policy and not the determinants of policy."

Those words of Mr. Acheson call for sober, even solemn, consideration by the American people. Their implications are far-reaching. They mean that demobilization—

I wish to get into the RECORD this statement from this editor:

They mean that demobilization will have to be slowed down and indefinitely prolonged to allow Mr. Acheson and his subordinates to carry out their "economic and social revolution."

American soldiers are going to be kept in Japan in larger numbers than military experts like General MacArthur and General Eichelberger say are necessary.

The confidence with which this bureaucrat tells Congress and the people of the country what they are going to do is only matched by the way President Truman has since equivocated on his first spontaneous approval of General MacArthur's announcement. Somebody has spoken in firm enough tones to President Truman to cause him to speak evasively where once he spoke frankly. When people are evasive they know something which they are afraid to tell about.

I wish to stop in the reading of this editorial and suggest again to the Senate that this raises the whole question of policy making. Who has been consulted in regard to the policy making heretofore? Who in the United States Senate or what committee was consulted about the Potsdam agreement, the occupation of Germany, or of Japan? As the White House announcement said, the United States alone is dictating the policy for Japan, because in this release that is given out it is said that even though it has to be done by the United States alone, they are going to carry out this so-called revolution over there in Japan, so that they can disarm Japan and prevent Japan being an aggressive nation.

I say, who makes the policy? Does not the Senate advise and consent? We are certainly doing so today in connection with the pending nomination. Do we not help make the policy?

Let us remember the discussion that took place at the time the extension of the reciprocal-trade agreements was before us. By the way, this man Acheson was for them, this same man Acheson who sold Bretton Woods to the people of this country. Look at his record. I have had only a few hours, over the week end, to look it over, but we find this man ready to go the limit in spending the taxpayers' money all over the world. This is the man, the next Under Secretary of State, or perhaps the Secretary of State, who will pass upon the reduction in schedules under the reciprocal trade agreements, this man who has declared himself for all these international benefits and reliefs.

Since we had the reciprocal trade extension matter up in the Senate, there have been instances throughout the country indicating to us a question whether we should have made such reductions in the schedules. There is the matter of the importation of potatoes from Canada. I understand that nearly a million bushels have come in, and we have to absorb those and pay the support price. There are so many potatoes in some of the States that the people cannot take them, and they are being sent to the dehydrating plants, and even Europe cannot buy them.

I say to Senators from the Middle Western States, this is the man who is to pass on the reduction of schedules under the reciprocal trade agreements. I cannot afford to have my record show that I joined in unanimously confirming this man's nomination, if he is going to reduce the schedules so as to work a hardship against the farmers of the State of Nebraska.

Another matter this policy question brings up, of course, is the matter of the demobilization of the Army, and I am certainly interested in that. Demobilization is completely dependent upon our policy both in Europe and Asia. The Senator from Texas will find many people writing him about whether or not we are going to keep soldiers in the Pacific area, and foster a revolution. He will receive many communications about that. The mothers and fathers are writing me, and writing with tears in their eyes, in an effort to get the boys home as soon as they can, and our job is to see that after we have permanently secured peace in Japan the boys are brought home.

I will go just as far as will any Member of the United States Senate on the terms necessary to assure a permanent peace, and I think they are set out in the Potsdam agreement. I will support them wholeheartedly. But if it amounts to going into a policy about which we know nothing, and which has not been clarified, which will result in a longer time being taken for demobilization, then certainly I shall stand on this floor and call it to the attention of the Senate if I am the only man who does so, and if I am the only one who votes against the confirmation. I can go back to my people with a clean record and tell them that the blood of American boys is not on my hands for fostering a revolution which might take hundreds of thousands of lives before it is ever put down. I read from the statement:

The important thing is that the policy in regard to Japan is the same policy which has always been held by this Government and is still held, so far as I know, and I think I know.

I wish now to put into the RECORD a resolution that was offered by Mr. COFFEE, a Democratic Member of the House of Representatives, calling for an investigation. This was in the Seventy-seventh Congress, in 1941. The resolution called for a thorough investigation into the sale of oil and scrap iron to Japan. I want the resolution in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby created a special joint congressional committee (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") to be composed of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members. It shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the extent to which, the sources from

which, the manner in which, and the mediums through which, the so-called Axis Powers are obtaining or have obtained essential war materials from the Western Hemisphere. The committee shall report to the Senate and to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable time the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this concurrent resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $20,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say that this man the Senate is about to confirm—I realize, of course, that the administration has the votes—went before a committee in defense of a rule which prevented the investigation of the sale of oil and scrap iron to Japan late in 1941. I cannot give the statement, because the record was executive, but I have the facts on good authority, and I can make the statement.

Here we find a policy in 1941 which is to appease Japan, to sell oil to Japan, to sell scrap iron to Japan. Today we find a policy to appease some other country, but to press down the iron heel on Japan. What is the policy today? If the policy of 1941 was the correct policy, this man Acheson has now made a complete about-face in his attitude.

Mr. President, I do not have any of the executive records. They are not available. But if any Member of the Senate wants me to give him the names of those who can furnish information, I will give them, and Senators can make the investigation themselves.

Mr. President, I read from the editorial in the Arizona Daily Star of Tucson, Ariz., as follows:

The resignation of Mr. Grew takes on a new importance. His moderating influence, an influence whose value can be measured by the hundreds of thousands of lives saved by the early surrender, has been supplanted by those whose ambitions appear so far to be alarming.

The astounding part about this development is that civilians in our Government, of unproven competence, seem more anxious to use our armed forces extensively than the men who did the fighting and have proven their competence to speak.

Thus we see the spectacle of a bureaucrat like Mr. Acheson boldly slapping a great and successful general like General MacArthur in public and getting away with it. With apparent confidence that the public will not realize the far-reaching implications of what his words mean, he speaks of carrying out a "social and economic revolution" in Japan "regardless of cost."

American soldiers and American money, "regardless of cost," are going to be used to carry out a policy the people of the country know nothing about.

Mr. President, did anyone know anything about that policy? I did not know anything about it until last Thursday.

When the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] replies, and I know he is anxiously waiting the opportunity to reply, I ask that he tell the Senate whether he knew about this policy and this social and economic revolution some are about to start in Japan, and if the Senator did know about it, will he tell us why the Senate of the United States has not been informed about it? I am held responsible by the people I represent, and I have a right as a Member of this body to know what the policy is.

I continue to read from the editorial in the Arizona Daily Star:

That is what is going to happen unless the people and the men in the armed services arouse sufficient opposition in Congress to stop this gross misuse of American power.

Mr. President, I have not met the editor of the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Star. I know nothing about the standing of that newspaper in its community. I think, however, the editorial is one of the finest I have ever read. I think it contains much good sense. I think it is time the American people woke up to the need for knowing what policy we are going to have in Japan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer. I have met the editor of the Charlotte Observer. I am not sure how much prestige that newspaper has throughout the South, but the editor of that newspaper writes some of the finest editorials that have come to my attention. This particular editorial deals with the misuse of power and the way MacArthur's name has been blackened, and also deals with the question of what our future policy toward Japan is going to be. It is an outstanding editorial and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which corroborates the editorial from which I just read, published in the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Star, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] suggests that I read it. I should like to read it, but I do not wish unduly to delay the Senate on the vote on my motion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KID GLOVES OR MAILED FIST?

Since the Japanese surrender, this newspaper has been disposed to leave all important decisions on the occupation of Japan up to General MacArthur on the ground that, as a man long experienced in the Orient and having the most potent of personal reasons for dealing sternly with the enemy, he knew more about the situation than we could possibly know at this distance.

Yet the general's expressed hope that 200,000 men will be enough for an occupation army has aroused some misgivings.

That number of men seems to be very small to control a warlike nation of 80,000,000 people who continue to give evidence that they do not yet realize that they are a beaten country.

General MacArthur did not say positively that 200,000 men would be enough. He merely hoped that, in view of the smoothness with which the occupation has proceeded so far, it would be enough.

But even this hope has given another ground for outcry by those who are incensed by what they call the "kid-glove" policy of General MacArthur toward the beaten foe.

They have heard the stories of Japanese cruelties to prisoners that surpassed in bestiality anything the Germans had conceived. They have read the blustering statements of Japanese military leaders that their country will come back as a great power and that the present reverse is only temporary. They contend, therefore, that the Japanese should be given some of their own medicine in the form of a harsh and merciless occupation.

There is ground for those misgivings. But on the other side we have this to the credit of General MacArthur:

Utilizing the authority of the Emperor instead of the force of American arms, he has dissolved the Japanese military organization, disbanded several militaristic societies, and brought about the formation of a new government and a new diet under the leadership of men who were imprisoned for opposing the old military clique.

All but a very few of the major war criminals on the wanted list have been brought in by the Japanese themselves and are now in Yokohama prison awaiting trial.

American prisoners of war have been returned in a steady procession to Allied hands.

The Japanese news and propaganda agencies have been put under the strictest censorship and have been forced to stop using language that gives the impression that the Japs are not beaten.

The general promises further that the Japanese educational system will have a thorough going-over to eradicate all teachings leading to the superman and Son of Heaven philosophies.

The occupation of Japan was entirely different from that of Germany, whose armies had been destroyed on her own soil. The Japanese Army was intact; no foreign soldier had set foot on her homeland. There was not even a friendly underground to help the occupying armies.

Consequently, MacArthur had to move with all the caution of a man closing on a treacherous enemy in the dark. A mistake might have been fatal.

That he made no such mistake is a great item to his credit.

Japan has lost her navy, her merchant marine, her industries, her empire. Her army is disbanded, her government in the hands of former prisoners, her national heroes awaiting trial like common criminals, her Emperior acting merely as the mouthpiece of a conquering commander.

It is not necessary to be brutal in order to make Japan feel our strength. She has felt it already, and with all her sources of trade and raw materials gone she will feel it for a century to come.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it has been my effort to show the Senate what is being said in editorials carried in outstanding newspapers throughout the country. The newspapers to which I have referred are not "red sheets." Oh, some may say that "Senator WHERRY is frightened over what 'red sheets' are saying." But I am quoting from expressions of opinion carried in outstanding newspapers, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] suggested that I do. I have introduced into the RECORD editorials from outstanding newspapers,

which are concerned about America's future policy, which are concerned about America's armed forces, which are concerned about our boys in the armed services, and are concerned over demobilization, as well as over our huge governmental Budget. The editorials I have presented came from newspapers located throughout the United States, and I ask the Senators to take note of what they say.

Mr. President, I have not asked that the nomination be rejected. I simply wish to have the nomination recommitted to the Foreign Relations Committee, to give us an opportunity for further investigation to determine whether the nomination to become Under Secretary of State. I ask the Senator from Texas to tell the Senate, if he rises to answer, whether the committee gave much consideration to the nomination. I do not know whether the committee did. I do not question the action taken, by the Foreign Relations Committee. I ordinarily vote to accept the judgment of the committee. Even the other day I would have voted for the confirmation of this man on the recommendation of the committee. I have always accepted the committee's recommendation. Except in one or two instances I have gone along with the administration because I believe the administration in developing its own program and making its own record it must make the decision as to who shall be called upon to carry out the program and policy of the administration.

But in view of the events of the past few days and even the past few hours, which have been brought to my attention, as well as editorials and newspaper comment, I believe more time should be taken for consideration of the nomination before the Senate acts on it. I believe that those who wish to should be permitted to present their views, so we may find out what the policy of the United States is going to be relative to the so-called economic and social revolution which it is proposed to bring about in Japan at whatever the cost may be. That policy has not been clarified by Mr. Acheson's answer. It may be said that the administration has made answer. I cannot see anything in the administration's answer that has clarified the situation. I think it ought to be clarified. I am sincere in that statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Paxton Howard, published in the Progressive, a newspaper which I diligently read. Mr. Howard reviews the condition to which Japan has been reduced today, and what lies in store for us if we seek a peace of vengeance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLAG OF HOPE—OR OF HATE?

(By Harry Paxton Howard)

Gen. Douglas MacArthur on September 8 drove into Tokyo, capital of defeated Japan, with a single squadron of American cavalry. As happens with other Americans at times, his auto broke down en route. He waited in the Yokohama road 15 minutes, then got another car to carry him into the devastated capital.

The Japanese Government offered to line the 3-mile route with armed police. The American general declined. Near the Imperial Palace the squadron of Seventh Cavalry alighted from their trucks for the short march to the American Embassy. There, General MacArthur stood alone before Lieutenant General Eichelberger, commander of the Eighth Army, which is now garrisoning Tokyo, and said:

"General Eichelberger, have our country's flag unfurled and in Tokyo's sun let it wave in its full glory as a symbol of hope for the oppressed and as a harbinger of victory for the right."

Such is the spirit that may, if carried out with sincerity and loyalty, mean a new day for Japan and for the world. "Symbol of hope for the oppressed. Harbinger of victory for the right." But the very day that this was proclaimed in Tokyo, some newspapers in the United States were furiously demanding that we be "tough" with the oppressed people of Japan, that we hang the Emperor who had accepted our drastic terms for surrender, that we should cynically ignore and violate all the promises of popular liberation that we made at Potsdam, that we should treat the surrendered people with a brutality and violence outdoing anything the British have done in India or the Soviet in Poland. "We are being too soft," screamed the stay-at-home patriots. "When a yellow man is down, kick him."

Whether we hold the flag "as a symbol of hope for the oppressed," and faithfully fulfill our promises for a free Japan liberated from the militarists who plunged their country into the terrible holocaust of war, or whether we make the American flag a symbol of oppression and revenge on a prostrate people, with American militarists replacing Japanese as ruthless oppressors, is more than a question of morality and sentiment. It concerns the entire future of the Far East, our reputation, our standing in the eyes of Asiatic peoples, our chances for enduring peace. No peace can rest on a policy of hatred and insensate revenge on a beaten people.

There is nothing mysterious about the Japanese mind. I lived in Japan for 5 years. I was myself a victim of the Japanese police, and was finally deported by the Japanese Government. Some of the finest people I have ever known were deliberately murdered by Japanese militarists and armed police. Scores of outstanding persons whom I never met were similarly murdered by militarist and patriomaniac assassins. Those victims had and have my warm and sincere sympathy—as they should have that of every decent, freedom-loving, peace-loving American.

The victims of whom I am writing were Japanese—Japanese labor men, Japanese Socialists and Syndicalists, Japanese businessmen, Japanese politicians, Japanese pacifists. They were of various origins and viewpoints—like Americans who love peace and who love democracy. But they opposed, from one viewpoint or another, the rule of the Japanese military gangs, the subordination of Japanese life to the requirements of military expansion, the suppression of civil liberty in one aspect or another in Japan. So they were murdered.

What shall we say of these people? Were they "bestial apes," as the New York Herald Tribune and Mayor LaGuardia scream? Were they "feudal minded" barbarians, as the poison papers of Marshall Field and William Randolph Hearst tell us in their daily doses of viciousness and hatred? Or were they people with whom we could really cooperate for a peaceful and stable world, with the power of militarists forever ended and imperialism replaced by the free cooperation of equal peoples?

It is remarkable that the most vicious, hate-mongering, racialist elements in the American press are in essential agreement with the Japanese militarists whom they most violently denounce. It is repeatedly their assertion, as it has been that of the Japanese militarists, that Japan is "unfit" for democracy; that the Japanese people are a special "breed" who don't want such "western importations." If we are looking for something mysterious in human mentality, we may find it in this meeting of American imperialist and Japanese imperialist minds.

But there is basically nothing mysterious about it. They are minds which are essentially hostile to all the ideals of equal liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and to life itself upon which democracy is based. They are the forces which have pushed us forward in the past and are pushing us forward today toward Asiatic dominion. Our Republic was based upon a rebellion against imperial domination, upon our right to be free. These people would make us the great world empire, with the American flag the symbol of ruthless might and aggressive domination over weaker peoples.

The United States chose a way of expansion which was unique in the world. We were established as a republic, but our colonists moved toward open land, and repeatedly came in conflict with the Indian inhabitants. There were brutal wars of aggression and conquest. We are as capable of such things as are any people. But at the very foundation of the Republic, the founding fathers in their wisdom devised a system by which we would not become a new empire, ruling over subject peoples and territories on this continent.

Virginia, far the greatest of the original States, did not become hegemonic in a group of 13 States, and extend the power of this group westward to the Pacific. Instead, it was specifically laid down that new territories acquired should be entitled and should be prepared for self-government, and that when self-governing institutions were established they could apply for admission to the Union as States.

Virginia voluntarily gave up its great territories west of the Appalachians. And we expanded westward. However devious, brutal, and aggressive much of our expansion has been, the fundamental virtues of our system kept us a republic. Our flag advanced to the shores of the Pacific, and the "conquered" territories became free and self-governing States. Their native inhabitants did not remain "subjects." Ultimately, they became citizens of the great Republic.

Our system was not perfect. There has been discrimination, exploitation, injustice. We have not achieved Utopia, and never shall. But we devised for the first time in history a program for democratic expansion which was basically sound and effective. And in terms of human freedom and welfare some of the "conquered" Western States rank higher than some of the "original" Eastern. Some of the original States, through the terrible anachronism of slavery and its after-products of inequality and discrimination, still rank far below most States in the essentials of democracy. But even they have not retrograded. They have come up from slavery, and their peoples are increasingly calling for and gaining the realities of democratic life.

But this great process of democratic expansion, by which we developed from a little federation of 2,000,000 people to a mighty Republic of 135,000,000 in 48 States, stopped at the shore of the Pacific. Beyond the vast ocean lay Asia—not a field for American colonization, but only a field for empire. No provision had ever been made in the American Constitution for our flag to wave over permanently subject peoples. But when we were pushed—in 1898—into war in the Far East, we became an active participant in the struggle for Asiatic dominion. It was a concept basically hostile to the whole democratic fabric upon which our Republic was founded. But we got into it, and became the allies

instead of the enemies of Imperial domination over subject peoples.

We no longer play a minor part in these struggles for Asiatic dominion. We now play the major part. We have become the dominant power in the western Pacific, with a foothold on the Asiatic Continent itself. We may accept the idea of a permanent conflict for ultimate domination, and look forward to war with the Soviet Union—which has now become the dominant power on the continent of Asia, but we do so at our peril. For the atomic age is one of lightning and terrible destruction, and our great and teeming cities are the most perfect targets in the world. If we are to survive, we must use our tremendous weight and influence for the organization of permanent peace.

But whatever the future is to be, the relentless logic of our treatment of Japan is that we must be honorable and just to our defeated foes. Unless we follow this, we have no claim to put anyone on trial as a war criminal. Asiatic peoples are watching us today. And the Japanese people are watching most closely, to see whether we are going to be tough to the people and soft to the militarists.

If our country cannot be saved from the Imperialists who look forward to another war a generation hence, we have no choice. We must have the Japanese as our allies, and must treat them with this in view. If we are to move forward in Asia toward the great goals of our own Republic—the cooperation of free and democratic peoples in a free world—we again have no choice. We must have the Japanese, and other Asiatic peoples, as our friends and collaborators in the building of that world.

This is the logic, and the only logic, of the situation. Whatever we may do toward Japanese militarists, it must be guided by justice and not revenge, and must aim at the ultimate end of destroying completely their influence over Japanese political life, in order that the forces of Japanese democracy may grow and strengthen themselves free from terrorism and violence.

If we single out, justly and properly, the militarists who have been the enemies of peace and democracy in the Far East, we shall find—as we are already finding—ever-increasing numbers of Japanese who will look to us as friends and liberators. But if our "trials" are to be lynchings of the yellow men, we shall rouse a terrible and lasting hatred which can only play into the hands of all our enemies in Asia and elsewhere, and make inevitable a real war for survival a generation hence.

Which road shall we take? What is the meaning of the American flag to be during the days, months, and years to come? Is it to be what a British visitor bitterly termed it after a trip to the slave South a century ago, before the Civil War:

"Where bastard freedom waves
Her fustian flag in mockery over slaves?"

Or is it to be, as General MacArthur said in simple words at Tokyo, "a symbol of hope for the oppressed and a harbinger of victory for the right?"

Which shall it be? The decision is in our hands.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not asking a hard peace or a soft peace. I am asking for a peace that will do what the American people want done in the Pacific area—a peace which will be permanent, which will be lasting. Some experts say that not for years and years will there be any difficulty in connection with the subjugation of the Japanese; that they are there on their little islands; that they have to work out their own social and economic problems; that they have little food and clothing; that they have no army—and what more are we asking for?

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks I wish to say that I am for just as hard a peace as anyone favors—a peace which will make certain that the Japanese will not again become aggressors. But I am not for starting any revolution in Japan which will involve the sacrifice of the lives of thousands of American boys. I do not want our boys sacrificed if it is unnecessary that such sacrifice be made. I favor the speediest demobilization of the Japanese armed forces that promptly can be done.

Mr. President, in all sincerity I submit to the Senate and to the majority leader that the nomination be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations so we may have an opportunity to investigate into the nominee's background, in order that we may find what future policies he favors, so we may know what the policies of the United States Government are going to be. I think that should be done before we vote on his nomination. I respectfully ask Members of the Senate to cooperate to that end; and if the nominee's record is clear, I shall be the first one on the floor of the Senate to vote in full support of Mr. Acheson.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks in connection with my motion to recommit the pending nomination to the Foreign Relations Committee, a portion of an editorial entitled "The Emperor's Status" from the New York Times of September 22, 1944. It states, among other things, what the Japanese Government understood with reference to the interpretation to be placed upon the Potsdam ultimatum.

There being no objection, the portion of the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EMPEROR'S STATUS

The Potsdam ultimatum to which Tokyo ultimately yielded called not only for the destruction of Japan's war-making powers but also for the elimination for all time of "the authority and influence of those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on a world conquest." This was to be followed by the general democratization of the country.

A good beginning in carrying out this program has already been made. More than three-quarters of the Japanese home army has been disarmed and disbanded; many of the most notorious war criminals have been put behind lock and key. Japan's economic system is being brought under Allied control, and the latest instructions call for a purge of all extreme nationalists from positions of power and influence in presumably both Government and private enterprise. To have accomplished all this with the limited forces at their disposal and without any incidents is a brilliant achievement, for which full credit should be given to General MacArthur and all his men.

But there is one fundamental problem on which all others depend, a problem that must still be solved, and this is what to do with the Japanese Emperor, who as god, emperor, high priest, and titular owner of all Japan, is at the head of the whole Japanese economic and social system. Does he, whose signature and seal adorn all the imperial rescripts exhorting Japan to war, belong among those "extreme nationalists" who deceived and misled the Japanese people, or are only his subjects and subordinates in this category? That inquiry raises the further question as to just what commitments we have incurred by agreeing to deal with the Emperor.

There is obvious confusion on this point not only in the minds of the Japanese but also in the minds of many Americans. The Japanese Government accepted the Potsdam ultimatum "with the understanding that the said declaration does not comprise any demand which prejudices the prerogatives of His Majesty as a sovereign ruler." On the basis of this understanding, the Emperor himself proclaimed that he had been "able to save and maintain the structure of the imperial state." And Japan's acceptance of this understanding as an agreement and an Allied obligation was further underlined by Premier Higashi-Kuni in a speech in the Diet in which he cited the Japanese proviso without amplifying it with the Allied answer. Yet it is this answer which must govern Allied action, and this answer involves no Allied obligation toward the Emperor whatsoever.

In his reply to the Japanese acceptance note State Secretary Byrnes clarified the Allied position toward the Japanese "understanding" in the following words:

From the moment of surrender the authority of the Emperor and the Japanese Government to rule the state shall be subject to the supreme commander of the Allied Powers, who will take such steps as he deems proper to effectuate the surrender terms. * * *

The ultimate form of government of Japan shall, in accordance with the Potsdam Declaration, be established by the freely expressed will of the Japanese people. The armed forces of the Allied Powers will remain in Japan until the purposes set forth in the Potsdam Declaration are achieved.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an article from a newspaper—I assume the New York Times—having to do with the number of forces we shall need in the occupied territories in the European theater.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ACTS TO SPEED FREEDOM IN REICH—ALL BUT TOP JOBS LIKELY TO BE YIELDED IN 15 MONTHS—ELECTION SCHEDULE DRAWN

BERLIN, September 21.—Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's command apparently hopes to end American military government in Germany, except for the top over-all posts, within the next 15 months. Military officers will be withdrawn steadily from civil administration posts as elections produce German officials competent to assume authority, United States group control council headquarters confirmed today.

This tentative election schedule has been set:

January: Gemeiden—communities ranging from rural hamlets to towns of about 20,000 population.

March: Landkreisen—equivalent of American counties.

May: Stadtkreisen—larger towns and cities.

October: Laender—states.

At present the lowest level of the military government is a detachment in charge of a landkreis. Under present plans these assignments would be eliminated as soon as possible after the March vote. By current estimates, German state governments could be expected to take office by November or December 1946, and thereafter United States supervisors would be needed only in zonal affairs.

Generally, officials look for the United States occupation army—already scheduled to be reduced to fewer than 400,000 men by spring—to be a mere token force of a few thousand a year hence.

"An occupation army has only one function—to present police power," said a civil-affairs expert, and it must be admitted that, contrary to expectations, we have not had to call upon the Army for help. The Germans have obeyed us without resistance."

OTHER POWERS MUST ACT

Because the occupation of Germany is a four-power affair, however, it may be necessary to persuade other Allied nations to reduce their military establishments here before the American force reaches its final token size.

Germans in the United States zone as yet have produced only rudimentary evidence of political interest. There is no political inertia among the scattered Communists who outlasted the Nazi persecution, but among the masses who formerly belonged to other pre-Hitler parties, interest is practically nil.

A people's party of Catholic elements has appeared in Bavaria, while at Frankfort on the Main both Communists and Social Democrats conducted rallies after American authorities belatedly followed Russia's example and permitted Germans to assemble publically.

The American plan is for each certified non-Nazi Party to enter candidates in the forthcoming elections. In the Soviet zone, a hard and fast combination of Communists and Social Democrats is expected to win any vote Marshal Georgi K. Zhukoff, Russian military administrator in Germany, permits, even if Christian Democrats and Liberal Democrats now allied with them in a union should split away.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his willingness to yield a moment ago.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has handled this nomination and made its report to the Senate. We know Mr. Acheson, and have known him for many years. He has been Assistant Secretary of State for a considerable period, and he will remain Assistant Secretary of State unless his nomination to be Under Secretary is confirmed.

So I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that if Mr. Acheson is as bad a man as he thinks he is——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Acheson had already resigned from the position as Assistant Secretary.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am in error. I suppose he resigned in view of this appointment. He was out only a day or two, and I had overlooked that fact.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Apparently there was no relation between the two events. It is generally understood that he had resigned and retired, and this other matter came up subsequently. I do not think there is any relation between the two.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. In a conversation with Mr. Acheson he told me that he intended to resign as Assistant Secretary, and that it had no relationship whatever to the other appointment. I presume this matter arose subsequent to his resignation.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Nebraska is unduly alarmed. He speaks about the policies which Mr. Acheson advocates, and the policies which he is going to make. Mr. Acheson does not make the policies. He is only Under Secretary of State. Above him is the Secretary of State, and above him is the President of the United States, who is charged with the responsibility of formulating our foreign policy.

There is no reason for sending this nomination back to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am sure that the minority members of the committee will corroborate my statement when I say that the Foreign Relations Committee has endeavored to handle these questions with no partisan spirit. I do not think there would be any advantage in sending this nomination back to the committee.

At this point I should like to place in the RECORD, for the benefit of the Senator from Nebraska, a complete biographical sketch of Mr. Acheson. I will not read it all, because it is too long. He was born in Middletown, Conn.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAN G. ACHESON

Born Middletown, Conn., April 11, 1893; Groton School graduate; Yale, A. B. 1915; Harvard, LL. B. 1918; member of bar of District of Columbia; United States Navy, 1918–19, ensign; private secretary to Associate Justice of United States Supreme Court, 1919–21; law practice, 1921–33, 1934–41; Under Secretary of Treasury, 1933; appointed Assistant Secretary of State February 1, 1941; member Foreign Service Personnel Board, Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service and Foreign Service School Board, 1941– ; chairman Executive Committee on Commercial Policy, 1941–44; chairman Board of Economic Operations, October 9, 1941 to June 24, 1943; member Frozen Funds Commission, 1941– ; member Requirements Commission, War Production Board, 1942; director, Office of Foreign Economic Coordination, June 24–November 6, 1943; chairman, Policy Committee and Coordinating Commission, Committee for Economic Policy in Liberated Areas, 1943; United States member of the Council, first session of Council of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Atlantic City, N. J., 1943; member, Department of State Policy Commission, January 15, 1944; member, Department of State Committee on Postwar Programs, January 15, 1944; chairman, Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy, June 20, 1944; delegate, United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, Breton Woods, N. H., 1944. Legal resident of Maryland.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there is nothing deep, dark, or dismal about Mr. Acheson. He has been around Washington for many years. He was formerly Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and of late years has been an Assistant Secretary of State. He is a resident of the State of Maryland. I am sure that the Senators from Maryland can advise the Senator as to his character and standing. At one time he was a member of probably the most powerful law firm in the city. He retired from private practice at considerable expense and sacrifice to enter the State Department at the specific request of Mr. Hull, who had a particular job which he thought he could do.

After his resignation, as suggested by the Senator from Maine, he intended to reenter private practice. He told me how anxious he was to return to his private practice; that the compensation of Assistant Secretary of State was very meager, and that he wished to return to his old firm, where the remuneration would be much greater. I presume he was persuaded by Secretary Byrnes to take the Under Secretaryship.

It seems to me that the Senator from Nebraska is about to magnify, expand, and inflate what is a very trivial matter into something which may become of tremendous importance within Japan, in its effect upon her people, and even upon a good many of our people here at home.

I wish to read the outrageous statement which Mr. Acheson issued. Here is the crime. Here is the bloody body. Here is the broken window through which the burglar climbed. Here is the mutilated figure of the innocent occupant of the house. I shall read from a stenographic report of what he said. Newspaper people are inquisitive. They are sometimes really almost impertinent in the questions they ask. Of course, that does not apply to any of those now in the press gallery [laughter], but there are some like that. This is from the stenographic report:

Sir, there were reports that you were disturbed over some of the recent statements made by General MacArthur. Do you have any comment to make on the occupation?

Answer. Well, I have not any comment to make on the state of my own being. That is not a very important matter.

I have no comment to make on the military aspects of what General MacArthur stated. That is a purely military matter with which the State Department is not properly concerned.

Is there anything wrong about that? It was a military matter as to how many troops would be required to occupy Japan. That was a military matter, and it was perfectly appropriate for General MacArthur to express his opinion on that subject, but normally that opinion would not go to the newspapers. Normally it would come up through appropriate channels to the Chief of Staff, and then to the President of the United States. General MacArthur saw fit to put it in the newspapers. I am not objecting to that. I am not criticizing that course. However, all Senators know that when a subordinate military commander has something to report, or some suggestions as to policies, the practice is to send it up through channels. But General MacArthur did not do so. That is all right. The Under Secretary of State says—and I think very appropriately—that that is a purely military matter, with which the State Department is not properly concerned. Does the Senator from Nebraska challenge that statement by Mr. Acheson? Does he challenge the statement of Mr. Acheson when he says that that is a military matter? He said, "I have no comment to make on it." Is there anything wrong with that?

I am trying to find the terrible attack which he made upon General MacArthur, and the humiliating rebuke which he gave him. I have read the statement

over a number of times, and I cannot locate anywhere in it a humiliating rebuke to General MacArthur.

Mr. Acheson further says:

I think I can say that I am surprised that anybody can foresee at this time the number of forces which will be necessary in Japan.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Without taking sides in this dispute, I think that is where he stubbed his toe. Having said that he could not talk on military matters, he immediately said that he was surprised that anyone should have an opinion on the subject. I am perfectly neutral in this controversy, but I believe that Mr. Acheson violated the principle which he had just stated.

Mr. CONNALLY. I read that not to justify it in its entirety, but to try to find out wherein lies the terrible attack. I do not believe that that is a terrible attack. He said that he was surprised that anyone should have an opinion on the subject. Let me say to the Senator from Maine that the estimates with regard to the occupation forces in Japan have already been changed several times. At first it was said that 900,000 men would be required to occupy Japan and the contiguous islands. General MacArthur changed his own mind very quickly, because instead of 17 divisions, which he wanted at the outset, he changed it to 6. Then he changed it to 3, and then to 2. If General MacArthur, who can make no mistakes as to estimates and no mistakes in statements to the press, has changed his own estimates four or five times, is there any basis for anyone to complain when someone says, "I do not know, and I do not know anyone else who knows just how many men will be required to occupy Japan"?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Does the Senator feel that if General MacArthur had not made public the release stating that he could occupy Japan with 200,000 men, the American people would ever have received the information if it had to come through Mr. Acheson?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator answer the question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I will answer it. I am not evading the question. The Senator boasted when he started his speech that he was in possession of some military knowledge which he had obtained from high military officers whose names he could not divulge. Why is it that the Senator can have that sort of information, and cannot divulge it to the American people? If he is so anxious for the American people to have it, why does he not give it to them?

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator please answer my question?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is debating an important question on the floor of the Senate, and withholding from the Senate and from the American people certain vital information.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I shall answer it in a moment, when it is appropriate to answer it and when I come to it in the logical development of my remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator is going to do that, I should like to suggest——

Mr. CONNALLY. Let the Senator go ahead and suggest.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator referred to the logical development of his remarks. I should like to have the Senator be logical and answer my question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator think the release would have been made public if it had not been made by General MacArthur?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course it would.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I should like to ask another question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask the Senator to wait a minute; let me answer one question at a time. Those in authority would have gone right straight to the Senator from Nebraska, just as they did with other military secrets, and the Senator would have immediately put it in the newspapers, as he put this matter in the newspapers; and so it would have gotten to the people, even though it is claimed that Mr. Acheson tried to suppress it.

Mr. WHERRY. Would it have gone to the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me answer the Senator. It would have gone to the Chief of Staff and to the Secretary of State, and then they would have sent it to the President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator where he got that information.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment. The Senator refused to yield to several Senators on one or two occasions. I shall yield to enable the Senator to ask any questions he may wish to ask, but I shall do so in my own way and in my own time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now, in his own way and in his own time?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment. If the Senator will cool himself off a little, that will help. I know he is heated up. He is like a fox hound that sees a victim, and he is spurred on by his enthusiasm of some years hence.

Mr. President, the Senator said it would not be known. The Foreign Relations Committee is here. We have honored members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. We are not going to conceal from the American people anything they should know. We would have known it. We knew the estimates. First, they said it would take 900,000 men. Was that information concealed from the American people? They found out everything about that.

So the whole matter is merely an unjustified attack upon the War Department, the State Department, and all others concerned, charging that they are concealing something from the people of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment, I should like to say that General Eisenhower estimated it would take between 500,000 and 600,000 United States soldiers to occupy the section of Germany which we are to occupy. Subsequently he reduced that number, not through the newspapers, but through the general channels of the War Department; and General Marshall himself gave out the information that the number had been reduced to 400,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course that is so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for the suggestion he just made. As I suggested earlier in my remarks, if either one of these generals in the field wishes to make a recommendation, the thing for him to do is to send it through the proper channels to the Chief of Staff, and it will go from him to the President of the United States.

Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that in one breath he says he does not wish to see in Japan a rebellion which will cost the lives of 200,000 Americans, but in the next breath he says that Japan is prostrate, unarmed, and cannot move a muscle. Yet he is worried about a military uprising in Japan. I say to the Senator that I want to see our boys return home at the earliest possible moment. I have used such feeble powers as I possess to that end. I have talked to the Chief of Staff, I have talked to the Secretary of War, and I have made remarks here on the floor of the Senate. All of us want the boys to come home. But when we have met and announced a statement in regard to Japan, namely, that we wish to pursue a policy toward Japan which will eradicate the war lust from the Japanese system, because we do not want another war in a few years, we should use whatever number of men it requires to occupy Japan until we can make our late enemy realize that war does not pay. Until we can make them come to the conclusion that their military ambitions are not going to be recognized in this world. I am in favor of keeping in Japan the number of men necessary to perform that task. I do not wish to see the world plunged into another great World War; and the Senator from Nebraska should know, and I think he does know, that in Japan, probably even to a greater extent than in Germany, there is a fanatical military spirit which builds up their ego and makes them think they are the conquerors of the world and a superior race. We wish to do whatever is necessary to be done to drive out that spirit. That is what Mr. Acheson was talking about when he said in his statement, which has been characterized as a terrible assault on General MacArthur—and let me say to the Senator from Maine that he apologized for what he said, which is what the Senator from Maine criticized, as follows:

That may come from my inadequate knowledge of the military field.

However, that is not very important. He was not assuming to determine the

matter. He said he had inadequate knowledge.

What he had to say was that the determination of the number of men needed is a military question and a military problem, to be determined by the military authorities, but, after all, under the higher level of the President and the civilian control of this Government. Is there anything wrong with his statement that the military are simply the instruments of higher policy? In the war the military performed the battle duty; but the fields of its activity, the places where it would attack, and the agencies through which it would carry on its military duty were all determined by the civilian authority, by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Marshal Stalin, and other heads of governments. The military is an instrument. It is not itself the repository of power.

Next I shall refer to another portion of Mr. Acheson's statement; or at least, I shall do so when the consultation on the other side of the Chamber has concluded. I yield four minutes to the Senators on the other side of the aisle, until they can confer and get through with their joint statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding 4 minutes to me. The argument which the Senator has been presenting——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I observe that the conference is over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator yielded to me for 4 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that a Senator who has the floor cannot parcel out his time to any other Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have made a rather careful examination of both the statement of General MacArthur and the statement of Dean Acheson, since the last meeing of the Senate. I wish to say to the Senator from Texas that I do not think General MacArthur selected the newspapers to inform the War Department of the number of men needed for the occupation of Japan. He could not have prevented the newspapers or he did not prevent the newspapers from getting information.

As I understand his statement, originally he asked for 500,000 men to occupy Japan. Subsequently he revised the estimate and asked for 400,000 men. But in his statement which was widely published in this country he said that, if unforeseen circumstances did not arise, within 6 months he could do it with 200,000 Regular Army troops. He sent that word to the War Department. I have talked with high ranking generals who have been in Japan, within the week, and they assert that General MacArthur did not do anything which would justify an attack upon him by the newspapers, as they did attack him by claiming that he mixed politics with the running of the Army. I disavow any interest in politics in connection with General MacArthur's possible candidacy for the office of President or for any other public office, so that I can dissociate myself from any of his backers if he should determine to run for office. But I wish to say that I had an opportunity to talk with General MacArthur when I was in New Guinea, and I have had an opportunity to ascertain some of the things on his mind.

I find that there is a misunderstanding regarding Dean Acheson's statement. I have no fault to find with him. I hope that what has happened to others whose nominations have been hurriedly confirmed will not happen to him, if his nomination is confirmed, because we seem to be getting along fairly well now. I have a copy of the statement which Dean Acheson made. I think the trouble came about when the newspaper men asked him, "May we quote you on this?" And he seemed to have expanded a little and said, "You may quote me on that," or perhaps he voluntarily said, "You may quote me on that." While disavowing any knowledge of the conditions he said, in effect, "This is from my inadequate knowledge of the military field."

I do not believe any citizen questions General MacArthur's knowledge of the military field from Port Moresby to Japan, perhaps, or from here through Pearl Harbor to Japan. But when Dean Acheson said, "I am surprised that any one can foresee now the number of forces that will be necessary," I think he laid himself open to some criticism by those of us who fear that he might have been joining in the somewhat general public clamor of trying to pull down General MacArthur who was on the spot. I assert again that General MacArthur has perhaps performed one of the outstanding services of American military field commanders in all military history. General MacArthur, in speaking of the situation, said in effect "It is one which unquestionably will be determined upon the highest diplomatic level of the United Nations, and it is one to which the answer cannot fail but be influenced by important events in the near and proximate future." So I think the whole situation has been generally misunderstood. I think that General MacArthur's statement was seized upon and misunderstood. I assert again that I am very sure that General MacArthur sent his communications through the General Staff because General Marshall and the President, at first blush, approved the statement. When Dean Acheson said that he could be quoted it gave at least the appearance of an opportunity to assume that an insult was intended against General MacArthur. I do not think it was intended as such, and I do not believe that General MacArthur deserved the criticism which he received.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for his observations. I wish to say that I am not attacking General MacArthur. I have no quarrel with what he did. If he wanted to give his statement to the newspapers, it was all right with me.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not believe that he did give the statement to the newspapers. I know that he did not send his official communications to the newspapers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, I would not object to it if he had.

Mr. CHANDLER. However, we can not keep newspapers away from the public.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection to the publication of any information which is of interest to the people of the United States. I merely say that the normal way for General MacArthur to have made a recommendation was to have sent it through the regular channels to the Chief of Staff and to the President. The Senator from Kentucky is on the Military Affairs Committee, is he not?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; and I have been a member of that committee for a long time. I do not believe there is any record that General MacArthur said to the press in effect, "I will occupy Japan in 6 months with 200,000 soldiers, and you can quote me on that." I think that he sent his statement through the regular channels, but the newspapermen were smart and got hold of it, and reported it through the press. Then Dean Acheson said he was surprised, and when questioned by representatives of the press, he said, "You can quote me on this." That invited a general quotation from General MacArthur.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I accept the Senator's statement. General MacArthur did not give the information out to the newspapers, but they got hold of it. Some newspapermen have radar minds. They look into the heads of persons and find something there. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whose fault it was that the information got into the newspapers, but I make no charge against anyone.

Mr. CONNALLY. And neither do I.

Mr. BARKLEY. General Marshall stated to the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives on the day he addressed us on the subject of demobilization, which was last Thursday, that he had only that morning received the official report from General MacArthur with respect to the requirement of 200,000 soldiers, but that the newspapers had carried the story 2 or 3 days previous to that time. Perhaps the delay in getting the information to General Marshall or to the War Department resulted in some one catching up with it on its way and putting it into the press. I do not believe General MacArthur was responsible for that, but the information did get into the press before the War Department received it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection to the information having been published in the newspapers. What I am trying to ascertain is where Mr. Acheson committed the heinous crime of making an attack upon General MacArthur. I have read most all of his statement. Here is the important part of it, according to my judgment:

> The important thing is that the policy in regard to Japan is the same policy which has always been held by this Government and is still held so far as I know, and I think I know.

Does anything in that statement attack General MacArthur? Is there any language in it which commits assault and battery upon General MacArthur? I do not think so. Every Senator admits

that matters of Government policy are determined by the President and by the Secretary of State, and that military matters are determined, not in the final analysis but in the recommendatory stage, by the military authorities, and ultimately by the top level. I hope that that will always be the policy of the United States, irrespective of the glamor and glory and panoply of war and those who love war. I hope that in this Republic of ours the civil authority will always have supreme jurisdiction over the military and over the naval. I look with apprehension and regret upon the tendency to put in high civilian positions military men, who sit behind desks with a row of stars on their shoulders and uniforms about their bodies. We should return to the custom of filling civilian positions with civilians, and let the civilian authorities dominate this Republic. That is what Mr. Acheson was trying to do. The matter of policy is determined by the civilian authority, such as the President and the Secretary of State, in conjunction with our allies.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the statement of the Senator from Texas that as soon as possible we should restore civilian authority. The pending question is, as I understand it, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Dean Acheson?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What difference does it make what General MacArthur or some civilian representative of the Government may have said? The question is, Shall we vote upon this nomination "yes" or "no"?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am becoming a little annoyed by having to listen to a discussion relative to the statements of General MacArthur and Dean Acheson, and not getting down to a vote on the pending nomination.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad the Senator is making his statement. However, it will not change one vote either way.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, I do not know.

Mr. CHAVEZ. General MacArthur does not need any defense. If Senators believe that Dean Acheson is not the proper man for the position to which he has been appointed, they can vote against him. If they think he is the proper man, they can vote for him. I should like to have an opportunity to vote.

Mr. CONNALLY. I sympathize with the Senator from New Mexico. The reason I am making my remarks is that I was not present the other day when the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] raised the issue and the majority leader asked me to submit some remarks because I happen to be the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The committee has favorably reported the pending nomination to the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield, I should like to say that I think he is rendering to the country a very great service in explaining this matter. Undoubtedly there is a great deal of misunderstanding pertaining to it. I have reached that conclusion, not from the statement of the Senator from Nebraska, but from reading editorials, statements of commentators in the press, and from statements made by persons over the radio. I think the country as a whole should be given a clarification of this important matter. It may all be a tempest in a teapot, and I have no doubt that it is. If it is such, it is a wise thing for the Senator from Texas to explain it in detail so that there will be a better understanding of it throughout the country. From interpretations of the situation which have been given by editors of newspapers, as well as news and radio commentators, it seems to me that a clarification is absolutely necessary. So I do not entirely agree with what the Senator from New Mexico has said.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Colorado. In his usually wise and able manner, he has completely met the issue.

Mr. President, let us see what else Mr. Acheson said. What I am about to read is really an important part of the whole statement:

> In carrying out that policy, the occupation forces are the instruments of policy and not the determinants of policy.

Is there anything wrong with that statement, that the military is the instrument of the policy-making power, and is not the determinant itself on policy? I do not think there is anything wrong with them, when anyone considers the relationship of the Army and the civilian authority.

He further said—and I wish the Senator from Nebraska would not choose the time I am speaking for all his conferences. I want him to hear what I have to say, because I am trying to answer some of the questions he asked.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have always found the distinguished Senator from Texas courteous.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am trying to be now.

Mr. WHERRY. The official reporter was asking me a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care who it was.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not call him in for a conference, and he was not consulting with me. I think it is highly discourteous to accuse a person of bringing in a secretary and conferring with him when the official reporter comes here to find out something about what I wanted in the RECORD. I cannot understand why the distinguished Senator from Texas, whom I have always treated with such high regard, and who has the high regard of all the Members of the Senate, would take an opportunity to do such a thing.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I abjectly apologize to the Senator from Nebraska. I meant no unkindness. I was trying to reply to the discussion he started. He started it last Thursday. He made extensive remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. Who started what?

Mr. CONNALLY. This discussion about Dean Acheson.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator means I started the discussion about confirming Mr. Acheson?

Mr. CONNALLY. On the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Texas stated he was not here last Thursday.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was not.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator read the RECORD?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have read it.

Mr. WHERRY. And the Senator says I started the discussion?

Mr. CONNALLY. I may have made another grievous error. [Laughter.] I wish to say to the Senator very kindly that I had no intention of ruffling his feelings, I meant no discourtesy, but when it comes to courtesy, I think we might use the reverse lend-lease, and when I am replying to the Senator's speech it looks to me as though he should do me the courtesy to listen, rather than spend time conferring with various persons. I do not know what the subject matter of the conference was, and do not care what it was, but I think the Senator owes me the courtesy, if he is talking about courtesy, to listen to what I am saying when I am trying to reply to him.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have listened to what the Senator has said, and I am delighted to stand on my feet and yield for any question. The Senator gave me 4 minutes once, and retracted it.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I did not do that. Before us is the guilty man.

> Shake not thy gory locks at me
> * * * * *
> My withers are unwrung.

[Laughter.]

In all kindness, the Senator knows I am not going to be discourteous. I do not mean to be discourteous. I am very fond of the Senator.

Let us see what else Dean Acheson said. What are the policies, the horrible policies, Dean Acheson is going to put in effect?

> That Japan will be put in a position where it cannot renew aggressive warfare.

Has anyone any complaint about that? That is one of the policies we want to enforce in Japan, and I thought it was subscribed to by all Members of the Senate. I know it is subscribed to by the people of the United States, that Japan will be put in a position where it cannot renew aggressive warfare. That means we are going to teach them not to start another world war, not to have another Pearl Harbor, not to treacherously assault us at Pearl Harbor while their emissaries are standing at the White House pretending that they want a treaty of peace. I want Japan to be taught that it will not pay to renew aggressive warfare, and I think that Dean Acheson is to be applauded for letting the country know that that is one of the policies to which this Government will adhere.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. CHANDLER. Can we not all agree that General MacArthur is just as anxious as anyone else to bring about in Japan complete adherence to the Potsdam declaration, and complete subjugation of the Japanese people in every particular? There is no issue so far as that is concerned, is there?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not making any issue. We are talking about confirming Dean Acheson or not confirming him. I have no complaint about General MacArthur, and I am not attacking him at all. I am not complaining about what General MacArthur has done. No doubt General MacArthur, if he is a good soldier—and the Senator says he is, and I assume he is—will carry out in Japan the policies which this Government, through its President and its State Department, lays down. I assume he will carry out the policy which the United States and its allies agree upon.

Mr. CHANDLER. Has the Senator any doubt about General MacArthur being a good soldier?

Mr. CONNALLY. I said I assumed he was.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does not the record show that he is a good soldier?

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as I know, it does. I was not over in the Pacific area, as the Senator from Kentucky was, right where these operations were taking place. I did not have the privilege of going.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator had the privilege of sending someone.

Mr. CONNALLY. I say, the Senator has more knowledge, and if he has not more knowledge, he had no business being sent. That was why he was sent, and I agree the Senator had better opportunity for judging than I had. I take it General MacArthur is a good soldier and a good man, and a good subordinate of the President of the United States when it comes to carrying out policies.

Now, let us see what else there was. We do not want Japan to be able to make aggressive warfare. Does anyone complain of that policy? If so, I should like to have it put into the RECORD, along with the letter from some constituents saying they do not agree to it. [Laughter.]

What else does he say? Here is the bug under the chip:

> That the present economic and social system in Japan which makes for a will to war will be changed so that that will to war will not continue and that whatever it takes to carry this out will be used to carry it out.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator please interpret that statement?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am just getting ready to interpret it.

Mr. WHERRY. As Mr. Acheson would like to have it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am going to interpret the statement. I do not know anything about what Mr. Acheson thinks. I am ready to interpret it, and I hope the Senator will listen this time.

What is this statement?

> That the present economic and social system in Japan which makes for a will to war.

Does the Senator deny that there is such a feeling in Japan, and has been for a quarter of a century?

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that he is willing to go into Japan with American boys and foster revolution?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I did not say anything about revolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator willing to do that? Is that what he means?

Mr. CONNALLY. Willing to do what?

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the administration's policy——

Mr. CONNALLY. I am explaining what this means.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator should do it in a logical way.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am willing to go in there and change their minds.

Mr. WHERRY. No matter what it takes?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know what it will take, but I am ready to go in there and undertake to change their minds.

Mr. WHERRY. No matter what it takes?

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment; I will answer the Senator's question. I am willing to go in there and do the things necessary to change their minds toward a constant will to war. We saw their will to war at Pearl Harbor. If they had not had a will, they would not have slipped up on us like a thief in the night, like a porch climber, and assaulted us and murdered our men. That is a will to war. I am willing to teach the Japanese that the will to war will not bring them dividends.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not that exactly what General MacArthur is doing? Is he not doing it exactly as the Potsdam agreement designed it should be done?

Mr. CONNALLY. If that is what he is doing, the Senator should not complain at Mr. Acheson backing him up. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator interpret what Mr. Acheson says as indicating he wants to go further than General MacArthur has gone? Does the Senator want to interpret it to mean that he has gone further than the Potsdam agreement has called for?

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will bear with me, in my poor, humble, staggering way, I shall try to answer him.

I am not interpreting anything but what is in this paper. I do not know General MacArthur's secret mental convolutions, and I do not know Mr. Acheson's mental lucubration; but I do know what is in this paper. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from Texas knows what is in that paper, are the remarks he is about to make to be considered as the administration's policy toward Japan?

Mr. CONNALLY. Administration! Antiadministration! Administration! Mr. President, I have not talked to the administration about this matter at all. Mr. Acheson came to see me the other day about a matter, and we did not even mention the question of his confirmation. I am not blindly following any administration leader or any political leader either.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Foreign Relations Committee hold hearings on the nomination of Mr. Acheson?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Acheson came to the committee. He was present and willing to testify, but no one cared to interrogate him, and the committee voted to report his nomination favorably, because he had been before the committee previously. He had been acted upon favorably once before when nominated to be Assistant Secretary.

Mr. WHERRY. Did he announce his policy then? Did he say what he was going to do with Japan?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, well, he is not announcing any policy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Acheson has been before the Foreign Relations Committee time after time. Everyone on the committee knows him and knows him well.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; every member of the committee knows him. Mr. Acheson is not making the policy. He is simply expressing his views about the policy. Let us see what he says:

> That the present economic and social system in Japan which makes for a will to war will be changed so that that will to war will not continue and that whatever it takes to carry this out will be used to carry it out.

I wholly subscribe to that doctrine.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that not what we have been fighting for?

Mr. CONNALLY. I was going to suggest that throughout this war we have all proclaimed that we were going to make the result of the war so decisive that Japan and Germany would never dare to attack us again, and we are trying to put in the minds of the Japanese people that that is our purpose. Let me address myself to the Senator from Nebraska for a moment. He speaks about the social and economic system. Does he know what those systems are in Japan? Does he know that Japan is a feudal country, and has been for centuries? Does he know that in Japan there is still present the old Samurai theory of militarism?

The Japanese have been brought up on the theory that a few great families, a few great industrialists rule the nation, and have a right to rule the nation. They are the ones who have fostered the agitation for new markets and

new territories and new outlets, and they have built up the military concept. We want to dislodge that theory from the minds of the Japanese people, and if it requires the destruction of these hard groups of industrial czars and social magnates to do it, I am willing to do it.

Mr. President, I am speaking for the peace of the world. I am speaking for the lives of boys not only in the United States but in distant lands across the seas. I do not want another world war. If we can stamp out of the minds of the Japanese the will to war and if we can stamp out of the minds of the Germans the will to war I am hopeful that we shall be blessed by many years of peace.

Mr. President, I have read the entire statement by Mr. Acheson. I find in it no reflection and no attack on anyone. The nearest approach was the matter which the Senator from Maine suggested, and that probably could have been handled in a more diplomatic way. But, Mr. President, many people talk too fast and talk too much. [Laughter.] I would not be surprised if both parties to this transaction had not talked a little too fast and a little too much. But it is not of the magnitude, it is not of the importance that is sought to be attached to it here.

Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the matter any further. Mr. Acheson is well known, I am sure, to a great many Senators. He is a man whom I regard as possessing unusual ability. I think he is one of the strong men in the State Department. I think he is a valuable man, a valuable servant of the Government, and I would not judge his whole future on the basis of some trivial incident.

If someone were to take a microscope and examine all of us I wonder if he would determine our whole career on the basis of one little insignificant something? If so, we would all be in a pretty bad fix. If the membership of the Senate were dependent on such an examination I am afraid there would not be a quorum of the Senate present. Everyone makes mistakes now and then. I am not admitting that what we have been speaking of is a mistake, or for that matter that it is of any significance if Mr. Acheson did make a mistake.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States should have something more important to do than spend so much time on such a matter as this. I apologize for making so long a statement. I did not intend to make a speech or make any remarks. I was not present in the Senate Thursday. I looked over the RECORD of Thursday. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I suppose in deference to the fact that I happened to be chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, thought I ought to say something to explain why the Committee on Foreign Relations had recommended the confirmation of Mr. Acheson's nomination.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I ask the Senator if he understands that General MacArthur in any way is to be here for confirmation or that his name is to come before the Senate for action? His seems to be the name that has been so much discussed at this time. We are not passing on General MacArthur.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not at all.

Mr. TUNNELL. The question directly before us, as I understand, is as to whether Mr. Acheson's nomination shall be recommitted to the Foreign Relations Committee. The Foreign Relations Committee, I believe the Senator said, voted unanimously to report the nomination.

Mr. CONNALLY. All members who were present did.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes. The Senator from Nebraska says he does not know whether he will vote to make the confirmation unanimous. I believe he said something to that effect, or that he was not ready to act. The question before the Senate is whether anything contained in recent statements so reflects on Dean Acheson that his nomination ought not to be confirmed. There have been no charges made against him.

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the Senator think anything has been brought out which should influence the matter?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I think he is entirely correct in his statement. Even at the worst, the offense would seem to be that Mr. Acheson did not agree or had a different idea respecting something said by General MacArthur. All of us wish to have freedom of opinion. I have differed frequently with the President of the United States. But if it is a crime to disagree with the general, so far as I know, that is the only crime with which Mr. Acheson has been charged—that he did not agree with some remark made by General MacArthur. I have no complaint of General MacArthur.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator's last statement with respect to what Dean Acheson said to the press is the all-important thing in this debate, in view of the fact that the Senator from Nebraska has referred not only once but a dozen times to a so-called social and economic revolution which the State Department wants to carry on in Japan. I submit that anyone who does not agree with what Dean Acheson says with respect to destroying the Japanese social and economic forces which have made war, he must admit that he wants to return Japan to her previous position as a militarist nation with the power to again make war upon this country and other Allied Nations.

In addition to what Dean Acheson said, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the terms of the Potsdam agreement.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have it in my hand.

Mr. LUCAS. I read:

> Following are our terms. We will not deviate from them. There are no alternatives. We shall brook no delay:
>
> There must be eliminated for all time the authority and influence of those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest, for we insist that a new order of peace, security, and justice will be impossible until irresponsible militarism is driven from the world.

If that declaration is carried out, it certainly involves a change in the social and economic order of Japan.

More important, I shall read the last part of paragraph 10:

> The Japanese Government shall remove all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people. Freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for the fundamental human rights shall be established.

If we carry out this one policy, we must of necessity change the social system in Japan. If we carry out the terms of the Potsdam Declaration in their entirety, certainly we must change the social order in Japan.

Paragraph 11 reads as follows:

> Japan shall be permitted to maintain such industries as will sustain her economy and permit the exaction of just reparations in kind, but not those which would enable her to rearm for war. To this end access to, as distinguished from control of, raw materials shall be permitted. Eventual Japanese participation in world trade relations shall be permitted.

That involves a complete change in the economic system of Japan. All her industries which made for war are to be destroyed. Certainly the economic and social systems of Japan are going to be changed. Everyone must recognize this inevitable fact. Acheson's statement is on all fours with the Potsdam Declaration. If the social and economic orders are not changed, we can get ready for another war. If they are not changed, we have fought this war in vain. All the special pleading about a social and economic revolution in Japan costing the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans is ridiculous.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois cannot yield. I have the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Texas yield so that I may ask the Senator from Illinois a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Illinois take the figure 200,000 from any statement I made?

Mr. LUCAS. The record will speak for itself.

Mr. WHERRY. I said that hundreds of thousands of men might be required.

Mr. LUCAS. Did not the Senator from Nebraska ask me a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to yield for a joint debate.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to finish my statement.

Anyone who advocates a different policy than that set out in the statement made by Mr. Acheson, advocates the return to the old order. It is unfortunate that the Senator from Nebraska has heralded to the country an article he read in the Washington Post as the basis for his inquiries instead of taking Mr. Acheson's statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I decline to yield further at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Anyone who advocates a different policy than that set out in Mr. Acheson's statement is advocating a return to where we were 5 years ago, back to the policy of isolationism, back to the policy under which we would permit Japan and Germany to rearm and become agressors, thereby bringing on World War III, which would mean the beginning of the end of civilization.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Illinois. Let me make a few comments, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska if he desires to have me yield. I wish to be courteous, but when I yield to one Senator, it is not quite in order to yield to another Senator and let them engage in a controversy.

I hold in my hand the Potsdam Declaration, to which the Senator from Illinois has referred. I have it marked in red pencil. I was about to comment on it when the Senator from Illinois made his statement.

Mr. President, the Potsdam Agreement constitutes the terms upon which Japan surrendered. They are her terms as well as our terms. The condition of the surrender was that Japan should accept the conditions of the Potsdam Agreement. That agreement provides that—

> There must be eliminated for all time the authority and influence of those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest—

Is there any objection to that? Do we not wish to put out of power those who brought about this war of world conquest?—

> for we insist that a new order of peace, security, and justice will be impossible until irresponsible militarism is driven from the world.

Is there any controversy about that? Is there any challenge to that statement? Is it not a wise one? Is it not a wholesome one? Is it not one which is in the interest of the peace of the world?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does not that fit in with the declaration of Mr. Acheson in his statement?

Mr. CONNALLY. He refers to it and approves it.

I read further from the Potsdam Declaration:

> Until such a new order is established and until there is convincing proof that Japan's war-making power is destroyed, points in Japanese territory to be designated by the Allies shall be occupied to secure the achievement of the basic objectives we are here setting forth.

If the Senator from Nebraska objects to any change in the social system of Japan, if he objects to any change in the industrial system of Japan, I do not see how he can avoid the conviction that in the course of time there will again be generated the feeling that the Japanese must conquer with arms, with swords in their hands, with airplanes in the air, and with battleships plowing the deep. We are trying to get away from that, and in order to get away from it we are trying to negative, overcome, and eradicate the great forces in Japan which have mothered that thought.

> Until such a new order is established and until there is convincing proof that Japan's war-making power is destroyed, points in Japanese territory to be designated by the Allies shall be occupied to secure the achievement of the basic objectives we are here setting forth.

Does anyone complain about that? That is in the Potsdam agreement. That has been accepted by Japan. That has been accepted by us, and that is to be the chart for the future. Of course, it will cause some changes in Japan. That is what we want. We do not want to revive the Samurai system, with a sword on each Japanese, a rifle in his hand, and a pistol in his pocket.

I read further from the Potsdam agreement:

> The Japanese Government shall remove all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people.

Is there any objection to that? Is there any objection to our trying to teach the Japanese how to have free democratic government such as our own? We have always preached the doctrine that democracy was interested in peace and was against war. Is there any harm in teaching the people of Japan that in following their war gods, in worshiping at their military shrines, and in dipping their hands in ceremonial blood, they are on the road to ruin? Why can we not teach them to live as democratic nations live? If we do we shall eradicate from their system a desire for war.

> Freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for the fundamental human rights shall be established.

Is anyone against that? Is anyone against free speech? Is anyone against freedom of religion or of thought?

Mr. President, I very much hope that the Senator from Nebraska will withdraw his motion and let the Senate vote direct on this nomination.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no disagreement whatever with the Potsdam Declaration, which the Senator has been reading. That is why I inserted it in the RECORD. I made that very plain in my opening remarks.

I am in total agreement with every phrase of the Potsdam Declaration. What I am taking exception to is the statement about which I wish to have a clarification, but the Senator from Texas certainly has not clarified it for me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have endeavored to do so. I am merely a poor mortal, of course.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has not clarified for me—for what reason, I do not know—anything relative to what Mr. Acheson has said about what will happen to Japan. The Senator has not clarified for me what Mr. Acheson has said about going into Japan and stirring up social and economic revolution.

Mr. President, I realize that I am outnumbered in this matter and that my motion will be rejected. But if there is only one vote in favor of it, I certainly shall have rendered that much service to the American people. A number of interpretations have been offered here today. The Senator from Illinois told us how he felt about it. Now the Senator from Texas has given his interpretation, and shortly we shall hear from the majority leader, I judge, and he will give us his interpretation. But Mr. Acheson did not clarify a thing.

I have asked whether Senators know what Mr. Acheson meant relative to the administration's policy. No one knows what he meant. There has been a tremendous amount of speculation about what is in his mind. Some say we can radar this thing. That is what Senators have been trying to do.

I have asked certain questions in connection with Mr. Acheson's statement about going into Japan and making economic or social changes there. I wish to know how far he wants to go. Is he going to use any men or any money? What kind of a doctrine is he going to teach? Are we going to go in there to appease some other nation?

Mr. President, I know I am hopelessly in the minority on this question, I realize that my motion will be rejected; but I have made it in all sincerity; and believe me, Mr. President, there will be many people in the United States who will be more interested in the clarification of Mr. Acheson's statement than they will be in the somewhat jocular way some Senators have treated my motion on the floor of the Senate.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The occupants of the galleries must not indicate their feelings regarding the proceedings. If they do, the Sergeant at Arms will be directed to clear the galleries.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the occupants of the galleries will not be expelled. They do not often get an opportunity to attend the sessions of the Senate and hear what is happening here. I know it is against the rules of the Senate for them to applaud, but I know sometimes they cannot resist the outbursts of emotion which well up within them. I hope the President pro tempore will not be too hard on them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair realizes, of course, that the occupants of the galleries do not ordinarily violate the rules of the Senate, but the rules of the Senate must be observed.

The Chair calls attention to paragraph 6 of rule XIX of the Senate, which reads as follows:

> Whenever confusion arises in the Chamber or the galleries, or demonstrations of approval or disapproval are indulged in by the occupants of the galleries, it shall be the duty of the Chair to enforce order on his own initiative and without any point of order being made by a Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to add a suggestion to what the Senator has read about the Potsdam agreement. It was

followed up, as the Senator knows, by a more elaborate statement which was in substance sent to General MacArthur on the 29th of August, and was sent to him officially on the 6th day of September. It attempted to integrate the Potsdam agreement. If the Senator will permit, I should like to call his attention to one or two paragraphs of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to have it all printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is all to be printed in the RECORD.

Under part 1, which is entitled "Ultimate Objectives," we find the following:

The ultimate objectives of the United States in regard to Japan to which policies in the initial period must conform, are:

(a) To insure that Japan will not again become a menace to the United States or to the peace and security of the world.

(b) To bring about the eventual establishment of a peaceful and responsible government which will respect the rights of other states and will support the objectives of the United States as reflected in the ideals and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

And so forth. The document is a long one, but it is almost in the same language as that used in the Potsdam agreement.

Under part 4, which is entitled "Economic Demilitarization," we find the following:

The existing economic basis of Japanese military strength must be destroyed and not permitted to revive.

In the mind of the Senator from Nebraska or in the minds of other Senators that may mean a revolution. Dean Acheson did not refer to it as a revolution. He was talking about economic and military changes in Japan which would rob her of the power and ability to make war.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished majority leader to the fact that Mr. Acheson said they are determined to carry that out at any cost.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, Mr. Acheson did not say that, in the first place.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the Senator's statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Acheson did not say that. He said they are determined to carry out the policy that is agreed to and established, whatever it may take. If the Senator from Nebraska is against that, that is his privilege.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to have it distinctly understood that I am for the Potsdam agreement 100 percent. I am just as much for an enduring peace in the Pacific as any other Senator possibly can be. The idea that certain Members of the Senate are the only ones who want a lasting peace in that area is as far from the fact as it can be. Some Senators have been waving the flag and have been speaking of themselves as the only ones who want peace in the Pacific area. Mr. President, let me say that I know something about the war, just as other Senators do. Mr. Acheson has said that it is proposed to sponsor and foster a social and economic revolution in Japan and that they will carry it out, whatever the cost. That is what he said.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, Mr. Acheson said nothing of the kind. The word "cost" is not in his statement. The word "revolution" is not in his statement. That is the misguided interpretation which the Senator from Nebraska placed on Mr. Acheson's statement last week.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished majority leader whether we have not had at least half a dozen interpretations made regarding what Mr. Acheson meant.

Mr. BARKLEY. At least none of them was as far wrong as was the interpretation made by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Then let us have a clarification of the statement. Why not do that so that we may understand it correctly?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to read what he said on the 6th of September:

The existing economic basis of Japanese military strength must be destroyed and not be permitted to revive.

Therefore, a program will be enforced containing the following elements, among others: the immediate cessation and future prohibition of production of all goods designed for the equipment, maintenance, or use of any military force or establishment; the imposition of a ban upon any specialized facilities for the production or repair of implements of war, including naval vessels and all forms of aircraft; the institution of a system of inspection and control over selected elements in Japanese economic activity to prevent concealed or disguised military preparation; the elimination in Japan of those selected industries or branches of production whose chief value to Japan is in preparing for war; the prohibition of specialized research and instruction directed to the development of war-making power; and the limitation of the size and character of Japan's heavy industries to its future peaceful requirements, and restriction of Japanese merchant shipping to the extent required to accomplish the objectives of demilitarization.

Subsequently the statement deals with the "promotion of democratic forces," as follows:

Encouragement shall be given and favor shown to the development of organizations in labor, industry, and agriculture, organized on a democratic basis. Policies shall be favored which permit a wide distribution of income and of the ownership of the means of production and trade.

Those forms of ecomonic activity, organization, and leadership shall be favored that are deemed likely to strengthen the peaceful disposition of the Japanese people, and to make it difficult to command or direct economic activity in support of military ends.

All those things are a part of our policy. all those things are a part of the outline which we established at Potsdam, and of course they are the policies which any responsible official of the American Government has in mind when he says those are the policies to be established by the Government of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that there is nothing in the statement of Mr. Acheson which mentions a revolution. No such word is used in his statement. The language complained of is as follows:

That Japan will be put in a position where it cannot renew aggressive warfare.

No one complains about that. Even the Senator from Nebraska has said that he is in favor of the Potsdam Declaration. Objection is being made to the present economic and social system in Japan which makes for a will to war. That is all. Our State Department officials do not care anything about Japan's system except to eradicate that portion of it which fosters and promotes a will to war. That is in the agreement in connection with the Potsdam Declaration.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Nebraska will withdraw his motion to recommit the pending nomination to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The committee has done its duty. It has disposed of the nomination by reporting it favorably to the Senate. Now let the Senate make the ultimate disposition of it.

I think we are undoubtedly magnifying the importance of this incident; but I believe that its magnification may have a very deleterious effect in Japan and in other foreign countries by suggesting that a disagreement exists between the military and the State Department, as well as between other departments of our Government. That kind of an impression going forth will not do any of us any good. We are working with our allies who are parties to the Potsdam agreement. They have subscribed to it. Japan has subscribed to it. We have subscribed to it. It is the program for the years in the future. There is nothing which Mr. Acheson said that in any way transgresses upon or went beyond the terms of the Potsdam agreement.

Several Senators. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to recommit the pending nomination to the Committee on Foreign Relations. On that motion the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say that I intend to vote against the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I know Mr. Acheson. I have known him well. I do not believe that any further investigation could possibly reveal anything that I, at least, do not already know about him. I think that he is qualified to be Under Secretary of State. I do not think that the Under Secretary of State makes the policies of the United States Government. I think that such policies must be made by the President. Therefore I do not believe that the disagreement with Mr. Acheson's policies as expressed in the controversy, so-called, with General MacArthur is any ground for refusing to confirm this nomination.

I voted against the confirmation of Mr. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce because I thought that as Secretary of Commerce Mr. Wallace would be in charge of a fundamental policy of government, and that his presence in the Cabinet would affect such policy. I think that unless some important question is involved the President is entitled

to have confirmed anyone whom he appoints. So far as the office of Under Secretary of State is concerned, I do not think that we should interfere with the President's right to select a man for that post merely because we happen to disagree with his policies. That applies also to a Cabinet officer. A Cabinet officer cannot himself reflect substantially the policy of the United States Government.

Insofar as there is a difference of opinion between Mr. Acheson and General MacArthur regarding policy, I sympathize with General MacArthur. I think there has probably developed a fundamental difference in policy toward Japan about which I should like to speak at a later time. But I think it is not involved in the vote on the confirmation of Mr. Acheson's nomination. I think the country should understand that a vote by any individual Senator to confirm Mr. Acheson's nomination, or a vote by the Senate as a whole to confirm the nomination, would in no way be passing upon the difference as to the general question of policy which may appear between Mr. Acheson's statement and General MacArthur's statement, if there is any difference of policy between them. I therefore wish to explain why I shall vote for Mr. Acheson's confirmation, and at the same time disagree to a large extent with what I think is the tendency of the policy which he has advocated.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not know Mr. Acheson. I do not know General MacArthur in any personal sense. I approach the pending question as objectively as I think any man can approach it. Frankly, I am a bit confused as to the sequence of events which have led up to the present moment. As I understand the situation, General MacArthur made a statement in Toyko the effect of which was that if nothing untoward happened he could get along with 200,000 regular soldiers, thereby permitting many of our soldiers to return to their homes. I hope that statement is true. The country hopes that it is true.

Mr. President, at a press conference—I am speaking not of any private conference—at the State Department representatives of the press suggested that Mr. Acheson was disturbed over some of the recent statements which had been made by General MacArthur. It is no business of the State Department to determine the number of soldiers to be used in occupied countries. The policy in that regard is not determined by Mr. Acheson, or even by the State Department. Of course, they are instrumental in determining the policy. But the policy had already been made at Potsdam by the highest level of government. The statement of General MacArthur was confined to the number of soldiers which would be necessary for occupation, and did not refer to policy.

Mr. Acheson said:

I have no comment to make on the military aspects of what General MacArthur stated. That is a purely military matter—

That is correct—

with which the State Department is not properly concerned. I think I can say that I am surprised that anybody can foresee at this time the number of forces which will be necessary in Japan.

That was none of Mr. Acheson's business. That was a matter for the War Department and for the Army. In the determination of the number of men necessary in Japan there is no one human being so well qualified to speak as is Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He is the supreme commander in the Pacific theater. His statement is the most authoritative one that could be made.

Then Mr. Acheson continued as follows:

The important thing is that the policy in regard to Japan is the same policy which has always been held by this Government and is still held, so far as I know, and I think I know. In carrying out that policy, the occupation forces are the instruments of policy and not the determinants of policy, and the policy is and has been that the surrender of Japan will be carried out.

Mr. President, I agree with that statement. The occupation forces do not make the policy of the United States Government any more than does the State Department determine the number of soldiers to be used in the army of occupation.

The press of this country, the citizenry of this country, and the newspapermen who were present at the conference certainly received the impression that Mr. Acheson was administering a rebuke to General MacArthur. No man occupies a place of greater responsibility than does Douglas MacArthur. Next to the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State is presumed to be the most influential voice in the State Department. The net result of all this has been a state of confusion which should be cleared up, and it should be cleared up before the Senate has to vote upon the question of confirming Mr. Acheson for the office to which he has been appointed.

With all due respect for my good friend the majority leader and the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I should think they would find it desirable in their minds that we clear up this confusion instead of letting it continue.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. What confusion is the Senator talking about?

Mr. REED. I am talking about the confused state of mind of the country.

Mr. CONNALLY. Here is the statement. Anyone who can read the English language should understand it. I do not see why there should be any confusion.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Texas was not paying attention to what I was saying.

Mr. CONNALLY. I heard the Senator mention my name as being the chairman of the committee, and I rose to pay him the attention I thought he deserved.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Texas tell the Senator from Kansas to what statement he is now referring?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator said he wanted this confusion cleared up. What confusion is he talking about?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Texas then referred to some statement which he held up.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have the statement here—the Potsdam agreement and the statement.

Mr. REED. I was talking about a particular statement which appears on page 3 of the mimeographed memorandum which was sent here. While we are on that point——

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. Is the Senator asking me a question, or not?

Mr. REED. No; I was not asking the Senator a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then I am satisfied.

Mr. REED. I hold in my hand a mimeograph copy of a statement which I secured only a few minutes ago. The senior Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, was gracious enough to let me read his copy at an earlier hour in today's proceeding. I wonder if the Senators on this floor have been furnished with a copy of this document, which was made up in the State Department and sent here, and which purports to be an answer to the Senator from Nebraska. It is a rather voluminous document consisting of 12 pages. Only 15 minutes ago was I able to secure a copy, and I got it from the secretary for the majority, who was good enough to give me a copy.

Mr. President, I do not think the Senate should vote when it has only inadequate and incomplete information. I think I suggested to the majority leader 2 hours ago that before the vote came on the pending motion, and before it came on the confirmation of Mr. Acheson, this document should be in the hands of every Senator, and every Senator should be given an opportunity to read it.

Mr. President, what harm could there be if this nomination went back to the Committee on Foreign Relations? The committee then could hold a hearing, at which all parties could be heard, all misunderstandings cleared up, and all confusion removed. This and other documents and all other pertinent information would be before the committee, and then before the Senate. I submit that that is the fair and reasonable and dignified way to proceed. It would not hurt anyone, and in a matter so important, in connection with a situation about which there is so much confusion in the United States, extending to other countries of the world, we should be very sure of our ground.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The first estimate of forces necessary to occupy Japan was 900,000 men. Then MacArthur, I assume after investigation—and we all know his reputation for efficiency—issued a statement that he could occupy Japan with 400,000. I think that was the number, was it not?

Mr. REED. It was 900,000, and then it was reduced to 400,000, and finally he said 200,000.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Was there anything wrong about that?

Mr. REED. No; it was very welcome news to the United States.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of course, everybody was happy about it.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Then what is all this fuss about? Was the State Department disappointed that we could control Japan with an Army of only 200,000 men?

Mr. REED. That inference could be and was drawn from what Mr. Acheson said. Whether he intended to be understood that way I do not undertake to say, but that is the inference that was drawn. The newspapers broadly printed the fact that the Under Secretary of State had rebuked General MacArthur. That is unfortunate.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Who was in better position to say how many men it would take to control Japan than General MacArthur?

Mr. REED. No one.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is the whole question in issue. What business is it of the State Department to find fault with him? They should have cheered him.

Mr. REED. I think it was none of their business. I think Mr. Acheson clearly spoke out of turn. His friends, in personal conversation, rather agree that that is the fact. They do not want to see him possibly humiliated, as they would call it, by having the nomination held up. I am much more concerned that the confusion in the country because the State Department has undertaken to administer a rebuke to General MacArthur in regard to something that is none of their business should be cleared up.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote for the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am not willing to have this issue come to a vote in the state in which it has been left so far as the discussion has proceeded, as it seems to me that it may not be entirely clear precisely upon what the Senate must vote.

I have been impressed by the return to the arena here of the redoubtable Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in all his ancient form, exhibiting the vestigial remnants of the dramatic power which has so often thrilled this Chamber. It has been conspicuously if not unhappily absent for the past 2 years, when he has been performing a remarkable feat of prestidigitation in bringing 91 Senators in this Chamber to such a point that they could agree in following him in foreign policy. I think it is one of the greatest feats that has been performed, and that history will ultimately so regard it. Today we see him in his ancient form, as a gladiator in the arena, or a matador in the ring, and it has seemed somewhat like ancient times.

However much I must agree with the Senator from Texas in his conclusion on the question before us, in agreement with the Senator from Ohio, whom the Senator from Texas rather unjustly and perhaps unkindly dragged in by his heels, when it finally appeared the Senator from Ohio was going to agree with him, I have to express a good deal of appreciation of and agreement with the Senator from Nebraska in some of the issues which he framed, as I happen to agree with him in most of the matters which it seemed to me were in issue, but which we cannot resolve by this vote. I have been entirely in accord with him on Bretton Woods, and reciprocal trade, particularly the importation of Canadian potatoes, which is a very tender subject with me. I agreed with him on aviation, when we were trying to preserve the United States air program in complete freedom, as against the program which Mr. Acheson has so eloquently and so successfully advanced over my futile objections thus far. And there are several other matters. If those were the issues, I should certainly have to support the Senator from Nebraska.

To me the unfortunate aspect of the situation is that apparently we should try the issue here between Mr. Acheson and General MacArthur, both of whom are now functioning, Mr. Acheson under the temporary appointment, as I understand, as Under Secretary of State, for which he holds a commission, so that he is Acting Secretary of State at this time, and General MacArthur, who has been given the very tremendous responsibility of carrying on our affairs in Japan.

It certainly would be most unfortunate if an apparent division should seem to lend substance to any suggestion that the divisions in council which have been the despair of democracy are continuing even under our Chief Executive now in office, whose entire course in this body was dedicated, by his great committee, to eliminating suggestions of disagreement and friction of this character.

Mr. President, I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Texas that the fault was not great in this particular episode. I appreciate that it well may be that Mr. Acheson said a little something that he should not have said; that in a way he exhibited his dramatic powers and treaded a little on the military side when he said what he did with respect to making forecasts. But, on the other hand, it was a somewhat minor fault, and profoundly as I disagree with some of the principles which Mr. Acheson, as Assistant Secretary, necessarily has presented, and undoubtedly will present as Under Secretary if his nomination is now confirmed, as I think we all realize it is likely to be, that is not the immediate issue. The immediate issue is whether or not a President of the United States is entitled to have in his immediate official family, as a Secretary or Under Secretary, in that very close relationship, men in whom he has confidence and whose character is not under serious attack.

We must assume that the policies are determined in the final analysis by the Chief Executive, insofar as the executive power extends, and certainly all the history of our present President during his tenure of office with us showed that he was dedicated to that very end.

I have a great deal of sympathy for the President in not being able to bring his boys entirely under control in this unfortunate controversy that has been perhaps somewhat magnified. But I personally know Mr. Acheson. I have had very serious disagreements with him in the policies which he has so effectively presented dealing with the so-called freedom of the air. From much of that discussion before the Foreign Relations Committee and in other forums I have accumulated a very considerable respect, first, for the brains, second, for the guts, and, third, for the energy of this gentleman, and I submit those are qualities that we very much need in our State Department at this time.

So I am quite prepared to accept President Truman's conclusion that Mr. Acheson is the one who can most effectively implement those policies under the direction of the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, and under the final control of the President of the United States, and it is for those reasons that I shall find myself obliged to vote contra to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, although I sympathize very deeply with much of what he has said. I also think he has rendered a profound public service by bringing to public knowledge the far more complete enunciation of the United States policy regarding Japan which was issued by the White House on Saturday night and which all the people of this country are now privileged to know.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate this afternoon. Recently at a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee I voted to report favorably the nomination of Mr. Acheson to be Under Secretary of State. In fact, I think I seconded the motion to approve his nomination.

I like Mr. Acheson personally. He is a man of character and ability. I do not agree with him in all the positions he has taken, in the past, nor do I expect to in the future. On this particular issue I feel it is unfortunate that the Acheson-MacArthur angle has entered into the picture.

First let me say that I think the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was very sincere and very courageous, as he always is, in raising this issue.

This is not a vote of approval or disapproval of General MacArthur. I regret as much as anyone in this Nation the effort which is being made in the country today by some people to smear General MacArthur. I think General MacArthur is a great American. He is a great soldier. He is a great leader and I believe he is handling the situation in the Pacific area in a very admirable way. It is very unfortunate that we should see headlines such as this: "Boos hint Communists plan MacArthur smear campaign."

It is very unfortunate to hear speakers on the radio attempt to smear General MacArthur. It is a sad commentary on decency and fairness. It is a reflection on those who are doing the smearing.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. In what newspaper did that headline appear?

Mr. BRIDGES. It appeared in the Times-Herald of this morning.

Mr. McMAHON. Oh! [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The headline appears above a news article from New York City. I have a copy of the newspaper in my hand, and, if the Senator will yield for a moment longer, I wish to say that the article states that the booing took place in Madison Square Garden, where 12,000 Communists and their sympathizers met last Tuesday night. At that meeting General MacArthur was booed.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article inserted in the RECORD at this point in the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOS HINT COMMUNISTS PLAN MACARTHUR SMEAR CAMPAIGN—DEMONSTRATION AT NEW YORK MEETING SEEN BUT START OF SCHEME TO DIM GENERAL'S STAR

(By Guy Richards and Russ Symontowne)

NEW YORK, September 23.—A few small boos—harbingers of bigger and better boos to come—greeted the name of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur at the Madison Square Garden meeting of 12,000 Communists and their sympathizers last Tuesday night.

The boos went almost unnoted against the background of tumultuous cheering for the early overthrow of capitalism and the quick rise of the Socialist state, demanded by leaders of the newly reorganized party.

SEEN AS TEST BOOS

But it is almost certain these were test boos, little samples of a wide variety of boos and hisses, hoots and jeers soon to come rolling from the party's production lines.

In fact, we were told by Communists off the record, and it took little reading between the lines of party publications to assure us, the great Red propaganda machines are ready-greased for a full-scale smear campaign against the general who brought an end to the world's greatest war.

GROUNDWORK DESCRIBED

Today we will describe how the groundwork for this campaign to discredit MacArthur has been laid and what the Reds hope to gain by it in this country. In another article we will attempt to show how this "get MacArthur" movement fits into the jig-saw picture of Moscow's plan for world expansion.

Before he left New York for Chicago, where he spoke tonight, William Z. Foster, national chairman of the party, gave us a quotation which broadly summarizes the party's new hatred of MacArthur.

"MacArthur's conduct in Japan," said Foster, "has been such as to require his correction by the President and by the State Department. His activity on behalf of a quisling regime in the Philippines, his methods in Japan and Korea, demonstrate that he is unfit to carry out the job of crushing Japanese fascism and its collaborators.

"It is no wonder that the reactionary, pro-Fascist press in America is grooming him for the Presidency in 1948."

A careful study of the columns of the Daily Worker, the Communist official organ, and talks with Communist leaders disclosed the party's alleged grievances against MacArthur.

MAC ARTHUR IS TARGET

But also it was revealed to us that the party is not hankering at this time for an out-and-out fight with the Truman administration and intends to use MacArthur as a convenient target for abuse it might otherwise heap upon the President and State Department.

"We may never learn to love Harry Truman but we may still wish to support him in 1948 against some greater reactionary," one Communist put it. "For the time being, at least, MacArthur will serve our purpose very well."

Now, turning to the specific Communist case against the general, we found that until quite recently the party had very little against him.

BLASTS FROM DAILY WORKER

Quite suddenly the Daily Worker began, shortly after VJ-day, to blossom forth with headlines, articles, and editorials blasting the general.

"As a reactionary military man he didn't matter so much to us," said one Communist high in the leadership. "But as a reactionary boss of Japan, playing with its Fascist elements, he matters a great deal."

The first thing griping the Reds is the fact that only American soldiers are occupying Japan.

"Instead of planning a joint occupation with our allies, as in Germany, the United States is making the job harder and costlier," a Worker editorial of last Wednesday read.

WANTED REDS IN JAPAN

"Of course we wanted Russian soldiers in Japan," a Communist leader told one of us. "We wanted the same quick and virtually bloodless revolution we had in European countries, in Poland, Rumania, and even France. We wanted the old Fascist leaders, not merely the military but the industrial war makers as well, turned out immediately and democratic elements installed in their places. As it is, every day MacArthur plays with these industrialists and politicians they entrench themselves and fix fascism's hold more tightly on Japan."

So, it is the party line to fix the blame upon MacArthur for the over-all occupation plan which was surely decided upon by the administration in agreement with the other Allies.

In many editorials in the last 2 weeks the Worker has harped upon MacArthur's continuance in office of Japanese officials.

"If we can raise enough heat we might be able to force the administration to withdraw MacArthur from Japan," a Communist told one of us. "Frankly, we are not very hopeful. But it might be done. He's been spanked several times by the administration."

A series of articles, signed with a nom de plume and date lined from the Philippines, appeared last week in the Worker, purporting to show that under MacArthur's orders troops in the Philippines were working with Quislings and in some instances actually jailing Filipinos who worked in the underground.

RED FEAR CITED

Russia's mounting fear of American might peeps through the lines written by James S. Allen in the Worker, September 16:

"It is well known," Allen wrote, "among those in close contact with MacArthur, and it has also been voiced in the press, that the commander views Japan as a base of reconnaissance against the Soviet Union."

The Daily Worker is seeking hard to make it appear that MacArthur is on the defensive. This is an old and familiar party tactic, used often before against its enemies. When MacArthur announced that he believed only 200,000 troops would be needed to occupy Japan, instantly the Worker declared this was "bait" to make American mothers and fathers of soldiers and sailors accept his "soft" handling of the Japanese.

NOT VERY HOPEFUL

But, while the party feels that abusing MacArthur as a "Fascist" is helpful and useful in restoring it to prewar vigor, one leader confided to us it really had little hope of altering the course of affairs in Japan.

"However," this man said, "we will certainly fix his wagon for the Presidency. You see, we don't really think he can be elected President. But you never can tell what will happen in politics, and it is a good thing to knock him out of the race now."

"However," he continued, "that isn't the main idea. Our real fear is that the reactionary and Fascist politicians and newspapers will build him up and then use him to force the nomination and election of some lesser known Fascist tool. If we can discredit him thoroughly now, he will lose his value to the American reactionaries long before 1948 rolls around."

It was a little boo for MacArthur at the Garden last Tuesday, but that little boo will soon become a great big boo, if the Communists can so contrive it. The party line says: "Get MacArthur."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the point I wish to make is that if it comes down to a question whether or not we in America are going to stand behind General MacArthur and the job he is doing over there, then I want to be counted as being for General MacArthur and the gallant men under him. I think most Americans in this country feel as I do respecting this. I regret the effort to tear him down and to smear him at a time such as this, when he is over there representing not only America but the Allied Powers, and when he is doing an excellent job.

But, Mr. President, I think the Acheson nomination does not involve that issue. So I propose to vote for Mr. Acheson as I did in the committee. In making this explanation, I want it to be clear that my vote in no way is a reflection on the able Senator from Nebraska or on the courageous stand he has taken in defense of that great American, Douglas MacArthur.

MAJ. GEN. LESLIE R. GROVES

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to speak about another matter for a few minutes because I am obliged to take a train out of the city in about 40 minutes. I do not wish to delay a vote on the pending nomination.

Mr. WHITE rose.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator from Maine wish me to yield to him?

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator would be so courteous, I should like to make a very brief statement respecting the nomination of Mr. Acheson, but I shall wait until the Senator from Tennessee has concluded his remarks, if that is his desire.

Mr. STEWART. It will take me only a few minutes. I am pressed for time.

Mr. President, on September 19 I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 175) which requests the President of the United States to appoint Leslie R. Groves, who is now a major general, Army of the United States, to be a major general of the line in the Regular Army of the United States; that is, to give him a permanent rank of major general. As the resolution provides, this would be done "in recognition of his outstanding services to the Nation and particularly the planning, organization, magnitude of work, and risks demanded by his contribution in the development of the atomic bomb."

As everyone knows, at least a large portion, if not the major portion, of the work done in the development of this bomb was done in the State of Tennessee, at Oak Ridge, where on Saturday

of this week, I understand, there is to be a celebration, which will be attended by Secretary of War Patterson and others.

I call attention to this resolution today chiefly for the purpose of emphasis. In doing so, I should like to refer to a number of comments from newspapers throughout the country. I shall not take the time to read them all, but shall ask unanimous consent that they be printed in full in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I refer first to an editorial entitled "He Deserves Reward," published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of Sunday, September 9, 1945. It reads, in part, as follows:

For 3 years the activities of Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves were cloaked in complete anonymity and secrecy. While others, more conspicuously placed, were receiving public adulation and decorations for military accomplishment, he was quietly plodding along in one of the most responsible tasks ever assigned a human being—that of directing the atomic bomb project.

I shall not read all of the editorial, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE DESERVES REWARD

For 3 years the activities of Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves were cloaked in complete anonymity and secrecy. While others, more conspicuously placed, were receiving public adulation and decorations for military accomplishment, he was quietly plodding along in one of the most responsible tasks ever assigned a human being—that of directing the atomic bomb project.

It was his job to produce what science had made possible, and that meant production from the ground up—construction of the gigantic Tennessee and Washington plants, and development of the testing reservation in New Mexico. It involved the employment of skilled technicians and the training of thousands of others and, when the time came, direction of productive operations and final testing of the weapon. In addition there was the over-all responsibility of maintaining complete secrecy, one of the most difficult of all the many complex phases of the undertaking.

The entire world knows the success of the project, although it cannot yet begin to estimate the effect of release of atomic energy on man's future. Such success is deserving of reward by those chiefly responsible for achieving it. Civilian honors will, no doubt, be accorded those scientists who participated. Military honors should, of course, go to those American Army officers having directive responsibility.

In that connection we can think of no better way of rewarding General Groves than to make his current rank permanent, or to give him even higher rank and make that permanent. His achievement comes easily within the classification of superlative, not only as to its effect on the Pacific war, but as it relates to the future of peace or war. In its way it was as great a victory as any achieved under combat leadership.

His present permanent rank is that of lieutenant colonel. When the Army is ultimately reduced to what is to be its peacetime level, high temporary ranks held by many officers will have to be relinquished. It would be a great pity if that were to happen to General Groves, and we do not believe the people would want it to happen.

Public attention is currently focused on the weapon and the potentialities of its power. It will not be amiss for it to be thinking of honoring those who produced it.

Mr. STEWART. Next I refer to an article in the September 3 issue of News Week, on page 42, under the title "National Affairs." Almost a full page is devoted to General Groves. He is referred to as the "Atom Man," and tribute is paid him. In this article it is suggested that recognition be given by the President of the United States for his services. I read a portion of the article:

President Truman's military advisers have fixed their general ideas of what this Nation's policy on atomic power should be. In order to maintain our headstart over other nations, they want continued research in and production of atomic energy, but for the Government's sole account and under its complete control. Only when the danger of aggression has been banished would they share our advanced discoveries with the world at large.

The article then proceeds to discuss General Groves and the work which he did at Oak Ridge in Tennessee in connection with the development of the bomb, which, of course, won the war. I ask that the article be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATOM MAN

President Truman's military advisers have fixed their general ideas of what this Nation's policy on atomic power should be. In order to maintain our head start over other nations, they want continued research in and production of atomic energy, but for the Government's sole account and under its complete control. Only when the danger or aggression has been banished would they share our advanced discoveries with the world at large.

The President's diplomatic advisers believe with the military experts that no such sharing will be warranted in the next few years. Assuming then that Mr. Truman recommends and Congress adopts their policy, the military men see a long-time job ahead for a mild-mannered colleague, Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves.

WHAT MAKES KNOW-HOW

An Army chaplain's son, Groves, when named executive director of the "Manhattan District" project in June 1942, already had much experience on big Army construction jobs, among them the Fort Peck Dam and the Pentagon Building. Through them, he had developed a prodigious memory, a mastery of detail, and ability to harmonize conflicts. He had experienced disasters, too. In 1927, a TNT explosion in a Vermont powder plant had killed an Army sergeant standing near him, and in 1931, while he was surveying the route for the proposed second interoceanic canal across Nicaragua, he survived an earthquake, winning the republic's Medal of Merit for relief work.

Groves' first task on atomic fission was to choose from among the blocks of research amassed by mathematicians, physicists, nuclear-physicists, and chemists the foundation stones for the plants on which the late President Roosevelt decided to risk $2,000,000,000 so that atomic energy could be released in quantities sufficient to win the war. Two years at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology before entering West Point, plus occasional dabbling in pure science after getting his Army commission, enabled Groves to talk the scientists' language.

BOSSES WANTED

Groves' second task was to contract for building and operating the plants, and the second enterprise found some big firms reluctant. Du Pont, for example, remembering its rake-over by the Nye munitions investigation a decade ago, came in only after Groves explained the urgency of the project and then put its management fee at cost plus $1 profit. And though some other firms sought to profit unreasonably by the speed factor, the only irregularity uncovered to date has been the short-changing of the Government by a few contract off-area bus drivers at the Oak Ridge, Tenn., plant. They have been prosecuted.

In his third task—enrolling a construction force of 100,000 or more and an operating force of 65,000—Groves made the American Federation of Labor joint recruiting agent with the War Manpower Commission. To William Green and the chiefs of AFL craft unions supplying the needed skills, Groves, at a meeting in the fall of 1942, said: "Of this project, I can only say that unless the Germans edge us out, it will win the war and save the lives of labor's sons. We can't have jurisdictional strikes." There were none.

FATHER WOULDN'T TELL

To safeguard the secret, Groves limited his social life to the Army and Navy Club, where reticence is respected. Sometimes, his daughter Gwen joined him on the club's tennis court. But, until the President announced it, neither the 16-year-old subdeb nor her mother knew that he was working daily with glittering scientist-socialites, whom the project had summoned to Washington.

Groves' promotions—to brigadier general when he took the job and to major general later—piqued the curiosity of his son Richard, who was a student at West Point. Upon his graduation last June, the young man probed his father; "Dad, the fellows here all ask me what my old man has done to rate two stars and his own sleeper plane." Groves let him remain perplexed.

Three times, aides left unlocked at night in Groves' office safe drawers containing project papers. Discovering the third offense himself, Groves called the culprit before him, exploded with a "Good Heavens," then asked: "Isn't this a bad example for the lower ranks?"

Groves' own example to his staff—a 12-hour workday—has not been altered by the Japanese surrender. Should he be detached from the Manhattan District and revert to his permanent rank of lieutenant colonel, Groves, just turned 49, has told friends he might leave the Army and try farming for a while. They think it unlikely that he'll leave. To Secretary of War Stimson's comment on his service, "truly outstanding," the President is scheduled soon to add another honor—the Distinguished Service Medal.

Mr. STEWART. I refer next to an editorial in the Washington News of Monday, September 10, 1945, entitled "Recognition, Please." The editorial reads in part, as follows:

President Roosevelt and Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves would have been forced to justify that $2,000,000,000, the work, the time, and the material that went into an unsuccessful project. And that would have been something to explain. After President Roosevelt died, the burden fell on General Groves alone. You can imagine the constant weight of that tremendous secret on him, as he went from the Pentagon to his home at 3508 Thirty-sixth Street NW., each night.

The editorial states that General Groves deserves high recognition for the excellent work which he did in this connection. I ask unanimous consent that

the editorial be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOGNITION, PLEASE

You'll want to follow the picture-story of the atom, which we begin today on page 8. And as you follow this fascinating story, ponder what would have happened to the two men chiefly responsible for the $2,000,000,000 set-up that solved the secret of the atom bomb—if that gigantic outlay had flopped.

President Roosevelt and Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves would have been forced to justify that $2,000,000,000, the work, the time, and the material that went into an unsuccessful project. And that would have been something to explain. After President Roosevelt died, the burden fell on General Groves alone. You can imagine the constant weight of that tremendous secret on him, as he went from the Pentagon to his home at 3508 Thirty-sixth Street NW., each night.

This Nation can give nothing further to the person of President Roosevelt. It can and should recognize the achievement of General Groves and the highly successful way in which he carried out his mission.

The planning, organization, magnitude of work and risks demanded by General Groves' task were no less than those required to mount an invasion. Our invasion leaders have had well-merited recognition. General Groves deserves as much.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like to take the time to say a little more about General Groves, and express my thoughts along the lines indicated by the editorials and by the resolution which I have submitted; but I realized that many Senators are now under pressure, and that there is some anxiety on the part of a few Senators to get away a little early this afternoon. For that reason I shall not consume any more time discussing this particular subject. However, I should like to say that I am sure the entire Nation agrees with the editorial comment to which I have referred. A number of other newspapers have also made favorable comments concerning General Groves and his excellent work. I believe that the entire Nation feels that for the President of the United States to bestow upon General Groves the permanent rank of major general would be a fit recognition of this achievement. I believe he is entitled to it. I think he is entitled to much more than that. Compared with the accomplishments of the man, that is a very small gesture, but at least it is in the right direction.

Mr. President, I should now like to refer briefly to another matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

FOOD SHORTAGES—FATS AND OILS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report consisting of five typewritten pages. I wish to have it printed as a part of my remarks. I do this in the interest of time. The report is brief and to the point. It concerns hearings which were held by the so-called Small Business Committee, of which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the full committee, and I are members. The hearings were held during the vacation, and they concern food shortages which had developed in the country, particularly with respect to fats and oils.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Among the most serious food shortages which developed in this country as a result of the war is that of fats and oils, which during recent months became particularly acute in the southern cotton producing States.

Due to this condition, Members of the House and Senate received numerous complaints from various sections of the South, indicating that agricultural laborers in the area were refusing to work, that mines were closed down, and that laborers generally were dissatisfied as a result of their inability to obtain sufficient fats and oils which comprise a large part of the normal diet of such workers.

Due to the seriousness of the situation, the Senate Small Business Committee's complaints subcommittee conducted public hearings on the matter, for the purpose of ascertaining what relief could be offered to fats and oil users, particularly in the critical southern areas.

These hearings involved a thorough examination of both supply and distribution problems and regulations affecting these products, which finally resulted in the following relief to the most seriously affected areas:

1. The Department of Agriculture diverted 12,000,000 pounds of salt meat and fatback which had been earmarked for export, to be channeled through dealers in the Southern States.

2. Military set-asides of lard were eliminated in five Southern States, having already been reduced in 24. The States in which the set-asides were eliminated are (1) Kentucky, (2) Tennessee, (3) Arkansas, (4) Texas, and (5) Oklahoma.

3. Eleven million pounds of oil from the producers of shortening and cooking oils in consumer-size packages were channeled by the Department of Agriculture into 10 key Southern States in the Cotton Belt.

It was testified during the hearings that 24,000,000 pounds of fats and oils would be required to eliminate the critical shortage throughout the Southern States for the third quarter. It is estimated by the Department of Agriculture that the adjustments which were made following the committee hearing would be more than ample to supply the amount of lard, salt meat, and other fats and oils needed by the South to assure the usually required diets of the workers in that area.

During the hearings witnesses for the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration were questioned at length concerning the feasibility of reducing exports of lard to England and other countries. It was pointed out that approximately 33,000,000 pounds of lard were scheduled for shipment to our allies during the third quarter. The agencies questioned, however, were disinclined to eliminate these exports in order to solve the domestic situation, expressing the belief that other steps could be taken to ease the critical shortage.

It was suggested during the hearings, that perhaps a portion of the exports going to Great Britain might be "borrowed" during the months of August and September in order to ease the southern shortage, and later repaid during the heavy slaughtering period which yields large amounts of fats and oils. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture expressed the belief that it would be a mistake to mortgage the future fats and oils supply in this manner, and that such action might create an extremely critical supply picture at a later time, and expressed the belief that a course which they were at that time preparing to follow, namely the adoption of the three-point relief program, would be much more satisfactory as far as the domestic fats and oils supply situation in the South is concerned.

It was pointed out that the average annual consumption of fats and oils per capita, all over the United States, is about 48 pounds in normal times, but that the average annual consumption in the South is much higher, running about 100 pounds per person. At the time the hearings were held, the per capita consumption of fats and oils throughout the United States had dropped to a rate of about 28 pounds a year and no special provisions were made for the southern States, thus making the problem in that section particularly acute.

However, the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration had already requested certain large packers to ship additional supplies of fats and oils which they were realizing from the reduced set-asides in the 24 States into the critical southern area in order to alleviate the situation. It was felt by these agencies, and rightly so, that maintenance of agricultural laborers on the job in the South and particularly in the cotton belt, was extremely important because of the fact that the cotton crop itself yields large quantities of cottonseed oil, one of the major United States sources of edible oils.

The Office of Price Administration indicated that it would continue to maintain relatively high point values on fats and oils throughout the country as long as the extreme shortage continues to exist. By this means, it was hoped that any additions to the civilian fats and oils supply would be channeled to the critical Southern States. The reasoning behind this procedure is that high point values in the North would discourage the purchase of fats and oils due to the preference of persons in this area for meats, other than the fat meats included within the general term "fats and oils." Thus, by limiting northern purchases, distributors of fats and oils would tend to ship to southern markets in which fats and oils have a high demand and in which persons are more inclined to spend their point supplies for such products.

Representatives of the Army and Navy testified during the hearing that neither branch of the military service had any excessive stocks of fats and oils and that their purchases were not too large for their requirements. The Army representative indicated that this branch of service carries approximately 1 month's supply of fats and oils in its inventory, making replacement on a varying basis, to correspond to consumption both in this country and abroad. The Navy representatives testified that about 3 months' stocks have been carried by this branch of the service but that at the present time they were engaged in reducing to a 2 months' inventory. Thus, adjustments in military procurement, according to the witnesses, does not offer any solution to the fats and oils problem.

Therefore, the action which the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration have already taken seem to offer the best solution to the critical situation which developed in the cotton States.

While this action does not alleviate the general situation throughout the country, it will, in the long run, tend to lessen the general fats and oils shortage as a result of the fact that larger amounts of cottonseed oil will be realized from the South if workers are kept in the fields. Thus, while the only long-run answer to the fats and oils shortage generally is more production, the steps which have been taken to aid the South will eventually help in obtaining such production.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to read a portion of the report:

Among the most serious food shortages which developed in this country as a result of the war is that of fats and oils, which during recent months became particularly acute in the southern cotton producing States.

Due to this condition, members of the House and Senate received numerous complaints from various sections of the South, indicating that agricultural laborers in the area were refusing to work, that mines were closed down, and that laborers generally were dissatisfied as a result of their inability to obtain sufficient fats and oils which comprise a large part of the normal diet of such worker.

Due to the seriousness of the situation, the Senate Small Business Committee's Complaints Subcommittee conducted public hearing on the matter, for the purpose of ascertaining what relief could be offered to fats and oils users, particularly in the critical southern areas.

These hearings involved a thorough examination of both supply and distribution problems and regulations affecting these products, which finally resulted in the following relief to the most seriously affected areas:

1. The Department of Agriculture diverted 12,000,000 pounds of salt meat and fat back which had been earmarked for export, to be channeled through dealers in the southern States.

2. Military set-asides of lard were eliminated in 5 Southern States having already been reduced in 24. The States in which the set-asides were eliminated are (1) Kentucky, (2) Tennessee, (3) Arkansas, (4) Texas, and (5) Oklahoma.

3. Eleven million pounds of oil, from the producers of shortening and cooking oils in consumer-size packages were channeled by the State department of agriculture into 10 key Southern States in the Cotton Belt.

Let me add that the cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Clinton Anderson, has been, in common parlance, 100 percent. I believe that it was largely through his efforts, and those of certain officials of the OPA, that we were able to obtain quick relief. We have not as yet had complete relief. We learned at the hearing that fats and oils are consumed on a larger scale per capita in the Southern States than in other portions of the country. For example, the per capita consumption in the South, as I recall, is about 100 pounds, whereas in the over-all picture for the entire 48 States it is approximately 48 pounds. We do not yet have the relief to which we are entitled. I wish to point out that we found that a large portion of the fat meat, lard, and shortening which should have been diverted into the portion of our country where the field hands and laborers were actually starving to death for want of it had been earmarked for export. Our information was that it was to be sent to the British Isles, where, according to our information, there already is a larger per capita supply of fats and oils than we have in this country. As a matter of fact, I think a great many foodstuffs and perhaps other things are in shorter supply in this country than in the British Isles—a subject which I imagine will be discussed pro and con before the boys from Britain go back with the baskets they brought over here the other day.

I desire to call particular attention to the relief which was granted through the Department of Agriculure. Let me say further that I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture requesting that we be permitted to have a conference with him before any further commitments were made in the next quarter for the furnishing of certain foodstuffs to Britain and others of our allies in Europe. In the letter I also requested that a complete survey of the situation be made, that we be advised about it, and that the interests of our own people at home be given full protection—a thing which I feel sure the Secretary will do, of course. As a matter of fact, he agreed to have the conference; and I am sure he will have and does have the protection, welfare, and interests of the American people at heart. But, Mr. President, we are not in a position to be prodigal with our supply of fats, oils, and certain other foodstuffs. We have permitted certain sections of the country really to suffer on account of the lack of them. It is with that situation in mind that the subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee will, within the next week or two, I imagine, hold further hearings on the same subject. That is all I wish to say on the matter, Mr. President.

NOMINATION OF DEAN G. ACHESON TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Dean G. Acheson to be Under Secretary of State.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the situation relative to Dean Acheson and General MacArthur has been discussed so thoroughly, I ask unanimous consent that a very brief statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES GENERAL MAC ARTHUR AS SECRETARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. I should, however, like to make clear my position with regard to the matter which has arisen in connection with him and with General MacArthur. I should like, moreover, to present my thought with regard to General MacArthur's future role in the service of the American people.

I do not believe that there is any vital difference or conflict between the State Department and General MacArthur.

A. General MacArthur, acting as supreme commander of the United Nations, did right in releasing his statement to the press to the effect that by next July only 200,000 men would be required in our occupation forces in Japan and Korea unless unforeseen factors arise.

General MacArthur is in the field. He knows the situation in Japan; he knows the Japanese people; he knows the East, its philosophy, its mental processes, its way of life. As a matter of necessity (as over-all commander) his discretion is unlimited, and he has exercised that discretion to the complete satisfaction of the American people. No one would think of curtailing his freedom in the issuance of statements to the press.

By comparing the White House directive of August 29 on far eastern policy with General MacArthur's actions, we can see how closely and faithfully the general has carried out his orders.

General MacArthur is a soldier fulfilling his duty. That duty entails a knowledge, as we have said, of the oriental mind (which the general knows far better than we here at home). He made his statement possibly partly for oriental consumption for reasons which to him were adequate.

B. Dean Acheson was right in asserting the primacy of civilian over military authority in our Republic as the determinant of policy.

It is, however, to be sincerely regretted that his statement was so worded as to involve any disparagement of General MacArthur's purpose and discretion or as to permit of any such interpretation. I can certainly understand the feelings of those of my colleagues who hastened immediately to prevent what they considered a slur against General MacArthur's honor.

To my knowledge there has been no dispute as to Dean Acheson's qualifications other than his remark with regard to General MacArthur. I shall, therefore, vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

C. Following Dean Acheson's statement, General MacArthur, in an interview, stated that his current assignment would be his last in public service.

General MacArthur has lived a strenuous life in the service of the Republic. He has served with unselfish devotion and with unparalleled excellence in countless fields and on countless fronts. He has already written such chapters of valor that he will live in our history as long as America lives. No American would deny him a well-deserved rest.

But for all his honors and for all his labors, it is not for General MacArthur to say whether this will be his last assignment in the public service. It is up to the American people to make this decision.

In my humble opinion, the American people will refuse to consider his current assignment as his last assignment on behalf of our Nation. In my opinion, as soon as the minimum needs for security of the United Nations are met through Japan's demilitarization, the American people will demand that General MacArthur be recalled for further duty in the land of his devoted countrymen, a land which he has not seen for so many years.

I believe that as soon as a single Cabinet Department of National Defense is set up, the ideal military man to fill that position would be Douglas MacArthur.

In any case, General MacArthur should immediately be brought home following the fulfillment of the minimum requirements for Japan's demilitarization.

Once Douglas MacArthur said prophetically and determinedly, "I will come back." Now I believe that the American people say, "You will come back—to continued service in the land you have served so well and so long."

Let us not, in any event, make a mountain out of this relative molehill in Asia, when the true mountain of crisis lies now in Europe.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, an editorial published in the Wanderer, a weekly Catholic newspaper published in St. Paul, Minn. The editorial is entitled "General MacArthur: Guest Editor." As a preliminary to the editorial, there are some remarks about General MacArthur. Following that is printed a copy of the address General MacArthur made at the time when the surrender document was signed by the Japanese. It seems to me that when diplomats are fighting over the bleeding corpse of a wounded world, quarreling like wolves over the body of a bleeding sheep, the sentiments expressed by General MacArthur should be considered. I think his words will go down in history as on a par with Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. He

manifests an understanding of spiritual values much neglected these days.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MAC ARTHUR: GUEST EDITOR

We take great pleasure in turning over this editorial column today to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, soldier and Christian gentleman. What he says was not written at the behest of the Wanderer, but every word is well worth repeating in the columns of a Catholic publication that has tried, in season and out of season, to uphold the idea that wars have never, by themselves, solved world problems and that genuine peace is the product not of military victory but of religious and moral regeneration. Or, as the motto of Pope Pius XII declares: "Peace is the work of justice."

The fact that General MacArthur gave voice to such sentiments at the moment of the Japanese surrender, moreover, lends added significance to his words and justifies the hope that they will ultimately prevail over the preachments of hatred and vindictiveness and national pride currently propagated by irresponsible elements.

Addressing the Allied and Japanese delegates assembled for the Japan surrender ceremony aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay, MacArthur declared:

"We are gathered here, representatives of the major warring powers, to conclude a solemn agreement whereby peace may be restored. The issues, involving divergent ideals and ideologists, have been determined on the battle fields of the world and hence are not for our discussion or debate. Nor is it for us here to meet, representing as we do a majority of the peoples of the earth, in a spirit of distrust, malice, or hatred. But rather it is for us, both victors and vanquished, to rise to that higher dignity which alone benefits the sacred purposes we are about to serve, committing all of our peoples unreservedly to faithful compliance with the undertakings they are here formally to assume.

"It is my earnest hope and indeed the hope of all mankind that from this solemn occasion a better world shall emerge out of the blood and carnage of the past—a world founded upon faith and understanding, a world dedicated to the dignity of man and the fulfillment of his most cherished wish for freedom, tolerance, and justice. * * *"

And after the representatives of Japan and of the nine Allied Powers present had signed the surrender agreement, MacArthur closed the ceremony with these words:

"Let us pray that peace be now restored to the world, and that God will preserve it always."

In full accord with the Christian chivalry revealed in MacArthur's attitude during the formal ceremonies was the address he delivered immediately afterward, from which we quote the following significant paragraphs:

"Today the guns are silent. A great tragedy has ended. A great victory has been won. The skies no longer rain death—the seas bear only commerce—men everywhere walk upright in the sunlight. The entire world is quietly at peace. The holy mission has been completed and in reporting this to you, the people, I speak for the thousands of silent lips, forever stilled among the jungles and the beaches and in the deep waters of the Pacific which marked the way. I speak for the unnamed brave millions homeward-bound to take up the challenge of that future which they did so much to salvage from the brink of disaster.

"We have known the bitterness of defeat and the exultation of triumph, and from both we have learned there can be no turning back. We must go forward to preserve in peace what we won in war.

"A new era is upon us. Even the lesson of victory itself brings with it profound concern, both for our future security and the survival of civilization. The destructiveness of the war potential, through progressive advances in scientific discovery, has in fact now reached a point which revises the traditional concept of war.

"Men since the beginning of time have sought peace. Various methods through the ages have attempted to devise an international process to prevent or settle disputes between nations. From the very start, workable methods were found insofar as individual citizens were concerned but the mechanics of an instrumentality of larger international scope have never been successful. Military alliance, balances of power, leagues of nations all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative

"We have had our last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

Thank you, General MacArthur. What you say has been frequently reiterated by thoughtful Catholic publicists in this country and elsewhere. For that they were scoffed at and denounced as theorists who ignored the cold realities of international affairs. That a realist of your stature, who surely cannot be accused of any bias in favor of our late enemies, has seen fit to voice a warning against reliance on power and might alone, pleading instead for a return to God and moral law, augurs well for the peace of which this Nation is at this moment the foremost custodian.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sorry this debate has arisen concerning two of our most efficient public servants. I do not intend to take part in the debate, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a short editorial which appeared in the Barre (Vt.) Daily Times of September 22, 1945. I think the editorial adequately expresses the opinions of a great many of the people of this country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dean Acheson has had a long and distinguished career in public service, and there is no legitimate reason why his nomination as Under Secretary of State should not be immediately approved by the Senate. It is true that he may have disagreed with General MacArthur on the question of the number of men needed to occupy Japan, but he did not, as charged, insult or blight the name of the general, for whom we have the utmost respect and affection. It was an honest difference of opinion and should be treated as such. Acheson is rightly deserving of the promotion to the office to which he has been named by President Truman.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to recommit the pending nomination to the Committee on Foreign Relations. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if he were present and voting he would vote as I have voted. Therefore, I will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY and Mr. GREEN] are detained in a conference with the Secretary of the Navy.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

I am advised that if present and voting, all the Senators whose absences I have announced would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. I announce the unavoidable absence on official business of the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. On this question if he were present and voting he would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 66, as follows:

YEAS—12

Brooks	Moore	Shipstead
Butler	Reed	Wherry
Capehart	Revercomb	Wilson
Capper	Robertson	Young

NAYS—66

Aiken	Guffey	Millikin
Andrews	Gurney	Mitchell
Bailey	Hart	Morse
Ball	Hatch	Murdock
Barkley	Hawkes	Murray
Bilbo	Hayden	Myers
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hill	Overton
Briggs	Hoey	Radcliffe
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Carville	La Follette	Stewart
Chandler	Langer	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Ferguson	Magnuson	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Mead	Willis

NOT VOTING—18

Austin	Glass	Russell
Bankhead	Green	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Knowland	Tobey
Eastland	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Gerry	Pepper	Wheeler

So Mr. WHERRY's motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BALL, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays are ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. KNOWLAND's name was called). I again announce the necessary absence on official business of the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. If he were present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I am advised that if present he would vote as I have voted, and I therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is absent on ofcial business in one of the Government departments. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

I announce further that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY and Mr. GREEN] are detained in a conference with the Secretary of the Navy.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

I am advised that if present and voting, all the Senators whose absences I have announced would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is detained on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	George	Morse
Andrews	Gurney	Murdock
Bailey	Hart	Murray
Ball	Hatch	Myers
Barkley	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Hayden	Overton
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Briggs	Hill	Revercomb
Brooks	Hoey	Robertson
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capehart	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Carville	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Cordon	McMahon	Wagner
Donnell	Magnuson	White
Downey	Maybank	Wiley
Ellender	Mead	Willis
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wilson
Fulbright	Moore	Young

NAYS—1

Wherry

NOT VOTING—26

Austin	Green	Russell
Bankhead	Guffey	Shipstead
Brewster	Kilgore	Taylor
Bushfield	Knowland	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Millikin	Tobey
Eastland	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Gerry	Pepper	Wheeler
Glass	Reed	

So the nomination of Dean G. Acheson to be Under Secretary of State was confirmed.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank McCarthy to be Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maxwell M. Hamilton to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Finland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bennett Champ Clark to be associate justice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wilbur K. Miller to be associate justice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of E. Barrett Prettyman to be associate justice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alexander Holtzoff to be associate justice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John A. Carver to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Whitfield Y. Mauzy to be United States attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Granville T. Norris to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dave E. Hilles to be United States marshal for the western district of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. Gilchrist Baker Stockton, to be rear admiral in the Naval Reserve.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to point out to the Senate that the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate has more or less temporarily adopted a policy of holding up nominations for temporary promotions to the higher echelons of the Navy. In the case of Captain Stockton, because of the peculiar type of job this reserve officer was to handle in the Philippines, we deviated from our policy.

I know that the Senate will be pleased to hear that, now that the war is over, in view of the fact that we are trying to demobilize the Navy, as well as the Army, we are attempting to have the Navy Department in every case justify any temporary promotion from now on in the higher echelons.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, without intending to have the bill taken up today, but merely in order to make it the unfinished business so that it can be taken up for consideration tomorrow, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 380, Calendar No. 582, the so-called full-employment bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have no objection to our proceeding immediately with the bill, except that it occurs to me that a bill which has been reported regarding Army volunteers could probably pass the Senate in 30 minutes. Until that is done, the entire draft problem will remain complicated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the importance of that bill, and if it could be considered without long debate, I should be in favor of laying aside temporarily the full-employment bill. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is not at the moment in the Chamber, and I do not like to do anything about the bill until he is present. If my motion shall be agreed to, and we can reasonably hope to dispose of the bill referred to by the Senator from Michigan after brief discussion tomorrow, or at any other time, by laying aside the full-employment bill, I shall be agreeable to that program.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his statement. It seems to me that in view of the turmoil of public opinion, both in and out of Congress, with respect to enlistments, the quicker we can undertake this experiment the sooner we can know whether or not it will be necessary to proceed with the draft.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate we cannot know what further legislation will be necessary until we know the degree of success the voluntary system may attain, and it is important to dispose of the matter at the earliest possible date. I shall cooperate to that end.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In addition to that is the fact that the full-employment bill cannot even pretend to take effect for 3 or 4 months, and after that will not really become effective for 6 months, so that I think we might spare an hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. All that is cumulative argument in favor of disposing of the other matter as quickly as possible.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish wholeheartedly to join the senior Senator from Michigan in urging early consideration of the bill which has just been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs permitting volunteering in the Army and Navy. I hope the majority leader will, during the course of the consideration of the full-employment bill, find time to have the bill dealing with volunteering in the services taken up and disposed of. I realize it cannot be taken up today, because it was reported today by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, but I point out that the bill has been passed by the House of Representatives and is ready and ripe for consideration tomorrow by this body. I wish to urge earnestly that the bill dealing wih volunteers be taken up at the earliest possible moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to proceed to the consideration of the Senate bill 380.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 380), to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Full Employment Act of 1945."

FREE ENTERPRISE AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 2. (a) It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to foster free competitive private enterprise and the investment of private capital.

(b) All Americans able to work and desiring to work are entited to an opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment.

(c) In order to assure the free exercise of the rights to an opportunity for employment set forth above and in order to (1) foster free competitive private enterprise and the investment of private capital; (2) promote the general health and welfare of the Nation; (3) foster the American home and American education as the foundation of the American way of life; (4) raise the standard of living of the American people; (5) provide adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans; (6) develop trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations; (7) maintain expanding markets for agricultural products and assure expanding income for agricultural enterprises; (8) contribute to the economic development of underdeveloped areas of the country; (9) encourage and strengthen competitive small business enterprises; (10) strengthen the national defense and security; and (11) contribute to the establishment and maintenance of lasting peace among nations, the Federal Government has the responsibility to assure continuing full employment, that is, the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans able to work and desiring to work.

(d) To that end the Federal Government shall, in cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and others, develop and pursue a consistent and carefully planned economic program with respect to, but not limited to, taxation; banking, credit, and currency; monopoly and monopolistic practices; wages, hours, and working conditions; foreign trade and investment; agriculture; education; housing; social security; natural resources; the provision of public services, works, and research; and other revenue, investment, expenditure, service, or regulatory activities of the Federal Government. Such program shall, among other things—

(1) stimulate, encourage, and assist private enterprises to provide, through an expanding production and distribution of goods and services, the largest feasible volume of employment opportunities;

(2) stimulate, encourage, and assist State and local governments, through the exercise of their respective functions, to make their most effective contribution to assuring continuing full employment;

(3) provide for an income for the aged sufficient to enable them to maintain a decent and healthful standard of living, and promote the retirement from the labor force of the older citizens; and

(4) to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment. Such Federal investment and expenditure, whether direct or indirect, or whether for public works, for public services, for assistance to business, agriculture, home owners, veterans, or consumers, or for other purposes, shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprises. Any such Federal investment and expenditure calling for the construction of public works by the Federal Government shall provide for the performance of the necessary construction work by private enterprises under contract, except where the peformance of such work by some other method is necessary by reason of special circumstances or is authorized by other provisions of law; and all such work shall be performed in accordance with all applicable laws, including laws relating to labor standards.

(e) It is the policy of the United States to discharge the responsibilities herein set forth in such a manner as will contribute to an expanding exchange of goods and services among nations and without resort to measures or programs that would contribute to economic warfare among nations.

THE NATIONAL PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT BUDGET

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session the National Production and Employment Budget (hereinafter referred to as the "National Budget"), which shall set forth—

(1) for the ensuing fiscal year and such longer period as the President may deem appropriate, an estimate of the number of employment opportunities needed for full employment, the production of goods and services at full employment, and the volume of investment and expenditure needed for the purchase of such goods and services;

(2) current and foreseeable trends in the number of employment opportunities, the production of goods and services, and the volume of investment and expenditure for the purchase of goods and services, not taking into account the effects of the general program provided for in paragraph (3) hereof; and

(3) a general program, pursuant to section 2, for assuring continuing full employment, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable. Such program shall include whatever measures he may deem necessary to prevent inflationary or deflationary dislocations or monopolistic practices from interfering with the assurance of continuing full employment.

(b) The National Budget shall include a review of the economic program of the Federal Government during the preceding year and a report on its effect upon the amount of the national income and upon the distribution of the national income among agriculture, industry, labor, and others.

(c) The President shall transmit quarterly to Congress a report on economic developments, together with such modifications in the National Budget and such legislative recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable.

(d) When the National Budget and the quarterly reports thereon are transmitted to the Congress, they shall be referred to the Joint Committee on the National Budget hereinafter established.

PREPARATION OF NATIONAL BUDGET

SEC. 4. (a) The National Budget shall be prepared under the general direction and supervision of the President, and in consultation with heads of departments and establishments.

(b) The President shall consult with industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State and local governments, and others, with regard to the preparation of the National Budget, and for this purpose shall establish such advisory boards, committees, or commissions as he may deem desirable.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL BUDGET

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the National Budget, to be composed of 15 Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and 15 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation of the Joint Committee shall as nearly as may be feasible reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the Joint Committee—

(1) to make a continuing study of matters relating to the National Budget and to consult with the President with respect thereto;

(2) to make a study of the National Budget transmitted to Congress by the President in accordance with section 3 of this Act; and

(3) as a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to the National Budget, not later than April 1 of each year (A) to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the National Budget, and (B) to prepare and report a joint resolution setting forth for the ensuing fiscal year its summary recommendations concerning the National Budget.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the Joint Committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(d) The Joint Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena, or to testify when summoned, under authority of this section.

(e) The Joint Committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments.

(f) The expenses of the Joint Committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

INTERPRETATION

SEC. 6. Nothing contained herein shall be construed as directing or authorizing—

(a) the operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government;

(b) the use of compulsory measures of any type whatsoever in determining the allocation or distribution of manpower;

(c) any change in the existing procedures on appropriations; or

(d) the carrying out of, or any appropriation for any program set forth in the National Budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by provisions of law other than this act.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS AND TO PRINT AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that permission be granted for the filing of minority views during the recess of the Senate and that various amendments which are to be proposed to the bill may be submitted and printed during the recess, so they may be available by tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator asked and secured such consent last Thursday.

Mr. TAFT. Consent was secured during the last recess of the Senate. I have now renewed the request to apply to the present recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 25, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate September 24 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William C. Mathes, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, vice Ralph E. Jenney, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 24 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean G. Acheson to be Under Secretary of State.

Frank McCarthy to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

FOREIGN SERVICE

Maxwell M. Hamilton to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Bennett Champ Clark
Wilbur K. Miller
E. Barrett Prettyman

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Alexander Holtzoff to be associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

John A. Carver to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho.

Whitfield Y. Mauzy to be United States attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Granville T. Norris to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

Dave E. Hilles to be United States marshal for the western district of Oklahoma.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVAL RESERVE FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Capt. Gilchrist Bates Stockton to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as naval aide and liaison officer to the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, to rank from the date of confirmation by the Senate.

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Gussie M. Jarvis, Bradgate.
John J. Franta, Gilbertville.
Henry A. Nemmers, Lamotte.
Perry M. Dougherty, Legrand.
Oley C. Hanson, Otho.
Edward Moroney, Swaledale.

OREGON

Glenwood Pounds, Adrian.
Marie W. Havill, Beavercreek.
Darrell L. Howser, Burns.
Leola L. Stoddard, Butte Falls.
Robert G. Henderson, Chemawa.
Sadie E. Wadsworth, Delake.
Arthur Roy Kerr, Depoe Bay.
Clara D. Neal, Sublimity.
Irwin H. Howe, Trail.
William H. LohKamp, Wecoma.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William F. McLellan, Hamer.
James C. Norton, Little Rock.
Mary Lucile Turner, Moore.
Wiley G. Griste, Sr., Ocean Drive.
Vera S. Buie, Patrick.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

SEPTEMBER 24, 1945.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord God, we praise Thee for Thy wonderful story of deathless love. Thou who art the creator of every good thing, lay Thine hand upon us and bless us. We do not present our supplication before Thee for our righteousness, but for Thy great mercies. O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; grant that we may hate the evil and love the good and establish justice in Thy name—what a privilege! what an opportunity! what a duty! Let none dare pass them by.

We pray that the living members of all great faiths may move forward as a united army, establishing righteousness as sons and daughters of the one God and Father of us all. Forbid that our country should regard any substitute for that spiritual relation of the human soul whose builder and maker is God. In this

hour, as we relax warfare against the common enemy, facing the great problems of materialism, stir up the wills of Thy faithful people and grant that the spiritual hunger which confronts the world today may enrich all altars and bring all Thy children into a fuller understanding of the Divine One whom we worship. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 20, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3686. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the registers of the land offices in Alaska to perform functions under the Alaska real property ownership declaration law; and

H. R. 3974. An act to provide for termination of daylight saving time.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1274. An act to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communications which were read:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Sincerely,

T. MILLET HAND,
Member of Congress.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Sincerely,

T. MILLET HAND,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 356), as follows:

Resolved, That T. MILLET HAND, of New Jersey, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I had a special order to address the House for 20 minutes on the future of UNRRA. There was no meeting of the House on Friday, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that on today, after the regular order of business and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

NUMBER OF PLANES DECLARED SURPLUS BY WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Military Affairs of the House and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 351), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to inform the United States House of Representatives the number of planes suitable for conversion to troop carriers that have been declared surplus by the War Department and sold to air-line companies within the past 6 months.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report may also be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us who introduced this resolution?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee report (H. Res. 351, Rept. No. 1006), as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 351) requesting certain information from the Secretary of War, with respect to the number of planes suitable for conversion to troop carriers that have been declared surplus by the War Department and sold to airplane companies within the last 6 months, having considered the same, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that it do not pass.

Your committee, having had under consideration House Resolution 351 (a privileged resolution), recommend to the House that the resolution be laid upon the table.

The Secretary of War, the commanding general, Army Service Forces, and the deputy commanding general, Army Air Forces, appeared before the Military Affairs Committee in an open hearing, held on September 18 and 19, 1945, and discussed in detail the War Department's plans for material demobilization. The deputy commanding general, Army Air Forces, furnished the committee full information on the subject of the resolution under consideration. This information is contained in records of the committee and is available for consideration and study by all Members of the House of Representatives.

Under the circumstances, no purpose would be accomplished by passage of the resolution under consideration.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

BIG-INCH PIPE LINE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I addressed the House on the subject of the problem of the Big-Inch pipe line and expressed my deep concern over the apparent undue haste with which it had been announced that the line is to be taken out of use. I am glad to report to the House now that it has been reported to me by the Surplus Property Administration that the RFC directive on shutting this line down, flushing it with water, and preparing to take it out of use is going to be held in abeyance until there is time for thorough investigation as to what is actually the best disposition of the Big-Inch line. Furthermore, I want to call attention to the fact that one of the engineers' reports which certainly should receive earnest consideration in this connection shows that the transportation of oil by means of this line, at least from east Texas to other points, would be just as cheap as other methods of transportation. It is my earnest hope that this will be thoroughly considered before such a tremendous investment of the people's money as has gone into this line will be allowed to be either wasted or to fall into monopolistic control. Clearly there are many interests that would like nothing better than to see the line abandoned and allowed to rust away. But from the viewpoint of the people's interest the right solution is for it to be operated as a common carrier to which all producers and consumers, large and small, would have access on exactly equal terms.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may sit tomorrow afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, as well as Wednesday of this week, at the

conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, as well as Wednesday and Thursday of this week, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: to include in one a letter he received from a group of servicemen in his State on the subject of demobilization and proper insignia, and in the other a poem.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of discharges of soldiers.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each editorials.

POSTWAR POLICIES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, so long as the war against our common enemies went forward, there were those who very forcefully contended that we should make no request of our allies that they should make concessions for our good. Even then there were others, of whom I was one, who felt that while we should freely sacrifice to help our allies make common cause against our enemies, that it was not unreasonable to ask that they in turn be willing to make some sacrifices to aid us. The first school of thought largely prevailed.

The fighting has come to an end. Other nations have not hesitated to express their wishes or to call on us for further sacrifices. The last clear opportunity to work out some mutually advantageous arrangement in regard to credit for our European allies is here. They need American credit. We want or should want to wipe out the colonial system in America. I believe we can accomplish a great forward step in real practical democracy and at the same time make world trade easier by the adoption of a plan which I suggested last spring. I shall discuss this plan for 20 minutes on the floor tomorrow afternoon. I hope that the Members will be interested.

HOUSE RULES

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BREHM addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a newspaper article.

BACK TO SLAVERY

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] this morning received permission that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow. I am a member of that committee. It is not my purpose to be at that meeting tomorrow afternoon because there is listed on the calendar for consideration a bill known as the Carden-Hurd bill, a private bill. That bill has to do with expenditures, because if that bill becomes a law in its present form and the Supreme Court renders a favorable decision, it will cost the taxpayers of this country over $20,000,000. I think the members of the Committee on Expenditures should be here on the floor when such legislation is pending and not in a committee meeting.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If it will cost $20,000,000 can anyone tell us where we are going to get that money?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is beyond me. Maybe the gentleman can. This bill grows out of the purchase of ships by the Government in 1917. In my opinion those interested have had their day in court and have been well compensated by the Government. Several years ago a bill almost similar to this was considered by the House and defeated. This is the second time that it is to be considered under a private rule. I feel all Members of the House should be present and hear the debate on this bill so they will understand just exactly what it is and understand what might result if this legislation becomes a law.

REMOVAL OF RATION POINTS ON BUTTER

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked Secretary of Agriculture Anderson to use his good offices in having all ration points on butter removed at once. Points on cheese were removed sometime ago and restrictions on the sale of cream have also been lifted, but still butter remains on the ration list without rhyme or reason.

Stocks of butter are piling up in the creameries of my district and throughout Iowa without proper outlet, and the large quantities of butter being released by the armed services, do not make the situation any better. This surplus simply means a lower price for butterfat to the farmers without any resultant benefit to the consumer, who without question would buy more butter if ration points were removed entirely.

I am advised that much butter is also becoming rancid, indicating that it has been in storage or on the merchants' shelves for some time. Even Members of Congress have told me that butter coming into their homes here in Washington has been returned to the stores on account of its rancid condition.

In view of the removal of points on cheese and the lifting of restrictions on cream, it would now only seem fair to let the trade buy butter without restrictions. In behalf of the farmers, the dairy industry, and the consumers of the country, I urge the removal of all points on butter immediately.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a soldier in France, with an article from the Stars and Stripes indicating that horses are given priority now over soldiers in returning to the United States.

THE BUTTER SITUATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is a ridiculous situation which makes the housewife continue to buy butter with the use of ration stamps when she can get all the cream she wants without all these little red points. Perhaps the OPA does not know that butter comes from cream. Cream is available now and all you need to do is to whip it up with an egg beater or other form of agitation and, lo and behold, you have

butter. The butter you make from this cream is not rancid. There are many complaints that the butter you buy at the store is tainted. I presume this is surplus butter which has been turned loose by the Army or some other Government agency.

The ration points should be taken off of butter and meat. It just does not make sense to continue rationing butter when you can get the cream without ration points. It does not make sense either to ration meat when the country has more potential beef than at any other time in its history. When, oh when, will the OPA adopt ordinary horse sense in their rationing program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALBOT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks concerning the market center program of the Quartermaster Corps.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a constituent on the subject of full employment.

GREAT BRITAIN AND THE STERLING BLOC

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers report that Lord Halifax, in a radio speech pleading for further financial help from the United States in substance, stated that unless such aid was forthcoming Great Britain would be forced to continue developing the sterling bloc in competition with the dollar bloc. I know of nothing concrete which indicates that Great Britain has at any time given the least indication of intending to give up any part of her sterling area arrangements, or any of the numerous multilateral trade agreements she has entered into with other nations. Nothing was presented in the hearings before our committee on the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme that could lead anyone to believe Great Britain intended or even desired to abrogate any of these arrangements.

Did not Lord Keynes, who wrote every substantial provision of this international monetary scheme, claim as one of its advantages that it permitted Great Britain to retain those arrangements when he said:

> During the postwar transitional period of uncertain duration, we are entitled to retain any of those wartime restrictions, and special arrangements with the sterling area and others which are helpful to us, without being open to the charge of acting contrary to any general engagements into which we have entered. Having this assurance, we can make our plans for the most difficult days which will follow the war, knowing where we stand and without risk of giving grounds of offense.

But the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme does not define the postwar transitional period.

Lord Halifax knows that these discriminatory practices against the United States will be retained whether or not we grant the sums he seeks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EQUAL POINTS FOR ARMY AIR CORPS GROUND PERSONNEL

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include quotations from newspapers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHAPMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert an editorial entitled "Britain's Jersey Act" from the Lexington Herald, Lexington, Ky.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the San Diego News.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

RED BAITING

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, it comes as something of a shock to see that the House Committee on Un-American Activities has resurrected the old tactics of the Dies committee in timing its investigations into local situations so as to cause maximum disruption in municipal and State election campaigns.

I refer to the calling of the Democratic leader, Mr. Laughlin, and certain Communist leaders from New York as a point in question. I raise the warning in this House that unless this Red baiting activity is held within bounds, if it cannot be stopped, we run extreme danger of actually helping men like Gerald L. K. Smith, whom we are not investigating, continue his disrupting baiting of Jews, Negroes, and Communists, and carry on his Hitler line in this country without ever being checked. Surely, it is clear now that the main stock in trade of all Fascists who rose to power was their running fire against Jews, Communists, and other political and religious minorities. The House committee would do well, it seems to me to investigate Gerald L. K. Smith and others spreading what painful experience has proved are poisonous attacks upon the very foundations of democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ARMY DOCTORS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JUDD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BUTTER RATIONING

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when we should decide whether we are to sit here and take the role of high-class office boys and let a few bureaucrats run this country or whether we are going to have a little something to say about it ourselves.

We have been dilly-dallying along with this butter business long enough. There is not a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, a member of the Appropriations Committee, or any other committee that is running the agriculture of this country who can stand here and give any reason why butter should be continued on the ration list. I do not know of any way of approaching it other than to introduce legislation to take it off the list. That is what I have proceeded to do. If we are going to do something for reconversion of agriculture, we had better be doing it right now. Then we will not have to listen to a lot of those smear radio skits like Orson Welles and Quentin Reynolds put on late last fall, telling the wonders of the New Deal agricultural approach and depreciating the Republican approach. This is the time to do it and do it right now.

Cream testing from 40 percent fat up is not rationed and provides butter for the man with the price—and is not rationed. Butter for the average citizen is rationed at the detriment of the farmer producing butter and to the detriment of the great percentage of the American consumers.

Butter is being allowed to become rancid from being too long in storage or improper storage. This spoilage harms the per capita consumption of this great food product. The war dairy food program was not based on common sense, and the peacetime dairy program is unscientific as well as senseless. Let us correct at least this one injustice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

NEED FOR THE RELEASE OF TRAINED POLICE PERSONNEL FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, apropos what my colleague from Minnesota said concerning the release of doctors from the armed services, there is another pressing problem that needs consideration. I am sure all of you have had experiences similar to those I have had, and it is just as important in my opinion as the problem concerning doctors; that is the release of some of the trained personnel in the police departments in congested areas. I know this may not be as pressing a problem everywhere as it is in Los Angeles, but in Los Angeles with almost 150,000 unemployed and the necessity to protect life and property in various crime waves that are being experienced there we need these men. The only procedure the chief of police can follow is to ask each man to make application to his commanding officer. This is a long and tedious process. I think the Military Affairs Committee should consider the matter in connection with the War Department and see if something cannot be done to relieve this situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION OF BOYS UNDER 21 YEARS OF AGE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to discharge from the armed services all boys under the age of 21 years, and men with families and others named.

This bill covers the subject in considerable detail but is supplemental and additional to other rules and programs of the Army and Navy.

I expect to talk about this bill on Thursday. I shall not engage in any tirade of abuse against the Army or the Navy or any officer in it; I wish to talk about the reasonableness of this proposition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post on the subject of the succession to the Presidency.

OCCUPATION FORCES FOR JAPAN

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, regardless of the widespread and well-planned smear program against General Douglas MacArthur, the fact still remains that he went into one of the most hazardous places a man could go into without losing a single man. The mothers of America in particular are especially grateful for his wise conduct.

Let me remind you that there are plenty of Chinese soldiers who could be had to occupy Japan and who would be glad to do it at $10 a month, I am told. This would mean the return of our men to their homes in this country where they belong. The Chinese would serve well under the leadership and direction of American officers. Such a course would save a lot of weeping in this country as well as a lot of money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

THE CIO CAMPAIGN AGAINST CONGRESS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to an article which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of Saturday, August 18, entitled "Sidney Clears the Way."

It states that the CIO union launches a drive to control Congress; that the CIO forces are launched today on a national campaign they hope will result in the control of the Congress to be elected next year.

Their method lies in the great number of strikes that are being called today under the guise of seeking a 30-percent wage increase, closing down the industries of this country, and putting people out of work so that the state will naturally be compelled later on, unless something happens, to take over all industry, and thus make us a communistic nation. That is the method by which they are going to bring about state socialism; that is the thing Communists are ultimately most interested in. If they cannot get that now, they intend to tie up the Congress by electing men to Congress who will do their absolute bidding so they will have this country right by the throat and put the Government in all business of the land. Private industry then is dead.

I advise the American people to wake up, because these Communists are dangerous. This program is being followed in Europe. They had an election in France yesterday and one in England earlier this summer. They are going to have one in America next year. What is going to happen to America? The American people will decide.

Let us keep America free, let us keep America in such condition that she may enjoy freedom and liberty. It can be done only by supporting private enterprise, where men can find jobs at good pay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion only to express my very deep appreciation to those Members of the House who this morning have expressed gratitude because I have served so well as a substitute topic for a gentleman in New York, Mr. Winchell, who uses me instead of wasting his time on better men. Winchell is mad because one of the former employees of Jergens was sentenced to the Federal penitentiary for misprision of treason. Walter does not like it because I told of Jergens hiring this woman and of her subsequent conviction on her plea of guilty. She did aid the saboteurs, and the Government locked her up. So he has some real reason to be mad at me.

I also appreciate the fact that I rendered a service in diverting Pearson's attention from being devoted to better men. As long as they are after Old Man HOFFMAN they are not bothering MacArthur or any other good men. They are just following the party line when they attack MacArthur and others and attempt to create discord. They will doubtless continue their attacks on Americans who will not follow their "red" line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two radio broadcasts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] seems to be very much disturbed because we are twisting the tails of certain Communists who are plotting the overthrow of this Government.

The Democrat he talked about is giving us information about one of these subversive individuals and we would like to find out what he knows.

Let me say right here that this same crowd the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] is defending is denouncing General MacArthur. At a Communist meeting the other night in Madison Square Garden, New York, they booed General MacArthur, the latchet of whose shoes none of them are worthy to touch.

I will tell you what is the matter. General MacArthur went into Tokyo and he is not asking any Reds to come in there with him. He is going to get hold of records that may show that this Communist outfit in New York, in the State of Washington, along the Pacific coast, and elsewhere have been plotting the overthrow of this Government at a time when we were fighting the greatest war in our history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is District day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, before calling District legislation, I shall say to the Members of the House that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House and the equally distinguished Commissioner from the Philippines desire to address themselves to the House on matters of national importance. I know that ordinarily the Members are not too interested in the details of strictly local legislation, but since I shall yield to these two gentlemen perhaps more Members might want to stay on the floor at this time.

THE SALE OF CERTAIN SMALL ROCKFISH IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3636) relating to the sale, in the District of Columbia, of certain small rockfish, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am sure the gentleman from West Virginia will make a brief explanation of the bill—and may I observe, Mr. Speaker, that the bills we have here for consideration today are not major in character, yet very necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 899 of the act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901 (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., title 22, sec. 1605), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 899. Small striped bass: It shall be unlawful for any person, prior to July 1, 1947, to offer for sale, to expose for sale, or to sell, in the District of Columbia, at any time during the year, any striped bass, locally called rockfish, which is less than 11 inches in length (measured from the tip of the nose to the tip of the tail), and it shall be unlawful for any person, on or after July 1, 1947, to offer for sale, to expose for sale, or to sell, in the District of Columbia, at any time during the year, any striped bass, locally called rockfish, which is less than 12 inches in length (measured from the tip of the nose to the tip of the tail)."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, about the middle of last week I stated to the Members of the House of Representatives that I was appointing a number of subcommittees to go to the various separation centers of the Army of the United States to investigate and make reports with respect to the Army demobilization plans and the details thereof. To my amazement these committees were appointed and authorized to move on Friday. This morning I received from one of the groups a rather elaborate, though not lengthy, but a definite, and what I would call a fine, presentation of the situation they found existing at Camp Devens and Fort Dix. That report is signed by ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida, chairman of the special committee; Mr. PHILBIN; Mr. HOLIFIELD; Mr. LEROY JOHNSON; and Mr. ROE of New York, all members of the House Committee on Military Affairs. Generally speaking the report is encouraging. The report shows that at both of these stations, particularly at Fort Dix, they were set up to handle 1,750 separations per day; that within the time intervening between September 13 and September 21 they had increased their capacity by double-shifting and extra hours to 3,000 enlisted men per day and 420 officers; more than 3,400 per day. Not only that, but they show in this report that they are not only working double shifts, but some of the crews that they have worked have been exhausted by fatigue, and they have had to educate and train and bring in new crews to perform the job.

The committee has made several recommendations that I regard as pertinent and proper. The report shows that the great difficulty is lack of available men to expedite this work. If you do not call this vast amount of work done in 10 days expediting the work, I do not know what you would call it. The committee also says in this report that the Army should mobilize the low-point or low-score men that they have in these various centers and utilize their services to increase the manpower needed to make this thing operative on a very large scale. One of the things that they point out in the report that I think is vital is the fact that before these men left overseas their records in a good many instances contained defects, and they were not complete. When they come to one of these separation centers the Army has arranged to put them through just as fast as their records can be made perfect. If they are not perfect, then they create a side line, you may call it a production line on the side, especially manned, where they go through these records, and if there is one defect found they take it out of a pocket and hand it to a specialist who undertakes to perfect that man's record as rapidly as possible. I think that shows a fine situation to exist, and I believe, if the Members will be patient, before very many weeks this situation will be so satisfactory in its operations that we will be relieved of a great deal of the pressure that comes from people who are not satisfied.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield four additional minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. After General Marshall and General Henry explained to the Members of Congress in the Library of Congress last week what they were trying to do, does not the gentleman believe the Members of Congress are pretty well satisfied that the Army is trying to do the job as well as they could expect it to do under the conditions?

Mr. MAY. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Members of Congress are apparently much better satisfied than they were. Perhaps they had just cause to be dissatisfied, from the number of complaints they are receiving from their constituents. If you include the United States as your bailiwick, I think I have about as much complaint to make of that as anybody else, because I am getting about 700 letters a day.

Mr. RICH. I was very much dissatisfied because I was getting a lot of them, but after I listened to those men I was convinced that they are doing about all that is humanly possible for them to do

to get the men out at the very earliest possible moment.

Mr. MAY. There is no question but that they are doing their best.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Has the committee that made this investigation given any thought or has the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs given any thought to these men who are now in the camps? There must be a bottleneck there that is delaying the discharge of these men. Why could they not be sent home on an indefinite furlough and then, when all of the kinks are worked out of their service records, be brought back to the nearest separation center and there receive a physical examination and have their papers in order? In the meantime, they could be back home with their families and their businesses for 2 or 3 months, perhaps.

Mr. MAY. I think I stated one of the chief objections to that a few days ago, that they would be out of the Army for 3 months without a perfected record, and all kinds of questions as to their records could arise and the men are entitled to a complete record before they are discharged.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand two camps were investigated, Camp Dix and Camp Devens.

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman made a report about Camp Dix. I should like to know about Camp Devens, because I have had quite a number of complaints that they were not acting very expeditiously at Camp Devens. What is the report on that camp?

Mr. MAY. I should like to yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for an answer to that question. He is chairman of the special committee that was up there.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Only this morning a man came into my office to make a complaint that they were not working very fast in that camp.

Mr. SIKES. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that the subcommittee found that the work at Camp Devens is proceeding in a very satisfactory manner. Unquestionably there has been a time lag from the time that a man came into Fort Devens until he started being processed for discharge. That is because men are arriving faster than they can possibly be discharged by the trained personnel which is now available for carrying on the discharge processes. However, I believe that what has been started in the last few days will remove a great deal of the criticism of the type to which the gentleman has referred, because now when men arrive at Fort Devens they are immediately furloughed home for a period of a week or 8 days, or whatever time it is estimated will be required before those men can start the 48-hour processing for discharge. They go home and stay with their people during that 7 or 8 days or whatever time is required before they can be processed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why are the men not given 20 days?

Mr. SIKES. Because they will be ready for them to start the processing in less than 20 days, and they want to have the men back as soon as they possibly can be handled. When they come back, they start immediately into the line to get their discharges.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Those men certainly are complaining.

Mr. MAY. Let me make this further suggestion in line with what my colleague from Florida has said. These men arrive in groups, or shiploads, large aggregations of them, several shiploads at a time. They come in by wholesale, whereas they have to go out by retail, one at a time, because of the necessity of perfecting their records.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Resident Commissioner from the Philippines [Mr. ROMULO].

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES AND PHILIPPINE TRADE RELATIONS

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, in the year since I had the honor to be sworn in as Resident Commissioner in this House I have addressed you many times, upon each occasion giving you a first-hand report of the war to recapture the Philippines and an account of the atrocities practiced by the Japanese Army upon my fellow countrymen. Today I have secured the privilege of speaking to you once more to put before you a situation of vital import to the welfare of my people, now almost completely freed from the presence of our savage enemies, through the brilliant campaign of the American Army and their Filipino comrades-in-arms under the command of General MacArthur.

This will be the first time that I shall have asked you to give your attention to any requests I have to make on behalf of my people, and I esteem it as one of the glories of the American system that they should have in this body a spokesman with the right to be heard on this floor.

Nearly a year ago Congress authorized the creation of the Commission for Rehabilitation of the Philippines, consisting of nine Americans and nine Filipinos, to recommend settlement of important outstanding questions affecting the future relationship between your country and mine. For the past 6 months this Commission, of which I am a member, has met from time to time and heard arguments upon the matters properly under consideration.

It is no part of my intention to report thus prematurely anything which has been said or done in these meetings of the Commission. That will, I suppose, be done in due course, and pursuant to the decisions of the Commission through its authorized spokesman. It is because some of the matters pending in the Commission should be decided, for obvious reasons, before independence is granted to the Philippines, that I have asked for permission to address you today. Independence may be granted us during the present calendar year. I have not hesitated, therefore, to ask for this opportunity to express before you the views of those whom I represent upon two important questions as to which I believe you should hear the opinions of the Philippine Government.

The first of these concerns the rehabilitation of the Philippines after the severe damages inflicted upon us by the course of the war. The Filipino members of the Commission have calculated that the war damage can be repaired by the payment of a sum amounting to $1,300,000,000, these figures to be recast upon exact computation on the ground now that the hostilities have nearly ended. The only other opinion so far expressed on this subject is limited to the sum of $100,000,000, proposed to be contributed by the United States in compensation through a War Damage Corporation—a sum exactly one-thirteenth of the damages to property in our islands as assessed by our own experts. In due course this matter will, no doubt, come before you for decision, and this question will not, it seems, be affected by the actual date finally set for our independence.

It is quite different, however, with the other most important question before the Commission. I refer to future trade relations, upon which our future existence so largely depends. To avoid entanglement with the most-favored-nations clauses agreed upon in the past by the United States with other nations, this question, it seems to me, should be decided while the Philippine Islands are still territory of the United States, and before independence has been granted them. I have the conviction that sooner or later, this question will come before you for determination. Obviously, it should be determined before the actual date set for our independence. The Filipinos are asking for free trade for a period of 20 years from the day of independence.

It was in 1909 that you enacted the law establishing free trade between the mainland and the Philippines, and this law stood substantially unchanged in effect almost up to the time of the Japanese invasion in 1941, although certain modifications had been established in 1913 and again in the Commonwealth law of 1934. In 1909, when this law was passed, free trade was not asked by the Filipinos—indeed it was opposed by their leaders since they recognized in this statute an effective means of tying the Philippines politically still more firmly to the United States.

Our formerly diffused foreign trade was, in the course of subsequent years, compressed as to 72 percent of its volume into one market. This was originally done, be it once more noted, at your behest and not o[illegible] our volition. The effect has been that we lost the other markets in which our trade had

been active for so many decades in the past. But the effect, commercially and financially, upon our national wealth was immense and raised us to heights of considerable prosperity. In the meantime, our islands had become the sixth largest customer in consumption of American export goods.

Today, in a land where famine stalks through the ruins, it is seriously proposed that we shall start upon our existence as an independent nation facing the gradual imposition of tariff rates both in the United States and the Philippines so that, after a period of time, there will no longer exist any free trade between your country and ours. This is a threat to the stability of nearly three-quarters of our present commerce, and will lead to confusion and depression for some years—years in which we are proudly determined to justify the high opinion of us expressed by your country in its independence law for the Philippines. American exports to the islands will be gradually restricted by the rising tariff rates against them, and this at a time when your country is making prodigious plans for the expansion of its own foreign trade.

I ask your consideration of the probable effects of a lowering of our standards of living by the restriction of our trade. This might even be attributed to some incapacity for self-government on our part, instead of to the withdrawal, step by step, of the chief market for our products. The effect of this upon the success of America's great experiment in colonial government will bring great disappointment to those many Americans who have always so generously wished us well.

It has often been said in recent years that handling of the Philippine problem by the United States will serve as a pattern in the future for the solution of the acute crisis which has plagued the Western World in its relation to the Orient. The whole new system now being developed which has won so much favor throughout the Eastern World, and for which America so justly receives the credit for wisdom and generosity, might be jeopardized by the failure now of the United States to place us in a situation where we can become strong and prosperous in the next two decades.

I ask you, moreover, to consider the very practical question of the effect upon American producers and manufacturers of the gradual removal of free trade with the Philippines—this is a rule which works both ways. You will lose trade with us in proportion as we have to surrender your markets. This will be no more to our liking than to that of American manufacturers and exporters who will have to meet tariff barriers in the Philippines rising year by year against them. Not only will our capacity to absorb and pay for American products be gradually restricted, if not completely strangled, but also those American goods which still manage to surmount a rising tariff wall will have to compete in our markets on even terms with imports to the Philippines of goods produced in other countries on a far lower wage scale.

The tremendous power of these great economic forces which you evoked nearly 30 years ago without our cooperation, and indeed against our wishes, has raised us up to a high standard of prosperity and abundance, judged by Eastern standards. Do you now propose to reverse the wheel and deprive us little by little of this flow of prosperity? You gave and you have the power to take away. But in our extremity we shall ask you for better terms and for a better start upon our new station in life. We shall ask of you a full 20 years more of this free trade, to enable us to recover completely from the destruction of this war, so that we may establish the new republic upon solid foundations to stand as an enduring monument to American wisdom and generosity.

In this era of political unrest and disturbance, in which throughout the world whole peoples and classes of mankind are asserting their claims to a more equal share of prosperity and division of the wealth of the world, are you now willing to launch an experiment by submitting the people of the Philippines to gradual economic stringency and increasing difficulty in acting that balanced role in the world for which you have trained us?

Gentlemen of the Congress, you have at this important moment in our history the power to do just that. This is the time for decision. Whatever you choose to do will be loyally accepted by us, and in the future we shall do our best to meet your expectations. But if you choose the downward path for our commerce with you, you will increase by leaps and bounds the difficulties of a new nation, founded by yourselves.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman seven additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. With pleasure.

Mr. RICH. Do you want independence for the Philippines now under the legislation that has been enacted on the date set?

Mr. ROMULO. Yes; on July 4, 1946.

Mr. RICH. If we grant that independence and we give free trade to the Philippines, how can we maintain our high standard of salaries and wages in this country? What will you do in the Philippines to see that the same schedule of wages is maintained there that is paid here?

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, we have in the resolution granting independence to the Philippines a proviso that specifically provides that you are to have air and naval bases in the Philippines after independence for the mutual protection of both countries.

Mr. RICH. For how long?

Mr. ROMULO. That has not been determined yet.

Mr. RICH. It should be forever. There is no use making a contract with the United States and setting any time limit. It should be perpetual.

Mr. ROMULO. That is to be decided.

Mr. RICH. Personally, I would not be interested unless it was perpetual.

Mr. ROMULO. That will be decided by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. With pleasure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman permit me to make an observation to the effect that, in my opinion, there is no question but what this Congress will be very liberal in extending trade privileges to the Philippines. We are going to be in the Far East, without any question. I want to ask the gentleman this question: He mentioned $1,100,000,000 and he mentioned $100,000,000. Would the gentleman mind telling us from what source comes the figure $100,000,000? The gentleman stated the figure $1,100,000,000 came from the Philippine members of your committee.

Mr. ROMULO. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What was the source of the $100,000,000 figure?

Mr. ROMULO. That is from Senator TYDINGS.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So for the moment we will not assume that that is in any way official. Now, assuming there is granted to the Filipinos, let us say, $500,000,000 or $1,500,000,000, or whatever the figure may be, would the gentleman care to express his views as to how that fund will be used with respect to reestablishing in the Philippines the industries which for their survival will have to have free trade with the United States, and particularly with reference to this point: Assuming that industry A in prior years shipped to this country 1,000,000 units. In the future we will say it has a reasonable market of a half a million units. In using the rehabilitation funds, do you propose to bring back into operation old industry at its prewar capacity, so that free trade privileges must not only take care of the normal exports but the excess exports of 500,000 units?

Do I make myself clear?

Mr. ROMULO. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. ROMULO. Yes; I will.

The rehabilitation program of the Philippines will be such as to take care of, among other things, those industries that have direct relationship with the United States so that in the future our trade relationship with this country will be closer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is a question involved there, however. Going back to the provisions of the Independence Act, we have the step-up and step-out privilege. Do you propose to bring back into operation through rehabilitation as great a production as you had before? Or do you propose in reestablishing that industry to bring back only a part of that production and to diversify into other industries which would not raise the free trade relationship problem?

Mr. ROMULO. The plan is to diversify so that our economy will not be geared entirely to the American economy; that is the plan of President Osmeña which he has outlined in his speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I hope the gentleman will take the floor some day and further enlighten us on that phase.

Mr. ROMULO. I certainly will.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I wish the gentleman would answer the question I asked a while ago in reference to the standard scale of wages. If you want free trade with America then you should have the same schedule of wages. Does the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. ROMULO. America will have air and naval bases in the Philippines. Certainly America would not want to have the Philippines on an unstable economy. Low standards would mean unrest. America would be interested in having the Philippines on a firm and substantial basis.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman that America would, but what are the Philippines going to do?

Mr. ROMULO. The Philippines are just as interested as is America. We are interested in free trade because if you close your markets to us we shall not have this high-priced market that will enable us to buy products from the United States which we cannot otherwise afford and which will help us maintain our standard of living.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman understands that we cannot open our high-priced markets to his country unless his country has the same kind of markets there; it has got to be a reciprocal matter.

Mr. ROMULO. It will be a reciprocal matter. American products will come into the Philippines tariff-free, duty-free, as they are now. When America gives us her markets she enables us to buy American commodities. You have a complete American market there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one additional minute to the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I have two questions to ask the gentleman. First, when the Philippines become entirely independent of the United States, how in the face of the most-favored-nations clause and policy can we grant complete free trade to the Philippines? Second, would not the authority under the existing trade agreement act to reduce present tariffs by 75 percent be virtually equivalent to free trade so far as the Philippine people are concerned?

Mr. ROMULO. I will answer the gentleman's first question by saying that a bill will be introduced today by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, that will answer this question relating to the most-favored-nations clause in the Trade Agreement Act. It will also answer the other question regarding the 75-percent tariff-reduction power.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to extend his remarks.

(Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, addressing myself specifically to the legislation, H. R. 3636, it will be informative to the House to know that this measure brings the sale of striped bass, locally known as rockfish, into conformity with sales practices in the States of Virginia and Maryland.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. This is a matter that we had hearings on before the committee after the bill was reported to the House on certain objections that were urged?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Virginia is correct. This is a compromise bill that has been endorsed by the Maryland and Virginia authorities as well as by the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Izaak Walton groups and others interested.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. I want to thank the chairman of the District Committee for the very fine way in which he has handled this matter. The provision of the bill meet with the approval of our watermen, so I understand, and we are grateful to him indeed for the way this matter has been handled.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE WITH RESPECT TO MAKING AND PUBLISHING OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF TRUST COMPANIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3867) to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to the making and publishing of annual reports by trust companies, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of having the gentleman from West Virginia explain the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, who calls attention to the necessity for a brief explanation of this bill, is the ranking minority member of the House District Committee. All of these measures today, as he knows, are brought to the House with the unanimous approval of the members of the District Committee.

In connection with this measure, I desire to state that its purpose is to relieve trust companies within the District of Columbia of the necessity of filing public annual reports for submission to the Comptroller of the Currency since they are already required to file reports annually under section 5211 of the Revised Statutes. There is some duplication and this is legislation to amend the present law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 730 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 edition, sec. 26–318), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided, however,* That trust companies which are required to file and to publish reports under the provisions of section 5211 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, shall not be required to make or publish the annual report required under this section."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FREE COPIES OF RECORDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR VETERANS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3868) to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the District of Columbia without the payment of any fees, for use in preserting claims to the Veterans' Administration, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object only for the purpose of having the gentleman from West Virginia make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under this legislation we would provide free copies of records within the District of Columbia to the veterans of this war. The purpose of the legislation is to bring into uniformity the regulations within the District of Columbia as they are in force in the various States.

We have had the support of the American Legion, the United States Veterans' Administration, and the District Commissioners on behalf of this bill. It simply facilitates the handling of these records and allows the veterans to have them free of charge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., that when a copy of any public record of the District of Columbia is required by the Veterans' Administration to be used in determining the eligibility of any person to participate in benefits made available by the Veterans' Administration, the official custodian of such public record shall without charge provide the applicant for such benefits or any person (including any veterans' organization) acting on his behalf or the authorized representative of

the Veterans' Administration with a certified copy of such record.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OPENING OF ROAD WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAINING SCHOOL, ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY, MD.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the last measure to be called up by the District Committee today is H. R. 3873, to provide for the opening of a road within the boundaries of the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md., and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from West Virginia to explain the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this provides for the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make necessary transfers of land in connection with the development and the opening of a road by the State of Maryland into Fort Meade. It is a jurisdictional matter and has the approval of the Commissioners as well as the Bureau of the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to convey to the State of Maryland the land and connections thereto necessary for use as a public thoroughfare through the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md., as shown on map No. 3094, filed in the office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby further authorized to grant an easement to the State of Maryland over the land and connections thereto, abutting said thoroughfare for slopes made necessary by the construction of this roadway.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH PROGRAMS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 349 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees. It has been unanimously reported; and from all information that I have obtained, it appears to me there is no opposition, and I feel there should not be any opposition to the bill. I think it is legislation in the right direction. The chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service [Mr. RAMSPECK] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who introduced the bill, are both here, and I know that they will explain the provisions of the bill and the need for this legislation. The resolution calls for 1 hour's general debate on the bill, after which it will be taken up under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up any great amount of time and I desire to be called when I have spoken 5 minutes. However, I cannot resist using a few minutes to call attention to the speeches that have been made here today. The fault finding and criticism that we hear on this floor against the War Department and other departments on demobilization of members of our armed forces is really amusing. Of course, I presume they feel they could do a better job than General Marshall and his staff and could have even conducted the war more efficiently than under his direction. But I doubt it very much. Although I have urged the War Department for some time to expedite demobilization, I am now satisfied, especially since hearing General Marshall, that it is doing everything humanly possible to bring the boys back as speedily as possible. I feel the personnel having to do with the return and discharge of the veterans are now commencing to carry out the expressed request and wish of the President, who has insisted that those who have served 2 years overseas should be brought back as quickly as conditions permit. Consequently I hope that from now on we will have a little less criticism, which I feel in a majority of cases is unwarranted.

I also heard a few Members express fears of strikes, and blaming it all upon labor, never considering for a moment that perhaps some of the industries themselves might be responsible for the strikes. Labor is obliged to assert itself and to exert some influence to secure rights and privileges which are being denied it by various large corporations. Naturally some gentlemen on the floor, as usual, express their fears of communism. Personally I think their statements are far-fetched and invariably are made to detract the attention of the American people from the real danger to our country, namely, the Fascist activities. What I would advise these gentlemen to investigate is some of the Fascist groups in this country and the activities of some gentlemen who I think are going much further in disrupting conditions in the United States than the much-abused so-called Communists.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman think the Communists are abused? The gentleman says "the much-abused Communists." The gentleman must think the Communists of this country are abused, then, according to his own statement.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is here and he will again pay his respects to the Communists. I agree with him that there is no room for them in this country. There is no question about that, but this is a free country.

Mr. RANKIN. Then why is the gentleman jumping on the Committee on Un-American Activities, the only committee we have in this House to investigate them?

Mr. SABATH. Just a moment; I have not said anything against the committee to investigate them. But I will say this, that you should also investigate the Fascist groups, those that are guilty of real subversive activities, and we have many here and they are not Communists. I can give the gentleman a list.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, we will be glad to examine the gentleman before the committee.

Mr. SABATH. I will come with pleasure, and I will show you that the men whose names I will give to the gentleman are guilty to a greater degree of disrupting conditions in this country than those that the gentleman claims are Communists. I admit there are some few fools.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman tell us why he has not given us that already if he has that information? Why has he not given that information to the Congress, to the public, and to the Committee on Un-American Activities if he has it?

Mr. SABATH. I have given it to the House and to the country many times, but no one has paid any attention to the subversive activities of these Fascists and these men who are creating trouble day in and day out, or to those who are publishing various pamphlets that are un-American and subversive. There are many others who are active in creating disturbances and troubles all over. I hope that when the gentleman starts to investigate Communist activities he will also investigate Gerald L. K. Smith, J. E. McWilliams, and his ilk, and I give you the names of a few more rabble rousers and the names of organizations that are creating more trouble than those charged by the gentleman from Mississippi, namely, E. A. Rumley, M. K. Hart, Friedrich H. Auhagen, Joseph P. Kamp, George E. Deatherage, Elizabeth Dilling, James True, George Sylvester Viereck, Charles

B. Hudson, Gerald B. Winrod, Robert Edward Edmondson, Edward James Smythe, and Col. Eugene N. Sanctuary. Some of the organizations which I suggest be investigated are the Cross and the Flag, American Mothers, Christian American Crusade, White Shirts, Black Dragon Society, Christian Front, Silver Shirts, Gentile Front, and the Paul Revere Sentinels. Of course, there are a great many other individuals and organizations whose activities should be investigated, and if the gentleman from Mississippi desires, I can submit a list of them.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I say that I am just as much opposed to Communist activities as is the gentleman from Mississippi, but I do not make it a business merely to jump on every labor leader and charge him with being a Communist because he advocates the cause of labor and the cause of good government.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I should like to return to the bill itself. I want to know what the words "and for other purposes" mean in line 10 on page 2 of the bill.

Mr. SABATH. As I said, there is present the gentleman who introduced the bill, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. They are thoroughly familiar with the provisions of the bill—more so than I am. Consequently, I am not going to deny them the right and privilege of explaining the bill, because I know it will be a pleasure for them to do so in an intelligent and informative manner, giving first-hand information to the gentleman and to all other Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to follow the example of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules part way. His speech consisted of two parts. First he explained that he did not thoroughly understand the bill that is coming up, and would not attempt to talk about it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. I did not state that I do not understand the bill. I said the bill will be more thoroughly explained by the proponents of the measure and the chairman of the committee which reported the bill than I can myself. I always feel these men who have spent weeks and weeks hearing evidence on the need for legislation are in a better position than you or I as members of the Committee on Rules who only hear the chairman and the ranking minority member on the application for the rule.

Mr. MICHENER. I stand corrected. I shall follow his example in not attempting to discuss a bill about which I have little information. However, I shall not follow his example in wandering off into the realm of politics here, there, hither and yon, with no starting point or stopping point nor even a landing point in sight. There is one thing we are glad to know, as the chairman has announced in unmistakable terms, that he is against communism, and that there is no place in America for communism.

Mr. SABATH. Nor for fascism.

Mr. MICHENER. I take it then, if that is true, if communism is a bad thing and if it is dangerous to the American system, of course, the gentleman can have no objection to the Congress, in its wisdom, trying to ferret out or find any way that this agency which he so seriously condemns is attempting to do that which he thinks is wrong and thus destroy our Government. I am not going to get into politics at all.

Mr. Speaker, I have no request for time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2716, with Mr. COFFEE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was drafted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Civil Service, headed by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], to whom I will yield in a few moments for a detailed explanation of the bill. I simply want to say in opening this discussion that this bill will not necessarily create anything that we do not already have in the Government. Many of the agencies do have a health program under authority which they have received in most cases from the subcommittee on appropriations before which they appear. However, this bill would correlate these agencies and activities and require that hereafter they go to the Civil Service Commission for approval when they want to establish health services, and then the Civil Service Commission would consult with the Public Health Service before granting that permission.

After securing the permission of the Commission it would still be necessary for them to come before the proper subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations before they could put it into effect.

The bill has the approval of the American Medical Association and numerous other agencies, representatives of which testified during the hearings.

As far as I know, there is no opposition to the legislation. I think it will be a step in the right direction, because it coordinates an activity that is already going on to some extent, and would make it possible to improve the service.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This bill does not provide for medical care to be paid for out of Government funds?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; it does not. It goes a little further than the first-aid stations, but it does not provide that the Government shall furnish a doctor for anybody.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Nor to pay for any medical services for anybody?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Not except what might be rendered in an emergency at the place of employment. If they need a doctor they will be advised to secure their own physician.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And that would be paid for, then, by the Government?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Oh, no. If they need a physician they will get their own physician and the employee will have to pay for it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. For an emergency?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. Of course, the first-aid room on the job would take care of that temporarily.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This is "either injury or illness."

Mr. RAMSPECK. That means a temporary illness when the employee is at work; for instance, when a person faints or has some temporary illness, perhaps due to eating something that disagreed with him. He might be given first-aid attention and then sent home and advised to call his own physician.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Further down the bill says "preemployment and other examinations." What does that term "other examinations" mean?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Well, I do not know that I can tell the gentleman just what that means. I can give him some illustrations of what goes on in the Government now. Every person employed in the civilian branch of the Government must first be examined physically. Then there have been periods when employees have been examined to ascertain whether or not tuberculosis is existent in the staff or not. That would probably come under the statement the gentlemen just read.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In the bill you speak about "education and preventive programs relating to health." How would that be done except through the Government paying for it?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Of course, that is dealing with the employees on the job. It is contemplated in this act, as a part of the health program, that employees would be advised how to keep themselves healthy so they can remain on the job. It is done in private industry all the time. The Government is lagging behind. Some of the agencies of the Government, as I said, are now doing it, but some are not. There is no coordination of the

program at all. There is no central agency to see whether they are doing it at all or whether they are overdoing it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman explain the words "minor illness"?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I will ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] to do that when he makes his explanation of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] such time as he may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Perhaps the gentleman would yield at this time to explain that term "minor illnesses."

Mr. RANDOLPH. I will be glad to explain it. A minor illness would be anything which would occur while a person was actively engaged in the performance of his or her service to the Government. It might be a temporary dizziness which would take place as the result of overeating or some type of indulgence. It could be mental anxiety, or conditions of pressure under which the worker was doing his or her job. It might also be a temporary condition that might take place during certain activities on the job which the person should not carry forward.

The American Medical Association, through its representatives in testifying when we had extensive hearings, discussed in some detail the types of illnesses that could be called minor; and in all of those instances we would refer the person affected to the private physician of that person for treatment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Except the immediate treatment that might be needed for the time being, while he is in his place of work; is that it?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Ohio is correct; and let me say that I appreciate the gentleman's questions in reference to this legislation because it is my feeling as the author of the bill, and it is the feeling of the subcommittee which held the hearings and of the entire Civil Service Committee which favorably reported this measure, that there is one fact that we want to keep in mind and that I know the gentleman from Ohio, himself a doctor, wants to have kept in mind, and that is that we are not bringing this legislation here in any attempt to socialize medicine in the Federal service.

We believe, as does the gentleman from Ohio, that there is a place for this health program just as there has been a place in the private industry of this country for this type of program. We do not want to be misunderstood. In the report in at least three places we have stated that this is not an attempt in any manner to go into the field of the private physician or hospital. We are simply attempting to take care of temporary or minor illnesses, then referring the person concerned to his or her private physician for the correction of the trouble. We believe this will enable the employee to be a more effective public servant and actually earn the salary or wage which is paid him by the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I wish to express my gratitude to the gentleman from West Virginia for the position he is taking in respect to socialized medicine.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What is meant by the phrase appearing in line 8 on page 1, "to establish by contract"? I wish the gentleman would explain that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We mean that the agency itself would have the responsibility of setting up its individual preventive health program. We would put that burden upon the individual agency after that agency had received the approval of the Civil Service Commission and the United States Public Health Service and after a showing before the Appropriations Committee of need had actually received from Congress whatever funds were necessary. It would be a method by which that agency would set up its health program.

Mr. RICH. If these various agencies employ doctors, are the doctors to be under the jurisdiction of the agency? Or will the agency contract with some private physician to do the work?

Mr. RANDOLPH. They could have a full-time medical officer or a part-time medical officer who would be practicing medicine in his own private capacity. It is estimated, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that at least one medical officer should be used for approximately 4,000 to 6,000 employees. The exact ratio would depend, as we have stated in our report, upon the number of shifts that might be worked, the types of industrial hazard that enter into the employment, the turn-over, and other conditions.

We have also estimated that nurses would be required at the rate of one for each thousand employees. So a small agency or bureau might find that a part-time medical officer would suffice, and that physician would practice medicine in his own field, devoting a certain number of hours to the agency in question, and the agency would pay for the service received.

Mr. RICH. Is it expected that they will put clinics or hospital rooms in every department and subdivision of Government—have every agency on its own?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; I do not believe we contemplate that, nor do I believe we should do it. I think that the proof of the agency's need for medical officers and nurses will lie in this fact: After it has cleared the Civil Service Commission, the Public Health Service, and the Appropriations Committee of this House, the Members will then know whether or not that agency needs the request and whether we believe we should give them the funds to carry forward.

Mr. RICH. Has the gentleman any data that have been submitted in the hearings that will tell us what the cost of this program will be; that is, putting in all the departments of the Government the provisions of the bill as outlined here?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I cannot give the gentleman a figure that will be all inclusive, perhaps, but we did in the hearings get from certain agencies that do have health programs in progress their costs. The War Production Board had an annual cost of operating its service of $48,000.

Mr. RICH. That is the War Production Board?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The War Production Board, yes; which, of course, is an emergency agency. I may say to the gentleman—and I think he will be very interested in knowing the fact—that certain agencies and bureaus within the Federal structure have actually circumvented the law—and these words are chosen advisedly—and have used funds delegated to an agency for purposes that would be carried forward in this bill, but they have done so without any authority. We had instances of that type brought before the committee. There were instances where the bureau, the board, or the agency had asked for a medical program and it was set up with a certain fund and the Congress approved it. The Department of Commerce has had a first-aid program costing approximately $24,000 a year. It serves approximately 11,300 employees. It was estimated, therefore, that the average cost per person would be about $2.14. The Treasury Department also had a program which was carried.

Mr. RICH. What did it cost there?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The cost to the Treasury Department was approximately $103,000 for an estimated 31,500 employees.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has given just three items, the WPB, the Department of Commerce, and the Treasury Department, which involves an expenditure of about $175,000. In all the departments of the Government what does the gentleman estimate it is going to cost to put this into effect if we pass the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would not hazard to tell the gentleman what I believe it will cost because when any agency has gone through the steps I have outlined of approval by the Civil Service Commission, by the United States Public Health Service, then by the Appropriations Committee of this House, we have shaken down any excess demands which could be made by those agencies for this type of program. In other words, each and every agency will have to stand on its own presentation of need for the funds which it requests.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that, but when we talk about shaking down, it seems to me that the Appropriations Committee has not shaken down enough heretofore in the operation of the Government during the past 12 or 15 years. All you have to do is look at the Treasury statement and you will see we have been shaken up and we are going to be shaken up a whole lot more before we get down to earth unless we know where we are going so far as securing the funds is concerned because the taxpayers of this country have about reached the point where they are breaking. We talk about reducing taxes, but if we keep saddling

on to the Government one thing after another, we are going to find that the Treasury will crack, unless we do away with some branches of government. When the Treasury of the United States cracks we are through as a democratic form of government, and we are going to lose our form of government. We in this House ought to be businessmen enough to know what a bill of this kind is going to cost, and to know how we are going to handle the affairs of this country, or we are not fit to run this Government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think it is important that I say to my colleague from Pennsylvania that I have the privilege of serving with him on the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. We have reported legislation which will be brought to this floor on Wednesday afternoon, and in that legislation it was my desire during its consideration that not a single agency or bureau be exempt from a reorganization plan which would be sent to Congress by the President of the United States.

Mr. RICH. I am going to support that bill, too.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In 1939, as the gentleman will recall, many of us on this floor did not want to have the legislation of that year scuttled by 15, 20, or 25 agencies being exempted. I joined him in believing that the sprawling octopus of this Government should be curtailed, and I think my record will show that I have joined in that regard. Because he brings the cost to our attention, I think it is apropos at this point to say that in February 1945 the Federal employees of the United States totaled approximately 2,900,000. If the average of 7 days of sick leave per year were reduced to 6 days, a saving of more than 5,500,000 man-days per year would result. This I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], would be the equivalent of about 20,000 full-time workers. If the time lost were reduced to 5 days per year, that is, by sick leave, a saving of 4,800,000 man-days would result, or the equivalent of 30,000 full-time workers. So I believe the philosophy of the legislation goes to the goal anticipated by the gentleman, because the people would be on the job. Absenteeism and turn-over would be decreased.

Mr. RICH. May I say here that in no way do I cast any reflection on the gentleman from West Virginia, but I do cast reflection on the Congress for the way we are doing business and the way we are heading, because we are heading for ruin, and if any Member of Congress—and I do not care which side of the aisle he stands on—gets up and says, "We can go on, and on, and on and not take account of the cost of every item that we are putting into Government," we are going to find out that eventually we will be ruined. If the gentleman from Georgia can give us the answer, I think we deserve that answer before we pass this legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia, but it is no reflection upon the gentleman from West Virginia, nor will it be upon the gentleman from Georgia if they cannot answer the question which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has asked, because each and every agency of this Government will have to make a showing before they can take advantage of this legislation.

Mr. RICH. The point is that you ought to find out before you pass legislation, and that applies to the gentleman from West Virginia, the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Pennsylvania. That applies to me just as much as it does to you gentlemen. We ought to know what this is leading us into before we pass it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I will say that it is leading us to an operation in the Federal Government as private industry has operated all these days and found to be good, and that is that the type of health and preventive programs within private industry have proven themselves from a dollars-and-cents standpoint; otherwise private industry would not carry them on.

Mr. RICH. I apply it in my industry.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I know the gentleman does.

Mr. RICH. But I know where we are heading in my own business. I do not know where we are heading for in this Government.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am not going to attempt to answer the question that the gentleman from Pennsylvania asked the gentleman from West Virginia, but I will attempt to point this out, that this bill does not necessarily cost a nickel.

Mr. RICH. It does not what?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It does not necessarily cost anything. It simply is a system by which we can find out what we are spending for health service. The gentleman was at one time a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not know whether or not he is now on that committee.

Mr. RICH. No; I am not on that committee, because I was not a Member of Congress during the term preceding this session.

Mr. RAMSPECK. This is what happens. An agency that has a cordial relationship with a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee comes up here and says, "We want to put in a first-aid room." They get some money for a health service. There are a number of those operating. Nobody, as far as I know, knows just how many there are or what they are spending. This bill will make it necessary that all be coordinated through one agency, but the bill does not give them a single dollar. They still have to go to the Committee on Appropriations just as they do now.

Mr. RICH. That is the same old story we always hear, that we pass a bill and then they go to the Committee on Appropriations to get the money.

Mr. RAMSPECK. They are getting it now.

Mr. RICH. That is just trying to cover up.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I am not trying to cover anything up; I am explaining the system that is in operation.

Mr. RICH. It is a bad system.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is a system of which the gentleman was a part when he was on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RICH. It is still a bad system.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I say it is bad, too. That is why I am trying to improve it.

Mr. RICH. I should like to do that, too, but I do not know how you are going to do it. I think the system is bad. I should like to know definitely where we are heading.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is what we are trying to do by providing that these agencies have to go through a central agency before they can have this service, instead of getting it from a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RANDOLPH. They are doing it, in some cases, by the back door now.

Mr. RICH. This would not go in effect until after we pass the legislation next week so that all these departments are shaken down, as it were; and we get rid of a lot of these Government agencies. We do not want to establish a service in a certain agency and find out 2 or 3 months from now that it is going to be eliminated by the Chief Executive, which I hope it will be. We do not want to establish something now in those agencies and have to throw them out later. You give a department head a few days' notice and he will spend money and do everything he can to increase the number of his employees, because he gets a larger salary if he has more employees. I want to prevent that if I can. Will the gentleman see that if this legislation goes through we will not permit these services to be established in agencies that are going to be either consolidated with some other department or eliminated altogether by the Chief Executive?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I can give the gentleman that assurance because certainly each and every request by an agency or bureau will have to go through the agency in question, and it would take months, of course, for them to establish their case, if properly presented. So I agree with the gentleman that in these wartime agencies which the President, we trust, will eliminate very quickly, these services should not be established. We trust not only that these agencies will be eliminated but that their functions will not be transferred to other agencies. I think one particular fault we have these days is that if we drop off an agency we allow the functions of that agency to be carried on by some other group. That is the reason the gentleman has joined the other members of the committee in reporting a bill from the Committee on Expenditures which will lop off the functions as well as the personnel.

Mr. RICH. That is right.

May I say also that I am sympathetic with legislation that will take care of the people, but I am against socialized medicine. I want that understood. I do not want to socialize this Government. There is a clique in this country and the Congress that wants to socialize everything. I am against it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I join with the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Further, why are you going to exempt the Tennessee Valley Authority? They want to be exempted

from everything. I think this Government ought to have a say over what they are doing.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I say that the Tennessee Valley Authority came before our committee and gave us the operations of their own health program which is now in progress.

We have had a request for amendment of this legislation, received from Secretary of War Stimson prior to his resignation, in which he asked that the Panama Canal be included in this exemption as well as the Tennessee Valley Authority, because those organizations are set up apart from the actual control of the Congress as far as they operate, as the gentleman knows. I am not attempting now to argue the philosophy of the TVA, but I am simply saying that in this instance they do have operating a health program under their own set-up.

Mr. RICH. I think the quicker we have the TVA audited by the Comptroller General the better it is going to be for this country. If we do that, we will know how judiciously and how wisely they are spending their money.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The Comptroller General audits the Tennessee Valley Authority at the present time.

Mr. RICH. No; he does not.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; he does.

Mr. RICH. He does not.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. GORE. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that what the gentleman from Mississippi has informed him is true. The Comptroller General audits the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Do they have this kind of service in first- and second-class post offices of the United States?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I cannot answer that. Perhaps the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, can answer the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is not material with reference to what I want to know. This would cover employees and officers in the first- and second-class post offices of the United States?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It would cover any department or agency of the Government, upon the proper showing to Congress after preliminary steps necessary to be taken.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Of course, the gentleman has no idea of the number of people this will put on the pay roll?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have simply stated to the gentleman very frankly, and I hope very honestly, that we have approximately, let us say, about 2,900,000 employees at the present time and we do have many of these agencies and departments that have carried on these health programs. They have done it sometimes without the authority or sanction of Congress in most instances. They have used funds that we have appropriated for their general use and have transferred them to these health programs. We would make these agencies come before the Civil Service Commission and the Public Health authorities and then come to Congress to get their authority to carry on any type of health program.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that this will be an economy act from the point of view of the number of dollars involved?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I believe it will be an economy.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will there be less appropriations for this character of service under this bill if it becomes law than we are now paying out?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe, as does the gentleman from Kentucky, in the employees of the Federal Government getting service to the *n*th degree. I believe this type of program will enable a better service to be given and ultimately the cost to the taxpayers will be less.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is not my question. We are giving these services, but in a rather haphazard way. We do not have a unified service. Does the gentleman believe it will lessen or increase the cost to the Federal Government?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In the first instance, I think it would perhaps increase the cost, but in the final analysis it would do what it has done in private industry, that is, it would reduce the cost.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman spoke about private industry having their doctors and nurses, and so forth. Do not the employees of private industry pay into a fund so much a month from their wages for hospital and nursing expenses and other medical expenses?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think, in some instances, that is true, although there are concerns I know of which give that assistance.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Of course, under this bill the Government would do it and our workers would receive those services free so far as they are concerned, would they not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Some of the questions that I was going to touch upon have been cleared up. One question was about the cost. On page 6 of the committee report it shows that the cost averages from $2.16 to $4.67 per individual, depending upon the department. The other question was that which the gentleman from Kentucky has touched upon. I think in most private industries they have a health program which is excellent. We should have one in the Government. But in private industry the individual pays in from 50 cents to a dollar a month, or whatever the cost might be, for attention or services that he might receive or which his family might receive. In this instance we are expecting eventually to set up a health program taking care of nearly 3,000,000 people, all at the cost of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment on the observation of my friend the gentleman from Nebraska, because it certainly is pertinent. I will say that in private industry, while I have studied the subject somewhat but not to the extent that the gentleman has, I find that those services go far beyond any services that are contemplated by this legislation.

The actual hospital bill is paid, and direct medical care is provided. We do not do that in this legislation. We refer the individual in question to his own private physician. We do not attempt to give any medical care or hospital assistance. I think the gentleman would agree with me that there is a difference in the private-industry program and that which would be forwarded by this legislation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Suppose this legislation is passed and you establish this health program in various Government agencies. Is that going to include medical aid and assistance to all the families of all the employees of the Government?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is not. The actual worker on the job is the only one provided for.

Mr. RICH. This is not the opening wedge for socialized medicine?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I repeat that I am against such programs. I have consistently been against them and I would not sponsor this legislation if it led even a short way in that direction.

Mr. RICH. How do we know that this is not going to eventually get us to that point? I want to be careful that we do not now establish something that will engulf us in socialism and communism in this country. I want to do anything in the world to keep away from that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In the closing seconds remaining, I will say that the passage of this resolution will reduce the turn-over and absenteeism in the Federal Government. It will therefore produce more efficiency and productivity by employees of the Federal Government. It will reduce administrative recruiting costs and make it possible in some instances to get work done with fewer employees, which I think is interesting to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Kentucky, and others who have asked pertinent questions as to why this committee has brought this legislation to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in this bill when it was before our committee, being a member of the

Civil Service Committee. I asked the gentleman from West Virginia a question or two. I know he has the highest motives and I believe if the bill would do what he thinks it will do under proper administration it might be good legislation. I am fearful, however, that it will not. That we may be starting down a road, if we approve it, that will continue to widen and continue to lengthen, and following the experience of the past it may prove to be very expensive for the National Government. I have never been quite able to make up my mind whether this legislation should be approved. The reason why I have not been able to do so is my lack of confidence in national administration generally among the various bureaus.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has pointed out that many of these governmental organizations, without the power of Congress and without its sanction, have set up clinical services, and so forth, in the various departments and are using Government money, almost illegally, I should say, to develop a health service in those various departments. If that be true, how can we trust the Appropriations Committee to keep them properly shaken down; how can we trust those departments not to go too far if we give them the sanction of legality by passing this act?

He said these programs would have to clear through the Civil Service Commission, the Public Health Department, and then be further checked by the Committee on Appropriations. These checks are necessary, and they should be wisely and properly applied. But will they? The answer is "No." The gentleman from West Virginia argued further that the health programs in business have been a success, and they must be good else they would not be continued and participated in by the big business concerns of the country. As was pointed out by the gentleman from Nebraska, in this instance there is a cooperative effort in that the employee contributes toward the cost of the service. This makes it quite different from the case where the Federal Government pays all. In such a case the Federal bureaus would not be so interested in conserving the finances of the Government as would the businessmen who help pay for the health programs in private business. So that is not a parallel which integrates very well in that argument.

We must assume further that if medical services are set up in the various Government departments there will of necessity be some initial outlay for equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. I could see where this service might be greatly expanded throughout the Nation. It occurs to me it might put a great many more people on the pay roll and might develop into a rather large and expensive organization. If I could be assured that this would not happen, I would be for the bill, but, judging the future by the past, I cannot bring myself to believe that this organization will be properly administered. For that reason, I cannot support the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I would call the committee's attention to certain phases of this bill and to the existing health program in the Federal Government. At the present time some 22 different governmental agencies deal with the health of the Federal employees and the citizens of the United States. Some time ago I introduced a bill to create a Secretary for Health in the President's Cabinet to bring all health activities under one head. We have the Public Health Service, we have the Labor Department, we have the Department of Agriculture, and a great many other agencies dealing with health. In this bill we set up another agency, as I see it; that is the Civil Service Commission. Perhaps it is needed. I have no objection to giving some preventive medical care to the health of Federal employees, but I do believe that this bill goes too far. You will find the following statement of purpose on the very first page of the bill:

> That, for the purpose of promoting and maintaining the physical and mental fitness of employees of the Federal Government, the heads of departments and agencies, including Government-owned and controlled corporations are authorized, within the limits of appropriations made available therefor, to establish by contract or otherwise health programs which will provide health services for employees under their respective jurisdictions.

I would point out in this connection that the physical fitness and mental health program for individuals is rather wide. That takes in all of the vaccination programs, all of the examinations ordinarily done by physicians. It also takes in the care of dental conditions, which would include extracting teeth and making bridges. The program presented here, if the Appropriations Committee is generous enough, attempts to give a rather complete health service to Federal employees. It establishes another agency, within the present agencies, with very wide authority. It would cost up to $9,000,000 a year.

In contrast with what is happening in private industry, let me say to you that the individual in private industry pays so much a month for the care he gets. In this bill the Congress is going out on a road which will lead to an extended health program far beyond what was originally intended by the bill. If the Federal employee were going to pay 25 cents or 50 cents a month, or whatever it might be, for his care, it would be a different story; but here you are setting up an agency, the Civil Service Commission, to deal with health problems. It is true they consult with the United States Public Health Service and are limited by the appropriations which the Congress might give. The Federal employee now has a generous sick-leave and vacation privilege. In this bill to cost the taxpayer $9,000,000 we start on a health program. I am doubtful whether this type of program should be adopted by the Congress.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The speaker is a practicing physician in private civil life. Did I understand one of the previous speakers, the proponent of the bill, to say that this bill had the support of the American Medical Association?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the hearings someone appeared before the committee, a Dr. Peterson, who outlined his views to the committee on how industrial health services should be conducted. He was asked whether he and the American Medical Association supported the bill and his answer was "Yes." I have had no word from the American Medical Association and I do not know if this Dr. Peterson represents them, but I may say that in my early life I practiced as a contract physician with a copper mine and I know all of the employees of the copper mine paid in so much a month for the care of themselves and their families, and this was a rather complete care; but I think it is a dangerous thing for the Congress to start appropriating for the care of 3,000,000 Federal employees and give them a health program without limitation, and I do not find any limitation in this bill except the appropriations from the Congress.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As I understand it, we have about 500,000 or nearly that number employed by this Government in foreign countries. I am wondering if this bill covers those people?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am wondering if this bill in its broad language as stated in its beginning covers those four or five hundred thousand Federal employees in foreign countries? Many of them are foreign nationals and not American citizens at all.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am sure it covers them.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to hear from the chairman of the committee or the ranking Republican member of the committee.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HEDRICK. I am sure the gentleman from Nebraska, being a physician, believes in preventive medicine and that this country will be faced with that problem in the future. The prevention of sickness and disease is the best investment in the world. Absenteeism from corporations has cost millions of dollars very year due to sickness. If that can be prevented by regular examination, by regular tests, it is money

well spent. Let us take the case of the Metropolitan Insurance Co., for instance: they pay health nurses to go around over the districts and examine their policyholders in order to keep them in good health so that they will not be sick. If the Metropolitan Insurance Co. thinks preventive medicine is a good idea, I do not see why the Members of Congress should not think so, too.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This goes far beyond preventive medicine. It takes care of all minor ills, all dental matters; it takes care of the entire health program outside of the preventive field, and that is the thing to which I am objecting.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did not the policyholders pay enough in premiums to provide that service?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Certainly the policyholders eventually pay for all of it.

Mr. HEDRICK. But they are not assessed anything additional for that service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is not one thing in this legislation that is intended, so far as I am able to ascertain—that points in the direction of socialized medicine. I am just as much opposed to what I understand as socialized medicine as anyone on the floor of the House, and I am sure the author of this bill takes a similar position. He has repeated two or three times his position with respect to that question. So it is not intended in anywise to involve or include socialized medicine. This legislation is intended only to provide medical care for temporary ailments and injuries of employees while at work. It is not intended to provide medical care for the employees at their homes. That must be taken care of by the employees' private physician. It is emergency medical treatment. That is all there is involved in this legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. On page 1 of the bill it is stated, as one of the purposes, that the intent is to authorize the heads of Federal agencies to establish, by contract or otherwise, health programs for the employees.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, the heads of these departments or bureaus could establish a health program and it would be mandatory upon the employees of that department, would it not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will answer that in this way: I do not know whether the distinguished gentleman was on the floor when we started the discussion on this bill or not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was not.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It was very definitely explained that, in the first instance, we do have these programs in our agencies at the present time. A number of our agencies have health programs. They are spending a considerable amount of money; in fact, it runs into the millions of dollars. Other agencies do not have them. One agency will have one kind of program and another agency will have a different one. We have been doing that for a long time. This legislation proposes that we coordinate our health programs in Government. Of course, we have to determine on a policy as to whether or not we want a health program in Government. Do you want a program that has to do with the protection of the health of the Government employees, or do you not? That is one thing to be determined. I believe the Members of this Congress are in favor of a reasonable but not extravagant program to protect the health of its employees for two reasons. Of course, one of them is that it should be done as a matter of right; and the second, as the author of this bill has explained, is that it means dollars and cents to the taxpayers of this country. That was illustrated with respect to industrial insurance. Of course, they want to protect their employees and keep them in good health, just as the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. wants to keep its clients in good health. It pays to do it.

If we are going to have a program of health service, is it not much better to coordinate these activities so that we will know where we are with respect to it, and not be in the position we are now? Under this legislation it is proposed that this program will not only be coordinated, but it will have to be approved by the Civil Service Commission, since all of the employees involved here are either directly or indirectly under civil service. This program also must be approved by your own public health agency, and then besides that the program will have to have the approval of the Committee on Appropriations of your own Congress. One of the difficulties or one of the complaints has been that some of these agencies have put on health programs, but this Congress has not known how much money has gone into its health programs in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, or any other department. The hearings disclose that some departments have spent more money than others for similar services. In fact many Members of this House do not realize large amounts are being appropriated for health services.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I ask the gentleman how the program is being conducted now?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself seven additional minutes.

I have tried to explain to the gentleman from Nebraska, and I think the author of the bill has also tried to explain, the method by which the program operates at the present time. It provides for emergency treatment for employees while they are employed at their work.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Who pays for it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The United States Government pays for it, certainly. It is done because it is believed that it means dollars and cents to the taxpayers of this country to protect and help its employees, so that they will not lose as much time as they would otherwise lose in their employment. This proposal is not like industrial insurance at all, where sick benefits are involved. The gentleman from West Virginia gave figures with respect to the number of manhours that are lost to the Government, which, after all, are lost by reason of unemployment on account of sickness and slight injuries. We are trying to help protect the employees against that by this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman knows that in some of the Government agencies the personnel themselves today are paying for their own medical care through their own organization. The Government is not paying for it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right. That has nothing whatever to do with this legislation. We hope among other things to help protect the Government against absenteeism. We have too much of it now. This might help a little. The medical care to which the gentleman refers is for care of the person while away from work, even in the hospital.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Has the gentleman any statistics to show what the absenteeism is that results from such diseases as could be prevented by the institution of this particular program?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; we do not have any statistics on that subject. The gentleman himself by reason of his experience as a doctor in dealing with all kinds of diseases knows there is naturally a good deal of absenteeism that might be prevented if there were a little bit of protection given these employees. What I am trying to get across to the gentleman is that since we have a program, a part of a program, in Government at the present time, it seems to me it would be better, we would get more out of it, more people would be taken care of, and it would be the economical thing to do, if we would coordinate it and get it under some kind of control. There are too many of our activities that have gotten out of control, and this is one of them. So let us try to get it under a little control and improve it, unless you want to knock it out. If you want to knock out the whole program, that is another story altogether. I am just trying to improve it if we are going to continue to have a health program in Government. If the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Nebraska think we ought to knock this program out of the Government and not have it at all, that is something else, but I say let us coordinate it and use it the best way we can if we are going to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In England and in Germany, the European countries where they instituted programs similar

to this to prevent absenteeism, the result has been in practically every instance to increase absenteeism.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In a health program?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am very much surprised and disappointed that that should be the case.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to my colleague from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. During the time these health programs have taken place, as I understood the gentleman from Kansas to say, they have been operated under different plans, there have been different types of health programs in these agencies.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not sure that the gentleman was on the floor when this was discussed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have been here practically since the discussion began.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then the gentleman heard the gentleman from West Virginia, author of the bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am not worried about the gentleman from West Virginia, what I am asking the gentleman from Kansas is, is there anything to show which type of health program is the best?

Mr. REES of Kansas. There is no particular type of program.

The Department of Commerce has a program and the Department of Agriculture has its own program. The cost per person is different. It is possible one renders a little more service than the other. In any event the medical service is temporary in nature and only while the employee is at his work.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Which one of them is working out better in canceling out absenteeism? Does not the gentleman believe that would be important to know?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not believe we have any figures. I am sorry I do not have that information for the gentleman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The bill reads, "to establish by contract or otherwise". What is the "otherwise"?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know exactly what the "otherwise" might be but believe it will permit employment per diem, per month, or on annual basis. I assume that if the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of Public Health, and the Committee on Appropriations have some control it will be better than it is under present conditions and circumstances. The whole thing ought to be worked out in a coordinated manner. The same service should apply the same to all employees, if we are going to have the service at all. Furthermore, I think it will be better to have the Public Health Service, the Civil Service Commission, and the Appropriations Committee of the House look the situation over, rather than to let it run in a hodgepodge sort of way as it is now doing. The defeat of this bill will only let things run as they are now doing.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The observation I was trying to make was that if there were different types of health programs in these Government agencies, surely somebody ought to know which one is the most efficient, and having found which is the most efficient, recommend that program to be adopted in all the other agencies.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think they would.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. On page 6 of the report it shows that there are different programs now in different Government agencies, varying from $2.14 a year to $4.67.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's observation is right. That is one thing this legislation should correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Are those different Government agencies spending Federal moneys for those purposes without approval of Congress?

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I tried to explain a moment ago, the direct authority is without the approval of Congress as a whole except as the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee recommends an appropriation for that particular agency. If the request comes, let us say, from the Department of Agriculture, it goes to the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations. If the request comes from the Department of Commerce, it goes to that subcommittee. Therefore, you do not have any coordination at all. The Subcommittee on Agriculture knows little about what was recommended by the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is there any reason why these employees of the various agencies should not pay into a fund for that care just as private industry is doing now?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It might be a good thing to do that. It is a question of policy. If the gentleman wants to submit that as a policy, that is another question. The Government, we know, has done a good many things for Federal employees. That is to say, it has given them liberal time for sick leave and that sort of thing, and for vacations. If the gentleman feels we should change that, that is another question to be submitted. It is as I said a question of policy. Of course this service to the employee is really emergency and applies only while employed. Ordinarily, when employees pay into a fund medical service is rendered in the home and at the hospital.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. When employees are referred to their private physicians or dentists, they pay those private physicians or dentists themselves, do they not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. They certainly do.

Mr. JUDD. Where it says "treatment of minor illnesses and dental conditions," does that mean minor illnesses and minor dental conditions? Could that include a bridge?

Mr. REES of Kansas. They are certainly two different things. I want the RECORD to show that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two more minutes in order that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may further explain the words "by contract or otherwise," about which the gentleman from Kansas inquired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I think it is salutary that we have on the floor this afternoon during the consideration of this legislation at least four members of the medical profession. I know I am appreciative that all of them have entered into the discussion. We find some difference of opinion, some holding back approval, and in one instance we find specific approval of the legislation, according to the statement of the doctor from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK]; and I assume the doctor from Minnesota is a believer in this legislation. I feel that he is. In connection with the use of a medical officer or a nurse by an agency, it is altogether possible, and the testimony so showed, that this person might give time to one or more agencies, perhaps to three agencies. In other words, as the gentleman from Kansas has said, although we believe in the best health program possible for the Federal employees, yet we have come to the point where we want restrictions placed upon the type of programs which are going to be carried forward. For that reason, this legislation providing for coordination is presented. I am sure that the committee is interested and at least the gentleman from West Virginia is interested in only a sound health program and not socialized medicine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of promoting and maintaining the physical and mental fitness of employees of the Federal Government, the heads of departments and agencies, including Government-owned and controlled corporations are authorized, within the limits of appropriations made available therefor, to establish by contract or otherwise health programs which will provide health services for employees under their respective jurisdictions: *Provided*, That the health services provided for Federal employees shall be established only upon recommendations of the Civil Service Commission after consultation with the Public Health Service and shall be limited to (1) treatments of minor illnesses and dental conditions except in cases of emergency or of injury or illness sustained while in the performance of the employee's duty in accordance with Act of September 7, 1916, entitled "An Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed. title 5, ch. 15); (2) preemployment and other examinations; (3) referral of employees to private physicians and dentists; and (4) education and preventive programs relating to health, including the alleviation of health hazards in the working environment: *Provided further*, That the health program now being conducted by the Tennessee Valley Authority shall not be affected by the provisions of this Act: *And provided further*, That such health programs as are now being conducted for other Federal employees may be continued until June 30, 1946. The Civil Service Commission shall serve as a coordinating agency in the development of such services for all Federal employees and, in collab-

oration with the Public Health Service, with respect to the extent to which such services shall be available to employees.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: On page 2, line 17, after the word "authority" insert "and by the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad Company."

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word of explanation. That amendment is offered at the request of the former Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, on the theory that conditions in Panama are different from those within the continental limits of the United States. They already have a program of their own down there.

I have consulted with the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and other members of the committee. Those members of the committee present have agreed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disturbed as to what this bill will do. I asked the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the ranking minority member of the committee, a question. While he went at length into a discussion of the matter, yet he did not answer my question.

As I see it, this bill authorizes the head of the departments or agencies to set up health programs which, inasmuch as the gentleman from Kansas did not answer my question, will be mandatory upon the employees to participate in. In other words, if that health program is set up, it is establishing another bureau within a department or bureau. It seems to me we have heard on the floor of this House some objection to setting up more bureaus.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield briefly.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If I thought this measure would set up one additional bureau or agency or would result in establishing one bureau or agency, I would not be for it at all. There are too many agencies and too many bureaus in the Government now. The gentleman from Texas and I agree on that question.

Mr. RUSSELL. But you are setting up another one to direct the medical health of the employees of the Federal Government, at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is not the intention at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what you are doing by this bill, whether you intend it or not. It seems to me you have seen enough of it to know that that will be the inevitable result.

As I stated, to me it seems you are just setting up an organization to further bring about State medicine. This is one of many legislative pegs that are being driven, forerunners of State medicine.

I wish to bring this to your consideration: The Federal employee is usually taken care of pretty well when one takes into consideration the compensation he receives, the attention he receives compared to the attention and compensation of the person who works for private industry. If he enjoys those benefits—and my mail each day is now and has been for the last 2 or 3 months—and I take it yours likewise—to the effect "I want you to help me get a job with the Federal Government; I want you to help me make a wartime appointment permanent under civil-service rules." They are pretty well satisfied.

This bill provides that the Federal Government, in other words the taxpayers, shall pay for this health program. To me it is high time to let every tub sit on its own bottom. It is no more the business of the taxpayer of this great country of ours to pay for a health program for a certain set of employees than it is for us to pay it privately; the same principle is involved. As I stated a while ago, to me this bill is just a forerunner of state medicine, an attempt to educate the people along the lines of state medicine about which we have heard so much. If the individual who enjoys the remuneration and other benefits of Federal employment is not able to take care of his own physical needs what about the poor fellow who is working for private industry?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman realize that we are already spending money by the hundreds of thousands of dollars on this thing now in the Federal Government? There are agencies already established doing this very thing.

Mr. RUSSELL. My answer to the gentleman is that a past wrong does not justify a future wrong.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman on that, but it seems to be a policy we have already established; that is the difficulty.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is high time to break such policies if they have been established. Does not the gentleman agree?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Shall we just withdraw the whole thing?

Mr. RUSSELL. A man working for the Federal Government, in the employ of his Government, who is enjoying as much or more compensation than he could ever possibly draw in private industry or private enterprise is not entitled to any more consideration at the hands of the taxpayers than Tom, Dick, or Harry scattered throughout the confines of this great country of ours. The quicker we stop such policies the better off we are going to be. It does not comport, it is not consonant, with the democratic principle that has made America the land of the free and the home of the brave, nor does it further the idea of free and equal rights to all with special privileges to none.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I assure the gentleman from West Virginia I should like to support this measure, but I cannot; I must oppose it.

This bill undoubtedly was written by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Dr. Parran, or it has his approval. Anything that comes from the hand of Dr. Parran should be examined and scrutinized very carefully, because he is reaching out for all the power he can possibly avail himself of to control the practice of medicine and the medical profession. This bill provides very broad powers.

It states at the very beginning:

That, for the purpose of promoting and maintaining the physical and mental fitness of employees of the Federal Government, the heads of departments and agencies, including Government-owned and controlled corporations are authorized, within the limits of appropriations made available therefor, to establish by contract or otherwise health programs which will provide health services for employees under their respective jurisdictions.

I shall not take the time to point out what this could be made to cover. The language in itself indicates what that might be.

On page 2 there appear to be what might be considered limitations to these powers, but upon examination those limitations are not very specific—they are not very clear. For example, it states that the service shall be limited to treatment of minor illnesses. What are minor illnesses? A headache might be a major illness for one person and a minor illness for another. It is difficult to tell in many cases what might be a minor or major illness. It also states that it shall be limited to dental conditions, and again to injuries or illnesses sustained while in the performance of the employee's duty in accordance with the act of September 7, 1916, and so forth. It is difficult to tell what might be included there.

Under this bill a physician could be employed not only on the premises where these illnesses or accidents take place, but he could go into the homes of those people and take care of them. It states, of course, something about referring employees to private physicians and dentists, but does not say when or under what conditions the Government physician shall refer these patients to private doctors.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is shewdly written and, on the whole, in my opinion, merely represents a further grab of Federal power and further control over the lives of our people. That is my candid view of this bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am not just certain what the gentleman meant by saying that the bill has been drafted very

shrewdly. I can say to him that the bill was not drafted by Dr. Parran, to whom the gentleman referred. The hearings on this measure by a subcommittee of the House District Committee consumed many days. This legislation not only has the approval of the subcommittee but it has the approval of the full committee and there was not a single witness or person representing a group who came before our committee in opposition to the legislation. There was publicity given to the hearings; there was an attempt to publicize the matter so that each and every Member of Congress might know what we were doing. This is not a matter of the past few weeks. It came up in the Seventy-eighth Congress, during which time hearings were held, and it would have been brought here last year had we been able to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to be fair about this matter. If the Surgeon General did not write this bill, of course I do not want to accuse him of having done so. Does this bill have the approval of the Surgeon General?

Mr. RANDOLPH. This bill has the approval of the Surgeon General, it also has the approval of the Surgeon General of the Army and has the approval of the American Medical Association and some thirty other witnesses and other organizations that came before us. I want the gentleman to know that the desire of this committee was to do what we thought was best in connection with restrictions upon a Federal health program to be carried forward in the future, because now we have a hodge-podge, we have a haphazard program and we felt restrictions could be placed upon the manner in which those programs were in force so that ultimately dollars and cents would be saved the taxpayers.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. May I say in reply to the gentleman from West Virginia, chairman of the committee, that the very approval of this bill by the Surgeon General is sufficient for my disapproval of it. I have followed the Surgeon General in his movements, and it is my judgment that he has been a most powerful influence in promoting a completely bureaucratized medicine.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, at the time I came to Congress I resigned as chairman of a county chapter of the Red Cross, after having served several years in the American Red Cross. While so engaged I signed a good many cards for training of nurses' aids and had a good deal to do with nurses in first-aid work in industry. Many statements have been made here that in industry the employees pay for all their medical service. That is not true. Many times industry provides nurses right on the job, several nurses in some cases, to help keep the employees in good health.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. After I have completed my statement I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. But the gentleman characterized a statement that I made as being false, relative to free service.

Mr. SAVAGE. I will give the gentleman the names of some of the companies so that he can ask them, if he wants to, whether or not they provide first-aid service paid for by the employer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, and I can give the gentleman the names of a good many more that do not do it.

Mr. SAVAGE. I do not say that all of the employers do. I said in many cases industry itself provides medical service, because they can keep the employees on the job that way and they can keep them well and working.

Mr. RUSSELL. I admit that, but in many instances they do not do it, so the statement the gentleman makes, to the effect that the statements made by the gentleman from Ohio and myself are not true, was uncalled for on the gentleman's part.

Mr. SAVAGE. I still say that some industries do provide it. There may be cases where the employees pay for everything they get, but I know that it has been given free in many cases because the companies feel that it is economical to keep those employees well and keep them on the job, and I know it has eliminated a lot of absenteeism. I am surprised to see Members here in Congress, where we have several first-aid rooms and a doctor, get up and oppose that same service for other Government employees who are making considerably less money than a Congressman makes. I think the record of turn-downs of boys unfit for military service in this war shows that this is vitally needed legislation; that there has been too much opposition to medical service; that there has been too much opposition to building up the health of the country. I am heartily in sympathy with this program, and I think it should have been done a long time ago.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat astonished at some of the arguments made about this bill. In the first place, we Members of Congress are enjoying, at the expense of the taxpayers through the medical department located right here at the Capitol, the very thing we propose in this bill. I think it ill behooves us to propose to wipe out this service unless we are going to wipe it out for ourselves. That is pretty plain talking.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the gentleman. Just wipe it out.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The argument is being made here that we are doing something for the employees. That is not the purpose of this bill. I call your attention to the testimony of Victor G. Heiser, representing the National Association of Manufacturers, on this bill. He says this:

> In 1940 the National Association of Manufacturers' committee made a survey of 2,064 plants that employed close to 2,000,000 workers in 47 States, to determine the extent, development, and effect of factory health programs. Many interesting facts were elicited. It was found, for instance, that plants that have installed medical services, on the average, have a reduction of 44.9 percent in accident frequencies, 62 percent in labor turn-over, 27 percent in absenteeism, and 29 percent in compensation insurance premiums.
>
> Industrial medicine began in industry as an in-plant emergency relief program and for the diagnosis and treatment of occupational diseases. It was soon apparent that much better results could be obtained by practicing preventive medicine. Apart from humanitarian considerations, industry has found it cheaper to prevent an accident or an illness than to pay for the reparation of it.

I call your attention next to the testimony of the representative of the American Legion on this bill. He said:

> It is a self-evident fact that the Federal Government, which is the largest and wealthiest employer in the Nation, should give to its employees the same protection and care along medical lines as that offered by private industry and especially in connection with our veterans.

Then I want to call your attention to one other statement I have here, from a lady representing the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., which I guess is the largest organization of its kind in the world. She says this:

> American industry, admittedly the most forward-looking in the world, has seen fit, during its evolution, to surround its workers with the cushion of medical care. You may be sure that this has not arisen for any reasons of altruism or idealism. It was simply in the interests of efficiency, and efficiency is good business.

In addition to those, we had testimony from the American Medical Association in favor of this bill, we had testimony from a gentleman representing the Eastman Kodak Co., and from several other people in addition to the ones I have quoted, all of whom endorsed the principle involved in this bill because they feel that it will save money to the Government, and so do we who are sponsoring it. It is not done for the purpose of giving something to the Federal employees, it is done for the purpose of saving money to this Government and for coordinating and controlling an activity that is already going on in a haphazard way whenever an agency can sell the idea to a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I wonder if the gentleman thinks his illustrations fairly fit the picture of the Federal employee. The illustrations the gentleman gave and the references he made were to industrial plants, where accidents were less and naturally the turnover was less, and so forth. We are trying to fit this into office work. I do not believe the gentleman's illustrations are quite analogous to our situation. I think the gentleman is making the picture stronger with his evidence on that premise than would apply to the premise to which we seek to apply it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I was reading to the gentleman the testimony of representatives of hard-headed businessmen. They think so. May I point out to him that the United States Government does have an Employees' Compensation Commission, for which we appropriate millions of dollars every year to pay employees who become sick on account of their work or who have accidents while at work. We do have a law dealing with sick leave which costs a good deal of money each year. The purpose of this program is to reduce those costs and to get more efficient service out of the employees.

Mr. VURSELL. Does the gentleman know what percentage of the sick leave is used up by the Federal employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No, sir.

Mr. VURSELL. Do they have 26 days a year or 15?

Mr. RAMSPECK. They have 15 days' sick leave a year. I cannot state how much of it is used on an average.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman does not know whether it is all taken up generally or not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I do not.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman made a statement with reference to unemployment compensation for sick leave.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I did not say unemployment compensation. I said compensation where they are injured or ill on account of their work.

Mr. RUSSELL. Where they are injured, that is all right; but if they become ill, they do not get anything.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If it is caused by their work, they do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the gentleman know of one such case? I have tried three cases with them, and in each instance they held it did not occur on the job. That is invariably what they hold—that they are not sick on the job.

Mr. RAMSPECK. In that case, it cannot be proven that the work caused it. But where a person suffers an accident on account of the work, that is covered.

Mr. RUSSELL. With reference to accidents, that is all right.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The question raised by the gentleman from Texas will be taken care of by an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. I talked to him about illnesses that occur on the job, and not off the job. That was the intention of the committee. It is the intention of the committee to confine itself simply to that type of illness. Of course, we will accept the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we must not forget that there will be tens of thousands of returning veterans of World War II who will be given positions in the Federal Government. It is a fact, and I say it simply as a layman, though the doctors know it better than I, that these men will be somewhat of a problem in connection with the emotional disturbance which has taken place during these past few years and months. The type of program which we would carry forward here would make that person a better employee and keep him on the job more days per week and per month and ultimately lessen the cost of the Federal structure by reason of this legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. May I state in answer to the distinguished chairman of the committee that we have already provided by law for medical care for the veteran. He is already entitled to it. We have seen to that, and rightfully so. Therefore, that does not add anything to your bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The American Legion thinks otherwise.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 2, in line 4, after the word "treatments" insert the words "on the job."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to which the gentleman from West Virginia and the chairman of the committee have agreed to accept. It merely makes clear what I know the committee had in mind, which is to provide for medical services to be given to a person injured or ill on the job and not for a doctor to be permitted to go out into the homes and engage in private practice, and so forth.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota is correct, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] know that was the intention of the committee. We are very happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. JUDD. I should think that would remove a great deal of misapprehension and opposition.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I gladly yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The addition of the words "on the job" is directly to the point. There is no question about that. I wonder if the gentleman would consider the use of the words "while employed," so that it would read "treatments while employed of minor illnesses," and so forth.

Mr. JUDD. I would rather say "while at work" rather than "while employed," because you are employed although you may not be at work.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is just a little technicality.

Mr. JUDD. The words "while employed" might cover a great many things. What we mean is, while he is at work in the agency or at the place of employment.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know what the gentleman has in mind. I think it is a good amendment. I was wondering if the expression "while working" could not be more happily phrased.

Mr. JUDD. I would suggest that the conference committee can work out that phraseology. I want to make it clear exactly what is meant.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that makes it clear. I did not rise to start any unnecessary controversy, but I thought perhaps better language might be used. The other body might look into that.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SAVAGE. For instance, if a worker became ill in the afternoon and was treated by a doctor on the job, and he felt he should go to that man's house in the evening and see how he was getting along, would this prevent his going to that man's house?

Mr. JUDD. Yes. If the illness is that serious, he should call in his own private physician. Is that not the understanding?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. That is our purpose, and we have so stated in the legislation; that the referral of such illnesses should be to private physicians.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the gentleman's amendment takes out a great deal of the apprehension I had with reference to the bill and makes it a much better bill, and with your amendment in, I will support the bill.

Mr. JUDD. I think this clarifies most of the difficulties we have had.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the committee for just a few minutes to emphasize, and, if possible, to clear up two or three matters. I refer especially to the question raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL], and call attention to his position with regard to helping Government workers. I agree with the gentleman we have provided a great many emoluments for Government workers. What I want to bring out is that we already have adopted plans of assistance in the health of our workers and we are just trying to coordinate that and get control of it, because at the present time it is pretty much out of control.

One other observation. I do regret that we did not call the physicians and surgeons, who are Members of this House, before our committee. The chairman suggested, of course, that everybody knew about the bill. It has been pending for quite a time, but I am sure it would have been much better if we had thought about it at the time and had called every one of them before our committee and had given them a chance to express their views and probably help write the bill, because their intention with respect to this question is pretty much the intention of all Members of the House. Their views would have been most helpful.

I do not want to get off on a tangent which in any wise will get socialized medicine into this legislation. The reason I am speaking particularly is that the RECORD will show it is the intention of the committee that this thing shall not in any way have anything to do with socialized medicine. It is not the intention to relate this legislation either directly or indirectly to socialized medicine.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 2, line 5, after the word "and" insert "minor."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, inserting the word "minor" before the words "dental conditions" merely makes sure that you are not going to be dealing with the replacement of bridges, and so forth. I hope the committee may see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I have no objection to the amendment and I understand the gentleman from Kansas has no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think there is danger of setting up in the bill another agency within the Government. I believe thoroughly in preventive medicine and in trying to keep people from getting sick; I believe that is essential. I am concerned, however, that we do not branch out from giving a person emergency treatment to giving him permanent care in his home. I think the Appropriations Committee must watch this angle very closely. Preventive medicine and the treatment of an individual while working may be accepted; but it is so easy for these things to expand. Some years ago the Congress set up the Children's Bureau, with few and limited duties in respect to protecting the health of children and laying down rules for the employment of children and the collection of vital statistics. The Children's Bureau has grown into a full-fledged health department duplicating a lot of the work that is being done by the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wish to assure the gentleman once again that it is the desire of the committee to have the help of the physician Members of this House. I appreciate, as I am sure the other members of the committee appreciate, the assistance they have given us today. I believe we are not in any controversy with them. They have pointed out certain safeguards which we have accepted as amendments, because our intention is their intention.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. COFFEE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees pursuant to House Resolution 349, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 52, noes 11.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 181, nays 72, not voting 178, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

YEAS—181

Allen, Ill.	Gordon	Manasco
Allen, La.	Gore	Mansfield, Mont.
Anderson, Calif.	Gorski	Mansfield, Tex.
Andrews, Ala.	Gossett	Martin, Iowa
Angell	Graham	Michener
Auchincloss	Granahan	Miller, Calif.
Barry	Grant, Ala.	Mills
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	Monroney
Bennet, N. Y.	Gwynne, Iowa	Morrison
Biemiller	Hancock	Murdock
Bland	Hare	O'Neal
Bonner	Havenner	Outland
Brehm	Hays	Pace
Brown, Ga.	Healy	Patman
Bryson	Hedrick	Patrick
Buck	Henry	Patterson
Bunker	Heselton	Peterson, Fla.
Burch	Hess	Peterson, Ga.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoch	Phillips
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Pickett
Camp	Holifield	Pittenger
Cannon, Fla.	Holmes, Wash.	Poage
Carnahan	Hook	Price, Fla.
Case, N. J.	Horan	Ramspeck
Celler	Howell	Randolph
Chelf	Huber	Rankin
Chenoweth	Hull	Rayfiel
Clark	Izac	Rees, Kans.
Clements	Jackson	Richards
Coffee	Johnson, Calif.	Riley
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Rivers
Combs	Johnson, Luther A.	Robertson, Va.
Cooley	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rodgers, Pa.
Cooper	Johnson, Okla.	Roe, Md.
Cunningham	Judd	Rowan
D'Alesandro	Kean	Russell
Daughton, Va.	Kearney	Sabath
De Lacy	Kee	Sasscer
Dolliver	Kefauver	Savage
Doughton, N. C.	Kelly, Ill.	Sikes
Douglas, Calif.	Kerr	Simpson, Pa.
Doyle	Kilday	Smith, Maine
Drewry	Kunkel	Sparkman
Earthman	LaFollette	Spence
Eberharter	Lanham	Starkey
Ellsworth	LeCompte	Stigler
Elsaesser	Lesinski	Stockman
Engle, Calif.	Link	Sumners, Tex.
Ervin	Ludlow	Talbot
Fallon	Lyle	Talle
Feighan	McConnell	Thom
Fernandez	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Fisher	McDonough	Thomason
Folger	McKenzie	Tibbott
Gallagher	Madden	Tolan
Gardner	Mahon	Traynor
Gathings	Marcantonio	Trimble
Gavin	Martin, Mass.	Vinson
Gerlach	May	Wadsworth
Gibson	Merrow	Weichel
Gifford	Morgan	Weiss
Gillette	Mundt	Welch
Goodwin	Murphy	White
Granger	Murray, Tenn.	Wigglesworth
Green	Neely	Wilson
Griffiths	Norton	Winter
Gwinn, N. Y.	O'Brien, Ill.	Woicott
Hagen	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolverton, N. J.
Hale	O'Hara	Woodhouse
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Konski	Woodruff, Mich.
Hall, Leonard W.	O'Toole	Woodrum, Va.
Hand	Pfeifer	Zimmerman
Harless, Ariz.	Philbin	
Harness, Ind.	Ploeser	
Harris	Plumley	
Hart	Powell	
Hartley	Price, Ill.	
Hébert	Priest	
Heffernan	Quinn, N. Y.	
Hendricks	Rabaut	
Herter	Rabin	
Hinshaw	Rains	
Hobbs	Ramey	
Hope	Resa	
Jarman	Rich	
Jensen	Robertson, N. Dak.	
Keefe	Robinson, Utah	
Kelley, Pa.	Rockwell	
Keogh	Roe, N. Y.	
Kilburn	Rogers, Fla.	
King	Rogers, Mass.	
Kirwan	Rogers, N. Y.	
Kopplemann	Rooney	
Lane	Ryter	
Larcade	Sadowski	
Latham	Sharp	
Lea	Sheppard	
LeFevre	Sheridan	
Luce	Simpson, Ill.	
Lynch	Slaughter	
McGehee	Smith, Va.	
McGlinchey	Smith, Wis.	
McGregor	Snyder	
McMillan, S. C.	Somers, N. Y.	
Maloney	Stevenson	
Martin, Iowa	Stewart	
Merrill	Sullivan	
Michener	Sundstrom	
Miller, Nebr.	Taber	
Mott	Tarver	
Murray, Wis.	Taylor	
Norrell	Thomas, N. J.	
Reece, Tenn.	Torrens	
Reed, Ill.	Vinson	
Reed, N. Y.	Wadsworth	
Rizley	Weichel	
Robsion, Ky.	Weiss	
Schwabe, Mo.	Welch	
Schwabe, Okla.	White	
Scrivner	Wigglesworth	
Shafer	Wilson	
Short	Winter	
Smith, Ohio	Woicott	
Springer	Wolverton, N. J.	
Stefan	Woodhouse	
Sumner, Ill.	Woodruff, Mich.	
Towe	Woodrum, Va.	
Vursell	Zimmerman	
Whitten		
Winstead		
Wolfenden, Pa.		
Worley		
Wickersham		

NAYS—72

Adams	Ellis	Mason
Andersen, H. Carl	Engel, Mich.	Miller, Nebr.
Andresen, August H.	Fellows	Mott
Arends	Fenton	Murray, Wis.
Arnold	Gearhart	Norrell
Barrett, Wyo.	Gillespie	Reece, Tenn.
Bates, Mass.	Gillie	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mo.	Grant, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Gross	Rizley
Boren	Halleck	Robsion, Ky.
Bradley, Mich.	Hill	Schwabe, Mo.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Schwabe, Okla.
Buffett	Holmes, Mass.	Scrivner
Carlson	Jenkins	Shafer
Case, S. Dak.	Jennings	Short
Church	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	Jones	Springer
Cole, Mo.	Jonkman	Stefan
Crawford	Kinzer	Sumner, Ill.
Curtis	Knutson	Towe
D'Ewart	Landis	Vursell
Dondero	Lemke	Whitten
Dworshak	Lewis	Winstead
Elliott	McCowen	Wolfenden, Pa.
Elston	McMillen, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—178

Abernethy	Gerlach	O'Hara
Andrews, N. Y.	Gibson	O'Konski
Bailey	Gifford	O'Toole
Baldwin, Md.	Gillette	Pfeifer
Baldwin, N. Y.	Goodwin	Philbin
Barden	Granger	Ploeser
Barrett, Pa.	Green	Plumley
Beall	Griffiths	Powell
Beckworth	Gwinn, N. Y.	Price, Ill.
Bell	Hagen	Priest
Bender	Hale	Quinn, N. Y.
Blackney	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Rabaut
Bloom	Hall, Leonard W.	Rabin
Bolton	Hand	Rains
Boykin	Harless, Ariz.	Ramey
Bradley, Pa.	Harness, Ind.	Resa
Brooks	Harris	Rich
Brumbaugh	Hart	Robertson, N. Dak.
Buckley	Hartley	Robinson, Utah
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Rockwell
Burgin	Heffernan	Roe, N. Y.
Butler	Hendricks	Rogers, Fla.
Campbell	Herter	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Hinshaw	Rogers, N. Y.
Cannon, Mo.	Hobbs	Rooney
Chapman	Hope	Ryter
Chiperfield	Jarman	Sadowski
Clason	Jensen	Sharp
Cochran	Keefe	Sheppard
Cole, Kans.	Kelley, Pa.	Sheridan
Colmer	Keogh	Simpson, Ill.
Corbett	Kilburn	Slaughter
Courtney	King	Smith, Va.
Cox	Kirwan	Smith, Wis.
Cravens	Kopplemann	Snyder
Crosser	Lane	Somers, N. Y.
Curley	Larcade	Stevenson
Davis	Latham	Stewart
Dawson	Lea	Sullivan
Delaney, James J.	LeFevre	Sundstrom
Delaney, John J.	Luce	Taber
Dickstein	Lynch	Tarver
Dingell	McGehee	Taylor
Dirksen	McGlinchey	Thomas, N. J.
Domengeaux	McGregor	Torrens
Douglas, Ill.	McMillan, S. C.	Vinson
Durham	Maloney	Wadsworth
Eaton	Marcantonio	Weichel
Elliott	Martin, Mass.	Weiss
Elston	May	Welch
Flannagan	Merrow	White
Flood	Morgan	Wigglesworth
Fogarty	Mundt	Wilson
Forand	Murphy	Winter
Fuller	Murray, Tenn.	Woicott
Fulton	Neely	Wolverton, N. J.
Gamble	Norton	Woodhouse
Gary	O'Brien, Ill.	Woodruff, Mich.
Geelan	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodrum, Va.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Cravens with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Brumbaugh.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. King with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Resa with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Clason.
Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Courtney with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Taber.
Mr. John J. Delaney with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Hope.

Mr. ELLIS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ANGELL changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] may extend her remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain letters and telegrams, together with lists regarding the retention of child-welfare centers. This exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing, and the estimate of cost is $156. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a report.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter to Mr. E. H. Thornton, vice chairman and general manager of the Galveston Wharves, Galveston, Tex., together with his reply thereto.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Hammond Times, of Hammond, Ind.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] may address the House for 12 minutes after the disposition of the legislative program for the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] may address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow following the other special orders already entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

IS CODE BREAKING STORY A PHONEY?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, last week we received startling confirmation of the long-suspected fact that President Roosevelt knew in advance that the Japanese were going to attack us. This information was disclosed to have been in the hands of Governor Dewey during his campaign for the Presidency last year.

Governor Dewey did not use this information because Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, urged him in a letter to refrain from doing so on the ground that we had cracked the Japanese ultra code, that it was of the highest importance that the Japanese be kept from realizing this, and that we were still deriving enormous military advantage from possession of the code.

Whether Governor Dewey was motivated in his decision by love of country of so high a degree that he willingly sacrificed the Presidency on the altar of patriotism, as is maintained by Republican Chairman Herbert Brownell, or whether he was influenced by a fear that he would blast his chances for the Presidency in leaving himself open to the charge of giving aid and comfort to the enemy, is immaterial.

The important fact is whether or not the Chief of Staff was playing politics at the behest of the Commander in Chief, while he was ostensibly concerned with the saving of American lives. In this connection, it must be borne in mind that this was not the first time that the breaking of the Jap code had been employed to further White House aims.

In 1942 the New Deal administration sought to indict the Chicago Tribune and two members of its editorial staff for violation of the Espionage Act because of a story in that publication listing the Japanese ships in the Battle of Midway. This story allegedly gave aid and comfort to the enemy, according to the New Dealers, by indirectly revealing the Jap code had been broken. Actually, the investigation was brought, as was widely recognized at the time, in an attempt to destroy the newspaper which the administration had failed to scare or cajole into surrender of its independence. The amazing vote of the grand jury against indictment was a memorable milestone in the battle for a free press.

Now, if we actually cracked the Japanese code then the Army in the case of Dewey was playing politics in silencing the Governor and the Navy was lending itself in the case of the Tribune to the White House as an instrument of vengeance. It is ridiculous to assume that the Japanese would adhere to one code, or variance of one code, from 1941 to 1945, particularly after the loss of a great sea battle in which the American Fleet apparently was able to foresee and checkmate every offensive move.

It is axiomatic that every nation is aware that other nations are trying to break its codes. Nations assume that such codes are broken regularly. While I do not propose to go into detail, I am told that our State Department codes are changed in almost every pouch. I am told by military men that we had positive knowledge that the Germans broke our code at least three times in the few weeks before the invasion.

The disclosure that we had cracked one code would not make the cracking of the next more difficult, I am told, nor would it bring more frequent changes in codes, because they are shifted with a high degree of frequency. Codes are being perfected in one department of the world's black chambers with as much intensity as another department is engaged in breaking those of other powers.

This would make it evident that the code-breaking story is a phoney and that both the Army and Navy hid behind the alleged code-breaking to undertake reprehensible errands for the White House unless they were hiding super-secret activities in the enemy's military establishment. The only genuine defense the services can have is that the Jap codes were being secured from traitors in the Japanese war offices.

The British Secret Service is the most efficient organization. It is highly possible that the service was able to find a weak link in the Jap war machine, as Britain had been allied with Japan for 20 years. If Jap traitors were the source of code information, which I am beginning to suspect, then there is justification for the secrecy surrounding the source of vital enemy information. If not, then the code story, as we have it today, is made out of whole cloth to cloak reprehensible conduct of the Commander in Chief.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, information of the most momentous importance has been brought to my attention. My subject is of extreme concern to every man, woman, and child in America, if not the entire world. I therefore ask my colleagues to set aside all habits of mind, all partisan or sectional interests, which do not permit, in the consideration of this subject, the most radical and imaginative thought.

The information given me leads to the inevitable conclusion that the most dangerous spots on the face of the earth are Washington, D. C., New York City, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Los Angeles, and the other large urban centers in this Nation. The conclusion is likewise inevitable that labor and management together must be henceforth considered an important part of our national defense and that within the next decade this Nation must make changes of the

most farreaching consequence in the decentralization both of cities and industries.

I am advised on the most competent authority that our scientists and technicians have now created atomic bombs of such prodigious and multiplied destructive power that the explosion which killed 150,000 humans and obliterated the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was only a small firecracker by comparison. These are in the early stages of development. It is impossible yet to estimate even on the basis of conjecture the ultimate effects of the gigantic blasting force and flaming destruction yet to emerge from the minds and laboratories of science and the mills and machines of manufacture. At this very moment, however, it is now possible to drop or to propel atomic charges into our large cities so as conveniently to kill millions of unsuspecting inhabitants in one operation.

We have seen reports and photographs from both Hiroshima and Nagasaki. We have seen reports from New Mexico. No further evidence should be necessary to shock the minds of men into realization that the diabolical inventions of war, once confined to Sunday newspaper supplements and comic-strip cartoons, are now the grim realities of present-day existence. For the first time in the history of this once-isolated Nation we now live in the shadow of the fear of attack. Other peoples in other lands have tasted this deadly fear in their daily bread—those living on the borders of the turbulent nations of Europe or in the vast areas of the world where civil war and the ways of marauding and aggression had become the pattern of life. To us who have walked upright without fear the realization that our traditional ocean barriers of defense no longer separate us from potential enemies embodies a profound change in the deep-rooted habits and convictions which have motivated our individual and national actions.

Americans must now understand that the whole conception of military attack and defense has been completely changed. As the invention of gun powder centuries ago changed the conception of war from one in which physically powerful and armored men would decide the issues of war in hand-to-hand struggle to one in which a firearm even in the hands of the weak might overcome the strong, so the atomic bomb changes the conception of war from the maneuvering of huge fleets on the seas and the deployment of large armies in the field to one of extermination or survival. There is no longer any front line. There is no distinction between combatant and noncombatant. There are no more soldiers and civilians. In the next war there will be only warring peoples. The contest will be between populations.

It is now probable that warfare itself in its tactical sense will be waged by a mere handful of men on each side. The workers of the world will produce rockets and radar and robot airships. A few highly trained specialists will employ them. They will direct these devices against the urban centers, the industries, the communications and transportation facilities of the enemy. The object will be to paralyze and to obliterate. There will be no chessboard maneuvering of troops, no strong points, no last stands, no skirmishing, no attacks and counterattacks. There will be no diplomatic formalities, no declarations of war, no speeches, and no negotiations. There will only be sudden, unannounced, and devastating attacks—huge rocket-propelled missiles hurtling through the stratosphere at the push of a button.

We have seen rocket bombs explode in the fields and cities of England. We have seen the marvels of electronics, of which radar is only one development. We have seen the destructive power of atomic energy. It takes no prophet to imagine how easy it will be, or let me say, how easy it is now, to send these explosives over oceans and continents and explode them with devastating accuracy on the other side of the world.

The consequences are appalling. In war the city of New York will be uninhabitable—if not destroyed at the very first blow. Even a missile which missed its mark and blew up the Groton Dam or the aqueduct would make necessary the evacuation of New York City within the space of hours—an impossible undertaking. What is true of New York City is also true of every other urban center in the United States. It is true of our railroad centers, our arsenals, our huge plants and factories, which in war provide our strength.

The only present answer to this potential threat lies in the decentralization of these cities, the distribution of our productive facilities over the widest possible areas, and the provision of underground shelter for both populations and industries.

There is as yet no military defense again this type of attack. Only two expedients have been suggested—the landing of specially trained paratroopers to seize the production plants and launching sites of atomic rockets, and the development of radar and electronic devices which will detect and explode these missiles in the substratosphere before they can do their damage. These expedients are still in the realm of experimentation, however, and hold out at the present time perhaps little more than wishful speculation. The development of tangible, practical defense is a scientific problem of the highest order and requires intensive application of all our genius in research and production. It must be the work of many minds—and those our very best.

Because warfare has so suddenly been changed in all its methods and conceptions, the determination of the steps necessary for national defense no longer can be dictated exclusively by men trained only in the traditional modes and methods of its waging. The principles and the objectives of war may remain the same, but the techniques have advanced so far beyond the strategic and tactical theories and practices of the military school that we can no longer rely on military minds alone for the final answer. It is no reflection on the men who have led us to victory in this war to say that the instruments developed largely under their direction have outgrown their scope and training. Many have devoted their lives entirely to the building, maneuvering, and arming of great naval ships, now rendered obsolete, or to the logistics, strategy, and tactics in the handling of large, now useless, armies. The great military leaders of tomorrow must have at their command all the resources of mind and knowledge in science, in industrial production, and in the problems of labor. There will still be soldiers and sailors, ships and airplanes. Yet so drastically have their uses in war been changed that the planning of national defense must include the broadest play of human genius. The legislative measures necessary for the establishment of national defense must be based on such technical and imaginative considerations that it is beyond the powers of the Military and Naval Affairs Committees in either the House or the Senate to amass all the necessary data, and pronounce expert judgment upon it in all its specialized phases.

We must not be handicapped either by superficial opinion or the strictures of mental habit and custom. Rather must we bring to this problem all the ingenuity and intellectual resourcefulness available in the Nation.

It is axiomatic that the great fundamental changes in scientific development which in past times have effected the course and character of war are not always apparent to military minds. There is a lag between the fact and the recognition of the fact. So in the last days of chivalry, military strategists and tacticians continued to employ the armored knight against the devastating effect of powder and shot. So in the days of Gen. Billy Mitchell conservative military and naval minds, trained in the day of trench warfare and swift-moving, lightly armored battleships, resisted his suggestion that air power would one day be the decisive factor in war. Those of us who remember the treatment accorded General Mitchell know only too well the danger of relying exclusively upon the military and naval strategists for creative imagination beyond the scope of their experience.

Yet we must not confine our critical analysis to military minds alone. The Governments of both England and France failed to take proper measures for defense in the days before this war and in their failure have taught us bitter lessons we must not ignore.

It was the French, for example, whose statesmen, unaware and uncomprehending, sheltered the French Nation in the imaginary security of a Maginot Line.

It was the French military leaders who failed to recognize the advances in the tactical combinations of air-tank-infantry combat teams. The whole French Nation conceived of war in terms of the last one, because its leadership thought in terms of the last one. The static warfare waged in the First World War had left an indelible impression upon the staff and line officers of the French Army and upon the political leaders of that time. Fearing war, they thought in terms of static defense. Thinking only in terms of defense, they only half prepared for war, because warfare is both

attack and defense, and the adoption of a fixed method of defense is only an invitation to the aggressor to devise new schemes and new stratagems for its reduction.

Hence the determination of measures for national security is a continuing and dynamic responsibility which must take into consideration the constant play of forces, the balance and counterbalance of scientific research, the daily changes in economic trends, the condition and psychology of labor, the production of weapons of offense and their defensive counterparts. It must take into consideration the changing practices and policies of foreign governments, the changing needs and ambitions of nations, the elections, revolutions, and counterrevolutions of the world.

For these reasons it has become a paramount necessity for the Members of this body and of the Senate, who are charged with the ultimate responsibility of providing legislation for defense, to have a source of technical information and interpretation upon which to base sound decisions. I have today, therefore, introduced a bill to establish a Commission of National Defense. This Commission is to consist of 15 members to be appointed by the President. These individuals would include military, naval, and aviation strategists; leading scientists; leading industrialists; and others. This Commission is to be a continuing body charged with the responsibility of recommending to the Congress a sound program for national security and proposals for change and improvement as conditions may warrant from time to time. The first and most urgent function of the Commission will be to study the effects of the discovery of atomic power on the strategy of war.

Since no responsible military or naval authority will attempt to estimate the limit of destruction of which this power is capable, it will be the duty of the Commission to evolve such measures of protection for the American people as it is possible to conceive. Pursuit of this aim may lead the Commission into strange and unexplored fields. It may be necessary to commandeer the thousands of miles of abandoned mine tunnels in the coal regions of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, and other coal-producing centers, and the metal mines of Michigan, Colorado, California, and other States. It may be necessary to recondition these tunnels for use as shelters for civilians and as locations for the production of essential war equipment.

It may be necessary to make plans for the eventual decentralization of all industries, the ultimate evacuation and scattering of huge cities.

It certainly will be necessary to harness all the energies of the laboratory and production line to devise instruments of detection and defense against the atomic bomb.

It must be obvious to all that great economic and social changes are implicit in these considerations and that the work of many Government agencies will be involved. It will be the duty of the Defense Commission to give definition to these problems in terms of national security and to coordinate its studies and recommendations with the policies and the actions of these other agencies.

Whatever the principles, however, whatever the size or significance of proposals, the Commission must study, appraise, and recommend action upon them. As the Manchester Guardian said, mankind has finally wrought the means by which to accomplish his own destruction. It is of the most transcendent importance that we now find the means for our defense.

No one can foresee where such study may eventually lead. The measures to be taken are now obscured. Yet the fundamental objective is clear and the ultimate condition plain. Our duty is to provide physical security for the American people. The condition of that security is that we must obtain it within the framework of a free society.

Labor and agriculture are now arms of the national defense. Labor and agriculture in the future will have far greater importance to the national interest and far greater responsibility. Yet both must voluntarily enlist in the common cause and not be conscripted.

If national interest dictates that the populations of large cities must leave congested areas and spread out through the countryside, great questions must naturally arise. The human rights and interests of citizens must not be overlooked or disregarded in a wave of national hysteria.

As I stand here today conjuring up the vision of horror and destruction to which atomic power may bring the world, I believe that it would be a tragic blunder for the human race to think of this new discovery in terms only of war. If the spirits and the minds of all men could be turned from evil there lies within the grasp of man the instrument to raise him to levels of dignity and prosperity heretofore undreamed by the most optimistic prophets of time. If it could be possible to devote the multiple energies and ingenuities of the human race to the development of constructive uses for atomic power, within a decade the resources and the civilization of man would leap at one bound into an almost Utopian richness. Great areas of the world, now arid and unproductive, would turn fertile and luxuriant. Into the hands of backward peoples would be placed the instruments and on their lands erected the factories which could raise the standards of their lives to a level far higher than that which this prosperous Nation now enjoys. Travel and communication throughout the world could become so simple and so commonplace that the free flow of ideas and philosophies would mix all the aspirations of all peoples in the common stream of the advancement of mankind. The pathways to the universe might be opened first to the curious minds of scientists and then to the common use of men. The hungry peoples of the world would find their daily bread; the cultured find new horizons and new lodestars for the intellect; the adventurous find new worlds and new challenges; the peaceful find new contentment; the industrious, new implements and new rewards.

Thus the causes of war might vanish in the fulfillment of the needs of humanity.

Yet so uncertain are the motives of men, so limited by custom their minds, so bound with prejudice their passions, so fraught with fear their relations with each other, that the trumpets of a new era must blow loud and long before their clarion is heard above the tumult of the world. At some hour on the clock of time the men and women of the world will know that wars are needless. They will know that wars begin in the hates and fears and greeds of mankind. They will know that the force and violence of aggressor states is directed against the sanctity of the individual. They will know that to live in peace is to live in mutual respect, that peace comes not from the absence of violence, but from a fundamental regard for human rights and the sacred inviolability of persons.

The Government of this Nation was laid upon a foundation which is the legal expression of that philosophy. It is my earnest hope that while we take measures at this time to protect ourselves against the evil prospect of war, we likewise take the most energetic measures to preserve at home and to promulgate abroad that respect for human dignity and freedom which is both the major hope and the most practical promise of an honorable and enduring peace.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have listened with rapt attention to what the gentleman has had to say. He may or may not know that I made a speech on the same subject only a few days ago. I would like to point out one thing which the gentleman mentioned which I think cannot be emphasized too strongly. With weapons like this, the advantage in future wars will always lie with that nation which is willing to be the most aggressive. I was much encouraged by the inclusion in the latter part of the gentleman's speech of emphasis upon working for peace. My mind is not capable of grasping how in the world a defense against this thing can be achieved. I believe that at the present time, while America has the great power which she now enjoys, it becomes our duty, a duty as profound as any that ever rested on any nation in history, to try to develop a means of welding the nations together for the preservation of peace as the only ultimate defense against this thing.

Mr. ARENDS. I agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRIMBLE). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. PATMAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday

and Thursday of this week I may have permission to address the House for 20 minutes on each day after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS (at the request of Mr. NORRELL) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech made by him over Station WIND in Chicago on last Saturday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset that I have just listened to one of the most informative and inspiring speeches I have heard in many a day in this House. It bears out the injunction of King Solomon that where there is no vision the people perish. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] has shown great vision in presenting this problem on the effect of the atomic bomb.

The reason I have asked for 20 minutes to address the House is to bring home to the Members the importance of doing everything within our power to expedite demobilization of our boys in all parts of the world. I realize there are heartaches in almost every home in the United States. They have waited long for the time when the boy who went abroad to fight for his country would return.

Moreover, I know how parents feel, because I have volumes of mail from them here. I know how the boys feel, because I am getting letters from every corner of the world in regard to this question of demobilization. The boys feel they have put up a heroic fight; that they have won the battles to which they were assigned. Now, they feel the time has come, when there is no further use for them by the Army, that they should be permitted to return home, and to be permitted to return home without delay.

There is another feature of it. Many of the doctors who are not needed in the Army are being retained. I know sections in my own district, which can be multiplied in most of the congressional districts of this country, where large areas of perhaps 25 or 50 miles in extent have no doctors. In some of those areas old-time doctors have worked, many of them at the age of 75, until now they are exhausted and have gone to sanitariums to be treated.

Recently infantile paralysis broke out in one of my villages and they had to send 25 miles for a doctor. It was a large, prosperous village, containing quite a large number of manufacturing industries. There is no reason why the boys, doctors, and all of them, should not be brought home, at least those who have not enlisted for a term of years and who are not Regular Army officers. Many of the boys are married. Many of them have children. The wives have undergone great privations. If I may say so, there is a moral question involved that must not be overlooked. These lads should be back in their homes where they belong, and there should be no delay on account of officers wishing to hold their jobs, because they are fearful they may be demoted, and their pay reduced if the boys came home.

There are many of these elements that enter into this situation. I could mention a great many injustices that are taking place. It is not good for the morale of the people. It is not good for the morale of those fine heroic men who put up such a magnificent fight for their country.

I want to read a few letters in the 20 minutes assigned to me. I have here a letter from Saipan, written on September 13, 1945:

SAIPAN, *September 13, 1945.*

DEAR SIR: During the news report from the States last night I heard them broadcast a statement from you as to the effect that you will introduce a bill to force the discharge of all men who have served honorably for 2 or 3 years. I was sitting in our outdoor theater and was waiting for a show at the time. Well there was a mighty cheer rose from the group that even beat the one that was heard when the war was over. Many fellows like myself think the present discharge plan is unfair, especially to single men. I enlisted in the Army December 14, 1942. Will soon have 3 years' service. Yet at the last count of discharge points I had only 37.

I was a senior in college when I came in the Army and wish to go back and finish up. So for the sake of thousands of fellows like myself, please help pass a bill that will get us out that have served long, honorable service, otherwise we will be sweating it out for several years over here. We are looking to you in Washington to get us out. I have found from experience that the Army works at a snail's pace. We have served the Army well and now want to return to civilian life and be a normal civilian again. Sir, we here on Saipan and other islands on the Pacific are counting on you. Please don't disappoint us. Let us out on the length of service.

I know a lot of fellows will be very happy and am glad we have some men with enough foresight like you that will speed our return.

Yours truly.

The following letter was written by the wife of a serviceman:

NEW YORK STATE, *September 20, 1945.*

DEAR MR. REED: I have followed with much interest your earnest endeavors in behalf of the demobilization of those men who can be released from the Army now under the newer rulings, but who for some unknown reason are being kept at their posts. Today I received a letter from my husband, at present in the Pacific theater, requesting me to write to you to see if something further could not be done to speed things along. He said that he would like to present the matter to you himself, but this would require official permission and might involve much red tape.

We are all appreciative of the fact that everything else cannot be pushed aside to permit those in whom we are most interested to be brought home immediately, but it does seem that by now at least the proper forms should be available to the men to be filled out and expedited for necessary approval and action. From the information received today, even these forms are not available yet. It would seem to me that if the Army would concentrate an equal amount of effort to bring back the soldiers in the Pacific area as it has for those in the European theater, that things might be handled more expeditiously. The transportation problem is critical and yet most of the larger liners are dispatched across the Atlantic and those men in the Pacific area are made to wait and wait.

Very truly yours.

This letter was written by a corporal on Ie Shima:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1945.

Hon. Representative REED: Sir, we are a combat group of soldiers with 18 months of overseas service.

We have four invasions to our credit, without a rest in between invasions.

Our first one was Guam, second was Leyte, third was Aka Shima, and then Ie Shima.

Sir, you must admit all these were major operations, and we did our job.

Now, with the war over, we want to go home and back to the United States, our native land, the one we love. Sir, we are Americans. Our country called us to arms and the call was answered. It was a hard fight. To quote Churchill, of England, "It will be a hard, long fight, with sweat, blood, and tears." How well the combat soldier can agree. There was sweat, blood, and tears. Sir, we are not by ourselves. There are countless thousands who agree after reading your statement that something should be done to get us home. We did our job, and we did it well.

Sir, we can assure you that we are waiting until Congress meets. Our mothers and fathers, wives and sisters and sweethearts are waiting.

We hope Congress won't let us down. As Americans with the love of freedom in our hearts, proudly we answered the call to arms. Now our job is done and we want to go home and have our chance to live in peace.

Sincerely.

This next letter is from a sergeant in Seattle, Wash., and is dated September 17, 1945:

DEAR SIR: This letter is an attempt to express my appreciation for your proposal of a bill to release all men who have been in service for 2 years or more.

The point system is grossly unfair to single men like myself who did not think it wise to get married and have children in the pre-Pearl Harbor days when we felt that war was inevitable.

I am now 30 years old, having been drafted at the age of 27. I would like to get out of uniform and take up my life again, and I think it is only fair that I be released before the married men who have only had a few months of service and yet who have more points than I due to one or two children.

Yours truly.

I received this next letter from a Medical Corps officer:

SEPTEMBER 13, 1945.

Representative REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To date I have accumulated 111 points. We are stationed on this small chunk of coral and are awaiting orders to move forward as a unit of the Army of Occupation. My attached letter is self-explanatory regarding my reasons for return home. I am not requesting immediate discharge, but I am definitely desirous of returning to my family.

This organization has been overseas approximately 42 months. Thirty-seven percent of the enlisted men have points ranging from 85 to 105 and 60 percent of the officers have accumulated more than 85 points.

To say that we are fed up is to put it mildly. The attitude of the officers and enlisted men is little short of alarming. Morale has deteriorated and faith in the institutions for which they have given the most productive years of their lives appears on the verge of being undermined.

I must apologize for not prefacing your surname with your initials, but I have no way of knowing what they are. However, let me again thank you for your inspiring words and the comfort of the realization that a fellow New Yorker remembered the forgotten men of the Pacific.

Sincerely.

The next letter is from an antitank company, the A. P. O. number of which is in San Francisco, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1945.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: I wish to take this means of expressing to you my heartfelt appreciation for your stand in the House of Representatives Monday, September 10, relative to release of men from the armed forces who have had years of service.

I feel that as a conscientious Member of the Congress of the United States you are diligently and ably making every effort possible to insure our return to the States in the quickest possible time, and much more quicker than the services care to release us now that the fighting is over.

The majority of the members of my company have served the country under arms since the summer of 1941, 4 years and more. Also, we have served overseas since July 21, 1943, 2 years and 2 months. One year of that time has been spent fighting and living in the swamps and jungles of that New Guinea hell hole; during our 2 years and 2 months overseas our itinerary has included 6 months' security and guard duty on the island of Oahu, T. H., 12 months in New Guinea participating in the "leap frog" landings on the coast of New Guinea from Wake Island-Maffin Bay area to Sansapor on the extreme northern tip of New Guinea, and from January 9, this year, until the peace offer by Japan, August 14, constantly in action against the Japs here on the island of Luzon in the Philippines; from January 9, D-day, we had 112 continuous days and nights in the line against the Japs; since that time elements of our division have been in constant contact with the Japanese, roughly a total of 218 days of action.

In my own company we have had exactly three men who were granted furloughs to Australia from New Guinea all during our stay there; the rest of us contented ourselves twiddling our thumbs, no passes, no furloughs, Australian chow and lousy, and malaria and scrub typhus galore. Of course, there were no furloughs here on Luzon; three furloughs out of the company (excepting strict emergency furloughs) in a period of 18 months; nothing but soul-killing routine duty and rugged fighting—and yet the Army wants us to go on to Japan as occupation forces. Is this gratitude and appreciation for a job well done? Most of us want to begin our own life; we've given almost 4½ years of our life to our country; why can't we get out of here now that the war is over and be home out of this damnable part of the world, the Pacific?

As was stated by a Member of the Congress Monday, the 10th, our theme out here is "wait until Congress meets." We are dependent upon you to return us to a life we have fought for and have been denied for 2 years and more, those 2 years being spent entirely in the jungles of the Pacific islands.

Sincerely.

I have here a letter from a Chinese detachment, as follows:

CHINESE DETACHMENT,
DOUGLAS ARMY AIR FIELD,
Douglas, Ariz., September 18, 1945.

Congressman REED,
Representative of New York,
Congressional Offices,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a New Yorker I was particularly gratified to see that you had attempted to have servicemen with 18 months of service discharged from the Army.

I for one, and many around me, feel that this whole demobilization program is being sadly bungled. It seems as if the whole program is being run for the high rank's convenience rather than for the benefit of the majority of the men in the Army.

Pilots are being discharged upon their own request, regardless of length or type of service, because they are surplus. Most of the men in the Army today are surplus but nothing is being done to discharge them.

Since 1933, I have voted a Democratic ticket but I assure you that should the Republican Party be instrumental in securing rapid demobilization my voting policy will be changed from then on.

Again, thank you for your stand on this important matter.

Sincerely yours.

The next letter was signed by 15 members of the armed forces who were redeployed direct to the Pacific:

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have just read in the Daily Pacifician an article in which you propose a bill to release all men with more than 2 years' service.

The men overseas, who must not be forgotten, are appreciative of the fact that there are Congressmen such as yourself who are attempting to do everything possible to see that we are returned to civilian life as quickly as possible.

We believe that the War Department has adequate shipping facilities to speed up the discharge procedure faster than the 10 months' time which it claims will be necessary.

We hope that your sincere effort in our behalf will produce the needed results. The undersigned are all ETO veterans redeployed direct to the Pacific.

Very truly yours.

The father of a serviceman writes as follows from New York State:

SEPTEMBER 16, 1945.

Representative DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In answer to a recent letter from my son, serving in the United States Army Air Corps, I am writing you as my representative of the following:

I have been urged by my son to write you, as many others are doing, in regard to discharge for servicemen serving 3 years or more and also to express opinion on the unfairness of the point system. To some it may be of advantage; to others, not.

My boy has been in service for the past 3 years; he is also serving overseas, but because of lack of points, is not eligible for discharge. Do you not think it is about time something were done for the discharge of men who served their country for 3 years or more, regardless of whether they have points or not? I am sure they have more than done their duty, and therefore they deserve some consideration.

Many of the boys who were drafted in their early twenties were just about beginning to start some of their future. Do you not agree they should be now given a break, a chance to readjust themselves in the proper way?

I am in the hope that you and the many other representatives who have been chosen by us people to make our decisions for us will do all in your power to give these boys the decent and proper break they will deserve.

From another GI comes this letter:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1945.

Hon. Representative REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a native of New York and a soldier in the United States Army, I am writing you concerning the demobilization plan. Your suggestion to discharge men who have been in service 18 months or more since September 6, 1940, is, in my opinion, the most reasonable suggestion made yet.

Although I have been in service 18 months, I was fortunate in one respect in not being sent overseas, but on the other hand was unable to secure any points for discharge. It seems to me that the service here in the States should be given a lot more consideration than it has been so far. After all we sacrificed our homes, jobs, etc., and now may have to go overseas for the army of occupation. I believe anyone who has been in 18 months deserves a discharge.

I sincerely hope you will push this issue to the best of your ability, and see if you can't get some of we boys discharged, and really believe you will do all you can.

Very truly yours,

Pvt. G. I. JOE.

I want to say that I know a great many Members of the House who are doing their utmost and cooperating in every possible way to have these boys discharged from the service, and I propose to use every possible parliamentary expedient to get this legislation out and to see to it that these boys who have served 18 months or more are discharged from the Army.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE FUTURE OF UNRRA

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we are going to be faced very soon with a request for an additional grant to UNRRA of $1,350,000,000. In view of that anticipated request I think we ought to analyze, at least, the job UNRRA has done so far and try to determine just what action we should take not only on this request for an additional appropriation, but also as to the advisability of continuing UNRRA at all, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time today.

Mr. Speaker, on November 9, 1943, representatives of 44 United Nations met at the White House and signed an agreement concerning the "United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration." This was the beginning of UNRRA. Within 3 weeks the UNRRA organization was set up, with Herbert H. Lehman, ex-Governor of New York, as Director General. In 6 months UNRRA had built up an administrative staff and a field staff; had decided on procedural methods; had surveyed present and potential relief needs; and had begun the stock piling of supplies. On May 19,

1944, it tackled its first job in the field—the assumption of financial and administrative controls of north African war refugee camps, taken over from a British relief organization. Then in September 1944 UNRRA held its second council session at Montreal, Canada, to check the results of almost a year of experience.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I am bringing these facts before you is to show that UNRRA is nearly 2 years old. We are not dealing with an infant organization. We are dealing with an organization that is fairly mature, an organization that can and should be judged on the basis of its efficiency or lack of efficiency. Today, therefore, we properly raise the question, Is UNRRA doing the job it was created to do?

The American people are entitled to know the true answer to this question, since it is they—through their elected representatives in Congress—who have been committed to paying $1,350,000,000 for UNRRA's operational expenses. Of this sum, approximately $800,000,000 has already been appropriated out of the pocketbooks of the American taxpayers. Since all contributions from every member nation total only $1,800,000,000, American taxpayers have contributed almost one-half the total resources of UNRRA and are under obligations to increase these contributions until they reach three-fourths of the total, and the end is not yet.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. In connection with the figures to which the gentleman has just referred, we are paying half the amount they have had, as against the 44 nations.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. On the same point the gentleman from New York has raised, it is true, is it not, that no nation that was invaded is expected to contribute to UNRRA, and that the contributions of the nations that do contribute are based upon 1 percent of their 1943 national income?

Mr. MASON. That is right.

China now requests UNRRA aid amounting to $900,000,000. Soviet Russia has also put in her request for $700,000,000, although to date no survey has been made, or even permitted, of Russia's ability to take care of her own relief requirements. This leaves only $200,000,000 of the total originally pledged to meet the commitments already made for the relief and rehabilitation of such countries as Albania, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Italy, and Ethiopia. Since we are now being asked for an additional contribution to UNRRA of $1,350,000,000, it is time we take stock to determine, if possible, whether UNRRA should be continued or replaced by an organization more American in origin, in make-up, and in efficiency of operation.

Mr. Speaker, although the United States has furnished and is furnishing the bulk of the money to operate UNRRA, she stands alone in the councils of UNRRA. Other nations, belonging to blocs, have the controlling power. Britain and her colonies stand together in their determination to rebuild British economy everywhere, and to reestablish British overseas trade. The U. S. S. R. was given three votes at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco. Those three votes will operate as one within UNRRA—plus the votes of the half dozen European nations now dependent upon, or within the sphere of, Soviet Russia. This is not a pleasant picture to present. But, as realistic thinkers, we must admit that the situation exists. Our country occupies a position of extreme loneliness when it comes to voting on major UNRRA decisions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the personnel of UNRRA? A job is only as good as the people who do it. At the outset UNRRA numbered among its personnel scores of men and women who were earnestly imbued with the hope of helping suffering mankind. Many of these people were highly trained in specialized tasks. After months of cooling their heels on the borders of "forbidden" territory, these conscientious people resigned and came home rather than draw pay for useless effort out of funds that were earmarked to prevent starvation.

UNRRA went on in spite of the return of the disillusioned. But, a different type of employee was sent to the field, and clearance, more often than not, came from quarters other than Washington, D. C. I have in mind the case of a distinguished journalist who was particularly interested in the welfare of the Czechoslovak people. He turned down many more financially attractive offers to work with UNRRA. On the very day he was supposed to leave by plane for Prague, he was given a cable stating that he was "not acceptable to the Czechoslovak authorities." No other explanation was offered. He had had several personal contacts with President Benes and former President Masaryk. He had been acceptable to them in the past. Now he was no longer acceptable. Why? The only explanation that he or his friends could give was that his political beliefs, which he had never kept secret, were not considered sufficiently "liberal." Thus, the valuable experience which he could draw upon was lost to UNRRA. And this is not an isolated case. There have been many similar instances. In fact, the criterion for UNRRA employment is rapidly coming to the point that it is not what a man can do which will get him a job with UNRRA, but rather what a man thinks.

In this connection let us look at what UNRRA officials themselves think in regard to their own personnel. An UNRRA spokesman declares:

> The actual distribution of supplies can be handled more efficiently and cheaply by nationals of recipient countries who know the conditions and the language. Americans, if they tried to distribute all the supplies, would get involved in politics as they did after the last war.

This is a frank admission by an UNRRA spokesman that Americans are amply qualified to foot the bill for the supplies given as relief, but that they are not to be trusted as distributors of those supplies unless they are closely supervised by the nationals of those countries where the supplies are distributed. It is not a complimentary appraisal of our national character. But, it does raise the question: "What national politics are being played in the recipient countries?"

Take Poland for example. Poland has made one of the most heroic combat contributions in this war. She has suffered as much, if not more, than any of our other European Allies. In November 1943 the Polish delegate to the Atlantic City meeting of UNRRA declared:

> UNRRA faces a task of magnitude equal to that of winning the war. UNRRA represents the great army that will win the peace once the enemy is defeated on the battlefield.

Yet if any one of the London Poles were to try to serve UNRRA in present-day Poland, his services would be of short duration, because only "Moscow Poles" are permitted to administer relief in Poland to the millions of Polish needy. With American hands tied, the question of who will eat and will go hungry in Poland is determined solely by Moscow—not by the amount of available food for Poland that may be provided by UNRRA.

Even the internationally minded Washington (D. C.) Post in an editorial on July 29, 1945, admitted:

> It will be something of a departure if the Russians permit UNRRA officials to scrutinize their affairs and supervise the distribution of aid.

What is true of Poland is also true of Yugoslavia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Rumania. These countries are all under the domination of Russia, politically and economically. No relief can be given without Russian permission and Russian supervision in any one of these countries.

POSTWAR REHABILITATION

Mr. Speaker, thus far my approach to UNRRA has been a negative one. Now in a positive approach to the larger issue of postwar rehabilitation, I want to advance the thesis that we can best restore the dignity of mankind if we retain our own dignity as a nation.

The United States has always been a humanitarian country. Every major war we have ever fought has been for the defense or perpetuation of a great humanitarian ideal. We entered World War I "to make the world safe for democracy." Yet, let me remind you, a forgetful Europe sneered at us after that war and labeled us "Uncle Shylock."

We have wealth only because we have learned to manage our resources during peace. We should not waste that wealth, while our fellow men are starving, in order to placate selfish nations or pander to the interests of selfish men. American wealth has been a very potent weapon of

war. It can be as potent a guarantor of peace—if this wealth is operated by its owners, the American people, who understand its use and appreciate its power.

I say, the first absolute requirement of any international relief undertaking is that the organization stem from the will of the American people. The form that this organization could take might be one of several: First, a governmental agency already in existence; second, a governmental agency created for this specific purpose; third, a consolidation of reputable private agencies. Such an all-American humanitarian group could and would operate efficiently. Instead of having its field forces involved politically in the countries in which they operated, this type of organization would be most free from foreign politics. Our State Department would be on the job to check even the beginning of such a trend. Such an organization would not enter a country unless full agreement had been reached with the duly constituted authorities of that country covering our right to supervise the distribution of supplies and our right to check upon the recipients of those supplies for the purpose of determining future needs. If any country which requested aid refused to meet these terms for aid, then the responsibility for depriving that country of such aid would rest squarely on the shoulders of the advocates of secrecy and double dealing.

Mr. Speaker, the duties and objectives of such an all-American humanitarian organization could well be exactly the same as those set forth in Public Law 267 of the Seventy-eighth Congress which gave approval to the international organization known as UNRRA. Public Law 267 gave UNRRA its life, its opportunity, its responsibility, and UNRRA failed. It failed because it was founded upon an inherently wrong premise—that of getting something for nothing. It failed because the same nations that before the war railed at us for our isolationism, barred at their frontiers any investigation of their prevailing conditions—a symbol of a deeper and more dangerous isolationism than we have ever known. It failed because it never took into consideration the dignity of the donor as well as the dignity of the recipients. It failed because it was honeycombed by foreign ideologies and shot through with factional foreign politics.

What about the future of UNRRA? UNRRA has failed and UNRRA must go. It is up to the American people to decide how UNRRA should be replaced—if they want UNRRA replaced. Whatever setup follows UNRRA, it must be American in inception, American in control, and American in operation—if it is to enjoy the support of Americans while its usefulness exists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order that I might follow the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], partly because of the sincere personal affection that I have for the gentleman, having served on some rather difficult committees with him in the past, and having known him well for that reason, but principally, of course, because of my profound concern about some of the problems about which he has been speaking.

I have before me some copies of the writings of Edgar Ansel Mowrer about current political problems, and particularly the situation in eastern Europe, with which writings I expect the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is familiar.

I have a copy here of the lead article in the Reader's Digest for September, written by William Hard, concerning some of the problems connected with the relationship of this Nation with the Soviet Union. No one has been more deeply disturbed than I over the fact that in some liberated countries of Europe there has up to date not been a free election held, that the promise some of us believed came out of Yalta for free democratic elections jointly guaranteed and supervised by all three major powers in those countries has not been fulfilled.

I am of the opinion that our policy toward the Soviet Union has to be at one and the same time more firm and realistic and also more understanding than it has been. I agree almost completely with William Hard in what he says in this article to which I have already alluded. He points out that one of the root problems is spheres of influence on the part of anybody, that the whole idea of the sphere of influence is a threat to future peace, whoever exercises it, and that the only answer to it is the attempt to do away with spheres of influence completely. He urges that every effort be made to build up the General Assembly of the United Nations organization since there all nations are represented. He calls for an international commission of "authoritative representatives of the Soviet Union, Britain, France, and the United States to organize and execute a policy of breaking down all barriers to complete informational enlightenment in every European liberated region." He insists upon world-wide cooperation rather than a parceling out of different areas of the world for control by different big countries. But he points out that part of the price of ending Soviet unilateral action in eastern Europe may be ending British and American unilateral or bilateral action in the Middle East for example.

Since I determined to make this speech today I have tried to inform myself as best I could about some of the problems of UNRRA. I talked to Governor Lehman personally and I read his testimony before the Senate committee. I have also tried to talk to as many other people about it as I could. I must say at the outset that I do not share the views of the gentleman from Illinois as to the seriousness of the situation. I do share his disappointment over the fact the job has not gone better than it has, and I share with him a deep resentment over any situation which may have existed in the past or which may persist where there is refusal to permit American missions to any country where American relief is being sent. The Governor has assured me specifically that there is not now any barrier against our sending missions of whatever size we choose to send into the countries in eastern Europe where UNRRA relief is going. In his testimony before the Senate committee he stated that the materials that are going out from UNRRA are plainly labeled as coming from UNRRA and also clearly indicate the country of origin.

It is important, I believe, for us to recognize the fact that UNRRA does not operate in any of the nations of western Europe, nor does it operate in any of the nations that were enemy countries, such as Rumania, Hungary, or Bulgaria. In those countries the job is supposed to be done by the Allied Control Commission to the best of its ability. In Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, in Greece, Albania, and to some extent in Italy, there UNRRA does operate. Those are the main places. China has asked for aid, and obviously will need it. So have some other countries.

UNRRA was the first great effort at international cooperation coming out of this war. It is, I think, no wonder it has not run perfectly.

But I am informed that it is at least the conviction of the Americans connected with UNRRA that at present food is being distributed without any discrimination, that our missions are there, that our observers are not interfered with, that our missions are not as large in some of these countries as they ought to be but that they will be enlarged and that this problem is being overcome. The main problem, the problem that is, of course, central to all others, has been UNRRA's inability to secure anything like the volume of relief supplies that have been needed, and today UNRRA has hardly any funds.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say that I am satisfied with the job that has been done or with some of the conditions that have existed. For I am not. But time is running out. Time is running out fast, and I doubt there is time now to change to another agency, as the gentleman from Illinois suggests.

Now, we would not certainly have said when the war was 90 percent won that we had expended all the money that we could afford, and therefore we had to stop, that we could not go any further with our military operations. But if we do not take the measures to prevent hunger in Europe this winter, we may find that we have done something quite as short-sighted as it would have been to stop the war short of victory—for the winning of the peace hangs in the balance.

In my judgment, if there is the kind of hunger and near starvation on the Continent of Europe and in Asia which people who have been there tell us, there is every reason to expect, in the months that lie immediately ahead, the world, including the United States, will have lost a great share of the advantages that should have been gained for humanity by the defeat of the Axis Powers.

I doubt whether it is possible to replace UNRRA, as the gentleman from

Illinois suggests, if we are to do any good at all, in time to meet the critical need of the approaching winter. I urged from the very beginning that the cooperatives of Europe and Asia be used as the instrumentalities through which relief should be disseminated, and I believe that would have been better than using governments, because it would have been closer to the people. I said that in my speech when UNRRA was first proposed. It has not been done that way. Am I to choose now whether I shall insist on it being done the way I wanted it or that food should be gotten to Europe as quickly as it can possibly be gotten there and in adequate amounts? If so, then with every fiber of my being, I choose the latter course.

As a matter of actual fact UNRRA has taken care of 4,000,000 displaced persons. There are more millions of displaced persons who need to be gotten back to their homes. It has distributed a great deal of food and other commodities. It has carried a lot of relief to people who desperately needed it. But the plain fact is it has nowhere near met the need because it has never gotten the amount of supplies that were needed.

We have testimony before us that seems to be of such a serious nature that we have got to take cognizance of it.

A warm personal friend of mine, who happens to be a Republican, incidentally, who lives in one of the communities in my district, returned only recently from Europe. He was with UNRRA and worked in one of the Balkan countries for UNRRA. I spent a couple of hours with him, asking all the questions that have been raised by the gentleman from Illinois, and a lot more, too. His report to me was that in his judgment the relief in this particular country where he had been—it happened to be Yugoslavia—was being distributed fairly and equitably and without political discrimination of any sort and, furthermore—and this is the main thing he said—that the next few months will be the critical time. He said that by next spring the people of this nation and other nations, he thought, would be in position to take care of their own needs, but the time that counts is this month, next month, and the next 4 or 5 months.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I am very much interested in this personal testimony of a man from the field, but I have here the testimony of two Members of Congress, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RYTER], both Democrats, who have just returned from a month's tour of inspection of UNRRA's work in Europe. Both of them testify that there has been, and still is, this undue political control of UNRRA's activities in these nations by Russia.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say to the gentleman that I do not think we ought to stand for any undue political control by anybody. We ought to insist upon the right of our people to go in there with relief supplies and to supervise to the extent necessary their distribution. I do not think it necessary for our people to do the actual distributing of the supplies. That might better be left as the work of the people who live in that country. We ought to insist upon the right of our people to go in there. I am with the gentleman 100 percent on that. I am not willing to say, however, that we ought to stop this work. It has got to go on even under unsatisfactory conditions which may exist under certain circumstances.

Here is a letter from a woman working in one of the Balkan countries. She says:

> Our nursing program is started. The gals want to learn but I wonder if it's worth the effort if the nurses and patients are going to starve this winter. You may be sure the Yugoslavs will produce superhuman effort and if they're fed this winter they'll do all the rest themselves.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only the nations in which UNRRA is working about which we need to be concerned. It is also such nations as France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Italy, and some of those countries which UNRRA has never been allowed to go into because they are not included under the act. In some ways our duty to these western countries and our stake in preventing the desperation of hunger there is even greater than is the case in the countries where UNRRA is at work. What about these western European countries?

What are we going to do about them? America, after all, carries the banner of human freedom, constitutional democracy, and the dignity of the individual man or woman. The rest of the world is going to judge those institutions largely by what America does in this crisis. I am not talking about loans now, Mr. Speaker. I am talking about straightout gifts of food, and I am limiting it to food, enough food so that the people will not be hungry, so that they will not face starvation, and the children being born will not be deformed when they come. It is as basic as that. I believe with all my heart that it is the will of the American people that this assistance should be given. Indeed, I have hundreds of letters to show that if it is necessary for us to continue rationing of certain commodities in the United States, it is the will of our people to do it in order to get this food over there. And if the job cannot be done any other way, and I doubt if it can, then as to food, and food alone, we ought to continue lendlease to those western European nations. Mr. Speaker, right now there is in prospect another great glut of eggs; there is the largest citrus-fruit crop in history coming along. What are we going to do? Will we see our farmers' prices collapse and what is even worse see people hungering for what we have in superabundance? However peace is to be built, it cannot be done that way. Food for the hungry is, I firmly believe, in accordance with the will of most of the American people in this hour. We are told, and I believe we can trust these figures, that the average amount of calories which the people of Greece are going to get in the 2 months immediately ahead is only one-fourth as great as the average American consumes. It will be only one-third as great in France as the average American consumes. Marquis Childs, the eminent columnist, who just returned from Europe, warns us of the consequences if we permit the same younger generation that has been taught all through the years of Nazi occupation to sabotage everything that could be sabotaged to find that liberation means hunger worse than they experienced even during that Nazi occupation.

Europe will be worse off this winter, according to the best estimate we can get, than it was during the Nazi occupation. What will that mean to people? What will it mean to the hope for democracy there? Remember democracy is the child of hope; dictatorship the offspring of desperation. Europe's supplies this year are 20,000,000 tons less than prewar. Sixteen million tons of this deficiency is due to the decline in her own food production. In addition to that her imports are only half of what they were prewar. Fifteen million tons of food are desperately needed, of which 65 percent fortunately is cereals, of which we have an abundance. About a million tons each of dairy products, meats, and fats and oils are desperately needed. A delegation recently in Poland, after a long trip, said they saw only three hogs in the whole country.

A correspondent of the New York Times recently wired as follows:

> Each time a chill wind blows after a summer shower, bending the ripe grain and driving the cattle into the lee of the hillsides, it breathes a warning over the bent backs of the peasants all over Europe that time is growing short. And in the cities, where in normal times there is less awareness of the change of seasons, there is this year a jealous counting of the dwindling daylight hours. The people await winter's coming with dread and foreboding. It will be a hard and hungry winter in all of Europe. * * *
>
> A terrific need for food is still evident all over Europe. In France 17,000,000 city dwellers get an average daily ration of about 12 ounces of bread, one-half ounce of meat, 1 ounce of cheese, 2½ ounces of fat, and one-half an ounce of sugar. In a recent week in Amsterdam the individual ration consisted of one loaf of bread, 7 ounces of biscuits, half a pound of rice flour, 1 ounce of cheese and 2 ounces of fat—that for a full week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

I do not close my eyes for a single moment to the fact that the American people have given all they could in this war, given most of all their own flesh and blood, but my speech today is dedicated not to depriving them of anything, it is dedicated to trying to keep faith with the men who lie dead on the battlefields of the world. I literally mean that, because, in my judgment, unless food is gotten to the people of France, Belgium, Holland, and Norway, yes, and Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, and Greece, and China, and some other countries, unless

it gets there in the next few months, the chance of the rehabilitation of the economies of those countries will be set back maybe for years, and the chance for peace and freedom set back even more. I view this as an investment in enabling those people to help themselves. I know our Secretary of Agriculture wants to help all he can. I know the problems of finance are complex. That is why I have proposed a revival of lend-lease just for this winter, just for food. The President of the United States only a few days ago said he believed the problems of finance were the crucial ones. I hope most earnestly that Congress is going to make it clear to the President that insofar as we can assist in meeting that part of the problem we are ready to do so, whether through UNRRA or otherwise. I need not remind the House that the war crisis is by no means past, that the whole world still trembles on the brink of dangers yet unknown. Let America not fail to heed the call of a hungry humanity in the months immediately ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LIQUIDATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to be known as the Government Corporation Liquidation Act of 1945. The bill provides that, regardless of how created, on or before July 1, 1946, Government corporations enumerated in the bill shall be dissolved and proceed to liquidate their holdings.

Among these corporations are the Institute of Inter-American Affairs; Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc.; Cargoes, Inc.; Petroleum Reserves Corporation; Rubber Development Corporation; and the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

The bill further provides that the corporations just named, together with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Corporation, Rubber Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, Disaster Loan Corporation, United States Spruce Production Corporation, and the United States Housing Corporation, shall complete their liquidation by July 1, 1947, and that if by that time they have not completely liquidated their holdings all the remaining properties shall be transferred to the Treasury Department for final disposition.

The corporate device in Government has assumed such proportions that it has relegated the Congress to an inferior position. I propose that Congress should regain the power which has been delegated to these corporations. It may develop that some of the functions of the corporations to be abolished are necessary in the proper conduct of our Government. If that is the case and it is so established at the time of hearings on the bill, such functions can be transferred to one of the regular established agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

Not all of the Government corporations have been included in my bill. It was not without some thought that they were excluded. They are not included in this bill for the reason I am not sure that they could be abolished without injury to the operation of our Government. As a matter of fact, there are a number of them whose functions will need to be continued. I do believe, however, that of those that are left there should be consolidation so that one corporation could carry on the services that a number of them are handling at the present time. For example, there are a half dozen corporations that loan money in connection with agricultural operations where one would be sufficient. The Department of Agriculture supervises the operation of the production credit corporations, the regional agricultural credit corporations, the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation, as well as additional corporations. Certainly there could be a consolidation of some of these corporations that would render satisfactory service and would save duplication as well as a considerable amount of expense to the Government. I believe that at the time of the hearings on my bill the committee should give careful consideration to all of the Government corporations with a view of determining whether additional corporations could be abolished and whether there could be a consolidation of services now being performed by a number of such corporations. Let me state further that I believe services of many of these corporations could be performed by established agencies without need of corporate powers.

In considering the final liquidation of the Government corporations which I named herein and which are included in my bill, I believe that a few pertinent facts concerning some of them would be of interest not only to the Congress but to the country at large.

Public Law 109, Seventy-ninth Congress, 1945, dissolves the Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, and Disaster Loan Corporation, and transfers them to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. No liquidation date is fixed.

The United States Surplus Production Corporation and the United States Housing Corporation have been in liquidation since 1918, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has been in liquidation since 1936.

Also it should be pointed out that Congress has provided dissolution and expiration dates for several of the corporations included in my bill. For example, the Petroleum Reserves Corporation and the War Damage Corporation are to expire on January 22, 1947. Inasmuch as the war has been concluded earlier than contemplated, I believe that stepping up the date 6 months for the expiration of these corporations created during the war will be advantageous.

The reasoning which prompted the introduction of this bill was based upon the inescapable conclusion that the Government corporation audit bill which passed the House several days ago is ineffective. That bill, the Members will recall, provided for no more than an audit of the Government corporations. An audit such as the one provided for in that bill will take years, during which time these corporations will continue to function. The Federal employees who are the officers and directors of these corporations have no intention of taking any affirmative action toward final and complete liquidation.

In most of the acts of Congress pertaining to corporations there is no mention of a date upon which final liquidation shall be consummated. This is a tragedy because, according to the administration policy for the past 10 or 12 years, it takes a Government corporation four or five times as long to liquidate as it does to perform its duties and functions as an operating corporation. During the so-called liquidation, the corporate entity lies dormant, but can be revived, oftentimes with little more than an Executive or departmental order. Make no mistake about it. The fact that a Government corporation has been dissolved does not mean that it is no longer a drain upon the Federal Treasury or a waste of the taxpayer's money. Thus, an audit does not solve this problem.

The problem with respect to final liquidation is further complicated by the fact that many acts of Congress which were rushed through at the urgent request of the administration contain no definite dissolution date. It is obvious that the present long and tedious liquidation process will not even begin until Congress takes affirmative action.

Most of the corporations affected by my bill were created either during the depression or the war period. The time has come to return to sanity in Government operations. The corporate device need not be used again if Government functions are organized under established departments of the Government.

As I have heretofore suggested new and additional corporations have been created whose functions could have been very well carried on through corporations already in existence. The Department of Agriculture is full of such examples. Unless definite effort is made by this Congress to liquidate and terminate these unnecessary corporations, it will be a long time before those in charge of them will make any move in that direction.

I do not claim that my bill is perfect in every detail, nor that other Government corporations should not be included. It does represent a serious effort upon my part to solve the problem in legislative manner. The bill is a working start. Hearings upon the measure will develop additional evidence which will show the necessity of immediate action along the lines I have suggested.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HINSHAW, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HAND (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. SULLIVAN, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. PRIEST, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. BULWINKLE, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARRIS, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. O'HARA, for 2 days, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1274. An act to amend the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 to provide for an orderly transition from a war to a peacetime economy through supplementation of unemployment compensation payable under State laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 1354. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of general of the Army, fleet admiral of the United States Navy, and general in the Marine Corps, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 25, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m., on Tuesday, September 25, 1945, on H. R. 2202, in room 362, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing on Wednesday, September 26, 1945, at 10:30 a. m. on H. R. 714, H. R. 2299, H. R. 2650, H. R. 954, H. R. 1131, H. R. 1981, H. R. 2957, and H. R. 3441.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, September 27, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1751, to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Merchant Marine Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics other than the United States.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, October 4, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m. to consider the bill (H. R. 3367) to amend Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing Tuesday, October 2, 1945, at 10:30 a. m. on H. R. 2111 and H. R. 4079, to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, and for other purposes. Hearings will be held in the committee room, 416 Old House Office Building. Anyone desiring to give testimony should notify the clerk of the committee prior to date of hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, will meet at 10 a. m., Tuesday, Octoer 9, to begin hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

Various groups who have representation in Washington will be heard during the first week, such as Members of Congress first, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Association of American Railroads, railroad traffic organizations, railroad labor, and truck and bus associations.

The second week will be devoted to various State commissions, agricultural associations, National Industrial Traffic League, and various citizens' traffic associations and traffic boards and chambers of commerce.

It is going to be necessary to limit the time for this hearing as much as possible. It is also desired to avoid any repetition in statements before the committee.

The committee would be pleased to have those who are intending to appear to advise the clerk promptly the least amount of time they will need in which to present their testimony.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

686. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Agriculture.

687. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

688. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

689. A letter from the Chairman, President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, transmitting its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending December 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

690. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $21,940 for the Executive Office of the President, Executive Mansion, and grounds (H. Doc. No. 288); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

691. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $16,000 for the Federal Power Commission (H. Doc. No. 289); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 716. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 1016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 902. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in a Quonset hut at Harrowbeer Airport, Yelverton, South Devon, England, on December 26, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 1017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 985. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires occurring at various naval shore activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 986. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in administration building at the naval air station, Bunker Hill, Ind., on December 28, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 1019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1062. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945; with amendment (Rept. No. 1020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3759. A bill to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 1021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 2677. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to accept and dispose of real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson, of Polk County, Ark., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on claims. S. 451. An act for the relief of Carl Baumann; without amendment (Rept. No. 972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on claims. S. 489. An act for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on claims. S. 573. An act for the relief of Lee D. Hoseley; without amendment (Rept. No. 974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on claims. S. 694. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers; without amendment (Rept. No. 975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on claims. S. 729. An act for the relief of William Andrew Evans; without amendment (Rept. No. 976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on claims. S. 762. An act for the relief of Everett McLendon, Sr.; Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr.; Mr. and Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr., for the benefit of their minor daughter, Nadine McLendon; and Everett McLendon, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 857. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Ford; without amendment (Rept. No. 978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 909. An act for the relief of Hugh Egan; without amendment (Rept. No. 979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 929. An act for the relief of Henry H. Huffman and Mrs. Marie J. Huffman; without amendment (Rept. No. 980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 996. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg) William Augustus White, United States Naval Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1007. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward P. Standley; without amendment (Rept. No. 982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRANAHAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 801. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children; with amendment (Rept. No. 983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 874. A bill for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges; with amendment (Rept. No. 984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 875. A bill for the relief of Nannie Bass; with amendment (Rept. No. 985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Annie M. Lannon; with amendment (Rept. No. 986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on claims. H. R. 2027. A bill for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2160. A bill for the relief of John J. Gall; with amendment (Rept. No. 988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2310. A bill for the relief of James A. Brady; without amendment (Rept. No. 989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2332. A bill for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.; with amendment (Rept. 990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2399. A bill for the relief of Arlethia Rosser; with amendment (Rept. No. 991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Capt. Werner Holtz; with amendment (Rept. No. 992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Helen Alton; with amendment (Rept. No. 993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRANAHAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2579. A bill for the relief of John G. Johnson; with amendment (Rept. No. 994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2642. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson; with amendment (Rept. No. 995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2686. A bill for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood; with amendment (Rept. No. 996). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2723. A bill for the relief of I. H. Beasley; with amendment (Rept. No. 997). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2810. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stuart B. Riley; with amendment (Rept. No. 998). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims:. H. R. 2835. A bill for the relief of James Lynch; with amendment (Rept. No. 999). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2836. A bill for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti; with amendment (Rept. No. 1000). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2927. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Merritt; with amendment (Rept. No. 1001). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRANAHAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3011. A bill for the relief of John Hames; with amendment (Rept. No. 1002). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3137. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1003). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3198. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1004). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3249. A bill for the relief of Stanley J. Lilly; with amendment (Rept. No. 1005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 136. An act for the relief of the Oregon Caves Resort; without amendment (Rept. No. 1007). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 935. A bill for the relief of Andreas Andersen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1979. A bill for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1009). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2595. A bill for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly; with amendment (Rept. No. 1010). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2620. A bill for the relief of Leslie O. Allen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1011). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2729. A bill for the relief of Donald George; with amendment (Rept. No. 1012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3008. A bill for the relief of Don Hicks; with amendment (Rept. No. 1013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3302. A bill for the relief of Christian H. Kreusler; with amendment (Rept. No. 1014). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3790. A bill for the relief of Genevieve Lund; with amendment (Rept. No. 1015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORT

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. House Resolution 351. Resolution directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives certain information relative to surplus aircraft (Rept. No. 1006). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 4152. A bill to establish a commission of national defense to study the technological revision of our national defense necessitated by atomic and other weapons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4153. A bill to repeal section 3540 of chapter 33A of Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 4154. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of forest products pilot plants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOLGER:

H. R. 4155. A bill to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting or required enlistment of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOCH:

H. R. 4156. A bill to provide for the immediate discharge from the armed forces of members thereof who were in enemy custody as prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 4157. A bill to preserve as a national memorial the United States aircraft carrier *Enterprise;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 4158. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present court house; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4159. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 4160. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 4161. A bill to provide that no veteran of World War II shall be denied mustering-out payment on account of being under age for service in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:
H. R. 4162. A bill to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to prescribe rules of pleading, practice, and procedure with respect to proceedings in criminal cases prior to and including verdict, or finding, or plea of guilty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:
H. R. 4163. A bill to amend Revised Statute 4131 (46 U. S. C. 221); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:
H. R. 4164. A bill to terminate rationing in the case of butter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:
H. R. 4165. A bill to prohibit aliens and felons from acting as officers or agents of corporations or business associations engaged in interstate commerce, or of labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:
H. R. 4166. A bill relating to assignments of claims against the United States for consideration for performance of personal services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:
H. R. 4167. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Coal Creek and its tributaries, in the State of Tennessee, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. WALTER:
H. R. 4168. A bill to limit the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:
H. R. 4169. A bill to provide for the liquidation of certain Government corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STIGLER:
H. R. 4170. A bill to dispense with the maximum income requirements necessary to establish eligibility for pensions for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BUFFETT:
H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution to create a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States to investigate and study all Federal salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLE of New York:
H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution authorizing an investigation relative to the readjustment of the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:
H. R. 4171. A bill for the relief of Mohamed Abdolah; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GATHINGS:
H. R. 4172. A bill for the relief of Carlton G. Jerry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARTLEY:
H. R. 4173. A bill granting a pension to Clara M. Stowe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JUDD:
H. R. 4174. A bill for the relief of Mayer G. Hansen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON:
H. R. 4175. A bill for the relief of Emile G. Peltier; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:
H. R. 4176. A bill for the relief of Mabel R. Woodfall; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1180. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Petition of Allen T. Frams and 20 citizens of Meeteetse, Basin, and Burlington, Wyo., in favor of H. R. 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1181. By Mr. COLE of Missouri: Petition of Sybil Barclay, of Fairfield, Mo., and 26 others; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1182. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of United German-American Societies of Syracuse, N. Y., requesting the reestablishment of facilities of communication for the use of citizens of the United States and residents of Germany; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1183. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of R. S. Hawkins and nine others, of Mexia, Tex., route 4, favoring legislation for the full pay and allowances to enlisted men of the Army of the United States for accrued furlough time which is now paid to Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1184. Also, petition of D. F. Fortson and 13 others, of Centerville, Tex., favoring legislation for the full pay and allowances to enlisted men of the Army of the United States for accrued furlough time which is now paid to Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1185. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Board of Commissioners of the City of Bayonne, N. J., endorsing the recommendation of President Harry S. Truman, as contained in the Kilgore bill, calling for a Nation-wide standard of unemployment insurance benefits of $25 for 26 weeks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1186. Also, petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Bayonne, N. J., wholeheartedly endorsing the Murray-Patman full-employment bill, and urging its immediate passage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1187. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Calvin Starr and several other citizens of Jasper County, Mo., urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1188. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Resolution by the executive council, Maine State Federation of Labor, Charles O. Dunton, secretary, urging reconversion period to cover time required to return to normal conditions of peaceful pursuits, and urging the maintenance of Government control of production; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1189. By The SPEAKER: Petition of Pueblo Chamber of Commerce, Pueblo, Colo., proposing a Missouri Valley Authority bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, September 10, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, fountain of all life, from whom cometh all serenity and certainty, flow into us as a deep and healing stream this day and let little things be submerged in great things and the fretful anxieties of time be seen in the quiet horizons of the abiding. Deliver us from the sin of self-distrust and from the greater sin of forgetting Thee to trust ourselves.

We tremble at the possibilities for evil which lurk in our own hearts. Grant unto Thy erring and willful children moral control and a ruling passion for world brotherhood, lest the awful instruments of death and destruction now held in frail human hands scourge the planet and melt into brittle glass the fruitful earth.

Open our eyes to the futility of changing maps without changing men. To this end may selfishness and all uncleanness be burned from our hearts, error purged from our minds, and our wills be lost in Thine: In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., September 25, 1945.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GEORGE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, September 24, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—LETTER FROM THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, certain legislation has been offered in the Senate, and I understand approved by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, suggesting the creation of a commission to handle the control, development, and use of the atomic bomb. I understand this legislation, and I know of several other suggestions that included the idea that the Chief Justice of the United States should be chairman of such a commission. Knowing that upon a previous occasion when it was suggested that the Chief Justice should serve as chairman of a commission to control soldiers voting the Chief Justice felt that any such assignment would be impossible for him to accept, I presented an inquiry to him with respect to the suggestion that he should head the commission to deal with the atomic bomb. I send to the desk a letter from the Chief Justice and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., September 24, 1945.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: I have your letter of the 21st, inquiring whether I would be disposed to accept the chairmanship of a

mixed commission to study and report upon the control, development, and use of atomic energy.

I am not unmindful of the grave importance of such an undertaking, and I can say that I would be deeply interested in rendering such a service if I were free to undertake it. But the duties of a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States are difficult and exacting. Their adequate performance is in a very real sense a "full-time job." I have accepted the office, and acceptance necessarily carries with it the obligation on my part to give whatever of time and energy are needful for the performance of its functions.

Having some knowledge of the nature of the problem which the proposed commission would be called upon to study, I am satisfied that I could not adequately discharge the duties of my office and at the same time give appropriate attention to the work of the commission. As I am already committed to the former, it is clear to me that I could not rightly undertake the latter.

With kind personal regards and all good wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

HARLAN F. STONE.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest that the letter from the Chief Justice lie upon the table pending a decision by the Senate regarding the appropriate forum to which the proposal for the control of atomic energy should be referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter will lie on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2716. An act to provide for health programs for Government employees;

H. R. 3636. An act relating to the sale, in the District of Columbia, of certain small rockfish;

H. R. 3867. An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to the making and publishing of annual reports by trust companies;

H. R. 3868. An act to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the District of Columbia, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration; and

H. R. 3873. An act to provide for the opening of a road within the boundaries of the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 3686. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the registers of the land offices in Alaska to perform functions under the Alaska real property ownership declaration law; and

H. R. 3974. An act to provide for termination of daylight saving time.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 583)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 24th instant,

Mr. RADCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. TAFT, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted on September 24, 1945, minority views on the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RESCISSIONS OF PORTIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT (H. DOC. NO. 290)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting proposed rescissions of portions of appropriations for the Military Establishment available for the fiscal year 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COST ASCERTAINMENT REPORT OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the cost ascertainment report and appendix for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH USE OF TRAILERS AT MURPHY AND FONTANA DAM, N. C., AND PARSONS, TENN.

A letter from the general manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of receipts and expenses in connection with the use of trailers at Murphy, N. C., Fontana Dam, N. C., and Parsons, Tenn. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

CLAIM OF WILLIAM WILSON WURSTER AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of William Wilson Wurster against the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS

Mr. TYDINGS presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland praying for continuance of the day care centers established under the provisions of the Lanham Act, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

OLD-AGE SECURITY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF RICE LAKE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Rice Lake Wis., relating to old-age security.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Rice Lake, Wis., in regular session assembled, That the Congress of the United States of America be requested to pass either H. R. 2229 or H. R. 2230 as a broadened measure at the very earliest date possible in order to provide old-age security for all our people in an adequate amount for each retired worker and to force into circulation each and every month the full amount collected to provide such annuities, less the necessary administration expense, thus providing a constant strong demand for goods and services; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman MERLIN HULL and to Senators ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., and ALEXANDER WILEY.

Passed this 28th day of August 1945.

Approved this 28th day of August 1945.

R. E. FINSTERWALDER,
Mayor.

Attest:

G. M. BAILEY,
City Clerk.

LIMIT OF ALCOHOLIC CONTENT IN BEVERAGES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Kansas Annual Conference of the United Brethren in Christ at Salina, Kans., on August 29, 1945, favoring one-half of 1 percent to be the limit of alcoholic content in beverages.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That we the members of the Eighty-ninth session of the Kansas Annual Conference of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ here convened in Salina, Kans., desire to make it known to the Congress of Kansas, and the Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., that we favor one-half of 1 percent to be the limit of alcoholic content for all beverages for human consumption, and further move that the secretary of this conference be instructed to write letters to our Representatives in the Senate and House of both Houses of Congress in Kansas and in Washington, D. C., to this effect.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 1765. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the Agricultural Byproducts Laboratory on the campus of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts; without amendment (Rept. No. 590).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1426. A bill to provide for the replanning and rebuilding of slum, blighted, and other areas of the District of Columbia and the assembly, by purchase or condemnation, of real property in such areas and the sale or lease thereof for the redevelopment of such area in accordance with said plans; and to provide for the organization of, procedure for, and the financing of such planning, acquisition, and sale or lease; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 591).

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to provide for the formulation of policies with respect to the control and use of atomic energy; with amendments; and

S. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George Catlett Marshall and to the officers and men of the Army who served under him during World War II; and providing for the procurement of a gold medal to be presented to General Marshall in the name of the people of the United States; with an amendment.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1430. A bill for the relief of Melvin McNeal and Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence McNeal; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 1431. A bill to provide relief for members of the American Volunteer Group in China and for their dependents; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1432. A bill to establish a Bureau of Veterans' Arts and Crafts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution authorizing report relative to location and cost of monument on public ground in District of Columbia to Armed Services of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution designating the 5th day of January of each year as George Washington Carver Day, and providing for the appropriate observance thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2716. An act to provide for health programs for Government employees; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 3636. An act relating to the sale, in the District of Columbia, of certain small rockfish;

H. R. 3867. An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to the making and publishing of annual reports by trust companies;

H. R. 3868. An act to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the District of Columbia, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration; and

H. R. 3873. An act to provide for the opening of a road within the boundaries of the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted an amendment, Mr. HICKENLOOPER submitted two amendments, and Mr. RADCLIFFE submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STIMULATION OF VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. REVERCOMB (for himself, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. WILSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HISTORY OF THE NAVAL ACADEMY (S. DOC. NO. 91)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, at my request the Navy Department has prepared a history of the Naval Academy, its growth and expansion during the past 100 years. The Academy will celebrate its centennial on October 10. I ask that this historical sketch be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REORGANIZATION OF THE INTELLIGENCE SERVICE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by him on Saturday last relative to President Truman's plan for the reorganization of the Nation's Intelligence Service, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM—DEBATE BETWEEN SENATOR WILEY AND LEO M. CHERNE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a joint debate on the unemployment problem participated in by him and Leo M. Cherne, executive secretary, Research Institute of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE POSTMASTER GENERAL AT SPRINGFIELD, MO.

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Postmaster General, Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, at Springfield, Mo., on the occasion of a dinner given in his honor, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLISH CATASTROPHE—ARTICLE BY F. A. VOIGT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Polish Catastrophe," by F. A. Voigt, from the September 1945 issue of the magazine the Nineteenth Century and After, which appears in the Appendix.]

REMARKS OF J. HOWARD PEW AT PICNICS OF SUN OIL EMPLOYEES' ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the remarks of J. Howard Pew, president of the Sun Oil Co., at picnics of the Sun Oil Employees Athletic Association at Marcus Hook on August 12 and August 19, 1945, which appear in the Appendix.]

IF I WERE A LABOR LEADER AGAIN—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM S. JACK

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "If I Were a Labor Leader Again," by William S. Jack, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNCIL FIASCO—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Council Fiasco" from the Washington Post of September 25, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DENAZIFICATION DIFFICULTIES—ARTICLE BY RAYMOND MOLEY

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Denazification Difficulties," by Raymond Moley, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT FROM IWO—POEM BY VICTOR HEYDEN

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Report from Iwo," written by Victor Heyden, of the United States Coast Guard, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GUFFEY obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Murray
Andrews	Gurney	Myers
Bailey	Hart	O'Daniel
Ball	Hatch	Overton
Barkley	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bridges	Hill	Robertson
Briggs	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Knowland	Taylor
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Tobey
Carville	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	McMahon	Walsh
Donnell	Magnuson	Wheeler
Downey	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Mead	White
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Mitchell	Willis
George	Moore	Wilson
Gerry	Morse	Young
Green	Murdock	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

HENRY L. STIMSON

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, as a life-long Democrat and a firm believer in party government, I should like to pay tribute to a great Republican who is also a great American, Henry L. Stimson, the man who was read out of his party because he wanted to serve his country as President Roosevelt's Secretary of War.

In my service in the Senate I have known two men who were really national-minded, men who saw America steadily and saw America whole, men who not only loved America as patriots but served America as statesmen.

One of these two men was the late George W. Norris, former Senator from Nebraska.

George Norris mistakenly opposed our participation in the First World War. He did so sincerely, and was respected for it.

Later, as legislative architect of the TVA and as an ardent battler against privilege and for the rights and dignity of the common man, George Norris helped prepare this country for victory in World War II. And as he came to realize that he had been mistaken in 1917, he admitted it and committed himself heart and soul to America's armed struggle against Axis tyranny and aggression.

The other of these two national-minded men is Henry L. Stimson, a man who has served in three Cabinets in the course of a public career which extended over a period of nearly 40 years, and proved both the vitality and continuity of American principles and American interests in world affairs.

Mr. Stimson, as we all know, never held an elective office in his life.

Under our Constitution, thank God, we are able to offer opportunity for service to men of all qualities without reference to skill in political electioneering.

President Taft appointed him Secretary of War during the closing years of the Taft administration.

After Woodrow Wilson's victory in 1912, Mr. Stimson returned to private law practice, and when America was at war served in France as colonel of field artillery.

It was not until the midtwenties that Stimson returned to public life.

Then Secretary of State Kellogg had involved the Coolidge administration in embarrassing difficulties in Nicaragua—the so-called Sandino affair.

Coolidge called on Stimson, who dropped his private business and went in person to Nicaragua, where he settled matters amicably and on a self-respecting basis.

What later became the good-neighbor policy received its first impetus, thanks to Henry Stimson's genius for statesmanship.

He was then sent to Manila as Governor General of the Philippines, where he first came into direct contact with Japan's drive for imperial aggrandizement.

President Hoover recalled him to Washington to serve as Secretary of State during his tragic 4 years' administration.

During these 4 years Mr. Stimson worked loyally to give effect to President Hoover's foreign policies of canceling the war debts by the Hoover moratorium and naval disarmament.

These policies led, in turn, to the Japanese aggression against Manchuria in 1931.

Despite Republican opposition, Secretary Stimson had the courage to associate this Government with the League of Nations and to invoke the Kellogg-Briand Pact for the outlawry of war in order to restrain Japan, only to find that the great European powers, including Great Britain, were unwilling to take a stand against Japan.

However, President-elect Roosevelt had understood the meaning of Stimson's diplomacy and, well before his inauguration on March 4, 1933, had specifically endorsed Stimson's policy in the Far East.

For Roosevelt, like Stimson, was a national-minded man, who preferred the welfare and safety of America to any consideration of political partisanship.

There might be and were grave political differences between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hoover, but that did not extend to American foreign policy in the Pacific as developed over the years.

It was in June 1940 that President Roosevelt invited Henry L. Stimson to become Secretary of War while the late Frank Knox, of Chicago, another great American, was asked to become Secretary of the Navy.

Hitler had smashed through the low countries, France was about to fall, and England had barely rescued her Army from Dunkerque.

The Republican Convention was about to meet, and the chief contenders for the Republican Presidential nomination included several convinced isolationists.

The late Wendell Willkie was not conceded much of a chance by most observers, since Willkie was also a national-minded American and no isolationist.

As a reward, Mr. Stimson and Colonel Knox were both read out of the Republican Party, but their distinction was such that this incident alone, in my opinion, tipped the scales away from isolationism and toward Willkie's nomination in that year of great decision, 1940.

That Henry L. Stimson was a great Secretary of War is attested by all who served under him.

In his late seventies—he is now 78 years old—he spent himself for more than 5 years in a hard, gruelling job that would have wilted many men younger than himself.

A Republican himself, he attracted to the Nation's cause many other Republicans and staffed his Department with Republicans in all policy-making positions.

I think we can all agree that, regardless of party labels, they did a splendid job for the American people.

We all know that mistakes were made, some of them serious, as was the failure to evaluate the Japanese threat against Pearl Harbor, but they were never fatal, and none of them was due to improper motives, lack of courage, or energy.

An enormous army was drafted, trained, and equipped.

Mountains of munitions and supplies of all kinds moved to the battle fronts.

The War Department, under Henry L. Stimson, never launched a campaign which it lost, never faced an enemy that it did not conquer.

President Roosevelt backed Mr. Stimson up loyally, and Mr. Stimson never faltered in his loyalty to the President, the Constitution, and the country which he served.

They made a great team and one which for the first time in our history gave free scope to science, from the jeep to the jet-propelled plane, and from radar to the atomic bomb.

Not since the days when Edwin Stanton was Lincoln's Secretary of War has the War Department faced so grave a crisis; not since the days when Newton D. Baker joined Woodrow Wilson's Cabinet has a Secretary of War been compelled to deal with problems of such magnitude and in such great multitude.

Henry L. Stimson, in my humble opinion, was a greater Secretary of War than either Stanton or Baker, great as they were, and when the full history of these times is written, future generations may rank him far above any of the men who have served their country as organizers of victory.

If the Republican Party cares to expel any more men of the caliber of Henry Stimson, we Democrats will be glad to have them.

Mr. President, it was most pleasing to me when the President of the United States saw fit to award Henry L. Stimson, Republican, statesman, and American, the Distinguished Service Medal. It was well deserved.

THE ACHESON-MacARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, yesterday I participated briefly in a discussion which took place concerning the controversy between Mr. Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, and General MacArthur. I laid stress upon the confusion and misunderstanding which prevailed throughout the country relative to the subject. I emphasized the interpretation of the press reports concerning Mr. Acheson's conference with the members of the press and newspapers throughout the country generally, and referred to the emphasis which had been placed by them upon Mr. Acheson's statements.

I wish to read briefly an editorial from the Pittsburg (Kans.) Headlight of September 20, 1945. The Headlight is one of the important smaller newspapers in Kansas. The writer of the editorial is one of the ablest editorial writers of whom I know. The editorial reads:

AS THE PUBLIC SAW IT

When Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State, put out his snippy statement which said that General MacArthur was not making policies in governing Japan, he invited what he got in the Senate Thursday. Acheson has been nominated to be Under Secretary of State. A Republican and a Democratic Senator went into action when the nomination of Acheson came up. WHERRY, of Nebraska, and CHANDLER, of Kentucky, assailed Acheson for this insult to General MacArthur. The talk got so hot that the majority leader, BARKLEY, brought about a postponement of action.

Whether what they said was sound or not, WHERRY and CHANDLER expressed the general view of the public that Acheson had no business making the statement that he made. The public generally interpreted the utterance as a nasty attempt to call down the supreme Allied commander who is at the front in Japan. The State Department official appeared in the picture, as the public saw it, angry because of the remark of MacArthur that under certain conditions the huge force of American men and boys now in the Pacific could be reduced to 200,000. The State Department might not believe that this is possible. But certainly there was no reason for the Department to discard diplomatic language in expressing itself.

The American public will have greater faith in what MacArthur says in Tokyo about things in Japan than in what Acheson says in Washington about things in Japan.

Mr. President, I have no desire to consume the time of the Senate. There are two other editorials which were printed on the same date in Kansas newspapers. They have reached me, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Parsons (Kans.) Sun of September 20, 1945]

WHO'S TALKING?

The Under Secretary of State, who presently is also the Acting Secretary of State, took an undisguised slap at General MacArthur yesterday.

The criticism from the State Department was over the general's statement that the occupation army in Japan could be cut to 200,000 troops within 6 months. The State Department didn't like it. Some others in Washington didn't like it, either. They are asking who is making the policy, Washington or General MacArthur?

It is expected that the country will show little sympathy for the expressions of surprise coming from Washington. It will put its faith behind an experienced officer on the scene who by past actions has demonstrated he knows whereof he speaks. It is some 6,500 miles from Washington to Japan, and that is quite a distance from which to judge how many men will be needed for occupation duty, whatever the policy, even if the judging is done by the cocksure officials of the State Department.

General MacArthur's mistake seems to be that he didn't consult Washington beforehand. That is not too serious a mistake, however. The State Department has not been infallible in the past and its judgment in this respect should not carry any more weight, if as much, than General MacArthur.

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Journal of September 21, 1945]

AS THE DIPLOMATS SEE HIM

The occupation of Japan has evidently been proceeding entirely too smoothly and efficiently to suit the administration in Washington. There ought, of course, to be much more mystery about the whole thing. General MacArthur ought never to have permitted so few difficulties to arise. Evidently he doesn't realize how provoking it is to the State Department's diplomats when decisions are made on the basis of mere facts. Furthermore, he let the public in on his plans, which is unpardonable.

It is obvious that MacArthur, who smokes a corncob pipe and doesn't wear a necktie, is just not built to wear striped pants.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT P. PATTERSON TO BE SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks copies of two letters. One of the letters was sent to Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, and signed Joseph Leib, service officer, past vice commander, Vincent R. Costello Post, No. 15, the American Legion, Washington, D. C. The other letter was an acknowledgment of the receipt of the letter to which I have just referred, signed by the clerk of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States Senate.

Mr. Leib objects to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Patterson as Secretary of War. I take no part in the controversy, but Mr. Leib has performed good service for the country at different times in calling attention to the poor quality of airplanes which were being used, and I believe he is entitled to have the letters to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: I hereby request an opportunity to appear before the Senate Military Affairs Committee relative to the nomination of Robert P. Patterson as Secretary of War.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH LEIB,
Service Officer, Past Vice Commander, Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, the American Legion

---

SEPTEMBER 19, 1945.

Received of Mr. Joseph Leib a letter dated September 19, 1945, addressed to Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman, Military Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C., requesting hearings on nomination of Hon. Robert P. Patterson to be Secretary of War.

W. I. SMALLEY,
Clerk, Military Affairs Committee, United States Senate.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which, being in the nature of a substitute for the bill, will be regarded, for the purpose of amendment, as a question. Perfecting amendments will have precedence, and should be offered before the vote is had on the committee amendment.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate on the pending bill, Senate bill 380, and I hope I may be permitted to complete my statement without interruption.

The full employment bill deals with the central economic problem of our time—the problem of assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy.

Failure to solve this problem would undermine the health and well-being of our people, shatter our political and social institutions, and wreck our hopes for avoiding a third world war.

Success in handling this problem would provide the people of America with the opportunity to enjoy the boundless resources and wealth with which providence has blessed us. It would strengthen our free-enterprise system against attack by alien philosophies. It would make an invaluable contribution to the maintenance of lasting peace among nations.

The full employment bill, in the form reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, provides the instrumentality through which business, farmers, labor, State and local governments and the Federal Government can work together in solving this problem and assuring sufficient employment opportunities for all who are able to work and desire to work. It sets forth general policies to guide us.

It establishes procedures and machinery through which we can translate these policies into action.

The full employment bill is a nonpartisan measure. It is sponsored by such able and distinguished Members of the Senate as the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

This bill, as reported to the Senate by the Senator from New Hampshire and myself on behalf of the Banking and Currency Committee, is the product of long study and intensive hearings. Its principles will be explained in considerable detail by its other sponsors. It is my purpose at this moment merely to give a brief analysis of its major provisions and set forth the reasons why the Banking and Currency Committee has recommended that it be enacted without further change.

By itself, the full employment bill will not, and is not intended to, produce a single job. As the Honorable Fred M. Vinson stated in his report to the Banking and Currency Committee on May 30, 1945:

> S. 380 does not profess to present a full conceived program for the achievement of full employment. * * * It is the necessary first step from which a full dress program of economic policies to promote the well-being of our free competitive economy will stem.

Like the San Francisco Charter, the full employment bill is a landmark, but not the end of the road. It can be effective only with continuous and conscientious implementation. Its objectives can be achieved only through the concerted and cooperative efforts of all economic groups and all levels of Government.

In recent months there has been much discussion about the need for strengthening the Congress. It has been pointed out that there is no arm of Congress which studies the annual State of the Union message as a whole. The full employment bill remedies this defect by establishing a joint committee of Congress to study the over-all problems of employment and production and to develop a full employment program adjusted to changing needs and changing conditions.

The purpose of this joint committee was admirably expressed by the master of the National Grange, Mr. Albert S. Goss, when he testified before your com-

mittee in favor of the full employment bill. Let me quote Mr. Goss:

Too frequently we have approached the consideration of such basic economic problems as taxation, transportation, tariffs, labor legislation, farm legislation, financial legislation, and a host of others in a detached and narrow manner, without adequate consideration for the effect of the policy established upon our whole economy. Every sore spot affects our whole economy, but we have been too much inclined to consider each problem separately. Here, in the joint committee, the interdependence of all segments of our economy would be recognized in a practical way.

The bill also makes it the responsibility of the President to submit to Congress a National Production and Employment Budget which contains the basic information needed by Congress in its deliberations.

We learned during the war that we can keep moving forward at high speed only if we have a goal. During the war we could not produce 100,000 airplanes until a goal had first been set. After the war we shall not be able to achieve full employment unless we set forth the full employment goal in specific terms.

Accordingly the first item in the National Production and Employment Budget is a statement of economic goals. These goals are set forth in terms of employment, production and consumption.

This recognizes the fact that employment depends upon production and production depends upon the purchase of goods and services that are produced.

The National Production and Employment Budget also provides for an appraisal of current economic trends—so that the Congress can judge the extent to which our goals are being met.

Finally, the national budget provides for a general program for attaining the goals that have been set forth.

To quote the testimony of Hon. John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the national budget—

provides a procedure for determining the state of health of the country as far as production and employment are concerned. It is a barometer by which to gage the economic climate.

By using this procedure and this barometer, the executive branch and the Congress will jointly develop the full employment program. Each will carry out its appropriate responsibilities under the Constitution. The Congress will make the decisions on policy. The executive branch will administer programs already established and submit new proposals to the Congress.

But the full employment bill is not limited to procedures and machinery. Section 2 of the bill also sets forth the principles to be followed in the development of our full employment program.

The first of these principles is found in subsection (a) of section 2:

It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to foster free competitive private enterprise and the investment of private capital.

This principle is based upon the conviction that full employment and free enterprise are twin objectives. It is based upon the rejection of the belief that sustained full employment is impossible under our free-enterprise system. In fact, we cannot have continuing full employment under our institutions without the expansion of private enterprise and the investment of private capital. Full employment without free enterprise, granted that it could be obtained that way, would be contrary to the traditions and desires of the American people.

The second of these principles deals with the rights of human beings. Subsection (c) of section 2, in setting forth the responsibility of the Federal Government to assure continuing full employment, begins as follows:

In order to assure the free exercise of the right to an opportunity for employment set forth above.

And above, in subsection (b) of section 2 it is declared that—

All Americans able to work and desiring to work are entitled to an opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment.

In his message to Congress of September 6, 1945, President Truman called for—

A natural reassertion of the right to work for every American citizen able and willing to work.

The full employment bill, as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee provides this natural reassertion that has been called for by our President. In so doing, it emphasizes the supremacy of the individual as opposed to the State. It emphasizes the fact that the sole purpose of Government is to serve human beings.

In this connection, I should like to call attention to a document entitled "The Eighteen Articles of Essential Human Rights" drafted by a committee of eminent jurists appointed by the American Law Institute.

Article 12 of this statement of human rights reads as follows:

Everyone has the right to work.

The State has a duty to take such measures as may be necessary to insure that all residents have an opportunity for useful work.

The document from which I have quoted was prepared by such eminent American jurists as William Draper Lewis, director of the American Law Institute; Noel T. Dowling, professor of law at Columbia University; Charles E. Kenworthy, of the Superior Court of Pennsylvania; Roland S. Morris, former United States Ambassador to Japan; Carl Loewenstein, professor of political science and jurisprudence, Amherst College; John E. Mulder, professor of law, University of Pennsylvania; David Reisman, former professor of law, the University of Buffalo; and Quincy Wright, professor of international law, University of Chicago.

Naturally, the statutory enunciation of the right to employment opportunity does not imply redress through the courts. The redress for individuals who feel that they do not have the opportunity to exercise this right is through action either to have their government improve its economic program or to obtain an improved administration of the Government.

The third principle set forth in section 2 is as follows:

The Federal Government has the responsibility to assure continuing full employment, that is, the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans able to work and desiring to work.

This principle is based upon the universally recognized fact that fear of unemployment and dwindling markets restrains business investment and consumer buying and thereby breeds unemployment and dwindling markets. Only the assurance that there will be sustained full employment can overcome this fear. Pious phrases about encouraging or promoting full employment will not help.

Only the Federal Government can provide this assurance. Business, by itself, cannot assume the responsibility for assuring full employment. This is admitted by the overwhelming majority of businessmen who appeared before our committee. Neither State governments nor local governments, by themselves, can assure full employment. This is well recognized by our governors and mayors.

The exercise of this responsibility by the Federal Government cannot detract in any way from the innumerable responsibilities of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments. In fact, the successful discharge of the Government's responsibility will ultimately depend upon the extent to which these groups properly exercise their own responsibilities. This fact has been admirably presented by Mr. Ralph E. Flanders in his letter to the chairman on June 14, 1945. It is to be found at page 205 of the record. Mr. Flanders is chairman of the research committee of the the Committee for Economic Development, and he is the head of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

A few brief excerpts from Mr. Flanders' letter are here in order. I quote from it:

On business devolves the duty of operating at its best possible efficiency and of thereby making it possible for it to expand production and employment, which it should do to the limit of its capacity for solid, sustained growth. It has no duty to furnish employment at a continued loss. * * * Organized labor has serious responsibilities in implementing the right to a job. * * * Local and State governments have duties in connection with the wisdom of their tax policies, the effectiveness of their preservation of human and property rights, and, in particular, the timing of construction work and any other expenditures which are not on a current basis.

Fourth, the bill firmly rejects the proposition that public employment is the main avenue toward full employment or that full employment requires continued deficit spending. Subsection (d) of section 2 emphasizes the intention of the Federal Government to assure full employment with the minimum possible resort to Federal investment and expenditure. It provides for the development of a consistent and carefully planned economic program in all fields of Federal activity. It establishes a firm priority upon the creation of an economic climate in which private enterprise can "provide, through an expanding production and distribution of goods and services, the

largest feasible volume of employment opportunities." It establishes a priority upon measures to assist State and local governments "to make their most effective contribution to assuring continuing full employment." It clearly sets forth the objective of reducing the size of the labor force by making more attractive the voluntary retirement of the older citizens.

It then provides that, to the extent that continuing full employment cannot be assured through other measures, the full financial resources of the Government shall be used to assure sufficient employment opportunities for all who are able to work and desiring to work. This principle is set forth in paragraph 4 of section (2). Let me quote this paragraph in full:

To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured (such program shall) provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment. Such Federal investment and expenditures, whether direct or indirect, or whether for public works, for public services, for assistance to business, agriculture, home owners, veterans, or consumers, or for other purposes, shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprises.

On September 21, 1944, little more than 1 year ago today, a similar statement of policy was set forth by one of America's outstanding leaders, as follows:

Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in private enterprise. * * * If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours.

The man who made that statement was the head of the Republican Party, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. If there is any difference between Governor Dewey's statement and the full employment bill, it is that the Governor went much further.

Governor Dewey said that, if necessary, the Government "must create job opportunities." The full employment bill, on the other hand, provides, not for the direct creation of work by the Government, but, if necessary, merely for "such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment."

This can include loans or grants to State and local governments and other "assistance to business, agriculture, home owners, veterans, or consumers."

In testifying before the Banking and Currency Committee in connection with this policy, Mr. Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who is well known to all Senators, made the following statement with respect to this policy on Federal investment and expenditure:

Several critics of the full-employment bill have suggested that the bill is designed to pave the way for huge deficit spending. This is a distortion of the meaning of the bill. It is my conviction that a policy designed to prevent depression and unemployment is the best contribution we can make to holding down Federal expenditures and the public debt.

In section 2, the bill also sets forth the principle of full employment without economic warfare. Let me quote subsection (e) of this section:

It is the policy of the United States to discharge the responsibilities herein set forth in such a manner as will contribute to an expanding exchange of goods and services among nations and without resort to measures or programs that would contribute to economic warfare among nations.

This provision is based upon the amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. It emphasizes that the day of economic isolationism in America is over. It indicates that the full-employment program will be oriented toward obtaining "an expanding exchange of goods and services among nations."

It declares to all the world that America is not interested in obtaining additional employment within its borders through an imperialistic drive for markets throughout the world.

For a more detailed analysis of Senate bill 380 as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, I refer the Members of the Senate to part III of the committee's report.

For an explanation of the major differences between the bill as reported, and the original bill, let me suggest a careful reading of part VIII of this report.

I should like to point out, however, that the bill as reported represents no changes in the basic principles of Senate bill 380 as introduced on January 22, 1945. The only important additions which have been made, aside from minor changes in language, deal with, first, old-age retirement, section 2 (d); second, agriculture, point 7 in section 2 (c); third, full employment without economic warfare, section 2 (e); fourth, mandatory consultation with industry, agriculture, labor, and so forth, section 4 (b). The first of these additions was proposed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and was based on a previous proposal offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. The other additions are in accordance with the amendments submitted jointly on July 28, 1945, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER.]

The full-employment bill and its principles have been enthusiastically endorsed by innumerable businessmen. They have received the enthusiastic support of every section of organized labor; including the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Labor Executives Association, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the United Mine Workers. They have been endorsed by the Methodist Federation for Social Service, the United Christian Council for Democracy, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, the Synagogue Council of America, the American Jewish Congress, the Central Council of American Rabbis, and other religious organizations. They have been endorsed by farm leaders, educational and professional groups, women's organizations, and experts in all walks of life. A partial list of the groups that have publicly endorsed the bill appears on page 19 of the committee's report.

Naturally there has been a certain amount of opposition to the bill. This has appeared in privately circulated articles and brochures. It has appeared in a portion of the press. It has appeared in part of the testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee, as well as in some of the letters sent to the chairman of the committee and printed in the record.

There are endless variations in the arguments that have been used by the opponents of the full employment bill. But, basically, their arguments boil down to three simple points.

First. They are sincerely convinced that continuing full employment cannot be achieved under our free-enterprise system.

Second. They are afraid of the effects of sustained full employment.

Third. They believe that the Government, rather than assuring full employment, should provide relief for the unemployed.

Let me take up each of these themes separately.

The argument that continuing full employment is impossible under our free-enterprise system takes many forms. Some, like the vice president of the Guaranty Trust Co., of New York City, who testified before the committee, merely state:

I think that they (depressions) are inevitable under the free-enterprise system and that the best we can hope to do is limit their depth and their duration.

Others use the deficit-financing argument and say it would cost too much. They start out by assuming an astronomical gap between the level of economic activity needed for full employment and the prospective or actual level of economic activity. They generally assume that we need a total production of $200,000,000,000 worth of goods and services, and that the purchasing power of business, consumers, and State and local governments adds up to only $140,000,000,000.

After having made this wild assumption, they then make the fantastic charge that the full-employment bill would have the Government make up the difference between these 2 figures, that is, provide $60,000,000,000 in Federal investment and expenditures.

Others claim that full employment cannot be maintained without complete regimentation. The Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, for example, has approved a report which states that depressions are "the price we pay for freedom."

Let me repeat this argument that has been made against the full employment bill: Depressions are "the price we pay for freedom."

Thus speak the councils of defeatism.

Those who support the full employment bill maintain that continuing full employment is possible under our economic system. We believe that full employment and free enterprise are entirely compatible. We believe that each one supplements and helps the other. We have studied the lessons of past depressions and are resolved that the future of America shall not be shaped by the dead hand of the past.

Those who conjure up the picture of endless deficit financing proceed on the assumption that depression is inevitable. Theirs is the arithmetic of despair. They talk in money terms about a gap of $60,000,000,000, between the goods and services that would be produced in full employment and the volume of goods and services that are being produced.

In human terms, such a gap means 20,000,000 men out of work. In other words, they start by assuming a catastrophic economic crisis, and then throw up their hands in despair at the amount of money it would cost to pull us out of such a crisis.

Those who argue that continuing full employment means regimentation are themselves sowing the seeds of economic and political revolution. No hostile foreign agent could do more to wreck the fabric of our society than to tell our people that unemployment is the price we pay for free enterprise.

In earlier years it was customary on the part of those who yearned for the past and feared the future to brand every proposal as being a step toward regimentation and the destruction of the American system. More than a century ago this argument was used against those who proposed free public schools. Later, it was used against Abraham Lincoln when he campaigned for internal improvements for the country. The same argument was made against the creation of the Federal Reserve System, the enactment of the income-tax law, the regulation of the stock exchanges, and the establishment of the right to collective bargaining.

In the case of these past measures, the net result of the cry that we were heading toward communism was to impair the reputation of those who shouted "wolf."

In the case of the full employment bill, however, those who say that full employment is impractical and that the sponsors of the full-employment bill are promising too much are jeopardizing more than their personal repute. They are publicly inviting the American people to search for some new economic system which would be compatible with sustained full employment. They are jeopardizing the future of economic and political democracy.

And now for the second source of opposition to the full employment bill: the fear of full employment.

This approach also takes many forms.

There are those who believe that full employment is inherently inflationary. Others are afraid that sustained full employment would deny them the windfall profits which can be obtained by "riding the business cycle."

Others are afraid that sustained full employment would give organized labor too much bargaining power. They claim that the fear of unemployment is a necessary incentive if they are to obtain a good day's work from their employees.

To each of these manifestations of fear there is a clear-cut answer.

The argument that full employment is inflationary is based upon the defeatist assumption that American business and American labor would take advantage of prosperity. It overlooks the basic economic fact that the fear of unemployment and depression is one of the fundamental causes of inflation. If under the full employment bill we can provide an assurance that there will be sustained full employment, we shall be able to counteract or eliminate this fear of the future and thereby remove one of the most dangerous of all inflationary factors.

Those who gear their activities to "riding the business cycle" are, for the most part, making a virtue of necessity. They are convinced that the cycle of boom and depression will go on in the future as it has in the past; and they are "out to get theirs." I am sure that most of them would prefer the stable profits to be obtained under an expanding economy based upon sustained full employment, in contrast with boom-time windfalls and depression bargains.

Those who argue that full employment would impair individual initiative overlook the fundamental fact that it is the desire for betterment which is the driving force in our free-enterprise system. Nothing can stultify initiative more than the lack of opportunity. On the other hand, sustained opportunities for employment would mean an unprecedented expansion of initiative and enterprise in every walk of life.

Those who want a safe pool of unemployed ignore the fact that a breadwinner who is out of work cannot obtain food and clothing for his family out of the thought that serious mass unemployment has been prevented. The knowledge that he is in a statistical minority will not satisfy a veteran of this war who finds that he has no opportunity for useful and remunerative employment.

Those who talk about a safe pool of unemployed also overlook the dynamics of our economic system. Men and women who are unemployed, whether they number 4,000,000 or 8,000,000, are poor customers for the goods and services produced by American industry and agriculture. Their very inability to purchase enough goods and services would precipitate a deflationary spiral which would rapidly increase the number of unemployed and bring on a major depression.

And now, Mr. President, I come to the third major argument against the full-employment bill—the argument that instead of assuring full employment, the Government should provide relief for the unemployed.

This is the logical position for anyone to take who believes that full employment is impractical and that depressions are the price we pay for freedom. This is the logical position for those to take who fear the effects of sustained full employment.

Let me quote from a letter received by the Banking and Currency Committee from Mr. Rufus Tucker, chief economist of General Motors Corp.:

> If the Government is asserted to be under an obligation to provide work for citizens, that means that the taxpayers as a whole are under an obligation to pay out money irrespective of the value of what they get for it. The taxpayers collectively may have a moral obligation to keep any citizen from starvation or excessive suffering, but it may frequently happen that that obligation can more adequately and cheaply be fulfilled in other ways than by providing jobs.

In other words, argues Mr. Tucker, relief is cheaper than full employment.

Mr. President, this argument ignores human values. It sets corporate reserves on a level above the health and dignity of the human being. It sets corporate fear of heavy taxation above our country's obligation to assure the existence of sufficient employment opportunities for all who fought this war, whether on the battlefields or in the factories.

Mr. President, this argument also ignores economic facts. In time of depression, the provision for relief may be cheaper than providing jobs. But relief is not cheaper than the prevention of depression. In fact, if we allow another depression to occur and then adopt a relief program, we shall be spending billions of dollars that might otherwise be saved. An ounce of prevention, as I have stated again and again, costs less than a pound of cure.

But those who argue that relief is cheaper take depression for granted. They have no faith in the vitality of our free-enterprise system. They have no confidence in the ability of the American people, through their Government, to win the war against unemployment.

Mr. President, unemployment and the fear of unemployment are deadly threats to American social institutions and the American way of life.

When there are too few jobs to go around, bitter conflict develops between groups and individuals. Under these conditions human virtues lose significance. The ethics of society revert to the ethics of the jungle, where "dog eats dog." Racial and personal hates emerge The forces of intolerance and fear come forth in racial and religious conflict. Group is set against group and class against class.

Ten or twelve years ago it would have been superfluous to state these things. Today, it appears that many have forgotten the misery and despair that stalked our land during the last depression. Today, it appears that many have become blind to the interests of our Nation, have grown deaf to the outcries of our people.

The farmers of our country want the expanding markets and stable prices that can come only with continuing full employment—and these blind men say that full employment is "impractical" under our system and that depressions "are the price we pay for freedom."

The businessmen of our country call out that they want customers, the steady customers that can come only when there are jobs for all—and these deaf men talk about a floating pool of unemployed.

Fifteen million soldiers, sailors, and airmen want opportunities for useful employment—and these apostles of defeatism offer not jobs but relief.

Mr. President, we face a period in American history when, as never before, we need unity in thought and unity in action.

The full employment bill, as reported from the Banking and Currency Committee, provides a common meeting ground for all who sincerely believe in full employment and the right to work.

Let those who are afraid that continuing full employment cannot be achieved set aside their doubts and join with the supporters of this proposed legislation in an all-out effort to see that it is achieved.

Let those who are afraid of the effects of full employment cast aside their fears.

Let those who offer relief instead of jobs set themselves a higher and nobler goal.

Let us join together and enact this historic legislation without delay and without impairment.

Let us thereby inspire business, agriculture, labor, and, above all, the men and women who fought and won the war, with a new confidence in America's ability to fight and win the peace.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MITCHELL in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. As one of the sponsors of the pending measure, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from New York for the fine job he has done in presenting the bill to the Senate. As Governor of my State during the last depression, I may say that I am entirely satisfied that if this measure had been a law at that time much of the misery, the want, the hunger and starvation the Senator has so ably described would not have existed in America.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to have the Senator's interpretation of the words at the beginning of section 2 (b):

> All Americans able to work and desiring to work are entitled to an opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment.

Is that intended to confer a legal right on a man to get a job? What is it exactly to which he is entitled? What is the nature of that declaration?

Mr. WAGNER. We have stated it time and time again before the committee.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is important that it should be stated on the floor of the Senate. I think the term is ambiguous, and that it is important that the Senator should say here exactly what the nature of this proposal is.

Mr. WAGNER. There are many ways of doing it. In the end the Federal Government enters when every other method fails to provide full employment.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator mean to say that a man who cannot get employment otherwise can go to the Federal Government and say, "Give me a job"?

Mr. WAGNER. No.

Mr. TAFT. It is not a legal right the Senator is proposing to confer?

Mr. WAGNER. No; it is not a legal right in the sense that he can sue.

Mr. TAFT. Then what is it exactly? What is the right a man has? Wherever the word "right," or the word "entitled," so far as that is concerned, is used in the Constitution or statutes, it confers a legal right. What kind of a right does this confer if it does not confer a legal right?

Mr. WAGNER. It is a right which society has to recognize. It is a right which all of us have to secure an opportunity for employment. We have said that in the bill. The individual has the right to an opportunity to be employed, and that right would have to be assured finally by the Federal Government when all other methods failed.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, it is not a legal right; but what kind of a right is it? Is it a moral right to a job?

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator might call it a moral right, if he liked.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator mean that we should adopt a policy and create a condition in which jobs should be available for all? Is that the meaning of it?

Mr. WAGNER. What we are proposing is that the President shall first present to Congress a proposal, a budget message. The trend of employment is pretty definitely known. If there is not any substantial unemployment, we go right on and continue helping private industry all the time. If, for instance, two or three million people may be thrown out of work and are not provided with jobs in any other way, we provide public works or other public methods for furnishing employment.

Mr. TAFT. Interrupting the Senator for a moment, if I may, he refers now to the policy stated in section 2, which says that "to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprise to assure continuing full employment. That is the section to which the Senator now refers?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator referred to public works. Is it confined to public works? What other kind of public investment and expenditure does the Senator have in mind?

Mr. WAGNER. There are other ways of doing it. This full-employment bill is not new in American history. I introduced such a bill in 1928, and it was finally passed in 1931 and signed by President Hoover. That bill provided a method by which public works were to be used as a stopgap. When there was unemployment in private industry, in order to take up the gap public works were to be inaugurated. When employment increased public works were to be retarded. In other words, public works are used, not in competition with private industry, but as an aid to private industry.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator knows I agree fully with that theory, and he knows that I offered a substitute for this subsection which contained exactly that provision, but it was rejected by the committee. So I am anxious to ascertain what there is in the subsection, in addition to public works, which could be included in the words "Federal investment and expenditure."

Mr. WAGNER. Activity of all types. When the President sends his message to Congress and indicates that there may be a danger of unemployment provision is made for the stimulation of private industry by all sorts of methods, such as loans and otherwise.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that. That is taken care of here in (d) (4), but when under the provisions of paragraph (4) we have done everything else, it says we must have "such volume of Federal investment and expenditure," and I am trying to find out what that means in addition to public works. I agree fully that we should have as much of public works as possible in times of depression, and less in good times. But what else does that language mean? Can the Senator tell what other forms of Federal investment and expenditure there would be?

Mr. WAGNER. There are some such projects in New York. Let us take the Triborough Bridge. That was——

Mr. TAFT. That is a public work. It falls under public works. I should like to find out what else there is.

Mr. WAGNER. Let us be calm about this matter. Private industry constructed the bridge, but it was done under a Government loan. That is a self-liquidating project because the loan is being paid off.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but it comes within the classification of public works. No one, I think, will dispute that.

Mr. WAGNER. There are different types of public expenditures.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is the Senator familiar with the book written by Sir William Beveridge, Full Employment in a Free Society, in which the whole theory of full employment by guaranteed assurance is set forth perhaps more fully than in any other book?

Mr. WAGNER. No; I have not read it.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator should read it because it is in a way the origin of the present theory contained in the pending bill. I should like to read to the Senator——

Mr. WAGNER. I think the Senator is wrong about that. I think the present theory of the bill goes way back to President Hoover's time when there was discussion about the use of public funds to aid in assuring full employment.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but the theory that the Government must spend enough money to make up this calculated deficit in employment comes primarily from Sir William Beveridge. That policy has not been adopted by the British Government, I may say, but that is where it started so far as this theory is concerned. What he says in his book is the same thing. He says that:

> It must be a function of the state in future to insure adequate total outlay and, by con-

sequence to protect its citizens against mass unemployment.

Then he outlines what the state might do in a program such as this, and I should like to read the outline:

The long-term program—

That is for Federal investment and expenditure—

outlined in part IV covers outlay of all kinds, under each of five heads. There is communal outlay on nonmarketable goods and services, including defence, order, free education, a national health service, roads, drains, and other public works.

That is the ordinary type of Government expenditure.

There is public business investment in industries now under public control or which may be brought under it hereafter, increasing the sector of enterprise in which investment can be expanded steadily. There is private business investment; here, through a new organ—described as a national investment board—the state, while preserving private enterprise, can, by appropriate measures, coordinate and steady the activities of businessmen. There is private consumption outlay, the largest head of the five; this can be both increased and steadied by state action in redistributing income, by measures of social security, and by progressive taxation. There is a new head—described as joint consumption outlay—under which the state takes the initiative by placing collective orders—for food, fuel, and perhaps other necessaries, with a view to reselling them later to private consumers at a price which may at need be lowered by a subsidy. Under this last head the state can influence both the amount and the nature of private outlay while still leaving it free.

Mr. President, I wonder whether this residual Federal investment and expenditure is the same kind of residual expenditure that Sir William Beveridge describes in his book.

Mr. WAGNER. I have not read the book. But we are concerned primarily with private industry and private investment. We want to keep people at work in jobs under private investment, and we sometimes provide stimulation to private industry so that private industry may provide greater employment. It is only in the event that there is a gap in employment that the Government comes in with public investment and expenditure and accelerates employment. The moment employment has increased and become normal, so that there is very little unemployment, then the expenditure program can be slowed down, and the public-works program is stopped.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator knows that if it were not for this provision for an unlimited volume of residual "Federal investment and expenditure," if that language were "public work," practically all my objection to the bill would be removed. I am trying to find out what it is that the Senator has in mind outside of public works in the "Federal investment and expenditure" clause. We have testimony that $5,000,000,000 is probably about the limit of public works. Such a sum might put two and a half million men to work, and there might be 10,000,000 threatened with unemployment. Where would the other seven and a half million men be put to work? What kind of Federal investment and expenditure is there to be, outside of public works?

Mr. WAGNER. We do not want such a depression to occur as we experienced once before. If this bill had been the law at that time 10,000,000 persons would not have been unemployed. We tried at that time to request Mr. Hoover to provide a public-works program but he said, "No. Everything is going to be all right." Finally the number of unemployed went from 2,000,000 to 15,000,000. Then, of course, we had to undertake an exceedingly extensive public-works program, involving a good deal of useless work. We want to avoid all that.

Mr. TAFT. I know. In the thirties we followed this theory in particular. We had a deficit of $3,000,000,000 a year for an average of 10 years, and it did not cure unemployment. We built all the public works we could think of and still we did not cure unemployment. I should like to know what the phrase "Federal investment and expenditure" means. How can the Federal Government succeed, outside of public works, in putting seven and a half million unemployed men to work?

Mr. WAGNER. We will not have that much unemployment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Ohio seems to be wholly favorable to a public-works program, but yet he objects to this bill for fear that the Federal Government will do something else than promote a public-works program. I am wondering just what he thinks the Federal Government would do to meet an unemployment crisis, to which he objects so strenuously.

Mr. TAFT. My answer to that question is that the way to cure an unemployment crisis is to adopt measures to stimulate private enterprise, and that can be done effectively by removing restrictions; Government can be taken out of business so as not to compete with private business and force it out of business and thus deprive people of work. All kinds of things can be done. There is no panacea for unemployment, and if an attempt is made to make this measure a panacea it will result only in an inflationary boom, a large increase in the public debt, and finally the extensive unemployment we are trying to avoid.

Mr. WAGNER. May I ask the Senator from Ohio in what competitive field is the Government competing with private industry?

Mr. TAFT. I said that if the provision in question means that we are going to do that, the result will be to discourage private industry and lead to a reduction of employment, because, after all, the private industrial machine is employing about 50,000,000 people.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; but we want to bring employment up to 60,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. According to General Fleming of the Federal Works Agency we might perhaps in 1 year spend $5,000,000,000 on public works and employ two and a half million men. If we go beyond public works into other fields we may actually so discourage the private industrial machine that it will not employ 50,000,000 people who should be employed.

Mr. WAGNER. We are trying to encourage them even more than they have been encouraged in the past.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to know what other fields the Senator from Ohio thinks the Federal Government could enter which would discourage private industry.

Mr. TAFT. As Mr. Beveridge suggests, in England it is proposed to invest in business generally, and to operate many factories which would produce goods which were not needed, and which would be piled up as a surplus. Those are the things which he suggests in the case of England. I think that if the Federal Government should go into that sort of thing, it would throw more people out of work than it would put to work.

Mr. AIKEN. It might, but its inclusion in a program is strictly prohibited under this bill.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, no; it is not strictly prohibited by this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Section 6 reads as follows:

SEC. 6. Nothing contained herein shall be construed as directing or authorizing—

(a) the operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government.

If that is not intended to prohibit the operation of plants, I do not know what it means.

Mr. TAFT. No; it does not.

Mr. AIKEN. It may be that the opponents of the bill know better what the proponents intended by the wording than do the proponents themselves, but I doubt it.

Mr. TAFT. Let me explain to the Senator what section 6 does. Section 6 does not do anything in the world except to say that this is not an authorization bill. It does not authorize anything for anybody. That does not mean that the President may not put it in his program. On the other hand, the bill provides that he shall put certain things in his program, including a sufficient volume of Federal investment and expenditure to meet the theoretical figure set up as a goal. All section 6 does—and we might as well be clear about it—is to say that this is not an authorization bill. It does not authorize an appropriation for any program set forth in the national budget, but it in no way limits the scope of the national budget. It in no way limits the recommendations which the President may make.

Mr. AIKEN. Are they limited now?

Mr. TAFT. No; they are not limited. As a matter of fact, without the bill at all, the President can do anything that he is authorized or required to do under the terms of this bill. The bill is not needed so far as the President is concerned. He may submit any program he desires. But we are asked to approve a policy in which Congress says that the President shall submit a program containing unlimited Federal investment and expenditure if that is necessary to achieve full employment, regardless of all other considerations.

Mr. WAGNER. If Congress says so. It all depends on Congress.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator makes another argument. He makes the argument that, after all, Congress is not bound. I quite agree. We cannot bind any future Congress. We cannot even bind the present Congress, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. TOBEY. Or our own party.

Mr. TAFT. An attempt is made to lay down a policy, and we are asked to subscribe to a policy. So the question is not, is it binding upon Congress? The question is not whether it is binding on the President. The question is, should we subscribe to a policy if it is an utterly unsound policy? That is the fundamental question which we have to decide.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to address my remarks to the Senator from Ohio. As I understood his comment and the reasons therefor, he is taking up now the very salient and important clause in the bill dealing with the right to work, and he asks what is meant by it. I will read to him two answers, in both of which I concur, and then give my own answer.

I read first from the testimony of John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, on this very point when he appeared before the committee. He said:

> Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to read into my statement an excerpt from a statement of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY which I think defines what we have been referring to in this bill as the right to work and the right to a job. It is an approved condensation from his speech, and if I may, I would like to read that here.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Very well.
>
> Mr. SNYDER. I think it defines that very well:
>
> "The right to a job does not mean guaranteeing jobs carrying set salaries and definite social standing. It is not the aim of the bill to provide specific jobs for specific individuals. Our economic system of free enterprise must have free opportunities for jobs for all who are able and want to work. Our American system owes no man a living, but it does owe every man an opportunity to make a living. That is the proper interpretation of the right to work."

I now read to the Senator from Ohio the remarks of a leader in industry, Clarence Avildsen, chairman of the board, Republic Drill & Tool Co., of Chicago, Ill. On page 656 of the hearings, he made the following statement:

> 1. The right to work. I do not say, nor do I think anyone else will argue, that the Government owes anyone his living. I do believe, however, that in a free society one must have an opportunity to earn a living, to do constructive work, and to be paid a reasonable wage therefor. I know there are those who will argue that there is no such thing as a right to work, and even if one does admit that such a right exists, that it is unenforceable, but I also know that we have just fought the most terrible and destructive war in history to establish the fact that men as individuals do have rights. These political rights and civil rights, based upon the concept that the individual is the important one and that governments exist only to satisfy his needs, can be enjoyed in a modern, industrial society only if every person is able to support himself—to have those basic necessities of food, shelter, clothing, medical care, and a reasonable amount of leisure, without which all other rights are meaningless. If we are to maintain those rights for which so many have given their lives in these recent years, we must admit the necessity to add to those rights another which is most basic and upon which the other rights depend. This is the right to work, to earn a decent living, and to do something creative for one's self and one's fellowmen.

Mr. President, I think we settled the question of the right to work 169 years ago, in the Declaration of Independence, when we decreed that among the inalienable rights of men was the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. A man can go to the courts and sue in the courts for life and liberty, but no man ever went to the courts and sued for the right to pursue happiness. But I maintain that that statement of 169 years ago becomes merely a will-o'-the-wisp if in the pursuit of happiness a man cannot get a job and receive a salary with which to support his family.

I maintain that 169 years ago assurance was given to every man in America that he would have the right to work. If our economic system cannot bear the load and the strain, and take care of the needs of men, then the Government has the responsibility, and under this bill the Government is coming into the picture. We will engage in deficit financing, and do whatever else is necessary to save human lives, prevent human misery, and establish for all time in this country the right to work.

What can we do in the alternative? There is a choice between the Government taking care of such condition through deficit financing, and going back to the relief rolls. We have fought a great war. Thank God it is over, and victory has come to us.

Two great scourges come upon mankind. The worst scourge of mankind is war. A close second to it is the scourge of unemployment and depression. We go all out to win a war. We should go all out to defeat a depression.

We are too prone to look upon systems of business, systems of finance, systems of government, and systems of party as the objective. Those things are only the means to an end, and the end is human happiness and human welfare.

Men talk about the genesis of this bill. The bill came from the hearts of true Americans who love their fellow men and are determined that this bill shall become law for the benefit of their fellow men in every class and section of our country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I believe that the statement made by the Senator is very significant, because he is one of the sponsors of the bill.

As I understand, this right is not a legal or constitutional right. It is like the rights in the Declaration of Independence, which were not intended to have any legal effect at all, and conferred on no one any legal right. Is that correct?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator knows the answer to that question. We thrashed it out a hundred times in committee. The right referred to means that in justice to our fellow men, they should have employment. It is their due.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is not answering the question.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator cannot put words in my mouth. I am giving the answer as I see it. What is the question?

Mr. TAFT. The question is, What kind of a right is this? The Senator says that it is not like a statutory right.

Mr. TOBEY. A man cannot go to court and sue for it.

Mr. TAFT. It is something like the Declaration of Independence, which states broad general principles.

Mr. TOBEY. I quite agree that it is like the Declaration of Independence. It is just as permanent as the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. TAFT. The right to life and liberty can be protected by law. The Declaration of Independence refers to the right to the pursuit of happiness—not happiness. The Declaration of Independence does not guarantee jobs. The pursuit of happiness would be equivalent to the pursuit of a job. That certainly is not very much of a right.

Mr. TOBEY. The word "pursuit" can be construed in many ways. It means that a man shall have the right to pursue a course to get a job. We tell him that he is going to have a job. That is his due, his right under the American form of government. It is justice to him.

Mr. TAFT. If the bill is not intended to confer a legal right, I do not greatly object to the declaration of general policy that the Government should pursue a policy which will bring about a condition under which a man can get a job. I agree 100 percent with that declaration. That is what we ought to say. I greatly object to saying it in this way, if that is what the authors of the bill say they mean. I think it involves the danger of a fraud on the American worker. When the bill is passed a great many persons will misconstrue this language to mean that they can go to the Federal Government if they cannot get a job anywhere else and say, "I have a right to a job. Give me a job." They will be disappointed when they find that the bill does not mean that.

Mr. TOBEY. No, Mr. President; I say to the Senator that we assure our fellow men that they have the right to work, and under this bill we propose that when in the different States conditions in the economic life become such that there is no other course to pursue and no other way of creating jobs for them, then we shall provide employment by the laws of this country, in such a way as to give them jobs.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator said he felt that deficit spending was the proper method to use.

Mr. TOBEY. In the last analysis, when everything else fails, yes. Then we propose to spend money. Human life is more important than balance sheets and dollars.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to obtain an answer, if I can, from the distinguished senior Senator from New York. My question relates to subsection (d) (4) on page 14, which provides—

> (4) to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in ad-

dition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment.

My question is, What does that mean, other than public works? I should like to find out what "Federal investment and expenditure" is, in addition to public works.

Mr. WAGNER. There is no doubt that if the point is reached where there cannot be full employment without public works and similar activities, then these things will be provided. But we are doing everything we can do to provide sufficient opportunities in private industry to give sufficient employment, except, of course, there are always some public works that are necessary.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I seem to be unable to get a definite answer to my question.

Mr. WAGNER. I agree distinctly with what the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] said, namely, that, after all, society, the Government, owes something to the individual. If there is no other way by which the individual can be employed, of course the Government is obligated to employ him. That is all there is to the whole proposition. But some people are worrying about rights!

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have asked the question of the Senator from New York three or four times, but I am unable to obtain an answer.

Mr. WAGNER. I know; the Senator never will be satisfied.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to pass on to one more question, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Montana. After just one more question I shall be through. My question is, Is this policy of full employment contained in the Democratic Party's platform or the Republican Party's platform of 1944?

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know. The Senator from Ohio drafted the Republican Party's platform, and perhaps he can tell us.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me read to the Senator from Ohio a statement which the titular leader of the Republican Party, Thomas E. Dewey, made at that time:

> Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in private enterprise. * * * If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours.

That is the statement of the titular leader of my party.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am quite prepared to say that Mr. Dewey and Mr. Roosevelt endorsed this policy, but I am asking whether there is any such endorsement in either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party platforms. The Senator from New York has said he does not know.

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator know whether it was contained in the CIO's political action platform of April 1944?

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know.

Mr. TAFT. I think I can assure the Senator that I do know that it was.

Mr. WAGNER. Well, they are American citizens, and they have a right to live.

Mr. TAFT. That is the only documentary basis I have been able to find to show where any political organization adopted the principle of the pending bill prior to the time when it was introduced.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Am I to understand that the phrase "Federal investment and expenditure" is confined exclusively to the construction of public works?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I was asking the Senator from New York for his conception of the provision. Then I shall be very happy to hear from the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WAGNER. Will the Senator from Michigan please repeat his question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand the Senator's answer to the question of the Senator from Ohio regarding the phrase "Federal investment and expenditure," as found, for instance, on page 14, in line 21, the Senator's conception of that phrase is confined to the construction of public works. Is that correct?

Mr. WAGNER. Let me see about that; I should like to read it again. It appears on page 14, the Senator said.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes—in line 21.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to have the Senator from New York express his idea about it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I wish to comment on it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before there is any comment, I should like to have the idea of the Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, "Federal investment and expenditure" probably would provide public works, but there are many different types of public expenditures. There are the self-liquidating projects and others. These are to come into the picture so as to keep employment at full volume.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am totally in agreement with the Senator about that.

Mr. WAGNER. Very well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But I wish to know what else "Federal investment and expenditure" would describe, other than public works, in the view of the Senator from New York.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the bill itself, at the bottom of page 14, provides—

> Such Federal investment and expenditure, whether direct or indirect, or whether for public works, for public services, for assistance to business, agriculture, home owners, veterans, or consumers, or for other purposes, shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprises.

There the bill itself provides for investments other than mere public works.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If we can get back to the question, Mr. President, what attracted my attention in the colloquy between the able Senator from New York and the able Senator from Ohio was the constant and exclusive emphasis which the Senator from New York put upon public works. I gathered the impression that the Senator's description of "Federal investment and expenditure" was confined to public works.

Mr. WAGNER. It depends on what is meant by public works. For instance, the Senator no doubt remembers the Home Owners' Loan Corporation bill, which was one of the measures I introduced long ago to help in a serious situation. That might be regarded as a public loan; it might be regarded as public works. It may be public works; it may be helping private capital and private investment. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Could the Senator give me a suggestion as to how, for instance, the authority might be used to help "private industry?" I think that was the Senator's phrase.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, how would the Senator propose to do that?

Mr. WAGNER. Take the case of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Does the Senator remember when home owners were on the point of losing their property because they were unable to pay the mortgages, and the Government stepped in and paid the mortgages for them? To that extent it was a public purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That did not create any jobs.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; it did.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator mean jobs in writing the mortgages?

Mr. WAGNER. Well, there were jobs in connection with it. We made loans for private building—for instance, the renovation of apartment buildings. Those were loans made by banks, guaranteed by the Government. That might be called either private or public.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then the Senator does not confine his definition of "Federal investment and expenditure" to just what we mean by the general phrase "public works construction"; does he?

Mr. WAGNER. No; I do not.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield next to the Senator from Montana, who some time ago asked me to yield to him.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I tried to obtain the floor at the conclusion of the address of the Senator from New York, but I was interrupted.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield to me for a moment, I will make a brief comment on the specific question the Senator from Michigan asked. There was considerable discussion in the Banking and Currency Committee in regard to the language "Federal investment."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have the floor now.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield for a question or for a mere statement.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I wish to make a brief statement apropos of the question the Senator from Michigan asked. As I have just stated, in the Banking and Currency Committee there was considerable discussion and voting in regard to the phrase "Federal investment." I offered an amendment calling for its elimination. That was voted down. I then sought some limitation or restriction in definition, because as the language stands it is apparent that possibly it would warrant or justify any form of Federal investment, or that, at least, in the absence of any language of limitation, such an interpretation might be put upon it, or at least be urged vigorously with a color of justification. Proponents of the bill insisted they did not contemplate Federal investment except along more or less customary lines, but they would not agree to words of limitation. With the Senator's permission, I make that statement of explanation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. WAGNER] has already given a clear and comprehensive explanation of the provisions of the full employment bill. He has explained in detail the provisions of the measure and the objectives to be achieved. This bill, as he has ably pointed out, is based on the need for a vast expansion of production and employment in the United States in order to enable our system of free enterprise to meet the demands of the American people.

As we look back over the past history of our system of free enterprise and our political system upon which it is based, we find that many changes have taken place. We have grown from an economy which was predominately agricultural to an economy which is predominately industrial.

Shortly after the Civil War a great expansion of industry began in the United States. The great western frontiers had been thrown open to settlement, offering new opportunities for our growing population. Prosperity was developing on every hand, and the press of the Nation was proclaiming a new golden age which would result from the huge combinations of industry and business which were then developing.

At the turn of the century this rapid growth of big business took on increased impetus. It was believed by many that those corporate expansions and consolidations would result in greater efficiency, bigger profits, and beneficient results generally to the economy as a whole. It was a period of intense financial and business activity, and the idea of big business took firm hold on the minds of the American people.

During the past decade, however, exhaustive studies have clearly shown that our economy has developed serious ills which threaten its future successful operation. This is acknowledged on every hand by economists and students of our free-enterprise system.

The great depression which followed the First World War, and which caused more suffering and distress than any other event in this century of our existence, was due to those defects which had grown up in our economy and were distorting its original principles. We had gradually departed from a system of free competition and had entered into a modified system akin to collectivism.

During the 1920's, following the First World War, this growth of big business proceeded at a rapid rate, and sight was largly lost of the original concept of free enterprise. In the period just before the commencement of World War II, 200 large corporations—a fraction of 1 percent of the total number—accounted for 50 percent of the total assets and 40 percent of the total sales. For a long time it has been recognized that real competition has been blotted out in the big basic industries of the United States, and instead of competition we have a system of controlled prices and production.

Those conditions finally resulted near the end of the twenties in a complete collapse of our economy.

In an editorial in June 1938, Fortune magazine, the leading business magazine of the Nation, discussed the causes of that collapse which began in 1929. After reviewing the origin of our political economy, and referring to its early promises, benefits, and advantages over previous systems, it was pointed out that it finally faltered and failed as a result of the development of these weaknesses. The Fortune editorial, among other things, stated:

> As representing the capitalist economy, business has an obligation to build a workable economic system. But by 1932 it was evident that it had failed to do this. It had failed, and it has since failed, to provide for approximately one-third of the American people. It has failed to provide these people with work, and hence failed to provide them with a livelihood, to say nothing of democratic opportunity. So, in the break-down of the economics of free capitalism, business is confronted with a realistic political fact, namely, that a majority of the American people, with the penniless third as a nucleus, are beginning to measure the virtue of their Government mainly in terms of the guaranties it makes concerning their income. * * *

The editorial continues:

> The path ahead of American business is indeed a narrow path, but it is perfectly clear. If the principles of democracy and of private enterprise are to be preserved, it is evident that private enterprise must admit into its affairs, as representative of the people, a Government profoundly concerned with the successful operation of the economic system. It should in the future be the object of business not to obstruct Government intervention at any cost, but to see to it that the intervening Government is enlightened in economic matters.

While 50 years ago we were a Nation of small businesses engaged in intense competition, today we are largely a Nation of big businesses, of trusts and monopolies, where prices and production in the basic industries are controlled, and where depressions and widespread unemployment are constantly recurring evils.

It must be clear to everyone that the problems of unemployment are threatening our system of democracy. This is not a mere assertion. It is a simple statement of undisputed fact, supported by the economic studies which have been taking place in this country during the past quarter of a century. It is supported also by spokesmen of the capitalistic system itself who have become aware of the serious defects in the system as it exists today.

The Brookings Institution, which during the past few years has been conducting intense research into the causes of the economic disturbances which have, with increasing severity, been recurring during the past 60 or 70 years, names the huge centralization of industry and monopoly as the chief causes.

In 1938 Fortune magazine made a study of the problem and reported its findings in an editorial printed in that magazine in the March 1938 issue. I quote in part from that editorial:

> In our time, men have been conditioned to the idea of bigness. They believe that to grow big is almost of necessity to progress. They believe that the expansion of American enterprise necessarily involves the corporate expansion of its units. And they are taught that the corporate expansion of the units should result in bigger profits, individually and to the economy as a whole.
>
> * * * * *
>
> But it is possible to question this: not that our time has been wrong, but that it may be time for something else. It may be time to reexamine our ideas of progress in the light of where we wish to go. It may be time to weigh the notion that here is some necessary connection between economic expansion and corporate bigness. It may be time to wonder whether profits and the national income would not be bigger if the corporate units of industry were not so big.
>
> American business was founded upon the principle of free competition maintained through free markets. But during the era of bigness the units of business became so big that they developed a fear of price wars; they dared not compete against themselves, and no one dared to compete against them. There consequently emerged the super-units—well-defined industrial groups whose members act in concert and whose aim is not price competition but, on the contrary, price stabilization.
>
> Now this technique of bigness, involving the artificial control of prices and other basic factors, is a collectivist technique. And the operation of the collectivist technique has created for business a precarious situation. Business has carried collectivism so far in its private affairs that its affairs are no longer private but by the bigness of their impact, public. * * * But, inasmuch as these policies impinge upon and invade the sphere of public welfare, they impinge upon and invade the functions of Government. By its very office, Government must intervene. * * * Thus collectivism in industry begets collectivism in Government. And if this is not collectivism as practiced in the so-called collectivist states, it is only a couple of theoretical steps removed from it. Carried to its extreme, it means the downfall of the economy upon which American business has been reared; the perversion of the democratic order; the destruction of the right to risk-and-profit; and, all too easily, the loss of those civil liberties that are at present based upon the principle of the limitation of governmental power.

It is now well-demonstrated by the many studies made by economists and research organizations that monopolistic practices constitute one of the chief reasons for the failure of our economic system to operate on an even keel. The

constant fear of an impending depression causes these large corporate units to take advantage of every opportunity to increase earnings beyond a reasonable degree. They exercise control over production and prices, thus interfering with free competition. Business management is devoted largely to meeting the constantly recurring threats of inflation and deflation.

Modern industry provides no board of directors or supervisory body to correlate its multifold activities. It has no general industrial or business research laboratory to keep it advised concerning economic trends or dangerous developments which might upset industrial balance. For example, in the late twenties, if American industry had had some sort of a supervisory agency designed to guard against dangerous trends, it might have been enabled to avoid the wild inflation and final crash in 1929.

Business and government are in constant conflict. What can be done to clear up this conflict which has been going on in this country for many years and permit business to go forward under a program of expanded production and employment which present conditions absolutely justify?

Back in 1938 Walter Lippmann, discussing this conflict between government and business, said:

> The development of combinations in business which are able to dominate the markets in which they sell their goods and in which they buy their labor and their materials must lead irresistibly to some form of state collectivism. So much power will never for long be allowed to rest in private hands, and those who do not wish to take the road to the politically administered economy of socialism must be prepared to take the steps back toward the restoration of the market economy of private competitive enterprise.

It seems absolutely certain that if we fail to meet this problem now, our country will be threatened with national economic disaster.

Mr. President, I should like at this point to quote from an able editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News of May 1938:

> Business in this country today is divided into two groups. One, and unfortunately the smaller, has come to realize that the world does move; that the only thing certain in life is change; that we are 20 years behind England, for example, in accepting such principles as collective bargaining and social security, and that to go against the tide is to drown. The other is the nostalgic delegation, dreaming of the good old days, yearning for the high-collared past, hating Roosevelt, but not realizing that Roosevelt after all is just a potent sign of the times, and serving on the committees that write the resolutions at the annual meetings of the United States Chamber of Commerce. If the first group could only get busy and vocal to the extent of selling the second that it's time to wake up, the futile fight between business and government might be turned into an harmonious advance toward better days and finer democracy.

We must create at once an opportunity for cooperation between the Government and business so as to bring about full production and full employment. If opportunity is provided the rest will follow in due course. Leave that to the millions of Americans—businessmen, workers, farmers, and the public generally.

Opportunity arises from creating and enforcing the free market, giving the country the assurance that the Government is standing back of the program and intends to see to it that the workers of the Nation are going to be employed, and that purchasing power is going to exist in the country which will encourage and make possible full production.

America is the richest, most highly industrialized, and most powerful Nation in the world. Our industries are the most advanced in modern technological methods, and we have a capacity to produce and consume which, if realized, will without Government spending programs provide for full employment of our workers.

Unless we are able to provide employment opportunities for war veterans and all those who seek and need employment in order to live, our country will be consumed with business and industrial unrest and agitation.

Full employment is not only essential to the welfare of the workers of the Nation, but, as I have demonstrated, is vital to the successful operation of our economic system. Furthermore, it is only through an economy of full production and full employment that we will be able to maintain the Nation's credit structure and liquidate the stupendous national debt which we now face.

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, its distinguished chairman the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and its distinguished ranking minority member the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] have rendered to this body a great service through the statesmanlike report which has been submitted on the full employment bill. Their careful analysis of the measure will be a distinct aid to the Members of the Senate in the study of the bill.

My association with this legislation began in December 1944, when the then Senator from Missouri, Mr. Truman, and I, submitted a subcommittee report to the Military Affairs Committee. At that time, we pointed out that the Contract Settlement Act, the Surplus Property Act, and the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act were "purely transition measures, yes, important transition measures, but nothing more," and that, "none of them attempted to insure a sound postwar economy."

The report proceeded to discuss the Government's responsibility toward postwar employment, and I quote further from it:

> In January 1944 President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress on the state of the Union, outlined an "economic bill of rights." The first point in this document was the following: "The right of a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops, or farms, or mines of the Nation. * * *"
>
> Statisticians may debate among themselves as to whether the precise goal should be a little more or a little less than the President's 60,000,000 figure, but no thoughtful American—no matter what his creed or station in life—would deny that every man or woman in the country who is willing to work and capable of working has the right to a job.
>
> The right to a job is not self-enforceable. It can be translated into reality only through the joint action of the people of our country—business, labor, agriculture, and all other groups—acting through the medium of their duly elected Government. In short, the so-called right to a job is a meaningless figure of speech unless our Government assumes responsibility for the expansion of our peacetime economy so that it will be capable of assuring full employment.

Mr. President, my study of the problem and principles involved in the full employment bill goes back a number of years. In 1937 I took part in a Senate special committee investigation of unemployment and relief. I learned then of the serious defects in our economy causing depressions and unemployment. I learned that there is only one thing that American business needs in order to provide sufficient jobs—and that one thing is customers.

In 1940 the Senate Committee on Small Business was established, and I became its chairman. That committee has worked diligently for 5 years on the problems of small business enterprise. As a result of my activities with that committee, I have found that, above all, the one thing that small business needs in America is customers.

During the Banking and Currency Committee's consideration of the pending full employment bill it was subjected to a bombardment of amendments. I acknowledge the sincerity of the opponents of the full employment bill, but it seems to me that the language of their amendments is mainly calculated to destroy the basic principles of the bill and make a mockery of our country's hopes for an economy of full production and full employment.

To me, these amendments indicate a lack of faith in our free enterprise system.

The proponents of these amendments argue that we have always had depressions and we will always continue to have them under our system. They contend that under our system of free enterprise it is impossible to have continuing full production and that we must have periodical depressions. They allege that full employment in peacetime is inflationary and that we must always have a substantial amount of unemployment. They therefore seek to delete any commitment in the bill which might do more than prevent serious mass unemployment.

The rank and file of businessmen, especially small businessmen, repudiate that doctrine. Many outstanding businessmen appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee and testified on behalf of the full employment bill. These intelligent and far-sighted businessmen recognize the need for cooperation between labor and capital and government. They recognize that industry cannot be benefited through the exploitation of labor—that full employment with good wages is essential to the successful operation of our economic system. They recognize that business can only be benefited through helping labor raise its general standards of living, because only by such a program can our system of free enterprise prosper.

I should like Senators who are opposing this measure to read a book recently

published by the Brookings Institution entitled "America's Capacity To Consume."

The average independent businessman in this country—businessmen engaged in real competition as distinguished from those who are protected by monopoly—are wholeheartedly in favor of the principle that every American who is able to work and desires work has the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment. This basic human right is clearly stated in section 2 (c) and section 2 (b) of the full employment bill.

I am convinced also that independent businessmen are committed to the principle that the Federal Government has the responsibility of assuring continuing full employment. They so testified at the hearings.

The American tradition of business enterprise has been that of a high volume market-high output, low prices, high wages. This was the fundamental assumption of the orthodox economic theorists from Adam Smith to Marshall, and it is a tradition which has been widely proclaimed by the Nation's leaders. President Truman said in the third annual report of the Truman committee:

> If we are to maintain the highest standards of living in the world, which we had prior to the war, and if we are to improve those standards, vastly increased quantities of basic commodities must be produced. The task of industry will be to produce those commodities and fabricate them into consumer goods at a fair profit based on a small margin and large volume of production. So long as prices do not exceed costs by too great a margin, the purchasing power of the workers through the wages paid for production should be sufficient to preclude overproduction.

This high volume market is what businessmen want. It means more efficient production at lower unit costs. This in turn means better profits. Although the profit margins on each unit will be smaller, they will be more stable, and there will be many more units. Let me quote from the National Association of Manufacturers, who state in their pamphlet entitled "Testimony to the Future":

> Selling more goods at lower prices is the aim of America's manufacturers. This is the road to profits, maximum employment, and maximum benefit to the consumer.

But ordinarily the individual producer has been afraid to carry out this tradition.

The fear of depression is based on a valid fear of competition in a shrinking market. Unless all industries expand output, cut prices, and raise wages simultaneously, no individual producer can count on increased purchasing power for his product. In the spring of 1944 Edwin G. Nourse, of the Brookings Institution, made this clear in a statement before the War Contracts Subcommittee:

> But no one who will honestly look at the past and present record of America can doubt that the majority of businessmen are, in fact, afraid of competition, just as they are afraid of really free enterprise.
>
> There is a constant fear that there won't be enough purchasing power to go around, that if we really "let ourselves go," with all our skill and ingenuity, with all the technical efficiency we have developed, there would be general overproduction, flooding of the markets, and general break-down.

The result? The producer plays it safe. He prices for depression, thereby creating depression. In the words of Mr. Nourse:

> Setting profit sights too high, charging what the traffic will bear when the going is easy, refusing to embark on economic ventures unless a return is assured which will yield profits on idle plant as well as utilized plant, and in periods of unemployment as well as more prosperous periods. This is self-defeating in the long run.

May I point out that this is not theorizing? Let me remind the Members of the Senate that a recent War Production Board study of "break-even points" for 60 industries revealed break-even points ranging from 20 percent of capacity, and averaging 53 percent. With price and output policies geared to the concept of such low ratios of capacity, unemployment becomes almost inevitable.

What can we do to give effect to the tradition of large markets and low prices? I submit that full employment on a continuing basis would break this paralysis of fear and uncertainty. Producers would gain a growing confidence in markets. They would know that consumers had income to spend, and also the confidence in their own future that would make them willing to spend. They could count on demand sufficient to justify expansion of output, low prices and high wages.

Many Members of Congress have spent a large part of their congressional careers in attempting to control and prevent restrictive practices on the part of business. I am sure they will agree with me that under conditions of continuing full employment there would be much less incentive to business to engage in these practices. Business would be less tempted to corner ever-larger shares of shrinking markets. Full employment would provide the basis for eliminating the barriers to raw materials, equipment, capital, and technology which tends to make big business bigger, and to squeeze out the small producer altogether.

Not only would full employment make it less advantageous for businessmen to engage in restrictive practices, it would also make it much more difficult for them to do so. There is no doubt that if we had a high level of activity, big business would face greatly increased competition from small firms.

There are a number of reasons why small businesses are the first and most unfortunate victims of depression, and why they tend to flourish and multiply during prosperity.

They are the most important channels for new and competitive products.

They are the most numerous in trades and services, which expand and decline more than proportionately with a national income.

I believe that small business has a useful and necessary function to perform, but that function cannot be performed unless the small businessman is given an assurance that there shall be, in the years ahead, stable and expanding markets based upon continuing full employment.

The businessman of today—whether small or large—faces three risks.

The first is the risk of competition—the risk that some other businessman will be able to produce a better product at the same price or an equal product at a lower price.

The second risk he faces is the risk of depression—the risk that all of a sudden his customers will dwindle and his markets will shrink.

The third risk he faces is the risk of unstable, inconsistent, or arbitrary policies on the part of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, these three risks are more than we can expect any businessman to face. They are more than businessmen will face.

When business is forced to face the risk of mass unemployment and the risk of unstable arbitrary and inconsistent government policies, which always flow from mass unemployment, business will inevitably look for ways to eliminate the risk of competition. This means private restrictions on prices and production, an increased trend toward monopolization of business activities, and the destruction of private competitive enterprise.

To quote from the Banking and Currency Committee report on S. 380:

> The assurance of continuing full employment will provide confidence in the existence of markets sufficient to absorb the goods and services produced by private enterprise. It will thereby contribute to the elimination of the risk of unstable and inconsistent Government policies. By so doing, it will allow business to forego restrictive practices and aggressively face, rather than dodge, the risks of competition.

Only the Federal Government itself, acting on behalf of all the people, can cope with these evils. Only the Federal Government can assure the sustained markets that will allow business to forego restrictive practices and move forward aggressively with the minimum amount of interference on the part of Government.

In modern business, confidence is just as tangible a factor as cash in the bank. It is the invisible basis of all plans for production, employment, wages, technological experimentation, financing, and every other factor involved in the conduct of business enterprise.

For a long time there has been a profound misunderstanding between business and Government. This misunderstanding arises from both sides. On each side it arises from the lack of knowledge and information concerning the other side.

On the one hand, representatives of Government, while well-grounded in theories, may not have adequate practical business experience. On the side of business, the average executive is too busy to follow the profound intricacies of modern interindustrial economics. Hence, to the Government sometimes the businessman may seem stubborn, and to the businessman, the Government representatives may seem erratic and untrustworthy. But neither of these impressions is basically correct. Each arises from a lack of knowledge and information concerning the other side.

This failure in mutual understanding causes acrimonious disputation because both sides go on the assumption that either one or the other must be right. The processes of cold logic lead them to that conviction. As a matter of practice, however, the logical development of either side to its conclusion would be cataclysmic. The liberal—the salutary—path lies somewhere between the two.

The essence of a capitalist system is that it is controlled not from above by an all-wise government, but from within by the automatic operation of certain so-called economic laws and by the no-less automatic operation of the enlightened self-interest of the capitalists. But under modern industrial conditions, these so-called laws and forces do not operate. Self-interest, for example, is notoriously unenlightened as to the true exigencies of the capitalist system. The booming American capitalists of the twenties were not enlightened enough to see that they must produce not only goods, but also the purchasing power with which to buy them. Instead they choked the country's purchasing power by skimming off larger and larger profits and unbalancing the economy.

This bill is designed to bring Government and business together, to end this misunderstanding and make full employment work for the welfare of the whole Nation through a solution of the problems of production and employment.

Section 2 (c) of the full employment bill, in affirming the Government's responsibility to assure continuing full employment, emphasizes that one of the major purposes of such assurance is to "foster free competitive private enterprise and the investment of private capital."

Section 2 (c) also indicates that this assurance is needed for the following purposes:

Promote the general health and welfare of the Nation;

Foster the American home and American education as the foundation of the American way of life;

Raise the standard of living of the American people;

Provide adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans;

Develop trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations;

Maintain expanding markets for agricultural products and assure expanding income for agricultural enterprises;

Contribute to the economic development of underdeveloped areas of the country;

Encourage and strengthen competitive small business enterprises; strengthen the national defense and security; and

Contribute to the establishment and maintenance of lasting peace among nations.

Who is there who would say that we can promote the general health and welfare of the Nation without an assurance that there will be employment opportunities for all who are able and who desire to work?

How can we protect the American home and the American educational system unless there are employment opportunities for the breadwinner of every family?

How can we raise the standard of living of the American people if millions of Americans are to be unemployed?

The able Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Fred Vinson, at the hearings on the bill stated this responsibility of the Government in convincing terms. He said:

Clearly it cannot be the responsibility of businessmen alone to prevent unemployment. * * * When we are confronted with problems of national scope involving collective responsibility, we must look to the National Government, acting for all the people to take the leadership in their solution. Let there be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of the word "assure." It is more than a mere pious hope—a mere paper promise to be kept to the ear and broken to the hope. It means the assumption of a definite moral responsibility. It does not, of course, mean that every individual will be led by the hand from one job to another.

How can we assure jobs for returning veterans unless we assure jobs for all?

How can we maintain expanding markets for agricultural products and assure expanding income for agricultural enterprises unless we can assure the farmers of America that there will be sustained full employment?

How can we contribute to the economic development of the South and the West unless our economy as a whole is expanding and healthy?

How can we carry out our commitments under the San Francisco Charter unless we can assure all the peoples of the world that this country will not allow another economic crisis to develop and will not again be responsible for spreading economic depression throughout the world?

How can any of us who voted for the San Francisco Charter maintain an untroubled conscience unless we take our stand with the Secretary of State, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, in his endorsement of this historic measure? Secretary Byrnes stated:

The enactment of the full-employment bill would demonstrate to the other nations of the world, in a dramatic way, that this country is determined to prevent depressions and to eliminate mass unemployment. It would thus contribute to the establishment of a liberal trading system and the attainment of an expanding world economy.

One of the main features of the bill is the provision pledging the financial resources of the Federal Government to fill any gap in full employment which may remain after the Government has made full use of all its powers and functions to aid industry in providing jobs. In other words, to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be maintained, the Government will undertake to provide sufficient investment and expenditures to fill the gap.

Naturally, this provision will be attacked by those who prefer to spend billions for relief after a depression develops rather than to provide useful public expenditure as a means of preventing depression. On this point, I should like to quote a recent statement by Mr. Harold D. Smith, Director of the Budget:

Several critics of the full-employment bill have suggested that the bill is designed to pave the way for huge deficit spending. This is a distortion of the meaning of the bill. I believe it was the intention of the authors to reach the objective—full employment—with maximum reliance on private enterprize and minimum reliance on Government spending.

It is my conviction that a policy designed to prevent depression and unemployment is the best contribution we can make to hold down Federal expenditures and the public debt.

The bill provides that the President shall submit to the Congress every year a National Production and Employment Budget. This Budget will include the proposed economic goals for the Nation, in terms of employment opportunities, production of goods and services needed to provide such employment opportunities, and the amount of consumption we require in order to absorb the goods and services that are produced at full employment. It will include the President's appraisal of growth and foreseeable economic trends—terms of employment, production, and consumption. Finally, it will include the general outlines of the administration's program to assure continuing full employment.

Without a national budget, as set forth in the bill, it would be impossible for the Government to grapple intelligently with the employment problem and to develop a consistent and carefully planned economic program.

Finally, the United States Congress, through a Joint Committee on the National Budget, must take the responsibility for considering and acting upon the President's program as a whole. The Congress must take the responsibility for all legislation to carry out the program for full employment. This provision of the full employment bill has received widespread endorsement.

Without a Joint Committee on the National Budget, it would be impossible for the Congress to view the economic situation as a whole and to discharge in a manner commensurate with the needs of our time the responsibilities of the Congress under the Constitution.

But there are some who have no confidence that free enterprise is capable of maintaining full production and employment. They fear that if Government undertakes to assure continuing full employment it may cost too much. They believe that relief for 20,000,000 people is cheaper than jobs for all. That was the basis of the debate which occurred earlier today on the floor of the Senate. Some Senators assume that if the Government undertakes to assure full employment, it will cost the country too much money. They say this bill is simply a deficit financing bill. If we have a fifty-billion or sixty-billion-dollar slump in the national income, they say the Federal Government would have to spend fifty billion or sixty billion dollars. The concept of "boom and bust" is so firmly ingrained in their minds that they can think in no other terms. They have so little faith in private competitive enterprise and political democracy that all their thinking, all their arguments—yes, and all of their amendments—stem from the basic assumption

that we are going to have another catastrophic depression.

Having made this assumption, they then say, "Look! The sponsors of the full-employment bill want us to spend fifty to sixty billion dollars!"

Since they place the protection of the Treasury dollars above human consideration and since they are willing to evade the fundamental concepts of democracy, let me answer their argument in terms of dollars. Under the National Housing Act, the Federal Government has committed itself to stand behind thousands of mortgages. The total commitment on guaranteed housing loans now totals about $4,500,000,000. If we have a drastic slump in national income, the Government will have to make good on that commitment. Also, under the National Housing Act, the Government has insured investments in savings and loan associations. That total commitment amounts to almost another $4,500,000,000. If we have another depression, the Government will have to make good on that obligation, also. Under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the Government has insured deposits in thousands of banks throughout the country. Its guarantee now covers $51,000,000,000 worth of bank deposits. If we have another economic crisis, the Government will be committed to making good on that sum. Let me repeat the figure, $51,000,000,000.

In this connection, let me quote from the report to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Honorable Leo Crowley, head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. In endorsing the full employment bill, Mr. Crowley made the following statement:

> If we do not in considerable measure solve the business-depression problem, bank losses may again become so large as to cause the insurance fund to become a considerable burden upon the Government. The success of deposit insurance depends upon adequate bank supervision, bank examination, and bank management on the one hand, and avoidance of major business depressions on the other. But if it is possible to say which of these factors is the more important, it is probable that the avoidance of major business depressions would contribute most toward avoiding unreasonably large bank losses and keeping the deposit insurance system solvent. This Corporation, therefore, is most happy that Congress is undertaking to treat as a unit the entire business-depression problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, in connection with my remarks, a table entitled "Estimates of Guaranteed Loans and Insurance in Force by United States Government Agencies."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimates of guaranteed loans and insurance in force by U. S. Government agencies

Description	Date	Amount
Guaranteed loans outstanding:		
Insured housing loans under titles I, II, and VI of the National Housing Act as amended	Jan. 31, 1945	$4,489,998,895
Federal ship mortgage insurance under sec. 1103 of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, added June 23, 1938	do	686,530
War production loans guaranteed by War Department, Navy Department, and Maritime Commission through Federal Reserve bank under regulation V of the Federal Reserve Board (included VT loans)	June 30, 1945	[1] 1,190,944,000
Guaranteed commodity loans secured by agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the Steagall amendment approved July 1, 1941	May 31, 1945	378,206,567
Agreements to participate in loans by commercial banks to business enterprises under sec. 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act as amended, and act of June 11, 1942, creating the Smaller War Plants Corporation	Dec. 30, 1944	101,718,592
Acceptances and loans by private banks under "take out" agreements with the Export-Import Bank of Washington. Commercial banks, parties to such agreements, are privileged to sell to the Export-Import Bank notes, drafts, and other obligations of private borrowers negotiated and held by such commercial banks	June 30, 1945	79,180,902
Guaranteed loans to veterans of World War II under Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944	Apr. 21, 1945	[2] 7,462,242
Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief; guarantees to commercial insurance companies the payment of premiums and interest on non-governmental-insurance policies carried by active military personnel. The face value of the policies involved as of July 31, 1944, was $200,500,000	June 30, 1945	13,144,786
Insurance in force:		
Life insurance: U. S. Government life insurance for veterans of World War I under the provisions of title III of the World War Veterans' Act of 1924	July 31, 1945	2,454,855,781
National service life insurance, for members of the armed forces of World War II, under the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940	do	123,579,575,163
Property insurance provided by War Damage Corporation in accordance with act approved Mar. 27, 1942. This insurance was for the purpose of affording protection against loss or damage to property, real or personal, which might result from enemy attack or defense action by our own military forces	Dec. 30, 1944	126,000,000,000
Marine and war-risk insurance administered by the War Shipping Administration in accordance with subtitle "Insurance" of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, as added June 29, 1940, and subsequently amended	do	2,219,043,684
Insurance of deposits of commercial banks provided by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in accordance with sec. 12b of the Federal Reserve Act, added June 16, 1933. The Corporation insures deposits up to a maximum of $5,000 for each depositor in insured banks	do	51,000,000,000
Insured savings and loan association share accounts and creditor obligations. This insurance is provided by the Federa Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation created by title IV, sec. 404 (a) of the National Housing Act, approved June 27, 1934. Under certain restrictions, each share account is insured up to $5,000	do	4,349,796,000
Insurance liability [3] under Federal old-age and survivors' insurance program	Jan. 1, 1945	50,000,000,000
Insurance liability [3] under railroad retirement program	June 30, 194	960,000,000
Insurance liability [3] of the civil-service retirement program (including other Government employees' retirement and disability programs)	do	1,000,000,000
Unemployment insurance, including railroad unemployment insurance. (The Government is liable to the full extent of the assets of the unemployment trust fund.)	do	7,315,000,000
Federal crop insurance: wheat, cotton, and flax crops planted for harvest in 1945, and trial insurance on corn and tobacco in 1945		[4]

[1] Federal Reserve Bulletin, August 1945, p. 791. This figure is for the amount guaranteed. The total amount of guaranteed loans outstanding as of this same date was $1,386,851,000.
[2] Business Week, May 19, 1945, pp. 21-24.
[3] Includes the face value of the life insurance liability only; excludes retirement benefits which might be paid.
[4] No figure available.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, was it deficit financing when the Congress decided to insure bank deposits? Was it deficit financing when the Congress decided to guarantee mortgages? Was it deficit financing when the Congress decided to insure the accounts of savings and loan associations? No, Mr. President; it was not deficit financing. It was just sound common sense. It was just good business.

There are some, however, who have different ideas of what is good business. Let me quote from Mr. Ralph B. Blodget, who wrote an article entitled "We Need Those Depressions," published in the August 25, 1945, issue of the University of Illinois bulletin, Opinion and Comments. I quote from the article:

> It is to be hoped that depressions are never abolished, for they have many desirable features. Those who learn to ride the business cycle can find as many advantages in depressions as in booms—personal as well as business advantages. Smart folks take advantage of the boom * * *; they are then ready for depression-time bargains, bargains in every conceivable thing from a suit of clothes to a railroad.

Mr. Blodgett illustrated his point by referring to the panic of 1893, during which the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. bought the Union Pacific Railroad for $81,000,000—less than half its original cost. Mr. Blodget failed to tell us about depression bargains in human beings.

There are some who want a safe pool of unemployed—to preserve "discipline" among their employees and give more "flexibility" to the labor force. They believe that a pool of unemployed, ranging from five to eight million people, is "safe." "Safe for whom?" I ask. Is it safe for the man who is one of those 8,000,000 people? Is it safe for the children who are born into the families that help comprise the 8,000,000?

There are some who say that the "boom and bust" cycle is—and I quote from the March 1945 Bulletin of the New York State Chamber of Commerce—"the price we pay for freedom." "Whose freedom?" I ask. What freedom can a man have when he has no opportunity to exercise his inalienable right to work?

"Who pays the price?" I ask. Do the fine, up-standing, well-financed gentlemen of the New York State Chamber of Commerce pay the price? Or are the copper miners, the steel workers, the small businessmen, and the farmers the ones who pay it?

Mr. President, my attention has recently been called to a syndicated column written by Roger W. Babson and

appearing in the Washington Post for July 2, 1945. His words should cause every intelligent businessman to pause and consider the kind of advice he is receiving. I quote from Mr. Babson's column:

Most economists are agreed that we should be prepared for trouble any time after 1950. As to what form this trouble takes depends largely upon the success or failure of the Russian Communist experiment. If, after 1950, Russia, with the rest of the world, suffers from unemployment, we have not much to fear.

Let me repeat that last sentence:

If, after 1950, Russia, with the rest of the world, suffers from unemployment, we have not much to fear.

Mr. Babson assumes that America and the rest of the world, except Russia, will, after 1950, experience an unemployment crisis. He pins his hopes upon the thought that Russia also will have mass unemployment. That is too dangerous a gamble to take. We must at all costs avoid such a catastrophe which might undermine our whole American system.

When I introduced the full employment bill in this United States Senate on January 22, 1945, I made the following statement:

Let us make our system of private competitive enterprise work so well here in America that other countries will seek to imitate us. Other nations follow our lead in technology—in mass-production methods of making steel and of fabricating automobiles and airplanes. Why should we not progress to the point where they will imitate us in the field of economics also? Why can we not take the lead in remedying the weaknesses that have developed in our capitalist system? Why can we not set an example here for all the peoples of the world by affording the fullest possible opportunity and encouragement for private initiative and ending chronic unemployment? Why can we not demonstrate to the world that it is possible to have the highest standard of living without abandoning our cherished political freedoms?"

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that I firmly believe that America, under free enterprise, is not inferior to Russia, and that through the measure here proposed we can prevent unemployment and thus prove to the world that democracy can work.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR BURTON, OF OHIO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] of date September 25, 1945, today, and copy of a letter from the Senator from Ohio to Hon. Frank J. Lausche, Governor of the State of Ohio. The clerk will read both letters, first reading the letter from the Senator from Ohio.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., September 25, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a copy of a letter which I am transmitting to the Governor of the State of Ohio resigning my office of Senator of the United States from Ohio, to take effect at the close of September 30, 1945.

It is a matter of deep personal regret for me to sever my cordial and pleasant relations with the Members of the Senate, but under the circumstances I feel that there is no other course that can be justified. I am resigning solely in order that I may become a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, and in that capacity I shall consider it a privilege to continue to serve in cooperation with the other branches of the Federal Government.

Yours respectfully,
HAROLD H. BURTON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., September 25, 1945.

Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Governor of the State of Ohio,
Columbus, Ohio.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: In view of the fact that the President of the United States has nominated me for appointment as associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and the nomination has been confirmed by the Senate, I consider it my duty to accept this appointment, and therefore respectfully resign my office of United States Senator from Ohio, to take effect at the close of September 30, 1945.

It has been an unusual and high privilege to serve in the United States Senate during the critical years of the war, and I wish to express my appreciation to the people of Ohio for the opportunity thus afforded me to assist them in winning the war and in laying the foundations for future international and domestic stability.

Yours respectfully,
HAROLD H. BURTON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communications will lie on the table.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Murray
Andrews	Gurney	Myers
Bailey	Hart	O'Daniel
Ball	Hatch	Overton
Barkley	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bridges	Hill	Robertson
Briggs	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Knowland	Taylor
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Tobey
Carville	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	McMahon	Walsh
Donnell	Magnuson	Wheeler
Downey	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Mead	White
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Mitchell	Willis
George	Moore	Wilson
Gerry	Morse	Young
Green	Murdock	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

STIMULATION OF VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand there is to be further discussion of the bill, and that other amendments are to be offered, so it is not appropriate that we vote on the committee amendment at this time. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is on his way to the Senate Chamber, and if no Senator is ready to proceed to discuss the pending amendment, I hope we may be able to lay the bill aside temporarily and take up the enlistment bill. The Senator from Utah will be here in a moment. I do not like to have the bill taken up until he arrives. However, Mr. President, in view of the importance of the so-called voluntary enlistment bill, which was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs yesterday, and the statements of Senators interested in the proposed legislation that it would not require very long to dispose of the bill, I think it appropriate now to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 3951. I make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I believe the suggestion just made by our leader is quite in order, because the Army is prepared and waiting to go forward with the voluntary enlistment plan.

The theory of the bill is quite simple. If I may speak in very general terms, it merely extends to men who will enlist in the Army most of the rights and most of the privileges which have been extended to the drafted men, and, of course, which would be extended to any men who are drafted at the present time.

At the present time the Army has authority to recruit up to 280,000 men into the regular service. At the present time also the Army may recruit from among men who are already in the service. The bill would make it possible for the Army to do what it has not done heretofore, recruit for a short period of 2 years both from among men in civilian life and from among those who are now in the service in the Army.

The bill as reported from the committee is identical with the bill passed by the House, except for a simple amendment on page 3, in line 14, which the committee deemed was a wise amendment, and which the War Department sustained the committee in recommending.

The House bill provided that a man already in the service who had served 6 months could enlist for 1 year. It was assumed by the committee that it would

be better to adhere more closely to the provisions offered to men in civilian life and make the enlistment period 18 months instead of 2 years. That was done primarily because, considering the matter of travel, all the other things which men do in the Army, and the foreign service which likely they will be called upon to perform under this enlistment plan, a 1-year enlistment period seemed too short. Therefore, the committee changed that period to 18 months, which means, of course, that those who are in the Army, after they have served 6 months, can enlist for another 18 months. There is no limitation on the number of enlistments, except the exigencies of the service.

There is much discouragement upon the part of the Army. The Army does not think the enlistment plan will be sufficient. The Army contends that the draft will have to be continued in order to provide the needed manpower in the Army. That, of course, is a matter of opinion. The Army authorities assume that they can probably obtain 300,000 men by enlistment. I received a letter from a man serving in the Army in Arkansas who said that when the offer of enlistment was made known to the men there about 50 percent of them volunteered. No one knows whether the voluntary plan will take the place of the draft plan or not, but the draft law remains in existence until next May. The draft law has been resorted to until now, and boys are still being drafted.

I think, Mr. President, that that is about the only explanation that is needed, because the bill is a simple one, allowing the Army to proceed with its enlistment program.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Assuming for the sake of argument that 300,000 men would enlist in the next 3 months, has the Senator any idea as to what the likely action or recommendation would be by the Army and Navy respecting the draft, if such an event happened as I have described?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Only what has been said informally in the hearings. It has been assumed by those who appeared before the committee that the draft will have to be continued. The Senator knows that the armed services were drafting men at the time of the Japanese peace to the extent of 80,000 per month. That has been reduced by Executive order to 50,000 a month. And that is the number being drafted now.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator leaves us, however, with the thought that if 300,000 were to enlist in the near future the draft might possibly be cut again as to the number required each month, as it has already been cut from 80,000 to 50,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not if the demands made on the Army continue to be as they are estimated to be today. If, for instance, the demand for troops of occupation goes down, of course, then if 300,000 volunteers were obtained the number drafted could be reduced by that number.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the present prospects are even if the Army obtains the 300,000 volunteers in the next 4 months, let us say, that in the near future the draft as it is today or substantially as it is today, would still continue.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; if the demand for manpower is as great as the Army today contemplates it will be.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah if it is not a fact that today the Army cannot accept volunteers.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Army can accept volunteers up to 280,000 in the Regular Army on a regular 3-year enlistment, which is the ordinary enlistment the Regular Army has always had but there is no way under the law of the land today to accept volunteers from among those outside the armed forces. This measure will extend the voluntary system to the civilian.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, today no one can volunteer for the Regular Army except he be in the Army of the United States?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. And therefore this measure at least opens the way for civilians to volunteer?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. This measure opens the way for civilians to volunteer. The only way in which a civilian can get into the Army is to offer himself for induction, and if he is accepted by the board, I suppose that is a voluntary enlistment, because he is not called. He offers himself, but he goes in as an inductee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then, this measure will simplify the system and open the Army recruiting offices to civilians, and those who have previously served in the Army can again volunteer?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator one or two other questions. Is it not a fact that insofar as the Regular Army is concerned, according to the testimony presented before the Military Affairs Committee by General Henry, the Regular Army has already obtained its full quota?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No. I think they do not yet have the 280,000 which they are allowed under the present law.

Mr. MAYBANK. If they do not yet have the 280,000, those who would bring the number up to 280,000 must volunteer on a 3-year basis.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill calls for volunteering on an 18-month basis for those already in the service.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. And a 2-year basis for civilians.

Mr. MAYBANK. Eighteen months for those who are already in the Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Therefore, those who have been in the Army for 6 months can volunteer for 18 months.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Whereas under the present circumstances, they can volunteer only for 3 years.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Therefore an opportunity will be afforded not only for civilians to volunteer, but for those who are in the Army to volunteer for 18 months instead of 36 months, which is an added inducement.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator a further question. As I understand, the men already in the service who might volunteer for 18 months, as well as civilians who would be permitted to volunteer for 2 years, would have the same guarantees with respect to benefits under the so-called GI bill of rights, hospitalization, civil-service privileges, and so forth, as do those who have been in the Army during the years of war.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct, so long as the draft act remains as it is. In other words, things take their normal course. Any boy eligible for the Army of the United States is extremely foolish not to go in between now and next May, because the advantages are so great.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator another question, which was raised in the committee. If this bill should become a law, a young man in civilian life who reaches the age of 18 years could volunteer for service in the Army for 2 years.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. After leaving the service, he would have the right to go to college for 2 years at the expense of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. He would be paid the same amount, $60 a month, plus $500 tuition, plus housing benefits and other benefits available to men who have been in the Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So long as the GI bill of rights and the Selective Service Act remain in force, there will be no difference whatever in the benefits accruing to men leaving the service.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was the idea of the distinguished Senator from Utah and other members of the Committee on Military Affairs that the benefits which applied during the war should now be granted to new volunteers, so that those who might volunteer might release from the armed forces those who desire to be released so that they could return to their studies, their homes, or their businesses, which they left during the war.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was for that reason that the Committee on Military Affairs and the distinguished Senator believed that every inducement should be offered to obtain volunteers so that those who served this country so faithfully in the hour of need might return home.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

We might go one step further. The Committee on Military Affairs agrees

with the Army and with the people of the United States that if it is possible to have a volunteer Army, that would be better than a conscripted Army. The theory is that if it is possible for us to have an Army by the volunteer method, it is advisable to pursue that course, and the committee believe that if we offer to volunteers all inducements offered to those who were drafted, volunteers will enlist, and those who have served can be promptly released and return home.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an observation? I have just come into the Chamber.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The provisions of the bill which seek to promote voluntary enlistments in the Navy have been studied by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate, and hearings have been held thereon. The committee is entirely satisfied with the provisions.

The problem of transferring from the Navy Reserve, especially in the case of enlisted men, to the Regular Navy is a very serious one, and at first blush discouraging as regards the possibility of being able to transfer enough of the Reserves to the Regular Navy. Therefore, every possible suggestion which has been made to encourage voluntary enlistments and every possible benefit which has been suggested, not only by officers of the Navy, but by enlisted personnel in the Reserves as well, has been considered.

It is my opinion that this bill, so far as it relates to the Navy—and I assume that in many respects the provisions with respect to the Army are similar—will be of tremendous assistance in providing the proper-sized volunteer Regular Navy. All the provisions of the bill which relate to the Navy are entirely satisfactory, most helpful, and will result in a new outlook and a new deal for future members of the Regular Navy of the United States; and I assume that is true of the Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his statement.

As chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I am extremely grateful that the Committee on Naval Affairs handled the bill while the Military Affairs Committee were engaged in hearings on demobilization. There has been the best kind of cooperation. While the bill is a military bill, it deals also with the Navy and the Coast Guard.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. This question may already have been answered; but I wondered about line 7 on page 2. It is provided that the period of enlistment shall be 2 or 3 years. Was any thought given to an enlistment period of 1 year?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. Such an amendment was offered and voted down in the committee. I understand that such an amendment will be offered on the floor of the Senate.

I have already given the reasons for the 2-year period. They are purely military. They involve considerations of convenience. It is felt that a 1-year period is not sufficient to permit a man to do what the Army expects him to do in the service.

Mr. LANGER. I am not a member of the Senator's committee, but if my memory serves me correctly, the Austin-Wadsworth bill provided for a period of service of 1 year for boys who were drafted.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The original draft bill, which was not the Austin-Wadsworth bill, but the Burke-Wadsworth bill, called for a period of 1 year, but that was primarily for training and not service. This is for service.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. I notice that in the matter of reenlistments, the words "1 year" have been stricken out, and "18 months" substituted.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. HOEY. Would it not be practicable to permit reenlistments for 1 year in the case of men who have already been trained? Would not the Army get a larger number by making the period of reenlistment 1 year, instead of 18 months?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That was the assumption made by the House of Representatives but the military authorities who appeared before our committee contended that if the period were reduced to 1 year—which means 18 months' service, because reenlistment is open only to those who have already served 6 months—it would not allow sufficient time, considering the time necessary to travel to the places of service. Very likely the Army would not get the service out of a soldier that it should get in that time.

Mr. HOEY. Since they have already served at least 6 months, and the Army has stated that 6 months is ample time within which to train a soldier, if they have already had the training, why would it not be practicable for them to reenlist for 1 year?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The only reason I know is that the Army says that it is not practicable. The House of Representatives in its action sustained what the Senator from North Carolina says.

Mr. HOEY. The House of Representatives provided for a reenlistment period of 1 year.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. HOEY. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs changed it to 18 months, on the recommendation of the War Department.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. HOEY. I feel that the period should be made 1 year. I believe that that would increase the number of enlistments and do away with the necessity of continuing the draft.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am sure that the Army will do its best to carry on if that is done.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did not the peacetime selective-service law, which was advocated by the War Department, provide for a period of service of only 1 year?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. As I stated in reply to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], that was primarily for training.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did not the representatives of the War Department state that they could get along without voluntary enlistments if they had such a law?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That was for training only. These men will be called into service and sent overseas. When we first enacted the Selective Service Act, it was not assumed that anyone would be sent overseas.

Furthermore, if Senators will remember, the greatest leniency is extended with regard to furloughs in the case of men who are in the service. They are permitted to go home and see their families and then come back. It will be found that the Army is not very wrong in asking for a period of 2 years, in view of all the privileges which have been given.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator does not anticipate that this bill will become permanent law, does he?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Does the Senator mean that the Army will regularly recruit for 2 years instead of 3?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am assuming that once the Army gets the 2-year habit, it will probably continue it. However, at the present time the Army believes that the 3-year enlistment is the proper one. The Navy is still insisting upon 4 years.

Mr. McFARLAND. When the occupation period is over, why would not 1 year be a proper period, rather than 1½ years or 2 years, if the men are simply to be trained to be reserves?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If they were merely training, 1 year would be sufficient, under the theory of the Draft Act; but it would not be sufficient for service in the Army.

Mr. McFARLAND. Why not state that?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The point is that a soldier must fit into a unit. The generals, colonels, and all others who have to do with the Army think in terms of units. They do not like a great change. Of course, they like what they call stability in their way of working. Other Senators can give all the reasons the Army has given and those I have attempted to give. Still, it is the opinion of the Army. Of course, the Senator is entitled to his own opinion, and I will not argue with him about it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am talking about the time when the period of occupation will be over. If it is proper to have compulsory training for 1 year, why would it not be proper to have 1 year's training in the case of volunteers?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is because the purpose of the Act is not for training, but for service. If the men are to be kept in an occupation army their lives will be risked the same as in the case of any other soldier. If we may judge by the experience after the last war, there may be trouble, and it is proper for the Army to anticipate trouble. An army of occupation cannot operate on the basis of simple training.

Mr. McFARLAND. But I am talking about the time after the period of occupation is over.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Practically the Senator is saying "Let us wait until that time comes." Today the problem

we face is the necessity of getting men into the Army by voluntary-enlistment arrangements, so that those now in the Army who have been drafted can get out of the Army and so that we shall not need to resort to the draft in order to get men. We wish to get them by way of voluntary methods, if it is possible to do so.

Mr. McFARLAND. As pointed out by the Senator from South Carolina, that would not be true in the case of a man who enlisted who was already trained.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, we are all concerned about the continuity of the forces necessary to be used for the occupation of conquered territory such as Germany, Japan, and other places in the Pacific area. No one knows just how long that period will last in any country. I do not think anyone can now foresee how long it will be.

We recall that General Wainwright, who came back recently, and who has been making some statements about it, said we should occupy Japan for 20 years. General Eichelberger made a statement to the effect that he did not think we would have to occupy Japan for more than 1 year. General MacArthur is said to have said to someone of Dallas, Tex., that 6 months would be sufficiently long. I do not know whether he did say that; but in Sunday's newspapers, as I recall, he was quoted as indicating that it would be a long occupation, for a number of years. So, Mr. President, the military authorities do not seem to know just how long it will require us to perform the obligation we have assumed.

No matter how long it may be, I suppose we feel that there should be some continuity in regard to it. Undoubtedly there will be a great turn-over, whether under the draft or under a voluntary system. What puzzles me about the difference between service for 1 year and service for 18 months is whether, if the period is a year, so much of the year would be consumed in training the men, especially men who enlisted, if they had not previously been in the Army, that they would not have long enough to serve in the army of occupation after their training was concluded. I think that is a matter of concern, namely, whether service for a year would give a man all the training he needed and at the same time would permit him to have a considerable period of service in the army of occupation. That is a matter on which I should like to have information from the Senator from Utah. If the period is made 1 year, how long will the men have to be trained in this country before they will be sent to an occupation area?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They would be given the ordinary 17 weeks of basic training, in the same way that everyone else was trained. The theory would be to keep them in this country as long as possible, until they were trained, before they were sent overseas.

Mr. BARKLEY. In any event, there will be a constant stream of men going in both directions. There will be those now in the army of occupation who will be coming home, and later on there will be those who will be sent over there to take their places.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. There will be a continuous exchange back and forth.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; in any event there will be that continuous exchange, either by means of the draft or by means of the voluntary method. The hope of the authors of the bill is that it will be possible to avoid the drafting of boys. It is hoped to avoid that by resorting to the voluntary method.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that. In that connection, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah what information he obtained from the War Department or from the Army officers who appeared before the committee regarding the intensity of the effort they will put forth to obtain voluntary enlistments. A good deal depends on the effort which is made. So many men have been in the Army or the Navy during the war that the posters in front of the post offices to "Join the Navy and see the World" or "Join the Army" and see it or do something else will not be sufficient, perhaps. It may be that many of the men who now wish to get out of the Army may later wish to go back, after they get out and look around. After they have been out awhile and have returned home, they may wish to return to the Army by way of voluntary enlistment. Can the Senator give us any information about that?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We have very much information along that line. In the whole demobilization process the opportunity of reenlistment is pointed out to the men. In all the services, everywhere, orders have already been issued to try to obtain reenlistments of men who already are in the service. In addition, the Army is setting up the most intensive campaign it has ever undertaken to obtain volunteers. The Army is determined to do everything it can to find out whether the voluntary system will work.

I myself chided them, as I know other members of the committee did, saying that the voluntary system never has had a chance. We said that they have only half-heartedly pushed the voluntary system. All of us recall that volunteering was stopped for a day or two after the draft system began, until we pointed out that volunteering was to be allowed under the Draft Act.

But now the Army is determined to do all it can to popularize volunteering, and I am sure it is quite likely that never before has the country offered to its citizens the number of opportunities which are now offered under the voluntary arrangement. I repeat to the Senator from Kentucky what I said before, namely, that, as I see the situation, so long as the Selective Service Act is the law, so long as the GI bill of rights is in existence, and so long as our men come under the provisions of those measures, any boy who does not thoughtfully consider going into the Army between now and May is quite foolish.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the information the Senator has given. I think we all agree that if we can obtain a suitable army of occupation from volunteers that is a very desirable thing to do. But until we know we can do it we cannot lift the draft. In other words, we cannot have a hiatus between the effort to secure volunteers and the necessity which might spring up in the event of a failure of sufficient men to volunteer, with the result that then we would have to enact another draft law. It is much better to be sure to obtain the required number of men by the volunteer system and then lift the draft entirely. I assume that the process will be a continuous one. If we have to occupy foreign countries for a number of years, this law will presumably remain in effect as long as necessary. There is no time limit on the proposed legislation, is there?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. What effect will the bill, if enacted, have on men who are already in the Army and who enlisted for a 3-year period before the war began?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Those men who were members of the Regular Army of the United States were automatically, when the emergency started, changed in status so that their enlistments came to an end and they then were in the service for the duration and 6 months.

Mr. BARKLEY. Men who had enlisted for 3 years, and whose period of enlistment had terminated while the war was in progress, were not able to be discharged, and their enlistments were continued for the duration of the war and 6 months afterward.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So they would be out of service at the end of 6 months in any event, even if they had enlisted prior to the war for 3 years.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. Many men are enlisting at the present time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I think I may contribute some information. Many members of the naval forces are being discharged and are now returning to their homes to visit their parents and friends. It is expected that many of them, after a brief vacation at home, will voluntarily return to the naval service. During the month of August there were more than 6,000 voluntary enlistments in the Navy. During the month of September it is expected that the number will be from 10,000 to 12,000. That means a rate of approximately 120,000 enlistments during the year. That number is not sufficient, but it is expected that after enlisted reserves have had a chance to go home and visit their families and friends many of them will rejoin the service. I am sure that that statement is true of the Regular Army as well.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are all of the enlistments reenlistments?

Mr. WALSH. No, they are mostly new enlistments. The situation is due in part, of course, to the Selective Service Act. As I see it, it does not seem possible that there will be much of a movement from the reserves toward enrollment in the Regular Navy until opportunity has been afforded to men to visit their homes and live for a while in civilian life. After that it is hoped and expected that

many of them will decide to enlist in the Navy or the Army.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? I do not want to make a speech.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. On page 2 of the bill, beginning in line 5, I find the following language:

The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to accept original enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of 2 or 3 years, at the option of the person so enlisted, from among qualified male persons not less than 17 years of age, including persons in active service in the Army of the United States or any component thereof: *Provided*, That upon the presentation of satisfactory evidence as to his age and upon written application for discharge by his parent or guardian presented to the Secretary of War within 6 months after the date of his enlistment, any man enlisted under the provisions of this act who is under 21 years of age and who has enlisted without the written consent of his parent or guardian, if any, shall be discharged from that portion of his contract of enlistment as extends beyond the duration of the present wars and 6 months thereafter.

A little later on in the bill men who are 18 years of age and older are specifically authorized to enlist without their parents' consent. I wonder how the Senator harmonizes those two sections.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Does not the second provision deal with men who are already in the Army?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator ought to know more about the subject than I do.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think that provision deals with those who are already in the Army.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let us see. The language reads:

Provided further, That no person under the age of 18 years shall be enlisted—

It does not say whether he is in the service or not—

without the written consent of his parents or guardians, and the Secretary of War shall, upon the application of the parents or guardians of any such persons enlisted without their written consent, discharge such person from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of such person, after enlistment, shall entitle him—

And so forth.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is assumed that the men referred to on page 3 of the bill have already passed through that stage.

Mr. CONNALLY. The language does not say so.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. On page 3 the language reads:

Any qualified and acceptable member of the Army of the United States.

If a boy is under age he cannot be accepted unless he is drafted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a minute. On page 3 the bill refers to boys 18 years old.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. But no person under the age of 18 years shall be enlisted without the written consent of his parents or guardians.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. No 17-year-old boy would be drafted, and 18-year-old boys could be drafted. Seventeen-year-old boys would have to obtain the consent of their parents or guardians.

Mr. CONNALLY. That has always been the law. There is to be no change in it, is there?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I believe not.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why does the bill provide at another place that if the boy under 21 years of age who has enlisted without the written consent of his parents may be discharged?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is the arrangement.

Mr. CONNALLY. The law has always been, as I remember it, that a boy more than 18 years of age could enlist in the Army without the consent of his parents or guardian. A bill is being presented to us having as one of its objectives the stimulation of enlistments, and yet it is being made more restrictive than is the present law.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not know whether that is true or not, but it is my understanding that an 18-year-old boy must obtain his parents' consent to join the service.

Mr. CONNALLY. No. Under the old law a boy 18 years of age could enlist without his parents' consent.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I think that I can answer the question. A young man 18 years of age or older is now subject to selective service.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be true, but he can also enlist in the Regular Army.

Mr. GURNEY. Under the provision on page 2 of the bill he may enlist in the Regular Army without the consent of his parents provided he is 18 years of age.

Mr. CONNALLY. Where is the language to which the Senator refers?

Mr. GURNEY. If the war or the emergency has been declared to have come to an end, and the boy is still under 21 years of age, the parents may ask for his discharge. So a man coming under the provision covering a 2- or a 3-year enlistment will not be obligated to serve out the enlistment if he is less than 21 years of age any more than he would be if he had waited for the selective service to catch up with him.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be clear to members of the Military Affairs Committee, but it is not clear to many other Senators, and it will not be clear to many fathers and mothers.

Mr. GURNEY. I think that it is quite clear if we will but read the language.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let us see about it. Beginning in line 4, on page 2, the language reads:

That notwithstanding the limitations contained in any other provision of law, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to accept original enlistments and reenlistments—

It has been said that the language elsewhere refers to men who are already in service. The words "reenlistments in the Regular Army" would certainly be according to the present law. Allow me again to read the language:

That notwithstanding the limitations contained in any other provision of the law, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to accept original enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of 2 or 3 years, at the option of the person so enlisted, from among qualified male persons not less than 17 years of age, including persons in active service in the Army of the United States or any component thereof.

They are to be limited if they are more than 17 years of age.

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. And the bill also provides that if the man is under 21 years of age all his parents need to do is to request that he be discharged, and they can get him out of the service. The law in its present form is that a man 18 years of age may enlist without the consent of his parents.

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why is the law to be changed?

Mr. GURNEY. The law will not be changed. The pending measure provides that if a man enlists at 18 years of age, and comes under the Selective Service Emergency Act, he may be discharged when he is 19 years of age provided the emergency has terminated.

Mr. CONNALLY. The language reads:

Provided, That upon the presentation of satisfactory evidence as to his age and upon written application for discharge by his parent or guardian presented to the Secretary of War within 6 months after the date of his enlistment—

And so forth. If that is not English, I do not understand English.

Mr. GURNEY. If the Senator will read on to line 18, he will find this provision:

shall be discharged from that portion of his contract of enlistment as extends beyond the duration of the present wars and 6 months thereafter.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that, but I want to know why we should permit men to enlist at 18 or above without their parents' consent, and then turn right around and tell them they can get out with their parents' consent.

Mr. GURNEY. It is to equalize them with the present law, under which all 18-year-old boys come.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It may be well to read the present law, and then I think the Senator from Texas will see that the provision here is consistent with the present law. I read now under the heading "Discharge of minors":

Upon the presentation of satisfactory evidence as to his age and upon application for discharge by the parent or guardian presented to the Secretary of War within 6 months after the date of his enlistment, any man enlisted after July 1, 1925, in the Army under 21 years of age who has enlisted without the written consent of his parent or guardian, if any, should be discharged with the form of discharge certificate and the travel and other allowances to which his service after enlistment shall entitle him.

Mr. GURNEY. If I may interrupt the Senator, this provision for voluntary enlistment is inserted so that a man who comes forward and volunteers before the draft takes him will not have to serve longer than the man who stays home and waits for the draft to select him. It

equalizes the opportunity or the responsibility.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask whether the committee gave any consideration to the possibility of increasing the remuneration of men in the Army as an inducement to voluntary enlistment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; some consideration was given to that, but not in a formal way. It was announced by some members of the committee that if the pay were increased there would be more volunteers, and one witness testified in the hearing that if volunteers were offered $125 a month, there would be no trouble getting volunteers.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It strikes me that if we are to give the voluntary system a chance to work and to provide an adequate number of men, we are going to have to increase the remuneration paid to the men, to make it at least a bit more comparable with what they would get in civilian life. Until that is done, I do not think the plan of voluntary enlistment will be given a fair trial.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I believe I can answer the question of the Senator from California. A shorter period of enlistment is offered than existed in the prewar period, and the inducement is that, under the proposed law, a man gets reenlistment payments which he did not get in the prewar period. For instance, a man who served 3 years will receive in a lump sum, when he reenlists, $50 a year for each of the 3 years. That takes care of the boys who have been in the service during the war period. In addition, he will get his mustering-out pay in a lump sum. In addition, he will get larger payments for his family than he otherwise would get. He has family allowances for quarters and subsistence which were formerly offered only to those in the top three grades of the enlisted service. There are many inducements for new enlistments in the Regular Army. He has the added benefits on discharge later, at the end of the period, of the GI bill of rights. All those inducements are advantages which he did not previously have. So I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Utah that any young man should look well to the advantages offered by this bill.

Those inducements during the last few months have been outlined to prospective volunteers. They are told, "These are what the Army and the Navy think they will be able to offer." But when this bill is actually law, the Army and Navy can say, "Here are the advantages." In other words, something on the barrelhead is being offered for reenlistments and for new enlistments.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. What is the pay of the enlisted man to be, under the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The same as the pay given an inducted person at the present time.

Mr. WHEELER. That is, $50 a month?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think it is $50 a month.

Mr. WHEELER. If he has any dependents, does he get allowances for his dependents?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The allowance for dependents is not covered in the bill. He has all the privileges and rights, but the right of allowances for dependents is not specifically covered in the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. A few days ago there was before the Senate a bill proposing to grant a hundred dollars a month to an unemployed person. It seems to me we cannot expect to get many men, certainly we cannot get any married men, to enlist in the armed services if the pay is only $50 a month.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The man who enlists gets other things besides $50 a month. He gets very much more than a man who receives a hundred dollars a month in civilian life.

Mr. WHEELER. How is he to support a family, a wife or dependents, if he has any, if he receives only $50 a month?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is assumed that the volunteer likely will not be a man with dependents.

Mr. WHEELER. So that the Army does not expect a man with dependents to enlist in the Army?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is assumed he will not.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Army is drafting men. For instance, when I was in Montana recently a man 35 years of age, who has three children, came to me and told me he had been drafted. It seems to me that at this time for the Army to be drafting men 35 years of age and with three children is rather absurd, when we are letting men out of the Army, and trying to get them out.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We have to resort to the draft, and continue to resort to the draft, under the present circumstances. That will undoubtedly continue to be the case, for the simple reason that the great number of men who have already been drafted and are in the armed services today will cover the lower ranges, and of course they will not be called back.

Mr. WHEELER. We have heard many reports as to the number of men who will probably be needed in Europe and in Asia. Recently, when the committee of which I was chairman was in Europe, every place we went, whether in France, Italy, Greece, or any other country, a great many were saying that it would be necessary for us to keep a large army of occupation there, not for the purpose of policing Germany, but for the purpose of policing France or some of the other countries, in order to keep down uprisings or to prevent revolutions. It seems to me that the number of men we are to have in the Army depends to a large extent on how many we are to have in the army of occupation in Germany and in Japan.

Information has come to me, from a very reliable source, to the effect that the Army will need a much smaller number of men in American-occupied territory in Germany, to police Germany, than the authorities had originally estimated. Can the Senator tell us what the Army thinks about the number of men who will be needed in occupied Germany? I have heard it stated as low as 50,000 men and, frankly, I cannot conceive of the need for more than 50,000 in the occupied part of Germany, having personally been through the area which the Americans are to occupy. I do not think a greater number will be needed because of the total destruction of the cities, and because the Germans are to be disarmed, and so forth.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No definite figures have been given. The Senator is familiar with what has been published in the press about that matter.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not familiar with all that appears in the press. I am confused, because I see published one day one statement which is supposed to be authentic, a different supposedly authentic statement published another day, and a still different statement published on another occasion. So many statements are issued that the American people, the mothers, fathers, and wives of the soldiers who are in the Army have become so confused that they do not know whether they are coming or going.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think everyone is confused. If the Senator asks me what my opinion is about the matter I probably cannot give him one that would be satisfactory. There are no figures available except those derived from what the Chief of Staff has said. The Chief of Staff said we had to have an Army sufficient to face any obligation which rests upon us in regard to occupation of countries in peacetime.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, we all agree with that statement, but it does not mean anything.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether the Senator from Montana was present when, last Thursday, General Marshall addressed Members of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sorry, but I could not be present.

Mr. BARKLEY. General Marshall said that the last word from General Eisenhower as to the number of men required in Germany was 400,000. He had received no later word from General Eisenhower. He said the figure was reached by reducing the previous estimate of between 500,000 and 600,000 to 400,000. He was very frank in his statement to Congress that he had received no estimate from General Eisenhower since the estimate of 400,000. He did say that the night before or that morning he had received the official estimate by General MacArthur of 200,000 men who would be needed in Japan and Korea by the 1st of next July; that General MacArthur was expecting that between now and that time there would be a peak of about 500,000 men needed in Japan, but after that peak had been reached and by the middle of next year the number could be reduced to 200,000. That is the

latest estimate. He stated that that did not include any men who would be needed in Hawaii, or the Philippines, or Okinawa, or on any of the islands of the Pacific. He said it had been estimated that the islands, the various points which would have to be garrisoned, would require probably 900,000 men, but that was subject to reduction when he obtained final reports from the generals in the field. That was the latest estimate General MacArthur could give us.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, it seems to me that we would undoubtedly need more men in Japan than would be needed in Germany by reason of the fact that we are occupying only about one-third of Germany, and, as everyone knows, we are occupying the poorer part of Germany. The Russians are occupying the part of Germany where most of the food is raised. We are occupying the part which contains the largest industrial population, and where the least food is produced, so from the standpoint of feeding the population and from the financial standpoint we are occupying the worst part of Germany, when we consider the fact that heavy industries or other industries are not going to be permitted to operate there.

Mr. President, if MacArthur can get along with 200,000 men in Japan, certainly it will not require 400,000 men to occupy the one-third of Germany assigned to us. I am not a military expert, but I say that if one uses his common sense, it would tell him that we do not need 400,000 men to occupy our portion of Germany. That is my impression after having visited Germany. I certainly hope that neither the officials of the Army nor anyone else in our Government is going to try to keep a great number of our soldiers in France or Italy or Greece or some other country simply for the purpose of trying to preserve order there. We have liberated those countries, and if they cannot take care of themselves and maintain order in their boundaries, then certainly American troops should not be kept there for that purpose. That is my conviction and my judgment.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. TUNNELL addressed the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon, and then I will yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was very much interested in the question raised by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] a moment ago. I think it is a very pertinent question. I certainly am not satisfied on the basis of the information submitted to the Senate by the committee regarding whether or not the committee has available for the information of the Senate the evidence and data which I think we need on the question as to what pay should be made available to the men who enlist in a volunteer Army. I think there are two or three premises to which we ought to give very careful consideration in this debate.

I think we should demobilize our drafted Army just as quickly as possible. We should not expect the young men of America to continue to serve in a drafted Army in performing a police job in the occupied countries. We are going to have to maintain such an Army in various parts of the world for many years to come. Unless they are given adequate compensation for the service they are rendering the civilians at home, we will do them a great economic injustice. I do not feel that the bill in its present form, on the basis of such reading as I have given to it, begins to allow that compensation which we ought to be willing to pay for the volunteer type of armies we are going to have to maintain as armies of occupation.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon permit me to interrupt him at that point?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. It is assumed by Army officials that the man who goes into the Army now is a single man, and that he will remain single while in the Army, and because of that fact no allowance is being made for dependents of those who volunteer.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I wish the Senator from Oregon would consider the very practical problem we are up against. It was considered by the committee, I am sure, that it would not be well for us to offer greater inducements to volunteers at the present time, because that would mean they would receive a salary larger than that of the conscripted men who have brought us victory. In other words, we could not have a higher paid volunteer for peacetime service serving alongside the man who had been in the war, and who was receiving a lesser amount than the volunteer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should be very happy to vote for an amendment that would give to the conscripted men, as long as we keep them conscripted during the peace period, a pay which I think is commensurate with the services which they are rendering. We should recognize the type of job and the changed conditions of service which the armies of the United States are going to be called upon to perform during the long period of foreign occupation which our international obligation to help maintain peace imposes upon us.

Thus we need to keep in mind the fact that the type of armed service which is going to have to be rendered by our Army in the years ahead is going to be quite different from the type of service we have looked upon our Regular Army in times of peace to perform. I submit that there are forces in this country which do not want to see a voluntary Army succeed in America. I believe we have an obligation to get a voluntary Army into the field just as quickly as possible, and end conscription. I certainly think we have an obligation to stop this drafting of boys from 18 to 21 who want to be in school, not in the Army, during peacetime.

Hence I find myself strongly in favor of the proposition that we as civilians here at home need to recognize that the men we put in uniform to serve in our armies of occupation in the years ahead are doing a real police job in the interest of maintaining permanent peace, and that a decent wage, if we want to use the term, for performing that sort of labor for the country, is what they are entitled to.

I think we should not ask the young men of America to subsidize those of us here at home so far as our financial obligations are concerned, by requiring them to serve in foreign lands in armies of occupation, at wages which are far too low.

I do not find in this bill anything which leads me to believe that we are starting out this voluntary Army on a decent basis of financial inducement. If it is to work successfully we should encourage volunteers to enlist on a rate of pay basis which would give them and their dependents a fair income in keeping with the standard of living which we allow other Federal employees of similar employment ratings. We really need to enlist an army police force to maintain order and enforce the terms of the peace in the conquered enemy nations. Such a policeman army should be composed of very able men and to build the type of volunteer Army we need to do the best possible job abroad in policing the occupied countries.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Oregon has said. I call attention to the fact that what the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] said is true. We should not pay volunteers any more than we pay those who were drafted. But I also call attention to the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs tells me—and I know it to be true—that we do make allowances for the dependents of the boys who are drafted, whereas it is not proposed to make allowances for the dependents of those who volunteer.

As has been pointed out, the Army of Occupation is a police force. Its members are used as policemen. We would not think of paying policemen in the city of Washington only $50 a month, and expect to have very many volunteers. I do not believe that there will be many volunteers on this basis.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that there are those in the Army who do not want a voluntary Army, but who want a drafted Army. I am in favor of doing away with the draft, and I am in favor of releasing from the service the boys who have been drafted and having the Army put upon a volunteer basis. I believe in paying the volunteers enough. We should adequately pay the boys who are to do police service in Germany and all over the world. The American people ought to be willing to pay them. If we want an American army of occupation all over the world, we ought to have sense enough to pay adequately its members so that they will be willing to serve.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thought I heard the Senator say that there was a limitation on the number who could be accepted as volunteers. Am I correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I believe not.

Mr. TUNNELL. Is there no limitation?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There is a limitation in the present law with regard to the Regular Army. The limitation is 280,000 men. However, that limitation is waived in this bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. Has the committee considered the possibility of either an Army of volunteers or an Army obtained by some system of draft other than the present law? Those who were drafted under the present law were drafted for the war, which has just closed. Does the committee have in mind the relief of all boys who were drafted for war?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That was the hope. They are now coming home as fast as ships can be obtained for them.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understand that.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The size of the Army cannot be reduced any faster than it is now being reduced. Perhaps another 100,000 a month could be brought home. That would be the maximum. More than 700,000 a month cannot be properly handled.

Mr. TUNNELL. I heard the statement of General Marshall, and it seemed to me that it was based upon facts.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It was based upon physics.

Mr. TUNNELL. I was thinking of a permanent arrangement. For example, many of the boys now in the Army were drafted for a period of 1 year. A great many of them have been in the service for almost 4 years, and some for almost 5 years. They really have some ground for seeking relief, either through a volunteer system, or some system of selective service, other than for war. If we are to have an army of occupation, I believe that the boys who go into that army should know that they are going in for occupational service, and are not being drafted for war. They should know that they are not being drafted for one year's service, with the possibility that they will be kept indefinitely in foreign countries.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

In regard to the question of dependency allowances, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] has stated, and as I stated in answer to him, the bill does not provide for dependency allowances in the case of volunteers. However, so long as the Selective Service Act is operative, until next May, any person who goes in will be given all the rights and privileges provided by that act. If a person volunteers now and becomes a member of the Army of the United States by voluntary arrangement, he will be in exactly the same position as the person who was inducted, so long as the act lasts.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. However, if he volunteers after the expiration of the act, he will receive no dependency allowance for his wife or children.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. WHEELER. It seems to me that if we make provision at the present time for dependency allowances for those who volunteer now, and make no such provision in the case of those who volunteer after the draft act expires, that is certainly unfair to the man who volunteers afterward. If the Army really wishes to obtain volunteers, it seems to me that the service must be made more attractive.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The way to accomplish what the Senator has in mind would be to renew the Service Men's Dependency Act when it expires. I ask the Senator to consider the practical situation. I know that he does, because he has had very much more experience in the legislative field than many of us have had. This bill comes over from the House of Representatives. The Army is anxious to start its recruitment and enlistment program. The whole country wants the Army to start on that program because we would like to get rid of the draft if we can. So long as the Selective Service Act and the Servicemen's Dependency Act are in existence, every right under those acts is open to the men who volunteer. However, such rights are not guaranteed in this bill. When the time comes—and that time is not now—if the Congress wishes to adopt a voluntary system, it can reenact all the provisions of the Selective Service Act and the Servicemen's Dependency Act, as well as other acts containing benefits to servicemen.

Mr. WHEELER. I congratulate the Senator on trying to establish a voluntary system. I have always felt that we ought to have voluntary system; but I have also felt that we have not paid the men in the service enough to obtain a volunteer Army. I have never believed in a peacetime draft. I certainly will oppose any peacetime draft so long as it is possible to obtain a volunteer Army. But the service must be made more attractive. With the cost of living as it is today, we cannot expect men to go into the Army for $50 a month, with no allowance for dependents, when other men are receiving $8, $10, or $15 a day working in factories. It is absolutely unfair to the men who are in the Army, and who are rendering a great patriotic service to the people of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I appreciate all that the Senator says. However, this is the most liberal measure ever sought to be enacted for the enlistment of men in the Army or Navy in the entire history of the country. I doubt whether Congress can be asked to go any further than that under the present circumstances.

The program is experimental. We do not know what the exigencies of tomorrow will demand. We have an estimate from General Eisenhower, and we have an estimate from General MacArthur. We do not know what the estimate here at home is.

We are dealing with an attempt to build up an army for the United States at a time when the United States already has more than 8,000,000 men in the Army. Common sense might say, "Let us use those men." But that is not the way the people feel toward them. They want the men who were inducted under the selective service, and who have served overseas, to get back home as soon as possible; and I know that this body wishes to have a voluntary system as soon as possible.

I assure the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Oregon that, given half a chance, the program will succeed.

Let us experiment a little. Let us not try to turn our backs entirely upon the experience of the Army and of the Navy in enlistments. Let us move forward gradually, and do the things we can do. So far as those who may wish to volunteer now are concerned, they will have all the benefits of the emergency legislation. If the time comes to reenact some of the emergency legislation for benefit of the men who have enlisted, then we can move into that field.

If we were to bring forward at the present time a bill based upon all the ideas which our committee has as to the post-war army of the United States, how to recruit that army and build it up, its organization, and all those things, we could not pass such a measure through Congress at this time. We could not bring the relief which we desire to bring to the boys who are due to come home.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I am going to support the proposed legislation, but I certainly hope that when the Draft Act expires, men who have families and who wish to enlist will be given an opportunity to enlist and will be given adequate allowances for their dependents. I shall vote for the measure because I believe in its principle. But I wish to see the boys now in the service released—not only those who are overseas and who should be brought home and be given an opportunity to get back into civil life, but likewise the hundreds of thousands of boys who have never left the United States, who have not had opportunity to go overseas, but have been lying around in this country doing nothing. It seems to me the discharges of such men should be stepped up.

Furthermore, let me say that while I was in Montana this summer, I spent some time in the farming area in the eastern section of the State. Everywhere I went people called my attention to the fact that their boys were in the Army and were lying around doing nothing. The farmers and ranchers in that area were in need of help on their farms and ranches, but they could not get any help and they could not get their boys out of the Army. While I was in the State there came to see me at least 500 farmers and ranchers who wanted to have their boys released from the Army and returned home, because they needed them on the farms to harvest the crops. Time and time again they said to me, "I got a letter from my boy, and he is just lying around doing nothing. He is doing no good for himself or for anyone else, but he could be back here helping harvest the crops and not only doing something for himself but doing something for his family."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As a result of the hearings held during the last few weeks, I am sure that condition will not last very much longer. The Army has realized the existence of such a situation, and it is trying to make some headway in correcting it.

I should also say to the Senator from Montana that as the bill came from the House of Representatives it carried the

liberal provisions about which the Senator is talking. So we are not arguing about the matter at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not think we should lose sight of the main problem which here confronts the people of the United States. First, we must occupy the countries we are supposed to occupy and the islands we are supposed to occupy, until the war we have won and the peace we think we have won have been secured.

Before President Roosevelt died, I had an opportunity to talk with him about this matter. He foresaw what would occur. He knew that when the war was over, everyone would want to come home. He knew that the fathers and mothers and the other loved ones of the men in the services would want them to come home. For the Senate committee, I traveled thousands of miles to almost all the war fronts, and I have yet to see an American soldier who did not want to come home at the earliest possible moment. Of course, he did not want to desert his outfit in the midst of a fight; but just as soon as it could be arranged for him to come home, he wanted to come.

Of course, Mr. President, it is impossible to bring all of them home until we occupy the countries we have whipped in battle. Initially, the occupation had to be taken over by the ones who were in the Army and were on the spot. They had to be used to occupy the conquered countries. President Roosevelt wanted to arrange to have the occupation taken over, after the initial stages, by the two and one-half million men in this country who never had left the United States during the war. They had not been engaged in any fighting. President Roosevelt was anxious to have those men take over the occupation, after the initial stages of the occupation had been handled by those who were already in that area. But just as soon as the initial stages of the occupation were over, he wanted to get those men home; and he wanted sent over there then, to take charge of the occupation, the men who had stayed in this country during the war and never had been engaged in any fighting.

Mr. President, whether we like it or not, we must occupy those countries until the peace we seek has been secured. If we fail to do that, we shall have another war.

I understand that the Senator from Arizona will offer an amendment seeking to use the services of our Allies in some of the occupied countries. Some of the men of some of our Allies do not make much money and do not have much opportunity, but they have just as intense hatred against our enemies as we have, and they could help in the occupation. In my opinion, their services should be used, and we should end the draft at the earliest possible moment, because the people of our country do not want the draft continued in peacetime. I have an idea that a great many of the officers of our Army—and, of course, without the Army, there would not be any need for the officers—are not anxious to have the draft ended. But it should be ended and we should have a voluntary system established quickly. I repeat that we should have a voluntary system, but that system should be operated with adequate pay. Adequate pay is not $50 a month.

If I can guess correctly, my estimate is that in the years which lie ahead we shall have many thousands of Americans in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Corps, in order to make sure that we shall not again become involved in trouble. If we are to do that, we must make service in the armed forces sufficiently attractive so that our men will make it a career. It should be considered an honorable career. We should not keep taking into the Army boys who would otherwise be going to school. We have already taken into the Army many boys and girls who were in the midst of their schooling. They should have an opportunity at the earliest possible moment to return to school. But it will take time and patience to do that, and we shall have to go along with the Army, at least until we can make plans for peace. The peace came quickly; it came quicker than many persons expected it to come.

Mr. President, I repeat that unless we make the voluntary system sufficiently attractive we shall not obtain the number of volunteers it will be necessary to have in the Army in order to do the tremendous job which confronts the American people, namely, keeping the peace we have won.

I thank the chairman of the committee for giving me this opportunity to express my views.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Montana raised a question about men who are not being discharged. The Senator may be interested in the latest figures regarding discharges. On August 14 some 5,000 men were discharged from the Army. On VJ-day, September 2, 11,000 men were discharged. On September 21, last Friday, 24,000 men were discharged.

I am quite certain that when the report comes in next Friday the figure will not be 24,000 but will be at least 25,000—showing that the Army is speeding up day by day and week by week the number of men who daily are being discharged.

The separations for the 7-day period ending August 17 were 40,005. The separations for the 7-day period ending September 21 were 139,065. The cumulative separations from VE-day through last Friday, September 21, were 905,000. I am quite certain that when the report comes in on Friday, the figure 905,000 will be stepped up very considerably.

As the distinguished chairman of the committee has said, the committee has been conducting hearings and doing everything it could do to expedite discharges from the Army. As the chairman has also said, I think there is no doubt that the War Department has greatly expedited the rate of separations from the service. From now on the separations will continue to increase and will be made more rapidly, as should be done, of course.

As the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has said, we have a job to do and we have certain commitments which we must meet. In order to meet those commitments we must have men in the Army of the United States. How many men will be required, say on July 1 next, or by next August, I do not believe anyone can tell. Much may depend on the turn of events within the months which lie just ahead of us.

I should say that the immediate purpose of this bill is to try to obtain volunteers so that no man who is now in the Army will have to serve for a longer period of time than 2 years.

The House committee, in submitting its report on the bill, said:

> But all those who, at a given moment, have completed 2 years of service and have not volunteered for a longer period should be considered as earmarked for and in the process of demobilization.

In other words, it should be made certain that none of the 8,200,000 men who were in the Army on VJ-day, or certainly on August 15 when Japan surrendered, will have to remain in the Army for a period longer than 2 years.

The House committee report continues as follows:

> Accordingly, at whatever the strength the Army must be maintained after July 1, 1946, pursuant to the turn of future events, the excess of that strength over 800,000 should be immediately replaced by trained and fresh troops, inasmuch as such excess—

That is the excess over 800,000—

> will represent veterans of more than 2 years' service.

They will have had at least 2 years of service. So we must make certain that we will have a sufficient number of volunteers to take the places of whatever number it will be necessary to have in the Army greater than 800,000, so that that excess over 800,000 can be demobilized and discharged from the Army.

With reference to the 800,000, the committee said:

> Furthermore, commencing in August 1946 persons in the 800,000 group noted above will complete their 2 years of service in the Army at the rate of 70,000 each month.

We must have a sufficient number of volunteers to be trained and ready to take care of the excess over 800,000 by July 1, 1946, and beginning with August of next year we must have at least 70,000 men who are ready to take the places of the 70,000 out of the 800,000 who will finish their 2 years' service and who will be ready to be demobilized after the completion of that period of service.

So, Mr. President, the urgency of the proposed measure lies in the necessity of obtaining the required number of men and having them trained so that the men who are now in the Army, as well as the people in civilian life in America, will know that no man who was inducted into the Army during the war will have to remain in service for a period longer than 2 years.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement with regard to the Army volunteer recruiting campaign be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOLUNTEER RECRUITING CAMPAIGN

The recruiting campaign to obtain volunteer enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army will be conducted in the following manner:

There are now being established throughout the United States 600 recruiting stations. These stations will be located in prominent sections of cities and towns and will be manned by trained personnel, consisting of 1,800 officers and 6,000 enisted men. Civilian personnel will be employed to perform the necessary clerical functions.

A recruiting officer and required personnel to conduct recruiting activities will be designated in each regiment and similar unit, post, camp, and station within the United States. Such officers and personnel will devote their full time to these duties.

All available media of publicity will be employed in this campaign. The radio program, Voice of the Army, which is broadcast by 615 stations, has been converted to recruiting purposes. Recruiting posters have been prepared for display in public places. Booklets and leaflets containing information concerning the advantages of service in the Army will be distributed to the civilian population and to military personnel at all posts, camps, and stations.

All overseas commands will conduct intensive recruiting campaigns along the lines as indicated for military installations within the United States.

The War Department has been unable to conduct an effective recruiting campaign under the authority provided by the act of June 1, 1945. The terms of that act limit the number of enlistments and reenlistments to 280,000, and require that such enlistments or reenlistments be accepted only from among persons who are now in the Army or who were discharged therefrom not more than 90 days preceding the date of their enlistment or reenlistment. Furthermore, many legal complications and obstacles exist concerning the rights, privileges, and benefits to which an enlistee is entitled under the present law, for example, the benefits provided by the GI bill of rights, the receipt of mustering-out payments and reenlistment allowances. Accordingly, clarifying legislation is necessary to enable the War Department to carry forward a successful recruiting campaign.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope that my good friend, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] will not press for a vote upon this bill tonight because I think the Senate should give very careful consideration to some amendments which I am sure will be prepared overnight in regard to the proposed measure.

The Senator referred to the bill as an experiment. I think it is a vital experiment. I think it is so vital to the welfare of this country that we must not permit it to fail. I think it is very important for our democratic system of government that we make a voluntary Army work during peacetime. I am very fearful that if this bill should be used as a pattern for a voluntary system, the result would be a failure.

We should also keep in mind the fact that the nature of Army service since the end of hostilities has so changed that our obligations to our men in the service have likewise changed. It is one thing to talk in terms of a compulsory draft service when the very security of our country is at stake in the midst of hostilities, but it is another thing to place burdens of draft service on a segment of the population for the benefits of all during peacetime. I think that if voluntary service is going to work we should give consideration to an amendment which will provide for adequate allowances to members of the families of men who serve in the voluntary Army.

I also believe, Mr. President, that we should make service in a voluntary army which will be used for occupational services attractive to men who seek a career in the Army. We have a chance to build up quite a different Army from the type which would exist if only very young men and adventurous teen-agers are to be appealed to primarily in securing enlistments for a voluntary army.

I believe, as the Senator from Kentucky so ably pointed out, that it should be recognized that there is a dignified service to be performed in protecting the welfare of our country on foreign soil in armies of occupation. We should be willing to pay for such service at good rates of pay. We should also be willing to recognize that such service is a valuable public service. It is just as valuable as the service which is being performed by employees in various Federal departments of this Government. I believe that the men who serve in our armed forces under the new conditions are entitled to compensation commensurate with such service on a plane with the various benefits which go along with Federal service.

Mr. President, I wish to make one further statement. I alluded to the subject in my previous remarks. I think that we need to give very careful consideration to some attitudes in America today in regard to what our military and naval structure shall be in the years to come. There will be at this desk at all times a vote ready to support the maximum defenses necessary in order to maintain America strong so that we can sit at the conference tables of the world and have our voice as a participating nation in the new world organization heeded. There will never be a vote at this desk in support of any measure designed to build up in this country a military system based upon principles of compulsion in conflict with what I consider to be basic democratic principles of voluntarism. There are forces in America today which I believe have not yet awakened to the fact that hostilities are over. The time has arrived when we should return as rapidly as possible to our democratic procedures of peacetime principles of representative government. They cannot exist in whole measure during time of war because of the law of national necessity. Whatever controls can now be taken away from the military over civilian problems should be removed.

I want to see the democratic principle of voluntarism built up in the military and naval forces of this country. That is why I stated earlier the thought that now that we have ended hostilities we owe an obligation to the men who are still in foreign service to see to it that as long as they continue to perform peacetime functions in the army of occupation, they will receive pay commensurate with such service.

Mr. President, I should like to see the pending bill amended so that not only will greater compensation be afforded to the members of the volunteer Army, but as long as it is necessary to keep the draftees in the army of occupation they may receive wages commensurate with the character of service which they are rendering at a time when civilians at home are free to take advantage of the economic advantages and opportunities of civilian life.

I do not think it is fair or right to keep a drafted Army abroad performing protective services of such great importance to all of us here at home unless we are willing to give them greater economic advantages than the present law provides. Further, I think this bill should establish the new volunteer Army on a better paying basis. It is too easy to forget our obligation to men in uniform, and, hence, I urge more careful consideration of this bill than a vote on it tonight will permit. This legislation is too important for hasty action without full debate on amendments which I am sure will appear if the vote is allowed to go over until tomorrow.

We should be willing to pay a fair day's pay for that service.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps the Senator has answered the question which I wished to ask, but I should like to know specifically whether if a married man, a private in the Army in Japan today, is eligible for discharge and volunteers to continue for a year and a half, his family allowance automatically will be cut off.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; so long as the serviceman's dependency law remains on the statute books of the land, he will be entitled to the dependency payments.

Mr. TAFT. That would apply to a married man who volunteered?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; so long as those laws are on the statute books.

Mr. TAFT. What is the period of expiration?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think it is the duration and 6 months after, under the Servicemen's Dependency Act.

Mr. TAFT. Six months after the declaration of the termination of hostilities?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes, and I suppose there would be an implied contract that if a person enlisted at the present time he would be entitled to the provisions of that act, although the law came to an end during the period of his enlistment.

Mr. TAFT. In other words, the law applies to anyone in the Army, no matter whether he was drafted or volunteered?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. A few moments ago I expressed my views on this subject, and the Senator from Connecticut has called

my attention to an editorial in the New York Times, published today, entitled "We Can Lose the Peace." The editorial writer says:

In its great determination to avert another world war by avoiding the mistakes which helped to produce the last one, the United States has adopted policies that seemed to recommend themselves by being the exact opposites of those we followed during and after the First World War. Out of that determination grew the demand for unconditional surrender and the complete military, economic, and spiritual disarmament of the enemy. Out of it grew the imposition of direct or indirect Allied, including American, rule over the enemy nations and the supervision of the restoration of democracy in liberated and satellite countries. Out of it grew, above all, a new American world policy which abandoned isolation and pledged the United States to provide, with its allies, sufficient force to prevent or suppress new aggression.

Yet in one respect, and that the most important of all, the United States appears to be bent on repeating the mistake which more than any other single error contributed toward precipitating the war just ended. In the exaltation of having finished the "war to end war," the United States led the world after 1918 in pacifism and disarmament. It scrapped its Army and much of its Navy and depended on international law and treaties to enforce themselves. It denounced armament among its present allies even while the aggressor nations were already arming themselves for war. It even furnished the latter with war materials in order to avoid trouble at the very time it was bombarding them with protests and pleas to stop their aggressions. In short, it adopted a role which appeared to the German and Japanese war lords to reveal a nation too "decadent" to fight and not worth much consideration in their plans for world conquest. They now know what a mistake this was, but it took a Second World War and more than a million American casualties to prove it to them.

Today that tragic history shows signs of repeating itself. The war is scarcely over; the peace treaties are still to be written; the objectives for which the United States entered the war are still to be attained; even the occupation of all enemy lands is still to be completed. Yet the cry that rings loudest through the land and makes every Congressman jump in fear of his job is, "Bring the boys home," with its accompanying demands for an immediate end of the draft and a demobilization of our "citizen" army in favor of a small "volunteer" army and a greatly reduced navy. There is no doubt that the young men who fought the bloody battles of this war are entitled to the earliest possible release, and that those who risked their lives to win the war should not be saddled also with the task of policing the lands they conquered. But it is the duty of both the President and Congress not only to provide adequate replacements for service abroad from among those who have not had combat duty but also to provide for an adequate permanent system of defense which will meet all foreseeable requirements.

That is more necessary now than ever before—first, because of the great new obligations the United States has assumed, and second, because of the changed power balance in the world, which the United States helped to bring about. A dispatch from our correspondent, Tania Long, in this newspaper yesterday points out that withdrawals from our occupation army in Germany are already so extensive, and replacements so inadequate, as to impair the functions of the occupation army as a whole, to the detriment of its objective and our prestige. Unless early safeguards are provided, a similar situation may easily arise in Japan. Only our enemies could welcome that.

Beyond this, however, the effectiveness of the United Nations Organization, the aims for which we fought and the future peace depend entirely on the balance of power now established, of which the United States is one of the main bulwarks. But any power balance can be disturbed not only by excessive armament of some nations but also by excessive disarmament of others, which must automatically lead to a new alinement among nations alert to maintain their security.

The present pell-mell rush out of Europe and out of Asia, under congressional pressure, is nothing less than a new retreat into isolation. Unless it is checked by sober counsel, it will invite risks which will endanger the peace that we have won.

Mr. President, I repeat, we can lose the peace, and it is important not to abandon too quickly the place we have won by hard-fought battles, because we may invite disaster if we do.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I desire to cover one or two points, if I may, with the permission of the Senator from Utah.

On page 3, line 14, the Senate amendment changes the provision from 1 year to 18 months. An important reason for making that change is that the training period here and then sending the men to the Pacific area or to Germany would consume so much time that the volunteers could not render much service in the occupation forces before they would have to be demobilized and brought back.

There is another reason. If we left it at one year, a man who had served in training in the United States for, let us say, 6 months, and was ready to go overseas, would have 6 points at that time. If he were allowed to enlist for 1 year he would then go overseas, and in 1 year gain 24 points, and at the end of the 6 months in this country and 1 year overseas he would have 30 points, and would then be eligible for discharge. To our committee it did not seem that we should by law allow a man to be discharged with 30 points when we cannot give discharges now as rapidly as we would like to, under the program of reducing the points to 70 or 60, and possibly later to 50 or 40.

One more point. Reference has been made to the fact that a policeman gets more in salary than we offer a private in the Army. I wish to say, first, that we should not consider $50 a month the complete remuneration of a soldier. First, under the bill, on page 4, automatic promotion is given the soldier at the end of 6 months, so that his rate of pay at the end of 6 months would be $60. Then we should be fair about it and take the average pay of the soldier, which is close to $75 a month. With overseas pay, it will probably be a great deal more than that.

In addition to that, we must add, too, that the Government furnishes food, clothing, and lodging, which in 1940 for an enlisted man amounted to $114 a month. So, all in all, we are offering soldiers in our Army, not policeman's pay, but in many cases more than policeman's pay. It figures up to a little more than $2,000 per annum. So it is not anything in the nature of a menial job that is being offered; in fact, it is very attractive.

Mr. President, I am afraid that in the RECORD tomorrow my answer to the Senator from California will not look as clear as it should, so I offer for the RECORD an explanation of the bill as it comes from the Senate Military Affairs Committee, which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, for the reason that we have only the House committee print, and this is from our own Senate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 1—SHORT TITLE

The first section provides that the bill may be cited as the "Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945."

SECTION 2—RECRUITING CAMPAIGNS

Section 2 directs the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to initiate and carry out intensive recruiting campaigns to obtain voluntary enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army and Navy.

SECTION 3—ENLISTMENTS AND REENLISTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The act of June 1, 1945 (Public Law 72, 79th Cong.), authorizes the Secretary of War, during the existence of the present war, to accept not to exceed 280,000 enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army from male persons who are honorably serving in the Army of the United States or who were honorably discharged therefrom not more than 90 days preceding the date of such enlistment or reenlistment. The act provides that the term of service of persons enlisted or reenlisted thereunder shall be for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter or for 3 years, whichever is the longer period.

Section 3 of the bill amends the act of June 1, 1945, so as also to permit the enlistment or reenlistment in the Regular Army of persons from civilian life, and it temporarily suspends the ceiling on the enlisted strength of the Regular Army. It authorizes and directs the Secretary of War, until June 30, 1947, to accept enlistments and reenlistments for period of 2 or 3 years, at the option of the person enlisting, from among qualified male persons not less than 17 years of age, and enlistments and reenlistments for a period of 18 months, plus the period of any furlough granted at the beginning of such enlistment, from qualified persons who have served in the Army for not less than 6 months. This section prohibits the enlistment of persons under 18 years of age without the written consent of their parents or guardians. It also provides for the discharge, upon application therefor by the parents or guardians, of persons under 21 years old from that portion of their enlistment period extending beyond the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, if they enlist under the provisions of this bill without the written consent of their parents or guardians. Provision is made by this section for the promotion to the grade of private first class of persons enlisting or reenlisting in the Regular Army on or after June 1, 1945, if they meet qualifications prescribed by the Secretary of War upon the completion of 6 months' service and have not been sooner promoted. This section requires the Secretary of War to make quarterly reports to the Congress of the number of men on active duty in the Regular Army who were enlisted or reenlisted on or after June 1, 1945. The Secretary of War is authorized

by this section to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to effectuate its purposes.

SECTION 4—RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR ENLISTED MEN

Under existing law an enlisted man of the Regular Navy who completes at least 20 years of active service may be transferred to the Fleet Reserve and receive, while on inactive duty, retainer pay at the rate of one-half the base pay he was receiving at the time of his transfer. Upon the completion of 30 years' service, including all service performed in the Fleet Reserve, such person is transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy and continues to receive the pay he was receiving as a Fleet Reservist and, in addition thereto, is granted the longevity pay he is entitled to receive for all periods of active duty performed. An enlisted man in the Regular Army, under present law, is required to perform 30 years' active service in order to qualify for retirement for length of service.

Section 4 of the bill would authorize the transfer to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and retirement of an enlisted man of the Regular Army upon the completion of not less than 20 years of active service. Such enlisted man would remain in the Enlisted Reserve Corps until his active and inactive service equals 30 years. When such enlisted man is so transferred and retired he would receive until death annual retirement pay equal to 2½ percent of the average annual pay, including longevity pay, he was receiving for 6 months immediately preceding his retirement, multiplied by the sum of the number of years of active Federal service performed by him, not in excess of 29 years. Section 4 further provides that in computing the length of service required for retirement pursuant to its provisions, or any other provision of law providing for the retirement of an enlisted man of the Regular Army, credit shall be given for all active Federal service performed in the Army of the United States, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, or any component thereof, any fractional part of a year amounting to 6 months or more to be counted as a complete year.

Under the provisions of section 55b, National Defense Act, a member of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, except in time of a national emergency expressly declared by Congress, may not be required to serve on active duty for a longer period than 15 days in any one calendar year without his consent.

SECTION 5—ENLISTMENT IN GRADES OR RATINGS

Section 5 authorizes the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to enlist or reenlist volunteers in such grades or ratings as each may severally prescribe.

SECTION 6—FURLOUGH TRAVEL ALLOWANCE

Section 6 authorizes the payment of a reenlistment furlough travel allowance to persons now in the military or naval service who volunteer for enlistment or reenlistment in the Regular Army or the Regular Navy. Each such volunteer when granted a furlough following enlistment or reenlistment would be paid in advance a furlough travel allowance at the rate of 5 cents per mile for the distance between the place at which stationed when the furlough becomes effective and his home or such place as, subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Department concerned, he may select, and from his home or other place so selected, to the place at which ordered to report for duty. Such furlough travel allowance is intended to cover both the cost of travel and subsistence. Whenever sea travel is involved no such allowance would be paid for that portion of the journey, but transportation in kind may be furnished. This section specifically provides that no furlough travel allowance shall be paid thereunder if travel allowance at least as great has been paid under section 126 of the National Defense Act to any person upon discharge or release immediately preceding enlistment or reenlistment in the Regular Army or the Regular Navy. If travel allowance in a lesser amount has been so paid under section 126 of the National Defense Act, the furlough travel allowance authorized by this section would be reduced by an amount equal to that so paid under section 126. Like the allowance under section 126, the furlough travel allowance is to be paid whether travel is performed or not.

SECTION 7—ACCELERATION OF MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS

Under the provisions of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, certain enlisted personnel, and certain commissioned officers of the lower grades, who serve in the present war and who are discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions on or after December 7, 1941, are authorized to receive mustering-out payments in the amounts of $100, $200, or $300, depending upon the length and character of service performed. These payments may be received by such members of the armed forces only upon final separation from the service or upon ultimate relief from active duty in the armed forces.

Section 7 of the bill amends the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 so as to authorize mustering-out payments to be received by eligible persons now in the service, if they so elect, when they enlist, reenlist, or are appointed in the Regular Army and Regular Navy. It further authorizes such persons to receive their mustering-out payments in a lump sum if they so desire. This section does not enlarge the number of persons who are eligible to receive the mustering-out payments now authorized nor does it increase the amounts thereof, but merely accelerates the time when such payments may be made.

SECTION 8—REENLISTMENT ALLOWANCE

Section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 authorizes an enlistment allowance equal to $50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, to be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the first three grades (master sergeant, first sergeant, technical sergeant, and staff sergeant in the Army; chief petty officer, first-class petty officer, and second-class petty officer in the Navy) who reenlists within 3 months from the date of his discharge.

Section 8 of the bill amends such section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide that the enlistment allowance payable thereunder to any person enlisted in the Regular Army on or after June 1, 1945, or in the Regular Navy, on or after February 1, 1945, shall be computed at the rate prescribed for enlisted men of the first three grades. This section further provides that in determining the eligibility of any person enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Army on or after June 1, 1945, or in the Regular Navy on or after February 1, 1945, to receive the enlistment allowance, and in computing the amount thereof, credit shall be given for all prior continuous active Federal service (whether commissioned, warrant, or enlisted) for which no enlistment allowance has previously been paid. Where interruptions in active Federal service do not exceed 3 months, the service performed is deemed to be continuous.

SECTION 9—ELIGIBILITY FOR EXISTING MONETARY ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS FOR DEPENDENTS

Under the provisions of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, enlisted men of the first three grades (master sergeant, first sergeant, technical sergeant, and staff sergeant in the Army; chief petty officer, first-class petty officer, and second-class petty officer in the Navy) are authorized to receive monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for periods during which quarters are not provided for their dependents. Prior to the enactment of the act of October 26, 1943, the dependents of such enlisted men were not entitled to receive family allowances provided by the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act. The act of October 26, 1943, authorized receipt of such family allowances by the dependents of enlisted men of the first three grades and provided that those who, on the effective date of the act, were receiving, or being entitled to monetary allowances, might choose to continue to receive family allowances instead. The election of an enlisted man to have his dependents receive the family allowance was made irrevocable. Since enactment of the act of October 26, 1943, no enlisted man who attained one of the first three grades has been eligible to receive the above-referred-to monetary allowance in lieu of quarters. If an enlisted man of the first three grades has a wife and one or more children, his dependents are entitled to receive more money under a family allowance provided by the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act than he is allowed as a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters by section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act. Conversely, if such an enlisted man has a wife but no children, he is entitled to receive a larger amount as a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters.

Section 9 (a) of the bill would authorize enlisted men of the first three grades to receive at their option, so long as the family allowance payments are authorized to be made under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act, either the monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents or to have his dependents become entitled to receive family allowances.

The Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act provides that enlisted men are entitled to receive family allowances for periods during which they are in the active military or naval service on or after June 1, 1942, during the existence of any war declared by Congress and the 6 months immediately following the termination of such war. Section 9 (b) specifically provides that the exercise of an option to receive the family allowance will in nowise have the effect of entitling an enlisted man to continue to have such family allowance beyond the date when such payments are not authorized to be made under existing law.

SECTION 10—EXTENSION OF FREE MAILING PRIVILEGE

Section 10 of the bill extends to December 31, 1947, the free-postage privileges now provided members of the armed forces by the Second War Powers Act.

SECTION 11—BENEFITS OF GI BILL OF RIGHTS

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GE bill of rights), which provides educational, loan, and readjustment allowance benefits for persons who serve in the armed forces prior to the termination of the war, contains certain limitations as to the time within which eligible persons may take advantage of such benefits. An educational or training course is required to be initiated not later than 2 years after the date of discharge of the person concerned or the termination of the war, whichever is later, and no education or training can be afforded beyond 7 years after the termination of the war. An application for the guaranty of a loan must be made within 2 years after separation from the military or naval forces, or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is the later, but in no event more than 5 years after the termination of the war. A readjustment allowance is authorized to be received by a veteran for each week of unemployment which occurs not later than 2 years after his discharge or the termination of the war, whichever is the later, but no allowance may be paid for any week commencing more than 5 years after the termination of hostilities in the present war.

Section 11 of the bill is designed to effect an equitable extension of the above-mentioned

time limitations so that they will not begin to run until the expiration of the first enlistment or reenlistment periods of persons who enlist or reenlist in the armed forces within 12 months after the date of enactment of the bill.

SECTION 12—EXTENSION OF PROVISION AUTHORIZING INCREASED PAY FOR FOREIGN DUTY AND SEA DUTY

Section 12 continues in effect the provisions of section 2 of the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, which provide the overseas pay differential for military personnel while serving on sea duty or on duty outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska. The present law authorizes the base pay of an enlisted man, warrant officer, or nurse to be increased by 20 percent and the base pay of a commissioned officer to be increased by 10 percent during periods of such service.

SECTION 13—EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF BILL TO MEMBERS OF THE COAST GUARD

Section 13 provides that the terms "Navy" and "Naval Establishment" as used in the bill shall be construed to include the Coast Guard, and that wherever authority is given to the Secretary of the Navy in the bill similar authority shall be deemed to be given to the Secretary of the Treasury to be exercised with respect to the Coast Guard at such time as the Coast Guard is operating under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in its action last Thursday the Committee on Military Affairs recognized the need for haste, and the Evening Star contained a very good editorial outlining the position of the members of the committee. I believe that for the information of the Senate I shall read it at this time, with the permission of the Senator from Utah, the chairman of the committee. The editorial is entitled "Congress and the Draft" and reads:

In shelving a proposal to revise the draft law so as to restrict inductions to men in the 21 through 25 age group, the Senate Military Affairs Committee has wisely refrained from acting prematurely in a situation still so fluid that no one can be certain how it will be a few months from now.

As advocated by Chairman THOMAS, the proposal would have eliminated teen-agers and 20-year-olds from the draft, cutting off a key source of manpower on the assumption that occupation and other needs could be met through voluntary enlistments, while demobilization proceeded at a progressively faster pace. In rejecting this, however, the committee, with Senator THOMAS himself conceding the validity of the point, has been guided by the fact that it is too early as yet to assume anything until we see just how many volunteers can be recruited.

Accordingly, instead of acting to change the selective service law, the committee has voted to report favorably the House-approved bill on voluntary enlistments. Known as the red-apple bill because of its attractive inducements, its chief provisions include mustering-out pay for men now in service who enlist, 5-cents-a-mile travel allowance for those granted furloughs on reenlistment, extra allowances for dependents, benefits of the GI bill of rights for those who enlist before next May 15 (when the Draft Act expires) and retirement on part pay after 20 years' service instead of the present 30.

That is an inducement which has not been mentioned on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

The committee's version differs from the House bill in only one respect. The House fixed the minimum enlistment period at 1 year for men who have served 6 months or more.

Not already, but who at the time of reenlistment had served 6 months or more—

But the Senate measure raises this to 18 months.

This change, which has been recommended by the Army on the ground that anything less would be wasteful and inefficient, may occasion some debate, and efforts may still be made to limit or end selective service at this time, but the legislation now pending is certainly fair and generous and merits prompt passage. After that, we should be able to know what to expect from voluntary recruitment, and once we are clear on that point, Congress will be in a much better position to decide just what ought to be done with the draft. To reach a decision now would be to act in the dark.

Mr. President, I believe that is the feeling of all members of our committee. We need more information concerning the rapidity with which our young men will volunteer for enlistment. We would like to see how fast the demobilization proceeds. We should like to see how world conditions are smoothed out so that we can better tell how many men we need in the Army.

So I recommend, Mr. President, and I am sure I speak for the great majority of the committee, almost for the unanimous membership of the committee, that the bill should be passed, and that immediately—this evening, if possible.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield at that point?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am compelled to reply to my colleague the Senator from South Dakota because he said that the great majority of the committee favor the committee amendment changing the House provision of 1 year to 18 months. I cannot agree to that statement. It is my recollection that the vote was 4 to 2 on that subject. Later on I shall have something to say about the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 14, to strike out "1 year" and insert "18 months."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion for a moment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I withhold it.

Mr. BARKLEY. When it was suggested that we lay aside the unfinished business, which is the full employment bill, to take up the pending measure, I was almost certain—of course one can never be sure of anything in this world, and especially in the Senate—but I was almost certain that we could pass the bill within an hour after taking it up. Based on my desire to have this bill enacted quickly so we can find out as soon as possible what can be accomplished by it, it seemed appropriate to undertake consideration of the bill. Now the day has worn on until it looks doubtful whether we can obtain a vote this afternoon. Any Senator can call for the regular order now or tomorrow, and that would mean that we would resume consideration of the full employment bill, and this bill would have to go over until we conclude action on the full employment bill. Therefore I wonder whether we cannot, with the understanding that we will try to complete action on the bill tomorrow, obtain a limitation of debate. I do not think there is anything complicated about the measure. We should obtain an agreement to limit debate on the amendment and on the bill, it seems to me. Otherwise we may have to put the bill over until the full employment measure is disposed of.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not know what amendments are going to be offered, but I understood there might be some additional amendments, and until we can know what those amendments are I should hesitate to agree to a limitation of debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I have no knowledge as to what amendments may be offered, except that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has an amendment which would affect the Philippine Scouts. I do not think consideration of that amendment would be affected by a limitation of debate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had an amendment he would offer. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator's program, but I think it is a bad practice to enter into an agreement for a limitation of debate before Senators can be apprised of what is in the offing so far as amendments are concerned. When the bill was brought up I heard the statement made that it would be disposed of with very little discussion, and yet debate has gone on for nearly 2 hours.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think that the consumption of 2 hours has been lost time by any means. I think the debate has been very fruitful.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree with what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said. I think this is a very important piece of legislation. As a matter of fact, the Senate might as well face the fact that the question of whether we are going to have a volunteer system in this country or whether we are going to have compulsion is going to be determined on the basis of the results of this experience. I do not think such a vitally important question, so far as the future of democracy in America is concerned, should be settled on the basis that we have a bill before us which has got to be passed and that we cannot have the opportunity for an adequate consideration of it. I am willing to cooperate with the Senator. I do not desire to take any great amount of time, but in the past I have regretfully entered into agreements to limit debate, and then found that some very important amendment was offered which could not be adequately considered under the limitation.

I should like to suggest to the able Senator from Kentucky that he let the matter go over until tomorrow. We can soon ascertain whether there are going to be any vitally important amendments offered, and if the consideration of the bill can proceed I am certainly not going to offer any opposition to its being disposed of. But I cannot escape the fact that this bill is of great importance, because we are going to decide, on the basis of the experience under this measure,

whether we shall have a voluntary system or whether we shall have compulsion in securing the necessary manpower for our armed forces. That, it seems to me, is an issue which is fateful, so far as democracy is concerned, and should not be given left-handed consideration by the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to say, Mr. President, that I do not in any way minimize the importance of this proposed legislation. I think it is important. I think that the problems presented by it are fairly simple, and the problems that are presented by any amendment are fairly simple. I have no wish to cut off debate. I realize that any Senator can call for the regular order, and put the bill off until we have disposed of the unfinished business, and that might be several days. All I am seeking to do is to have this bill enacted, with due consideration to its importance, so that we can start on this experiment and see how it works out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that I cannot think that any Member of this body would delay the passage of this important legislation. I hope the discussion of the question of limitation of debate may go over until tomorrow. I do not want to prolong the debate, because sometimes when we get into these discussions many questions are asked, and properly so, to develop the subject. So far as I am concerned, a reasonable limitation is all right. But I join in the suggestion that the matter might go over until tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator from West Virginia desires to address the Senate in opposition to the committee amendment raising the time from 1 year to 18 months, and that he has an amendment to offer at another place in the bill providing for 1, 2, or 3 years, instead of 2 or 3 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And beyond that the Senator has no further amendment, so far as I understand.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Not at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not attempting to commit the Senator on that subject.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The course of action by the Senate might develop a situation which would create the need for other amendments to be offered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield so I may offer an amendment at this time?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and myself I offer an amendment which I ask to have printed and to lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at this moment I shall not ask unanimous consent for limitation of debate; but I do wish to urge the importance of this measure. I think we ought to get started on this experiment to see what the result is going to be. I realize that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow—or even at this moment—any Senator may call for the regular order, and this bill will have to be laid aside until we complete consideration of the unfinished business.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The Army has about 30,000 men in the recruiting service, under General Gilbert. They cannot do anything in the way of making a firm offer to prospective enlistees without the authority of law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course not.

Mr. GURNEY. It is just that important. If we wish to be sincere with the boys in the service and provide replacements for them, as we say we wish to do, we must enact a law which will permit voluntary enlistments.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe that the whole possibility of what may be done under the provisions of the bill is in suspense until it becomes a law. No one can hold out an inducement to anyone else until he knows that he is authorized by law to do so.

I therefore urge the importance of disposing of the bill as soon as possible. I shall not ask for a limitation of debate at this time; but I hope that tomorrow, if we proceed with the consideration of this bill, we can reach an agreement which will enable us to pass it, and that we may come to an understanding as to the length of time to be occupied by further consideration of the bill, so that we may dispose of it without running the risk, after 2 or 3 hours of debate, of having consideration of the bill postponed for 2 or 3 or 4 days, depending upon the length of time occupied by consideration of the other bill.

In view of that situation, I believe that we ought not to force a vote on any amendment at this time, including the committee amendment. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. It is agreeable to me to resume consideration of the bill tomorrow, until the regular order of business is called for.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that in the meantime we can arrive at some understanding by which we may expedite consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I am glad that the majority leader is not at this time pressing for action, or pressing his request of a limitation of debate. Like him, I understood when the subject was broached yesterday that consideration of the bill would occupy only a short time. I think some Senators were optimistic that it might be disposed of within half an hour. But apparently it is a matter of great interest to the Senate. It is evident that many Senators wish to discuss it. I feel that in a short time tomorrow we can determine what amendments are to be offered. Beyond that I should be rather reluctant to see any limitation of debate by unanimous consent, with so few Senators present. I am glad that the Senator from Kentucky is not pressing his request.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John C. Lehr, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Gael E. Sullivan, of Illinois, to be Second Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, effective October 1, 1945, vice Smith W. Purdum, retired.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT P. PATTERSON TO BE SECRETARY OF WAR—SERVICE OF HENRY L. STIMSON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Porter Patterson to be Secretary of War.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the confirmation of this nomination I wish to say a few words in regard to the propriety of the nomination, and the propriety of the Senate's contemplated action in confirming it.

For many years I have known the retiring Secretary of War, about whom high praise has been uttered on the floor of the Senate—not too high; not more than he deserved.

Last night I heard over the radio a program honoring the service of Henry L. Stimson. The program was participated in by many outstanding Americans, including former President Hoover, under whom he served as Secretary of State.

I remember that even before I came to Congress, in 1913, Mr. Stimson had been Secretary of War under President Taft. Following that service he retired to private life. Later he engaged in the military service, during World War I. Subsequently he became Secretary of State under President Hoover.

It is always hazardous to calculate what might have happened in the world if something else had happened which did not happen. However, I have always had the feeling that if the attitude taken by Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State in 1931, when Japan invaded Manchuria, had been supported by the other peace-loving nations of the world, we might have avoided the war out of which we have just come. No one knows that. No one can be sure of it; but that was the first step of aggression among the Axis Powers.

Later Mr. Stimson was appointed by President Roosevelt Secretary of War. He presided over the War Department during the world's greatest war.

In all these capacities Mr. Stimson served by appointment, and not by elec-

tion. As I recall, he was never a candidate for public office except in 1910, when he was drafted by his party as its candidate for the office of Governor of New York.

Over a period of 40 years a man who was not an office seeker, a man who, it might be said, was drafted for public service, exemplified the theory that the office ought to seek the man, instead of the man seeking the office. That theory cannot always be carried out in practice, but it is a beautiful theory. He has served his country in such an outstanding way as to merit and receive, at the age of 78 years, the unanimous approval and commendation of his countrymen. That is an achievement worthy of comment and recollection.

Not only have I the greatest respect for the official record of Henry L. Stimson in three administrations and in three outstanding positions which sought him, but I have a profound respect for his character—his moral character and his intellectual character—his intellectual integrity, his honesty of purpose, and his determination to serve his country. He has served it. He is now beyond the pale of criticism, because he has retired at the age of 78. I suppose he has no further purpose to hold public office. In his later years he is entitled to that repose which his services have earned for him, and which we all wish for him.

I did not desire to have him retire without saying these things. I recall that a year ago he asked me to assemble several Members of the Senate, including the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the minority leader, the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, and the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who now presides over the Senate. There was an appropriation pending which contained an indefinite item about which there might be inquiry. He called us together and explained to us, without naming it, what it was all about. He stated that we would have to take him and the War Department on faith, and that if anyone asked about that particular appropriation, we were simply to say that it was vitally important, and that the exercise of the power which was involved in it might revolutionize not only war itself, but peace also.

Of course, all of us kept that secret. That was the atomic bomb, which has become one of the great scientific achievements of the American Nation. We had faith in Henry L. Stimson, and in his belief. Of course, things which involve the expenditure of so much money mean the taking of chances. But we had faith in his integrity and good purpose. I rejoice now, as we all do, that we had such faith.

Mr. President, there has been nominated as Mr. Stimson's successor the man who has been his Under Secretary, a man who retired from a position of lifetime security on the bench to become Under Secretary of War and a great cog in the wheel of responsibility in the conduct of the war. I know of no more appropriate appointment that could have been made by the President of the United States as the successor to Henry L. Stimson than that of Robert P. Patterson as Secretary of War. It emphasizes the fact that in this great struggle partisan politics has had no place and should have had no place.

It is not too much to say, I think, that Mr. Patterson, in accepting this appointment, may have surrendered another position, for which he undoubtedly was under consideration, in order to serve his country in the capacity of Secretary of War, as the successor of a great War minister who has just retired at the ripe age of 78 years.

I congratulate Mr. Stimson and I wish for him long years of happiness in the contemplation of a life well spent in the service of his country, and I congratulate the President of the United States on appointing as Secretary of War a man who has been Mr. Stimson's right arm during these tragic days. I believe Secretary Patterson will measure up to the high standard which has not only been set by Mr. Stimson, as chief War minister, but which has been set by Judge Patterson himself in the performance of his duties as Under Secretary of War.

Mr. President, I felt that I should say these things about these two great Americans who have rendered such outstanding service to their country.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I cannot help expressing my gratification and gratitude that the Senator from Kentucky has spoken as he has of the life and services of Mr. Stimson. He has been one of the greatest figures in our public life during the last half century. He has served in exalted places, and he has always served with distinction to himself and with honor to his country. I think he has left the public service perhaps for good, but, in any event, he has left it with the esteem and respect of the American people for his character and for the services he has so well rendered.

His successor comes to us from the State of New York, where he practiced law with distinction and where he served on the court of that State with learning and capacity. During the time he has been in Washington, in the War Department, he has shown the same abilities which distinguished him in the State of New York. I, too, join with the Senator from Kentucky in expressions of good will for him, and I give to him assurances of my great respect and my well wishes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I cannot let the opportunity pass without saying a good word for the man whose nomination we are now considering. I come from an agricultural section of the country, where the people were very short of farm machinery, of tractors, and of trucks. I wish to say for the RECORD that I never went to Mr. Patterson asking him to declare some of the Army property surplus, if he possibly could do so, that he did not do so. Hundreds and hundreds of trucks went to North Dakota at a time when the farmers were desperate because they had no way to move their grain. They went there because Mr. Patterson, I believe, thoroughly understood the farmers' problem.

On behalf of the farmers of the Northwest for whom he did so much, I desire at this time to say that I believe by the appointment of Mr. Patterson the President of the United States has pleased the farmers of this country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination of Mr. Patterson to be Secretary of War is confirmed.

SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, to be Surplus Property Administrator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has requested that the nomination be passed over until tomorrow because of a certain situation into which he wishes to make some inquiry. I understand he hopes that by tomorrow there will be no difficulty in determining it, so I have no objection to having the nomination passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In view of the objection, the nomination will be passed over.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of B. Howard Caughran to be United States attorney for the Southern District of Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chester M. Foresman, of North Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Joseph Gillespie to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 26, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 25 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

WAR DEPARTMENT

Robert Porter Patterson to be Secretary of War.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

B. Howard Caughran to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Chester M. Foresman to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

James Joseph Gillespie to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

William Clayton Rose
Clarence Lionel Adcock
Albert Francis Hegenberger
Wallace C. Philoon
Ralph Maxwell Immell
Carl Raymond Gray, Jr.
Frank Edward Lowe to rank from September 7, 1943.

To be brigadier generals

Edward Allen Noyes
Winfred George Skelton
William Donoghue Cleary
James Keller Herbert
Robert Kinder Taylor
Sidney Lovett Chappell
Robert Morris Hardaway
James Dennett McIntyre
Clyde McKay Beck
Edward Sedley Bres
Donald Bennett Adams
George Abbott Brownell
William Claire Menninger
Luther Lyons Hill
James Fenton McManmon

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O patient and loving Master of Galilee, lift our spirits into fellowship with Thy divine presence; in this quiet Chamber, though we say no creeds, yet our faith is quietly committed to Thy tender mercy. Teach us to deal with the faults of others as gently as we do our own. Draw us away from the present duties of self that we may feel more keenly for the poor and the unfortunate who are in heaviness through manifold weakness and temptations.

In Thy day, O Christ, when Thou didst walk the earth, the world was dark and the lamp of hope was quenched; faith was abandoned and beaten down because love's pure flame had paled and died on the cross. Yet out of the dreary depths of the mystic shadows came the divine hope of the world with its new song of brotherhood, of love for the lowly and the ignorant. O let it be heard in all wayside ministries, in our family life, in the industrial life of our country, that peace and good will may reign among us, giving rich privileges and opportunities to all men who love Thy law. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GIFTS TO HEADS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised this morning to read that the President had given a $385,000 plane to General de Gaulle. I am surprised that such a thing as this would be done without particular legislation concerning the matter. That approach to the problem tends to create distrust in this country of the administration's international setup. I am in hopes that as we go along we will get back to constitutional processes so that the Congress of the United States will be consulted before anything of that kind is done in the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by the Governor of Pennsylvania. I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that the Public Printer estimates the cost is $124.80. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

MILITARY SCHOOLS OR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REED of New York addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the regular order of business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] may address the House for 15 minutes on next Wednesday following my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this morning my attention was directed to an article appearing in a local newspaper describing how 45 veterans were dismissed from the Washington (D. C.) Navy Yard.

In view of the seriousness of the charges which were made, I have addressed a letter to Secretary Forrestal asking for full details regarding the dismissal orders.

This appears to be another example of the flagrant disregard of congressional intent as expressed in the Veterans' Preference Act. It was because of such incidents that I introduced a bill, H. R. 4069, making it mandatory on the Civil Service Commission to issue reduction-in-force regulations to the various departments and agencies which would provide that veterans would be the last to go when reductions in force were found to be necessary. There are so many loopholes in the present civil-service regulations that a department or agency can do almost anything it wants to do when reducing personnel.

I intend to get to the bottom of this and to the many other violations of the Veterans' Preference Act which have been brought to my attention within the past several weeks.

This is only the beginning. Unless the Congress takes action now upon my bill, the disregard of veterans' rights will result in a horribly unfair condition.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Sun of August 13, 1945.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include an article and in the other a proclamation of the President.

MILDRED H. TRIMBLE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 357) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mildred H. Trimble, widow of James F. Trimble,

late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said James F. Trimble.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESTRUCTION OF CARTELS IN AXIS NATIONS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday there was released the text of an announcement by the President on the policy which will be pursued by our Government in Japan. This policy as stated includes not only the prohibition of production of all goods designed for military or armament purposes, but also a program for the dissolution of the large industrial and banking combinations which have exercised control over a great part of Japanese trade and industry.

Mr. Speaker, such a policy is the very heart of a sound program if we are in earnest about preventing the resurgence of Japanese militarism or aggression. In line with this policy, I note with satisfaction General MacArthur's refusal to approve the appointment of one of the Mitsui to an important post, but this is only the beginning of a long and difficult task, and I cannot refrain from asking what has happened to our policy in Germany. Recent press reports, including comments by Mr. Walter Lippmann, have been most disturbing—they have indicated that General Eisenhower's forthright instructions have been circumvented and disregarded and we do not as yet have any assurance that even the heart of the Nazi war economy, namely, I. G. Farben, is being broken up or deprived of its prewar economic power. One wonders why the Interdepartmental Policy Committee on Germany, which did considerable work on this cartel problem, has been so quietly dissolved.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is high time that specific publicity be given to what our economic program in Germany is to be, the same as has been done with regard to Japan. I am not for throttling production in these countries so long as it is production of consumer goods, and so long as needy nations which have been ravished by Germany or Japan share in the output. But unless these monopoly and cartel structures are destroyed, there will occur, just as sure as night follows day, a resurgence first of the economic power of the Axis Nations, and, second, a rebuilding on the framework of these cartels of their military power as well.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Col. Charles L. Wood, editor of the Rolla Herald of Rolla, Mo.

Mr. HOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in two instances, in one to include an address.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given pemission to revise and extend his own remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the Appendix on two subjects and to include certain letters.

GEORGE A. CARDEN AND ANDERSON T. HERD

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resolution (H. Res. 248) and asks for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1270) to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 150]

Abernethy	Chapman	Gifford
Andrews, Ala.	Chiperfield	Gillette
Andrews, N. Y.	Colmer	Granger
Bailey	Courtney	Grant, Ala.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Crosser	Hagen
Barden	Curley	Hall,
Barry	Davis	Edwin Arthur
Beckworth	Dawson	Hall,
Bender	D'Ewart	Leonard W.
Bolton	Douglas, Calif.	Hancock
Bradley, Mich.	Douglas, Ill.	Hand
Bradley, Pa.	Eaton	Harless, Ariz.
Brooks	Elliott	Harness, Ind.
Brumbaugh	Elsaesser	Harris
Buckley	Elston	Hart
Bulwinkle	Fellows	Heffernan
Bunker	Fernandez	Hendricks
Butler	Fuller	Herter
Byrne, N. Y.	Fulton	Hinshaw
Byrnes, Wis.	Gamble	Hope
Campbell	Gerlach	Jarman
Cannon, Fla.	Gibson	Jensen
Kee	Pfeifer	Sheridan
Keefe	Philbin	Simpson, Ill.
Keogh	Ploeser	Slaughter
Kilburn	Plumley	Smith, Wis.
King	Powell	Somers, N. Y.
Larcade	Price, Ill.	Sparkman
Latham	Priest	Starkey
Lea	Quinn, N. Y.	Stevenson
LeFevre	Rabaut	Stewart
Luce	Rains	Sullivan
Lynch	Reece, Tenn.	Taylor
McGlinchey	Resa	Thomas, Tex.
McGregor	Rivers	Torrens
McMillan, S. C.	Robertson,	Towe
Marcantonio	N. Dak.	Wadsworth
Merrow	Rockwell	Weiss
Mundt	Roe, N. Y.	White
Murray, Tenn.	Rogers, Fla.	Wilson
O'Brien, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.	Winter
O'Brien, Mich.	Rogers, N. Y.	Wolcott
O'Hara	Rooney	Wolverton, N. J.
O'Konski	Ryter	Wood
O'Toole	Sadowski	Woodrum, Va.
Patrick	Sharp	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 295 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SALE OF SURPLUS WAR-BUILT VESSELS

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 358) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION UNDER FEDERAL AID

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 359) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. Con. Res. 81), providing that the war emergency has been relieved to an extent which will justify proceeding with the highway-construction program under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Roads, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage

without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

GEORGE A. CARDEN AND ANDERSON T. HERD

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is recognized.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the rule before the House at this moment proposes again to bring in for consideration a bill providing relief to two citizens of the country. It is commonly known as the Carden and Herd bill. It has been before the House on previous occasions and on each has met with disastrous results. I desire to take just a few minutes time to briefly explain the nature of the claim.

Soon after the outbreak of World War I many ships belonging to foreign owners were interned in different American ports. Among these were seven ships which belonged to an Austrian owner. Messrs. Carden and Herd were ship operators and had been for a considerable time. They knew or they learned that these ships were for sale, and on April 1, 1917, they made an offer to the representative of this foreign owner proposing to purchase these ships at a price stated. On April 5, I believe it was, 1917, the offer was accepted and payment in part made, I believe, by Mr. Herd. On April 7, 2 days following, transfer of ownership of the ships acquired by Carden and Herd was made to a syndicate in New York composed of seven people, a syndicate which Messrs. Carden and Herd formed in order that they could handle the transaction and with the transfer to the syndicate Messrs. Carden and Herd acquired the right to operate these ships. They were not interested in the ownership, they were interested in operation; that was their business. The ships, however, were disposed of at a price that would give Carden and Herd a profit of something like a half or three-quarters of a million dollars. Within a few days after the transaction was had a Mr. Denman, of the Shipping Board, approached Messrs. Carden and Herd with the view of acquiring title to the ships in the name of the Government. Negotiations had been pending for several days when President Wilson learned of the existence and ownership of these ships and he commissioned Mr. Barney Baruch to acquire title. Mr. Baruch contacted Carden and Herd, and after some negotiations and insistence on the part of the President that they be acquired at the cost to Carden-Herd, these parties agreed that if they could untangle their trade made with the syndicate they would make the transfer upon the condition that they be permitted to operate the ships.

Mr. Herd or Mr. Carden went to New York at the suggestion of Mr. Baruch and did bring about a cancellation of the trade that they had made with the syndicate and Carden and Herd then made a transfer to the Government. After the transfers were made Messrs. Carden and Herd began to call upon the Government to go through with the understanding that in the contract made with them they would be permitted to operate the ships, but nothing was ever done about it.

This case went to the Court of Claims. Members who have been here for some time remember, I am sure, a former Member of this House, C. W. Ramseyer. Mr. Ramseyer as commissioner made an exhaustive examination of the entire record in this case and in his report he said:

On the basis of the negotiations between Baruch and plaintiffs, the plaintiffs believed that they had a binding agreement with Baruch under which they were to have the operation of the seven ships for the respective lives thereof at the going rate (which at the time was 5 percent of the gross freight receipts) and to receive $6,778,006.70, representing the original cost of the ships to them and the allowance of $301,933.70 for expenses.

Continuing, he said:

Except for the understanding of plaintiffs that the agreement between them and Baruch included the operation of the ships in addition to the cash consideration, the plaintiffs would not have transferred the ships to the defendant.

In other words, he makes a finding of fact to the effect that these people would not have made the transfer except that they had understood that the right to operate the ships was a part of the contract.

Continuing, Mr. Ramseyer said:

Upon leaving Baruch plaintiffs and their attorney went immediately to see Denman. They related the negotiations with Baruch, showed him the items of cash agreed on, with which Denman stated he was familiar, and they told him of their understanding with Baruch that they should have the operation of the ships, to which Denman replied that they were to have the operation of the ships at the going rate.

When the preparation of the papers for the transfer of the ships was under discussion in Denman's office, Love asked about the preparation of papers for the operation of the ships and later suggested that a clause be put in the Memorandum of Closing covering the matter of the operation of the ships. To both the inquiry and the suggestion, Denman replied that that could not be done then as he was going to have prepared a general form of contract for the operation of ships. A few hours after the bills of sale had been delivered Love again asked Denman about the operation of the ships and was told that they had to be repaired first.

When these people were undertaking to get an adjustment on their claim they were told by Mr. Denman to go to the President. They did approach the President, presenting to him a record covering the entire transaction up to that point. On February 9, 1921, President Wilson addressed a letter to Mr. Baker in which he said:

MY DEAR MR. BAKER: Having read the enclosed, I am myself convinced that the claim is a just one and my own recollection tallies with that of the writer in respect of everything in which I played a part in the narrative. I leave the matter to your own judgment as to what is equitable and right in the circumstances. My own wish would be that the claim could be paid.

Mr. Baker went out of office before he could act upon this matter, and his successor took up consideration, and finally did allow to Carden and Herd as out-of-pocket money $550,000. That represented no profit whatever to Carden and Herd, but it was simply to cover expenditures that they had made up to that time.

The receipt that was given clearly shows that the payment was for the purpose which I have stated, and expressly excluded compensation for any profits that Carden and Herd might have earned as the result of the carrying out of the operation of the ships as provided for in the contract.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of asking a question that bothers me in connection with this matter, and possibly the gentleman can give us some light on it. As the gentleman may recall, when this matter—or an identical proposition—was before the House some time ago, I spoke for the rule and voted for it. The rule was adopted. The matter was defeated in the course of the afternoon, and when it finally came on for a vote the measure was defeated by the House.

Mr. COX. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman will agree that this procedure is a little extraordinary to start with. Normally matters like this are handled on the Private Calendar, and if they are objected to they are put on the Omnibus Calendar and then acted upon.

As I said, I spoke for the rule on the other occasion and voted for it. I think that bill as it came on for action had been amended to strike out the interest feature. But it was a jurisdictional bill. The thing I should like to have the gentleman's idea about is this: Is it proper legislative practice to again act on the measure, it being identical with what was acted on before?

Mr. COX. Answering the gentleman, I very frankly concede that this is a rather extraordinary thing that is proposed, but it is the only thing that can be done that will make possible rendering justice to people who have an honest claim against their Government. The Rules Committee, of which the gentleman is a member, reported the pending rule. The passage of the bill, which the pending rule is intended to make in order, would simply give to Carden and Herd the right to go to the Supreme Court on appeal from the Court of Claims.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 151]

Abernethy	Barden	Bradley, Mich.
Andrews, Ala.	Barry	Bradley, Pa.
Andrews, N. Y.	Beckworth	Brooks
Bailey	Bell	Brumbaugh
Baldwin, Md.	Bender	Buckley
Baldwin, N. Y.	Bolton	Bulwinkle

Bunker	Hartley	Quinn, N. Y.
Burch	Heffernan	Rabaut
Butler	Herdricks	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hinshaw	Resa
Campbell	Hook	Rivers,
Cannon, Fla.	Hope	Robertson,
Celler	Jensen	N. Dak.
Chapman	Keefe	Rockwell
Chiperfield	Keogh	Rogers, Fla.
Colmer	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Courtney	King	Rogers, N. Y.
Crawford	Larcade	Rooney
Crosser	Lea	Ryter
Curley	LeFevre	Sabath
Davis	Lesinski	Sadowski
Dawson	Luce	Shafer
Douglas, Ill.	Lynch	Sharp
Eaton	McGlinchey	Sheridan
Elliott	McGregor	Simpson, Ill.
Elsaesser	McMillan, S. C.	Simpson, Pa.
Elston	Madden	Slaughter
Fernandez	Marcantonio	Smith, Wis.
Fogarty	Merrow	Somers, N. Y.
Fuller	Miller, Calif.	Sparkman
Fulton	Mundt	Starkey
Gamble	Murray, Tenn.	Stevenson
Gerlach	Neely	Stewart
Gibson	O'Brien, Ill.	Sullivan
Gifford	O'Brien, Mich.	Taylor
Gillette	O'Hara	Torrens
Granger	O'Konski	Vursell
Grant, Ala.	O'Toole	Wadsworth
Hagen	Patman	Weiss
Hall,	Patrick	White
Leonard W.	Pfeifer	Wilson
Hancock	Philbin	Winter
Hand	Ploeser	Wolcott
Harless, Ariz.	Plumley	Wolverton, N. J.
Harness, Ind.	Powell	Zimmerman
Harris	Price, Ill.	
Hart	Priest	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 292 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings were dispensed with.

GEORGE A. CARDEN AND ANDERSON T. HERD

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, if persistency is a virtue, the proponents of this bill are indeed virtuous. As was explained by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], this claim had its genesis in the last World War—1917—and it has been an habitual caller at every session of Congress, I think, since that time. It has run the gantlet of the Private Calendar. It has always been defeated. It has had several days in Congress. The claim had its day in the Court of Claims, and, as was explained by the gentleman from Georgia, the Court of Claims denied the petition and thereby determined the claimant was not entitled to relief, either in law or equity. In short, the claim has been adjudicated by the court having jurisdiction.

The gentleman from Georgia devoted considerable time to the report of our former colleague, Mr. Ramseyer, whom we all loved and respected, and who later was a commissioner on the Court of Claims, and who, as a commissioner, heard the evidence and obtained the facts. The complaint seems to be that the court did not agree with the conclusion of the commissioner. That is answered by saying that there was a difference of opinion between the master who heard the evidence and the court who decided the case. But I am not going into the details as to the facts. If this bill becomes a law, then Carden and Herd are given preferential treatment as against those having claims coming in that category; in other words, they will be singled out and permitted an appeal which others, under like conditions, are not permitted, and to which they are not entitled.

Let us consider what is involved. The original claim carried, as I recall, between six and seven million dollars; I think it was possibly around $7,500,000. But listen to this: If this bill becomes a law and an appeal is permitted and the court reverses the Court of Claims, then interest will automatically attach from the date the claim accrued—in 1917—at, as I recall, 6 percent interest. Therefore, there is involved here between eighteen and twenty million dollars, and there would be no discretion on the part of the court as to interest, because if the court found for the claimant, then automatically the 6 percent interest must be allowed.

Mr. CRAVENS and Mr. MAY rose.

Mr. MICHENER. If I am in error, correct me. I will not yield for a question.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. MICHENER. If I am in error, correct me.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MICHENER. No; because I do not know enough about the details. This is a private bill. This is not general legislation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] is most familiar with this bill. He has followed it down through the Committee on Claims for years. Unavoidably, however, he is away today. I cannot take the time, because others who know more about the claim and who will answer the gentleman's question will be permitted to talk. I am not going to deprive others of an opportunity to discuss this matter.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield just for a moment on the investment phase of the claim?

Mr. MICHENER. Not if the gentleman wants to discuss the claim, because I cannot take the time.

Mr. CRAVENS. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that if these gentlemen had been paid this claim 25 years ago when it came due, there would be no interest due on it.

Mr. MICHENER. That is just what I said, that the interest attaches as of the date the claim accrued, if there ever was a claim, and up to now, from 1917 to 1945, this Congress has never thought there was a claim or, at least, never allowed the claim.

This is one of those old, hoary claims that has been kicking around here for all these years. For my part, I have opposed it; yes. I voted against the rule in committee; yes. Maybe I am wrong. I am going to vote against this rule, and I am going to vote against the bill. I cannot be a party, allowing this claim the purpose of which is to take $20,000,000 out of the empty pockets of the taxpayer to pay a claim which was settled and receipted for many years ago.

I do not want to take any more time, but some of our Members want time. Therefore, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], who, I think, favors the claim.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, now that my very dear friend from Michigan has claimed that he has always opposed this claim but has known nothing about its merits, I think I will proceed to consider the merits of the bill.

The purpose of H. R. 1270 is to authorize by law an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from a decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd.

The Judiciary Committee considered the claim of George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd during the Seventy-first, Seventy-second, and Seventy-third Congresses and finally reported out a bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and consider the claims of George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd, legal or equitable, and to render judgment thereon. This private act became a law June 13, 1934. The claimants, George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd pursuant to said act of June 13, 1934, filed their petition in the Court of Claims. The hearings were held by Commissioner William Ramseyer, an able jurist and a former Member of the House of Representatives.

I question whether this House has ever had as one of its Members a better legal mind than that of Hon. William Ramseyer. There seems to be no dispute as to the accuracy of the facts found by Commissioner Ramseyer relating to the merits of the claim filed by said claimants.

The Court of Claims apparently disregarded essential facts found by Commissioner Ramseyer and on May 2, 1938, dismissed the petition. The facts in brief are these:

On April 5, 1917, the claimants, Messrs. Carden and Herd entered into a contract for the purchase of seven Austrian ships from the Austrian owners for $6,476,073. On April 6, 1917, the claimants entered into a contract for the resale of the ships to a syndicate which had been formed for that purpose. The price of the ships to the syndicate was $7,371,141 cash, plus the right of Carden and Herd to operate the ships at the going rate of 5 percent of the gross freight receipts.

Thereafter, on April 23, 1917, before the transfer of the ships to the syndicate, President Wilson directed Mr. Bernard Baruch, then a member of the Council of National Defense, to acquire the ships from the claimants for use in the prosecution of the war against Germany. President Wilson asked Mr. Baruch to procure the ships from the claimants at cash to them. The claimants let the Government have the seven ships for $6,778,006.70, which was far less than the market price. A part of the consideration, however, was to be the right of claimants to operate the ships for the Government at the going rate of 5 percent of the gross freight receipts. The ships were transferred to the Government with the definite understanding

that claimants were to operate the ships as heretofore indicated. The Government failed to carry out its part of the contract.

Now then, here is a moral obligation which the Government cannot disregard without gross injustice to the claimants and dishonor to itself. Let us examine this question of a moral obligation on the part of the Government. Is it a sufficient consideration to support a contract such as the one before us? Also is there a moral obligation to give aggrieved citizens their day in court?

I quote now from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States* v. *Realty Company* (163 U. S. 438):

Mr. Justice Peckham delivered the opinion of the Court:

"Under the provisions of the Constitution, (art. I, sec. 8), Congress has power to lay and collect taxes, etc. 'to pay the debts' of the United States. Having power to raise money for that purpose, it, of course, follows that it has power when the money is raised to appropriate it to the same object. What are the debts of the United States within the meaning of this constitutional provision? It is conceded and indeed it cannot be questioned that the debts are not limited to those which are evidenced by some written obligation or to those which are otherwise of a strictly legal character. The term 'debts' includes those debts or claims which rest upon a merely equitable or honorary obligation, and which would not be recoverable in a court of law if existing against an individual. The Nation, speaking broadly, owes a 'debt' to an individual when his claim grows out of general principles of right and justice; when, in order words, it is based upon considerations of a moral or merely honorary nature, such as are binding on conscience or the honor of an individual, although the debt could obtain no recognition in a court of law. The power of Congress extends at least as far as the recognition and payment of claims against the Government which are thus founded. To no other branch of the Government than Congress could any application be successfully made on the part of the owners of such claims or debts for the payment thereof. Their recognition depends solely upon Congress, and whether it will recognize claims thus founded must be left to the discretion of that body. Payments to individuals, not of right or of a merely legal claim, but payments in the nature of a gratuity, yet having some feature of moral obligation to support them, have been made by the Government by virtue of acts of Congress, appropriating the public money, ever since its foundation. Some of the acts were based upon considerations of pure charity."

Now let us see what the principles of law have been as enunciated by such men as James Wilson who helped frame the Constitution of the United States and who taught these principles to his law class in Philadelphia in 1790. Here is what he said, and there were many claims arising out of the Revolutionary War to which he had reference:

When questions — especially pecuniary questions—arise between a state and a citizen—more especially still, when those questions are, as they generally must be, submitted to the decision of those, who are not only parties and judges, but legislators also; the sacred impartiality of the second character, it must be owned, is too frequently lost in the sordid interestedness of the first, and in the arrogant power of the third. This, I repeat it, is tyranny, though it may be more formidable and more oppressive, is nether less odious nor less unjust—is either less dishonorable to the character on one party, nor less hostile to the rights of the other, because it is proudly prefaced by the epithet—legislative. He, who refused the payment of an honest demand upon the public, because it is in his power to refuse it, would refuse the payment of his private debt, if he was equally protected in the refusal. He, who also robs as a legislator, because he dares, would rob as a highwayman—if he dared.

And are the public gainers by this? Even if they were, it would be no consideration. The paltry gain would be but as dust in the balance, when weighed against the loss of character—for as the world becomes more enlightened, and as the principles of justice become better understood, states as well as individuals have a character to lose—the paltry gain, I say, would be but as dust in the balance, when weighed against the loss of character, and against the many other pernicious effects which must flow from the example of public injustice. But the truth is, that the public must be losers, instead of being gainers, by a conduct of this kind. The mouth, which will not utter the sentiments of truth in favour of an honest demand, may be easily taught to repeat the lessons of falsehood in favour of an unjust one. To refuse fair claims, is to encourage fraudulent ones, upon the commonwealth. Little logic is required to show, that the same vicious principles and dispositions, which oppose the former, will exert their selfish, or their worse than selfish, influence to support the latter.

I think I have proved, that if the sacrifice, which has been mentioned, is demanded and enforced by the public, when the competition between public and private interest does not take place, it is tyranny, and not government; folly, and not wisdom. I have added, that if this sacrifice is demanded and enforced further or longer than the competition indispensably requires, this too, is tyranny, and not government. This, likewise, it is easy to prove.

There may be times, when, to the interest, perhaps to the liberty of the State, every private interest and regard ought to be devoted. At those times, such may be the situation and the peril of the commonwealth—for it is in perilous and distracted times, that, by the citizens, extraordinary exertions of duty ought to be made—at those times, a citizen obeys his duty's and his country's sacred call; he makes the necessary sacrifices, without expressly stipulating for a recompense: of demanding such a stipulation, the impropriety and the indelicacy may be equally evident. Great sacrifices and great exertions are made with faithfulness and zeal; perhaps, with considerable success. The perils disappear; to distraction and danger, peace, and serenity succeed; the commonwealth becomes flourishing and opulent. Ought the sacrifice, which, in the hour of her distress and danger, was made at her call, to be continually enforced and demanded by her, after the danger and distress are over? But this sacrifice is demanded and enforced continually, if this citizen has neither received, nor had it in his power to recover, that recompense, which is just. This case—if such a case has ever happened—may go without any actual redress; but it can never go without well-grounded complaint.

If that does not cover this case, then I am not familiar with the English language. He was laying down a rule of honor for this Nation to follow in these claims. The question of the time that has elapsed does not enter into the situation at all. This honest citizen had these ships turned over to the Government at a loss, with a definite agreement that they were to operate the ships at a rate of 5 percent of gross freight receipts which the Government broke, which deprived these men of their compensation. The time now has come when this Congress, acting not only as legislators but as judges as to whether or not this should go to the courts, ought to resolve this in the name of honor and justice to the country itself.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MAY. It seems to me the only question being whether Congress will permit the courts to hear and determine the rights of citizens, and since we set up the courts and the Constitution provides for them, every citizen ought to have a chance to go to the courts.

Mr. REED of New York. Exactly. And that was recognized by Mr. James Wilson, and it has been followed down though the years since that time.

I am telling you if the time ever comes when this Government fails to stand upright before the world as a great moral force, whether it is acting on a little claim or a big claim, it will be a sorry day for this Republic.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I know the gentleman was a Member of this House in 1919 when some folks up in New York, or at least their heirs, claimed the Revenue Department had collected $49,000 from them illegally 50 years before. They took the case to the Supreme Court of the United States and the Supreme Court held that it had been collected illegally, but when we considered a bill here for the heirs it was about 51 years that it had been kicked around in Congress. It was always a just claim.

Now, as to this matter, I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I know that our committee has by an overwhelming vote at various times reported this bill favorably. I wish to point out this one fact: There were a few persons in charge of the Government who had this matter under consideration. President Wilson, Bernard Baruch, Mr. Deming of the Shipping Board, and some others. Every man, including President Wilson, who had anything to do with this matter, said this claim was just. All this bill provides is that we vote on the rule. For what? To give a right to consider this bill, which only asks that these people have the right to take their case decided by the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court after it had been decided on a technicality. It was said here Mr. Ramsayer, one of the ablest lawyers in this House, after reviewing the whole record and knowing all the facts and knowing the law——

Mr. REED of New York. And the benefit of having the witnesses before him.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And having the witnesses before him, said that this was a just claim; and the Court of Claims threw the case out on a technicality.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was said a moment ago if the Supreme Court made a favorable finding for the plaintiffs in the case it might aggregate millions of dollars. Is that not all the more reason why a very humble citizen, who has been trying persistently for years to get justice, ought to

have a chance to go to the highest Court of the land and let them pass on the law and the facts and dispose of it once and for all?

Mr. REED of New York. Certainly. There is only one course that is just and honorable in this case.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there any appeal from the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court of the United States, without coming to Congress to ask for it?

Mr. REED of New York. No; not at that time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There was not at that time when this case was acted on by the Court of Claims, and that is where the trouble is. Since this case occurred before the Court of Claims, the Congress by statute provided for an appeal from Court of Claims in cases like this. This bill merely gives Carden and Herd the right to appeal to Supreme Court. The same rights other litigants now have under general law passed by Congress.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. What the gentleman from Kentucky said is correct. This bill picks out a case back yonder and gives it special treatment; in other words, where you are defeated in the highest court of the land today to which you are entitled, you have had your day in court. If this bill passes, the Congress picks out these two gentlemen and gives them preferential treatment—a right of appeal—that others do not have.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further. It does not matter so long as we keep within the rules of the House, and we to do justice to a claimant; that is the important course of action in this country; that this country do justice to the humblest person in the land.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. CRAVENS. I wish to call attention to the fact that if this case had been decided a few months later than it was actually decided by the Court of Claims then under general law without the necessity of this bill these claimants would have had a right to go to the Supreme Court and have their case decided by that tribunal.

Mr. REED of New York. It seems to me a case of this kind is an absolute tragedy, it is a reflection upon the Congress, upon the Government of the United States. Here we were at war when we were just as seriously threatened apparently as we were in this war. The whole country was stirred and they were sending our boys overseas and these boats were needed. These claimants let the President of the United States have these boats which were essential. Now the country is at peace and these men have waited all these years unable to pay their creditors because they could not get the money due them from their Government. Where is there any justice in the action of the Congress just because they have the power and because they dare, sitting as both legislators and judges, deprive these claimants of what rightfully belongs to them?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know whether the gentleman from Arkansas made his point clear or not, although he did state it clearly; that is this: The reason this legislation is now necessary is because this case was decided by the Court of Claims a little before Congress corrected the procedure. Under the then procedure the right of appeal did not lie from the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court, but since this case was decided such right of appeal was granted. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman does, and I wish to thank him for his statement.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. If this right of appeal be granted by this legislation would we be opening the door to other claimants to appeal?

Mr. REED of New York. That does not enter into the consideration at all. In my judgment we have before us a case in which there has been an injustice and the claimants are seeking their day in court from Congress. If there are other similar cases they are entitled to similar treatment. Why not?

Mr. DONDERO. Are we setting a precedent?

Mr. REED of New York. I hope we are setting a precedent to do justice to people who have honest claims against the Government.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why should the Government seek to evade an honest claim any more than a private individual?

Mr. REED of New York. They should not; I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. Answering a little more fully the question of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, I believe the gentleman ought to point out that the change in the right of appeal was made by law. It will not set a precedent. It is only as to those cases that originated like the Carden and Herd case before that correction, that it would apply.

Mr. REED of New York. Here is another point that has not been brought out: If we let this case go to the Supreme Court of the United States eventually and they decide it, if they decide for the claimant we know that we have performed a just act; if the Court decides against the claimants the country suffers no loss.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has made a very careful examination of the record in this case. I wonder if it is not the judgment of the gentleman that all of the morals are on the side of the claimants?

Mr. REED of New York. Absolutely. I have tried to point that out, and in doing so have quoted the Supreme Court of the United States on that question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Do I understand from the discussion about this bill that they do not have a right of appeal under a writ of certiorari at the present time?

Mr. REED of New York. Apparently not. This is the usual course of procedure.

Mr. MICHENER. I can answer that.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, the distinguished gentleman knows that there is a profound and radical difference between a writ of certiorari and an appeal. The only way that these gentlemen can get a decision from the Supreme Court on the merits is by an appeal.

Mr. REED of New York. All a writ of certiorari means is bringing the record before the court.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it does constitute some right of appeal, and that is a right given to other claimants as well.

Mr. REED of New York. That does not touch the foundations of this claim at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], who has followed this claim through from its beginning and knows as much about it as anyone in the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have read about as much of the record in this case as any Member of the House. This includes both the hearings in both the House and in the Senate. My friend from Georgia [Mr. COX] made a fair statement. There are one or two sentences, however, with which I take issue. I will refer to them.

This case grows out of the purchase of seven ships by the United States Government in 1917. When the Austrian owners knew we were going into the war, after leaving their ships for 3 years in our harbors, they arranged through a broker to sell the ships. Messrs. Carden and Herd were the men that the brokers interested. Messrs. Carden and Herd could not put over the deal. They needed financial assistance. They went to a young man by the name of Mr. Percy Hine, Jr., of New Jersey and New York, a capitalist. This young capitalist formed a syndicate which made it possible to buy the ships. The deal was closed 1 day before we entered the war. One member of that syndicate, not Mr. Carden nor Mr. Herd, put up the 10 percent that was necessary, over $100,000, and with the other gentlemen signed the note which was turned over to a bank and that bank credited either Mr. Carden or Mr. Herd with the money with

which they bought the ships. The Senate hearings showed any one of five members of the syndicate could have handled the deal by themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the record shows that Messrs. Carden and Herd did not put up any money themselves despite what anyone might tell you.

We had Coast Guardsmen aboard those ships for months and months to see that they were not destroyed as the Germans had sabotaged the ships they had in our harbor.

The Government paid them just exactly what the ships cost, and remember this, the Government also paid them the out-of-pocket money to which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] referred. That was added to the price. That out-of-pocket money went solely to Carden and Herd.

Aside from that there was a string attached to the sale by the Austrian owners. That string provided that the ships could only be operated in South American waters. In order to remove that string your Government also gave Carden and Herd over a million dollars to clear that. I do not know whether it is correct or not but a responsible member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], says there is a record showing Mr. Carden and Mr. Herd received part of that money, the balance being paid to the Austrian owners.

We turned some of those ships over to our allies after we reconditioned the ships. You know and I know when ships remain in salt water for 3 years and never move that it costs money to recondition them. We paid for the reconditioning of those ships, and it was after that we turned some of them over to our allies. Some of the ships were destroyed by German submarines.

The only claim that Carden and Herd have is that they maintain they were to operate the ships. Conceive, if you will, of this country buying ships to be used during the period of the war to carry troops and supplies to be operated by private individuals. If anybody can show me any kind of a piece of paper signed by a Government official authorized to sign with Carden and Herd or the syndicate in the form of an agreement that Carden and Herd or the syndicate should operate the ships, I will withdraw my opposition and I will vote for the bill.

After the war we passed what was called the Dent Act. I was here at the time, not as a Member of Congress, but as a secretary. Mr. Dent was chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of this House, and the bill carried his name. Now, I would like to have you gentlemen who were talking about the right of appeal listen to this: In that bill Congress set up a board in the War Department to consider claims against the Government. You know and I know that an individual cannot sue the Government without its permission. But the Congress granted that permission in that act. It provided that the board should hear the claims. If the board denied the claim or the claimants were dissatisfied with the award it provided for an appeal to the Secretary of War. That is how this case got before Secretaries of War Baker and Weeks. Secretary of War Weeks, a Republican, former United States Senator from Massachusetts, awarded Carden and Herd $550,000, but it was not for out-of-pocket money as the gentleman from Georgia stated. They had already received the out-of-pocket when the Government bought the ships from Carden and Herd and the syndicate as I previously stated. They signed a release when they received the money.

Now, I will yield to anybody who will deny that statement. Do you deny that statement?

Mr. CRAVENS. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will show it to you before general debate is concluded if this rule passes.

Mr. COX. Of course, the gentleman denies it because the gentleman is not familiar with the record.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am perfectly familiar with the record. The Congress of the United States, in passing the Dent Act, provided that if claimants were not satisfied with the Secretary of War's decision, they could appeal to the Court of Claims. Messrs. Carden and Herd took advantage of that act. A former Member of this House, Mr. Ramseyer, a gentleman I knew and served with and whom I highly respected was the Commissioner of the Court of Claims that examined the record. Another former Member of this House, who was at one time chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. Green of the same State, Iowa, wrote the opinion for the Court of Claims, and every member of the Court of Claims concurred in his decision denying the claim. No one can deny that statement.

This report contains a great deal favorable to the claimants, but it does not contain information that this House is entitled to, and that is a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States written to the Senate Committee on Claims. I do not have time to read it all, but I will read the concluding paragraph:

> From the facts before me it is concluded that the United States has already paid and furnished to Carden and Herd all to which they are entitled legally, equitably or otherwise, growing out of the sale by them of the seven Austrian ships to the United States. Accordingly I am unable to recommend favorable action on the claim which was the subject of this bill.

There is another letter missing from this report that Members of this House are entitled to, and that is the letter from the Attorney General of the United States. We are entitled to those letters being placed in the report. What did the Attorney General of the United States say? I only have time to read a part of it:

> On the other hand, after a full trial on the merits, the Court of Claims has held that there was no legal obligation on the part of the Government to pay to the claimants any compensation in addition to the amount which they had already received, to wit, $8,391,028.70. By the award of the Secretary of War, they realized a profit of $550,000 on this transaction. They now seek a further profit, for which they did not stipulate in their original contract.

Now, what is meant by the Attorney General when he says they seek a further profit which they did not stipulate in their original contract? That means that when they sold the ships to the Government they did not stipulate in their original contract that they were to operate the ships and to be paid for the operation of the ships. That is the only conclusion I can reach and which is a definite statement from the Attorney General that they had no agreement or contract with the Government to operate the ships upon which they base their claim for additional money from the Government.

Let us look at this in this way. Here are two men who promoted this deal. They received, we know, a clear profit of $550,000 and put it in their pockets. They did not give a dime to the syndicate. Nobody can deny that statement. They received the expense money or out-of-pocket money which I assume was for negotiations when the Government bought the ships, and they did not give a dime of that out-of-pocket money to the syndicate. They pocketed that also or paid their expenses. It seems to me they were well paid for ships they only had in their possession a month.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Missouri the balance of my time.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. No member of this syndicate has ever derived a dollar in profit out of this transaction. They notified Mr. Carden and Mr. Herd to go ahead and turn the ships over to the Government and stated that they did not want any profit. The record of the Senate Committee on Claims shows that.

If you are going to do anything in connection with this matter, is it not absolutely fair that you extend the right of appeal not only to Mr. Carden and Mr. Herd but to the members of the syndicate who put up the money?

When this bill was pending before, there was also pending before this House a bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who is still a member of the Judiciary Committee, who wanted the syndicate to have the right to take the case to the Supreme Court, as well as Mr. Carden and Mr. Herd. It seems at one time the syndicate was not interested, but that was a long time ago. Some of the members of the syndicate have passed away. They have estates and they have attorneys. As to the estates, it was stated in the Senate hearings by two attorneys—this might not be the exact language, but it means the same—"We would like to see the bill passed, and if the Supreme Court does render a favorable decision and the Congress appropriates the money we will impound that money in the Treasury of the United States and sue for the part that is due our clients."

Mr. Carden and Mr. Herd had seven partners, and here we pick out two of the nine people engaged in that transaction and give them the right to go to the Supreme Court, give them the right to recover if the Court does render a favor-

able decision, while the other seven are out of the picture.

The only difference between this bill and the bill that was previously defeated in the House is that at that time there was about $16,000,000 involved, the principal plus the interest. Of course, the interest has increased and now the amount is over $20,000,000.

If this bill is considered under the 5-minute rule, I am going to offer an amendment the same as I offered on the other bill, providing that the judgment of the Court shall not include any interest. That amendment was accepted by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEAVER] when this bill was under consideration before.

Again I say that if this Congress intends to grant the right to anyone to appeal to the Supreme Court in this case, it should include not only these two gentlemen but the other seven members of the syndicate, including, if they have passed away, their heirs. That is only fair.

These people have had their day in court and they have gone to the court which the Congress provided was their last appeal, the Court of Claims.

There is another question involved in this argument according to my opinion and that is that there were thousands upon thousands of individuals, partnerships, and corporations that took advantage of the Dent Act. Hundreds of them were not satisfied with the decision of the Board and the Secretary of War and went to the Court of Claims. Therefore if you intend to pass any legislation it should cover all cases that were considered under the Dent Act and not this individual claim, and let all have the right of appeal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri makes perhaps the most persuasive case in behalf of this bill that I have heard. He recites for us and pictures a fabric of conflicting circumstances that should be passed upon by the high Court of the land if justice is to be done.

Secondly, within 1 minute I can make perhaps this other point. He says if anybody can show him a piece of paper to indicate that there was an understanding or an agreement that they were to operate these vessels, he will eat it. We were within the shadow of the war. Responsible Army and Navy officials in that day, even as they do now, had the habit of committing the citizenry of the country to spend their own money to bring minerals out of the ground, and to set up plants and establishments for the purpose of prosecuting the war effort. So many commitments were made orally and on a basis of faith. Are you going to let that circumstance stand in the way now of doing justice for a humble citizen who for a generation has been trying to get justice out of the Government?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I dislike to take issue with my good friend the gentleman from Missouri, but his statement evidences a complete lack of familiarity with the record in this case. He makes an affirmative declaration that neither Carden nor Herd put up a dime whereas the record shows that Mr. Herd put up 10 percent of the purchase price represented by his own personal check. He further leaves you under the impression that the Government paid to Carden and Herd something above a million dollars in order to have released the limitation upon operations under their original contract of purchase. He leaves you in doubt as to what became of a sum of money above a million dollars. The record shows that every penny of it went to the Austrian owners.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. The record shows that $188,000 was turned back to Carden & Herd out of the $1,056,000.

Mr. COX. The record shows that the money paid for the release went to the Austrian owners and Carden & Herd did not profit by 1 dime. They are still out of pocket a very large amount for which they should have been reimbursed.

Now the gentleman from Missouri undertakes to support the proposition that if there be a claim against the Government, it is in the name of the syndicate. Carden & Herd formed the syndicate. Carden & Herd made the purchase of the ships from the Austrian owners. The syndicate was formed in order to make it possible for them to handle this transaction. The sydicate was eliminated and was put out of the picture in order that the Government might carry on its negotiations with Messrs. Carden and Herd.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Was the syndicate closed up at the special request of President Wilson?

Mr. COX. Messrs. Carden and Herd returned to the members of the syndicate every penny they put up plus 6 percent interest, and it would be a gross miscarriage of justice not to permit them to take their case to the Supreme Court.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I should like to stress the point that there seems to be enough controversy and conflict as to the facts as evidenced here by this debate as to warrant taking the matter to any court.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 72, noes 75.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 142, nays 147, not voting 142, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—142

Allen, Ill.	Flood	May
Allen, La.	Gary	Monroney
Anderson, Calif.	Gathings	Morrison
Arends	Gillespie	Murphy
Barrett, Pa.	Goodwin	Norrell
Bates, Ky.	Gordon	Norton
Bennet, N. Y.	Gorski	O'Neal
Bland	Gossett	Patman
Bloom	Granahan	Peterson, Fla.
Bonner	Green	Phillips
Boykin	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pittenger
Brehm	Hale	Price, Fla.
Brown, Ga.	Hall,	Rabin
Brown, Ohio	Edwin Arthur	Ramey
Bryson	Halleck	Ramspeck
Buck	Hays	Randolph
Burch	Healy	Rayfiel
Byrne, N. Y.	Hobbs	Reed, Ill.
Camp	Holmes, Mass.	Reed, N. Y.
Carnahan	Howell	Richards
Case, N. J.	Jarman	Riley
Chelf	Jennings	Rivers
Chenoweth	Johnson, Calif.	Robsion, Ky.
Church	Johnson, Ind.	Roe, Md.
Clark	Johnson,	Rooney
Clason	Luther A.	Rowan
Combs	Johnson, Okla.	Russell
Corbett	Judd	Sheppard
Cox	Kearney	Short
Cravens	Kefauver	Sikes
D'Alesandro	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Maine
Delaney,	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Va.
James J.	Kerr	Stigler
Delaney,	Kilday	Sumners, Tex.
John J.	Kirwan	Talbot
D'Ewart	Kopplemann	Tolan
Dickstein	Lane	Towe
Dirksen	Lanham	Traynor
Dondero	Lemke	Vinson
Doughton, N. C.	Lewis	Wadsworth
Doyle	Link	Walter
Drewry	McCormack	Wasielewski
Earthman	McKenzie	Weaver
Eberharter	McMillen, Ill.	Welchel
Engle, Calif.	Mahon	West
Ervin	Maloney	Whitten
Fallon	Manasco	Wickersham
Fellows	Mansfield,	
Fisher	Mont.	
Flannagan	Mansfield, Tex.	

NAYS—147

Adams	Folger	Landis
Andersen,	Forand	Latham
H. Carl	Gallagher	LeCompte
Angell	Gavin	Ludlow
Arnold	Gillie	McConnell
Auchincloss	Gore	McCowen
Barrett, Wyo.	Graham	McDonough
Bates, Mass.	Grant, Ind.	Madden
Bennett, Mo.	Gregory	Martin, Iowa
Biemiller	Griffiths	Martin, Mass.
Bishop	Gross	Mason
Blackney	Gwynne, Iowa	Michener
Bradley, Mich.	Hare	Miller, Calif.
Buffett	Havenner	Miller, Nebr.
Burgin	Henry	Mills
Canfield	Heselton	Morgan
Cannon, Mo.	Hess	Mott
Carlson	Hill	Murdock
Case, S. Dak.	Hoch	Murray, Wis.
Celler	Hoeven	Neely
Clements	Hoffman	Outland
Clevenger	Holifield	Pace
Cochran	Holmes, Wash.	Pickett
Coffee	Hook	Poage
Cole, Kans.	Horan	Rankin
Cole, Mo.	Huber	Reece, Tenn.
Cole, N. Y.	Hull	Rees, Kans.
Cooper	Izac	Rich
Crawford	Jackson	Rizley
Cunningham	Jenkins	Robertson, Va.
Curtis	Johnson, Ill.	Robinson, Utah
De Lacy	Johnson,	Rodgers, Pa.
Dingell	Lyndon B.	Sabath
Dolliver	Jones	Sasscer
Douglas, Calif.	Jonkman	Savage
Durham	Kean	Schwabe, Mo.
Dworshak	Kee	Schwabe, Okla.
Ellis	Kinzer	Scrivner
Ellsworth	Knutson	Shafer
Engel, Mich.	Kunkel	Smith, Ohio
Feighan	LaFollette	Spence

Springer	Thom	Welch
Starkey	Thomas, N. J.	Whittington
Stefan	Thomas, Tex.	Wigglesworth
Stockman	Thomason	Winstead
Sumner, Ill.	Tibbott	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sundstrom	Trimble	Wood
Taber	Voorhis, Calif.	Woodruff, Mich.
Talle	Vorys, Ohio	Worley
Tarver	Vursell	

NOT VOTING—142

Abernethy	Gearhart	O'Toole
Andresen, August H.	Geelan	Patrick
Andrews, Ala.	Gerlach	Patterson
Andrews, N. Y.	Gibson	Peterson, Ga.
Bailey	Gifford	Pfeifer
Baldwin, Md.	Gillette	Philbin
Baldwin, N. Y.	Granger	Ploeser
Barden	Grant, Ala.	Plumley
Barry	Hagen	Powell
Beall	Hall, Leonard W.	Price, Ill.
Beckworth	Hancock	Priest
Bell	Hand	Quinn, N. Y.
Bender	Harless, Ariz.	Rabaut
Bolton	Harness, Ind.	Rains
Boren	Harris	Resa
Bradley, Pa.	Hart	Robertson, N. Dak.
Brooks	Hartley	Rockwell
Brumbaugh	Hébert	Roe, N. Y.
Buckley	Hedrick	Rogers, Fla.
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Rogers, Mass.
Bunker	Hendricks	Rogers, N. Y.
Butler	Herter	Ryter
Byrnes, Wis.	Hinshaw	Sadowski
Campbell	Hope	Sharp
Cannon, Fla.	Jensen	Sheridan
Chapman	Keefe	Simpson, Ill.
Chiperfield	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Colmer	Kilburn	Slaughter
Cooley	King	Smith, Wis.
Courtney	Larcade	Snyder
Crosser	Lea	Somers, N. Y.
Curley	LeFevre	Sparkman
Daughton, Va.	Lesinski	Stevenson
Davis	Luce	Stewart
Dawson	Lyle	Sullivan
Domengeaux	Lynch	Taylor
Douglas, Ill.	McGehee	Torrens
Eaton	McGlinchey	Weiss
Elliott	McGregor	White
Elsaesser	McMillan, S. C.	Wilson
Elston	Marcantonio	Winter
Fenton	Merrow	Wolcott
Fernandez	Mundt	Wolverton, N. J.
Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.	Woodhouse
Fuller	O'Brien, Ill.	Woodrum, Va.
Fulton	O'Brien, Mich.	Zimmerman
Gamble	O'Hara	
Gardner	O'Konski	

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Grant of Alabama for, with Mr. Beall against.

Mr. Sparkman for, with Mr. Hancock against.

Mr. Andrews of Alabama for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Patrick for, with Mr. Brumbaugh against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Sheridan for, with Mr. Fenton against.

Mr. Resa for, with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin against.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Keefe against.

Mr. Fulton for, with Mr. McGregor against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mrs. Bolton against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Curley with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Barry with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Priest with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. King with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Davis with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Hébert with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. HOEVEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TO EXEMPT ANNUITY PAYMENTS FROM TAXATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 350 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2948) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 2948 reported by the Committee on the Civil Service. I understand there is opposition to the rule providing for consideration of the bill. Later on, of course, I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], a minority member of the Committee on Rules.

I shall not take time now except to say the resolution provides for 1 hour general debate on the bill. It is an open rule, and after the reading of the bill it will be taken up for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service will explain the reasons for the need of the enactment of the proposed legislation.

The bill aims to exempt from taxation those retired Government employees whose annuity is below $1,440. It is in the interest of the underpaid employees and those receiving small annuities. I believe it is legislation deserving of the approval of the House. I understand the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and some others are opposed to this aid for the little fellow. I am sure after you have listened to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service, you will come to the same conclusion as did the Committee on Rules when they reported the rule making the bill in order that favorable action should be taken on the proposed legislation.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. Later I will yield to those gentlemen who asked me for time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 350 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 2948, reported by the Committee on the Civil Service. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate.

The bill made in order by this rule exempts from taxation under the internal-revenue laws all annuities paid to civil-service employees up to a total of $1,440 a year. At the present time under the Railroad Retirement Act all annuities paid railroad workers are exempt as a result of previous legislative action taken by this Congress. Under the internal-revenue laws that portion of any annuity which the recipient has previously paid in is not taxable. So in forgiving taxes against those who draw annuities up to $1,440 a year under the Civil Service Retirement Act we are actually only exempting from taxation that portion of their annuity which would otherwise be taxable.

Inasmuch as the average annuity paid under the Civil Service Retirement Act is somewhat less than $1,000 per year, and inasmuch as approximately half of such amount has been paid in by the recipient, it can readily be seen the amount actually exempted from taxation by this bill will not be great.

When this matter came before the Rules Committee there was some question in my mind, and in the mind of other members of the committee, as to whether this measure should have come from the Civil Service Committee or from the Committee on Ways and Means, inasmuch as the latter committee does have jurisdiction over tax matters. The question of jurisdiction, however, is not one upon which we are presently called to pass here today; instead we are called upon to decide by our vote on this rule whether or not we wish to consider this legislation which has been submitted by the Civil Service Committee. Personally, I feel all Government annuities and pensions should be tax-exempt up to a reasonable amount. If there are any individuals who need such relief and such exemption it is those individuals who are living on the small annuities partially paid by the Government and partially from funds they have had deducted from their salaries throughout their years of service. So I am going to support this resolution and hope the rule will be adopted so the bill may be considered on its merits.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. To what group of annuitants does this apply?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. To those covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. All of them?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It does not reach out to those in private industry?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; it covers only those coming under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is the basis for exempting annuities paid to Federal employees but not annuities paid in private industry?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is thought that perhaps it would be better to exempt from taxation the small annuities paid by the Government than to increase the annuities, which are, of course, also paid by the Government, in part, at least. Inasmuch as these annuities come out of the Government's pocket anyhow, it does not make any great difference whether you tax them or do not tax them, as far as the Government is concerned. It is a question of how much you pay and how much you get back.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That does not include the railroad workers?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. The annuities paid railroad workers are already exempt under the Railroad Retirement Act, as passed by the Congress.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It does not include miners or factory workers?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. No one is included except those employed by the Government.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How about those under social security?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Social-security payments are now exempt under the law.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. All of them?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is my understanding.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What group, if any, is not exempt from these retirement-benefit taxes?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. All groups receiving annuities, such as from life insurance and State and municipal annuities, are still covered by the revenue law.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They have to pay their tax?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Under the general revenue law any annuity is not taxable up to the amount paid in by the recipient.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Under the present law are they allowed to deduct the money paid in in civil-service retirement benefits, to be paid out in annuities when they reach a certain age at which they can receive them, to the extent they have paid in the money?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That portion which they have paid in is not taxable. Under the revenue law they are entitled to have any annuity exempt up to and until they receive the total amount they have actually paid in.

Mr. KUNKEL. That applies to the civil service?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That applies to all persons who pay for annuities, regardless of the type, because they already paid the tax on such amounts as earned income.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I find myself desiring to go along with the gentleman's position on this bill, but I find another situation too. I have a man living in my district who operates a farm and has a private life insurance company contract. He receives an annuity along with his farming operations or without farming operations. He must pay an income tax on that portion of his monthly or annual receipts which covers interest earned on the previous deposits under the contract.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have many Government employees who have retired and who have businesses on the side. It is very difficult for me to agree to go along with a proposition of this kind where my other friend has to pay a tax on that portion of his income. How can we justify a position of that kind?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The portion of the annuity of the civil-service worker that is being taxed, is being paid by the Government as a part of his remuneration and, in my opinion, should not be taxed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me see if I understand the gentleman. Under the Civil Service Act he makes deposits from time to time over a period of 10, 15, or 20 years, then retires, and after retiring the cost of living advances; is there something in the machinery whereby he gets an increase from the Government?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; and this bill is designed to prevent any such demands or, at least, to slow such demands, for increases in annuities.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If we are going to increase those annuities to Government employees because the cost of living advances, and if due to pressure in the future we propose to do that, then a fellow who has a contract with a private insurance company may come in and say to his Federal Government: "You under Government management made my cost of living advance, therefore you have to give me a special handout."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman is correct in that these annuities are fixed by law and at the time the payments are made by the individuals covered. It is to prevent that very thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. One other question, please. Under social security all that the recipient receives is exempt from taxation; is that correct?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And under the Railroad Retirement Act all of the benefit received is exempt from taxation?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The real effect of the passage of this bill is to provide for this group of Federal employees that they shall have an exemption for income-tax purposes of $1,940 and the rest of the people of the country have an exemption of $500.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not so certain that is a correct statement. It is to exempt their income from annuities up to $1,440, half of which they have paid in, and give them exactly the same privilege that you and the rest of the Members of Congress gave to the railroad workers.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct, and I think the gentleman from Tennessee is incorrect when he says that $500 would be added to the exemption contained in this act.

Mr. COOPER. It certainly will, and every expert consulted on it says that.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If that is true, then it is done under the Railroad Retirement Act, and the Social Security Act came out of your committee.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. No; it did not come out of our committee.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The question raised by the gentleman from Michigan concerning the farmer has raised in my mind the question of annuities earned by school teachers in the various States where they also pay in some amount toward their annuities and the State advances the balance. Now they are not exempt. They have to pay on the full amount of their annuity.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is correct, but the gentleman must remember State legislatures fix the annuities and pass the laws setting up the annuities for school teachers, while Congress passes upon legislation for civil-service workers.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. DOUGHTON].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 153]

Abernethy	Brumbaugh	Crosser
Anderson, Calif.	Buckley	Curley
Andresen, August H.	Buffett	Davis
Andrews, Ala.	Bulwinkle	Dawson
Andrews, N. Y.	Bunker	Domengeaux
Baldwin, Md.	Burgin	Douglas, Ill.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Butler	Eaton
Barden	Byrne, N. Y.	Elliott
Barry	Byrnes, Wis.	Elston
Beall	Campbell	Fenton
Beckworth	Cannon, Fla.	Fernandez
Bell	Celler	Fogarty
Bolton	Chapman	Fuller
Boren	Chiperfield	Fulton
Bradley, Pa.	Clason	Gamble
Brooks	Colmer	Gardner
	Courtney	Gearhart

Gerlach	Larcade	Rockwell
Gibson	Lea	Roe, N. Y.
Gifford	LeFevre	Rogers, Fla.
Gillette	Luce	Rogers, Mass.
Granger	Lynch	Rogers, N. Y.
Grant, Ala.	McMillan, S. C.	Ryter
Hagen	Marcantonio	Sadowski
Hall,	Merrow	Sharp
Leonard W.	Mott	Sheridan
Hancock	Mundt	Simpson, Ill.
Hand	Murray, Tenn.	Slaughter
Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Harness, Ind.	O'Brien, Mich.	Smith, Wis.
Harris	O'Hara	Somers, N. Y.
Hart	O'Konski	Sparkman
Hébert	O'Toole	Stevenson
Hedrick	Patrick	Stewart
Heffernan	Pfeifer	Sullivan
Hendricks	Philbin	Taylor
Herter	Ploeser	Thomas, Tex.
Hill	Plumley	Torrens
Hinshaw	Powell	Weiss
Hope	Price, Ill.	White
Jensen	Priest	Wilson
Jonkman	Quinn, N. Y.	Winter
Keefe	Rabaut	Wolcott
Kefauver	Rains	Wolverton, N. J.
Keogh	Resa	Woodhouse
Kilburn	Robertson,	Woodrum, Va.
King	N. Dak.	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 292 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TO EXEMPT ANNUITY PAYMENTS FROM TAXATION

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has been recognized.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pending resolution which would make in order H. R. 2948, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act passed May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this bill if enacted into law would have perhaps serious implications so far as our tax laws are concerned and it is one of the most discriminatory measures so far as the taxpayers of the country are concerned of any bill that has ever been brought before the Congress of the United States.

When I found that the bill was going to be considered I wrote a letter to the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, former distinguished Member of this House and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, now Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, for an expression of his views on this legislation and he states so fully and so thoroughly what this bill would accomplish, and makes such serious objections to the bill, that I shall ask the Clerk in my time to read the letter from Secretary Vinson which discusses the measure.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter in the gentleman's time.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, September 21, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have requested the views of this Department with respect to the bill H. R. 2948, which is the subject of a privileged resolution (H. Res. 359), reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. No. 959), involving the taxation of annuities paid under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

H. R. 2948 would amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to exempt from taxation so much of any annuity paid under the act as does not exceed $1,440 in any calendar year. It was stated by the Committee on Civil Service in its report that the bill supersedes the earlier bill, H. R. 577, which would have provided that none of the money mentioned in the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be subject to taxation.

The bill would exclude one narrow class of retirement payments from income subject to the Federal income tax, contrary to the general rule that pensions, annuities, and other retirement benefits are includible in gross income. There appear to be no persuasive reasons to support the conclusion that the beneficiaries of the Civil Service Retirement Act should be less able to pay tax on their benefits than other retired employees with similar amounts of pension income, such as retired State, county, or municipal employees, beneficiaries of industrial pension systems, and retired employees generally, who have provided annuities or other retirement income for themselves. Similarly, there appear to be no adequate reasons for treating any particular group of retired employees more liberally for tax purposes than the large number of persons who were self-employed in their working years and who have retired on their own savings, such as partners or individual proprietors of small businesses, doctors, lawyers, and other professional people.

It is also the view of the Department that the proposed bill would cause unjustified discrimination as between the retired civil-service employees who would benefit from the exemption and salary and wage earners generally. It would not appear that the ability of the retired person to pay income tax on a given amount of income is less than of an active wage earner with the same income. On the contrary, it can very well be argued that in some respects at least the ability of the retired person to pay tax may be greater. He is often in a better position to reduce his living costs by residing in a less expensive locality, and is generally relieved of the personal expenses which are the normal incident to earning a living, such as commuting expenses, increased clothing costs, the expense of eating in public restaurants, and so forth.

I believe it is apparent that the reasons I have set forth for not favoring the enactment of this bill are not in any substantial degree affected by the limitation of the exemption to annuities not in excess of $1,440 per year. The Department's reasons for viewing the bill as undesirable are applicable to retirement incomes generally and not merely to exemption of annuities above any given amount.

The limit of $1,440 upon the exemption is drawn from the Railroad Retirement Act, which limits the maximum annuity under that act to $1,440 per year. At the present time, old-age benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act and Social Security Act enjoy exemption from taxation. While these benefits are not strictly pensions in the usual sense of the word, much of what I have said regarding special pension or retirement income exemptions would appear to be applicable to them. It is the view of this Department that the benefits under both the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act should be recognized as income and their tax status governed by the generally applicable revenue laws. In view of this, it is the position of this Department that these two existing exemptions should in no event be regarded as justification for the creation of additional exemptions in the retirement income field.

Under the circumstances, the Treasury Department is not in favor of the enactment of H. R. 2948.

A statement similar to this one of the views of this Department has been made to the chairman of the House Committee on Civil Service.

Sincerely yours,

FRED M. VINSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this bill into law would practically exempt all retired Federal employees from Federal taxation. There are about 78,000 of them. The $1,440 exemption under this bill, together with the $500 exemption under the general income tax law, would make $1,940 for a single person, $2,440 for a married person, and $500 more for each dependent. So you can see what would happen if this bill is enacted into law. Only about 1 percent of all of the Federal employees have retirement benefits of over $1,900. Consequently 99 percent of Federal retired employees would not pay any income tax to the Federal Government whatever. This, Members of the House, is discrimination between taxpayers that this Congress cannot afford to make.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Am I correctly informed that the gentleman's committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, unanimously opposes the enactment of this bill, and that all of the members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, have so expressed themselves?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That is correct.

This bill would excuse from Federal taxes about 99 percent of the retired employees of the Federal Government. If we do that, what are the implications? If we excuse this number, then what would become of the State employees, the school teachers, the sheriffs, the firemen, and the policemen? To be consistent, this Congress would have to extend the same immunity privileges to all classes of people under the same circumstances.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. If we exempt the Federal employees, would it not in good conscience be necessary for us to exempt all the State, county, and municipal employees who have civil-service annuity benefits in similar fashion? That, we are informed, will cost the Federal Treasury about $6,000,000,000 in taxes.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That is the point I was endeavoring to make. If you set this precedent with Federal employees, in order to be consistent you would have to extend the law to relieve from taxation all State employees and others similarly situated. More than that, you would have to extend it to cover the annuitants receiving payment from private companies, about 450,000 of them, and about 350,000 people receiving such benefits from insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this rule will not be adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that the great Committee on Rules would grant a rule on this bill, which is clearly a usurpation of the functions of the Committee on Ways and Means. What kind of a tax law would you have if we pass this bill and then the Committee on Military Affairs comes in later with a similar bill to exempt retired members of the Military Establishment, and the Committee on Naval Affairs comes in with a bill to exempt members of the Naval Establishment, and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries reports a similar measure as to the merchant marine? Why, you would have the worst hodgepodge conceivable. I am surprised that the Committee on Rules would give a rule for a bill of this character.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman should not be surprised that the Committee on Rules granted the rule because there was no opposition to the granting of the rule. It was granted because we believe it is in the right direction, to help the little people whose annuities are less than $1,440. We always wish to help the little man first.

Mr. KNUTSON. Sure, sure, sure; please, I have only one handkerchief.

The reason no opposition appeared before the Committee on Rules was that we were not advised that this bill was before the gentleman's committee, or the 25 members of the Committee on Ways and Means would have appeared in opposition. The least the Committee on Rules could have done was to notify the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that the Rules Committee was about to take this bill up for consideration.

I went to the desk to try to get a copy of hearings. Do you suppose there were any printed hearings available? No, there are none to be had, so we may believe no hearings were held.

The meager report on the bill contains a letter signed by Harry B. Mitchell, President of the Civil Service Commission. Since when has Mr. Mitchell become an authority on taxation? In contrast to the Mitchell letter, the chairman presented a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury. Let me ask the chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service if he or any member of his committee called upon the Treasury Department for an opinion as to what this bill would do and how much it would cost?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman give me a chance to answer his question?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not going to yield to the gentleman to make a speech. He can answer "yes" or "no."

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not want to answer it that way.

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not think the gentleman did.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. As I understood the reading of the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, he stated that he had so advised the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. KNUTSON. And notwithstanding such a letter they proceed to bring out a bill which will create a special and favored class of taxpayers. How will those taxpayers who must continue to carry the load feel?

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that if we want to be fair and equitable the only result of the passage of this bill could be that we would have to provide a $1,940 exemption from Federal income tax for everybody.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why treat one class of taxpayers in one way and another class in another way?

Mr. COOPER. For 1946 it is estimated we will collect in individual income tax around $13,500,000,000. If an additional exemption of $1,440 were allowed, the revenue loss might well exceed $7,000,000,000, which would be more than half of the total individual revenue collected.

Mr. KNUTSON. Do you get that, gentlemen? The gentleman from Tennessee estimates the loss may be $7,000,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas because I want the House to hear the author of this freak legislation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, the gentleman is not discussing the merits of the proposed legislation. You do not want the House to understand that these billions of dollars mentioned by the gentleman from Tennessee are involved in this particular bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. No, not in this particular bill, but it opens the door to future huge losses in revenue.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman who now has the floor does not even know how much money will be lost to the Treasury and has not even the time to find out how much money will be lost to the Treasury under this bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not know and neither do you. That is what I am objecting to.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The committee report on this bill does not show how much it would cost the Treasury.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, it never occurred to them to take into consideration the cost.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The fact remains if this exemption is allowed to everybody in the country, which would be fair and right, it would result in a loss of about $7,000,000,000 in revenue.

Mr. KNUTSON. Furthermore, what general tax reduction can we give to the country if you pass this bill and you pass the same principle on to every taxpayer?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The effect of this bill if it is enacted into law would be to throw a monkey wrench into our work in connection with bringing out a tax-relief bill, which we hope to bring out soon.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, it would be worse than that. It would throw an atomic bomb into the whole tax structure.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It is quite obvious when you give an exemption on retirement pay for a certain job and do not give the same exemption on the salary for the job, the Government is paying people more money for not working than it pays them for working.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, that is the philosophy we seem to be operating under. And if they make it high enough, I am going to quit working too.

Mr. Speaker, why single out one class for preferential treatment? Is there anyone within the sound of my voice who can justify that? No, there is not a single one.

I have studied this report carefully, and there is not a word in it about how much it will cost. It may not be very much, but if you pass this bill you have allowed the camel to get his head under the tent. The next thing you know the whole carcass will be inside.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman read the last paragraph of the letter from Mr. Mitchell, the President of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, yes. I thank the gentleman.

I read:

The Bureau of the Budget—

Says Mr. Mitchell, who is one of the recent recruits to the ranks of financial authorities—

advises that the enactment of the proposed legislation, either in its present form or if amended as suggested in this report, should not be considered as being in accord with the program of the President.

Now, we Republicans are going to stand by the President. What are you Democrats going to do?

Are there any other parts of Mitchell's letter that the gentleman would like to call to my attention?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not think the other parts are worth reading.

Mr. KNUTSON. As for me, I am taking my place by the side of the President, the Commander in Chief. He and his advisers best know what we should do in this particular instance.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the unwise nature of this proposed legislation has been so thoroughly demonstrated that anything I might say would be in the nature of surplusage.

However, since I am the Member of the House who objected to the legislation upon its initial call on the Consent Calendar, I do feel that I should make a brief statement for the RECORD as to the reasons which impelled me to take that action.

I think the only logical argument which could be advanced in favor of the bill, if it be an argument, is the large number of Federal employees in the United States at the present time, most of whom, whether they are now on retirement compensation or not, might be expected to be deeply interested in the enactment of legislation of this sort. However, I do not believe the Federal employees of my congressional district believe that this bill ought to be enacted into law, because, although it has been several months since I objected to its consideration on the Consent Calendar, I have received only one protest from one employee in my congressional district because of that action.

I do not want to go before the farmers of my district and say to them that I voted to exempt from taxation $1,940 in the case of a Federal employee who is receiving retirement annuity, whereas their income exemption on account of receipts from their hard labor is only $500 per year. I do not want to make that sort of statement to the laboring men of my district nor to the white-collar workers nor to others who have small incomes. I can conceive of no reason for discrimination as between various classes of low-income taxpayers in this country. I believe in giving every reasonable consideration to the employees of the Federal Government, but I think there is no justification for having those who do not receive any aid from the Federal Government who have small incomes, and who pay taxes to the Government, help to pay for the annuities of these Federal employees who have been retired and who receive equal or larger incomes in the form of annuities, and at the same time exempt those annuities of the Federal employees, for only half of which they pay, from Federal income taxation. I would like to vote to increase exemptions for all taxpayers, but not merely for a particular class.

There is another feature of this case to which no reference has been made. There are many Members of this House now who are agitating for the enactment of legislation to provide for retirement benefits for Members of the Congress of the United States.

I today heard some Members of the House who believe legislation of that type should be enacted express their intent to vote for the pending legislation, mentioning in that connection the fact that if retirement legislation should be enacted for the benefit of Members of the Congress they also would be exempt under the terms of this bill from the payment of taxes on $1,440 of their proposed retirement benefits. I happen to be one of those who do not believe in the enactment of retirement legislation for Members of Congress. But it is certainly a peculiar circumstance that this bill has never come to the floor of the House for consideration under a rule until this time when agitation, as you know, is strong in the Congress for the enactment of retirement legislation for its membership Is it possible that some Members are more deeply interested in themselves than in the Federal employees? I certainly feel that the rule ought to be defeated. I can conceive of no reason why it ought to be adopted even to bring the bill up for your consideration. This is to my mind a rather ridiculous and discriminatory proposition. I do not believe any Member can defend it before constituents who are not Federal employees, and not even before the fairest-minded of them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I seem to be one of those who has hurt the feelings of the members of the great Ways and Means Committee of the House. To appear to have taken over their prerogatives, as the gentleman from Minnesota has suggested, seems to be an almost unpardonable sin. As I remember, on one occasion at least a committee of the House—I believe it was the Post Office Committee—criticized the Ways and Means Committee for what they believed was taking over prerogatives of the Post Office Committee with respect to a bill concerning 2- or 3-cent postage; but we are not taking over any of the prerogatives of the Ways and Means Committee or any other committee of the House. We are dealing with a civil-service problem. The bill was referred to the Committee on the Civil Service, where it belonged. That was several months ago.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will be glad to yield when I get through with my statement.

The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee says the members of his committee have agreed to oppose this rule to permit the legislation to be considered. There are several distinguished members on that committee. So far as I know, not one of them protested the assignment of this bill on the floor or made formal request that it be reassigned to their committee.

Not one member of the Ways and Means Committee, and I believe there are 25 members on that committee, appeared before the Committee on Rules to offer objection to consideration of this bill under the rule now before the House.

This legislation deals with a problem of civil-service employees. I regret very much that neither of the members of the Ways and Means Committee who took the floor have really discussed this bill; they have just tried to read it off the floor without even discussing its merits.

This Congress has already provided for or permitted exempting railroad retirement payments; why not, if you think this is wrong, offer a bill and repeal that exemption? You have already permitted exemption of social-security payments.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. When I get through I will be pleased to yield.

Nevertheless you certainly would not want to repeal that. I have not seen any effort to repeal it on the part of those who are so vigorous in opposing the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. COOPER. Congress did not do that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The Congress approved it, and I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I do not believe he will come to the floor of this House and ask for support of a bill to tax social-security payments. I do not believe he wants to do that; if he does he can speak in his own time and explain to the House how and why social-security payments should be taxed.

This bill deals with people in civil service who have retired. It covers individuals who have reached the age of retirement. The average age of retirement is about 70 years. It covers about 72,000 employees. It covers individuals who get, on the average, only a little over $900 a year. That is the group we are talking about. If we cannot get this kind of legislation through, then there is going to be a demand to pass a measure to increase those retirement payments. A part of these funds we are talking about are contributed by the individuals who receive the annuities, and a part is contributed by the Federal Government. As I have stated, the average payments are something over $900.

This particular legislation should stand or fall on its own merits. Not on whether it should be considered by a committee to which it was never assigned, and where, in my judgment, it did not belong. Do you want to take care of this group of individuals who are living pretty close to the ragged edge right now as far as income is concerned, or do you leave them out, although other groups have had similar exemptions? That is all there is to it. There are about 72,000 of them in all. If you do not believe this kind of legislation is good, if you do not want to protect these people, that is one thing; but if you do want to protect them and give this little bit of relief which, after all, will not amount to a fractional part of a lot of relief that this Ways and Means Committee is going to give to big corporations in the next few months—and I grant they are entitled to some relief—then vote for this rule. It will not be a drop in the bucket compared with reductions and deductions this same Ways and Means Committee will recommend to this House in the near future.

The Members who have spoken against this rule will be on this floor before long and tell you with tears in their eyes, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] portrayed a little while ago, but it will be on behalf of the great corporations of this country when it will be said they ought to be exempted here and exempted there by the millions and by hundreds of millions—and I grant some relief in that respect will be necessary—whereas this bill today does not amount to as much as a million dollars in all.

You ought to let this bill come on the floor for discussion. Vote for the rule. Let us discuss the legislation and let it be presented to the House. You ought not

throw it out because a certain committee feels a little aggrieved when the bill was not referred to it. If you feel these people are entitled to have their case heard, then vote for the rule; if you do not think these people are entitled to this relief and do not even want to hear their case, then you will vote against the rule. But let us discuss the bill on its merits, fair and square, and not do as has been done here today, talk as if it is a silly, trifling thing to do. I have the highest respect for the great Ways and Means Committee of this House; I know it has a lot of pride in its prestige. I have the highest regard for the distinguished chairman of that committee. He is a truly great man. I have the highest regard for every member of that committee. But why not let the claim to a so-called prerogative be submerged to the consideration of this legislation. Consider it on its merits. It affects about 70,000 citizens of this country. It should not be considered lightly. Let us, as I say, consider it and debate it, and then vote for or against it, and do it on its merits.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, like my friend from Kansas, I dislike to find myself in disagreement with the distinguished Ways and Means Committee, but, so far as I am concerned, there is no sacred committee in this House. There is no valid question of jurisdiction involved because we are simply amending the Civil Service Retirement Act.

The Ways and Means Committee did not raise this question with the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee some years ago when it brought in a railroad retirement act containing the identical words that we propose to put in this act. They have not brought in any legislation to remove the exemption given to the beneficiaries, some 50,000,000 of them, covered by the Social Security Act, although it is stated there was no specific exemption included in it. I do not remember for certain, but my recollection is that a tax exemption was provided for the men in the armed services under a bill which came out of the Committee on Military Affairs. I may be wrong about that.

As far as the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury is concerned, I, too, have a letter in my pocket from him, dated September 21, 1945, which was written because the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee asked him to write a letter about it and the Secretary was kind enough to send me a letter in similar vein. Of course, we all love Fred Vinson. Nobody has a higher regard for him than I do. He is one of the most able men I have ever known and a delightful fellow personally. But he sat as a Member of this House and as a member of the Ways and Means Committee and helped to pass the Social Security Act, which does exempt them, and he sat as a Member of this House when the Railroad Retirement Act was passed with an exemption in it in specific language. It is a little late now for him to complain about the situation. If you have listened to his letter intently, you will see that in the same letter he also advocates repeal of these exemptions that now exist under the Social Security and the Railroad Retirement Acts. That is logical. If the Committee on Ways and Means will come in here with a bill to repeal all exemptions, why, then, let us talk about it. All this bill does is to put these people—about 70,000 of them, who are approximately 60 to 70 years of age or older and who get an average annuity of less than a thousand dollars a year—on the same basis that Congress has placed those under the Railroad Retirement Act and on which, taking the word of the gentleman from Tennessee, the Treasury Department itself has placed those under social security by interpretation, if you want to have it that way. Is there anything unfair about that? Is there anything discriminatory about that? If that is not the right policy as to taxation, why does not the great Committee on Ways and Means bring in a bill eliminating all of the exemptions and putting them all on the same basis?

If they will do that, then we will talk about policy. But the policy has already been established by this Congress in the Railroad Retirement Act, and all we are asking you to do is to vote for this rule and give us a fair chance to discuss this situation that exists with reference to these old people, many of whom retired as much as 20 years ago, and many of whom get a bare pittance of a retirement.

It is true, as the gentleman from Kansas says, that great pressure has been brought to bear on many of us to increase these annuities on account of the rising cost of living. As one Member of Congress I have resisted that move. I do not think it ought to be done. I do not think that retirement legislation ought to be hooked to the rising and falling costs of living. It is in the nature of an insurance contract, as I see it. But the Senate last year passed a bill increasing them 15 percent. We held it in our committee, and I fought to hold it there, and that is one reason why I am in favor of this bill because I think it will do justice to these seventy-thousand-odd people just as we have done under the Railroad Retirement Act and as the regulations of the Treasury do for the 50,000,000 under social security. We ask you to do this for these poor old people now in their old age.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Do these people now pay taxes on this 5 percent that goes into the retirement fund, under the income-tax laws?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; they pay on the 5 percent which they pay into that fund as a part of their salary.

Mr. RIZLEY. Then why is that not double taxation unless we do something for them?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The Treasury Department, when they make their returns, permit them to deduct each year a certain percentage of their contribution, but they tax them on the rest of the annuity.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman, I think, is a little in error when he compares the Railroad Retirement Act to this proposition, because in the Railroad Retirement Act the Government does not put in a dime.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No.

Mr. JENKINS. The employees pay it and the railroads pay it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is true.

Mr. JENKINS. But in this case the individual pays part and the Government pays the biggest part.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is probably true. But does not the Government operate the Railroad Retirement Administration and pay for all that operation?

Mr. JENKINS. It surely does.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. So the Government does pay something.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, after the speech which has just been made by the chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service, I hope that the rule will be favorably voted upon. However, I desire to say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] that the rule is before us because the Committee on Rules, and especially I, at all times believe that the membership of this House should have the right and privilege to vote on any bill that any legislative committee reports or recommends, and that, I repeat, is the reason the rule is here.

I am struck by the outrage of the gentleman from Minnesota on the action of the Committee on Rules in bringing out a rule for the consideration of a bill for the relief of people receiving annuities of less than $1,440 annually. How does this loss in revenues in exempting these deserving and worthy former workers of the Government who served in the low-pay brackets compare with the huge losses in revenue by reason of the adoption of the Ruml plan which forgave taxes to the large corporations amounting to six and one-half billion dollars. I am surprised that the gentleman should so strongly oppose this rule when only this morning he was one of the 10 Republicans who voted against reporting out the unemployment compensation bill. Oh, I concede that three or four Democrats voted with the Republicans and I presume they are the same three or four reactionary Democrats who invariably vote against the Democratic program or any program that is not in the interest of the big interests. That bill is now dead for some days to come until the people will awaken to the need of the passage of such legislation and will force the Committee on Ways and Means to act on an unemployment compensation bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman mentioned my name.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that

the gentleman is not talking about the bill and the question.

Mr. KNUTSON. We do not expect him to.

The SPEAKER. This discussion has taken a wide range.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That may be so, but the gentleman must keep within the rules.

Mr. KNUTSON. This is the Golden Rule.

Mr. SABATH. I am speaking on the rule, as to why the rule should be adopted, because it aims to relieve and help most needy former workers of the Government. As to the statement that the proposed legislation does not include retired persons who received higher earnings in city, county, and State governments, let us amend the bill to bring them all in. It will not amount to much. Very few employees in my district will be affected, perhaps fewer in numbers than in the district of any Member of the House, but I cannot lose sight of the fact that the cost of living of these small-income people has increased and they are entitled to this relief which will exempt their small annuities from taxation.

As was stated by the gentleman from Kansas, there will shortly be a movement to reduce tax on the income of war profiteers and those who have made millions out of this war. I wonder how the Republicans will vote then. I presume they will again run true to form and duplicate their vote on the adoption of the Ruml plan and again relieve the big interests from the payment of taxes on profits from war contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAMSPECK) there were—ayes 75, noes 82.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 169, nays 123, not voting 139, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—169

Adams	Brehm	D'Alesandro
Allen, Ill.	Brown, Ohio	De Lacy
Allen, La.	Bryson	Delaney,
Andersen, H. Carl	Bunker	James J.
	Byrne, N. Y.	Delaney,
Anderson, Calif.	Canfield	John J.
Andresen, August H.	Carnahan	Dirksen
	Case, N. J.	Dolliver
Angell	Case, S. Dak.	Dondero
Bailey	Chenoweth	Douglas, Calif.
Barrett, Pa.	Church	Doyle
Barrett, Wyo.	Clark	Ellsworth
Bender	Clason	Elsaesser
Bennet, N. Y.	Cochran	Engel, Mich.
Biemiller	Coffee	Engle, Calif.
Bishop	Cole, Kans.	Fallon
Blackney	Cole, Mo.	Feighan
Bland	Corbett	Flood
Bloom	Cravens	Folger
Boykin	Cunningham	Forand
Gallagher	Kee	Peterson, Fla.
Gardner	Kelley, Pa.	Pittenger
Gary	Kelly, Ill.	Price, Fla.
Geelan	Kilday	Rabin
Gillespie	Kirwan	Ramey
Goodwin	Kopplemann	Ramspeck
Gordon	Kunkel	Randolph
Gorski	LaFollette	Rayfiel
Granahan	Lane	Reece, Tenn.
Grant, Ind.	Latham	Reed, Ill.
Green	Lemke	Rees, Kans.
Griffiths	Lesinski	Richards
Hale	Lewis	Rivers
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Link	Rooney
	Ludlow	Rowan
Halleck	McCormack	Sabath
Havenner	McCowen	Sasscer
Healy	McDonough	Savage
Hedrick	McGlinchey	Schwabe, Mo.
Heselton	McGregor	Shafer
Hill	McKenzie	Sikes
Hoch	Madden	Smith, Maine
Hoeven	Mahon	Smith, Va.
Holifield	Manasco	Snyder
Holmes, Wash.	Mansfield, Mont.	Starkey
Horan		Stigler
Howell	Mansfield, Tex.	Talbot
Huber	Martin, Iowa	Talle
Hull	Merrow	Thom
Izac	Michener	Thomas, Tex.
Jackson	Monroney	Thomason
Johnson, Calif.	Morgan	Tolan
Johnson, Ill.	Morrison	Voorhis, Calif.
Johnson, Ind.	Mott	Vorys, Ohio
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Murphy	Walter
	Neely	Welch
Johnson, Okla.	Norton	Wickersham
Jonkman	Outland	Worley
Kearney	Patterson	

NAYS—123

Arends	Graham	Rankin
Arnold	Gregory	Reed, N. Y.
Auchincloss	Gross	Rich
Bates, Ky.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Riley
Bates, Mass.	Gwynne, Iowa	Rizley
Bennett, Mo.	Hare	Robertson, Va.
Bonner	Hays	Robinson, Utah
Boren	Henry	Robsion, Ky.
Bradley, Mich.	Hess	Rodgers, Pa.
Brown, Ga.	Hobbs	Roe, Md.
Buck	Hoffman	Russell
Buffett	Holmes, Mass.	Schwabe, Okla.
Burgin	Hook	Scrivner
Camp	Jarman	Short
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Carlson	Jennings	Smith, Ohio
Clements	Jensen	Spence
Clevenger	Johnson, Luther A.	Springer
Cole, N. Y.		Stefan
Cooley	Jones	Stockman
Cooper	Judd	Sumner, Ill.
Courtney	Kean	Sumners, Tex.
Crawford	Kinzer	Sundstrom
Curtis	Knutson	Taber
D'Ewart	Landis	Tarver
Dingell	Lanham	Thomas, N. J.
Doughton, N. C.	LeCompte	Tibbott
Drewry	Lyle	Trimble
Durham	McConnell	Vursell
Dworshak	McMillen, Ill.	Wadsworth
Earthman	Maloney	Wasielewski
Eberharter	Martin, Mass.	Weaver
Ellis	Mason	Weichel
Ervin	Miller, Nebr.	West
Fellows	Mills	Whitten
Fisher	Murray, Wis.	Whittington
Flannagan	Norrell	Wigglesworth
Gathings	Pace	Winstead
Gavin	Patman	Wood
Gillie	Peterson, Ga.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gore	Pickett	
Gossett	Poage	

NOT VOTING—139

Abernethy	Celler	Fuller
Andrews, Ala.	Chapman	Fulton
Andrews, N. Y.	Chelf	Gamble
Baldwin, Md.	Chiperfield	Gearhart
Baldwin, N. Y.	Colmer	Gerlach
Barden	Combs	Gibson
Barry	Cox	Gifford
Beall	Crosser	Gillette
Beckworth	Curley	Granger
Bell	Daughton, Va.	Grant, Ala.
Bolton	Davis	Hagen
Bradley, Pa.	Dawson	Hall, Leonard W.
Brooks	Dickstein	
Brumbaugh	Domengeaux	Hancock
Buckley	Douglas, Ill.	Hand
Bulwinkle	Eaton	Harless, Ariz.
Burch	Elliott	Harness, Ind.
Butler	Elston	Harris
Byrnes, Wis.	Fenton	Hart
Campbell	Fernandez	Hartley
Cannon, Fla.	Fogarty	Hébert
Heffernan	O'Hara	Sharp
Hendricks	O'Konski	Sheppard
Herter	O'Neal	Sheridan
Hinshaw	O'Toole	Simpson, Ill.
Hope	Patrick	Slaughter
Keefe	Pfeifer	Smith, Wis.
Kefauver	Philbin	Somers, N. Y.
Keogh	Phillips	Sparkman
Kerr	Ploeser	Stevenson
Kilburn	Plumley	Stewart
King	Powell	Sullivan
Larcade	Price, Ill.	Taylor
Lea	Priest	Torrens
LeFevre	Quinn, N. Y.	Towe
Luce	Rabaut	Traynor
Lynch	Rains	Vinson
McGehee	Resa	Weiss
McMillan, S. C.	Robertson, N. Dak.	White
Marcantonio		Wilson
May	Rockwell	Winter
Miller, Calif.	Roe, N. Y.	Wolcott
Mundt	Rogers, Fla.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Murdock	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton, N. J.
Murray, Tenn.	Rogers, N. Y.	Woodhouse
O'Brien, Ill.	Ryter	Woodrum, Va.
O'Brien, Mich.	Sadowski	Zimmerman

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sheridan for, with Mr. Gillette against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Hancock.

Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. Brumbaugh.

Mr. Rains with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.

Mr. Resa with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Butler.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Zimmerman with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BOREN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain articles in each.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Grover B. Hill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California and Mr. McDONOUGH asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMY

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the topic which is of foremost interest to the folks in America is still

that of demobilization. Members of Congress are receiving thousands of letters, not only from the servicemen but from their parents, urging that we, the Congress, do something about speeding up demobilization. I feel that this Congress will be derelict in its duty unless it does take some steps to not only limit the size of the Army, declare that the war ended as of VJ-day, September 2, and to declare that the war powers of the President shall end at an early date.

We all know that a tremendous task has confronted the Army in setting up the machinery which will afford not only a speedy but an equitable demobilization of our armed forces. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to berate the Army or to enter into a tirade against their present efforts at demobilization, but I do desire to make some remarks and have some letters printed from servicemen which will bring to your attention the need of some changes in the present demobilization plans. I believe that all men with two or more years of service should be permitted a discharge.

I believe men who are being furloughed home should be left there until the Army is ready to complete their discharge papers. I believe that no boy under 21 years of age should be drafted into the Army. I believe that married men who are 27 years old and who have children should be sent back home. I feel that high priorities for discharge should be given to liberated prisoners of war, men who have been wounded, and limited-service personnel. I believe that the present system of discharging professional men is not adequate. I also feel that Congress should exercise their right under the law and declare just what size the future peacetime Army should be.

It is around these subjects I propose to group some of my remarks.

General Marshall, when he spoke before the joint session of Congress, pointed out some of the difficulties. He analyzed and reviewed the history of the past plans. He pointed out that changes were being made and hoped for more speed. The future demobilization plans are not entirely clear. It seems to me that it has left many unanswered questions. I am prompted today to make remarks about demobilization plans and to offer some suggestions which I hope may be helpful. The Army changes its requirements for discharge two or three times a week. Some of these suggestions may be adopted before the sun sets.

2 YEARS' SERVICE

The War Department has announced that it is their intentions to have all men with 2 years' service earmarked for an early discharge. Then, why is it not feasible to give these men an indefinite furlough home? When they are ready to discharge them from the service, they can be called back for their physical examination and their discharge papers put in order. At the present time, there are many men who have had long periods of service in both the European and Pacific theaters of war. They are being given a 30-day furlough and then brought back to some camp. It seems to me that they should be left at home until the military are ready to give them an immediate discharge. I present some letters which indicate the feeling of servicemen upon this point:

BROKEN BOW, NEBR.

Day by day reports come in from the GI's who have been overseas, and now are being shunted from camp to camp with absolutely nothing to do but sit around and wait for some higher up authority to decide what to do with them. Why in 'ell don't they muster them out right now or send them home and mail their mustering-out papers to them? I have two boys who have been in the whole d—n mess for 3 years and 4 months and who are in this category. Whoever hatched up this cursed point system ought to be drawn and quartered. Probably some Pentagon bureaucratic chair warmer.

Myself, like thousands of other fathers, want my boys at home to take on where they left off upon entering the Army. Their jobs are waiting for them. The point system is absolutely discriminatory in that the boys who were overseas servicing the front lines never had a chance to pile up points, or even knew they would be required to compete with the front-line boys for discharge points. One of my boys was in this position and is now sweating it out at Indiantown Gap, Pa., after a 30-day furlough. Just think of the rotten mess he is in—nothing to do and wants to be home on the job—his own job. With only 48 points, he tells me, he is a casual. He says, "Casual means, in my class, like all other 45 pointers and over, are in a pool to be sent any place in the United States of America that limited servicemen are needed." So he is sweating it out, waiting to be shipped to some other camp to be again shipped to some other camp. Just imagine his state of mind.

BALTIMORE, MD.

DEAR SIR: Although I am not from your State, I feel that I should write you about your proposed bill concerning discharges. I think the plan to release men with more than 2 years' service is excellent. Although no mention has been made of officers in comments I have read on your bill, I sincerely feel that officers should be included. There are many officers in the Army who desire discharges just as badly as any enlisted man. I had completed 3 years of college when I volunteered for the service in August 1942, and now I want very much to complete my college training. I feel it is only fair to include everyone in the bill—officers, too.

HUMBOLDT, KANS.

Unless something is done soon, many men in Europe are to be forgotten and left over there to serve in the Army of Occupation—men with 65 to over 95 points, who have served already well over a year overseas, in some cases, 2 years. I refer to the men of the Three Hundred and Fifty-eighth Engineers who, because of a colonel's selfish greed for power and also because he has no desire to return to the States because of trouble at home, has gotten the Three Hundred and Fifty-eighth Engineers assigned to the job of policing the Nurnberg, Germany, area. Can't something be done to help these men?

There is no man in the regiment who has less than 45 points now, as this unit was screened and those with below 45 points removed, and will probably soon be sent to the States for 30-day furloughs before being assigned to new duties, while the men with high points will remain overseas for another year. The Army says they are demobilizing men as fast as possible, and yet they will allow one colonel's ambitious scheming to keep his rank to hold hundreds of men in the European theater who should be sent home. The families of those men are depending upon our leaders in Washington to see that the Army does not keep men in the service just to satisfy the plans of some high Army official.

KEARNS, UTAH.

We men are stationed at the AAF overseas replacement depot at Kearns, Utah, awaiting shipment to POE. All of us have from 2½ to 3½ years' service, and we feel that the point system, though fair, does not adequately cover the present need for discharging men and to keep men with lengthy service from going overseas. When we here witness the enormous waste of manpower and the vast number of men with only a few months' service, we feel that we are due some consideration.

(Signed by 45 men.)

CHATHAM FIELD, GA.

DEAR SIR: I am a private with 3 years 2 months in the Army and am 30 years old. Until a few days ago I worked continuously on the line as a radio mechanic on airplanes. Now I have been transferred to another section and am doing janitor work in a building.

Since men who are 26 years old aren't being drafted anymore, I hope someone will remember fellows like myself who have pulled dirty details, worked KP for 18 hours a day, and have done many disagreeable things that a civilian would have to see us do before most of them would believe it were true, for three long years, and all for $23 per month, as I have an allotment for my mother.

I had a good job in civilian life, but after going away so long I have my doubts if it will still be there for me when I do get out. I have only 37 points, as I have been in the States all the time, but through no fault of mine.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

DEAR SIR: After reading the article in the papers on the work you are trying to do in discharging veterans, I want to be the first of my ship to thank you.

I have been in the service for the last 34 months, and have applied for a dependency discharge, but it seems useless. The news in the newspapers was the first encouraging piece we have seen. I have a total of 41½ points, but that isn't enough. I am married and have two children that are of 3 and 4½ years of age, and at the present moment are under medical care. Although at the present time we are not doing anything but wasting time waiting for someone to tell us what we are going to do with our ship, I believe that I could be a lot more help to my wife and children.

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD.

DEAR MR. MILLER: I read in the papers yesterday of your intention to introduce legislation calling for the discharge of servicemen who have been in the armed forces for 2 or more years. It is one of the fairest plans I have yet heard advocated.

I happen to be one of a large group of men, all of whom have been in the service for two or more years, but who have had to spend all of their time in this country, either because they were physically disqualified for overseas duty, or because they were classified as key specialists at their jobs here and therefore, could not be replaced. As a result, none of us have been able to acquire a very large total of points. It seems bitterly unfair to us, Mr. MILLER, that a man who may have sacrificed 2 years of his life serving his country has only 24 points to show for it, while another man who may have been drafted only last month but who happens to have three children would have a total of 36 points without having served a day.

Your plan would do away with such injustices of the point system. We don't ask that any specific group be shown special

privileges or be released ahead of any other group, but we do feel that the fairest method of release is that based on length of service And, surely, any man who already served 2 years, whether here or abroad, is entitled to his discharge within the next 90 days.

TROOP TRAIN EN ROUTE.

DEAR SIR: This letter is being written on a troop train en route from Briggs Field, El Reno, Tex., to McCook Army Air Base, McCook, Nebr. Almost all of the men on this shipment have over 2 years' service; however, we are going to McCook to be shipped overseas as occupation forces. We will join the Four Hundred and Forty-eighth Bomber Group at McCook and the Two Hundred and Seventy-sixth Service Group.

All of us have been discussing your recently introduced legislation for the discharge of men with two or more years' service, and laud you in your efforts. We have not tried to avoid overseas service during the war; we just weren't sent; but now that the war is over, we do not think it fair that we, with two or more years' service, should be used as occupation troops. Surely, there are more than a million and a half men who have entered the service within the last 2 years.

Your legislation may be too late to stop us from shipping overseas, but we want you to know that we appreciate your efforts. The signatures of this letter all have two or more years' service.

(Signed by 165 servicemen.)

KEARNEY, NEBR.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLER: My husband enlisted in July 1941. He now has 4 years service in the Air Corps. He has been stationed at Columbus Army Air Field with the training command most all the time. All of this time he was physically fit for overseas duty At that time, he was called essential and couldn't be sent overseas. Now that the war is over, they want to send him overseas for another year or so. That will make a long time in the service of his country when lots of men are home with discharges with only 2 or 3 years' service. Why is this?

NORTH LOUP, NEBR.

DEAR SIR: I am one of the many farmers who have lost a part or all of their help to the Army, and now that hostilities are at a close, I think that every effort should be made to get these essential men back on the farm where they make a real contribution to the food situation.

As it happens, I have a son-in-law in the Navy, a son in the Air Forces, and a stepson in the paratroops. None of them had to go across for service and have been sent hither and thither for training, and are now stationed with time on their hands and with absolutely no constructive work to do. They are made to do such menial and disgusting tasks as cleaning up quarters for higher-ups or picking up cigarette butts. Nothing, in my estimation, can more humiliate a self-respecting citizen than such treatment, especially when they know there is much work they can do that would be of real service.

GOLDSBORO, N. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Being neither a citizen of your State of Nebraska nor a member of your party, I feel some hesitancy in taking up your valuable time with this letter. However, as a citizen of the United States and as an interested parent of a son in uniform, I want to endorse your stand toward demobilization, and I hope you will push it through to a successful conclusion.

I have a son in service with months of overseas service and battle stars to his credit. He is a captain in the Medical Corps, but with the existing inequalities of the point system, he writes that it will probably be the far distant future before he accumulates enough points for a discharge, yet at the same time we are suffering in this section for a shortage of doctors.

MERIDIAN, MISS.

DEAR SIR: To show you how unfair the Army is handling this business of demobilization, today at Key Field, Miss., all the officers were called in for a meeting and informed that they were eligible for discharge regardless of the number of points they have acquired, but that they had to make up their minds today. If they did not sign up for discharge today, the Army would hold them "for the duration." Of course, enlisted men must have 80 points. Many of the officers discharged here have had only 24 to 30 points. Frankly this caste system in the Army makes a joke out of the word "democracy."

CASABLANCA.

DEAR SIR: The average man at this depot has been here for over 2 years and more than 30 percent of the men have been here just 3 months short of 3 years. You would think they were readying us for shipment home. Instead, they have told us we are vitally needed here and no man who has been overseas for 33 months is interested in whether he is needed or not. He just wants to get home. Thirty-three months is just too long to be away from home, particularly now that the war is over. There are many men all over the world who have not seen their homes even once in the last 3 years. I say, get them home and get them home fast. If an officer can hold on to his men overseas he gets promotion because most officer promotion in the Army is on a time basis. So long in grade and you get promoted. Our own situation is bad but there are some men in this theater in Africa who have been here for as long as 42 months. The situation whereby they are trying to hold us here is a disgrace.

FRANCE.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am completely in accord with your statements: "Inspired by the military," "Only naturally wanted to hang on to a good thing," and "There are 1,000,000 men holding commissions, the best job some of them ever had." It is heartening to the men overseas to know that somebody in Washington realizes that there is a large number of high-ranking brass who would like to hold on to the mode of living they have adopted through the courtesy of an act of Congress, but the over-all percentage of the personnel of the Army falls into the same category as myself and are damned well sick of having our personal liberty restricted and being treated as serfs.

There are 2,000,000 men in the ETO not doing anything sensible or constructive and are rapidly becoming a burden on these people who make their home here. They don't want us around and we don't want to be around. I've spent 3 years and 1 month in this Army and I want to go home. Writing to a Congressman is a new experience for me but I have plenty of free time and believe your stand should be encouraged.

POSTMASTER,
San Francisco, Calif. (APO).

MY DEAR MR. MILLER: I am writing this in representation of some 15 men in my office. We have been sitting, by now, for a long time watching and wondering what the Army is going to do about getting us home and discharging us. It seems, Mr. MILLER, we are still getting the old Army game thrown at us, "the run-around."

We see the War Department is still putting up the stalling act. We have been in the Army a long time and know it first hand. What is more ridiculous than an officer without a command who does not want to get out of the Army? There are many shoe clerks and soda-jerkers who hold commissions from captain to major, and who will fight like hell to stay in the Army. Never before have they had such a paying job and never before have they had authority. No, Mr. MILLER, they do not want to give that up.

There are still men over here who have point scores of 80 to 100 and over. There has been no attempt in one particular company on this island to move these men to a dispersal center. Those men have been sitting in those areas over a month! Doing KP and picking up cigarette butts, digging ditches, and other menial tasks! Four thousand men have been in one area well over a month!

DRAFTING BOYS UNDER 21

I also note, Mr. Speaker, that the War Department has finally indicated that they would not take boys in the service under 20 years of age if they were still in high school or would wait until they had completed their semester in college. The House will remember that the age for drafting was lowered from 21 to 18. In doing this, we interrupted the educational courses of many young men. It does seem to me that if the draft must continue, we should cease drafting these boys below 21 years of age. On the same basis, we should say that any boy who has been drafted and whose education has been interrupted should have the permission to go back and finish his education at the earliest possible moment.

The teen-age boys were drafted to get sufficient manpower to win the war. Surely, they are not needed to win the peace. The job of occupation forces is one for men with maturity and judgment. The Selective Service expects to continue drafting some 50,000 a month. This, naturally, must take the young men who are just reaching the age of 18 or it reaches into the men up to 27 who have, heretofore, been deferred while the war was on because they were either engaged in occupational jobs which we thought were necessary or they may have physical ailments which kept them out of the Army. I present letters on drafting 18- and 19-year-old boys:

GRAND ISLAND, NEBR.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Since hostilities have ceased it seems to us parents of these young boys a grave injustice since they are just out of high school, and if they are required to serve 2 years in the Army, it is a safe guess that 90 percent of these youngsters will never go back to school again, and surely that is a matter of grave importance, not only to the youth of our country but to the Nation itself.

There are, surely, more than enough men in the service who will gladly volunteer for this occupational service, who have had a chance to get an education and who have no other plans for the immediate future.

I know I am speaking for an untold number of parents who feel the same as I do regarding this matter and so I am appealing to you on the behalf of all, that you use your influence and have the drafting of these young boys who should be in school terminated at once.

Please accept this appeal in the spirit in which it is written as we are all interested in the welfare of our Nation, but we feel that this is a matter of grave importance regarding the future of our young boys.

OVERTON, NEBR.

DEAR SIR: Will you please use your influence to set aside this deplorable idea of drafting these young boys, especially the ones

under 21 years of age? It is bad enough to draft the older boys, but to take the teen-age boys is a crime. They are just at the age when they should be in school.

KEARNEY, NEBR.

DEAR SIR: They told us the 18-year-old boys would be inducted and sent to school for specialized training and indicated that it would be largely a program of physical fitness. Many of our teen-age boys were on the battle fronts in less than 6 months.

They told us that they needed these 18-year-old boys for replacement and for their youthful zeal and reckless daring in order to win the war.

All this talk about military training and physical fitness is pure balderdash. They do not take men who are not physically fit and there is little evidence from any source that there are seriously planned programs in any branch of the service to keep men physically fit.

For God's sake let us let these youngsters mature before we throw them into the typical Army environment. Is this Nation so lacking fiber and sinew that we must call upon teen-age boys to carry the load in the occupation of Germany and Japan? It was terribly unfair to ask them to fight battles in a cause which was not of their making, but one's protests were lost in the shuffle in wartime. Let us not continue inequitable situation in the time of peace.

OVERTON, NEBR.

DEAR SIR: We think it is high time to stop drafting 18-year-old boys into the Army, and urge you to do all you can to put a stop to it. The war has been won and we would like to see the school boys get a chance to do something for themselves.

ST. ANN, NEBR.

DEAR SIR: Selective Service seem to think they have the green light to go ahead and induct all these men as fast as possible. Our local draft boards are doing a good job of it too. Those brass hats in Washington, many of whom have never seen a farm or ranch, plan to induct all these farm-trained youth, regardless as to the amount they farm or extent of their livestock production and replace them with war veterans and prisoners. In our operations, it will not work.

RELEASING MEN WITH DEPENDENTS

I also would like to refer to the fact that with the continued draft, it is taking men who have dependents, and I mean as dependents a wife and children, into the Armed Forces. In doing this, Mr. Speaker, the Army is breaking up the homes in this country—the home which is the foundation of democracy. When the family ties are dislocated, it has a profound and far-reaching effect upon the Nation. I do not believe that we can continue taking men who have families and, thus, break up the homes of this nation. On the same basis, it would seem advisable for the military authorities to immediately discharge those men who are married and have families. Certainly, no pre-Pearl Harbor father should now be drafted or kept in the service.

ST. JOSEPH, MO.

At present I am spending a 30-day furlough at home. I have just returned from overseas, having been in 3 battles. I have 72 points and I know that many like myself and others that have over 45 points will not go over again. So, as a father with 3 years' Army service, I see little use of an Army of men like myself, wasting time as a serviceman in the States doing nothing.

So, I hope you will succeed in making it possible for men in the States like myself, to, as soon as possible, return to our natural peacetime status. For I know that life is precious and the return to Army barracks as a cog in an idle machine is one of the most demoralizing conditions that a fine country, such as ours, could continue to uphold.

DETROIT, MICH.

My husband is 35 years of age; we have been married 13 years and have boys 11 and 6 years old.

When my husband was drafted, he was forced to leave a sales business. Now the Army refuses to discharge men 35 years old unless they have 2 years of service. If my husband is retained in service, we will suffer great financial loss, and it will become more and more difficult to establish himself with customers again.

These things plus the growing cost of keeping two boys in school and the greater need of the older child for his father necessitates a discharge at once.

CHADRON, NEBR.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to the draft. I think that men in our armed services with families should be returned immediately to continue the building of homes for America.

It seems very foolish to use the taxpayers' money to pay men with families $80 to $240 a month.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

SIR: Here, for example, in Trinidad, the officers are still having their wives shipped down at Government expense, despite the fact that the war is over and most of these officers are Reserves, expecting momentarily to be discharged. Naturally, having their families along fighting the war with them sort of eases the hardships they suffer—hardships such as private cottages, beautiful clubs and bars, and all the liquor they can drink at taxless prices.

Here, for example, we are badly in need of men to wait on the officers' tables, men to run the officers' wine messes, and men to run the officers' pleasure barges. The Navy, as a whole, is probably just as badly in need of personnel, and has great trouble letting them go.

Perhaps I'm being too bitter. I can't help it, and neither can most of my friends in the service. The longer we stay in, the worse it gets.

FORT WARREN, WYO.

Most fathers were drafted very late in the war, and, due to the lateness of their induction, they have less points than any other category. When the emergency made the father draft necessary, the Army voiced a hope to have them home with their children by Christmas. Now the Army blandly speaks only of their point system and of the possibility of releasing all men with at least 2 years' service. If the Army or this administration is permitted to forget their promise to the American home the bitterness always felt by those who have been betrayed will be reflected at the polls next year.

Thousands of soldier-fathers are already beginning to feel that their uniforms would be more appropriate with black and white horizontal stripes. Surely, no official can defend a plan to force the parents of our children to serve out a term of 2 years. Is anything more deplorable? Has the Army become a penal institution?

The immediate release of fathers would not hinder in any way the release of war-weary veterans as the administration has admitted their facilities are greater than the number of returnees. Today these men are picking up cigarette butts, digging dandelions with mess knives, and various other manufactured jobs, while their babies cry for them and mothers are left without explanations. If it is a question of who will get civilian jobs, who is more entitled to them? The fathers of this country face the greatest responsibilities of the future.

CRAWFORD, NEBR.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to urge you to bring the fathers home from overseas as soon as possible.

We have two children, ages 6 and 4. According to the present point system, it will take a long time before he is allowed to come home as he has never been in any combat zone.

I've had to use most of our small savings in order to make ends meet. We don't have relatives with whom we could live and so I have to buy everything and I've had doctor and dentist bills.

Aside from financial problems, children need their fathers more than even the wives and husbands need each other.

The children had often asked "When daddy could come home?" I always told them as soon as the war is over. So after the first confusion of whistles blowing and other noise-making when Japan surrendered, I looked across the street and saw the children sitting side by side on the curb. I asked them what they were doing and they answered "Waiting for daddy to come home." They thought it would be only a matter of a few moments. I wish it were that simple.

LIMITED SERVICE

There are many limited-service men who have not had the opportunity of going overseas or getting decorations and, thus, piling up sufficient points to merit their discharge who have been in this country and in the Army for several years.

General Marshall's statement that men with 2 years of service could expect being discharged by late winter helps to answer some of the criticism of the limited-service man. It does seem now that, in the light of our experience in Japan, fewer men would be needed than we anticipated a few months ago. If these men with 2 years service are to be discharged in December, why would it not be a wise approach to send all of these men who are not vitally needed in the machinery of demobilization home to their families and businesses? They also could be recalled when ready for a discharge.

CAMP WHEELER, GA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: May I present the cause of the so-called limited-service personnel of the Army. This term limited service is a broad term and really is not applied to a specific group. It includes several types of personnel. One group that is possibly included in the term limited service is the IV-D's. There are some 190,000 IV-D's in the Army at the present. None of these IV-D's meet the minimum physicial induction requirements. Most of these men have been in the Army over 3 years, and under the present point system IV-D's cannot see any hope of getting out unless our Congress steps in and helps us.

MAXTON, N. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Congratulations on your stand to force a showdown on this draft and discharge question. Our country needs more men like you, men who are not afraid to stand up for what they know is right.

If you could see what we are doing here at this base I am stationed, you would realize just how much of the taxpayers money is being used to pay men to pick up cigarette butts and cut grass. It's a crime. On top of all this, some of these men are 39 years old and have received nothing but promises as to when they will be released. The Army

is certainly bungling up the job and we are counting on you to lead the forces to take us out.

CHATHAM FIELD, GA.

DEAR SIR: Recent publications have named you as one of the leaders in Congress's investigation of demobilization—an advocate of a more liberal and less prolonged process of discharging servicemen.

I wish to bring to your attention the plight of the Army's IV–F men—the limited-service men. A great majority of them are of no further use to the Army, but because of their low point scores they, apparently, have little chance to be discharged. Are we, the limited-service men, the forgotten men of demobilization?

FRANCE.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing to thank you for your efforts to get us out of the Army. Perhaps my own case will show you how unjust the present situation is.

I have been in the Army over 3 years and a third of that time has been overseas. My thirty-second birthday is fast approaching. Yet, a few days ago I was told that I would have to do occupation duty.

Many others like myself are in limited service, and in the service forces. We had little or no chance to gain sufficient points for discharge yet the 3 years I've been in service is more than double the Army average.

The men here are already saying "The Democrats got us in but the Republicans will get us out."

Thank you again for starting to rectify the present injustice.

FORT DEVENS, MASS.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: What about the men in the Army who are disqualified for overseas service? I have done the dirty work for over 4 years and could never get a promotion because I am disqualified. Men in this category are few and far between and there is no glamour in catering to them. Don't you think we want to go home? I am 33. A young boy in his teens steps out of a war job, becomes an aerial gunner, makes technical sergeant, collects good pay all the time, and now is on his way out. I had no chance to get a promotion in the Army because I belong to a minority group, and now you insist on keeping me here. Laugh at this letter if you please, I don't give one continental damn. If you had been away 4 years from your home, you would see things a little different.

I have written to all my friends back home. If we are being kept here as a WPA, why not let those who like this kind of a life stay and let those of us who have something to go home to, go to it?

GRAND ISLAND, NEBR.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have served 28 months in the Army, have only 38 points, and yet I've served 16 months overseas. Now, I am faced with another overseas assignment. There are many others like me in the Army. I'm writing for all and not for personal reasons. The general opinion of the men I've come in contact with in the camp feels the Army point system is very unfair to certain branches of the service.

CRITICAL POINTS

I also point out the discrepancy in the Army's demobilization point plan in which they say that it is necessary to have 80 points at present, but 60 as of the 1st of November, and men with 45 points are not to be sent overseas. These 45-point men, gaining but one point a month, must spend from 1 to 2 years in the Army in this country in order to accumulate sufficient points for discharge.

SIZE OF ARMY

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should immediately take steps to ascertain how large a military force will be needed in the Regular Army. A bill has been introduced limiting the size to 1,000,000 men. We now have something like 419,000 in this Army and it is my belief that, under the bill recently passed which would encourage enlistments, sufficient men will be obtained to meet all the requirements of the Army. The Navy has indicated they want 500,000 men and will be able to get them by voluntary methods after the first of the year. Why should not the Army make a similar statement? This draft should not be continued during peacetime as an instrument forcing universal compulsory military training upon the country.

CAMP BOWIE, TEX.

DEAR SIR: We are gratified to learn of your action toward effecting a speedier discharge. Although this camp is not filled, we who are here are twiddling our thumbs. Others who have also returned from ETO and who write from scattered camps report a similar situation at their camp.

I have been appointed assistant recruiting officer for my unit, and yet I can only offer $21 a month, no choice of branch of service, no guaranty the men can retain their present rank. Inducements of that nature won't promote reenlistments. If Congress is going to make changes in advantages offered the serviceman, they must act at once.

Oh, yes; you'd be amazed at how many men would reenlist if given the same pay privileges now existent and allowed to return as occupational troops in Germany.

BOELUS, NEBR.

DEAR SIR: The war is over and I think it is time again for Congress to start running the United States, and not a bunch of high-ranking military officials who are worried more about losing their ranks than about the desires of the people, that makes this the great country that it is. I, for one, and speaking for many others, want the Government law making back where it was before the war, in Congress, elected by the people.

HENRIETTA, TEX.

DEAR SIR: I note that you are trying to force a show-down on the draft and discharges. More power to you.

Our farmers and ranchers here are without help. They are mostly worn out on the home front, trying manfully to maintain their homes and do their bit toward every war effort. They have carried on through the struggle, but are now entitled to relief. Railroads are advertising daily for civilians to assist them. Businessmen are short-handed, with inexperienced help. Yet, the Army camps are crowded to the guards with men and boys with apparently nothing to do but "fiddle while Rome burns."

I have four sons in the service and danged if I can get one of them out to help me here.

Of course, the Army and Navy higher-ups will want to keep our boys in as long as possible. Those fellows are trained to think mainly in terms of the military.

PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

I also refer, Mr. Speaker, to the point system of discharging doctors and nurses. It is necessary for these men to have 80 points for a discharge. If they are 48 years of age and were in the service prior to Pearl Harbor, they are also entitled to release. I maintain that the present system would let out less than 10,000 physicians and not the 30,000 indicated by the War Department's recent release. There are many communities that are in dire need of physicians. The committee in the Senate was recently informed that the Army was wasting their medical talent. Many of us have stated that was the situation all along. This could, and must, be corrected.

WALLA WALLA, WASH.

I have been in the Army 38 months and have only 56 points, which should keep me in the Army until I have forgotten all medicine I ever knew. I have worked about 6 months out of the 38. We, the volunteer physicians, are hoping you will at least try to cut down the total duration of Army service to 2 years. Here at McCann General Hospital at least 50 percent of the physicians could be released tomorrow and the necessary medical work could be done by the remainder in 4 hours per day.

President Truman stated that no man would be kept in the Army a day longer than absolutely necessary. He also told us that they were discharging men at the rate of 650 every 24 hours, and that at Christmas 2,000,000 men will have been returned to civilian life. That statement seems impressive until one takes a look at the size of the Army—8,000,000 men as of July 1. If it discharges 2,000,000 men by Christmas, there will be 6,000,000 men left. It should be remembered, also, that they are continuing selective service at the rate of 50,000 a month. So, when Christmas comes, 7 months after the end of the German war, and 4 months after the Japs surrendered, we will still have an army of 6,000,000 men, to say nothing about the number in the Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Forces. Certainly, with all of the separation centers and all of the available help, we ought to speed up the discharges from the Army. The Army, in my opinion, is deliberately slowing demobilization.

If it is their honest intentions not to keep anyone in a day longer than necessary, then they should send the men they expect to discharge home on an immediate furlough and leave them until they are ready for the final separation.

LIBERATED PRISONERS AND WOUNDED MEN

It does seem, Mr. Speaker, that the Army ought to give a high priority for discharge to the liberated prisoners of war and to those who possess the Purple Heart. A few letters introduced at this point express the sentiments of thousands in this class:

JERSEY CITY, N. J.

I am a former prisoner of war, and through the newspapers I have become aware of the fact that you intend to introduce a bill that calls for the discharge of former prisoners of war. It is indeed very gratifying to see that at last someone has taken up our cause. I am not alone, I know, in thanking you for all you are doing in our behalf. Our number is not great and we have, as everyone knows, suffered much and all we ask is to be sent home. The Army could easily give us an indefinite furlough home, pending our discharge instead of having us do all sorts of details that are needless. I sincerely hope, as do all of us, that you will press this matter of discharge of us former prisoners of war so that we may return home to our wives and children, sweethearts, and mothers and fathers where, with our loved ones, the memories of those dark days shall be forgotten.

I'm very glad to see that someone is working for the many boys who have been prisoners of war and are now scattered in numerous

camps around here just "passing away time," waiting for someone to act instead of just talking. We have been in the States now for over 4 months and haven't done anything but shift from one camp to another. We could have been discharged or at least be home on an indefinite furlough until they decide what to do with us. More power to you and keep up the good work.

(Signed by 100 prisoners of war.)

POSTMASTER, NEW YORK.

I suppose you know as well as I the position of a returned prisoner. The boys who, like myself, were taken on the parachute fiasco on D-day knew at least a year of pretty damned unpleasant existence—the Air Force men and some of the people bagged in north Africa and Italy took more than 2 years of it in many cases. Barbed wire's no fun, sir. Malnutrition and, in the closing months, near starvation are messier and so is the sort of unreasoning, brutality, and knocking around every prisoner has run into at some period of his captivity. Maybe you've talked to some of the kids who had it roughest—those who were forced onto working parties to do a 14-hour day, 7-day week, in the factories and mines and on rations that we luckier ones found just enough to keep alive on.

But, here's the point, Mr. Representative: Time in a Nazi prison counts for no more than time behind a London desk under the Army's point system. A headquarters clerk in a rear echelon office could collect as many as 5 battle stars and 25 discharge points for his unit's combat participation. An Air Force man who loaded rations on an English field has 5 points for every campaign in which planes of his squadron flew. But, a prisoner is attached to no unit, receives no consideration.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would call attention to the men who are now in this country and expect to be discharged when the Army gets around to it. Some of these men are being sent home on a furlough. Why should they not stay there instead of being called back to camp? They have parents, wives, children, and businesses. The fact that they are not being discharged is causing most of the irritation at home. They should not be herded back to some separation camp and made to await the slow, noisy machinery of demobilization. If this policy continues, the Army can certainly expect to hear a great deal of grumbling from the soldiers and from their parents. If they are really not to be kept in the Army longer than necessary, then let us see that they get home at once. It would take less personnel in the demobilization machinery. In fact, I am of the opinion that if the War Department would use a little horse sense on this single point, most of the objections to the present slow rate of discharge would be removed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a list of questions which he prepared.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

EUROPEAN COLONIAL POSSESSIONS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 1945, I sought to call the attention of this House to the importance of then beginning negotiations for the transfer of sovereignty over the colonial possessions of European nations now held in the Western Hemisphere. I felt then that it was then a proper time to begin those negotiations. The war was then in progress. We were supplying our allies with great quantities of goods and supplies under the lend-lease program. We made our contribution freely. We neither asked nor received any payment, and in many instances we received precious little thanks. The fighting is now over and the lease-lend program has been closed with a tremendous balance due the United States. We are shipping no more goods under this program, but we do recognize that we must continue to give aid to our allies for a long time. The nations of Europe need credit. They need American goods. We want to supply these goods both to aid our friends and to provide a market for our farms and our factories. We want to put American workmen to work producing the things Europe needs. To do this, someone must pay the bill. Since the other nations do not have the dollars needed to pay these American workmen, these American farmers, and American manufacturers, the American Government must provide the dollars if this trade is to materialize. Of course, we could simply give this property to our allies, but it seems to me that if the needy nations possess some property we could use, in good conscience this property should be transferred to the nation that is supplying their needs.

I suggest no coercion. I suggest no force. I only suggest that inasmuch as our allies have not hesitated to call on us for goods and services which they needed, and as we have responded freely, we should feel at liberty to call on them to supply us with those things which they own and which we need. When our allies needed oil we did not hesitate to send it even though we were rationing gasoline to our own citizens. When our allies needed lumber we sent it, although our supplies were and are desperately short. We are still short of fats, but we gladly share our supply with our allies.

Today Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Denmark all own territories in the Western Hemisphere. We need bases in many of these territories, and even more important, we need to show our sincerity in our attachment to the principles of democracy and freedom by aiding the people of these lands to enjoy governments of their own choosing.

Some 80 years ago this Nation was torn by a great civil war. At the end of that war we had adopted the policy and recognized the principle that no man could claim a property right in a fellow human being. Today it seems to me we should recognize the equally sound principle that no government can justly claim a property right in the government of other people. Governments should be no more susceptible of being bought and sold than are human beings.

I am not suggesting, and I have never suggested, that we should compel the European nations to give up their property rights in the Western Hemisphere at the point of a gun. I am not suggesting that we today should hi-jack them and compel them to give us the property they claim in this hemisphere. That was one mistake we made in this country 80 years ago when we freed the slaves. Had the United States been willing to pay for the property rights then held under the laws of the United States rather than to destroy those rights by force, we could have doubtless saved many times the amount of money involved, as well as untold suffering and all the evil that has so long flowed from the hatreds of the War Between the States. Certainly we should deal more generously and more intelligently today than we did 80 years ago, but we should be nonetheless determined to wipe out an archaic and indefensible system of property in our hemisphere. I am not asking that we interfere with the colonial system of the Old World. I recognize that it is not for us to dictate the government of Europe, Africa, or Asia, but in the free new world of the west, we do have a duty to buy our brothers out of foreign bondage—a duty to give all men of these lands freedom—not simply to transfer their ownership from one master to another.

When James Monroe announced the doctrine that bears his name, he but said that the European nations might not extend their system of colonial empires within the Western Hemisphere. The time has come when we should say to the European nations: "You shall not maintain colonial empires within the Western Hemisphere." The time has come when we should make the Western Hemisphere a hemisphere united in freedom and when we should drive from our shores the last vestige of slavery whether it be individual or governmental slavery, and when we should have freedom of government as well as freedom of individuals. Let us bring the Monroe Doctrine up to date. Let it reach all the people of the Americas. Let every American be a citizen—not a subject.

The time has come when we must recognize that governments as well as individuals owe an obligation to their neighbors, and the time has come when we should make some positive approach to see what can be done in this respect. The only criticism I have ever heard offered to this suggestion is that, "Well, they will not do it. Great Britain will not sell her colonies. France will not dispose of hers." How do you know they will not? Who has tried to buy them? Who has offered to purchase them? Who is trying to see what could be done? Surely not the United States.

I do not think that we have the right to condemn our allies and say that they will not make an effort to pay their debts until we give them an opportunity to pay their debts. We are doing a whole lot of talking these days about finding some basis on which to extend credit to those very nations that have these colonial possessions in the Western Hemisphere. What better basis of credit might we find than to offer to buy their property? As an individual I found out long ago that if I owed my banker and I possessed property that I was not using, it was pretty good business to sell that property and pay my debts. I do not know what better arrangement could be offered to the nations of Europe than to

give them the opportunity to sell some of the property that they have, which brings them no income, which renders them no benefit, which provides for them no protection, the property that they own in the Western Hemisphere that is but a dead weight upon them. Let them sell it to us. Let us give them a handsome price for it. Let us credit it on what they owe us. It would be to their benefit. It would be to our benefit. Certainly it is not a healthful situation for us to allow foreign debts to pile up, nor is it healthful for foreign nations to let their debts pile up far beyond their ability to pay. Why not offer them a way to make a payment on these debts? Why not see what they will do? So far we have made no effort to find out what Great Britain, France, or the Netherlands would do.

Let us ascertain their price. Let us at least see what they ask for these colonial possessions in the Western Hemisphere. If a reasonable basis of credit can be arranged, let us give it to them. We will be doing a good thing for the United States. We will be doing a good thing for the European countries, and we will be doing a good thing for the cause of freedom throughout the world. We will be strengthening our belief in democracy and independence in the Western Hemisphere. We will be making it possible for all the nations of the Western Hemisphere to know that the United States believes in the freedom of all the countries of this hemisphere. Let us prove to the people south of the Rio Grande that we want a free and independent America; that we want every island, every acre, and every person in the Western Hemisphere to enjoy freedom, to enjoy independence.

We point to the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor and we are proud to say what this Western World means in the way of freedom, and yet on the very shore of North America itself there are areas where people are not citizens of any land but the subjects of foreign rulers. That sort of situation should not be permitted to continue. We should at least make some effort to try to remedy it. If the European nations are unwilling to use the property that they have in this hemisphere to apply on their debts, then we will know better how to deal with them in the way of credit. We will be in a better position after we have tested their attitude to know how to deal with them when they ask further credits. Let us ask the State Department to find out what they will do. Let us not go on the assumption that our allies are so selfish and so unwilling to pay their debts, so untrustworthy, that we cannot hope to get them to make a fair trade with us. Let us see whether they will trade or not. In justice to our allies, we owe it to them to carry out the negotiations and see if they will not trade with us. I think they will. I think if we will make a sincere, honest, and real effort to buy that territory, we can buy it and certainly when we have bought it, it would be our moral duty then to free it.

I think along with that obligation goes an obligation to the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. We should give them freedom, retaining only those military and naval bases that we need for our own protection and for the protection of the very area involved, but giving the government of those lands to the people of those lands. We cannot say that it cannot be done, because we have not tried it. We have done it successfully in Cuba. We are doing it successfully in the Philippine Islands. Until we have tried it, we have not acted in good faith.

Four or five months ago, I introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution No. 52, simply asking the State Department to enter into negotiations to see what could be done in the way of freeing all the peoples of the New World. I think it is a reasonable request. I hope that the Members of this House will agree that it is reasonable and that we should undertake it. I repeat. The time has come when America must say to the Pharoahs of Europe, "Let my people go."

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S PROGRAM

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, the thoughts of every one of us these days are centered on getting our loved ones home as quickly as possible, but we must remember that the quicker they come home the shorter the time for us to get our house in order to receive them. Time is running out. Our men are coming home, and at the same time our factories are closing down.

We now have the gigantic undertaking of changing over from the manufacturing of planes, tanks, and guns to stoves, refrigerators, tractors, and the building of homes. This is an undertaking that involves not only machinery but men.

There will be 20,000,000 men and women between the armed forces and the war workers who must be employed. They must be found jobs in the face of the cessation of yearly Government war expenditures from sixty to ninety billion dollars. They must be found jobs in the face of such rapid technological advances in the last few years that one man can now do the job of two.

President Truman, in his magnificent message to Congress, recognized fully the difficulties of reconversion. He outlined a program to assist, as he says, industry and labor to get over the line from war to peace—to reestablish an expanded peacetime industry. To do this the President feels that Government must assist industry in every way possible to reconvert as quickly and effectively as possible so that the number of unemployed during the reconversion period will be swiftly and substantially reduced.

Furthermore, he proposed certain measures during the demobilization and reconversion period to assist veterans and labor. It is now up to Congress to enact the needed legislation if we are to have an orderly transition from war to peace. An orderly transition will help us lay a solid foundation for economic stability here at home.

Time is of the utmost importance or people may lose the confidence and faith needed to win the peace.

It is because President Truman knows this so well, that again and again he urges cooperation. He knows that cooperation was the cornerstone of our winning the war, both internationally and on the home front. This will be true also in the immediate future and in the years that lie ahead if we are to succeed.

Therefore, it is not surprising that one of the most important recommendations in President Truman's program is the full-employment bill. The full-employment bill depends in the last analysis on the cooperation of Government, labor, and industry for its success. In order to obtain economic security at home and political security throughout the world, we must have a prosperous, healthy, happy America. In order to do this, we must have full production—full employment. In order to have full employment, we must set full employment as a goal.

You cannot go anywhere unless you know where you want to go. If President Roosevelt had not set the goal of a hundred thousand planes, we never would have produced them. Unless we set full employment as our goal now, we will never reach it.

This is what the full employment bill does:

First. It establishes full employment as a Government policy—as our goal.

Second. It works out a democratic procedure for making this policy a reality.

The bill states clearly that—

> It is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise. The program must be one to assist private enterprise, to expand production.

But the kind of private enterprise to be expanded is competitive and not monopolistic. This means giving small business, which forms the basis of our economy, a fair chance. The President in his message made many specific suggestions to aid small business.

In the bill we do not guarantee anybody a job. We do intend to guarantee plentiful jobs for those able and willing to fill them. The bill declares that "all Americans able to work and seeking work are entitled to an opportunity for a job." We do guarantee that whenever private industry cannot provide full employment, the Government will then step in immediately with long-planned and worth-while projects—projects which in themselves add to the riches of our country.

This is not socialism. This is making the principal point of President Roosevelt's economic bill of rights—the right to work—mean something. This is the very stuff that a democratic people's Government is made of and without it a free society in this day can no longer survive.

This is not a bill for any one group. This bill, if implemented, insures the future of industry as well as labor of the farmer as well as the white-collar worker, of the war workers as well as the vet-

eran. For business, if assured of a supporting policy in Congress, will dare then to invest and expand. With full employment and full consumption there will be a market for the full product. If the workingman is sure of a job, he will buy; if the farmer is sure of a market, he will produce and spend.

History shows us that we have had, as Senator O'MAHONEY says, a series of booms and busts—the busts growing bigger each time as our economy becomes more complex. Busts cost money—lots of money. The cost of the depression from 1929 to 1941, as a result of the lack of planning in the twenties, has been authoritatively estimated as between $350,000,000,000 and $355,000,000,000—more than our national debt on VJ-day. Moreover, unless we have a high national income, we have not a chance of paying off our national debt.

President Truman has met the issue squarely. Unemployment must be licked. We cannot afford to take a chance on failure now any more than we could afford to take a chance on losing the war. We must wage peace as we waged war. It is up to Congress to pass this full employment bill as quickly as possible.

The President promises that war controls will be dropped as speedily as possible so that reconversion of industry may take place as speedily as possible. But he goes on to remind us that we must continue to fight against inflation and he warns us against the mistakes made after the last war when we failed to hold the line.

President Truman recognizes in his speech that science must now either serve man in the interests of a fuller and better life or destroy us all. He realizes what too few seem to have realized that with the knowledge we have gained of atomic energy, we have entered a new world. The President said:

> No nation can maintain a position of leadership in the world of today unless it develops to the full its scientific and technological resources. No government adequately meets its responsibilities unless it generously and intelligently supports and encourages the work of science in university, industry, and in its own laboratories.

The President has urged that a research agency be established by an act of Congress so that scientists may serve all the people in the future not only for defense against any weapon, which we pray will never have to be used, but as an offensive weapon against sickness, bad housing, and limited opportunities for business, agriculture, and education.

To win the peace, we must be healthy. We must be decently housed. Our educational facilities must be expanded and reorganized. To win the peace, we must see that scientific research serves peace as it has served war. To win the peace, there must be equal opportunities for advancement for all Americans, without discrimination because of race, color, or religion. To win the peace, there must be full employment. And it is to the interest of the Nation as a whole that the buying power of the majority of the people, who are in the low-wage bracket, is high enough so that they can buy and keep production flowing. That means raising the minimum wage, as advocated by President Truman.

President Truman has urged action—quick action. If we act quickly here in Congress, it will get us, as he says, over the line from war to peace. If we act quickly and follow his program, we do more than that. We lay the foundation for our realization of goals of human happiness and well-being never reached before—goals which must be reached if we are to have security at home and lasting peace in the world. These new goals have been summarized in President Roosevelt's now famous economic bill of rights behind which President Truman staunchly stands.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order be transferred to tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3686. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the registers of the land offices in Alaska to perform functions under the Alaska real property ownership declaration law; and

H. R. 3974. An act to provide for termination of daylight saving time.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3686. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the registers of the land offices in Alaska to perform functions under the Alaska real property ownership declaration law; and

H. R. 3974. An act to provide for termination of daylight-saving time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 26, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m., on Wednesday, September 26, 27, and 28, 1945, on H. R. 2202, in room 362, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing on Wednesday, September 26, 1945, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 714, H. R. 2299, H. R. 2650, H. R. 954, H. R. 1131, H. R. 1981, H. R. 2957, and H. R. 3441.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, September 27, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1751, to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Merchant Marine Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, October 4, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m. to consider the bill H. R. 3367, to amend Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress as amended.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing Tuesday, October 2, 1945, at 10:30 a. m. on H. R. 2111 and H. R. 4079, to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, and for other purposes. Hearings will be held in the committee room, 416 Old House Office Building. Anyone desiring to give testimony should notify the clerk of the committee prior to date of hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, will meet at 10 a. m., Tuesday, October 9, to begin hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

Various groups who have representation in Washington will be heard during the first week, such as Members of Congress first, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Association of American Railroads, Railroad Traffic Organizations, railroad labor, and truck and bus associations.

The second week will be devoted to various State commissions, agricultural associations, National Industrial Traffic League, and various citizens' traffic associations and traffic boards and chambers of commerce.

It is going to be necessary to limit the time for this hearing as much as possible. It is also desired to avoid any repetition in statements before the committee.

The committee would be pleased to have those who are intending to appear to advise the clerk promptly the least amount of time they will need in which to present their testimony.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 2346, the Seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

692. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting (1) proposed rescissions of portions of appropriations for the Military Establishment available for the fiscal year 1946, amounting to $28,692,772,000, and (2) a proposed provision authorizing certain transfers of appropriated funds (H. Doc. No. 290); was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 357. Resolution granting 6 months' salary and $250 funeral expenses to Mildred H. Trimble, widow of James F. Trimble, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1023). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 358. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3603 a bill to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1024). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 359. Resolutions providing for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 81 providing that the war emergency has been relieved to an extent which will justify proceeding with the highway-construction program under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 1025). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on Labor. H. R. 3864. A bill to establish the office of Under Secretary of Labor, and three offices of Assistant Secretary of Labor, and to abolish the existing office of Assistant Secretary of Labor and the existing office of Second Assistant Secretary of Labor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4076) granting an increase of pension to Earl W. Newlon, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 4177. A bill to amend section 205 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, so as to impose certain limitations on the authority of the Price Administrator to institute actions on behalf of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 4178. A bill to grant to veterans of the present war a temporary exclusion from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4179. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of the alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4180. A bill to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAFOLLETTE:

H. R. 4181. A bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment under fair labor employment standards and practices in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4182. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4183. A bill to place on the retired list certain former commissioned officers of the Army who served during World War I; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4184. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and operation of an additional military academy in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 4185. A bill to provide for future trade relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4186. A bill to provide for covering into the Treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution declaring it to be un-American to participate in activities to create racial or religious disunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MILLER of California introduced a bill (H. R. 4187) for the relief of Mrs. Vesta Meinn and Mrs. Edna Williams, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1190. By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of city council, city of Malden, Mass., that immediate steps be taken to speed up machinery necessary to bring the boys home sooner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1191. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Railroad Commission of Texas, opposing F. R. 3262; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1192. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by 100 employees of the Southern Pacific Co., relative to H. R. 1362, amending the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1193. Also, petition signed by 121 employees of the Northern Pacific Terminal Co., Portland, Oreg., relative to H. R. 1362, amending the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1194. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution of Pile Drivers, Bridge, Wharf and Dock Builders, No. 34, of San Francisco, requesting Congress investigate the authenticity of the George Gallup poll; to the Committee on Rules.

1195. Also, resolution of board of port commissioners, city of Oakland, Calif., memorializing the Civil Aeronautics Board with respect to certificates for overseas air service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, September 10, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, by whose word man goeth forth to his work and to his labor until the evening: Through the terror and tumult of this tragic day, may we discern the shining path which is leading upward to the City of God. Set our feet with steadfast purpose, day by day, upon the glowing pathways of righteous duty and selfless service. In spite of suspicions, animosities, disappointments, and disillusionments which plague the councils of men, steel our hearts to seek peace and pursue it that the sadly sundered family of mankind may at last be bound by golden cords of understanding fellowship around the feet of the one God. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, September 25, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 24, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 374. An act to amend the act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce";

S. 397. An act to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939–41; and

S. 1045. An act to provide for pay and allowances and transportation and subsistence of personnel discharged or released from the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard because of under age at the time of enlistment, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion by Mr. BARKLEY, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] be excused from further service on the Committee on Claims, and that he

be assigned to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF DEFENSE WORKERS

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period beginning April 1, 1945, and ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALUMINUM PLANTS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the chairman and a member of the Surplus Property Board, transmitting, pursuant to section 19 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, a report with respect to Government-owned aluminum plants and facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, which were referred as indicated:

A petition from the Alaska Development Board, Juneau, Alaska, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an agricultural program for Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Rita M. Wiseman, secretary, Star Welfare League, Inc., New York City, N. Y., relating to the atomic bomb; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1360. A bill to compensate Benali El Oukili Boucheta, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for the wrongful death of his son Mohammed Ben Boucheta Ben Ali El Oukili, near Marnia, Algeria, on September 30, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 593);

S. 1361. A bill to compensate Clement Euziere, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for personal injuries caused by a naval vehicle near Oran, Algeria, on September 21, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 594);

S. 1362. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer land for resettlement in Guam, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 596); and

S. 1363. A bill to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of water damage occurring at certain naval and Marine Corps shore activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 595).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 656. A bill to provide further for the appointment of postmasters for fourth-class post offices in the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 597).

By Mr. HOEY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 3220. A bill to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 598).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1383. A bill to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864; without amendment (Rept. No. 599).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to investigate the matter of the development and control of the atomic bomb; with amendments, and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

PHILIPPINE FUNDS IN THE UNITED STATES TREASURY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Philippine Government is almost entirely out of funds. However, it has funds in the United States Treasury of which we are the trustees. I have been authorized by the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs to report a bill to turn this money over to the Filipinos now so that they will not have to make a loan. I now ask unanimous consent to report without amendment from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs the bill (S. 1281) to provide for covering into the Treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States, and I submit a report (No. 592) thereon. I thought I had better make this statement in submitting the report of the committee, because I should like to ask the leaders on both sides to cooperate with me in getting early consideration of the bill, since otherwise the Government of the Philippines will be out of money, and will have nothing with which to pay its expenses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GERRY:

S. 1433. A bill to relieve certain members of the military and naval forces from Federal estate tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

S. 1434. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Joseph Christian Mueller; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. BUCK:

S. 1435. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 so as to afford veterans certain additional preference in the purchase of surplus property; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1436. A bill for the relief of John B. Hanson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1437. A bill to provide for the release from the armed forces of men under 20 years of age who desire to resume their education; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROTECTION OF TRADE-MARK OWNERS, PRODUCERS, AND DISTRIBUTORS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—AMENDMENT

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1417) to protect trademark owners, producers, distributors, and the general public in the District of Columbia against injurious and uneconomic practices in the distribution of competitive commodities bearing a distinguishing trade-name, brand, or name, through the use of voluntary contracts establishing minimum resale prices and providing for refusal to sell unless such minimum resale prices are observed, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. WHEELER, the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1403) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Norman Nedrud, and it was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

Mr. WAGNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 177), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee on S. 380, Full Employment Act of 1945.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Dewey Insists on New York Rights in Seaway Bill," from the New York Herald Tribune of September 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star paid a well-deserved tribute to Chairman HATTON W. SUMNERS, of the House Judiciary Committee, in an editorial printed on September 24, which complimented the Texas Congressman for the valuable service rendered by him in his support of the resolution for a constitutional amendment which would provide a representative in Congress and the electoral college for the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO REMOVE A WRONG

One of the best statements of the District's case for representation in Congress and the electoral college was made last winter by Chairman HATTON W. SUMNERS, of the House Judiciary Committee, appearing before a subcommittee in behalf of the resolution for a constitutional amendment sponsored by himself and Senator CAPPER, of Kansas.

It would be difficult to find a better summary of the issues involved or a more convincing argument. No one has ever publicly attempted to answer Mr. SUMNERS and the Star doubts that anybody will. To deny the truth of what he says is to repudiate the basic principles of democratic government. Mr. SUMNERS would win in any debate.

The opposition to this amendment takes a more insidious form than open attack on its merits and is therefore more difficult to combat. The opposition is inaction. It is hard to beat because it operates under the surface, and there is no direct pressure from

the voters to bring it out. Voteless ourselves, we lack this means of applying pressure.

This makes all the greater our reliance on men in Congress who are motivated by their own desire to correct a fundamental injustice. There is no question as to the absolute wrong of continued denial to the people of Washington of the right of representation in their Government. There is no question that the people of Washington want that right, that its exercise would vastly improve local government, that it would be of invaluable assistance to Congress in its exclusive legislative control over the seat of government, and that it would remove a mocking contradiction between what we practice and what we preach.

Our chief hopes rest with men in Congress who are willing to undertake the removal of a wrong because they know it is wrong.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Andrews	Hart	Overton
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Saltonstall
Brewster	Hoey	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Buck	Knowland	Taft
Burton	La Follette	Taylor
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Carville	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	McMahon	Walsh
Donnell	Magnuson	Wheeler
Downey	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Mead	White
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Mitchell	Willis
George	Moore	Wilson
Gerry	Morse	Young
Green	Murdock	
Guffey	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in a committee meeting.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

THE ACHESON-MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to burden my colleagues with any further argument relative to the confirmation of the nomination of Dean Acheson, but I take the floor to ask to insert in the RECORD editorials and releases which have appeared within the past 24 hours. These editorials and releases substantiate to a great degree the arguments which I advanced on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, on Monday, September 24, 1945, I charged that Mr. Acheson had publicly rebuked General MacArthur. Now I find, in yesterday's edition of PM, a substantiation of my charge, which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

HATS OFF

Hats off to Dean Acheson, the courageous new Under Secretary of State, who has won the first round in his fight for a stern, but just, Japanese peace. Acheson ran into trouble with MacArthur supporters when he rebuked the supreme commander for attempting to make occupation policy instead of carrying it out, but he now has won through to a position where he can see to it that the terms of the Potsdam surrender terms are carried out. Acheson is the leader of the younger, more progressive men in the State Department, and opposed former Under Secretary Grew on the question of retaining the Emperor. He wants to carry out a complete reorganization of the Japanese Government and economic structure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I stated that I was fearful there was a definite plan to remove General MacArthur from his command.

Again I find substantiation of my charge in the same issue of PM, in an article entitled "Soviets Dissatisfied With MacArthur Acts," which reports Mr. Molotov's demand for participation in the administration of Japan, from which I quote:

Non-Soviet delegates were construing Molotov's proposal as implying the U. S. S. R.'s discontent with MacArthur's alleged pussyfooting toward Japan's Old Guard, notably including the industrialists.

Mr. President, I request that the complete article be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIETS DISSATISFIED WITH MACARTHUR ACTS—LONDON SOURCES SAY MOLOTOV PROPOSES ALLIED GROUP TO GUIDE GENERAL

(By Frederick Kuh)

LONDON, September 25.—Vyacheslav M. Molotov, Soviet Foreign Minister, raised the far eastern problem at the foreign ministers conference yesterday in a manner which the four other delegates construed as indicating strong Soviet dissatisfaction with General MacArthur's policies toward Japan.

According to usually trustworthy conference sources, Molotov specifically proposed the creation of an inter-Allied commission which would be consulted by MacArthur in shaping the pattern of Japan and other Pacific regions.

[President Truman, in his Saturday statement, said participation in the occupation of Japan by forces of nations which took part in the defeat of the Japanese "will be welcomed and expected," but made it clear that in all differences the "policies of the United States will govern."]

The commissar refrained on this occasion, according to the same sources, from designating either the countries he wants represented on the proposed commission or the commission's geographical location.

SEEKS LARGER ROLE

It was obvious, of course, that he was particularly concerned to assure the Soviet Union a larger share in determining the affairs which MacArthur is now directing single-handed, in practice.

The other delegates assumed that Molotov would wish the seat of the suggested inter-Allied commission to be at Tokyo.

Secretary of State Byrnes was understood to have replied that the United States delegation was not at this time prepared to discuss the proposal. Byrnes was said to have indicated that he came to the foreign ministers' conference, above all, to prepare European settlements, that he was not briefed in sufficient detail nor did he have in his delegation the Far East experts necessary to go further into Molotov's project now.

The impression prevails that the question—like all others that have arisen throughout the conference—will be postponed until the foreign ministers' next session, probably in November.

Ernest Bevin, British Foreign Secretary, was reported to have replied to Molotov in the same vein.

Non-Soviet delegates were construing Molotov's proposal as implying the U. S. S. R.'s discontent with MacArthur's alleged pussyfooting toward Japan's old guard, notably including the industrialists.

GROPE FOR SOLUTION

The delegates, meanwhile, were groping desperately for a compromise on the latest crisis shaking the whole conference.

This arose after Molotov Saturday told Byrnes and Bevin that in the Soviet Union's opinion China should be excluded entirely from the Council of Foreign Ministers' preparation of peace treaties with Italy, Finland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, while France ought to have a voice in preparing only the treaty with Italy among those on the agenda.

Molotov's objection to French and Chinese participation in these negotiations is based upon the Potsdam agreement. The United States of America and other delegates acknowledge that Molotov's position is, in fact, entirely in harmony with the understanding of President Truman, Prime Minister Attlee, and Premier Stalin at Potsdam.

The official minutes of the first day of the London conference reveal, however, that the foreign ministers unanimously agreed that all five delegations would take part in discussing these treaties, that France, however, would have no right to vote on any of the proposed treaties except that with Italy, while China would not be entitled to vote on any of them.

EXPLANATION

Why, it then is being asked, did Molotov agree to this procedure in London on September 11 and then last Saturday insist upon a strict interpretation of the Potsdam ruling which would bar China from the sittings dealing with all these treaties and exclude France from all such sessions except those concerning the Italian treaty?

Only one explanation is heard among the four non-Soviet delegates, and that is that throughout the conference, Molotov has found himself in a one-to-four minority on every major issue.

According to American commentators, Molotov presumably came to the conference assuming that China would take a reserved and neutral position on the disputed European issues, while France would divide her support about equally between the Soviet Union and the two major western democracies. Instead, Molotov was said to have found all four other delegations at the round table ganging up on him.

NEW APPROACH

Following the protest against French and Chinese participation in negotiation of the peace treaties, it was believed in responsible American quarters that the U. S. S. R. has decided it would be preferable to change the entire method of preparing the peace settlements.

It is assumed that after the foreign ministers' conference adjourns Wednesday or Thursday, the Soviet Government will want to open direct negotiaitons between Moscow and Washington and between Moscow and London and prepare the treaties through channels outside the Foreign Ministers' Council.

Such a new approach to the entire problem of the peace would be considered by responsible United States authorities to be reasonable, and perhaps desirable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask also that an Associated Press dispatch from London, entitled "Russia Asks Voice in Ruling Japs," which appears in the Washington Post of today, be inserted at this point in my remarks. I should like to point out that the subheading of this story reads "Byrnes opposes suggestion."

I should like at this time to congratulate our Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, for his stand.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA ASKS VOICE IN RULING JAPS—INTER-ALLIED COMMISSION PLEA FOLLOWS RED CRITICISM—BYRNES OPPOSES SUGGESTION; BEVIN AND MOLOTOV CLASH OVER THE BALKANS

LONDON, September 25.—Coincident with reports of bitter personal clashes between British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin and Foreign Commissar V. M. Molotov, Russia was declared tonight to have asked a voice in determining General MacArthur's policies in Japan and the rest of the far Pacific.

The Bevin-Molotov friction was said to have resulted in the discussions about the Balkans.

Tentative plans for a December meeting in Washington of an Allied control commission for Japan have been presented to the Big Five Council of Foreign Ministers, it was learned authoritatively tonight.

The proposal, originally put forward by the British, has been neither accepted nor rejected by the United States, reliable informants said.

PRESSURE FORCED RESTORATION

Authoritative sources said the British plan was put forward several weeks ago but withdrawn yesterday. Pressure exerted by the dominions, particularly Australia, forced the British cabinet to restore its support of the measure.

A reliable source said the Pacific proposal had been presented to the Big Five Council. The representatives of the major powers had been discussing minor matters in the absence of any agreement on the European peace settlements they were directed at Potsdam to chart.

Molotov was understood to have suggested that an inter-Allied commission be created as part of MacArthur's administrative machinery. Such a proposal would be in line with recent protests in Russian newspapers against MacArthur's occupation policies.

BYRNES RAISES OBJECTION

United States Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, conference sources said, objected to this question being raised, on the grounds that he had come to the conference to discuss European issues only and that his staff of advisers was not prepared to produce data on Asiatic matters.

Persons in a position to know what was happening in the conference sessions said Molotov's move was a reflection of Soviet dissatisfaction with what the Russians regard MacArthur's policy toward the "old gang" in Japan, especially the industrialists.

Earlier the Russians were said to have opposed western interference in the Balkans—an apparent reversal of the understanding sought by the late President Roosevelt and former Prime Minister Churchill that there should be no spheres of influence.

OTHER ISSUES OVERSHADOWED

Controversy over the newly introduced Asiatic issue and the Balkan question—troublesome from the start—overshadowed discussions on repatriation of displaced persons claimed by Russia, and on the opening of European waterways before winter.

This first full-scale international conference to follow the war is expected to end tomorrow or Thursday. A member of the American delegation said Byrnes would make a broadcast report on the conference soon after his return to the United States.

An informant who attended the secret sessions of the foreign ministers of the United States, Russia, Great Britain, France, and China gave this as an example of the friction between Molotov and Bevin:

Molotov, objecting to the British attitude against Balkan governments sponsored by Russia, declared that Bevin was supporting an antidemocratic regime in Greece.

TIRED OF BEING "BUTT"

Angered, Bevin retorted that he refused to permit that he be spoken to in such a tone. "Besides," Bevin is reported to have said, "I am tired of always being the butt for accusations. It is as though I am always being put in the prisoners' dock. Is it because I used to be a docker?"

"Well," Molotov was said to have replied, "I don't know, but there is one thing you and I have in common anyway. Our nobility is not very old."

Regarding the repatriation issue, the Russians were declared wanting assurance that Poles and residents of the Russian-absorbed Baltic states be returned. The American-British attitude was that Moscow cannot claim these peoples unless they wish to return.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on Monday I further stated to the Senate my grave apprehension over the following statement by Mr. Acheson:

That the present economic and social system in Japan, which makes for a will to war, will be changed, so that that will to war will not continue, and that whatever it takes to carry this out will be used to carry it out.

I sought at that time to have Mr. Acheson's statement clearly interpreted to the American people, for many newspapers throughout this country interpreted it to mean we were fostering a social and economic revolution in Japan, no matter what the cost.

Again I find my fears substantiated in the leading editorial in yesterday's edition of PM, from which I quote:

To leave Japanese society what it was before the war, a society ruled by militarists, monopolists, and warlike bureaucrats, centered about an Emperor worshipped as a God, is to risk another and perhaps more disastrous Pearl Harbor a generation hence. Yet to change it requires—that horrid word again—a revolution.

Mr. President, I ask that the full editorial be inserted in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHIND THE FIGHT ON ACHESON

WASHINGTON.—The nomination of Dean Acheson as Under Secretary of State has been confirmed in the Senate with but one adverse vote—WHERRY, of Nebraska, the Republican whip. But the fight of which he was the momentary center is far from over. The attack on Acheson was only incidental, merely one phase, an opening phase, of a well-planned campaign to soften the peace terms for Japan and Germany.

The scene on which one looked, the debate to which one listened, from the Senate galleries yesterday afternoon was in many respects extraordinary. Less than 4 years have passed since Pearl Harbor, the war with Japan is hardly over, yet a nominee for the office of Under Secretary of State was being attacked as advocating too harsh a peace with Japan.

That attack was not being led by some eccentric, or by the spokesman for some tiny subversive party, but by the Republican floor leader of the Senate. True, his party colleagues did not support him in the final vote, but neither did they rise to dissociate themselves from his views. On the contrary, while WHERRY returned time and again, in raucous tones, to the accusation that Acheson favored "an economic and social revolution" in Japan, TAFT and VANDENBERG looked very pleased with the proceedings, like satisfied spectators at a bear-baiting.

CONNALLY AT HIS MAGNIFICENT BEST

CONNALLY led the battle for the administration and the clever and quickwitted Texan was at his magnificent best, one moment sly and sarcastic, the next thundering. With his fringe of shaggy white hair, his spectacles slipping down on his nose, his debonair bow tie, CONNALLY looked like an old-time Shakespearian actor or stage Senator. But one had no impulse to smile, one felt like cheering, when he cried with intense sincerity: "I speak for the people of the world," in asking for a peace that would forever eradicate Japan's will to war.

One horrid word—revolution—was the focal point of the debate. WHERRY kept coming back to it over and over again, as though he felt sure that semantics would overcome common sense in the minds of the American people. He was all for a permanent peace and he was 100-percent for the Potsdam Declaration, but he saw no reason to waste the taxpayers' money and the lives of American boys to bring about a "revolution" in Japan.

SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, certainly no leftist, in appearance he might be a small-town banker, jumped up angrily to ask how one could carry out the Potsdam Declaration without a revolution in Japan. He read clause 10 of the Potsdam Declaration, which pledges the establishment of free speech in Japan, and said that one "must of necessity" change the social system of Japan to effect this.

"If it is not changed," LUCAS cried, "we might as well get ready for another war."

But BARKLEY met the WHERRY attack on a different level. The majority leader said the Nebraskan was misinterpreting Acheson's words. BARKLEY insisted that Acheson called for a "change," not a "revolution," in Japan. Acheson had said that "the present economic and social system in Japan which makes for a will to war will be changed * * *." Fear of the horrid word "revolution" put BARKLEY into a defensive position, and it is this on which WHERRY counted.

THAT HORRID WORD AGAIN

The unpleasant, the appalling fact, about the debate over Acheson was that within 4 years of Pearl Harbor spokesmen for the American Government were forced to explain, almost to apologize for, the only policy which possibly can prevent renewed Japanese aggression in the future. To leave Japanese society what it was before the war, a society

ruled by militarists, monopolists, and warlike bureaucrats, centered about an emperor worshipped as a god, is to risk another and perhaps more disastrous Pearl Harbor a generation hence. Yet to change it requires—that horrid word again—a revolution.

All last week in the House the pre-Pearl Harbor isolationists, the covert sympathizers with fascism, the sneak spreaders of anti-Semitism, were harping on the same theme. The men who helped lull us into a false sense of security before Pearl Harbor I are helping to prepare the way for Pearl Harbor II.

Their strategy—and the strategy of the Hearst-Patterson-McCormick press—is to identify the demand for a firm and lasting peace with communism. Logically, this makes no sense. Are Wainwright and Chennault and Halsey—to name but three advocates of treating Japan severely—Communists? Are the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post Communist papers because they have criticized MacArthur and called for the revolutionary recasting of Japanese society?

Logically, the line makes little sense. But logically there was little sense in their pre-war line that Germany and Italy and Japan were bulwarks against Communism, a menace only to the Communists, no danger to ourselves. Emotionally, it served then and it may serve now to fool enough people to make an effective national policy impossible. The friends of the Axis, the fake isolationists, the "fellow travelers" of the Goebbels line, hampered defense measures before Pearl Harbor and may hamper efforts to prevent another Pearl Harbor.

Their campaign is focused at the moment on Japan, but they also are pleading for softer terms in Germany. It was significant that Landon last week coupled his defense of MacArthur with an attack on the Morgenthau plan. WHERRY hinted on the floor of the Senate yesterday that he had information from military sources (whose identity he would not reveal) that Eisenhower, too, had reduced his estimates of the number of men required to police the Reich.

They lost the fight against Acheson, but they expected to lose that fight. What they hoped to gain was to demonstrate, by the drubbing given the Under Secretary of State, that it would be politically unpleasant and unsafe in the future for an office holder to advocate a realistic peace or to criticize their idol, MacArthur. They hoped to terrorize. They hope that Byrnes and Truman, more cautious than Acheson, may soft-pedal their program in the future.

But this is not an issue on which decent men can compromise honorably. The future security of the world depends on seeing it through in Germany and Japan. We all owe a debt to the plain speaking of Senator RUSSELL last week and of Senators CONNALLY and LUCAS yesterday. And if the administration is to do its duty to our country and to its future, it will not let itself be cowed by the old pro-Axis brigade. It will take the issue to the people. It will explain over and over again, simply and clearly, in a great campaign of public education, just why we must bring about revolutionary changes in Germany and Japan if your children and our grandchildren are to be secure. To retreat, to be apologetic, to take the defensive, to compromise, would be to make ourselves the accomplices of treason.

I. F. STONE.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit also two editorials from the Philadelphia Inquirer, the first entitled "Now—End All Sniping at MacArthur," the second entitled "Let MacArthur Do His Job," which are self-explantory.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW—END ALL THE SNIPING AT MAC ARTHUR

Now we have installment No. 2 in the publication of directives to General MacArthur about his job in Tokyo. On Saturday President Truman issued the full text of the general instructions sent to MacArthur on August 29.

In the midst of the sometimes heated debate in the Senate yesterday over the nomination of Dean Acheson for Under Secretary of State, Mr. Truman disclosed that on September 6 he wired the Supreme Allied Commander in Japan: "Since your authority is supreme, you will not entertain any questions on the part of the Japanese as to its scope."

In other words, General MacArthur was told: "You're boss, and don't let anybody argue with you about it." Fine. It was a good message; the right thing to say. But what happened while this was held under cover?

Bickering, criticism, and even fulminations broke out in Washington, not over anything MacArthur did or failed to do, but about his remark that, if things go well, 200,000 soldiers may be sufficient for occupation months from now.

The effect of this unfortunate development was to create among the Japs doubts about MacArthur's real status and uncertainty regarding American policies. That, above all things, should be prevented. But are there any more undisclosed directives? If so, they should be made public at once, not one by one every time some new incident arises.

Mr. Acheson has been confirmed. That has nothing to do with the issues more or less artificially raised about MacArthur, in which Mr. Acheson played no small part. Senator WHERRY, in the confirmation debate, declared a "smear campaign" has been under way against General MacArthur. The administration, including Mr. Acheson, should take every possible step, without delay, to remove that unsavory impression.

Our proconsul at Tokyo is doing a good job. He is getting at the roots of Japanese aggression. The militarists and the industrial oligarchy alike are feeling the weight of his stern measures. He is obeying his orders. There must be no more sniping at MacArthur. In its possible effects on the Japs it endangers everything we have fought for in the Far East.

LET GENERAL MAC ARTHUR DO HIS JOB

General Douglas MacArthur's straightforward, comprehensive statements on what is going on in Japan under his direction, made in an interview with Hugh Baillie, president of the United Press, should shut off the heat burning up some distinguished minds in the State Department in Washington.

The last thing this country wants, or will tolerate, is an unseemly row over who's boss over whom, and about what. America won out in its greatest war by being united. It must remain so to achieve a copper-riveted peace and to carry out policies that will render impossible any revival of Jap militarism.

We have General MacArthur's unqualified assurance that every step under way at Tokyo or contemplated by him is guided toward that vitally important end; that Japan is already militarily, commercially, and economically prostrate and faces catastrophic conditions.

By no possibility, in his opinion, can the Japanese stage any form of military comeback for 25 years, if then. Their problem, a tremendous one, will be to get enough to eat. He asserts that by stern, uncompromising application of the principles of the Potsdam Declaration, Japan will be rendered incapable of further aggression during the predictable future.

That is exactly what America wants and will insist upon. Public opinion in this country not only desires it but demands it. Although questions may have arisen, from misinterpretation or misunderstanding of preliminary occupation measures, General MacArthur has gone far to lay the specter of a kid-glove peace for the Japanese.

This may be assumed, not only from his words but by a careful review of his acts. He has successfully landed, without firing a shot or suffering a casualty, about 150,000 men in one of the most warlike countries in the world. He is proceeding systematically to land 350,000 more. Thousands of Allied prisoners have been rescued. The list of major Jap war criminals arrested is already a sizeable one and is growing. Demobilization of the Japanese Army is being effected at greater speed than was contemplated. Significant, positive steps toward industrial demobilization are in progress.

In these and many other matters of paramount importance General MacArthur is proving a shrewd and capable administrator, as well as topnotch soldier.

The general's speculation over the possibility of reducing our occupation force in a short time to 200,000 men and of comparatively early withdrawal from Japan, as well as some similar observations, were unfortunate. But he makes it apparent that he has not attempted to adopt direct policies to this effect.

Furthermore, in his interview with Mr. Baillie, he makes this precise declaration: "All major policies will be determined on the highest governmental levels by the Allied Powers and will be executed by me as their agent."

There is an American soldier speaking. We cannot expect perfection from General MacArthur in handling his gigantic job. But neither the State Department nor anyone else should rush into angry criticism at every provocation, although as announced yesterday some general statements of policy were effected for General MacArthur's guidance.

MacArthur had to expend American lives to gain the victories which carried him from Australia to Tokyo. Getting into Japan and taking over without losing a man, "in the greatest gamble in history," is an equally brilliant achievement.

Japan must be wholly stripped as a fighting power. She must be forced, if she will not move voluntarily, into the ways of peace. Unity, not hotheaded criticism, is essential to accomplish that—in Washington, as well as Tokyo. Let General MacArthur do his job.

Mr. WHERRY. Further, Mr. President, I ask that an article entitled "Mac Gets Go-Ahead on Policy in Japan," from the Washington Daily News of September 25, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAC GETS GO-AHEAD ON POLICY IN JAPAN

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The MacArthur controversy eased today with a general agreement that he was supreme authority in Japan to enforce the principles of the Potsdam declaration.

The Senate yesterday confirmed by a vote of 69 to 1 the nomination of Dean G. Acheson to be Under Secretary of State. That action was a rejection of complaints that Acheson had rebuked General MacArthur for announcing that his occupationary force soon could be reduced to 200,000 men.

President Truman made public shortly before the vote the text of a recent directive sent to MacArthur reaffirming his supreme authority in Japan.

A move to prevent or delay Acheson's confirmation was led by Senator WHERRY, Republican, of Nebraska. On the showdown tally he voted alone against Acheson. Only 11 of his colleagues previously had joined him in voting to ask the Foreign Relations Committee to reexamine the question of

Acheson's promotion from Assistant Secretary to Under Secretary.

COMMIES CONFOUNDED

White House publication of the new directive, dated September 6, made the Potsdam declaration the basis of our policy in Japan. Against a rising clamor of liberal and Communist protests, the White House unequivocally reiterated that MacArthur was the instrument through which our policies would be effected. The left wing is protesting that MacArthur is sabotaging the democratization of Japan.

The dispute probably will echo tomorrow on the House side of the Capitol where the Un-American Activities Committee will meet to hear Communist witnesses discuss their recently revived class warfare program. Representative MARCANTONIO, American Labor Party, of New York, who always votes the Communist Party line, has denounced the hearing as a "witch hunt."

RANKIN REPLIES

The probability that MacArthur's actions would come up in tomorrow's hearing arose during House debate yesterday. Representative DE LACY, Democrat, of Washington, accused the committee of Red baiting. Representative RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, a committee member, replied that DE LACY was defending Communists who "are at the present denouncing General MacArthur." He said MacArthur's name had been booed at a New York mass meeting.

A glance at the Communist press will show that party members not only are booing him; they are accusing MacArthur of making a soft peace in the Pacific, of conniving with Fascists in the Philippines, and with failure to carry out Allied policies in Japan.

The Communists are particularly angered by the fact that MacArthur—with the 100 percent backing of Mr. Truman—is making the occupation of Japan an American show. The Communists are angry because other allies are not represented in the occupation forces.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also ask that there be inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "MacArthur Policy," by Thomas L. Stokes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR POLICY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

During Senate debate on the administration's Japanese policy a Republican Senator remarked that his Republican colleague from Nebraska, Senator WHERRY, had performed a public service in provoking spirited discussion.

It was, in its way, a public service.

For it served to bring out some truths—rather unpleasant truths—but very good for the public to know.

It served to reveal, for example, that some elements in the Republican Party—including some well-known leaders—place an interpretation on the war and the victory different from what apparently is generally accepted. It indicated that, as for them, the war changed things very little.

The debate was precipitated by Senator WHERRY'S challenge last week of the nomination of Dean Acheson as Under Secretary of State. He had objected because Mr. Acheson, as Acting Secretary in the absence of Secretary Byrnes, had rebuked General MacArthur for saying that within 6 months only 200,000 men would be needed for occupying Japan. Mr. Acheson held that policy announcements should come from Washington, and not from field commanders.

Before the debate got well under way, it became obvious that Mr. Acheson was merely an excuse for attacking the whole theory of the administration's policy of social and economic reform in Japan.

The Senator gave a clue to what it was all about when he charged, in repeated indignant outbursts, that Mr. Acheson was "out to foster a social and economic revolution in Japan." Some Democrats questioned the extremity of this assertion. But it is obvious from the White House announcement that the administration does intend to foster a change in Japan aimed at breaking down the feudalistic economic and social system to bring eventual democracy.

What was startling was Senator WHERRY'S angry surprise about this policy, which had been clearly enunciated in numerous public pronouncements.

The course of the debate seemed to indicate definitely:

1. That the old guard element of the Republican Party, at least, is out to challenge the whole theory of administration policy as a political issue.

2. That the isolationist "line" is being built around this attack and by exploiting the "bring the boys back home" issue, for which the MacArthur announcement first was capitalized.

3. That General MacArthur, the war hero, is being used as a handy symbol.

The brief comments of Senator TAFT, Republican, Ohio, regarded as the Republican old guard leader in the Senate and nationally, are interesting. He said, for instance, that "there is developing a difference of policy toward Japan" and that "as far as there is a difference of policy, if there is one, I agree wholly with General MacArthur."

This, and other Republican remarks in debate, seemed to suggest that there might be a MacArthur policy. Hitherto, the general has been defended as carrying out the policy of the administration.

Is there a MacArthur policy?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want the American people to know that what I consider to be two of the most crucial questions confronting this country have not yet been answered by this administration.

The first question is, What did Mr. Acheson mean by his statement which inferred we are embarked on a policy of fostering a social and economic revolution in Japan whatever the cost?

The second question is whether or not an agreement has been reached between this Government and Russia which goes beyond the Potsdam Declaration, which Russia did not sign, concerning the future of Japan.

I submit, in conclusion, Mr. President, that neither Mr. Acheson nor the majority leader, nor the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has satisfactorily answered these questions for the American people. Therefore I believe the time has come for the President himself to clarify these issues.

STIMULATION OF VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 3, line 14, striking out "one year" and inserting "eighteen months."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire at this time to address myself to the pending bill, which deals with voluntary enlistments in the Army and the Navy. I am glad indeed that the unfinished business was laid aside yesterday in order to permit consideration of this measure. I think that action was thoroughly justified because there is no bill upon the calendar which so urgently calls for immediate consideration at this time as the bill which has now been taken up.

The first and most important question the Congress has before it in dealing with the Army and the Navy at this time is the question of the discharge of men in the services. Upon the reconvening of the Congress this month the Senate Military Affairs Committee proceeded at once to hold hearings upon the question of separation from service. Those hearings have been productive, I feel, of much good and a great deal of information.

As was revealed in those hearings, separation from service has been proceeding very slowly, and, as shown on the Senate floor yesterday by the statement of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] since those hearings have been in progress both the Army and the Navy have stepped up their discharges and shown an earnestness to separate men from the service. We have been assured by General Marshall in his statement made before the Members of Congress that under the point system there would be reduction of points required for discharge. I am glad to have that statement, but I want to say, Mr. President, that I feel the discharge program is not proceeding fast enough and that it will not proceed fast enough even under the plan laid down by General Marshall. Only this morning I received a letter stating that about 10,000 men in one of the camps in the South, men with sufficient discharge points gained through service, are being held there and have been held there for weeks. I hope if those men cannot be discharged promptly, if the separation facilities are jammed—and I can understand they might well be—that they will be furloughed home to be recalled for discharge.

Another thing I wish to urge before this body, as I have urged it before representatives of the War Department, is that men who have dependents be returned to their homes as promptly as possible, because such men have not only the obligation of a day-to-day living to be made for those dependent upon them, but they have the further obligation of establishing themselves in a business or in a position which may permit them to provide for the comfort and the needs of their families.

There can be no doubt that today there are thousands of men in the Army and in the Navy who are not needed there. We have almost 8,000,000 men left in the Army at this time. Certainly they are not needed.

Mr. President, as to the point system, let me say that it has been lowered a little. We have been promised that it will be lowered more from month to month. But it ought to be lowered even today, at this time, so that men will not

be necessarily held in camps located in this country because of the point system.

We are told that the transportation problem presents difficulties in connection with bringing men home from overseas. That perhaps is correct. But that problem does not confront us with respect to the men who are already in this country, and there is no reason to hold those who are here by the use of a point system, because if that be done, then that system no longer becomes one to aid in the discharge of men, but it becomes one to keep them in the service unnecessarily long.

So, Mr. President, I appeal today, as I have since the committee hearings began, that the point system, if it is to be followed, be used with sense and fairness, and that the point requirement be lowered. Not only should the point requirement be lower, but I urge that servicemen who have others dependent upon them be promptly returned to their homes. What I have said about the Army and Navy applies equally with respect to the Coast Guard and the Marines.

That, Mr. President, is the important question with which we deal today concerning the Army and the Navy and all other branches of the military service.

There is a second problem which confronts us and a second subject to be dealt with, which is covered by the proposed legislation, and that is to put the Army and the Navy upon a volunteer basis as promptly as that can be done. Only in this way may we end the draft. The House has passed the bill which is pending here. The Senate Military Affairs Committee has reported the bill with one change. That change is the pending question, an amendment which provides that if one has served in the armed forces for 6 months he may enlist for a period of 18 months, enlistments being thrown open to others for 2 or 3 years. At the proper time I shall offer an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and myself changing the enlistment period as now provided in the bill from periods of 2 or 3 years to periods of 1 or 2 or 3 years. Later I shall discuss that subject; but under the procedure of the Senate we must deal first with the committee amendment, which is to strike out "1 year" and insert "18 months." It is my hope that the committee amendment will not be adopted and that the Senate will adopt the 1-year provision contained in the House bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is not able because of illness to be on the floor today, and he has asked me to take charge of the bill. I should like to say to the Senator from West Virginia that, even though there was an adverse vote in committee on the question which he raises, so far as I am concerned, and being now in charge of the bill, I would be glad to accept the Senator's suggestion that the committee amendment changing the period of 1 year, as written into the bill by the House, to 18 months, be rejected, and that the House proposal be accepted. I may say further that the Senator's proposal with respect to newly enlisted men would be acceptable if he would change the 1 year to 18 months; that is if he would modify his proposal with respect to new enlistments by striking out "1 year" and making it read "18 months or 2 years or 3 years," that would be satisfactory.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am very glad indeed to hear the proposal of the able Senator from Colorado, who is now in charge of the bill. I wish to say to him that so far as I am concerned his suggestion is acceptable. If we can agree on that, the debate need proceed no further.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That arrangement is acceptable to the committee. I suppose there are members of the committee who will very reluctantly accept that change, but it seems to me that it is a fair compromise. Since many Members of the Senate desire to modify the provision in that respect, I hope that that modification will be accepted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I believe that this is a very satisfactory solution of the issue which has arisen between us, and I will accept the compromise. As I understand, the committee amendment will be rejected, and we will adopt the House provision providing for 1 year's service for those who have been in the service 6 months; also that enlistments for all persons will be open for periods of 18 months, 2 years, or 3 years, as they may choose. Is that the understanding?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is the understanding.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to accept the proposal, and there is no need for me to debate it further.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator will modify his amendment and offer it in the modified form, making the change from 1 year to 18 months.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will offer the amendment changing the language in the amendment from "1 year" to "18 months." I will offer the amendment as soon as the committee amendment is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 14.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I understand, the proposal is to reject the committee amendment and adopt the language of the House provision.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Then, after the committee amendment is rejected, the Senator from West Virginia will offer his modified amendment, which will provide that enlistments, as provided for on page 2, in the paragraph beginning in line 4, shall be for periods of 18 months, 2 years, or 3 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the amendment reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs was offered in committee, adopted by a majority of the members present, and reported to the Senate. The suggestion was made after lengthy consideration.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the committee amendment changing the period from 1 year to 18 months, on page 3, line 14, was made on the recommendation of the War Department. I dislike very much to have this compromise made after thorough consideration was given in committee to the recommendation of the War Department. I wish to say definitely that if the period is not changed from 1 year to 18 months, the Congress will not be keeping faith with those who won the war—the high-point men who are now eligible for discharge. They expect to be released from the Army just as soon as Congress can make it possible for them to return home.

The reason for this proposed legislation is to make it possible for many volunteers to enlist; and the more volunteers who enlist the quicker the boys now in the Army can return home. If the volunteers who are obtained can be kept in the service for only 1 year, other men must stay in the Army, because the new enlistees will serve for only 1 year instead of 18 months. Someone must render service in the occupational forces. I believe that Congress should definitely consider the recommendations of the War Department. The Department had studied this plan. It has lived with it. It has just won a war. Certainly its recommendations should not be brushed aside so lightly.

There is one further point to consider before we reject the committee amendment. Suppose a man has been in the service for just 6 months, or suppose he went into the service last month, or goes into the service in December. If he enters the service in November or December, under the Selective Service System up to May of next year he can say "I have served 6 months under the selective service. I now wish to enlist for 1 year."

Suppose he served his first 6 months in the United States. I am taking a hypothetical case, but I am sure it illustrates my point. He would have six points under the discharge plan before going overseas. Then presumably he would be sent with the occupational forces. It would require 5 weeks, say, for him to go to Japan. He would serve 6 or 7 months overseas, actually in Japan, and then would come back about a month before he had to be demobilized, at the end of his 1 year. So he would serve overseas from the time he left the port until he returned, or 11 months, let us say. That would represent 22 points. He would have had six points to begin with, for service in the United States. He would be credited with another point for the final month, while he was here being discharged. That makes a total of 29 points.

Are we going to ask that the boys who have 60, 70, 80, or even 100 points be compelled to stay in the service longer because we take hasty action on this legislation? I do not believe that those who plan to volunteer would object to a period of 18 months, especially boys who have served in the United States for a

long time. Many of them would like to serve overseas. Perhaps they have been held here on special jobs. Perhaps they have accumulated only a few points and would like to see the world. I think they would like to come back and be able to join the Veterans of Foreign Wars and similar organizations for which overseas service would make them eligible.

We must also look at the financial picture. It is about time for us to do so, with the large debt which our country is facing.

Finally, the members of the Committee on Military Affairs considered this subject at length. The committee amendment was recommended by the War Department. Therefore I hope that the committee amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I feel that a brief reply should be made, because I do not follow the argument of the able Senator from South Dakota with respect to the House language preventing the release of high-point men. On the contrary, the faster we get volunteers into the Army the faster men will be released, both high-point and low-point men. The more attractive the service is made for those who enlist, the faster will releases be made, not only of high-point men, but of low-point men; and the sooner we shall then have a volunteer Army and Navy, instead of an Army and Navy of impressed citizens.

The Senator speaks of the point system. I hope that within a year the point system will have been abandoned entirely. I hope that by the time anyone who enlists under this provision has completed his service and his enlistment has expired, the point system will have ended. The 1-year period applies only to those who have had 6 months' service. I think the adoption of the plan which has already been passed by the House of Representatives will be helpful in the early creation of a volunteer army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] Apparently the "noes" have it and the committee amendment is rejected.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understood the Presiding Officer to declare that the committee amendment was rejected before the suggestion of the absence of a quorum was made. What is the ruling of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Colorado that, under the rule, the quorum call cannot be interrupted. When the absence of a quorum was suggested, the Chair did say that apparently the committee amendment was rejected. Then the Senator from South Dakota suggested the absence of a quorum, and the clerk is now ready to proceed with the calling of the roll.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, am I to understand, then, that the result of the vote on the committee amendment was not announced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced that apparently the "noes" had it and the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote on the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the call of the roll following the suggestion of the absence of a quorum cannot be interrupted. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY. No Senator has yet answered to his name during the call of the roll; accordingly, the suggestion of the absence of a quorum can be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I will do that or I will move that the vote on the amendment be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from South Dakota does not withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, the clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Andrews	Hart	Overton
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Saltonstall
Brewster	Hoey	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Buck	Knowland	Taft
Burton	La Follette	Taylor
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Carville	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	McMahon	Walsh
Donnell	Magnuson	Wheeler
Downey	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Mead	White
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Mitchell	Willis
George	Moore	Wilson
Gerry	Morse	Young
Green	Murdock	
Guffey	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the voice vote on the committee amendment be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota that the vote on the committee amendment be reconsidered?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I feel that I should object to the unanimous-consent request, for the reason that I feel that the vote was against the amendment. Of course, the Senator from South Dakota has a right to move that a vote be taken on the question of reconsideration but in view of the action of the Chair, and in view of my belief that the ruling of the Chair was correct, I do not feel that I should consent to the unanimous-consent request for reconsideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I hope the Senator from West Virginia will not object to the request of the Senator from South Dakota. I will vote against a motion to reconsider and oppose it as hard as I can but I still think that if the Senator from South Dakota desires to have a vote on the question of reconsideration, he should have it. That will be only fair. I hope the Senator will be granted unanimous consent, if that is what he requests.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I very much hope that the request of the Senator from South Dakota will be granted. I have no criticism of the Chair's ruling. The Chair expressed his view as to the viva voce vote. The Chair acted with a celerity, however, which commends him as a presiding officer, but I think it did take the Senator from South Dakota somewhat unawares. I know he was on his feet seeking recognition and intending to move or to ask unanimous consent as he now has. I very much hope the Senator from West Virginia will not object to the request.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in view of the general feeling that objection should not be made, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has requested unanimous consent that the vote on the committee amendment be reconsidered. Without objection, the vote on the amendment is reconsidered.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may we have a statement regarding it?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, we have before us again, after the announcement that it was rejected, the committee amendment which appears on page 3, line 14. Before the roll call I made a short statement with reference to the reasons why the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate had recommended this change in the House version of the bill. Since the committee action I have been informed that the House will be in complete agreement with the action of the Senate committee. Of course, that information came to me from individual Members of the House. I cannot say definitely what the entire House membership will do.

I ask that Senators take into consideration the fact that there are many members of the armed forces who have not yet served overseas. It is a possibility that many of them would like to serve overseas. If we allow any of them to reenlist for only 1 year they will not be long overseas.

Mr. President, I wish to make an additional statement. At the hearings General Gilbert appeared and stated the position of the War Department. He said:

> At present we are accepting enlistments in the Regular Army for a 3-year period. Incidentally, I might add that heretofore our experience has shown that the term enlistment for 3 years has been no handicap to recruiting.

The only time the Army was allowed to accept volunteers was before the Selective Service Act went into effect. That was during the prewar period. The War Department has now recommended this provision of 18 months' enlistment. In the committee the provision was adopted after thorough consideration. I hope, therefore, that the committee amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand that if we vote "yea" we shall be voting for the period of 18 months. If we vote "nay" we shall be voting for a period of 1 year. I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the committee amendment. On page 3, in line 14, after the words "period of", the committee amendment proposes to strike out "1 year" and insert "18 months."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to speak against the committee amendment. It seems to me that we face, without question, the ending of the draft. I do not think the American people are going to stand much longer for the drafting of 18-year-old boys. I do not know how long it will be. It is absolutely essential, therefore, that the voluntary system shall succeed. I think there is a considerable number of boys who are now in the Army who would agree to continue their service for 1 year, but who would not agree to continue it for 18 months. I believe there are many men abroad who would be willing to remain abroad another year if they had the opportunity to do so. I feel that we should make the voluntary system just as attractive as it is possible to make it. The men do not have to be trained. They have already been trained. They are already in the Army. I do not see any good reason why a voluntary extension of any term under which they are now serving would not be a good policy for Congress to adopt. It would not apply to new men who have not had training. As I understand, the proposal with regard to them will be 18 months so that they may be trained.

Mr. President, I hope that the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield so I may propound to him a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee took the language as it came from the House and added a period of 6 months in order to make the period 18 months with reference to those who are already in the service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. As the bill now stands it provides for a 2-year or a 3-year enlistment on the part of those who wish to go into the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. It applies to new men.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that all men who go into the service as new volunteers will enlist for 2 years or 3 years under the regulations of the War Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true under the bill in its present form.

Mr. BARKLEY. So if the committee amendment is rejected, the men who are now in the Army may enlist for only 1 year, and those not now in the Army may enlist for 2 years or 3 years. But if the committee amendment is agreed to, the men who are now in the Army may enlist for 18 months, making a total of 2 years if they have already been in for 6 months, and others, unless changes are made in the bill, would enlist for 2 years or 3 years.

Frankly, I have had some doubt about the committee amendment. I personally want the volunteer system to succeed. I want to get rid of the draft as soon as possible, and yet I do not want to have created such a situation that there will be a gap between the Army we now have and the Army we shall need.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to make a statement with reference to the question which has been asked.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to have the Senator from Kentucky finish his statement, and then we can discuss the matter further.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I do not wish to prolong the discussion any more than necessary, but I should like to have this matter made clear.

If the committee amendment is agreed to I presume that the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia to reduce the 2 years or 3 years to 18 months would not follow because there would be those in the service who would be enlisting for 18 months, having already served 6 months, and that would make a total of 2 years. If we reduce the period for new men to 18 months we create a differential between those who have been in the service and those who have not been in the service. What is the Senator's opinion as to an assurance that there would be a sufficient number of enlistments for 1 year among those who are now in the Army over and above those who would enlist for 18 months, so as to make more sure obtaining the required number of men in the various categories for the army of occupation? I do not want to have a situation created which would necessitate reactivating the draft beyond the time when we would otherwise abolish it, merely because we have fallen down with our voluntary system.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have nothing on which to base an answer to the Senator's question except my own opinion. I believe that hundreds of thousands of men who are in the service would volunteer for 1 year but would refuse to volunteer for 18 months.

Mr. BARKLEY. Assuming the forecast to be accurate that there would be a larger number of men enlisting for a year than for 18 months, in the event there would not be a sufficient number of them, even under 1-year enlistments, to supply the necessary personnel, what would happen?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, we are not repealing the draft. It is still in full force and effect and will remain in effect until repealed. We will have to cross that bridge when we come to it. I know that it is the hope of many of us that this bill will make it unnecessary to reenact the draft law after it expires.

With reference to the 1-year reenlistment, we must remember that it applies only to men who are in the service. Many of the men who will volunteer under this provision will have been in the service for 4 or 5 years. None of them will, of course, be eligible to volunteer until they have been discharged from the Army. We know now that men are not being discharged from the Army who have had less than 3 years of service. So we do not need to worry about the men not having had experience.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I believe the answer of the Senator from Colorado is somewhat in error. I think that a man who is now in the service, no matter if he has spent 3 or 4 or 5 years in the service, does not have to wait for a discharge before he may enlist for a 1-year period or an 18-month period. If today he is in the service at Fort Belvoir or at any other place—Japan or Germany—he can walk up to his company commander and say, "I wish to enlist for 1 year under the provisions of the bill passed by Congress," and his discharge papers and reenlistment papers will be given him then and there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not so understand.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think that the language of the bill is pretty clear about that, I will say to the Senator from Colorado, and I believe the Senator from South Dakota is correct. The provision reads:

> Any qualified and acceptable member of the Army of the United States, or of any component thereof, who has performed active service therein for a period of not less than 6 months, shall, upon his application, be accepted for an enlistment period of 1 year—

The committee amendment makes that 18 months—

> plus the period of any furlough granted at the beginning of such enlistment.

I would think that under that language there is no discretion in the War Department. If a man is in the service today and decides he wants to enlist, he has the right to enlist, and the bill says that his application shall be accepted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me point out to the Senator from Alabama and the

Senator from South Dakota this language:

> Any qualified and acceptable member of the Army of the United States.

As I understand, the Army of the United States is the Army that is made up of selectees, and no one in the Army of the United States is serving for a term of enlistment of 3 years. The only persons who have an enlistment period of 3 years are those in the Regular Army. Therefore, this is open only to those in the Army of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, in many cases those 3-year periods have expired, because every enlistment was extended for the duration of the war. So I imagine most of them, if there had not been a war, would have gone out of the Army and would have been entitled to do so, but, because their enlistments were extended by law to the end of the war, they are still in the Army.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As to those, they would have the right to reenlist.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. If any member of the Regular Army reenlisted just prior to World War II, his term of enlistment would have expired sometime during the war, and if there are any Regulars still in the military service, they are now in the Army of the United States, and are not Regulars. In fact, all those in the Army now are in the Army of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield on that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I feel that the Senator from South Dakota is mistaken in his statement, because we have today special legislation dealing with enlistments in the Regular Army. Last June we passed a law opening up the Regular Army to enlistments for 3 years. As I understand it, the Regular Army is recognized as a very different thing from the Army of the United States. That is so today, in wartime, and at other times. The statutes speak of the Regular Army and the statutes speak of the Army of the United States. There are men who have been in the Regular Army and whose period of enlistment has expired during this war, and they automatically go into the Army of the United States for service for the duration of war and 6 months thereafter just as those who have been drafted. Of course, those men would be entitled to enlistment, under the bill, but it would seem that one in the Regular Army is not entitled, during the term of his enlistment, to cancel his enlistment and enlist under the proposed law, because the bill applies solely—and the language is clear—to those in the Army of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I ask one other question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us assume that there would be a spurt of reenlistments, so that next May, we will say, the reenlistments would result in a larger Army than we might need for occupation, and for the supply of the occupation armies. It takes many men to supply an army of 200,000, or 400,000, or 900,000. So the size of the Army would not be limited to the troops occupying Japan or Germany. Therefore, under a spurt of reenlistments for a year, we would get all the men we needed. Then, acting in that situation, suppose we should repeal the draft, or allow it to expire. When this year's enlistments had expired, the Army would still need more men, as we are told that the occupation will continue for years. General MacArthur in a statement appearing in the newspapers of this morning, attempting to correct what seemed to be some confusion on the subject, said we would have to occupy Japan for years, and it has been generally expected that we would have the same problem in Germany.

At the end of 1 year, if there are not enough enlistments or reenlistments to create an Army sufficiently large for the occupation forces—and we are acting already under the impulse of a 1-year enlistment—if we repeal the draft, or allow it to expire, where will that leave us in the future so far as the men we must have in the armies of occupation are concerned?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall yield after I answer the question of the Senator from Kentucky.

I do not know how we are going to cross the bridge the Senator has in mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that, but it makes me hesitate to tear down the bridge we already have so that we may have to build another one when we come to another stream. That is one thing that is troubling me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The difference between 1 year and 18 months, which is the subject of the present discussion, is not a sufficient difference to resolve the question which the Senator has asked.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may go to the wisdom of the whole bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to say, in connection with the observation of the Senator from South Dakota, that I am informed by our legislative experts that the Senator from South Dakota is correct in his statement that anyone in the Regular Army would be eligible to enlist for 1 year, and thereby receive his discharge.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad the Senator has answered in that way, because I am sure that every man now in the Army is in the Army of the United States. No Regulars are in the Army now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Regulars are a component part of the Army of the United States.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The same as the National Guard.

Mr. GURNEY. The law provides that the Army of the United States shall consist of the Regular Army, the National Guard of the United States, the Reserve Corps, and so forth.

I wish to call the attention of Senators to the fact that voluntary enlistments have not been allowed during the war, since Congress enacted the selective-service law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is by regulation, not by law.

Mr. GURNEY. Oh, no; the law provided that any man who wanted to volunteer his services should do so through the local selective-service board, and be assigned to the Army or the Navy. He could not pick his place. He was sent where he was most needed in time of war. He could not volunteer for the Army or the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator will recall, however, that the Navy accepted enlistments for a long time, until they were finally stopped by regulations of the Selective Service.

Mr. GURNEY. That is the time when we stopped any voluntary enlistments, and the Navy did continue, even after that, to accept 17-year-old volunteers.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. In connection with the pending legislative proposal, as a member of the committee I wish to say that it is my personal opinion that we are rushing through legislation which has not been considered as much as it should have been. We are doing it in the hope that we might aid in speeding the discharge of the men who fought so valiantly and deserve to be discharged so that they may return to their homes as they desire. The Army has not to date properly discharged those who deserve justice.

For the permanent RECORD, Mr. President, I wish to read from the report of the committee what the War Department stated in connection with the shortening of the time of voluntary services. With the permission of the Senator from Colorado, I should like to read a paragraph from the statement made by the committee:

> The War Department has advised your committee that commencing in August 1946 there will be 70,000 members of the Army who will complete 2 years of service each month. Under the proposed 2 years' service plan all of those veterans should be considered earmarked for release from the Army at that time. All 1-year enlistments obtained during the next few months would begin to expire in and after September 1946, at the exact times when large numbers of replacements for veterans who have performed 2 years of service will be required. Accordingly, 1-year enlistments would result in prolonging the return to civil life of many veterans beyond the time when they should be released from the service.

Mr. President, I wanted that to appear in the RECORD for the reason that it is my opinion that within the next 6 months we will be writing another bill providing for some form of volunteer Army. As the distinguished Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] stated yesterday, this bill furnishes no great inducement for older men, for married men, for more mature men to join the Army. It is a bill based on the Selective Service Act, which gives GI rights, and so on, to

young men 18 years of age who might join the Army for a year or 2 years, and receive all the advantages now available to those who have been through the thick of battle with respect to loans, college education, as well as other advantages.

I merely wanted to express that opinion, Mr. President, because, while I shall vote for the measure, I shall do so most reluctantly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the question raised by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], of course, goes to the fundamentals of the bill and, as I see it, can only be cured in one way. Whether the enlistment is for 18 months or for 1 year is entirely beside the point. If there were in the bill a provision for enlistment only of men who have been honorably discharged from the Army, of course the difficulty he speaks of would be entirely cured. I do not think there is much difference between 18 months and 1 year so far as the fundamentals of the bill are concerned. But if we want to cure the difficulty the Senator from Kentucky has raised, all we need to do is to require that a man eligible for enlistment shall have received an honorable discharge from the Army. If that were done, all the question with respect to dangers he suggests would be entirely met.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it is quite obvious from the statement just made by the Senator from Colorado that his mind was not quite fully made up that the committee amendment is the correct one. Certainly if his mind is not made up, then the minds of the other Members of the Senate are in confusion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not think that is quite a fair statement. In answer to the question of the Senator from Kentucky I presented a way to obviate the dangers he suggested. Does the Senator from South Dakota think there is any great fundamental difference between 18 months and 1 year?

Mr. GURNEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator thinks there is all the difference in the world.

Mr. GURNEY. I think it is a very important difference. So does the War Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator from South Dakota think that the 18-months' provision entirely covers the question which was raised by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. GURNEY. It would help extremely.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is the Senator's opinion. In my opinion it would not help at all.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question. Does the present plan contemplate that the army of occupation shall always consist only of American soldiers, or is it contemplated that at some time members of the Army of Holland, a country which has been much interested in the Pacific area, as well as men from Australia and New Zealand shall be a part of the army of occupation, or that the army of occupation shall contain soldiers from others of the thirty-odd Allied countries who were associated in the war? That question comes to me daily.

Mr. GURNEY. I cannot answer that question, but I can say to the Senator that, as he knows, there are in the occupation forces in Germany soldiers from quite a number of the Allied countries. Without doubt there are some British troops in Japan. I do not know what the percentage is. I expect the army of occupation in Japan consists of almost 99.9 percent American soldiers.

Mr. YOUNG. It seems to me that the number of soldiers we are to provide in the army of occupation for years to come would have some relation to the pending bill. If we are always to furnish the soldiers for the army of occupation we will of course be obliged to have a larger Army. Soldiers of the other Allied Nations should form a part of the army of occupation.

Mr. GURNEY. It is predicted that we will not obtain more than 300,000 or 400,000 men under the volunteer system. We know that now we must keep 400,000 men in Germany, and after some time two or three hundred thousand men in Japan. So, it seems to me, the question whether other Allied countries will furnish occupation troops is not germane to the pending bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am much interested in the questions the Senator has raised. I wonder whether at any time during the committee investigation the Department was asked for its opinion, or for its policy with respect to the question of occupation forces in Japan, particularly occupation by the Chinese.

Mr. GURNEY. I can answer the Senator by saying that when the committee considered the bill it did not ask the War Department from which country the occupation forces should come or what the occupation forces should be, for the good and sufficient reason that we knew we would need for other purposes as many volunteers as we could secure under this bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understand it may not be relevant in connection with the pending bill, but I wonder whether the committee has made inquiry on that point.

Mr. GURNEY. I should rather have the chairman of the committee answer that question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to inquire then of the Senator, to whom we look for military guidance, whether or not he has formed any views on that question.

Mr. GURNEY. I hope the Senator from Maine is serious when he says he looks to me for military guidance, because I am sure that the committee amendment should be adopted.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have not indicated any doubt on that, because I have usually voted with the Senator from South Dakota on all issues of this character, but I think it is a matter of great significance to the American people in connection with the matters which seem so vitally to concern us.

Mr. GURNEY. I may suggest to the Senator from Maine that probably this is not entirely a matter for consideration by the Military Affairs Committee. Consideration of it should probably be initiated in the Foreign Relations Committee in connection with our relationships with other countries.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator, then, go so far, in view of his military experience and background, as to give us any opinion as to whether he is in doubt as to the competency of properly trained Chinese troops to participate in the occupation of Japan?

Mr. GURNEY. I shall plead entire ignorance as to the competency of that army.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am not asking the Senator that. I asked him whether he has any doubt as to the competency of properly trained Chinese troops to participate.

Mr. GURNEY. It would be a fine thing if they could be utilized to perform whatever duties the Security Council might request. It would relieve us of an obligation which is becoming increasingly heavy.

Mr. BREWSTER. And the Senator would feel the same way as to the possibility of a division of Philippine troops?

Mr. GURNEY. Of Philippine troops and Dutch troops.

Mr. BREWSTER. And Koreans, possibly?

Mr. GURNEY. If they were properly trained.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, one final word respecting the committee amendment, which I hope will be adopted. The amendment was recommended after thorough consideration. Let me say that the amendment was recommended by the War Department, which has functioned so efficiently toward the accomplishment of two great and widely separated victories. They have kept faith with us. They have done a fine job. They are keeping faith in the demobilization program. They are demobilizing men rapidly. Twenty-four thousand men were discharged as of last Friday. So I think the Senate can well approve the recommendation of the War Department as to this amendment.

There is confusion in the minds of those who have studied the bill. There are differences of opinion. The best way to resolve those differences is to adopt the committee amendment and let it go to conference. There the problem can be handled as it should be. Should the committee amendment, providing for a period of service of 18 months, be agreed to, it would then go to conference. I should also like to see taken to conference the original amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] providing for a period of 1 year for original enlistments, on page 2 of the bill as it is printed. Let us take both those ideas to conference, where they can be properly resolved for the best interests of the country, so that we may be sure of clinching the security which the high-point men have obtained for us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 14. On

this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. CAPEHART'S name was called). I am asked to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] on public business. I am not authorized to state how he would vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in a committee meeting.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—16

Bailey	Gurney	Maybank
Ball	Hart	Overton
Barkley	Hatch	Reed
Downey	Hayden	Vandenberg
George	Knowland	
Guffey	McKellar	

NAYS—63

Aiken	Green	Myers
Andrews	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Taylor
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Carville	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McMahon	Wagner
Connally	Magnuson	Walsh
Cordon	Mead	Wheeler
Donnell	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Ferguson	Morse	Willis
Fulbright	Murdock	Wilson
Gerry	Murray	Young

NOT VOTING—17

Austin	Glass	Russell
Briggs	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	Mitchell	Thomas, Idaho
Capehart	O'Daniel	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Eastland	Pepper	

So the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in connection with the question propounded by the Senator from Kentucky, he brought out something which is very important to this bill. In order to avoid confusion and contradiction, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, in line 15, before the period, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "Unless at the time of such application he is serving under an enlistment contracted after June 1, 1945, which will not expire within 1 year from the time of such application."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the reason for offering the amendment is obvious. It should be adopted if we are to avoid a contradiction. Senators will notice that on page 2, in line 4, the paragraph commences with the following language:

That notwithstanding the limitations contained in any other provision of law, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to accept original enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of 2 or 3 years, at the option of the person so enlisted, from among qualified male persons not less than 17 years of age, including persons in active service in the Army of the United States or any component thereof.

Under the language of the bill as it came from the House of Representatives and as the bill now reads, even with the amendment on which the Senate just voted, any person who might have enlisted for 3 years since July 1 could now reenlist for 1 year and could thus cancel his 3-year enlistment.

I wish to read a paragraph from page 5 of the report of the Committee on Military Affairs:

The act of June 1, 1945 (Public Law 72, 79th Cong.), authorizes the Secretary of War, during the existence of the present war, to accept not to exceed 280,000 enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army from male persons who are honorably serving in the Army of the United States or who were honorably discharged therefrom not more than 90 days preceding the date of such enlistment or reenlistment. The act provides that the term of service of persons enlisted or reenlisted thereunder shall be for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter or for 3 years, whichever is the longer period.

Under the language of the bill, of course, there would be no such thing as a 3-year enlistment if the man so enlisting decided that he would prefer to take advantage of the provision in the bill under which he could enlist for 1 year. So in order to protect 3-year enlistments, adoption of the amendment which I have offered is a necessity, as I see it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB obtained the floor.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I must leave the chamber, and before leaving I should like to request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an analysis of the provisions of the bill which affect the Navy. The analysis shows the benefits presently received by those in the Navy and the changes which would be made by the pending bill. It will be very helpful to have in a condensed form this analysis of the changes and benefits printed in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to have that done.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 5: Authorizes the enlistment or reenlistment in such grades or ratings as may be prescribed by the Secretaries of War and Navy, respectively.

The Navy already had this provision but it is necessary to reenact it here in order that there would be no question of the Navy being authorized to continue present practice.

Section 6: This section provides for a travel allowance of 5 cents per mile for enlisted men who reenlist upon discharge or upon enlisting in the Regular Navy from the Naval Reserve to cover the cost of travel when granted a reenlistment furlough or leave, and subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War or Navy. The travel allowance may be either to and from their home or to such other place as the man may select. If sea travel is involved the man would be furnished the transportation in kind and subsistence en route.

Present law provides a travel allowance only on reenlistment or upon expiration of enlistment of 5 cents per mile only to the man's place of enlistment. The travel allowance provided in this section does not duplicate the allowance now provided by law but extends the allowance both to and from his home.

If a man has good reason, such as if his family were residing somewhere else other than his official residence, the Secretary of the Navy, under appropriate regulations, could permit the travel to and from the location of his family rather than insist that it be computed only to his official residence.

Section 7: This authorizes payment of mustering-out pay under the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to enlisted men and officers not above captain in the Army or lieutenant in the Navy who are discharged from their Reserve status for the purpose of being reenlisted or appointed in the Regular Naval or Military Establishment.

The present Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 authorizes this pay only when discharged or released to inactive duty. It is not a new provision but merely extends the Mustering-Out Payment Act.

Section 8: This section authorizes the reenlistment allowance to be based upon the highest enlisted grade held at the time of reenlistment with regard to the Navy or at the time of discharge or release from active duty in the Army of the United States for the purpose of enlistment in the Regular Army. It permits, including all continuous active Federal service (Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard), whether in enlisted grades or in commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant officers' grades in computing, the number of years' service for the pupose of reenlistment allowances.

Navy temporary promotion law now permits enlisted personnel who are serving temporarily in higher commissioned grades to count such commissioned service for purpose of reenlistment allowance if they revert to enlisted status. Navy is included in this section to insure that it can be so allowed.

Under the law an enlistment allowance of $50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which last discharged, is paid to every honorably

discharged man of the three highest pay grades upon reenlistment, and an allowance of $25 is paid to men in the four lower grades under the same conditions.

Section 9: This section permits enlisted men of the first three pay grades (chief petty officers, petty officers first class, petty officers second class) in the Navy to elect to receive either the money allowance for quarters for dependents provided in the Pay Act of 1942 or the family allowance provided by the Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended. It would continue the provisions of existing law providing that the payment of monetary allowances may be paid only for such dependents as the enlisted man has made an allotment of pay not less than the amount of such monetary allowances for the support of the dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

Existing law provides that a man has only one chance to determine whether to accept a money allowance in lieu of quarters or to elect to receive the allowance under the Family Allowance Act. Conditions have changed in many instances, such as, a man having had several additional children born during the war or having been promoted to a higher rating. Where this has happened and the man elected to receive the money allowance in lieu of quarters he receives less than if he had elected payment under the family allowance provision.

Section 10: This section continues sending first class letter mail free of postage by any person in the armed forces until December 31, 1947.

Section 11: This section makes the GI bill of rights (Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944) providing for education, loans, and certain unemployment benefits which are now only authorized to personnel who are discharged or released to inactive duty payable to personnel who transfer from the Reserve to the Regular Establishment. The GI bill of rights is made applicable only during a man's first period of enlistment or reenlistment, after which he will, if he remains in the service, not be entitled to these provisions.

Section 12: This section makes the provision of 10 percent increase in pay for officers and 20 percent increase in pay for enlisted men and warrant officers for service at sea and foreign service permanent legislation. Under present law this sea and foreign service pay would terminate 12 months after the termination of the present war.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, by the pending bill there will be set up for the first time what is to be known as the Army Reserve. The pending legislation attempts to make the Army Reserve comparable and similar to what has existed for some time in the Navy, namely, the Fleet Reserve. The benefits mentioned in the pending bill for the Army Reserve are at variance in some respects with those now enjoyed by the members of the Navy's Fleet Reserve. I simply wish to say that later, as I do not want to interfere with the passage of the pending bill, a separate bill will be offered by me, and in it provision will be made to make the benefits and pay to be received by those serving in the Fleet Reserve similar to those to be received by members of the Army Reserve.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 7, after the words "in the Regular Army for periods of", insert the following: for periods of", it is proposed to insert the following: "eighteen months or."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, provision now is made for enlistments open to everyone for periods of 2 or 3 years. The amendment I have offered would add provision for enlistment for a term of 18 months. If the amendment is agreed to, the bill will then read, at that point, "for periods of eighteen months or two or three years."

Originally I desired that the language "one year" be placed at that point in the bill. But this morning the able senior Senator from Colorado who is handling the bill for the committee stated that if I would modify my amendment so as to make it read "eighteen months", instead of "one year", it would be acceptable from his viewpoint. That I have done.

So, Mr. President, if the amendment I have now offered is agreed to, enlistments may be made for 18 months or 2 years or 3 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, let me say that I shall be glad to take to conference the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

The Secretary of War, with the approval of the Philippine Legislature, is hereby authorized to enlist in the Philippine Scouts, with pay and allowances authorized under existing law, 50,000 men for service in the occupation of Japan. Such enlistments shall be for 3 years and citizens of the Philippine Islands shall be eligible to volunteer for such service.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we all are aware of how the Japanese ravaged the Philippine Islands. Any Senator who has visited the Philippine Islands will remember what a magnificent body of troops the Philippine Scouts were. I saw them when I visited Manila, and many other Senators have seen them. They were a fine, well disciplined body. The way they fought at Bataan was perfectly heroic.

So we have had an organization in the Philippine Islands for the past 40 years with a tradition of good discipline, valor, and all other commendable military attributes.

It occurred to me that the Philippine people would be happy to participate in the occupation of Japan, and that the Philippine Scouts would be exactly the type of military organization to use for that purpose.

I consulted the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. McCloy, who indicated that he thought the basic idea was entirely sound. I consulted General Marshall about it this morning. The original draft that I had prepared contained more words. General Marshall suggested that if the amendment were streamlined so as to state the basic proposition, its adoption by the Senate would be highly desirable.

I am offering the amendment with the understanding that, when the bill goes to conference, if the War Department has any suggestions to make for a further perfectioning of the language, the conferees may consider it. I feel, however, that it is important that a proper authorization be incorporated in the bill for the enlistment of more men in the Philippine Scouts. The maximum strength of that military organization as now authorized by law is 12,000. The amendment would provide for an increase above that number of 50,000 to be used in the occupation of Japan.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I may state that we shall be glad to take the amendment to conference, and I hope that the Senate will agree to it. It seems to me to be a strengthening amendment and should be made a part of the bill.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HART. I ask the Senator from Arizona what will be the status of the Philippine Scouts in the event that the amendment is agreed to, and the Philippine Commonwealth becomes a full independent nation, as we expect it shall be. What effect would it have on the citizenship of the men who enlist?

Mr. HAYDEN. That situation is taken care of in the amendment by a provision which does not change the citizenship of those enlisted in the Philippine Scouts. The amendment states that:

The Secretary of War, with the approval of the Philippine Legislature, is hereby authorized to enlist in the Philippine Scouts with pay and allowances authorized under existing law, 50,000 men for service in the occupation of Japan. Such enlistments shall be for 3 years and citizens of the Philippine Islands shall be eligible to volunteer for such service.

The idea is that the enlistment period will extend beyond the 4th of July 1946 when the Filipinos will have full and complete independence. The Secretary of War, under my amendment, would be authorized to accept enlistments of citizens of the Philippine Islands in the Philippine Scouts for a period of 3 years. I have provided that the Philippine Government shall be consulted before any final action under the amendment is taken, because we know that the independence of the Philippine Islands is to take place next year.

Mr. HART. Does the Senator apprehend no difficulty whatever in connection with those men acquiring a wholly different citizenship?

Mr. HAYDEN. They will not acquire a wholly different citizenship. Each scout will remain a citizen of the Philippine Islands. The language of my amendment is:

The Secretary of War, with the approval of the Philippine Legislature, is hereby authorized to enlist in the Philippine Scouts, with pay and allowances authorized under

existing law, 50,000 men for service in the occupation of Japan. Such enlistments shall be for 3 years and citizens of the Philippine Islands shall be eligible to volunteer for such service.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona is to permit the Army to accept enlistments of Philippine citizens. Such action is to be taken as a part of our defense program.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. All the Senator from Arizona is proposing is that we may accept enlistments in the Philippine Scouts. He is at the same time taking cognizance of the fact that we have had them in our forces for many years. His amendment would permit enlistments in the Philippine Scouts which in turn would result in helping our forces in occupation work.

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is simply providing that we may make use of the instrumentality we have had as a part of our defense program for a great many years. Is that not true?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may propound a question to the distinguished Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Colorado restate what he said a few minutes ago? Is the amendment acceptable to the committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the troops to whom the Senator from Arizona has referred be supplementary to our own forces and help reduce the number of our own men that will be needed for occupational purposes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is my idea of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Obviously, if 200,000 men will be required for use in Japan, and if 50,000 of them can be supplied from the Philippine Islands, it will reduce the number of soldiers from America who might otherwise be required.

Mr. WHERRY. The proposal would result in a reduction of the number of our own men who would be required in Japan?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Arizona whether, in his opinion, any Filipino citizens enlisting under the provisions of his amendment would become entitled to all the rights to which American soldiers would be entitled?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, not at all. If foreigners are recruited for service in the American Army in time of war, after they enlist they are entitled to become naturalized citizens of the United States, but that is not true in this instance. The amendment provides that only citizens of the Philippine Islands may enlist in the Philippine Scouts. They must be citizens of the Philippine Islands in order to get into this service, and when they return to their homes they will still be citizens of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona would not affect the status of the Philippine Scouts or deprive them of anything to which they are entitled.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Alabama is correct. The existing authorization will be found in the United States Code, 1940, under title X, chapter 19.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Andrews	Hart	Overton
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Saltonstall
Brewster	Hoey	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Buck	Knowland	Taft
Burton	La Follette	Taylor
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Carville	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	McMahon	Walsh
Donnell	Magnuson	Wheeler
Downey	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Mead	White
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Mitchell	Willis
George	Moore	Wilson
Gerry	Morse	Young
Green	Murdock	
Guffey	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. WHERRY. May we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a new section, as follows:

The Secretary of War, with the approval of the Philippine Legislature, is hereby authorized to enlist in the Philippine Scouts, with pay and allowances authorized under existing law, 50,000 men for service in the occupation of Japan. Such enlistments shall be for 3 years and citizens of the Philippine Islands shall be eligible to volunteer for such service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment which is lying on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 14, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That any person enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Military or Naval Establishment within 20 days after discharge from such establishment shall be enlisted or reenlisted in a grade or rating at least as high as the highest grade or rating, permanent or temporary, held by him at the time of such discharge."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this amendment is offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and myself. It merely does for the Army of the United States what is done under existing law for the Regular Army.

I should like to read into the RECORD at this point from the regulations for the Regular Army. I read from the United States Code, Annotated, title 10, under the heading "Army," paragraph 630:

Rank and grade of noncommissioned officer on reenlistment: Any noncommissioned officer discharged with an excellent character shall be permitted, at the expiration of 3 years in the active service, to reenlist in the organization from which discharged with the rank and grade held by him at the time of his discharge if he reenlists within 20 days after the date of such discharge.

Mr. President, that provision was enacted on June 3, 1916. My amendment would make it possible for a corporal, for instance, to reenlist as a corporal, instead of reducing him to a buck private, or it would permit a sergeant to reenlist as a sergeant.

We know that at the present time, especially in the army of occupation, and in the Army trying to supply the men in the armed services, technicians are needed. Sergeants are technicians. It is important that they be permtited to reenlist as sergeants, and not be compelled to enlist as buck privates. That is the purpose of the provision which the Senator from Wisconsin and I have offered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, just a word or two in support of the amendment.

As the able Senator from Colorado has pointed out, this provision is taken from the existing law so far as it applies to the Regular Army. On that score it seems to me only fair that the same provision should be accorded those who reenlist in the Army of the United States.

In the second place, so far as a great majority of those persons who have obtained ratings are concerned, many of them have been trained at great expense to the taxpayer in special fields of activity, and it seems to me to be logical that every effort should be made to retain in the armed forces those men who have been trained in radar, electronics, and in special types of mechanical skill.

In the third place, it seems to me, as we look forward into the future, the more men with technical training we can induce to remain in the armed forces, the more modern and up to date will be the tendency of our military establishment.

Mr. President, I very much hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. MURDOCK in the chair]. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 14. Effective as of the first day of the first month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the base pay of any individual on active duty in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, and the base pay of any commissioned officer on active duty in the Public Health Service or the Goedetic Survey, shall be increased by $25 a month, which increase in pay shall be in addition to pay and allowances otherwise authorized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak rather briefly on the proposed amendment. I think, in order fully to understand the implications of the amendment, we ought to give some heed in this discussion to the great changes in the world order which the results of this war have produced. We should keep in mind the fact that we are not going to return to international conditions and relations as they existed prior to the war. We have taken upon ourselves, as one of the Allied Powers of the world, the great solemn obligation of devoting ourselves, in concert with other peace-loving nations, to seeing to it, to the extent that nations working cooperatively can see to it, that such a holocaust as the one we have just come through shall not be repeated.

I do not know of any greater obligation that could rest on the lawmakers of any generation than the obligation that rests on the Congress of the United States to see to it that we lend our efforts to molding a world system that preserves law and order in the world. That will require the exercise of police power by the cooperating nations if they are to see to it that the causes of war do not rise again in the world.

I agree with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and with other Senators who have expressed similar views on the floor of the Senate during this discussion, that the bill which is before us is at best a stopgap bill. We certainly are not passing today the armed forces bill in the form that I think it is going to have to be adopted in the very near future, when the people of this country fully awaken to their obligation in maintaining police forces the globe around. We should proceed at once to give careful consideration to the type of army and navy, its size and pay, and the nature of service required of its members. This bill only scratches the surface of the vital military issue which confronts us.

As I indicated in my remarks yesterday, I think the nature of our Army is going to change as we carry forth our joint obligation with the Allied Powers in preventing warlike nations from arising agan. Some strange things, I think, are happening in America today as far as public attitudes are concerned. We are a great people to engage in wishful thinking. We would like to go back into a dream of unreality. We would like to assume that we can conduct ourselves as a nation as we did prior to this war. But that is just physically impossible and it would be morally indefensible. Should we try that course, should we take the attitude that Germany and Japan should be allowed to go their way, or should we take the attitude that our allies of today in the score of years ahead should be free to follow whatever national program they wish to follow without any reference to the implications and effects of their program upon the peace of the world then surely we will lose the peace.

I say that either we are going to have to live in concert with other nations in implementing the great ideals of the Atlantic and the Pacific Charters, or we will sentence our grandchildren to doom.

In my judgment we cannot consider our international policies without considering the type of military force we are going to maintain in this country. I do not think we come onto the floor of the Senate and pick up such a bill as this and consider it in a vacuum. We must consider bills such as this one in connection with our entire international program.

Our very able Secretary of War last night, so the morning press stories state, very rightly pointed out to an audience, if the press reports are correct, that we cannot afford in this country to become militarily weak. I think if we are going the fulfill our obligations in preserving peace we must remain strong, we must remain so strong that when we sit down at the conference tables of the world other nations will know that we not only have the intention to live up to the ideals to which we have pledged ourselves, but that we have the determination to back up those ideals with necessary police force. In other words, I think our idealism is going to have to be very heavily charged with some stark realism. We have to recognize that this war has not changed human nature one iota, and that the forces and causes of war are only dormant today. They were not destroyed by this war. Every reliable source I have been able to go to in regard to the attitudes toward this country existing today in Europe, are exceedingly discouraging to me.

I do not believe that the lethargy that is overtaking American public opinion in regard to our relations with the rest of the world should be permitted long to endure. I think we as representatives of the people have an obligation to see to it that the channels of information as to the true state of facts as they exist in various parts of the globe concerning the attitude of other nations toward us, and the misunderstandings that are developing, be made available to the people of this country. Our people must be awakened from their dream that many of them are enjoying in these days that now that hostilities are over, the rest of the world can take care of itself, and we can go on our merry way of making profits. Surely we must look after the economic well-being of our people and I am supporting legislation to that end. However we must not center all of our attention as a people upon our economic well being because great principles of international morality are at stake today, and if we fail as a Christian Nation to live up to those principles our economic well-being will not save us from the hatred of the world. In the atmosphere of international hatreds lurks the danger of war.

I think that one of the best demonstrations we could give to other peoples of the great strength of democracy is to demonstrate to them that we can fulfill our military obligations under the San Francisco Charter by way of a volunteer army.

I happen to be one who feels that it is very essential that in the troublous days through which we are passing we should rededicate ourselves to those basic tenets of voluntarism which are to be found at the very roots of democratic and representative government.

I wish to join with those military leaders—and I believe there are many of them—who believe that every reasonable inducement should be given to the young men of this country to volunteer for a period of time in our armed forces. As I understand the report of the committee, the whole purpose of the bill is to hasten voluntary enlistments in our Army. I wish that we, as a Nation, could be able to show the world, certainly by July next, that democracy is so dynamic in America, that we believe so firmly in its principles of volunteerism that the compulsory features which have characterized the peacetime armies of Europe and Asia, in countries which have devoted themselves so frequently to the gods of war, are not necessary in America when she is called upon to perform her international obligations in helping to police the world.

It seems to me that the nature, function, and purpose of such a police army are different from those of the type of army to which we were accustomed prior to the war. I should like to see the armies of occupation become great demonstrators of the democratic way of life. I wish to see them composed of the finest cross-section of American manhood. I want the men in those armies to feel at all times that they are performing a great patriotic labor in behalf of democratic principles. I want them to feel that their Government recognizes the dignity of their service, just as I feel that the dignity of labor should be recognized in all fields.

I have talked with a great many returning Army officers and privates, and I have been surprised at the unanimity of opinion among them. They tell me, "If you really want a large volunteer army, then make it clear to the potential volunteers that you recognize the dignity of their service, and that you will give them fair economic advantages for service in the Army."

I submit, Mr. President, that the base rate of pay for the type of army which we ought to maintain in performing our international police obligations should be higher than is called for in this bill. I should be less than honest if I did not say quite frankly that I do not know what the exact amount should be. I agree with the sentiments expressed on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon, that the problems involved in fixing a pay structure for an organization as vast and complex as the Army and naval forces of this country are very complicated. Yet I believe it is important at

this time, as we pass what I think we are all compelled to admit is stop-gap legislation, that at least we recognize the principle for which I am pleading, namely, that we give to the men in our armed forces compensation more nearly commensurate with the importance of the service which they render. I believe that if the members of our armed forces today, and the volunteers of tomorrow, knew that we were willing at this time, as a temporary measure, at least, to recognize that something more should be added to their base pay, it would have a great effect for good so far as the morale of our forces is concerned. It would speed up the filling of the ranks of a voluntary army and also speed up demobilization. In my judgment the present pay is too low for the service which we expect from a peacetime army of this new era. I believe that a $25 increase would serve as a great inducement for early enlistments, and would enable us to reduce more rapidly than we are now doing the men in the conscripted army.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have not a copy of the Senator's amendment before me, but a moment ago I read the copy at the desk. I notice that the words used in describing the Army personnel are "personnel in the Army of the United States." I do not remember the words used in describing the personnel of the Navy.

I should like to remind the Senator from Oregon that there is a distinction between the United States Army and the Army of the United States, as I understand; and perhaps a comparable distinction exists in the terminology of the Navy and the other branches. My inquiry is this: Has the Senator considered the application of this terminology? Is it to apply only to the emergency army, or is it to apply to the Regular Army and the Regular Navy? I merely wish to clarify that point, because of the language used.

Mr. MORSE. I took the language from the existing laws. It is my intention that the $25-a-month increase shall be paid beginning on the first day of the month following the passage of the act, to every man in the uniform of the Army or Navy of the United States. Let me make clear to the Senator from Iowa that I do not mean that it shall be given only to the new enlistees, but that it shall be paid to the men now in the service, including those who were drafted as well as those who enlisted.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will further yield, I am raising this question only because of the potential danger of misinterpretation of the terminology of the amendment as applicable only to one group of members of the armed forces. I think it might be well to look into that particular terminology.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The language of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon would apply to the Army of the United States, and it would apply as well to the Regular Army. The Army of the United States is the over-all Army. The Regular Army is a component part of the Army of the United States; but under the language of the amendment it would apply both to the Regular Army and to the emergency Army.

Mr. MORSE. That is the desire and intention of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell me the amount which is being paid by other countries, for example, England, Russia, and China?

Mr. MORSE. It is considerably lower. I cannot give the exact amounts, but they are considerably lower than the amounts paid to members of the American armed forces.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator any idea of the comparative pay? Do we pay twice as much as any other country at the present time?

Mr. MORSE. I am sure that we pay twice as much as do some of the other countries, but I do not have the exact data before me.

However, my position is that, as between this country and other countries, differences in pay between countries is not at all material to the objective of the amendment. The objective of the amend- is to give to the members of our armed forces what we consider to be decent pay when compared to the compensation of other American public servants.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell me aproximately how much the increase of $25 a month would cost our Government annually?

Mr. MORSE. The answer can be arrived at by determining the size of the Army which our military authorities decide we must have in order to perform the job, and then multiplying that figure by $25. However, I do not know what the amount is because we do not know how large the Army will have to be. But I take the position that, however large the Army is, we should be willing to give to our men in uniform who are performing great service for their country economic remuneration at least commensurate with those of Federal employees of similar classification doing civilian work.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator believe that the increase should be more than $25, if that is true?

Mr. MORSE. I said at the beginning of my remarks that I am sure the $25 amount is not an adequate one, and I offer it now only as a stopgap amount to demonstrate to those in the armed services that we desire to keep faith with them and that we desire to give them at least reasonable compensation for the services they are performing for us.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say that at one time after the war broke out I offered a bill to make the pay $100 a month. The only Senator who voted with me for the bill was Senator Clark, of Missouri. I still think our private soldiers should receive more pay. I should like to have some information regarding a comparison between the pay our soldiers receive and the pay received by the soldiers in the armies of other nations.

Mr. MORSE. I wish I could give the Senator that information, but I do not consider it relevant to the merits of my amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether he can tell us how the pay received by the men in our Army compares with that presently received by the members of the armies of other nations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, Mr. President, the Army of the United States receives the highest pay of any army in the world at the present time.

If the Senator from Oregon will further yield at this time——

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to say that the Committee on Military Affairs did not consider this provision or any other provision along the line of increased pay. I notice that the amendment would apply to admirals, generals, and all persons in the armed forces; it is not confined merely to enlisted men or to men who might volunteer. It would apply to everyone in the Army and in the Navy.

Of course, Mr. President, there is nothing quite so complicated as military pay. The committees in Congress spent 8 months in consideration of the Adjusted Pay Act, and they held hearings and made detailed studies of the military pay before it was possible to work out a bill on the subject.

I should like to say to the Senator that if he will introduce a bill on Army pay, the Committee on Military Affairs will hold hearings on it and will work out the matter to some sort of conclusion. I noticed that the Senator from Oregon himself stated a moment ago that he did not know the exact amount which should be offered to the men in the military service. That only illustrates what I am trying to say, namely, that the subject is a very complicated one and it can hardly be dealt with properly by an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate. The matter should be considered by the Committee on Military Affairs. Long hearings should be held. Every viewpoint should be considered. Then if the Congress decides to increase the pay, naturally it should be done.

But to bring in an amendment now, when we do not have any Budget estimates of the total cost, certainly is not the proper way to go about the task.

Another point which comes to my mind is this: What will the veterans think—those who fought and won this war, who served in the fox holes all over the world, and who put up the hard fight which was necessary—if now, at the end of the war, we increase the pay of the whole Army? It seems to me that the only fair way it could be done would be to make the increased pay retroactive from the very beginning of the war. Of course, if that were done, we would need to have some

Budget estimates, because the amount would run into a huge total sum.

At any rate, Mr. President, I must say that our committee has not considered this amendment at all. I cannot speak for the committee; I suppose some members of the committee may favor the amendment and others may oppose it. At any rate, the committee has not acted upon this matter, and has not had anything of the kind under consideration in the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In connection with what the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado has said, I should like to ask the Senator to permit me to make an explanation for a moment, in view of the fact that the Senator from Colorado is in charge of the bill. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], unfortunately, is not here.

Some months ago I introduced a bill providing for an increase of $50 a month in the pay of those in the armed forces. The bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The committee has not held hearings on the bill. If the distinguished chairman of the committee were now present, I would discuss it with him. He requested that until the entire matter of the pay of the members of the armed forces can be worked out, together with the matter of the various payments or allowances for the families of soldiers and sailors and the soldiers' and sailors' relief bill, action on the bill I introduced be delayed.

I simply wish to make that statement because the Senator from Colorado suggested that there had been no hearings or consideration or discussion of the matter. That is eminently correct. Nevertheless, my bill requesting a $50 straight raise certainly would be considered by the committee for those who fought in the war and desire to reenlist, provided, of course, the various allowances, and the GI bill, and so forth, are considered in that connection. My bill, of course, was not in connection with this bill, but it concerned those in the service.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have high regard for the good judgment of the Senator from Colorado, but I am forced to disagree with him when he says that if we now raise the pay of volunteers we should make the increase retroactive, so as to have it apply to those who suffered in the fox holes during the war.

My attitude on this matter is that in wartime, when men are going to be shot at and when they have to risk their lives, such service is a patriotic duty which should be assumed by every one of us, and money is not the prime consideration. We cannot pay a man enough to compensate him for losing his life. I feel that in peacetime, service in the Army should be considered as an occupation, as a job. We pay enough money to get men to work in the State Department and in the other departments of Government, and I feel that in peacetime we should pay enough money to get the necessary men to serve in our armed forces.

I am not familiar with the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. I hope it will be read again so that I shall be able to understand it more thoroughly. But regardless of whether I vote for the amendment, I simply wish to express my views on the matter of increasing the pay of the members of our peacetime Army to such an extent that we can obtain, by voluntary methods, the needed men.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Oregon that one of the points made by the Senator from Colorado, I believe, is of such weight that we should not act on the pending amendment until thorough consideration has been given to it by the committee and until all information in connection with it is assembled. I make the suggestion to the Senator from Oregon for the following principal reason: During the war we increased the pay of the men in the enlisted service to a point where it was far beyond that received by the soldiers or sailors of any other country in the world. Perhaps it was not high enough, but certainly we have no greater need for soldiers than we had during the conduct of the war. We not only had need for them then because our national security was in question, but we required them to face the risk of possible death—and many of them have actually died—or of wounds or other disabilities. The war is over and we are now facing an increase in the pay of the enlisted personnel of the Army and the Navy at a time when many soldiers have already been discharged with wounds and disabilities of one kind and another which they contracted while in service. During that time those men received a very low rate of pay. If we are to agree to this proposal—and it may be wise to do so—it should be done only after there has been full and ample consideration of the entire problem involved.

Without taking issue with the Senator's point of view, or saying that it is not correct, because it may be a correct point of view, I do not believe we are well advised to consider the amendment, with all its ramifications and background, until a committee of the Senate has had an opportunity to assemble all of the pertinent information connected with it, and ascertain whether the proposal can be amply sustained by the facts in the case.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before we get too far away from the points which were made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], I should like to answer them, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. I merely wish to comment on the statement of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I certainly would be the first to admit, in view of such study as I have made of Army pay structures, that they are very complicated indeed. That is why I do not come here today, following our discussion yesterday afternoon, with a bill providing for what the future Army pay schedules should be.

I understand that the purpose of the pending bill is to induce enlistments so that we may obtain a voluntary Army to supplant the drafted Army which we now have.

I think this proposal represents an expression on the part of the Members of Congress of the United States to the men now in service, and those who are in foreign occupied countries who would like to return home and take advantage of some of the economic facilities afforded to citizens of this country, of our recognition that they have at least a moral case for more pay. Call this increase a token payment if you want to, it is an earnest payment showing our intention to make a fair and just contract with our servicemen. It would serve, I predict, as a great morale builder and an inducement for enlistments. I am confident that our veterans both in and out of the Army of this war would endorse it overwhelmingly if we gave them the chance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill is not confined entirely to a voluntary Army.

Mr. MORSE. I recognize that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. At the present time we have in the military forces more than a million commissioned officers. As I understand it, the bill would apply also to them.

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, it should.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Those men will not volunteer. They are already in the Army.

Mr. MORSE. In fairness to the men who are already in the Army, I think that so long as the amount of money asked for will not result in excessive payments, we should make the rate uniform. That is why I propose a uniform increase of $25. If we add $25 to the pay of every man in uniform, in my judgment we still will not reach the pay rate which we should eventually reach when we come forward with a well-worked-out pay bill.

The suggestion has been made that we should not provide for this peacetime increase because of the effect it might have on veterans who have gone through the war and are now being demobilized after having endured various degrees of suffering. Allow me to say to the Senator that he will always have a cooperative partner in me in seeing that the Congress passes legislation doing economic justice to the men who have been and are to be demobilized. I do not think we have done economic justice to them in any GI bill which has been passed up to the present time.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand the proposal the men who enlist during peacetime are to receive all the benefits which men received who served during the war as active members of our armed forces. In other words, if a new man who did not have any part in the war enters the service now, he will not only receive

the higher rate of pay, but he will also obtain his right to an education and to borrow money and go into business, as well as many other advantages which we have given to the veterans of the past war as a recognition of, and a sort of adjustment, it may be called, to the hardships which they endured. Having given all those advantages to peacetime soldiers seems to me all the more reason why this matter should be considered in the committee before we vote upon it here in the Chamber. We obviously do not have the entire picture of what the peacetime soldiers will receive in the way of benefits which were originally intended for those who were in service during only the duration of the war.

Mr. MORSE. I think that I have already shown that I do not agree with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The distinguished Senator from Oregon has stated that this proposal would be a morale builder for a peacetime Army. I should like to say that if we are considering morale building we must consider the very substantial number of men who are leaving the armed forces. It seems to me that the proposal might act more as a deterrent to morale building than as a stimulant.

He also said that the proposal would act as a stopgap. With that I agree. As one who sat in the hearings of the Naval Affairs Committee, I know that the officials of the Navy feel that the eight separate inducements provided for in this bill, amounting to $500 in cash on reenlistment of a senior warrant officer, plus benefits to follow after enlistment, are sufficient to build the Navy with volunteers or at least will go a long way toward that end.

I agree with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that this is a stopgap measure. It is proposed to adopt it at a time when the whole emphasis is being placed on getting men out of the Army. This feeling is strong in our minds today, so we should make haste slowly in considering such an increase as this proposed.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for giving me an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to have the contribution of the Senator to the discussion, but I disagree with his premises and conclusions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the proposal of the Senator from Oregon—he may correct me if I am wrong—is to expedite the discharge of men from the service, and he feels that such expedition will be furthered by increasing the pay of men under the voluntary system.

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly the point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If this bill is agreed to, and if, for example, the report comes back to us that instead of being able to obtain 200,000 men, or 300,000 men we obtain only 100,000 men, then the Senate will, of course, be faced with a problem of continuing the induction system in order to make up the difference. If we do not obtain replacements for the purpose of sending overseas, we will be continuing on a long-term basis men who are now overseas. In that, there is no equity.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from California for the excellent reenforcement of my point of view. He has expressed it much better than I have expressed it. I think that if we are going to build up a voluntary army—and I believe it is essential that we build one—we will have to furnish a financial inducement that will encourage men to enlist. I think that as we adopt the type of inducement which I suggest here today we will hasten the demobilization of men who are now serving in the Army.

Mr. President, I have expressed my point of view, and I would appreciate it very much if the Senate would extend to me the courtesy of a yea-and-nay vote. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, any suggestion from the distinguished Senator from Oregon always commands my sympathy and consideration. Of course, the amendment offered by the Senator contains certain very persuasive features. But, like the distinguished acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], I feel that the Senate should not act on this proposal at this time.

The pay of the Army is a very complicated matter. The Members of the Senate who have served on committees dealing with pay bills know that it has taken time and effort to work out pay schedules so as to make them equitable and scientific.

In the matter of pay, we cannot consider merely the base pay, to which the amendment is directed. The amendment provides for an increase of $25 a month in the base pay of every one in the armed forces. It does not stop there; it even takes in the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service. This is the first time I have ever known of any proposal to deal with pay in the Coast and Geodetic Survey and pay in the Public Health Service along with pay of the armed forces. There never has been any connection between the pay in the Coast and Geodetic Survey and in the Public Health Service, and pay of members of the armed forces.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Alabama will find that, so far as officers assigned to those services are concerned, the legislation has always been uniform with the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. It does not affect any in those services other than those in the armed services of the country.

Mr. HILL. As I was saying, we cannot consider merely the question of base pay. We start out, of course, with base pay. The base pay of a private, we know, is the pay of the seventh grade, which is $50. Then, when a soldier steps up to the next grade, he receives $54. When he becomes a corporal he receives $66, when he is made a sergeant he gets $78, as a staff sergeant he receives $90, as technical sergeant, $114, as a master sergeant or first sergeant, $138. That is base pay. Incidentally, the private automatically steps up into the next grade, with a $4 a month increase, after he has been in the Army 6 months.

But the base pay is not all. There is the provision for longevity pay, which must be considered. There is the 20 percent additional pay, computed on the base pay, while a man is serving outside continental United States or in Alaska. There is the extra pay which goes to the specialist. The flier in the Air Corps draws 50 percent additional pay, computed on base pay of his current grade, while flying. The parachutist does not receive 50 percent extra, but he gets a flat $50 a month in addition to his base pay. The glider man receives 50 percent additional pay. Then there is the combat and the expert infantryman, who receives $10 a month extra pay so long as he is a combat infantryman. He gets $5 a month extra pay if he is an expert infantryman. The Medical Corps man receives $10 a month additional. Then, of course, men who receive decorations get so much extra pay for each decoration.

In addition to the pay, there are certain allowances. For instance, there is the enlistment allowance, which is computed at $50 for each year of prior continuous service. In other words, if a man reenlists after serving 1 year, he gets a $50 reenlistment allowance for that 1 year. If he served 3 years, he would get $150 when he went back.

There is also mustering out pay, which is $100 for service of less than 60 days, $200 for service of more than 60 days, and then increases up to $300. A man who has been in the Army for 3 years, when he reenlists, gets $150 for his reenlistment allowance, and he would get also $300 mustering out pay. In other words, he would get at that one fell swoop, $450.

Then there are certain allowances for furlough travel and subsistence allowance. At the present time, as we know, under the servicemen's relief law, there is an allowance for dependents. I understand the distinguished Senator from Oregon is to offer an amendment to make sure that, even when the war is over, and the 6 months' period has elapsed, these allowances which have been worked out may be continued. There are also certain retirement benefits.

Then, of course, as has been brought out, a man enlisting today has all the benefits under the GI bill of rights, including, I take it, not only the benefits now existing, but those under any amendment Congress may see fit to adopt liberalizing the law. The man enlisting would be the beneficiary of existing provisions, and any additional benefits which may be provided.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not true, so far as that is concerned, that that is part of the bill as reported from the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon has nothing to do with that phase of it. If there is

anything wrong with the matter of extending benefits, which is the point raised by the Senator on the record, that is the fault of the bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HILL. The bill merely provides that the benefits which members of the Army now enjoy under the existing GI law shall be enjoyed by men enlisted under the pending bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that.

Mr. HILL. The pending bill does not attempt to amend or change the existing benefits under the GI law.

I may say to the Senator that the legislation called the GI bill of rights came out of the Senate Committee on Finance, which has jurisdiction over legislation of that kind. It would hardly have been incumbent on the committee, I might even say hardly proper, for the Committee on Military Affairs to go into the GI bill of rights in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a little earlier the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], as I recall, pointed out that if some of the amendments which had been proposed were adopted they could be taken to conference, and there certain refinements could be made in them if necessary, based on recommendations made by the War Department, or on what later facts might be developed. The fact remains that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon is adopted the bill will go to conference, and if there are some adjustments necessary to be made to work out the problems it may involve they can also be taken care of by the conference committee. If the Senate is in favor of some increase, the amendment will give the conference committee that much to work on.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from California that I do not know whether the bill will go to conference. Of course, the bill can go to conference. The only amendment that has been placed in the bill so far which might cause disagreement on the part of the House is the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] dealing with enlistment of some 50,000 Filipino Scouts to perform occupational duty in Japan. I can well imagine, however, that the House might agree to that amendment without even sending the bill to conference.

Mr. President, I wish to say, however, that I do not think that the subject matter of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon should be worked out in conference. I think it is a matter which should be worked out by the legislative committee, the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, after hearings and after a full consideration of the whole question of Army pay and benefits. As we know, conference committees do not ordinarily hold hearings. They do not have opportunity for hearings. They are not supposed to go into extensive consideration of questions of this kind. I think this matter ought to be worked out by the legislative committee, which, as I said, is the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

I may say to the Senator, as one member of that committee, that I think the committee ought to consider this question, and ought to do so without delay. No doubt changes should be made in the pay structure. I have had the opportunity of serving on military committees both in the House and Senate, when matters of pay were being considered, and, as I have stated, they are complicated matters. They are matters on which much testimony is needed, and the expression of opinion by many individuals, so that the pay schedules can be worked out on a fair and equitable basis, which will do justice to everyone, and achieve the result sought to be attained.

Mr. President, I do not think the Senate should adopt the amendment now without consideration being given to it by the Committee on Military Affairs or any other committee, and without any hearings having been held on it. I do not think an amendment which provides for a flat raise in the base pay of $25 should be adopted now without such consideration and without hearings, for there are many other forms of pay, many forms of allowances, and many different benefits which must be considered in connection with the question.

As I understand the Senator's amendment, it provides for termination on July 1, 1947. Does the amendment contain the July 1, 1947, limitation?

Mr. MORSE. No this amendment does not contain that limitation.

Mr. HILL. The limitation of July 1, 1947, appears in another amendment which I believe the Senator intends to propose. As I understand that amendment of the Senator from Oregon, it would extend existing family allowances and benefits to those who reenlist. Whether we accept the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Oregon or not, those benefits will continue to the end of the war and 6 months thereafter. But for fear that the 6 months thereafter may end before we can act further in the matter, I shall support the Senator's amendment with reference to extension of benefits to dependents of those who reenlist. I do not think, however, we should act to raise the pay of every member of the Army $25 a month without any consideration having been given in committee to that subject, without any hearing having been held on the subject, and without any testimony having been taken, without any estimate of cost, and without considering other ways that may be open to make the enlistment more attractive.

In connection with the proposal for increase of pay, I should like to call attention to the fact that the soldier receives, in addition to his pay, certain allowances and benefits. He is provided with housing and is given his clothes, and he has a number of perquisites. I am reminded of the testimony of Gen. Charles P. Summerall, given when he was Chief of Staff, before the House Military Affairs Committee. He was talking about the soldier, and the morale of the soldier, and what made the esprit de corps of the Army, and he said that three factors were involved. The first factor was promotion, the opportunity for the soldier to receive the reward to which he felt he was entitled for faithful service. The second factor was housing and food. The third factor was pay. The general said that as between the three factors, the pay factor was much the smallest; that it was considered in connection with enlistment in the Army and in the Navy that pay had much less to do with the morale of the individual and the esprit de corps of the service than did the question of promotion and the matter of how well the men were housed and fed.

So, Mr. President, I am convinced that careful investigation should be made into the different types of pay and of allowances and of benefits and other matters which might enter into consideration of the question of making the service more attractive before we take action such as that proposed by the Senator from Oregon. The Military Affairs Committee ought to have an opportunity to hold hearings and examine this problem and submit a bill which is the result of hearings, of testimony, of estimates of cost, so we will know what we are doing, after we have had the result of careful consideration on the part of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator's point of view. I should like to say a word in regard to the argument which has been made throughout his presentation, and that of others that the Military Affairs Committee has not taken into consideration possible changes in base rates of pay. I think it is most unfortunate that the committee has not done so. When it brings before the Senate a bill which is supposedly designed to increase the volunteer enlistments in the armed forces of the United States. I think the pay structure of the armed forces should have been considered as one of the basic first problems for the committee to consider. But the committee not having done so, it is not sound for it to object to my amendment on such procedural grounds. It can still consider the problem in future legislation.

The point I want to make is that the amount that I propose in my amendment is such that I believe almost everyone will have to agree that it would not result in excessive pay. Hence whatever subsequent action the Military Affairs Committee might take on the pay structure of the armed forces could be added to this amount, and this amount itself would in no way jeopardize or embarrass future legislation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will say that if we put the $25 increase in the law at this time the Committee on Military Affairs would feel that that point had been settled. It might think that action could be taken which would be better and more persuasive in order to induce men to enlist in the Army of the United States, and thus release the men who have seen long service.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I must leave the Senate to attend a committee meeting at once, and I shall make my remarks very brief. I have not heard all the argument. I came into the Chamber when the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] was delivering his address upon the amendment, and I have heard the interrogatories which have been propounded during his address.

Mr. President, I rise simply to give the reasons for the vote which I expect to

cast on this amendment. The men who are to be taken into the service under the terms of this bill will be volunteers. They will be under no compulsion whatever. I do not know, because I cannot estimate, how many more men would volunteer to enlist in the Army if the suggested increase were made.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has just suggested to me that when we raise the base pay we affect all the other forms of pay. Practically all the additional pay is a percentage of the base pay. So when the base pay is raised, we not only affect the base pay but practically all the various types and kinds of pay. The base pay is the basis upon which practically all other forms of pay are graduated.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I was saying, I do not know how to estimate the additional number of men who might be induced to volunteer because of the extra $25. I have a feeling that it would not materially affect the number of enlistments, because, in my judgment, in all likelihood, men with families and dependents are not going to volunteer to go back into the Army. The great bulk of men who will reenlist will probably be unmarried men without dependents. I do not believe that an additional $25 a month would effect very many reenlistments.

This amendment affects not only the enlisted men but all grades in the Army and Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and all the other branches of the service. It affects all the admirals and all the generals. Colonels, majors, and all other officers would receive the increase. Every individual in the armed services would receive an extra $300 a year. So it is not limited. I do not mean that that fact vitiates the amendment, but we might as well understand that if we vote for $300 a year more we are voting it for all the generals, all the admirals, and all the other officers, as well as the enlisted personnel in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and other services.

I am not convinced that the additional $25 would effect very many voluntary enlistments. The 8,000,000 men who have been drafted in the American Army had no choice about it. They were not asked to volunteer. They were drafted. The strong arm of the Government of the United States—and properly so—reached into every home in the Nation and took the strongest and best. They responded, and they joined together to form the greatest military force in the history of the world. We paid them a base rate of $50 a month.

I have the feeling that the question of justice or injustice as between those who were compelled to fight through the jungles, the mountains, and deserts on $50 a month, and those who are going to volunteer when there is no fighting, and receive $25 a month more than the men who have done the fighting received, is involved in this proposal. I cannot vote for such an increase. At least I cannot do it on the spur of the moment, without any consideration, not only on the part of the Committee on Military Affairs, but also the Committee on Naval Affairs, because the proposal affects the Navy. It affects the Marine Corps. It affects the Coast and Geodetic Survey, as well as the Public Health Service. Some of those services do not come within the jurisdiction of either the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Naval Affairs. Legislation affecting the personnel of the Public Health Service is a matter over which the Committee on Commerce has jurisdiction. The Committee on Finance also has some function to perform in regard to that subject.

So we have a proposal here which involves the jurisdiction of four committees, no one of which has considered the question. We are asked on the spur of the moment, as an inducement to further enlistments, to add $25 a month to the pay of those who are to come in under a voluntary system, after the fighting is over. There is no way to avoid consideration of the question of justice which is involved, as between the men who have done the fighting, and those who are to volunteer in the future. The question will arise as to whether those who have done the fighting were treated justly and fairly while they were fighting, as compared with those who are to enlist and do no fighting, and who are to receive $25 a month additional. I cannot reconcile such a proposal with my view of justice as between the two classes of men in the Army, the Navy, and the other services.

I have just been informed that this amendment would cost approximately $3,600,000,000 a year. I do not know that we ought to consider that factor in determining whether it is just to pay the increased amount to volunteers. However, $3,600,000,000 is a considerable sum to pay in order to induce more volunteers to enlist in the Army and Navy. I do not know how many more would be induced to enlist. I have some doubt as to whether a man who would volunteer would be influenced to any great extent by an additional $25 a month. If the increase were carried through all the branches of the service, and all ranks, the cost would be approximately $3,600,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am astounded that the Senator is worried over the cost of it, because there is plenty of money in the deficit. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the facetiousness of the Senator's remark. I think it might be helpful for us now and then to be astonished at the amount of money in the deficit. I thank the Senator for his suggestion.

Mr. President, I appreciate the sincerity of the Senator from Oregon, and I regret that I cannot, in good conscience, support his amendment; but I cannot support it for the reasons which I have indicated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator's position. I am interested in the figures which the Senator has given. If the Senator is to use those figures for purposes of persuasion, it seems to me that the Senate is entitled to have a break-down of the figures, and an explanation as to why he thinks the cost will be that much. It is my understanding that the military officials of the country and the administration have not as yet agreed on the size of the peacetime Army. I am inclined to believe that if we can adopt a voluntary system and get rid of the draft system, we shall find we can do the job much more cheaply than we shall be able to do it at the present rates of pay if we continue to impose upon the American people in peacetime a conscripted army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot break down the figure. The figure was furnished to me by a member of either the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Appropriations. I cannot break it down.

In addition to what I have said, I believe that the committees which have jurisdiction over the question of pay in the Army, the Navy, and the other services ought to be given an opportunity to consider the question, hear both sides of it, and devise a scientific method by which our future Army shall be paid. We should not, by an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate, create a differential between the men who are to serve in the Army as volunteers and those who have gone through the hell of war on two-thirds of the pay proposed by this amendment. For that reason I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that the Senator does not have the breakdown of the figures which he has given. I wonder if some member of the Committee on Military Affairs, which has the information, can give us the figures as to the size of the Army which was used as a basis for calculating the cost at $3,600,000,000. I think it is a fair question, because the argument has been used, with some effectiveness, that an additional cost of $3,600,000,000 would be involved. Personally I believe that that is considerably more than would be involved if the amendment were agreed to. I am interested to know from the Senator from Kentucky how large an Army he contemplates in order to reach the figure $3,600,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I stated, the estimate was handed to me after I rose to speak. It was handed to me by a page. It was furnished by a member of either the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Appropriations. I cannot guarantee that it is accurate. I would not attempt to do so. However, it is an estimate made by whoever sent me the memorandum. I am not in a position to break down the figure. I cannot guaranteee that it is correct, but I submit it to the Senate for whatever it may be worth.

Mr. President, for these reasons I am unable to support the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, much as I sympathize with any movement to increase the pay of the enlisted men in the Army and Navy, I feel constrained to vote against the pending amendment. I do

not believe that the question of increasing the pay of officers is of special importance at this time.

If there is any problem with which I have been confronted as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs which is complicated and involved, and which would require a Philadelphia lawyer like my friends from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] to unravel, it is the question of rates of pay for the men in the various branches of the Army and Navy. It requires long and patient study, and involves a tremendous number of comparisons between the pay at one rate, and the pay at an advanced rate.

Only today I was obliged to go to the Navy Department and one of the officers suggested to me that the pay of officers of the Navy should be increased. I said, "Do not mention that. Do not talk about increasing the pay of officers at this time. Whatever we ought to do for the enlisted men, it does not seem to me that this is the time to consider increasing the pay of officers of the Navy."

In my opinion some of the officers of the Navy are paid as much as they should be paid, and others are not. The disparity I have observed is in the case of officers of the age of 35 to 50 who have families and whose children are of school age. It is very difficult for them to educate their children, under the pay they are receiving.

However, the point I make is that this question is so involved and so complicated that it should not be settled or disposed of at this time on the floor of the Senate and without study by Senate committees, much as I commend the desires and motives of the Senators sponsoring the amendment. All pay rates should be subjected to careful scrutiny and study, otherwise injustices are certain to result.

The pending bill without this amendment will help very much to increase voluntary enlistments. Its provisions are generous, and they are generous for a purpose. The purpose is not so much to aid the persons whom it is sought to have join the Army or Navy as it is in connection with the desire of the Army and Navy to obtain enlistments.

I wish to quote from testimony before the committee in regard to the extent to which the bill goes in granting benefits which heretofore have not been granted. At a recent hearing, inquiry was made by my colleague the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as to what results the bill would have in terms of what a man would have in his pockets because of the benefits provided by the bill. I now read from the testimony of Commander Walters on that subject:

Commander WALTERS. Suppose this man took advantage of the 3 months to stay out; it is quite possible he would have received the final mustering-out payment before he reenlists, so he would have received the $300 for mustering-out payment. Upon reenlistment he receives $200. Suppose he receives the maximum under the section for travel allowance or allowance for leave, and suppose the trip included 400 miles both going and coming. That would be $20. Now, he is given a 30-day reenlistment leave, during which time he would draw his full pay of $143.60.

Senator ROBERTSON. His new pay?

Commander WALTERS. Yes; that is the pay of his rating. He would get a leave rate of 65 cents a day for 30 days, or $19.50. If he were to go on foreign service after reenlistment, his pay would be increased by $37.60 a month. Right there, there are five items which would possibly net that man $683.

That is what it would be possible for such a person to receive, but I think it is only fair to say it is, in my opinion, an extreme case. However, it would be possible in certain cases for that much money to be received by a man who was discharged from the Navy, if he reenlisted in the Navy within 3 months after his discharge.

I hope the whole question of pay will be studied by the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the other committees concerned. I must repeat, that in my judgment, it would be a mistake to adopt the pending amendment at this time without having it studied and considered by one of the appropriate committees. It may be that in particular cases more than 12 months' pay or $300 should be granted in the way of an increase, and it may be that the acount should be less or more.

In any event, the reason why I shall vote against the amendment is that it is of such character and type, and it involves so many related questions, that it should be considered by one of the Senate committees. Again, I inquire as to the propriety of increasing the pay of those who are to serve in the Army forces in peacetime without including those who have fought successfully the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the purpose of the Senator from Oregon in offering the amendment. I agree with him that we should do whatever may be necessary in order to have our Army become a Volunteer Army as quickly as is humanly possible. But I find myself in a state of mind which precludes my voting for an increase of pay immediately after the war, because to grant such an increase would mean that the boys who served the greatest length of time during the war would feel that benefits were accorded soldiers serving after the war which were not granted to them, although they happened to be, according to the circumstances, in action and in danger of losing their lives at all times during their service.

Perhaps $25 a month is not a sufficient increase. If it is not, I shall vote for more. I wish to have our Army go on a volunteer basis at the earliest possible moment. It may be that the benefits to be received by returning veterans who come out of the war handicapped are not sufficient. In that event I shall vote for an increase of those, first of all.

At the present time, before we know just how large our Army is to be and before we know to what extent we shall use various numbers of troops overseas, I think the question is one which well can wait until it is studied by the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee. At that time I shall vote for an increase of pay or benefits or whatever may be necessary in order to try to place our Army quickly on a volunteer basis.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I realize that the pending bill is of great importance to the people of the country, and especially to the members of the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which latter committee I am a member.

But the bill pending before the Senate before the measure now under consideration was taken up, and the bill which was being considered under the regular order, was the full-employment bill, so-called, on which all debate was stopped yesterday afternoon at 2:30. At that time its further consideration was displaced by the bill now under consideration, by unanimous consent. The bill now being considered was debated for the remainder of yesterday and for all of the session today up until now. I think debate on the measure should be closed sometime during today.

Therefore, I give notice that if the matter is not decided before the opening of the session of the Senate tomorrow, I shall call for a return to consideration of the full-employment bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. CAPEHART'S name was called). I announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] on public business.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I am advised that if present he would vote as I have voted, and therefore I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in a committee meeting.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—13

Aiken	La Follette	Taylor
Butler	Langer	Wheeler
Chavez	Morse	Young
Ferguson	Shipstead	
Knowland	Smith	

NAYS—64

Andrews	Guffey	Myers
Bailey	Gurney	Overton
Ball	Hart	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Reed
Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brewster	Hayden	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Brooks	Hill	Stewart
Buck	Hoey	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Tydings
Carville	McClellan	Vandenberg
Connally	McFarland	Wagner
Cordon	McKellar	Walsh
Donnell	McMahon	Wherry
Downey	Magnuson	White
Ellender	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Mead	Willis
George	Millikin	Wilson
Gerry	Moore	
Green	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—19

Austin	Glass	Pepper
Bilbo	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Briggs	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Mitchell	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	O'Daniel	
Eastland	O'Mahoney	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, after line 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 9. (a) Section 101 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. The dependent or dependents of any enlisted man in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, including any and all retired and Reserve components of such services, shall be entitled to receive a monthly family allowance for any period during which such enlisted man is in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after June 1, 1942, (1) during the existence of any war declared by Congress and the six months immediately following the termination of any such war or (2) during a period of enlistment or reenlistment contracted by such enlisted man prior to July 1, 1947."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have only a sentence or two to say in regard to the amendment; I think it speaks for itself. A very able argument in support of the amendment was made a few moments ago by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The purpose of the amendment is, of course, to offer an inducement for rapid volunteering of enlistees in the armed forces of the United States, so that we can demobilize the great Army which has just won the victory for us. I think the amendment would result in inducement for enlistment, and I think its terms speak well for themselves.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In what way and in what amount does the Senator's amendment increase the family allotment?

Mr. MORSE. It assures to the enlistees who enlist between now and July 1, 1947, that they will enjoy the allotments which are now enjoyed by the men in the armed services.

Mr. OVERTON. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. We cannot hear the debate on this side of the Chamber. I make the point of order that the Senator is not speaking loud enough to be heard on this side.

Mr. MORSE. I shall endeavor to oblige the Senator. As I said to the Senator from West Virginia, the amendment proposes to assure that those men who enlist in the Volunteer Army from now until July 1, 1947, will enjoy the same family benefits or allotments which are now allowed by law to the men presently in the armed forces.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the Senator's amendment does nothing except to extend the time in which the dependency allowances are to be made. Under the present law they expire 6 months from the time the termination of hostilities is declared. As I understand, if I am correct, the only thing the amendment does is to provide that, regardless of when that time may be, dependency allowances shall continue until the 1st of July 1947.

Mr. MORSE. They shall be allowed to the men who enlist between now and then as they are now paid to servicemen.

Mr. TAFT. To all men, or only to those who enlist?

Mr. MORSE. To those who enlist from now until July 1, 1947.

Mr. TAFT. It occurs to me that it should be extended to everyone until that time. Many men may not be let out.

Mr. MORSE. The first part of the amendment assures that those who have to stay in the Army, who are now in the Army, shall have the benefits until they are demobilized, and the latter part of the amendment assures that those who enlist between now and July 1, 1947, shall have the allotments for the period of their enlistment.

Mr. TAFT. So that the general effect is merely to take the present law, which applies to everyone in the Army, and extend it until the 1st of July 1947?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. BURTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Just a question to clarify the situation so far as I am concerned. Am I to understand that under the amendment offered, so far as the soldier, the sailor, or anyone else who volunteers is concerned, he would be given family allotments after his severance from the service?

Mr. MORSE. No.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Only during the time of his service?

Mr. MORSE. During the time of his enlistment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Senator's amendment necessary? Does not the bill we are enacting carry family benefits and allotments?

Mr. MORSE. It will not, as the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, in those instances in which the man who is not now in the service enlists between now and July 1, 1947.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. I thought I understood the Senator to say, in replying to the question of my colleague, that the amendment would continue the benefits until July 1, 1947, but I do not understand that would be the effect of the amendment. As I understand, it would extend the benefits without limit to those who enlist before July 1, 1947, or may otherwise be in the service.

Mr. MORSE. It will extend the benefits to those who are now in the Army until they are demobilized, and it will grant benefits to those who enlist between now and July 1, 1947, for the period of their enlistment.

Mr. BURTON. Would the allowances stop on July 1, 1947?

Mr. MORSE. No, they would not.

Mr. BURTON. They would continue indefinitely?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. That is for the period of the enlistment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. On behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs I should like to say that we would be glad to take the amendment to conference. Personally, I approve it. I think it is very constructive, and that it clarifies some of the points which were left open in the bill as it was passed by the House.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3951) was read the third time and passed.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee

amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senate is not yet ready to vote on the committee amendment. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is there any amendment now pending to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no amendment pending except the committee amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, it is proposed to strike out lines 20 to 24 inclusive, and line 25 through the word "such," and insert:

(4) In furtherance of the objective of full employment and to supplement investment and expenditure by private enterprises, State and local governments, the Federal Government shall, consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy, proceed with a comprehensive program of public works and other expenditures so planned that they can be speeded up and enlarged when other employment decreases and retarded when full employment is otherwise provided.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the amendment, and in doing so to make some comments generally on the bill, which is referred to as a full-employment bill. I assume everyone has in mind the fact that the name is to a certain extent a misnomer, because under no conceivable circumstances will all people be employed. Some people do not want to be employed. Some want to be on half-time instead of full time. Some will receive unemployment compensation. Some will probably be on relief, and so on. Therefore, I do not think anyone contemplates that under any circumstances there will ever be such a thing as full employment in this country.

I am, however, not going to dwell on that particular point, but will discuss some of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the Senator think that under the provisions of the bill anybody will be employed unless he joins a union and pays dues?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill does not state that.

Mr. BAILEY. But the bill does declare for the right of employment.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to ask the Senator from Maryland whether the amendment he has submitted is the first amendment which appears in the minority report and which is also printed and lies on the desks of Senators.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I have offered only one amendment. I have other amendments which will be offered later on.

Mr. TAFT. But the amendment the Senator has just offered is the one which is set out at the end of the minority report; the first of the three amendments set out in that report?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, there is no one in this country or out of it, I assume, who does not look upon unemployment as being tragic. It is tragic for the individual; it is tragic for the community. Since I have been in the Senate I do not recall any occasion when any other bill has been before a committee of which I have been a member where there has been such full agreement and accord as to the general objectives which are in mind and which are sought. Each and every one of us desires to relieve and eliminate unemployment and we dedicate ourselves to that undertaking. In the pending bill there are three provisions in the main. The first is not strictly a matter of legislation. It is more or less an announcement of a policy; an attempt to establish a principle in regard to unemployment. It does not attempt in any way to implement what is to be done.

There are, however, two other sections of the bill designed to set up machinery which would attempt to operate in the direction of trying to eliminate unemployment. One is a provision for fact-finding facilities, for the submission of an estimate and for a budget by the President, and also there is a provision for appointment of a joint committee consisting of Members of the House and the Senate.

I am confident that no one will object to the general underlying purposes behind the last two provisions. It is certainly most important that everything should be done which can reasonably be done to find out what unemployment there is in the country and its nature, extent, and characteristics. It is also most desirable that everything necessary should be done in the way of preparing factual data and submitting it so that a foundation may be laid for what should be attempted in order to relieve unemployment.

The provision for a joint committee of the House and Senate may be somewhat debatable; but it is certainly desirable that the House and the Senate should keep closely in touch with what is going on, especially in regard to such an important matter as this. Whether the particular machinery of a joint committee is desirable or whether some other method should be suggested is something which is probably not of primary importance. But it is desirable that there should be fact-finding facilities in operation. It is desirable that estimates should be made, and that suggestions be presented as to what can be done in regard to relieving unemployment, and it is most assuredly desirable that in this matter the Senate and the House should cooperate closely in some suitable way. All this is needed at any time and under any circumstances. It is particularly desirable in these days in view of the fact that the greatest dislocation of industry and labor which the world has ever known exists today. Certainly everything that can reasonably be done to help remedy that situation, everything which will foster industry, everything which will stimulate employment, is most desirable and must be fostered. The need is imperative.

The question now arises: If we are all in accord with regard to so many matters why are we in disagreement at all? The difference of opinion arises in regard to the procedures which should be adopted. If Senators will turn to section 4 on page 14 they will find this language:

(4) to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment.

Mr. President, what does that language mean? There is a definite statement "to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be insured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed."

If that means what it purports to mean on its face it is certainly a clear and definite statement that the Federal Government will take up the slack of unemployment by public works or by other public expenditures. That is clearly a flat-footed guaranty that the Federal Government can and will take up all of such slack.

Mr. President, so far as I am advised, no such a guaranty has ever been made in any democratic country, in any country of free institutions.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I would not question at all the Senator's statement, except to this extent: He says no such attempt has ever been made, and I think he qualifies the thought that the Federal Government would come in and take care of the situation in the event of a great national emergency. Is that what the Senator is referring to?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I mean this: Attempts have been made again and again in the past to do what is possible to remedy unfortunate conditions which have brought about unemployment and specifically to eliminate unemployment; but I do not know of any instance when the Government of this country or any other country of democratic principles has provided a flat-footed guaranty that the Government will provide a job for each and every individual who wants one, irrespective of what might be the nature and extent of other olibgations of the Government. That is the distinction. The question arises, Is that a proper obligation for the Federal Government; and if so, can it be carried out? That assumes whatever is implied by any such guaranty must be done at any cost. In the first place, there are specific provisions in the bill for public works. There is not, however, anything definite and specific beyond that as to what is meant thereby. References are made again and again to public expenditures, but efforts to find some words of definition as to what is meant by public expenditures did not develop any satisfactory results in the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to help the Senator. I do not wish to hamstring him.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. I point out to the Senator—and I doubt not that he is familiar with it—that on page 34 of the committee's report, having in mind the particular thought which the Senator has of striking out anything but public works, we find the following language:

The first amendment—

Referring to the Senator's amendment—

The first amendment of this type would strike out this provision and substitute a provision for the mere acceleration of public works when private employment declines. The purpose of this amendment is to remove the policy of providing enough investment and expenditure, if needed, to assure continuing full employment.

The argument is made that there is a very definite limit to the amount of useful Federal public works construction in any given year—say, about $5,000,000,000. It is then argued that if there is a serious decline in private activities, it would be impossible to assure full employment through the provision of public works.

It is true, of course, that public works alone cannot meet every conceivable emergency. But it is also true—and this point deserves particular emphasis—that "Federal investment and expenditure" as referred to in section 2 (d) is not limited to public works. It also includes public services and assistance to business, agriculture, home owners, veterans, or consumers. It includes loans and guaranties, as well as grants-in-aid and other direct disbursements. "Federal investment and expenditure," therefore, as contrasted with Federal public works, is broad enough to meet any conceivable emergency.

Because of this fact, the provision as it now stands is well calculated to prevent emergencies. It is designed to show that the Government really "means business." This provision provides the basis for confidence in sustained markets and will make it possible to achieve full employment with a minimum of Federal investment and expenditure. If it is stricken—

In accordance with the desire of the Senator from Maryland—

the costs to the Government will be incalculably greater.

In closing my comments to the Senator, let me say that we have worked together in the committee from different points of view, but as personal friends. Beyond peradventure it should be understood that the philosophies and policies of the bill contemplate only one thing. It comes into play only when we are faced with great unemployment, when the specter haunts us and looms up ahead. Then the administration, the Government, with the Congress implementing the policies, puts into effect policies which will take care of the need, and anticipate it before it becomes a fait accompli. The Senator realizes that, does he not?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I agree with some of the things which the Senator from New Hampshire has said, and I very much appreciate his comments.

Since the Senator has made reference to me personally, let me be personal for a moment. In my small way I have tried to do something along these lines. In 1933 I was not a Member of the Senate. I held no public office. I wanted no public office, and certainly did not expect to run for any. Upon the insistence of President Roosevelt—he telephoned to me a number of times—I agreed to take over the eastern part of the country for the PWA, and later went all over the United States trying to help organize the work of the PWA.

I refer to that fact only for two reasons: First of all, because certainly I tried to do what little I could at that time to assist in a most worthy cause. I endevored to help combat the evil of unemployment. In the second place, I remind the Senator that we found that what we could accomplish by public works at that time was relatively small when compared with the entire problem of employment.

Today the situation may be a little different, but I remind the Senator from New Hampshire that so far as I am aware we have no estimate which would indicate that more than several million persons could be employed in public works on projects which now are known to be worth while and sound. It is my recollection that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has not gone higher than an estimate of 5,000,000. When we are enunciating a principle and laying down a doctrine, we cannot assume that unemployment will not go beyond that figure. We know that in 1933 it reached the figure of at least 10,000,000. God grant that it will never reach that number again. It may be that after the war, as a result of the efforts to produce civilian goods and do many other things which are possible and desirable in this turnover from a status of war to peace, unemployment will not be the specter it might otherwise be. However, the fact remains that it may be that only a relatively small percentage of those who are unemployed can obtain employment through public works.

It is true that various other suggestions have been made in the report as to what in addition could be done to lessen unemployment, but no one has brought forward any real estimate indicating that the sum total of all other Federal activities would produce very much in excess of what probably could be obtained by public works. If we are to lay down the principle that we are to make a flat-footed guaranty that everyone in the United States is to have a job, we ought to be prepared to back it up.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As the Senator says, the bill requires that the deficit be made up by Federal investment and expenditure, regardless of amount. Does the Senator so understand it?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Undoubtedly so.

Mr. TAFT. In addition to the things which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has suggested, let me add this observation: The Senator has pointed out that we shall soon run out of public works. I wish to suggest one other form of expenditure which would probably be immediately proposed, and that is subsidies in connection with food and other products. Literally billions of dollars could be spent if we wished to buy all the wheat produced at $3 a bushel and sell it for $1.50. I suggest to the Senator that that is one of the things which might be done. The reinstallation of subsidies would be a way of giving away money. That kind of Federal investment and expenditure is simply giving away money. That is the only way I can see that prescription No. 4 could ultimately reach the figure it might have to reach if we were to carry out the exact prescription of the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from Ohio is entirely correct. Of course, we can find numerous ways to spend money. There is no doubt that we can spend any amount of money the Government can put its hands on. We are not here to endorse that course. We are here to discuss what is a sound policy, and not merely what is a possible policy.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me propound a hypothetical case to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Assume that in the aftermath of war we are to have good business. We expect that the shelves of merchants will be filled with commodities until the consuming power purchases them. There will then come the saturation point, and probably the time will arrive when a relapse will set in. History has a habit of repeating itself.

When, as, and if the Nation is confronted by depression and unemployment, and 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 men are crying for work and for bread, and a public works program provided solely by the proposal of the Senator would take care of not more than 3,000,000 or 4,000,000, what does the Senator propose to do with the additional 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 unemployed who want work and cannot get it? Are we to have relief rolls, and another WPA, with its leaf-raking projects, killing the spirit of mankind, and creating an inferiority complex in the breasts of men? What would the Senator propose in such a dilemma?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. We could attempt anything that was wise, sound, and practical.

Mr. TOBEY. What would the Senator suggest? Suppose that were now the case? What would the Senator suggest? The people are knocking at our doors. They are up against it. Fear and apprehension control the minds of men when unemployment stalks in the land. The public works program would take care of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 unemployed. What would the Senator do with the remainder, who cry for bread? Would the Senator give them a stone?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course not.

Mr. TOBEY. Are we to say to them that we cannot adopt a certain program because it is not orthodox? In a dilemma such as that, we would go the limit to save human lives and take care of human needs, whether the program involved deficit financing or not. There would be no other alternative.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator knows the answer to that. So far as I personally am concerned, during the 10 years I have been in the Senate I have voted

again and again for PWA, WPA, and for other measures of benefit or for relief. What we shall do in the situation to which the Senator has referred is to see that people in this country do not suffer.

Mr. TOBEY. How are they going to be saved from suffering? Are we going to give them a dole, a hand-out, or what? Or are we going to give them work?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. We are going to give them work, so far as doing so is consistent with sound policy. Beyond that, we will see that they do not suffer so long as there is food and other necessities in the country.

Mr. TOBEY. The soundest policy in the world is to look after human needs. The Senator from Maryland knows that as well as I do.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I have stated what we will do.

Mr. TOBEY. But the Senator proposes only the use of public works, and the Senator has said that public works will provide employment for only 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 persons. If we take the advice of the Senator from Maryland, we go back to public works only. Yet, as we heard yesterday, according to the testimony of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], if at some time in the future there are 10,000,000 unemployed persons in this country and if public works will provide jobs for perhaps 5,000,000 of them, 5,000,000 others will not be taken care of.

We ask the Senator what he offers. We ask in all sincerity what he offers for the possible total of 10,000,000 unemployed persons.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I can answer the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me first?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire what he is offering, outside of public works?

Mr. TOBEY. I am very glad to answer the question, and I say that the answer is to be found on page 14 of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. That program will not provide unemployed people with work.

Mr. TOBEY. How does the Senator know it will not? On what authority does the Senator make that statement?

Mr. TAFT. I ask on what authority the Senator says he knows it will.

Mr. TOBEY. I know it will, because he who runs may read; there it is.

Mr. TAFT. All those items provide for giving away Federal money, which will be the only remedy left, and the one to which the Senator will be forced. It will be the only remedy not already tried. The things which are provided for there have been tried—every one of them, public works included. The only remedy in the bill which the Senator proposes which has not already been tried is the giving away of billions of dollars of Federal money through subsidies or otherwise. That policy the Senator does not admit.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, so that I may suggest a point of order?

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to answer the Senator from Ohio, and I will hold myself in subjection so that I shall not be too excited about the matter. But I am deadly in earnest, because the cause justifies the means, as I view the situation.

In answer to the Senator from Ohio let me say that he makes a declamando statement that the system we propose will not work. I asked the Senator how he knows it will not work. The Senator does not speak as one having authority, to me. We have offered the program in all sincerity, and there it is. But if the Taft amendment or the Radcliffe amendment is adopted and if all the rest of the plan we have proposed is thrown into the scrap heap, the result will be that all that millions of people in the country will have to look forward to will be employment on public works, which both Senators admit will be able to provide employment for only 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 of our unemployed. We say that is not enough.

We come down to the last consideration, namely, that what we are legislating for in this bill is to take care of the day—and God grant it will never come in this country—when we shall have millions of unemployed persons. We propose that when we get into that type of emergency situation, when the Nation is in extremis, we go the limit, unorthodox or not, in spending the taxpayers' money to the utmost, to save the millions of persons who otherwise would be thrown out on the streets, in human misery.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that what he has in mind is that we must find some method of spending money, in addition to spending it on public works, whether sound or not. I do not believe that is our proper course. I believe we should make some effort, through public works and other suitable and sound Federal expenditures, to take care of the situation. If under such a system there are some who still are not taken care of, relief will be provided for them.

Let me remind the Senator from New Hampshire that if the program which he desires to have adopted were carried out, probably there would always be some persons on relief. There is always a certain amount of turn-over in employment and there is seasonal employment, and for various reasons some relief will at all times be needed. No one thinks for a moment that it is possible to employ every person in the United States; and there might be some situations under any program, even under the program the Senator from New Hampshire has advocated, when it would be necessary to provide some relief. But I say we cannot afford to proceed on an unsound basis, merely on the theory that we shall have to find jobs for everyone. Such a program will not do the individuals any good and it will not do the country any good. On the contrary, it will be a detriment to both.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator said, if I correctly recall his statement—and I think the RECORD will sustain me on that point—that we should use public works and other Federal expenditures. Did not the Senator say that?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. What does the Senator mean by that? The bill says, "Provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed." So the Senator himself would use Federal expenditures. From what does he shy?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There are various forms of Federal expenditures which are proper and which can be utilized. A while ago the Senator from New Hampshire referred to an HOLC. There may be, and doubtless will be, other forms of Federal expenditure which will be suitable. The point I am trying to stress is that in every case there should be a test as to soundness and we should determine to use only means which themselves are practical.

Mr. TOBEY. What is the specter in the closet? What is the ghost which stalks forth? What is it that the Senator fears? What is his apprehension over the words—

> (4) to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment.

Is not that a worth-while objective, to the extent that it cannot otherwise be taken care of?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, it is desirable; and when I read my amendment the Senator will see what I have in mind. What the Senator does not know and what he cannot know—and yet he is willing to come forward with a flat-footed declaration of policy which he cannot back up—is whether we can provide sufficient public works and other public expenditures to take care of the whole situation. No one knows whether that can be done. It has never been tested. Certainly it is not sound principle to build up a theory or philosophy on something which has not been tested.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I will not interrupt the Senator any more; he has been very courteous to me. I wish to make only this closing statement: The Senator says our proposal is new and novel. Let me say it may be new and novel, although I do not think it is. However, the fact remains—and on this point I want my voice to sound over this body today—that our plan is to provide for taking care of the situation in a great national emergency when the Nation is prostrate, so to speak; and we are taking time by the forelock and are looking ahead to see what we can do in that eventuality. When that time comes, if it does come, what shall we do? The Senator agrees that public works cannot provide employment for more than 5,000,000 persons. When that time comes, the job of the administration and of the Congress will be to fill the gap with some kind of work, so as to provide job opportunities, insteading of providing a dole and passing on a pittance to men employed in raking leaves.

I think this proposal is fundamental. I think it is sound and I hope it will prevail.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The statement of the Senator from New Hampshire is entirely in-

correct. The bill as written does not say a word about public works. It says "Federal investment and expenditure"—of any kind. Consequently, as has been pointed out, public works will soon be exhausted as a means of providing sufficient employment, and then we shall turn to other "Federal investment and expenditure." I have been trying to find out what that is.

I suggest that it means that we must give away Federal money, through subsidies or otherwise, if we find there is not sufficient employment in the country. I do not think the proposal advanced by the bill will produce employment. I think that in the end it will produce unemployment. I say that the remedy proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire will not be effective; it will not accomplish the very objectives of the bill.

Mr. TOBEY. But, Mr. President, I say it will work, and would not the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Maryland far prefer to give men jobs, rather than to give them relief or doles?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has entirely avoided the issue. The issue is not whether his proposal would give men aid. The issue is whether it would give them work. I say it would not. It would simply build up a tremendous deficit and it would inflate our economy hopelessly and without beneficial results.

Mr. TOBEY. In the event of widespread unemployment affecting 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 people in this country, would not both the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Ohio far prefer to give men jobs rather than to give them a dole or other relief?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. If the jobs were worthwhile jobs, of course the answer is "Yes." But we have already pointed out to the Senator from New Hampshire that, so far as worth-while jobs are concerned——

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the bill qualifies that.

Mr. TAFT. So far as worth-while jobs are concerned, it would be impossible to find enough public works to provide them. It could not be done if a major unemployment crisis occurred. That is what was found out in 1932. So it was necessary to inaugurate the PWA program, because it was all that was left; there was no other way to handle the situation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. Furthermore, let me suggest——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I very seriously desire to make a point of order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has yielded to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico will state the point of order.

Mr. HATCH. The point of order I desire to make is that in the interest of orderly procedure in the Senate, the rules of the Senate must be obeyed and Senators desiring to have a Senator yield should first address the Chair and secure permission. It is entirely evident that it has been most difficult for us to understand two or three Senators talking at the same time. So I insist on the point of order.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland will desist until the Chair makes a ruling on the point of order raised by the Senator from New Mexico. The Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct in regard to the rule. For two, three, or four Senators to be talking at the same time is not an effective way of debating. Senators desiring to speak must ask the occupant of the floor if he will yield. The Senator occupying the floor may yield the floor at any time to any Senator, but not to three or four Senators at the same time.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I agree with the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The question is, What should be done if we are faced with an unemployment problem? The answer to that question is not found in the bill. Many things could be done. In my opinion, the only way to deal with unemployment is not through Federal spending, but by sound policies of speeding up throughout this country the machine of private enterprise. That machine employs approximately 45,000,000 or 50,000,000 people, whereas Government can probably never employ more than 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 people. If the private industrial machine is speeded up 10 percent more people can be put to work than would be put to work by public spending.

The question, Mr. President, is: How should that be done? The pending amendment does not affect all the things which may be done to stimulate private enterprise. Many attempts have been made, many of which have not been successful. Every other government is trying to solve the problem, and we hope that we may be more successful than they have been. If there is one thing in this bill which can succeed when everything else fails, it is government spending. That is a feather bed on which we can always fall back.

I suggest that public spending outside of public works is not helpful in curing a depression. There are many better methods which can be used. There is no panacea to which we may resort. We simply must combine a large number of different kinds of measures. We can always turn to Federal Government for relief of our responsibilities, and many persons think that the Federal Government can finally assume the responsibility of spending the necessary funds. Such a philosophy results in an invitation to public spending, and an invitation to spending ourselves into prosperity and increasing the public debt. So long as that is the philosophy of the bill I cannot vote for it. I feel that it would wreck this country faster than anything else. If there should be any increase in employment the increase would be merely temporary in character. The spending of public money for public works is one remedy, but to say that it is the final solution of our difficulties is only to lay down for this country a policy which will lead to destruction.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, allow me to read from the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself:

> In furtherance of the objective of full employment—

That certainly states very definitely what we have in mind—

> and to supplement investment and expenditure by private enterprises, State and local governments, the Federal Government shall, consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy, proceed with a comprehensive program of public works and other expenditures so planned that they can be speeded up and enlarged whenever employment decreases and retarded when full employment is otherwise provided.

The statement is very definite that in furtherance of the objective of full employment, an objective which we all seek——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The charge has been made on the floor of the Senate that the Senator's amendment is limited only to public works. It has been explained that the use of the words "other expenditures" includes probably any expenditure which might be necessary to carry out the avowed purpose of full employment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think the point which has been made by the Senator from New Mexico is a very good one. However, let me remind the Senator of the fact that the amendment states, in part:

> The Federal Government shall * * * proceed with a comprehensive program of public works and other expenditures.

Mr. HATCH. Yes. I understand that.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is not possible at this time for any person to forecast with any degree of accuracy just what public expenditures might be necessary. Various kinds have been suggested, and others undoubtedly will be tested and tried out.

Mr. HATCH. The point which I was making is that it is not intended by the language of the amendment to foreclose any proper form of expenditure which would contribute to full employment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Not at all, because it will be noted that the language says:

> In furtherance of the objective of full employment and to supplement investment and expenditure by private enterprises, State and local governments, the Federal Government shall, consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy—

And so forth. The statement was made in the committee that the language "consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy" took the heart out of the amendment. What is the force of it? Does any Senator mean to advocate that

the Federal Government shall adopt a policy inconsistent "with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy"?

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I yield to no one in my desire to do what little may lie in my power to eliminate unemployment; but I am not prepared to take the position that that is a primary consideration, and that it comes ahead of everything else. In the pending bill there is an unqualified guaranty that that must be done. What does it mean? Does it come ahead of the defense of the realm? Does it come ahead of agriculture and small business? Oh, yes; I know that at different places in the bill the word "foster" is used. But there is a difference between "foster" and "guaranty."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator seems to leave out of the picture entirely the language which was put in by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to cover, in my opinion, the very point which the Senator is now stressing. The Senator lays great stress on his amendment from the standpoint that we proceed with a comprehensive program of public works and other expenditures, so planned that they can be built up and enlarged when other employment decreases, and retarded when full employment is otherwise provided. The Senator seems to lay great stress on the fact that his amendment contains the word "planned." However, he forgets entirely the fact that the bill contains the following language. I read paragraph (d) on page 13:

> To that end, the Federal Government shall, in cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and others, develop and pursue—

I call the special attention of Senators to the words which follow—

> a consistent and carefully planned economic program with respect to, but not limited to—

Does the Senator take the position that the word "planned" in his amendment is any more important, has any more weight, or is any more effective than the words "develop and pursue a consistent and carefully planned economic program"? Does the Senator take the position that under that language we forget everything else but public works and public expenditures, or is it not reasonable and correct to say when we have already stated that whatever the program is it must be a consistent program and a well-planned program, that we cannot accomplish anything more by stating later on in the amendment more facts? I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a moment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Utah has attributed those words to me. It is a very different concept. A carefully planned, over-all program dealing with the economic future is one thing; a program of public works so planned that it can be retarded when times are good and expanded when times are bad is an entirely different conception, and a much more detailed one, one which goes back, as the Senator knows, to as far as Mr. Hoover. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], I think, back in 1932 or 1933, proposed such a program. It is a policy which I think is entirely sound.

Let me suggest to the Senator that it is a very difficult program to carry out, because what we find is that the pressure for public works is just as strong when times are good as at any other time; and if we get a large public-works program going in the height of prosperity, then when there is a desire to extend it and to put more people to work in hard times, the opportunity is greatly limited.

In other words, we might plan for a public-works program of $5,000,000,000, and we will have one of $2,000,000,000 going on all the time, so that the additional expenditure will not be more than $3,000,000,000. This concept of a public-works program is a different and distinct program from a general and carefully planned economic program.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Ohio has at least attempted to answer my inquiry, will the Senator from Maryland yield now, that I may make some comments on the statements of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me say to the Senator from Utah, first, that I have no objection to the language which he has quoted from the bill, and if it be true that parts of the amendment which are offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself are mere surplusage—and I do not admit that to be so, since I believe it all has effect, purpose, and purport—it does not do any harm; but I emphasize that I do not think it is surplusage.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to direct the brief remarks I make to the Senator from Ohio. There may be some magic and some charm in repeating the words "planned" and "planning," but my answer to the Senator from Ohio is that if a program including public works is consistent and well planned, certainly it will not be, as indicated by the Senator from Ohio, as large a public-works plan or program when it is unnecessary as when it is necessary.

If I may make one further observation, both authors of the amendment assure the Senate, as they assured the Committee on Banking and Currency time and time again, "Oh, yes, we believe in the full-employment bill," but it is my opinion that the amendment offered at this time is not to help the bill, but it is offered to cut the very heart out of the bill, as was so frequently stated by one of the authors of the bill in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The very purpose of the bill is to say to the people of the United States that if all other measures fail; if private industry, if private capital, if private enterprise, States, local governments, and all measures and programs fail, then the Federal Government will assume responsibility to see that millions upon millions of people do not become permanently unemployed. All the bill says is that on the failure of all other programs, and especially private industry and private capital, rather than see millions of men and women unemployed, the Federal Government will, if necessary, step in, to use the Senator's words, and take up the slack.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that in its beginning the language of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Ohio and myself is, "in furtherance of the objective of full employment." That is what everyone wants and will work for. The issue which I raise is that the bill states that after other methods have been tried and there is still some unemployment, then the Federal Government, irrespective of what may be the amount of it, guarantees a job to everyone in the United States, regardless of other obligations of the Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator point out anywhere in the bill where the word "guarantees" is used? The Senator keeps injecting into his discussion of the bill the word "guarantees." Will he point out any place in the bill where the word "guarantees" is used?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator must realize that an idea can often be conveyed without using some particular phraseology. Let me call the attention of the Senator to paragraph 4, on page 14:

> To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment.

If that means anything at all, it means that it is a full guaranty.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me that little or no attention has been paid to the most important words in the Senator's amendment. In my opinion, so far as expenditures are concerned, the Government could spend just as much under the Senator's amendment as could be spent under the text for which it is substituted. The important thing to me in the Senator's amendment is these words:

> The Federal Government shall, consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy, proceed with a comprehensive program.

Mr. President, that is the note I find lacking in the pending bill. If that note were in the pending bill, I should find very little to criticize in it, but, as the able Senator from New Hampshire says, when there are 10,000,000 unemployed, what are we going to do about it? Of course we are going to do something about it. But it seems to me that the implication of the bill as it stands is that when such a situation arises, we have one sole and only obligation, and that is to look after the 10,000,000 and to forget the other 120,000,000 entirely. I submit that we have just as great an obligation continuing to the other 120,000,000 as we have to the 10,000,000, and it is absolutely essential, even for the welfare of the

10,000,000 themselves, that the program we adopt shall be geared into a national policy consistent with our total needs, obligations, and other essential considerations. If that is done, I can see very little objection to the program.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I shall yield in a moment. The Senator from Michigan is entirely correct, that particular clause in the amendment is one which was objected to again and again by the committee. Everyone knows we want to do every thing we possibly can to prevent unemployment. Several of us on the committee raised this question, "What do you mean by the guaranty of jobs? What do you propose shall be done with the 10,000,000? Must the Federal Government in order to give them all jobs change its policy for the defense of our country and destroy our agricultural policy?" It is true that the point was made in the committee that this bill is only a declaration of principle, and therefore it does not make so much difference as to the scope of the language used. I wish to emphasize the point that while this bill is a declaration of principles, we have no more right to be careless in making a statement of principles standing alone than we would have if it contained implementing language. If we are going to establish a policy we should see to it that that policy is a sound one, irrespective of whether in this particular measure there is any implementing legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice, whereas the bill itself provides:

> To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed.

The amendment of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Maryland does not provide for investment, but for expenditure only. Is it the purpose of the amendment to prevent the Government from lending money at a low rate of interest, if that is necessary in order to keep business going and people from being unemployed? Is that the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will say to the Senator from Vermont, most assuredly not.

Mr. AIKEN. It reads that way.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me make a further statement. Again and again in committee we endeavored to have eliminated the word "investment," or what is preferable, to obtain a satisfactory definition as to what was meant by it. All such efforts were resisted. There is no doubt in the world that certain expenditures can, should, and will be made by the Federal Government.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the purpose of eliminating the word "investment" in this case?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. In the first place, an expenditure may or may not involve an investment. I have no objection to the word "investment," if there is a sound definition of exactly what is meant by it. But an inference which might be deduced from this bill is that if there is not provided a sound system of public works sufficient to employ those who are out of employment, we have committed ourselves to an undefined program of Federal investment. What is meant by that? Does it mean that we are going into Federal investments of a nature such as we have not made before? Does it mean that we are going to infringe on private industry? I do not know what "investment" standing alone means, but if we use the word "expenditure" it is sufficiently comprehensive. When the Federal Government expends money it may or may not get something for it by way of investment; but that avoids the possible inference by the use of the unqualified word "investment" that this bill commits us to any form of Federal investment.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator object to the Federal Government lending money at a low rate of interest if it became necessary to keep small business on its feet and people from being unemployed?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Most assuredly not.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a statement on that point?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to point out to the Senator from Vermont that in line 8, the words "stimulate, encourage, and assist private enterprises" certainly would cover the kind of loan the Senator is referring to. It does not make any difference what is stated in paragraph 4 because the language of paragraph 1 covers that kind of assistance.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not see why anyone should object to having the word "investment" written into the bill when investment might be necessary, even though we do not know now what kind of investment would be necessary, but we assume that the kind of investment necessary would be set forth in whatever message the President might send to the Congress.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Vermont what I said before, that I think the word "expenditure" alone is sufficiently broad, but I have no objection to any language suitably restrictive in regard to the word "investment." I do not think, however, this phrase should be used without any qualifications, especially when it is coupled with the idea that if public works are not sufficient then we are going to embark on an undefined program of Federal investment.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely want to indulge in two bits of repartee, one to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Repartee?

Mr. TOBEY. Repartee is good; and I hope the repartee itself is equally good. Here it is: The Senator from Michigan said that in the event of a direful situation we would look after 10,000,000 unemployed, and we would also look after the remaining 120,000,000. If that is good philsophy, those who would be taken care of would be the unfortunate unemployed individuals in this country.

Did the Senator ever listen to the Gospel hymn, the Ninety and Nine?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, yes.

Mr. TOBEY. It is a good hymn.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes. I quite sympathize with the Senator's interest in the "one," but I remind him that the hymn also refers to the other "ninety and nine."

Mr. TOBEY. Yes, but it takes care of the "one" alone. The others take care of themselves, for they are prosperous in the fold. The one is out alone on the range, and the Lord goes out and brings him back into the fold. That is what this bill is going to do, bring the unfortunate unemployed in under the beneficence of jobs.

Mr. VANDENBERG. "Beneficence"—does that describe it?

Mr. TOBEY. No, not quite.

Now may I say a word to the Senator from Ohio, who stated what I think he did not intend to state. He said public works were not mentioned in the bill.

Turn to page 13:

> (d) To that end the Federal Government shall, in cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and others, develop and pursue a consistent and carefully planned economic program with respect to—

Now turn over to page 14:

> Public services, works, and research.

And again on page 14:

> To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured—

> A public program—
>
> shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well being and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprises. Any such Federal investment and expenditure calling for the construction of public works by the Federal Government shall provide for the performance of the necessary construction work by private enterprises—

For carrying along the policy of stimulating private enterprise.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. If I said there was no reference to public works I was mistaken. My point is that the first sentence in paragraph (4) is not confined to public works, is not a program of residuary public works, it is not a statement that if private enterprise cannot provide employment public works must be resorted to; but it provides for all kinds of expenditures, of which presumably public works is one.

May I suggest to the Senator that everything in the world is included in the first 10 lines of paragraph (d), and the remainder of paragraph (d) might be struck out with profit, in which case we would not need to offer the amendment we are discussing. Really public works are covered in that paragraph. I am perfectly willing to include public works. My objection is to making public investment and expenditure the ultimate recourse for any situation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I ought to give a little help to the Senator from Maryland, and then I shall subside. The Senator from Maryland began to question a few minutes ago in his colloquy with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] about what constitutes Federal investments. I call attention to page 14, line 25:

Such Federal investment and expenditure—

Then page 15, line 3:

Shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprises.

I submit that is an investment. If we spend money for projects that contribute to the national wealth and well-being by such spending of money, that comes pretty near being an investment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Any investment which is sponsored on the theory that it might contribute to public welfare, irrespective of what the investment is, might mean many varied forms of investment.

Mr. TOBEY. The provision says "the national wealth and well-being."

Mr. RADCLIFFE. What does that mean?

Mr. TOBEY. Just what it says.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Many people might say that what we ought to do is take over the railroads and the banks. That would be for the benefit of the public. That would be for national welfare.

Mr. TOBEY. Well, of course, this bill does not say that, or anything resembling it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course it does not.

Mr. TOBEY. It says just the reverse of that.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. But the phrase, "the public welfare", without any words of limitation or restriction, might mean a great deal.

Mr. TOBEY. I think the Senator will agree with me that all through this bill, in at least a dozen places, we pay tribute to private enterprise. We put it first. We are going to stimulate it and help it and aid it. There is no question about that in the Senator's mind, is there?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. None in the world. But here is the distinction: Throughout the bill it is stated that it is proposed to encourage and sponsor many forms of industry, and that is proper. No one is against that. Everyone is in hearty accord with such an idea and such a policy as that. The point I make is that industry should be encouraged and fostered. But there is no absolute guaranty, as there is on the question of unemployment; and I see no reason why we should single out one form of industry and say that it shall receive an absolute guaranty, while other industries shall be merely encouraged or fostered.

Mr. TOBEY. The aim of all these things is to protect the country from the curse of unemployment, is it not? That is the objective, is it not?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. We all have that specific objective in mind. Senators may recall that years ago one of the arguments used in behalf of a protective tariff was that if we had a high tariff for certain industries, prosperity would percolate through to the rest of the people, and all around prosperity would follow. I am not raising any question as to the wisdom or lack of wisdom of that policy at this moment, but I say that there is a very definite distinction involved when we come forward with a guaranty to those who seek employment, and when we merely state that we foster and encourage other forms of endeavor. That is a basic distinction. The point is, Do we wish to make it?

Mr. TOBEY. Good private enterprise in this country is the norm. But eventually, when the norm is stricken, and there is a cancer spot of 10,000,000 unemployed on the norm, we say that we shall use every possible effort, whatever it may be, to eradicate the spot. When the war was in progress the Senator and I, and all the others of us, joined in a wholehearted effort to give the President war powers. We enacted the First and Second War Powers Acts. We cut the corners, stimulated private production, and put the fire out. Is there any less danger to the country in a Nation-wide depression? Does it not have to be met with the same heroic treatment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is enough of a logician to know that when a need is pointed out, there is not implied the endorsement of every policy which is suggested to meet that need. Everyone in this country today is determined that there shall be no suffering. So long as there is food, or anything else in this country which is needed for the relief of suffering, we are going to see that it is shared with those who are in distress. But that purpose and intent does not warrant us in adopting a policy which may be in itself unsound.

Mr. TOBEY. The purpose of the bill is to implement that determination, is it not?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Most assuredly so.

Mr. President, the bill is in some respects what might be termed a lopsided bill, because, as I stated a moment ago, it makes an unqualified guaranty that positions will be provided for those who seek them. If the Government is to carry out such a policy, that means that everything else must suffer, if need be, in order that that obligation may be met fully.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think it ought to be made clear whether the objective of the bill is to make its aims a paramount consideration, standing above every other consideration in the National Government, or whether, by real intent, it is meant to reconcile the objectives of the bill with the other necessary activities of the Government. I think that should be done without equivocation, without dodging or ducking, by plain, straightforward language.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from Colorado is entirely correct. The purpose of the amendment is to carry out that idea. We recognize that unemployment is a serious curse on any country. We realize that we must do everything we reasonably can to get rid of it; but we are not willing to adopt the theory that the relief of unemployment is paramount to every other obligation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That was the purpose of my question to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. What was the Senator's question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. My question is whether the Senator places the provisions of this measure in the position of a paramount necessity, above every other requirement of the Federal Government, or whether in real intent he means to reconcile them with the other necessary activities of the Government.

Mr. TOBEY. I will answer the question in this way and I hope the answer will satisfy the Senator. I am asked whether I place the provisions of this bill in a paramount position. I regard as of prime importance, as the first order of business, the duty—and privilege as well—of the American Government, when, as, and if we get into a time of depression, with tremendous unemployment, to give relief to those who are unemployed. There could be no greater need at such a time than to stop unemployment, relieve human distress, and get back to normal. Therefore I favor the bill, which definitely gives assurance on the part of the Government that when, as, and if a time like that should come, it would be the responsibility, the duty, and the privilege of the Government to use every means at its command to assure the people of jobs.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has said that there is nothing greater than the objective which he mentioned, but that does not answer my question. I asked him whether he regarded it as a paramount objective, above everything else.

Mr. TOBEY. When a condition such as that develops, yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Regardless of defense?

Mr. TOBEY. The home interests——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Regardless of national defense?

Mr. TOBEY. Tragedies at home are equal to tragedies abroad.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I say, regardless of national defense?

Mr. TOBEY. National defense would be taken care of.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would it be subordinated?

Mr. TOBEY. If we have an Army and a Navy, we shall have national defense.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I asked the Senator whether or not he would subordinate national defense to his objectives.

Mr. TOBEY. I believe that the first line of national defense is the welfare, well-being, safety, lives, and fortunes of the American people.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland further yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I asked the Senator whether or not he subordinated the na-

tional defense, in terms of our military forces, to the objectives of the bill.

Mr. TOBEY. I do not; but I ask the Senator what he means by national defense?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator does not subordinate it, he is reconciling it.

Mr. TOBEY. What does the Senator mean by national defense?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The defense of this country from invasion, attack, or defeat by an enemy.

Mr. TOBEY. I say to the Senator that, in my judgment, during the next 10, 15, or 25 years, the danger to this country from invasion is far more insignificant and improbable than the danger which may confront this country with 10,000,000 unemployed crying out for bread and jobs.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland further yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have asked the Senator a simple question, which he has not yet answered. Does he place the objectives of this measure in a paramount position, above all other considerations?

Mr. TOBEY. I have answered the Senator. I have said that the first defense of this Nation is the well-being, welfare, lives, and fortunes of its people.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Of course it is.

Mr. TOBEY. I stand on that answer.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am asking the Senator whether he places the objectives of the bill above military defense.

Mr. TOBEY. I have answered the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the Senator's answer?

Mr. TOBEY. I have said it twice. I will say it the third time. The first defense of this country, in my opinion, is to safeguard the lives, fortunes, and well-being of its citizens. If we do not do that, we shall have no national defense, no Army or Navy. There will be nothing left in this country but anarchy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland further yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I repeat my question. I ask the Senator whether he subordinates military defense to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. TOBEY. No; I do not.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then the Senator reconciles the two. What is the Senator's basis for objecting to the general recognition of that principle in the language of this amendment?

Mr. TOBEY. Because the fact remains that the language of the bill covers everything that may be used. I read from the committee report, on page 14. We are going to go all-out to save a situation such as that. We are not going to be qualified, limited, or hamstrung by technical verbiage.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the Senator's objection based upon the contention that the language of the amendment does not adequately provide for a reconciliation?

Mr. TOBEY. I believe that the language of the bill as drafted amply covers the situation, and will give assurance to the American people as to what our policy is to be as a nation in time of unemployment and distress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator assert that the language of the bill reconciles the objectives of the bill with the other necessary objectives of our Government?

Mr. TOBEY. I do not quite get the meaning of the question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will repeat it. I am speaking now of the provisions of the bill, not the amendment. Does the Senator assert that the provisions of the bill reconcile the objectives of the bill with the other necessary objectives of this Government?

Mr. TOBEY. What does the Senator mean by "other"?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Military defense, for one thing.

Mr. TOBEY. I have answered the question as to military and naval strength. Of course, a nation of 130,000,000 people is going to defend itself.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator asks me what I mean by the other necessary objectives of the Government. I gave him one example, but there are dozens of others.

Mr. TOBEY. I answered particularly as to military and naval defense.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I assume that there are other necessary objectives of government.

Mr. TOBEY. I do not know what they are.

Mr. MILLIKIN. For one thing, the necessity of maintaining the Government.

Mr. TOBEY. What does the Senator have in mind specifically?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let us——

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado; and then I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota, after I have made a very brief statement.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I assume that there are many basic necessities of government. We must maintain our courts. We must maintain military defense. Some persons might say that we must maintain a Senate and a House of Representatives. There are many, many essential things for the Government to do. We are working on those all the time. I ask the Senator to show me where in this bill he reconciles his objective with those other necessities.

Mr. TOBEY. Oh, yes; there is no question in my mind but that under the provisions of the pending bill ample opportunity will be provided and is expected to be made to take care of all the needs of this country, including the needs of the Government, and so forth.

Let me ask a question. The Senator from Colorado has been very good at asking questions, so I wish to propound one to him. Suppose we get into a situation in this country in which public works will not take care of the employment needs; for instance, suppose the situation is such that there are ten or twelve million unemployed in this country, and suppose we find that public works will provide employment for only 5,000,000 of them. What would the Senator do to take care of the remaining number of unemployed?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am very glad to answer that question.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall be glad to have the Senator answer it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the crazy twenties we thought the source of wealth was the stock ticker, and in the succeeding years we thought that the source of wealth was the printing presses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. Mr. President, we can destroy this country by running those printing presses and by following an irresponsible fiscal policy, just as we can by following a policy of regarding the stock ticker as the source of wealth and by relying on other unsound policies.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe that the Senator's question was what will we do if we have ten or twelve million unemployed persons and if we find that 5,000,000 of them are not taken care of by the public works program of which we have been speaking.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes. If under a public works program there are not enough jobs to take care of millions of unemployed persons, including men who have come back from the war, what shall we do? I should like to have the Senator's answer to that question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We would necessarily have to consider whether by following the program the Senator from New Hampshire proposes we would destroy the economy of our country. We would destroy our economy by relying on the printing presses as the source of our wealth and the panacea of our troubles. That is what the Senator would have us do, because he has resisted every effort to bring the objective of his bill into relation with a balanced budget or into relation with the other essentials to good, sound government.

The Senator from New Hampshire has stated his objective, namely, the securing of full employment. At the present time the wealth of the Nation is to be found in the people and in the local communities. This country now has a debt of $300,000,000,000 and an annual deficit of $50,000,000,000. Let us govern ourselves accordingly, and at the same time remember where the wealth of the country is.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, in closing let me say to the Senator from Colorado that under section 2 (d), on page 14, paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) provide for exhausting all possible help from the States and private enterprise before anything of the sort is contemplated.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Of course, Mr. President, if the States, the local communities, and the people have exhausted all possibilities of aid, nothing will be left to us. We do not operate in a vacuum. We do not get our money out of the thin air. We get it from the people. If the tap roots have been severed, what shall we have to deal with?

Mr. TOBEY. Under those circumstances, what will happen to the people?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know; if the people are completely denuded of their strength and resources and if the local communities and if the States have gone bankrupt, there will be nothing left to put up.

Mr. TOBEY. So, Mr. President, the bill concludes:

(4) to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, Mr. President, the Senator asserts that after the people have lost everything they have and after the local communities have lost everything they have and after the States have lost everything they have—and that is where the wealth now is—we shall have something left and we shall do something. That is a non sequitur on its face.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I cannot follow the reasoning of the Senator from Colorado, I am sorry to say.

I thank the Senator from Maryland for yielding to me.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota in a moment. First, I wish to thank the Senator from Colorado for his very forceful statement. He has stressed the point we have in mind. This bill certainly would have full employment considered as paramount to everything else. Again and again in the committee we called attention to the fact that there might be other obligations of the Government to which equal consideration would have to be given. That is the reason why we use the language—

Consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy.

Most assuredly, Mr. President, the Government should consider everything in proportion. Most assuredly the Government should not single out one objective and say that under all circumstances it must come first, ahead of everything else. But that is what the bill in its present form would do.

What we have in mind in the pending amendment is that the various needs and obligations of the Government shall be considered and that in working out a policy suitable recognition shall be given to the doctrine of relative values and to the theory of sound proportions.

In the committee we were told that we must not do that, and that no such amendment as we now offer would be tolerated. We were told we must state flatfootedly that full employment is the paramount obligation. Mr. President, no one can foresee what full employment might cost us. No one can foresee what might be our obligations for self-defense or in connection with our various domestic policies.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I merely wish to comment briefly on a statement made a few minutes ago by the Senator from New Hampshire which to me was the most startling and amazing statement of political philosophy I have ever heard uttered on this floor. I understood the Senator from New Hampshire to say that if 10,000,000 of our people became unemployed, under the philosophy of this bill the obligation to find and to guarantee jobs for those 10,000,000 people would become the paramount obligation of the Government, and that all other obligations would have to give way before it.

Mr. President, I came to the Senate with the somewhat old-fashioned idea that the paramount obligation of our Government is to protect and preserve the individual rights and freedoms of individual citizens as set forth in the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. It seems to me that this insistence that complete, utter economic security must be guaranteed every individual by the Federal Government, regardless of what else we may have to do or what other obligations under the Constitution we would consequently have to shirk, is exactly the kind of political philosophy and attitude which, on the part of the people in Italy and Germany, led straight to fascism and nazism.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is entirely incorrect. May I answer the Senator?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I have not yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire. Does he desire that I yield to him?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I would appreciate it very much indeed if the Senator from Maryland would yield to me.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thought the Senator was about to leave the amendment which has been under discussion and was about to discuss another amendment. I wish to be sure that I have the situation in mind. Aside from the language mentioned by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], am I correct in assuming that in the amendment the Senator states full employment as an objective, whereas in the bill it is stated as an obligation or, as the Senator interprets it, as a guaranty?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, that is the real difference between the amendment and the bill. I was going to illustrate that situation by discussing another amendment which the Senator from Ohio and I shall offer.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In regard to the discussion relative to the assurance of full employment as an obligation superior to all other obligations or all other matters of policy, I wish to suggest to the Senator that there is no question that we can provide for full employment in the United States. Russia does it; Germany does it. In other words, if we are willing to sacrifice freedom, we can secure employment. There is no question about that. Unquestionably, if we put full employment as the absolute goal above every other consideration, we put it above freedom. It seems to me that in the long run the tendency unavoidably is to lead us into a completely totalitarian state where the state gives full employment by giving everybody a job and telling him what job which he must take.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is correct; and that is what I had in mind when referring to the fact that the test to which the Senator has referred has never been tried out in any country having democratic institutions.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will yield in a moment.

As an illustration of how one-sided is the language of the bill in its present form, allow me to say that at the bottom of page 12 is the following:

(b) All Americans able to work and desiring to work are entitled to an opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment.

I suggested in the committee that that language was certainly one-sided, and I offered an amendment which would provide that persons would have either an opportunity for employment, or the right to engage in some form of gainful occupation. That amendment was voted down, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and I have offered the following amendment to be added on page 12 at the end of line 26: "or to earn a remunerative living as an independent operator in agriculture, commerce, industry, or the professions."

As I said a while ago, when there is suffering in this country we will try to relieve it as soon as possible so long as there is anything which we can utilize for that purpose. However, we should not take the position that the matter of employment comes before the defense of the realm, before agriculture, commerce, or industry, or before those who engage in other occupations or professions. Our duty whatever it may be—and we may have different opinions as to what that duty may be—is just as strong to the farmer, the grocery man, the lawyer, the druggist, and others in similar classes of endeavor, as it is with respect to the laborer.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I have studied the proposed amendment, and I think it is a constructive one. I talked to the Senator about it during the recess. I have also talked to the legislative expert who advised me that the amendment could be carried into effect by adding to the end of paragraph (b) in line 26 on page 12 of the bill, the following:

Including self-employment in agriculture, commerce, industry, or the professions.

I agree with the Senator that the amendment has merit, because there will be great need for expansion in the different fields he has mentioned, such as agriculture, commerce, and industry, as well as in the professions. There will be a great need for more doctors and dentists throughout the country, and the need will also be extended to business establishments. There will be a need for more business establishments, as well as an increase in industry and commence. One of the reasons why those various branches of activity have been retarded is the condition which has developed un-

der our economic system making possibly the growth of monopolies and big business which have in turn engaged in price fixing activities, to the detriment of small business enterprises. I believe the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Do I understand the author of the bill is accepting the Radcliffe amendment?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; in the form in which I have suggested.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that matter should be discussed a little further. I certainly will not be bound by any such acceptance.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Allow me to say to the Senator from Kentucky that I believe he has in mind the wrong amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am talking about the amendment the Senator has offered. As I understand, that is the one now before the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. No; the Senator from Maryland referred to a subsequent amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes. I discussed a second amendment to be offered which is closely related to the first.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was called from the Chamber in connection with an important Senate committee, and I was not present when the Senator offered his second amendment. However, I want to make it plain that if the Senator from Montana is agreeing to the first amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland, he will not have my cooperation.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from Kentucky is mistaken.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Montana accepting any amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MURRAY. I have merely stated that the Senator's proposal has merit, and that so far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept it in the form in which I stated it could be added to the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. As one of the sponsors of the bill, I wish to say that I will not accept any amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] or the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] until it has been printed and we have an opportunity to study it. We know that the Senator from Ohio has a philosophy that the fewer persons who have employment in this country, the better off the country will be. He has publicly so stated. I wish to read the Senator's own words on that subject.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Allow me to say for the information of the Senator from Vermont that he is somewhat under a misapprehension. The amendment to which I refer has been printed, and it is shown in the minority report.

Mr. TAFT. The statement which was made by the Senator from Vermont is untrue, and he knows it to be untrue.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not untrue, and I can prove that it is not untrue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. On January 18, 1945, the Senator from Ohio delivered an address to the National Industrial Conference Board in New York City. He evidently thought that the address was a good one, because he subsequently, on January 22, 1945, asked to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I quote from the speech which he made:

> How can we say there must be 60,000,000 jobs when perhaps 50,000,000 workers can do all the work of the Nation? Doesn't a nation have a higher standard of living if the work can be done by a fewer number of people in fewer hours?

Those are the words of the Senator from Ohio. If they do not mean that the country is better off when we have a substantial number of unemployed, I do not know what they mean.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The statement I made was perfectly true. When we had a pioneer economy everyone from the child 5 years of age up to the man 65 or 70 years of age worked. Since then we have steadily reduced the number of persons who must work in proportion to the total population. The more we can reduce that number the fewer will be the number of persons who will work, the later in life at which they will begin to work, and the earlier they must retire. The result will be a higher standard of living. If the work which must be done can be done by only 50,000,000 people, our standard of living will be higher than if the work requires 60,000,000 people. The situation has been steadily improving since the beginning of this country. It has steadily improved even since the early days of Rome and the barbarian states.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the Senator from Ohio take the position that it is impossible, under our system of free enterprise, to furnish full employment in this country, and that we must have——

Mr. TAFT. I do not take any position at all. I say that there is no panacea by which we can furnish full employment unless we are prepared to adopt a totalitarian system. As soon as our policy of free enterprise is interfered with by politics, or by various kinds of pressures which upset what might be called the balance of the system, the resultant imbalance will not be cured by pouring in vast billions of dollars of Federal money. It certainly will not be a panacea.

Mr. MURRAY. Does not the Senator recognize that our economic system owes an obligation to the people to furnish an opportunity for them to make a living? Is not that one of the basis for having a system?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly it should be the policy of the United States to let everyone work who wants to work, and it should be the policy of the United States to give everyone an education, so far as that can be done, and to retire them at an early age. That should be the policy of the United States Government.

The Senator asked, Is it an obligation? What does he mean? Does he mean an obligation to do it by law? Does the Senator mean an obligation to give every man a job who comes and asks for a job? Is that what he means? What does he mean by saying we have an obligation?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Ohio overlooks the fact that our economic system has been changed by individuals. It has been controlled by monopoly and the building up of big business, which has prevented industry from operating in such a fashion as to furnish full employment. That has been recognized by the economists and students of this problem for some time.

Mr. TAFT. What has the Democratic Party been doing about these monopolies for the last 12 years?

Mr. MURRAY. The Republicans have been so entrenched in the Senate and in the House that we have had great difficulty in doing anything, but we are making an effort, just the same.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from Montana uses a phrase which illustrates the point. He spoke about an obligation. Yes, it is an obligation. Everyone thinks it is an obligation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The only issue is whether it is such a paramount obligation that it comes ahead of every other obligation.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wished to make an inquiry of the Senator from Ohio. I have not read the full speech from which the Senator from Vermont quoted, in which the Senator from Ohio stated that if there were 60,000,000 people who wanted to work and who could work, and we could get along with 50,000,000, we would have a higher standard of living. If there are 60,000,000 people available for work and who want work and need work, but the work which the 60,000,000 could do or would do can be done by 50,000,000 because of greater efficiency, what is the Senator's remedy; what is his thought as to what shall happen to the other 10,000,000?

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, I did not say that 60,000,000 wanted to work, and that it would be better to have 50,000,000. I am merely saying that a situation in which all the work that needs to be done can be done by 50,000,000 creates a higher standard of living than if 60,000,000 are doing it. How do we get the figure of 60,000,000? In the first place, there are only about 34,000,000 family units in the United States. There are about 8,000,000 individual units, which makes 42,000,000. So that to provide 60,000,000 jobs means we are going to

give two jobs to each of 18,000,000 families in the United States. Are we sure they have to work or want to work? In other words, if we can give the 50,000,000 people sufficient pay, if they can do the work, if the machinery is so fine that that 50,000,000 can do the work, there are probably 18,000,000 wives or other people in the families who will not have to work. So that the suggestion that 60,000,000 jobs are necssary is a pure estimate. I maintain that if we got down to the point where only one man in a family had to work, and he could support the family, there would be a higher standard of living than if his wife had to work and his children had to work, perhaps, and many others in the family had to work. That is the suggestion I made in the speech. If the Senator from Kentucky will read the speech, I think he will agree with everything I say in it. I am hopeful he will.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I thought the Senator's speech was that good, I should read it tonight.

Mr. TAFT. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the position of the Senator from Ohio in regard to the matter, and I agree it is not possible to get the theme song of any speech without reading it all. I also agree that the figure 60,000,000 is purely an arbitrary one. I do not know whether there are 60,000,000 people who, in normal peacetimes, want to work. I realize that there probably will be, if there are not now. We have never worked 60,000,000 in peacetimes. We did not really employ 60,000,000 wage earners at the peak of the war. But as our population increases, we can anticipate a time when there will be 60,000,000 available workers.

I realize also that it would be a happy situation if our economic and social system should be so worked out that old people would not be required to work, and that young people within school age would be able to go to school instead of working. But if it turns out that in our economy there are 60,000,000 people who need to work in order to support themselves, and yet the work which the 60,000,000 would do can be done by 50,000,000 because of greater efficiency, or for any other reason, then, as a social and economic problem, we must give consideration to what is going to happen to the 10,000,000 who want to work and need to work but who cannot obtain work because the 50,000,000 are able to do the work that is necessary to be done.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with everything the Senator from Kentucky has said. The only question is as to what policy we shall prescribe, or whether we shall prescribe any completely definite policy, concentrated on one thing, so to speak, at least all the emphasis on one thing, namely, public spending. I wish to discuss that at some length tomorrow. I cannot answer the Senator except by stating the whole philosophy of my opposition to the particular section of the bill we are considering.

I am in favor of concentrating our program so that it will be directed, all of it, to eliminating unemployment. I am in favor of considering any measure proposed within that field. I think we make a mistake in adopting as a definite formula and prescribing in this bill, as I shall show tomorrow, a perfectly well recognized system advanced by Lord Keynes and Mr. Beveridge in England, and advanced by Henry Wallace in this country, that the proper cure for unemployment is more Federal spending. That is the point of my opposition to the bill.

I think we should have an economic program. I do not particularly think that the present administration would adopt the economic program I would adopt, but I think someone should adopt an economic program. The administration is in power, and was put in power by the people, and I am in favor of it adopting a program, but I think it should be a wide-open program, under which the people are free to choose any method they wish to choose, and not be bound by a policy laid down by Congress that in the long run Federal spending must be put in front of everything else.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I agree with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from Maryland wish to conclude his remarks on the amendment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I should like to make one statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to ask a question as to the parliamentary situation. Did the Senator withdraw the original amendment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; it is still pending.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me refer again to the language of the amendment, "consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of international policy." That, of course, involves matters of the Treasury and the debt. That matter will be discussed tomorrow, but it is certainly one question which is entitled to proper and suitable consideration and action.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As a member of the committee, I have attended the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the pending bill, and I have been rather intrigued with one particular phase of this matter in which I am personally interested, and I wonder if the Senator has had any different experience from mine.

A great host of people came before the committee and categorically approved every phase of the bill as it is proposed, a very impressive list; but so far as my experience went, as a member of the committee, I did not hear one single individual who wholeheartedly approved every phase of the bill say anything at any time about where the money was to come from to pay these deficits or extraordinary Federal expenditures. I heard no program and no mention of raising the money proposed to be spent in the years to come to secure by Federal action the employment spoken of. I wonder if the Senator had any different experience from mine in the committee.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. None whatever, and tomorrow the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Maryland will offer an amendment covering that particular point.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to take the Senator from his feet, but if he has finished discussing the amendment, I think the Senate might recess until tomorrow.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. And take it up tomorrow and go on with it?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Has not the Senator finished his remarks?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I have nearly finished, but I should prefer to conclude tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought probably the Senator wanted to conclude his remarks this afternoon, and if he does, we can remain in session.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The amendment is really basic to the whole bill.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will yield to me, I shall occupy only about 30 seconds of the Senate's time. I wish to answer the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], but first I wish to say one word in reply to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. He asks us where we are going to get the money. I ask him the question: Where did we get the money with which to win the war?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. By deficit financing, and the taxes are not laid yet with which to pay the bill.

Mr. TOBEY. Exactly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The proponents of the bill are now proposing to embark on a program of unlimited financing, without giving one single thought, in the provisions of this bill, to where the money is coming from.

Mr. TOBEY. In the great war emergency the Nation found the money necessary to win the war. The Nation can find the money necessary to win the war in a domestic emergency coequal and dangerous in extent to that of the war emergency.

Now, answering the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who said the Senator from New Hampshire had made the most amazing statement of political philosophy——

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I assume the Senator from Kentucky would like to have the Senate take a recess at this time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am in no hurry. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] said he wanted to speak for a few seconds. He has perhaps another sentence or two he wishes to utter.

Mr. TOBEY. I do not think I can be cut off before doing that.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me make a very brief statement.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator yielded to me, did he not?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I thought the Senator had finished.

Mr. TOBEY. No. I had a double-barreled statement to make. I have given the first barrel to the Senator from Iowa. I will give the second barrel now. The second barrel is addressed particularly to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who rose on the floor a few moments ago and said, "The most amazing statement of political philoso-

phy I ever heard on the floor of the Senate was enunciated by the Senator from New Hampshire." The Senator from Minnesota said that the first and paramount obligation of Government is to protect and preserve the rights and freedom guaranteed to the citizens. I assume he was referring to the first ten amendments to the Constitution, to the Bill of Rights, Nos. 1 to 10. I am ready to lay down my life with him to protect the rights of our citizens, the freedom of religion, the freedom of speech, the right of trial by jury, and the other rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

But let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that if we come to that point in this country—and God forbid we ever do—when 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 unemployed are walking the streets, when their children are at home crying for bread and lack the necessities of life—when we get into such an emergency those unfortunates will not worry about freedom of speech or freedom of assembly or trial by jury, when their stomachs are empty and up against their backbones.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may make one brief remark?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think that is why we are elected to the United States Senate. It is our job to worry about them all the time.

Mr. TOBEY. That is what we are doing in this bill, providing for any such eventuality.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I have nearly finished but the hour is very late. I have a few remarks I want to make tomorrow when the Senate convenes. I am perfectly willing and ready, if the majority leader desires, at this time to stop, but I wish to leave one idea with the Senate. I think the discussion today has emphasized the point that the difference between us is this: Is this the paramount obligation, or should it be considered in connection with other obligations of the Federal Government, whatever they may be, and whatever might be the proper amount of force and credit and strength to be attributed to each and all of them?

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I want to be sure that we are now considering the Radcliffe amendment we were discussing earlier in the day. Later we went on to talk of other amendments. I am somewhat confused respecting the situation. There was even a suggestion made of accepting one of the Senator's amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was a confusion which arose in my mind.

Mr. WAGNER. It also arose in mine.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator from Maryland was talking about the amendment which was pending. He said he would accept something as a part of it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think I can explain the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand now that from the parliamentary standpoint the original amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland is the pending question. That while he has had another amendment printed, it cannot be offered at this time.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The language of the second amendment was discussed in explanation of the first amendment, because the two are so closely interrelated in nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] on page 14 to strike out lines 20 to 24, inclusive, and line 25 through the word "such", and to insert certain language which has previously been read.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, to be Surplus Property Administrator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gael E. Sullivan, of Illinois, to be Second Assistant Postmaster General, effective October 1, 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John C. Lehr, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, September 27, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 26 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Rosa L. Spence, Buffalo, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gaddis W. Killian, Coilbran, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Sarah E. Waites, Cusseta, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clarice Davis, Hacoda, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bob Lee Dixon, Hatchechubbee, Ala. Office became Presidential Juply 1, 1945.

John T. Cope, Inverness, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Roxie Lois Clark, Jack, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James T. Finley, Jr., Owassa, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary R. Huguley, Pigeon Creek, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Thadeus E. Bolling, Pike Road, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert C. Newton, Webb, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

ALASKA

Velovous Allen Poor, Douglas, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Arleen Kranich, Homer, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Orrin S. Felmley, McGrath, Alaska. To correct name.

ARKANSAS

Eula E. Gardner, Bee Branch, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Joe H. Webb, Egypt, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Doris L. Crank, Garland, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hendrix Williams, Grubbs, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Myrtie V. Martin, McKamie, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John Louis Robinson, New Blaine, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles F. Smith, Oden, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Madie C. Duncan, Ogden, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ruth V. Gibson, Summers, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Henry M. Lambert, Winthrop, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CALIFORNIA

Alice R. Scheiber, El Dorado, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George O. Athey, Forestville, Calif., in place of I. J. Silk, resigned.

COLORADO

Velma Anna Thomason, Adams City, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lillian M. Drysdale, Austin, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles C. Chambers, Cokedale, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Constance Espinoza, Conejos, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dorothy L. Pollock, Eckert, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bertha W. Simpson, Iliff, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Cecile B. Ashcraft, Matheson, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frances Tweedie, McClave, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Talitha B. Utterback, Mesa, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John R. Hunter, New Raymer, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Marie E. Entwistle, Nunn, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Thomas A Davis, Portland, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Albert W. Manhart, Sedalia, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary D. Brunelli, Sopris, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Christine Jespersen, Weldona, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONNECTICUT

Sol Adler, Cobalt, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles T. Swanson, Cornwall, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Irma R. Doughty, Groton Long Point, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Thomas L. Barry, Norfolk, Conn., in place of C. J. Fields, resigned.

Orrin R. Bugbee, West Suffield, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

FLORIDA

Willis C. Preston, Cypress, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edythe E. Parker, McDavid, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John R. Moseley, Milligan, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Myrtle L. Duggar, Panacea, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945

HAWAII

Julia K. L. Rodrigues, Hanalei, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

IDAHO

Lola Rossi, Idaho City, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Maybelle E. McEachern, King Hill, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Walter J. Morbeck, Kingston, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lynn S. Anderson, Lorenzo, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George E. West, Middleton, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John Henry Thompson, Malta, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Nettie A. Sheffler, Sagle, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

ILLINOIS

Frederick W. Neal, Alexander, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John F. Gruneisen, Dundas, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Marguerite W. Talley, Parkersburg, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary Z. Schnell, Roxana, Ill., in place of H. H. Strahan, retired.

INDIANA

Jennings W. Luttman, Hudson, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Jesse Yoder, Plymouth, Ind., in place of J. C. Whitesell, deceased.

IOWA

John S. Benbow, Archer, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Nelle B. Davis, Conway, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Esther E. Olson, Jolley, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Tjebbe D. Beintema, Leighton, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James M. Van Vliet, Otley, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Timothy P. Sheehy, Searsboro, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

KANSAS

William F. Folkerts, Albert, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Anna B. Jennings, Arnold, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Floyd B. Martin, Lane, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

KENTUCKY

John R. Murray, Guston, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elmer Schadler, Morning View, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William F. Marrs, Mount Hermon, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Estelle Little, Sandgap, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert A. McDowell, Simpsonville, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

LOUISIANA

Margaret M. Watson, Fluker, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bolden L. Kinchen, Watson, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MAINE

Lauren F. Kelly, Belgrade, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Julia D. Wells, Brownfield, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John H. Watterson, Blaine, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edith M. Bradbury, East Brownfield, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Eva F. Sanborn, East Sebago, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Nettie L. Towle, Enfield, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Egline Plourd, Frenchville, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elsie A. Davis, Greenwood Mountain, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alfred E. Crabtree, Hancock, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Merle R. Snell, Kents Hill, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Adelaide Walker Lister, Locke Mills, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Pauline E. Higgins, Manset, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charlotte F. Robbins, McKinley, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles F. Huff, Orrs Island, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frank D. Fournier, St. David, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Cora B. Means, Sedgwick, Maine. Office became presidential July 1, 1945.

Herman L. Sawyer, Steuben, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fred L. Ludwig, Washington, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vance A. Lincoln, Wayne, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Daisy M. Littlefield, Webhannet, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MASSACHUSETTS

John F. Counihan, South Hamilton, Mass. In place of D. H. Knowlton, deceased.

C. Herbert Jefferson, South Hanover, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George O. Vaine, Winchendon Springs, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Theodore R. Shepard, Alba, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Simon F. Close, Birch Run, Mich., in place of A. M. Wolohan, resigned.

Elsie W. Kibby, Bradley, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edith G. McNamara, Brethren, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Maxine Hilden, Free Soil, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hazel E. Vredenburg, Ossineke, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Myrtle S. Dunbar, Samaria, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Orton E. Melchoir, Wallace, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William J. Roberge, Wilson, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MINNESOTA

Arnie N. Sellman, Almelund, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ellsworth T. Swanson, Crystal Bay, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Evelyne L. Wilson, Mahtowa, Minn. in place of H. A. Wilson, deceased.

Frank B. Klein, St. Bonifacius, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSISSIPPI

Naomi Leach, Center, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ivy L. Parker, Derma, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

J. Lester L. Beasley, Sherman, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mamie L. Odom, Slate Spring, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Jimmie A. Bevill, Thaxton, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Amanda Burchfield, Tomnolen, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSOURI

Lottie Mason, Bois D'Arc, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alfred G. Krueger, Jr., Bridgeton, Mo., in place of D. E. Marcum, resigned.

Joe Rogers, Clearmont, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Earl L. Wilegus, Foristell, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Essie L. Glascock, Holliday, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Everett E. Neely, Stahl, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MONTANA

Edana F. Boschert, Ballantine, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Norman M. Spangelo, Box Elder, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elizabeth McCormick, Clydepark, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mina B. Madsen, Dagmar, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Joshua E. Patterson, Edgar, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ruth M. Atkins, Gallatin Gateway, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles L. Gorman, Havre, Mont. In place of G. A. Wright, resigned.

Emma M. Shults, Inverness, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Esther E. Heigh, Ismay, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clarence J. Morgan, Judith Gap, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Marion Coates, Martinsdale, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Leslie N. Field, Melstone, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Kathryn E. Auclair, Paradise, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

F. Reese Puckett, Peerless, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William L. Marsh, Roy, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Eunice N. Skinner, Simms, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alerta K. Bradbury, Willow Creek, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEBRASKA

Evelyn A. Endres, Crab Orchard, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Maude M. Dunn, Inavale, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Otis T. Carlson, Marquette, Nebr. In place of R. M. Guilford, declined.

Robert G. Lynch, Roseland, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harry V. Smith, Waco, Nebr. In place of E. J. Kaltenborn, transferred.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

John P. Wright, Bretton Woods, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Glenn E. Gray, Kearsarge, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Marion Horner Robie, Melvin Village, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fred E. Carswell, Milton Mills, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Irene N. Wentworth, New Durham, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frank E. LeBranche, Newmarket, N. H., in place of A. F. Priest, removed.

Hayden E. Cheney, Newton Junction, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Susie C. Simpson, West Rumney, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW JERSEY

Frank F. Rogers, Deal, N. J., in place of J. A. Poole, retired.

Edward J. Meskill, Lambertville, N. J., in place of J. A. Cleary, retired.

Josephine M. Schmidt, Magnolia, N. J., in place of V. A. Cox, resigned.

Earnest A. Oakley, Pequannock, N. J., in place of Elah Munson, resigned.

Victor E. Heineman, Ridgefield Park, N. J., in place of Fred Heckel, removed.

NEW MEXICO

James E. Matchin, Crownpoint, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vincent C. Steele, Greenville, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Louise Miller, Loco Hills, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bertha R. Yessler, Nara Visa, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Anastacia V. Lopez, Penasco, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW YORK

Helen T. Quick, Athol Springs, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Myrtle M. Fingar, Coram, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert W. Tomlinson, McLean, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frank J. Donnelly, Mill Neck, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William H. Smith, Swormville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George W. Doremus, Tallman, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Loretta H. Grover, Varysburg, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Howard D. Kellogg, West Falls, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mildred W. Gimlich, West Lebanon, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Marie H. Bingham, Westernville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

Wade W. Bridges, Mooresboro, N. C., in place of E. B. Harris, resigned.

Robert C. Pearce, Micro, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH DAKOTA

Hannah M. Fedje, Barton, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alice Jacobson, Benedict, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary Fritz, Bowesmont, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John Fiske, Colfax, N. Dak. Office become Presidential July 1, 1945.

William F. Stone, Knox, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elizabeth L. Stahl, McGregor, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William F. Henger, Mooreton, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harold D. Ward, Palermo, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OHIO

Earl L. Davis, Barberton, Ohio, in place of L. V. Walsh, removed.

Joseph A. Schira, Carey, Ohio, in place of O. P. McDaniel, transferred.

Tressie L. Kissling, McGuffey, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Guy H. Latham, Monroeville, Ohio, in place of M. E. Martin, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Charles A. Warren, Brinkman, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Thomas H. Atkins, Bromide, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Henry C. Black, Cloud Chief, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gussie C. Morton, Cromwell, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Obera Goodwin, Durham, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dora L. Parks, Fay, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harold Chaffin, Francis, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Joseph E. Carnes, Kansas, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Virgil L. Stokes, Marietta, Okla., in place of O. B. Autry. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1945.

Jerome H. Hodgens, Moffett, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ethel Watkins, Talala, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Artie B. Clement, Texola, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John R. Chitwood, Vinson, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OREGON

Anna J. Schatz, Adams, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Eula M. Easley, Bates, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Emma L. Saling, Beaver, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Don C. Meyer, Blue River, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Blanche E. White, Corbett, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gladys D. Holverson, Crescent Lake, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mae E. St. Helen, Donald, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elsie E. Campbell, Eagle Creek, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harriet A. Zumbrun, Fort Klamath, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edith T. George, Goble, Oreg., in place of C. F. Fowler, transferred.

Richard E. Tozier, Helix, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles M. Cox, Lowell, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Anna Tohl, Manzanita, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Connie Hanner, Murphy, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Nancy F. Skinner, Adrian, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Stuart E. Shearer, Braeburn, Pa., in place of E. J. Coleman, deceased.

James H. Opie, Donaldson, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lettie C. Reese, Exton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Arthur Bagshaw, Glenloch, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

L. Chester Stevens, Hustontown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary E. R. Martin, Indiana, Pa., in place of H. W. Fee, retired.

William Van Tassel, Lawrence, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lynnford L. Livengood, Manorville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Daniel M. Herr, New Providence, Pa., in place of H. C. Bair, retired.

E. Pearl Witherow, Olanta, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vincent Smith, Riddlesburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George McConnell, Sandy Lake, Pa., in place of F. M. Smith, deceased.

Verna B. Fissel, Shermans Dale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Florence V. Wiley, Uwchland, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles A. Barlok, Whitney, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

RHODE ISLAND

Harriet A. H. Nichols, Foster Center, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Thomas J. Conroy, Hamilton, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mary Bates Ratchford, Carlisle, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Roy B. Cromer, Lake City, S. C., in place of E. G. Poston, transferred.

Benjamin T. Garrett, Six Mile, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Harold M. Bitzer, Tolstoy, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TENNESSEE

Ona G. Matheny, Campaign, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Sinda Rector, Pioneer, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lambert C. Idol, Westbourne, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Dorothy R. Spande, Adrian, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lillian Meadows Smith, Argyle, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Newt Woolard, Oklaunion, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Carl P. Koch, Jr., Von Ormy, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

UTAH

Clark S. Wood, Levan, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Cora E. Paxton, Lynndyl, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ora E. Fotheringham, Minersville, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bertha D. Bench, Saltair, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

VERMONT

Beatrice M. E. Holmes, Canaan, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Rose B. Kemp, Craftsbury, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dorothy M. Stewart, Cuttingsville, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Katherine D. Kelley, Middletown Springs, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

May P. Squire, New Haven, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Francis E. Dennis, North Clarendon, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William H. Salmond, Perkinsville, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fred B. Tilden, Roxbury, Vt. Office made Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elwood C. Bacon, Thetford Center, Vt. Office made Presidential July 1, 1945.

VIRGINIA

Edna O. Watkins, Buffalo Junction, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Regina E. Selby, Greenbackville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lottie Herndon, Ruckersville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Adam R. Springston, Wilsons, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WASHINGTON

Louis Von Salzen, Ashford, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ella M. Jasmer, Carbonado, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hilborne W. Miller, Colbert, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Carl Arthur Appelo, Deep River, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mattie Laugenour, Hunters, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Enis Beasley, Lyman, Wash., in place of B. S. Vanderford, retired.

Andrew Alner, Moclips, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alfred H. Rodal, Rollingbay, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elizabeth H. Harrow, Skamokawa, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ruby D. Sooter, Underwood, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WEST VIRGINIA

Mary Leftwich, Coal Fork, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Archie L. Peak, Decota, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Foster M. Mays, Kenna, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William A. Thrash, Petroleum, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edith Graham Eckle, Sandstone, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edison R. Lynch, Wyco, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Wence Brzezinski, Krakow, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Walter M. Touhey, Maribel, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gilbert H. R. Frey, Richfield, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dorothy Nielson, Withee, Wis., in place of E. M. Laneville, transferred.

WYOMING

Mary Belle Cozzens, Byron, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mildred P. Sloan, McFadden, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Walter W. Walker, Yoder, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 26 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Gael E. Sullivan to be Second Assistant Postmaster General effective October 1, 1945.

SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

W. Stuart Symington to be Surplus Property Administrator.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John C. Lehr to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan. (Now serving under an appointment which expired June 26, 1944.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou the revelation of the heart of our Heavenly Father, give us courageous strength for this day; give rest for the laborer, grace for trials and compassion for the toiling millions of earth. Shed more light upon the events of these hours that we may meet situations wisely and solve problems justly.

Thou who wert with shame and grief bowed down, yet touched with a feeling of our infirmities, persuade us that benevolence is a tremendous power and he who has this spirit will do gladly and freely that which he knows to be right and just. Help us to shun movements which challenge the liberties of freemen. Impress our country that sound principles never die, either for the individual or for the Nation. Let us not be deceived, O Lord; Thou art not mocked; whatsoever a people soweth that shall it also reap. Bless our land; break down all barriers that prevent unity and harmony between management and labor and give peace to our fellow countrymen everywhere. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday entitled "We Can Lose the Peace."

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from overseas.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Henry J. Kaiser delivered before the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel on the Hoover plan in the matter of postwar loans and assistance to foreign governments.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Constantine Brown.

EXEMPTION OF TAXATION ON ANNUITIES

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House voted to make in order the Ramspeck bill, to give to retired Government workers, as tax-free income, the sum of $1,440 over and above exemptions and deductions now allowable, of their retirement pay.

As pointed out yesterday by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, that measure is highly discriminatory. I anticipate action on the bill will be taken by the House this week. Before the House votes on the bill I hope every Member of the House will read the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Fred Vinson, which was read to the House yesterday by the chairman of our committee the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Anyone who reads that letter cannot help but vote against that bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The bill is objectionable both from the standpoint of equality of treatment of all taxpayers, and likewise from the standpoint of any opportunity that the Ways and Means Committee will have at this time to give some measure of relief to all the taxpayers in the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is a regulatory, independent agency exercising many quasi-judicial functions the foremost of which is the examination of banks, and therefore should not be treated as a regular executive or administrative agency.

Economies in governmental expenditures will not be effected by reorganization of the Corporation since it has always been self-supporting, has from its very inception operated without annual appropriations, and exercises no functions that can be abolished or properly transferred to any other agency.

The funds of the Corporation, about two-thirds of which have been accumulated through assessments paid by insured banks, are in the nature of a trust fund set aside for insurance purposes; any diversion, through reorganization, of these funds to other uses would be a breach of faith and trust on the part of the Government.

The FDIC has been administered quite satisfactory to the many many millions of stockholders who have their savings invested in bank stocks and those who have their savings deposited in the commercial banks of the Nation. Any reorganization scheme which will cause loss of confidence on the part of these millions of stockholders and depositors can bring great harm to our economic structure. The Congress should not include the FDIC in the reorganization bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by a Denver attorney on the Missouri Valley Authority.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a very able editorial, a tribute paid to labor and industry in this reconversion period in Massachusetts called the Quiet Sector.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from a member of the armed forces in Europe and published in a newspaper. I further ask that the name of the newspaper and the name of the soldier both be deleted, for obvious reasons, but the letter is of such nature as to be of interest to the Congress, to the country, and I hope to the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the

RECORD and include a letter from an excellent friend of mine on Saipan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of the sermon delivered by Bishop Haas at the funeral of Monsignor Ryan. This may exceed the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing, but notwithstanding that I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding that it may exceed the limit, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I presume every Member of the House received a form telegram this morning from the North American Newspaper Alliance which read as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *September 25, 1945.*
Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Request file up to 50 words NPR collect your views whether atomic bomb secret should be given Russia and why.

NORTH AMERICAN NEWSPAPER ALLIANCE.

Here is the telegram I sent them in reply:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 26, 1945.*
NORTH AMERICAN NEWSPAPER ALLIANCE,
New York, N. Y.:

Why limit this to Russia? Now that war is over would anyone suggest we turn over our newest battleships or B–29's to any of our erstwhile cobelligerents? When is Russia going to return our "garden hose"? The fire is out, isn't it? It does not presently appear essential to world peace that Russia be given atomic bomb secret. Should such essentiality materialize consideration of matter could then be had.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Member of Congress.

LET'S KEEP THE SECRETS OF THE ATOMIC BOMB AND INSURE THE PEACE OF THE WORLD

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we all received telegrams similar to the one just read by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] asking us our attitude on giving the secrets of the atomic bomb to Russia.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my attitude on the entire proposition.

America today, as Winston Churchill said, is at the summit of the world. We are today the most powerful nation in the world, and in a position to make ours the most respected nation on earth.

I am opposed to giving anybody the secret of the atomc bomb. Let us keep the secret, keep the bombs we have, keep our machinery ready to make more if necessary, maintain the largest air force on earth, and a navy second to none.

Then let us say to the rest of the world: "If you want peace, let us see you observe it."

In that way we can have peace for the next 50 or 100 years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 74, noes 31.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a motion to adjourn does not require a quorum and that it is too late now for a roll call.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 27, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. on Thursday, September 27, and Friday, September 28, 1945, on H. R. 2202, in room 362, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, September 27, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1751, to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Merchant Marine Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a times from the American republics, other than the United States.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, October 4, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., to consider the bill H. R. 3367, to amend Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing Tuesday, October 2, 1945, at 10:30 a. m. on H. R. 2111 and H. R. 4079, to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, and for other purposes. Hearings will be held in the committee room, 416 Old House Office Building. Anyone desiring to give testimony should notify the clerk of the committee prior to date of hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, will meet at 10 a. m. Tuesday, October 9, to begin hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

Various groups who have representation in Washington will be heard during the first week, such as Members of Congress first, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Association of American Railroads, Railroad Traffic Organizations, railroad labor, and truck and bus associations.

The second week will be devoted to various State commissions, agricultural associations, National Industrial Traffic League, and various citizens' traffic associations had traffic boards and chambers of commerce.

It is going to be necessary to limit the time for this hearing as much as possible. It is also desired to avoid any repetition in statements before the committee.

The committee would be pleased to have those who are intending to appear to advise the clerk promptly the least amount of time they will need in which to present their testimony.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of the rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4100. A bill to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut; without amendment (Rept. No. 1027). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4188. A bill to extend the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to certain veterans discharged or relieved from active service prior to December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4189. A bill to extend the time within which veterans may qualify for or receive the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 4190. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Warren, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4191. A bill to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 4192. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary B. Buckley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4193. A bill for the relief of the estate of Chambers H. Buckley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4194. A bill for the relief of Alice Randolph; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1196. Mr. KEARNEY presented a petition containing the signatures of 34 citizens of the Thirty-first Congressional District, State of New York, advocating the enactment by the Congress of prohibition legislation (H. R. 2082), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, September 10, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who are the light behind life's shadows and the love behind life's sorrows, stooping to our low estate, give to us, we beseech Thee, sufficient of Thy light for us in the dark to rise by. Thus in the constant radiance of Thy presence may we walk life's common way in fortitude and singleness of heart. Our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded as in Thy name they laid the deep foundations of this free land. In dark days Thou didst lead them along a toilsome and tedious road. So may our hearts be sensitive to Thy guidance and our daily service worthy of the trust which the Nation has committed to our hands.

We ask it in that name which is above every name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., September 27, 1945.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 26, 1945, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Crugers-on-Hudson, near Peekskill, N. Y., as Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message will be received.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, September 26, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

OCCUPANCY OF THE CHAIR

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I just noticed with interest the announcement read from the desk about the necessary absence of the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate and appointing the honorable Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] in his place. As I looked up I saw a transition taking place, mirabile dictu, and my mind went back to an epitaph on a tombstone in a graveyard in a small New Hampshire town. A little child had been born and died at the tender age of 3 weeks. The epitaph on her tombstone reads this way:

It is so soon that I am done for;
I wonder what I was begun for.

The Senator from Utah may feel that way.

Mr. THOMAS of UTAH. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, whatever else happened, it was certainly a temporary absence. I congratulate the Senator from Utah, and I also congratulate the Senator from Tennessee on being able so promptly to resume the duties of the Chair, which he performs with such great ability.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair makes this statement: He thanks the Senator from Utah very earnestly and heartily for his kindness in opening the Senate proceedings; the Chair appreciates it very much. The Chair also thanks the Senator from Kentucky for his kind reference to the present occupant of the chair.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have been appointed by the President of the United States a national delegate to the International Labor Organization Conference. I therefore ask to be excused from the sessions of the Senate while I am performing the duties incident to that appointment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Utah is excused.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM C. MATHES TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, October 5, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of William C. Mathes, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, vice Ralph E. Jenney, deceased. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Democratic Central Committee of San Mateo County, Calif., favoring an appropriation for the construction of the Pillar Point breakwater at Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, Calif., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REMOVAL OF CHEESE AND BUTTER FROM RATIONING—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a joint resolution passed by both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature urging the removal of cheese and butter from rationing.

Since the passage of this resolution, cheese has been removed from rationing.

However, butter still remains on the ration lists. I have repeatedly urged of Secretary of Agriculture Anderson that all points be taken off this latter natural item. But to date my efforts have been unavailing.

May I therefore resubmit my recommendation, along with that of the Wisconsin Legislature, that butter be immediately removed from rationing. It is essential that the Nation's dairy farmers be permitted immediately to readjust to their normal peacetime markets. I need only recall to you that butter has normally supplied a market for 36 to 45 percent of the total milk production of this country. Butter has furnished a ready cash market for the producers, large and small, who are situated in remote areas and who do not have access to markets for whole milk, as well as to producers located more favorably for markets.

In the years since the start of the war literally hundreds of creameries have been forced to close their doors. It is therefore an act of simple justice, both to the American dairy farmer as well as to the entire American people whose prosperity will depend in part upon the well-being of our dairy farmers, to remove butter immediately from rationing.

There being no objection, the joint resolution presented by Mr. WILEY was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution petitioning the Office of Price Administration to abolish rationing of butter and cheese

Whereas rationing was created as a wartime emergency measure and it now appears unnecessary to continue rationing of butter and cheese; and

Whereas in order to protect the dairy interests of Wisconsin and other dairy States, it is urgent that rationing of butter and

cheese be dispensed with immediately: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin respectfully petitions the Office of Price Administration to forthwith abolish rationing of butter and cheese; and be it further

Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the Office of Price Administration, both Houses of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS IN KANSAS AND MISSOURI

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the flood-control committee of the Citizens' Regional Planning Council which covers the counties of Wyandotte and Johnson in Kansas, and Jackson, Clay, and Platte Counties in Missouri, relating to the construction of certain flood-control projects in Kansas and Missouri.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas with the end of the war both in Europe and the Pacific, material and labor will soon be available for the construction of flood-control works in the Missouri River Basin; and

Whereas in each of the past 4 years there have been threats of serious damage in the greater Kansas City area as well as elsewhere in the valley, especially in 1942, 1943, and 1944, an additional rise of 2 feet in the river would have flooded both the Kansas City, Mo., Municipal Airport and the entire central industrial districts both in Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. The resulting damage would have been tremendous. A disastrous flood may occur in the near future; and

Whereas at the outbreak of the war, work had already been started on major flood control works in Kansas and necessary funds had been appropriated and allocated for certain projects including the protection of the central industrial districts in Kansas City; when the war started this work was stopped and funds were withdrawn; and

Whereas the Congress in the flood-control bill of 1944 authorized a complete flood-control project for the Missouri River Basin in what is known as the Pick-Sloan plan, under this authorization the project will be planned and constructed by the United States Engineers Corps and Bureau of Reclamation. Many of these plans are well advanced needing only the appropriation of funds for the beginning of construction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Regional Planning Council, That through action by its flood-control committee and approved by the executive committee, we urge the Congress of the United States as follows:

1. To reappropriate funds to continue construction of those projects in this area already started, and to start construction of those projects in this area for which funds had previously been appropriated; and appropriate funds for the early start of the projects covered by the Pick-Sloan plan, as such appropriations may be requested by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, and as material and labor become available for their construction as follows (these projects have already been approved by Army engineers for the protection of the Kansas City area):

A. Retention reservoirs on tributaries of the Kansas River:

Kanapolis Dam on the Smoky Hill River in Kansas. Reservoir on the Republican River in Harlan County, Nebr. Tuttle Creek Reservoir on the Blue River in Kansas. Milford Reservoir on the Republican River in Kansas.

B. Liberty Bend cut-off on the Missouri below Kansas City, Mo., to lower flood heights at the Kansas Citys.

C. Flood protection works on the Missouri River for the protection of the following districts:

Birmingham levee district, Clay County, Mo.

Blue Valley industrial district, Jackson County, Mo.

Northeast industrial district, Kansas City, Mo.

North Kansas City industrial district.

Municipal Airport and water supply works of Kansas City, Mo.

Central industrial district of Kansas City, Mo.

Fairfax industrial district, Kansas City, Kans.

D. Flood protection works on the Kansas River for the protection of the following districts:

Central industrial district, Kansas City, Mo. and Kansas City, Kans.

Armourdale industrial district, Kansas City, Kans.

Argentine industrial district, Kansas City, Kans.

Turner, Kans., district.

2. That no action be taken by the Congress that will create any over-all authority by whatever name to carry out the construction of the works provided for by the Pick-Sloan plan as already authorized. That these works be planned and constructed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation as already provided for in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

RESOLUTION OF ASSOCIATED NEEDLE INDUSTRIES OF OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Associated Needle Industries of Omaha, Nebr., proposing certain policies with reference to employment, fair competition, and inflation.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Associated Needle Industries of Omaha, a nonprofit association of 14 manufacturers, is vitally concerned with the reconversion of the Nation, and particularly concerned for the reconversion of the members of this association to a peacetime basis; and

Whereas the association and its members are opposed to policies which—

(1) Do not expedite employment;

(2) Do not permit and encourage fair competition;

(3) Promote inflation by artificial restrictions of production; and

Whereas this association and its members are firmly convinced that present OPA policies will close plants, increase unemployment, stifle competition, promote chiseling and black-market operations through its artificial barriers to production and result in devastating inflation; and

Whereas this association and its members firmly believe that present practices impeding the release and disposal of Government-owned surplus materials contribute substantially to the afore-mentioned evils and, further, will result in financial loss to the Government; and

Whereas this association and its members do firmly believe that insured competition and all-out production provide the only avenues by which we can encourage investments, increase employment, eliminate black markets, prevent inflation and maintain a free economy and a free people: Be it hereby

Resolved, That in the best interests of the Nation, the Congress be respectfully requested to—

(1) Promote and insure fair and free competition;

(2) Expedite the disposal of surplus materials;

(3) Abolish unnecessary price controls;

(4) Abolish unnecessary material controls; and further be it hereby

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the president of this association to Senators WHERRY and BUTLER and to Congressmen BUFFETT, CURTIS, MILLER, and STEFAN, and to the Omaha Chamber of Commerce and to the National Chamber of Commerce.

N. B. LAMM,
President, Associated Needle Industries.

Subscribed and signed before me on this 15th day of September 1945.

[SEAL] ANNA K. SCHMITZ,
Notary Public.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. WALSH introduced Senate bill 1438, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1439. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. FULBRIGHT introduced Senate bill 1440, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

INDUCEMENT TO CITIZENS TO MAKE THE NAVY A CAREER

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for reference to the Committee on Naval Affairs a bill to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States Navy a career. I ask that a brief statement explanatory of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1438) to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States Navy a career was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. WALSH is as follows:

The bill is intended to provide more incentives for men to make the Navy a career for 16 or 20 years and thereafter transfer to the Fleet Reserve. The Navy has had a Reserve force ever since 1916. In both World War I and World War II the men and officers of the Reserve have been of great value to the Navy, as they provide a large reservoir of trained men who were immediately available for active service with the fleet and who were available to train the additional personnel needed as the numbers of naval vessels continued to increase.

The Naval Reserve occupies an important place in our plans for the future security of our Nation, and officers and men of the Reserves are needed to augment the Regular Navy immediately on the outbreak of war and with the Regular Navy to bear the first shock of battle in meeting an enemy attack.

Under existing law men may transfer to the Fleet Naval Reserve after 20 years of service. The privilege of transferring to the Fleet Naval Reserve after 16 years of naval service is limited to those who enlisted in the Navy before July 1, 1925. Section 1 of Senator WALSH's bill would extend this privilege of transferring after 16 years of service to those who have enlisted since July 1, 1925; to those who have served in World War II; and to those who first enlist in the Regular Navy within 120 days after enactment of the bill.

Enlisted men who have first enlisted in the Navy since July 1, 1925, and who have transferred to the Fleet Naval Reserve after 20 years of service have received pay at the rate of one-half of the base pay to which they were entitled at the time of transfer. This retainer pay has not included permanent additions to their basic pay nor has it contained a provision for increase of pay due to heroic action. Section 2 of the bill would provide that naval personnel who transfer to the Fleet Reserve after 20 years of service would receive retainer pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the base pay with permanent additions thereto that they were receiving at the time of transfer, multiplied by the number of years of service. There would be an additional increase of 10 percent for men who have been credited with extraordinary heroism in the line of duty or whose average marks in conduct are not less than 95 percent of the maximum. Any increase of pay to which individuals might become entitled under this section would commence on July 1, 1945.

At the present time members of the Fleet Reserve, once they have been transferred thereto, are not able to count additional active service, even though it be wartime service, for purposes of increasing the pay they receive as members of the Fleet Reserve. Section 3 of the bill would permit all active-duty service performed by Fleet Reservists during time of war or between September 8, 1939, and December 7, 1941, for purposes of increasing their pay after they have returned to an inactive-duty status as members of the Fleet Naval Reserve.

To encourage immediate reenlistments the act of August 18, 1941, permitted the payment of double-enlistment allowances to members of the naval service who in time of war or national emergency reenlisted within 24 hours at the ship or station from which discharged. The Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 suspended authority to make payments of these double-enlistment allowances because adequate numbers of men were then being supplied through selective service. Section 4 would reinstate the authority of the Navy Department to make the double-enlisted allowance payments which were authorized by the act of August 18, 1941.

The act of July 24, 1941, permits retired officers of the Navy who had been placed upon the retired list for physical disability to be advanced on the retired list of the Navy to the highest temporary rank held during the war with 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which they were entitled while serving in that higher rank, provided he encountered further physical disability while serving on active duty. The law makes no similar provision for retired enlisted men of the Navy. Section 5 of the bill would grant to retired enlisted men of the Navy the same privilige enjoyed by officers.

The act of July 24, 1941, does not authorize officers and men of the Fleet Reserve (enlisted men transferred to the Reserve after 16 or 20 years of service) who served on active duty during the war and who received temporary advancements during the war to retain these higher ranks while on an inactive duty status. Section 6 of the bill would provide that Fleet Reservists, when returned to an inactive duty status, would retain the highest ranks to which they were temporarily promoted during the war if their services in those ranks were satisfactory. If again called to active duty, however, these officers or men would return in a rank or rating no higher than that in which they were serving at the time of release.

Under existing law, officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve when they are placed upon inactive duty after their service in this war is complete must return in their permanent ranks or ratings. Section 7 of the bill would permit them to return to the inactive list of the Naval Reserve in the highest rank or rating held by them while on active duty if their performance in that rank or rating was satisfactory. It is provided that they would receive no pay increases as a result of occupying a higher rank or rating while on the inactive list of the Naval Reserve and that if recalled to active duty, they would return in their permanent ranks or ratings.

PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL THROUGH EXCHANGE OF STUDENTS IN THE FIELDS OF EDUCATION, ETC.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, for reference to the Committee on Military Affairs, authorizing the use of credits established through the sale of surplus properties abroad for the promotion of international good will through the exchange of students in the fields of education, culture, and science.

Mr. President, the enactment of this bill will assure that at least a part of the returns from the sale of our surplus materials to foreign countries will accrue to the interest of America. Most of the nations desiring to purchase our trucks, railroad equipment, and so forth, abroad, do not have American dollars, or even the goods, to pay and it will, therefore, be necessary for our Government to establish credits for this purpose. These debts may never be paid in full and might, like the war debts after World War I, become a source of irritation between nations and prevent the orderly reestablishment of trade and commerce and the strengthening of our political relations with other countries.

I do not mean that other countries have any plans to try to cheat our country. It is merely a recognition of the facts as they exist today with regard to the international exchange, and ability to make settlements as between nations.

If this bill is approved, the funds will be utilized to exchange students, create a better understanding of our mutual problems, and promote friendly relations, while avoiding possible ill feelings between Nations resulting from inability to meet obligations set up in accordance with traditional methods.

The Surplus Property Administrator has recently indicated that the disposal of surplus property abroad would be placed under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State, to assure conformity to American foreign policies. The disposition of such funds as may be allocated for this educational fund as proposed in this bill will be in accord with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of State.

This bill also provides that expenditures shall be made in accordance with the program to be initiated under the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations, under which the proposed educational and cultural organization of the United Nations will be established under the United Nations Charter, so as to coordinate all educational activities in the international field.

A precedent for this program may be found in our action with regard to the indemnity paid this country as a result of the Boxer Rebellion in China in July 1900. By the protocol of September 7, 1901, an indemnity of $333,000,000 was imposed upon China payable to those countries who were involved in the Boxer Rebellion in the preceding year. Of this amount the United States had claimed $25,000,000. This proved more than adequate to indemnify the claims of nationals of the United States and in 1908, approximately $10,000,000 was returned to the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government placed the money in a trust fund for the education of Chinese youth in China and in the United States. The balance of the amount due, slightly over $6,000,000, was remitted by the United States in 1924. These remunerations were made by Senate Joint Resolution 23, May 25, 1908, and House Joint Resolution 248, May 1, 1924.

This act of friendship has had a very great influence in the promotion of the good will and friendly relations that have prevailed between the people of America and the Chinese. I do not think that one can deny that the exchange of students has been one of the most successful of our international policies. The foresight of our Government, nearly 50 years ago, has paid great dividends in our relations with the people of Asia. The good will and understanding created by the exchange of students has been our greatest bulwark against unfriendly criticism of our policies in the Far East. Many students of the Chinese and other Asiatic peoples agree that our enlightened attitude toward China was our greatest defense to the propaganda of the Japanese in recent years and is to a great extent accountable for the loyalty of these people during the recent war. I think it is reasonable to assume that if a similar program can be intelligently administered among the several nations nese in recent years and is to a great contribution will have been made to the future peace of the world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Arkansas will be received and referred as requested.

The bill (S. 1440) authorizing use of credits established through the sale of surplus properties abroad for the promotion of international good will through the exchange of students in the fields of education, culture, and science introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TYDINGS submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free

competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, which I ask to have printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, these amendments would strike from the GI bill of rights section 1505, which provides:

In the event there shall hereafter be authorized any allowance in the nature of adjusted compensation, any benefits received by, or paid for, any veteran under this act shall be charged against and deducted from such adjusted compensation; and in the event a veteran has obtained a loan under the terms of this act, the agency disbursing such adjusted compensation shall first pay the unpaid balance and accrued interest due on such loan to the holder of the evidence of such indebtedness to the extent that the amount of adjusted compensation which may be payable will permit.

This section of the GI bill of rights is being used as an argument to veterans returning from the war that the Government is not giving them anything, is not helping them, is merely letting them have their own money to pay the expenses of their education, and that they are being required to pay their own tuition and pay for their own books under the GI bill of rights.

This section was placed in the bill by the House, and certainly it should be repealed. If we pass an adjusted pay bill, which I hope we shall do in the future, we can take this matter up then, but under no circumstances should a veteran ever be compelled to pay for his tuition and books. I certainly do not think he should be compelled to pay back the $50 or $75 a month, or whatever sum he may have received for educational benefits.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments submitted by the Senator from Arizona will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as requested.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, at this time I also ask unanimous consent to submit amendments to the bill (S. 650) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, as amended, which I introduced on February 27, 1945. The effect of these amendments would make payable to the beneficiaries of veterans the amount of their insurance in a lump sum, or in cash payments in such amount as the insured may designate, and the remainder in installments.

I ask that the amendments to my own bill be referred to the Committee on Finance for its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments submitted by the Senator from Arizona will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance as requested.

PRESIDENTIAL TENURE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary in support of Senate Resolution 1, in relation to Presidential tenure, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARNING IN 1934 BY EDWIN GORDON LAWRENCE OF TROUBLE WITH JAPAN

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the El Paso Times of September 20, 1945, containing a warning by Edwin Gordon Lawrence of trouble with Japan, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPROVEMENT OF THE SOIL—ADDRESS BY MRS. ROY C. F. WEAGLY

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "For Land's Sake and for Life's Stake," dealing with improvement of the soil, delivered by Mrs. Roy C. F. Weagly at the Northeast Farm Bureau Conference in New York on September 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Need Power Plus the Seaway," from the Chicago Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials dealing with the St. Lawrence Seaway, one entitled "Biggest Power Source," from the Democrat and Chronicle, of Rochester, N. Y., and the other, entitled "Labrador Ore and the Canal," from the Vindicator of Youngstown, Ohio, which appear in the Appendix.]

A STRONGER CONCILIATION SERVICE—EDITORIAL FROM THE JOURNAL OF COMMERCE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Stronger Conciliation Service," published in the Journal of Commerce of New York, on September 25, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRICES OF POULTRY AND EGGS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram received from the Barney Mercantile Co., Raymond Olson, manager, of Barney, N. Dak., and a letter from Ray Thompson, of Walcott, N. Dak., one of the outstanding farmers of our State, dealing with the prices of eggs and poultry.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARNEY, N. DAK., *September 26, 1945.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

We are with you on your fight for farm prices. Eggs dropped 13 cents, poultry 7 cents per pound. Protect farm prices and we will all get along.

BARNEY MERCANTILE CO.,
RAYMOND OLSON,
Manager.

WALCOTT, N. DAK., *September 11, 1945.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The price of eggs has dropped 9 cents here the past 4 days. Poultry for market is also dropping. Is this the assurance that farmers had, that an abrupt end of the war would not leave them holding the bag?

I hope you can look into the situation, and expose it to some bright publicity. That might help. I have also notified the Secretary of Agriculture.

Yours truly,

RAY THOMPSON,
Walcott, N. Dak.

P. S.—Aandahl must be asleep, or don't care.

RELIEF FROM ACTIVE DUTY OF OFFICERS, WARRANT OFFICERS, AND FLIGHT OFFICERS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the wish closest to the hearts of the people today is the return of members of families to civilian life, certainly all of us have been and are now doing everything we can in the interest of having members of the armed forces returned home, which they justly deserve and desire

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent document printed by the War Department which goes into many details for the relief from active duty of officers, warrant officers, and flight officers. Of course this goes beyond the point system for discharge and perhaps is not generally known. I hope this will be read not only by those immediately interested but by the hundreds of thousands of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the United States, so that those far removed from here may know the proper procedure.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Circular No. 290)

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., September 22, 1945.

(Effective until March 22, 1947, unless sooner rescinded or superseded)

RELIEF OF OFFICERS, WARRANT OFFICERS, AND FLIGHT OFFICERS FROM ACTIVE DUTY

SECTION 1. GENERAL

1. Introduction and applicability: a. The purpose of this circular is to inform all concerned of current War Department policies regarding the relief from active duty of officers, warrant officers, or flight officers, hereinafter collectively referred to as officers, who have served honorably and who do not qualify for release under the Readjustment Regulations.

b. All applications for relief from active duty in accordance with the provisions of this circular will be considered first under the provisions of Readjustment Regulations 1–5, as amended. The separation, if approved, will be effected under the regulation which is the most appropriate in each case.

SECTION II. RELEASE OF SURPLUS OFFICERS

2. General: The provisions of this section are applicable to officers—

a. Who have completed a reasonable tour of service and

b. Who are surplus to the needs of the Army on the basis of their present qualifications and

c. Whose retraining in a skill needed by the Army would be uneconomical within the

time they could reasonably be expected to serve before becoming otherwise eligible for separation.

3. Recommendations for relief from active duty: a. Recommendation for relief of an officer under paragraph 2 will be submitted by the officer's immediate commander under the provisions of this section whenever he becomes surplus to the needs of the command. Prior to recommending an officer for relief under this section, consideration will be given to retraining for a different category of assignment. In the event that retraining is considered uneconomical, the recommendation for relief from active duty will be submitted without further delay.

b. In cases of officers serving in the zone of the interior, recommendations will be forwarded through command channels for final approval to the commanding general of the major command or to The Adjutant General for those officers not under the assignment jurisdiction of a major command. Except in cases of Medical Corps officers and officers who are eligible for oversea duty and have completed less than 2 years' active, honorable military service since September 16, 1940, the authority to finally approve recommendations may be delegated to, but not below those commanders specified in paragraph 9b (4), (5), and (6), AR 605–12, August 17, 1944. The authority to finally approve recommendations for the relief of Medical Corps officers and officers who are eligible for overseas duty and have completed less than 2 years' active honorable military service since September 16, 1940, will not be delegated below the War Department.

c. In cases of officers serving in overseas theaters, recommendations for relief from active duty will be made by the officer's immediate commander and forwarded through command channels to The Adjutant General, Attention Officers' Branch, Separation Section, Munitions Building, Washington, D. C. Recommendations disapproved by the theater commander will not be forwarded.

d. The recommendations will include the following:

(1) Date the officer reported on extended active duty, his age, his adjusted service rating score as of September 2, 1945, and his desires as to retention in the service.

(2) Statement of duty assignments for which the officer concerned is qualified by training and experience and by civilian occupational background.

(3) Statement that a surplus exists in the command jurisdiction of officers of the particular grade or any higher grade who are qualified to fill these duty assignments.

(4) Statement that the officer is entitled to separation under honorable conditions.

(5) Statement that no disciplinary action or reclassification proceedings under AR 605–230 are pending or appropriate in the case.

(6) Statement that no hospital disposition board or Army retiring board proceedings are pending or believed to be appropriate.

(7) A complete and up-to-date copy of officer's qualification card (not original).

e. Each commander taking action on a recommendation for relief from active duty will either reassign the officer within his jurisdiction or forward the recommendation, including in his indorsement the statement required by d (3) above, pertaining to surplus of officers in his command.

4. Requests for relief from active duty: Individual application for relief from active duty under the provisions of this section is not authorized.

5. Approval: a. The headquarters in the zone of the interior authorized to finally approve recommendations for relief from active duty under this section will, upon approval of the recommendation, issue necessary instructions to accomplish the release of the officer.

b. Commanders of overseas theaters are authorized to return to the continental United States officers whose recommendations for relief from active duty they have approved. Radio report of such cases will be made to The Adjutant General. The return of officers from overseas under provisions of this section will not serve to displace high-score officers or enlisted men.

6. Release of officers of particular categories: The use of the provisions of this section by the major forces to provide for bloc release of officers of particular categories surplus to the Army-wide needs may be authorized by the Assistant Chief of Staff, G–1, War Department General Staff, on specific request of the major force. Such requests, when submitted, will be accompanied by complete data establishing the bloc as surplus to Army-wide needs.

7. Controls: The commanding generals of the major commands will establish the necessary controls to insure that:

a. Releases of officers in accordance with the provisions of this section are accomplished generally in the order of merit established by their adjusted service rating scores.

b. No releases of officers under this section will operate to defer the relief from active duty of officers or the discharge of enlisted personnel entitled to separation under the readjustment regulations.

8. Miscellaneous provisions: a. Forwarding endorsements of recommendations for relief from active duty may contain any additional details deemed desirable but not specifically required by paragraph 3. In the event that approval is recommended when all the required statements cannot be made, full particulars justifying exceptional action in the case will be furnished.

b. Officers relieved from active duty under the provisions of this section are relieved for the convenience of the Government, and if otherwise eligible, are entitled to mustering-out pay.

SECTION III. RELEASE ESSENTIAL TO NATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY, OR INTEREST

9. Applications: In particular instances when it can be definitely determined on documentary evidence that an officer can render more valuable service to the Nation in a civilian capacity, he may apply for release from active duty under the provisions of this section. Releases in accordance with the provisions of this section will be held to a minimum, and applications for release will be carefully scrutinized and approved only in cases where it is clearly indicated that release of the individual from active military service is essential from a national point of view. Careful consideration will be given to determining that the application is based on the national interest rather than on the personal desire and interests of the individuals concerned. An application for relief from active duty under the provisions of this section must originate with the officer. An application submitted in his behalf will be referred to him without action. Applications will be accompanied by documentary evidence in the form of affidavits, statements, letters, or telegrams, setting forth the need of the services of the individual applicant. They will include the following information:

a. Date the officer reported on extended active duty, his adjusted-service rating score computed as of September 2, 1945, and age.

b. Name of firm, or agency, or description of individual enterprise.

c. Product manufactured or services rendered.

d. Title and description of position to be filled.

e. Connection with the activity prior to military service.

f. His qualifications for the position.

g. Letter from a responsible official of the firm, corporation, or agency substantiating the facts given above.

10. Forwarding of applications: (a) Applications will be forwarded as prescribed in paragraphs 3b and c.

b. The first forwarding endorsement will include the following statements:

(1) Approved or disapproved.

(2) This officer is (or is not) occupying a "key" position and a replacement will (or will not) be required.

(3) Services of officer have been such as to entitle him to separation under honorable conditions.

(4) No hospital disposition board or Army retiring board proceedings are pending or believed appropriate.

(5) Complete and up-to-date copies of officer's qualifications card (not original) are attached.

(6) No disciplinary action or reclassification proceedings under AR 605–230 are pending or appropriate in the case.

c. Subsequent forwarding endorsements will include statements b, (1), and (2) and such other remarks as may be deemed pertinent.

11. Approval: a. The headquarters of the final approving authority will, upon approval of the application, issue necessary instructions to accomplish the release of the applicant. Disapproved applications will be forwarded to The Adjutant General, attention: Officers' Branch, Separations Section for final consideration, accompanied by an endorsement stating reasons upon which action was based.

b. Eligibility for mustering-out pay will be determined by the provisions of AR 35–2490.

SECTION IV. RELEASE BECAUSE OF UNDUE HARDSHIP

12. Application: a. Application of an officer may be made for relief from active duty because of undue hardship, either to the individual or his family. An application for relief from active duty under the provisions of this section must originate with the officer. An application submitted in his behalf will be referred to him without action. Applications will be forwarded in the manner prescribed in paragraphs 3b and c above and will include a statement of the date the officer reported on extended active duty, his adjusted-service rating score computed as of September 2, 1945, and age.

b. Such applications must establish the following:

(1) The individual or his family is undergoing hardships greater than the normal hardships which are being experienced by all members or families of members of the military service.

(2) The hardship is not of temporary nature.

(3) There are no means of alleviating the condition other than by relieving the officer.

(4) Upon release, the officer will be able to eliminate or materially alleviate the condition.

c. Documentary evidence in the form of letters, telegrams, or affidavits establishing the necessity for relief from active duty will accompany each application.

d. Application for relief from active duty for undue hardship of officers temporarily in the United States from oversea theaters will be submitted to the commanding officer of the installation to which the individual concerned has been directed to report upon expiration of temporary duty or leave. The commanding officer of such station will process the application in accordance with the procedures prescribed by the major force having command jurisdiction over the installation.

e. The headquarters of the final approving authority will, upon approval of the application, issue necessary instructions to accomplish the relief of the applicant. Disapproved applications will be forwarded to The Adjutant General, Attention: Officers' Branch, Separation Section, for final consideration, accompanied by an indorsement stating reasons upon which action was based.

13. a. During the period of active hostilities the Army's pressing need for manpower

necessitated that extremely rigid standards be observed in reviewing applications for separation for hardship. With the Army now in the process of demobilization it is desired that these rigid standards be relaxed. However, the basic principle of demobilization which contemplates the release, in order of merit, of those most deserving of separation will be considered in reviewing requests under this section.

b. Eligibility for mustering-out pay will be determined by the provisions of AR 35-2490.

SECTION V. RELEASE BECAUSE OF AGE

14. Requests: Male officers who have attained the age of 50 years and female officers who have attained the age of 40 years will be relieved from active duty under the provisions of this section providing:

a. They request such relief in writing.

b. They are entitled to separation under honorable conditions.

c. No disciplinary action or reclassification proceedings under AR 605-230 are pending or appropriate.

d. No hospital disposition board or Army retiring board proceedings are pending or believed to be appropriate.

15. Separation: Officers who apply for relief from active duty under provisions of this section will be reported for separation without delay and in no case later than 60 days after application is made.

SETION VI. MISCELLANEOUS GENERAL PROVISIONS

16. Granting of accrued leave. a. An officer who has been recommended for or has requested relief from active duty may, with his consent, be granted accrued leave pending final action in the case.

b. An officer granted such leave will be specifically notified that he is subject to reassignment.

c. Prior to final separation from active service, an officer will be granted, when practicable, terminal leave under the provisions of AR 605-115.

17. Retention of commissions after relief from active duty: A commissioned officer relieved from active duty under the provisions of this circular will be furnished a certificate of service and may retain his commissioned status, as follows:

a. An officer holding an appointment in the National Guard of the United States or in the Officers' Reserve Corps will return to inactive status in the grade held upon relief from active duty. If he holds an appointment to higher temporary grade in the Army of the United States, he will retain this grade until 6 months after the termination of the war.

b. An officer holding an appointment in the Army of the United States only will retain his appointment on inactive status until 6 months after the termination of the war.

c. Any appointment to a temporary grade in the Army of the United States (Air Corps) made under the provisions of Public Law 453—Seventy-seventh Congress, will be terminated.

d. Any officer relieved from active duty under the provisions of this circular may submit his resignation, if he so desires, at the time of relief or at any time while on inactive duty.

18. Special provisions for National Guard officers: In the case of a National Guard officer relieved from active duty under the provisions of this circular, The Adjutant General will notify the Chief, National Guard Bureau, and the adjutant general of the State of origin, in order that appropriate action may be taken with respect to the status of the officer in the State organization.

19. Special provisions for battle wounded: Special consideration will be given to the desires of combat wounded officers who, as a result of their wounds, are permanently below the physical standards for general service. Such personnel who so desire will be relieved from active duty whenever practicable. However, if any individual specifically requests to be retained on active duty, special consideration will be given his retention provided his physical condition, experience, and the needs of the service will permit useful employment. Combat disabled officers will not be encouraged to remain on active duty.

20. Rescission. a. The following publications are rescinded:

(1) War Department Circular 485, 1944, subject: Relief of Officers, Warrant Officers, and Flight Officers from Active Duty.

(2) Section VII, War Department Circular 137, 1945.

(3) Section V, War Department Circular 150, 1945.

(4) Letter, AGPO-S-A-220.8 (August 18, 1945) dated August 29, 1945, subject: Release of Physically Qualified Military Personnel by Means Other Than Readjustment Regulations.

b. Cases initiated under the provisions of rescinded publications prior to receipt of this circular will be processed for final action under the provisions of this circular.

(AG 210.8 (September 14, 1945)).

By order of the Secretary of War:

Official:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

EDWARD F. WITZELL,
Major General,
Acting The Adjutant General.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] for himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] striking out all after line 19, on page 14, down to and including the word "Such", in line 25, and inserting in lieu thereof certain language which has heretofore been stated.

The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Andrews	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Buck	Knowland	Smith
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	McMahon	Tydings
Cordon	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Donnell	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Ellender	Millikin	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	White
George	Morse	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	Willis
Green	Murray	Wilson
Guffey	Myers	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is recognized.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, it is not my intention today to detain the Senate by any extended remarks. Yesterday a discussion occurred which lasted several hours, on the amendment which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and I had jointly offered. The discussion also covered certain phases of the bill. I think the discussion of yesterday was very helpful in bringing out clearly the definite issue which is presented by the amendment. It is this: Does the Senate of the United States want to adopt the theory that it will give an unqualified guarantee to labor or any other form of industry, or does it want to consider that other obligations of the Federal Government, no matter what they may be, must also be considered?

When we attempt to establish a policy or doctrine, as the pending bill proposes to do, we ought to be sure that it is a sound and not a one-sided doctrine. If it is our intent and purpose to make the flatfooted statement that labor or capital or some other form of human endeavor shall be preferred at all times over all other forms of activity which the Government is under obligation to protect, then let us say so.

That point is clearly in issue before the Senate, because objection has been raised again and again to a clause which appears in the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio and me. The amendment was drafted by me in the subcommittee while the bill was under consideration there, and it was discussed freely in the subcommittee and in the full committee, as it has been on the floor of the Senate yesterday. The language in the amendment to which I refer especially is this: In referring to the obligation of the Federal Government to proceed with a program of public works it states that it shall be "consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy."

That means what it states. It means that any obligation which the Federal Government assumes under this bill must be considered consistent with any other obligations it has. Such obligations may include matters of national defense, matters of government, or matters affecting other activities of the Federal Government in behalf of its citizens.

When I suggested that if the language contained in the amendment was not satisfactory, then the conclusion was inevitable that those who objected approved the converse, I think the position I took was a sound one. If those who oppose it do not think it is consistent with the aims and purposes of the bill, then they must consider it inconsistent. The suggestion was made, however, that we should not have to say anything about it; that we should ignore the whole point. I do not think that is treating the great principle involved with frankness and candor. If we are going to make the unqualified statement that a particular activity in this country, either on the part of its citizens or on the part of the Government, is paramount, and at the same time we have a mental reservation that someday we are going to change that situation, we are not proceeding soundly. I do not feel that the Congress in establishing or attempting to establish a general principle should do so with any mental reservations that it does not mean exactly what it says. I have not heard any Senator on the floor of the Senate or in the committee state unqualifiedly that the obligation to labor in this country must come ahead of everything else. Yet when I try to insert in the bill language which embodies that idea, opposition is raised.

This is a time when we should be entirely frank and candid with ourselves and with the country. If it is our intent and purpose to take the position that the demands of labor, whatever they may be, must always be paramount, and, in stating a principle, we are unwilling that to provide that what may be done under the bill should be consistent with other obligations which may not be foreseen at this time, then we ought to say so. We ought not to be evasive, and we ought not to ignore the point.

With respect to labor, everyone knows that labor plays an indispensable role in this country. It is entitled to a full opportunity, and the language of the bill attempts to set that forth, and no objection is raised to it. I am heartily in favor of such a policy and have so voted and will continue to do so. Again and again I have supported measures which were favored by labor, and I know I shall do so again. But this is the first time since I have been a member of this body that I have been asked to take the position that the rights of any segment of industry are paramount and come ahead of every other obligation, even ahead of the safety of our country, and of most important matters relating to our Treasury and our budget—a phase of the matter which will be discussed a little later.

This is new doctrine, and I do not subscribe to it, and I do not propose to take the position that any one obligation of the Federal Government must under all circumstances be paramount. Each obligation must be considered in connection with all others which may exist at the time, and then we should reach a conclusion as to the course to be followed. That is the only sound way to operate. That is the way every businessman, every farmer, and every professional man operates. He considers the facts at the particular time, and then makes his decision as to their relative value and as to what he shall do. That is the way we have always operated. Yet we are now called upon to take the position that one industry, one activity should be singled out, and the unqualified statement should be made that it must always be paramount. Either we mean it or we do not mean it. If we mean it, let us say so; but let us say it with our eyes wide open, in full realization of the significance of the position we are taking. If we do not mean it, and if we have in mind that when circumstances arise affecting national defense, agriculture, or other activities toward which the Government has an obligation, we will then, if necessary, give such activities at times, precedence over or equality with the demands of labor, why is there objection to the provision of the amendment which reads "consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy"?

We either mean that whatever we do shall be consistent, or we do not mean it.

Mr. President, I shall not at this time attempt to develop this idea further. It was discussed at considerable length yesterday, and doubtless during the debate much will be said on the subject. Quite likely I shall attempt to make further comments, but I think the issue is clear before the Senate. I understand that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] desires to discuss this question. He and I have an amendment which is very closely correlated with this amendment, an amendment which is not in any sense antagonistic, but which may in many ways be considered to rest on the language of this amendment.

The words "consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy" refer among other things to efforts to try to balance the Budget or to adopt procedures looking in that direction. I shall not discuss that point at this time. I simply wish to say that the amendment which will be offered by the Senator from Ohio and myself, and which I understand he desires to discuss today in connection with other matters, is closely tied in and interrelated with this amendment. It carries out the same idea. It emphasizes in a concrete way what this amendment states in a general way, that there may be other obligations, now or later, which are entitled to consideration. When we establish our policy we should bear that fact in mind, and not attempt to proclaim something which states very conclusively on its face that there is one paramount obligation, and that therefore under all circumstances it must control.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I regret very much that circumstances have prevented me from being present in the Chamber during all of the previous discussion on the bill, particularly inasmuch as the remarks which have just been made by the Senator from Maryland indicate again the complete misconception upon which the opposition to the bill is based.

The Senator from Maryland is evidently under the impression that the purpose of the bill is to place industrial labor ahead of all other considerations. It seems to me that it is clearly written into the bill that this is not so. In the bill as it has been reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency there is a clear statement of the very point which the Senator from Maryland seeks to cover by his amendment. I refer to the provision on page 13, in subsection (d) of section 2. It reads as follows:

To that end—

That is, the end of establishing free enterprise and full employment—

the Federal Government shall, in cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, State and local government, and others, develop and pursue a consistent and carefully planned economic program with respect to, but not limited to, taxation; banking, credit, and currency; monopoly and monopolistic practices; wages, hours, and working conditions; foreign trade and investment; agriculture; education; housing; social security; natural resources; the provision of public services, works, and research; and other revenue, investment, expenditure, service, or regulatory activities of the Federal Government.

It seems to me to be obvious that this language makes it altogether clear that the Senator, in making his argument and offering his amendment, is doing so under the misapprehension that the purpose of the bill is to provide only for industrial labor.

Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me remind the Senator from Wyoming that the language to which he refers must be considered in connection with section 4, on page 14. It is true that the bill states that we must establish policies of that sort, but there is no unqualified guarantee of anything except in section 4. There is no statement in the section to which the Senator from Wyoming referred that the position of that obligation must be established and maintained at all cost. If he will turn to section 4, he will find this language:

To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment.

That is an unqualified pledge of the United States Government that it will provide full employment. There is no pledge in the other language as to any other form of industry. One statement in the bill is a pledge, and the other is a statement of policy of fostering which we advocate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator referred to section 4. I turned to section 4. From reading it, I saw that the Senator was not referring to section 4, but to subparagraph (4) of section 2.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. On page 14.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My eye was directed to section 4 because of the Senator's inadvertency. Let me read what section 4 (b) says. This is on page 17:

(b) The President shall consult with industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State

and local governments, and others, with regard to the preparation of the National Budget, and for this purpose shall establish such advisory boards, committees, or commissions as he may deem desirable.

That is a clear and explicit declaration, in words that cannot be misunderstood, that the purpose of the bill is to deal with the entire economy, and not with a single phase of it, as the Senator mistakenly asserts.

Let me turn now to subparagraph (4) of section 2, on page 14, the one to which the Senator refers. It reads as follows:

(4) to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment. Such Federal investment and expenditure, whether direct or indirect, or whether for public works, for public services, for assistance to business, agriculture, home owners, veterans, or consumers, or for other purposes, shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprises. Any such Federal investment and expenditure calling for the construction of public works by the Federal Government shall provide for the performance of the necessary construction work by private enterprises under contract, except where the performance of such work by some other method is necessary by reason of special circumstances or is authorized by other provisions of law; and all such work shall be performed in accordance with all applicable laws, including laws relating to labor standards.

Mr. President, the burden of my argument is that the language to which the Senator has alluded and which I have just read does not lend itself at all to the interpretation which he has placed upon it. I am aware, of course, of the fear that activates many, if not most, of the opponents of this measure. I wish to discuss that, Mr. President. But before doing so, since there are several Senators on their feet, who apparently desire to interrogate me, I shall be very glad to yield; and first I yield to the Senator from Utah, who was first on his feet.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I simply wished to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that during the committee hearings this question was argued, reargued, and reargued. The very distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is a member of the subcommittee, called attention to the fact that although in section 2 there was language which read as follows:

(d) To that end the Federal Government shall, in cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and others, develop and pursue a consistent economic program.

There should be written into the bill additional language, and the distinguished Senator offered the language "and carefully planned" to be inserted after the word "consistent." The subcommittee, the supporters of the theory of the bill, and the supporters of the bill, very willingly agreed to include the language "carefully planned." But, Mr. President, after my experience with the subcommittee it seems to me that the opposition to the bill in the subcommittee will not stop at any language until the entire philosophy and theory of the bill are sabotaged. They say, "Yes; we earnestly believe in full employment, but—." And, Mr. President, regardless of how many times we include the phrase "carefully planned economic program," it is my opinion that they will not be satisfied. If the philosophy of the bill is not to have the Federal Government give the people of the United States to understand that, if and when everything else fails, the Federal Government will, to the extent necessary, see that there shall not be any appreciable or material permanent unemployment in this country, then I simply do not understand it. After the experience we went through in the thirties, if we have not learned that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government not only to say to the people, "We will not tolerate any great unemployment permanently in this country," but to say, "If and when everything else fails, the Federal Government has the duty to step into the picture with all the resources at its command and see that unemployment in great numbers does not exist," then I think we blind ourselves to the necessities of the situation.

Mr. TAFT, Mr. RADCLIFFE, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Utah for the statement he just made. Before yielding to the other Senators who are claiming my attention, I merely wish to make a remark which is evoked by the statement made by the Senator from Utah.

The truth of the matter is—as is clearly demonstrated by the report of the minority—that the real issue here is whether we shall proceed into the future upon a program which shall make direct relief or work-relief by the Federal Government necessary or whether we shall undertake to proceed on a program which will eliminate that. The Senators who are opposing the bill denounce "Federal investment and expenditure," but what do they say in their report? Let me read it. I read now from page 5:

It is said that the refusal to make up the theoretical deficit by public spending means the starvation of the unemployed. Of course, this is not true. Our policy requires that everyone in this country receive a proper standard of food, clothing, housing, and medical care, and we are making substantial provision to carry out that policy. If unemployment exists, many persons live with their families or expend their savings without any application to the Government for aid. Many persons draw unemployment compensation such as that we have just provided for the unemployed and for the veterans. Others are provided with work relief or direct relief.

Mr. President, it is perfectly clear that the issue here is whether we shall follow the policy thus proclaimed by the sponsors of the amendment, the authors of the minority report, namely, a policy of work relief or direct relief, or whether we shall pursue a policy intended so to organize our whole economic machine, including agriculture, consumers, self-employers, and every other category of our population, that there shall be full employment by private enterprise.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico, who has been on his feet seeking recognition for some time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not think I can be classified as one who opposes at least the objectives of this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator cannot be so classified.

Mr. HATCH. Certainly I am not a member of the committee and I have not indulged in any of the controversies which evidently have been rather warm within the committee itself. I know nothing about the suggestions which were made there in opposition; but I know that I was concerned about this particular paragraph (4) when I first read it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Naturally, the Senator would be.

Mr. HATCH. And I was concerned about what it meant. I was interested in the explanation made yesterday by the Senator from Maryland.

In the light of what the Senator from Wyoming has said as to the meaning of paragraph (4) and the entire bill, wherein would that meaning be changed or destroyed in any way by this particular amendment? If there is a real, genuine difference between the amendment and the provisions of the bill as the Senator has stated them, I should like to have the Senator explain the difference.

Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment, to make a brief comment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. TAFT. I do not wish to make a speech.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is all right; I am always glad to yield to the Senator, to hear either his speeches or his comments.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the Senator said I had taken the position that other activities were either ignored or bypassed. That is not the case. The language in the bill clearly states that we shall foster and stimulate activities other than labor, but the absolute pledge is only in regard to one, and that is labor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely wrong. Employment does not mean employment by industrial labor only. It means employment by the Senator from Maryland in his own office; it means the employment of the head of a great insurance company; it means the employment of a lawyer or of a doctor or of a physician or of a dentist. It means the employment of an engineer. It does not mean labor alone; it means the self-employed; it means the businessman.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, that is true. But let me ask the Senator a question. If his interpretation of the language of paragraph (4) is correct and if it is not an unqualified pledge, then the language of the amendment I have proposed, which calls for action by the Federal Government "consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy" is nothing more than a clarifying amendment. If paragraph (4) is not an unequivocal pledge, then the language I have offered in the amendment clarifies it. What is the Senator's objection to the language of the amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the objection is in the implication which would inevitably follow the adoption of the amendment based upon the language of the minority report, which is a clear declaration for work relief or direct relief. I am against another WPA, and I am against the so-called security wages paid by WPA, as I have always been. I am in favor of free enterprise and the democratic system and the system of private property. But if the Senator will bear with me for just a moment, by the time I get through I think my position will be clear.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me first, to answer one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. On the theory which the Senator has just advanced, namely, that this pledge is not unequivocal, what is his objection to the language beginning with the words "consistent with its need"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I object to it because it is already in the bill. Apparently this matter was debated over and over again within the Committee on Banking and Currency, and every concession that was made by the sponsors of the bill was met by another amendment on the part of those who opposed it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Will the Senator tell me where there occurs anywhere in the bill the language beginning with the words "consistent with its needs"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If the Senator endorses the idea, why does he object to it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because it is already in the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Then, the Senator thinks it is surplusage and not harmful.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, we could spend the whole day arguing back and forth with reference to the meaning of a few words.

Before I allow any further interruptions by the Senator from Maryland I shall yield for a few moments to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], whom I see standing.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator read the first part of paragraph (d) on which he has relied, as shown on page 14. The language is as follows:

> To that end the Federal Government shall, in cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and others, develop and pursue a consistent and carefully planned economic program with respect to, but not limited to, taxation, banking, credit, and currency; monopoly and monopolistic practices; wages, hours, and working conditions; foreign trade and investment; agriculture; education; housing; social security; national resources; the provision of public services, works, and research—

The language includes public works as well as everything else—

> And other revenue, investment, expenditure, service, or regulatory activities of the Federal Government.

Why can we not stop right there? If the Senator would eliminate the remainder of the section I would vote for the bill and support it, and we could dispose of it within 5 minutes. In other words, I fully agree with the Senator that the part of the section which I have just read is sound. I agree that we should have an economic program, but I want to know why the remainder of the section, which attempts to prescribe definite requirements, should not be eliminated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator has asked the question because, of course, it goes to the very heart of this debate.

The reason I would be opposed to eliminating the remainder of the section is that it undertakes to implement the declaration of policy. It calls, first, for a program—I now read from page 14, beginning with line 8:

> (1) Stimulate, encourage, and assist private enterprises to provide, through an expanding production and distribution of goods and services, the largest feasible volume of employment opportunities.

Why should I agree to strike that language out? I would not agree to strike it out because I want it to be clearly written into the bill at the very head of the list—just as it is written in the bill in its present form—that the purpose of the bill is to stimulate free private enterprise. That is what we are shooting at.

Mr. TAFT. It is already in section 2 (a). It is in the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To further answer the Senator from Ohio, I turn to the next paragraph on page 14, beginning with line 12, and read:

> (2) Stimulate, encourage, and assist State and local governments, through the exercise of their respective functions, to make their most effective contribution to assuring continuing full employment.

Mr. TAFT. Why is not that in what I have just read?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now we come, of course, to the very heart of the discussion. What the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Maryland fear is unlimited Federal spending. They say this bill constitutes a pledge for unlimited Federal spending. That is not the case. What subsection (4) does is merely to declare that after the new economic Budget Bureau, which is to be established under the bill, has surveyed the whole situation and has made its recommendations to the Congress with respect to what can be done to stimulate free private enterprise, and after it has made its recommendations as to what can be done and what will be done by State and local governments in meeting the great issue of our time, if it should then appear that the activity of private enterprise, the investment and the expenditure of private enterprise, and the activities and actions of State and local governments are not sufficient, the Federal Government shall step in. What is wrong about that?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, if we were dependent solely upon Federal spending, if we were dependent upon deficit spending in order to provide employment, the outlook would be dreary and dark indeed. I do not hesitate to say that if we are driven again to that point it will be difficult to imagine that our system of private enterprise can endure. I am against creating a situation which will threaten our system of private enterprise, our system of democratic economy, or our political democracy. I believe with everything that is in me in maintaining a system of individual enterprise and individual economic freedom. Senators who are opposing this proposal, as well as some newspapers and some persons from the financial centers in New York city and elsewhere who condemn it, do so with the fear that if we undertake to place responsibility upon a governmental agency to undertake some planning in order to save free enterprise, it will be impossible to escape totalitarianism. I deny that.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator, unfortunately, was not present yesterday. I wonder if he will agree with the statement of one of the authors of the bill, that the language in paragraph (4) on page 14, reading:

> To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment.

Is the very heart of the bill. That is what one of the authors of the bill said yesterday. I wonder if the Senator agrees that what I have read is the heart of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, I do.

Mr. TAFT. It is the heart of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, because if we permit unemployment to raise its ugly head in America again, our system will be in danger—a fact which I shall prove before the debate is concluded.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator says that the language to which I have referred is the heart of the bill, then he cannot say that this is a deficit-spending program?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, that does not follow at all. The Senator from Ohio has in mind the difficulties of our problem and not the philosophy of the bill. I can understand, Mr. President, why there is opposition to this measure growing out of the fear of totalitarianism. We look abroad and we see totalitarianism on the march. We know that here in America alone the rank and file of the people still hold to the theory of eco-

nomic freedom and individual free enterprise.

But I wish to invite the attention of Senators to the chart on the back of the wall on which there is outlined the record of prosperity periods and depression periods in the United States from 1860 down to the present hour. The chart was not prepared by the authors of the bill; it was not prepared by any "leftists." It did not come from any organization that is interested in Federal spending. It came from the Cleveland Press Co., of Cleveland, Ohio. The chart is taken from another chart which was prepared, in the first instance, by the National Association of Purchasing Agents, based upon sound statistical data.

Senators will see that from 1860 down to this hour the history of our Government has been a history of great booms and great depressions; but the unfortunate fact is that the depression which began in 1929 was the deepest and the most prolonged of all. We were rescued from that depression only by the deficit spending of the war. Shall it be said that a free democratic country does not dare to attack this problem? Shall it be said, in the implication of the report of the minority, that we must be content to go forward in the future as we have gone in the past, depending upon work relief, relief of some kind or another from public agencies?

Mr. President, is it not worth something to attempt to make the free economy work and to set up an agency of government whose responsibility it will be to seek to do that thing? There is great danger, as shown by our experience. There is a reason for the fact that the depression which began in 1929 was so deep and so prolonged. The reason is that there has been a tremendous change in our economy and in the instruments and methods by which our economy is administered.

A few days ago I was reading in the newspapers about the flight from the northern islands of Japan of General LeMay and the others. They flew over seas and over land from Japan to Chicago in 26 hours. Do you suppose, Mr. President, that that is a fact that is without significance? It is a most significant fact, because it illustrates the great change which has come over our economy.

Back in 1860, before we had begun to build transcontinental railroads, ours was principally an individual economy. In all the States people were doing almost exactly the same things. The communities and the States were practically self-sufficient. They were engaged in producing their own food, in manufacturing their own clothing, in manufacturing their own shoes, in manufacturing, for the most part, all the things they needed. But science and invention, which improved the means of communication and transportation, have changed our economy to such a marked degree that the individual no longer is in control of his own economic destiny, because the tools with which we work—like the great airplanes which brought the fliers from Japan—are beyond the command of the individual.

The result of this has been such that there was published recently by the Committee on Economic Development a booklet on little business and the necessity of encouraging little business. Remember, the Committee on Economic Development is not a committee of leftists, it is not a committee of long-haired theorists, it is not a committee of deficit spenders. It is a committee of businessmen, business leaders of America.

In their pamphlet about little business they point out that there has been such a tremendous concentration of economic power in the United States that more than 50 percent of all the industrial workers in America are employed by less than 2 percent of the employers. That is what has happened to us. The individual is not the commander of his economic destiny, and if we are to say that government must take its hands off, that government cannot step in, then, Mr. President, there is no possibility of escaping another depression when this war ends, as I shall presently demonstrate.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. In connection with the thought about concentration of business in the hands of a few, would the provisions of the pending bill correct that situation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; this bill is not a panacea.

Mr. WHERRY. I was called from the Senate Chamber, and I did not know what the Senator's position was.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all.

Mr. WHERRY. It is a question of enforcement to see that these huge concentrations do not happen, and that is the responsibility of the enforcement branch of the Government, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, Mr. President, to accomplish this program of preserving free enterprise, the capitalistic system, and economic independence for the masses of the people, for the farmers of the West, for the ranchers of the West, as well as for the workers in the settlements, there must be a well-rounded policy, which will be developed, I hope, by the committee to be established under the bill.

Let me say to the Senator, I concede that the provisions of the bill which call for the establishment of a special joint committee, made up both of Democrats and Republicans, the leading members of the leading committees of the Senate and of the House, to review any recommendation which may be made by the Executive, is one of the most important legislative proposals that has ever come before the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming, and I know what an intense interest he has had in small business, and of the activity which he has helped to create within the Small Business Committee, and also in the Smaller War Plants Corporation, in order to foster new business and to place private business on its feet. But I am also interested, as I am sure the Senator is as well, in the huge concentrations. I believe the Senator's statement was that less than 2 percent of employers of the country employ 50 percent of the workers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the statement of the Committee on Economic Development.

Mr. WHERRY. That is something which is under the jurisdiction of the judicial branch of the Government, the enforcement branch, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I think it is much more than that. It goes to the creation of an atmosphere in which the investment of private capital may be encouraged. I believe it is based primarily upon a system of incentive taxation, taxation that will stimulate the owner of private capital to put his money into new enterprises. That is lacking now because of many factors of our taxation system which I do not desire to go into now. But the second method of preserving and stimulating free enterprise would be to develop such a policy toward monopoly or concentrated power as to stake out a region in which little business would be free from suppression by the powers of concentrated economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator's answer to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has cleared up one of the questions I wanted to ask the Senator. I have generally regarded this bill as perhaps ineffective. First, let me say that unemployment is an evil. I think all of us are agreed that unemployment is a great evil, and that we have to find a solution for it. My greatest disappointment in the bill is that I cannot find in it a solution for that evil. Perhaps I am too pessimistic about it. I should like to have the Senator describe its application. Suppose Congress had enacted into law such a bill as is now pending, and it had been on the books at the time Cleveland made the statement that the people should support the Government, and not the Government support the people. Suppose we had such a law on the books at that time, how would it have changed conditions?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would have helped President Cleveland to create the conditions under which the people could support the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator thinks it would have been a welcome and progressive move?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator that properly understood this bill will do precisely that. As I said at the outset, the objection to the bill arises from misapprehension and misunderstanding. I picked up a newspaper the other day and read in it a letter which was written supposedly by a veteran. He was declaiming against the bill on the ground that it was going

to put government into industry. Of course it does nothing of the kind, but there is that misapprehension that the purpose of the bill is to put the Government of the United States into competition with private business. The reverse is the truth.

What I want to say to the Senator—and I think this is the explicit answer to the question he has in his mind—is that our economy has become so complex and so complicated that if we are to preserve freedom, local freedom, freedom for the people of Colorado and Wyoming in their industries, as well as freedom for the individuals, we have got to undertake to have the Government do a little planning in order to preserve that freedom. Do not imagine that we are going to get away from planning. Planning is being done every day and every week of the year by concentrated private enterprises, so called. They call themselves private enterprises, but they are not private in any sense. They are great public institutions with hundreds of thousands of stockholders and hundreds of thousands of employees. That is not private enterprise in the sense in which I mean it. It is private enterprise, of course, as distinct from government enterprise.

But here is a bill the direct purpose of which is, and the provision is written into the bill, that, so far as any Government contracts for Government public workers or other investments are made, they shall be carried out by contract with private enterprise and not by Government enterprise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There are two other applications I should like to have the Senator discuss. The second application is this: Suppose the bill had been on the books during the depression which began in 1929, would it have saved the very bad situation which followed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it would have done so. If the Senator will look at the chart which hangs on the back wall of the Chamber he will see what happened at that time because we did not have such a law on the books. The depression beginning in 1929 ran deeper than any other previous depression. It ran through 1936. Ninteen hundred and thirty-seven shows a little above the line, that is to say our economy got out of the red, so to speak. But that was the year that the President of the United States sent a budget to Congress cutting down expenditures, and when that budget came here, and the first appropriation bill in obedience to the budget was below what had been spent in years before, then from every desk in this Chamber there came the cry to resume the spending.

Mr. President, I am not an advocate of spending, but what I am saying to the Senate is that unless we have a plan we cannot avoid it. This bill is an attempt to create the possibility of a plan to prevent the need and necessity of deficit spending.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have one more application in mind, because I am trying to understand the bill by its application to the problem we are facing. The third application I should like to have the Senator discuss, if he will, is the situation we faced after 1933 when a new administration came into power. Is there anything in the bill which is contrary or in opposition to the remedies which were put into effect under the New Deal? Is there anything in the bill which is in the nature of a cure other than deficit spending?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is it dependent entirely on deficit spending?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As I interpret it, the remedy which the New Deal brought forth was based entirely upon deficit spending, and I wonder how this bill would have changed the situation which existed from March 4, 1933, on.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would have changed the situation in this respect: The Senator will remember that in 1933 one of the very first acts of the administration was to have passed what was known as the national industrial recovery bill. Strangely enough that bill, or the idea upon which it was based, came from the United States Chamber of Commerce, at a convention of the United States Chamber of Commerce in San Francisco, held years before the adoption of the NIRA, with its program of turning over to industry the power to regulate itself, as it was politely described. That idea came from organized industry. One of its factors was accompanied by an extension of public works, and an appropriation was made under which public works were to be authorized. Those public works were being administrated by the Public Works Administration under Secretary Ickes in accordance with the free enterprise system, under contract with contractors, but because the job was so great and unemployment was not being reduced, then the administration, by Executive order, an order with which I never agreed, took $500,000,000 away from the Public Works Administration and created the other Administration which turned out to be in its last analysis the WPA. That was a mistake, I will say to the Senator from Colorado.

If this bill had been in existence, if it had been passed in the Hoover administration, and the capacity of our Government leaders and our business leaders had been concentrated upon an effort to stimulate little business all over the country, we never would have had to resort to the WPA, with its security wage and its Government-made work.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to the Senate that the report of the minority of the committee is clearly a declaration for the resumption of that philosophy. In the conditions which exist in the world today it is perfectly absurd.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. First, I wish to compliment the able Senator from Wyoming for his presentation of the situation which now confronts the United States. We may well consider this bill, instead of being a bill to put the Government generally into business, as some of its opponents seem to fear, as a declaration that we will do everything in our power to create and maintain such conditions as will keep the Government from going into business. We ought to be able to conceive, and I think all of us do conceive, that if the time comes when there are 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 unemployed persons in this country, which will mean from 30,000,000 to 50,000,000 people in need, pressure will be exerted upon the Congress to have the Government operate plants. I do not wish to see the Government enter into the operation of plants. I hope that time will not come. That is the reason why I am one of the sponsors of this bill. I feel that we can create and maintain such conditions as will enable us successfully to resist any demand or urge for the Government to go into business in competition with private business. But there are certain activities which the Government can carry on which encourage private business rather than compete with it.

I think the Senator from Wyoming is presenting the situation very clearly and is doing a great service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to join in the compliment. The Senator is very clear, very forceful, and really eloquent. But I wish to add a footnote by way of contradiction.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad that the Senator added the word "note" after "foot." I do not wish to get the foot from him. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAILEY. One of the greatest Presidents this country ever had or ever will have was Grover Cleveland, a great man and a brave man. The Senator did not say that we owed to Grover Cleveland our recovery from the very severe panic of the 1890's. I do not charge the Senator with ignorance or willfulness on that point, because he was not there. I was there. I was 21 years of age when Grover Cleveland was elected the second time, and I voted for him. This country got out of that depression just in time for William McKinley, another great and good man, to obtain the benefit of the foundations which Cleveland had laid.

What were the foundations? That is why I rose. It makes no difference what we say about people of the past and what they did, or whether we give them credit or not. What was Grover Cleveland's method, and on what foundations laid by him did McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt build?

The first foundation was order. We cannot have a stable economy without order. When Cleveland called out the troops to put an end to the so-called Pullman strike and let the people of the country know that there was a Government at Washington that governed, that was the foundation of the recovery.

He did another thing. When the air was filled in our party—I am sorry to say—with talk about the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the immortal ratio of 16 to 1, Grover Cleveland erected

the standard of sound money; and upon the foundation of order and sound money we had the glorious prosperity of McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt.

That is only one point, but to my way of thinking, it is a monument. I do not see any end to this sort of thing. I believe that the American people can build a successful economy if we have order and a stable currency.

The Senator spoke of the year 1937 as a year which gave some promise of recovery. He went so far as to say that that was due to spending, and that the recession occurred in that year because the spending was withdrawn, although all of us demanded a renewal of it. I am sure that I did not. I have a recollection of my course. But I wish to point out to the Senate that 1937 was the year of the sit-down strikes, which shook the economy of this country to its foundations.

Mr. President, I merely wished to introduce a little footnote of history from my point of view.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the interruptions of the Senator from North Carolina are always very valuable, and personally I always enjoy them. The Senator goes into another question which I shall not discuss at this moment.

The Senator's reference to Grover Cleveland as the man who laid the foundation upon which there was recovery later in the McKinley administration reminds me of the fact that in one of his messages Grover Cleveland outlined as clearly as it has ever been outlined the danger which this country was confronting from the concentration of economic power. We are suffering now, and have been for 20 years, from the ill effects which President Cleveland foretold when he warned the Congress and the people of the United States against monopoly.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the pending bill were a law today, would it provide full employment, and would we have assurance that employment would result?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. This bill is not a panacea. I have not sponsored it as a panacea. What I am urging upon the Senate is that we must undertake this Government study if we are to escape disaster; and I shall demonstrate that to be so.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any way to avert unemployment if we cannot get labor back to work? What purpose would such a statute serve if we could not get labor back to work?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, if people will not work, we have an altogether different problem. But I am acting upon the assumption, which I think has been very well demonstrated, that most people want to work. But that, of course, is an entirely different question.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there ever a time in the history of this country when there was more work to be done than there is now?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In my judgment 90 percent of the people still want to work.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there ever a time when there was more work to be done? We talk about freedom of enterprise. We have an enormous consumer demand from one end of the country to the other. There is a demand for the production of 5,000,000 automobiles. There is also a demand for hundreds of articles such as refrigerators, radios, and almost anything we can think of.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that this issue cannot be confused by dragging across the trail the controversy between labor and capital. Of course there are ills. Of course there are wrongs. Of course, as I have said, this bill is not a panacea. But in my judgment the conditions which we have in this country with respect to strikes were promoted by fear. Fear is the source of most of our unwise actions. Fear is what plunged the world into war.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have yielded about an hour of time to the Senator. If he will be good enough to postpone his observations until after I have developed my principal discussion, I shall be very glad to yield to him then.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not having previously yielded to the Senator from Arkansas, I now yield to him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to make only one observation. The Senator from Wyoming has spoken of conditions which now obtain, emanating from "fear." Let me say to the Senator that, in my humble judgment, there is more "fear" right here in Washington and in the Senate of the United States than anywhere else. It is "fear" that is prompting this legislation, and such "fear" at this time and under present conditions is wholly unjustified. By this course we are absolutely generating "fear" in the minds of the people throughout the country, and they are becoming afraid that Washington is not competent to take care of the situation, and in that respect we are doing much to justify that apprehension.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, Mr. President, the discussions which occurred in the Committee on Banking and Currency and the discussions which have taken place on the floor of the Senate demonstrate conclusively, in my opinion, that the Senator is mistaken in his diagnosis of the situation.

Now let me demonstrate the situation from the chart which I have had placed at the front of the Chamber. I made this demonstration to the Committee on Banking and Currency on the first day of the hearings on the bill. Bear in mind that I pointed out that all over the world the problem of adjusting the economic systems of the peoples of the world to the conditions which existed had been so great as to plunge the world into a war. It was the failure of business leadership and government leadership to make it possible for people to support themselves that brought about the war. I say to you, Mr. President, that the danger of communism and of totalitarianism in this world proceeds, not from a measure of this kind, but from the failure to adopt a measure of this kind. Look at the chart; look at the history of our experiences. We cannot afford to drift. If we drift, if we say that the Government must keep its hands off, then be sure we shall have disaster.

It has been said by some of those who oppose this bill that no system except communism can provide full employment. Is not that a profound confession of defeatism? Is not that statement a profound acknowledgment of a belief that the free-enterprise system cannot provide full employment? That is why the minority have submitted their report in which they talk about work relief and relief by means of Government spending as if it were something inevitable. I refuse to believe that it is inevitable. I believe that if we look at this matter intelligently, with our eyes open, and free from preconceived notions and fears about what is intended, we shall understand that a great, free government which planned a successful war on two continents can successfully plan to maintain and keep the free-enterprise system.

Mr. President, the chart entitled "Mass Market for American Business" was prepared at my direction from the hearings of the Senate Committee on Finance on May 9, 1944, when figures were presented showing the total amount of income received by persons in various salary brackets. The Committee on Finance was trying to determine what steps should be taken to raise the largest possible amount of taxes to finance the war, and the committee wanted the facts. I requested the draftsman to prepare this chart in the form of a flagpole resting upon a base, the base being—as shown by the testimony before the Finance Committee in 1944—the total amount of money received by everyone in the United States whose income was less than $2,000 a year, the total amount of money received by everyone in the United States whose income was more than $2,000 a year and less than $4,000 a year, and the total amount of money received by everyone in the United States whose income was from $4,000 to $5,000 a year. There it lies—the base of the flagpole.

The flagpole consists of the total amount of money received by those whose incomes ranged from $5,000 to $10,000 a year; in another bracket the flagpole consists of those whose incomes ranged from $10,000 to $25,000 a year.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, is that in the record?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; it is in the record, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, then there is another bracket. It is for those who received $25,000 a year and more.

It will be observed that in drawing the chart provision was not made for each bracket in the rising scale. That is why the flagpole is broken at the top. As I told the Committee on Banking and Currency, if that chart had been drawn to represent the total amount of money received by those who were receiving, let us say, from $30,000 to $40,000 a year, from $40,000 to $50,000 a year, from $50,000 to $75,000 a year, from $75,000 to $100,000 a year, from $100,000 to $250,000 a year, and so on, up to the 79 individuals who in that year were receiving $1,000,000

or more each, there would not have been sufficient space in the Senate Chamber for the column which would have had to be drawn to make that representation.

Mr. President, this reminds me that at every step in the way toward progressive legislation which would preserve a free economy there has been resistance by those who feared that a radical result would follow. Many of the present Members of the Senate were here when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation bill was under discussion, and they will remember that it was denounced by many of the Senators who now denounce the pending bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I call attention to the fact that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation bill was sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who opposes the pending bill in its present form.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, Mr. President, I understand that. I do not believe the Senator from Michigan is always wrong, and I do not believe the Senator from Ohio is always wrong——

Mr. TAFT. I appreciate that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But, Mr. President, here on the chart there is a representation of the total economy. It will be observed that the total receipts of those receiving $25,000 a year or more were $7,700,000,000, and the total receipts of those receiving from $10,000 to $25,000 a year were $7,500,000,000. If we add them together, we find that they total $15,200,000,000 for everyone in the United States receiving more than $10,000 a year.

Mr. President, every penny of that money could be taken by taxation, and it would not make a dent upon our Government economy. Those who are under the impression that we can tax wealth to support a free government are utterly mistaken. The money is not there. Of course, $15,000,000,000 is a lot of money in any man's language. But the whole amount received by those who are receiving $2,000 a year or less is $45,700,000,000. Forty-five billion dollars is three times the amount received by those in the $10,000-and-up brackets.

Add to those who are receiving $2,000 or less the total amount received by those whose incomes are from $2,000 to $4,000, aggregating $44,000,000,000, and the total is $89,700,000,000, which was the amount received by the people of the United States whose income was less than $4,000, as compared with less than $16,000,000,000 for those in the $10,000 brackets and up. Add those who were receiving from $5,000 up to the upper brackets, and it amounts to $8,900,000,000.

Mr. President, is it not clear that our economy is based upon the masses of the people, and upon their ability to earn money, whether it be in agriculture, industry, or in any of the professions? Unless the masses of the people who constitute the base of this flagpole are fully employed and drawing compensation there can be no security for those whose incomes put them in the flagpole.

I recall that in 1932, before the change of administration, when the Federal guaranty of bank deposits was being discussed, a great Chicago banker by the name of Trailor was mentioned several times in the Democratic convention of that year as a possible candidate for Vice President. During the depression he learned a lesson which converted him from opposing the guaranty of deposits to the support of such a program. That was because there was a run on his bank. One day, because of that run, he went down to the bank, lined up a number of friends who had funds to deposit, and persuaded them that it would be in the interest of keeping open the bank for them to deposit funds. He made a drama out of it. He stood in the lobby of the bank and said to the depositors who were clamoring for their money, "Do not take your money out; these gentlemen are depositing money. We are ready to pay you, of course." However, the run continued. And then Mr. Trailor, when he had changed his opinion about the desirability of a Federal guaranty of bank deposits, made this wise remark: "I have come to the conclusion that unless we make certain that people in the lower scale of income have their feet upon the ladder there is no security for us who are at the top." No truer words were ever spoken.

Mr. President, is it clear why I am talking in behalf of this bill? I am speaking in its behalf because I know that if we permit unemployment to cut down receipts of the millions who are receiving the $89,000,000,000, then we destroy purchasing power. We destroy it for every farmer, every rancher, every small businessman, every small bank, and every small grocery store. We destroy the capacity of the people to buy the things which they need. If we fail to maintain the power to buy and prevent unemployment from developing, and at the same time permit purchasing power to disappear, then beware. We already see written in the international sky what can happen when Government fails in its task.

The danger, Mr. President, is even greater. Here is a chart which I had prepared for the purpose of showing what to my mind is the most significant fact in America, but one to which we blithely close our eyes. This chart shows three lines. One of them represents the national income, or the amount of money received by all the people and all businesses. Another represents the national debt. Another represents Federal revenue. Observe that the chart runs from 1933 to 1945.

The national income in 1933, at the depth of the depression, is clear from the first chart which I presented. That is, the income of all the people was only about $47,000,000,000. That is why the stores were closed. The people did not have money with which to buy. That is why the price of wool went so low. That is why the price of copper went so low. That is why the price of every commodity produced by agriculture and other industries went so low. The people did not have the money with which to buy the things they needed.

We came into the year 1933 without a law which required any agency of the Government to study ways and means of keeping the people employed. So we had no recourse. It is true that under the Hoover administration there were some public works. Some postoffices were constructed. But the catastrophe was so great that little could be done about it. We had waited too long. We had not acted in advance. We were following the philosophy which is represented here by the minority views in connection with this bill. That philosophy was, "Let it run. Presently we will go around the corner. Presently somehow there will be purchasing power reestablished. "Oh," it is said, "let us lend some money to the big fellows at the top." So we set up the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and we spent Government money, deficit money, to make loans to the banks, the insurance companies, and the railroads. No one was talking about deficit spending then. But what difference is there between turning money from the Federal Treasury over to large enterprises in the hope that somehow or other it will percolate through and reach the people at the bottom—what difference is there between that and spending for public works and WPA?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is not the great difference that the money which was loaned was paid back, and that it did not represent deficit spending at all?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator, if he will examine the reports of the RFC, will discover that it was not by any means all paid back. Much of it was lost.

However, the point I am making is that the national income was down in 1933. Under the impetus of the then Government program, which was, I may say, a hand-to-mouth program, adopted because we had to have something—"We have to do something" was the cry—there was an increase in the national income. It went up to about $74,000,000,000. Then there was another recession in 1937. We may debate about what was the cause of that recession, but the fact remains that that was the year when an effort was made to cut down Federal spending.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. At the same time was there not a move in the country on the part of industry to raise prices, and did not that rise in prices on the part of the big basic corporations of the United States have some effect? The records show that in 1937 the basic corporations of the United States made more profit than they did in 1929, and it seems to me that had some bearing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is correct; I think there was an effort to raise prices that year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will yield, is it not true that the President of the United States, speaking with respect to that recession, said that it was planned that way?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Did he not say, "We planned it that way"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; he was not talking about the recession; he was talking about an utterly different thing.

Mr. MURRAY. President Roosevelt in 1937 warned the country against the rapid rise in prices that was taking place, and singled out the copper interests as having raised their prices excessively. Furthermore, is it not a fact that Secretary Ickes and the Interior Department, which conducted public works, complained constantly about the rise of the price of everything that was going into public works?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I remarked to the Senator from Montana once before, I know he is very familiar with the copper industry and with the cement industry, and what was done with regard to them. But I am not concerned about the mistakes of the past. Mistakes have been made on both sides.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me merely to correct the Senator from Montana?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, commodity prices as a whole did not rise before 1940. They did not rise in 1938. On the other hand, wages did rise. That was the period of the sit-down strikes in the motor industry, and a very substantial increase in all railroad wages took place. So that if there was any inflation at all, it was in connection with wages, as much as profits.

The Senator also made the statement that the large corporations made more in 1938 than in 1929, which is not accurate. Their profits were away below what they were in 1929. The figures which the Senator from Montana put into the RECORD show that only 130 out of 600 corporations—and they were not particularly the large ones—made more money in 1938 or 1937 than they did in 1929. They had expanded their businesses, they had grown, whereas 470 made very much less. So that the statements made by the Senator from Montana are not correct.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to develop my theory.

Mr. MURRAY. Would the Senator permit me to make a very short reply?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not claim that industry as a whole raised prices or made more profits or that commodity prices rose, but I do claim that the basic industries of the country—steel, cement, copper, oil, and the other basic industries—raised their prices, and that the corporations which were noncompetitive were the ones which raised the prices, which had its effect on the whole economy. There was, of course, a very broad segment of business that was in competition, and they did not raise their prices. They could not. They were compelled to hold down their prices.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the debate between the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Ohio goes into one of the subjects which would have to be discussed by the agency which is to be set up under the bill, and which would then have to be pursued by the joint committee which is to be created by the bill.

Since I have referred to the joint committee, let me remark again that there is nothing in the bill which authorizes the Executive to indulge in deficit spending. It does not authorize the Executive to spend a dime. It merely authorizes the executive agency to make a plan, and that plan, far from being guaranteed, must then, under the terms of the bill, pass the scrutiny of both Houses of Congress, first through the joint committee which is to be set up, a committee which is designed to coordinate our economic system, a committee from the lack of which much of our trouble probably has arisen. Then, after that joint committee has made its recommendations, any measures which are suggested will have to go through the consideration of the respective standing committees of the Senate and the House.

Mr. President, this is a bill to vest in Congress the power and the responsibility of meeting the issue, instead of continually delegating the power to the executive branch of the Government. This Mr. President, is a bill to restore the functions of Congress.

Let me refer again to the national income. In 1939 the war broke out in Europe, and in 1940 our businesses and industries began to feel the impetus, because money was being spent, some of it by the French Government, some of it by the British Government. Some of it was being spent by our Government for purposes of war. Immediately the national income began to rise.

Then, after we got into the war, in 1942 the national income jumped from less than $75,000,000,000, in 1937, to almost $125,000,000,000, because we were manufacturing the commodities of war. The expenditures for war reached their peak in 1945, and the Federal debt reached its peak the same year, $261,000,000,000.

Who knows what $261,000,000,000 is? Two hundred and sixty-one thousand million dollars—who knows what that is? But whatever it is, it is our debt. It is represented by bonds held by banks and insurance companies, by bonds held by veterans, veterans of the Army and of the Navy, it is represented by bonds held by the common people of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At the proper time I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question about this chart. What he has described, as I understand it, is the so-called Hanson theory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the Senator is quite wrong. I am not describing the Hanson theory. I am describing the financial condition of this Government and of the people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not an advocate of deficit spending.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me ask my question in this form, then, without putting in the name of Professor Hanson, whose theory I cannot understand.

The debt of the country has been going up very substantially. The income is rising, and the revenues of the Government are rising more slowly. In the fiscal year 1945, when the income of the country was up to about $170,000,000,000, approximately $95,000,000,000 of that was represented by purchases by the Federal Government, and the balance by our people. That was in time of war. The honorable Senator in his previous chart shows that the great purchasing power of the country came from persons with $4,000 and less income a year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Individual purchasing power.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Individual purchasing power. In peacetime much of that great Government purchasing of approximately $95,000,000,000 by the Federal Government has got to stop. Much of the purchasing must be by private individuals. My question is this: In the opinion of the distinguished Senator can the debt of the Federal Government keep on going up or remain as much as it is above the revenues of the Treasury, and still make it possible for the individual to have that purchasing power?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly not. Of course it cannot. That is what I am arguing against. I am arguing against deficit spending. I am arguing against a situation that compels it. I am arguing against the work-relief proposal of the minority, which is deficit spending. I am arguing for the investment of private capital under a free-enterprise system, and the elimination of deficit spending.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill in one of its provisions seeks to provide for Federal investment and expenditure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Can the Federal Government do that successfully to help the purchasing power of individuals, and do it without providing taxation to meet the cost and yet avoid deficit spending?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Government can avoid deficit spending by stimulating the investment of private capital in independent local enterprise. I should like to see the industries of Massachusetts restored to what they used to be before some of them moved out of the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator whether he is speaking as a former resident of Massachusetts or as the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am speaking as a Senator from Wyoming and as a native of the State of Massachusetts, a State which I am proud to say has always been very progressive in its attitude toward public affairs, a State which I am sure would endorse the principle which I am advocating here today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator one more question in a serious vein?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am serious all the time, and even in the last remark. [Laughter.]

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That stands as the record of the Senator from Wyoming, and I appreciate it.

How can the theory which the Senator has just advocated be carried out without some form of the Hanson theory of borrowing from one's self?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will pardon me, I will come to that in a moment. It is represented on another chart which I have here. I am very happy the Senator has asked the question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think Senators who are busy in their offices or who are having their lunch do not care to be disturbed. I think those who are absent because of the lunch hour will be here presently. I would just as soon proceed.

Mr. MORSE. I merely want to add the comment that there is a possibility that we may reach a vote on this important amendment, and insofar as our side of the proposition is concerned I think the distinguished Senator is presenting the objective data which every Senator ought to have clearly in mind before he makes up his mind as to how he will vote on the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the comment of the Senator from Oregon.

A discussion of the chart, I may say, so that it may be in the RECORD, and of all the charts that I present, will be found in connection with reproductions of the charts in the first part of the hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee, so those who wish to review this matter later will have the opportunity to do so by looking through the hearings.

The point of it all is, of course, that in 1943 the national debt, which in 1933 was a little less than $25,000,000,000, and which at the very height of the depression spending during the New Deal administration was only about 46 or 47 billion dollars—I am reciting the figures from the chart as it is and not from the statistical data which will be found in the hearings—the national debt, as soon as we started preparing for war, began to skyrocket. Between 1940 and 1945 it rose from $50,000,000,000 to $261,000,000,000. That, Mr. President, represents deficit spending for war. But in 1943 for the first time in the history of this Nation the national debt was greater than the total national income of all the people of the United States for a single year. Never before in all the history of this Government has that happened. Never before has it happened in the history of any government that was able to survive.

Back in the administration of Andrew Johnson, after the Civil War, the national debt was about two and one-half billion dollars. It remained there almost constant until after we entered World War I. Just before we entered World War I, in the Wilson administration, the national debt was $3,000,000,000, an increase of only $500,000,000 in all the years since Andrew Johnson.

When we came out of that war the national debt was about $25,000,000,000 or $26,000,000,000, and we were so much concerned then as a government in reducing taxes, instead of paying off the debt, that by the time the depression hit us the debt had been decreased by only $9,000,000,000. That is why at the beginning of the Roosevelt administration we had a debt almost as great as that with which we issued from World War I.

Never in all that long history, from the beginning of the national debt down through World War I, did the national debt ever even approximate the national income of the people. Not until 1943, when it exceeded it. And now it is almost $100,000,000,000 greater than the national income, which for 1945 was $161,000,000,000, although the national income has already dropped with the cancellation of war contracts.

Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts, whose questions were most pertinent, if the national income drops, the Federal revenue raised by taxation will drop. And when the Federal revenue by taxation drops it will be difficult if not impossible to carry the interest on the national debt.

When the Bureau of the Budget sent its recommendations to Congress at the beginning of this Congress for the appropriations which were made for the fiscal year ended June 30 next, it was set forth that the interest upon the national debt for the ensuing year would probably be about $4,500,000,000. The cost of all the executive civilian branches of the Government, as set forth in that same Budget, was only about $1,080,000,000. Add the cost of the Executive Office of the President, the cost of all the courts, and even the cost of Congress, and it is scarcely enough to make the total more than $2,000,000,000. In other words, the interest upon the national debt for the next fiscal year, as estimated by the Bureau of the Budget, is almost twice as much as the entire cost of all the executive, legislative, and civil branches of Government.

Mr. President, that is what is wrong with the world. We have not taken the time as a people to plant to keep the free-enterprise system working. We have not taken the time as a government to plan to keep the system of private property working. We have not taken the time as a Congress to set up an agency the duty of which would be to see to it that this system shall not fail. It is to accomplish this purpose that the bill has been introduced. The opponents of the bill criticize it upon the ground that we cannot provide for public works and Federal expenditures without increasing the debt. Mr. President, the answer to that is that we cannot pay the interest on the national debt unless we have full employment; and if we are going to avoid full employment by the Government under some totalitarian system, then I say that a democratic legislature had better get busy planning to avoid totalitarianism.

We cannot permit the national income to drop and hope to keep the Federal revenue high. If we permit the national income to drop, the revenue will fall off; but whether or not we allow the revenue to drop, the debt will stay where it is.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Assuming that the Federal Government supports such a program of public works as is necessary under the philosophy outlined by the Senator from Wyoming, and that it is necessary for Congress to appropriate large amounts of money to sustain such a program, is it or is it not the Senator's opinion that that program ought to be sustained by current revenue, as a result of taxation levied by Congress, to pay for the program at the time it is projected?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not necessarily. I am thinking now of a Federal expenditure which is most profitable. I think of the building of Boulder Dam, authorized by the Congress under the Hoover administration. I think of the billions of dollars which were expended from the Federal Treasury in the construction of that dam. Every penny of that expenditure has been justified, because it produced business. It created income, not only for the people who were employed upon the project, but for those who supplied materials and commodities in connection with its construction. It provided income for cities and States. It was in every sense of the word an expenditure which produced revenue.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I take it that the answer to my question is that the Senator is not greatly concerned about a further increase in the national debt.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; I am terribly concerned about it. I do not wish to see an increase in the national debt. I wish to prevent it.

Mr. TYDINGS. How can we prevent it unless we are to pay currently for any program which the Government undertakes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I have just pointed out, the cost of Boulder Dam was not paid currently.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not mean to imply that the revenue must necessarily be raised in the same year. My question implied that we should simultaneously enact other measures which eventually would liquidate the cost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; and the bill provides for that. The bill calls for other measures—taxation and the like—to do that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, I take it that it is the Senator's answer that concurrently with any sustained program of Government public works there should be provided taxation, either immediate or eventual, to liquidate any increase in the national debt to pay for such a program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will not say to the Senator that in no event should we undertake any increase of the national debt.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not put the question in that way. The Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I understood the Senator perfectly, but I did not want to give an answer which would be less than frank. It was necessary to indulge in deficit spending to fight this war. If a situation should arise in which the stimulation of private expenditure and the investment of Federal and State funds in revenue-producing public works and in other enterprises were not sufficient to provide full employment, I do not wish to say that in this bill we should declare that a future Congress should not do what the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Wyoming have already done by their votes in the past.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not wish to engage in polemics with the Senator from Wyoming at this juncture of the debate, when he is explaining very interestingly the data which he has assembled, but I think it is fair to assume from the answers he has given that the Senator favors, with some possible exceptions, a program which will either currently or eventually pay for any increase in the national debt.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want a sound fiscal system, and I am working for a sound fiscal system. But I wish to point out to the Senator that less than 3 weeks ago this body passed a bill which authorized the expenditure of $75,000,000 every year for 5 years in the construction, by the Federal Government in conjunction with the States, of airports. There was no provision in the bill or in the tax law for immediate revenues. Of course, I believe that that is an expenditure which will be productive of employment and of tax revenue to the Government, as well as of new business, and which will eventually pay for itself.

Mr. TYDINGS. To state the obvious, the Senator opened his discussion with the statement that it would take as much to pay the interest on the national debt alone, to use my own words, as the Government received in revenue annually prior to 1933.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Therefore, he said it would be very difficult for us to sustain cur economy unless the income of the Nation was kept up so as to furnish the necessary revenue to keep things current.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Therefore, by any kind of logic, the conclusion must follow that the higher the national debt is allowed to go, the more difficult it will be to meet what the Senator now says is almost an impossible problem; and I think one may draw the conclusion that in any program which we may promulgate for unemployment, it is absolutely essential that currently or eventually it be accompanied by a program which will insure, directly or indirectly, its repayment to the Federal Treasury, or else we shall face real disaster.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in that connection?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator to wait a minute, please.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for his contribution to the argument. I am in substantial agreement with what he has said, of course. But so far as this particular bill is concerned, I do not wish to cut off by any declaration the power of a future Congress to meet a crisis which may develop.

I say to the Senator that under the bill, as it is drawn, it becomes the duty of the new executive agency which is to be set up and the duty of the joint committee which is to be created to review exactly such contingencies, and it will be my hope that both the Executive and the congressional joint committee will devise ways and means whereby all these expenditures can pay for themselves.

What I have in mind at the moment is, for instance, Rock Creek Park, through which I drive almost every day in coming to the Capitol. There is an example of the expenditure of Federal funds without any thought of direct or, I may say, even indirect revenue. It was an expenditure by the Federal Government.

In New York and Connecticut there is a magnificent highway over which I have driven many times. There is in Pennsylvania a very magnificent highway. They were built at the expenditure of a tremendous amount of money. But in each of those instances tolls are exacted; the people who use those highways pay a toll. The result is that we have a system of parks and transportation combined which is sustained in the first analysis, by Federal investment and expenditure, and subsequently is repaid not only in the comfort and pleasure they provide to those who use the parks but in the tolls they pay. I understand that the tolls produced a very large sum of money.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me nothing the Senator has said is inconsistent with the other amendment which the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] and I propose to offer, which reads:

Provided, That any program of Federal investment and expenditure for the fiscal year 1948 or any subsequent fiscal year when the Nation is at peace shall be accompanied by a program of taxation designed and calculated to prevent any net increase in the national debt (other than debt incurred for self-liquidating projects and other reimbursable expenditures)—

Those are the things the Senator has been saying we should use unless others more desirable are available.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I say we should not use anything which is not a self-liquidating investment.

Mr. TAFT. Our amendment concludes with the following words:

over a period comprising the year in question and the ensuing 5 years, without interfering with the goal of full employment.

I wonder whether the Senator is prepared to endorse that principle, namely, that if a large plan for Federal expenditures is submitted, there should also be submitted, at least, a program of taxation, not designed to balance the budget that year, necessarily, but designed over a 10-year period to be sufficient to meet the contemplated program of expenditures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator's amendment would be a dangerous one because of the fact that it is accompanied by the defeatist minority report which shows that those who have been opposing the bill and who are suggesting the amendment are activated by the desire, somehow or other, to secure a declaration of principles which will be antagonistic to the desire to maintain full employment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Then, do I correctly understand that the only objection the Senator has is to the motive or alleged motive of those who propose the amendment, and not to the amendment itself?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; I do not. We have here a bill the philosophy of which is being attacked. I may say that amendments which proceed from those who have persistently and upon every possible occasion attacked the fundamental purpose of the bill and would have prevented its report, if they had been able to do so, would be like gifts borne by Greeks; I would be very, very suspicious.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to proceed with my statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well; I shall not interrupt the Senator if he does not care to be interrupted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have been on my feet for a long time, and I should like to complete this presentation.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because of the question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts regarding the financing of the debt, I present this chart, which I also presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is entitled "Who Buys the National Product?" It will be observed that the first column, which is labeled "1940," shows, first, the amount of purchasing power provided by consumers. That is shown by the heavy black column. Above that is shown the amount of purchasing power provided by business. That is shown by the cross-hatched column. The next block in the column is a speckled one. It represents Government nonwar spending. The little black cap at the top of the column represents Government war expenditures. So, Mr. President, in 1940, before we entered the war, the great bulk of our expenditures comprised those which were made by consumers; the great bulk of the expenditures was made up of what the people of the United States purchased for their needs and desires. Let us say that was approximately $90,000,000,000; the exact figures will appear in the hearings. The amount expended by business was only a little more than $10,000,000,000 or $12,000,000,000. The amount spent by Government in nonwar

expenditures was approximately the same. The Government war expenditures amounted to very little.

But in 1944, after we had been waging the war for 3 or 4 years, consumers' expenditures had increased, of course, almost to $100,000,000,000. Business expenditures had also increased. Why? Because the investment in war plants was made substantially by the Government. Most of the expenditures which were made to build our war plants came from the deficit. It was Government spending, not business spending.

Then the huge black column at the top, showing Government war expenditures, teaches us that for the war we were spending, in 1944, almost as much, through the Government, out of the deficit, as all the people of the United States had spent in 1940. The truth of the matter is that for purposes of the war the Government has bought almost 50 percent of all goods and services which were produced in the United States. Because the Government was doing that, the national income increased, as I have shown.

It is estimated by financial experts, of whom I am not one, that if we are to carry the national debt, that is to say, if we are to secure to the Federal Government revenue which will be sufficient to pay interest of $4,500,000,000 upon the national debt, we shall have to keep the national income up to approximately $200,000,000,000. If we permit that income to fall, our revenue will fall.

So the question which Senators must decide is, who will furnish the purchasing power necessary to maintain the national income at a level which will carry the national debt after the Government stops purchasing for war, as it has done?

I assert that that is a problem of such magnitude that we cannot afford to fail to establish an agency to study the matter. We must establish such an agency and allow it to work without any restrictions, and without any false attacks being made upon it such as those which are now based upon a misinterpretation of the intent of the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, of course there is one element which the experts never seem to mention, although it is a very important element in connection with the $200,000,000,000 expenditure of 1944. The Senator is too wise a student of economy to overlook it. The fact is that in 1944 the black line superimposed upon Government non-war expenditures really resulted from a reduction in wages. That may seem to be an astounding statement. But we must realize that when the American people submitted to very high wartime taxes in order to create money in the Federal Treasury which the Government spent, they correspondingly reduced their own income, except to the extent that it showed up in the form of savings.

We must also realize that the people loaned the Government for the purchase of war bonds a portion of their wages which they had not paid in taxes.

So while the economists point to a $200,000,000,000 income, in truth and by every standard from the economic standpoint, the gross income should be reduced by the amount of wartime taxes, and by the amount we loaned to the Government. Otherwise the picture is totally erroneous.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I might agree with the Senator without any effect upon the argument which is here being presented. I merely wish to reassert that, as I see it, there is a complete misconception upon the part of many persons, particularly those who are in the upper brackets of income, that, somehow or other, they will be the ones who will be obliged to pay the cost. That is a great mistake.

When I had prepared the chart which I was discussing a little while ago, I called up officials of the Treasury Department and asked them if they could give me the figures relative to the proceeds received by the Federal Government by way of income taxes in 1944, and if so, would they divide it into classifications with reference to salary brackets. They did so. I am sorry I did not have a chart made of the information. Other things prevented my doing so at the time.

Mr. President, here is an interesting fact: The total estimated tax receipts for 1944, according to the Treasury Department, were $17,800,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Exclusive of corporations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The figure I have given represents, as I understand it, income tax receipts.

Persons with incomes of $25,000 and more paid $4,200,000,000. Those who were in the brackets between $10,000 and $25,000 paid $2,100,000,000. Those who were in the brackets between $5,000 and $10,000 paid into the Treasury in the form of taxes $1,700,000,000. Those whose incomes were from $3,000 to $5,000 paid in the form of taxes $3,300,000,000. Those whose incomes were from $2,000 to $3,000 paid in the form of taxes $2,800,000,000. Those whose incomes were from $1,000 to $2,000 paid $3,200,000,000 Persons with incomes of less than $1,000 paid $500,000,000.

I ask Senators to observe this: Those who received less than $3,000 paid to the Government $6,500,000,000. Those who received $10,000 and more paid to the Government $6,300,000,000, or $200,000,000 less than those at the bottom of the scale receiving less than $3,000.

If we were to compute those figures on the basis of the persons who received more than $5,000, and also those who were receiving less than $5,000, we would arrive at the following result: The total taxes received by the Federal Government from persons receiving more than $5,000 a year was $8,000,000,000. The total receipts from those receiving less than $5,000 a year was $9,800,000,000, or $1,800,000,000 more than the amount which the Government received from persons with incomes of more than $5,000 a year.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator that my recollection is that just prior to the outbreak of World War II in 1939 the Treasury Department estimated that if every person receiving $100,000 a year or more, or having an income of $100,000 a year or more, were to turn into the Government his entire income and retain nothing whatever, the total amount which would be received from such sources would be only a little more than $1,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator that I made substantially the same statement before he came upon the floor.

Mr. President, I now find that I have on my desk some notes which I made when I appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee. If the Senator will have in mind the original chart showing the total amount received by persons in the various brackets he will see that those who received $2,000 each or less, the total amounting to $45,700,000,000, numbered 32,500,000. Those in the brackets from $2,000 to $4,000 numbered 14,600,000. Those in the brackets from $4,000 to $5,000 numbered 2,000,000. Those in the brackets from $5,000 to $10,000 numbered 1,200,000. Those receiving from $10,000 to $25,000 a year each numbered 446,000. Those in the brackets of $25,000 and more numbered 129,000.

The Senator is quite correct. The Government could take the entire revenue of those who are in the income brackets above $10,000 without affecting in any material way its ability to meet its problem. The problem, Mr. President, is to stimulate the purchasing power of the masses. The solution of the problem which confronts us today is what America has been proud of doing from the very beginning, that is to say, to increase, improve, and elevate the standard of living of the people of America. The more people there are who receive $2,000 a year the better off we are, and if they could be receiving $5,000 a year we would be substantially better off.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Roughly calculating the figures as to incomes just given by the Senator, I have tabulated in my own mind about fifty million. Does the Senator have a recapitulation of that number?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I tabulated in my own mind, as the Senator read the last figures about classified incomes, that there were about 50,000,000 people paying income taxes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Just about fifty million; 32.5, plus 14.6, plus 2, plus 1.2, plus .446, plus .129—a little more than fifty million.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That was for the year 1944?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Nineteen hundred and forty-four, yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understand the proposal generally advanced by the sponsors of the bill, it contemplates a 60,000,000-job program of full employment. Is that substantially correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The "60,000,000 jobs" was a phrase that came out of a political campaign. As I understand, it was intended to dramatize the number of persons in the United States who would be self-employed, who would be employed in professions, school teach-

ing, medical professions, and the like, in business, little business and big business, in industry, in agriculture, and in all the callings which the people of America follow. It was based solely upon a computation of proportion of the population in 1950, as I recall, which would in the normal course of events not be in school, but wanting in some way or other to earn a living.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have often heard, in connection with this program, about people employed and full-employment opportunities, and reference to 60,000,000 jobs. I merely wanted to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that in 1944, which undoubtedly was the saturation point of employment in this country, so far as everyone who wanted to work having a job was concerned——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In what year?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Nineteen hundred and forty-four; people looking for employees could not find them. I want to know whether, based upon these statistics, the estimates are not a little high as to the number of persons who can be put to work under any kind of a program in peacetime in this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that, of course, is the very issue of the bill. I do not believe that we have to throw up our hands and say a free enterprise system cannot provide sufficient employment. That, I say, is a completely defeatist attitude, and I want to fight to make it possible for enterprise to furnish the work.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am completely committed, in my own thinking and my belief, to the idea that if we let private enterprise operate freely, it will provide full-employment opportunities.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, the Senator and I are in agreement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The question is whether or not the goal we are approaching, at least in argument, is not, after all, in the light of all the provable and produceable facts as to employment in this country, and taking into consideration all the factors, one which, from a practical standpoint, we have never reached up to the present, and are we not "kidding" ourselves, in a way, in thinking that we can reach it under such a program?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will pardon me, in just a moment I shall show him a chart which will answer the question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator still have the so-called "flagpole chart"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, it is here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator recur to that for a moment, when he gets through with what he is now discussing?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. Addressing myself to the inquiry of the Senator from Iowa, I wish to call his attention to the chart entitled "Labor Force and Employment in the United States, 1900 to 1944." This appears in the hearings on page 27.

The heavy line on this chart indicates the actual employment, year by year, from 1900 to 1944. The top line running diagonally across the chart represents the so-called labor force, the number of employable people in the United States who naturally and normally are available for work.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. How are those statistics gotten together? The Labor Department gives us one set of figures, the labor unions another set, and the Industrial Conference Board gives us another. I am interested in knowing on what this chart is based, and whether the Senator believes there are any reliable figures on which we can all rely as a basis for our argument.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator can rely upon this chart, because I took the utmost care in having it prepared. Members of the staff of the Committee on Economic Development, of the National Planning Association, and of the Department of Commerce, as well as the Department of Labor, furnished the basic material upon which the chart was drawn. I believe it to be accurate.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator thinks that in the future we can work out some plan so that we can be agreed as to what are the correct figures?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I think we can.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is very important, in connection with the whole discussion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator. I was going to say that the lower line on the chart, running diagonally across it, represents the employment in prosperity years. In other words, if we had had what is called substantially full employment all through this period, the lower diagonal line would represent it. The area between the lower line and the upper line, that narrow ribbon, represents what the economists call the frictional unemployment, those who are out of jobs because they are going from place to place, those who have quit work on the farm because they want to go into town for a little vacation, or for some other reason, school teachers who have quit because they do not want to work the remainder of the year; in other words, people who for their own personal reasons do not want to accept jobs which are available. That is the so-called "frictional unemployment." In other words, the number of people employed in a free economy may reasonably be expected to be a million or two million or perhaps three million below the entire labor force, without doing any harm to anyone. The danger comes when conditions are such that people who want jobs are unable to find them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, let me ask the Senator this question: Is it the Senator's view that under the proposals of the pending bill it is the responsibility of the Government to furnish job opportunities for all, including the "frictional" labor group that is constantly unemployed? In other words, what I am trying to get at is, how extensively should this planning be made? Should it encompass the entire economy to the point where there is a shortage of labor, or should it only attempt to get up to the point where the reasonable demands for jobs is met—up to the point where "frictional" unemployment may begin?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. For my part, I believe in the reasonable definition. I do not believe in trying to create a system whereby people would be attracted into employment who should not in the public interest be employed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. To my mind, it is extremely important to arrive at an understanding as to whether we should attempt to aim at a full saturation of opportunities in this country for all possible employees, all those who might at some time or other, willy-nilly, want a job, or whether we should say that our attempt is to arrive at a place where our economy will be efficiently complete, so far as jobs are concerned, with respect to the labor market and everything else, if we come as near as we can to reasonable employment. I am confused on that point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I do not think the Senator is confused at all.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think it is important for us to know just how far the planning is to go.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My best answer to the Senator is this: The first Presidential campaign I remember anything about in any detail was the campaign of William McKinley for the Presidency, and I remember that the battle cry in that campaign was the "full dinner pail." How full was the "full dinner pail"? What they were talking about was——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if I may say so to the Senator, as I understand, in acting on the pending bill we are going beyond any political shibboleth.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Or political arguments, or vote-catching phrases. At least I hope the bill is of that sincerity, and I rely upon it being so. We are now faced with a program-making or policy-making bill, and getting down to brass tacks as to what we are going to do, because we are announcing a policy by which we plan to assume responsibility for this economic measure, and not to shirk the responsibility when the votes are counted and say that the bill is nothing but a campaign promise made in the heat of a campaign. Therefore, I think it is important that we should narrow the issue and reach as full an understanding as possible so as to know what may reasonably be expected in connection with the measure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I want to say first that the details of whatever plan is presented will have to be worked out by the agency which is established and by the joint committee. There is nothing in the bill which guarantees a job to anybody.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thoroughly agree with the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let alone to the full labor force. There is nothing in the bill which declares that the Government should not be satisfied with the reasonable sort of employment which, as shown on this chart, we would have had in prosperous years.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with what the Senator from Wyoming has said and what the Senator from Iowa has just stated. I wish to say, however, that on frequent trips to Montana I have visited a good many farmers. I find they are very much worried. I thoroughly agree with the philosophy of the bill that if private industry and local governments, cities, and counties, cannot furnish sufficient employment to the people of the country, the Government itself must do so, whether we like it or not, simply for the preservation of our own country. I think that is intelligent self-interest.

But let me call attention to the language of paragraph (b) of section 2:

All Americans able to work and desiring to work are entitled to an opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment.

The Senator will find that a great many stockmen and farmers in his State of Wyoming are very much afraid that that language will result in some individuals deciding that they do not want to work on the farm or work elsewhere; that they will say that "The Government of the United States owes us a job at a remuneration such as we think we ought to get."

Of course, I appreciate that that is not the intention of the bill. We cannot write into a law much of what has been said during political campaigns. Frankly, I am afraid that many of the workers throughout the country are going to be misled by this particular statement of the bill. Many people are afraid of what may happen as a result of this particular language being in the bill.

It seems to me, Mr. President, something should be done to clarify that language, so we would not be holding out a promise to individuals which we all know cannot be fulfilled and will not be fulfilled in the sense that everyone will be furnished work. Take the housewife, for instance, who ought to be at home taking care of her children or taking care of the home. She may want to have part-time work in order to make a little money. We cannot guarantee work to such a woman. In wartime many women were employed because there was great need for them to help out in industry to carry on the war program.

A short time ago the Senator spoke of the committee which was to be set up. I understood the Senator to say that some persons were opposed to such a committee. Does the Senator know of anyone who is opposed to the committee being set up?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not say that, Mr. President. I do not know of anyone who is opposed to it.

Mr. WHEELER. I thought the Senator made that statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I did not say that.

Mr. WHEELER. I think it is absolutely essential that a committee be set up in order to study the economic situation with which we shall be faced in a comparatively short time. I do not, however, like to hold out to the workers of this country a promise which I know cannot be fulfilled or upon which they can place a wrong interpretation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think it would be utterly impossible to draft any bill or pass any law which would not be subject to misinterpretation somewhere along the line. I think the record which has been made by the people of this country in producing for the war, by the people on farms and ranches, as well as people in the factories, demonstrates beyond any peradventure of a doubt that the masses of the people of the United States are sound. The people of this country are not chiselers. There are some who do not want to work; there are some who want to get by on their wits; but we cannot afford to lay down an economic program upon the basis of possible misuse or abuse. We have got to lay down our program upon the basis of the record which has been established by the people of America, who have just come through one of the most magnificent demonstrations of their industry and patriotism that anybody could imagine.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMAHON in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator think for one moment that any statement I have made assumes that I have come to such a conclusion?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; I know the Senator has not.

Mr. WHEELER. No; not at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has pointed out that there are some people who have that point of view.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly; and I do not want to hold out to our people the promise of something the Congress will not do or that the people as a whole will not do. In my judgment, the language I referred to is causing most of the misunderstanding that exists with reference to this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has been my experience, I will say to the Senator, that the misunderstanding is fragmentary, to say the least.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish the Senator were correct that it is fragmentary, but I am very much afraid the Senator will find it is not fragmentary. The purpose of the proposed legislation, as the Senator sees it, and as most of us here see it, is not the purpose which has been represented to a great many people throughout the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not seen the representations of which the Senator speaks.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator has read the New York Times, I am sure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; and I know that the New York Times was wholly mistaken about the whole program. I desire to point out again that the most careful safeguards have been thrown about the proposed legislation. As one of the sponsors of the bill, I proclaim again that the purpose of the bill is not to promote a condition which will cultivate abuse. The purpose of the bill is to maintain purchasing power, without which the system of private property probably cannot endure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to ask the Senator a question. I understand how he reaches the heavy black line on the chart, but how does he reach the double line? By what statistical methods does the Senator determine the double line, representing frictional unemployment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The top line is the labor force, as estimated from figures compiled by the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. TAFT. Incidentally, in its last dive, it includes the armed forces of the Nation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does not dive.

Mr. TAFT. I mean in its last rise, it includes the armed forces. But how does the Senator reach the other figure, marked "labor force"? That figure runs in a steady line.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the figure I am talking about.

Mr. TAFT. What is it supposed to represent?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is supposed to represent the number of employable persons in the United States who desire work as self-employers, or as agricultural workers, industrial workers, or workers in any branch of our economy.

Mr. TAFT. That is the line which reaches 60,000,000 in 1950. I compared that figure with the population of the United States when the Senator offered the chart in the committee, and I found that he had that line going up faster than the population of the United States. The chart starts with a certain population in 1900 and a supposed labor force. If the Senator increases the figure representing the labor force at a rate corresponding to the increase in population, he will not reach 60,000,000. He will reach only 55,000,000 jobs. I asked the Senator at the time whether he would compare that figure with the population increase and let us know the result.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator asked for the population figures. I obtained them and placed them in the record. They are in the record on page 30. I have not made the statistical computation to which he now refers. I find that in 1944, according to the Bureau of the Census, the population was estimated at 138.1 million; in 1943, at 136.5 million; and in 1940, at 132 million. I assume that the relationship is an actual, statistical, scientific, and objective relationship.

Mr. TAFT. I only wish to call attention to the fact that the line at the right of the chart, which reaches 60,000,000, includes a considerably larger percentage of the total population estimated for 1950 than does the line at the left, representing the labor force, as compared with the total population in 1900.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, there are all sorts of estimates as to what the population will be in 1950; but I was attempting to answer the question of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] with respect to the labor force.

Mr. TAFT. May I supplement the question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. With respect to the frictional unemployment, is it the Senator's understanding that the words "full employment" as used in the bill include the frictional area?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; they do not.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator differs with Sir William Beveridge, who is perhaps the principal writer on this subject. Sir William Beveridge has written a book entitled "Full Employment in a Free Society." He distinctly says in his book that full employment means having always more vacant jobs than unemployed men, and not slightly fewer jobs. So his definition of full employment is different from that of the Senator. Perhaps the authors of the bill might attempt to agree on what they mean by full employment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that Sir William Beveridge is not one of the sponsors of the bill. He was not consulted in its drafting. However, he was a member of Parliament who was defeated in the last election because the British Government and British industry had not succeeded in solving the question of unemployment; and because of the failure of the British Government to solve the question of social security and full employment we now have a British Government which is devoted to the theory of the nationalization of industry. I am here today arguing for the passage of this measure because I do not wish to see appearing in the United States the same trend which has appeared in Britain, and which I think is appearing also in France. The election which is to take place in France within a few weeks may surprise many of us in the United States as much as did the British election. We had better prepare for this movement.

Mr. TAFT. I have examined the literature on this subject. The book by Sir William Beveridge is certainly the fullest exposition of the theory involved in the pending bill. Before that we had Keynes on spending, and we had various plans for full employment under a totalitarian state. But this is the first attempt which I have seen in a full style to reconcile the idea of the right to work and full employment with a free enterprise state.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the Senator will realize that Sir William Beveridge was speaking for a homogeneous nation, the nation of Great Britain, which could be stowed away in one of the several United States, a nation with a population only a fraction of that of the United States. The conditions which exist in Britain are different from those which exist here. It may be that the liberal point of view expressed by Sir William Beveridge is altogether appropriate to the small country of Great Britain. The Senator is the only one who is citing Sir William Beveridge in connection with this measure.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I was glad to hear the Senator's explanation of what caused the overturn in the election in England. Let me say to him that if he had been in England he would not have thought that that was the only reason why there was an overturn.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not say that it was the only reason.

Mr. WHEELER. In my judgment, after talking with a number of individuals in England, the principal reason for the overturn was the regimentation of the people, and what they had to go through during the war. I am inclined to believe that the Senator will find that the present Labor Party is about as conservative, nationalistic, and imperialistic as was the old Tory Party. It is certainly as imperialistic; and I do not believe it is very much more radical than was the Conservative Party toward the end.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator will not try to involve me in a debate on internationalism.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator injected the question. I am merely asking him to follow the course of events and see what happens in England with reference to the so-called radical Labor Party. My experience with the British has been that, generally speaking, the British laboring man is far more conservative than is the Democratic Party in this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It remains to be seen what will happen.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I caught the Senator's remark awhile ago, he was only attempting to allude to the defeat of Sir William Beveridge, and not the entire British election.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did make reference to the entire British election, and I also stated that reports current in the press would indicate that there is a so-called radical tendency in France, as well. As a matter of fact, we all know it. Totalitarianism is advocated by powerful forces throughout the world.

To get back to the chart, actual employment is represented by the heavy black line. Of course, there are times when conditions are such that more than the normal labor force is drawn into industry. As has been pointed out by the Senator from Montana, that happened during the war, when, as shown by one of the columns on the chart, after 1940 the number of employed persons went far beyond the number representing the normal labor force.

That was because school teachers, young boys, old men, and old women, and wives left their homes to go to work. They were impelled by patriotic motives. It is not the desire of the sponsors of the pending bill to promote any conditions which would have such a result. The danger is not in excessive employment; the danger to our system is in unemployment. Please observe how the line, as shown on the chart, fell after 1929. The actual employment in 1929 was approximately 47,000,000. In 1932 and 1933 it decreased until there were scarcely 35,000,000 persons employed. But the great danger is that, with improving technology, the output of goods is so much greater than formerly that we are producing more with less labor than at any time in our history.

There was another chart among the number, but it seems to have disappeared as the charts were carried out, but it will not be necessary to have it brought back. I shall merely say that in 1940 we produced more goods and services than at any previous time in our history. We produced more goods and services in 1940 than we did in 1929. The population was increasing, to be sure; but when, in 1940, we were producing a gross national product, as shown by this chart, very much in excess of $100,000,000,000, it was being done at a time when there were almost 9,000,000 unemployed persons. In 1929, when we had no unemployment problem, the gross national product was only approximately $100,000,000,000. In other words, we are now producing more, with fewer people working fewer hours, speaking industrially, than ever in our history. That is also true upon the farm. Since machines have gone into use on the farms, we are faced with the necessity of adjusting ourselves to the tremendous technological change which has occurred.

My whole argument, let me say, inasmuch as Senators have interrupted me with so many questions—and, of course, I have stood on the floor much longer than I intended to do, and I shall bring my remarks to a speedy conclusion——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator refer again to the so-called flag-pole chart for 1 minute, please?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I tried to follow the Senator's application of tax returns to that chart. The Senator has a table on his desk. As I followed him—and I am very much interested in this question, because I am a member of the Finance Committee—I observed that the members of the group labeled "over $25,000 a year" were taxed at a rate of approximately 60 percent of their total income.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; the tax on them was very heavy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It was approximately 60 percent; it was more than $4,000,000,000, on a total income of $7,700,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And those in the lower bracket, with incomes of less than $2,000 a year, for which I calculated the rate in my mind as the Senator was reading the chart, were subjected to a tax of approximately 6 percent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; there is no doubt about that. As the Senator knows, the rate of taxation on the higher incomes is much greater than that on the lower incomes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wondered what is the implication of the chart on taxes which the Senator read, and what is its application to this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cited those other figures to show that we cannot depend upon the revenue derived from those whose incomes are in the upper brackets to support our economy. In order to support our economy we must raise the standard of living of those at the bottom of the scale. That is the only purpose. I am pointing out that there are so many millions in the lower brackets and there are such a few thousand in the upper brackets that the solution of a free individual economy is to increase the standard of living of those at the bottom of the scale.

[Manifestations of applause by occupants of the galleries.]

So, Mr. President, my argument is simply this: Wherever we look in this world we know that a great economic question confronts us. We know it was unemployment of the masses in Germany and in Italy, the inability of little business to survive in a concentrated economy, that brought about the rise of Mussolini and Hitler. We know that every radical movement obtains its impetus from the failure of government to provide conditions under which the masses of the people may maintain themselves. This Government of ours was created by men who understood well what they were doing. They were creating a government of the people; they were creating a government which should serve the interests of the people. In other words, they were creating a government the objective of which would be to create such conditions in our economy as to improve the lot for the masses of the people. That is what they meant when they drew up the Preamble to the Constitution, "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare," and so forth. It has been the objective of statesmen throughout our history to promote the general welfare, and the great controversy which has raged has been between those who have advocated the Hamiltonian theory of taking care of the wealthy first, in the belief that they would take care of the masses of the people, and those who have adhered to the Jeffersonian theory that the true aim of government is to provide for the welfare of the masses, because they were secure in the belief that when opportunity is preserved for the masses there will be plenty of opportunity for those at the top of the scale.

Without any question, Mr. President, if we adopt in this Nation a program to study the free-enterprise system and to try to make it work and to create opportunities for the people at the bottom of the scale so that they can live in their own homes, in their own communities, in their own States, instead of being herded from corner to corner of the United States into temporary jobs, if we promote such an economy, we shall be creating and multiplying the number of persons in the upper brackets. Those persons whose incomes are in the upper brackets, those who are managers of concentrated industry, and are fearful lest it be impossible for them to secure workers at low wages, are defeating their own interests by seeking to oppose the inauguration of a program which will improve living standards for the masses of the people.

Mr. President, there is nothing in this bill which is not consonant with true Americanism, with the principles of the Constitution of the United States, or with the principles which have been preached from every political platform in every political campaign, by every party which believes in free enterprise. This is an American bill to make free enterprise work. This is a bill to provide that we shall not leave the planning to managers of large concentrated industries, but that we shall do something through the government of the people to aid the little fellow and the local fellow, as well as to build up industry in my State and other States for the purpose of creating opportunities everywhere, to make it possible for the farmer to sell the products of his farm, to make it possible for the shopkeeper to load his shelves and sell his goods, and to make it possible for young people to go to school. This is a bill to promote the general welfare.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator has stressed the fact that this is a bill to help the little fellow and the local fellow get into business and take care of himself. However, there is nothing in the bill, so far as I have been able to examine it—and I was a member of the subcommittee which considered it—that is in any way inimical to big business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Nothing whatever.

Mr. MURDOCK. Big business may go into the Senator's State, and I hope it may go into my State as well, because in some industries we must have big business. There is nothing in this bill that is in any way antagonistic or inimical to the interest of big business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Big business will be more vigorous and more profitable if we create a condition under which little business can thrive. There is nothing in the bill which is in any way antagonistic to big business or to wealth.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think that I can agree with about 90 percent of everything which the Senator from Wyoming has said.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Donnell	La Follette
Andrews	Downey	Langer
Bailey	Ellender	Lucas
Ball	Ferguson	McCarran
Bankhead	Fulbright	McClellan
Barkley	George	McFarland
Bilbo	Gerry	McKellar
Bridges	Green	McMahon
Briggs	Guffey	Magnuson
Brooks	Gurney	Maybank
Buck	Hart	Mead
Burton	Hatch	Millikin
Butler	Hawkes	Mitchell
Byrd	Hayden	Moore
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Morse
Capper	Hill	Murdock
Carville	Hoey	Murray
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Daniel
Cordon	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Overton	Stewart	Wagner
Radcliffe	Taft	Walsh
Reed	Taylor	Wheeler
Revercomb	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Robertson	Thomas, Utah	White
Russell	Tobey	Wiley
Saltonstall	Tunnell	Willis
Shipstead	Tydings	Wilson
Smith	Vandenberg	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to state to the Senate that there is a widespread desire among Members of the Senate to conclude the consideration of the pending bill if possible tomorrow, and to that end I am hoping we may remain in session today until 6 o'clock, and meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow, in an effort to conclude the bill tomorrow if it is at all possible. I hope Senators will cooperate to that end.

Mr. WHITE. I wonder if the majority leader would not also express the hope that there may be a recess on Monday, when an event of some historic importance which many Members would like to witness is to take place.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the ability of the Senate to be in recess all day Monday will depend entirely on the state of the public business. I am familiar with the event to which the Senator alludes, which is the swearing in of one of our colleagues as a member of the Supreme Court. I am sure we should all like to attend the ceremony, but it has not heretofore been customary for the Senate to take a whole day's recess on account of such an event. If we have any reason to reassemble on Monday I should frankly dislike to avoid having a session for the whole day, much as we should all like to see the Senator from Ohio sworn in as a member of the Supreme Court.

Mr. WHITE. But it is not customary for the Senate to give to the Court a member of such abilities as the new member.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has given other members to the Supreme Court, and I do not recall that we took a recess to see them sworn in. That would not militate against a recess in this case if it would not interfere with the Senate's business, but I should not want to guarantee now that we would have a recess Monday for the whole day.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio be kind enough to permit me to make a motion to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business for the purpose of taking up two short resolutions which are important, which I am ready to report from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection, if the majority leader desires to have it done. I am not in charge of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. This is the first I have heard of it.

Mr. LUCAS. The resolutions are very short.

Mr. BARKLEY. Frankly, I do not see the great emergency of the resolutions which would justify taking up time out of the consideration of the pending bill. If we should take them up after we finish the day's work, when we are about ready to recess, I think it would be better.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know how long the Senate is to be in session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I just announced that I hoped the Senate would remain in session until 6 o'clock, and meet tomorrow at 11 a. m., in the hope that we may finish the consideration of the bill tomorrow. Is the Senator of the opinion that the two resolutions are of such importance that we should interfere with the pending business in order to consider and act on them, rather than wait until we finish the day's work to take them up?

Mr. LUCAS. One resolution deals with expenditures requested under the concurrent resolution adopted yesterday by the Senate which deals with the atomic bomb. I do not think there will be any debate on the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. We never can tell what will happen in the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I withdraw the request for the moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think a little later, when we finish the day's business, it would be more appropriate to take up the resolutions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may we not see if there is any difference of opinion regarding the resolution dealing with the atomic bomb? There are reasons why we should proceed as quickly as possible to send the proposal to the other House, and I am sure that there is no disagreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not expressing disagreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it would have been agreed to by now.

Mr. LUCAS. I am hoping we can get an agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. With respect to the resolution dealing with the atomic bomb, is it the intention of the Senator from Illinois to have the resolution acted on this afternoon?

Mr. LUCAS. All the resolution does is merely make an appropriation of money in line with what the Senate agreed to yesterday. It was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The committee has acted, and I am ready to report the resolution back to the Senate. There was little or no debate on the resolution yesterday, and there should be no debate on it today.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the resolution referred to the one reported from the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to provide for a joint committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report, with additional amendments, Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had previously been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Foreign Relations were, on page 2, line 3, after the word "the", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "development and control of the atomic bomb" and insert "development, control, and use of atomic energy"; in line 6, after the word "its", to strike out "development and control" and insert "development, control, and use"; and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$25,000."

The additional amendments of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate were, on page 2, line 24, after the word "paid", to strike out "one-half"; and in line 25, after the name "Senate", to strike out "and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives."

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the development, control, and use of atomic energy, with a view to assisting the Congress in dealing with the problems presented by its development, control, and use. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

The title was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to investigate the matter of the development, control, and use of atomic energy."

CLERK HIRE IN OFFICE OF SENATOR BURTON

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I also report favorably from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate an original resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 178) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the clerical assistants in the office of Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, appointed by him and carried on the pay roll of the Senate when his resignation from the Senate takes effect, shall be continued on such pay roll at their respective salaries for a period not to exceed 1 month, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I said before the call of the quorum, I agree with 90 percent of all the Senator from Wyoming has said. The only point of disagreement is that I do not think that the remaining 10 percent justify in any way the conclusion that the delightful ends the Senator has stated will be reached by passing the pending bill.

In the first place, the bill does not do anything except declare a policy, primarily. It has three parts. To begin with, there is section 2, a declaration of policy by the Federal Government. It is a policy which is not binding on any future Congress, and is not binding even on the present Congress, yet if that policy is wrong, I cannot subscribe to it or to the bill.

The second part provides that the President must submit an annual budget, statistical information, and an economic program, with which I fully agree, but the bill says further that in doing so he must do it in accordance with the policy prescribed in section 1.

The last section provides for the creation of a legislative committee. I think the Senator from Wyoming is correct in saying that such a committee can accomplish a great deal. After the committee of 15 Members of the House and 15 Members of the Senate gets into actual operation, considers the program and submits a report, I doubt very much if the standing committees of the Senate will pay any attention to the report, based on the experience I have had with committees. Yet I think the committee will do good. It will certainly throw light on the effect of each measure on the whole economic program, and I think that should be done.

I agree with the Senator from Wyoming. When he says that we should attempt to prevent another great depression, that we should do everything possible to bring about full employment, and should consciously plan to do so. I agree

with him that we should give the President authority and tell him he must submit a program with reference to that end. It is an important end; the President's program must be submitted with reference to it, and the Congress must consider it. With that I agree 100 percent.

I agree entirely with the Senator from Wyoming when he said that if we have another depression such as occurred in 1932 and throughout the thirties, we face the likelihood that the people of this country will say that, in spite of the fact that the free-enterprise system has brought about a higher standard of living here than anywhere else, still if it cannot solve unemployment, if it cannot solve depression, if it cannot prevent tremendous economic declines similar to the one which occurred in the 1930's, we will have to find some other system. With that I agree. I agree that we have the duty, if we possibly can, to develop a program which will prevent, or at least reduce or alleviate, the effect of such depressions. We must develop a program which will avoid unemployment, which will avoid the hardship and poverty which resulted from the depression of 1932 and some previous depressions.

But every administration in the history of our Government has been trying to do that. We have not had an administration which has not had an economic program. There has not been an administration which has not attempted to secure full employment. The full dinner pail campaign of 1896 was simply a campaign for full employment. Two chickens in every pot, and an automobile in every garage, or two automobiles in every garage was simply a program for full employment. Every administration has had that end in view.

The Senator from Wyoming is imagining things when he thinks there are those who want to grind the faces of the poor in order to enrich the wealthy. Certainly there are no individuals in the Republican Party or in the Democratic Party, or in public life who desire such a program. All of us want a program to prevent unemployment. How we are going to get it is the question. That is a much more difficult problem. Certainly I do not think it is going to be brought about by this bill. But I am in favor of the provision for economic planning. I am in favor of economic planning. Of course, I do not entirely trust the present administration to make the plans as I would make them. But the necessity for doing so exists, and the power to do so should be given. The administration should be told, "You must put this question high at least on your items of priority, and you must develop a program aimed at preventing depressions, the best program you can develop." To that principle I agree entirely, and no amendments offered to this bill in any way change that purpose of the bill as stated by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator speaks of his lack of trust of the administration, his lack of trust in the agency which would be set up. May I inquire of him whether he has any trust or confidence in the judgment of the gentleman who was the last Republican candidate for the Presidency, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, whose statement made just about a year ago, September 21, 1944, deals exactly with the issue presented by the Senator's amendment. Governor Dewey said that——

Mr. TAFT. The Senator was not present yesterday when I made a statement concerning that speech. It was read twice. I stated that I entirely disagreed with it. That if Mr. Dewey had not pursued that course I think he might have been elected President of the United States. But from the time he made that speech he went down hill with the people of the United States, and I said that I entirely disagreed with the statement which he made, and which, as I said, has already been read twice on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not aware that the Senator from Ohio made his disagreement known at that time. I am very glad that it is known now. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator will take account of the fact that the Senator from Ohio was himself a candidate in Ohio at the same time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the question is not what our end is. There is not any question about the purpose. The question is: What does this bill do? What is the program that this particular bill provides? What is the plan, the real plan of this bill? It was somewhat more clearly set out in the former bill which was introduced in the Senate and then rewritten by its authors. It is somewhat confused in the pending bill. But there is not any question that it is exactly the same plan.

In section 3 of the pending bill the President is required to transmit to Congress a budget, which shall set forth "for the ensuing fiscal year and such longer period as the President may deem appropriate, an estimate of the number of employment opportunities needed for full employment."

That is the first thing. How many jobs is it necessary to provide? Henry Wallace has written a book called Sixty Million Jobs, which was published recently, in which he sets out the full employment theory, and the national budget idea, and how it is to be calculated. If Senators read it, they will understand, perhaps, a little more clearly what the bill provides, although I think the bill itself is clear. If Mr. Wallace were to answer the question raised by the provision I have read, he would say 60,000,000 jobs should be the estimated number of jobs for full employment. I have already indicated my doubt as to whether 60,000,000 is a correct figure. The Senator from Wyoming presented a chart which showed the job force of the Nation running up to 60,000,000 in 1950. Mr. Wallace has backed up from 1946 to 1950—4 years. Of course, there will be more jobs in 1950 than in 1946. Still, if the labor force of the Nation should be in the same proportion to the total population in 1950 as it was in 1900, as shown by the chart, then the labor force would be 51,000,000 and not 60,000,000. Of course, it is true that more women have gone to work. There are more cases of two individuals of a family working now than before. But also we have steadily raised the level of education and forbidden work at lower ages. We have attempted to retire the older people on pension. I see no reason why necessarily there should be a larger proportion of the Nation at work in 1950 than in 1900.

As I said yesterday, as a matter of fact, a nation as it rises in its standard of living should have fewer workers, because it should be unnecessary for the children or the older people or wives to work. I see no magic in the figure of 60,000,000. But any administration that estimated less than sixty million would be accused of running out on the labor force, and of not being really in favor of full employment, and so there is every incentive in making the calculation to figure it as high as can be.

The speech I made, to which I referred yesterday, was simply to point out that there was no magic in having more jobs. The Nation is not better off because more people are working. We have steadily reduced the number of hours people work, and successfully so. It ought to be possible to do the work with fewer hours of work, rather than with more. So, also, it ought to be possible to do the needed work with fewer people than with more.

Then the language of the bill continues:

> The production of goods and services at full employment, and the volume of investment and expenditure needed for the purchase of such goods and services.

Mr. Wallace says that amount is $200,000,000,000. He says if 60,000,000 individuals are put to work it will mean $200,000,000,000. That is his estimate of national goods and services. That is equivalent to about $160,000,000,000 of national income as usually figured. How is it arrived at? It is a pure guess. Anyone can figure it. It all depends upon how much wages those who are receiving the money are to be paid. What is the average income to be? How much of a national income do we need to put 60,000,000 people to work? How much are we to pay them? That is the first question. Are we going to pay them for 40 hours work the same pay that they have been receiving for 48 hours and overtime during the war, or are we to pay them at current wage rates? The difference in that single figure in making this calculation represents the difference between $200,000,000,000 and probably $160,000,000,000 or $165,000,000,000.

I only emphasize the uncertainty of the calculation, I do not object to making it. I think it ought to be made. But when we come to the controversial paragraph 4 we find that based upon these figures the difference is to be estimated, to determine how much Federal investment and expenditure must be brought about.

The next item in the National Budget is this:

> (2) current and foreseeable trends in the number of employment opportunities, the production of goods and services, and the

volume of investment and expenditure for the purchase of goods and services, not taking into account the effects of the general program provided for in paragraph (3) hereof.

An estimate of the national income or national production is made 18 months in advance. On the first of January the estimate must be made for the first of July of the following year. That is a little more tangible than the other provision, because it is not so entirely within the factors one might choose to use. Today I believe that most statisticians estimate the national income at approximately $160,000,000,000. If we estimate what is needed to put 60,000,000 people to work, there is a gap of $40,000,000,000.

The next item is "a general program, pursuant to section 2." When we recur to section 2 to find out what that should be, we find that it is a program which covers everything. First, the program is to stimulate private enterprise. Then, to the extent that private enterprise does not fill the gap, the program is to "provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment."

So a program is submitted dealing with private enterprise, and an estimate is made as to how much of the gap is to be made up by the program to stimulate private enterprise. That is an almost impossible calculation. I do not know how it is to be made. I do not know how to estimate the effect if the tax law is changed, or what effect there will be if we decide to give banks the power to lend money to small business. I do not know how that effect is to be calculated. Presumably it is to be guessed. An estimate may be made that private enterprise can be stimulated to the extent of $10,000,000,000. All through the 1930's we tried to stimulate private enterprise, or we said we were trying to stimulate private enterprise. We made all sorts of loans. Still that program did not succeed, so it is a little doubtful just what new methods of stimulating private enterprise can be found.

Suppose we estimate that private enterprise can be stimulated to the extent of $10,000,000,000. That leaves a gap of $30,000,000,000 to reach the goal of $200,000,000,000, and that gap is to be met by Federal investment and expenditure. We do not wait to find out the results of the program. The program is submitted 18 months in advance, in all its various features, and then there is a purely statistical calculation.

My contention is that while these statistics are important, and will show a trend up or down, they are so indefinite that we cannot possibly base an actual, definite figure for the expenditure of Federal money on any such statistics, and we ought not to do so. We ought simply to say, "Submit your statistics; submit your program, including public works, public expenditures, and everything else you want, and let us see if unemployment can be prevented." That is the course which I would favor. That is what these amendments, in effect, propose. That is the primary purpose of the bill, as stated. All I want to do is to take out of the bill the statistical figure which inevitably will lead to an estimate calling for anywhere from $20,000,000,000 to $40,000,000,000 worth of Federal expenditures to take up the gap.

I do not know what those Federal expenditures would be. We talk about public works. There is an idea that all we have to do in the event of unemployment is to provide public works. It was pointed out yesterday that no one has estimated for public works more than about $5,000,000,000 a year of worth-while projects for any length of time. That would put to work about two and a half million persons. The theory is that it makes no difference how we spend the money; that if we only spend it, in some way we will put more people to work. I suppose that the easiest way to spend money is to pay subsidies. Today we are spending nearly $2,000,000,000 on food subsidies. If we wish to give money away, a system of subsidies is the easiest way to do it. We could buy all the grain at one price and sell it at a lower price. That might be justified on the theory that the consumer, getting it cheaper, will have more money with which to buy other things, and thereby stimulate private enterprise. I do not believe that the theory that public spending, aside from public works, will produce employment is proved by any manner of means. I doubt very much if that kind of Federal spending would produce immediate employment; and I feel quite confident that, continued over a long period, it would simply produce an artificial inflation. It would result in a gradual rise in prices, which would force regimentation or control, or it would increase the debt, and, as the interest on the public debt steadily increases, I feel very confident that it will do more to cause unemployment than it will to bring about employment.

This is the so-called compensatory spending theory. It is recognized by economists, and it is written into the bill. That is the name which is used throughout the world in economic circles. It has not been tried, and yet we are asked to endorse it as a fundamental principle of Federal policy. I do not know exactly where it came from. I do know that to a certain extent the language originated with the Soviet Constitution. Article 118 of the Soviet Constitution reads as follows:

> Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to work—the right to receive guaranteed work with payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality.

I think we might perhaps improve our terms by including part of what the Soviet Constitution contains—that workers will be paid for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality. However, the theory of the right to work started with the Soviet Constitution. I read further from the Soviet Constitution:

> The right to work is insured by the Socialist organization of national economy, the steady growth of the productive forces of Soviet society, the absence of economic crises, and the abolition of unemployment.

Of course, the right to work is justified in the Soviet Constitution because it can be enforced. In a totalitarian state everyone can be put to work. Mussolini did it, Hitler did it, and Stalin does it. Workers can be assigned to certain tasks. Of course, the system involves the necessity of the workers taking the jobs to which they are assigned, and the pay which those jobs provide. But it can be done in a totalitarian state. As stated in the Soviet Constitution:

> The right to work is insured by the Socialist organization of national economy.

In the kind of state which is set up under that constitution, the right to work is perfecly logical.

The obverse of the picture is interesting. It is article 12:

> Work in the U. S. S. R. is the obligation of each citizen capable of working, according to the principle: "He who does not work shall not eat."
>
> In the U. S. S. R. the principle of socialism is being realized: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work."

I believe that the Soviet Constitution is entirely justified, because it is based upon the theory of a totalitarian state which can put people to work. When we come to the private-enterprise system, the idea is not so easy to apply.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator does not contend, does he, that there is anything in the bill which says that anyone who does not work should not eat?

Mr. TAFT. No. The authors of the bill say that when they use the term "the right to work" it does not mean what it means in the Soviet Constitution. The Soviet Constitution gives the absolute right. A man can go to the government and say, "I want a job," and he gets a job. But the authors of the bill say, "We do not mean that. When we talk about the right to work, we do not mean the absolute right. All we mean is that the Government ought to adopt a policy which will create a condition in which everyone who wants a job will find one somewhere."

I have no objection to that; I believe in that policy. I think that policy should be part of the program. I prefer to have it stated as a policy of the Government, rather than to have a direct statement that everyone is entitled to work, which is substantially the way the bill now reads. As the bill now reads, the right to work is substantially insured by the Federal Government. But the authors of the bill say that is not what they mean. Of course, there is another reason why they cannot say that is what they mean. If we made the right to work a legal right, almost any workman could prevent a union which had a closed-shop agreement from preventing him from working where he wanted to work. As a matter of fact, in the State of Texas a constitutional amendment was proposed with that very purpose, and it was campaigned for as an abolition of the closed shop.

The authors of the bill admit they do not mean the right to work. They say that does not mean a legal right, that Mr. Vinson says it is a kind of moral right, and that the only meaning would

be that it is an obligation of the Government. I agree with that. Since that is what it means and since the language is at best ambiguous, I have no objection to that statement of it, although if they would say it would be a policy of the Government I would be for it 100 percent.

Mr. President, under the free enterprise system we had Mr. Keynes recommending large government spending programs. We had the National Resources Planning Board doing planning in this country, with a long list of Federal investment and expenditure projects, but never a suggestion—and I read through the whole list—as to where the money would come from. They did not provide for that.

But Sir William Beveridge is a frank, straightforward man who says what he means. When he presented his plan on social welfare he figured the exact cost and he put it down on the books. So we know exactly what he was proposing. About a year ago he wrote a book entitled "Full Employment in a Free Society." In it he attempts to work out a reconciliation of full employment with the free-enterprise system. He sets out exactly the machinery which is suggested in the pending bill. He is not the author of a bill, but I certainly think he could sue the authors of the bill on a copyright of the proposed method, if a man drawing a bill were subject to such a suit. His book is interesting because it shows what the theory is. He emphasizes the fact that government spending is the key to the theory of full employment. He says:

> The first condition of full employment is that total outlay should always be high enough to set up a demand for products of industry which cannot be satisfied without using the whole manpower of the country. * * * Who is to secure that the first condition is satisfied? The answer is that this must be made a responsibility of the state. No one else has the requisite powers. * * * It must be a function of the state in future to insure adequate total outlay and by consequence to protect its citizens against mass unemployment, as definitely as it is now the function of the state to defend the citizens against attack from abroad and against robbery and violence at home.

That is the key to his policy of compulsory government spending. He believes the government must assume the responsibility of spending the difference between the estimated calculations and the deficiency which may result. He outlines the long-term program which would be adopted under a plan of "federal investment and expenditure," as mentioned in paragraph (4) of the pending bill. He says it covers outlays of various kinds, under each of five heads. First, he says:

> There is a communal outlay of nonmarketable goods and services, including defense, order, free education, a national health service, roads, drains, and other public works.

In other words, that is direct government, the ordinary activities of government.

I read further:

> There is public business investment in industries now under government control or which may be brought under it hereafter.

In other words, that would be Federal investments such as the Tennessee Valley Authority or similar projects.

Then he says:

> There is private business investment; here through a new organ—described as a National Investment Board—the state, while preserving private enterprise, can, by appropriate measures, coordinate and steady the activities of businessmen. There is private consumption outlay—the largest head of the five; this can be both increased and steadied by state action in redistributing income, by measures of social security, and by progressive taxation. There is a new head—described as joint consumption outlay—under which the state takes the initiative by placing collective orders—for food, fuel, and perhaps other necessaries—with a view of reselling them later to private consumers at a price which may at need be lowered by a subsidy. Under this last head the state can influence both the amount and the nature of private outlay, while still leaving it free.

He outlines the various things he means when he says "federal investment and expenditure." It means investment in business. It means subsidy. It means any plan, I suppose, to give money to the British or to any other nation, on the theory that that produces purchasing power which puts people to work—of course, at the expense of a tremendous increase in the national debt.

Sir William Beveridge then says this about it:

> Full employment cannot be won and held without a great extension of the responsibilities and powers of the state exercised through organs of the central government. No power less than that of the state can insure adequate total outlay at all times, or can control, in the general interest, the location of industry and the use of land. To ask for full employment while objecting to these extensions of state activity is to will the end and refuse the means. It is like shouting for victory in total war while rejecting compulsory service and rationing.

Mr. President, I think Mr. Wallace is in a way a disciple of the same idea. His book does not set out compulsory public spending quite so clearly, but it does refer to different kinds of Federal budgets. In one he suggests that the State and local governments spend only $22,000,000,000; in another he suggests that they spend $35,000,000,000; and in another he suggests that they spend $65,000,000,000. He says he prefers the one in which they would spend $35,000,000,000. He says:

> In the case of the "government model," with consumers spending only one hundred and twenty billion and business only $15,000,000,000, we would have 10,000,000 or more unemployed if Government spent only $30,000,000,000; but there would be no unemployment if Government spent the entire balance of sixty-five billions.

He figures that it would cost approximately $35,000,000,000 of additional Government spending to take care of 10,000,000 unemployed. We had 10,000,000 unemployed during most of the thirties.

There is another estimate by Mr. Willford I. King, who is almost the original writer on the subject of national income. He says:

> Probably the sponsors of the Murray full-employment bill have never visualized the extent of the inflation that might eventually be necessary to make such a public-works program effective. During most of the last decade, at least 10,000,000 of potential workers were idle. At present, unionized construction workers' wages average $1.36 per hour. At 40 hours per week for 52 weeks, this would come to $2,834 per year per worker.
>
> The wage bill for 10,000,000 workers on public construction would, therefore, presumably amount to around $28,340,000,000 per year. But the United States Census shows that, for every dollar paid out on construction projects for wages, an additional $1.42 goes for materials and equipment. To do the work efficiently the Government would, therefore, need some $42,000,000,000 worth of such articles.

His estimate is somewhat higher than Mr. Wallace's estimate, but we are dealing with perfectly tremendous figures. Sir William Beveridge recognizes it, Mr. Wallace recognizes it, and Prof. Willford King recognizes it.

As I have already said, this is a theory and we do not know whether it would work and actually produce employment. In my opinion it would destroy the State; it would destroy the Nation, and it would eventually produce unemployment. Whether it would even produce full employment immediately is somewhat doubtful.

Of course, it would increase the national debt, continue in force a large volume of interest on the debt, and ultimately make it impossible to balance the Budget. It would force prices up. We cannot start a Federal program involving the expenditure of $20,000,000,000 or $30,000,000,000 a year without establishing vast Federal bureaus for administrative purposes. The moment it is done there are created vested interests in a great many persons.

Take the present subsidies, for example. We cannot get rid of them overnight because if we were to do so we would wreck the cattle business and the dairy business. Those subsidies will hang on for several years. When such bureaus are created there is also created with them equities and rights in individuals which cannot soon be eliminated. We all know that the equities which are created in employees in various governmental departments continue. We know that it is impossible to get rid of Federal spending once it is started, and if we should spend $30,000,000,000 in a single year we could not discontinue it within only the next year. Inflation will be sure to follow later. Then we shall have a constant rise in prices. If we are prepared to eliminate freedom and continue indefinitely price and wage controls, we will eventually arrive at a point where people can no longer pay the bills with the wages which they receive.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator subscribe to the theory that under a private enterprise system, in order to keep people employed and to achieve full employment, or a reasonable approximation of it, we must have a high wage, high velocity, fair profit, economy, and that those things can be reached only by a constant reduction in the unit cost of mass production products?

Mr. TAFT. I believe that I can agree in general with that theory. If we constantly increase prices and wages we cannot secure the increase in the standard of living which we are trying to achieve.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is precisely what I was getting at.

The proponents of this bill have again and again proclaimed their regard for the private enterprise system, and I assume that this excludes Government control in peacetime of wages, business, or of profits. That being true, there is nothing which needs to be done to meet the requirements of the formula except that which can be done administratively at this moment, without any law of any kind.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, there is no question that the President can do anything today that he could do under this bill. We do not have to pass this bill in order to give the President power to submit a national budget. He can obtain all the figures he needs from the Bureau of the Census, the Department of Commerce, or from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. He can submit a budget even if we do not pass this bill. The bill provides that he must do so, and do so on a certain theory. He must make certain statistical calculations, and when he finds it necessary, he must use Federal money.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So far as a constant reduction in unit price of mass production products is concerned, I doubt whether anyone would contend that it can be coerced by Government. It is something which must necessarily be worked out in harmonious adjustment between capital, management, and labor. That again is a challenge not for a law but for administration under existing law. It can be achieved without a law today as well as with a law tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is entirely correct.

As I have alerady said, the American Farm Bureau Federation is definitely opposed to the entire bill. A letter from them appears on page 1072 of the hearings. It states:

> The American farmer recognizes that a high level of employment is essential to the national well-being. The American farmer believes, however, that it is not the responsibility of Government to assure every individual a full-time job at competitive levels of pay, at all times, under all circumstances, and to assume the obligation of unlimited expenditures to carry out this commitment.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I know the Senator wants to give the whole truth, and the whole truth with reference to farm organizations is that while the American Farm Bureau is registered against the bill, the National Grange, through its president, Mr. Goss, appeared before the committee and made a lengthy address in favor of the bill. The Farmers Union, a large farm organization, also appeared in favor of the bill. So the batting average is 2 to 1 among the farm organizations in favor of the bill as against the American Farm Eureau Federation, which is against the bill.

Mr. TAFT. The Farmers Union is in favor of the compensatory spending theory. I read with care the statement of Mr. Goss, and it seemed to me that his whole emphasis was on the objectives of the bill. He did not attempt to analyze the machinery which will carry the theories into effect. I thought that the statement which I read was not only effective as coming from a large group of our population but was also very well stated. It brought out the very point which I have been trying to make.

I continue reading:

> The American Farm Bureau Federation, while favoring the goal of full employment, is strongly opposed to the bill S. 380, in its present form, because it believes that this legislation will discourage rather than help our economy during the critical reconversion period.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The American farmer, like American labor, has a vital stake in full employment, but both the farmer and the laborer have an even greater stake in our democratic way of life, for which many have died on the field of battle. We believe that the program as proposed in this bill will eventually mean the Government absorbing more and more functions and displacing the creative initiative of the individual, which has made this Nation great. We believe that the maximum employment can best be attained and the national welfare most effectively promoted by adherence to the following basic objectives.

Of course, the theory of this bill means a steady expansion of Federal power. We cannot give the Federal Government billions of dollars to spend without expanding Federal power. Of course, the adoption of the theory would remove every critical faculty in dealing with any measure. It is assumed by many that the statement that full employment will be achieved in 18 months is sufficient justification for spending huge sums of money regardless of the actual details of the situation which may exist. Such a philosophy makes legislation impossible because it assumes the position that the objective of full employment, backed by unlimited spending, is supreme over every other consideration of national policy. That is the theory of the bill. It is contained definitely in paragraph (4) which some of us are trying to eliminate from the bill. We are trying to have it replaced by a provision which will merely say that consideration shall be given to all these purposes, but that it shall not be assumed that public spending is the ultimate panacea for full employment.

Of course, the bill is inflationary in character because the machinery which we have prescribed for it is bound to be inflationary. Any government is bound to put the number of jobs on a high level. Any government, when it multiplies the number of jobs by the average wage, will have to put the wage high or the situation will resolve itself against the worker and in favor of low wages.

The whole theory of the bill is Mr. Wallace's philosophy. The highest point we reached in the war was $200,000,000,000 a year for goods and services, the Government spending $100,000,000,000 of it. We have to maintain that in peacetime, and if we cannot do it normally, if it is not a natural result, the Federal Government must spend the difference in order that we may reach the $200,000,000,000 goal.

Mr. Wallace's philosophy may not dominate the administration which makes this estimate, but the whole force is to make the estimate just as inflationary as possible, so that when we finally get through with the problem, we are doing just exactly what we did in 1929. At that time we inflated the economy by the extension of private credit. We extended loans abroad; we sold securities all over the country; we built great unnecessary buildings, office buildings, hotels, theaters, so many that no more were required for another 10 years after that time, and the construction industry was dead. We built up a tremendous inflation, and when people suddenly realized they had gone too far, the reaction was so great we had the greatest depression we ever had.

Now it is proposed that we do just exactly what we did in 1929, and if we do the result will be exactly the same. We can go on spending a little longer; Government resources are greater than those of private credit, but sooner or later we will reach the point where the extension of credit will collapse, and then the whole business structure will fall.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator has several times mentioned different authorities whom he accused of having the same philosophy as that exemplified in the bill, or who had announced that policy. He speaks of the Soviet Government. Of course, there is no ground for supposing—and the Senator does not suggest that there is—that any part of the bill was taken from the Soviet Constitution.

I should like to say in passing, however, that whatever there may be, whether it is in the Soviet Constitution, or the Finnish Constitution, or the French Constitution, or the British Constitution, or the common law of those countries, which has a chance, in my judgment, of being for the benefit of my fellow men and for the advancement of their interests, I am not afraid to take it from any source. I am more interested in human beings than in sources.

The Senator has also alluded to Henry Wallace. Henry Wallace occupied the rostrum in this Chamber for 4 years as Vice President. He is now Secretary of Commerce. He is a thoughtful man, and a great public servant. I do not always agree with him, but I voted for his confirmation, and have been prouder of that vote as the days have gone by.

Henry Wallace has written a book, and the world can read it. He did not write the pending bill, and was not consulted about the bill. But let me say one more word about Henry Wallace. Those who scoff at Henry Wallace, in my judgment, in future days will come to praise.

Now, taking up the statement the Senator has just made, he said this bill is the philosophy of Henry Wallace. I, as a Republican from New Hampshire,

CHARLES TOBEY, say something to this side of the aisle. If this bill represents the philosophy of Henry Wallace, it is also the philosophy of the leader of our party, the titular leader of our party, Thomas E. Dewey, the man we cheered in Chicago, for whom I voted. I have quoted this before. It is Dewey's philosophy. This is his statement:

> Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in private enterprise. * * * If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours.

That, fellow Republicans—forgetting the other side of the aisle temporarily at least, for which I ask them to pardon me—should be considered as good Republican doctrine. Yet men stand and assail it, speaking of Soviet Russia and Henry Wallace. Why not speak of Tom Dewey and millions of others? There are millions of Republicans in this country who endorse the principles enunciated here.

Our responsibility in a time of depression and widespread unemployment is either to give men opportunity for employment, or furnish them subsistence on relief. Senators may take their choice. As for me, I am going to vote to give men employment, a chance to work out their own salvation, to support their families, and retain their self-respect.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my difficulty is that the bill does not do what the Senator from New Hampshire suggests. If the bill did that, I should be for it. But the Senator says he will assure them. How will he assure them? By methods which within a very few years will produce much greater unemployment than would have existed if we had not spent the money. I have no objection to the principle of the Senator's proposal.

The Senator's $64 question, as it is always asked, is, What would you do if you faced a period of unemployment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will desist a moment, the Chair wishes to call the attention of the occupants of the galleries to the fact that it is a violation of the rules to applaud any speeches made in the Senate. There have been demonstrations before, and if they occur again, the galleries will have to be cleared. The Chair asks the occupants of the galleries not to demonstrate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when we face a problem of unemployment we will use every means in every line possible to stimulate the economy by sound methods which may be permanent, which may not only restore employment but will permanently maintain employment at a stable level. There are many different things which could be done and many different fields in which action could be taken. Most of them relate to private enterprise.

I have pointed out before that whereas public works may put two and a half million men to work, the private-enterprise system is employing 50,000,000 people. If we can give people the incentive to increase business, if we pursue a policy which will encourage private investment, if we really do it, do not just say we are going to do it, and if we increase the private-enterprise machine by 10 percent, we will put many more people to work than will be employed by all the Federal works programs we can ever devise.

I have here an amendment, though I do not know that I shall offer it, a complete substitute for subsection (d). Senators will find it on their desks. It proposes an economic program which may include, but need not be limited to, the following:

> (1) Sound taxation and expenditure policies designed to balance the Budget over the ensuing 6 years—

Which should be changed to 9 years—

> to encourage private investment in and expansion of business enterprises; and to encourage adequate consumers' expenditures.

I do not know anything that will better bring about an increase of the private-enterprise machine than sound policies of taxation, sound fiscal policies, if we are not to have inflation.

> (2) Measures dealing with the control of private and public credit to the end that the level of business activity may be neither inflationary nor deflationary but fundamentally sound and constantly rising.

In other words, if we find things are going too fast, check the credit. That was done during the war. We can cut down installment buying so that people could not buy automobiles on the installment plan. If the desire is to stimulate buying, if there comes a time when we are afraid there may be a letting down of business activity, reduce the percentage so that automobiles may be bought on a 10-percent basis. I do not object to Government control of private credit, using it as a means of expanding or contracting private business.

> (3) Policies within the scope of proper Federal action tending to maintain the proper relationship between expenditures for capital and replacement, for consumers durable goods, and for consumption.

The Government cannot undertake the whole thing without too much of a regimentation, but there are many fields in which it can act. There is the question, for instance, of expenditures for capital and replacement, which deals with the problem of housing. We can tone down the FHA, and stimulate the housing program or retard it.

> (4) Policies within the scope of proper Federal action tending to maintain the correct relationship between the level of wages, the level of farm prices, the level of industrial prices, and the cost of living.

One of the causes of the 1929 depression was that farm prices got below industrial prices. We have found various methods by which we can stimulate farm prices, if you please, and we should do so. We should see to it that there is a proper relationship. At the present moment the OPA is pursuing the policy that wages can be increased and at the same time prices be held down. That simply will not work. It is bound, I think, to destroy private enterprise. If that kind of policy is pursued private enterprise, I believe, will be destroyed, because while the large companies can continue to operate, no one is going to enter into a new business in which he will lose money. If wages go up and prices are held down there will be no extension of private enterprise. People will not go into new businesses.

> (5) Policies affecting the rate of interest and the rate of return on capital.

That is recognized today as a proper method of trying to control the problem of savings as against the problem of consumer expenditures.

> (6) Federal stimulation and development of production and construction by industries, corporations, and individuals through insurance guarantees or otherwise.

I am willing to try any reasonable methods which are suggested to stimulate private enterprise in fields where for some reason it is not able to proceed by itself.

> (7) An increase or decrease in the expenditures of the Federal Government of all kinds designed to assure continuing full employment, including a comprehensive program of public works so planned that it can be speeded up and enlarged in times of lesser activity by private enterprise.

That is one of the things which should be done. Certainly it is one of the things that can be done in an economic crisis. But it is not a panacea any more than any of the other seven things I have listed are panaceas. There is one thing which can be done, and which would be done by the amendment now before the Senate. Instead of saying, "Here is a panacea and if you are not satisfied that the other remedies are going to do it, you have got to recommend it," we simply say, "Here is another thing that will help, and you are authorized to use it, to consider it, and to submit something along that line."

> (8) Policies designed to prevent monopoly and promote competition.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is interested in that, if it can be done to keep consumer prices down, increase the consumer's purchasing power, and spread the money over a larger number of industrial enterprises and production.

> (9) Policies designed to promote foreign trade; and
>
> (10) Policies relating to old-age pensions which will provide for an income for the aged sufficient to enable them to maintain a decent and healthful standard of living, and promote the retirement from the labor force of the older citizens.

Mr. President, if we find we have too many workers, one thing we can do is to drop the old-age pension down to a point where people can retire at an earlier age. There are many other things that can be done, but my objection to the bill is that all these things are cast in the background, and are under the shadow. They are to be tried, yes, but ultimately the Federal Government undertakes that it will absolutely insure employment by Federal spending. Once we have that insurance, what happens? What further responsibility is there on the State and local government, and why should they do anything? The

Federal Government has undertaken to do the whole job. Why should the local governments undertake to inconvenience their systems? The Federal Government has taken it off their shoulders. The bill, instead of trying to work out further plans to stimulate private enterprise, provides immediate recourse to more Federal spending. It becomes the key to all national policy from this time on. Not only is Federal spending a panacea, it is a dangerous drug. If we once begin to take it we never can escape it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The proponents of the pending amendment have accentuated the fact that it is their desire and purpose to stress the opportunity for private industry, and to make it possible for State and municipal governments and private enterprise to do everything they can do to help solve the unemployment problem. No one has raised any objection to that. Never in all the discussions in the committee was any objection raised to that idea. As a matter of fact, there is nothing in the amendment which is now pending which in any way runs counter to that view. On the contrary, the pending amendment states emphatically that State and municipal governments and private industry shall be encouraged in every way possible in order to make their contribution toward relief of unemployment. There is absolutely no difference of opinion whatever on that ground. There was not in the subcommittee nor in the full committee nor has there been on the floor of the Senate any difference of opinion on that ground. The only point of difference has been that if it should develop that all these various methods were not sufficient, whether there should be, as a declaration of policy, an unqualified statement, that the Federal Government will spend enough money to absorb unemployment relief. That is the only difference. There has been complete unanimity on everything that leads up to that point.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Maryland is entirely correct. The only issue raised by these amendments is whether we say, "When submitting your program you are free to consider every element and choose every element," or whether we say, "You must consider a number of elements, but when you get through you have got to make up the difference in a statistical estimate by recommending Federal expenditures."

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from Ohio has stated the situation correctly. The only point of difference is when it comes to unemployment which has not been taken up by the various agencies other than the Federal Government.

Mr. HATCH obtained the floor.

EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSEL BY PEARL HARBOR JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in this morning's Times Herald of Washington there was an article which is so utterly baseless that I cannot let the day go by without commenting upon it. The article reads as follows:

POLITICS SEEN IN PEARL HARBOR COUNSEL CHOICE

Former Attorney General William D. Mitchell yesterday was chosen chief counsel of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee after Chairman Hannegan, of the Democratic National Committee, it was learned authoritatively, had turned thumbs down on at least one other lawyer given committee consideration.

This intrusion of boss politics into the selection of the man who will assume the burden of uncovering the true story of Pearl Harbor was merely one of the incidents which marked a series of behind-the-scenes maneuvers.

FULTON BLACKBALLED

The man blackballed by Hannegan was Hugh Fulton, former counsel for the Senate War Investigating Committee headed by President Truman when he was Senator. Fulton, widely acclaimed for his probing skill, incurred Hannegan's displeasure by his political ambitions when Mr. Truman became President.

Sam O'Neal, publicity director for the Democratic Committee, conveyed Hannegan's disapproval of Fulton to the Democratic members of the committee and he was immediately removed from consideration. Fulton, a Democrat, had been sponsored by Senator Brewster (R.), of Maine, a member of the Truman committee.

Mitchell, final choice of the committee, was approved unanimously after he had assured the five Senators and five Representatives that he would seek to discover the responsibility for American unpreparedness at Pearl Harbor without regard to whom the evidence might hit.

FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL

The 71-year-old New York lawyer was Solicitor General in the Coolidge administration and Attorney General under President Hoover. He practiced law in Minnesota until he received these appointments, then headed his own law firm in New York after his term as Attorney General ended in 1933. He was chairman of a Supreme Court advisory commission.

In the executive sessions of the committee, it was learned, Chairman BARKLEY (D.), of Kentucky, sought approval of a rule which would have confined the questioning of witnesses to the counsel, leaving the 10 committee members mute.

This unprecedented suggestion evoked indignation from Republican members and several Democrats who noted that it relegated the committee to the status of a jury, leaving the sole responsibility for uncovering the evidence in the hands of one man. BARKLEY then withdrew his proposal.

Ordinarily, Mr. President, these little snipers write their names over the articles in the press, but in this case the identity of the writer of this article is not known, because he was not courageous enough to sign his name to it, or place his name at the head of the article. Therefore I am unable to pin responsibility on any individual, but I suppose it is only fair to say that the newspaper involved accepts full responsibility for the article itself.

Mr. President, I suppose that the committee as a whole, and members of the committee individually, may anticipate that as this investigation proceeds efforts similar to this will be made in some quarters to discredit the investigation in advance. No legitimate interpretation can be put upon this maliciously false article other than to say that it is untrue in every sentence and every word, except insofar as it states the fact that Mr. Mitchell was chosen to be general counsel of the committee. I suppose we may anticipate that efforts will be made, as the committee goes along, to discredit in advance the committee, its hearings, its investigation, and its report.

When I submitted the resolution which called for this investigation I had no idea that I would be named on the committee. Furthermore, when the committee was being organized after the House had unanimously agreed to the resolution, I implored the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], President pro tempore of the Senate, not to appoint me as a member of the committee. I urged that in my position as majority leader of the Senate I had all the work that any human being ought to be expected to do, and that, in my opinion, I could not do justice to membership on the committee to investigate the Pearl Harbor disaster without neglecting my duties in the Senate, and that if I undertook to perform both functions, I probably would neglect both. Nevertheless, the President pro tempore insisted that I be a member of the committee, and appointed me.

When the committee met for organization I was made chairman of the committee over my protest, as every member of the committee will testify. Notwithstanding that, I was unanimously—with the exception of my own vote—made chairman of the committee.

We have had three or four meetings of the committee. Thus far the committee has been unanimous in everything it has done. It has proceeded in harmony, understanding, and accord. No politics has been injected into the deliberations of the committee. There has been none in any decision which it has reached. It is my hope and belief that the committee will continue in that nonpartisan spirit. Unless it were willing to do so, I would not wish to have anything further to do with it, or to associate myself with it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sorry to interrupt the able Senator from Kentucky, but I feel that I should say something on this subject in relation to the meetings which the committee has held.

Let me say that at no time has there been even a thread of dissent in the committee. There has never been anything that could be said to be political in any way. No question was ever raised in the committee as to who should ask questions or should not ask questions. The Senator from Kentucky is absolutely correct when he says that this article does not convey what was done or said in any of the committee meetings. It is to be regretted that politics should in any way be brought into this investigation. Mr. President, this is a serious matter. It is a matter which deserves the careful attention of a committee. The committee has been appointed. The committee has not proceeded upon any partisan idea whatever, and there is no evidence to indicate that the committee will proceed along that line.

Mr. President, I wish to say again that nothing was said about who should question any witnesses, and nothing was said in relation to the production of witnesses. Therefore I think it is fair to say that politics has not entered into the proceedings of the committee. I hope—and I know—that is the way it will continue. I hope the public will accept this committee as a committee of men who feel that they have a grave responsibility to the people of the United States, and that they want to do this job without party politics, as Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives should do it.

I am glad to join with the Senator in making this statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I have no wish to comment on the newspaper article which the Senator from Kentucky has read, or upon the activities of the committee, so far as I know them, except in one particular. I want it known that I do not conceive that the committee could have made a wiser selection than its choice of Mr. Mitchell. He is a lawyer of high distinction, who once served as Attorney General of the United States. I think it has been recognized by all who are familiar with the activities of the Supreme Court of the United States and those who practice before it that no man has ever appeared before the Supreme Court of the United States who held the respect and confidence of that Court to a greater degree than did Mr. Mitchell. It is commonly understood that he was one of the most successful practitioners who ever appeared before the Supreme Court of the United States. I have had a personal acquaintance with him for many years. He is a man of quiet ability. He is a man of character. He is a man of courage. He is a man who has the very highest conception of public duty and public service, and I wish to congratulate the committee on its selection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Maine.

Mr. President, I wish to state categorically and without reservation that the statement in the article to the effect that Mr. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, injected himself into this subject, directly or indirectly, or even remotely, is without the slightest foundation. No member of the committee consulted Mr. Hannegan about the choice of counsel. Mr. Hannegan did not intrude himself by offering any suggestion or advice, directly or indirectly, as to who should be chosen as counsel for the committee.

I wish also categorically to state, without reservation, that the paragraph of the article which states that "Sam O'Neal, publicity director for the Democratic Committee, conveyed Hannegan's disapproval of Fulton to the Democratic members of the committee and he was immediately removed from consideration," is an unmitigated, unreserved, unconditional falsehood, written by the man who wrote this article for the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C. No member of the committee saw Mr. O'Neal in this connection, or in any other connection relating to the appointment of counsel, or any other service which the committee has begun to render to this country and to the people.

I wish categorically to state that the last two paragraphs, relating to me, in which I am accused of having proposed a rule which would confine the questioning of witnesses to the counsel, are also equally an unconditional, premeditated falsehood.

I wish I knew the identity of the author of it, so that I might call him by name here on the floor of the Senate. But I do not, and therefore I cannot.

Mr. President, a number of persons were suggested and considered by the committee for counsel. The fact that any of them were not chosen is no reflection on them. The committee had to make a choice. It had before it suggestions of able, eminent counsel. The committee's one desire was to get away from politics and to choose the best qualified man, the man with the highest possible standing, who was willing to undertake the job. We conferred personally with Mr. William D. Mitchell. His reputation was known to all of us. He was one of the first men who was thought of in connection with this work. None of us knew whether he would undertake it. As chairman of the committee, I communicated with him and asked him to come to Washington in order that the committee might confer with him about it. He came. He conferred with the committee. There was absolute frankness on both sides. Then, without a dissenting vote, all 10 of the members of the committee voted unanimously for the selection of Mr. William D. Mitchell.

I do not have to say that Mr. Mitchell's reputation is Nation-wide. I do not have to say that he is a man of the highest character, of the highest standard of legal ethics. I do not have to say that in our judgment he is as well qualified as any other man, if not better qualified than any other man, we could have chosen for this important task.

I have felt called upon to make this statement because I do not propose that we shall have our work submarined, before we get started, by malicious little articles of this sort designed to create lack of confidence and dissent among the people and possibly among the members of the committee. I hope this is the last time I shall be called upon to deny or comment upon any article appearing in the newspapers, either in Washington or elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to congratulate the chairman of the committee and his committee for the wonderful selection they have made. I have known Mr. Mitchell for years. The committee could not have chosen a man who would more directly take partisanship out of the investigation. I congratulate the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I think that is the feeling of the Senate and the feeling of the country, notwithstanding the effort to create suspicion and doubt of our integrity and our good faith, before we can even start on the investigation.

So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to be diverted from the performance of my duty by this article or by any other articles of similar tenor which may appear. But I did not want this occasion to pass without expressing an opinion of it and of the man who wrote it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. The distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, in expressing his reluctance to accept the chairmanship of this important committee, was guilty of such an understatement that I cannot allow it to pass unchallenged. The distinguished Senator said he had all the burdens and responsibilities that an ordinary man could carry. I think I am voicing the consensus of the opinion of the Members of the Senate of the United States when I say that only the most extraordinary character we have in the Senate and the most extraordinary character I have ever known could carry the burdens which are borne by our distinguished majority leader. I, for one, a neophyte in the Senate, when I first knew him, and ever since I have known him, have marveled at his patience, his integrity, his industry. I have watched him here, day after day, every day, prepared to speak on complicated legislative matters and to meet unfortunate situations such as this, and I know that the distinguished Senator by his career in Washington has finally achieved such a reputation that he is totally invulnerable to such attacks and such misrepresentations as the one referred to. I am glad to have this opportunity to express my admiration of the industry, integrity, and ability of our beloved leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, what I said about myself in regard to reluctance in accepting this assignment ought to be said, I think, of all members of the committee. None of them sought this assignment. None of them accepted it except with great reluctance. No one who could appreciate the magnitude of the task would wish to add it to all his other burdens as a Member of the Senate of the United States. What I said about myself applies to all the other members of the committee with equal strength and equal validity.

I sincerely hope we may be permitted to proceed with our work, as we have started out, on a high standard of patriotic public service, without efforts being constantly made, even before we can get started, to discredit the committee and its work and its counsel in advance.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

Mr. HATCH and Mr. MOORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am about to proceed with discussion of the pending amendment. Did the Senator from Oklahoma desire to comment on it?

Mr. MOORE. No. I wished to obtain the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Is the pending amendment the one offered yesterday by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; that is the pending amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, that particular amendment is addressed and directed to paragraph (4), appearing on page 14 of the bill. During the discussion yesterday and today by the authors of the amendment and the authors of the bill, it did not seem to me that there was a great deal of difference between what was intended by either. There was a difference in the language, which is interpreted by the authors of the amendment in one way and by the authors of the bill in another way. If it is only a difference in language, and if the objectives and purposes are the same, it occurred to me that the language should be refined and expressed in a way which would meet the intentions of both.

Today, Mr. President, I have drafted a substitute which I shall offer for the pending amendment. I claim no authorship of the language in the substitute, for by and large it is taken altogether from the bill and from the pending amendment, hoping thereby to reconcile the differences and make clear and certain what I believe all intend.

I shall read the substitute which I have drafted, and I hope it will be accepted by those on both sides.

Beginning in line 20 on page 14, I propose to strike out all down to and including the word "Such" in line 25, and to insert the following—I shall now quote the language I propose as a substitute:

To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be—

Mr. President, that is the exact language of the bill. Following that language, the bill uses the word "assured." The word "assured" has given considerable trouble. Many persons, not only in the Senate but outside the Senate, believe that the word "assured" means "insured," that it means a guaranty. The authors of the bill say it is not used in that sense; they say that by the bill they are not guaranteeing, nor can they guarantee, anyone a job. That being true, I have used the word "attained" in place of "assured."

Following that, I pick up language from the proposed amendment, which is—

The Federal Government shall, consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy—

Those are the exact words of the pending amendment, and they are taken from it. As I heard the authors of the bill yesterday, they did not contend that their bill was inconsistent with national needs or other essentials or considerations of the Federal Government. On the other hand, they argued that their bill was consistent with national needs and other considerations. I heard no Senator dispute the fact that all legislation should be consistent with national needs. I cannot conceive of any Senator standing on the floor of the Senate and advocating legislation which is admitted to be inconsistent with national needs. If the contrary is the purpose of the authors of the bill and the authors of the amendment, why not adopt such simple language as that which I have suggested?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I am sincerely interested in what the Senator is saying. After his suggested use of the words "to the extent that continuing full employment cannot be attained," would he consider the use of substituting for the word "attained" the word "achieved"?

Mr. HATCH. I am using that word in a later phrase. I do not wish to repeat the same word, although I would otherwise have no objection to its use.

Then I take up the language of the bill just as it is written, and after the words "and after other considerations of national policy," say:

provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments to—

The author of the bill uses the word "assure," carrying the thought of guaranteeing. I have changed the word to "achieve" so that the language will read:

To achieve the objective of full employment.

That is the proposed substitute.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator read his amendment in its entirety?

Mr. HATCH. The language would be as follows:

To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be attained, the Federal Government shall, consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to achieve the objective of full employment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not wish to be too meticulous in making suggestions, but it seems to me that in order to carry out the full intent of the bill the words "full employment" should be preceded by the word "continuing."

Mr. HATCH. So that the language will read "to achieve the object of continuing full employment."

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. That would be the language.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand the proposal now being made, it is to insert in line 21, in place of the word "assured" the word "attained."

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I am wondering if it would not be more appropriate to say "full employment is not otherwise attained" instead of saying that it "cannot otherwise be attained."

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection to that. I am trying to frame language which will meet the various conflicting views which have been expressed, but which to my mind are not in conflict. Does the Senator suggest using the words "is not otherwise"?

Mr. WHITE. The suggestion I make would involve the use of the words "is not otherwise attained." I am speaking offhand without having thought much about it. I do not have any particular pride in the suggestion.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I am not sure that I was able to follow very carefully the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico. Does the Senator from New Mexico understand there is to be any obligation in his suggestion which would rest on the Federal Government to make up for any deficits in employment?

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator mean a contractual obligation? There is the obligation set forth here, and in the Senator's amendment, that when full employment is not achieved, and it is consistent with the national policy, it shall be the duty and obligation of the Federal Government to use its resources to achieve the objective of full employment, but not a guaranty of jobs to anyone. The whole purpose is stated as an objective and not a guaranty.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The amendment which was offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself begins with this language, "in the furtherance of the objective." If the Senator means that the word "achieve" is more or less identical in meaning with the language "in furtherance of the objective" it seems to me that it is more or less stated already in a somewhat different form. If there is a shifting of the extent and nature of the obligation of the Federal Government, then there may be involved a difference.

Mr. HATCH. I have tried to follow the language for which the Senator argued yesterday, namely, that it was in furtherance of the objective of full employment. I think that is what the language states. I think that is what the authors of the amendment contend that it states. The question is one merely of agreeing on language.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think the Senator from New Mexico is making a helpful effort to try to find language which may express what the authors are trying to achieve, namely, that of getting rid of unemployment. There is no doubt in the world about that. However, there seems to be a difference between the amendments, which grows out of the fact that the amendment now pending provides that "in furtherance of the objective of full employment" these things shall be done. The language which is being suggested goes further than that

and, I assume, creates some sort of a guaranty. When this language was discussed in the committee—and I have reference especially to the words, "consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy"—it is very definitely my recollection that the statement was made by some members of the committee who are in favor of the bill that if that language were incorporated it would cut the heart out of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, of course I was not present in the committee and I am not a member of it. If that language was used in the committee, I can well understand how it came to be used. It was no doubt used in the heat of committee argument and debate when men frequently say things without first thinking them through. I do not think any committee member would make the statement that if the bill had to be consistent with national policy its effect would be destroyed.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Again and again the question was asked by myself and others, "What is the objection to the language? If you do not think it is consistent, then it must be inconsistent." Certainly the statement was made, unless my memory is entirely in error, that the language to which I have referred was at the very heart of the bill. As stated awhile ago, I am quite positive that one of the members said that if it were put in it would cut the heart out of the bill. Certainly, if my memory is correct, there must have been something in that statement.

Mr. HATCH. I, too, have engaged in debate and argument in committee, and I have been guilty of making statements which I should not have made. But I wish to say that I think the bill itself, insofar as it seeks to attain or achieve or promote full employment, is consistent with the national policy of this Government.

Mr. TOBEY. Good for the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I think the Senator from Maryland agrees to that.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I agree with that. It is consistent, but then the question arises, provided the objective is not attained, provided there is still a deficit, what, if anything, is the Federal Government going to do? That is the crux of the matter.

Mr. HATCH. As I have said, I have used almost the exact language of the Senator's amendment and of the bill, language about which there is no dispute.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I was not raising any objection to the Senator's amendment. The amendment has not been studied and considered. I think it is an excellent effort on his part to try to suggest something to harmonize the language. But I desire that there should be kept in mind whether or not, according to the language the Senator drafted, he believes there is a responsibility resting upon the Government to pick up the slack of unemployment which may exist after all other agencies, private enterprise, State and municipal activities, fail to accomplish what is desired.

Mr. HATCH. Yes, I believe that. I think the obligation does rest on the Federal Government after all other agencies have failed.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, there is an obligation, but what I should like to know is how far the obligation goes. Every member of the committee was willing to assume that not only is there an obligation, but that the Federal Government should do everything it could consistent with other obligations.

Mr. HATCH. That is exactly what my proposal says, that is what the bill says, and that is what the Senator's amendment says.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think the language of the Senator, which I have not been able to study very carefully, tries to set forth the same idea, and to reach the same goal, but I wanted to know whether he felt that under the language he submitted there was still a responsibility upon the Federal Government, after all these other things were done, to see that the last remnant of unemployment was taken care of.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to say to the Senator from Maryland that after he studies the proposed substitute he will find it meets—at least, I think it meets—every objection he raised yesterday to the committee bill.

The first objection was that it made employment paramount and above everything else in that it guaranteed full employment, while it only fostered the other things. The authors of the bill denied that. They said that was not true.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. But they objected to the "consistent" clause.

Mr. HATCH. My suggestion does away with the very words which the Senator construed as bringing about that condition, and it inserts other words which I do not think could be interpreted that way at all.

The Senator's other objection was that the bill, in addition to making employment paramount, actually guaranteed a job. Again there was dispute. The authors of the bill said it did no such thing. My amendment seeks merely to clarify that, and I think it does.

I think the Senator's objection was met, and I hope the authors of the bill will agree that my amendment does at least express their intentions as well.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I certainly appreciate the Senator's efforts.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Wyoming was the first I heard address the Chair, and I yield first to him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I wish to compliment the Senator from New Mexico on the effort he has made. In my opinion he has made a very correct analysis of the issue which has developed.

As I listened to the reading of the amendment he now proposes, the modification, an attempt to combine some language offered by the Senator from Maryland and the language reported in the bill, I think he has done an excellent piece of work. It seems to me it meets the issue.

I hope the Senator will offer the amendment so that it may be printed and considered by all members of the Senate overnight. So far as I am personally concerned, I think the Senator has done a great deal to clarify what apparently was a troublesome issue in the minds of many, in the Senate and outside the Senate.

It may be that the amendment which the Senator has offered will not be acceptable to some. It will not be acceptable, I can say, to those who feel that Government policies should actually fall short of preventing unemployment.

Mr. HATCH. Now I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall certainly be very glad to consider the amendment offered by the Senator. The only objection I thought of, as I heard it read, was in the words "such volume as to achieve full employment." That seems to follow the qualification in the first part. I have some doubt whether even with the qualification it does not impose the same volume and concept to which I objected in the bill and described in my recent remarks.

I shall be very glad to study the proposal of the Senator. I have no doubt we can consider it in the morning.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I wish to concur in the praise of the Senator from Wyoming for the effort the Senator from New Mexico is making to clear up the situation. The Senator is going to have the amendment printed. I am rather favorable to it, but I wish to confer with all the sponsors of the bill and the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I think we can do that overnight and I hope that in the morning the amendment will be presented. As I understand, the Senator proposes to offer it as a substitute.

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Mr. WAGNER. Very well. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. First I should like to comment that I think the attitude of the sponsors of the bill is most helpful. What has disturbed me, and, in a sense, shocked me, has been that good faith suggestions from Senators who are anxious to support the bill apparently heretofore have been set aside on the theory that its text is sacrosanct, and that no change should be made in it.

Mr. President, I happen to be one of those who are very anxious to support the measure. I happen to find my chief objection answered by the language in the substitute, which merely insists that the program to meet unemployment shall be geared into the total public interest.

Everyone who has anything to do with the bill says that is what it means, yet up until the moment the able Senator from New Mexico proposed to put it in type, we were told that we could not have such an amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I might say to the Senator that no one told me,

and fools rush in where angels fear to tread, so I just sat down and wrote the amendment out.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I refuse to join the Senator in cataloging him in the class in which he has just cataloged himself.

Mr. HATCH. With the angels? [Laughter.]

Mr. VANDENBERG. What I wish to say is that there is no doubt in my mind that with one or two changes of the nature proposed we could get very nearly a unanimous Senate to support the proposition that we shall proceed to plan against depression, and never, never again be left without a plan when we confront depression. It seems to me that if we can have just a little good faith and consideration of the effort to make the bill say what everyone connected with it insists it means, we can achieve a very healthy, wholesome net result.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think that if we had a little more time and a few more statements we might pass the bill this evening, but since there have been several expressions of desire to have the proposed substitute printed, I now send it to the desk with the request that it be printed, and I shall offer it as a substitute for the pending amendment. I say again, as I stated in the beginning, that the words are not my words, there is no pride of authorship, they are largely words from the bill and from the proposed amendment, and if any Senator can suggest a word which will better state what all have in mind, so far as I am concerned, I shall be glad to have it used.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, may we have the amendment read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the amendment of Mr. RADCLIFFE (for himself and Mr. TAFT) as a substitute for the language beginning on page 14, line 20, down to and including the word "such", in line 25, insert the following:

(4) to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be attained, consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government and other essential considerations of national policy, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to achieve the objective of continuing full employment.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the economic, social, and political implications of the President's recent message to the Congress are such that a discussion of the program seems appropriate.

I had awaited the President's postwar message with anxiety and hope that it would point the way to a restoration and preservation of our American way of life. Those of us who were pleased to believe and hope that the influences that had so long permeated the executive branch of our Government were to be put aside have been disillusioned. It now seems clear that the peacetime policies of the Executive will be a continuation and extension of those policies and practices that have for more than a decade led us far from the Constitution.

Although the message is expressed in terms of admirable objectives, the President lacks confidence they can be attained within the limits of a free economy operating under a system of private enterprise. The President has said that it will be the postwar policy of the executive branch to demobilize, as soon as possible, the armed forces; to clear the war plants so as to permit contractors to proceed with peacetime production; to remove all possible wartime Government controls in order to speed and encourage reconversion and expansion; to reestablish and expand peacetime industry, trade, and agriculture. The President declares that in order to provide jobs, we must look first and foremost to private enterprise, to industry, agriculture, and labor. He insists that Government must inspire enterprise and confidence that comes mainly through deeds, not words; that the Government must give assurances of stability and consistency in public policy so that enterprise can plan better by knowing what the Government intends to do; and that business must have assurance that every governmental policy and program will be pointed to promote maximum production and employment in private enterprise.

The means proposed by the message to accomplish these objectives, however, are such as to chill with fear every businessman and congeal the very forces that motivate private enterprise.

The recommendation for the retention of wartime controls over prices, and consequently over profits, invalidates the virtue of the objectives expressed. Considerable publicity is being given to the release of many unimportant controls, but the essential controls over prices are to be retained. When prices are controlled, wages and salaries are necessarily controlled and likewise profits, if any, are automatically controlled. The President suggests we must continue such controls in order to overcome the dangers of either inflationary prices or the possibilities of lowered incomes and widespread unemployment. The governmental policy, he said, must guard against both contingencies. In other words, the Government is to prevent prices from either rising or falling and the artificial controls designed for such purposes are to be maintained and continued until all danger of such possibilities have passed. If such is to be the yardstick by which wartime controls of prices, salaries, and wages are to be removed, then it is obvious that the termination of our wartime controlled economy is a myth and the private enterprise system merely a fond memory. Under such program the American people are confronted with permanent controls of those essential forces that make possible a completely controlled economy. True, the message promises the elimination of rationing and price controls on one commodity after another just as soon as supply comes into balance with demand. It is an economic axiom that under an artificially controlled price the operation of the natural forces of supply and demand is stymied and consequently supply either does not catch up with demand under policies predominantly inflationary or overruns demand under policies predominantly deflationary. A perfect demonstration of this economic truth is seen in the operations of OPA. A shortage of meat and other foods, clothing, household wares, and hundreds of other commodities in the legitimate markets induced by prices artificially fixed under their normal level has caused a serious lag in supply. Likewise, a fixed price above normal levels would have caused supply to overrun demand. Demand and supply are economic complements of each other and one may not be controlled without throwing the other out of balance. Business and industry know this truth and therefore have received the President's proposal for a continuation of these wartime controls with misgivings. It would have been a wholesome and encouraging aid to American business and industry if the President had suggested an early date for the termination of all wartime controls. No greater assistance could be given to reestablishing a free economy and the consequent national prosperity that would follow.

It seems that one of the outstanding results of this war has been the manner in which the propaganda machine has misled a large segment of the public. It is contended by the control agencies that price inflation has been curbed and a fair distribution of available consumer goods has been accomplished under Government control. The trend of the propaganda now is that since such controls were good for our war economy, they are acceptable for peacetime. Price indexes are submitted to prove the point. The facts are that the price indexes officially released are deceptive in the extreme. Prices alone no longer tell us the true situation. Price indexes are held down by so many factors, such as reduced quality of goods, reduction of services that formerly represented a part of price, tie-in sales, forced use of substitutes, black-market operations, Government subsidy payments not included in price calculations and which remove part of the price from the indexes, exclusion of items that have gone up most violently, the retention in the indexes of items that cannot be obtained in the market, that a distorted picture is obtained. If we are to know the truth about wartime inflation, let us talk to the housewives of the country who spend their days shopping in the legitimate markets for food and clothing of acceptable quality at a price they can afford to pay. Some economists estimate that a 1939 dollar is worth only about 60 cents in today's market. What we should understand is that trends of inflation and deflation are the sunshine and rain that make a free economy flourish in the soil of a democracy. A trend too far in either direction, like floods and drought, is bad, but such is the hazard of a free economy, which is the essential factor of democracy. To suggest at this time a further continuation of the very policies that

have all but destroyed our American system is most discouraging.

It is an economic fraud to say that the manufacturer is free to obtain raw or processed materials, and at the same time to control the prices of those materials at a level which prevents their production. It means nothing to the manufacturer to increase the level of his wholesale prices and at the same time to control retail prices that prevent an outlet being furnished for the manufactured product. Certainly it is economic suicide to the retail merchant when the controllers boost his wholesale prices and his wage cost, and at the same time control his retail prices at the same level. There can be only one answer to the problem of reconversion and peacetime prosperity under a free economy, and that is a complete termination at an early date of wartime controls. Economic crimes in the nature of artificially controlled prices, like other crimes, beget crime. When one force is controlled, it becomes necessary to control the counterforce.

The recommendation of the message that the Government assume the direct burden and responsibility of paying all unemployed individuals a maximum of $25 a week for 26 weeks in each year suggested economic and social consequences that would demoralize business and industry. The proposal is an invitation to idleness and unemployment and a deterrent to the building of that character of moral fiber which has made democracy work in America.

The President's proposal insisted that it would be applicable only to those "ready, willing, and able to work." By what standard or yardstick are we to measure readiness, willingness, and ability to work? We know it to be a truth that if the reward for unemployment is high enough, those who prefer leisure at these rates will devise ways to prove their eligibility under such general terms. The President's plan also has the vice of affording a temptation for political operations too great for any practical person to expect that the politically ambitious would not utilize them to the fullest extent.

The proposal proceeded on the assumption that private industry will fail in its responsibility to create a high degree of employment in the postwar period. It is a fact, however, that industry is fortified with the greatest backlog of unfilled orders in the history of the country. The shortages and inflation brought about under our wartime controls have been such that we moved into the peace with the people destitute of almost every necessity of life and a lowered standard of living that can only be rehabilitated by new homes, cars, refrigerators, washing machines, electrical appliances of all kinds, and hundreds of other items which can be supplied only if we have a high rate of employment, unhampered by governmental control. It is the preponderance of opinion throughout industry that if industry is given the green light by Government there is no danger of substantial unemployment for an unforeseeable period. Would it not be a wiser and more practical course for Government to stand aside and give business and industry an opportunity to assert these pent-up forces rather than to burden them with the threats of a program which can only mean a continuation of high tax levels and a system of Government controls, both of which dull the incentive for private effort?

The highest estimates of responsible sources indicate that approximately fifty to fifty-two million jobs will be required in the postwar period to prevent any substantial amount of unemployment. The Statistical Abstract in 1940 showed an experienced labor force in certain categories as follows:

Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	9,141,000
Mining, production of coal, petroleum, metals, stone, sand and gravel	1,109,000
Building and construction	3,508,000
Railroads, streetcars, trucks, buses, warehousing, and related transportation facilities	2,429,000
Communications, telephone, telegraph, and radio	410,000
Utilities, electric light, power, gas, water, sanitary services	570,000
Wholesale and retail trades of infinite varieties, including stores of all kinds, milk routes, filling stations, etc	8,201,000
Business and repair services	983,000
Banking, insurance, and real estate	1,548,000
Personal services, housemaids, hotels, laundries, beauty shops, and similar services	4,439,000
Theaters, motion pictures, and other types of commercial amusements	481,000
Lawyers, doctors, engineers, architects, dentists, teachers, clergymen, and other professions	3,519,000
Local government services, such as firemen, policemen, street cleaners, and other local governmental services	1,867,000
Canning, baking, hard and soft drinks, meat products, candy, cigarettes, tobacco manufacturing, milling, and feeds	1,336,000
Textiles, including the manufacturing of carpets, hats, and wearing materials of all sorts	2,251,000
Sawmills, planing mills, cabinetmaking, furniture, and related enterprises	1,069,000
Paper and paper products	350,000
Printing, newspapers, books, and publishing houses	683,000
Petroleum refining and manufacture of coal products	212,000
Rubber	173,000
Leather workers, shoe builders, harnessmakers, luggage manufacturers	407,000
Glass, pottery, and related industries	972,000
Total	46,517,000

The job classifications enumerated, totaling more than forty-six and one-half million, will not require retooling or a physical reconversion to peacetime pursuits. These are industries that are ready to go the very moment governmental restraints and controls are removed. Thus it appears that the segment of our manufacturing industry which must retool its plants and make physical changes to reconvert to peacetime operations will not be required to absorb more than five to six million workers.

If governmental controls of raw and processed materials are removed and controls of prices are terminated, there appears to be every assurance that private industry can and will furnish the jobs necessary for high employment and a healthy economy. The Congress could not do more to encourage the realization of a high state of employment than to reject, at least for the time being, discouraging and pessimistic proposals for an unemployment dole.

The President's message proceeds with the recommendation for a substantial increase of the minimum wage now provided by law. If, as the administration appears to believe, we are confronted with the possibilities of large unemployment, the President has committed the folly of an economic inconsistency.

It is a recognizable fact that controlled wages fixed at a level above their productive value discourage employment. The market for labor and other personal services is subject to the same principles of supply and demand as are applicable to the supply and demand of consumer goods, and the only possible route to high employment is high production. The more production and consumption, the greater the labor demand, which tends to increase the competitive price for labor, and thus wages go up. To tell business and industry that they will by law be required to pay a minimum wage to all employees, regardless of the value of the services received, the ability and capabilities of the worker, the productive value of his work, at a time when the employer does not know what he can receive for his goods or his production or what profits may be realized, is to discourage employment and, in fact, to make impossible employment for many in the lower wage brackets.

The minimum wage law was enacted by the Congress to prevent exploitation of labor; but I do not believe it can be said, with reason, that there is likelihood of the exploitation of labor in the near future. The harsh fact is that labor unions, with Government encouragement, have attained a position of arbitrary power so great that now they actually hold the key to our entire economic future.

No analysis of the President's message, of course, can fail to recognize the economic, social, and political implications of the proposal that the Congress adopt the pending so-called full employment bill. The legislation urged upon the Congress asserts that it is the "responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment." Such pronouncement of governmental policy simply means that those who work and produce, and who consequently pay taxes and buy bonds, are to assume the responsibility to support those who fail or refuse to work and produce. Certainly it is the concern of any government that its people be profitably employed to the fullest extent possible; but to say that it is the "responsibility" of the Government, which is the same thing as saying it is the responsibility of the people

generally, to provide investments and expenditures to any extent needed to assure full employment is to accept the essence of statism. No government can discharge the responsibility of making investments and expenditures that will insure continuing full employment unless at the same time it asserts the right to own or control all the resources of the country it governs and to direct the activities of all the people of the country. Such a policy necessarily is built on the theory that those who work and produce can sustain the permanent burden of maintaining the cost of the society in which they live, the burden of feeding, clothing, and housing themselves, and at the same time can contribute a sufficient amount to Government for the investments and expenditures necessary to sustain those who fail or refuse to work and produce. The acceptance of the fixed policy of "full employment by Government expenditures" is an acceptance of the proposition that Government can increase the volume of employment by taxation or borrowing. The truth is that Government expenditures derived from either taxation or borrowing do not increase the ultimate average volume of employment, because money taken from the taxpayers and bond buyers or borrowed from the banks in the form of additional printed money diminishes the spending power of the people by exactly the same amount that it increases the spending power of the Government. That is done in two ways—first, by diminishing the amount of money available for private investments by exactly the same amount as is received in taxes or borrowed by the sale of Federal bonds and, second, by inflating the remainder to the extent that money is borrowed from the banks. It necessarily follows that when the Government takes money from the people, either by taxation or by borrowing, directly or through the banks, the tendency is for private enterprise to throw out of work as many people as are hired to work on Government projects. The application of this principle caused the depression of 1932 to become chronic, and it was only terminated by artificial employment brought about by war. A continuation of the policy will not correct the evil, but on the contrary a discontinuance of deficit spending is essential to a healthy economy and high employment.

Probably few advocates of the full employment bill have attempted to count the cost of a permanent WPA operated with the necessary efficiency to obtain "full employment." Assuming that we revert to the economic level of 1940—and there is no reason to believe that a continuance of the same principle will not bring about the same results—we can expect to have not less than 10,000,000 unemployed. The present unionized construction wages average $1.36 per hour. Employment at that wage for 40 hours a week for 52 weeks would mean an income of $2,829 a year for each worker. Government expenditures on that basis for 10,000,000 employed on public construction would, therefore, amount to $28,290,000,000 annually. According to the United States Census figures, for every dollar paid out in construction wages, an additional $1.42 goes for materials and equipment. Thus, to carry on a volume of work calculated to absorb 10,000,000 unemployed, the Government would need to spend approximately $40,000,000,000 a year, in addition to wages, making a total of over $68,000,000,000 per annum. The fact that a portion of such huge expenditures would come in part from local, State, and municipal governments would not alter the end result, because the total would necessarily represent taxes in some form.

The mere squeeze on Government between income and outgo in dollars is not the only vice in the program. The Secretary of the Treasury has made the startling announcement that we must have a postwar Budget of approximately $25,000,000,000 a year for future governmental expenses. Let me pause here to observe that such an amount is over three times greater than the corresponding amount for the highest prewar year of Government spending. It is, therefore, clear that the most optimistic estimate of national income will be inadequate to finance such a Budget and at the same time to carry the relief program proposed. Thus the difference must be added to our already mountainous deficit approaching $300,000,000,000, with the consequent deflation of the purchasing power of our dollars—in other words, inflation of prices. It seems difficult for the political mind to grasp the fact that the public debt is an irresistible inflationary force that asserts itself in direct proportion to the size of the deficit. A national debt is a mortgage upon the wages of every worker, the home of every citizen, the bond of every bond buyer, the life insurance policy of every policyholder, and the savings of every depositor.

There is yet another vice in the proposal of the President, so far reaching that its consequences are incalculable. It is implicit in the proposed legislation that a great national bureaucracy must be set up and maintained, manned by experts, social workers, planners, investigators, economists, and labor experts, welded into bureaus, commissions, and agencies, reaching into every State, county, town, and hamlet in the land. Such would create a political instrumentality so powerful that in the hands of the politically sagacious it would have the potentialities of destroying the framework of representative government. If anyone is in doubt of this possibility he has only to review the political activities of the WPA during the elections of the prewar period.

The proposed legislation denies that the Government would compete with private enterprise under the program to be inaugurated. But do those who support the proposal think that public works are not in competition with private enterprise? Do they think that the wages paid on public works are not competitive with the wages of private industry? Do they think that a Government contract is not competitive with the contracts of private builders and contractors? Do they think the purchases of material and equipment by governmental agencies are not in competition with the purchases made by private enterprise? Actually, it is impossible for the Government to invade the sphere of business in any form without setting up competitive repercussions.

The message of the President, so far as the recommendations for a legislative program are concerned, seems to be founded on a continuation of governmental expenditures. The recommendations for continued Federal aid to housing and slum clearance, a continued Federal public-works program, continued aid for public-works programs of the States and local municipalities, a broadened and enlarged social-security scheme, additional aid to veterans, an additional $500,000,000 to Commodity Credit Corporation for continued and increased subsidies and for the continuation of price supports, are all the essence of discouragement to private business and industry. Implicit in these proposals are the very forces that destroy private enterprise. Implicit in all of these recommendations is a continued and extended bureaucracy that saps the strength and virility of constitutional government, and eventually leads to the tragedy of statism and dictatorship. Likewise, implicit in these recommendations are the tools for an enlarged political oligarchy that will be perpetuated by the distribution of political favoritism by those in power to the critical voting areas at election time.

One cannot view the President's message other than as a political document. The promises and high ideals expressed together with the conflicting and counterbalancing promises and recommendations designed to appeal to all groups of all beliefs and all persuasions, read like the political platforms of recent years.

At no place does the President refer to profits and the profitable operation of private business which is the very motive power that creates the incentive for the expansion of business and industry, and the production of goods and services that mean prosperity, a balance of supply and demand, stabilized prices, high employment, and the happiness and welfare of our people.

Politically wise, the message avoids the important and difficult labor question. There is no suggestion for legislation that would curb and control the labor monopoly that operates as a super government. There is no suggestion of legislation that would insure the right of every American citizen to work for whom he pleases at a wage acceptable to the employer and the employee without paying tribute to the labor racketeers who have assumed the real political and economic leadership of our country. There is no suggestion of legislation of a definite or detailed plan for the liquidation of the thousands of bureaus which are now attached to Government and are housing over 3,000,000 employees at public expense. On the contrary, the proposals and recommendations are such as to enlarge, maintain, and continue in peacetime the bureaucracy built up during the war. The message fails to suggest a plan for the reduction of the confiscatory taxes under which we now labor. True, the President says that there should be a limited reduction of taxes. Such gesture is wholly inconsistent with

his recommendations for continued governmental expenditures.

The message, in fact, makes the President all things to all men.

The President refuses to face the fact that a continuation of deficit spending by Government is an inflationary force which will inundate business and industry. It can bring upon the people only financial chaos and depression with all its attendant hardships.

The President refuses to recognize the truth that as the public debt increases, the burden of taxation to retire it and to pay the carrying charges on it, must increase and continue. The greater the tax burden, the less invitation there is to business and industry to carry on their proper functions in the private enterprise system. The President has refused to reckon with the fact that Treasury obligations to the extent of almost $60,000,000,000 will mature in the coming fiscal year, and that approximately $95,000,000,000 will mature within the next 5 years. The President refuses the only philosophy under which the free enterprise system can survive, namely, a government with a balanced budget which means that government must live within the limits of what its people can afford to pay in taxes.

It is crystal clear that the message of the President presents the inescapable issue to the American people of whether the free-enterprise system is to continue or whether we are to continue the spending policies which lead to an ever-increasing deficit, an ever-mounting debt, and directly to government ownership and a socialistic statism. There is no other issue now before the American people. It is clean-cut and precise, and it is for the American people to choose which road they will travel. The Congress of the United States is the representative of the people, and it is to be hoped that the people of America will make known to the Congress their position on this issue.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Civil Engineer Lewis B. Combs to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 20th day of July 1942;

Admiral Samuel M. Robinson, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 27th day of August 1945;

Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of September 1945;

Rear Adm. Cato D. Glover, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of December 1943;

Rear Adm. Austin K. Doyle, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of December 1943;

Rear Adm. Thomas G. W. Settle, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving on special duty with the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 10th day of August 1945;

Rear Adm. Milton E. Miles, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander United States Naval Group, China, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 13th day of August 1945;

Commodore Oscar Smith, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to the commander in chief, United States Atlantic Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 12th day of April 1943;

Commodore Benjamin V. McCandlish, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commandant of a naval operating base, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 17th day of September 1943;

Commodore Gordon Rowe, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval operating base, Midway, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 24th day of April 1944;

Commodore Elliott B. Nixon, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier and commandant, Tenth Naval District, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 3d day of April 1945;

Commodore James K. Vardaman, Jr., United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as naval aide to the President, to rank from the 9th day of August 1945;

Commodore William S. Parsons, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving with the atomic bomb project, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 10th day of August 1945;

Commodore William W. Behrens, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Md., and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 22d day of August 1945; and

Commodore Mark Y. Hersey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval operating base, Manila, Subic, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 24th day of August 1945.

Sundry officers of the Naval Reserve to be lieutenant junior grades or ensigns in the Navy; and

Sundry officers for promotion in the Marine Corps.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, September 28, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 27 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Thomas Henry Green (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as the Judge Advocate General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from December 1, 1945, vice Maj. Gen. Myron Cady Cramer, the Judge Advocate General, whose term of office expires November 30, 1945.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Lois G. McClain, Acmar, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Laura Herring, Alberta, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Allen C. Coleman, Allen, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lilian Mary Thomas, Battles Wharf, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John D. Reid, Blount Springs, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Madie Ellis, Brownville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edwyn E. Cook, Calhoun, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mabry A. Hudson, Choccolocco, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vera B. Rabby, Coden, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Horace E. Davidson, Coker, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Guy D. Ward, Cottonwood, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Amby Campbell, Crossville, Ala., in place of W. F. Croft, transferred.

Louise T. Willingham, Emelle, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Helen P. Welch, Epes, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Burnie J. Wall, Equality, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John R. Griffin, Excel, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Reuel M. Lankford, Fackler, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Walter D. Browder, Gaylesville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Russell P. Gilbert, Geiger, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Nonie Virginia Singleton, Gorgas, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clara M. Adair, Graysville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Chester M. Ross, Groveoak, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hassie H. Nickerson, Jacksons Gap, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James V. Herron, Keener, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Georgia Lyon Dunn, Laceys Spring, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Jacob B. Patterson, Lacon, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Jim W. Cleveland, Lawley, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert Brocks, Meridianville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ola Hale, Murrycross, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Carl Brown, Muscadine, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Marie G. Lucy, Portersville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ollie W. Phillips, Ralph, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Pearl R. Pierce, Saraland, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frances Graham Henderson, Satsuma, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

J. Bryan May, Sawyerville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Martil B. Roberts, Semmes, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Paul H. Savage, Jr., Spring Garden, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mildred S. Burnett, Stanton, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Jesse M. Fleming, Tennille, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Emma P. Mitchell, Ward, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert T. Yarbrough, Woodland, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ARIZONA

Frank V. Howey, Cactus, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gladys E. Tanner, Emery Park, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Helen M. Young, Saint David, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elmer L. Hinners, Somerton, Ariz., in place of W. B. Ham, resigned.

ARKANSAS

James F. Yates, Canehill, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Della E. Stripling, Center Ridge, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Will W. Clayton, Delaplaine, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Olive Wixson Ford, Fisher, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Joseph A. Schnitzer, Fort Smith, Ark., in place of Lewis Friedman, deceased.

Etta M. Poston, Gilmore, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Rena M. Stout, Hattieville, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hattie A. Beasley, Hiwasse, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James O. Carter, Omaha, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Graydon E. Bone, Oxford, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Virgil I. Cragar, Perry, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James G. Royer, Pleasant Plains, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Myrtle Kirk, Poplar Grove, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Anna McCall, Portia, Ark. Office become Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert F. Godfrey, Pyatt, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Irene Morgan, Roland, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ethel L. Powell, Round Pond, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John Franklin Neal, Rudy, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

J. Allan Richardson, Sidney, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ralph McDonald, Weldon, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CALIFORNIA

Agnes M. Mairose, Adelanto, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Zetta I. Leinberger, Broderick, Calif., in place of P. O. Van Deren, retired.

Don O. Rice, Bryn Mawr, Calif., in place of R. E. Swinney, resigned.

Elizabeth L. Clary, Coachella, Calif., in place of W. R. McCutchen, resigned.

Marjorie E. Stover, Crannell, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Roy W. Mitchell, Cutten, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Eva L. Thompson, Fawnskin, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bernyce M. Spencer, Fetters Hot Springs, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gladys I. Leidy, Hammonton, Calif. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1945.

Frieda C. Albiez, Hayfork, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Van R. Majors, Heber, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mildred Chapman, Keddie, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Marjorie M. Morrison, Korbel, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Margaret E. Marlatt, La Vina, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary A. Wallace, Littlerock, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Pauline E. Stambaugh, Locke, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Flora Ann Clark, Lucerne Valley, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Grace V. Telleson, Miramar, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Albert R. White, Monolith, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Albert A. McKenzie, Monticello, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hazel M. Robinson, Oro Grande, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Blanche D. Schlegel, Pine Valley, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

La Verne Friberg, Richvale, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Myrtle H. Williams, Rockport, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert Le Beuf, Rodeo, Calif., in place of H. C. Halterman, removed.

Dorothy M. Durham, Ryde, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Marian E. Sager, San Luis Rey, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George E. Guenther, Shafter, Calif., in place of L. L. Rosenstiel, resigned.

Clarence L. Scheiber, Shingle, Calif. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1945.

Oliver W. Holland, Terra Bella, Calif., in place of W. H. McCloskey, resigned.

Moses R. Saunders, Trinidad, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONNECTICUT

Flora M. Caples, Chestnut Hill, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles J. Seiferman, Portland, Conn., in place of J. C. Bransfield, deceased.

DELAWARE

Robert P. Woolery, Grubbs, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Roy W. Anderson, Magnolia, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harvey M. Jones, Woodside, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

FLORIDA

Dora L. Kixmiller, Anastasia, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frances I. Warttig, Anna Maria, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Truby B. Pinholster, Brooker, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Belle K. Smith, Edgewater, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ruby McL. Floyd, Elkton, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lillie Foy, Ellenton, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ruth C. Owens, Eustis, Fla., in place of J. L. Crayden, removed.

Leona M. Mercer, Hosford, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ethel Cox, Intercession City, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Onnie Lou Carr, Lemturner, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vivian Prouty, Lockhart, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary E. Pryor, Mary Esther, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William F. LaRoche, Merritt Island, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

J. Harry Hildale, Oak Hill, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harry F. Wells, O'Brien, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John M. Hamlin, Osprey, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gussie White, Pinetta, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William D. Thomas, Samoset, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clifford H. Meigs, Shalimar, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vera G. Bingham, Silver Springs, Fla., in place of M. R. Pasteur, deceased.

Mary Louise Gormley, South Daytona, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert H. Albury, Tavernier, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elizabeth M. Porter, Valrico, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Archie A. Wadsworth, Wimauma, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Enoch S. Maddock, Windermere, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clifford A. Flood, Yulee, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

GEORGIA

James H. Smith, Ashland, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alma Gillis, Axson, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Royce G. Braselton, Braselton, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Wilson T. Tuten, Bristol, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Blanche A. Tarvin, Cataula, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert L. Vining, Chatsworth, Ga., in place of R. A. Redmond, deceased.

Mary M. Lassetter, Clem, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Curtis Rice, Du Pont, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Winnie S. Giles, Elko, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Minnie O. Rozar, Empire, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dymple Warmack, Fair Mount, Ga., in place of M. C. Cook, resigned.

Clarence Finleyson, Finleyson, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Luther G. Fortson, Fortson, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Louis A. Mauldin, Habersham, Ga., in place of C. V. Harper, resigned.

Garland B. Turner, Hillsboro, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Howard R. Park, Ideal, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Isabel R. Bulloch, Juniper, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Silas White, Kirkland, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Thomas L. Harbin, Lithia Springs, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Margaret Mable, Mableton, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary B. Herrin, Manor, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Riley O. Crosby, Mershon, Ga. Office became Presidential Juy 1, 1945.

Olin S. Horne, Metcalf, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Kathleen Hammond Langston, Middleton, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Julia W. Miller, Midland, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert Homer Smith, Midville, Ga., in place of G. M. Barnes, deceased.

Stella A. Teel, Morris Station, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Adahbelle Elrod, Murrayville, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Matthew D. Freeman, Nicholson, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Claude A. Bennett, Plainville, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Pauline S. Middleton, Ramhurst, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Joseph B. Mahan, Rydal, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fannie M. W. Brim, Sasser, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Joe M. Athon, Shady Dale, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Nan L. Johnson, Stockton, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Marie Warren Harris, The Rock, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nettie R. Miles, Varnell, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Paul A. Cline, Waleska, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Myra L. Lang, Waverly, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Luther F. Richards, White, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Joseph M. Drury, White Oak, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edgar S. Hicks, Yatesville, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

HAWAII

Robert Yutaka Hamamura, Anahola, T. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James D. Lewis, Jr., Kaunakakai, T. H., in place of J. D. Lewis, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
Joseph P. Dolim, Keahua, T. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

ILLINOIS

John W. Martens, Anchor, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Kathryn F. Vogel, Andalusia, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Elmer E. Young, Bardolph, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lillian E. Kraut, Batchtown, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Frank C. Goddard, Belknap, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Pearl I. O'Brien, Belvidere, Ill., in place of W. W. McIntire, removed.
Byron A. Knief, Burlington, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harry R. Terpening, Cameron, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Otto H. Vogt, Campbell Hill, Ill., in place of Hilda Luehr, resigned.
Dora Turchi, Cedar Point, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
George L. Weith, Centerville Station, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mabelle Dailey, Chana, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mildred E. Halsne, Davis Junction, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Thomas H. Peddie, Dawson, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Hattie A. Robinson, Dix, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Maude M. Palmer, East Lynn, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Elizabeth K. Ware, Ellisville, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harry E. Millay, Ellsworth, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Muriel C. Macauley, Golden Eagle, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Margaret E. Hicks, Goldengate, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gwen B. Mundschenk, Graymont, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Cloyd M. Ostrander, Harmon, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ralph E. Ferrell, Herod, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Otie L. Keen, Keenes, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lewis W. Langham, Keyesport, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Grayce A. Harmon, Lakewood, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Louise M. Gibbs, La Rose, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mary E. Kennedy, Lee, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Richard L. Peterson, Lynn Center, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ethelyn C. Bushue, Mason, Ill., in place of D. D. Debault, resigned.
Grace Dilley, Norris, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Viola T. Swanson, North Henderson, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Dorothy O. Rock, Oakley, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Florence Hendricks, Oconee, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
George W. Scott, Osco, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Frank J. Mulholland, Ottawa, Ill., in place of J. J. Hart, resigned.
George B. Garrison, Pearl, Ill., in place of B. D. Sutter, resigned.
Howard J. Gorman, Peoria, Ill., in place of D. H. McClugage, deceased.
LaVerne M. Mailfald, Prairie View, Ill., in place of R. J. Kreuser, resigned.
Eva L. Glascock, Raleigh, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charles E. Hancock, Rapid City, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Zola E. Skibinski, Richview, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Dorothy J. Eycroft, Sciota, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gertrude C. Carr, Sherman, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Delano L. Wetherell, Shumway, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Chester O. Burgess, Sigel, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Orilla M. Anderson, Smithshire, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Garnet K. Martin, South Elgin, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Beulah Nickerson, Speer, Ill. Office Presidential July 1, 1945.
Cora I. Kemnetz, Strawn, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Stephen Durochin, Taylor Springs, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Russell L. Akright, Timewell, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ola M. Beal, Walnut Hill, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945
John A. Leturno, Wheeler, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

INDIANA

Charles Peffley, Bridgeton, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Stella Larimore, Brooksburg, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Eva Eherenman, Burket, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ora E. Marlow, Coalmont, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Emerson E. Bridges, Commiskey, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Claude C. Garrison, Donaldson, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Francana McGhehey, Fishers, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Bertha B. Finley, Hartsville, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John H. Cox Ingalls, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Leora B. Alexander, Judson, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Fanny Maurey, Mecca, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Olin S. Mayfield, Memphis, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mary L. Hasty, Milroy, Ind., in place of Melvin Woods, transferred.
Louane Neff, Mount Summit, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Emerson A. Behlmer, Napoleon, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Walter D. Carlock, Paris Crossing, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edan Kirkham, Prairie Creek, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Helen McConnell, Scipio, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Hugo L. Hartke, Stendal, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edna Howard, Velpen, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Oscar Nierste, Westphalia, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

IOWA

Robert R. Kriete, Baldwin, Iowa, in place of E. H. Luett, transferred.
Edward J. Heffbauer, Blue Grass, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Hilda A. McGovern, Brayton, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lucille Sexton, Cromwell, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nellie M. Easton, Curlew, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Walter W. Delahoyde, Dawson, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Elizabeth Grimme, Durango, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ervin F. Spratt, Elkhart, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Frank W. Elias, Ely, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Martha E. McClaskey, Exline, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Andrew L. Dickinson, Gilbert, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Henry J. Eischeid, Halbur, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Elizabeth K. Buren, Leland, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Selmer E. Skare, Lincoln, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Leonard S. Lawless, Macksburg, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Leonard C. Gordon, Martelle, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Guy E. Waldron, Meriden, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jacob Ruedy, Middle, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Rose Mae Hatter, Millersburg, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edith Page, Nemaha, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Albert N. Kloser, North Buena Vista, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Leo J. Mehaffey, North Liberty, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mollie Daley, Parnell, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Essie B. Whisler, Unionville, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Francis M. Bucher, Wapello, Iowa, in place of Bernice Herrick, resigned.
Esther N. Booth, West Chester, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

KANSAS

Melba M. Bates, Allen, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Aldmar Demars, Aurora, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Frank L. Weeks, Belvue, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John J. Sedlacek, Bremen, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Frances Z. Wolf, Bucyrus, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jack VanSickle, Cedar Point, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Marie Mize, Cleburne, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Byron O. Shupe, Denton, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edith Maxine McKie, Edmond, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Catherine M. Moylan, Emmett, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Elsie Jane Reed, Ensign, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harry J. Hunter, Hanston, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Marie Oehm, Home, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Beulah M. Dillon, Iuka, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Otto F. Grothe, Lehigh, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jessie L. Dennis, Leona, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
William G. Arnold, Mahaska, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nicholas G. Blick, Maize, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jesse C. Swigert, Manchester, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jesse E. Snedegar, Matfield Green, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John I. Goodrum, Mayfield, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clifford C. Lemmon, Mission, Kans., in place of Otto B. Critchfield, declined.

John E. Sparling, Oneida, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Howard E. Monroe, Oswego, Kans., in place of Fairfax Barnes, resigned.

Florence M. Martin, Palmer, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hazel W. Harrell, Paradise, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Grace Schweitzer, Penokee, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Anna Marie Todd, Redfield, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John C. Scribner, Saffordville, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Minnie K. Cardwell, Scandia, Kans., in place of Lyell D. Ocobock, resigned.

Laura A. Fields, Talmage, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fred E. Feyerabend, Woodbine, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

KENTUCKY

Amy Levan, Burna, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert Chesnut, Burning Springs, Ky. Office made Presidential July 1, 1945.

Golda West, Cromwell, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Winnie K. Veatch, Crutchfield, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Daniel M. Mann, De Mossville, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Thelma L. Vest, Elliston, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Emma Luckett, Fairfield, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Luther S. Safriet, Gatliff, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William Cantrill, Garrison, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Golden R. Back, Harveyton, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles W. Keatts, Herndon, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Grace Hamilton, Melvin, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Thomas J. Turner, Minnie, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Irwin G. Cochran, Oak Grove, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Loma B. Gaines, Oakland, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Claude Hurt, Olaton, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bessie M. Watkins, Pine Mountain, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fannie Elder, Pryorsburg, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Homer Boyd, Rockport, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lettie Smith, Sassafras, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Kelly H. Allen, Shelbiana, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gladys Morgan, Smithfield, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ella B. Burdick, Tollesboro, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Wilford D. Cunningham, Webbs Cross Roads, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

LOUISIANA

Cornelius H. Ferguson, Atlanta, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Loney N. Davis, Ball, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Virgie M. Judson, Denham Springs, La., in place of John Allen, removed.

Florence C. Clarke, Fairbanks, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lucille Smith, Fields, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Minnie S. Teer, Fordoche, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alonzo B. Catron, Forest, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elton J. Champagne, Franklin, La., in place of V. J. Chauvin. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

Berta Cobb, Longville, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Wilfred August Guidry, Mermentau, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Rex B. Hawthorne, Mira, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Evlyn F. Griffith, South Mansfield, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert L. Brooks, Swartz, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mattie B. Gryder, Vienna, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MARYLAND

Josephine Warrenfeltz, Breathedsville, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edith S. Wright, Elk Mills, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert D. Sewell, Hydes, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Kathryn M. Hurlock, Kennedyville, Md., in place of R. R. Kirby, resigned.

Evelyn C. Mast, Loch Raven, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Allie J. Twiford, Marbury, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alice T. Walter, Nanticoke, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Irma Esham Bowen, Newark, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ethel B. Spilman, Washington Grove, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MASSACHUSETTS

Laura A. Hepsley, Blandford, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Agnes K. Faxon, Brookville, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fred E. Daisy, Carlisle, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Marion E. Nordin, East Dennis, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James J. Trioli, Fayville, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edna May Halden, Franklin Park, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Sarah G. Sampson, Green Harbor, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lucy A. Freeman, Millbrook, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Laura Boulais, Oakdale, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lewis W. Jenney, South Carver, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frank K. Lynch, South Chatham, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clarence W. Bayles, South Dennis, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles T. Williams, South Egremont, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Amber E. Columbia, Westport Point, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Belle Edwards, Attica, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Karl W. Pendell, Bailey, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bruce McFall, Brant, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Adrian L. Eldred, Breckenridge, Mich., in place of J. L. Breckenridge, deceased.

Helen G. Paul, Clifford, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ethel M. Baldwin, Decker, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Burchett Doster, Doster, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert E. Van Driesen, Eagle, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George H. Messenger, Eckerman, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Olive M. Martin, Elmira, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gordon S. Ehle, Fenwick, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ervin C. Dunckley, Frederic, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Minnie Wilson, Gould City, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frances Lindberg, Hessel, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Beatrice Gissberg, Hulbert, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edwin V. Lamb, Jeddo, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lembi H. Timonen, Kearsarge, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Diana Wardwell, Leonidas, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frank B. Mills, Millersburg, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945

Elwin E. Ritchie, New Troy, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Florence B. Munn, Paris, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Floyd C. Fuhriman, Perkins, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bessie B. Morse, Sandcreek, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Evelyn Wykoff, Sans Souci, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Kenneth C. Potter, Shelbyville, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Velma Gillard, Spruce, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vera I. Driffill, Tipton, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Albin Lahikainen, Toivola, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Wilfred N. Holman, Trimountain, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mable V. Rose, Trufant, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Olive E. Niles, Vanderbilt, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elver I. Carroll, Walloon Lake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MINNESOTA

Jack E. Essila, Angora, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Louis I. Westby, Avoca, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Rose C. McFarland, Bena, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Helmer J. Hedberg, Bock, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Arthur Laniel, Brooks, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Anna M. Albertson, Brookston, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lucille R. Gallagher, Cedar, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alfred V. Benson, Danvers, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dora H. Halbert, Halma, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Garnett W. Hines, Hines, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lyle M. Smith, Holloway, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John S. Easter, Humboldt, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Berniece Bales, Huntley, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George W. Cameron, Jr., Invergrove, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Viola P. Johnson, Jacobson, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Doris E. Gagnon, Jenkins, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alfred Sletta, La Salle, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hilda Hammer, Leoneth, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alfred H. Roloff, Lynd, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clarence H. Guetzkow, Mayer, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clarence T. Newhouse, Mendota, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Louise R. Reinarz, Mizpah, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Anna G. Lechner, North Redwood, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Esther J. Finden, Oak Park, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ida B. Mattson, Ormsby, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frank W. Hill, Ostrander, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harry B. Roth, Plato, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fred C. Meyers, Porter, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Celia G. Hickman, Randolph, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Otto C. Kunkel, Rapidan, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clarence M. Breneman, Ray, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clarence Mielke, Richville, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Herman J. Weis, Roscoe, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clara E. Bloms, St. Michael, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Christie A. Ahles, St. Vincent, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John J. McGillin, Stillwater, Minn., in place of P. J. Arndt, deceased.

Vernice C. Heutmaker, Victoria, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dwight M. Backman, Whalan, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

August C. Ewert, Waldorf, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clifford J. Newgard, Waltham, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Otto H. Koetke, Walters, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ada V. Erlandson, Warba, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSISSIPPI

Geneva S. Moore, Belden, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hazel J. Varnado, Chatawa, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dollie B. Blackwell, Duffee, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Sam O. Buckley, Enterprise, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Eula Ligon, Glen, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Maud Atkinson Davis, Horn Lake, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John L. McElroy, Kewanee, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Celeste M. Balfour, Lamar, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Jodie G. Dexter, McNeill, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hilary Hazelip, Mashulaville, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Susie V. Mauldin, Moss, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William W. Finch, New Site, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lula E. Gipson, Puckett, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Samuel H. Childress, Satartia, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frank E. Hollowell, Sharon, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Nellie T. Hobgood, Silver City, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John B. Parker, Tula, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Annie Saxon, Union Church, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mattie Sue Gibson, Verona, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Aileen Rawlings, Washington, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSOURI

John Wesley Elliott, Altamount, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Minnie Schleicher, Amity, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles O. Broughton, Bethel, Mo., in place of Sam Ziegler, retired.

Lucille Ross, Blairstown, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Eli V. Van Sickle, Cantwell, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary T. Peters, Conception, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Nannie C. Kugler, Cross Timbers, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William Sanford Smoot, Downing Mo., in place of J. F. Hargis, deceased.

Alma C. Patrick, Duenweg, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Wesley T. Butler, Excello, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lillian Crow, Farber, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lurla F. Irey, Fortuna, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Pearl M. True, Harwood, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William E. Alexander, Humphreys, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Sarah E. Maxwell, Industrial City, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clarence McCollum, New Boston, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John L. Bosch, Pickering, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clayborn J. Crowley, Rayville, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mattie L. Koontz, Richards, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary Slade, Rocheport, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Evelyn E. Fieker, Stotts City, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Sam A. Warner, Vichy, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Russell W. Disharoon, Villa Ridge, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Joshua Fergason, Wakenda, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Thomas H. Sinnott, Wayland, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ora E. Head, Weatherby, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Thomas O. Morgan, Whitewater, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MONTANA

Joyce C. Dickson, Neihart, Mont., in place of B. V. Powers, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Pauline Rosenow, Alvo, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Viola Calhoon, Benedict, Nebr., in place of M. G. Westervelt, retired.

Edward L. Spatz, Bruno, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George R. Hanson, Champion, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Daisy G. Hendricks, Douglas, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Angus K. Halcomb, Filley, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Albert O. Kruger, Gurley, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vratislav J. Kovarik, Hallam, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Laura F. Besley, Halsey, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vera Fisher, Hubbell, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ruth C. Olson, Johnstown, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Irene Jansen, Kennard, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bernice L. Irland, Otoe, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vera J. King, Primrose, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Francis H. Holtorf, Saint Libory, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William J. Johannes, Seward, Nebr., in place of G. D. Thomas, retired.

Joseph Kounovsky, Snyder, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fannie H. Manning, Steele City, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Amy E. Conant, Wellfleet, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Floyd A. Garrett, Whitman, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Frances B. Donovan, Ashuelot, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mertie L. McAllister, Center Barnstead, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hazel M. Ford, Danbury, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ruth H. Almeder, Georges Mills, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Florence A. Goodwin, Gilmanton Iron Works, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George H. Yeaton, Gossville, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Barbara L. Swett, Grasmere, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vernon F. West, North Sutton, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Eunice G. Woodman, Northwood, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW JERSEY

Mary Pettibone, Brant Beach, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Doris Brown ,Bridgeboro, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ray N. Gerew, Cape May Point, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Isaac S. Luttman, Dayton, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Helena Katherine Himmler, Deans, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Chester B. Moore, Deerfield Street, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Paul W. Robinson, Dividing Creek, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Florence N. Watson, Edgewater Park, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elizabeth Hamilton, Fieldsboro, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Wilbert W. Arnold, Greenwich, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Samuel M. Lear, Harvey Cedars, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Deborah E. Butcher, Heislerville, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Emilie J. Burnett, Liberty Corner, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles S. Toop, Lincroft, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Wilma B. Clayton, Marmora, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Jennie Rumford, Masonville, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles J. Gaskill, Newport, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elsa Maxwell, New Vernon, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Rebecca Reisman, Norma, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George T. Osborn, Osbornsville, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elizabeth E. Church, Rio Grande, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Max Wurtzel, Rosenhayn, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW YORK

Ward A. Withey, Allentown, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ida M. Negus, Alplaus, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bernadette I. Coultry, Altona, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

LaBelle F. Garland, Armonk, N. Y., in place of Charles Kaiser. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Helen T. Kane, Averill Park, N. Y., in place of H. E. Kane, deceased.

Theodore H. Kronke, Bardonia, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles J. Reilly, Bloomington, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fred W. Thomson, Bovina Center, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Grace R. Lehley, Brant, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Stephen W. Schuster, Jr., Callicoon Center, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Burton Yates, Caroga Lake, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Margaret E. Bentley, Conewango Valley, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Raymond O. Phelps, Cowlesville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Morris A. Davis, Crompond, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edith M. Ortner, Darien Center, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Helen R. Vail, East Marion, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gladys M. Laing, East Otto, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Clara L. Walker, Farnham, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mildred B. Albers, Fort Hunter, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
E. Arthur Calkins, Glen Wild, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Thompson B. Ward, Guilderland, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jennie Young, Howes Cave, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Fred Churchill, Hughsonville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mary A. Russell, Keene, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charlotte M. Fleischman, Laurel, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
George B. Nivison, Lodi, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Alice M. Grace, Lowman, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Eileen B. Kennedy, Marietta, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Julian L. Peck, Masonville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Muriel E. Raymond, Minerva, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Laura T. Le Duc, Mooers Forks, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gilbert V. Horton, New Suffolk, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Amanda Stewart, North Branch, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ella B. Kavanagh, North Java, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Alice M. Tobin, Old Chatham, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James A. Flynn, Point O'Woods, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mary P. Van de Wal, Schodack Landing, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Freda C. Stearns, Smiths Basin, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
G. Wilson Murdock, South Schroon, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Eckert A. Smith, Spring Glen, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
J. Carl Blust, Stittville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
August P. Lenz, Thendara, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
George E. Varley, Thomson, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Frances H. Courtney, Wilmington, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Beatrice M. Velsor, Woodbury, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Fred Hensel, Yulan, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

Calvin F. Perry, Sr., Archdale, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
DeWitt T. Freeman, Bat Cave, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Talmage R. Preston, Belew Creek, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Maude Miller White, Buxton, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Sadie B. Rountree, Corapeake, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Carre N. Boykin, Fairview, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Eugene R. Duvall, Grassy Creek, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Anne R. Ewell, Hamilton, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Eugenia M. Corbett, Ivanhoe, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Perry T. Roane, Kelford, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Katie C. Wayne, Lake Waccamaw, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harold M. McGrath, Linville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ina M. Wilson, Marston, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John A. Beshel, Nazareth, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Samuel B. Wilson, Newell, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jodie B. Ragan, Newhill, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Roger W. Davis, Pendleton, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Will G. Pitman, Penland, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mamie Pfaff, Pfafftown, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Thomas D. Preston, Pine Hall, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Beatrice C. Richardson, Pleasant Garden, N. C., in place of W. V. Gray, retired.
Grace E. Stahl, Pores Knob, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Alice G. Shavender, Ransomville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Eubert P. Rutherford, Rutherford College, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Laura E. Andrew, Sedalia, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Howard G. Barnes, Severn, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Alma O. Nelms, Stem, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ida J. Thorp, Stovall, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Philip Y. Snow, Toast, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edmond F. Sherwood, Vilas, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Clyde H. McClure, Walnut, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Carlotta W. Flynn, Wananish, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charles D. Ball, Jr., Westfield, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Thelma T. Wheeler, Whitsett, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Janie J. Henry, Winnabow, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Stella Phelps, Woodville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Florence R. Hanby, Wrightsville Sound, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH DAKOTA

Irwin E. Walton, Bantry, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Irene Miller, Burlington, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Joyce E. Murray, Cayuga, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Veva M. Fosnes, Emerado, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lottie Posey, Glenfield, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Oliver M. Sproule, Manvel, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Grant O. Perry, Plaza, N. Dak., in place of N. O. Julson, resigned.
Robert O. Johnson, Sutton, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edna W. Dewerff, Wheatland, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OHIO

Martin L. Neff, Adelphi, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Perley J. Shadel, Alvordton, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Clarence C. Daw, Ava, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Oral V. Waugh, Bladen, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James Blair, Buffalo, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Zelda M. Stoneking, Chandlersville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ruey A. Donohoe, Dunglen, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Hulda C. Schumacher, Glandorf, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mary E. Cummons, Hanover, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mary L. Smith, Harrisburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Helen F. Grady, Hayesville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Luella F. Hayes, Hooven, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Raymond E. Beardsley, Huntsburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Helen B. Gorton, Irwin, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nelle O. Ayliffe, Kipton, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Harry Clark, Kirkersville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
William E. Walker, Midland, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Frank R. Brewer, New Marshfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Fenton L. Brown, North Kenova, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Mary A. Hankinson, Norwich, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
E. Dana Wickline, Rio Grande, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Carl B. Dager, Robertsville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John F. Rider, Rockbridge, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Helen M. McGuire, Rudolph, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nona E. Aleshire, Tremont City, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gail Calvin, Union Furnace, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mae Litten, Vaughnsville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Pauline B. Davies, Venedocia, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OKLAHOMA

Evan E. Wiley, Arapaho, Okla., in place of M. L. Jarvis, resigned.
Nellie I. Malone, Cashion, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Maureta G. Pappan, Chilocco, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Cornelia M. Jenkins, Drummond, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Helena M. Hood, Hoffman, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lula T. Stiles, Hollister, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lillie E. Williams, Leflore, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Haskell C. Donnelly, Lehigh, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mamie I. Pope, Loyal, Oya. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Rephord H. Stevens, Mustang, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John W. Clarke, Nardin, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Sally L. Clayton, Oakhurst, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ruby E. Harper, Quinlan, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Roberta J. Price, Rosston, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Beuna M. Gass, Selman, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Carrie Zahn, Sharon, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Clarence O. Lester, Smithville, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mary Marie Yaeger, Springer, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OREGON

Hazel V. Graham, Cutler City, Oreg., in place of P. H. Bartsch, resigned.
Emma M. C. Breshears, Lexington, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harold M. Foster, Lorane, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Le Roy A. Starr, Adamsdale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jennie B. Fox, Aitch, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Alma V. Lewis, Alverda, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Paul J. Kline, Arcadia, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Eva M. Weller, Aristes, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harold F. Herr, Bausman, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ethna L. Crowe, Bear Lake, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edna P. Thompson, Bigler, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Emma A. Murray, Boalsburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Helen M. McGovern, Branch Dale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gail Wood, Brave, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Helen Preksta, Cadogan, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Oliver W. Gehris, Center Valley, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Marshall Troutman, Clearville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Sarah A. Dermody, Damascus, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
George V. Butz, East Texas, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Elizabeth McC. Seese, Ehrenfeld, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Faye E. Zahniser, Fleming, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John J. Mohr, Fogelsville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mary E. Spangler, Frank, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Louise E. Rosencrance, Greeley, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Marie J. Suain, Hazel Hurst, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nellie K. Bistline, Ickesburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ruth Dalton, James City, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Maude C. Alexander, Julian, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Adeline G. Kokinda, Junedale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edna M. Albright, Kempton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lucressa H. Morrison, King of Prussia, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Annie V. Lefever, Kirkwood, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Erwin A. Deming, Lake Ariel, Pa., in place of M. L. Samson, resigned.
Alfred E. Vouaux, Lake Como, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charles G. Matz, Landingville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charles A. Dillman, Lavelle, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mildred G. Kerchner, Lenhartsville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jessie I. Snagusky, Llewellyn, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Joseph Verbish, Locustdale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Susan Danshaw, Maryd, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lorena E. Haws, Monocacy Station, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Raymond H. Moser, Neffs, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nettie R. Akens, New Bedford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Cormac A. Kennedy, Oneida, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jessie M. Shaffer, Osterburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Julia A. O'Hara, Pleasant Mount, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edward F. Workman, Reinerton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Fred L. Claggett, Rummerfield, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Helen L. Benney, Rutherford Heights, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charles K. Flock, Sallodasburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Grace E. Carpenter, Starrucca, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Howard M. Smith, Stillwater, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Joseph D. Roeder, Summit Station, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Anna C. Hiltebeitel, Sumneytown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Martha N. Gingrich, Swatara Station, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
George H. Bronson, Sweet Valley, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harry S. Klose, Swineford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jacob B. Hendricks, Trexlertown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Alpha I. Williams, Wallaceton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Marjorie A. K. Crippen, Wells Tannery, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jane W. Hinkle, West Hickory, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mary K. Ricker, Bath, S. C., in place of H. H. Armstrong, resigned.
Andrew F. Blair, Blairs, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gladys P. Harrison, Bluffton, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lottie W. McCaskill, Cassatt, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
William B. Simpson, Catawba, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Martha E. Peeples, Sateechee, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ruth M. Dixon, Cherokee Falls, S. C., in place of A. F. Robbins, resigned.
Norman B. Williams, Dacusville, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Eunice McKeown, Fort Lawn, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Bessie E. Drawdy, Green Pond, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Rita B. Rentz, Islandton, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Stella H. Grady, Jamestown, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Van C. Oxner, Kinards, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Delma B. Liddell, Lowndesville, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Palmer M. Moore, Lowrys, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Joel T. Massey, Mauldin, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Frank B. Berry, Reevesville, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
May S. Hallman, Ward, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Rosabelle W. Trotti, West Columbia, S. C., in place of DeW. T. Latimer, transferred.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Ruth E. Peterson, Brandon, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Agnes Malloy, Burbank, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Josephine Tompers, Cavour, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Margie L. Smith, Cheyenne Agency, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
George Lehnert, Glenham, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Anton Koslowski, Grenville, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gladys F. Johnston, Hazel, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harry O. Starksen, Hetland, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Fred Coates, Igloo, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Sidney Parkinson, Kadoka, S. Dak., in place of A. A. Dithmer, retired.
Della I. Olson, Lily, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mildred E. Van Houten, Northville, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Dona E. Linehan, Oglala, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TENNESSEE

Lillian V. Proctor, Burlison, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Sandy B. Harris, Cunningham, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James C. Duke, Darden, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jessye L. Williamson, Denmark, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Herbert C. Hurst, Eagan, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Una E. Fleming, Elbridge, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mable E. Watkins, Fosterville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Bessie Sutton, Frankewing, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Laura J. Keck, Goin, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edna H. Butler, Goodspring, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Rebecca E. Fleming, Hartford, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James W. Cross, Hickory Point, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
William R. Rice, Hollow Rock, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mildred P. Smith, Huron, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Joe R. Pigg, Kelso, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Guy L. McHaney, Luray, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James L. Gooch, Michie, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mabel Lowery, Ocoee, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Joyce Myrtle Stratton, Oldfort, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charles H. Biggs, Palmersville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Margaret E. Harris, Pleasant View, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Betty L. Sharp, Seymour, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Frank S. Grizzell, Sharps Chapel, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Robert H. McFall, Slayden, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Zaida I. Fullwood, Stantonville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harvey M. Ewing, Tennessee City, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mary F. Hall, Westport, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Jewel D. Eades, Alanreed, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Louise Henicke, Alleyton, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Neil W. Sheridan, Augusta, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lovey L. Bailey, Bradshaw, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Oma Wall, Broaddus, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Freeda M. Burkett, Burkett, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Cecil D. Foster, Cedar Bayou, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Maudie M. Hensley, Chicota, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ervin Sherman, China, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Vernie A. Payne, Combes, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ima M. Shannon, Direct, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ruby E. Page, Doole, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Annie B. Causey, Doucette, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Matthew G. Crosby, Douglas, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Pearl W. Lee, Driscoll, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Turner F. Gassaway, Elm Mott, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Daniel A. Juren, Ellinger, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John D. Furrh, Elysian Fields, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jesse R. Chambers, Everman, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Richard A. Watson, Forreston, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mabel F. Hoover, Friendswood, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charles F. Broyles, Fruitvale, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Leona B. Dozier, Fulshear, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edna A. Upton, Gillett, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lela M. Williams, Girard, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Carl B. Cheaney, Gouldbusk, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Elizabeth D. Davis, Hardin, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John H. Pope, Harelton, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edna E. Horning, Hartley, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Carl T. Wilkinson, Harwood, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edwin A. Raeke, Industry, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Hattie M. Austin, Ireland, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
J. Morgan Pickett, Kempner, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Werner E. Knippa, Knippa, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Robbie M. Phipps, Lake Creek, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Vera L. Platzer, League City, Tex., in place of H. L. Hall, resigned.
Georgie F. Morgan, Leary, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mary J. Townsend, Leesburg, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Loy W. Bynum, Lelia Lake, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Grace B. Shepherd, Leona, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jannie A. Minton, Lipscomb, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Opal M. Browning, Lohn, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Antone J. Lichnovsky, Nada, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nettie Stewart, Otey, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Wince D. Jones, Petty, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Robert R. Sanders, Pollok, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nora E. Yarbrough, Ponder, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Carrie McClure, Port O'Connor, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Katherine Kenner, Powell, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Robert S. Lee, Poynor, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Tommie L. Timmons, Prairie Hill, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John R. Dunahoo, Ridgeway, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Dillie N. Kimbrell, Rowlett, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Fannie Fuqua, Shiro, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Byron C. Lusk, Sidney, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nannie E. Webb, Simms, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ida Mae Meador, South Houston, Tex., in place of L. E. Charlesworth, resigned.
Willis C. White, Springlake, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
B. Maurice Cummins, Taft, Tex., in place of B. H. Cummins, resigned.
Lula M. Hassey, Tye, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Frank J. Meares, Welch, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Dannye E. Gilley, Whitehouse, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Bertie A. Hart, Winchester, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

UTAH

Adrian Janse, Huntsville, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Naomi A. Burgener, Midway, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

VIRGINIA

Joseph H. Hurst, Allisonia, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Sallie B. Willson, Ballsville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Bettie F. Gayle, Baskerville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John C. Kehoe, Bealeton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harry R. Bell, Birdsnest, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harry B. Marshall, Blue Grass, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mary Webb, Branchville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Bertha B. Alvis, Brook Hill, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lawrenceson C. Costen, Buell, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John Duke, Jr., Carrsville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Annie L. Davis, Cascade, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jerry Morgan, Catawba, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Virginia M. Cline, Clear Brook, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edwina Boisseau, Dewitt, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Idamae Turner, Dorchester, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
French S. Brawner, Dumfries, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Rosalie R. Baker, Dunbar, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Fleda H. Goodwyn, Dundas, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edna Kilgore, East Stone Gap, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mary E. McChesney, Fishersville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Etta C. Turner, Fort Blackmore, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John R. Sweeney, Jr., Gainesville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nathan H. Tillage, Gloucester Point, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James M. Jones, Goodview, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Cynthia L. Kerr, Goodwins Ferry, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Maude Gilmer, Hansonville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gorman A. Hilton, Hiltons, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edna Y. Harper, Holdcroft, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gordon P. Murray, Hollins, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Fred L. Marshall, Keeling, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Rosa L. Thrift, Kinsale, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Genevieve P. Gresham, Lancaster, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ella S. Hockaday, Lanexa, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Claude L. Bradshaw, Laurel, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Eva G. Davenport, Leona Mines, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Marie H. Clark, Lively, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gladys M. McLaughlin, Lowmoor, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Theron P. Bell, Jr., Machipongo, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Adelbert D. Sydnor, Mannboro, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nannie B. Chase, Mappsville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John E. Dodson, Mattoax, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Norman O. Armstrong, Midland, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Stephen M. Nelson, Nelson, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ellie I. Amburgey, Nora, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Julia Maloney, North Garden, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lucille H. Gilbert, North Holston, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edward L. Deane, Nottoway, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nancy C. Leontal, Oakton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lauza Richie, Oakwood, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Walter H. Burgess, Paces, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charlie A. Pannell, Parrott, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
C. Meredith Richardson, Pendletons, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Anne G. Pearl, Port Republic, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Joseph Thomas Tokarz, Port Richmond, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
William R. Bailey, Quinton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ollie May Brooks, Red Ash, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Anne H. Giles, Rock Castle, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Margaret M. Powell, Seaford, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Linda T. Meissner, Skipwith, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Thomas H. Elmore, Snowville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Wiley H. Robertson, Spout Spring, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James H. L. Parker, State Farm, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John E. Winstead, Village, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lola G. Fowler, White Post, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Buren Skinnell, Wirtz, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WASHINGTON

Helen L. Gilbert, La Grande, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Benjamin B. McKenzie, Mead, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John Dean, Otis Orchards, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Austin J. Dickinson, Riverside, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WEST VIRGINIA

John J. Balassone, Albert, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edgar D. Combs, Augusta, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Martin D. Welsh, Bakerton, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nancy R. Browning, Barnabus, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charles R. Cunningham, Baxter, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gladys P. Frazier, Beards Fork, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Irma Botkin, Big Chimney, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mamie P. Maynor, Bluecreek, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James D. Mode, Cinderella, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Wilda Y. Shannon, Coalton, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ruby Williams, Drybranch, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John U. Hevener, Dunmore, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Maude S. Walker, Fort Ashby, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Jesse P. James, Frametown, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Stanley A. Patton, Gap Mills, W .Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
George O. Morris, Gay, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James F. Lewis, Gerradstown, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Arthur E. Stacey, Glen Ferris, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Arietta J. Allen, Green Spring, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Orville G. Toney, Hansford, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Alice B. Chapman, Hartford, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Shirley L. Diddle, Henderson, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lillie B. Sharps, Independence, W. Va. Office made Presidential July 1, 1945.
Vennie B. Coleman, Itmann, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Maurice H. Smith, Killarney, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lester H. Harman, Kingmont, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mollie Davis, Lavalette, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nellie Robinette, McConnell, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Thomas F. Dick, Maitland, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ruby E. Garten, Meadow Creek, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Clara M. Hall, Miami, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Kathryne Marlow, Palestine, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
William Baxter Harvey, Premier, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harley Z. Moore, Smithburg, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Aubrey J. Bishop, Summerlee, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Marjorie Hamilton, Switzer, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nancy Sinclair, West Milford, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lloyd C. Gwinn, Whipple, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Arthur Downing, Wilkinson, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Hattie M. Gannon, Armstrong Creek, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Donald E. Chapman, Ashippun, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charles H. Barlow, Briggsville, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Frank W. Zetzman, Fall Creek, Wis., in place of H. E. Steinbring, resigned.
Omar F. Huebner, Ixonia, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edgar H. Bradley, Pickett, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Kate M. Pottie, Stockbridge, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WYOMING

Floyd M. Vaughn, Clearmont, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Warren Clark, Frannie, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Clifford A. Kizzire, Granger, Wyo., in place of R. R. Steenburgen, resigned.
William R. Kirlin, Lagrange, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Florence B. Robertson, Manderson, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Strong Son of God, in this era of confusion, draw all hearts to Thee and lift us above all impediments; when the clouds lower and the tides are adverse, give us that inner force which increases our usefulness many times. In every emergency, we pray for a cooperative and loyal citizenship which realizes that the true way of a nation is to work and earn, to save and give. Not by might nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord.

Our country has a commission to carry out, though its path be of pain or of difficulty; O bring men to their senses; cleanse all minds of unwise impulses that stand in the way of duty and responsibility; take away all hindrances from wise decisions, and remove the yoke from the oppressed of every rank and station, however diverse in circumstances and character. In these crippled times, O give us such a power as we have never before felt, losing ourselves in healing the wounds of an uprooted world. Let Thy guidance today be a token of Thy goodness and of our worthiness. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On September 18, 1945:

H. R. 3907. An act to provide for administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by a Surplus Property Administrator.

On September 20, 1945:

H. R. 3644. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional rates of compensation or pension and remedy inequalities as to specific service-incurred disabilities in excess of total disability.

On September 22, 1945:

H. R. 999. An act for the relief of Lily L. Carren;

H. R. 1057. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Margaret Hockenberry, a minor;

H. R. 1257. An act for the relief of George C. Tyler and Doris M. Tyler;

H. R. 1564. An act for the relief of William W. Maddox and the legal guardian of Donna Sue Maddox and Saddie Inez Maddox;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Aloysius G. Miller;

H. R. 2028. An act for the relief of John Visnovec, Rose Visnovec, and Helen Visnovec;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Edmund F. Danks, as administrator of the estate of Edna S. Danks, deceased;

H. R. 2163. An act for the relief of Teresa Tine;

H. R. 2511. An act for the relief of Patricia W. Kacprzyk and Alex D. Leontire; and

H. R. 2641. An act for the relief of Frank Glen.

On September 24, 1945:

H. R. 241. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruby H. Hunsucker;

H. R. 799. An act for the relief of the estate of Stanley E. Smallwood; to the legal guardian of Frank Carter, Jr., a minor; to the legal guardian of Donald R. Keithley, a minor; to Keithley Bros. Garage;

H. R. 1882. An act for the relief of R. L. Whittington, Mrs. R. L. Whittington, and Mrs. J. B. Whittington.

H. R. 1992. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of Alaska, in trust for the Roman Catholic Church; and

On September 25, 1945:

H. R. 1456. An act for the relief of George E. Baker; and

H. R. 3974. An act to provide for termination of daylight-saving time.

On September 26, 1945:

H. R. 1713. An act for the relief of Canal Dredging Co.; and

H. R. 3686. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the registers of the land offices in Alaska to perform functions under the Alaska real property ownership declaration law.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3951. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

AUTHORIZING ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF PERSONS INDIGENOUS TO INDIA

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 361, Rept. No. 1029), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible, for naturalization, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

REORGANIZATION OF AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 360, Rept. No. 1028),

which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Batesville (Ark.) News Review.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the coffee situation.

ELLIOTT ROOSEVELT

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, much publicity has been given to the investigation by the Committee on Ways and Means of loans made by various individuals to Elliott Roosevelt. The Committee on Ways and Means has concluded its investigation and will soon make a report thereon. I had expected to discuss this investigation and report before the House, but I cannot with propriety do so until the report has been made public after having been filed with the House. As soon as that is done I expect to discuss the matter either on the floor or by way of an extension of remarks.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection

UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if your home was on fire you would first look after your family and put out the fire. You would not go to the cellar and take the ashes out of the furnace, you would not go to the kitchen and prepare a dinner. You would not carry in wood and paper and place it on the fire—no, you would try to put out the fire.

America today is on fire—strikes in the oil industry putting thousands and thousands out of work—strikes in the auto industry putting hundreds of thousands of peoples out of work. Strikes of elevator operators in New York City putting out 1,850,000 office workers. It is spreading over this Nation fast just when we want to get business in operation.

We are having hearings in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to create more jobs when we have 4,000,000 jobs going begging. The President is interested in greater unemployment payments to workers out of jobs, when we have millions of jobs going begging. Put out this fire. Let the President and Congress direct their efforts in stopping strikes and permitting men to work before this fire burns down our Government house.

The Communists want to burn this house down by having the Government take over all private business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by George S. Benson, president, Harding College, entitled "Five-Talent Men."

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial from the Saturday Review of Literature. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $104, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. RYTER asked and was given permission to extent his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two bills he is introducing today.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of the United States ought to take an appeal from the decision of the judge in California to make a United States citizen of Harry Bridges. If he does not do that, somebody ought to be investigated to find out just why this Communist trouble-maker was made a citizen of the United States.

The other day, in addressing a group of CIO members, here is what this West Coast Communist, Harry Bridges, said to them, according to the newspapers:

If all CIO members could understand what united political actions mean, there might not be any more employers or private industry in the United States.

If that is not a subversive statement, I want to know what it is.

If we are going to sit here, if the courts of the country and the Attorney General, the law-enforcing agency of this Government, are going to permit a revolutionary Communist, preaching revolution, to come in here and be made a citizen of the United States while our boys are fighting and dying to save constitutional government, it is about time we let the American people know it.

ELEVATOR OPERATORS' STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remark and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, an AP press dispatch this morning carries the statement that 15,000 elevator workers in New York City are carrying on a strike which affects an estimated 1,500,000 individuals. In that 1,500,000 individuals are probably at least 100,000 garment workers, who want to go to work making clothing. I suggest to Dubinsky and to members of his union that they personally go over and argue peaceably, quietly, politely, but effectively—do you get my meaning?—effectively, but without violence—be careful about that, with these fellows who will not run the elevators, and they will get to their jobs. Otherwise those who want to work, who are not permitted by the strikers to work, will soon be hungry.

Why argue with men who want to strike? Let them strike, but let them get out of the way of those who want to work, and do not give strikers relief at the expense of the taxpayers who stay on the job.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—CITY OF COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1634, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, a bill for the relief of the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa.

The purpose of the measure is to authorize and direct payment of the sum of $8,750.13 to the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for 50,144 sacks purchased by the city which were used together with other sacks furnished by the Engineer Corps, United States Army, to strengthen embankments along the Missouri River in order to avert the flood which threatened the city in the spring of 1943. The sacks for which payment is sought were purchased directly by the city of Council Bluffs from a private concern in advance of the threatened high waters.

It appears that during the high-water conditions encountered, the United States district engineer at Omaha, Nebr., rendered all possible assistance to local interests in the protection of private and public property at Council Bluffs and in strengthening all flood-protection systems. This assistance also included rescue work.

As indicated in the report on the measure, it has been the policy of the Engineer Department over a period of years to furnish Government property such as boats, barges, and other equipment to stricken communities for emergency use in protection of life and property when no suitable private equipment was on hand. The cost of this assistance has been borne by the War Department. It has never been the practice of the Engineer Department to make monetary restitution for efforts or materials expended by local authorities in flood fighting. The emergency flood protection measures taken by the city of Council Bluffs do not appear to differ from those taken by other cities and municipalities similarly affected by flood conditions.

Because the enactment of the bill would have the effect of establishing a precedent for the payment of similar expenditures made by local interests during the 1943 flood emergency, as well as other emergencies which might arise on all navigable waters and their tributaries which have been improved in the aid of navigation, and for flood-control purposes, I feel obligated to withhold my approval of the legislation.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1945.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the message and accompanying bill will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

There was no objection.

EXEMPTING ANNUITY PAYMENTS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2948) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2948, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this matter was discussed when the rule was under consideration the day before yesterday and there is not very much more to be said about it. The purpose of the bill is to relieve to a limited extent the distress that has been experienced by 78,000 elderly citizens who have retired from the Government service and who are now on the annuity rolls under the Civil Service Retirement Act and whose average annuity is approximately $950. Many of them, of course, receive much less. These citizens, because of the reduction during wartime of the exemptions under the income-tax legislation, are required to pay taxes on these small annuities which they receive.

It has been said there are approximately 78,000 of these people, 90 percent of whom are beyond 60 years of ago, one of whom is 100 years of age, and thousands of whom are up in the seventies, and hundreds are in the eighties. Most of them receive very small annuities and find it burdensome to have to pay taxes on these small amounts which they receive.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Is it true or is it not true that some of these people receive annuities as high as $4,000 a year?

Mr. RAMSPECK. There are a few who do, yes; but the vast majority get $600, $700, $800, and $900 a year.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am very much in sympathy with those in the low brackets who receive a small annuity, not only Federal employees but State and city employees. For instance, in my city the firemen and policemen and their widows receive a very small annuity and very few of them receive over a thousand dollars. I have looked into the situation, but as this bill is drawn I am prohibited from offering an amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act that could include the policemen and firemen in my city. I would like to see something done for them because they do not receive the amount that the Federal employees receive. Many of them are widows of policemen and firemen who lost their lives in line of duty.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is true, but that is within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. The Civil Service Committee has no jurisdiction over it. I think there is a bill pending before the Ways and Means Committee on that subject.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman feel it would be more logical to take up this entire question in one measure rather than deal with it piecemeal?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think it will ever be taken up if you wait for that, to be perfectly frank about it. We are dealing with this as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce dealt with the railroad employees. Exactly the same exemption is provided in that act as we are undertaking to put into this act. The question did not arise until we got into the war situation, when personal exemptions were lowered to $500 under wartime taxation, and for the first time these small annuities were brought under the tax law.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The gentleman says these smaller annuities, which average only $900, must pay taxes. They do have the same exemption as other taxpayers, do they not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; they do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield myself two additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

I have in my hand several letters from old people, and I want to refer to one or two of them.

I have a letter from a gentleman in Los Angeles who retired under an annuity of $1,200 a year. He states that his taxes for this year are $131. He points out the increased cost of living and how difficult it is for him and his wife to get along on that amount.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am sorry I cannot yield right now.

I have a letter from a gentleman in Texas who points out somewhat the same thing. He also complains of the fact that he is discriminated against because those who are beneficiaries under the social security and railroad retirement are treated differently and do not pay any tax on their annuities. Of course, that is also true of pensions granted to former servicemen.

I have another letter from a man in Maryland who receives an annuity of $1,108.68. He is complaining of the same situation and the difficulty of getting along on these small annuities.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Not at this time.

The fact of the matter is that the Senate in the last Congress passed a bill to increase these annuities by 15 percent, on the theory that the increased cost of living made it necessary. That would have cost the Government many times what this will cost. It would have cost over $11,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield myself one additional minute, Mr. Chairman.

I think it is simple justice to those people to put them in the same situation in which the Congress put the railroad people who retired under the Railroad Retirement Act, and in which the Treasury Department put the beneficiaries of the Social Security Act by interpretation.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman in position to advise the Committee as to what loss in revenue will be sustained by the adoption of this measure?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I am not. I have no estimate of it. It would not amount to a great deal, because most of them receive very small annuities. They have an exemption of $500, so that the amount exempted by this act would be very small.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman advised as to the attitude of the administration with reference to this legislation?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The Treasury Department wrote a letter to both the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and to myself opposing it.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Are postal employees included under this bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; they are. All people in the Government service who have retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act are included. Many thousands of former postal employees do come under the provisions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. RICH. I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. All I can yield the gentleman is 1 minute; I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. RICH. I wish to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] this question: Who is to blame for the high taxes to which these people are objecting? Who is responsible?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Emperor Hirohito and Adolf Hitler.

Mr. RICH. That is about the kind of answer I would expect the gentleman to make. It is my creed that in the matter of taxation all should be treated alike. Whether a man earns $2,000 or receives it from the Government in the form of an annuity, no distinction should be made. This bill should be defeated because everybody in this country should be treated alike, notwithstanding the fact that the Railroad Retirement does provide for exemption of annuities paid thereunder; everyone should be treated the same in the matter of taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us (H. R. 2948) provides for exempting from taxation annual annuity payments of retired Federal Government employees up to $1,440.

As all know, civil-service employees pay into the retirement fund 5 percent of their salaries. The statutes already provide for exempting practically all of this 5 percent.

Data furnished me by the Civil Service Commission show that, on an average, a retired civil-service employee would have contributed only between $240 and $290 out of the $1,440 that is proposed to be exempted from taxation in this bill, while the Government, that is the taxpayers, would have contributed the remainder, or between $1,150 and $1,200.

This bill proposes, therefore, to make a flat tax exemption on the income of each retired Federal Government employee up to about $1,175. This would be in addition to the regular $500 personal exemption that is already allowed all taxpayers. This would be unfair to the other taxpayers of the Nation—wage earners, farmers, school teachers, entrepreneurs, and so forth.

It is wrong to exempt from taxation the income of particular groups. Such a policy results in shifting a disproportionate share of the tax burden onto the other groups. To be fair we must lift the exemption level for all alike.

This is a tax measure and should have been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and not the Committee on the Civil Service. It is hardly likely that the Committee on Ways and Means would have reported this bill out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a considerable amount of opposition to this legislation because it happens that it did not come from the Committee on Ways and Means. As I said on Tuesday when this measure was under consideration under the rule, I regret if anyone's feelings have been injured by reason of the committee which reports this bill. This is a civil-service measure and was correctly referred to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This bill after introduction was referred by the Speaker of the House under his prerogative, was it not, to the Committee on the Civil Service?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the Speaker is guided by parliamentary procedure and practice, is he not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Most assuredly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Any suggestion that the bill was improperly referred, of course, is a criticism of the Speaker? Certainly no one wants to in anywise criticize the action of the Speaker or anyone else with regard to such action.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In any event, not one member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House ever asked that this bill be referred to that committee during the period of several months it was pending before our committee. Not one member of the Ways and Means Committee appeared before the Rules Committee to object to consideration of this bill on the floor of the House. So the Ways and Means Committee does not have to feel hurt. Certainly no one has bypassed that committee with respect to consideration of this measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Having been responsible for putting this bill on the program under a rule, the thing that impresses me is that the bill is now before the House, having been reported by the committee of the House to which it was referred under the rules of the House. The Committee of the Whole should now consider the bill on its merits, the substance of the bill rather than enter into a jurisdictional discussion. That is the way the matter appeals to me. There is no leadership question involved. My own personal opinion is that the bill is a deserving one and should pass. Certainly there is a clear distinction between income earned during life employment and an annuity received when people have earned it as a result of putting back some of their earnings gained out of their productive years of life to give them at least minimum economic security during the latter years of life. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that we ought to extend it to all annuities, not only Federal but State and city, and again expressing my own personal opinion, I do not see why we should let any jurisdictional fight interfere with consideration of the bill on its merits. It is a good bill and I intend to vote for it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I intended to say practically the same thing the gentleman from Massachusetts has so well expressed. The bill is before us. We ought to consider the legislation on its merits, whether we are for or against it. But let us not vote against it because some committee members feel that the bill should have been referred to their group for consideration.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In the interest of uniformity of treatment, and the gentleman is in favor of that, why not extend

the provisions of this bill to include all low-income annuitants, school teachers, farmers, and others?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman wants to bring that problem to the attention of the Congress, I am sure it will receive the consideration to which it is entitled.

I want to add one more statement. The gentleman from Georgia inquired a moment ago with respect to the attitude of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury himself supported legislation that gave the railroad people the retirement benefits that they receive now and he also supported legislation dealing with social security whereby those payments were exempted. Of course, in his letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House he suggests that all that be taken out and no exemptions allowed. If the Ways and Means Committee proposes to take the advice of the Secretary of the Treasury, then that committee will bring to the floor of the House a bill to require every social-security recipient, 50,000,000 of them, to pay taxes on the funds they receive from the Government and every retired railroad employee would have to pay taxes on the funds accumulated in his favor and to which he contributed. I just do not believe that all of the members of the Ways and Means Committee of this House want to go on record to do that sort of thing, but that is the recommendation they are submitting as a part of their opposition to this bill. I have not heard any Member say he wants to repeal the present law with respect to those two groups, and I do not think I will hear a demand from anyone to do it. Of course not. I do not believe that any one Member of this House who seems to oppose this measure so vigorously and who quotes from the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury will submit legislation to take away exemptions from social-security recipients, retired railway employees, and others in similar categories. Of course not. I certainly would not favor such action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself seven additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I ask the gentleman if legislation is pending before his committee to increase all annuities at the present time?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. May I say further that there are inequities in the amount of retirement payments as between those who retired before January 1942 and those retiring subsequent to that date. If the bill before us is defeated, the pressure for consideration of legislation on that problem will be even greater than it is now. Those people who retired before January 1942 feel they are entitled to an increase in payments because of the increased cost of living, and for the further reason that a large group of employees who retired since 1942 are receiving more liberal payments than they are.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Would that not be a fairer way to handle this matter?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not so sure. You have quite a complicated problem when you deal with that question, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota. When you proceed to attempt to adjust retirement payments for any group, and I agree there are adjustments that should be made, you will find that there are thousands affected thereby who will feel they are entitled to what they regard as fairer consideration. The whole problem should be reexamined, but we cannot do that in this legislation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The President has also recommended that the Members of Congress increase their salaries.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am advised he recommended an annual salary of $20,000. I appreciate his opinion, but I am certainly not in accord with his views. I just do not think it is the thing to do. Let me say this in line with the gentleman's observation. The majority of the membership of this House saw fit not many weeks ago—and some Members have been talking about precedent around here—to increase their own incomes by 25 percent, not only for the present, but they made it retroactive, so each Member could receive the full $2,500. I did not go along with the majority on that question, but I certainly respect the views of those who differed with me on that proposition. Perhaps I should add that this House will be confronted with legislation to increase all Federal employees by 25 percent. I am informed the administration is supporting such measure. In fact, a bill is now pending before the Committee on Civil Service on that subject. So when you talk about precedent you see what you get into on that question. I do not see how Members who voted for and supported and are receiving that extra $2,500 should oppose this legislation on the ground of economy, because the amount that they voted for this House membership is more than is going to be allowed to the whole 76,000 who are included in this bill; I mean it amounts to as much money as the taxes you are going to forego by this measure.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If an individual bought an annuity from some insurance institution and his income was $1,500, under this bill would he be exempt?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman knows this legislation would not affect the indiivdual who bought an annuity. But may I say this, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania is receiving an annuity from a life-insurance company——

Mr. RICH. I do not receive any.

Mr. REES of Kansas. He does not pay taxes on the annuity. All he pays taxes on is what amounts to about 3 percent of it.

Mr. RICH. On the income.

Mr. REES of Kansas. On the investment. The recipient of returnment funds, when he pays money into the Federal Treasury, pays it out of his salary and he pays taxes on it; that is, that part which he contributes. At the present time he also pays taxes on part of that same money.

Mr. RICH. Is not our tax structure such that every individual is supposed to pay on the amount that he receives? Is that not the case, outside of the Railroad Retirement Act?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The Railroad Retirement, certain funds paid to soldiers and to those in the naval forces and to those under the Social Security Act and I do not know how many more.

Mr. RICH. This bill is going to make another preferred class, is it not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This bill is going to provide for a further exemption for a low-income group that receives an average of $960 a year. A group of people of average of between 68 and 70 years. It will provide them a chance to have a little bit of relief from a part of the burden of taxation to which I think they are entitled. There are about 78,000 people involved here. All but a very small percent receive less than $1,000 a year income. Ninety percent of these recipients do not have any income in addition to their retirement payments. Nearly all of them do not have earning power. As I have said, the average is between 68 and 70 years, and a good many of them are more than 70 or 80 years of age. I should add for the RECORD, that under civil service retirement, the life expectancy of those 62 years of age is 15 years; those aged 68, 11.4 years; 70 years of age, 10 years. I feel these individuals are entitled to this consideration. It should be brought out, too, that the right to retirement pay has always been regarded as a part of the remuneration of Federal employees. The policy of allowing retirement funds is followed to a great extent to make the Federal positions more attractive for career service.

Mr. RICH. Let us exempt them all from tax and treat everybody in this country alike.

Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this bill is so important the Members of the House ought to hear the debate on it. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think I asked this question the other day. I voted for the rule on this measure in order to get some information. Can the gentleman tell us how much money this would affect as far as taxes are concerned?

Mr. REES of Kansas. As near as we can ascertain, it will amount to a little less than $1,000,000 in taxes. That is the figure that has been given to me, right around $1,000,000. It affects about 78,000 annuitants. I believe I gave the figure of 72,000 before.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the great Ways and Means Committee of the House, whose opinion I respect.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. If all taxpayers in a similar category were extended the same treatment, what would the loss to the Treasury be, approximately? I know the gentleman believes in fair treatment to all taxpayers, but if all taxpayers are extended the same treatment, what would be the estimated loss of revenue at this time when our Government expenditures are so colossal?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman brings in a bill from his committee that would take in all individuals receiving a like amount, I am not sure how much the amount would be, but I am talking only of these individuals, and this figure is less than $1,000,000 and affects some 76,000 people who are in a low-income group and whose average age is between 68 and 70 years. Of course, they have passed the age when they can earn for themselves and 90 percent have no other income.

I have in my files several hundred letters from individuals, some of them from the State of North Carolina, telling me that because of their low income, and because of increased cost of living and because the tax assessed against them has reached so far down into the lower income brackets, they just do not have enough to live on, even to get along and have the bare necessities of life. It seems to me this House can at least take care of a group that is entitled to this consideration. Then, if the distinguished chairman wants to do so, and feels that it should be done, he can bring to the floor of the House legislation to take care of the other groups, and we will iron that out when it comes to the floor of the House. If he follows the advice in the letter he approved, he had read to this House, then he would wipe out all exemptions, that I assumed when considered by this House.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Why should it not all be done at the same time?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree the whole problem should be carefully studied, but I am inclined to believe, if past record is a criterion, such legislation might not reach the floor of the House very soon. I say this in view of the fact that the committee has been rather slow in giving consideration to matters of this kind. I know the committee is extremely busy. It has evidently been quite busy during the past few weeks. I am sure the people of this country are looking and hoping with great expectations for a real, sound, constructive tax program.

We are all looking forward to the time that tax program might get to the floor; I am a little afraid it will not come in time to give much consideration to the group that we are talking about here today.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation ought to stand or fall on its merits. If you are in favor of this legislation, you ought to support it. If you are not in favor of taking care of this group, that is something else. But let us not be influenced by the feeling of a committee of this House, who seem to be more opposed because they did not have the bill referred to that group, rather than of its merits. This legislation is supported by the American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have a telegram from William Green, president of the American Federation, endorsing this bill wholeheartedly and requesting that it receive the support of the membership of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. What would be the approximate tax on a $900 annuity? Would it be about $15?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I assume it would be about that. The gentleman, of course, can easily figure that out. I assume that would be about the average.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman from Georgia mentioned that on an income of $1,200, a $130 tax would be paid. Is that correct or would that include other income?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I cannot quite agree with his views. I tried to explain to the House about 90 percent of these individuals receive only money from their annuity and do not have additional income.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the normal $500 individual tax exemption be added to the $1,440 exemption on these annuities?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If an individual is getting a great big income in addition to this, he might have that benefit, but there are very few in that group.

Mr. STEFAN. As the bill is written, however, the bill introduced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] provides for an exemption of $1,440. Is that correct?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right. That is the maximum in any case and conforms to other legislation that has been approved by this House for other groups.

Mr. STEFAN. However, it could include an additional $500 exemption, could it not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It could be worked out, but very few would be affected by that.

Mr. STEFAN. As the gentleman explained previously, the normal average income of these people is $900?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The average income is $960.

Mr. STEFAN. And their average age is 68?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right; a little more than 68. At the age of 62, the average life expectancy is 15 years. A few come in at 60 years of age, a small group come in at 62. As I said, the average life expectancy of a man at 62 is 15 years. For those 68 years of age, the life expectancy is 11 years. For those 70 years of age, the life expectancy is 10.28 years.

Mr. STEFAN. How many years of service have been rendered by these 76,000 people, on an average per individual?

Mr. REES of Kansas. They have rendered some 30 to 35 years of service in the Federal Government.

Mr. STEFAN. But they have not served for less than 30 years?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this legislation should stand or fall on its merits. It ought to be passed and we should not let any bias or prejudice enter into this thing. I cannot see why the question of establishing a precedent should enter into the matter. As I said a moment ago, you have already established plenty of precedents. The House established a precedent of its own when it voted additional funds for its Members. We were told it was necessary because the additional funds were needed on account of the increased cost of living and other increases in expenses. The question of precedent is not involved here.

I have no feeling at all with regard to this legislation. I have the highest respect for the views of those who differ from me. The question involved is whether this measure is right. That is all there is to it. May we vote accordingly?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is always a bit discouraging, especially when you are dealing with a technical subject such as taxes, to find three-fourths of the Members not present. Therefore, I am rather glad that I did not know until about 30 minutes ago that I would speak on this bill in general debate, because I think I would have been wasting my time to have prepared a documented discussion of what is involved because it does no good to talk to empty seats.

May I say to my distinguished friend who said that the House should not be influenced by the attitude of the Committee on Ways and Means, which is almost unanimous in its opposition to this measure, that I agree with him in general in that opinion because we do not claim to be any smarter than anybody else.

We do claim that we spend more time studying taxes than any other committee, and we do claim that we have access to better technical advice than most of the other committees avail themselves of. I do not know what technical advice the Civil Service Committee received on this bill, but my horseback opinion is that it did not get any. In the first place we have a constitutional question. That may not mean so much these days, but I would hate to see the time come when it does not mean anything to the House.

Our courts have always held, under the fifth amendment to the Constitution, that taxes must not be capricious; they must not be discriminatory; they must have the essence of equality. In 1870 the Supreme Court held in Collector against Day that we could not tax the salaries of State employees. In 1939 Mr. Justice Stone overruled that opinion in Collector against Day, and then we passed a bill taxing State employees along with Federal employees. We provided that the States could tax Federal employees, provided they did not discriminate against them. Now we are proposing to discriminate against State employees, of whom I understand there will be 158,000 or more eligible for retirement, by virtually eliminating all retired Federal employees from income taxes. That is about what it amounts to. I understand there will be only 1 percent left to pay. In addition to a tax-free $1,440 income, if single, the taxpayer receives $500 exemption; if a married man, he receives $1,000; if a married man with two children, his exemption is $2,000 and all are allowed deductions. It leaves about 1 percent who will be subject to tax.

It is estimated that the average income in this Nation next year will be $2,207. When we last had up an income-tax bill, Mr. Murray, of the CIO, said we should not tax anybody with an income of less than $2,500. I understand that is still his position. In order to get revenue to finance about 45 percent of our war spending—and that is all we did, because we have been having a forty-five- or fifty-billion-dollar deficit, and we will have a $30,000,000,000 deficit this year—we had to impose 3 percent on all over $500; then 19 percent in the lower brackets, which was heavy. I will agree it was heavy.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MAY. With a $30,000,000,000 deficit for this year, what will be the public debt?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The public debt, so the Secretary of the Treasury tells me, would amount to $272,000,000,000, because he has a right nice little nest egg of cash. I think the cash is between fifteen and seventeen billion dollars. I offered the suggestion that with $30,000,000,000 added to it we would be pushing the $300,000,000,000 limit. He said fortunately that would not occur.

Now, in the highest peacetime year the actual expenditures were only $8,400,000,000. I do not know what we propose to spend in the first peacetime Budget, which will be fiscal 1947, but it is generally talked about as a $25,000,000,000 Budget. That is 300 percent more than any peacetime expenditure before, and if we apply the principle of this bill to all of similar income we will have a tax rate below any peacetime tax rate in the last 10 years.

So the proposal of this bill really amounts to this: We will spend 300 percent more, and tax less than we did in peacetime. That adds up in the end, Mr. Chairman, to bankruptcy, and it cannot add up to anything else. It would mean a lack of faith to those who have bought bonds on the assurance that there could be no sounder or safer security than the obligations of their Government. It adds up to failing to keep faith with the 11,000,000 men who fought for the preservation of representative democracy, because in the midst of financial chaos no democracy will survive.

Why do I say we would be called upon to extend this? Because already this morning I have received a letter from the National Education Association of the United States demanding the same thing. Mr. Frank W. Hubbard, director of the research division of this association, under date of September 26, writes as follows, and I ask your attention while I read it:

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., September 26, 1945.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
House Ways and Means Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned has been asked to call the attention of the House Ways and Means Committee to certain tax problems facing the teaching profession. These problems have been brought before the Bureau of Internal Revenue and other officials of the United States Treasury several times, but they are of the opinion that the solution is a legislative rather than an administrative matter. The National Education Association, therefore, speaking for the teaching profession, asks that the House Ways and Means Committee consider these problems when it convenes for the purpose of revising tax legislation this fall.

The three problems in question are: (1) The withholding exemption applied to teachers employed for a school year of less than 12 months, (2) the deductibility of summer-school expenses when attendance at summer school is a required business expense, and (3) the exemption from taxation of a portion of the retirement allowance of retired teachers.

1. The majority of public-school teachers are paid in 9, 10, or less number of monthly payments. The Bureau of Internal Revenue has ruled that the available yearly withholding exemption must be applied as if these teachers were paid in 12 monthly payments. This ruling works a hardship upon teachers in that a greater amount is withheld from each monthly pay check than is necessary for the annual tax due. Although the law provides for later adjustment, teachers are in the meantime unable to enjoy the purchasing power of the amount unduly withheld. Teachers' salaries are in the beginning so low that this extra withholding causes unnecessary hardship. The adjustment of the withholding exemption would considerably ease the financial burden of present tax rates upon these low salaries.

2. In a number of school districts, and often by State law, teachers are required to attend summer school in order to retain their positions and their licenses to teach. The expenses of attendance at summer school is a business expense for teachers, but because it results in professional improvement, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has refused to permit its deduction. Perhaps it is true that those who attend summer school for the purpose of self-improvement, primarily, or to qualify for a raise in salary, or for any other voluntary reason should not deduct the expenses incurred. However, when the attendance at summer school is a requirement the expense becomes a business expense; and since such attendance is applicable to all teachers in a school system or in a State, and recurs at stated intervals, the expense becomes an ordinary business expense—ordinary in the business life of a public-school teacher. Furthermore, the Bureau's denial of this deduction seems inconsistent with other rulings of the Bureau; for example, a teacher's expenses in research work are deductible. Hence, if a teacher attends classes his expenses are not deductible, but if he does research work during the summer such expenses are deductible.

3. With regard to the exemption of a part of the retired teacher's income from taxation, there are two bills already before Congress: H. R. 2330 introduced by Congressman WEISS provides for the exemption of the first $2,000 of pension or annuity received in any year. This bill applies to public employees in general and to employees of nonprofit (tax-free) corporations. H. R. 456 introduced by Congressman KEOGH would exempt the first $1,440 of all retirement allowances regardless of the source thereof. There is also H. R. 577 introduced by Congressman REES which applies to civil-service employees of the Federal Government and provides for the exemption of civil-service annuities in their entirety. It is difficult to see why civil-service employees of the Federal Government should be given this exemption if other public employees do not have the same privilege.

I agree with him. I cannot see why one type of public employees should be taxed and another exempted, nobody else can see it and be logical because there is no logic in it. You are proposing to discriminate in behalf of the Government Federal employees and you are doing it, in my opinion, in an unconstitutional manner.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I consider the statement just read as unanswerable.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I fully agree with the gentleman; you cannot answer it. You can say, if you want to, that we sympathize with those of small income. But the reason you should leave this matter to the Ways and Means Committee is that in our next tax bill we intend to go as far as the spending program of the Congress will permit in increasing the exemptions so that those in the lower income brackets will suffer no undue hardship. We want, however, to carry out the constitutional requirements for equality of taxation. What are you going to say to your school teacher, your policeman, your fireman, your company pensioner, and the millions of others, if we give this special treatment to a few retired Government workers?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman from Virginia has raised some pretty strong issues in connection with this bill and I believe he has presented them fairly. I feel that the difficulty I have in dealing with legislation in many instances comes not from the fact that the argument taken as a whole is sound but that in the application of the argument when we get down here to Congress we never have a chance to vote on the entire issue as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has expounded it. What we are faced with is the fact that by order of the Speaker this

bill went to a certain committee and they have reported it.

We are told that if this covered teachers, policemen, firemen, and every Federal, State, and municipal employee, it would be sound and ought to be passed. I agree with that position and I think the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], expressed it very well. We are faced here with a proposition that we have one group of annuitants out of all the groups that we feel should be entitled to some relief. The question is, having this opportunity shall we pass it up and wait perhaps forever for an opportunity to act in favor of a larger group?

I feel that these people at the age of 68 and 70 with a small income—$1,440 is named, but the amount of money they receive is in some instances $500 or $600—ought to be allowed to keep the money that is paid to them. At the time the agreement was reached when they went to work they thought they would get the whole of it. To tax this small amount I do not believe is necessary.

So far as committees are concerned, I would like to have had a report from the Ways and Means Committee on this bill. I would like to have them bring forward a bill that will cover all annuitants. Then we could thresh the whole matter out, but in the meantime we must act on this one. Therefore, as I would support a similar bill for school teachers because I believe they are entitled to such protection and as I would support such a bill for other annuitants, I will support this one.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I call attention to the fact that 25,000,000 of the present taxpayers have an income of less than $2,000 and they will stay on the tax rolls until general relief is given. Under this bill we will be giving relief to 75,000 retired Government workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would suggest that the individuals we are talking about today are people who have reached the age of 68 and 70 years. We are not talking about the group who still has a chance to earn an income as they go along. These people we are talking about today are past their income-earning years.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is the income of those people less valuable than the income of the man who earns $2,000 a year?

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I seem to be between two fires and I am not sure whether I am supposed to answer either one. So far as I am concerned, the action of the House on this bill will be some indication to the Ways and Means Committee as to how the House feels with reference to the payment of taxes on annuities.

Mr. Chairman, every committee of this House has more than it can handle in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Certainly that is true of the Ways and Means Committee. To show how difficult it is for groups to get proper protection when legislation on a large scale is being considered by a committee, we have seen the unemployment compensation bill recently sidetracked by the Ways and Means Committee. Included within the terms of that bill was a provision for Federal workers who have no unemployment compensation at the present time. They do not receive a cent under the State compensation acts. At the Springfield Armory from 12,000 to 15,000 men and women since May 1, 1945, have lost their jobs. They were loyal. They were urged to stay on the job and not seek permanent employment in companies elsewhere because they were making a very important weapon, the Garand rifle. They stayed there until the job ran out. There is no State unemployment compensation for them. I would like to see that bill brought up for consideration so that we might have a chance to act favorably on it. I feel certain that a majority of Congress would vote for the provision for Federal unemployment compensation.

This provision should be retroactive in scope to May 1, 1945, at least, since the termination of the hostilities with Germany caused many contracts to be canceled with resulting loss of employment to war workers.

I would also call the attention of the House to the fact that Government workers in arsenals have their wages determined by wage surveys. These wage surveys cover a considerable area surrounding the city in which the arsenal is located. Throughout this war, the Federal employees at the Springfield Armory have received less than the average wage paid in private plants in and about Springfield for the same type of work. A wage survey was in progress at the time that President Roosevelt proclaimed his "hold the line" order. The survey was completed and showed that substantial increases in pay should be made to many classes of employees at the Armory. They were denied these increases by the ruling of the War Department that the President's order prevented them from putting into effect the findings of the survey.

Not only did employees in surrounding private plants receive higher pay than the armorers, but, in those cases where their employment did not prove to be permanent at the end of hostilities, these men and women became eligible for Massachusetts State unemployment compensation at the rate of $21 a week for 23 weeks. Since the rifle is a war product, it was evident that most of the armorers must lose their jobs when the war ended. There is no Federal unemployment compensation today which can be made available to them. For that reason, I hope that the members of the Ways and Means Committee, who have raised the question of jurisdiction on the present bill to tax annuities reported by the Civil Service Committee, will see to it that further consideration of the unemployment compensation bill shall be given shortly. By postponing the present consideration of the bill, hardship has been visited upon many Federal employees who are deserving of unemployment compensation. The people of every State in the Union have provided such compensation by State laws for employees in private plants. It is only fair that a benefit which is available to one group of our citizens shall be made equally available by this Congress to the thousands of loyal and patriotic men and women of America who helped to win the war on the production line in Government plants.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, this is indeed a very important measure.

Everybody, of course, would like to give relief to low-income people of this country. Nobody would like to withhold from them the consideration that is here proposed. Yet we have a responsibility that we must meet. We have the credit of your Nation and mine that has to be protected. We have 85,000,000 bondholders that are entitled to protection. If this type of relief is going to be given to every special group that comes along and says that they deserve it, it will simply wreck the revenue program of this country. It is not a question of what we would like to do. It is a question of what should be done under the stern realities that are facing us. If this relief is given to this small group of retired Federal employees you cannot in all fairness and equity and in sound logic say that similar relief should not be given to all the other people of this country. When you allow this $1,440 credit against gross income and then the person gets $500 specific exemption that he is entitled to under the law now, that means $1,940 exemption for this small group of retired Federal employees. If you extend that same type of treatment to all the other taxpayers of this country, which would only be fair and right, it would mean a loss of more than $7,000,000,000 of revenue, and for 1946 it is estimated that the individual income-tax revenue will only amount to about $13,500,000,000, so that it would mean that you would lose more than half of the individual income-tax revenue. It is time for us to give careful consideration to a matter of this kind. These retired Federal employees are receiving the same type of fair treatment that other people of the country receive today. Only 3 percent is collected on the amount that is paid in, because it is estimated that the fund earns 3 percent, so that 3 percent of their contribution to the fund is treated as income and the balance of their annuity is excluded for income. When the entire amount excluded equals their total contribution, the entire annuity is included in income. It is on a fair basis. We could not justify action here today in allowing this type of discrimination in favor of the retired employees of the Federal Government and

thereby discriminate against all of the other people of this country; thousands of them who are living on annuities. You have your local school teachers, the farmers, the policemen, as well as beneficiaries under private retirement plans of industry throughout the Nation.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman have any figures available to show a breakdown of the seventy-thousand-odd annuitants who are receiving annuities under the Federal plan which will indicate the wage or annuity classification in which they fall? I would like to know, for instance, how many people are receiving annuities in excess of $2,000 a year. I am told that there are a large number.

Mr. COOPER. I do not have those figures before me.

Mr. KEEFE. How many are receiving annuities in the various brackets that would be affected by taxation?

Mr. COOPER. I do not have full figures on that. But I submit that the Committee on the Civil Service reporting this bill should have provided that type of information. We do know that there are some few retired Federal employees receiving as high as $5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee.

In reply to the inquiry made by the gentleman from Wisconsin——

Mr. COOPER. Do not yield to me if you want to make a speech yourself. Go ahead and make it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thought the gentleman wanted the information.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from Kansas has the time. The gentleman from Wisconsin asked for that information. As a member of the committee the gentleman should have already given that information.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee talked about the number of recipients and about those who are receiving thousands of dollars of income, and all that sort of thing. There are 1,803 who receive annuities of more than $1,440 per annum, so that less than 2½ percent of the recipients receive more than $1,440. So there are 1,803 out of the total of 76,551 who receive more than $1,440 annually. This is in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Then as to the 1,803, they would be receiving an exemption credit of $1,940 under the terms of this bill, $1,440 plus $500 normal exemption.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman does not have the complete statement.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the rule making H. R. 2948 in order, and when the bill comes up for final passage I shall vote against the bill.

My primary reason for opposing this legislation is because it is discriminatory in that it gives one class of our citizens a tax advantage over other classes. One of the cardinal principles of taxation is that the tax should not be discriminatory. Now, what is proposed in this bill? Its sole purpose is to give retired Government workers a tax advantage over all other taxpayers. Manifestly this is not right. Under the law at present the ordinary citizen and the Government employee, whether active or retired, is given a tax exemption, if single, of $500, and if married $1,000, plus a further exemption of $500 for each dependent. This legislation would give the Government employee, if retired, an exemption of $1,440, which, plus the exemption under the general tax law of $500, would make a total exemption of $1,940. Of course, the retired Government employee if married would be entitled to a further exemption of $500, making a total of $2,440, and in addition $500 for each dependent. Only about 1 percent of the 77,000 retired Government employees have retirement benefits of over $1,900; hence 99 percent of the retired Government employees would not pay one penny income tax to the Federal Government.

Now, may I ask, why give this exemption to retired Federal employees and not extend the same consideration to retired State employees—to school teachers, policemen, firemen, clerical workers, and so forth? And, may I also ask, even if extended to State employees, why exempt retired Federal and State employees and not exempt other citizens falling in the same income class? If the same treatment is accorded all citizens in the same income class—and it should be if we give this special treatment to retired Federal employees — the Government would lose something like $7,000,000,000 in revenue.

Another cardinal principle of taxation is that the tax burden should be distributed in such a way that the burden will fall, as far as possible, upon those best able to pay. This legislation would destroy this great principle in that it would place the tax burden in the lower-income group upon those least able to pay. Why? Simply because those in the lower-income group of retired workers best able to pay are those who draw retirement pay. Farmers and millions of laborers do not draw retirement pay, and many of these people when they retire do not have a single thing to fall back on and are right up against it, and yet under the terms of this legislation these people would be given no relief.

This is class legislation pure and simple, and should be defeated.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury, our distinguished and beloved friend, Fred Vinson, in a letter he wrote to me on September 21 about this matter says this:

> As the report of your committee on this bill indicates, old-age benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act at present enjoy exemption from Federal income tax. While these benefits are not strictly pensions in the usual sense of the word, much of what I have said regarding special pension or retirement income exemptions would appear to be applicable to them. It is the view of this Department that the benefits under both the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act should be recognized as income and their tax status governed by the generally applicable revenue laws.

There has been some talk here about jurisdiction. I say that if the Committee on Ways and Means raise the question of jurisdiction, why have they not abolished the exemption held under Social Security, which is entirely within their jurisdiction? Fifty million people are covered by that act. They have done nothing about it. They have not attempted to do anything about it, yet it is exclusively within their jurisdiction.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The annuity they receive is so very small, anyway, that it would amount to very little. It would practically amount to nothing.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The amount these people receive is so small it amounts to very little.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That exemption was not made by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I understand that, but the Treasury exempted them and the Committee on Ways and Means has not done anything about it.

They talk about discrimination in favor of this group. The very opposite is true. Who is exempted now from the income tax? Army and Navy pensions are all exempted, and those men contribute nothing to their retirement pay. The social-security beneficiaries are exempted by action of the Treasury Department. The beneficiaries of the Railroad Retirement Act are exempted by action of this Congress. The group that is not exempted is this one, with which this bill deals. All we are asking you to do is not to discriminate in favor of these people but to remove a discrimination against them in favor of millions of other people in this country, under similar legislation.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I cannot yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The gentleman misquoted the law as to Army and Navy pensions. The gentleman ought to be willing to be corrected.

Mr. RAMSPECK. All right; go ahead.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The regular retirement pay of Army and Navy men is subject to full tax. It is only the compensation of wounded soldiers which is free from income tax.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am glad the gentleman corrected me on that.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. That is not entirely correct. It is correct that the retirement pay of an Army man is exempt unless he is retired for disability incidental to his service. But he does have the right to elect to take the maximum portion of it as compensation from the Veterans' Administration, and in that case it is no longer taxable.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. Now, then, we have had that question straightened out.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Members pass on this question on its merits. I make this proposition to my distinguished and beloved friend, the gentleman from North Carolina: Let us remove this discrimination against these poor old people who get an average annuity of $960, most of whom are in their seventies and eighties and one of whom is 100 years of age. Then, if the gentleman wants to consider the whole question of exemption, let the great Committee on Ways and Means bring in a bill abolishing all of them and we will pass on all of them at one time and pass on them fairly. I think that is a fair proposition. Let us remove this discrimination now and put these people on the same basis as those under social security and railroad retirement. Let us treat them fairly. Let them bring in the whole question of taxation as to whether anybody is going to be exempt or not, and, if so, for how much, and treat them all alike. Then I will be willing to meet them here on that proposition. But they are undertaking here to continue a discrimination against people who are no longer able to earn; against people who are struggling with the high cost of living and trying to get along on a mere pittance; against old men and old women who need this exemption because they do not have enough money to meet the increased cost of living. I say to you in all seriousness I believe we will save money in passing this bill because if it had not been for one or two of us on the Committee on Civil Service you would have had a bill in here last year, a Senate bill already passed by that body, costing over $11,000,000 which would have increased these annuities by 15 percent. Just a few of us on the committee held out, and the committee did not act on it. If this bill is not passed, you will have renewed pressure for that. The people affected by this act are the rural letter carriers, the city letter carriers, and the post-office clerks, and various other people who have served this Government faithfully for more than 30 years. The vast majority of the seventy-odd thousand people affected by this act, with the exception of those who retired because of disability, have put in 30 years of faithful service. They could not retire until they were 60 years of age. They have just a few years left to live and they ought to have this discrimination removed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 18. None of the moneys mentioned in this act shall be assignable, either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, or attachment, garnishment, taxation, or other legal process: *Provided, however*, That the exemption from taxation as provided herein shall apply only to so much of any annuity as does not exceed $1,440 in any calendar year."

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the enactment of this proposed legislation. I want to make it clear in the first instance that I am not opposed to it because of any jurisdictional question or because I feel that this measure should not have been brought before the House from any committee except the Committee on Ways and Means. I think the question before the House today as to the passage of this measure should be decided wholly on its merits. I submit to the membership, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is highly discriminatory. I do not think anybody will deny that fact. It is discrimination in favor of retired Federal employees. Just because it is a pension from the Federal Government is no argument why it should be exempt, unless you are going to argue that every citizen in the United States who has an income from a pension fund, whether it be a city employee, whether it be from a teachers' retirement fund, or whether it be from investments he made throughout his life. I think they should all be treated on the same level. If you are going to pick out a pensioner from the Federal Government and give him special exemptions, I say it is not fair to the millions of other persons in the country who subsist on a pension.

There has been an appeal to the membership on the basis that these pensioners receive only a small amount of money. The bill makes no provision that only those shall be entitled to exemption who have a small income. If a pensioner has an income of $50,000 and receives a pension, he is entitled to this extra exemption of $1,440. So you are not doing anything but discriminating in favor of a special class, no matter what their income is. If you provided in this measure, "A person who has no other income from any other source is entitled to this exemption," that would be a different matter. But any Government employee who has worked in Washington for 20 or 30 years, if he has been at all prudent, has other income aside from this pension. These pensions run up as high as $5,000. A pensioner receiving $5,000 gets a special exemption of $1,440. Is that fair to any person who keeps on working after he is 60 or 65 years of age? You are placing an extra burden on every other taxpayer by creating this special exemption.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is too highly discriminatory. If you consider it from the over-all tax picture, it should not be passed. If the question came up to exempt every pensioner in the United States, no matter from what source, then would come the question, If pensioners all over the United States, no matter from what source they receive their pension, should be exempt, why not say that every person in the United States, no matter from what source his income is derived, is entitled to the same amount of exemption? That is the point. It is too highly discriminatory. Legislation should be passed only with a view as to the over-all picture, and not because some of these people may be old or something like that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee in its good judgment will defeat this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, let us hold counsel together for a few moments, and consider this measure and its implications when and if it becomes law, and what is likely to transpire when you men and women return home to visit with your constituents.

If this bill is finally passed and becomes law, you will have any number of people stop you on the street and say, "Bill, why did you vote to exempt Federal employees from paying income taxes? Why did you vote for a bill that will give those in the higher brackets $1,440 exemption, plus $500 that they now get under the general tax law?" "Well," you will say, "they cannot pay it." "That may be true, but what have you done for me? It is also hard for me to pay Federal taxes. They are high. I am a retired teacher. I draw only $75 a month retirement pay. What did you try to do for me, Bill?" And Bill is going to be put to it to answer it; and Bill is going to be kept busy from the time he steps out of his automobile back in the district until he returns to Washington. In a few days he will be counting the days when he can leave the district, without losing face, and get away from the criticism that the enactment of such legislation as this is going to heap upon his sorely perplexed head.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman means that Bill will be perplexed only for the time that he stays.

Mr. KNUTSON. Bill will be perplexed all the time he is in the district. And when the votes are counted Bill is going to comment upon the cruelty of fate. You cannot afford to pass legislation like this which singles out one group for preferred tax treatment.

I hope everyone present listened attentively to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]. His argument is unanswerable—to think of granting $1,940 tax exemption to retired Government workers in the higher brackets, men and women who have been working for the Government for years,

who have been getting 30 days annual leave and 15 days sick leave, with few worries during the depression. How are Members going to justify voting for a proposition like this, Mr. Chairman? They cannot do it and none will be able to get away with it because some young clever fellow is going to get into the game in your district and he is going to say: "Well, Bill took care of that little group, but what did he do for you farmers or you workingmen or you small businessmen? Did he get you out of paying Federal incomes taxes?"

I am not talking of the ethics of the thing. The bill, of course, should have gone to the Ways and Means Committee; but that is water over the wheel. Let us look at its practical application. It is dynamite, gentlemen, it is dynamite; and I want to plead with you on this side of the aisle not to commit political harakiri by voting for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I wish to say in answer to the gentleman from Minnesota that every argument he makes applies with equal force to the exemptions now in existence for beneficiaries under the social-security law. They apply with even greater force, because under the Social Security Act many men who are wealthy and work for corporations receive those benefits, and if they die and leave a widow or children the benefit in some cases far exceeds anything that is possible under the Civil Service Retirement Act. So I say to the gentleman from Minnesota, why do not he and other members of the Ways and Means Committee bring in a bill repealing the exemption which is now enjoyed by the beneficiaries under the Social Security Act?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I believe the gentleman is on good ground there; I believe his contention is absolutely right. All should be treated alike.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is exactly what I am arguing now.

Mr. KNUTSON. And I will propose to the committee that we take all exempted taxpayers off the exempt list.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Until that bill is brought to the floor let us do justice to these people and put them on the same basis as those that are under the gentleman's jurisdiction.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to make an effort not to repeat arguments that have been made on this proposition unless what I am about to say has been said during the time I was absent from the Chamber.

For many years, for more than a quarter of a century, I have been interested in the very people this bill is supposed to grant special benefits to. They have all been friends of mine and I do not know of anything that gives a Congressman more joy, more genuine happiness, than to go back to his district and to say to any group: "Did you see what I did for you?" Of course, they are delighted. You figure it means a great many votes.

It is not pleasant to stand up here at this time when you are offering a special group some benefits that you are not giving to other people. I want to say that the real issue involved here is the question of whether or not we are going to have continuity in our revenue system. I do not know of a time that it has been more important for the Ways and Means Committee to retain jurisdiction over revenue measures than at this time. I know the individual members of the Ways and Means Committee, including myself, would like to bring relief to all the taxpayers of the country who have carried a tremendous burden during this war. We would like to be able to reduce it not only for individuals but we would like to reduce taxes, if possible, for industry, for the individual proprietorships and partnerships and all. Why? So that they can give jobs to people during the reconversion period in order to head out into prosperity and to normal conditions again.

If these bills are brought in here piecemeal, as this one has been, and if this bill is passed now without any consideration on the part of the committee that should have had jurisdiction of it, all of this talk about trying to do something for the great masses of people throughout the country and about creating jobs goes into the ash can. You have simply destroyed all of the efforts that have been made during the past few months by different organizations to try to work out a postwar tax bill that will stimulate industry and encourage private investors to use their capital in order to build up the pay rolls of this country and to create more jobs with the idea of stopping inflation. All of those questions are involved here.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. If this measure should become law, would there not immediately spring up a demand that the Military Affairs Committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries bring in similar legislation to take care of the retired in those branches of the services?

Mr. REED of New York. That is undoubtedly true. I have the utmost respect for the chairman of the Civil Service Committee here and also for the gentleman who is leading the fight on the minority side, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], but I know just exactly what those gentlemen would say if we were to attempt to usurp the jurisdiction of their committee. Our form of government cannot work unless under the committee system the integrity and the jurisdiction of each committee is preserved. We must do that today, or, I am telling you, we will have the most terrific reaction generally throughout the country on the coming tax bill that we have ever had over any legislation in this country.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It seems to me it is rather strange to try to increase the incentive to people to go to the Government and get a political job for themselves when we ought to have a bill here demobilizing those in the Government service and getting some of the people off the Government pay roll.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks.

Mr. Chairman, we must be fair to the public generally. If we grant this exemption of $1,440 and the other exemption of $500 or a total of $1,940 that has been mentioned before, we cannot go before the country without offering the same $1,940 exemption to other persons throughout the country. That means $7,000,000,000 added to the tax burden, and away go the tax reductions, and away go the incentive to build up industries and pay rolls in this country.

The correction of the erroneous reference of public bills is governed by rule XXII, sections 1, 2 and 3, which provide for the introduction, reference to committees and change of reference of petitions, memorials, bills, and resolutions. Under section 3 of this rule, the erroneous reference of a public bill may be corrected by the House without debate in accordance with rule XI—relating to the jurisdiction of committees—on any day immediately after the reading of the Journal, by unanimous consent, or on motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction, or on the report of the committee to which the bill has been erroneously referred—IV, 3364. According to the later practice the erroneous reference of a public bill, if it remain uncorrected, in effect gives jurisdiction to the committee receiving it—IV, 4365–71. It is too late to move a change of reference after such committee has reported the bill—Speaker Clark, December 15, 1917, page 349.

The correction of the erroneous reference of public bills is, then:

First. Without debate—rule XI, section 3.

Second. Immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Third. And is made: (a) by unanimous consent, (b) on the authorized motion of the committee claiming jurisdiction, or (c) on the report of the committee to which the bill was erroneously referred.

The motion is privileged only when formally authorized by the committee to which referred or the committee claiming jurisdiction—VII, 2121–2123. Such motions are open to amendment but the amendment, like the original motion, is subject to the requirement that it be authorized by the proper committee—VII, 2127. The following is the proper form of resolution by the appropriate committee, authorizing a motion to re-refer:

Resolved by the Committee on ——— of the United States House of Representatives, That the chairman of the committee be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appear upon the floor of the House of Representatives at the first opportunity available to him and to move to re-refer H. R. ———, a

bill to ———, introduced by the gentleman from ——— [Mr. ———], on ———, from the Committee on ——— to the Committee on ———.

Upon moving to re-refer, the chairman will thereupon say:

CHAIRMAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on ———, I move to re-refer the bill, H. R. ——— to ——— and for other purposes, from the Committee on ——— to the Committee on ———.

SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to re-refer the bill H. R. ——— from the Committee on ——— to the Committee on ———.

Reference of a public bill is subject to correction at any time before the bill has been reported, although the committee to which referred may have held hearings and have given the bill extended consideration—VII, 2127, 2128. The re-reference of one section of a bill would carry with it the entire bill—VIII, 2326.

Motions for change in reference:

First. Must be authorized by the committee claiming jurisdiction—Section 354; 65-2-2068.

Second. Must apply to a single bill and not to a class of bills—VII, 2125.

Third. Must not apply to bill identical with one already reported—VII, 2125.

Fourth. Must apply to a bill erroneously referred—VII, 2125.

Fifth. May be amended if amendment is authorized by the committee claiming jurisdiction—VII, 2127.

Sixth. May not be divided—VII, 2125.

Seventh. May not be debated—VII, 2126-2128.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin: Page 1, line 6, after the word "act", insert "or moneys received by recipients of State, county, city, or village retirement payments."

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Georgia please withhold his point of order?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I will be glad to.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to issue a discordant note in this discussion, but last Saturday on my way home I stopped at a filling station to get some gas. The chap buttonholed me right away and wanted to know if I was going to vote for such and such a bill, because he was much interested in it. So I said, "Why are you interested?" He said, "Why, I get $147 a month and my wife gets $100, and we have to pay considerable taxes on that, and we would like to have that bill passed to cut down our taxes." I said, "My good friend, you know in the country I am from the hired hands out on the farm get $50 a month and have to pay $75 a year income tax. People receiving from $15 to $20 per week are having a high percentage of their wages withheld each month. Congress has made many commitments that they are not fulfilling too well these days." I said, "You probably do not know it, but you ask one of your many other customers, Mr. WICKERSHAM, of Oklahoma, and he will tell you that eggs are only 24 cents a dozen in Oklahoma, when 90 percent of parity guaranteed by law is 31.5 cents per dozen. So before I vote for any bill to take money out of the Treasury I am going to vote to put enough in the Treasury and keep enough there to fulfill our commitments made to the food producers during the war. So I am sorry I cannot support your bill next week," and I did not the other day and I shall not today. But regardless of that, I do say if we are going to enter into this field of special legislation for the few at the expense of the many, at least we should include the people in the States and the cities and the counties who are recipients of these same kinds of payments. I think most anybody would be willing to go that far, and I am very much surprised that my distinguished colleague would object to my amendment. We have legislation for the few at the expense of the many. The hearts bleed but only for the few.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order, not because of any disagreement with the gentleman's argument, but because I think this subject should be voted on on its merits.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin wish to be heard?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill under consideration deals strictly with civil-service retirement benefits to Federal employees. The gentleman's amendment would include all recipients of State, county, city, and village retirement benefits. It is very clearly outside of the scope of the bill, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I have not suggested that this bill should have gone before the Committee on Ways and Means because my feelings are hurt. I am not a member of that committee. The reason this bill should have gone before the Committee on Ways and Means is because that committee is wholly responsible for maintaining an equitable and just tax structure, and the Civil Service Commission is not, or is any other committee of the House. This is important and should be emphasized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAY moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill, H. R. 2948, back forthwith to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield my 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, if I may.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman cannot do that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. He can yield time while he is holding the floor.

Mr. MAY. I yield part of my time, then, to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, for the first time in a number of years we are now preparing to bring in a tax-relief bill. The bills we have been bringing in for a number of years have been bills to increase taxation, made necessary especially, of course, by the large expenditures on account of the war.

In my judgment, the way we determine this matter here today will have very much to do with what action will be taken in the future with respect to general taxation relief legislation. The distinguished gentleman, the silver-tongued orator from Georgia, my good friend [Mr. RAMSPECK], very adroitly tries to dodge the issue by saying, "Why does not the Committee on Ways and Means bring in legislation repealing the exemptions given in respect to the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act?" Why has he not been before our committee asking such a change in the tax laws with respect to that legislation? If his reason is that there is a discrimination in favor of these two classes, the way to correct the wrong is not to repeat the wrong. The way to correct two mistakes is not to make a third mistake, as the gentleman proposes to do.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield to me to answer the question?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am glad to answer the gentleman's question. I am not a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The door is always open. We hold public hearings all the time. If the gentleman spent as much time trying to help the Committee on Ways and Means remove what he admits is a discrimination as he has spent on this bill, it perhaps would not be necessary to bring in this legislation. That is an adroit move to strengthen this bill; that is all it is. That is a flank attack.

Mr. RAMSPECK. May I say in reply to the gentleman from North Carolina that my committee has no jurisdiction over the Railroad Retirement Act, over the Social Security Act, or over taxes in general, and I have not advocated the repeal of either one of the exemptions enjoyed by those under such legislation.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Yes; but the gentleman challenges us to do it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman from North Carolina read a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury advocating their repeal. The gentleman has in his committee a bill proposing to widen the exemptions and include State, county, and municipal employees. It has been there for months and months, but the gentleman's committee has not taken any action on it.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It is very easy to widen exemptions and it is very easy to extend reductions of taxes, but when you come to denying relief it is quite difficult.

In conclusion, may I say that a bill of this importance with the implications of this bill should not have been brought in here without our being given time to explain the ramifications of this bill and its implications. I am not criticizing the Committee on Rules, but as to bringing it in here with 1 hour of general debate, when everyone knows it covers the whole field of taxation, we should have been

given more time to explain it and to explain our opposition to it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. COX. I want to make answer, at least for myself as a member of the Committee on Rules, that I offer my apologies to the House for voting to bring this measure before it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, there is no one in this House with any more admiration or affection for the gentleman from North Carolina than I have. I was named after him. We are both named Bob. But he has a great committee that has been sitting on this question for many, many months. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] called your attention to the fact that they have bills pending dealing with this subject.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. May I call to the attention of the gentleman the fact that we in the Committee on Ways and Means have not been idle these many months.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No, I did not say the gentleman's committee has been idle. But the gentleman from North Carolina is talking about wanting time. There is absolutely nothing to prevent the Committee on Ways and Means, after we dispose of this bill on its merits, from bringing to this House any legislation they want to dealing with the whole question. Therefore, I appeal to you to vote on this thing on its merits.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The gentleman knows that in the short time that we will have to get a tax bill through the House and the Senate and on the statute books, which tax bill we propose to bring out, we will not have the time to explore the tax situation. If we do that, we will get no relief whatever for 1946. It will be impossible.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It does not have to come in necessarily as part of that bill. But the gentleman's committee can at any time, this month, next month, or in November or December, bring in legislation dealing with this whole question.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, in view of my liberality toward the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from North Carolina, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, this is the second time in my 15 years of service in the House that I have offered a preferential motion to strike out the enacting clause. I have done so this time for the same reason as I did the first time, namely, to avoid a controversy between two of the high and important committees of the House of Representatives. I think we ought to vote on this thing and get it out of the way.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I disagree with the gentleman from Kentucky. We have only a few more minutes of debate, and we can vote on this thing on its merits. This is just a parliamentary maneuver to try to prevent a real vote on the merits. I ask you to vote down this motion and let us then vote on this bill, which we will do in a few moments, and vote on it on its merits. Then, if the Committee on Ways and Means wants to bring in legislation of a general nature, they have that opportunity, and the House can then pass on the whole question. Let us put these people in a position of equality and justice with those under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act. If we want to change the policies later, that can be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

All time has expired on the motion.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk again read the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAMSPECK) there were—ayes 76, noes 89.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAY and Mr. RAMSPECK.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 98, noes 91.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2948) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation, pursuant to House Resolution 350, he reported the same back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the recommendation of the Committee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAMSPECK) there were—ayes 99, noes 85.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just counted. Evidently no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 146, nays 177, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—146

Andersen, H. Carl	Bates, Ky.	Bradley, Mich.
Andresen, August H.	Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ga.
Arends	Bell	Braumbaugh
Arnold	Bennett, Mo.	Buck
Barrett, Wyo.	Bland	Buffett
	Boren	Burgin
	Boykin	Butler
Camp	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Cannon, Mo.	Hobbs	Rich
Carlson	Hoffman	Richards
Chapman	Holmes, Mass.	Riley
Chelf	Jarman	Rizley
Church	Jenkins	Robertson, Va.
Clements	Jennings	Robinson, Utah
Clevenger	Jensen	Robsion, Ky.
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Calif.	Rockwell
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Ill.	Rodgers, Pa.
Cooley	Johnson, Luther A.	Rogers, Fla.
Cooper	Johnson, Okla.	Russell
Cox	Jones	Schwabe, Okla.
Crawford	Jonkman	Scrivner
Curtis	Judd	Sheppard
Dingell	Kean	Short
Dondero	Keefe	Sikes
Doughton, N. C.	Kinzer	Simpson, Pa.
Drewry	Knutson	Smith, Ohio
Dworshak	Lanham	Spence
Eaton	LeCompte	Springer
Eberharter	Lyle	Stefan
Ervin	McConnell	Stockman
Fellows	McMillen, Ill.	Sumner, Ill.
Fisher	Mahon	Sumners, Tex.
Flannagan	Maloney	Sundstrom
Folger	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Gavin	Mason	Talle
Gillette	May	Tarver
Gillie	Miller, Nebr.	Tibbott
Gossett	Mills	Trimble
Graham	Monroney	Wadsworth
Gregory	Murray, Wis.	Walter
Gross	Norrell	Wasielewski
Gwinn, N. Y.	O'Hara	West
Gwynne, Iowa	Pace	Whitten
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patman	Whittington
Hall, Leonard W.	Peterson, Ga.	Wickersham
Hancock	Phillips	Wigglesworth
Harris	Pickett	Winstead
Hays	Poage	Woodruff, Mich.
Henry	Priest	Worley
	Rankin	

NAYS—177

Adams	Gallagher	Mansfield, Mont.
Allen, Ill.	Gardner	Mansfield, Tex.
Allen, La.	Gary	Marcantonio
Anderson, Calif.	Geelan	Merrow
Angell	Gillespie	Michener
Auchincloss	Goodwin	Miller, Calif.
Bailey	Gordon	Morgan
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gorski	Morrison
Barden	Granahan	Mott
Barrett, Pa.	Grant, Ind.	Neely
Beall	Green	Norton
Beckworth	Griffiths	O'Konski
Bennet, N. Y.	Hale	O'Neal
Biemiller	Halleck	O'Toole
Bishop	Hart	Outland
Blackney	Hartley	Patterson
Bloom	Havenner	Peterson, Fla.
Bradley, Pa.	Healy	Pittenger
Brehm	Hébert	Price, Fla.
Brooks	Hedrick	Quinn, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Rabin
Bryson	Heselton	Ramey
Bunker	Hess	Ramspeck
Byrne, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Randolph
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Rayfiel
Canfield	Holmes, Wash.	Reece, Tenn.
Case, N. J.	Hook	Reed, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Horan	Rees, Kans.
Chenoweth	Howell	Resa
Clason	Huber	Rogers, Mass.
Cochran	Hull	Rogers, N. Y.
Coffee	Izac	Rooney
Cole, Mo.	Jackson	Rowan
Combs	Johnson, Ind.	Ryter
Corbett	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sabath
Cravens	Kearney	Savage
Crosser	Kefauver	Schwabe, Mo.
Cunningham	Kelley, Pa.	Shafer
Curley	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Maine
D'Alesandro	Keogh	Smith, Va.
De Lacy	Kerr	Snyder
Delaney, James J.	Kilday	Somers, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Kirwan	Stigler
Dirksen	Kopplemann	Sullivan
Dolliver	Kunkel	Talbot
Domengeaux	LaFollette	Thom
Douglas, Calif.	Lane	Thomason
Doyle	Larcade	Tolan
Earthman	Latham	Torrens
Elston	Lemke	Towe
Engel, Mich.	Lesinski	Traynor
Engle, Calif.	Lewis	Vinson
Fallon	Link	Voorhis, Calif.
Feighan	Ludlow	Vorys, Ohio
Fernandez	McCormack	Weichel
Flood	McDonough	Weiss
Fogarty	McGlinchey	Welch
Forand	McGregor	Woodhouse
Fulton	Manasco	Woodrum, Va.

NOT VOTING—108

Abernethy	Gibson	Philbin
Andrews, Ala.	Gifford	Ploeser
Andrews, N. Y.	Gore	Plumley
Baldwin, Md.	Granger	Powell
Barry	Grant, Ala.	Price, Ill.
Bender	Hagen	Rabaut
Bolton	Hand	Rains
Bonner	Hare	Rivers
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	Robertson,
Bulwinkle	Harness, Ind.	N. Kak.
Burch	Hendricks	Roe, Md.
Campbell	Herter	Roe, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Hoch	Sadowski
Carnahan	Holifield	Sasscer
Celler	Hope	Sharp
Chiperfield	Kee	Sheridan
Clark	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Colmer	King	Slaughter
Courtney	Landis	Smith, Wis.
Daughton, Va.	Lea	Sparkman
Davis	LeFevre	Starkey
Dawson	Luce	Stevenson
Delaney,	Lynch	Stewart
John J.	McCowen	Taylor
Dickstein	McGehee	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas, Ill.	McKenzie	Thomas, Tex.
Durham	McMillan, S. C.	Vursell
Elliott	Madden	Weaver
Ellis	Martin, Iowa	White
Ellsworth	Mundt	Wilson
Elsaesser	Murdock	Winter
Fenton	Murphy	Wolcott
Fuller	Murray, Tenn.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gamble	O'Brien, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gathings	O'Brien, Mich.	Wood
Gearhart	Patrick	Zimmerman
Geriach	Pfeifer	

So the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the enacting clause be stricken out was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gathings for, with Mr. John J. Delaney against.

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. McCowen against.

Mr. King for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Murdock against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Colmer with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Davis with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.

Mr. BUFFETT and Mr. GILLIE changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending bill do now close.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I renew my motion.

The motion was agreed to

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2948) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation, pursuant to House Resolution 350, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TARVER. I am.

The SPEAKER. Does any Member of the minority who is opposed to the bill wish to offer a motion to recommit?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill. I offer a motion to recommit, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KNUTSON moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 2948) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation, to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the noes had it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 130, not voting 111, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

YEAS—190

Adams	Bradley, Pa.	Cole, Mo.
Allen, Ill.	Brehm	Combs
Allen, La.	Brooks	Corbett
Anderson, Calif.	Brown, Ohio	Cravens
Angell	Braumbaugh	Crosser
Arnold	Bryson	Cunningham
Auchincloss	Bunker	Curley
Bailey	Butler	D'Alesandro
Baldwin, N. Y.	Byrne, N. Y.	De Lacy
Barden	Byrnes, Wis.	Delaney,
Barrett, Pa.	Canfield	James J.
Beall	Case, N. J.	Dirksen
Beckworth	Chelf	Dolliver
Bennet, N. Y.	Chenoweth	Domengeaux
Biemiller	Clason	Douglas, Calif.
Bishop	Clements	Doyle
Blackney	Cochran	Earthman
Bloom	Coffee	Elston
Bradley, Mich.	Cole, Kans.	Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.	Jackson	Patterson
Fallon	Johnson, Ill.	Peterson, Fla.
Feighan	Johnson, Ind.	Pittenger
Flood	Johnson,	Price, Fla.
Fogarty	Lyndon B.	Quinn, N. Y.
Forand	Kearney	Rabin
Fulton	Kefauver	Ramey
Gallagher	Kelley, Pa.	Ramspeck
Gardner	Kelly, Ill.	Randolph
Gary	Keogh	Rayfiel
Geelan	Kerr	Reece, Tenn.
Gillespie	Kilday	Reed, Ill.
Gillie	Kirwan	Rees, Kans.
Goodwin	Kopplemann	Resa
Gordon	Kunkel	Rogers, Mass.
Gorski	LaFollette	Rogers, N. Y.
Granahan	Landis	Rooney
Grant, Ind.	Lane	Rowan
Green	Larcade	Ryter
Griffiths	Latham	Sabath
Hale	Lemke	Savage
Hall	Lesinski	Schwabe, Mo.
Edwin Arthur	Lewis	Shafer
Halleck	Link	Sheppard
Hart	Ludlow	Smith, Maine
Hartley	McCormack	Smith, Va.
Havenner	McDonough	Snyder
Healy	McGlinchey	Somers, N. Y.
Hébert	McGregor	Springer
Hedrick	Manasco	Sullivan
Heffernan	Mansfield, Tex.	Talbot
Heselton	Marcantonio	Thom
Hess	Merrow	Thomason
Hill	Michener	Tolan
Hinshaw	Miller, Calif.	Torrens
Hoch	Morgan	Towe
Hoeven	Morrison	Traynor
Hoffman	Mott	Vinson
Holifield	Murdock	Voorhis, Calif.
Holmes, Wash.	Neely	Vorys, Ohio
Hook	Norton	Vursell
Horan	O'Konski	Walter
Howell	O'Neal	Weichel
Huber	O'Toole	Welch
Hull	Outland	Woodhouse
Izac		

NAYS—130

Andersen,	Graham	Peterson, Ga.
H. Carl	Gregory	Phillips
Andresen,	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pickett
August H.	Gwynne, Iowa	Poage
Arends	Hall,	Priest
Barrett, Wyo.	Leonard W.	Rankin
Bates, Ky.	Hancock	Reed, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Harris	Rich
Bell	Hays	Richards
Bennett, Mo.	Henry	Riley
Bland	Hobbs	Rizley
Boren	Holmes, Mass.	Robertson, Va.
Boykin	Jarman	Robinson, Utah
Brown, Ga.	Jenkins	Robsion, Ky.
Buck	Jennings	Rockwell
Buffett	Jensen	Rodgers, Pa.
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Camp	Johnson,	Russell
Cannon, Mo.	Luther A.	Schwabe, Okla.
Carlson	Johnson, Okla.	Scrivner
Case, S. Dak.	Jones	Short
Chapman	Jonkman	Sikes
Church	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
Clevenger	Kean	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Stefan
Cooley	Kinzer	Stigler
Cooper	Knutson	Stockman
Cox	Lanham	Sumner, Ill.
Crawford	LeCompte	Sundstrom
Curtis	Lyle	Taber
D'Ewart	McConnell	Talle
Dingell	Mahon	Tarver
Dondero	Maloney	Thomas, N. J.
Doughton, N. C.	Mansfield,	Tibbott
Drewry	Mont.	Wadsworth
Dworshak	Mason	Wasielewski
Eaton	May	West
Eberharter	Miller, Nebr.	Whitten
Ervin	Mills	Whittington
Fisher	Monroney	Wickersham
Flannagan	Murray, Wis.	Wigglesworth
Folger	Norrell	Winstead
Gavin	O'Hara	Wood
Gillette	Pace	Woodruff, Mich.
Gossett	Patman	Worley

NOT VOTING—111

Abernethy	Campbell	Delaney,
Andrews, Ala.	Cannon, Fla.	John J.
Andrews, N. Y.	Carnahan	Dickstein
Baldwin, Md.	Celler	Douglas, Ill.
Barry	Chiperfield	Durham
Bender	Clark	Elliott
Bolton	Colmer	Ellis
Bonner	Courtney	Ellsworth
Buckley	Daughton, Va.	Elsaesser
Burch	Davis	Fellows
Burgin	Dawson	Fenton

Fernandez	McCowen	Sadowski
Fuller	McGehee	Sasscer
Gamble	McKenzie	Sharp
Gathings	McMillan, S. C.	Sheridan
Gearhart	McMillen, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Gerlach	Madden	Slaughter
Gibson	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Wis.
Gifford	Martin, Mass.	Sparkman
Gore	Mundt	Spence
Granger	Murphy	Starkey
Grant, Ala.	Murray, Tenn.	Stevenson
Gross	O'Brien, Ill.	Stewart
Hagen	O'Brien, Mich.	Sumners, Tex.
Hand	Patrick	Taylor
Hare	Pfeifer	Thomas, Tex.
Harless, Ariz.	Philbin	Trimble
Harness, Ind.	Ploeser	Weaver
Hendricks	Plumley	Weiss
Herter	Powell	White
Hope	Price, Ill.	Wilson
Kee	Rabaut	Winter
Kilburn	Rains	Wolcott
King	Rivers	Wolfenden, Pa.
Lea	Robertson, N. Dak.	Wolverton, N. J.
LeFevre	Roe, Md.	Woodrum, Va.
Luce	Roe, N. Y.	Zimmerman
Lynch		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. John J. Delaney for, with Mr. Gathings against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Baldwin of Maryland against.

Mr. McCowen for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Fellows with Mr. King.

Mr. Andrews of Florida with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Roe of Maryland with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Gross.

Mr. WADSWORTH and Mr. EBERHARTER changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask uuanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR TO BE CALLED ON TUESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday be dispensed with and that it may be in order to call the Consent Calendar on Tuesday immediately preceding the call of the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF OCTOBER 1

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking what the program will be for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the ship disposal bill, H. R. 3603, comes up. On this bill there will be 3 hours of general debate. Consideration of that bill will continue until Tuesday, following call of the bills on the Consent and Private Calendars.

After disposal of that bill, the so-called reorganization bill will come up for consideration, and it is expected that will take the rest of the week. It is hoped, however, that we may dispose of it by Friday. A number of Members have stated that they have made certain arrangements and plans ahead of time and if the bill is disposed of by Friday I shall ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn until the following Monday. In order to accomplish that it may be that I will ask the House to meet on some if not all of the days that the reorganization bill is being considered at 11 o'clock. I shall confer with the leadership on the other side on that later.

Mr. JENKINS. I am especially interested in knowing whether there is any chance of finishing the reorganization bill and voting on it Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. That would be most pleasant to me.

Mr. JENKINS. Of course, I hope we do not.

Mr. McCORMACK. When I stated that some Members had made arrangements for Friday, it might have been they stated Thursday. I have discussed this with some Members.

Mr. JENKINS. I would sooner the vote come on Friday, but I am just wondering if the gentleman thought the vote might come on Thursday.

Mr. MICHENER. Has the gentleman taken into consideration Nimitz Day on Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman calls that to my attention. We could legislate, if necessary, on Friday. I would like to dispose of the reorganization bill next week. This meeting for Admiral Nimitz will take place on Friday. I had completely overlooked that and I thank the gentleman from Michigan for reminding me of it. I am very anxious to have the reorganization bill disposed of next week. On Wednesday and Thursday probably we will meet at 11 o'clock, and if consideration of the bill is not disposed of on Thursday, we will proceed on Friday after the joint meeting to complete consideration of the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. If consideration of the reorganization bill is concluded on Thursday, there will be no business on Friday, other than the joint session?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM PROVIDED FOR BY ACT OF DECEMBER 20, 1944

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 81.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That for the purposes only as specified in section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (Public Law 521, 78th Cong.), it is hereby found as a fact that the war emergency has been relieved to an extent that will justify proceeding with the highway-construction program provided for by said act, and for the purposes of said act the first postwar fiscal year referred to therein shall be the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there was a rule granted on this bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes. I may say for the benefit of the House that a rule has been granted for the consideration of the bill under which 1 hour's general debate has been provided. However, I have made a careful check of this matter and I do not believe there is any opposition at all to the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MICHENER. There are several members of the committee here. The Members over here on our side are anxious to know what the bill is about.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I will be glad to explain it.

When we passed the Postwar Highway Act, which was approved December 20, 1944, we provided that it should not go into effect until after the war because it was a postwar highway program. Under the terms of the act, therefore, none of the provisions of that law can become effective until we do certain things. The President must determine when the emergency has ceased to exist or a concurrent resolution must be adopted by both Houses. We brought this resolution before the House for the sole purpose of having the Highway Act go into effect and become operative. I am sure it will pass the Senate.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before us with a unanimous report from the Committee on Roads. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], has explained the necessity for this concurrent resolution, because the Postwar Highway Act provides for such a concurrent resolution. This is the time to begin the long-deferred highway-construction program of the country, which is unanimously concurred in by all the State and Federal agencies having to do with road

construction and which I think meets with the full approval of the Congress. I hope, as the gentleman has suggested, that it passes by a unanimous vote.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Without this, as I understand, they cannot proceed; is that right?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is right.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. May I ask when this will go into effect if we adopt this resolution? When would the road-building program get under way?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The fiscal year ends June 30, 1946. We hope to get it started within this fiscal year.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. I would like to know whether or not the basis of distribution of the fund is satisfactory to the majority of the State highway commissioners and the Governors of the several States.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. There was some controversy about the distribution of funds, but the whole thing was finally ironed out, and when the postwar construction bill was reported out it was accompanied by a unanimous-consent report.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for this legislation, as I see it, is due to the fact that the laws authorizing this construction carry the special provision that the war must be over before any of this money can be spent for road construction.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would like to ask my chairman if it is not true that the Highway Act provides that the money shall be expended for 3 years beginning with the first fiscal year following the cessation of hostilities as declared by the President, as declared by concurrent resolution of the Congress, or, in the third place, as declared by concurrent resolution of Congress fixing the first fiscal year only for highway construction, and that the sole purpose and effect of this bill is to provide that the first fiscal year for highway construction shall be the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The gentleman has accurately stated the proposition.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, both the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] have explained the bill. The Committee on Rules has reported a rule which was unanimously adopted, favoring the need of this legislation. I therefore hope that unanimous consent will be given for the consideration of this resolution, which would save an hour and a half or 2 hours' debate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I ask the gentleman from Utah, the chairman of the committee, what effect this declaration that the fiscal year shall be that ending June 30, 1946, will have on the matching by the States?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No effect whatever. That is provided for in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But in a certain sense it will shorten the time in this year for getting under way.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Of course, it will shorten the time, but it will permit the program to go into effect immediately on the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This fiscal year's program will have to get under way immediately in order to take full advantage of this year's allotments.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. It is true, is it not, that nearly all of the States, counties, and cities that intend to proceed with this program have funds available already with which to match these funds?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I may say that I have heard from nearly all the States in the Union and they are all very eager to have this resolution passed. They all tell me they have plans ready to proceed with the work as soon as this resolution is adopted.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. May I say for the benefit of the committee that I have talked to the chairman of the State Highway Commission of New Jersey and have been informed that we already have our postwar plans ready, and that the sooner this Government money is made available the sooner we will be able to go ahead and increase employment in that great State.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to urge the immediate passage of this bill dealing with the postwar highway construction program. This is one of the measures which we have contemplated as cushioning the change from war to peace. It is time now to enact this bill so that the funds necessary for this road program will become effective at the earliest possible opportunity. This measure means much to Montana and the West because we already have laid our plans for highway construction and rehabilitation and we want to be prepared to take care of our veterans when they return and our workers who have been employed in war industries on the Pacific coast. This concurrent resolution should be passed now so that our long deferred and necessary highway program can get under way.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 359 was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California., Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan, and Mr. ERVIN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Times.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a newspaper article.

Mr. HANCOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Secretary of War Patterson.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and further to extend his remarks and include a letter from two constituents.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the scientist who invented the atomic bomb.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a short bill he introduced today.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Creek Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he had given to the newspapers.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION AND PROHIBITING DRAFTING OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS INTO THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a resolution to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting or required enlistment into the Army or Navy of boys under 21, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say in the beginning that it is not my purpose, in introducing this bill, to preempt the authority or prerogatives of the Army or the Navy. I have listened with great interest to the statements of certain of our Army men which were quite enlightening and altogether fairly reassuring. But I did not observe and I do not now observe in the regulations which have been adopted consideration with any particularity of the matters which are adverted to in the bill which I have introduced.

In order that you may know immediately what it is about, I desire to read a part of the bill, as follows:

> There shall be discharged from the military and naval forces of the United States as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit every member of such forces or any component part of either who (a) is on the date of the enactment of this act under the age of 21 years; (b) has on the date of the enactment of this act a wife and one or more children to whom he bears or would maintain, but for his service, a bona fide family relationship in his home; (c) has attained on the date of the enactment of this act or shall thereafter attain the age of 35 years.

Mr. Speaker, I provide in this bill that this act shall not be deemed to affect the program of the Army or Navy as to the discharge of men in the service on other grounds and for other reasons not named in this act, but provide that this act shall be construed as additional requirements in the demobilization and discharge of servicemen from the Army and the Navy. Those are the salient portions of the bill which I have found myself compelled to introduce for the very particular reason that we have been definitely and positively told that no consideration would be given to the fact that a boy is under the age of 21 years in the matter of his discharge. Neither has there been a disposition, so far as I have been able to observe, to give attention to family life in retaining men overseas or in the service since the war has ended. I think these are two of the most important considerations which could move the Army, Navy, or anybody else in the demobilization of the armed forces wherever they may be, whether located in this country, or in camps, or buildings doing what we call desk jobs, or overseas now on patrol duty. These are two considerations, as I view it, which cannot with impunity be neglected by the people of the United States, the Army and the Navy included. It is a serious thing to separate longer than is absolutely necessary the father from the wife and children at home.

Whether they shall have been separated for a period of a year and a half, or 2 years, or 3 years, or 4 years, in my judgment, as soon as it can possibly be accomplished, in a time when the forces are going to be reduced and reduced most materially, these husbands and fathers should be discharged; we should remember that fathers are needed at home; that husbands are needed at home, and unless there is an emergency and a compelling reason to deny them the privilege of returning to their firesides, where they may look after their wives and children, it ought not to be done.

I said the other day that it would not be my purpose to engage upon a tirade of abuse against the Army and Navy or any of its officers, and I decline to do that. In fact, I profess to you I do not have a disposition to do so. But surely it is legitimate, and would not be considered treasonable, if one were to make suggestions of the need of the daddies back at home with their wives and children, and that, at the earliest time facilities for the return to their homes will permit, which I conceive to be a reasonable requirement, they should be discharged.

Then we come to the important consideration of what we are going to do with the boys who, by necessity, were required to enlist in the Army and Navy of the United States when they were but children, 18 years of age, supposed to be in school, needful to the country that they be in school.

I stop to observe, Mr. Speaker, that I voted on that proposal, when we who thought, and we were not mistaken, that the country would be overtaken by this holocaust of war that promised to invade the earth, and I voted for the conscription of boys 18 years of age. I have no apology, and I cannot regret my personal action upon that occasion, because we were told, and I rather agree now, that those boys were needed and that they should be in training; that a great war was about to overtake us; that those young men were susceptible of training and becoming efficient soldiers, sailors, and airmen. Under this necessity—and it was a necessity, in my judgment—we provided that boys 18 years of age, throughout the land, should leave their schools, quit their colleges, and go to the protection and salvation of their country. Some will never come back. Some of many ages will never return. That we only have to grieve about and can do nothing more about. They will not be back. No doubt their families, with all their sorrow and grief and heartaches that have been caused by the fact that they will not return, have a measure of relief from their feelings in the realization that those grand young boys gave their lives in behalf of freedom, democracy, and righteousness in the world. But there are many of them, those who were taken from their schools, interrupted in their efforts to obtain knowledge which they sought to obtain in order that they might increase their chances of making valuable citizens in the country, who are still in the service and ought not to be.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman's idea of releasing them. How does the gentleman feel about stopping the further drafting of individuals of that age?

Mr. FOLGER. That is in the bill I have offered, I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska, that no more boys under the age of 21 shall be drafted.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am pleased to know that. I am concerned about the military authorities using the draft law as an instrument of forcing compulsory military training upon the country which we are doing now in peacetime.

Mr. FOLGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I began to wonder if the past preparations we have made throughout the United States in school districts, in every county, in every State in all the Nation, have been wisely conceived, and the great expenditure of billions on top of billions in providing educational opportunities for the boys and girls of the United States were justified or wise. I do not believe we have gone far enough in that direction. I believe we should be wisely spending if we would increase, and I may say by far, our appropriations notwithstanding our situation from a financial standpoint today, increase the efforts we have made to give the young men from the time they enter the schools, until their college days are over greater opportunity than has been afforded to many of them, a greater opportunity than they have had heretofore. But what I am referring to is: Have we been playing with something that is not of particular concern, that is not regarded as of very high importance in providing, one way and another the school advantages that our country affords to the young men and the young women of this country? There is nobody who will say, "Yes," we have been.

What are the school ages? Ordinarily the child begins his school at 6 years of age. He goes through the elementary processes and reaches what we may term the high-school status or position in his life. He continues with that until he shall have put in 11 or 12 years and by that time he is 17 or 18 years of age. Those who by appropriations from the State and the ability of their parents to afford it, sometimes at great sacrifice, those people to whom opportunities have been given, then spend 4 years in college from 17 to 21, the very years, if you please, that have been set apart by the economy of the universal program of the entire United States to furnish these boys an opportunity to get an education. Shall we here, when the emergency that compelled us to draft them in the beginning, is over, when that time has passed, treat this as a light consideration, as a relatively unimportant thing in the life and welfare, if you please, not only of the boy himself but of the country, too, say that

it is not interesting to us in the demobilization program that consideration shall be given to these young men in the very years set apart by us and of necessity now obtains? Shall we deny to the grand Republic, which we all love—and as much as anything else—the opportunity to the glory and worth these educated boys will give to our Nation; and the opportunity, if you please, that this Government offers to every young man in his life as he comes on to the status or position when he must take his place in the affairs of men? Their opportunities have been jeopardized during war; but it is cruel to demand of them further denials of a chance in life—and it is dangerous to the Nation.

Again I say, I am not disposed to enter upon a tirade of abuse against anybody. Time after time we have glorified the deeds of those yet living, who led us through successfully this debacle of war that tried the souls of men all over the earth. I joined in it as heartily as anybody else.

Not long ago we were considerate enough to bury in Arlington Cemetery an unknown boy in honor of the privates in the ranks who fought and brought victory to us in a former war and we denominated that in honoring them the grave of The Unknown Soldier, he who represented the boys and the young men who went to war and under the direction and authority of their superior officers dared to die. Many did die that this country might continue to be a land of glorious opportunity.

Yet on this day in 1945, in the month of September, we have not come to the place in our program of demobilization where we are willing to manifest a concern for the welfare of these boys who did go, those privileged to come back, so as to permit them to continue in their education preparatory to a life which may extend to that of threescore years and ten and possibly by reason of strength to fourscore years. We seem content to allow them to lose forever this opportunity of educational development and preparation for the years that are to come.

It is a matter of importance to them, yes, and one that we should not fail to be very, very much concerned about. It is a matter of great anxiety to their fathers and mothers, and anxiety that we should not despise; but more than that, it is a matter of high importance and should be a matter of definite concern to the public welfare.

We want a nation of educated men and children. If there is to be thrown at us any dereliction in the years to come it is that one of our greatest failures was the failure to furnish greater opportunity, greater opportunity in this life to start out with a chance when they reach that age which we have denominated by law as the age of manhood, 21 years of age, with an education upon which to build that life in whatever vocation they may choose and not be forced to be unprepared. For the fathers, the husbands, the children back home, the wives, the boys under 21 years of age, I plead for a most definite and hurried consideration of the necessity that the law-making power the Army and Navy are under to give these people a chance and do it now. Of course, we shall not forget the wounded and the weary soldiers. There is plenty of room to include all these. In any case, in the Army and Navy more than 9,000,000 can be discharged. The VE- and VJ-days have already come and gone.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Caroline has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

AMENDMENT PROPOSED TO ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT; ALSO AMENDMENT TAKING FROM NATIONAL CHAIN STORES UNFAIR TAX ADVANTAGE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to discuss two bills which I am presenting today. One is an amendment to section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act. This amendment which I propose does nothing more than requires that no seller shall sell a commodity at a price or at a discount, by reason of quantities sold, or seasonal orders, or for any other reason, unless he has made the availability of such price and/or such discount under the same conditions known to all of his customers, and unless such price and/or such discount under the same conditions is, after having been so made known, in fact available to all of his other customers for a reasonable period of time, according to customary trade practices.

This amendment will eliminate all secret deals and make prices and discounts known to all customers of manufacturers and other sellers operating in interstate commerce. Its approval by the Congress will prevent a vicious practice which has a tendency to, and, in fact, does breed a monopoly in favor of the large operators and places small business at their mercy. It writes into unmistakable language the original intent of the Robinson-Patman law so there can be no further doubt about it.

The other bill which I am offering today is an amendment to chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code as section 10 on chain stores operating at a loss. This is a bill to prevent national chain stores from operating a store at a loss to destroy a competitor and receive a tax deduction therefrom.

Mr. Speaker, in presenting an amendment to section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act, I do so with a view to strengthening that law to prevent evasion and discriminations that have had the effect of defeating the purpose of this act.

The Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Antitrust Act has for its purpose the prohibition of all discriminations of every description in the sale of merchandise by the seller, whether in price, quantity, or service—

Where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them.

This law further prescribes—

That nothing herein contained shall prevent differentials which make only due allowance for difference in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold or delivered.

It is further—

Provided, however, That the Federal Trade Commission may, after due investigation and hearing to all interested parties, fix and establish quantity limits, and revise the same as it finds necessary, as to particular commodities or classes of commodities, where it finds that available purchasers in greater quantities are so few as to render differentials on account thereof unjustly discriminatory or promotive of monopoly in any line of commerce; and the foregoing shall then not be construed to permit differentials based on differences in quantities greater than those so fixed and established: *Provided, further,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent persons engaged in selling goods, wares, or merchandise in commerce from selecting their own customers in bona fide transactions and not in restraint of trade; *and provided further,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent price changes from time to time where in response to changing conditions affecting the market for or the marketability of the goods concerned, such as but not limited to actual or imminent deterioration of perishable goods, obsolescence of seasonal goods, distress sales under court process, or sales in good faith in discontinuance of business in the goods concerned.

There has crept into business, however, secret pricing or concessions of one type or another to evade the provisions of this act, to favor large buyers, which this amendment seeks to correct and overcome. In the investigation of large-scale buying and selling by a special investigating committee of the House in 1935, of which I had the honor to be chairman, there was disclosed a condition whereby a large national retail distributor in the dry-goods business placed orders for blankets in January in advance of the usual trade-buying season with manufacturers, and he was granted a special price concession because this kept the organization of the manufacturer intact for the first 6 months of the year, until the normal buying by wholesalers and others opened around June and July.

Due to this advance buying, it was asserted by this buyer, his company obtained special prices. On the other hand, it was the regular trade which kept these manufacturers' organizations intact the latter half of the year. If it were not for this later normal buying the organization of the manufacturer would not be occupied the last half of the year, and the entire operating costs would be heaped on the companies buying in advance. It is an injustice and a discrimination, therefore, to favor the advance buyer with extreme concessions over the normal buyer.

Moreover, it has been disclosed in the trial of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., now taking place in the Federal court at Danville, Ill., on a criminal information filed by the Government, that

this company has been receiving a secret price of 20 cents a case on package branded rice, conditioned on the purchase of 50,000 cases in a year, and an extra 5 percent if 60,000 or more cases were purchased. The next largest chain store corporation received but 10 cents a case, while other quantity buyers obtained no allowance. Letters from this company's files show this discrimination to have taken place.

In another instance this same A. & P. Corp., according to documentary evidence, received 25 to 30 cents a case lower price on private-brand oats than any other chain or wholesale buying agency, which this trial alone exposed. From what I am informed, there is much of this secret pricing going on in various lines of industry to the detriment of the great majority of competitors of these favored secret buyers.

This amendment which I propose does nothing more than require that—

No seller shall sell a commodity at a price or at a discount, by reason of quantities sold, or seasonal orders, or for any other reason, unless he has made the availability of such price or such discount under the same conditions known to all his customers, and unless such price and/or discount under the same conditions are, after having been so made known, in fact available to all of his other customers for a reasonable period of time according to customary trade practices.

This amendment will eliminate all secret deals and make prices and discounts known to all customers of manufacturers and other sellers operating in interstate commerce.

Its approval by the Congress will prevent a vicious practice which has a tendency to, and in fact does, create a monopoly in favor of the large operators and places small business at their mercy.

A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 15, sec. 13 (a)) is amended by inserting immediately after the colon at the end of the first proviso the following:

"*Provided, however*, That no seller shall sell a commodity at a price or at a discount, by reason of quantities sold, or seasonal orders, or for any other reason, unless he has made the availability of such price and/or such discount under the same conditions known to all of his customers, and unless such price and/or such discount under the same conditions is, after having been so made known, in fact available to all of his other customers for a reasonable period of time, according to customary trade practices."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to sales made after 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

BILL TO PREVENT CHAIN STORES FROM OPERATING A STORE AT A LOSS TO DESTROY A COMPETITOR AND RECEIVE A TAX DEDUCTION THEREFOR

Mr. Speaker, in offering this amendment to chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code as section 10 on chain stores operated at a loss, I am led to the necessity of this action by what I have known to occur in the past, and especially by the disclosures brought out in documentary evidence in the trial of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. now being heard in the Federal court at Danville, Ill., before District Judge Walter C. Lindley.

The object sought is to prevent corporations of this type operating numerous stores throughout the country at a loss to undermine independent competitors to gain a monopoly of production and distribution and, at the same time, in returns for income-tax purposes, to be able to deduct such losses from corporation reports. This has become a notorious practice and places in the hands of such corporations an effective weapon to destroy all competition. This applies not only to the food trade but to distribution fields in other industries which have the same effect.

To illustrate my point, the court record in the A. & P. trial discloses the alarming fact that as many as 4,374 stores of this system were operated at a net loss in 1938 which was charged against the corporation's income-tax return. Other exhibits from A. & P. files show that at a meeting of the executive committee of the New England division, John A. Hartford and George L. Hartford, the two owners of this gigantic chain corporation, authorized its operation without any profit. The same thing applies to the Atlantic division, operating out of Philadelphia.

This company was making a vicious price war on the First National Stores of Boston and independent grocers in the entire territory of the New England division, comprising some 1,600 stores, with branches in Albany, N. Y.; Portland, Maine; New Haven, Conn.; Providence, R. I.; and Boston, Mass. Testimony in this case points out that the New England division adopted resolutions on two different occasions thanking the two Hartfords for their generosity in permitting the division to conduct all stores without realizing any profit on store operations.

The court record in this case further shows that the Government was deprived of income tax on $780,000 due to the losses in the New England division, and $592,000 in the Atlantic division, or a total of $1,272,000 in 1939, according to the minutes of the divisional presidents' meeting who, with the Hartfords, dominate the policy of this large corporation. In addition, $300,000 yearly was spent by National Consumers Tax Commission, which was disbanded after several years because it failed to function as the Hartfords wanted it, through the ladies who were chairmen of some 600 such groups in various cities. In addition, there is the $93,000 yearly fee plus expenses of Carl Byoir and associates for lobbying and propaganda purposes. It is fair to assume that all of these items were charged off as legitimate expenses, which, combined, should represent more than $2,000,000 a year on which the Government collected nothing for income tax.

The main dependence for profit is placed on subsidiary earnings, allowances from other manufacturers, and stock gains commonly known in the trade as short weighting, overcharging, and price boosting at check-out counters. Without these outside earnings all the stores would be conducted at a distinct loss. The effect of this creates a monopoly and makes impossible the operation of competing independent dealers. The treasurer of the First National Stores Corp. testified at this trial that his company suffered a decrease in earnings of $1,421,000, or 27 percent, because of this price war. The Government therefore lost that income tax from this corporation while other competing food dealers were similarly affected.

The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. has 5,700 stores, or 1½ percent of the total number of all grocery stores, including other chains. Its sales are around $1,400,000,000, or 13.5 percent of the total grocery business. This leaves the remaining 86½ percent for distribution among 345,611 independent food dealers and 34,658 chain stores, or a total of 380,269 of both types.

Taking all types of chain stores into consideration, with 123,195 units out of a total of 1,770,355 stores of all kinds, the chain corporations have but 7 percent of the stores. Yet they control, according to the last census, 21.7 percent of all the retail business. Included in this total number of chain stores, it should be remarked, are a large number of small local companies, because four stores are considered to be a chain. With those eliminated the percentage of sales control over total retail business would be materially increased, while the number of stores of the larger chain systems would be substantially reduced.

Under these circumstances the present Internal Revenue Code, by virtue of passing on losses of stores caused by operating many of them deliberately at a loss for a period of time to establish them on a profitable basis at the expense of other retail competitors who have no such cushion, is allowing these big corporations to escape payments of income tax and at the same time to create a monopoly.

If we are to have full employment and provide opportunities for returning servicemen to enter business, protect small business in general, and collect all just income tax on legitimate earnings, this amendment should be adopted by the Congress.

A bill relating to the tax treatment of chain stores operated at a loss

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting, after section 109, a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 110. Chain stores operated at a loss.

"(a) In general: In the case of any retail store which is part of a retail chain, if for any taxable year the amounts which, except for this section, would be deductible on account of such store exceed the amounts which, except for this section, would be includible in gross income on account of such store, the amounts which would be so deductible shall not be allowed as deductions for such taxable year and the amounts which would be so includible shall be excluded from gross income for such taxable year.

"(b) Definition: As used in this section, the term—

"(1) 'Retail chain' means a group of — or more retail stores which, either directly or through one or more persons, or by leases, contracts, or other arrangements or devices, are subject to a single common control.

"(2) 'Retail store' means any place at which sales of merchandise, and delivery thereof, are made, or at which services are furnished, to retail customers in the ordinary course of business, but such term does

not include any establishment or facility maintained by a common carrier as part of its transportation facilities primarily for furnishing meals or other commodities to its passengers and employees, or any branch office maintained by a newspaper for the distribution of its papers or taking subscriptions or advertisements therefor."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 19—.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to revise and extend my remarks and to insert copies of the bills which I am introducing today and which I have discussed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, we have had some very curious headlines appearing in the papers of late. The American people are wondering what there is to the headlines. General Eisenhower has stated that General Patton has had too many Nazis remain in office. I do not know what the situation is, but I hope we get to the bottom of it. I also feel that the American people do not believe that they have sent their boys to death at Iwo Jima and in the bloody jungles of the South Pacific to have Hirohito made a socialite.

Almost every paper I have picked up in the past 2 weeks has had a front-page story with scare headlines on the so-called strike wave throughout the country. A great many editorial writers have clamored for governmental action against the men and women out on strike.

I do not share the newspaper hysteria about the strikes or the threatened strikes in many industries vital to the reconversion program.

I think there should be governmental action. It should not, however, be punitive action against the strikers, but constructive action to get at the real basis of the strikes.

Unfortunately there seems to be a strong feeling among my colleagues in Congress that the way to settle a strike in the oil, or automobile, or lumber industry is for Congress to go on strike against American workers.

That, in effect, is what the decision by the House Ways and Means Committee to shelve the Kilgore unemployment compensation bill adds up to.

I cannot conceive of any action better calculated to create labor unrest than this decision

I deplore the fact that thousands of American men and women have to resort to the economic pressure of the strike to gain concessions from management. Strikes now inevitably will threaten the reconversion program; will interfere with the smooth and speedy return to peacetime production.

I do not believe, however, that too much weight should be given to the exaggerated accounts of strikes and of impending strikes.

As far as I have been able to ascertain, the number of workers on strike throughout the country since VJ-day has never exceeded 350,000. This is a high figure, true, but, compared to the total work force, it represents less than 1 percent. It is a fractional part of the millions of workers who have been laid off since VJ-day.

I certainly do not mean to underestimate the seriousness of the labor unrest in the country, nor to condone strikes. But neither do I think the picture should be distorted out of all proportion to serve the purposes of antilabor interests.

Too much credit cannot be given to American labor for the miraculous job of war production. That record should not be forgotten now when labor is feeling the pinch of unemployment and reduced earnings.

The abrupt end of the war in the Pacific came at a time when no governmental program had been formulated to cushion the shock of reconversion unemployment. The human side of the reconversion program had been almost totally neglected.

Inaction and indecision by both the Congress and the administrative departments of the Government has served to strengthen the conviction of labor—organized and unorganized—that bad times are ahead.

The man or woman who is lucky enough still to have a job in any one of the great mass production industries sees his or her weekly pay check shrink and knows it will shrink further. These workers know that industry has been cushioned against reconversion losses to the tune of billions of dollars in tax refunds, and in Government contract termination clauses. The workers know that industry made enormous profits during the war years—and is guaranteed profits for at least 2 years after the war.

The individual worker has no such guaranties. His uncertain economic position, his fear for the future, is the flame that is blowing the lid off the labor pot. The way to keep the lid from blowing off entirely in a series of reconversion-impeding strikes is to put out that fire—to remove the uncertainty and fear of unemployment.

There certainly has been little done in Washington in the past few weeks to remove these basic causes of strikes.

Some time ago, while still Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Secretary of the Treasury Fred Vinson told Congress that the American people were faced, as he called it, "with the pleasant prospect" of living 50 percent better than they had before the war.

American consumers—workers, farmers, businessmen—all are going to have to live on a basis of an ever-widening and improving standard of living. This assumption must be at the basis of all our thinking in economic terms, if we are to take advantage of the technological improvements and the vastly increased plant facilities developed during the war.

Unfortunately, not enough of the lawmakers and administrators in Washington are operating on this principle. On the contrary there seems an all too general assumption that the standard of living of millions of Americans must shrink with the end of the war.

The one individual who took the forthright position that a higher standard of living was possible under the free enterprise system has been pilloried by the press and rather unceremoniously relieved of his duties.

William Davis, until a few days ago Economic Stabilizer and long the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, said he believed it was entirely possible for wages to be increased up to 50 percent within the next 5 years without calling for price increases.

To me this statement is the logical corollary to Secretary Vinson's warning that we must live 50 percent better than we did before the war.

I not only agree that substantial wage increases can be granted without interfering with the price structure, but I firmly believe that they must be increased if the necessary purchasing power to keep American industry fully productive is to be maintained.

Labor will not feel any security against unemployment and lowered incomes until the Government adopts a positive policy of high wages and low prices.

Obviously it will not be possible for all industries to grant substantial wage increases without making some upward price revisions. But it can and must be done in the great mass production industries which are the backbone of the reconversion program, and which have plenty of profits, both on hand and assured, to absorb increased wages.

A high-wage policy, openly arrived at and adopted by the Federal Government, should not be looked upon as a concession to organized labor. It must be recognized as a concession to the necessities of this period of economic transition.

If, as Fred Vinson and other farsighted economic thinkers have said, Americans must learn to live better than ever before, the means must be provided to make this possible.

Certainly it cannot be done, the national standard of living cannot improve, on the wage structure which prevailed before the war.

The consumer purchasing power generated by prewar family incomes is just not great enough to purchase full production and full employment in this country.

Instead of dissipating energy and promoting labor strife by name calling and vilification, serious study should be given to the demands of labor.

Strikes are never settled in the editorial columns of the papers. They are settled by honest cooperation between labor, management, and Government to find an acceptable and honorable compromise.

The end of the war in the Pacific, a war in which both labor and management contributed so much, should not signalize the start of industrial warfare on the domestic front.

There are several things that I wish to raise at this point as to what the Congress may do to bring about less disputes between management and labor. Take, for instance, the National Labor Relations Board, which is now 3 months behind in

their decisions, because of the fact that the Congress of the United States failed to appropriate a sufficient amount of money for the operations of that agency. When a dispute arises, it should be settled as expeditiously as possible. What good does it do to have a paper decision of a dispute a year after the actual dispute arises? In the interim, the workers are penalized, management is in confusion—the result is, strike after strike.

First. Let the Congress appropriate a sufficient amount of money so that the National Labor Relations Board can keep current in their decisions, and you will eliminate many of the controversies that have arisen.

Second. The Congress should authorize legislation and appropriate a sufficient amount of money for a complete reorganization of the Labor Department, so that the Labor Department can be put on a basis of service to both management and labor; an expanded conciliation department; an educational program so as to educate both labor and management in the field of human relations. Yes; in the field of being able to properly contact the worker at the factory level. The program should be instituted so as to train stewards and foremen in the field of human relations and in the field of labor relations. Universities in this country should be encouraged to cooperate with the Department of Labor in setting up a course of labor relations. In other words, the Department of Labor should be placed on the same basis of service to labor and management as the Department of Agriculture is to the farmers of this Nation. The Department of Agriculture has actual direct contact with practically every farmer in the Nation. The Department of Labor should be placed in the same position.

Third. Legislation should be passed in economic fields so as to place in the hands of consumers the purchasing power necessary for the purchase of the product of industry, and necessary for the products of agriculture. When the farmers of the South were receiving $25 a bale for cotton they could not buy the farm machinery necessary for the proper operations of their agricultural pursuits. But now that they are receiving $105 a bale for cotton they are in a position to buy the machinery that is produced by the workers in the factories of Detroit, Cleveland, and other large metropolitan industrial areas. But the workers in these factories cannot buy $105 cotton on 50-cent wages. Consumers make jobs, providing they have consumer purchasing power. Let us enact the minimum wage, the full coverage, unemployment compensation—to tide us over during the reconversion period, and a tax program that will give to the worker the same privilege that has been given to industry.

An increase in wages, without an increase in prices, is necessary. The economic facts of life prove that wages can be increased without increasing prices. Increased production must be supported by increased consumption, and increased consumption will be possible only through increased wages. Profits of all corporations, before income taxes in 1944 were about $25,000,000,000. That is five times what they made in the prewar years of 1936 to 1939. The present wage demands made by labor organizations would, if approved, add not more than $8,000,000,000 to the total wage bill of the country. Corporate profits last year, therefore, were large enough to pay labor's demands and still leave them $17,000,000,000 profit, or more than three times what they made before the war.

The demand now made by labor for an increase in wages without an increase in profits is a reasonable one, because that increase would come out of the extra profits that were made because of war. Is it reasonable that there should be allowed by the OPA an increase of 30 percent over the 1942 price of a half-ton Chevrolet truck, without any increase in the wage scale of the workers? The fact is that corporations have been making so much money in war contracts that they can run at a loss in order to drive down the wage scale. The Congress of the United States, in the "gyp" tax bill that was passed, provided industry with reserves and insurance to carry it through the reconversion period, even if profits go down or turn into losses. Corporations now hold in their vaults or in banks $20,000,000,000 of cash and Government bonds, in excess of their 1939 net working capital. This sum came out of war profits. Corporations will soon receive, on account of this "gyp" tax bill, a refund from the United States Treasury of 10 percent of all excess-profits taxes paid during the war. That will give them another $3,000,000,000 in cash. Corporations can claim further cash refunds from the Treasury during the 2 years of reconversion if their profits fall below prewar normal, or they incur losses. This provides an additional cushion amounting to another $27,000,000,000. So that the total reserves and possible refunds for corporations add up to approximately $50,000,000,000. Average net income of all corporations after taxes in 1936 to 1939 was $3,300,000,000 a year. To carry them through the reconversion period of reduced earnings, corporations have, first, war savings equal to 6 years of average prewar profits, second, a cash refund from the United States Treasury equal to 1 year of average prewar profits, third, an insurance fund provided by the United States Treasury to be drawn upon in case of low earnings or losses, equal to 8 years of average prewar profits. Now let us bring this down to the individual and compare it to the meager claim that is being made for unemployment compensation of the worker of $25 a week for 26 weeks to tide him over the reconversion period. This is the bill that the Ways and Means Committee attacked so viciously and turned down this week. This was the same committee which acted so favorably by passing the tax bill so generous to industry. If the average wage earner were treated as the corporations are treated and protected by the Congress for the reconversion period, if the individual worker were a corporation, he would have, first, savings in cash or war bonds of $7,200. Second, he would be entitled to a refund from the United States Treasury of $1,200. Third, he would be entitled to a Government insurance fund to draw on in case of reduced earnings or loss of a job, equal to $9,600. His total protection if he were treated the same as the corporations are being treated, would amount to $18,000 per person. And still there are those in the Congress of the United States who refused to even give him the meager protection of $25 a week for 26 weeks to tide him over the reconversion period.

I think it is about time that the Congress of the United States turn toward fair treatment of the laboring class of this Nation and give to them a program whereby they will have decent wages, decent housing—yes, even an annual wage. When that is done, you will have practically eliminated labor-management disputes.

In closing, might I say that if the Members of Congress of the United States—including the Senators, of course—would turn their efforts toward blending into the President's program the breath of human relations, instill into it an inertia, that would make it a living reality by the enactment of that program, we will have given to the boys who sacrificed during the bloody years of the war, their fathers and mothers, and all America, the American way of life. When that is done, we will have done our duty as representatives of the people of America, and industrial strife, labor-management disputes, will disappear into thin air. Until we have done that, we shall continue to have labor-management disputes. It is my suggestion that the Congress of the United States should never take any step toward compulsory arbitration in any form whatsoever. The enactment of legislation which will take care of the causes is the kind of legislation that is necessary to bring about a democratic America and the American way of life.

The launching of any repressive legislation against labor, or any legislation which tends toward compulsory arbitration at this point, is done, in my opinion, for the purpose of diverting the attention of the workers and other progressive Americans from the real issues which confront the Nation. Today the real problem is not industrial disputes which are so luridly held up as a threat to our economy. The real problem, in my opinion, is the problem of an expanding economy. The Congress of the United States should turn its attention to the enactment of legislation that would put into effect the 21 points advocated by President Truman.

Full employment, and full production—with an increase in wages without an increase in prices—a raising of the standard of living to the millions of workers so that their families may be well clothed, well fed, well housed, and properly educated.

If a program of this kind is adopted by the Congress, we will have taken care of the disputes between labor and management.

Workers do not strike without cause. They do not strike for the fun of striking—they fully realize that a strike means a present loss of earning power to themselves—it means sacrifice on the part of their families. Therefore, it is

the duty of the representatives of the people to determine what those grievances are, to enact legislation to eliminate those grievances, instead of attempting to enact legislation of a repressive nature, which tends toward compulsory arbitration. These are abnormal times. In a democratic nation there are bound to be disputes in times of stress. There are bound to be strikes unless the economic problems are met so as to eliminate the causes of strikes.

The people in Germany did not strike. Do we want to implant upon this Nation the type of government that eliminated strikes in Germany? God forbid that such be the case while the battlefields of Europe are still wet with the blood of those who offered up the supreme sacrifice that democracy might live.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include in my remarks at this point an article from the magazine PM of last Thursday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. The following article was written by Mr. I. F. Stone, one of the foremost economists and writers of America, and appeared in PM magazine on Thursday, September 20, 1945.

In explanation, might I point out that preceding this article were two illustrations. One to the left is a man in a rowboat fishing, representing industry, and one to the right a laboring man standing in front of an employment agency.

THE COCKEYED ECONOMICS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

The gentleman at the end of the line on the left is going to spend the reconversion period fishing.

The gentleman at the end of the line on the right is going to spend the reconversion period standing in front of an employment agency.

The first gentleman is one of the owners of industry. The second gentleman is an industrial worker.

The first gentleman is so well protected by unemployment insurance that he can make more money loafing at Palm Beach than working during the next 2 years.

The second gentleman is so poorly protected by unemployment insurance that he and his family will soon be hungry if he doesn't find a job.

Is there such a thing as unemployment insurance for industrialists? There is.

True, there is no statute called jobless insurance for the owners of industry. Nevertheless, provision has been made to protect them against loss of income during the reconversion period.

In the first place, they get a kind of "severance pay" to compensate them for the cessation of war work. This is a flat 10-percent rebate on their wartime excess-profits taxes. This will amount to about $2,840,000,000, or a sum equal to more than half total net corporate earnings in the banner year 1937.

In the second place, should they merely drop below their so-called normal profit level in the next 2 years, they can draw a further cash refund from the United States Treasury to make good on those losses.

Their refunds, of course, cannot be greater than the amounts they paid in income and excess-profits taxes during the war. But the backlog on which they can theoretically draw amounts at this time to $62,000,000,000.

Of course, they will not draw that much. Net corporate earnings in 1929 were less than $9,000,000,000. In 1937, they were little more than $5,000,000,000. The point is that this backlog is many times larger than that required to guarantee high peacetime profits to industry during the next 2 years.

In fact, it is so high that many businessmen could make more money in 1946 and 1947 if they shut up shop and went off to Miami. Guaranteed cash refunds from the United States Treasury are larger than anything they could make in the normal operations of their businesses.

Do you think we exaggerate? We give you an example supplied by the latest report of the United Steel Workers of America, CIO: The Lukens Steel Co., one of the first steel firms to cash in on the carry-back provisions of the excess-profits law.

For the 36 weeks ended June 16, 1945, Lukens Steel earned only $40,968 in net profits after taxes. Under the carry-back provisions of the Federal tax laws, Lukens received back some of the taxes it had previously paid.

The United States Treasury sent Lukens a check for $366,000, a refund out of taxes in other years, making Lukens' profit for period in question $407,768—as compared with average earnings from 1935 to 1939 of $7,000 a year.

Do we really think the average businessman is going to go fishing during 1946 and 1947 and live off his tax refund? No!

Neither do we think the average worker would go fishing during 1946 and 1947 if Congress had increased his unemployment compensation to a maximum of $25 a week for 26 weeks.

We ask Members of Congress to consider (1) the unfairness, and (2) the economic unsoundness of a situation in which industry is protected against loss during reconversion while its workers get only the most meager protection.

War workers cannot go to the United States Treasury and collect a flat 10-percent rebate on the high income taxes they paid during the war. Industry can.

War workers cannot collect a further rebate on their taxes if their earnings during 1946 and 1947 fall below average prewar earnings or a fixed percentage of their invested capital, whichever is higher. Industry can.

Philip Murray, of the CIO, in testifying for the full-employment bill, recently told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that if labor were as well supplied as capital with reserves for the reconversion period, every worker in this country would have $18,000 in savings and possible tax refunds.

All that workers can fall back upon is their inadequate jobless insurance—and the same Congress which has been so generous with industry in framing the tax laws balked yesterday at maximum payments to workers of $25 a week for 26 weeks.

Let us examine the situation a little more closely. The taxes on which industry is allowed rebates during the reconversion period were not taxes so high as to wipe out war profits. On the contrary, despite the high rates, profits after taxes were three times higher than before the war.

Nor did these high taxes prevent industry from accumulating reserves with which to tide itself over the reconversion period. On the contrary, its reserves have grown to the highest point in history:

Net working capital, United States industry:	
1945	$47,000,000,000
1939	25,000,000,000

So industry faces reconversion with $47,000,000,000 in its jeans, with a check coming in from the United States Treasury for another $2,840,000,000, and with the right to cover any losses from a $62,000,000,000 kitty in the Treasury.

Compare that with the worker's principal backlog—the unemployment-compensation reserves of the States, which total less than $7,000,000,000.

What of the worker's savings?

Few figures are available. But we do have a sample provided by the steel industry. The United Steel Workers, CIO, estimate that America's 475,000 steel workers emerge from the war with a total of $285,000,000 in savings, or $600 a worker.

Compare that backlog with the blacklog of the steel industrialists. They emerge from the war with savings (net working capital) of $2,000,000,000. Their flat 10 percent rebate from the Treasury will amount to more than $200,000,000. If they only break even next year, they will be able to collect another $149,000,000 from the United States Treasury.

It is obvious that in the steel industry the "haves" copped off the lion's share of the war profits. The situation in steel is pretty much the situation in all war industry.

There are circumstances in which it would make sense for Congress to allow only the most meager jobless compensation to workers while handing out big cash rebates to industry.

In the steel industry, for example: Let us suppose the positions were reversed. Let us suppose the $2,000,000,000 of working capital was in the pockets of the steel workers and the $285,000,000 of worker savings were in the treasuries of the companies.

In that case, the buying power of steel workers would be so great as to require no help from the Government. In that case the buying power of the workers would be so great as to necessitate expansion of industry to meet demand.

In that case industry would need liquid funds quickly for expansion and it would be good economic policy for the United States Treasury to allow hefty rebates.

But that is not the case today. The existing circumstances make as little sense from the standpoint of economics as of abstract justice.

When steel and other workers have so little to spend for the products of industry, what capitalist is going to be reckless enough to invest his money in expansion? Why add to idle investment funds with huge rebates from the Treasury?

Would it not make better sense to end the cash rebates from the Treasury and instead allow decent unemployment compensation to workers during the reconversion period?

The money paid Joe Jones, the steel worker, shows up at once on the cash registers of industry and stimulates business. The money paid Joseph M. Jones, the steel capitalist, ends up with other idle funds, an undigested lump on the sick stomach of the investment market.

It is cockeyed economics to add to the idle investment funds of industry and skimp on jobless pay to industry's workers.

For industry's workers are also industry's consumers. And until their purchasing power rises, those investment funds will stay idle.

The pattern of congressional policy is as sinister as it is senseless. Low jobless compensation holds down wages when it is essential that wages rise to make it possible for us to consume all that our war-expanded industry can produce.

High cash reconversion rebates from the Treasury are the other side of the picture. They make it possible for industry to "sit it out" during the reconversion period.

A big industrialist can live off the United States Treasury while he cuts down production to reestablish a basic monopoly, to break a labor union, or to force down wages through lock-outs.

The United States Treasury is thus in the position of subsidizing unsound, social and economic policy. For American stability and

prosperity depend on expanding output and rising wages.

This is the background, these are the fundamental issues, behind the brave, but unsuccessful, fight KILGORE and a handful of progressives, with too little support from the White House, waged in the Senate for halfway decent unemployment compensation during reconversion.

I. F. STONE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, the Army and the Navy have been doing a progressively better job of demobilization. For this we commend them. We all know, of course, that the speed of demobilization cannot be fast enough to satisfy anxious parents, wives, and sweethearts. Nor can it be fast enough to satisfy the men and women who want to get home to loved ones and to interrupted careers.

I am among those who feel that constant emphasis of the human element in demobilization is necessary and desirable. It is the only way to keep attention focused on the No. 1 reconversion problem—the problem of reuniting American families and returning our service men and women to normal lives.

I am also one of those who believe that the Army and Navy are capable of speeding up demobilization more than they have. To think otherwise would be to ignore their recent efficiency records.

What groups should be discharged first is a very difficult problem on which the answers vary. There is no age group, or combat group, or group of fathers and husbands that cannot present compelling argument for their immediate release. Frankly, up to the extreme point consistent with national safety I believe that every man inducted for duty should be released in the shortest possible time and that an enthusiastic effort should be made to secure every possible volunteer for the Regular Army.

However, there are a few small groups that do deserve special consideration. It is about one of these groups that I now address my remarks in the hope that the War Department will hear and heed.

Very soon after VE-day some six divisions were quickly shipped from Europe to the United States. These divisions were screened for men with over 85 points, and practically all the high-point men were discharged. The rest were given 30 days' furlough and reassembled for shipment to the Pacific. The first of these to be sent to the Pacific theater was the Eighty-sixth Division, better known as the Black Hawk Division. The other was the Ninety-seventh Division.

In these two divisions are thousands of fathers, combat veterans, and men with more than 2 years of service. It is possibly true that a great majority have more than 35 points, since the average number of points in the Eighty-sixth Division is 55. Men with 35 points are no longer given overseas assignments.

The Eighty-sixth and Ninety-seventh Divisions were shipped to the Pacific a considerable time after VJ-day. The other four divisions were held back by a change of orders.

Therefore, and because the Eighty-sixth and Ninety-seventh Divisions were accorded special treatment in being moved out of the country, it is my contention that they should be given special treatment in being moved back into this country.

The War Department says that demobilization must deal with individuals, not units. That is their own rule and subject to their own amendment. In any case, it seems to me to be only simple justice that these men, who were redeployed from the European theater to the Pacific theater, should be governed by the point system now in effect just as if they were still in the United States. The fact that they were sent first should not deprive them of the benefits of the change of regulations. Certainly all of them who have more than 35 points should be returned to this country. Certainly all past and future regulations governing the discharge of combat troops and men with dependents should apply to them as being in this country regardless of where they are stationed.

These men of the Eighty-sixth and Ninety-seventh are among the most dejected men in the service. I have had scores of letters from them and from their parents portraying their mental attitude. It is not wholesome. If I were to do less than urge special consideration of their case, I would be heartless.

Two weeks ago several hundreds of the parents and wives of members of the Black Hawk Division held a mass meeting in Pittsburgh at the courthouse. They there agreed to petition for the return of their sons and husbands. In 6 days they mailed to me petitions with over 17,000 signatures appended. These petitions are here before you for your inspection. Perhaps as many more signatures have since been secured.

Let me read what the petition says:

The mothers and wives of soldiers of the Eighty-sixth Blackhawk Division which fought in Europe and are now on their way to Japan for occupational duty, solicit your support in petitioning Congress to return this division to this country at once, if possible to be stopped en route, for the following reasons:

1. These soldiers fought and sacrificed so that the world might have freedom, liberty, and justice for all. Now they themselves are not getting justice. Soldiers who fought in Europe should not do occupational duty.

2. Soldiers in our camps who have never left our soil, with 1, 2, and 3 years training should be considered capable soldiers, they and other nationalities should do occupation duty. All must do their part.

3. If 2 years service is to be the maximum for the newly drafted, the same rule must apply to combat soldiers who fought for us and helped save the world. Here again if we expect to teach others how to be fair we should start at home and see that our soldiers are given a fair deal.

4. Some of the sergeants and corporals in the Eighty-sixth Division have been in this division 31 to 34 months, however have only 41 to 45 points. This low score despite long service is no fault of their own, they did what the Army told them, trained several separate sets of soldiers, for overseas duty, before this division went overseas as a unit. These soldiers, if we again mean to be fair, should have received or now should receive an additional point per month for the months they spent in this country as instructors. The present Army point system actually penalizes these soldiers who were capable to instruct.

In connection with the petitions I received the following letter from the chairman of the group which should be read into the RECORD at this point:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *September 20, 1945.*
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Congressman from Pennsylvania,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A meeting of the mothers and wives of the gallant soldiers of the Eighty-sixth Blackhawk Division was held in Pittsburgh, Pa., on September 13, 1945, for the purpose to devise ways and means of having this combat division, which is one of the two divisions which fought in Europe that are now on their way to Japan for occupational duty, returned to this country at once, stopped en route if possible. The meeting was attended by over 400 persons.

The meeting was opened by all present bowing their heads in silent prayer, asking God's help for these soldiers who fought so the world might have freedom, liberty, and justice, that they now receive immediate justice from their own country.

All present know that the Eighty-sixth Division and one other division are the only two divisions which fought in Europe and left this country to do occupational work in Japan, and we understand that no other divisions will be sent to do this duty, therefore, this can only be considered unfair treatment to the Eighty-sixth Division and the one other division. It was then decided that to correct this unfair treatment we would request Congress by petitioning them for the return of the Eighty-sixth Division to this country at once and to request Hon. ROBERT J. CORBETT, Congressman from Pittsburgh, Pa., to present our petition.

Further, Congress should make a thorough investigation at once why this division, which was scheduled to be at Camp Gruber, Okla., for a period of 8 weeks, was, after only about 2 weeks at this camp and only a few days before VJ-day, sent to California, and then, actually about 1 week after VJ-day, rushed onto ships and started on their way to Japan for occupational duty.

General MacArthur's recent statement that only 200,000 Regular Army soldiers will be required to police Japan further proves that this division should be returned to this country at once.

This division does not have the benefits of the recent September 5 revised discharge plan; however, due to the unfair treatment to date the mothers and wives of these soldiers asked that the division be returned as a unit.

The present Army point system should be disregarded in its entirety and our representatives should provide a new set of rules for demobilization.

It is hard to believe that gray-haired mothers and fathers of these soldiers, after having prayed to God for a speedy victory and their sons' early return, have to, in this country, go door to door getting petitions signed to prove that many, many others feel as they do.

We ask, please, that Congress do everything in their power to get these soldiers returned to this country at once. God surely will reward all who help get these men home to their loved ones and a civilian Christian life to which they are now entitled.

Attached hereto is the petition which has been signed by 17,300 persons.

The next meeting will be held in Pittsburgh, Pa., September 27, 1945, with the fathers also being invited to attend, at which time plans will be discussed as to making

this a permanent organization, probably to be known as the Mothers, Fathers, and Wives of the Eighty-sixth Blackhawk Division of World War II.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ADAM T. MEYER,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, if the authorities in the War Department can picture in their mind's eye the terrific effort that has gone into the securing of these petitions; if they can visualize the anxiety, yearning, and concern of all of these human beings, I am sure they will take steps to correct this injustice. They believe that the accident of the speedy departure of the Eighty-sixth and Ninety-seventh Divisions should not deprive these men of the benefits of the regulations now governing all other men returned from Europe to the United States. I wholeheartedly support this position and respectfully urge the fastest possible action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to emphasize the necessity of dealing fairly with our servicemen in all matters, and especially on demobilization. I believe the Army and the Navy are making every effort at this time to be fair and speedy in the demobilization of our servicemen. But in this instance I wish to call to the attention of the Congress and the American people and the War Department that the Eighty-sixth and Ninety-seventh Divisions have not received that fair consideration which we Americans expect and demand for our boys. As a Pacific theater combat veteran myself I know that the combat man from the European theater has done his fair share and should not have been sent to the Pacific since VJ-day and if so sent, as were the Eighty-sixth and Ninety-seventh Divisions, they should now be returned.

You ask me, how can we do it without the ships? I know the Navy is putting into use all possible ships to bring our boys back, and is doing a magnificent job. Fine large troopships like the U. S. S. *Mount Vernon*, under her capable captain and fine crew, are bringing back thousands of our servicemen in fine health and spirits. A salute to the *Mount Vernon* and her sister ships of the Navy for their fine job.

Having returned from Europe on a Navy troop ship myself within the past several weeks from a congressional tour of investigation, I know the actual facts of the fine job being done. However, how about the War Shipping Administration and their shortsighted policy which I believe is delaying the return of our boys?

At the present time I am advised there are approximately 138 Liberty ships and Victory ships entirely serviceable being held at James River. These ships are fully manned and the War Shipping Administration is holding full crews on such ships for a month. These ships are being manned by seamen who are being forced to stay on the ships, not in active service. This is being done by the War Shipping Administration. Ships of our merchant fleet are not in the service of bringing back our servicemen from overseas. Think of the thousands and thousands of boys who could be on their way home in 138 ships.

You ask me, Do I know whether the Liberty ships can carry servicemen? Of course they can. So there are at least 138 ships that can be used at once. If not, why not? Get these ships in service and bring our boys back at once. Bring back the men who have their 36 points in the Eighty-sixth and Ninety-seventh divisions, as under the present regulations such men are not required to serve in the Pacific. Be fair with these men and apply the War Department rules to every serviceman, whether he be in this country or far away in the Pacific where his protests of injustice cannot be heard. The families and friends of these men have spoken and are protesting by these petitions which contain over seventeen thousand signatures. Fair treatment must be given these outraged thousands of citizens who protest the War Department's treatment of these servicemen of the two divisions indicated. You know that one of the reasons we have a democracy in this country is that everyone is willing to abide by fair and honest decisions, and the fact that the minority have a right to be heard on all questions. Let us heed what the people want. Let us make fair and just decisions for our servicemen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

OPA POLICY

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, President Truman by his directive 9599, under which Mr. Bowles is operating, has thrown open the switch that will help to sidetrack business, jobs for all, and encourage economic chaos. He should rescind that directive which is blocking the road to business and employment, and get back on the main line.

Mr. Speaker, unless Chester Bowles, the Price Administrator, changes his policy and abandons some of his unworkable controls on retail business which is the outlet for manufactured goods in this country, and adopts a more reasonable control over the manufacturers and distributors, his policies will slow down business in the United States to where his gloomy prediction of eight to ten million unemployed in 1946 will become a reality. If this happens, his policies will have made the greatest contribution to such a chaotic condition. Wholesale and retail merchants, in normal times, employ over 8,000,000 people. No other business in the United States reaches that figure.

Many small merchants gave up their help to go to the war and the man and wife, with little extra help in many cases, carried on, working unthinkable hours. Their extra efforts brought the cost of doing business to the lowest possible point. Now, Chester Bowles is enforcing the rule on retail merchants that their prices must not be higher than in 1942. He has ruled that these businesses must be conducted at this low-cost level, which will drive thousands of small businesses out of business and will prevent the merchants from re-employing the servicemen when they return. Unless this ruling is lifted and a reasonable profit is provided, not only for the manufacturer, but for the retail merchant, the wells of supply and distribution will be dried up, scarcity will be maintained, inflation encouraged, and Mr. Bowles will then insist that price control and rationing must be continued because the supply has not met the demand.

Not content with holding the retail merchant down to 1942 price levels, he says to the manufacturer, "You must try to sell goods to the retailer at their 1942 levels, but where your costs have increased by reason of a raise in wages or otherwise, you are permitted to raise your wholesale price of goods, but the retail merchant is not permitted to correspondingly raise his prices." This is what the retail merchants refer to as the "squeeze" which is making business casualties out of them by the thousands. The retailer's costs, too, have gone up where he hires most of his help, but he gets no relief.

Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of this country has such an arrogant, arbitrary ruling been given the force and effect of law. This ruling goes beyond the intent of Congress for establishing price control. It is totalitarian and un-American in principle. Mr. Bowles claims for his authority, the War Powers Act and that he is following the intent of the President's recent directive No. 9599. If he is carrying out the will and direction of the President, the Chief Executive will also have to bear his full share in contributing to the drying up of the wells of production and distribution which will wreck many small business concerns all over the Nation, deny the reemployment of servicemen and others, and bring about the 1946 unemployment rolls predicted by Administrator Bowles.

Mr. Speaker, Chester Bowles says price control must be continued until the supply meets the demand. Any laboring man, farmer, or businessman agrees with this statement. Apparently Mr. Bowles does not believe what he says, because his actions and rules in the control of production and distribution of merchandise is the old New Deal philosophy of scarcity. He insists that in order to hold the line men must produce, process, and manufacture, and must sell goods, in many instances, at less than cost. Anyone with reasonable intelligence knows that in order to get big production and supply of goods, there must be allowed a reasonable profit.

Even though the war is over, there is still the danger of inflation. The production of more goods is the only sure prevention against inflation. Mr. Bowles is blocking the road to the production of more goods. His rules and regulations are encouraging inflation. He should be compelled to change his policies or the Congress should demand his dismissal and that, in his place, an Administrator should be appointed who realizes that greater production is necessary to absorb the millions of workers who are returning from the services, and those who are no longer needed in war plants, and to get a greater production of goods for the

people thereby diminishing the pressure and danger of inflation.

Merchants' shelves are empty all over this country. Men, women, and children are clamoring for clothing of every description. They are being denied and prevented in large measure from getting them because of the unwise and unworkable orders of the OPA applied to the manufacture and distribution of goods.

Mr. Speaker, I have on my desk a copy of a study recently made by a Dr. Backman, of New York University, for some retail consultants whom Mr. Bowles called in to help him. This report shows that an ever-increasing list of goods must be sold at prices that do not enable the merchant to recover his cost and the expense of doing business. OPA has been issuing these orders faster since VJ-day than ever before.

In 1940 there were approximately 1,770,000 retail stores in the United States. Of this number approximately 1,000,000 do less than $10,000 worth of business a year, and a total of 1,615,000 stores are under the $50,000 annual volume line. I have had some experience with small business and I can tell you that a man who does less than $50,000 retail business a year is really small business. Everything that bears on his business makes an impression.

Those retailers who do less than $50,000 a year do 41.2 percent of the selling in the country. The rest of it is done by 156,000 establishments. Out of a total of 6,200,000 people employed in retail stores, the little fellows in normal times give work to 3,800,000 people.

A small businessman, say in the $25,000-a-year class, finds his expense rate up 4 or 5 percent if he hires a man at the prevailing rate of wages to help him. Can you imagine how that small fellow is going to get the help he needs, to let his wife go home from the store now that the war is over, when OPA freezes him down against his wartime expense rate?

Mr. Speaker, these merchants, even the little ones, have cut their expense rates during the war. Part of this is due to the fact that they can't get help. Part of it may be accounted for because they cannot buy as much advertising space, make deliveries, or do other desirable things that the people want.

And now OPA tells these little fellows, already tied to the lowest expense rate they ever had, that they have got to stick with it. They cannot go back to prewar services and they cannot hire more men, take back those who went to war, without losing money. It is very strange, but I find that while OPA lets manufacturers go back to a base period when they had normal expenses and profits to start computing prices, they freeze the little merchant to his wartime expense rate which is the lowest expense rate he ever had.

The worst part of it all is that OPA is too busy to work out a way to figure out absorption on an individual store basis. Do they go to a store and say, "How much money did you make last year; how much are you making now and how much squeeze can you take on a sheet, or a refrigerator, a stove, or a house dress?" They do not.

Some economist sits down at a calculating machine and comes up with a figure. He will say, "The average profit of all stores last year was 10 percent, therefore, all merchants can take a 5 percent squeeze without going below the profit line they had some years before the war."

The same thing is true of average profits. In getting an average, they lump in thousands with no profit alongside thousands who had a profit. There will be concerns who had big profits and there will be others with none at all in the mass of figures from which they get the magic absorption formula. It is unfair and inequitable.

The merchants I know are all decent, hardworking people. They have tried hard to make regulations stick and they have made sacrifices. They have been badgered around by investigators trying to find a 1-cent mistake that will cost the merchant $50 when the OPA gets through with it. They have taken all this quietly as their contribution to the war but now they want to do their job bringing prosperity and full employment back.

Mr. Speaker, these small towns are the economic backbone of thousands and thousands of communities. Anything that hurts them will hurt all the way down the line. If they cannot sell goods and make a living out of doing it, they do not sell goods and they do not place orders and when they do not place orders, factories do not make goods and idle men stand around the plants wondering what is the matter. When I consider these things which OPA is doing, I am not surprised that OPA makes estimates of as high as 10,000,000 unemployed next year. And I also can understand why they think we may have to keep some price controls for a long time. If you dry up production, we will have to keep price controls until we have enough goods to go around. And we never will get enough to go around and bring back competition in price so long as OPA dries up production with this sort of economic thinking.

I am not prepared to say how soon all price controls should go off, but I am sure of one thing. OPA had better obey Congress and stop tampering with established business methods and practices, which we asked them to avoid doing when we wrote the price-control law.

Mr. Speaker, if OPA will start a sincere effort to do an orderly job of pricing goods so as to speed up production, I am sure there will be no excuse for OPA to come here about January 1 and ask us to renew the Price Act again in June. If they do that, it will be because they have been more interested in tinkering with the engine than in trying to make it go.

It is the job of Congress to look into such problems and unless we want to see 10,000,000 unemployed men sitting around, we had better get at the job soon and determine whether we can force the Administrator to change his course. If we cannot, we should demand that the President replace him with one who will encourage production with proper regulations rather than to retard production, which will increase unemployment and encourage inflation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Willard D. Archie, editor, Shenandoah Sentinel, Shenandoah, Iowa.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. MAY), on account of official business for Military Affairs Committee, from September 30 to October 10, inclusive.

To Mrs. NORTON, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. GATHINGS, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. WEAVER (at the request of Mr. KERR), for 1 week, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), from September 5 to an indefinite date, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, October 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. on Friday, September 28, 1945, on H. R. 2202, in room 362, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the full Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, October 2, 1945, at 10 a. m., at which time consideration will be given to H. R. 3709 and H. R. 4127; also to receive a report from subcommittee No. 2, on H. R. 2543.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, October 4, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3367) to amend Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing Tuesday, October 2, 1945, at 10:30 a. m. on H. R. 2111 and H. R. 4079, to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, and for other purposes. Hearings will be held in the committee room, 416 Old

House Office Building. Anyone desiring to give testimony should notify the clerk of the committee prior to date of hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, will meet at 10 a. m., Tuesday, October 9, to begin hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

Various groups who have representation in Washington will be heard during the first week, such as Members of Congress first, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Association of American Railroads, railroad traffic organizations, railroad labor, and truck and bus associations.

The second week will be devoted to various State commissions, agricultural associations, National Industrial Traffic League, and various citizens' traffic associations and traffic boards and chambers of commerce.

It is going to be necessary to limit the time for this hearing as much as possible. It is also desired to avoid any repetition in statements before the committee.

The committee would be pleased to have those who are intending to appear to advise the Clerk promptly the least amount of time they will need in which to present their testimony.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

693. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $30,300 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 291); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

694. A letter from the chairman, President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, transmitting an amendment to its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending December 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

695. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the National Railway Labor Panel, for the period ending December 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

696. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the fourth quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the Education and Training of Defense Workers, covering the period beginning April 1, 1945, and ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Appropriations.

697. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation concerning the claim of William Wilson Wurster against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

698. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the Cost Ascertainment Report and Appendix for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

699. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a summary of the reports of claims for damages resulting from the explosions at the naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif., which occurred on July 17, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 360. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4129, a bill to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1028). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 361. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3517, a bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 1029). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Patents. H. R. 4080. A bill to amend section 476, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 2), providing for officers and employees of the Patent Office, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1030). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 565. An act to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone; with amendment (Rept. No. 1031). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 805. An act to insure further military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources; without amendment (Rept. No. 1032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4173) granting a pension to Clara M. Stowe, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4195. A bill to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4196. A bill to provide for removal of restrictions on property of Indians who serve in the armed forces; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4197. A bill to terminate rationing in the case of beef; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4198. A bill to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States Navy a career; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4199. A bill to extend the existing contributory system of retirement benefits to elective officers of the United States and heads of executive departments; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4200. A bill relating to the tax treatment of chain stores operated at a loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4201. A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4202. A bill to meet the immediate emergency caused by the closing of the wartime child care services; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 4203. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4204. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROE of New York:

H. R. 4205. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," approved February 24, 1923, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4206. A bill to increase the estate tax specific exemption in the case of estates of members of the armed forces who died during the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4207. A bill to grant to personnel in the naval forces certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the National Defense Program in Its Relation to Small Business in the United States, House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings on financial problems of small business held before said committee during the current session; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution to declare September 2, 1945, as the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 4208. A bill for the relief of the Calvert Distilling Co.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4209. A bill for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. R. 4210. A bill for the relief of the estate of Bob Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4211. A bill for the relief of the estate of George D. Croft; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Michael A. Driscoll; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Coutoulakis; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4214. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Benjamin Babine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Jane O'Malley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 4216. A bill for the relief of Cristina Gallego; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 4217. A bill granting a pension to Nellie V. Chambers; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

1197. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of Altis Chapter, No. 85, Order of Ahepa, of Springfield, Mass., urging that the Council of Foreign Ministers grant the claims of Greece for due reparations, the annexation of Epirus, the Dodecanese, and Cyprus, and the rectification of the Bulgarian boundary to a line which will provide the maximum natural defense from Bulgaria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1198. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Joe M. Tatum, FSA committeeman, route 1, Barry, Tex., and G. W. Watkins, FSA committeeman, route 2, Corsicana, Tex., protesting against the Tarver amendment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1199. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of City Council of City of Chicago, requesting the War Department to arrange for demobilization of the Thirty-third Infantry Division as unit, at or near Chicago; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1200. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Oklahoma Colored Democratic Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to establish a hospital for Negro veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1201. Also, petition of district No. 8, United Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers of America, CIO, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their support of H. R. 7; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1202. Also, petition of the American Geophysical Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the mapping by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey and the United States Geological Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1203. Also, petition of the executive committee of the Arkansas Valley Ditch Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the so-called authority bills before the Congress; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, September 10, 1945)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our need is the altar of our prayer; the panoply of Thy love is the sanctuary of our devotion. Thou hast called us, whose lives pass swiftly as a watch in the night, to labor with Thee in the unfolding purpose of the ages. Since it is of Thy mercy that this another day is added to our lives, sanctify our work; let no unhallowed words pollute the tongues which Thou hast made to praise and bless Thee, no evil action defile the bodies which Thou hast taught us are the temples of Thy presence. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HATCH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, September 27, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2948) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 81) providing that the war emergency has been relieved to an extent which will justify proceeding with the highway-construction program under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Overton
Bailey	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barkley	Hoey	Robertson
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Brooks	Kilgore	Shipstead
Buck	Knowland	Smith
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	McMahon	Tydings
Cordon	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Donnell	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Ellender	Millikin	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	White
George	Morse	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	Willis
Green	Murray	Wilson
Guffey	Myers	Young
Gurney	O'Daniel	
Hatch	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I am about to end my daily contact with Members of the Senate. I do so to accept membership on the Supreme Court of the United States. I value infinitely the friendships I have formed in the Senate, and I hope those friendships will continue as long as I live. I want Members of the Senate to feel at home in my judicial chambers across the Plaza, and therefore I now invite those who conveniently can do so to attend a brief informal reception in those chambers, and I invite them to bring their families. This reception will be held at 12:30 o'clock next Monday afternoon, October 1, closely following the open session of the Court, beginning at noon, during which I shall have taken my oath of office.

It has been an inspiration for me to serve in the Senate since January 3, 1941, and to share here in helping to win the war and lay the foundations for international and domestic postwar stability.

I have here deepened my conviction that our constitutional government is so well built that no change of any one official seriously disturbs the stability of it. I am equally convinced, however, that the Government serves the people effectively only in proportion as its officials understand the ever-changing needs of all our people, provides constructive policies to meet those needs, and interprets with dependable impartiality the laws which declare those policies.

In my new assignment I shall have the obligation not to make but to interpret the laws, the treaties, and the Constitution of the United States. I shall deem it a privilege, in that capacity, to cooperate with all branches of our Government. Therefore I shall not be far away from here either in fact or in spirit.

I thank the Members of the Senate and, through them, the people of the United States for the increased faith they have given me in the priceless value of a free and representative government under a constitution designed to insure equal justice under law to all the people. I know of no place in America where one can contribute more to justice for all than as a member of the Supreme Court, and I welcome the opportunity.

I shall do my best to be worthy of my new trust, so help me God. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have heard this valedictory with deep and peculiar regret. It happens that the Senator from Ohio, my colleague [Mr. BREWSTER] and I are all graduates from

the same small college in the State of Maine. We are all of us on the governing board of that college. Each of us is the recipient of a degree of doctor of laws from that college, and I confess I hate keenly to see that trinity in Senate service now broken.

I have in mind, however, Mr. President, that there was a time when a graduate of this same small college presided over the Supreme Court of the United States as its Chief Justice, when one of its graduates was Speaker of the House of Representatives, and a third graduate of that college was the Presiding Officer of this body. In the transfer of the activities of the Senator from Ohio from this body to the Supreme Court I hope I see that small college again on the march. I hope the day is not far distant when he will grace the office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. And without meaning to deny to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] that which he is so completely entitled to have, I nevertheless cherish the hope that the day is not distant when my remaining colleague from the State of Maine will preside over this body. And I give assurance that in Maine's delegation in the House there is at least one graduate of this college who is qualified to preside over that great legislative body at the other end of the Capitol.

Speaking as a friend of long years, I have full faith that the Senator from Ohio possesses every qualification demanded by this great office to which he now goes. He is studious as few men are studious, a seeker always for the truth, a defender always of the truth and of the right as it is given him to see the right. And notwithstanding my conflicting emotions, I extend to him every good wish, and I have for him every expectation of a long and an honorable service upon this greatest of courts.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, without making any predictions as to who will hereafter preside over the Senate of the United States or over the House of Representatives, I wish in a word to comment upon the departure of our friend, a Senator for another day, and soon to be a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I have sometimes in little gatherings told a story about a man in whose office I studied law when I was a boy. His name was Judge Bishop. For 17 years he presided over the intermediate court in Kentucky between the trial court and the court of last resort. He was a great judge. After he retired from the bench he took me into his office and I enjoyed the rare privilege of studying law under him for a period of 2 years. As I said, his name was Bishop. He was the original of Irvin Cobb's old Judge Priest. Cobb demoted him from Bishop to Priest and wrote his charming book about him. The judge used to tell me about his experiences on the bench.

One day he told me about holding court in the little county seat of Smithland, which nestles on the banks of the Cumberland River where it empties into the Ohio. In that town there was only one hotel, a rambling old brick house, with high ceilings and large rooms, and in each room there were anywhere from two to four double beds. The hotel was always crowded when court met because the lawyers, the litigants, and the witnesses came there. One night the hotel was so crowded that it became necessary to put an Irishman in the room with old Judge Bishop, and the next morning while they were dressing Judge Bishop said in a sort of patronizing way, "Pat, you would have been in the old country a long time before you would have slept with a judge."

"Yes," Pat replied, "and faith and bejabers, Your Honor, you would have been in the old country a long time before you would have been a judge."

So he told me that he never bantered with another Irishman after that for sleeping in the same room with him.

That story is only applicable to our very dear friend and colleague for a few more hours, in this, that if he had stayed in Ohio and had not come to the Senate the chances are he would not now be on the verge of becoming a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. That, of course, is speculative. But I have no doubt that his appointment to the Supreme Court grows out of the fine service he has rendered here, and the knowledge of the appointing power, as well as of his colleague and of the country, of the fine qualities he possesses not only to make a great Senator, as he has, but to make a great Justice of the Supreme Court, as he will.

I have heretofore said that I witness the departure of Senator BURTON with deep regret, but I congratulate him, and I congratulate the President, and I congratulate the Supreme Court and the country upon his accession to that great tribunal, and I predict for him, at his youthful age and his sound health, long service and a distinguished record upon the highest court not only in this land but, as we believe, the greatest court in the world. I wish for the Senator in all his activities that satisfaction which comes only to those who have an inner consciousness of duty well done, and when he has completed his duties on the bench that he may enjoy such repose as he may wish in the contemplation of the service which he has rendered to his country.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, which were referred as indicated:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin ordered to lie on the table:

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to repeal the emergency war time law forthwith

"Whereas standard time was changed to war time in the interest of the war effort and now no further need for continuing on war time exists: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorializes Congress to repeal the war time law forthwith; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President, to each House of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Office of Price Administration to abolish rationing of butter and cheese; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WILEY on September 27, 1945, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9192.)

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Potomac Cooperative Federation, an organization of consumer cooperatives of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., favoring retention of all necessary rationing of scarce food items, so as to assist in a program of maximum assistance to the war-torn liberated areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION RELATING TO COMMON CARRIERS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Public Utilities Commission favoring the enactment of House bill 2536, relating to common carriers.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the legality of the present practice of establishing rates for public transportation through the medium of rate bureaus has been recently challenged; and

Whereas the Massachusetts Public Utilities Commission believes that the established practices for the regulation of interstate public transportation should be continued under the supervision and control of the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

Whereas the Bulwinkle bill, so-called H. R. 2536, now pending in the Congress, purports to make legal the acts and agreements among carriers establishing rate bureaus, joint tariffs, and schedules of service subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and expressly exempts such coordinated rate bureaus and committees so functioning and agreements consummated thereunder from the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act, so-called; and

Whereas said H. R. 2536 legalizes such customary practices by the Interstate Commerce Commission, we believe the continuance of such practices are in conformity with the public interest: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Public Utilities Commission endorses H. R. 2536 and

recommends its adoption by the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in Washington and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Senators and Representatives from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

THOMAS A. FLAHERTY,
CARROLL L. MEINS,
FRANCIS M. MCKEOWN,
JOHN M. WHOULEY,
DAVID M. BRACKMAN,
Massachusetts Public Utilities Commission.

A true copy.
Attest:

JAMES M. CUSHING, *Secretary.*
BOSTON, MASS., *September 25, 1945.*

PROTEST AGAINST DRAFTING OF 18-YEAR-OLD BOYS ATTENDING HIGH SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an interesting letter from V. L. Ragland, a prominent businessman of McPherson, Kans., protesting against the drafting of 18-year-old boys, who are attending high school and college. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter presented by Mr. CAPPER was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCPHERSON, KANS., *September 20, 1945.*
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I earnestly urge you to use your influence and support to immediately stop the drafting of 18-year-old boys who are attending high school and college; this is especially true of boys who are attending college. I understand that a majority favor the deferring of these boys until they complete their college training but up to now nothing has been done about it and dragging the boys out of school goes merrily on.

As these college boys are the future backbone of our country it seems almost unbelievable that a country as strong as ours would have to resort to this method to raise an army for occupational purposes, when it has been proven without a doubt that young men this age are taken out of school for as much as 2 years 70 percent of them never return to school.

I have no objection to a year or so military training for all our young men, but I don't think the time to give it to them is in the middle of their years attending school. For example, I have a boy who finished high school last spring and we enrolled him at the Wentworth Military Academy, Lexington, Mo., for the summer term in junior college. He will be 18 this coming November, will have completed one full year college work at the end of the first fall semester as he is attending Wentworth again this fall and in addition to this 1 year college he will also have 1 year military training. He is majoring in chemistry, either industrial or chemical engineering. Does it not look just about downright silly to take this boy or any other boy under like circumstances out of college in the middle of the year, put him in the Army for 2 years and expect him to come back and take his seat in the classroom the same as if nothing had happened Not if I know anything about the Army, and I had a hitch in 1917–18.

Your sincere consideration in this vital matter will be greatly appreciated by me and hundreds of other parents who are striving to educate their children.

Yours very truly,

V. L. RAGLAND.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING—LETTER FROM OMER J. McCORMICK

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I received a letter from Mr. Omer J. McCormick, Neosho Rapids, Kans., commenting favorably on a statement made by me, "It is time to cut spending," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEOSHO RAPIDS, KANS.,
September 22, 1945.

ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I just read your statement, "It's time to cut spending." I think you are right 100 percent.

I think it is a mistake to pay people to loaf, when there is more work in the Central States than we can get help to do.

I am a farmer and stockman, and I have let the improvement and fences go to pieces since we have been in the war, so as to produce all we could. Now we would like to fix them up if I could get the help.

All of our doctors around here went to war, and I think it is time they sent some of them home.

I think all of our boys that have been in service overseas should be sent home. We have a lot of boys in the Army that have not been out of the good old United States of America that could take their place.

Your friend,

OMER J. MCCORMICK.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is need for printing additional copies of the hearings on the pending bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, from the Committee on Printing Senate Resolution 177, and ask that it be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 177) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee on S. 380, Full Employment Act of 1945.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. PEPPER):

S. 1441. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1442. A bill for the relief of George O. Weems;

S. 1443. A bill for the relief of Tom B. Deen; and

S. 1444. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reta H. Hardin et al; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1445. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of permitting States, and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, to secure coverage for their officers and employees under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of such act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma):

S. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution permitting federally owned alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2948) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 81) providing that the war emergency has been relieved to an extent which will justify proceeding with the highway-construction program under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

INVESTIGATION OF MEANS OF INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN TRANSPORTATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. SHIPSTEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 161) authorizing an investigation of all means of interstate and foreign transportation, which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS FOR THE PROMOTION OF SCIENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there are several bills before the Senate dealing with research and the promotion of science. At the request of the offices of several Senators and Senators themselves, I ask that these bills and proposals and excerpts from certain reports be combined in one pamphlet and printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the St. Lawrence seaway and the President's letter in regard to it, as published in the New York Herald Tribune of September 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETING IN LONDON—TASK OF UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP—ARTICLE BY SUMNER WELLES

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Meeting in London—Task of United States Leadership," written by Sumner Welles and published in the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

NAVY DEMOBILIZATION PROGRAM—LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in my opinion the highest concern of the American people today relates to when and how quickly their sons and friends in the armed services are to be demobilized. The appeals reaching Members of the Congress in letters and through personal contact are touching and most appealing. The men in the services themselves are, in large numbers, communicating with the Members of Congress. These communications indicate a restlessness and a lowering of morale because of the uncertainty of the demobilization programs. This situation must not be disregarded. At the moment, of far more importance to mothers, fathers, wives, and relatives, than plans for reconversion, avoidance of unemployment and other postwar economic policies, is the answer to the question, "When will my son or brother return home?"

This subject has given all of us much concern, and I find it difficult for the public to realize the limited power of the Members of Congress to deal effectively with the situation because we are still in the midst of the war emergency, and full power and control of the armed forces is still under our military leaders.

As a result of correspondence and interviews with the Secretary of the Navy in regard to the Navy demobilization program, wherein I urged prompt and effective action to muster out of the service as rapidly as possible the reserve officers and enlisted men who entered the Navy as civilians to fight the war, who feel now that the fighting has terminated, they should return to their peacetime pursuits, I have received from Secretary Forrestal a reply to my recent letter in which he states the position of the Navy. It is the first complete analysis of this subject setting forth the position of the Navy that I have seen, although, from time to time, various statements and regulations have been issued. I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Members of the Congress and the general public.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, September 25, 1945.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: Let me at the outset thank you for your letter of September 7 on the Navy's demobilization plans. The suggestions which you made were thoughtful and provocative, and we are mindful that they come from one who has had long experience in naval matters. I hope you will continue to give us the benefit of your observations on demobilization.

You say in summation that "those now in the service, as well as their relatives and friends, are anxious to know when they may expect to be released." I agree. Let me try to satisfy that desire.

We hope that by September 1, 1946—1 year after the formal surrender of Japan—everyone will be out of the Navy except those who are serving voluntarily and those who, because they were inducted into the Navy recently, still have unexpired service under an amended Selective Service Act. That is our goal. To achieve it, all our recruiting and transfer programs must be successful.

To give you a more precise idea of when men will be out of the Navy, one of every three will be home by mid-February, one of every two by mid-April, two of every three by mid-June, and five of every six by the end of August. As I said before, we hope that the one-sixth remaining in the Navy next September 1 will be men who elect to stay and those who have unexpired service under the Selective Service Act.

We hope to beat that schedule, releasing more men than it calls for in the months immediately after the turn of the year. We have fixed a fast demobilization plan, but we will beat it if we can. We hope to be the first of the armed forces to return to peacetime strength. We have a schedule for laying up ships, disbanding air groups, and decommissioning bases which synchronizes with the release of personnel. By September 1, 1946, the Navy expects to shrink to 500,000 men and 58,000 officers. We hope that the Navy, in peacetime, will remain at about that size.

I have spent some time emphasizing the speed and the completeness of our projected demobilization because I think it is important to realize that our demobilization point system does not determine who gets out of the Navy. Everyone who wishes to will get out of the Navy in fairly short order, but everyone cannot get out at the same time. The demobilization mechanism only governs who gets out first. That is the function of our point system, or the system which you call automatic discharges.

As you know, the question of who gets out of the Navy first is decided on the basis of four factors: (a) Length of service, (b) length of service overseas, (c) age, and (d) dependency. I believe everyone will agree that these factors should determine the priority of release of men from military duty. They are the factors which will put at the top of the list for release those men who have served longest, who have served overseas in active theaters of war, who are oldest, and who have people dependent on them for support.

You included these four factors in the formula which you suggested in your letter, and I am pleased that you agree with us that length of service, service overseas, age, and dependency are four considerations which should govern the order of men's release.

You also suggested two other factors. The first additional factor which you suggested is recognition of medals and decorations. We have recognized medals in a slightly different way than you suggest. Any Reserve or inductee who has won the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Navy Cross, the Legion of Merit, the Silver Star, or the Distinguished Flying Cross in combat is automatically released on his own request.

The second additional factor which you suggested is the recognition of battle stars. The Navy has not recognized battle stars in its release formula because to do so would unjustifiably discriminate against some combat veterans. Battle stars are worn by men who were in certain major naval engagements. But there were many engagements of individual ships or of small groups of ships—such as armed guard actions in the Atlantic, PT boat operations in the Pacific, individual destroyer or cruiser actions—which were fully as hazardous to the personnel involved as any of the major operations. These small but deadly actions were not assigned battle stars. Therefore, to recognize battle stars in the release formula would be to discriminate against those men whose service in combat happened to be in isolated rather than large engagements. You will agree, I am sure, that this discrimination would not be justifiable.

You also suggest a slightly different handling of the factor of dependency. The Navy allows a flat credit of 10 points for dependents. You suggested 5 points for each dependent up to a maximum of 15 points.

A flat credit for dependency was decided upon by the Navy for several reasons. First, dependency takes many forms—a parent, a wife, a child, and other relatives, are often truly dependent—a fact which was recognized by Congress in both the Selective Service Act and the acts establishing family allowances and other forms of financial aid for dependents. In following this traditional pattern, the Navy allows dependency credit to some 700,000 persons in the Navy who have dependents other than children. Further, we felt it highly desirable to keep the entire process of computing points as simple as possible in order to avoid the type of complicated figuring which slows down the whole process. Accordingly, we chose the simple device of a flat credit, and have made provision for the man with an unusual degree of dependency by means of the hardship cases, each such case being decided on its individual merits. As you know, we have now been able to liberalize the administration of these hardship cases to the extent that any enlisted man with three or more children under 18 is assumed to have a hardship case and will be released upon his application.

Having established this formula governing the release of officers and men from the naval service, we are going to try to stick to it. We believe the system does justice to the men in the Navy and we feel a responsibility not to undermine it by draining off personnel through other methods. The inevitable result of so doing would be to prevent the lowering of the scores in the future and would simply mean the retention in the service of men who would otherwise become eligible.

We have, however, recognized the problem which you raised in your paragraph headed "Discharge programs for special corps and classifications." In this paragraph you suggest that officers and men in certain duties like intelligence, construction, public relations, etc., are less essential now, whereas other personnel, particularly those in the Medical Corps, are almost as necessary now as when we were engaged in actual fighting.

Instead of releasing the less necessary groups of persons outside the formula, we have chosen to hold them to the general point system, but to establish for them special critical scores. For example, we quickly discovered we had a relatively large surplus of aviators. Accordingly, the critical score for their release has been cut to 44 points against 49 points for other officers. This device of establishing lower critical scores for surplus categories will be used in other cases if and when we discover those surpluses. At the other end of the scale the need for medical personnel, which you mentioned, has obliged us to set a critical score for male doctors of 60 points, 11 points higher than the normal score for officers of 49 points. By these variations in critical scores the Navy hopes to prevent the needless retention of surplus personnel.

Incidentally, I believe the paragraph above answers your questions about aviation, medical, and construction personnel. They all are under the point system. Doctors and aviators have special critical scores, but all others, including construction personnel, have normal critical scores.

The third type of discharge which you suggest, special order discharges, is the one that causes the greatest difficulty. As you know, we do recognize cases of family hardship—which should not be confused with cases of business convenience—and we do give special attention to discharge applications from enlisted men who have been long in the service and who have especially pressing dependency situations.

You may be interested in how we handle applications for release in hardship cases.

A hardship application filed by an enlisted man or an officer goes first to the applicant's commanding officer. The commanding officer must forward the application to Washington, making whatever recommendation he sees fit. Therefore, a hardship plea cannot be either pigeonholed or rejected in the field. Here in Washington the hardship appeals of enlisted men are decided by the Enlisted Personnel Office of the Bureau of Personnel. Those of officers are decided by a board, the membership of which we keep anonymous so that the board cannot be subjected to pressure. No official of the Department will be allowed to overrule this impartial board.

My own observation indicates that both the board and the Enlisted Personnel Office are being lenient in matters of true family hardship—as distinguished from cases of business convenience.

In all honesty, I believe these are the only special order discharges which we can consider. We have had appeals to release all married men and we also have appeals to release single men so that they can get married. We are asked to release all combat veterans because of their sacrifice, and we are asked to release all noncombat men because they won't be any use to the Navy. We are told we should release all young men because they are preparing for their careers, and we are told that we should release all older men because their careers may be ending.

Each of these appeals has its validity, but there is no unanimity among them. They are so conflicting that, if we tried to satisfy one this week and another next week, our demobilization would break down in a chaos of cross-purposes. The net result, I am convinced, would be to slow down the whole demobilization.

The best answer to the appeals of special groups is a fast over-all demobilization. For that reason, we have fixed the rapid release schedule to which I referred before—and we will beat it if we can.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the heading of the first article on the front page of this morning's Washington Post reads, "President carries fight for jobless pay to House after 'let-down' by Senate." The reference is to a conference which the President had yesterday with the Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee with respect to the bill providing unemployment compensation of $25 a week for 26 weeks. Charles G. Ross, Presidential press secretary, is quoted in the article as follows:

The President spoke vigorously. He said he stood pat on 26 weeks and $25 for unemployment compensation. He said the Senate let him down and he expected the House not to do so. He said his views were fully outlined in his message to Congress and he stood by them.

From the statement of the President that "the Senate let him down" there follows reasonably the inference that the Senate was under some obligation to the President with which the Senate failed to comply. From the President's statement the implication may clearly be drawn that the Senate had failed to perform its duty by not carrying into effect the President's desires in this matter.

I think it proper that the Senate pause at this point to remember now and for all future time that it is not a body subordinate to the President of the United States or subject to the duty to follow his desires, irrespective of the judgment of Members of the Senate.

It is a proper function of the President to make recommendations to Congress, and it is of high importance that respectful and thorough consideration be given by Congress to every recommendation made by the President. This, however, is entirely different from the view that Congress owes an obligation to the President to follow his recommendations blindly. There is no basis for the President of the United States to be of the opinion that merely because the Senate fails to approve legislation suggested by him the Senate has thereby omitted a duty, which omission is a logical interpretation of the term "let him down."

We have had in past years many illustrations of Executive domination over Congress. It is to be devoutly hoped that no repetition of such domination will ever again occur in our national history. Our Government consists of three coordinate branches, the legislative, executive, and judicial. Each has its own functions. Each is responsible for its own independent exercise of those functions. Each of them owes a duty not to the other branch, but to the people of the United States to perform this duty fearlessly, independently, and without subordination to another branch of government.

The Congress will do well at this point to caution itself never to accede or agree to the doctrine that Congress is subordinate to the Executive. Congress will do well also to caution itself at this time never to accede or agree to the doctrine that by omitting, after the exercise by it of honest judgment, to enact legislation favored by the Executive, it has "let down" the Executive; namely, that it has failed to perform a duty which it owes to the Executive. We are chosen to perform our duty to the people of the United States. We owe no duty to comply with directions or orders of the Executive to enact legislation. Our duty is to do what we ourselves think best. To fail to follow the opinions of the Executive does not constitute a breach of duty, a noncompliance with obligation, or a "letting down" of the Executive.

In conclusion, I call attention to certain words in Washington's Farewell Address, which are as true in this September 1945 as they were in September 1796 when he delivered that immortal document. Those words are:

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking, in a free country, should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding, in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A first estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal, against invasions by the others, have been evinced by experiment, ancient and modern; some of them in our own country, and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular, wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance, in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can, at any time, yield.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had intended to address myself to the full-employment bill earlier in the debate. Not having done so, I really feel that many of the remarks which I shall make today will not add anything to the debate, because they have been covered, in the main, by the very excellent discussion on both sides of this question in the speeches which have preceded. Hence I suggested to my cosponsors of the bill that we might very well forego my discussion today. However, it was the judgment of those supporting the bill that in order to complete the record this speech should be made a part of the record because of the emphasis which I shall give to certain features and objectives of the bill.

It is my understanding, Mr. President, that it is the desire—and I certainly share in it—of Senators on both sides of the aisle that we reach a vote on this bill today, if possible. Therefore, I shall decline for the main to yield during my speech, although I shall wish to extend every possible courtesy to my colleagues if they feel it important that they interrupt for comment or questions on anything I say. I assure my colleagues that after I close my speech I shall be very glad to subject myself to such cross-examination as they may wish to put me to on this very essential piece of legislation. I hope that when I decline to yield during the course of my remarks, no colleague will consider me in the slightest way discourteous, because such will not be my intention.

Mr. President, as a Republican, I support and sponsor the full-employment bill because I feel that maintaining full employment is absolutely essential to preserving our economy in this country. If we lose that economy we shall lose many democratic rights as well. I am sure that many of my colleagues in the Senate are aware of my conviction that we shall have to maintain on an efficient and a highly productive level our system of private enterprise economy if we are to preserve political democracy itself. I have said before, but it is a truth which I think so fundamental that it deserves repeating, that under our form of government we cannot separate our form of

economy from political democracy itself, because if we do we will have to substitute for our system of private enterprise a regimented economy. If we have a regimented economy by government we also lose many of our basic political democratic rights. I think that the contest between economic systems is one of the great battles of ideology going on in the world today, and it is not foreign to our shores. It is being waged in America today and I want to throw my support to private enterprise. The question is whether we are going to make political democracy and the private enterprise economy work cooperatively in this country, to the end that we can assure full employment under our great democratic Government. We know that our form of government elevates to the highest position among the nations of the world the rights of the individual and the dignity of men. However, if in the future it fails so to plan its economic affairs as to give its people the chance to work and maintain a decent standard of living they will insist upon changes in our economy.

So I say, Mr. President, that I feel that the full-employment bill is essential in order to hitch together political democracy and a private enterprise economy. I recognize that there are great differences among us in our approach to these problems, although this debate has shown very clearly that we are of one mind as to the objectives. The opponents of the bill or those who would modify it in various respects have stated over and over again on the floor of the Senate that they are sympathetic with the objectives of the bill. I know their sincerity is as deep as the sincerity of those of us who believe that legislation such as S. 380 will be necessary if we are to hold out to the common men and women of America what amounts to an economic insurance policy which will protect them from the misery and cruelty of depressions and deflated dollars.

I recognize, Mr. President, that one of the great shortcomings of most of the legislative programs of the past 20 years—and I include Republican as well as Democratic administrations in that period of time—has been a failure on the part of both great political parties to come forward with a realistic tax program.

I am aware of the fact that so far as political issues are concerned, and sometimes so far as political consequences to individuals are concerned, a proposal to tax sufficiently to pay for the benefits of government is considered to be bad politics. However, I am convinced, Mr. President, that we cannot maintain the benefits of government which must be maintained and expanded as problems arise unless we tell our people honestly and forthrightly that they must expect to pay taxes to meet the costs of those Government services. In my judgment, if we are to be perfectly intellectually honest about it we must tell the people that they must expect to pay high taxes for years to come, not only in order to pay the great cost of this war—a cost which, after all, is very cheap, because the winning of the war makes it possible for us to be here today as free men representing a free people—but to pay the cost of all other obligations which the Government must assume.

(At this point Mr. MORSE yielded to Mr. CONNALLY, who spoke on the ratification of the water treaty by the Mexican Government, and debate ensued, all of which, on request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, was ordered to be printed at the conclusion of the speech of Mr. MORSE.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I happen to be one who believes that we, as representatives of the people of this country, should make perfectly clear to them on a factual basis what are the tax problems of the country, and what are the budgetary necessities of the Government. If we do so, I believe that they will be perfectly willing to pay for the benefits which they insist upon receiving provided we make it possible for them to maintain a standard of living sufficiently high to permit them to pay out of the productive enterprises of this country, and the wealth produced through them, the taxes necessary to meet the expenses of whatever legislative program shall be enacted by the Congress in the public interest.

Moreover, Mr. President, I feel that we should not endeavor to incorporate a tax program into the pending bill. When we are ready to grapple with the tax problems of this Congress I shall be perfectly willing to take the position that we must impose taxes sufficiently high to make it possible to protect the value of the American dollar. Unless we raise revenues through taxation to protect the value of the American dollar there can be no doubt about the fact that we shall be headed toward runaway inflation. Mass unemployment is certain to go along with inflation, and no amount of spending can help unemployment caused by inflation. I shall be perfectly willing to put my political head on the block, so to speak, in support of an adequate tax program in order to protect the value of the American dollar, because I conceive that to be one of my primary duties to the people whom I try to serve. This full-employment bill will assure employment only so long as we protect the soundness of our dollar. Cheap money doesn't create jobs; it destroys them. That is why I think that after passage of this bill we should tackle our tax problems.

However, Mr. President, I am not one who becomes alarmed over the label "deficit spending." When deficit spending for any emergency period of time appears to be necessary in order to maintain and expand the productive resources of this country for the purpose of providing jobs for men and women, I shall not hesitate to vote for deficit spending for whatever the period of time may be which is found to be necessary. Deficit spending, if it results in the creation of wealth-producing jobs, does not deflate the value of the dollar, but protects its value because out of those jobs will come savings with which the cost of the enterprise can be paid through taxes. It is true, of course, that if deficit spending continued for so long as to create a debt in excess of wealth produced, the value of the dollar would be deflated. But I do not fear deficit spending during an emergency in which we are threatened with a depression and unemployment if we agree that the costs of the projects for which the public money is spent will later be returned in taxes after the emergency is over.

Hence I think we should make clear that a time will come when we will have to pay for the cost of any particular emergency in the alleviation of which we spend money under the terms of this bill. I am one who believes that during the serious depression of the 1930's we should have adopted, at the time Congress passed much of the legislation which was enacted during that period, a more adequate and fairer tax program. I assert now that if this proposed legislation is enacted, as I trust it will be, in order to meet the expenditures which the Government will have to make if it is to provide opportunities for the employment of those who want to work, it will be necessary to establish tax brackets sufficiently high to meet the necessary costs.

I have one other statement which I wish to make with reference to the tax problem. The pending bill refers to aiding private industry. One of the best ways in which this Congress can aid private industry is by lifting from it taxes which today amount to confiscation, taxes which destroy the confidence of business, and which offer no inducement to the owners of surplus venture money to invest their funds in wealth-creating industry. I think that at a very early date we should remove the high bracket tax on industry. It is now preventing the investment of huge surpluses of money which should be invested during the reconversion period in new industries and in projects which will produce wealth-creating jobs and new profits out of which new tax dollars can flow.

However, I shall oppose any attempt to weaken and cripple this bill by any amendment which seeks to require as a condition precedent to providing work opportunities the revenue from taxes to pay for job producing projects. I think our American economy is too dynamic and too vital to necessitate, when we pass the pending measure, the adoption of a tax program which in and of itself would make it impossible during the emergency to provide the jobs necessary to carry out the objectives of the legislation. I agree we must raise the costs through taxes and shall vote for a tax program which will do it when we take up the tax problems of this Congress.

Mr. President, I think that the full-employment bill is not the ogre which some of its opponents would make of it. The bill first states its objectives in very plain language. I think that in the closing hours of this debate it would be well to review briefly those objectives.

One of the objectives is that everyone shall have a chance to earn a living in a free competitive economy. The plain and clear language on page 12 of the bill, beginning on line 21, is as follows:

> It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to foster free competitive private enterprise and the investment of private capital.

I know of no one who quarrels with that premise. The bill states further:

All Americans able to work and desiring to work are entitled to an opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment.

We may have some differences of opinion with respect to all the implications and meaning of that language. I am not only willing to stand on what I think is the clear meaning of that section, but I venture the suggestion that if that objective is not carried out in America during the years ahead, private industry itself will be the greatest sufferer.

I have heard no voice raised against the major objectives of this bill, so I assume that we are in general agreement concerning them.

The bill also states in very plain language that the maintenance of full employment opportunity is an obligation and a responsibility of the Government of the United States. Furthermore, the bill accepts in full such responsibility. It states that we will assure the existence of opportunities for full employment.

In other words, to the extent that it can—to the extent that it can, I repeat—the Government will assure that everyone will have a chance to earn a living. I think in this modern world, with all the technological advancements in the field of production, advancements which have accrued to the great advantage of industry generally, that if the best economic interests of employees and industrialists are to be protected, if their property rights are to be preserved, a democratic government ought to recognize, keep faith with, and fulfill the basic objective of the bill—that everyone will have a chance to earn a living.

In stating these things in plain language the bill does not quibble or dodge or duck the issue. It does not indulge in double-talk. It does not say we will encourage this objective or promote this condition or that we will do something along this line. It says that it is the obligation of the Government to assure that everyone will have a chance to earn a living. It definitely does not say, Mr. President, that we will assure jobs for some and doles for others. It says in plain language, which I think the common people of this country can understand, that we will do whatever is necessary to assure full employment. The bill says so in this language:

Stimulate, encourage, and assist private enterprise to provide, through an expanding production and distribution of goods and services the largest feasible volume of employment opportunities.

Further, the bill says:

Stimulate, encourage, and assist State and local governments, through the exercise of their respective functions, to make their most effective contribution to assuring continuing full employment.

It says that in order to assure full employment opportunity the Government of the United States will create programs and use the sources of governmental powers authorized under the Constitution as developed and improved throughout the years.

This language is to be found on page 13 of the bill, line 22, where it says:

To that end the Federal Government shall, in cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and others, develop and pursue a consistent and carefully planned economic program with respect to, but not limited to, taxation.

I digress for a moment to point out that the bill itself recognizes that we have an obligation as a government to face forthrightly the taxation problems which confront the country. Those of us who sponsor this bill know that an adequate tax program must reinforce this bill just as such a tax program should support all legislation involving public expenditures.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was just wondering if it has not been a fact that the Government has done in the past everything the bill calls for. Has not the Government in the past done the things for which this bill calls?

Mr. MORSE. I think decidedly not.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under this bill what will the Government do in the future that it has not done in the past?

Mr. MORSE. The Government will do what is called for under every section of this bill in regard to coming forward with the necessary program to meet emergencies of unemployment as they arise, by way of governmental expenditures, cooperation with local and State governments and with private industry. The bill calls for advanced planning to meet unemployment emergencies. The plans are to be worked out by the President and approved in every detail by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Has not the Government always done that?

Mr. MORSE. If the Government had always done that, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana, we would not, in my judgment, have had the misery and hardship of the great depression of the thirties. We had doles and work relief, not a wealth-creating employment program.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is proceeding on the premises that in the future we are going to be more active than we have been in the past and that the Government's program and plans will be better than they have been in the past.

Mr. MORSE. I am proceeding on the premise that democracy is vital enough to assure full employment to its people. I think that it must be more wise in the future in handling these problems, if it is to survive.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not quarreling with the Senator's statement, and I am not quarreling with the bill at the moment. But as I was sitting here and as the Senator was talking I was just wondering if it is not a fact that the Government for 160 years has done exactly what the Senator is talking about and what the Senate has been talking about for several days. It may be that what the Government has done has not been done so efficiently as it might have been done; but the fact still remains that it has done it; and I do not like to have the American people sold on the idea in the latter part of September 1945 that in the future we are going to do something for them we have not done in the past. It may be that we can do it more efficiently, but it certainly is nothing new.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator's point of view, with which I find myself in complete disagreement, because I do not think the Government has to the degree that it should lived up to the obligation to do all within its power and within its resources to provide full employment and to control the causes of depressions.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely point out, with reference to inquiry of my good friend from Indiana, to the Senator from Oregon, that there is something more in this bill than has been talked of on this floor, and that is the provision in the bill which I call particularly to the attention of the Senator from Indiana, for a Joint Committee on the National Budget, and a National Production and Employment Budget, under which a survey of conditions will be made through the research agencies of the Government. That is something new, and, in my judgment, something good.

The Senator from Indiana is the head of a very successful business corporation which bears his name—more power to him—and which he has built up. I think he will agree with me that he has in Indiana a great research agency whose duty it is to make surveys ahead as to what the probable demand will be for his products, what the supply of materials will be, and what the wholesale opportunities will be. That is certainly true of the General Electric Co., the United States Steel Corp., General Motors, and other corporations. Under this bill the Government will undertake more than it has done heretofore, more than General Motors has done, more than the Senator from Indiana has done in his organization.

We have vast research potentialities in our Government, and we can get the best experts in the world, who can investigate and consider all the ramifications of industry and business, put them in a test tube, so to speak, hold up the test tube to the light and see, so far as is possible, what future conditions are going to be. Then, the Congress, to which we hope to continue to belong from year to year, will implement the ideas and aspirations of this bill in the light of the findings of the research agencies of the Government showing employment conditions.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Allow me to reply to the Senator from New Hampshire by saying I thank him for his contribution, and to say that if those who feel that in the past

the Government has been doing everything that is called for under this bill, then, in my judgment, they should have no objection to giving their votes in support of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GUFFEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not make the statement that the Government had been doing everything it might have done. I merely asked the question whether it was not a fact that the Government in the past had done all the things the bill provided for, and whether the Senator's position, and that of the able Senator from New Hampshire, was not that under the bill the Government would be able to do the things it had done in the past and do them more efficiently.

Mr. MORSE. That is not my answer, I assure the Senator from Indiana. My answer is that the Government has not done in the past many of the things permissible under the bill which it should do.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not care to take the Senator's time, and I do not wish to get into a debate on the subject, but I should like to have someone—and the Senator need not do it at the moment—point out to me anything that will be done under the bill, other than research in advance, which the Government has not done in the last 160 years. It certainly has promoted private enterprise; it certainly has promoted WPA and PWA, and it certainly has spent billions upon billions of dollars in made work. It certainly has done all the things called for in the bill. I am not fighting the bill; at the moment I am not against the bill, but I do not like to have the American people sold on the idea that all at once here is something brand new, because there is nothing brand new in it.

Mr. MORSE. By his illustrations, the Senator brings out exactly the type of things the Government has done in the past which, in my judgment, were the wrong things to do, because they were not wealth-creating things. I refer to his illustration of WPA and the so-called dole, job-relief projects. This bill seeks to aid private enterprise in its productive activities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, would it interfere with the Senator if he yielded to me in connection with the point raised by the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me that one of the replies to the able Senator from Indiana is that the answers we have made to depressions heretofore have been hit-and-miss answers, they have been spasmodic answers, they have been expedients, whereas the pending measure contemplates a plan with respect to depressions.

If the Senator will permit, I should like to testify that that prospectus has, from my point of view, very honorable Republican roots. When I came to the Senate in 1928 the first bill I ever introduced in the Senate, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 17, 1928, was a plan for a "prosperity reserve," which is an even better term than "full employment." It sought the orderly planning of useful public works, and provision in advance for their financing, to be used in time of depression, to cushion, so far as possible, the impact of the depression. I still believe in planning in 1945 just as much as I did in 1928.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may address myself to a remark made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to take exception to something the Senator from Michigan said, though I know that is dangerous. He said that this effort has very honorable Republican roots. I ask him to strike the word "honorable." "Republican roots" are synonymous with honesty and integrity.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think I shall still allow the adjective to remain, because the point raised by the Senator from New Hampshire is controversial in some quarters.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In theory any man would have a good deal of difficulty in opposing the bill. I think it contains some provisions which may not work as well as its well-intentioned authors propose. For example, there is the provision that the President shall look ahead for a year and determine what, in his judgment is going to happen, and then to promulgate policies to deal with what he thinks the events of the future are likely to be.

Mr. President, I say this not in opposition at all, because it is sound, but the President does that anyway, as the Senator from Indiana has pointed out, in his messages to Congress on the state of the Union. However, as the bill deals specifically with employment, I can imagine two cases. I shall take the Republican case first. I can imagine Mr. Dewey being our President, for example, and he and Mr. Brownell, chairman of the Republican National Committee, looking ahead, let us say, to a time when the prospects for employment were not very good, and telling the country formally that under his administration the conditions were very bad and likely to become worse, and that therefore "we must do thus and so."

Or I can imagine Mr. Truman consulting with Mr. Hannegan, about a year before election, and saying, "There are 8,000,000 people out of employment and conditions are going to grow worse, and we must tell that to the country." If I know Mr. Brownell or Mr. Hannegan or the average human being in political life, I know that a man in such a position would undertake to persuade the President to tone down what he said about a bad condition being likely to come to pass, because if a Republican President should say that, the Democrats would say, "Here are his very words. He shows his incompetence to run the country. He tells you that conditions are going to be bad, and that millions are going to be out of employment." If a Democrat in the President's chair should make such a statement, the Republicans would say the same thing.

I do not make this statement to belittle the bill or to criticize the work of its authors, because I think in most respects the theory set forth is a good one. The one thing which cannot be written into the bill is the human adaptability to the theories of life and philosophy. When we come to deal with politics, no matter how dark the depression is 1 year before any election, regardless of whether the administration is Democratic or Republican, we can bet our bottom dollar that the President, who will probably be a candidate for reelection, will tell the country that things are going to become better, it would not make any difference whether it was Herbert Hoover, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, or any other President, because, after all, we live in a world that has in it an awful lot of human nature.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. I repeat, Mr. President, for those who have come into the Chamber after I started, that although I wish to extend any courtesy anyone may ask of me, it is my desire to cooperate with the floor leadership today and to finish my speech as quickly as possible, and then answer questions at the close. I shall, however, continue to extend the courtesy of yielding to any Senator who feels he must interrupt before I conclude.

I wish to thank the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] for his helpful contribution to my remarks. To supplement what I have already said to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] I wish to add that procedurally and substantively the terms of the bill, the program called for by the bill, and the economic planning which will be adopted as the policy of the Government, if the bill shall be enacted, are so different from the hit-or-miss programs, from the too-little and too-late programs of the Government in meeting depression problems heretofore, that I feel confident in saying that the Government has not been doing for 160 years the things proposed by the policies of the pending bill.

Returning, now, to the section on page 13, line 22. Mr. President, I repeat the quotation, because I stopped in the middle of the reading before, but I think we should consider it again from the standpoint of the objectives of the bill. I read:

> To that end the Federal Government shall, in cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and others, develop and pursue a consistent and carefully planned economic program with respect to, but not limited to, taxation; banking, credit, and currency; monopoly and monopolistic practices; wages, hours, and working conditions; foreign trade and investment; agriculture; education; housing; social security; natural resources; the provision of public services, works, and research; and other revenue, investment, expenditure, service, or regulatory activities of the Federal Government.

Finally, Mr. President, because employment depends on production and production depends on purchases, on expenditures, the bill says in plain language that if necessary the Government of the

United States will provide Federal investment and expenditure to assure the attainment of the objective.

Let me remind the Senate that we have for the most part agreed upon the objective. It is that everyone able and willing to work shall have a chance to earn a living. The language of the bill to which I have just referred is on page 14, line 20:

(4) to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has offered and printed copies of it have been placed on our desks this morning, a proposed substitute for that language which has my full endorsement. I think he is to be congratulated on the great contribution he has made by his sincere endeavor to get both sides to this controversy to reach an agreement upon the wording of this section. We must try to reach reasonable compromises so that this bill, with its policies so vital to the economic future of this country and to the private enterprise system, may be passed by the Senate today.

However, let me comment briefly on the language as it is presently in the bill. Let me invite Senators' attention to that language most carefully. It says:

To the extent—

That is qualified language—

To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured—

It says that we will—

provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed.

But let me repeat what I have previously said, that sometimes in the discussions some of us forget that when we pass this bill we are adopting only a policy and a procedure for carrying out that policy. The various proposals for aiding employment will come before the Congress in the report submitted by the President, and Congress will have ample opportunity to approve or disapprove of those proposals. Then, so as to be perfectly clear, the bill specifies that this investment and expenditure shall be for wealth-creating projects as follows—page 14, line 26:

Whether direct or indirect, or whether for public works, for public services, for assistance to business, agriculture, home owners, veterans, or consumers, or for other purposes, shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprises.

I consider that language of great importance when we contemplate the implementation of the objectives and policies of this bill, because that language makes very clear that it shall be the obligation of the President to come forward with suggestions and recommendations designed to contribute to the national wealth; in other words, we shall not have doles and work-relief programs. Rather, we shall have programs out of which new wealth, resulting in new tax dollars, will flow. Furthermore, the obligation is imposed upon him to come forward with a program for our consideration that seeks to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprises. To me that language is perfectly clear and plain. I think it is simple and positive. In my judgment it should not be changed. It certainly should not be weakened or watered down in any way.

The language of the bill does not say "We will almost do the job." It does not say "if," or "but," or "whereas," or "however," or "may be," or "as limited by arbitrary conventional restrictions." It states an objective and the broad policies for attaining the objective in clear and understandable language.

Now what about the relation of this bill to agriculture? I am glad to say that Oregon is still a great agricultural State. We are proud of our modern industries, and we intend to keep them busy; but we still have our roots in the forests and in the soil. However, national full employment is vital to the prosperity of the farmers not only of my State but of the entire Nation.

I have been somewhat amazed and puzzled to note that some who oppose the full-employment bill seem to think that it is not in the best interests of the farmers. The farmers, Mr. President, know that their market is primarily the market basket of the workers in the cities. The farmer is a busy man, a worker—and what a worker! He is a citizen, perhaps the most wide awake of all citizens politically, and he is a family man. As a businessman the farmer fully realizes that if there are opportunities for employment in the cities and the towns of the country it means that there will be opportunities for the farmer to earn a decent living because he can then sell his products at decent prices. As a worker the farmer's job is production, and he likes that job. Farmers go on producing not matter what happens, and what a beating they sometimes take when the markets in the cities fall away, when the jobs are not in the cities from which the potential purchasers of farm products can receive pay envelopes large enough to pay good prices for their purchases of farm goods.

I could take time, Mr. President, to back up this observation with reams of statistics on quantities produced and prices paid, but these figures are already in the record, put there by farm leaders and farm authorities from all over the country. When business falls off and people in the cities lose their jobs, not only does the farmer lose in the volume of alfalfa, corn, hogs, and all other farm products he can sell, but the prices he receives go all to pieces. I think this employment bill is essential to preventing a depression in the agricultural economy of the country. As one vitally interested in the welfare of agriculture I sponsor this bill because it will be a great aid to farmers.

As a citizen and a voter aware of his responsibilities, the farmer is not easy to deceive. In my judgment he is watching us today. He will not be fooled—that is, not for long—if we quibble and equivocate instead of facing the issue fairly and squarely and writing legislation that will assure the farmers of America of a consumer market with pay envelopes for workers big enough to pay decent prices for farm products.

As a family man the farmer has not forgotten the day not long ago when agriculture became the poorhouse of our economy, the last refuge of the unemployed. He has not forgotten the days when his fine boys and girls could not find opportunities to seek careers in the cities. Statistics show that in normal times there is a constant flow of young people from farm to city. Because of great improvements in modern agricultural productive methods not all of the boys and girls are needed on the farm to produce the goods necessary to feed the Nation. We can and should support farm prices through governmental action, but we cannot support farm prices for long unless we find ways to discharge our responsibility of maintaining full employment so that there will be a market for farm goods.

These are some of the reasons why I have sponsored the full-employment bill, and why I believe the overwhelming majority of the plain people of this country are in favor of the bill.

Yesterday I received a letter from a great American, a man who for many years has been very prominent in economic and legislative affairs of this country, Morris Llewellyn Cooke. I read an excerpt from the letter now, and ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with the resolution attached thereto and the list of supporters of the bill. In his letter Mr. Cooke says:

I have the honor to transmit herewith the text of a resolution adopted at an all day, national conference on the full-employment bill held at the Hamilton Hotel, Wednesday, September 12. As you will note, it is the joint expression of 41 national organizations representing, I believe, a very large segment of the voting population of the United States.

The supporting organizations are prepared to give their wholehearted support to the early enactment of an effective full-employment bill without any emasculating amendments that are being proposed by opponents and "yes—but" supporters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). Without objection, the Senator's request is granted.

The letter, resolution, and list of supporters are as follows:

THE HAY-ADAMS HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., September 24, 1945.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have the honor to transmit herewith the text of a resolution adopted at an all-day national conference on the full-employment bill held at the Hamilton Hotel, Wednesday, September 12. As you will note, it is the joint expression of 41 national organizations representing, I believe, a very large segment of the voting population of the United States.

The supporting organizations are prepared to give their wholehearted support to the early enactment of an effective full-employment bill without the emasculating amendments that are being proposed by opponents and "yes, but" supporters.

On behalf of these organizations, I commend you on your support of S. 380—H. R. 2202, and assure you of our assistance in the campaign for its enactment.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS LLEWELLYN COOKE.

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF EARLY ENACTMENT OF AN EFFECTIVE FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL (PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT A MEETING OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, SEPTEMBER 12, 1945, WASHINGTON, D. C.)

The following statement is made by the undersigned in behalf of their organizations:

"Action to assure confidence in continuing full employment is necessary for the transition to peace and later. The sequence of temporary dislocation, postwar boom, and final collapse are deadly threats to economic and social stability at home and to the maintenance of peace throughout the world.

"Dislocation and transition are already upon us. Millions of Americans are already turned out unwanted to look for jobs. Measures to alleviate these temporary hardships are necessary and should be taken immediately, but confidence in postwar prosperity and stability is the essential to prompt and lasting recovery.

"Nothing can so foster that necessary confidence in the hearts of workers, farmers, business and professional people and all others as to know that their Government will, in their names, dedicate its full constitutional power to the performance of this duty.

"It is necessary and proper for the Government of the United States to adopt immediately legislation which will recognize the right of all Americans willing and able to work to useful, regular, remunerative, and full-time employment, and which will recognize the responsibility of the Government, acting on behalf of all the people, to assure opportunities to exercise that right.

"Legislation which will commit the power of the Federal Government to assure sustained full employment is the first step needed. Such legislation must contain these vital and indivisible principles:

"1. All Americans willing and able to work have the right to useful, remunerative, suitable, regular, and full-time employment.

"2. It is the responsibility and the duty of the Federal Government to assure, by whatever means are needed, that sufficient employment opportunities exist for all Americans to exercise this right at all times.

"3. It is the responsibility and the duty of the Federal Government to coordinate the appropriate activities of the Federal Government in order to foster the highest possible sustained level of employment through private enterprise and to provide useful Federal investment and expenditure adequate to maintain full production and full employment.

"We urge the Congress of the United States to pass promptly legislation containing as a minimum these positive commitments and to this end we pledge our efforts and support."

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (TO DATE) WHICH SIGNED THE ATTACHED JOINT RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL AT THE FULL EMPLOYMENT CONFERENCE, SEPTEMBER 12, 1945

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.
American Association of Social Workers.
American Federation of Labor.
American Jewish Congress.
Americans United for World Organization.
American Veterans Committee.
Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
Business Men of America, Inc.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches.
Disabled American Veterans.
Hosiery Wholesalers National Association.
Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.
League of Women Shoppers.
Methodist Federation for Social Service.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Board, Y. W. C. A.
National Catholic Welfare Conference.
National Citizens Political Action Committee.
National Conference of Jewish Women.
National Consumers League.
National Council of Scientific, Professional, Art, and White Collar Organizations.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Council for Social Studies.
National Education Association of the United States.
National Farmers' Union.
National Lawyers' Guild.
National Urban League.
National Women's Trade Union League of America.
Non-Partisan Council of Alpha Kappa Alpha.
Railway Labor Executives Association.
Southern Conference for Human Welfare.
Synagogue Council of America.
Union for Democratic Action.
United Christian Council for Democracy.
United Council for Church Women.
United Mine Workers.
United Steel Workers of America.
United States Conference of Mayors.
W. I. V. E. S.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not suggest that any Member of the Senate should vote for any bill, including this bill, because as of a particular time a wave of overwhelming support exists in the country in favor of the bill. I think that informed popular support is a factor that should be taken into account, but not from the selfish standpoint of any political significance it may have to any individual Member of the Senate, because I believe that every Member of this body should rise above such political considerations. However, I do think that as representatives of the people of the country we must necessarily, and should, give great heed today to what I think is an overwhelming feeling in this country that this Government must pledge itself to the objectives and policies of this bill. The people are calling out to this Government to do all within its power, as provided for in the bill, to prevent another depression. They insist that it must not happen again, so that millions of Americans will not suffer the cruelties of the dole, will not suffer the indignities which they suffer so far as their self-respect and feelings are concerned when they find themselves unemployed and on relief. As citizens of a country with the greatest resources of any nation in the world, our people are demanding, and rightly so, that we adopt this bill which aims to assure them of jobs which permit them to maintain their self-respect and provide a decent standard of living for themselves and their families.

Is that asking too much of democratic Government? Our people answer, "No."

Before I close I wish to say a few words in regard to the minority report, a report which I am sure expresses the views of men who are just as sincere as any of the cosponsors of the bill, but views with which I am in such complete disagreement that for the RECORD I feel I should comment upon them.

Personally I feel that if the minority report is the best case that can be made out against the full employment bill, I am very grateful for the privilege of sponsoring this necessary measure.

The minority report criticizes certain details of the bill. Thus it says, on page 1:

> We disagree with some of the methods prescribed to achieve the goal of full employment—

Yet I felt, as I studied the report paragraph by paragraph, that it not only attacked the details of the bill, but also implied a lack of confidence in the private enterprise system itself, and in the competency and dynamics of responsible representative government.

The language of the minority report even goes so far that at one point, on page 6, it seems—although I am sure not intentionally—to attack the motive of those who sponsor the bill. I quote from the bottom of page 6 of the minority report:

> The bill contains numerous expressions of lip service to private enterprise. Considering its origin, we may well question the good faith of these professions. For while the bill professes an interest in the encouragement of private enterprise, the basic policy recommended is one which will inevitably destroy private enterprise.

I am very reluctant to believe that whoever wrote that language meant it as an attack on the good faith of my cosponsors. I am convinced that my cosponsors and I are just as concerned about preserving private enterprise as are any of the opponents of the bill. If I were disposed to impute questionable motives, which I am not, it would be easy to quote sections of the minority report in which the writer of the report gives lip service to the objectives of full employment, as on page 1 and page 7, and then, in other passages, virtually states in so many words that we cannot hope to attain those objectives. In my judgment the minority report takes a defeatist attitude toward this vital problem of full employment. It plays a dirge to private enterprise rather than sings a song of hope and confidence.

For example, on page 7, the minority report recommends certain amendments "designed to remove the objections which we have stated," and flatly claims that such an amended bill would "then provide for an economic program which may embrace every possible policy to secure prosperity and full employment."

Not only that, but it is further stated that such an amended bill "will do everything that can be humanly done to prevent another serious depression. We realize, like the majority, that we must do everything possible to avoid a recurrence of the conditions which existed in the thirties."

Mr. President, I think that is a pretty clear statement of the devotion of the opponents of the bill to at least the objectives which the cosponsors of the bill seek to obtain. But along with this apparent endorsement of the objectives of full employment—one might say lip service if we wished to be unkind, and I do not—there are repeated indications in the minority report of a lack of confidence in the ability of responsible elected representatives of the people to frame sound policies or to estimate the consequences of the policies they adopt.

Likewise the minority seems to lack confidence in the ability of administrators chosen in our constitutional tradition to execute the laws which we make in the name of the people. The truth is that our people have more confidence in government to protect them from unemployment than they have in the business interests of the country to save them from depressions. History shows that business, unchecked by government, repeats periodically the cycle of boom and bust. When unchecked by government, business in its ecompetitive struggle indulges in exploitation of labor, which exploitation plays an important causative part in creating unemployment because it results in low standards of living. Private enterprise is essential I think to our form of government but it must be deprived of the license to exploit a pool of unemployed workers. This bill will do it and the people know it.

Further, the minority of the committee would apparently hamstring future Congresses by imposing limitations on the measures which might prove necessary in the future. They do this in spite of their professed willingness to embrace a policy which, to use their own language, "will do everything that can be humanly done to prevent another serious depression." I feel that there may be, I trust that there will not be, emergencies in the future in which it will be absolutely essential to give the Congresses of that day unrestricted authority and power to adopt such programs for meeting those economic emergencies as in their best judgment are necessary at that time.

In passing, Mr. President, I find some little amusement in the apparent eagerness of the minority through their amendments to restrict the action of future Congresses, when at the same time they state on page 1, that section 2 of the bill "is merely a declaration of policy which cannot be binding on any future Congress or even on this Congress." I agree that the bill is primarily a statement of policy plus procedures for implementing that policy but I believe having that policy enacted into law and thereby assuring to the people of the country a program of full employment will be one of the greatest instruments for building up confidence in the private enterprise system and in a democratic government's ability to meet depression emergencies.

There are other sections of the minority report which are equally confusing, and, in my judgment, misleading. For example, much attention is devoted to the danger that under the full employment bill measures will be adopted which will lead inevitably down the primrose path to inflation, and hence to regimentation. Yet, at the top of page 2 I find the pending bill attacked on the ground that it is merely a declaration of policy, having no legal effect, and that "if any feature of the program submitted by the President is not authorized by existing law, it would be necessary to pass a special enabling act before it could be adopted."

That is true, and, in my judgment, that is one of the most sound provisions of the bill. It shows the devotion of those on the majority side to the basic principle of checks and balances, and the constitutional right of the Congress of the United States to pass judgment upon Executive proposals for economic planning.

As to some of the detailed criticisms of the bill in the minority report, the report begins with what reads like a wholehearted acceptance of the objectives of full employment. It states that "a comprehensive and carefully planned program should be adopted by the Federal Government looking to the maintenance of full employment." In addition, the report specifically approves provisions in the bill directing the President to submit a national budget and program to prevent unemployment, and establishing a joint congressional committee to consider the President's program. In other words, this language of the minority seems to me to say that the writers of it were prepared to approve everything in the bill except the commitment to make it successful.

Next, at the bottom of page 1 comes the statement that "section 2 is merely a declaration of policy which cannot be binding on any future Congress or even on this Congress."

I submit that that is true. It should not be presented by the minority therefore, by implication as a criticism of the bill. However, I believe that a Congress of the United States can formulate, and should carry out, broad policies in the public interest, in peace as well as in war. True, subsequent Congresses can modify that policy; but if it proves to be a sound policy, supported by the people, they will not do so in the future.

On page 2, near the middle of the page, the report suggests that "it might be desirable to create the Office of Director of the National Budget and require the director to be confirmed by the Senate. Planning of this economic program is extremely complicated and cannot possibly be done by the President himself. It should be done by an identifiable group, responsible to the Congress and the people, as well as to the President, and not by an anonymous group of economic planners."

In passing on that point, I am a little puzzled to reconcile this language with the view expressed by some of the proponents of the minority side of this issue, when they say in effect that the President can do everything that the bill calls for anyway, and therefore the bill is unnecessary.

In the next paragraph the report approves the idea of a joint committee to study the effect of proposed legislation on economic stability, but it then proceeds to suggest that the standing committees may not give weight to the work of such a joint committee.

Mr. President, I am convinced that it should require very little argument to support the premise that if the bill is passed and if a joint committee of such great importance as is provided for in the bill is set up, every committee of the Congress whose problems are mutually associated with the problems of the joint committee will extend to it not only the highest of respect for its views and its work, but the maximum amount of cooperation.

But the minority report says:

> We question somewhat whether the standing committes will pay much attention to the report of the joint committee.

Reading on at the bottom of page 2, I find that the report sets up what I think is a straw man by reading into the bill—

> A particular policy which is endorsed by Congress and enjoined upon the President as a necessary part of any plan he submits.

I say this is a straw man because the bill has been very carefully written so as not to embrace any particular policy except full employment and the retention and strengthening of the American free-enterprise system. It has been very carefully written to invoke the entire range of implementing programs that are open to us under our form of government in pursuing its agreed-upon objectives. It very specifically does not bind or attempt to bind any future Congress or any future administration by restricting the means whereby they may carry on their job of working toward our national objectives.

Getting into details, near the top of page 3 the report quotes a Government official as stating that—

> There is not even an accepted statistical basis for estimating the number of people who are unemployed in any particular time.

That no such grave uncertainty exists in the minds of those who are primarily responsible for keeping track of employment and unemployment has been stated in no uncertain terms by the Director of the Bureau of the Census. Thus, on page 1117 of the hearings, the Director of the Bureau of the Census has this to say on the problem:

> At the present time the monthly report on the labor force measures has a high degree of accuracy; not only the number of persons employed and unemployed, but also the characteristics of the persons in each worker or nonworker category.

And on the following page, page 1118, the Director of the Bureau of the Census says:

> The monthly report on the labor force also provides a complete and unduplicated count of total employment which is used as the over-all frame of reference for other counts of employment. The monthly report on the labor force provides the only count of domestic servants, unpaid family workers, and others not covered by establishment reports such as those collected by the Department of Labor, the Social Security Board, and the Department of Agriculture. Also, persons working for more than one employer during the reporting period are counted more than once on establishment reports, but only once in the monthly report on the labor force.

I take it from the testimony of the Director of the Bureau of the Census, Mr. President, that services now available would give us a fairly accurate statistical picture of employment and unemployment. But even should the minority be correct on this point—although I think they are not—it is a procedural matter which could easily be remedied by providing the necessary service for the collection of any statistics needed under the type of planning provided for by the bill, if those services are not now in existence.

In the next paragraph the report casts doubt on our ability to estimate national income and output; yet if we cannot make such estimates, how then can we expect to frame good tax legislation? It is true, of course, that we can hardly hope to reach precision in these matters, but it is also true that we need not be exact.

Still on page 3, the next passage refers to the situation in 1929—that golden year of sickening economic disaster. Here the writer of the report begins to reveal the fundamental hopelessness in his views, a feeling that we cannot do much about depressions. He says, to use his language:

> Think how wrong any estimate for 1930 would have been if made in 1929.

As I reflect on the events of 1929, my reaction is just the opposite. Every time I recall those black days of despair, I am impressed anew with how badly we needed the full-employment bill in 1929. I am impressed with how desperately foolish, how blind we shall be if we take that chance again without the planning services provided for by the pending bill. If this bill had been on the books in 1929 the dole and relief programs of the great depression would have given way to wealth creating jobs.

At the bottom of page 3, I find a still more revealing statement of the defeatist philosophy. The language describes the duties of the President under section 3 (a) to submit a program for assuring full employment and for stimulating and encouraging private enterprise to increase its activity and to assist State and local governments to do the same. The language reads as follows:

> Then the President has to make an estimate of how much his economic program will cause private enterprise to make up the deficiency between the desired goal and the estimated reality.

Then there is this comment from the minority:

> Of course this is almost an impossible estimate because it is so extremely difficult to judge in dollar or jobs the effect of any general measure, such, for instance, as a tax bill or currency measure.

Mr. President, it is a difficult job, but we must not make it a hopeless job; we must not approach it with a feeling of incapability. In my judgment, we must face it with all the resources we can bring to our command to see to it that such an analysis is made, so that we can get ourselves into the best possible position to meet the threat of depression when the clouds of economic disturbance come over the horizon.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator care to yield to me for a question in regard to the general discussion?

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. The criticism made regarding the difficulty of obtaining statistics was not intended to militate against the desirability of obtaining them. In fact, I think one of the advantages of the bill is that it will force the development of statistical methods which do not now exist. The argument was made in the report more for the purpose of showing that the figures were so uncertain that we ought not to be required—as I believe we are under paragraph (4)—to base an explicit number of dollars on the calculation made on the basis of the estimates. That is a criticism intended not against pursuing statistical methods, but the point is made that they are so uncertain that we should not say, for example, "After you have arrived at these figures you should not then say that $10,000,000,000 of Federal expenditure is necessary, or that $15,000,000,000 is necessary." Therefore the statement should not be a definite statement, but merely one that we should proceed with a comprehensive public works program in order to bring about the objective.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for his clarifying statement.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the Senator's position is that the bill does not prescribe a definite formula which must be followed, but that the field is left wide open. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. MORSE. I believe there is a wide opportunity for the exercise of a great deal of discretion on the part of the President under this bill. There may be situations in which the President will be convinced that he has the evidence necessary on which to base clear predictions as to employment needs in the 12-month period ahead, and perhaps he will want to come forward with a specific program for expenditures in terms of dollars.

Mr. TAFT. If I agreed with that interpretation of the bill, I would not bother with an amendment. I believe that the bill, as modified by the Hatch amendment, meets my objection to the formula to which reference has been made. However, without it I think there is in the bill a more definite prescription of an exact spending program than perhaps the Senator believes.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the viewpoint of the Senator, but I believe that one of the great strengths of the bill is what I please to call its discretionary features. It allows the President to come before us at any time with a program or a plan which he thinks it necessary to recommend in order to meet an existing unemployment problem.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some say that we cannot look ahead. They fear that we cannot estimate the future consequences of our acts, and that we cannot tell in advance what the things we do on this floor will mean in terms of dollars and jobs. I, for one, refuse to follow such a political philosophy of despair and hopelessness. This bill may not accomplish our agreed-upon objectives, but I am willing to try it. I am willing to let the President exercise the discretion which the terms of the bill provide in connection with economic planning for full employment. I am willing to try it because I am satisfied that the alternatives offered by the opponents of the bill will not be helpful in preventing depressions.

After describing how we really cannot do anything about anything, some of the opponents of the bill, as expressed in the minority views, proceed to make what to them is a final and crushing argument, as set forth on page 4 of the minority report:

> This is the so-called compensatory-spending theory, advanced by Lord Keynes, Stuart Chase, Sir William Beveridge, and Mr. Henry Wallace.

Mr. President, in my opinion that is merely an argument by invective. I think it is a non sequitur. As one of the cosponsors of the bill, I assert that my judgment has not been influenced one iota with regard to similar views held by other persons in this country or abroad. I think it is fallacious reasoning to object to this bill because of an allegation which, in my judgment, cannot be substantiated in fact, namely, that the roots of the bill are found in the philosophy of Keynes, Chase, Beveridge, or Wallace.

Proponents of full employment were doing their utmost to have this Government adopt a full-employment program before Keynes wrote his articles and book or before Wallace wrote his book.

For example, Mr. President, yesterday my attention was called to the program of full employment which had been pursued for many years past by labor in this country. In reply to statements which have been made repeatedly to the effect that this bill is inspired by, or copied from the proposals of Sir William Beveridge or Lord Keynes, or the writings of Henry A. Wallace or taken from the Soviet Constitution, I should like to read a statement made by Louis G. Hines, legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor at a full-employment conference held in Washington September 12, 1945, and a supplementary statement submited at the conference by Boris Shishkin, economist of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Hines' statement supplemented American Federation of Labor President William Green's testimony in support of the bill as follows:

> The 7,000,000 members of the A. F. of L. stand squarely behind the Murray-Outland bill, better known as the full employment bill now pending before Congress. The approval of the A. F. of L. for this legislation was contained in a statement presented by A. F. of L. President William Green to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency during the recent hearings. There is insistent need for this type of legislation to insure the perpetuation of free enterprise and sufficient employment for all who need work and are willing to work. Our membership has been fully apprised of the merits of this legislation through contacts with our national, State, and city bodies. Wide response from the millions of wage earners represented by the A. F. of L. reflects the demand of the American workers that this legislation should pass without delay.

Supplementing Mr. Hines' statement, Boris Shishkin pointed out at the September 12 conference that the American Federation of Labor, in hearings before the Tolan Committee on Defense Migration in 1940, supported a policy of full employment, which policy was subsequently published in the Federationist, the official organ of the American Federation of Labor, in its issue of March 1941 from which I read:

> The American Federation of Labor calls upon the representatives of American industry, technology, and government, to work with labor in an intensive and constructive effort to insure America against an emergency crisis and to make provision for full employment and full use of our industrial

plant and of our resources as a means of providing a firm foundation for a lasting, prosperous, and democratic peace.

That, Mr. President, was stated before the Beveridge plan, the British white paper, and the other proposals which the enemies of this bill now allege to be its inspiration. If a source of inspiration must be found and identified, I submit that its source may be found among the publications, the testimony, and the statements of great labor leaders of the United States, such as those to whom I have referred as being connected with the American Federation of Labor. The record is perfectly clear that labor leaders in other branches of organized labor, such as the railroad brotherhoods, the United Mine Workers of America, the CIO, and others, have for years been trying to make people in this country see that we must preserve a system of private enterprise in order that free labor may survive. It cannot survive under any system of economy except a private enterprise economy. Labor understands that very well, although at times it needs to have its recollection on that point refreshed.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat, that labor in this country is fundamentally interested in maintaining the private enterprise system. Labor generally recognizes that only through maintaining the private enterprise system can American workers remain free men, because, as I indicated earlier in my remarks, if we substitute for that system a governmental regimented economy, then of course the freedom of labor ceases to exist.

Mr. President, I think that is basically the reason why labor recognizes the vital importance of this bill, not only to their own selfish economic interest, in the sense that through it they have a chance to earn a decent living and maintain their families on a high standard of living, but they recognize also that if their Government in the years ahead fails to meet the problems of depression, then we will be confronted in this country with a test as to whether political democracy and economic democracy can serve the economic well being of our people.

No, Mr. President, the source and inspiration of the bill is not to be found among the men whom the opponents of the bill would cite as being the source. The source of the bill is to be found among those in this country who believe we cannot afford to run the risk again of those economic conditions which existed during the thirties. Labor and industrial statesmen agree that the Government has a great responsibility to see to it that it uses its resources and brings those resources to the aid of industry in this country, and that the Government supplements industry during emergency periods by making available through the processes of the bill jobs for those who seek and wish employment but who cannot get those jobs from private industry.

Mr. President, I would digress further at this point to say also that I do not share the observation that was made yesterday on this floor by a Republican spokesman in regard to the fight, the gallant fight, for the principle of full employment, that was made by the distinguished candidate for the Presidency of the United States on the Republican ticket in the last election, Thomas E. Dewey. I do not think there is any basis in fact for the observation that Dewey lost the election when he stood for that great progressive principle of Republicanism and Americanism—full employment.

In his San Francisco speech, when he said out of the depths of his sincerity that "the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours" Dewey voiced a principle held by a majority of Americans without regard to party. This is not the time or the place for me to express my views as to why I think the election was lost by the Republicans, but I happen to be one who believes Mr. Dewey's stand for full employment reassured millions of Americans that the Republican Party is going to live up to the obligations and the responsibilities of making political and economic democracy work in America. I think Dewey's stand on this issue gave hope to millions of Republicans that the party is really not a party of reaction but still is a people's party.

Now to return to the minority report, Mr. President, I am interested in the very amendment the minority proposes on page 7. It says in plain English that the Federal Government shall "proceed with a comprehensive program of public works and other expenditures so planned that they can be speeded up and enlarged when other employment decreases and retarded when full employment is otherwise provided."

Where is the difference between that objective and the objectives of the bill? I can tell the Senate where the difference really is, I think, because there is a difference, and it is a very fundamental difference indeed.

I think the minority reveals that it has a great fear of the private enterprise system succeeding, because in the second paragraph on page 4 the minority says:

> The authors of the bill emphasize the fact that efforts should be first made to stimulate private enterprise, but every government has always made such efforts, and yet they have not solved the problem of preventing depressions.

Here is the same recurring thought, the same underlying philosophy of defeatism and despair. Let me emphasize it again. If this report reflects the views of our opponents, I suspect that they have no faith in the American system of private enterprise and no faith in the competence and responsibility of representative government to meet economic emergencies.

All these expressions of fear, all these warnings of excessive spending, can have no real basis except a conviction that private enterprise will fall so short and our free Government will fail so badly that we will again be forced to try to spend our way into prosperity.

In the very next paragraph of the report on page 4 it threatens us with the public spending of $65,000,000,000 in a single year. It says:

> During the thirties, we frequently had 10,000,000 unemployed, according to some estimates, in spite of all the assistance and encouragement given to private enterprise.

Mr. President, that statement could only have been written, I think, by those who feel that we will again have 10,000,000 unemployed "in spite of all the assistance and encouragement given to private enterprise." I interpret this part of the minority report as an expression of fear that the private-enterprise system has failed and will continue to fail in the future. I say to the minority, we must not permit it to fail; we must be willing to adopt the provisions of the pending bill and make a great effort to see to it that the Government, through cooperation with private enterprises, uses whatever resources are necessary in a given emergency to give American free men and women the chance to work and to live a decent life.

If this defeatist view prevails, Mr. President, it would seem to me quite certain that the private enterprise system must fail. If we allow our country to slip back into the stagnation of the thirties, then you and I, I think, ought to know what will happen. The people will throw us out and seek new leaders, and they will be right in doing it. They will seek leaders who will give them counsel and acts of courage, not fear, of hope, and not despair.

One more word on the minority report. There is another contradiction, I think, near the bottom of page 4. The minority, I think, reads into the bill the statement that the spending policy is definiately prescribed regardless of all other considerations of national policy.

In the first place, there is no such language in the bill. In the second place, the minority have previously claimed on page 1 that the bill is merely a declaration of policy which cannot be binding upon any future Congress, or even on this Congress; that is, a declaration of policy having no legal effect.

Now we cannot have it both ways, Mr. President, even if the opponents insist on reading into the bill things that simply are not there.

Aside from this, let me note again the revealing language of the report which suggests that the writers place financial policy above human welfare, for they say on page 4:

> The approach of a war might make it wise to husband all further ability to incur debt. Further increase in debt might shake the confidence of the business world.

In other words, this view would prefer to husband financial resources and waste human resources. I do not agree with this view. I would certainly place human resources far ahead of financial resources, and all the more so in the case of an approaching war.

But I submit, Mr. President, that a conflict cannot be allowed to develop between and among us in regard to the great objectives of this legislation. It seems to me the minority report and opponents of the bill generally reflect in their view a great lack of confidence in the private-enterprise system. The report seems to overlook the point that one of the most effective ways to conserve financial resources is to use and not waste the willing productive labor of our people. The only way to financial health and solvency for a man or for a nation is to work and earn on a productive basis. I con-

sider full employment essential to securing national profits in excess of expenses. I consider it an essential if we are going to have a tax program sufficiently strong to meet our national financial obligation.

At the bottom of page 4 the report says:

> After all, there are some things more important than employment. One of them is national freedom. One of them is freedom of the individual.

Yes; national freedom is more important than employment. Yes; freedom of the individual is more important than employment. But I happen to be one who is convinced that we will lose these precious things if we are not competent as a government to assure to all of our people the opportunities to earn a decent living so they can keep their freedom.

On page 5, the report mentions such figures as $20,000,000,000 a year as possible expenditures under this bill. I think this reflects again the conviction that the private-enterprise system will fail to provide all necessary jobs and that it will fail by such a wide margin as to require such excessive spending, and I call it excessive spending. The minority would leave us, it seems to me, with Hobson's choice: To lose our freedom through mass unemployment or to lose it through excessive spending.

The writers of the report say on page 5:

> The alternative to a rapidly increasing debt is the levying of heavy additional Federal taxes. Here again, the remedy would discourage free enterprise from expanding to provide the necessary job opportunities.

No, Mr. President, I do not think this is the only alternative. Our free and self-reliant people will not accept a doctrine of frustration. There is a better way. I think it is the way of full employment provided for in the pending bill. It is the way of courage, of constructive leadership, of competent and timely action. It is the way of the full employment bill.

Again I note in the minority report further counsel of despair. At the bottom of page 5, immediately following the language I have just read, the minority report says it is not true—

> That the refusal to make up the theoretical deficit by public spending means the starvation of the unemployed.

Oh, no; the minority say in effect, we should give them doles.

At the bottom of page 5 they say:

> Our policy requires that every one in this country receive a proper standard of food, clothing, housing, and medical care.

They point out that if people lose their jobs they can live with their families or expend their savings. They say that after they have exhausted their own resources and those of their families "others are provided with work relief or direct relief."

So, Mr. President, there you have it in bald, plain language. There is the philosophy of the opponents of the bill set forth in all its stark simplicity. They will feed the people, they will provide clothing and housing and medical care, they will even give them doles and work relief, but they will not give them productive work. They will not assure them a chance to have a job and maintain themselves and their families under a private enterprise system in accordance with a high American standard of living.

I say to you, Mr. President, as solemnly as I can, that the American people will not stand for any such program as the opponents of the bill suggest as an alternative. They will not again tolerate the misery, the frustration, the sheer indignity of doles. I think that the insistence of the American people for full employment—and I believe that insistence is present in the country today—is clear. They are insisting that the Government must see to it that we do not run the danger resulting from the great national issues which would arise, involving disputes on a national scale over even ideologies of government itself, if our Government should fail to provide full employment and thereby thrust our people into another depression such as the depression of the thirties. We have an obligation to the millions of Americans to provide the constructive leadership through legislation such as the bill now pending before the Senate.

But even, Mr. President, if I thought that the people would stand for the dole, which I do not, I would then inquire, How can we afford to pay for idleness? How can we afford to carry out the policy which the report states at the bottom of page 5 in these words?

> Our policy requires that every one in this country receive a proper standard—

Note, it says a proper standard—

> a proper standard of food, clothing, housing, and medical care.

How can we afford such a policy unless we make it possible for the people to work and earn incomes in wealth-creating jobs?

Returning to the minority report I find on page 6 an interesting and, I think, a sound observation. The report says:

> It is important to adopt such other Government policies—

Meaning other than Government public spending—

> that there will be a proper incentive of private industry to expand; a proper relationship between wages, prices, and the cost of living; a proper relationship between farm prices and industrial prices; and a proper relationship between savings and consumer expenditures.

That is fine, and I fully agree except that I would not exclude government spending when needed. I am glad that our opponents are with us on many things in this bill. I hope we can reach agreement on both the objectives and procedures of the full-employment bill in keeping with the principles, the bill as we have submitted it to the Senate.

In closing, Mr. President, I submit that this bill will stimulate great intangibles in public thinking, which are vital to property. Let us not overlook the great intangibles of public opinion. I mean, for example, the element of confidence. I mean the flat commitment, the plain, honest language which will say to our people that we will assure opportunities for them to earn a decent living and out of that pledge they will take hope. I mean the plain, honest language of this bill, which says that we will do whatever is necessary to make good in maintaining a decent standard of living for all our people, not merely for some. I mean the plain language which says that we will do everything possible to maintain full employment through private enterprise, and that in order to do this, in order to foster the very confidence on which private enterprise is necessarily based, we will, if necessary, step in and provide the Federal investment and expenditure essential to full employment.

Let us not quibble, hedge, and dodge this issue before our people today. Let us either tell the people that we will make good on this great economic need, that we will assure them opportunities, or else let us admit that we are doomed to business cycles or economic revolution in America. Let us admit, and not merely hint, that we have lost faith; that we do not really believe that the private-enterprise system can give the people what they want; and that we do not really believe in the competence of responsible representative government. For myself, I will fight against the philosophy of despair which I think is held by the opponents of the bill.

Let me say a few words on the proposed amendments set forth in the minority report. On page 7 these amendments are described as being designed to remove the objections which the report has stated. On page 7 it is stated that the bill—

> will then provide for an economic program which may embrace every possible policy to secure prosperity and full employment. * * * It will do everything that can be humanly done to prevent another serious depression. We realize, like the majority, that we must do everything possible to avoid a recurrence of the conditions which existed in the thirties.

Then the minority proposes amendments which, unless they are meaningless, mean that they would do perhaps almost enough to make good on our commitment. They mean that we do not really think we can make good. They mean—if, in fact, they have a meaning—that we will offer our people doles, not work.

At the very end of the minority report we find this revealing statement. I quote from the bottom of page 7:

> We have had some doubt regarding the statement in section 2 (c) that "the Federal Government has the responsibility to assure continuing full employment."
>
> The word "assure" is an ambiguous word which might be interpreted to mean that a legal obligation is assumed to every man to give him a job. * * * We still feel that it may gravely mislead the public at large.

I do not think we should have any misunderstanding about this, Mr. President. I do not believe that the word "assure" is at all ambiguous. I do not find any misunderstanding about it among those with whom I have talked. They think it means, and I think it means, to make available the opportunity to earn a decent living. It means that we will face the task of doing whatever is needful to make political and economic democracy survive in America.

I consider the full employment bill essential to that end. I believe that we have before us a great nonpartisan bill, involving a great nonpartisan American problem. I know of no greater issue that

is going to challenge the statesmanship of the Congress of the United States than the stand which individual Members of the Congress take upon the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. The distinguished Senator stated at one point in his remarks that the only policy set forth in the bill was the policy of full employment. It seems to me that there is another policy which is sought to be established, and one which gives me much concern. I refer to the policy which would permit continued unlimited deficit spending. I wonder if the Senator will let me have his views on that question. Perhaps he touched upon the subject when I was not present. What is the Senator's view with respect to an amendment which would provide for a tax program to go along with the bill and the budget which the President would submit, to pay for the cost of the unemployment program over a period of 4 or 5 years? If such an amendment were adopted, I should be very happy to endorse the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator, my good friend from Delaware, that almost at the beginning of my remarks I discussed at some length my views in regard to the obligations of the Congress of the United States to present to the American people a forthright and intellectually honest tax program. I believe that we have the obligation to make clear to the people of the country that along with the benefits of government which they rightly demand must go the obligation of the people to pay for those benefits through a tax program.

I also said in those remarks that I did not believe that we should insert in this bill a tax program, or that we should limit future Congresses in regard to the tax program which they might find it necessary to adopt in order to bring the country through an emergency which might require heavy expenditures for full employment. I said that I was not opposed to deficit spending to meet an emergency if we constantly keep in the minds of the people of the country the recognition of the fact that they must pay the bill created by the deficit spending once the productive wheels of industry start turning again, and national revenues raised through the productive resources of the country in amounts sufficient to support the necessary tax assessments.

So my specific answer to the Senator's question is that I would not vote for any amendment which would seek to impose upon a future Congress the obligation, at the time such expenditures must be made to meet an emergency, of providing a tax program to equal those expenditures. I believe that broad latitude ought to be given to the Congresses of the future. They have a right to take such latitude anyway, no matter what kind of a bill we pass today. I do agree, however, that the tax legislation of the Government should provide the revenue necessary to pay for full employment as national income permits.

Mr. BUCK. I do not believe that it would be possible to enact a tax bill at this time to pay for the contemplated expenditures; but why should it not be the policy of the bill that over a period of years a tax program should be inaugurated to pay the costs of Federal expenditures which might be necessary under the unemployment program?

Mr. MORSE. Because I believe that that is a policy which should be expressed in the tax legislation itself. I do not believe that it should be made a part of this bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I cannot understand the Senator's point of view. Why should he say that we must impose on Congress the obligation to spend money, but we must not impose on it the obligation to raise the money? I cannot understand the distinction which the Senator makes between imposing upon Congress a policy of spending, and imposing upon Congress a policy of taxation.

Mr. MORSE. If I correctly understand the position of the Senator from Ohio in regard to the so-called tax amendment, he would make a part of this bill such an amendment, which would say to future Congresses, "No matter what the emergency may be in which you find yourselves, you cannot meet that emergency by governmental expenditures unless at the same time you impose, for a definite term of years, a specific tax program which will raise the money with which to pay for the expenditures which the Government finds necessary in order to solve the unemployment problem of that period."

Mr. TAFT. It sounds very reasonable to me. I do not see anything wrong with that principle. The Senator states it exactly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to submit a general question to the Senator because I have such great respect for his opinion. Perhaps it is not directly related to the bill, and yet it certainly is related to the fundamentals to which the bill is addressed, and I am thinking of the Senator's long experience on the War Labor Board when I submit the question to him. I ask the Senator whether he thinks it is possible for us even to approximate any sort of full and stabilized employment without also succeeding, either voluntarily or otherwise, in attaining a greater stabilization of labor-management relationships?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is absolutely essential. I think it must be accomplished if we are going to keep both free industry and free collective bargaining in this country.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. It seems to me that as we sit here dealing with this academic phase of the subject, knowing that we are entirely surrounded outside in the realistic world with controversy which makes any sort of planning for industry or for labor impossible, we must concede that what we seek here to do touches only one factor, and that the other factor cannot long resist our attention.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator is quite correct.

RATIFICATION BY MEXICO OF UNITED STATES-MEXICAN WATER TREATY

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's remarks,

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to make a few remarks about an extraneous matter, but I shall ask unanimous consent that my remarks appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of the address of the Senator from Oregon. What I shall have to say will take only a moment.

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate with a sense of extreme gratification that the Mexican Senate has ratified the Mexican Water Treaty which was ratified by this Senate some time ago. That action was taken by the Senate of the Republic of Mexico by unanimous vote and without appending to the treaty any reservations whatever, so the treaty was ratified in the exact form in which it was ratified by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a very brief comment?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me offer to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee my congratulations that, holding, as he does, one of the most important and arduous positions in the world today, he has seen brought to a successful conclusion one of his undertakings under this administration. During the hearings on the treaty there were times when the Senator from Texas and I were brought into apparent opposition. I admired his patience and ability in that connection, and, so far as I am concerned, I am glad that the matter has been brought to a final and successful conclusion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished senior Senator from California for his kind remarks and for his gracious and rather extravagant estimate of the services of the senior Senator from Texas. The Senator from California in the hearings, with the marvelous zeal which is his and with the unusual ability he possesses, fought very vigorously and very determinedly against the treaty, but now that it is all over, we are restored to our plane of cordiality and good will.

Mr. President, I wish to say that it should be a source of gratification to the people and the Government of the United States that this question has finally been adjusted and settled. It has been a matter of uncertainty and indecision for a period of 75 years. Now that the treaty has been ratified, the issue has been removed from the field of diplomacy and controversy; and the people of California and Texas, especially, know what their rights are and they can make their plans accordingly. As a representative of Texas, I am ex-

tremely happy that the issue has been determined.

I thank the Senator from California for his remarks, and I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding. I ask unanimous consent that these remarks of the Senator from California and my own appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Oregon, rather than in the midst of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I extend my sincere compliments to the senior Senator from Texas for the outstanding leadership which he exercised in bringing about the ratification by the Senate of the Mexican Water Treaty. I think the reception of the treaty in Mexico has been due, in no small measure, to the very fine acts of statesmanship which the Senator from Texas evidenced in the presentation of the treaty to this country as well as to Mexico.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I now ask to have stated the amendment which I suggested yesterday and which I now offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the amendment of Mr. RADCLIFFE (for himself and Mr. TAFT) as a substitute for the language beginning on page 14, line 20, down to and including the word "Such" in line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

(4) to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be attained, consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government and other essential considerations of national policy, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to achieve the objective of continuing full employment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in offering this amendment, I do so, as I stated yesterday, for the sole purpose of expressing in language what the authors of the bill and the authors of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated many times on the floor of the Senate during the debate was exactly what they intended. I felt there was no difference at all between the intentions of either, and it seemed to me that a provision could be written which would carry out the purposes and desires of those on both sides of the controversy. That is what was sought to be done. The amendment does not offer a compromise between the two so-called opposite schools of thought. It is merely a statement of what they both have contended for.

I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and other Senators who have agreed in substance that this amendment does state what they desired; and, as I understand, they are willing that it now be adopted.

Mr. President, I hope that the distinguished and able senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], one of the authors of the bill, will join with his colleagues who sponsored the pending measure and will also agree to the adoption of my amendment. I hope it will be adopted at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say that we have not accepted the proposed substitute, and if there is to be a vote on it we much prefer the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] and myself. We think it states the proposition much more clearly and definitely.

I think the substance of our amendment is contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico; I do not see any great difference; but unless the authors of the bill are prepared to accept the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, if we are to have a contest and a vote on it, I should much prefer, and I think the Senator from Maryland feels the same way, to have a vote on our amendment, not on the substitute, in which case we would not be prepared to accept the substitute.

So, Mr. President, I should like to know whether the amendment is a compromise or whether we are asked to modify our proposal because we prefer not to modify it. We think it is a clearer statement than that contained in the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, although we realize the motives which inspired the Senator from New Mexico in suggesting his amendment in an effort to reach a compromise, and we appreciate his efforts.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me say that I understood that my proposal was acceptable to all the authors of the bill. However, a moment ago I spoke to the Senator from North Dakota, and he told me he desired to speak against the amendment. Whether he meant the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Maryland, I am not sure. I hope, as I have said, that the Senator from North Dakota will join with the other authors of the bill in agreeing to accept the amendment I have proposed, so that we may dispose of it now.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay a vote on this particular amendment. I am against both the Taft-Radcliffe amendment and the Hatch amendment. I do not wish to delay a vote on it, and I am perfectly willing to have the Senate proceed to vote now. I shall speak against the entire bill, no matter what is the outcome regarding these two amendments, as to both of which I am prepared to vote.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has said he is prepared to have a vote taken now on the amendment. Therefore, I ask that the Senate vote now on it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask the Senator for his conception of what the amendment means. I think we are in agreement as to the objective. As the Senator knows, my fundamental objection to the bill as reported has been that while textually it seems to create, although this purpose is denied by the sponsors of the bill, an exclusive obligation on the part of the Government to deal solely with unemployment and to apply the formula here proposed, regardless of what might be the impact of the formula on the national economy, yet it seemed to me that it would not be sound and that it would not have a long-range beneficial effect on unemployment itself. It seems to me that the Senator's amendment puts into words the thing we have been told by the sponsors of the bill is within their meaning, namely, that we shall seek this objective to the maximum possibility within consultation of the national economy generally.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not think there has ever been any question about that in the minds of the authors of the bill. We have always intended that unemployment and full employment should be dealt with and must be dealt with consistently with the entire national economy, and that is what the amendment I have proposed actually says.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the Senator from North Dakota for his willingness to have the Senate vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] proposed as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. In regard to the question asked by the Senator from Michigan as to the attitude of the sponsors of the bill, I should like to state that all the sponsors of the bill are in agreement on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Ohio. I think the amendment states what was always the contemplation of the provisions of the bill; but, if there is any doubt about it, the adoption of the amendment now proposed will clear it up very definitely.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his statement. What has puzzled me is why there should ever have been any resistance to saying textually what the able senior Senator from New York has constantly said the bill means.

Mr. WAGNER. Exactly.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, a number of us on the committee are under the impression—and statements made during the proceedings in subcommittee, in committee, and in course of the debate clearly demonstrate the basis of that opinion—that the language of the bill singled out one form of industry and made it paramount. Again and again attempts in subcommittee, committee, and on the floor have been made to obtain some modification of the language in such way as would recognize the fact that there might be other obligations which should likewise be considered and reckoned upon before an unemployment program was adopted. That is the reason why the language "consistent with its needs, obligations, and other considerations of essential national policy," was submitted in subcommittee, in committee, where it was voted down. I personally prefer the language of the amendment which was submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself. However, I am mindful of the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] includes the language which the Senator from Ohio and myself desire to have inserted in the bill, namely, the so-called consistent clause. To my mind it is very desirable that there shall be absolutely no misunderstanding whatever that any obligation which the Federal Government may assume shall be consistent with its needs, obligations, and other essential considerations of National policy. That is one reason why I have insisted again and again upon a clean-cut and definite statement on that point. I insisted upon it in the subcommittee, in the main committee, and I have also insisted upon it on the floor of the Senate. I think the language of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio and myself represents a very comprehensive statement covering the entire field of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico clearly sets forth the substance of our amendment. There is no real difference in the scope of the two amendments. If by agreeing to that amendment of the Senator from New Mexico we can readily dispose of the issues before us personally, as one of the sponsors of the amendment offered by myself and the Senator from Ohio, I am willing to vote for the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he insists upon a quorum call so that I may propound a question?

Mr. WAGNER. I withhold the suggestion, and yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. In his answer to the Senator from Michigan, which I did not clearly hear, did the chairman of the committee accept the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the amendment is accepted in the language in which it is now written, am I to understand the chairman of the committee to state that the amendment will not mean that the Federal Government assures full employment, but that it will do everything consistent with its needs and other obligations to aid in achieving full employment?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the language does not guarantee full employment or assure it. Am I correct?

Mr. WAGNER. I think the statement of the Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, there is to be no guarantee or assurance on the part of the Federal Government that, after all other means have failed, it will guarantee full employment.

Mr. WAGNER. There has never been a guarantee under the pending measure, but merely that the Federal Government should do everything within its power to assure the opportunity of employment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Government will be expected merely to do the best it can to assure the opportunity of employment.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at this point I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the substitute amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Mexico goes, of course, very much further than the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Ohio does not contain the language which is found in the Hatch amendment, namely:

> To the extent that continuing full employment can not otherwise be attained, consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government and other essential considerations of national policy, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to achieve the objective of continuing full employment.

That language is not in the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] and the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before a quorum call is proceeded with?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] to the language of his amendment. I believe there is in it an inadvertent misplacing of the consistency clause. As the language now reads, unless it was changed while I was temporarily out of the Chamber, the qualification clause qualifies that which precedes it rather than that which succeeds it. I suggest that the language of the consistency clause follow the word "provide" rather than the word "attained."

Mr. HATCH. I doubt that the change should be made. I think the language is plain as it now reads. I think its meaning is clear. I may say that the language was submitted last evening to the drafting service. After some changes were made they were convinced that the language of the amendment in its present form is the proper language to use. I do not believe there could be any doubt about what is intended. If we were to change the language now I am quite sure that we would get into complications.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I have a great deal of respect for the drafting service, but I also have respect for the elementary rules of grammar.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I would say that the change should be made. I am sure that if the Senator from New Mexico will consider it he will come to the conclusion that the word "provide" should come ahead of the word "consistent."

Mr. HATCH. There may be some merit to the suggestion, but I am reminded of what the Senator from New York said yesterday evening about a certain distinguished citizen of the United States who said that we can always draft legislation until the semicolon men got hold of it. Personally I have no objection to making the change. I do not want the language changed, but I am willing to make the change suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. MILLIKIN. My suggestion is that the consistency clause follow the word "provide", instead of the word "attained."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Overton
Bailey	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barkley	Hoey	Robertson
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Brooks	Kilgore	Shipstead
Buck	Knowland	Smith
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	McMahon	Tydings
Cordon	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Donnell	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Ellender	Millikin	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	White
George	Morse	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	Willis
Green	Murray	Wilson
Guffey	Myers	Young
Gurney	O'Daniel	
Hatch	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, has the Senator from New Mexico modified his amendment?

Mr. HATCH. I was just about to ask permission to modify the proposed amendment in accordance with the suggestion made by the Senator from Colorado, which is at the desk. The clause beginning with the word "consistent" will follow the word "provide."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment, so the question now is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to state the reasons why I am willing to accept the amendment.

In my opinion, the bill contains a prescription of a definite formula, known as the compensatory spending theory, advanced by Mr. Beveridge, Lord Keynes, and various other economists. That compensatory spending theory required a calculation of what industrial activity would be, what would be necessary to produce full employment; and if there should be a deficit, there was a definite prescription that there must be Federal expenditure sufficient to meet it, regardless, I think, of any other consideration.

The pending amendment adopts the essential features presented by the Senator from Maryland and myself. It says that the volume of investment and expenditure shall only be provided if it is "consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government and other essential considerations of national policy."

In my opinion, that kills the compensatory spending theory, because, if I am correct in my interpretation of the bill—and I may be wrong—and there should result a $30,000,000,000 deficit, the President would no longer be required to submit a program of Federal investment and expenditure of $30,000,000,000, if he found that would create a deficit, shake public confidence, or do other things which might do more harm to employment than good.

The other parts of the amendment offered I do not feel are as well framed, but it seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico adopts the essential thing in which I have been interested in the debate. I am very glad, therefore, to urge that, since it is agreeable to all, the amendment be adopted by those who are in favor of the Taft-Radcliffe amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] satisfy himself in any way he wishes, but I want it understood that the sponsors of the bill do not accept his construction of the proposed amendment at all. It does not do anything of the nature he mentions. I want it to appear in the RECORD that I am absolutely against his construction.

Mr. TAFT. Do I understand the Senator to say that the bill, then, still contains the compensatory theory of spending?

Mr. MURRAY. No, and it never contained it at any time. That is a proposition the Senator is urging for the purpose of creating prejudice against the bill. It had no merit at any time, either in the committee or on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. This is the first time that anyone, I think, has denied that that was in the bill, and I am delighted to have one of the authors of the bill deny it. I am glad to accept his interpretation, and since that is now cleared up, I am very glad that all differences between us have disappeared.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, replying to the remarks of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] about his interpretation of this clause of the bill, as it will be amended if the amendment shall be agreed to, I cannot go along with his interpretation. Of course, he is an eminent lawyer, and I am merely an ordinary layman; but a cat can look at a king. Therefore I wish to state my interpretation of the words as they appear to my mind.

The language is "consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government," we can provide and shall provide such volume as is necessary. I submit—and I want it to appear in the RECORD—that no need or obligation of the Federal Government can be paramount to a situation of dire distress in this country caused by great unemployment, for it is a prime need and it is a basic obligation to take care of that matter. That is the interpretation I shall put on the language in the future, if we get into such a situation in this country. There is no greater need, no greater obligation resting upon us, than to take care of unemployment when, as, and if it develops and gets out of hand, and becomes Nation-wide, constituting a grave emergency.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am sorry to delay the vote, but I wish to express my opposition to the pending amendment. I am wholeheartedly opposed to it. I do not believe the pending so-called full-employment bill is going to provide jobs for anybody. There is nothing in it which would give anybody a job unless it be the provision with respect to the establishment of a corps of statisticians which would provide figures for the President upon which to base his program. Yet I feel that the bill has a value. I consider that there is a psychological value in the bill as it is now written, but not as it will appear if the pending amendment is agreed to. The bill says emphatically that the Federal Government does assume the ultimate responsibility to see that everybody in America who desires work has an opportunity to work. The language which is proposed to be inserted waters that down until it would say, "We will see that you have a job if something does not interfere."

Mr. President, I should like to compare that with the Federal deposit insurance law. There is nothing in that law which says, "Your deposits are insured unless something else happens so we cannot take care of this obligation." It says, "Your deposits are insured up to $5,000," and regardless of whether or not we deserve it, the people of America have confidence in the Congress of the United States. It is their ultimate recourse to come to Congress. I know that because I have come directly from the people. I know how they thing respecting different things. They feel that if the Congress says "There will be a job" there will be a job. But if we say "There are going to be jobs—perhaps," this bill will not be worth the paper it is written on, because there is nothing to it other than a declaration of principle. On the other hand, if the people can have confidence in it, it will mean something. It will give them confidence that there will be jobs; they will go ahead and spend the money they have saved during the war which will start the wheels turning again, and businessmen will have confidence.

I call attention to the upsurge in the stock market immediately following President Truman's message to the Congress. Some businessmen may curse this bill as a conglomeration of silly platitudes, but at the same time, when the President issued his message saying that there was going to be full-employment legislation and other liberal measures, business reacted favorably.

Aside from the common sense proposal calling for economic planning, to my mind the only good that can come from the passage of this bill is the psychological effect it will have upon the country. If we water it down it will have no effect whatever.

At the risk of being tedious I wish to say a few words to my colleagues and tell them exactly how I stand on this and other measures advocated by the President in his message to the Congress a short time ago. Not so very long ago I was one of those who might be classed as belonging to the lower strata of our society. I was raised on a side-hill farm, and all my life I have spent in the show business. I was just downtown addressing a luncheon meeting, and was there introduced as a formerly well-known star of the stage and radio. I told them they were mistaken; that I was merely a poor ham actor, and that is true. I never saw Broadway. I have never yet seen a show on Broadway, much less participated in one. I had my own company playing through the West, and the depression and the talkies came at the same time. We could not secure bookings because the theaters were full of talkies, and if we did get a booking no one came to see us anyway, so it made no difference. I saw what people went through in those days.

We had to go into the small communities, to cross-road halls and schoolhouses which the talkies had not reached. Many times we have taken farm produce, chickens—sometimes live chickens—and vegetables, in exchange for tickets to our show. I have seen children stand outside and beg to be admitted, and I would admit them sometimes, and, at times, about the third night, instead of 20 children, there would be about 150 standing outside, and then I would have to draw the line.

I know how the common people feel when they cannot get jobs. Frankly, Senators, I have seen the time when I would have signed up for $25 a week for the rest of my life. I would not have done it if I were the only one I had to consider, but I had a family, and the members of my family needed medical attention, and I could not afford it. In such circumstances it is not a matter of favoring democracy or private enterprise. It is a matter of life or death.

To be perfectly frank, Senators, the experiences I went through started me

thinking. If I had not gone hungry I would not now be a United States Senator, because I was pretty well satisfied. I had started my own business and made several thousand dollars in a few weeks' time, and I thought everything was quite rosy. I did not give private enterprise credit for it, because I did not even know there was such a thing as private enterprise. I was just going along making a living and doing the best I could. But when the going got tough I started to study, and I did study diligently for a number of years. I have seen the sun come up while I was still reading. It got to be a matter of religion with me. I read books of all kinds. I want to be fair about this matter, and I will say that I read Capitalism the Creator, and I read books by Stuart Chase, and many others, I read a book by King C. Gillette, the man who invented the safety razor. He pointed out that there was plenty for everybody; that it was simply a question of whether we were going to shut the factories down and starve to death. His idea was that the whole country should be operated on a business basis as he operated his great factory for producing razor blades. He said in his book:

> I will produce my razor blades just as cheaply as I can and sell them for just as much as I can get for them, and if I can get more for my blades by advertising than I can by making a better blade I will advertise.

He contended that our whole economic system was wrong. He said:

> Our system of competition for profit leads to war.

Frankly, I was greatly influenced by that book written by King C. Gillette. God help the man; he died broke, as I understand. He loved his fellow men so much that he neglected his business.

But I want to make it plain that I was not a Communist and I was not a Socialist. I have never belonged to either of those organizations. I have talked to Socialists and I have talked to Communists, and they were just the same as Senators are here. I believe they were just as smart and just as amiable. They were splendid men who earnestly believed in what they fought for, as I give Senators here credit for believing in what they are fighting for. But I never joined any of their organizations. My father was a Democrat, and I think that is why I am a Democrat, although even if my father had not been a Democrat I think I would have had enough sense to be a Democrat anyway. [Laughter.]

Frankly, Mr. President, my economic ideas were quite radical back in those days. I was ready to junk the profit system and plan for plenty. Well, I take it if one is going to do anything about a proposition the only way to do it is to start, so I ceased my travels about the country and took up residence in Idaho with the purpose in mind of running for office. After I had been there 6 months I announced my candidacy for Congress. I had to make use of the tools at hand. By that time I had gone out of what I am pleased to call the show business, because there was no longer any place to put on shows. I had organized a cowboy band. So I took the cowboy band and campaigned with them. I was fourth in a field of nine in the primaries in that race for Congress. It encouraged me. I defeated five old party wheelhorses.

The next year it so happened that the late great Senator Borah had in the meantime gone to his reward. So I decided that if I were going to do anything along political lines, there was no use running for dog catcher or even for Representative in Congress. I might as well run for the Senate. So I ran for the United States Senate.

I did not know anything about politics. When I first ran I did not know a single precinct committeeman. When I ran for the Senate in 1940, while the politicians were arguing over which one of them was going to be nominated, I went out and frankly laid it on the line to the people of Idaho, a State which has been Republican, and which is considered pretty conservative. That was in 1938, a year of comparative prosperity. I told the people that the private enterprise system had not worked, and I quoted from King C. Gillette's book.

It is very easy to argue for a planned economy. It is much easier than to try to convince the people that there is any logic in our present economic system. I told them that we could plan for plenty, and they nominated me for the United States Senate. I had one precinct committeeman working for me.

As soon as I got the nomination the politicians got together. I had not asked their consent to run. They got together and ganged up on me. While Roosevelt was carrying the State by 25,000, I lost by 15,000, and that was a pretty bad beating.

The politicians figured that that was the end of me. The war started shortly after that. They said I was too old to fight, and that the next best thing I could do would be to get a job in a defense plant, which I did. First I went to a war plant in my State of Idaho, and told the man to whom I applied that I wanted a job on defense work. He told me to write my name, which I did. I shoved the paper across the counter. The man looked at it and said, "GLEN TAYLOR. Are you the man who ran for the Senate?" I said, "Yes." He said, "Well, Mr. TAYLOR, we have nothing suitable for you." I explained to him that I did not want to manage the plant. I simply wanted a job. I told him that I was a pretty good home-made carpenter, better than some of those who carried cards. I could drive a truck. I could use a sledge hammer expertly—which was true. I used to have a tent show, and had to drive stakes. But the man insisted that he had nothing suitable for me, so I saw what the score was. He thought I wanted to put on a silk hat and a pair of gloves and be a gentleman.

So I left Idaho and went to California and got a job in a war industry there. I worked shoulder to shoulder with the common man. I know what he thinks, and just about how his mind works. I worked right along with him. My coworkers did not know that I had run for the Senate. I kept it very dark. I wanted to be one of them.

Then 1942 came along. I went back to Idaho and ran again. The politicians were very much surprised to see me back. They thought that they had done for me, because I had been beaten twice.

The same thing happened again. I got the nomination while the other boys were arguing over the matter, and this time I was defeated by only 4,000 votes. That was very encouraging. I saw that I was making headway. So I went back to work in a defense plant, and the politicians were sure that they were rid of me.

I am recounting this simply to encourage anyone who may be listening who believes that things are not being run properly. He should not give up. If he wants to be a United States Senator, let him start running and keep at it.

I returned to Idaho and ran again. Again I got the nomination.

While I was in the war plant I saw a great deal of inefficiency. It was not a Government plant. It was a cost-plus plant. This can be no reflection on the Government. The newspapers of my State picked up the statement which I made in the Senate some time ago and tried to make it appear that the New Deal was at fault because there was inefficiency in the war plant where I worked. That was not the case. The New Deal had to pay the big business boys.

We all remember that big business was the first to go on strike when the war started. They said that they would not produce anything unless they got cost-plus. They did not intend to take any chances whatever. So the system of cost-plus contracts was inaugurated. It was very wasteful and extravagant. I saw many things that could have been done better, but no one wanted any suggestions from a poor, lowly sheet-metal mechanic.

Incidentally, I held a union card. I was not asked to join. I joined voluntarily, because I realized that the only chance the workingman has to get a fair break is by organizing. There was one man who worked in the plant who was a janitor. That is not much of a job, but there was a janitor's union. However, he did not join. No one made him join. He used to tell me that he worked overtime on Saturday and Sunday, and received double time for overtime, and that he was very much pleased about it. I said to him, "Did you ever stop to realize that you would not get any overtime or double time if there were no union?" I saw him the next day, and he said, "I went down and joined the union yesterday."

My experience there changed my outlook somewhat. I believe it was the most trying time of my life. I made good wages but could not save very much, and I could not exercise my initiative. I saw things that needed to be done, but no one was interested; so we continued to waste time, taking a week to do a job which could have been done in 2 days if some of us had been allowed to figure out a better way to do it.

I decided then that perhaps the idea we have of every man being his own boss if he cares to be was not so bad, after all. Frankly, my present attitude is that I should like to see the private enterprise system continue. I admit that I am not so closely wedded to that idea as are some others. Frankly, if the stopper is

kept in the kettle and we refuse to allow any changes to take care of changing circumstances, and the thing blows up, and the Socialists take over, I will try to help the Socialists make socialism work, just as I am honestly and sincerely trying to help the private enterprise boys make that system work now.

In 1944 I went back to Idaho and ran again. I got the nomination, and this time I was elected, and here I am. The callouses have scarcely worn off my hands; but I thank God that callouses have not yet started to form on my heart. I am here because I am sincerely interested in the welfare of the common people. I feel that the bill now pending before the Senate will help to make jobs for people, not because it will give anyone a job, as I said before, but because it will give confidence to the people to go ahead; and confidence is absolutely essential to the working of our private enterprise system.

I am opposed to changing the language of the bill. The proposed amendment would make the bill wishy-washy. It does not say that, "come hell and high water, we are going to give the people jobs." It says that perhaps, if other things do not get in the way, we will provide jobs for the people.

Let me read an excerpt from our declaration of war on Germany. After declaring a state of war, and saying that we were going to fight Germany with all our armed forces, we proceeded to say:

> And to bring this conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

The Congress did not say, "We are going to spend so many billion dollars, and if that does not win, we will give up." It said that all the resources of this Nation were pledged to bring the conflict to a successful termination.

That is the way I feel about the full employment bill. If we are to have any bill at all, then let us say, "All or nothing. We will give them jobs or we will die in the attempt." We might as well say that, because if we do not give them jobs, the private-enterprise system will be finished, anyway.

I have been with the people. I know how they feel. I know how easy it was to persuade them to throw the whole thing overboard; and it can be done much more easily if the system breaks down again. They have seen what we can provide in war in the way of jobs and a high standard of living for all the people. If we break down again, we are bound to lose our private-enterprise system.

There are two matters upon which I will not compromise. I shall always fight for democracy and an opportunity for every citizen to earn a living. That is my attitude. I am here to try to make our economic system work. I am willing to cooperate with anyone who wants to make it work; but when I see some of the opposition to the various valley authority projects, I wonder. I will admit that these projects are socialistic. There is no use beating around the bush about it. They are socialistic, but they will provide abundant cheap power. That will bring into being new private industries, and farms upon which people can settle, and keep our private-enterprise system working. So when I see proposals of that kind scuttled, and measures like this watered down, frankly, my hopes are not very high.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will reject the pending amendment and pass the bill as it is presently written.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to express the fervent hope that we may conclude consideration of the pending bill today. I have not had anything to say about it thus far, and I shall speak only briefly at this time.

I was not a member of the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, and I did not attend the hearings which were held before the subcommittee. I have not read them. I doubt whether any Member of the Senate has read all the hearings on the bill, because they are somewhat lengthy and voluminous, and with all the other things we have to do it is difficult to read all of hearings which occupy 3 or 4 weeks, so as to be familiar with everything which everyone may have said for or against this bill or, in other cases, for or against other measures of similar importance.

I am fairly well familiar with the general theory upon which the pending bill is based. I have not adopted as my policy the theory of anyone who has written on the subject. I hope I shall never reach the time when I cannot be benefited by reading what other men say in regard to economic problems. But my thinking on this measure has not been induced by Sir William Beveridge, Lord Keynes, Mr. Henry Wallace, or anyone else, although I am reasonably familiar with what they have had to say and with their theories, and with much that they have said and with much that they believe I agree.

Mr. President, I was for this bill as it was reported from the committee. In the committee I voted against all amendments designed to water it down, because I think the bill itself watered itself down as far as it could safely be watered down and still have anything whatever left.

We all agree that what we are undertaking to do is to adopt a policy, a goal, to which not only the people of the United States but also their representatives in Congress may look forward with some hope of attainment.

As has already been said, there is nothing in the bill which automatically gives anyone a job. There is not a sentence or paragraph or section of the bill which automatically gives a job to anyone. There is not a paragraph or a section of the bill which sets up a Government project which will give a job to anyone. The bill sets out certain goals to be attained. In view of the language contained in section 6, to which I shall refer in a moment, it may not make a very great deal of difference what the language of subsection (d) may be; but no matter how broad or how comprehensive it may be, the entire bill is modified by section 6, which, in order to be overcautious, sets out certain things which cannot be interpreted as being authorized or directed by the terms of the bill which precede it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to prolong my remarks by a running debate, but I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to point out that my interpretation of section 6 in no way limits in any respect the program which is prescribed under section 2. It seems to me that all it does is to say that this is not an authorization bill and that if the President recommends anything which is not already covered by law, it will be necessary to obtain an authorization bill. I think that is what section 6 means. I do not think it is a limitation on policy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall read section 6 in a moment, and I shall place my interpretation upon it. As I interpret it, no matter what else is placed in the bill, we cannot do anything about it until Congress subsequently passes some other law.

Subsection (d), at the bottom of page 13, provides as follows:

> To that end—

In other words, to the end of accomplishing the objectives mentioned in subsection (c), and so forth—

> The Federal Government shall, in cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and others, develop and pursue a consistent and carefully planned economic program with respect to, but not limited to, taxation, banking, credit, and currency; monopoly—

And so forth. It sets out the goal to be attained.

At the bottom of page 14, paragraph (4) reads as follows:

> To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured—

In other words—

> Such program shall, among other things—
> (1) Stimulate, encourage, and assist private enterprises—

And so forth—

> (2) Stimulate, encourage, and assist State and local governments—

And so forth—

> (3) Provide for an income for the aged sufficient to enable them to maintain a decent and healthful standard of living—

And so forth; and—

> (4) To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment.

As a substitute for that language, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] offered yesterday his amendment providing that these things shall be consistent with all other needs and all other programs of the Federal Government—in other words, making this program secondary, as I understand it, to all other programs and all other efforts. I am sure the Senator from Maryland did not so intend it, but it seems to me his amendment offered a loophole for any future Congresses to say that the program, whatever it may be, recommended by the President and outlined in the National Budget, is not consistent with

all other things the Government is obligated to do, and therefore they will do nothing about it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not place that interpretation upon the word "consistent." I do not regard the term "consistent" as meaning that the unemployment program proposed by the bill shall be considered as secondary to other programs. When an activity is consistent, it means that it will work and be considered with other activities.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, if it is to be consistent with other programs already adopted, that means it shall not be inconsistent with or in opposition to other programs or shall not prevent the working out of all programs already adopted.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It means that the unemployment program shall not take a place superior to that of other programs already adopted unless expressly so determined, but that the needs and obligations of the Government under other programs, whatever they may be, shall be considered together with the needs and obligations under the unemployment program, and then we shall decide what shall be done at that time in regard to all of them, each standing on its own intrinsic merits.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and that will have to be consistent with the routine reports of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on measures referred to him; and if he finds that the program to be inaugurated under this bill is not consistent with the programs established under other measures, he will recommend the rejection of this program.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, when we say that this program is to be consistent, that means that the other programs to which the Government is committed shall be considered in connection with this program and none shall be considered as being superior to the others unless specific facts demonstrate a superiority.

Mr. BARKLEY. It means that the program to be inaugurated under this bill must be considered in the light of everything which has been ordained by the Government and is being carried out and must be done, and it means that, if anything in connection with the program organized under the provisions of the pending bill is inconsistent with any part of the programs inaugurated under measures previously enacted, the program proposed under the provisions of this bill shall be abandoned.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It means that there shall be a basis of relative values and a sense of proportion, and that each proposition, when it comes up for consideration, shall be considered on its merits without any prejudged opinion as to which of one or more needs or obligations is superior to the other. That is the way in which we have always operated. That is the way our legislation has been enacted for years and years. When a proposition comes before the Senate it is considered in connection with what has been done or what is under consideration, and with what are relevant and interrelated facts. Then we reach conclusions as to what should be the predominant factors in determining our judgment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not believe the Congress of the United States has ever proceeded on any policy in an emergency by first considering whether or not what it was about to do was consistent with something else which it had done theretofore. I do not think we have ever adopted a policy on the basis of whether the legislation which was being considered was or was not consistent, no matter what the emergency might be, and took the position that we would not do anything about the emergency because it was inconsistent with some other program which might be technical or routine in nature.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The meaning is that if we have a program of national defense, for example, we will do what should be done under that program, bearing in mind all our other obligations. If there are two propositions being considered, we must consider the two together and then decide what is the proper course to follow in regard to each, bearing in mind all the facts and all the circumstances.

Mr. BARKLEY. I assume that debate on the Senator's amendment is academic anyway, because the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] offered a substitute which I suppose, from all I understand, will be agreed to. Then the Senate will be called upon to decide whether it will accept the substitute in lieu of the language of the bill. I was explaining why I voted in the committee against the proposal of the Senator from Maryland, and why I shall vote against it if I am called upon to vote upon it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. While the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] was not in the Chamber the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and I both made statements to the effect that we considered the amendment which we had offered to be superior in many respects to the amendment which was offered by the Senator from New Mexico, although both covered the same ground. We are willing to accept it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico is superior to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Ohio. As between the two, I am in favor of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. I reserve the right to determine, in case the amendment shall be agreed to, whether I will vote for the language in the bill.

Mr. President, I am not one of those who deny the obligation of our Government to take steps to alleviate the economic and social conditions of our people. The Government of the United States is the only symbol of organized society to which the people may look. All kinds of volunteer organizations, and all kinds of religious bodies may pass resolutions and adopt policies and programs for the alleviation of suffering and want, as well as for the elevation of standards of living, but the only agency of the American people that can do anything about those conditions with any power whatever is the Government of the United States. Whether we like it or not, that statement is becoming more and more true as our economic and social life becomes more complex. We are no longer living under simple agricultural conditions. Thomas Jefferson is said to have stated—although I have not been able to find any record of it—that that government is best that governs least. If he ever said it I have not been able to find it; but if he said it, no doubt he was talking about a simple agricultural, pastoral life at a time when there were no complexities involved, and when the Government of the United States was not compelled to intervene in order to protect the weak against the strong. I do not care to go into that philosophical, political, and metaphysical field. We are living in a complex age, and conditions are becoming more and more involved. In my judgment, our Government cannot ignore its obligation to deal with these economic and social problems. It was because of that fact that we enacted the social-security law providing for old-age pensions and old-age subsistence. It is because of that fact that we are now considering the pending bill for full employment of our people. The other day we considered an unemployment compensation law. It is evident that we must deal with all these problems.

I have received letters from businessmen who object to the pending bill. They seem to have allowed goose pimples to form all over their anatomies because of a fear that the bill would interfere in some way or other with private enterprise, and that it would establish competitive business enterprises for the purpose of employing people.

Mr. President, I wish to read from the bill. I believe that section 6 waters the bill down to as great an extent as anybody could want to have it watered down, if it is to mean anything at all. I assume that we are hoping that the language of the bill means something, and that we are not going to enact a futility. I hope that we are not marching up the hill and then marching down again, and saying that we passed a full-employment bill. Every section of the bill, every paragraph, and every line of it, must be read in connection with section 6.

Under the title "Interpretation," section 6 reads as follows:

> Nothing contained herein—
>
> That is in this bill—
>
> shall be construed as directing or authorizing—
>
> (a) the operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government.

Nothing in this bill shall be construed as authorizing or directing the operation of any plant in order to produce anything the American people may need, or which may employ people who need work. Nothing in this bill shall be construed as authorizing or directing anything of that nature. How can any man who operates any business enterprise see under his bed any ghosts or spooks which would arouse

fears in his heart because of the provisions of this bill, when the first subparagraph of section 6 states that nothing in the bill shall be construed as authorizing or directing anything of the kind?

I continue reading:

(b) The use of compulsory measures of any type whatsoever in determining the allocation or distribution of manpower.

No agency of the Federal Government, under this bill, shall have any authority to do anything toward the allocation or distribution or redistribution of employees anywhere in the United States in order to give jobs to them. Government agencies are denied any power or authority, under this bill, to allocate or redistribute manpower in the United States.

Subsection (c) reads:

Any change in the existing procedures on appropriations.

That is, nothing contained in this bill shall be construed as directing or authorizing any change in the existing procedures on appropriations. We all know what those procedures are. We know that appropriation bills for all purposes are referred to the Appropriations Committee. Not under any constitutional mandate, but as a matter of immemorial habit or custom, appropriation bills originate in the House of Representatives, come to the Senate, and then are referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Nothing in this bill shall be construed as directing or authorizing that there shall be any change in that procedure. So we need not be uneasy about the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee being impinged upon, or Congress going awry in the appropriation of money on matters which have not gone through the regular procedure.

Subsection (d) provides:

Nothing contained herein shall be construed as directing or authorizing the carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the national budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by provisions of law other than this act.

No matter what the national budget may provide, no matter what the recommendations of the President may be, no matter what his annual report may contain in regard to statistical information or prognostications as to investment or employment, under this bill no project can be carried out or begun unless Congress later on separately, by other legislation, shall authorize specifically the things which are to be done, without regard to this measure. So that the bill is not even an authorization to build a bridge or highway, or to do anything which would cost one dollar to the United States, unless later Congress separately and specifically authorized the construction of a project or a program of projects which would involve the employment of men in industry.

Therefore all the fears which have been conjured up that the Government of the United States is going into business in competition with private industry have no foundation. Men who proclaim such a fear have not even read the bill, because, I contend, section 6 waters down the entire legislative program, so that all that remains of it is a goal, an objective, a perspective, that we will do all we can to create conditions which will give employment to all our people who are able and willing to work. But we cannot even do that until subsequently Congress passes additional legislation authorizing any of the things we may have in mind to supplement private industry and to supplement the activities of States, counties, and cities, and all the other accumulated agencies of employment, when there is a need for the Federal Government to supplement these things with such projects as may be hereafter authorized in order to give full employment to our people.

Mr. President, that is why I could not support the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Ohio in the committee. That is why I favor the Hatch amendment as against their proposal. I am not enthusiastic about the limitations placed upon the power that Congress may exert to attain the goal and the objective, even by the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico. Personally I prefer the language as it is in the bill. But if the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico shall be adopted in lieu of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Ohio, in view of the limitations placed upon the entire bill in section 6 I am not certain whether it makes much difference whether the original language of the bill be retained or whether finally the substitute amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] be adopted.

I wanted in this brief period of my contemplation of this subject to call the attention of Senators to the fact that, no matter how ambitious their goals may be, no matter how high their aspirations may be as to objectives, no matter what lip service we may render to full employment, even under the bill as written by the committee nothing can be done about it until Congress later on passes additional legislation providing employment and projects which will give jobs to people. We can deal with the problems as they arise, and need not conjure up imaginary fears now, because it seems to me we have hedged it around with all the safeguards that may be written, in order that Congress may not go wild either in the adoption of projects or the expenditure of money.

Mr. President, I have stated my view about the proposed legislation. I am not afraid of it. I am not scared at the contemplation of anything Congress may do hereafter, and I should infinitely prefer that we plan in advance in order to forestall unemployment and forestall depressions, than to idle around and loll around and loiter around in our legislative capacity until the catastrophe has overcome us, when we must proceed hastily to deal with the problem, as we did in 1931, 1932, 1933, and subsequent years. I wish to guard against the recurrence of raking leaves or digging holes in the ground, or any other unuseful or unconstructive work or unremunerative work that may not contribute to the wealth of our Nation, and I hope we may be foresighted so that, with all our frailties, in the years to come we may provide against depressions and may meet by legislation the problems as they arise year by year.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay a vote for very long, but I think the pending amendment is vital to the bill. If the section remains as it was reported by the committee, I cannot vote for the bill, and I wish to state my views very briefly.

It seems to me that the type of language written into section 2 of the bill is extremely unfortunate. We cannot read the newspapers or talk with our constituents without realizing that a great mass of the people of this country will, if we pass the bill, no matter what we say it means, interpret it as meaning that the Federal Government has guaranteed a job to every individual who wants one. Of course, we know that the bill does no such thing, but I think we are laying up trouble for ourselves because the language of the bill is calculated to mislead the people, and is susceptible of the interpretation I have suggested, and I think we may be very confident that that interpretation will be placed upon it.

Actually, of course, section 6 nullifies any legal commitment if any is made in section 2. It is my own opinion that the bill would be much sounder if section 2 and section 6 were both stricken out, and only sections 3, 4, and 5 were left in the bill as having any legal effect.

I think both the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] have made an excellent case for a better job of economic planning by the Government to achieve the goal of full employment, which every administration in every country has sought. I think that objective would be completely accomplished if section 2 were stricken out completely.

In section 2, on page 14, in the statement of what the program shall include, we find that it shall "stimulate, encourage, and assist private enterprise." That can mean anything under the sun.

Then it is provided that it shall "stimulate, encourage, and assist State and local government." Again, those are most general terms.

Subsection (3) is a little more specific. It provides "for an income for the aged sufficient to enable them to maintain a decent and healthful standard of living."

I suppose the Townsend group will interpret that as an endorsement of their program.

Then we come to subsection (4), which reads:

To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be assured, provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed, in addition to the investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, and State and local governments, to assure continuing full employment.

There is nothing general or vague about that. It is a flat commitment. To those sponsors of the bill who have argued that that is not a commitment to definite deficit spending, I say that if it is not, I do not know how they read the English language. It says the Government will spend sufficient money to assure full employment. It does not say anything about providing the revenue so that it will not be deficit spending. If that is not a flat moral commitment to

the deficit spending theory of achieving prosperity, then I cannot understand the English language.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am not sure that I heard distinctly what the Senator said, but in reading the amendment I think he left out the phrase "consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government."

Mr. BALL. Let me say to the Senator that I was not reading the amendment. I was reading the language of the bill as it was reported by the committee. I am supporting the amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am sorry I interrupted. I thought the Senator was reading the pending amendment.

Mr. BALL. My argument is that the language as it now stands is a flat commitment and a direction to the Federal Economic Planning Commission to adopt a deficit spending theory of achieving prosperity.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Minnesota just said that as he interprets the bill it is now in such form as to assure that the Federal Government could and would go into deficit spending in order to achieve prosperity. I think he misinterprets the whole intent of the bill. When, as, and if this Nation becomes engulfed in a great fearful wave of unemployment and depression, and millions are out of employment, and a public works program does not take care of and fill the gap, and men are knocking at doors seeking for work, and children are crying for bread, the plan proposed under the bill is not one aimed at achieving properity; what we are undertaking to do in such an emergency is to defeat adversity and we shall use deficit spending under this bill to defeat adversity when it affects the lives and fortunes of millions of our fellowmen, and when there is no other recourse.

Mr. BALL. I am glad to hear the Senator from New Hampshire, one of the sponsors of the bill, admit that the bill carries with it a commitment to deficit spending.

Mr. TOBEY. It is a commitment to use all resources of the country to defeat adversity, an all-out effort just as we used to win the war.

Mr. BALL. The Senator can say it in any words he wants to; it is still deficit spending.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I invite the Senator's attention to page 13, the opening language:

> In order to assure the free exercise of the right to an opportunity for employment set forth above and in order to—

And then a number of objectives are listed. Let me now direct the Senator's attention to page 13, where it says:

> The Federal Government has the responsibility to assure continuing full employment; that is, the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans able to work and desiring to work.

That has not yet been affected by amendment.

Mr. BALL. That is correct. I shall come to that a little later. As it stands, I think paragraph (4) on page 14, while it has no legal effect, certainly leaves any President in the future free to submit and any Congress free to approve any kind of program they want to on any basis. So far as I am personally concerned, if I voted for the bill with that provision in it I would feel that when the President submitted a program calling for $5,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000 or $15,000,000,000 of deficit spending to assure full employment, I had morally committed myself at least to support such a program, although I grant that the bill imposes no legal obligation on any future Congress and cannot do so. Actually, it would be a much more honest title for the bill if it were labeled, instead of a full employment bill, "a bill for Federal economic planning," which is actually what it does legally.

Referring to the argument raised so frequently by the sponsors of this bill that, if in 5 or 10 years we face a situation where 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 are unemployed, the Federal Government will have to step in and do something about it, and that probably in that case the free private-enterprise system is washed up, I am inclined to agree with that argument, but I am not prepared now to wash up the present system.

Mr. President, if the Congress adopts the policy contained in paragraph (4) of deficit spending, with all that that implies, I think we are making absolutely certain that we will arrive at that day.

We talk about stimulating and encouraging free enterprise so as to provide full employment. Mr. President, today there are more than 500,000 men unemployed because of strikes, and heaven only knows how many more hundreds of thousands are unemployed because materials and parts are not being made and are not available because of work stoppages due to labor disputes. Yet the Congress is not doing anything to resolve the present chaos existing in the field of labor relations.

Today the OPA in setting reconversion prices for smaller industries—and if I have received one I have received reports of a dozen cases from my State—is pursuing a policy that is slowing down reemployment and making sure that we will have widespread unemployment. Are we doing anything about that? Have we made any move to adopt the resolution offered the other day by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to investigate the OPA and at least see what kind of theory they are following in the matter of pricing? No. Are we moving to establish a labor relations policy so that a businessman planning to expand his business or to start a new business may have some remote idea of where he stands, and what will be the procedure if a union comes in and makes demands on him? No. Can private enterprise hope to meet the call of full employment until it has some assurance of what the labor-relations policy is going to be? No.

I do not think they can make any planning to affect full employment until we tell them what the postwar tax program is going to be. We have now in effect an 80-percent excess-profits tax. I think everyone will agree that that is an extremely excessive tax insofar as stimulating expansion of small business is concerned. It does not affect a big business so much. How can a small business—and small business is always developed by plowing back earnings—how can a small business hope to get anywhere under an 80-percent excess-profits tax?

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] told us yesterday that during this war the tendency to concentrate the industry of the country into a few large firms has been accelerated. How can we hope that competitive free enterprise will meet the challenge of full employment until we do something about reversing that trend toward monopoly. How can we hope that they will do it while under the Supreme Court interpretation there is a wide open loophole in the Sherman Antitrust Act and all that an employer has to do to evade that act completely is to conspire to fix prices with a union, and he cannot be touched?

What I object to in this flat commitment to deficit spending is that while we are setting up an economic planning agency to study all the factors which may affect the goal of full employment—and of course we are all for that—we are telling them in advance that they must reach this one specific conclusion—deficit spending. That is the only answer we give them. We do not say anything specific about labor relations, about OPA policies, or about taxes or about monopoly. All those questions are dealt with in general terms. It would be just as though the Senate were to create a committee to investigate the Pearl Harbor disaster and were to tell the committee in advance that it must find Kimmel and Short guilty. That is a fine way to plan objectively—to tell what conclusion must be reached before beginning to study the facts.

Finally, Mr. President, I am dubious about where this insidious and insistent demand that the Federal Government assume completely the obligation to provide every citizen of this country with a high standard of living, is going to lead us. It seems to me that it was the demand for economic security above everything else which led the people of Italy and Germany into the clutches of the Fascists and the Nazis. We have just finished fighting a great war because to us there are things which are more important than having full stomachs and security. So far the free enterprise system has provided the highest standard of living of any economic system that has ever been tried. However, I am not so sure that we can make a free enterprise system work and assure everyone complete economic security, because unfortunately there is a minority of individuals who, if they have that assurance, will not try. It is individual initiative and enterprise, and determination to provide adequately for their families, which have made men and women achieve in this country.

Finally, if we as individuals are to turn over to the Government our obliga-

tion to produce something, to do our part of the job of achieving security for ourselves and our families, I fear that inevitably we shall also turn over to the Government a large part of our individual liberties and freedom. If the Government is to guarantee every individual a job, it will not be long before the Government will be telling the individual where he shall work, at what he shall work, for how much, and how long. His freedom will be gone. There were jobs for everyone in Russia, Germany, and Italy. I would take a considerable degree of unemployment in this country before I would wish to see such a system imposed in the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator says he would take a considerable degree of unemployment. Would he be willing to take unemployment himself, and have his wife and children go hungry and in need of medical care? How would the Senator feel then?

Mr. BALL. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that he is not the only Member of this body who has been unemployed. I have gone hungry, and my wife has gone hungry. However, that never impelled me to say that the fundamentals of individual freedom and political liberty on which this Government was founded should be thrown overboard in favor of totalitarianism.

So Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Taft-Radcliffe amendment, as modified by the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] will be adopted. I think it would improve the bill if we were to strike out all of section 2, but I believe that the amendment meets the main objection, and it will enable me to vote for the bill. If it is not adopted, I cannot in good conscience support the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show my vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The RECORD will so show.

The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland and myself I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, at the end of line 15, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That any program of Federal investment and expenditure for the fiscal year 1948 or any subsequent fiscal year when the Nation is at peace shall be accompanied by a program of taxation designed and calculated to prevent any net increase in the national debt (other than debt incurred for self-liquidating projects and other reimbursable expenditures) over a period comprising the year in question and a reasonable number of years thereafter."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for himself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Actuated again by the desire to conclude consideration of the bill today, I wish to propound a unanimous consent request, that from now until the conclusion of consideration of the bill no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the bill or any amendment thereto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to feel the Senate out in another direction, having evidently put my hand on the wrong place at this particular time. [Laughter.] Would the Senate be willing to agree that at an hour not later than 5 o'clock p. m. a vote be taken on the bill and all amendments thereto.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I would have to object to fixing an hour for voting. I should be glad to agree to a limitation of debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, much as I should regret the necessity for a session tomorrow, if we cannot conclude consideration of the bill today, I see no alternative to having a session tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this is the second amendment which is presented in the report of the minority to be found on Senators' desks, with a modification. In the amendment in the minority report, the period during which taxation was to cover any deficit is stated to be "the year in question and the ensuing 9 years, without interfering with the goal of full employment." The amendment which I am now offering strikes out "the ensuing 9 years, without interfering with the goal of full employment" and inserts "a reasonable number of years thereafter," so as to make the amendment read:

Provided, That any program of Federal investment and expenditure for the fiscal year 1948 or any subsequent fiscal year when the Nation is at peace shall be accompanied by a program of taxation designed and calculated to prevent any net increase in the national debt (other than debt incurred for self-liquidating projects and other reimbursable expenditures) over a period comprising the year in question and a reasonable number of years thereafter.

Under the program suggested in the bill, the entire emphasis is on Federal investment and expenditure. There is reference to a taxation program, but so far as I can see it is a program designed to encourage employment by reducing taxes rather than by increasing them. This amendment provides that if a program of expenditure is to be presented a program of taxation shall be presented to accompany it. It does not require that the Budget be balanced in 1 year. A deficit may be contemplated in the year in which the program is submitted, or for several years; but the amendment requires that with the program of expenditure there shall be submitted a program of taxation which, over a reasonable period of years to be selected by the President in submitting his program—I suggested 6 years or 10 years, although it might be longer—will liquidate the expenditures. Presumably some of those years would be prosperous, and we would pay off whatever deficit we had in the year in which it was thought necessary to recommend a deficit.

Mr. President, it seems obvious to me that if we are to have a program of expenditure which would require a system of taxation so heavy as to discourage employment we ought to know what that system of taxation is.

Incidentally, it seems to me that Congress should say to the Executive, "If you are going to recommend a program of expenditures or public works, you should assume the responsibility at the same time of telling us what the cost will be, and you should tell us what taxation system should be provided in order to raise sufficient money for the program and in what manner you propose to raise it." Then we could judge whether the expenditure should be made. Then we could judge whether perhaps it would discourage employment more than it would encourage it. Then we could judge whether it would impose on consumers who are not employed such a burden as actually to handicap them as against those whom we are trying to take care of by a program of full employment.

Mr. President, it seems to me so obvious that unless we adopt some such provision the entire bill will be one-sided; it will recognize only expenditures, but it will not in any way recognize the responsibility to raise the money with which to pay the bills which will be incurred.

It seems obvious to me that if we are going to lay emphasis on "Federal investment and expenditure"—and that phrase appears three, four, or five times in the bill—we certainly should say to the President, "If you wish to engage in such a program and if you think it is necessary, let us know the system of taxation which is essential in order to meet the program."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that the amendment about which the Senator is now speaking would delete the word "net," which appears before the words "increase in the national debt"?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio did not delete that.

Mr. TAFT. I did not eliminate the words "prevent any net increase in the

national debt." They appear in the printed amendment. As a matter of fact, I have been very liberal because I exclude debts incurred for self-liquidating projects, which mean irrigation projects, such as Boulder Dam, any large expenditures which are self-liquidating and will pay themselves off, and other reimbursable expenditures.

I would even except loans. We may question whether they will be paid, of course, but, so far as the system of taxation is concerned, I would not require that taxation be levied to such an extent as to bring in the amount of money needed to make the loans. In the case of those which presumably are reimbursable, I see no objection to a reasonable increase in the national debt.

Mr. President, I asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who testified in favor of the bill, whether he favored a policy of deficit spending. He said he did not. He said the period of years should be a reasonable one and that we should not have to balance the Budget in a particular year, inasmuch as there might be reasons why that could not be done. But he said that over a period of years he was opposed to a policy of deficit spending.

I think nearly all the economists who support even the compensatory spending theory say that sufficient taxes should be levied in the good years to make up for the deficit in the years that are bad. Their only question is how long the period should be. So I do not believe that by adopting this amendment we would be departing even from the theory of the radical economists who believe that Government spending is a solution for the unemployment problem. The theory is that if the Government spends $20,000,000,000 this year, everyone will be put to work and there will be a period of prosperity. Very well. Then where is the system of taxation which in a period of prosperity will repay the money which will be put up this year?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I direct this inquiry to my colleague from Ohio. In his original draft of the amendment, which I happen to hold in my hand, after stating the number of years, there appear the words at the conclusion of the amendment, "without interfering with the goal of full employment." I think the inference is justified that the framers of the amendment thought there was a possibility that if the amendment were put into effect it might interfere with the goal of full employment, and so they put in that clarifying and saving clause. But now the Senator has deleted it. I wonder why.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did so because many persons who read the amendment said to me they thought it was ambiguous, and I think it was. The idea was that the program of taxation which would be submitted should be one which would not be so heavy that it might interfere with the goal of full employment, by discouraging private enterprise from going ahead. That was the idea, but it was not clearly expressed. The language was ambiguous. It seemed to me better to leave it out and eliminate it, and simply to require a system of taxation.

I have no objection to that language, but I think most of those who read the amendment did not understand at first glance what those words meant, and I thought it was better to eliminate them.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator has explained it so well that I request him to put the words back into the amendment and let the words speak for themselves.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator then be persuaded to vote for the amendment?

Mr. TOBEY. I think I would. "Almost thou persuadest me," as Agrippa said to St. Paul.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am glad to hear that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Sentor yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A moment ago the Senator said that even those who oppose this compensatory spending believe that the Federal Government should in good years levy sufficient taxes to make up for deficit spending in poor years. I wish to ask the Senator a question and to make an observation. Was there ever a time in the history of America when the prospects for prosperity were brighter than they are for the present and the next few years? I do not believe there ever has been.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to conclude with my observation, Mr. President: There is more purchasing power in the hands of the people today than there has ever been in the history of our country. There is more pent-up demand for goods and services than there has ever been before. We boast about our system of free enterprise and we express the hope that it can be preserved. Let me say to the Senator that if free enterprise cannot survive during the next few years then there is no hope for democracy. But, Mr. President, with the greatest opportunity we have ever had, I do not entertain the idea that now seems to predominate in the minds of Senators, namely, that we must now, without any real cause for fear or any real cause for a case of the jitters, go into hysterics about unemployment, when I see no unemployment in the country today and when I see no prospect of unemployment if we remove the controls and let the people go back to work and get back to getting the services and supplies and goods they want. I think it is well for us to try to plan to tax sufficiently to meet the cost of the proposed expenditures, but it seems to me this proposed legislation is premature if we really have faith in our private enterprise system. If we have lost faith in it, possibly the pending bill is well justified.

Mr. TAFT Mr. President, I think I agree with all the Senator has said, with some exceptions. I have always felt that we would have a prosperous period for 5 or perhaps 10 years after the war. However, I have always felt that the time would come when the backlog would be exhausted. I have always felt that the real crisis in this country will be in 5 or 10 years from now, and that will be the time when we should plan to avoid a depression, if we can do so.

I do not regard this bill as one needed for today. I do not see any hurry for it. I regret that we were called back from the vacation to consider it. I do not believe it will have any great value until, as I have said, 4 or 5 years from now.

There is one remark the Senator made with which I also agree, namely, that there is one way to prevent prosperity, and that is to foster a condition in which no one will work—a condition which seems to be growing in this country today—and a condition in which wages will be increased while prices will be held down, which apparently is the present policy of the administration. If wages go up, it seems to me prices should go up, because if they do not, I believe private enterprise will be so discouraged that there will be no expansion, and all the additional people who may want to go into business and who should be encouraged to go into business will wait until they see that the prices they will receive will afford an adequate return against the costs they will incur. I think there is a serious danger today, if the present policy of the administration is continued, that we may have a depression. I hope very much that that policy may be changed.

I agree with what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] said yesterday on the subject of retaining Government controls; and one condition requisite for the prosperity the Senator advocates is certainly the lessening of the Government controls which exist today.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. It seems to me that an argument is being advanced that if the proposed law is ever needed it will not be needed for 4 or 5 years. That is not an argument for not passing the bill now. I think that now would be the ideal time to pass it. If we have prosperity for a period of 4 or 5 years, or 3 or 4 years, perhaps the people will say, "Well, no wonder we have prosperity; we have a full-employment law." Such a law would give them confidence that prosperity would continue forever. We have been told in the past by Mr. Hoover and by Mr. Roosevelt that fear is the only thing we needed to fear. We should try and establish the belief in the minds of people that they have nothing to fear. Mr. President, I believe that now would be a good time to pass the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I am in favor of passing the bill, and with the change already made in it, if the amendment is agreed to, I intend to vote for the bill, and hope that it will be agreed to by the other House.

Mr. TAYLOR. We should pass the bill before we are face to face with a situation in which we will have to use great sums of money.

Mr. TAFT. Not only that, but it will require a year in order to put the law into operation and make possible the fruition of plans contemplated by the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It seems to me that for psychological reasons this is a very desirable time to make some provision for meeting expenditures which may become necessary. We all realize that this bill is something more than a restatement of general principles. If we are to enunciate principles and make provision for expenditures it seems to me that now is a good time for us to indicate that we are giving consideration to the question of how the expenditures shall be met.

I think we have wisely avoided setting forth any specific legislative program on that particular point. We are merely trying to provide that any plan which may be adopted shall contemplate the balancing of the Budget within a reasonable length of time. I cannot understand how anyone can object to such a policy. We must work out some plan by which the Budget may be balanced within a reasonable time. I am sure that all of us have that idea in mind, and if it is worthwhile being stated in general principle, why should we not incorporate the idea in specific language so that the public will know that we intend, whenever a deficit exists, to provide a plan of taxation by which the budget shall be balanced within a reasonable time. That is an objective which we all have in mind. Why not give concrete expression to it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for himself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] why he left out of the amendment the language which he had in it when it was originally presented? I am speaking of the language to which reference was made only a few moments ago.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I thought the language was ambiguous. The Senator from New Hampshire questioned me and I said that I was willing to restore the original language if thereby his support of the amendment would be secured. It is agreeable to me to make the language read "over a period comprising the year in question, and a reasonable number of years thereafter, without interfering with the goal of full employment."

Mr. MURRAY. In other words, if at any time there should be a serious period of unemployment, no attempt would be made to balance the budget.

Mr. TAFT. No; that is not what the language means. What I have in mind is a program of taxation which is designed and calculated to prevent any net increase in the national debt, but without interfering with the goal of full employment.

Mr. MURRAY. If there should occur a serious depression which required a heavy program of appropriations, and the Budget had not been balanced for some time, would the Senator construe the language of the amendment to mean that in the midst of such a depression we would undertake to balance the Budget?

Mr. TAFT. No. I have no objection to an unbalanced budget in 1 year or 2 years, but considering the matter over a period, for example, of 10 years, we should be able to tell whether prosperous conditions have returned sufficiently to take care of a deficit in depression years.

Mr. MURRAY. Has not that been the system of government for many years past?

Mr. TAFT. No; I would not say the Government has recommended any system of taxation in the past, except a system of hand to mouth, any more than it has recommended an economic program except one of from hand to job. My proposal is that we should plan our expenditures and correspondingly plan a system of taxation.

Mr. MURRAY. I have heard discussions relative to tax bills which have come to the floor of the Senate during the many years I have been a Member of the Senate, and I have always understood the policy of Congress to be that the Budget should be balanced whenever it was feasible and practical to do so. Can the Senator point to anything in this bill which precludes that kind of a policy being carried out? Is there anything in the language of the pending bill which would prevent the balancing of the Budget?

Mr. TAFT. I find at four or five places in the bill reference to a program of Federal investment and expenditure. Federal investment and expenditure is at least one of the solutions to be provided, according to the language in which the bill is framed. If we are to follow a program of that kind we must also be told what it will cost. As has already been pointed out, the proposal is only a program. Of course, it may appear that there will be no deficit. On the other hand, there may be a large deficit. But in any event, we should know what form of taxation we must have if we are to go ahead with Federal expenditure in the way the bill proposes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reference has been made to certain years. Let us assume that in the year 1950 it may become necessary to spend a few billion dollars in order to take care of unemployment. That being so, we must, in that year, under the Senator's amendment, increase taxes.

Mr. TAFT. No. All that is required is that the President shall submit a program showing how the particular system of taxation suggested would produce a few billion dollars a year for 4 or 5 years thereafter, so that the net result for 6 years, for example, would be a balanced budget. Congress does not need to enact such a system right away if it does not care to do so. It is not intended that there shall be required a balancing of the Budget in any year, or any combination of years, but that only over a reasonable period of time the President shall inform the Congress what kind of a system of taxation will be necessary to justify the expenditure. We might find that the system was completely discouraging to private industry, and that it might result in creating more unemployment than in creating employment. Moreover, we must know how much the system will cost and where the money is to be obtained with which to finance it.

Mr. MURDOCK. I can see no objection to the amendment so far as a balanced budget within a reasonable number of years is concerned, but it would seem to me wholly inconsistent for the Federal Government to be confronted with the fact that it must expend a few billion dollars in order to do away with unemployment and at the same time raise taxes.

Mr. TAFT. That is not involved at all. It is a program over the 10 years of taxation, designed to show what this proposal is going to cost.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator says 10 years. The amendment says a reasonable number of years.

Mr. TAFT. The President may pick out any number of years he thinks is reasonable—5 years, or 15 years—so long as it shows that we are not spending beyond our means.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator explain how he would define what a reasonable period would be?

Mr. TAFT. That would be up to the President. It is a prescription to the President to submit the estimate. He can pick out any number of years. I suppose that if he said 50 years, Congress might say that would be unreasonable; but I do not know what they could do about it. This leaves it up to the President as to what period he desires to submit.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator says he does not expect serious unemployment for at least 5 years.

Mr. TAFT. That is my own belief, if private enterprise is allowed to act as it should be permitted to act.

Mr. MURRAY. I notice that is the opinion of experts, statisticians, and economists. I note that Roger W. Babson wrote an article which appeared in the Washington Post July 2, 1945, in which he said:

> Most economists are agreed that we should be prepared for trouble any time after 1950. As to what form this trouble takes depends largely upon the success or failure of the Russian Communist experiment. If, after 1950, Russia and the rest of the world suffer from unemployment, we have not much to fear.

Apparently Mr. Babson does not expect that anything is going to be done about it, and that so long as there is unemployment in other countries of the world, we do not have to have any program in this country to meet unemployment conditions. It seems to me that the Senator is leaving this matter rather vague when he says that the Budget should be balanced over a reasonable period of years.

Mr. TAFT. It is leaving it rather vague, but it states the principle. After all, this bill is only concerned with stating principles, and the amendment states a principle which I think is fundamental in the administration of such a Government as ours.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not see the necessity for it, and I do not think the amendment adds anything to the bill. There is nothing in the bill which would prevent the President from sending a message to Congress at any time when he felt that the Budget should be balanced. There is

nothing in the proposal before us whatever which would interfere with the President calling for a balanced Budget. Therefore there can be no necessity for the amendment, and I am opposed to it. It is not designed to help the bill, but create an erroneous impression as to the purpose and effect of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to modify the amendment by adding at the end thereof the words "without interfering with the goal of full employment."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, with that language included, then, the effect of the amendment would not be to require the balancing of the Budget if there were an unemployment situation.

Mr. TAFT. No; that is not what the language says. The program of taxation must be one which will not interfere with the goal of full employment. That is the effect of the addition of the words.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not a reasonable number of years be that period of time during which the Government, through taxation or any other method, if there is any other method, could finance the full employment program without increasing the hardship to a greater extent than it would alleviate the distress?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is the meaning of it.

Mr. AIKEN. No one can foresee how long a period that would be.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. It is left to the President. As a matter of fact, a good many of the economists regard business conditions as going in cycles. There was testimony from Mr. White, on the Bretton Woods bill, that there are more or less recognized periods of cycles. There might be 9 years between the ups and downs, and I assume the President would pick out one of those which his economists told him was a typical cycle, including both good and bad years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, the size of the deficit would have some bearing on what was a reasonable number of years.

Mr. TAFT. That is also true. If the deficit figure were large, it would have to be spread over a longer period.

Mr. AIKEN. I think government, like an individual, would like to finance as far ahead as possible. I myself do not see that the acceptance of the amendment would weaken the bill. I do not claim to be an expert in analyzing a bill, but I can not see why planning a program of taxation or other means of financing some distance ahead is wrong.

Mr. TAFT. This is a planning bill, and it should cover planning for taxes as well as spending.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It strikes me that there is probably an inconsistency in the terms of the Senator's amendment, with the addition he has suggested. I suppose the original theory of his amendment was that whenever the President presented a program for Federal investment and expenditure in any one year he should also present a program of taxation. I find in the amendment the words, "calculated to prevent a net increase in the national debt for that year and subsequent years over a reasonable period."

The Senator originally had 5 years.

Mr. TAFT. Including that year or a reasonable number of years, as he may select.

Mr. BARKLEY. The program he may submit would be for a particular year. Let us say that for the year 1948 he would recommend a program of expenditure. Under the amendment he would have to prepare a tax program and submit it not only for that year, but for a period of years following it, although following 1948, or any other year, there might not be a program of expenditure. It is difficult to understand just what the Senator has in mind.

I might offer the Senator a suggestion before he answers. The President's program for investment which he submitted to the Congress might go to various committees. It might go to half a dozen different committees in the two Houses. But all taxation must originate in the House of Representatives, and must originate in the Ways and Means Committee in the House; so that the probability would be that five or six or more committees would be dealing with the suggested program of expenditure in any one year, accompanied by a tax program, which theoretically would be expected to be carried out by the Congress in order that there should be no increase in the deficit. That tax program would, under the Constitution, be required to go to one committee in the other body. So that we would have no assurance that Congress would enact tax legislation dealing with a program of expenditure in any one year. I am wondering whether the amendment would really be effective, or whether it is even consistent with itself.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand the Senator. The program submitted by the President would go to the standing committee, the joint committee of 15 from the House and 15 from the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. They do not have legislative jurisdiction.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the legislation to carry out the program would have to be parceled out among probably half a dozen different committees.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct, but the only effect of this amendment is to add the Ways and Means Committee to the other committees.

The Senator referred to the fact that tax measures must originate in the House. So would the appropriations the President is to recommend have to originate in the House, unless it were an authorization bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Unless the Ways and Means Committee proposed a tax program, no matter what we did with the program so far as expenditure was concerned, the Senate could never deal with it in the way of taxation.

Mr. TAFT. There is nothing in the bill that makes any program compulsory unless we want to make it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that.

Mr. TAFT. It is simply a program the President is supposed to submit.

Mr. BARKLEY. But it is supposed to have some moral effect; otherwise it would be useless.

Mr. TAFT. I presume it would be supposed to have some moral effect. It would have a moral effect on taxes, I suppose. That is why I inserted the language.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not see how anyone can oppose the amendment unless he wishes to admit frankly that this is a program for deficit spending, indeed, unlimited deficit spending, and if that is the program, then it makes no difference what law may be passed, we are not going to have full employment, we are going to have national bankruptcy. That is the only answer.

A prohibition law was passed, but it did not result in full prohibition. We are not going to have full employment by this sort of legislation. We must carry out a sound fiscal program if we are to have full employment in this country. The one way to destroy full employment or to prevent full employment is to have an unsound fiscal program, because such a program would nullify everything we do, and everything we might attempt to do.

We now have 25 cents back of the dollar. The national debt is still being increased. The more the national debt is increased the thinner is the backing behind the dollar. When the man in the street loses confidence in the American dollar, then nothing we can do will prevent inflation—inflation of the most disastrous kind.

If we are living in a world of reality, if our heads are somewhere down in that atmosphere where men have to live and move, if we have not lost all sense of reality, then there can be no just opposition to this amendment, which simply provides that when the President proposes a program of public spending he shall likewise recommend a program of taxation which over a reasonable period of time, to be adjudged by the President, of course, will bring about liquidation of the debt which the President is asking the Congress to incur.

My own judgment is that any man who opposes this amendment announces to the world that this whole scheme is fraudulent and is not intended to do anything but fool the American people, if you please, the American worker.

If Senators really want to do anything they will say that if we incur a debt, and we have any faith in this program bringing on full employment, we will also consider a tax which over a reasonable period of time will liquidate the debt, and not let it add to our national debt.

There is one thing certain, Mr. President, and that is if we keep on increasing the national debt, if we provide for unlimited and uncontrolled deficit spending, we will rapidly approach the time in this Nation of capital levies and confiscation, and then gentlemen who cry out for full employment will be crying for the rocks and the mountains to fall on them and hide them from the faces of the workers of this country who have relied upon mere language of a bill to bring about full employment and prosperity. Prosperity does not come that

way. Prosperity comes only from work, from the employed time of the workers. Unless this Nation is willing to forget unrealities and disregard unrealities and face hard facts, prosperity will not come back.

But surely there is not a man alive who can defend this bill against the open assault and attack that it is a bald proposal for deficit spending, unlimited deficit spending, if he is not willing to provide that at the time when the President makes the proposal to spend in order to provide work, he shall likewise be asked to submit a program of taxation over a reasonable period of years that will liquidate the debt.

Mr. President, I cannot see how anyone can vote against the amendment. In my judgment, it would be reasonable to provide for a system of taxation which would currently liquidate the debt, provided Senators have any faith that this bill will produce full employment, because if it does produce full employment there will be a base of taxation which will care for the debt.

The way the bill is drawn it does not provide for a current collection of anything on the debt or for liquidation of the debt, but merely leaves it to the President to suggest some system or method of raising revenue over such period as may seem to him reasonable to liquidate the indebtedness.

So I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], as modified.

Mr. TAFT and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Ohio whether he ought not to transpose the language at the bottom of his amendment so that it would be placed in line 5, after the word "taxation", because I gather that the program which is to extend over a period of years is the taxation program, and not the expenditure program, so that it would read:

> That any program of Federal investment and expenditure for the fiscal year 1948 or any subsequent fiscal year when the Nation is at peace shall be accompanied by a program of taxation for the year in question and a reasonable number of years thereafter designed and calculated to prevent any net increase in the national debt.

It is the taxation program, as I understand, that the Senator intends to continue over a period of years, and not the expenditure program, because the expenditure program would be for any particular years according to the President's program. Does not the Senator think the amendment would be clarified by inserting the language at the point I suggested?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think so. It seems to me to be clear. It is accompanied by "a program of taxation designed and calculated to prevent any net increase in the national debt, over a period comprising the year in question" or any reasonable number of years.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me the taxation program ought to be over a period of years instead of the expenditure program.

Mr. TAFT. It is.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the way the Senator's amendment now reads, it modifies the length of time of the deficits, and not the period of taxation. What I think the Senator is trying to do is to provide a period of taxation over a period of years that will not increase the debt. He does not want to tie it to the deficit but to the tax program.

Mr. TAFT. I see what the Senator means. I would be willing to modify the amendment so that it would read:

> A program of taxation over a period comprising the year in question and a reasonable number of years thereafter designed and calculated to prevent during any period any increase in the national debt.

That is what the Senator from Kentucky is suggesting.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that improves it, and ties the "reasonable" to the taxation and not to the expenditure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state that unanimous consent is required to modify the amendment, because the yeas and nays have been ordered. Is there objection to the modification asked for by the Senator from Ohio in his own amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment may be modified.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In the interest of better draftsmanship, to eliminate something which is ambiguous to me, at least, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether he would be willing to accept a change in the language. The amendment now reads "without interfering with the goal of full employment." I ask if the Senator would be willing to accept instead the language "unless such program of taxation interferes with the goal of continuing full employment."

First, let me say that the language "continuing full employment" has been used elsewhere in the bill, and I think in the interest of consistency it ought to be used again at this point.

Second, I believe that the language "unless such program of taxation interferes" makes perfectly clear what I think the Senator has in mind, with which I am in agreement.

Mr. TAFT. That is not what I have in mind. I have explained twice what I have in mind—that the program of taxation shall not be one which will interfere with the goal of full employment. At first I omitted the words "without interfering with the goal of full employment" because I thought they were ambiguous. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] requested me to restore them, and I was willing to restore them. I think they should be restored, and remain as they are. I do not care further to modify the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the Senator has accepted the modification which I have suggested.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I will modify the amendment in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, as chairman of the committee, I see no objection to the amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It seems to me that the language which has been appended, "without interfering with the goal of full employment," throws some confusion on what I thought was the purpose of the amendment. It seems to me that a program leading to a balanced budget might become a matter of paramount necessity, and it might have to interfere with the goal of full employment, and might have to interfere with many other things. Is it the intention of the Senator, by the amendment as now modified, that a program leading to a balanced budget shall not be submitted, no matter what the compulsions for it may be, if it interferes with the goal of full employment?

Mr. TAFT. No. My purpose is that the program of taxation should not call for taxation so high as to interfere with the goal of full employment. If the budget could not be balanced, the program of Federal investment and expenditure would have to be reduced. A certain program of expenditure might be recommended. It would require a program of taxation; but it might be found that the program of taxation was so heavy as to interfere with full employment. So it seems to me that the whole plan would have to be revised, and either extended over a longer period of years or reduced. Either the investment and expenditure would have to be reduced or the whole plan would have to be extended over a longer period of years. The important point is that the program must be balanced, without interfering with the goal of full employment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Suppose it were the other way around. Suppose that the threat of inflation, which would put everyone out of employment, were so imminent or so foreseeable that it became necessary to have a projected program leading to a balancing of the budget which would interfere with full employment. Would the amendment reach such a situation?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DONNELL. I presume the Senator from Ohio wishes to answer the question of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think I can state any more clearly than I have what I intend. Perhaps I made a mistake in restoring certain language at the request of the Senator from New Hampshire, because I see that it is capable of ambiguous construction, as I feared. However, I will not attempt further to modify it.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, after the very clear exposition by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I realize that any remarks along the line of those which I shall make are unnecessary to present the facts which

he has so ably presented to the Senate. However, there is one thought which I should like to emphasize in connection with his address this afternoon. I shall endeavor to make my remarks as brief as possible.

As I see it, there are three reasons for supporting this amendment. One is the reason of good common sense, good business judgment—the very point which the distinguished Senator from Georgia elaborated upon so eloquently and powerfully only a few moments ago.

The second point, as I see it, upon which this amendment deserves our support is a very close approximation to the point of the constitutional power of Congress.

I am not undertaking to say that without this amendment the bill would be unconstitutional. However, I do undertake to say that the clear intent of the Constitution of the United States is that the expenses, the outlay, the investment to carry out a program such as that which is recited in the so-called full-employment bill, must ultimately be paid for by taxation, and cannot ultimately be paid for otherwise.

I do not undertake to deny the fact that the Constitution of the United States gives to Congress the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States. I do not undertake to deny that for a temporary period—perhaps under great emergency, or perhaps not even under great emergency—the power to borrow money to carry out this program may possibly be reasonably implied from the language of the Constitution. But the point to which I advert is that the Constitution of the United States contemplates that if a program of this type shall be adopted by the Congress, ultimately—not, perhaps, temporarily, but ultimately—the expenses and outgo of such a program must be paid from taxation, from revenue, and not from deficit spending, involving an undetermined period and undetermined unpaid obligations.

I say that for this reason: In the first place, we all realize that the power of the United States Government itself is strictly limited. Our power is not unlimited. We realize that under the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States it is provided that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. But the correlative statement of the power of Congress itself may not come so readily to our minds. I undertake to quote a sentence or two from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Dorr* v. *United States* (195 U. S., 138, p. 140), where the court said:

> It may be regarded as settled that the Constitution of the United States is the only source of power authorizing auction by any branch of the Federal Government. "The Government of the United States was born of the Constitution, and all powers which it enjoys or may exercise must be either derived expressly or by implication from that instrument." (*Downes* v. *Bidwell* (182 U. S., 244, 248) and cases cited.)

Where do we find power to enact legislation of the type of the Full Employment Act of 1945? As we search through the Constitution we realize that a considerable number of explicit and express powers are granted to Congress. They include the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, the power to coin money, the power to establish post offices and post roads, and numerous other specific powers which are expressly granted by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, if we search these powers from one end to the other, with the possible exception in some instances of the power to regulate commerce, we shall not find any express power given to the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the purpose of providing employment for any one. The Constitution gives to Congress the power to establish post offices and post roads, to coin money, to define piracies, to declare war, and many other powers. Except possibly in the event of national emergency such as war, there is not a word in the Constitution which authorizes the enactment by Congress of an act guaranteeing employment, or undertaking to provide employment. But there is a clause in the Constitution which to my mind will authorize it. It is clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States. That clause does not refer expressly to this situation; it does not refer expressly to conditions such as these. It reads as follows:

> The Congress shall have power—

To do what? Not to enact laws for the general welfare; not at all. The Constitution states this:

> The Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

For many years there was a controversy, as every lawyer in this body and as, doubtless, nearly every other Member of this body, if not everyone, will remember, as to the proper construction of that section of the Constitution, namely, as to whether, on the one hand, it gives the power to levy and collect taxes, and, on the other hand, whether it gives the power to provide for the common defense and general welfare. But the Supreme Court has settled that question; and, Mr. President, with your permission, I should like to read a few sentences from the decision of that Court in the case of the *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U. S. 64), where the Court said:

> The clause sought to authorize the legislation—the first—confers upon the Congress power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, and to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States * * *." It is not contended—

Said the Court—

> that this provision grants power to regulate agricultural production upon the theory that such legislation would promote the general welfare. The Government concedes that the phrase "to provide for the general welfare" qualifies the power "to lay and collect taxes." The view that the clause grants power to provide for the general welfare, independently of the taxing power, has never been authoritatively accepted. Mr. Justice Story points out that if it were adopted "it is obvious that under color of the generality of the words, 'to provide for the common defense and general welfare,' the Government of the United States is, in reality, a government of general and unlimited powers, notwithstanding the subsequent enumeration of specific powers."

Then, Mr. President, the Court concluded as follows:

> The true construction undoubtedly is that the only thing granted is the power to tax for the purpose of providing funds for payment of the Nation's debts and making provision for the general welfare.

So, Mr. President, the proposition I present is that the only place in the Constitution where Congress is granted the power to enact legislation such as that now proposed is the clause which authorizes the Congress to levy and collect taxes.

Yesterday a dramatic and powerful address was delivered to the Senate by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. He concluded his address with a short sentence:

> This is a bill to promote the general welfare.

That is undoubtedly the theory of the proponents of the bill.

Mr. President, the only other place where "general welfare" is mentioned in or in connection with the Constitution is in the preamble of that instrument; but as we all realize—and it has been expressly held by the Supreme Court of the United States—the preamble grants no legislative power whatever.

So, Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, the proposition to which I direct your attention at this moment is based on the fact that the only power under which Congress has the authority to enact the proposed legislation which is before the Senate this afternoon is the power set forth in this clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, namely, the taxing power; and the provision with respect to paying the debts and providing for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States, as a definition and a limitation of that power, is the only provision in the Constitution under which you and I have authority to pass the proposed legislation.

So, Mr. President, when the senior Senator from Georgia so eloquently referred to these facts, upon which he laid emphasis, and also to the fact that he himself would not be averse, as I understood him to say, to some provision for current revenue, I understood him to say that he himself was emphasizing vigorously and powerfully the fact that this section of the Constitution contemplates, and that certainly this program of general welfare must be tied into, a taxation program.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I am for this amendment, first, because of the fact that it represents sound common

sense and good business judgment, the same kind of judgment which every Member of this assembly would undertake to use in the management of his own business, so as to know where the money is coming from before it is expended, to arrange for the procurement of the money before he arranges to expend it. That is the first point.

The second point upon which I stand for the amendment is, as I tried to indicate, that whereas there may be some question as to the technical constitutionality of any provision which would contemplate an extended payment of an extended indebtedness, nevertheless the whole spirit and whole intent of the only section of the Constitution of the United States under which this specific bill which is proposed to be enacted would be valid and constitutional is that the expenditure must be tied to some provision for the raising of the money by means of taxation.

Mr. President, for these reasons I am for the amendment as suggested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio for himself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the amendment, I should like to clarify, for the record, a statement made yesterday by the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. I do this only for the record. The American Farm Bureau is opposed to the proposed legislation as it came from the committee. For some reason, when the Senator from Ohio placed in the RECORD the statement made on the part of the American Farm Bureau, not all the statement was included. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the entire statement made on the part of the American Farm Bureau, including the reasons set forth as to why it is against the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American farmer recognizes that a high level of employment is essential to the national well-being. The American farmer believes, however, that it is not the responsibility of government to assure every individual a full-time job at competitive levels of pay, at all times, under all circumstances, and to assume the obligation of unlimited expenditures to carry out this commitment. It is the responsibility of government to help create an environment in which the private citizens of the Nation can develop opportunities which will not only provide jobs but will also afford the worker an increasing standard of living.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, while favoring the goal of full employment, is strongly opposed to the bill S. 380—the Full Employment Act of 1945—in its present form, because it believes that this legislation will discourage rather than help our economy during the critical reconversion period.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has supported in the past and will again support a well-coordinated program for useful public works designed to alleviate unemployment.

The American farmer, like American labor, has a vital stake in full employment, but both the farmer and the laborer have an even greated stake in our democratic way of life, for which many have died upon the field of battle. We believe that the program as proposed in this bill will eventually mean the Government absorbing more and more functions and displacing the creative initiative of the individual, which has made this Nation great.

We believe that the maximum employment can best be attained and the national welfare most effectively promoted by adherence to the following basic objectives:

1. Industry, labor, agriculture, and other groups should assume the primary responsibility for cooperation in production, price, and wage policies designed to attain maximum production and employment, and to maintain an equitable balance in purchasing power among all groups.

2. Reconversion from war to peace must be handled in an efficient, prompt, and orderly manner so as to provide the maximum reemployment of veterans and war workers.

3. Unemployment compensation programs should be supplemented where necessary to meet the essential needs of workers during the reconversion period.

4. A useful, well-planned and coordinated public works program should be carried out, if needed to alleviate unemployment.

5. A sound fiscal and monetary policy should be adopted to bring greater stability to our economy and to our price level.

6. Taxes should be adjusted in such a manner as to facilitate reconversion and encourage the highest possible level of employment and production.

7. Every practical effort must be made to encourage an increased volume of foreign trade. An international conference designed for this purpose should be called in the immediate future.

8. The international monetary plans must be developed on a sound basis and in such a manner as to promote domestic and foreign business.

9. A vigorous antimonopoly program should be carried out in order to promote and provide an opportunity for our competitive economy to function effectively.

10. An aggressive program for the promotion and development of small business is also essential.

The American Farm Bureau Federation pledges its cooperation with labor, industry, other groups, and Government in developing and carrying out sound, practical, and effective measures to attain these fundamental objectives.

Edw. A. O'Neal, President; Earl C. Smith, Vice President; Warren W. Hawley, New York; George M. Putnam, New Hampshire; Arthur Packard, Vermont; Herbert Voorhees, New Jersey; John M. Bailey, West Virginia; Perry Green, Ohio; H. E. Slusher, Missouri; Frank W. White, Minnesota; Allan Kline, Iowa; Hassil E. Schenck, Indiana; H. J. King, Wyoming; George Ogilvie, Nevada; George H. Wilson, California; J. F. Porter, Tennessee; H. L. Wingate, Georgia; R. E. Short, Arkansas; Ransom Aldrich, Mississippi; J. Walter Hammond, Texas; Mrs. Roy C. F. Weagly, Maryland.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me also say that on page 9067 of the RECORD the following appears:

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I know the Senator wants to give the whole truth, and the whole truth with reference to farm organizations is that while the American Farm Bureau is registered against the bill, the National Grange, through its president, Mr. Goss, appeared before the committee and made a lengthy address in favor of the bill.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Albert S. Goss, president of the National Grange, as found in the hearings taken in August 1945, be printed in the RECORD. That will clarify the apparent confusion which arose between the two Senators regarding the statement made by Mr. Goss concerning the bill. I should like to say that relative to section 2, Mr. Goss said the following in his statement:

Section 2 (b) has caused confusion as to the exact purpose of the measure. This subsection has the tone of subscribing to the "Government support the people" theory, with which we are in sharp disagreement.

Then he suggested four different amendments to the committee amendment. He finally concluded his remarks as set forth on page 824 of the hearings, as follows:

We feel that without these, or similar amendments, the bill is not a sound measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ALBERT S. GOSS, MASTER OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. Goss. I have prepared a written statement, Mr. Chairman, and I would appreciate it if I be allowed to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; without interruption, if you prefer it that way.

Mr. Goss. Yes; I would prefer that.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

CONFLICTING VIEWS ON PURPOSE OF S. 380

Mr. Goss. We find a great deal of confusion with reference to the purpose of this bill. Some consider it a measure to promote "the highest feasible levels of employment opportunities through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure" as stated in section 2 (d), while others see in it a bill for the Government to create jobs for everyone.

The former contend that the essential features of the bill are, (1) the national production and economic budget providing for a periodical survey of our domestic economy and a report to the Congress, (2) a joint congressional committee of Senate and House of Representatives of major committees to review the facts and coordinate congressional legislative planning to meet the Nation's economic needs, (3) a stock of public expenditure projects worked out on a sound basis, and (4) a plan to use them when needed to meet an emergency.

The latter see in the measure (1) a vast public-expenditure program which will be used to prop up a tottering economic structure, and (2) instructions for the Government to open up some form of public expenditure project whenever unemployment of any kind appears.

This confusion arises partly from what appears to be a conflict in the purposes of the bill as expressed in section 2 (b) and 2 (d), and possibly other places, and partly from the fact that the bill has been called the full employment bill or sometimes the public-works bill. In any event we believe the bill should be amended so that its purpose cannot be misunderstood. We will suggest some specific amendments for this purpose.

Before suggesting amendments we should first determine what the purpose is. All are agreed that we want full employment, but there are two very different schools of

thought on how to obtain it. These different views stem back to basic differences in the theory of government. Some believe that it is the responsibility of the Government to support the people; others that it is the responsibility of the people to support the Government. Some believe that we have reached a stage in the progress of mankind where we cannot consume the goods we produce, and that it is necessary to enter into a program for Government spending in order to create jobs. Others believe that it is entirely possible to develop and maintain a sound, well-balanced economy which will normally result in full employment without resorting to unusual Government expenditures except in cases of emergency.

THE GRANGE IS OPPOSED TO STATISM

These two schools of thought lead in sharply divergent directions. One leads to statism and the other to private enterprise. We cannot travel both roads at the same time. Our first step should be to choose which course to follow.

The Grange adheres to the private-enterprise school of thought. Our philosophy is based upon three broad economic principles which we have come to call the Grange guideposts.

They are:

"First. All prosperity springs from the production of wealth, or consumer goods. Stating it another way, any program which retards the production of wealth is unsound.

"Second. The compensation of each should be based upon what he contributes to the general welfare.

"Third. The prime purpose of Government is to protect its citizens from aggression."

We believe in an economy of plenty characterized by ample production, maximum consumption, and the full employment which will inevitably flow from such conditions in a well-balanced economy. The Government's chief role in a free-enterprise system is to see that it is free—that its citizens are protected from physical or economic aggression or interference, so that each may develop his talents in his own way according to his capacity, energy, and ingenuity, just so long as his activities do not interfere with the rights of others. Under such a system, America has developed a standard of living so much higher than any other nation in history that we can see no sound reason for abandoning it. True, many abuses have crept in, but let us find and cure them, rather than turn to statism, which has no enduring record of success, though often tried.

We believe the Grange guideposts are economically sound, and we measure every proposal by the principles therein expressed to see whether or not it rings true. We have followed such a course in considering the bill under discussion and we find much in it which merits support. In some places clarification is needed; in others, weaknesses or defects are revealed for the correction of which we will make suggestions.

DANGER THAT FEDERAL SPENDING WILL COMPENSATE FOR, RATHER THAN CORRECT, MALADJUSTMENTS

Before taking up the provisions of the bill, I should say that we are in thorough sympathy with the general program of studying our economic situation and devising plans for meeting any needs which may develop. We are in sympathy with the professed purpose of operating as far as possible through private enterprise. We also believe that if private enterprise fails to do the job, after being given an adequate opportunity, the Government must step in to see that its citizens have an ample opportunity to make a living. We believe that private enterprise can do the job, but we also believe that it is possible to handicap private enterprise in many different ways so that it cannot operate successfully. We believe that the greatest danger in this bill lies in the probability that if private enterprise were not doing the job, the tendency would be to call upon the Government to step in with public works, or other form of public expenditure, rather than cure the handicaps which prevented private enterprise from functioning. We believe that, no matter how skillfully we plan, there will be ups and downs in our income and employment, and that we should plan so that the Government can step in during the depression periods with self-liquidating public works, or some form of public expenditure which will be to the lasting good of the Nation, as a means of furnishing employment, rather than raking leaves or going on the dole. If, however, we do not take adequate steps to see that the maladjustment which brought about the depression is cured, the net result would be that we would drift toward statism and away from that private enterprise which develops individual initiative, and makes it possible for each to receive a compensation in proportion to his individual effort. We think the bill lacks definiteness in this respect.

INSUFFICIENT STRESS ON AGRICULTURE

Our second criticism is that the bill bases its whole program on jobs for workingmen, and in its practical application ignores America's largest industry, that of agriculture. While it is true that the word "agriculture" appears once or twice in the bill, this industry in which 20 percent of our people are engaged, and upon the trade from which another 20 percent are directly dependent for a livelihood, is ignored in the actual workings of the bill. It is assumed that with full employment, there would be prosperity in agriculture. This does not necessarily follow, and we believe that it is essential to consider the problems of agriculture along with the other problems before prosperity could be reasonably expected.

There can be no prosperity for agriculture without full employment. We recognize that as clearly as anyone. In fact, whenever we have had a prosperous agriculture, there has always been full employment. However, full employment does not assure prosperity for agriculture, as was clearly demonstrated in the early twenties when business and labor enjoyed the highest income and the greatest prosperity in the Nation's history up to that time. During that same period, the farmers lost their shirts, and it was the break-down in purchasing power of the 50 percent of our people who were then engaged in farming, or dependent upon farm trade for a livelihood, that led the way to the most disastrous depression in our history. It was the failure to recognize this condition, and to provide a basic remedy, which prevented adequate recovery. We are sure that the sponsors of the bill are in thorough sympathy with maintaining a high income for agriculture along with a high income for labor and industry and that the omission is an oversight. It is all the more necessary that this principle be recognized, because the chief cause of the break-down in agricultural income has been the service that agriculture has rendered the Nation in producing an abundance.

Agriculture cannot plan its production with definiteness, both because of the number engaged in it under individual management, and the vagaries of the weather. If we are to have enough for all, we will frequently have surpluses. Under our marketing system these surpluses have often resulted in driving prices down below cost of production, even though we might have had full employment. We are certain that prosperity depends upon abundance, but in our plans we must provide that the purchasing power of agriculture is maintained when we contribute our share to a program of abundance, and happen to raise a bit of surplus. We failed to do that in the twenties, and that is what will happen again, unless definite steps are taken to prevent it.

Therefore, we are proposing certain additions to the bill which will recognize the part that agriculture plays in our economy. We are not proposing full legislation to meet agriculture's problems, but merely that they be recognized in the whole picture and that, in the planning, the President present the problem to Congress in his national budget, so that Congress will be on notice that the economy cannot be maintained on a free basis unless something is done to meet whatever problems agriculture may be facing in maintaining an adequate income and an adequate purchasing power.

DANGER OF PATERNALISM

We believe that the Government does not owe anyone a living and ordinarily does not owe anyone a job. Through the prevention of aggression, both physical and economic, as outlined in our Guidepost No. 3, we believe the Government does have the responsibility of seeing that a free and open economy is maintained under which opportunities exist for one to make a living, or either find or make his own job. Section 2b puts the Government in a paternalistic role which we do not feel is justified. It is an expression of lack of faith in a free system under which individual initiative is relied on to develop the opportunities to be found in a free economy, and we believe the wording is such as to indicate to most people that they have the right to look to the Government for work, even if opportunities for self-employment might exist around them. If a man loses a job and there are opportunities for self-employment such as farming, or starting to make flower pots, or neckties, or put up horseradish, or enter into any one of thousands of productive undertakings that an enterprising self-reliant citizen might develop for himself, we do not think that he has the right to demand that his Government make a job for him. If there are no opportunities, we think that the Government has the responsibility of correcting the economic maladjustment which has resulted in the denied opportunity and, in the meantime, public expenditure should be used to provide the job, but we think it is a mistake to develop a policy under which everyone will look to the Government for a job at the least provocation.

We have faith in the possibilities of a self-supporting economy. We believe that a nation which has learned to produce the enormous wealth per capita which we have demonstrated can be produced, can certainly learn to consume what it produces, and learn to keep its economy in balance. It ought not to be as hard to effect an adequate method of distribution of the wealth we produce when we are enjoying plentiful production, as it is to distribute that wealth when we suffer from scarcity. We may have to overcome selfishness and greed through the prevention of economic or physical aggression, but really this should not be as hard a job as to learn to produce everything we need. In other words, we have faith in developing individual initiative and enterprise. There are certain types of activities in which the Government can engage, which will help to foster and develop individual initiative and enterprise; there are other types in which it may have to engage in order to prevent aggression; and the Government should stand by to help its citizens in case they are the victims of aggression; but let us not encourage people to run to the Government at the least provocation, or to lean unnecessarily upon the Government. It is a self-reliant citizenry which has built America, and we believe we should do our utmost to protect and develop self-reliance among our people.

DEFINITION OF FULL EMPLOYMENT

Now turning to the bill itself, we think the bill would te improved if the second section were devoted to definitions of full employment, and Federal investment and other

expenditures, as proposed in the Morse amendment, with three changes.

First, we would add to line 12, page 4, of the Morse amendment, after the word "work", the words "within reasonable access," so that the phrase will read "opportunities to engage in productive work within reasonable access at locally prevailing wages and working conditions, etc."

Some contend that if a factory closes down, and if private industry does not open it, the Government should. We cannot subscribe to such a position. If our economy is kept free, someone will operate the factory unless it is disadvantageously located, or poorly designed, or subject to some other natural handicap. In such event it should not be operated, and those who have worked in it should seek employment under economically sound conditions. The wording of the amendment and the position of the word "locally" might be construed to mean the opportunity to engage in work locally. We are sure that is not the intended meaning, but we are equally sure that job opportunities which are practically inaccessible should not be statistically used to prevent the reasonable carrying out of the purpose of the bill.

Second, we suggest that some other term than "frictional unemployment" be used to avoid the necessity of adding another section defining the definitions.

Third, other references to investment and expenditure obviously do not refer to investments of every nature, but rather to investments which result in the expansion of facilities which will require the employment of labor or the use of material the production of which will require the employment of labor. We believe that the term investments as used in this bill should be defined in the section devoted to definitions.

DEFINITION OF GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITY

Section 2 (b) has caused confusion as to the exact purpose of the measure. This subsection has the tone of subscribing to the "Government support the people" theory, with which we are in sharp disagreement. It may be interpreted as meaning that it is the responsibility of Government to bring the job to the man, rather than the responsibility of the man to seek the job which will exist somewhere within reasonable access if the Government assures a truly free economy. If that free economy breaks down, a humane Government must and should step in to take care of the needs of its citizens. I believe this section has given rise to the extreme differences in opinion as to the purpose of the bill. If the purpose of the bill is to develop a free economy, why not say so in terms that do not lead to confusion?

For these reasons we recommend that section 2 (b) be amended to read as follows:

"All Americans have the right to engage in any occupation, business, or enterprise of their choice, which may not be inimical to the interests of others, and it is the policy of the United States to protect its citizens from acts of physical or economic aggression such as may prevent them from exercising that right, and to foster ample production of consumer goods under conditions which will result in maximum consumption, so that those who have finished their schooling, and do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities, and who are able to work and seeking work, may have an opportunity to engage in useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment."

22. The wording may well be improved, but this would appear to be the proper point to eliminate the confusion and make it clear that it is the policy of the Government to protect its people in the rights to engage in free enterprise and enjoy the ample production of consumer goods which would flow from it, and that if free enterprise failed to result in full employment within the terms of the definition, it is the responsibility of Government to step in with public expenditure to meet an emergency.

We recommend that section 2 (d) be amended to read as follows:

"It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will prevent monopoly and encourage economic returns to its citizens in approximate proportions to what each contributes to the general welfare, as the basic means of securing the highest level of consumption of consumer goods, and personal services, thereby assuring the highest level of employment opportunity through private and non-Federal investment and expenditures."

Our chief objection to subsection (d) as it is written is that it confines its recommendations to jobs, while we believe that basically it is the production and consumption of consumer goods which count. The section ignores the problems of agriculture and similar industries (such as fishing). If it is not desired to amend the section as completely as I have suggested, its present form could be improved by changing the last clause to read:

"It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will (make possible the highest levels of production and consumption of manufactured goods and the products of our farms and similar industries, as the basic means of securing) the highest feasible levels of employment opportunities through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditures."

The words in parentheses are new, being substituted for the three words "stimulate and encourage," line 4. While this would be an improvement over the section as written, we decidedly prefer the substitute section which we have first suggested.

We think the bill lacks definiteness of purpose in its failure to point out that it is the responsibility of Congress to cure any uneconomic causes which may have resulted in unemployment as soon as possible. We, therefore, recommend a new subsection under section 2 as follows:

"(g) When it has become necessary for the Federal Government to make investments and expenditures in accordance with the provisions of subsections (e) and (f) of this section, it is the responsibility of both the administrative and legislative branches of the Government promptly to take such steps as may be necessary to restore and maintain economic conditions under which full employment will be maintained on a self-supporting basis without Government expenditure."

Unemployment and destructively low price levels are not the causes of economic trouble, but rather the results of maladjustments. The trouble may arise from an unsound tax law, or tariff policy, or discriminatory freight rate, or monopolistic control of essential industries, or it might be something wrong in the field of labor such as work slow-downs or stoppages, union membership restrictions, jurisdictional wastage; or, in the field of agriculture, restricted production or the piling up of surplus products may be a cause of trouble.

MINIMUM WAGE LAWS

Let us illustrate what we mean. Last Sunday, in a nationally broadcast program, a representative of the CIO advocated a minimum wage law of 87½ cents per hour. Let us assume that such a law were passed and its application made universal, while price controls of foodstuffs were maintained. Few farmers could employ labor under such conditions, and a million or two men would be thrown out of work. Our supply of food would drop at least a third, and black markets would serve the wealthy, while the poor would go hungry. Very few could employ domestic help of any kind, and other millions usually so employed would not have jobs. Public works would have to employ many millions, but that would not get at the heart of the trouble, which would be that we were failing to produce ample consumer goods. Admittedly an extreme case, but not much more extreme than we may actually face. Let us assume a 65-cent minimum wage, which is roughly double what the average farmer makes with all his investment. Suppose we have no price controls, but through our reciprocal trade agreement laws we held farm prices to world levels. Even if farmers were exempted from this 65-cent minimum wage provision, they could not compete with 65-cent public works opportunities, and over one-third of the Nation's normal purchasing power would be reduced to subsistence levels. Obviously we would be headed for an economic upset that no amount of public expenditure could cure. The only cure would be to return to the maximum production of wealth. We believe the bill should clearly provide that public expenditures would be resorted to only as an emergency, and that the first responsibility of the Congress would be to find the cause of the emergency and apply a remedy.

PUBLIC SPENDING A TEMPORARY PALLIATIVE

It may be pertinent here to remind ourselves that practically every nation in the world suffered from the effects of the depression which followed the last war, and that of them all, the United States spent the most in public expenditures trying to get ourselves into economic balance again. We failed. In fact we were the last one of the major powers to get out, and it was not until a threatening war brought up our production of goods that we really made progress. It is easy to make the error of putting a thousand men under public employment and driving a like number out of private employment. We repeat unemployment is the result of something wrong. We hope the bill makes it amply clear that the first job is to find what is wrong, and that public expenditures are justified only as an expedient until the basic trouble is located and fixed. We are not opposed to all types of Government expenditures on public works, but we believe that the normal public expenditure should be based upon what a healthy economy can afford, rather than on what a sick economy needs. We believe in a proper use of medicine, and keeping a supply on the shelf, but don't believe in using it unless we are sick.

THE NATIONAL BUDGET

We approve of the purposes of section 3 under which the President shall submit a National Budget to the Congress, but call attention to the fact that in election years the new President does not take office until 2 or 3 weeks after the Congress has convened. Under the provisions of section 3 (a) the outgoing President would have to submit the budget for the incoming administration. The incoming President should be given enough time to act. We suggest that section 3 (a) read as follows:

"Within 30 days after the beginning of each regular session, or as soon thereafter as practicable, the President shall submit to the Congress the National Production and Employment Budget"—

And so forth. Because we feet it essential that the part that agriculture plays in our national economy be considered in the make-up of any production and employment budget, we recommend a fourth subsection to section 3 (a) enumerating the things which the President shall set forth in such national budget, reading as follows:

"(4) The estimated volume of farm and fisheries production, and prospective domestic and export consumption thereof, with estimates of price levels necessary to render returns to the producers sufficient to maintain standards of living (a) consistent with

the labor and investment used in the production thereof, and (b) such as may reasonably be expected under conditions of full employment."

Subparagraph (c) of section 3 ignores the necessity of corrective legislation. In order to avoid this we recommend that line 21, page 5, be amended to read:

"(c) To the extent, if any, that any suggested legislative action or such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure—"

And so forth. To cure the defect of ignoring the effect of agriculture on our whole economy we recommend a new subsection to section 3, following line 16, page 6, as follows:

"(d) If the prospective price level of the products of agriculture and fisheries may prove insufficient to render an income as defined in subsection (a) (4) of this section, the President shall include recommendations designed to bring the income of producers of agricultural and fish products up to levels consistent with a full-employment program."

The above changes will necessitate renumbering subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) to make them become (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively. It will also necessitate changing line 5 on page 7 to read: "(c), (d), and (e) of this section shall include such measures."

We do not think that the submission of the national budget at the beginning of each regular session is sufficient. Present subsection (g), beginning with line 16, page 7, grants permission to the President to transmit further estimates. We think this should be mandatory and recommend that line 16 be made to read as follows:

"(h) At least semiannually, and whenever he deems it advisable, the President shall transmit."

ADVISORY BOARDS SHOULD BE MANDATORY

We heartily approve the use of advisory boards as provided in section 4 (c), for they provide a practical means of keeping administrative officials familiar with the problems of all segments of our economy. However, we believe the provision should be mandatory. It has been our experience that the value of such advisory boards is greatly enhanced if they are provided with resident staff officers to keep in constant touch with problems as they arise. We, therefore, recommend that this subsection be amended to read as follows:

"The President shall consult with industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State and local governments, and others, with regard to both the developments and administration of the national budget, and for this purpose may establish such advisory boards as he may deem advisable, and may pay any expense in connection therewith including the employment of a resident board secretary where advisable."

The failure to recognize the part agriculture plays in our economy has been emphasized in section 5. In order to overcome this we recommend the addition of the word "agriculture" after the word "on" in both lines 18 and 22 on page 8, so that the Committees on Agriculture will be presented on the joint committee.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR VARYING EXPENDITURES

Up to this point the central thought of the bill has been to make an adequate survey and report the conditions to the Congress, so that it could take appropriate action. This places the responsibility on the Congress, where it belongs. Section 6 departs from this basic approach and instructs the President to make a quarterly study and take what action he considers appropriate. We think the responsibility should be kept in the Congress. We realize that in ordinary times the Congress may not be in session when the President feels that action is necessary, but in such circumstances we believe the representatives in the Congress on the joint commitee should pass on any decisions made. We, therefore, recommend that section 6 (b) be amended to read as follows:

"(b) Subject to such principles and standards as may be set forth in applicable appropriation acts and other statutes, the President may formulate recommendations for varying the rate of Federal investment and expenditure to whatever extent and in whatever manner he may determine to be necessary for the purpose of assisting in assuring full employment and an adequate price level for agriculture and similarly situated industries, with due consideration being given to current and anticipated variations in savings and in investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. Such recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress if in session, or to the joint committee as provided in section 5 (a) hereof if the Congress be not in session. If the Congress be not in session, it shall be the duty of the chairman of the joint committee to assemble the members of the committee within 20 days to consider the recommendations of the President. The President is hereby authorized to put such recommendations into effect unless disapproved within 60 days from date of submission by a majority vote of both Houses of the Congress, if in session, or a majority vote of said joint committee in case the Congress be not in session."

We feel that such a provision will not only prevent a hasty and unwise use of Federal expenditures, but it will also assure better cooperation between the Congress and the President. The Congress will be much more inclined to provide an ample number of projects for Federal expenditure if it knows that it will have an opportunity to pass upon the necessity of their use. In such circumstances we can plan ahead much more constructively.

We also feel that this suggested amendment greatly lessens the possibility that such projects might be used for political purposes. No matter what party is in power, there would be a temptation to make use of public funds prior to a general election, either in order that certain communities might have temporary benefits through the expenditure of funds in that community, or that the whole economy might be "pepped up" temporarily. We feel that this is one of the serious objections to the bill in its present form. But if the Congress, made up of representatives of all parties, or the joint committee in which the political parties have similar representation, had to approve these expenditures before they were made, it would be necessary for the President to present a defensible case justifying the expenditure. We feel that this is very important. Unless such a safeguard is provided, the whole question of making use of public expenditures rather than getting at the heart of the maladjustment which is responsible for unemployment might be determined by a President quite contrary to the wishes of the Congress or the policies set forth in the bill. The easiest way to get temporary acclaim, and possibly the easiest way to win an election, would be to spend public money rather than follow the more difficult course of correcting the maladjustment. The amendments we have suggested are designed to lay emphasis on the necessity of correcting maladjustments, but section 6 is wide open unless protected by some amendment such as we have suggested, enabling the Congress to keep control of the situation. If the expenditure of public funds is justified, it should be borne in mind that the Congress will be just as anxious to make use of this procedure as the President. We do not believe that the restrictions will handicap any justified expenditures but we feel it is essential to prevent the possibility of abuse.

It may be well to consider where the money is coming from. That must always be the responsibility of the Congress. The Congress should be foresighted in authorizing a supply of public works in order that we may not be caught unprepared in case of emergency. This might run into billions, and the determination when to use the money should not be left to one man. It is the clear responsibility of the Congress and should be carefully safeguarded as such.

We believe the bill when perfected will be a distinct contribution to our economic thinking. Too frequently we have approached the consideration of such basic economic problems as taxation, transportation, tariffs, labor legislation, farm legislation, financial legislation, and a host of others in a detached and narrow manner, without adequate consideration for the effect of the policy established upon our whole economy. Every sore spot affects our whole economy, but we have been too much inclined to consider each problem separately. Here, in the joint committee, the interdependence of all segments of our economy would be recognized in a practical way. A comprehensive national survey is made and the findings reported to a joint committee of both Houses made up of representatives of the major committees to which most of these problems are referred. If amended the way we have suggested, the responsibility for final action remains with the Congress where it belongs, but it is given adequate information and equipment to do whatever job needs to be done.

S. 380 NOT A RECONVERSION MEASURE

One more point before we close. This is not an emergency measure. Quite the opposite, it sets up permanent machinery for study and investigation with recommendations to be made to the Congress so that it may take well-considered rather than hasty action. We have been somewhat concerned by the amount of steam put behind it to pass it in a hurry as a means of meeting our immediate problems of reconversion. I think this has contributed to public distrust and misunderstanding, for unless there is intent to jump into public expenditures before the studies are made, there seems no need for excessive haste. Neither is there reason for delay, for if its purposes are sound we should begin such studies promptly. The circumstances justify most careful scrutiny to see that its purposes are not misunderstood. Care should be exercised to see that nothing in the wording would justify the conclusion that the Congress was approving a policy of statism as a means of meeting a situation during the period of reconversion in which considerable unemployment is an inevitable aftermath of war. The wording should be such that its purpose is clear. Then it will be recognized as a method of providing a reasonable assurance against economic tailspins, and a measure which could be counted on as a real safeguard by those contemplating risking their time and money in initiating some private enterprise. That is the purpose of the amendments we have suggested. We feel that without these or similar amendments the bill is not a sound measure.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Goss. Are there any questions to be asked?

Senator MURRAY. I note your statement in your concluding paragraph there, "We have been somewhat concerned by the amount of steam put behind it to pass it in a hurry as a means of meeting our immediate problems of reconversion." I don't understand that there has been any great amount of steam put behind this bill to get it passed. We were criticized, in fact, for not pressing it more diligently and having it passed before we took the adjournment recently. We were very severely criticized in some sections of the country for that failure. I am glad to note that you say, "Neither is there reason for delay, for if its purposes are sound we should begin such studies promptly." I think that is true. I think we are proceeding diligently, but not with any great

steam behind the bill. We are giving full hearings here and we are very glad to hear your very comprehensive statement here.

I appreciate that you are in favor of the principles and policies designed to be achieved by this legislation; you are proposing some amendments which you feel would really strengthen it. But I do think that we have not attempted to railroad this bill through in any way.

Mr. Goss. I am glad you mentioned that, because I did not mean to intimate you are trying to railroad it through. I think the committee is handling it very well. In the back country there has been a lot of work done, propaganda, if you call it, that——

Senator MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. Goss. That already has been designed to get this bill out immediately. I just happened to receive today a letter from an officer in our Nebraska State Grange, telling of two men who were out there going through the country, working along the line of immediate pressure. Now, those things have caused suspicion. This man was badly upset over it and he wrote me about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly he is not an agent of this committee.

Mr. Goss. I am very glad that Senator Murray raised that question, because if the wording of my comment could be construed as a reflection upon the committee, that was not the intent. I think the committee has handled it very, very well.

Senator MURRAY. I appreciate that.

Mr. Goss. We have been told weeks in advance that you planned this hearing. We have been asked to appear, and the impression I have had of the work of the committee is that you are seeking to get a full expression of all views.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. Goss. We certainly appreciate that, but I do want to make it clear that in the back country there is a lot of pressure and it has caused suspicion as to the purposes of the bill.

MISINTERPRETATION OF THE BILL

Senator MURRAY. Don't you think that the apprehension in the back country is due to the fact they are fearful of the danger of unemployment developing in this country in the postwar period and they are anxious that some program be established by the Government which is going to encourage them in the feeling that we are going to have high production and full employment in this country?

Mr. Goss. That may be. I think, Senator, as I stated right at the opening, there are two schools of thought with reference to it. I think some people are viewing this bill as an opportunity to throw public works wide open, and we are going to have a lot of Government employment as soon as there is any unemployment, we are going to jump right in, and I think some people are pushing it for that reason.

The CHAIRMAN. But the bill does not provide for that, Mr. Goss. There is no such provision in the bill.

Mr. Goss. I don't think the bill does provide for it, but I think that the bill might be construed by many as meaning that. I have tried to make that clear. I have tried to be perfectly fair in our presentation of what we believe should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. As far as I am concerned, I think in your statement that "Others believe that it is entirely possible to develop and maintain a sound, well-balanced economy which will normally result in full employment without resorting to unusual Government expenditures except in cases of emergency"—I think that is what the sponsor of this bill and the committee believe. So you are right about that.

Mr. Goss. As you notice, I have suggested several amendments which I thought would avoid that misunderstanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will have to consider those.

Mr. Goss. Undoubtedly there is a lot of misunderstanding through the country about this bill. I don't know that I ever saw a bill whose sponsors and opponents differed more widely as to what it means. I think that ought to be cleared up.

Senator MURRAY. Yet don't you think we have attempted to use here the clearest language to emphasize the fact that we are trying to protect free enterprise here? We are trying to foster free enterprise. The very first sentence in the bill provides that the Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce and in the development of the natural resources of the United States. Then it goes on with other provisions there with reference to its objectives. It says, in subdivision (d) of section 2, at the bottom of page 2:

"In order to assist industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in achieving continuing full employment, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will stimulate and encourage the highest feasible levels of employment opportunities through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure."

Now, it seems to me that that is a very clear statement that it is the purpose and the object of this legislation to do that through private enterprise, and only when conditions develop that bring on unemployment notwithstanding every effort has been made to have it accomplished through private enterprise then the public-works program is to be supplemented.

I notice in another paragraph in your statement here, at the top of page 3——

Mr. Goss. May I just comment on that last statement?

Senator MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. Goss. I quite concur that it is written in in many places. I also know that there is a misunderstanding in spite of the fact it is written in, and what I have tried to do is to suggest a wording that would avoid that misunderstanding.

Senator MURRAY. Don't you think largely that misunderstanding is because of the fact that there has been a statement published widely throughout the United States attacking the bill and misrepresenting its purposes? In fact, they have even charged that it is communistic, that we got the idea from Stalin and from foreign countries. I have read articles and editorials in the press. In fact, I have two or three volumes of them up in my office, of propaganda of that kind which naturally would mislead people, because people read these things in the paper and believe them, but when you come to read the bill you find a totally different proposition.

Mr. Goss. Well, the misunderstanding has come from a number of things. For example, I heard one of the strong proponents of the bill argue that when a factory was closed down, private enterprise should be given 30 days to open it, and if it could not open it that the Government should step in and open it, and that this bill provided for it. I don't think this bill does provide for it, but he was using that argument. So I say that with all the arguments, both by the friends and opponents of the bill, that have gone through this country, the committee should be doubly careful to see that the bill is so worded that there will be no misunderstanding.

The CHAIRMAN. I can assure you the committee will consider your amendments very carefully. Thank you very much.

Are there any other questions?

Senator TOBEY. Just one comment. You spoke of there not being more in the bill to sustain agriculture. Are you familiar with this amendment that Senator Morse has presented on behalf of himself, Senator Langer, and myself, on agriculture, two pages that are given to elucidating the agricultural position? Have you read that?

Mr. Goss. Yes.

Senator TOBEY. Do you approve of that?

Mr. Goss. I don't believe we ought to write the details of how you are going to handle anything. This goes into considerable detail. It opens up some controversial problems as to just what the agricultural law would be. I get the impression that it would open up a possibility for a very heavy regimentation of agriculture. So I have suggested in here that instead of writing the details in that they do two things: First, that the President recognizes it in his budget and calls the attention of Congress to the problem; second, that he makes such recommendations as at that time seem pertinent.

I am not out of sympathy with the emphasis the amendment seeks to attain, but I think it is not quite in keeping with the simplicity of the rest of the bill. If you went into such details for labor and industry and other programs as you have in agriculture, you would have a bill from 40 to 100 pages long, instead of this length.

Senator TOBEY. All right, thank you. That is what I wanted to know—your reaction to that amendment.

Mr. Goss. To a certain extent my criticism would extend to the first section of the proposed amendment also.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

(There was no response.)

Thank you very much.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I wish merely to add that I was requested to straighten out the record, and I am sure the statement speaks for itself.

Mr. TOBEY. Is it the Senator's understanding that Mr. Goss opposed the legislation, or was in favor of it?

Mr. WHERRY. Unless the four amendments which he offered were placed in the bill his position was that he would not be in favor of the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. Has the Senator read the full text of Mr. Goss' remarks?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator put them in the RECORD?

Mr. WHERRY. I have already done so.

Mr. TOBEY. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. WHERRY. I know the Senator from New Hampshire wants to be fair, and would not place any interpretation upon Mr. Goss' statement which was not a correct interpretation.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that every Member of the Senate has a very high regard for Albert Goss, master of the National Grange. His testimony was on the bill before it had been rewritten by the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true. He testified on August 29. I was instructed by Mr. Goss to say that as the bill was reported by the committee he felt that it should be amended in accordance with the amendment which he suggested, and if the amendments were not placed in the bill his construction of Senate bill 380 would not be changed.

Mr. AIKEN. What amendments have been placed in the bill and what have not been placed in it?

Mr. WHERRY. One amendment which Mr. Goss asked for was an amendment to section 2 of the bill. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] might change the language of the bill in accordance with Mr. Goss' wishes.

I did not rise to take issue with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] or the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I merely wished to submit the testimony which was given by Mr. Goss on the 29th of August before the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not attempting to speak for Mr. Goss. I do not pretend to know why his amendments have not been offered on the floor of the Senate for the consideration of the Senate. As I understand, Mr. Goss has expressed himself as being in full sympathy with the pronounced objectives of the bill, although I do not question that he has differed with the verbiage of the bill to some extent.

In regard to the American Farm Bureau Federation, I understand that its executive committee took a stand against the bill. I also understand that there was a difference of opinion among the members of the executive committee. Those who differed with the majority did not see fit to file minority views or anything of that nature. They did not want to have any squabble with the majority. So, as the record stands, the American Farm Bureau Federation is opposed to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to detain the Senate in reaching a vote on the pending amendment, but I want it clearly understood that the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which came to my attention yesterday, is now in the RECORD. I have cleared up the record with reference to the position which Mr. Goss takes in connection with certain amendments. His position with reference to Senate bill 380 will have to be interpreted as being against the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], as modified, which will be read by the clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 15, after the word "standards", it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That any program of Federal investment and expenditure for the fiscal year 1948, or any subsequent fiscal year when the Nation is at peace, shall be accompanied by a program of taxation over a period comprising the year in question and a reasonable number of years thereafter, designed and calculated to prevent during that year any net increase in the national debt (other than debt incurred for self-liquidating and other reimbursable expenditures) without interfering with the goal of full employment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

I am advised that if present and voting, all the Senators whose absences I have announced would vote "yea".

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness. All of these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I am advised, however, that on this vote both Senator BRIDGES and Senator THOMAS would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—82

Aiken	Hayden	Overton
Bailey	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Ball	Hill	Reed
Bankhead	Hoey	Revercomb
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bilbo	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Briggs	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Brooks	Knowland	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Taylor
Capehart	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Tobey
Carville	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McMahon	Tydings
Connally	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Cordon	Maybank	Wagner
Donnell	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Mitchell	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	White
Fulbright	Morse	Wiley
George	Murdock	Willis
Gerry	Murray	Wilson
Green	Myers	Young
Gurney	O'Daniel	
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews	Chandler	Hatch
Austin	Eastland	Pepper
Brewster	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Guffey	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Hart	

So the amendment offered by Mr. TAFT (for himself and Mr. RADCLIFFE) was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask the clerk to read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 18, after the word "responsibility," it is proposed to add the following: "with the assistance and concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, and labor, and State and local governments."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is merely to make clear what the title of the bill says is the purpose, that the Federal Government shall step in to insure full employment so far as it can, with the assistance and concerted efforts of industry, labor, capital, local and State governments. That is the intention of the bill, so the authors say. I have submitted the amendment to a number of them, and they are in favor of it. I have submitted it to a number on the other side of the proposition, and they favor it. It is simply in the nature of a clarifying amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Could the amendment be interpreted to mean that the Federal Government itself could not do anything unless it had the active cooperation of these other agencies?

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no; it merely means that the Federal Government is not the only agency in the whole picture which has the full responsibility.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, that it contributes to an over-all program?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] to page 18 of the bill, paragraph (3), and I will ask him for his views as to the purpose of that portion of the paragraph beginning with subsection (b) in line 19. The provision has to do with the functions of the Joint Committee on the National Budget of the two Houses. I read:

It shall be the function of the joint committee—

"As a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to the National Budget, not later than April 1 of each year (A) to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the National Budget."

That is self-explanatory. My query goes to the next provision:

(B) To prepare and report a joint resolution setting forth for the ensuing fiscal year its summary recommendations concerning the National Budget.

My inquiry goes particularly to the purpose of having reported to the Congress a joint resolution which in itself, if enacted, would have the force of law, and which under the Constitution must carry the signature of the President, as would any other legislation. Can the Senator advise me as to what the purpose of that is?

Mr. WAGNER. I shall read from the report:

The purpose of this joint committee was admirably expressed in the testimony of Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange (p. 824):

"Too frequently we have approached the consideration of such basic economic problems as taxation, transportation, tariffs, labor legislation, farm legislation, financial legislation, and a host of others in a detached and

narrow manner, without adequate consideration for the effect of the policy established upon our whole economy. Every sore spot affects our whole economy, but we have been too much inclined to consider each problem separately. Here, in the joint committee, the interdependence of all segments of our economy would be recognized in a practical way."

In other words, the joint resolution would include the report of the committee, which would contain all the rejections and acceptances of the joint budget program.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the paragraph itself first provides for the making of a report by the joint committee to all the appropriate committees of both Houses. That is perfectly clear, and an orderly method of presenting its findings and recommendations. What is the purpose of requiring the committee, in addition to making that report to both Houses and to all the committees interested in both Houses, to prepare and report a joint resolution setting forth for the ensuing fiscal year its summary recommendations concerning the national budget? What purpose is to be subserved by that.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from New York will allow me to observe, I think the Senator from Oregon has made a sound suggestion. I do not see any use of that. We have a legislative drafting service which can draft all the resolutions, joint or otherwise, we need. I do not see that there is anything to be accomplished by having the joint committee prepare a resolution and send it to Congress to be referred to various committees. I do not think subsection (B) really is of any value.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in that event, on page 18, in line 19, I move to strike out beginning with the word "and" all down to and including the word "Budget" in line 22, and to strike the comma after the word "Budget" in line 19 and insert a period. Also to strike out the "(A)" in line 15, which ceases to have any meaning if the motion is agreed to.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the elimination of subparagraph (B).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, in line 24, it is proposed to strike out the word "desiring" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "seeking"; and on page 13, in line 21, it is proposed to strike out the word "desiring" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "seeking."

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, we have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not think the amendment is at all controversial. The original language was "seeking." The word "seeking" implies some effort to secure a position. The word "desiring" is negative in that respect. I think the word "seeking" is a better word.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, in line 26, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof a comma, and add the words "including self-employment in agriculture, commerce, industry, or the professions."

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I think this amendment will somewhat round out the objectives of the bill. It refers to employment. Since we are interested in fostering employment, we are also interested that people in self-employment, in agriculture, commerce, industry, and the professions should be on an equal footing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, in line 1, it is proposed to strike out the words "right to an."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this amendment is simply to reconcile subsection (c) with subsection (b) which was amended in the committee. There was some controversy over the original amendment which changed the language in (b), and I overlooked the striking out of the words "right to an." That makes it consistent with the language of the first subsection.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. How will the provision read with the Senator's proposed amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It will read:

In order to assure the free exercise of the opportunity for employment set forth above—

And so forth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I must give an admonition to the majority leader of the Senate. Some 2 years ago, in a situation somewhat like unto this——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For what purpose?

Mr. TOBEY. To give an admonition to the majority leader of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Some years ago the distinguished majority leader, at a time like unto this, when amendments were being offered from all four corners of the Senate floor, and when we were considering a bill at the tail end of the session, rose on the floor and dramatically charged and enjoined us as follows: "When we approach the tail end it is the wise policy to proceed with caution."

I bring that back to the Senator's memory now. Let us go slow and know what we are doing in this great flash flood of amendments which is being poured upon us now.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for his admonition, and I assume by reason of it that we are approaching the tail end.

Mr. TOBEY. I sincerely hope so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the period at the end of section 2 (a) of the bill as reported, it is proposed to add the following:

In furtherance of this responsibility the Federal Government should not pursue a policy of engaging in commercial activities in competition with free, competitive private enterprise or the investment of private capital.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, with great frequency and announced with great vehemence by its sponsors are statements that free enterprise is being promoted by this bill. There is very little in the bill that assures any attention being given to the fostering of free enterprise except what appear to be some occasional statements which are not confined to anything in particular.

My amendment proposes to add to section 2 a little clearer declaration of the devotion of this bill to free enterprise, if that is what it means, and I propose to add to that section the amendment as read. The language, therefore, would read as follows:

It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to foster free competitive private enterprise and the investment of private capital.

That language is already in the bill. I would add to that this further declaration:

In furtherance of this responsibility the Federal Government should not pursue a policy of engaging in commercial activity in competition with free, competitive private enterprise or the investment of private capital.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and other Senators address the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

Has the Senator from Iowa concluded his remarks?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I claim the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; but the fact that a Senator claims the floor does not always mean that he is entitled to the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Chair recognized the Senator from Wyoming. The Chair had stated the pending question, and several Senators rose to their feet, but the Chair was good enough to recognize the Senator from Wyoming, and therefore by reason of the recognition of the Chair I claim the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the sponsor of this amendment and of the Senate——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Wyoming now have the floor, or do I have the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator from Iowa had concluded, and the Chair put the question. While putting the question, the Senator from Wyoming rose and was recognized by the Chair. If the Senator from Iowa desires recognition later, he will certainly receive it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say, Mr. President, that if the Senator from Iowa has not completed his explanation of his amendment I shall be very glad to await the explanation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For the purpose of explaining the amendment I may say to the Senator from Wyoming and to other Members of the Senate that the amendment provides that in furtherance of the declared responsibility announced in the first paragraph of the bill it is the responsibility of the Federal Government, in effect, in fostering free enterprise, free competitive enterprise, not to pursue a policy of competition.

That is, our Government will not adopt or pursue a policy of competition with free competitive enterprise or the investment of private capital. In preparing this amendment I used the word "pursue" as a softer word than "refrain" or "avoid," which I first submitted in the committee, because certain members of the committee thought that the word "avoid" was a complete admonition for the Government to stay out of all manner of activities. The question was raised as to whether or not the use of the word "avoid" might preclude the Government from going into REA activities, irrigation projects, dam construction, and such things. I was perfectly willing to agree, and do agree that there are large fields of activity of that kind which are either too extensive or too expensive for private capital successfully to handle. I therefore attempted in this amendment to qualify and modify the activity of the Federal Government by a mere admonition that, as announced in this bill, it was not our general policy to pursue such a competitive theory in connection with private enterprise. I think it strengthens the statement that it is our responsibility to foster private enterprise. I believe the amendment would not harm the bill, but would add confidence on the part of those who will have to administer the bill, and those who will have to cooperate with the administration.

In my own State, from which I have recently returned, and through correspondence which has come to me I find a substantial fear that there is an ulterior purpose behind the bill to move the Federal Government in and take the actual control of competitive private enterprise in many fields; that it is a move toward Government ownership. I myself do not hold that view. I believe I have studied the bill with sufficient care, and have discussed it to a sufficient extent with members of the committee so that I am satisfied in my own mind that there is no such intent. But after all this bill—a policy-announcing bill, and not an enabling act, except in certain particulars—still must receive the cooperation of free enterprise in this country if free enterprise is to make it work. After all, that is the group which must make the bill and the future implementing legislation work.

If we are to avoid collectivism as an ultimate result of full government paternalism. I believe that every reasonable and moderate assurance that we can give should be given to free enterprise that their government is not, by insidious means, step by step, moving in to take control of their activities. I believe that the more such assurances we can give, the more we can strengthen the activities which must arise under this bill, and the better we can look forward to its success.

I sincerely hope that the bill will work. I believe that there are many deficiencies in it, beginning with its title, which is a "fooler," a misnomer, so far as its actual purposes are concerned. But I am willing to go along, and I believe that the bill has potential possibilities in connection with its planning provisions if properly administered.

Mr. President, the success or failure of this proposed legislation will depend not so much on its verbiage, but upon the administrative judgment and the administrative progress which is made when it once goes into effect.

It is the administration of the legislation and not the words contained in it, which will measure its success.

It is for that reason that I offer this amendment, only to emphasize to the free American people, in a time of economic and social confusion at the close of this great war, and on the verge of a reconstruction period, that we propose to encourage free enterprise by some rather strong assurances and statements that its own Government does not design, either by this bill or as a policy, to move in and take over the control of competitive private enterprise or the investment of private capital in an expanding economy.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming for yielding to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was very glad to hear the Senator from Iowa say that from his own reading of the bill he was satisfied that there was nothing contained in it which would sustain the apprehension expressed by some that this is a measure designed to permit the Government to take over private enterprise. Great care has been exercised in drafting the bill, to make it clear that its primary purpose is to make the free enterprise system work. Its primary purpose is to set up an agency of government in the executive branch which will cooperate with a joint committee in the legislative branch to stimulate the investment of private capital in the encouragement of free enterprise. In view of the clear language in which that is stated in the bill, and in view of the primacy which the bill gives to the encouragement of free enterprise, it seems to me unnecessary, by general language such as that in the Senator's amendment, to endanger the activity of of the Federal Government in some very necessary enterprises.

The Senator from Iowa referred to rural electrification. The rural electrification program was resisted on this floor on the ground that it was in competition with private enterprise. Now we know that the rural electrification program has done more to encourage private enterprise than many things which had been accomplished up to that time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot recall the language of the REA Act. I ask the Senator if it is not true that the REA Act itself specifically provides that the REA activities shall not enter into direct competition with existing privately owned power lines. Is not that true? I will say to the Senator that it is my recollection that it is, but I would not wish to make the flat statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not remember the language to which the Senator refers, but I do know very well that REA has established rural electrification projects in areas in which private projects had previously operated ineffectively. The result of the institution of rural electrification projects has been not only greatly to assist farms and local businesses, but even to assist many of the private enterprises which had been operating inadequately before.

The Senator referred to reclamation. The reclamation projects upon which the entire West depends, projects for which Senators on both sides of the aisle fought so vigorously when the flood control bill was under consideration in the last session of Congress, are supported by public power projects, by the manufacture of power under the Bureau of Reclamation. Every one of those projects would come under the ban of this amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would it not also not only be possible, but almost certain, that this amendment would be construed as declaring a policy which would ban any further TVA development because it comes in competition with private enterprise and private investment? Would

it not also be interpreted as declaring against the policy which we adopted within the past 2 or 3 weeks, to expend Federal money in the building of airports all over the Nation for the accommodation of travel, which airports come in competition with railroads, busses, and other forms of transportation? How can this general language be interpreted otherwise than as indicating a policy which bans all those things because they come in competition with private investment, although the Government has already embarked upon them wherever thought necessary?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad that the Senator has made reference to the airport bill. I was about to call attention to it myself.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that subsection (a) of section 6 of the bill is all that is really needed in order to guarantee that the Government is not going to engage in competition with private productive enterprise? That language reads as follows:

Nothing contained herein shall be construed as directing or authorizing—

(a) the operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The purpose of that provision was to carry the reassurance the Senator from Iowa is requesting.

Mr. BARKLEY. And it is more specific than the amendment which he offers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is more specific. I feel that the language offered by the Senator from Iowa is so general in its effect that it would be an extremely dangerous amendment to adopt. I hope it will not be approved.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have finished.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa was first on his feet, and he is now recognized.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from Kentucky. The Senator referred to section 6, which says:

Nothing contained herein shall be construed as directing or authorizing—

(a) the operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government—

And so forth. In the discussion which the Senator from Kentucky had with the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Kentucky indicated that we have already done all that will be needed to give this assurance. I ask the Senator from Kentucky if he interprets section 6 as being a general prohibition against having the Government enter the field of private enterprise.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is a more specific prohibition than the language of the Senator's own amendment, because it sets out specifically and in very clear language a declaration that—

Nothing contained herein shall be construed as directing or authorizing—

(a) The operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government—

So, Mr. President, if that does not operate as a prohibition against doing anything of the sort under this proposed legislation, I do not know how to construe it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have given considerable thought to section 6. I have heard it discussed from all standpoints. I have come to the conclusion that all section 6 means is merely a statement that the bill does not go so far as to authorize the operation of such plants. It is not a prohibition against the Government going into such activities, but it is merely a statement that the Government will not attempt to go that far in this program.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the amendment ties specifically into subsection (a) of section 2, which says:

It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to foster free competitive private enterprise and the investment of private capital.

Then it goes on to say, Mr. President, that in furtherance of that responsibility the Federal Government should not pursue a policy of engaging in commercial activities in competition with free competitive private enterprise or the investment of private capital. So, tied into subsection (a) of section 2, the amendment is also limited to the provisions of the bill, and I do not think it is as strong as subsection (a) of section 6, which specifically prohibits the construction of this bill as authorizing its use for any purpose outlined in the amendment offered by the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if that is the case, I submit that if my amendment is not as strong a prohibition as the one contained in section 6, it certainly will not limit the bill in any greater way or, as alleged, hurt the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, I probably should have said that it would not be so well adapted even to accomplish the same purpose, because if it is not as strong as the language contained in section 6, it certainly is not needed. If it is not as strong, it is encompassed within the prohibition contained in subsection (a) of section 6, and therefore is redundant. If the amendment is intended to mean that by this bill we are declaring a general policy that the Federal Government cannot engage in any activities similar to those in which it is now engaged, such as public improvements, the building of airports, the building of dams upon our rivers so as to control floods and incidentally create power, and the establishment of Rural Electrification Administration organizations and other similar projects, certainly it should not be adopted because it is not the intention of Congress, I am sure, to declare a policy which would be construed as preventing the Government from doing the things it is now doing, things which private capital has not done and cannot do, as I view the possibilities for the investment of private capital.

Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, if I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky does not have the floor. The Senator from Iowa had the floor and he gave it up. The Senator from California has first addressed the Chair, and he is recognized.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as I have listened to the arguments on this bill in the last few days and as I listened to the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, I have agreed with the distinguished majority leader that, the pending measure is a most emasculated instrumentality for the purpose of maintaining full employment and indeed for preserving our very civilization. We have already watered down the bill until it does not amount to very much. I hope the proposed amendment will not be used to further weaken it.

I am not, however, very much concerned about the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa, because when the tremendous impact of coming events strikes us, and our hearts and homes, we in the Congress and Government of the United States are going to do everything that is necessary to be done to preserve our lives and existence. But I do wish we had the power to project ourselves forward 20 years and to place ourselves in the position of historians of that time who will review this argument. I say "historians who will review this argument," assuming that any such are then in existence, and that is a very real question, because if we can believe authoritative sources, fantastic and incredible as is the story of the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima, we already have bombs from atomic power many times more destructive than that bomb. Indeed I believe we already possess power by which we may readily destroy all civilization including ourselves.

Mr. President, I am one who has announced my belief that the only hope of preserving civilization is to perfect an international organization and turn over to it control of atomic bombs and atomic power. Many Members of the Senate, perhaps a large majority, will disagree, but I feel that every Member of the Senate must and will agree that with the dreadful, fearful power of atomic energy, so fantastic that it is incredible, our Government must control atomic bombs in the United States. If our Government does that, it must control all atomic energy. I see no escape from that conclusion.

Mr. President, let us not be misled by those who tell us that the use of atomic energy for commercial purposes will not occur until 10 or 20 years from now. That is not so. Assuming continued peace, commercial use of atomic energy will be developed in the world within far less than 20 years. If great interests in the United States, to preserve the value of coal mines, petroleum, railroads, and hydropower plants, endeavor to hold back the development of atomic power, of course, Europe and Russia will move away from us, and we would rapidly become a fifth-rate power.

I, for one, Mr. President, am not willing to fetter, even by innocuous declarations, the hands of our Government and of our Congress by saying, for instance, in regard to atomic energy that the Government could not sell it in competition with petroleum or coal mines

or electrical power. I think such a declaration, in this the most dynamic era of all time, is short-sighted and futile, and only blinds us to coming events which will test our courage, tolerance, and wisdom, as well as our democratic institutions, to the utmost limits.

Mr. President, there may be Senators present who would say, "Yes; atomic energy is a dreadful, fearful power which may destroy all our cities, homes, and civilization, but we must turn it over to DuPont, General Motors, or other corporations or individuals for private exploitation." But I am sure our people will say that this power, dreadful for evil, imperial for good, must be used by the Government of the United States for our own people and those of all the world; that it must be used for the common good everywhere, even though it brings our Government into competition with private business.

I make no pretensions to clairvoyant powers or ability to prophesy, so I am unable to say what will happen in relation to these tremendous changes that are upon us. I am glad that the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is pressing his resolution to investigate this subject and God guide him and the President and anyone else who must assume responsibility to deal with this dangerous and difficult subject.

Mr. President, I am not speaking with this vehemence because I am worried about this amendment. When the day of action, and the day of reckoning comes, we Senators will do what we believe should be done, and we will not be fettered by any words which would prevent us from disposing of atomic power to factories or to towns or cities by the Federal Government, whatever seems to be best for us, even though our Government might then come into competition with coal and electric power, and adversely affect the banks and insurance companies whose interest largely rests upon existing values and equities.

Mr. President, I for one regret that this dreadful power is now reposing in the hands of mankind. We are like children playing with dreadful toys which may destroy us overnight. I do not believe there is any use in minimizing the danger in which we stand. And neither do I believe there is much use in proceeding to weaken by amendment the bill which is now pending, and I for one intend to vote against the amendment which is now before the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to protest with all the emphasis at my command against the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa. To adopt it would be the same as saying that our Government cannot appropriate money for highways, for the improvement of waterways, or for the construction of airports. I believe that every Member of the Senate was besieged by lobbyists at one time or another during this year who urged us not to vote money for highways, or waterways, and other things which are absolutely necessary to the welfare of the country. If we followed the requests which have been made of us we would be unable to construct REA lines or do anything of that nature. I wish to protest with all the vigor at my command against agreeing to the pending amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, among other things which the amendment would dispose of would be the Senate restaurant, and then we could not obtain any more bean soup. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this is a very important matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa has been recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. It will save no time by not ordering the yeas and nays, because any Senator may immediately suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am rather surprised to find that the pending amendment is the neutralizer of the atomic bomb. I think that perhaps it will be viewed with only a grain of encouragement by nations which have been striving to find a defense against the atomic bomb. To say that this amendment, in the language in which it is couched, would prevent governmental activities is to make a statement which is not true.

The pending bill is of a policy-making nature. It is a policy-announcing bill. All the pending amendment does is to declare that the general policy of the Government is not to go into private business. By no stretch of the imagination, in my opinion, can it be said that the amendment would preclude construction of REA lines, highways, power dams, reclamation projects, or other public works. I think that any argument in that direction is specious and without foundation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that a representative of the railroad brotherhoods appeared before the committee and protested against any bill the language of which would permit money to be used for the construction of highways?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If that be true, I can only say that I was not present at the session of the committee at which the person to whom the Senator from Vermont refers appeared.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] on page 12, in line 22.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names.

Aiken	Byrd	Ferguson
Bailey	Capehart	Fulbright
Ball	Capper	Gerry
Bankhead	Carville	Green
Barkley	Chavez	Gurney
Briggs	Connally	Hawkes
Brooks	Cordon	Hayden
Buck	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Burton	Downey	Hill
Butler	Ellender	Hoey
Johnson, Colo.	Moore	Taft
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Taylor
Kilgore	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Knowland	Murray	Tobey
La Follette	Myers	Tunnell
Langer	O'Daniel	Tydings
Lucas	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
McCarran	Overton	Wagner
McClellan	Radcliffe	Walsh
McFarland	Reed	Wheeler
McKellar	Revercomb	Wherry
McMahon	Robertson	Wiley
Magnuson	Russell	Willis
Maybank	Saltonstall	Wilson
Mead	Shipstead	Young
Millikin	Smith	
Mitchell	Stewart	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. HATCH's name was called). The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is necessarily absent on important official business. If present he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is absent on official business. If present he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. The senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is absent on important public business at the War Department.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of illness. I am advised that if present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—30

Bailey	Ferguson	Revercomb
Ball	Gerry	Robertson
Brooks	Gurney	Smith
Buck	Hawkes	Taft
Burton	Hickenlooper	Tydings
Butler	Millikin	Vandenberg
Byrd	Moore	Wherry
Capehart	O'Daniel	Wiley
Capper	Radcliffe	Willis
Cordon	Reed	Wilson

NAYS—49

Aiken	Carville	Downey
Bankhead	Chavez	Ellender
Barkley	Connally	Fulbright
Briggs	Donnell	Green

Hayden	McKellar	Saltonstall
Hill	McMahon	Shipstead
Hoey	Magnuson	Stewart
Johnson, Colo.	Maybank	Taylor
Johnston, S. C.	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Kilgore	Mitchell	Tobey
Knowland	Morse	Tunnell
La Follette	Murdock	Wagner
Langer	Murray	Walsh
Lucas	Myers	Wheeler
McCarran	O'Mahoney	Young
McClellan	Overton	
McFarland	Russell	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Chandler	Hatch
Austin	Eastland	Pepper
Bilbo	George	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Glass	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Guffey	White
Bushfield	Hart	

So Mr. HICKENLOOPER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I had prepared some remarks on the bill which we have been discussing for the last few days, but I feel we have had enough talk on it, so I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he expects this matter to appear as a speech, or as a memorandum or statement.

Mr. WILEY. It will be printed as ordered by the President of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. After the Senator gets consent.

Mr. WILEY. I understood I had gotten consent.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I had a right to object, and I rose and addressed the Chair as loudly as I could.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Of course, if the Senator from Texas was on his feet and asking recognition, he is entitled to have a reconsideration of the order.

Mr. CONNALLY. All I can do is address the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. CONNALLY. There is objection until I find out about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is objection. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection to the Senator's having his material printed in the RECORD in the form of a statement or memorandum, but I shall have to object if he puts it in as if he delivered it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. I understand, Mr. President, that my request was in accordance with the rule. I do not want any violation of the rule by myself. Of course, the statement will not be printed as a speech, it will be printed, as I requested, as a statement, and I am sure that there is no necessity for any objection to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY. I make no objection if it appears as a statement and not as having been delivered on the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am familiar with the rule, and I made no request in violation of the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the matter will be printed as requested.

The statement is as follows:

FULL EMPLOYMENT, BUT IN THE AMERICAN WAY

Mr. President, I should like to present my views with regard to the full-employment bill, S. 380.

But before I do, may I recall a pertinent quotation from Scripture. This quotation may help to give us that sense of balance, of calm, of reason and judgment which is so badly needed to solve our problems.

The quotation is from I Kings 19: 11 and 12, and it is this:

"And, behold, the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks before the Lord; but the Lord was not in the wind; and after the wind an earthquake; but the Lord was not in the earthquake:

"And after the earthquake a fire; but the Lord was not in the fire; and after the fire a still small voice."

I emphasize the fact that it was always "the still small voice" which has guided men to the solution of their difficult problems such as this.

INITIAL SUMMARY

Now, specifically, my position on this bill's various aspects is as follows:

A. Objective: The objective of this bill (promoting full employment in America) is a noble one. It is one with which no American-thinking American will disagree if the means to attain that objective are appropriate.

B. Nature and result: The nature of this particular bill and its possible results have, however, been terribly misrepresented to the American people, not, however, by members of this body.

C. Instrument: The principal instrument (a joint congressional committee) by which this bill will attempt to realize its objective is one which can be very constructive and useful.

D. Psychology: The guiding psychology behind this bill (a psychology of fear and leaning on Government) is dangerous to the American way of life.

E. Financial theory: The financial theory which seems to be behind this bill (that of deficit financing) also violates the American way.

Now, let us briefly consider each of these aspects in the order cited above.

A. OBJECTIVE

What is the stated objective of this bill? It is as follows:

"To establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government."

I have stated that no American-thinking American will disagree with this objective if the means to attain it are seasoned by the Taft, Radcliffe, Hatch, and Tydings amendments.

But I emphasize "American-thinking American." Why do I do so? Because there are American citizens who think and act not in the American way but in the European way, in the Communist way.

This is not mere conjecture or idle hearsay. I personally have heard men say: "When the war is over we will take over the factories." They had deep convictions on that subject.

Now, where did they get those convictions, those ideas? Who fostered them? What agencies and organizations fed into the minds of the workers that forceful expropriation of other people's property was a solution to the problem of unemployment—to bettering their way of life?

But a few months ago, after the German surrender in northern Italy, we saw the workers attempt to take over the factories. Then, lacking management "know-how," lacking materials, lacking credit, they returned them to the owners.

Crimes are often committed in the name of liberty. But as shown above, crimes can also be committed in the name of a false way of life.

No "American-thinking American" wants that to happen here.

I, for one, want all of my countrymen who are ready, willing, and able to work to have gainful, rewarding work in the American way. I want them to be employed at a living wage and at ever higher standards of living. I want their initiative and their diligence to be well compensated. But, above all, I want unhampered the American initiative to create wealth and jobs, to sustain the Republic. "Leaning on others" never built this great Nation. It was the ingrained, innate, self-reliance and creative energy that did the war job and made us the leaders of freemen among the nations of earth.

The much-discussed thoughts of bread lines, of doles, of apples being sold on street corners by veterans, are as completely objectionable to me as these thoughts are to everyone of my colleagues and to every right-thinking American.

Well, how are we going to assure against these conditions? This brings us to the nature of this bill which is supposed to insure full employment.

B. NATURE

Just what does this bill provide?

Sections 1 and 2 state the title and aims of the bill.

Sections 3 and 4 provide for a national production and employment budget to be prepared by the President, with the advice of various groups and to be transmitted to Congress.

Section 5 provides for a Joint Congressional Committee on the Budget consisting of 15 Members of the House and 15 Members of the Senate who will make a continuing study of the national budget.

Section 6 is an interpretation of the provisions of the bill which is designed to antidote some of the fears which have grown up because of this bill.

That is the sum and substance of this bill.

But that is not what has been told to the country. This bill has been presented as a panacea which will cure every employment problem in every community. It has been represented as guaranteeing a job of his own choosing to every worker. The Senator from Wyoming did a fine job yesterday. He definitely stated it was not a panacea, not a guaranty.

This bill has been sold, oversold, publicized, and ballyhooed to the extent that part of the public has almost gotten to believe that the millennium will be legislated into existence once this bill has passed. This debate has cleared up much misapprehension.

When will we awaken from the mesmeric spell that we can by legislation alone cure economic ills, moral ills, and war. Political paternalism breeds individual weakness and lack of stamina—the very stuff which makes for unemployment.

Let us all be fair and admit that there has been misrepresentation on both sides of this bill. One group has held it to be a universal panacea and the other group has held it to be an unmitigated evil.

Actually the bill is neither. It contains at least one constructive feature. Let it be known—

It does not authorize the expenditure of a single nickel.

It does not authorize the President to do anything which he cannot do on his own initiative now.

It does not create a single job except for the staff of the proposed joint congressional committee.

It does instruct the President to report out a production and employment budget.

C. THE INSTRUMENT

Having seen the nature of this bill, let us look at the instruments which it sets up to achieve its objectives.

One of these instruments, of course, is the proposed new "National Production and Employment Budget" which is supposed to predict many months in advance—

1. The total of employment opportunities, production, and investment which are necessary for full employment;

2. These three items as they are actually expected to be; and

3. A program which will make sure that the totals that are necessary and the totals that are expected may be brought together so as to coincide.

All of these calculations are, of course, so difficult to make accurately as to be almost impossible. Who can predict all the variations in the human equation a full year in advance? Moreover, who can foresee the effect of the President making these predictions upon the state of mind of the Nation—its confidence, its energy?

Mr. President, my purpose here is to be constructive and I want to call attention to another instrument planned by this bill which could have an entirely beneficial result.

That instrument is the proposed Joint Congressional Committee on the National Budget. If this new joint committee were to work with the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue in limiting Government spending, in balancing income with outgo, in insuring an equitable tax system, in encouraging private enterprise, in siphoning out public works in accordance with the Taft-Radcliffe amendments, it might help to resurrect that dormant spirit of faith and confidence which is so essential to American prosperity.

If, on the other hand, this new committee became just one more funnel for a lot of synthetic thinking (aimed at deficit spending, at an increase in the Federal bureaucracy, etc.), then this committee would be one more instrument impairing our American way of life.

I would want this new committee to work in the American way rather than against it.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress, on January 21, 1943, I introduced Senate Resolution 3 to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. Again in this Congress I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 on September 10, 1945, in order to create this same joint committee. Needless to say, if the sound objectives which I have indicated above and which I stated in Senate resolution 3 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 of the Seventy-ninth Congress were to be achieved by the joint committee proposed by Senate bill 380, I would be indeed proud and happy and would not care in the slightest that my own particular bill for these objectives had not been enacted.

But as I have said, the test of the new committee will be in the actual work that it does. Its findings, however, will have to be siphoned through a standing committee. That's a real check and balance.

These, then, are the instruments proposed under Senate bill 380 and the varying results that they may have—good and evil, depending on how they are utilized.

D. PSYCHOLOGY

Unfortunately the results which may be predicted under this bill are not enheartening. That is because the psychology behind this bill is a fear psychology. It is apparently based on distrust in the American system of private enterprise. It promotes anxiety, doubt, and fear in the American people about the true effectiveness of our American system.

Our late President said that the only thing we had to fear is fear itself. Why then is fear injected into the American people to the effect that depressions are certain unless this bill is passed? Medical science has shown what fear does to an individual. It strains the heart, it stops digestion, in some cases it is so harmful as even to cause death. Well, our country is made up of individuals and to inject them with fear may do as much damage to our system as it would do to an individual.

But not only is the psychology of fear stimulated by some of the proponents of this bill, but the psychology of leaning on Government is stimulated. Our people are encouraged to believe that this bill and similar bills can change economic laws and in effect can legislate the millennium into existence.

Those possibilities are obviously completely false. It is my hope and my earnest belief that our people have enough horse sense and will come to know that this bill, with its glittering generalities and objectives, with its pious pronouncements, with its theories, with its fanciful statistics, does not legislate jobs into being or appropriate one cent for that purpose.

E. FINANCIAL THEORY

The most crucial part of this bill is, of course, its underlying financial theory. That theory is one of deficit financing. Throughout the years of the New Deal this theory has been called compensatory spending, pump priming, and any other innocuous title that could be thought up. But the principle is always the same—the Government spends more than it takes in.

In 1932 the Democratic administration was elected on the promises of balancing the Budget, reducing Government expenditures, curtailing the bureaucracies, and other similar economy measures.

Yet, in 7 years of the New Deal, 1933–1940, we incurred a deficit of $22,000,000,000, or an average of over $3,000,000,000 for every year. In spite of that enormous deficit spending, we had an average of 20,000,000 persons on relief through those 7 years. Obviously deficit spending was not the answer to unemployment. Why then is it presented now as the answer to unemployment? Why then is it presented now as the key to the door of prosperity when it will have even more harmful effects than before in view of our approaching $300,000,000,000 of national indebtedness?

Now let me make my position clear. I recognize the obligation of Government—which is the agent of the people—to so act in an emergency that it will do whatever is necessary to alleviate economic maladjustment and economic ills. Therefore, there are occasions when deficit spending is appropriate. The war exemplifies that. But when the Government goes into deficit financing as a planned and continuous program, then there is double responsibility upon us to inquire:

(a) Whether the situation requires same.

(b) Whether deficit spending will not cause more harm than good.

With reference to (a), it is obvious that the situation now and in the foreseeable future does not require deficit spending. Private industry is ready to go on all-out production if it can get materials and labor. The cities and the States are ready to go, especially if they find that any unemployment is imminent. Our people have accumulated savings of over $140,000,000,000 and have an enormous backlog of demand for housing, household appliances, autos, farm machinery, and the like. There will be a tremendous demand to recondition our railroads, to increase air transportation facilities, and such. Why, then, should we lose our heads in a wild rush to meet the directives of the deficit spenders? Why should we put the Federal Government into competition with the States and the cities in building public works, when, instead, the Federal Government projects should be held back on the shelf to meet any labor slack that may occur in spite of the efforts of private enterprise, our States, and our cities to prevent it.

With reference to (b), it is obvious that deficit financing now and in the foreseeable future will do more harm than good. It will bring us still further to the brink of inflation. It will peril the solvency of our $300,000,000,000 of national indebtedness held by our banks, our insurance companies, our trust companies, our corporations, and by individuals. In placing these bonds in jeopardy, deficit spending will strike at the very heart of the American way and of the well-being of the American family.

CONCLUSIONS

And so it is obvious that if we would have true full employment and if we would retain our liberty and individual security, we must proceed to get that full employment in the American way.

Now, how are we going to do this?

I submit the following proposals:

1. GET GOVERNMENT OUT OF BUSINESS AND GET BUSINESS INTO GOVERNMENT

Smash the bureaucratic stranglehold which has throttled American business. Free business of the shackles of Washington dictates. Free Government of the wild-eyed spender, the blank-minded lender, the foreign-minded schemer, the irresponsible dreamer who have plagued industry, labor, and agriculture.

2. ENCOURAGE THE MEN WHO CREATE WEALTH, WHO CREATE JOBS

Give them the tax incentives to produce. Take the brakes off the activity of the men of enterprise, the men of vision, the men of courage. Give them the go ahead to expand, to build, to develop.

3. MEET THIS CRITICAL LABOR SITUATION HEAD-ON

While we are talking here in the Senate about this bill, irresponsible labor leaders are sabotaging the very life of this Nation. Meet their challenge head-on. Smash the lawlessness, the will-to-violence of these men who are driving the great mass of honest American workers to ruin.

Ask the labor leaders that they come forth with a bill which will constructively produce work and jobs.

Put an end to the kind of situation such as occurred recently in Detroit. Eleven men were fired as a result of bodily injury being done to a foreman. After an appeal to the appropriate Government board, 7 of the 11 men were reinstated. One of the remaining 4 had left the State. Because the last 3 were not reinstated, several thousand men struck in one plant. And as a further result of their striking, 50,000 men in a Ford plant were forced out of work because materials were unavailable. If labor leaders will not join in framing such a bill, then let this body initiate legislation which will protect the public interest by making violators responsible to law. How much longer will we tarry?

4. RESURRECT THE SENSE OF INITIATIVE IN MEN, THEIR DILIGENCE, THEIR CONFIDENCE, RATHER THAN IMPLANTING IN THEM THE DEFEATISM THAT GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRATS CAN REBUILD AMERICA

This is the planning America needs. By diligence, the Nation's house was builded. By diligence it will continue to be built. Plan constructively Federal projects and siphon them in as needed, keeping ever in mind the people's savings in the $300,000,000,000 of bonds, make the Budget committee work, as I have indicated, and "well done" will be the verdict of our people. Put an end to Federal paternalism. Restore in men their desire to rise by their own efforts—work, industry, thrift, collaboration.

These, then, are the ways by which we will achieve full employment—in the American way.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 8, in subdivision (1) of section 2 (d) before the word "stimulate" it is proposed to insert the following: "avoid unnecessary governmental restrictions and by other means."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I propose to insert the words of the amendment in line 8, on page 14, after (1) and before the word "stimulate." I propose to add the words "avoid unnecessary governmental restrictions and by other means," which would make the last sentence of the paragraph beginning in line 6, together with the following paragraph, as I would amend it, read as follows:

> Such program shall, among other things—
> (1) avoid unnecessary governmental restrictions and by other means stimulate, encourage, and assist private enterprise to provide—

And so forth. I call the Senate's attention to the fact that the amendment contains the words "unnecessary governmental restrictions." It appeals to me, Mr. President, that there could be very little objection to that language. I think it is quite generally felt that there is a growing fear of governmental restrictions.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. What tribunal is going to decide what are "unnecessary governmental restrictions"? Where does the responsibility lie to determine the equation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that this bill is full of uncertainties and nebulous statements of policy.

Mr. TOBEY. If we were to grant that to be true, would the Senator add one more to it, and have that procedure continued ad infinitum?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think we need to add that fundamental, and I think it is highly necessary that unnecessary governmental restrictions be avoided in this period.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I am glad the Senator feels so happy. The sponsors of the bill, however, are opposed to the amendment. It is absolutely uncalled for and unnecessary. It is assumed that this is a bill against private industry whereas it is a bill to stimulate, encourage, and assist private industry. I do not think the amendment is offered with any intention to help the bill at all. It is offered, I think, for the sole purpose of casting an insinuation against the bill which is not justified by its provisions as a whole.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Montana a question? Is the Senator from Montana in favor of maintaining unnecessary governmental restrictions in connection with business and industry in this country?

Mr. MURRAY. To what unnecessary restrictions does the Senator have reference?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They run all through our governmental regulations. It would take volumes to publish them. The lists are so long that they almost defy belief. I would not undertake to start stating what are the unnecessary governmental restrictions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Before I yield to the Senator from Kentucky, I again ask the Senator from Montana: Does he care to answer my question? Does he want to leave any unnecessary restrictions in this country?

Mr. MURRAY. I challenge that statement. There is absolutely nothing in the bill that involves any restrictions, unnecessary or necessary. The bill is designed to assist private industry to maintain production and full employment, and the amendment is totally unnecessary. It does not mean anything. It could not accomplish anything except to confuse the issue.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I again ask if the Senator from Montana cares to answer my question? If he would rather not, I shall pursue the question no further.

I will now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I answered the question. I cannot give the Senator understanding. If the Senator does not understand the answer I have given, it is not my fault.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I admit I am somewhat confused by the Senator's answer.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ought to yield to the Senator from Kentucky first.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have changed my mind, and do not wish the Senator to yield to me.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I was somewhat in doubt and have been for quite a while respecting the whole bill, but if the Senate refuses to adopt this amendment I can be sure my people back home will compliment me in voting against the whole bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. AIKEN and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. HATCH'S name was called). The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is necessarily absent on important official business. If present he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is absent on official business. If present he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. The senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is absent on important public business at the War Department.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of illness. I am advised that if present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—35

Bailey	Gurney	Robertson
Ball	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Smith
Buck	Langer	Taft
Burton	McClellan	Tydings
Butler	Millikin	Vandenberg
Byrd	Moore	Wherry
Capehart	O'Daniel	Wiley
Capper	Overton	Willis
Cordon	Radcliffe	Wilson
Ferguson	Reed	Young
Gerry	Revercomb	

NAYS—44

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Murdock
Bankhead	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Barkley	Kilgore	Myers
Briggs	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Carville	La Follette	Russell
Chavez	Lucas	Shipstead
Connally	McCarran	Stewart
Donnell	McFarland	Taylor
Downey	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McMahon	Tobey
George	Magnuson	Tunnell
Green	Maybank	Wagner
Hayden	Mead	Walsh
Hill	Mitchell	Wheeler
Hoey	Morse	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Chandler	Hatch
Austin	Eastland	Pepper
Bilbo	Fulbright	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Glass	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Guffey	White
Bushfield	Hart	

So Mr. HICKENLOOPER'S amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 18, after the word "responsibility", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government and

other essential considerations of national policy."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment in line 18 on page 13 would be to make the language read, beginning with the words "the Federal Government," in line 17, as follows:

The Federal Government has the responsibility, consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government and other essential considerations of national policy, to assure continuing full employment, that is, the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans able to work and desiring to work.

The purpose of the amendment is to bring the language of that part of the bill into conformity with the language, as amended, on page 14, in subclause (d) (4). We have been all over it and argued it. The amendment was agreed to for similar language there, and I assume that there is no need for extended argument.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly read the text?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Starting in line 17 on page 13, the language, as proposed to be amended, would read:

The Federal Government has the responsibility, consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government and other essential considerations of national policy, to assure continuing full employment, that is, the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans able to work and desiring to work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator caught it, but immediately after the adoption of the Hatch amendment, as I recall, I offered an amendment in that section which the Senator did not include in the reading of the language as he proposes to amend it. The amendment which I offered was to insert, in line 18, after the words "responsibility", the words "with the assistance and concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, and labor, and State and local governments," so that the language would read:

The Federal Government has the responsibility, with the assistance and concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, and labor, and State and local governments—

And so forth. The reason that amendment was offered is obvious, because it was the one place in the bill where it seemed that no one except the Federal Government had any responsibility to make jobs.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then I will modify my own amendment so that the consistency clause will begin immediately after the Senator's amendment, adding the word "and" at the beginning of the amendment as I have offered it.

Mr. TYDINGS. How would the language then read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The language will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 17, after the comma, the language would read:

The Federal Government has the responsibility, with the assistance and concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, and labor, and State and local governments, and consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government and other essential considerations of national policy, to assure continuing full employment, that is, the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans able to work and desiring to work.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the language which the Senator from Colorado is attempting to insert at this point has already been included in the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], which has been adopted. This is a mere repetition of the language in the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. It is totally unnecessary. It confuses and makes the section more vague than it should be.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to bring the language into conformity with the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if his language is identical with the language of the Hatch amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is identical.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. [Putting the question.]

The Chair is in doubt and will request a division.

On a division, Mr. MILLIKIN's amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment, as amended, is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. TOBEY. I ask for the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered; the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For what purpose does the Senator rise?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For what purpose does the Senator rise?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to discuss the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas was trying to obtain recognition before the clerk started to call the roll, and he is entitled to it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate. I merely wish to make a brief statement.

I have no objection to that part of the bill contained in sections 3, 4, 5, and 6. I think it is very well that that part of the bill be enacted. I could not support the bill in its original form. A number of amendments have been adopted which tend in some measure to clarify it.

Mr. President, the reason I cannot vote for the measure is that I still believe that by section 2 we are conveying to the people of the Nation an impression that from now on the Federal Government takes over the full responsibility of seeing that there is continuing full employment in this Nation. By that policy, whether we use the word "assure" or the word "guarantee", certainly we shall convey the impression that the Federal Government will guarantee everyone a job at all times.

Mr. President, I certainly am just as strongly in favor of having us do everything we can to promote full employment as anyone here present is. I am just as strongly in favor of fostering free enterprise as anyone else here present is. But I know that if we undertake to guarantee continuous full employment at all times, under any conditions, and if we make that the paramount policy, above all others, it cannot be done except with unlimited deficit spending. I believe that of the two, the risk of some unemployment or a program going all the way on a policy of unlimited deficit spending, the latter course would be more dangerous to this Government than would the former.

I assume there never was a time, unless it is now and during the war period, when there were not some few unemployed persons for some short time.

Mr. President, as to the rest of the program, namely, the plan to have a joint committee to study proposals and to have the President make recommendations respecting these things, that may be well and good. But we have all agreed that there is now no immediate prospect of wholesale unemployment in the near future. If there is, if with the demand for goods and services which exists in this country today and with the purchasing power which now reposes in the hands of the American people, there is now a threat of immediate unemployment, then, Mr. President, I see no hope of preserving democracy, and the only course which will be left to us will be to go into a state of socialism or communism or some form of totalitarianism whereby the Government itself will assume full responsibility and will provide everyone with a job and, along with that, will also provide direction as to where they shall work and when they shall work and what compensation they shall receive.

Mr. President, with the proposals which have been made from time to time that this Government implement private employment by providing public-works program, I am in thorough accord. I have constantly and consistently supported all such measures. I wish to reserve the right to decide about that when the time comes.

At this time I do not wish to make a committal for the future, without having an opportunity to study the programs when they are submitted and an opportunity to vote on them according to their respective merits and according to the needs which exist at the time.

I know it is said we can still do that under the provisions of the pending bill. Mr. President, I am simply trying to guard against practicing any deception or against committing at this time any act which will mislead the people I represent. I know that under the terms of the bill I would be able to study the programs and decide them on their merits when the time came; but by declaring at this time the policy enunciated in the bill, by declaring it at a time when we should have every reason to expect fair and full employment, and by declaring that we guarantee everyone a job, I would feel that I had made a committal—by voting for section 2 of this bill—to vote for practically any program which might be submitted, if it were submitted under the authorization and direction contained in the bill. If I did not then support and vote for whatever may be proposed, I possibly would be charged with not keeping faith with the policy here announced.

I do not think there is any great emergency existing. I do not think there is any stress which can be put upon us at this hour for the adoption of this legislation. It might be wise legislation a year, 2 years, or 5 years from now. But I am unwilling to make an all-out committal without having the opportunity from time to time, as programs are presented, to study, consider, and weigh them in the light of conditions then existing.

Mr. President, the bill is a better bill than it was when originally introduced. I believe that less violence will be done by the bill in its present form than in the form as reported by the committee to the Senate. I do feel, however, that we are creating the impression that the Congress is giving assurance that this Government will see that everyone is furnished with a job at all times, and that there will never be any unemployment. I cannot subscribe to that policy. I will go as far as I can to preserve our institutions and our system of government. I am in favor of full employment and the making of expenditures consistent with a sound public policy. I am as strongly in favor of those measures as is any Member of the Senate. But I will not make a committal with reference to circumstances which I cannot foresee. If I should support this bill with section 2 in it, I would feel that I was committing myself to carry out practically any program which may be recommended as to any unemployment situation which might arise. I think we will have plenty of opportunity to act in time when such situations threaten to arise.

It has been difficult to follow all the amendments which have been offered and adopted today and to get their full significance.

I believe the bill as originally drawn, if passed, at least in the form as reported by the committee, would certainly convince the American people that the Government is making assurances—a guaranty which I do not believe it could redeem except by unlimited deficit spending. I think that the true meaning of the bill in the form as originally reported to the Senate was the laying of a foundation for the establishment of a permanent and gigantic WPA.

For the reasons which I have stated, I shall not vote for the bill on its final passage. However, I am glad that the amendments to which I have referred have been agreed to. To a great extent they modify the original form of the bill. I still believe that the bill creates the impression that Congress is guaranteeing to every person in America a job at all times, and I do not believe that is sound public policy, unless we are prepared and willing to spend this country into bankruptcy and change from a democracy into a totalitarian state. That I am not willing to do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The yeas and nays having been demanded and ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

I am advised that if present and voting the Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is absent on public business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the same announcement which I made previously in regard to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of illness. I am advised that if present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 10, as follows:

Yeas—71

Aiken	Briggs	Carville
Bailey	Brooks	Chavez
Ball	Burton	Connally
Bankhead	Butler	Cordon
Barkley	Capehart	Donnell
Bilbo	Capper	Downey
Ellender	McFarland	Shipstead
Ferguson	McKellar	Smith
Fulbright	McMahon	Stewart
George	Magnuson	Taft
Green	Maybank	Taylor
Hawkes	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Mitchell	Tobey
Hickenlooper	Morse	Tunnell
Hill	Murdock	Tydings
Hoey	Murray	Vandenberg
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	Wagner
Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Kilgore	Overton	Wheeler
Knowland	Radcliffe	Wiley
La Follette	Reed	Willis
Langer	Revercomb	Wilson
Lucas	Russell	Young
McCarran	Saltonstall	

NAYS—10

Buck	McClellan	Robertson
Byrd	Millikin	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	
Gurney	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—15

Andrews	Chandler	Hatch
Austin	Eastland	Pepper
Brewster	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Guffey	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Hart	White

So the bill, S. 380, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have certain imperative duties awaiting attention in my State of California. I therefore ask unanimous consent of the Senate to absent myself for the purpose of going to California for a week or 10 days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, October 2, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 28 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice Charles Fahy, resigned.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

SENIOR SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY MEDICAL DIRECTORS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

John R. Murdock, August 1, 1945.
George G. Holdt, August 1, 1945.
Homer L. Skinner, September 1, 1945.
Leo W. Tucker, September 1, 1945.
Roy E. Bodet, September 1, 1945.

SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEONS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Sidney P. Cooper, July 1, 1945.
George H. Hunt, August 1, 1945.
H. Van Zile Hyde, July 14, 1945.
Roger E. Heering, August 1, 1945.

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Sol R. Baker, July 5, 1945.
Burnet M. Davis, July 5, 1945.
Theodore E Hynson, July 6, 1945.
Raymond Hofstra, August 1, 1945.
Leo W. Koster, August 1, 1945.
William F. Powell, August 1, 1945.
Fred W. Thyng, August 1, 1945.
William B. Wiley, September 1, 1945.
James K. Shafer, August 1, 1945.
Benno K. Milmore, June 1, 1945.
Evert A. Swensson, June 1, 1945.
Mayo L. Emory, June 1, 1945.
Phillip H. Best, September 1, 1945.
Edward W. Kunckel, August 1, 1945.
Joseph C. Sturgell, July 1, 1945.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Emory S. Moore, Jr., July 5, 1945.
Manrico A. Troncelliti, July 5, 1945.
Junius A. Evans, July 6, 1945.
Leo P. Krall, July 6, 1945.
Louis C. Floyd, July 7, 1945.
Richard E. Markley, July 7, 1945.
Arthur L. Koven, July 11, 1945.
Charles D. Muller, Jr., July 11, 1945.
Robert L. Cannon, July 19, 1945.
Robert J. Bryan, August 1, 1945.
Wade H. Etheridge, Augut 1, 1945.
Vincent G. Peiffer, October 1, 1945.
George F. Kamen, September 1, 1945.
Richard H. Linn, September 1, 1945.
John H. Pritchett, Jr., September 1, 1945.
Griffith E. Quinby, July 1, 1945.
William C. Redmon, September 1, 1945.
Raymond F. Corpe, September 1, 1945.

SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY DENTAL SURGEONS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Herbert A. Spencer, Jr., August 2, 1945.
Charles H. Wright, Jr., August 8, 1945.

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY DENTAL SURGEON EFFECTIVE AUGUST 3, 1945

Donald L. Truscott

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Frederick S. Loe, Jr., August 2, 1945.
John C. Heckel, August 3, 1945.
Eugene H. Hess, August 3, 1945.
Robert J. Herder, August 4, 1945.
Carl E. Johnson, September 1, 1945.
Aurthur J. Lepine, September 1, 1945.

SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 1945

James H. LeVan

SENIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS TO BE TEMPORARY SANITARY ENGINEERS EFFECTIVE AUGUST 2, 1945

Edmund C. Garthe
Harry G. Hanson
Richard F. Poston

ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Ernest C. Anderson, July 31, 1945.
Roscoe H. Goeke, August 2, 1945.
Donald L. Snow, July 31, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 28 (legislative day of September 10), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Lewis B. Combs to be a civil engineer, with the rank of rear admiral, to rank from July 20, 1942.

Samuel M. Robinson to be an admiral, to rank from August 27, 1945.

Louis E. Denfeld to be a vice admiral, to rank from September 1, 1945.

Cato D. Glover, Jr., to be a rear admiral, to rank from December 1, 1943.

Austin K. Doyle to be a rear admiral, to rank from December 19, 1943.

Thomas G. W. Settle to be a rear admiral, to continue while serving on special duty with the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from August 10, 1945.

Milton E. Miles to be a rear admiral, to continue while serving as commander, United States Naval Group, China, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from August 13, 1945.

Oscar Smith to be a commodore, to continue while serving as chief of staff to the Commander in Chief, United States Atlantic Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from April 12, 1943.

Benjamin V. McCandlish to be a commodore, to continue while serving as commandant of a naval operating base and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from September 17, 1943.

Gordon Rowe to be a commodore, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval operating base, Midway, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from April 24, 1944.

Elliott B. Nixon to be a commodore, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Caribbean Sea frontier, and commandant, tenth naval district, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from April 3, 1945.

James K. Vardaman, Jr., to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, to continue while serving as naval aide to the President, to rank from August 9, 1945.

William S. Parsons to be a commodore, to continue while serving with the atomic bomb project, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from August 10, 1945.

William W. Behrens to be a commodore, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval training center, Bainbridge, Md., and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from August 22, 1945.

Mark L. Hersey, Jr., to be a commodore, to continue while serving as commander, United States naval operating base, Manila Subic, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from August 24, 1945.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE OF THE NAVY

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Paul K. Blesh et al.

To be ensigns

John E. Adams et al.

(NOTE.—A full list of all persons whose nominations to be lieutenants (junior grade) or to be ensigns in the Navy confirmed today may be found at the end of the Senate proceedings, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 18, 1945, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 8690 with the name of Paul K. Blesh and ending on page 8692 with the name of John A. Zink.)

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

Francis P. Dayton to be a captain, from June 9, 1945.

Walter S. Metzger to be a second lieutenant, from August 8, 1944.

Arnold B. Capps to be a second lieutenant, from August 8, 1944.

William H. Rankin to be a second lieutenant, from February 4, 1944.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

It is a good thing to give thanks unto Thee, O Lord most high, Thou whose right is to reign and whose throne is from everlasting to everlasting. Make of our hearts an empire, a kingdom cleansed and purified, where darkness, fear, and unbelief may disappear. Stimulate us with the buoyant faith that the path of the just is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.

As we ponder the difficulties wherein progress must be made, let this supreme truth inspire us with increasing hope and courage: There is a power not of ourselves that makes for righteousness. One touch of Thy spirit, one light from Thy throne will reveal unto us the way and bring a clearness and a certitude which will enable us to grip the truths for which we must work and live. Grant that our efforts may bear witness that they are born of Him who liveth to die no more; whose rule of conduct can never be set at naught. In a solemn covenant with Thee, may we keep the faith and complete the tasks for which we have been called. We breathe this prayer in the

blessed name of the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 27, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 380. An act to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government; and

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to investigate the matter of the development, control, and use of atomic energy.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Department of War.
3. Federal Trade Commission.
4. Office of Censorship.
5. Office of Defense Transportation.
6. Office of War Information.
7. United States Railroad Retirement Board.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN THE REGULAR MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate voluntary enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand there is an amendment in that bill, offered, I believe, by Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, which I hope the conferees will accept. It would permit the Filipinos to supply a certain number of men, I think 50,000, for the occupation of Japan. That would do three things. In the first place, it would give every oriental to understand that we respect the Filipino people.

It would give Japan to understand that the Filipinos are to be respected by them from now on.

At the same time, it would encourage the Filipinos to understand that the American people have confidence in them.

It is one of the finest gestures that could be made by us at this time insofar as the Philippine Islands and Japan are concerned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ANDREWS of New York, and Mr. SHORT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an historical digest of the organization of St. Vincent de Paul Society, and in the other a report of the activities of the Salvation Army.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, when your Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture submitted its report of the investigation of the War Food Administration, it indicated its purpose to continue in touch with the situation developed by its investigation, to the end that everything possible might be done to assure corrective measures to eliminate the mistakes in administration which it had endeavored to point out.

The Secretary of Agriculture has just transmitted to the committee a statement of the steps which have been taken under his direction to correct those errors of administration. His actions in that regard have not been concluded. The subcommittee is continuing its interest in the subject matter to the end that the objectives stated in the report of its investigation may be fulfilled.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that there may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter which has been received by the subcommittee from the Secretary of Agriculture, to which I have made reference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, while I have great confidence in Secretary Byrnes, his yielding to Commissar Molotov on yesterday sickens me. I am wondering if it means that we, too, have accepted the domination of Communist Russia over the entire world. Is it another case where we win the war but lose the peace? Must we now look alone to God to protect America?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE] be granted indefinite leave of absence due to illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the atomic bomb has blasted an old world into eternity. Hardly any of us seem yet to realize that other factors shaping the future are almost insignificant compared to the tremendous question as to whether this release of the very power of the universe will become a force for good or ill, the cause of a war that will obliterate civilization or a force for lasting peace.

A recent Associated Press article reports the statement of 96 percent of the chemists, biologists, and scientists who worked upon the atomic bomb and quotes them as follows: "We can expect no enduring monopoly of the atomic bomb." These men also urge "immediate control of this weapon by a world authority." I have their statement in my hand.

Maj. Gen. Leslie Groves, who directed the atomic bomb project, is reported by the United Press as warning that people everywhere are working on the atomic bomb and that the rest of the world will eventually catch up with the United States in its development.

Mr. Speaker, unless America seizes upon the opportunity of the next few months and years to use her present position with every resource at her command to build an enduring peace, the future of our children is the very blackest one that any generation has faced in the long history of civilization.

I wish to call attention to the speech I made on this subject on September 12 and also to the bills which I introduced on that same day containing proposals for the control of this terrible new power and its use as an instrument for world peace. I appeal to the Congress and the Nation to realize the transcendent importance of this matter.

As I have said before repeatedly the whole future hope of humanity depends upon a moral, social, and spiritual progress equal to the scientific progress represented by the atomic bomb. Unless we catch up in our ability to control the evil forces in our hearts and among the nations, scientific advances and particularly the release of atomic energy, will become a peril manifold greater than any mankind has ever faced before.

Today the United States is relatively powerful enough to bring the nations into a genuine world system of armament control and peace enforcement. If we demonstrate our readiness to both take the positive action necessary and also to make the sacrifices necessary to accomplish this I believe we can place every

nation in the world in a position where it cannot refuse.

The one hope of humanity, the one way it can avoid self-destruction, is precisely what the men who perfected the atomic bomb have proposed; namely, establishment of the right of a world authority to inspect and have access to and know all about and control the production plants, laboratories, and every other kind of armament establishment in every single country in the world. I believe America could force this if we said we would give information regarding the release of atomic energy to such a world authority and to no one else.

Time is short, Mr. Speaker, and our children's hope of ever being able to live out their life span hangs in the balance and awaits our action.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article appearing recently in Life magazine.

Mr. FOLGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short excerpt from a speech by Hon. Winston Churchill.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a prominent businessman.

Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances in the Appendix of the RECORD and in two to include editorials.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from today's Washington Post.

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article prepared by himself and published in Nation's Business for September 1945, entitled "Bureaucracy Rides the Rivers."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests to submit: First that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD; and second, that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] may extend his own remarks on the Elliott Roosevelt tax matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SUPPORT H. R. 3939 TO ERADICATE CANCER AND INFANTILE PARALYSIS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEVENSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters of demobilization, one from a serviceman and the other from the father of a serviceman.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include a radio address, an article for the need of doctors being relieved from the Army because of the acute shortage of doctors in civilian life and an article by George Fielding Eliot.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials from a Nebraska paper.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from a Nebraska paper and in the other to include an article on the Naval Academy, written by Jim Chinn, of the Washington Post.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from an overseas veteran.

SURPLUS POTATOES FOR STARVING NATIONS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

OCCUPATION TROOPS

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was attracted by a headline on the front page of the Washington Star last Saturday, as follows:

> Eighteen-year-old draftees may go abroad after 9 weeks' training—Army and Navy say they are no longer bound by act of Congress.

Why are the Army and Navy so eager to circumvent the intention of the representatives of the people in sending our 18-year olds into foreign countries to do police work for which all agree they are not fitted. Who are they to decide what shall be done with our 18-year olds in direct opposition to the intent of the Congress?

I quote further:

> Selectees may be sent overseas after only 9 weeks of Army training, including those 18-year-old soldiers who were bound by an act of Congress to receive at least 6 months' training before being sent to combat areas.

It must be remembered that Congress reduced the draft age below 20 only after a fight on the floor of this House and did so only because of stern necessity. Now that the war is over 18-year olds should not be taken and after 9 weeks' training shipped to foreign countries with the fraternization bars down, to police the armies of enemy and liberated countries.

Congress has been in the habit of delegating many powers and much authority but this is a decision that we as the representatives of the American people must make ourselves. We are closer to the people than Army officials.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on September 26 I was granted unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the Missouri Valley Authority. I am informed by the Public Printer that this exceeds the two pages of the RECORD allowable and will cost $156, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, and notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances—in one to extend his remarks on the subject of discharges from the Army and Navy and include a newspaper article, and in the other to extend his remarks on the subject of loans to Great Britain and Russia and include an editorial and a newspaper item.

THE LATE LT. COL. A. PETER DEWEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, Peter Dewey, lieutenant colonel in the Army of the United States has given his life in defense of the American Army headquarters in Saigon, Indochina, where he was in command. Peter Dewey was the heroic son of our former colleague the Honorable Charles Dewey, of Illinois.

Many of us here have known and loved Col. Peter Dewey, as fine and gallant a young gentleman as ever drew breath in America. As lieutenant he served as interpreter to our high command in their early dealings with the French. As captain he preceded the American assault troops into southern France, dropping in by parachute several weeks before D-day. As major and lieutenant colonel, he served in extremely hazardous undertakings within Japanese-held territory before VJ-day.

Peter Dewey lived in the highest tradition of our country. He died in defense of our flag.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the machine gunning of Col. A. Peter Dewey, Army of the United States, in Saigon, by Annamite Revolutionists may, in a sense, be another shot "heard around the world" in awakening the American people to the necessity of deciding how far we as a Nation are going to support with military forces the colonial policies of other nations. If the death of valiant Peter Dewey, parachutist, and wearer of the Medal of Merit for bravery, may result in saving the lives of many other American boys, his sacrifice may not have been made in vain.

In this connection, let me quote from an editorial in last evening's Star, entitled "Revolt in Indochina":

The Japanese unquestionably favored native independence aspirations during their 5 years' occupation of Indochina, but they did not create the movement, which had long existed and had given the French colonial authorities much trouble. The chief center of disaffection is Annam, which retained the status of a protectorate with a native monarch and local self-rule. The Annamites are a warlike people with a strong national consciousness. It is they who head the independence movement, and it is notable that this movement is not only nationalistic but has a distinct Communist tinge.

* * * Indeed, they are actually opposing the small British forces sent in to maintain order during the interim period before troops from France can arrive, and they have killed an American officer from the District of Columbia attached to a military mission in Saigon.

The untimely passing of Peter Dewey comes as a shock to those of us who were privileged to serve with his distinguished father in this body. I knew Peter well. He was a fine and courageous young American with a splendid military record. Prior to the invasion of southern France he was dropped behind enemy lines one dark night for the purpose of correlating and stimulating underground activities. This he was able to accomplish in a marked degree because of his fluency in the French language. Peter's work contributed greatly to the success of the invasion of France, as the records show. It is particularly sad in that he should become a casualty after the termination of the war which he so greatly helped to win.

A fine young American gentleman has gone to his reward. Peace to his ashes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of the membership of the House, and very especially the membership from Illinois, learned with profound sorrow of the passing of a great soldier. I think it has been the pleasure of a great many Members of the House to enjoy the hospitality of our former colleague, Representative Charles Dewey, and on those occasions we had a chance to see what seemed like a stripling youngster, who seemed so young for war. I remember seeing him on many occasions over the years in the garden of their home just across from the Old House Office Building, and then learned after awhile that he was soldiering in far-off fields. I saw him for the first time when he returned, when he was generously bemedalled and beribboned as an indication of the appreciation of a grateful Nation for the great and heroic work he had done for the cause of victory and the cause of freedom. But he was not content to stop there. The fields of Africa, France, and Italy well knew his tread.

He was in the Arabian country on the Gulf of Aden and finally wound up in the Orient. He met an untimely death after the V of victory had been written in the sky. What a tragedy it is, as my colleague the gentleman from California has so well indicated. He served and died in the greatest tradition of this great Republic. It is a reminder to us as we think of that spirit of adventure and daring that constantly possessed him and took him to all corners of the earth, carrying out the secret missions of this Republic, that we, too, can partake of some of that spirit in solving some of the problems that lie ahead, including those problems that are on the international front. Let his passing, like that of other gallant soldiers of this Nation, be a reminder to us that we must carry on in the interest of peace and international amity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ERVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the New York Herald Tribune showing that the attacks upon Czechoslovakia are unfounded and unwarranted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SECRETARY OF STATE HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. I feel that a majority of the Members agree with me that the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] relative to the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, is unwarranted and surely not conducive to aiding him in his extremely important task in working out and adjusting the many troublesome questions affecting the future peace of the world.

The gentleman from Georgia stated that the Secretary of State is being influenced in his actions by Commissar Molotov. Does the gentleman feel that the Secretary of State should blindly follow only the contentions, demands, and views of Great Britain regardless of whether they are fair or just? May I say to him that I have received many letters charging that the Secretary of State is being influenced and playing into the hands of Great Britain in aiding it in its selfish aims. In all instances I have answered that such insinuations and charges are unwarranted and uncalled for.

I served with the Secretary of State while he was a Member of this House; I have followed his splendid service in the United States Senate; his fine judicial service in the United States Supreme Court, and his zealous work as assistant to the President of the United States during the trying war period. Not only do I feel but I am satisfied that he has performed his duties in all these high offices honestly, efficiently, and fearlessly, having at all times the interest of the people and the country at heart. No one to my knowledge has been able to control his actions or his views. I am confident that when we and the country are informed as to his activities and accomplishments, they will meet and be received with universal approval. And neither Mr. Molotov on the one hand and I hope Great Britain on the other will be able to sway him from the course of righteousness and justice. I am confident that he will carry out the wishes of the President and will be ever-watchful in safeguarding our country's rights and hopes in bringing about a world adjustment of all matters to the end that a permanent peace will follow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, one with reference to interdependence and the other the policy regarding Japan.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a transcript of testimony of Assistant Commissioner Warne, of the Bureau of Reclamation.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include therein excerpts from newspaper articles.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances—in one to include an editorial and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two letters from constituents and also to print in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Tulsa Tribune.

BANK EARNINGS AND INTEREST RATES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a brief analysis of commercial banking in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE LATE WILLIAM N. ROGERS

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I regret that it is necessary for me to inform the House of the recent death of William N. Rogers, who represented the First New Hampshire District for two terms in this legislative body. Ex-Congressman Rogers was the youngest man ever elected to serve as Representative from his district. He died last week at the young age of 52. His passing is a great loss to New Hampshire and I know that Members of this House, who were acquainted with him, join me in extending deepest sympathy to his bereaved family.

"Bill" Rogers attended Brewster Academy and Dartmouth College. He received his bachelor of law degree from the University of Maine. He was a football star while at Dartmouth and all his life was interested in athletics. He was a member of the New Hampshire Bar Association and president of the Carroll County Bar Association in 1921 and 1922. He was a member also of the Phi Kappa Psi fraternity, the Knights Templar, the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, the Wonalancet Club at Concord, and the Episcopal Church.

William N. Rogers was an able lawyer, a fluent speaker, and an excellent public servant. He spent many years in public life, serving his district and his State with distinction.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the passing on of a Member is a matter of keen regret to all of us in the losing of a colleague. The passing on of a former Member with whom we served is likewise a matter of keen regret to all of us who served with him. Those of us who served with the late William N. Rogers remember him for his noble outlook on life, his quiet sincerity, and devotion to duty, as well as his steadfastness to his duty both on the floor of the House and in committee work. The passing of Bill Rogers is a matter of keen regret to his friends who served with him, as well as to his many friends. I know I speak the sentiment of all of them in extending to Mrs. Rogers and the other members of her family our profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMUNIST ATTACK ON GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Communist attacks on General MacArthur are now showing their object and their purpose.

These attacks have come because General MacArthur did not let a bunch of alleged Communists in Japan step in with a holier-than-thou attitude, put on a synthetic revolution, and take over.

We have been getting along with our Russian ally as best we could, but if Stalin does not want the United States and Great Britain to have anything to say about what goes on in the Balkans, I for one propose to back MacArthur in saying what goes on in Japan.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

SALE OF SURPLUS WAR-BUILT VESSELS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 358 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the problem dealt with in this bill that comes to us from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, has been very carefully worked out by that committee. It is a bill that provides for the sale of our war-built fleet. I know of no opposition whatever to the rule or to the bill. I have no request for time and do not wish to use any myself.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, there is no objection on this side of the rule. We appreciate that at this time we possess around 58,000,000 tons of shipping. I understand the needs after the war will be about 15,000,000 tons. I would say, however, that we are all aware of the history of the sale of war vessels after the last war, which is not very complimentary. That must not happen again. I have read this measure carefully. It is very complicated, and I understand from members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that there will be some very important amendments offered on the floor today.

As I say, there is no objection to the adoption of the rule, in order that the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may bring forth the facts to enlighten the House under the rule which provides for 3 hours' general debate after which it is open to amendment under the 5-minute rule.

I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration, H. R. 3603, has for its principal purpose the sale of surplus war-built vessels. During its protracted consideration by the committee I endeavored at all times to use as my chart the declaration of policy contained in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, referred to as the magna carta of the American merchant marine. This policy is reaffirmed in section 2 of the present bill. It cannot be referred to or read too often:

SEC. 2. (a) It is necessary for the national defense and development of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States that the United States have a merchant marine (1) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of its water-borne export and import foreign commerce and to provide shipping service on all routes essential to maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times; (2) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (3) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States; (4) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel; and (5) supplemented by American-owned facilities for repairs, marine insurance, and other auxiliary services.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine, and to facilitate the adjustment of the merchant marine from war service to peacetime operations.

Mr. Speaker, before the war the world had about 74,000,000 deadweight tons of shipping. At the present time the United States alone has between 56,000,000 and 57,000,000 tons of shipping, costing $17,000,000,000. Before the war we had 11,000,000 tons. The following number and types of ships are now owned by the United States Government and are under the control of the Maritime Commission:

C–1 type	110
Concrete C–1	22
C–2	218
C–3	146
C–4	75
P–2	19
Special and combinations	34
Liberty	2,500
Victory	527

Tankers	530
Liberty tankers	60
Small type tankers	90
Total	4,324

Out of this total of 4,324 ships there should be a ready domestic market for the 2, 3, and 4 C-types of ships, the special and combinations, and, perhaps, the tanker types. This is about 25 percent of the ships owned by the Government.

The Libertys and other types of ships are far less desirable. They are either too slow or do not contain the desirable cubic space. They were built for the war and did a good job, but are not economical or best suited for peacetime trade in competition with other maritime nations.

For nearly a year before the collapse of Germany, Britain was building specially designed ships for her peacetime trade. Further than that, she was not only building for herself, but she was also building ships for neutral Portugal's peacetime trade.

It is well-known that Sweden took advantage of her neutrality and has built over a million tons of the finest merchant ships afloat.

For months past we have been building ships for the Netherlands. The Sun Shipbuilding Co., in its Philadelphia plant, is building ships for that country that are comparable to our C–3's, which is the best type of ships we have.

During the hearings on this bill lasting over a year, your committee has been confronted with two schools of thought with particular reference to sections 8 and 9 of the bill. Section 8 provides for exchange of war-built vessels by allowing a turn-in credit for old or antiquated ships. Section 9 provides for an adjustment for prior sales to citizens, and it also contains an exchange provision.

Both sections are highly controversial.

One school of thought maintains that if the turn-in price is too low, owners of old vessels requisitioned by the Government will not negotiate with the Maritime Commission for war-built vessels, but will hold the Maritime Commission to its charter contract to put their old ships in class by reconditioning them. It was testified by the Chairman of the Maritime Commission that this cost might run as high as $20 a ton. This would defeat the very purpose of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The second school of thought holds the opposite view. Their conclusion is that if the Government allows too much for the turn-in value of old or antiquated ships, then the net return to the Government will be too low.

Mr. Speaker, while we are duty bound to get the best possible price for our surplus ships, we should also keep in mind that there is no law which compels an owner to turn in old ships for new ones. He will only do so if he feels he is getting just compensation for his old ship.

Mr. Speaker, the committee's task has been more complex due to the fact that the shipping interests themselves lack unity. They were divided into three groups—the subsidized operators, the nonsubsidized operators, and those not wanting a ship sales bill of any kind, in the absence of which they believed they would be able to buy our ships at any old price, as was the case following the First World War.

During the First World War it cost the Government $200 a ton to build ships, and they were sold after that war for as low as $5 a ton. That should not happen again.

Mr. Speaker, the Maritime Commission has sent four bills to committees of Congress having this legislation in charge in both bodies. I am unable to state which of these bills is better or worse in some of their provisions. The first bill absolutely discriminated against American ship owners in favor of foreign-flag operators. This discrimination was, of course, rejected by the committee. The last bill contains a big-stick provision which would allow the Maritime Commission to give preference to purchasers of our vessels who, in the judgment of the Commission, play ball, as against those who have the courage of their convictions. This discriminatory provision, if written into law, would establish a precedent which could be used by every department of Government in the sale of surplus commodities and the settlement of war claims.

With all of our vast tonnage we will not be as well equipped as foreign nations to meet the needs of foreign trade. Their scarcity of tonnage will be rapidly remedied by building new ships specially designed to meet the requirements of the routes they are to travel. This fact in itself will place the American merchant marine at a competitive disadvantage.

But further than that, Mr. Speaker, the interpretation placed on the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by the Civil Aeronautics Board has completely denied American ship operators equal opportunity of competition with every other maritime nation in the world. In denying the use of the air to our shipowners in foreign trade they have placed handicaps on the American merchant marine that create an unwarranted situation that can only be overcome by increased subsidies paid out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country. This particularly applies to passenger and fast-express traffic.

There is no doubt that the Government through the Maritime Commission would have received very much higher bids for the American President Line, which it took over, were this line permitted the right to operate air travel parallel to its surface routes. This is the only American-flag shipping company that has maintained an around-the-world passenger service and it had done this for many years prior to the war. As another result of the unwarranted action of the Civil Aeronautics Board there is no demand from American ship owners for the 19 P–2 war-built vessels owned by the Government. These ships cost $304,000,000. They are excellent, fast passenger ships, built to carry more than 500 passengers. They are not desired by American ship operators because they expect the action of the Civil Aeronautics Board will reduce transoceanic passenger travel in American ships to a minimum.

How much longer will Congress permit the Civil Aeronautics Board to hold the American merchant marine in a straitjacket and lash it to the mast of restriction. No other maritime nation has or would tolerate such a board.

Those who would interpose objections to a ship sales bill have yet to raise their voices anywhere in defense of an American merchant marine, such as is proclaimed in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, against bureaucrats in high Government positions who would reduce the American merchant marine to the level of a fleet of tramp steamers. The need for an adequate American merchant marine for our national security and peacetime economy is more necessary now than at any time in our history.

Mr. Speaker, with certain amendments to be offered to the bill by the committee, and, perhaps, by Members from the floor, as can be done under the open rule, the bill should be passed by the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from Admiral Vickery to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this rule. If this bill can be so amended as to be helpful to our merchant marine and at the same time do justice to the United States Treasury I shall support it. I am frank to state, however, that in the light of such consideration as I have given the bill I cannot support it in its present form.

The more I consider it the more I question whether it will serve to produce the results which it seeks. I fear that instead of a ship sale bill it will tend to become a ship gift bill. I fear also that it will open the door to washing up questionable claims of long standing against the United States in the field of ships requisitioned, in the field of charter hire, in the field of insurance, on a basis wholly different from that contemplated by the Congress under existing law.

I think that the bill should be drastically amended, and if it cannot be properly amended that it should be recommitted to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for further consideration.

I note in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that in a letter recently addressed to Senator BAILEY, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, the Director of the Office of Mobilization and Reconversion, Mr. Snyder, emphasized certain defects in this legislation which he considers serious, recommending a series of amendments.

Based on the bill in its present form, as I understand it, I believe that it is subject to the following comment and objections:

First. As a matter of law, there is ample authority today for the disposal of these wartime ships. Under the Surplus Property Act and other legislation, the Maritime Commission is specifically authorized to dispose of these ships on a

basis of competitive bids. No further legislation is necessary.

Second. This bill seeks to substitute for competitive bidding a ship-sale formula, as I understand it, of not less than 35 percent of the cost of construction of vessels delivered in the calendar year 1944. In other words, it seeks to impose a floor of 35 percent. The justification for this substitution, as I understand it, is the belief of those who should be in a position to know that the United States Treasury will realize more dollars under this formula than would be realized under the customary system of competitive bidding. I hope this is a fact. Frankly, I have grave doubts in my own mind that this will in truth prove to be the fact.

Third. The formula to which I have referred is, to say the least, most indefinite and most complicated. Its fundamental basis is that of construction costs which are not available. Again and again in the past as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have sought specific construction costs from the Maritime Commission, only to be told that they were not available. Repeatedly when costs have been furnished, it has been found that those costs have shown a wide variation from other costs furnished by the Commission in respect to the same ship or the same type of ship.

In a letter recently addressed by Admiral Vickery of the Commission to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], Admiral Vickery states in substance that the Commission is unable to state how the provisions of this bill will work, that the information obtainable is only fragmentary, and that only after final enactment of this legislation will it be possible to supply a more detailed estimate than is "appropriate" at this time.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the letter at this point in the RECORD:

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF SHIP SALES PRICES UNDER H. R. 3603, AS REPORTED ON JUNE 28, 1945

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington 25, D. C., July 26, 1945.

Hon. S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: You and other members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee have expressed interest in seeing about how the provisions of the ship sales bill as reported by the committee would work out with respect to principal types of vessels which would be available for sale under its terms. Accordingly, there is enclosed herewith a tabulation based upon preliminary estimates approximating the amount for which standard vessels of each of the principal types could have been constructed in the United States under normal conditions relating to labor, materials, and other elements of cost obtaining on or about January 1, 1941, which is the formula prescribed in the bill. Upon final enactment of the bill a much more detailed estimate than is appropriate at this time can be made, and some adjustment of the January 1, 1941, figures shown on this table may, therefore, be necessary, but it is believed that the figures will not be changed to such extent as to invalidate their use for present purposes.

The estimated cost of 1944 deliveries, based upon the best information obtainable at this time is necessarily, to some extent fragmentary, since most of the contracts involved are still open for purposes of audit, and some are still in course of execution. Here again, however, it is not believed that there will be any substantial change in the figures. While the calendar year 1944 is a typical period for use in fixing floor prices for the bulk of the ship construction covered by the bill, it has been found that in the case of the small carbo vessel (C1–M–AV1) figures based on 1944 construction would not be typical, since a very small number of this type were built in 1944, the bulk of the deliveries being in the middle part of 1945. For this reason floor prices based on 1944 are not shown for this type in the table. We have in mind suggesting an amendment which would enable the Commission to use a typical 6-month period for this type. Preliminary indications are that the cost of building the small cargo ships based on a typical 6-month period in 1945 covering the major deliveries of this type will be about $1,750,000 which would result in floor prices for this vessel of about $700,000 for subsidized citizens and about $612,000 for unsubsidized citizens.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD L. VICKERY,
Vice Chairman.

Fourth. The so-called floor of 35 percent, if I understand this bill correctly, will not, in fact, be the floor. With section 13 (a) in the bill, referring to replacement, alterations, and modifications for commercial operations, and section 8 in the bill, referring to the trading in of other vessels as a part of the purchase price of those under consideration, it would appear possible to go far below the floor prices specified in the bill.

Incidentally, I may mention that I am advised that the Export-Import Bank has already approved a loan of some $30,000,000 for the purchase of several ships by another government. It would appear, therefore, that in addition to the floor price and far less than floor price contemplated we also contemplate substantial financial assistance to foreign governments for the acquisition of these vessels.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman's comments, especially with reference to the floor price in section 8, are very well taken as regards the bill we now have before us. However, may I say that that is recognized in the committee, and it is the intention of the chairman later to offer certain committee amendments which will take care of the difficulties to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am glad to have that assurance from the gentleman from Michigan, a distinguished member of the committee in charge of this bill.

Fifth. Section 8 in its present form is particularly reprehensible, in my judgment, in the light of experence, because, as I understand, it allows a trade-in-credit against purchase prices under consideration up to the amount which the owner agrees would be the liability of the United States in the event of loss; in other words, up to the insurance value of the vessel traded in. Time and time again, Mr. Speaker, we have seen in the past a tremendous overinsurance of vessels by the Maritime Commission. I have myself put in the RECORD previously examples of insurance allowed to the extent of 1,400 percent of the book value of the vessel insured.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. May I say that section 8, as revised, now provides that no allowance on a turned-in vessel greater than 10 percent of the cost of the vessel being acquired can be allowed. What the gentleman has said is absolutely correct, but we have taken care of it in the committee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I hope that that amendment will be adopted when we reach that stage of the proceedings. The section in its present form cannot be justified.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. It was adopted unanimously by the committee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I again quote Mr. Snyder, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, in this connection. In the letter referred to he states: "Certainly there should be some drastic limitation placed on the trade-in allowance permitted." I agree with him.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. In addition to the adjustment on the trade-in allowances, I have an amendment I shall offer to the Committee which will also apply to the so-called inflated insurance values that were paid during the war, to which the gentleman from Massachusetts has referred. It will require a scaling down of those insurance claims that have been paid during the war period.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, my time is very short. The other matters which I desire to enumerate are the following:

Sixth. Section 8 (c), as I read it, authorizes the transfer of the ships which we are talking about in settlement of any claim against the United States in the field of compensation for requisition and in the field of indemnity for losses. It seems to be applicable to all such claims. No basis for valuing the ship transferred is prescribed. The valuation appears to be left to the discretion of the Commission. The section seems to open the door to adjustment of any of these outstanding claims on a basis very different from that originally contemplated by the Congress.

Seventh. Section 9 of the bill, as I understand it, contemplates the repayment of some $39,000,000 in respect to ship sales which have already been agreed to or actually executed. The sum in question will be largely payable to subsidized operators who have already enjoyed such liberal treatment from the Government.

Eighth. Section 10 in effect wipes out section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 providing for just compensation without enhancement because of the war. In effect it apparently says to the Maritime Commission, "You write your own interpretation of that section." This section again apparently permits an opportunity for cleaning up questionable outstanding obligations on a basis of agreement with the Commission rather than on the basis of existing law.

Ninth. Section 12 substitutes valuation under the Internal Revenue Code in respect to vessels reacquired by the United States for valuation under section 902 of

the present law and apparently limits the period of reacquisition to 5 years from the termination of the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, instead of permitting reacquisition in the event of any national emergency.

Tenth. Section 13 (a) authorizes the Commission to make such replacements, alterations, or modifications in respect to any vessel authorized to be sold or chartered and the installation of such special features as may be advisable to make the vessel suitable for commercial operation. The cost of this work is apparently left to the discretion of the Commission and deductible from the floor price for the vessel in question.

Eleventh. Section 13 (c) attempts to exempt Maritime Commission contracts for the construction of ships from section 202 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1934.

This section provides that any contracting agency shall terminate prime contracts for war production whenever, in the opinion of the agency, the performance of such contract will not be needed for the prosecution of the war—unless the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion finds that the continuation of some or all the work in process under such contract will benefit the Government or is necessary to avoid substantial physical injury to plant or property.

I again quote Mr. Snyder, Director of Mobilization and Reconversion, in this connection:

I can find no reason why ships should be exempted from this section of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act.

Twelfth. Section 13 (d) provides that all moneys received by the Commission under this act shall be deposited in the construction fund of the Commission.

The Commission has received for its construction fund since July 1, 1940, over $12,500,000,000. Six hundred million dollars of that has come from sources other than appropriations constituting a revolving fund which is not under the control of Congress. The War Shipping Administration has had in its revolving fund available for expenditure, according to the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, for the fiscal year 1946, over $1,543,000,000. I am opposed to further increasing the revolving funds available to either agency. If I had my way, I would make all such expenditures subject to the Congress.

One more quotation from Mr. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion:

Under the bill receipts from the sale of vessels would be placed in a revolving fund to be used by the Maritime Commission. Sound accounting practice requires that receipts of this type be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

And then he adds:

It would seem to me that the Congress would wish to retain its control over Maritime Commission appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. Snyder.

From time to time I have inserted certain tables in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which the Members will have in mind. Those tables, among other things, show 69 ships 20 years or more of age purchased by the Commission for $26,300,000, or seven times the book value of the ships.

They show 758 ships 20 years or more of age with a book value of $37,900,000, earning under charter $199,700,000 in 18 months.

They show 690 vessels 20 years or more of age with a book value of $34,500,000 and insurance allowed to the extent of $477,300,000, or 1,400 percent of the book value.

I hold in my hand at this time a tabulation prepared by Admiral Land, giving the "sound cost" of the steamship *Lafayette* just prior to the war as $178,301. I am officially advised that this ship was subsequently insured for $843,000 and given a trade-in allowance of $676,000.

I also include certain figures showing acquisition prices if based on book value as compared with bare-book charter hire paid and insurance allowed by the Commission in absence of acquisition:

Name of vessel	Acquisition price if based on book value	Date chartered	Months chartered	Charter hire paid to Apr. 1, 1945	Insurance carried by the Maritime Commission
Absoraka	$38,860	May 9, 1942	35	$1,299,000	$640,000
		May 26, 1942	34	2,104,668	694,744
Aqurdale	33,880	Apr. 4, 1942	36	1,313,100	555,750
Aquistar	33,880	Feb. 17, 1942	37	1,261,182	(?)
Alabaman	53,500	Nov. 24, 1941	41	1,746,108	(?)
Alamo	21,750	Mar. 14, 1942	36	896,766	383,294
Algic	37,630	Mar. 12, 1942	36	1,377,000	706,400
American Press	24,610	Mar. 9, 1942	36	1,252,800	599,925
American Star	31,230	Apr. 15, 1942	35	1,218,000	570,000
American Trader	42,158	Apr. 20, 1942	35	1,788,200	1,179,970
Arizonan	43,685	Mar. 10, 1942	36	1,670,400	(?)
Atlantic Trader	21,200	June 4, 1942	34	663,680	(?)
Cacique	28,840	June 6, 1942	34	816,014	318,600
Carolinian	53,213	Feb. 3, 1942	38	1,617,204	(?)
Cathlamet	48,060	July 1, 1942	33	1,232,550	663,900
Charles H. Cramp	44,880	May 9, 1942	35	1,430,380	798,575
Charles R. McCormick	40,000	Mar. 24, 1942	36	1,440,000	723,150
City of Philadelphia	21,735	June 6, 1942	34	883,575	322,425
City of Fort Worth	22,540	Nov. 14, 1941	41	812,362	317,175
City of Houston	22,500	June 1, 1942	34	1,440,000	317,175
City of Omaha	50,500	Mar. 11, 1942	36	992,250	738,075
Coast Shipper	26,500	Feb. 21, 1942	37	1,048,950	405,000
Colahee	50,050	Jan. 10, 1942	39	1,491,750	706,400
Coloredo	22,450	Mar. 25, 1942	36	898,128	377,250
Delnorte	42,140	Apr. 29, 1942	35	1,302,000	684,900
Dorothy	42,080	July 25, 1942	32	1,102,432	586,400
Dorothy Phillips	22,300	Jan. 3, 1942	39	787,449	248,250
Ellenor	28,820	Apr. 25, 1942	35	938,385	357,490
Falmouth	19,450	Aug. 5, 1942	32	750,304	311,250
Genevieve Lykes	22,400	May 7, 1942	35	800,870	303,750
Georgian	43,300	Feb. 2, 1942	38	1,763,200	(?)
Governor John Lind	31,300	May 9, 1942	35	933,450	(?)
Green Mountain	$48,100	Jan. 3, 1942	39	$1,450,800	$719,730
Hastings	42,200	May 6, 1942	34	1,383,290	821,792
Hamlin F. McCormick	41,500	July 8, 1942	33	893,607	386,850
Hawaiian	60,200	Jan. 9, 1942	39	1,611,675	(?)
Henry S. Grove	49,900	May 19, 1942	34	1,392,028	800,000
Hollywood	47,700	Mar. 25, 1942	36	1,344,960	652,791
Horace Luckenbach	54,860	Feb. 14, 1942	37	1,732,081	947,100
Jean	43,000	June 9, 1942	34	1,163,344	582,400
Jefferson Myers	51,100	Mar. 27, 1942	36	1,695,600	824,250
Kansan	29,100	Jan. 24, 1942	38	1,570,350	(?)
Mahimahi	48,800	Jan. 23, 1942	38	1,611,200	795,000
Makeweli	20,900	Apr. 4, 1942	36	793,512	285,740
Makiki	66,900	Feb. 16, 1942	36	1,400,561	695,381
Maliko	61,300	Mar. 13, 1942	36	1,549,152	879,014
Margaret Lykes	27,300	May 26, 1942	34	943,500	450,000
Meantieut	48,800	Mar. 20, 1942	36	1,400,292	702,975
Mokihana	49,130	Jan. 26, 1942	38	1,611,200	795,000
Monroe	41,100	June 4, 1942	34	1,116,900	(?)
Narbo	49,300	May 21, 1942	35	1,355,630	705,150
Nashaba	48,000	June 5, 1942	34	1,319,132	701,175
Nemaha	50,240	Mar. 5, 1942	37	1,480,000	738,075
Nira Luckenbach	37,050	Jan. 28, 1942	38	1,383,200	653,140
Nishmaha	49,500	June 5, 1942	34	1,327,006	705,900
Norfolk	23,020	May 23, 1942	34	571,616	177,450
Norlago	22,240	Dec. 11, 1941	39	892,710	315,000
North Haven	25,240	May 7, 1942	35	112,700	502,500
North Wind	21,670	May 11, 1942	34	178,760	302,000
Ozark	22,250	Apr. 10, 1942	36	872,172	321,600
San Antonio	22,200	June 7, 1942	34	822,358	321,075
Spencer Kellogg	54,080	Apr. 20, 1942	35	1,176,000	637,200
Susan V. Luckenbach	67,340	Jan. 8, 1942	39	1,924,600	936,700

The record of the past, Mr. Speaker, demands careful legislation at this time.

The Treasury must be safeguarded. The sins of the past must not be whitewashed.

Whether the bill can be put in proper shape on this floor or not, frankly, I do not know. If not, in my judgment it should be recommitted to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for further consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole and to include quotations from the so-called Harvard report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the

consideration of the bill H. R. 3603, with Mr. STIGLER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are privileged to have in the early consideration of the bill, the objections of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]. Many, if not all, will be met by committee amendments, which have been under consideration by the committee. I do not think it will be possible to meet all of them.

The bill is one of the most difficult bills that I have had anything to do with in my 27 years of service in this House. It far exceeds the 1936 act, which was considered by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries while I was serving as chairman. There are more complications; less unanimity among interests that ought to be united in presenting a bill. More questions have arisen than in any other bill we have considered. Its preparation has taken much more time than I could have desired and could have believed was possible, because we have gone over the bill many times, considered many prints, and tried to reconcile as nearly as we could, the various opposing interests. I doubt very seriously that any member of the committee would endorse every provision of the bill. It is the result of compromise, but through it all there has been a desire manifested that we should preserve and advance the interests of an American merchant marine; that we do not propose to give away ships to foreigners if we could help it, while we expected, as far as we could, and I think we have done it, to accord to them their just rights and privileges.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Should a qualified Great Lakes operator desire to purchase one or more vessels authorized to be sold under this bill and then move the vessel or vessels from salt water to the Lakes for operation there, I would ask the gentleman whether such sale at the statutory sales price defined in the bill is permissible.

Mr. BLAND. I do not know of any reason why they cannot operate them, because the bill provides for no restrictions. One of the things about which we had a great deal of trouble in the committee was whether there should be restrictions on the operation of these ships that are sold. The bill is confined to ships of 2,000 tons and above. If a Great Lakes operator bought these ships and could get them up to the Great Lakes, I do not see why he could not operate them.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Just to clarify the record for the future, while this bill does not specifically apply to what we ordinarily call the Great Lakes type of boat, the bill applying to ocean-going boats of 2,000 tons or more, nevertheless, there is no restriction as to their purchase by Great Lakes operators and subsequent removal to the Great Lakes for operation there.

Mr. BLAND. None whatsoever. I have talked with the legislative counsel who assisted us constantly and to whom I wish to accord full praise for having helped us very materially.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. He certainly did.

Mr. BLAND. Without his help we could not have gotten far. His patience, unending zeal, and devotion to duty has been marvelous. And also to men in the Maritime Commission. So far as that is concerned, if a vessel were built in the Great Lakes and she were 2,000 tons or more in size and they could get her to the ocean she would be able to serve commercial use in the ocean. I do not know why there would be any objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I desire to clarify the record for the benefit of the membership who may not be familiar with this bill. The gentleman, of course, appreciates that we passed special legislation covering the construction of 16 ore-type carriers on the Great Lakes which are not in any sense of the word under this bill.

Mr. BLAND. I believe what the gentleman says is absolutely true.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND. Something was said about our giving away ships. Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a surplus that was brought about to meet the need of wartime conditions. Admiral Land very well expressed the situation in his speech at Mobile, Ala., on National Maritime Day, and I think he expressed the same views before the Committee on Appropriations:

> It should be noted that we are dealing with a surplus commodity, and most of which I might add was built to be expendable in warfare. So we should determine a procedure about half way between scrapping war-built surplus ships and giving them away. It is an extremely difficult problem and any solution must be a compromise, because it will always be impossible to satisfy all hands.

Mr. Chairman, we had the situation confronting us after the last war where we had spent $3,000,000,000 for the establishment of a fleet; then we proceeded practically to give it away in order to establish a merchant marine, and rather than helping us it hurt. The Harvard report was prepared by a group from Harvard specially employed by the Maritime Commission and the Navy. This group prepared a report on the ship-disposal bill. This report is a fine collection of information available not only for present use but future use. Unfortunately it did not come to us until after our bill was reported; but I was gratified to hear Admiral Land say in a conversation recently that the bill we had prepared—and he did not agree with all of its provisions—complied 80 percent with the Harvard report.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman from Virginia, the very able chairman of the committee which reported out this bill has full knowledge of this subject and I have great confidence in his judgment about matters. I want to ask the gentleman with reference to our experience in the last war. I think the gentleman was on this committee at the close of the last war or shortly thereafter.

Mr. BLAND. I think it was 1922 when I went on the committee.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I recall after the last war there used to be at Solomon's Island a large number of ships that had been used in the last war. Among others there was the ship that carried President Wilson to the Peace Conference, the George Washington, that was out there wasting away. The question is, Are we profiting any by our experience of the last war in our disposition of the ships left over from this war? It looks rather wasteful to see a large number of those ships that were wasting away with time.

Mr. BLAND. We are trying to avoid that. Whether we will succeed or not the future must determine; but we have tried in the framing of our bill to have consciously in mind all the time the experience that we went through just after the other war, an experience which meant the sale of ships for as low as $5 a ton, practically given away. I recall how many times we were called on to consider measures for the relief of people who had bought these ships. Various attempts were made to get them out of the trouble they were in. The first act was in 1920. I was not on the committee at that time. Then there was the act of 1928 for the carrying of the mail; then another act in which the Government paid money for the construction of ships in its various efforts to get out of this difficulty, until in 1935 Franklin D. Roosevelt announced that we should call a subsidy by its true name and that the only relief was through subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, we are trying, so far as we can in the legislation here, to avoid increasing the subsidy and at the same time to take care of the ships nearer home, ships in the coastwise trade. At one time the ships in the coastwise trade were fairly well protected because no one could run in competition with them; however, the railroads came on and through the Florida Citrus Fruit case and other cases, it was held that if a lower tariff prevailed for the benefit of the ships the railroads would be permitted to lower their tariffs too. So now we have given them a slight preference in the differential.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it the gentleman's object by this legislation to give first opportunity in the sale of these ships to American interests?

Mr. BLAND. Absolutely. That is one thing we spent days and weeks upon. The first preference all up and down the line shall be given to Americans. There are ships here that might be good for the carrying of passengers, but because of the difficulty the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] has point-

ed out here as to the airplane competition there may be no demand for them, and may I add to what he says, that there is the further trouble that the airplanes are guaranteed their profits and the shipping companies have to fight for their profits.

When the bill was passed which established the Civil Aeronautics Board it was distinctly understood before our committee, before we withdrew the bill that we had then pending, that ships would be recognized and given equal rights as other means of transportation.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe that in dealing with the legislation pertaining to shipping we should treat ships on the same basis as aviation or any other form of transportation?

Mr. BLAND. The Lord knows I do, and I wish I could find out some way to carry it into effect.

Mr. RICH. When we in Congress treat everybody alike, then we need not fear legislation we put on our books. However, when you give subsidies to one industry or one branch of transportation different than you do to another, then you have to look out, because eventually it is going to catch up with you and you will find out you have done the wrong thing.

Mr. BLAND. I agree with the gentleman. The trouble is in knowing whether you are treating everybody alike. They come to you and offer plausible explanations and present very plausible claims so that frequently you do not know whether you are treating everybody alike or not. But I want to do that if I can.

Mr. RICH. One other question I would like to get an answer to. We want to get every dollar possible out of these ships for the benefit of the American Treasury, because we know that it is a sick-looking box, and we have to help it every way we can. After you give consideration to the sale of these ships to American individuals and American interests and they take all the ships they want, when you offer the balance of them to foreign countries you have to be careful that by so doing these vessels will not in the end do us a lot of injustice and take trade away from us in competition with American enterprise. Many of these vessels that are going to be sold abroad will be operated by labor and wages that are so much less than we pay in this country.

Mr. BLAND. If the gentleman can tell me how to place any restrictions that will be binding, all right, but I do not see how we are going to enforce them as to foreign countries.

Mr. RICH. One suggestion I would make is this, that after you sell all the good vessels, and you have some vessels left that you question whether they are worth very much, but you get a chance to sell them at a very cheap price, I think maybe you better junk them. That will be the best thing I think you can do to help the Treasury of the United States; that is, when they are so bad that you cannot operate them and our people will not take them.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. As to the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts who had the floor a few minutes ago, that the proceeds from the sale of these ships should go into a revolving fund and thereby Congress lose control of that money, does not the gentleman think it might be a better policy if that money was covered into the Treasury and Congress control it?

Mr. BLAND. The committee considered that. The original Merchant Marine Act of 1936 established a revolving fund. I would much rather see it continued under the present plan. I can realize the difficulties the gentleman fears. I do not know whether the provision is subject to a point of order. I think, if a point of order is made, I am going to try to defend against it, but to be perfectly frank with the gentleman, how far I will get with it I do not know.

Mr. DONDERO. The reason I bring up that point is this: The gentleman knows I have a very high esteem for his judgment. There is a feeling throughout the United States that Congress has already delegated too much of its power to other bodies and bureaus and has thereby divested itself of the proper control of the people's funds.

Mr. BLAND. Without committing anything with respect to this bill, I think there is a great deal of merit in what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Is it not a fact that the largest number of ships that will be surplus are of the Liberty type?

Mr. BLAND. Yes; it is. I am glad the gentleman called my attention to that, because the surplus ships very largely will be of what is known as the Liberty type. The Liberty type was adopted after a model of an English ship. It is slow in speed. Our men apparently do not want it. From a questionnaire that we conducted some time ago I do not know of anybody that seemed to want these vessels. I believe Admiral Land did testify that there might be possibly more interest in the purchase of some of these ships. The Liberty type is not a desirable type, not a type for which we are going to find a ready sale in this country.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. We will be able to sell hardly any of them to our home people.

Mr. BLAND. I think that is unquestionably true.

In a letter Admiral Land wrote when the application was made for the War Shipping Administration to be granted a certificate of convenience and necessity to operate coastwise and intercoastal ships, it is stated that there is no subsidy given and no relief except in this bill, a preferential relief of 5 percentage points on the sales price.

Mr. DONDERO. If the gentleman will yield further, what is the amount involved in the sale of these ships? Does anyone know, or was any intimation given to the gentleman's committee?

Mr. BLAND. If the gentleman is talking about the cost involved it was about $15,000,000,000, a little over that. What the returns will be I do not know. I think practically we may just as well forget about getting any ample return. Possibly, like other surplus war property, we may get I think 33⅓ percent, as much as they have been getting, and we may get something more than that, but I cannot say just exactly the amount involved. I do not know how much would be sold.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Some Member a few moments ago said something about a subsidy. There is no subsidy insofar as the operation of these ships is concerned, is there?

Mr. BLAND. This bill provides absolutely no subsidy. The only thing you could possibly call a subsidy is where they get the ship at less than its original cost. But there is no subsidy. There is this to be borne in mind. The subsidy we had under the 1936 act was one to give a construction differential in order to put our people on a parity with foreigners in the acquisition of ships. That payment went to the shipyard. Then there was an operating differential where an agreement was made to operate on essential routes and build up trade.

Someone said a while ago something about paying, that we want to do something for the Treasury. God knows I do. But I wonder if we want to lose sight of the fact that through the instrumentality of these ships sailing the seas, going to all the ports of the world, we may stand a chance of getting back some of that money and building up our foreign trade. As Admiral Land once said, "The pie may be a little small now, but we must help bake a larger pie." As President Wilson said in speaking of the American nations, we have to weave the delicate fabric of comprehension and understanding and agreement and friendship between them. Paraphrasing his remark, I say that we must weave the delicate fabric of comprehension between all of the nations of the world.

I look upon these men who go out in these ships on these essential routes as ambassadors of good will and as builders of trade. The Maritime Commission Academy at Long Island looks upon them in the same way because they are trying to educate them to be emissaries wherever they may go in building up the trade of America. If we settle our debts, we must rely not only upon our export business but we must have these ships carrying goods both ways.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The gentleman from Virginia has partially answered what I had in mind. The bill does not provide for subsidies. It is a fact, is it not, that purchasers of these ships would be entitled to the privileges of subsidies provided in the 1936 act?

Mr. BLAND. Of course. But they would not be entitled to a construction differential.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. No; but they would be entitled to the operating differential?

Mr. BLAND. We have a way of calling them all subsidies. They would not

be entitled to the construction differential, but if they used a ship on an essential trade route and then negotiated a contract with the Maritime Commission, I do not see any reason in the world why they should not qualify for an operating differential subsidy.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. In that case, they should be entitled to it.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. BOYKIN. The gentleman is speaking about the Treasury of the United States, which the gentleman from Michigan was inquiring about. Is it not a fact that the Maritime Commission has already made a trade to sell practically every one of the fast ships that we have, that is, all of them except the Liberty ships? I believe they testified that they have already been sold and the trade has already been made?

Mr. BLAND. I believe that is true in some cases.

Mr. BOYKIN. It will bring the Treasury a great deal of money. It will bring them at least this 33⅓ percent.

Mr. BLAND. It will bring them what we have not now and what we are not going to get in any other way.

Mr. BOYKIN. I believe that will satisfy the gentleman. I believe that is what he wanted to know.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. My suggestion that the money be covered into the Treasury of the United States does not necessarily mean that that money will be lost to the creation and maintenance of a maritime commerce with the rest of the people of the world. It does mean that the money would be under the control of Congress.

Mr. BLAND. That is true.

Mr. DONDERO. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. BLAND. That is true. I was directing my remarks to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Do I understand that some of the ships involved in this legislation have already been sold and that this legislation really will be a means of carrying out the transaction?

Mr. BLAND. Some of the ships have been sold, and it will be followed by a readjustment of contracts in which we readjust what they have been paid under certain conditions. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] will fully explain that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The deal has already been made with regard to many of these ships?

Mr. BLAND. With reference to some of them, subject, however, to revision of the terms of sale to comply with the terms of this bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We are talking about these subsidies being paid. I think the impression is left that we are not paying subsidies on account of these ships. The fact is that we are now paying subsidies if they comply with certain rules. Is that not correct?

Mr. BLAND. The operating subsidies were cut off in 1942.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We are not paying any of these subsidies now?

Mr. BLAND. No. I think I am correct in saying they are not paying those.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Under the act, we can go ahead and pay subsidies—that is, we are authrized to do that if we want to.

Mr. BLAND. I think so.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is, without enacting any further law?

Mr. BLAND. The act of 1936 still stands as to operating differentials. Those operating differentials are to take care of the difference between foreign and domestic operating costs. It is not a payment just as a gift, but it is to take care of the difference in wages and cost of maintenance, repairs, and other expenses incidental to the operation of the ship, to simply preserve a parity between them and our competitors.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So in all likelihood we will begin paying these subsidies again, will we not?

Mr. BLAND. Well, there is a probability that we will. I rather hope they will, because we must have that in order to meet other nations of the world.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand this measure, ships will first be offered to our own people in this country?

Mr. BLAND. They will.

Mr. SPRINGER. If any of the ships are disposed of to foreign governments, they will be required to pay dollar for dollar, according to the value of the ships they purchase. Is that correct?

Mr. BLAND. No. They are offered at the same price they are sold here. Otherwise, you will not sell them. There is a statutory sales price.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

They are offered to our people at a statutory sales price, which is fixed as to citizens. The price to foreigners is negotiable. That is the minimum.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it also true that those foreign governments will be required to pay cash for any purchases they make of that character?

Mr. BLAND. No; I think they are given the right to put a mortgage on them. They must pay one-fourth cash and the balance in not to exceed 20 years.

Mr. SPRINGER. But they are paid for partly in cash?

Mr. BLAND. One-fourth.

Mr. SPRINGER. And the remainder is secured?

Mr. BLAND. Yes. A condition in selling them is that the Maritime Commission shall satisfy themselves as to the solvency of the people to whom they are sold.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this has been a very involved, controversial, and complicated piece of legislation to work out. It is one on which we have spent about 15 months in committee, and on which we have spent many weeks at a time working very intensely. Our chairman, as usual, has been more than gracious and cordial to every member of the committee who wanted to express himself on the many features of the bill. I feel safe in saying that, despite all the handicaps under which the committee has operated, we are bringing to this floor a bill which, with certain committee amendments that will be offered tomorrow, is just about as good a bill as we knew how to bring out.

As has been said heretofore, the committee has been considerably hampered in its consideration of this bill, in working out various features. First of all, we had those in the shipping industry itself who desired that no bill be brought out in order that history might repeat itself, and once again, following this war, we again might be selling our ships which cost around $200 per ton at approximately $5 a ton. Then, naturally, we had those in specialized trades who represented to us in the committee from time to time and in our offices off the committee floor their own particular problems, requesting that special provision be made in the bill to take care of them.

Then we had many differences of opinion between the subsidized group and the unsubsidized group. I wholeheartedly favor the granting of subsidies of the operating and construction kinds, when necessary to maintain our merchant marine on the high seas.

It might be well to point out at this time that the Maritime Commission has seemed to be very partial toward the subsidized operator in its dealings with our committee on this bill. It seems to me well to point out that the commission prior to this war had designated some 30 essential routes on which operating subsidies would be paid, in order, to permit the American flag to sail in competition with foreign-flag ships on those particular routes. These routes are world-wide but it is of interest to note that about 25 of these routes were in operation and were divided up between about 12 subsidized operators. In the handing out of its operation subsidies, the Commission not only specifies the route which the company shall serve but directs when and how many ships shall sail on that route and in the event in its opinion it feels the service given is not satisfactory it can then either grant a franchise to another operator or order the operator to increase his service. Generally speaking, the fact is that the commission has frozen the operation of these 25 routes to the favored twelve and it has generally refused to permit any other lines to have access to any of these selected routes and it appears to look with disfavor on many of the nonsubsidized operators competing in parallel service on the subsidized routes, notwithstanding that in actual practice it develops that while the subsidized operators have been permitted to cling to their routes, nevertheless, on frequent occasions they have given but the barest service and actually made most infrequent calls to some of their designated ports.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, as I have previously said, I do feel that Congress was wise in enacting the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and in granting operational subsidies as a matter of principle when it was found impossible by and large for the American merchant marine to compete with foreign competition on all routes, operating as they do uniformly with much smaller crews, on a much lower wage scale than is paid the American seaman while at the same time most of these foreign lines were receiving financial aid from their own government.

At the same time, however, I have felt just as sincerely that when a shipowner operating under a free competitive system, such as ours—and I hope it always will be—gambles his own money, takes his own chances on facing the competition in a world-wide shipping industry, he is entitled to at least an even break, and I think he is entitled to a little more than an even break as compared with the subsidized shipping of foreign nations; and that has been provided for by adequate safeguards in the bill.

I believe the two fundamental principles we have to look at in the consideration of this bill are these: First of all, we want to maintain the American merchant marine paramount on the high seas of the world; and I say that despite the constant interruption we have had from the State Department seeking to undo that policy. I believe we are entitled to keep the American merchant marine on the high seas and in a dominant position; and yet back in the first of March 1945, in a report to the chairman of this committee signed by Joseph C. Grew, Acting Secretary of the State Department, we find this statement of policy on the part of the State Department:

The general policy adopted and developed to govern the postwar sale of Government-owned merchant vessels should be in close harmony with a broad foreign economic policy which will best serve the national interests of the United States. In the postwar disposal of its merchant vessels, the Government of the United States might seek to pursue a narrowly nationalistic policy involving undue emphasis of short-range considerations.

In fact, I say that is subject to some question.

It might seek to advance its national shipping interests by endeavoring to utilize its somewhat monopolistic position as the owner of the major portion of the world's ocean-going tonnage to force increased participation by American shipping in the internationally commercial traffic of immediate postwar years.

Well, why should we not, unless it is the determination of the State Department that we shall forever remain a fifth- or sixth-rate maritime nation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask where we and our allies would have been if it had not been for the rapid expansion of the American merchant marine? Yet now it is the policy of the State Department to want to give this merchant marine away to the other countries of the world.

The State Department continues:

Such a policy could have only limited and temporary success, and it would be distinctly out of harmony with the broad policy of promoting the flow of trade through the reduction of nationalistic restrictions and discriminations.

Get this:

If the Government of the United States were to attempt to take advantage of the war losses of other countries and of the wartime increase in its own merchant fleet to establish itself in a dominant shipping position, it would be acting contrary to its basic policy of promoting sound international economic relations and an increasing flow of commerce. Spokesmen for the shipping industry have themselves repeatedly expressed recognition of the fact that the successful development of this broad policy will be of vital importance to the health of the shipping industry in the postwar period.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Would the gentleman care to make some comment with reference to subsection (d) of section 13 on page 21 of the bill which provides for a revolving fund for the moneys received from the sale of ships? Why did the committee decide on putting that section in the bill?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Yes; I believe I can answer the gentleman. The justification advanced by the Maritime Commission is simply that these ships were built by the Maritime Commission out of their construction fund. So they say the money from the sale of these ships must be replaced in the fund if we are to continue building a merchant marine.

Mr. DONDERO. The point I make is that Congress thereby loses control of those funds. Would it not be much better to have the proceeds covered into the Treasury and when appropriations are required, let the Maritime Commission come here and justify any demands that it might make for the building or the sale of other ships?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. There was some question about that raised in the committee, and at one time our committee struck that provision from the bill.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I am sure the gentleman wants the record correct, and it might be incorrect unless I misunderstood the gentleman's answer. He said that the money that these ships were built with, or at least a part of the money, came from a revolving fund of the Maritime Commission. These ships were built with special appropriations.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I did not mean to say that.

Mr. BONNER. The revolving-fund money is not tied up in these ships.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. They were built with funds that had been appropriated to the Maritime Commission.

Mr. BONNER. Specifically appropriated as wartime funds, not as peacetime funds.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. That is true.

Mr. BONNER. The revolving fund is a peacetime fund.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I think some of the money for the construction of these ships may have come from the revolving fund.

Mr. BONNER. As I remember the testimony, I do not recall that any money other than specifically appropriated wartime funds was used in the construction of these ships. If I am incorrect I would like to know.

Mr. BLAND. How about the C-ships?

Mr. BONNER. I would like to be corrected if I am incorrect. Of course, I am like the gentleman over here; I expect to raise a point of order against this very item and have it revert back to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I appreciate the gentleman's position and shall support him here as I did in the committee.

Mr. BONNER. I do not think the returns from these ships should go to the Maritime Commission and be used in the revolving fund. Specific funds should be appropriated, if that becomes necessary.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I shall support the gentleman's position.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am wondering how in the world that got in the bill unless the Maritime Commission wanted it in there.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Let me repeat exactly what the Chairman has told you and what the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] told you. This is the fourth bill that has come down to us from the Maritime Commission and, in addition to that, we have had about six or seven committee prints of every one of them. Every time the Maritime Commission has come down to us it has come down with a new suggestion and we have had an awful time trying to work out a bill without stepping on the toes of the Maritime Commission because they change their mind about as often as the day is long.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to this matter of policy. Reference was made some time ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], to a letter which Mr. John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, sent to Senator BAILEY under date of September 25. I will put the exact wording of the letter in my extension of remarks:

In general, may I urge upon the committee the desirability of looking at the ship-disposal problem as part of the over-all question of international trade and commerce and foreign policy. This bill is conceived too narrowly. We live in a world in which our own safety and prosperity are directly dependent on the maintenance of friendly relations with other countries and on their economic progress as well as our own. As you know, the President has made this his policy and he believes that it should be followed in the case of ship disposal as well as in all other aspects of our foreign relations.

Yet all through our deliberations on this bill the White House has always called it a "rush bill"—a "must bill"—

and I for one congratulate each and every Member for sincerely thinking of America first.

We find in here that the Office of Reconversion goes still further than the State Department when the State Department tells us we should not take advantage of our dominant position today to monopolize world trade in the future. The Office of Reconversion proposes, if you please, that we sell ships to aliens or to foreign purchasers on exactly the same basis that we sell them to our own nationals. They recommend further that we charter these ships to foreigners. Now, if you charter a ship to a foreigner, it must be remembered that he is going to use that ship and wear it out as fast as he can in a few years, then turn around and get a new ship, probably better suited to his trade, out of his own profit and built abroad.

Thus the American owner, the American taxpayer, and the American laboring man all stand to lose. The American seaman loses the chance to operate those ships in world trade; the American shipyard worker loses the right to repair or reconstruct those ships; the American operator loses the profit that he would make from the operation of same and from which he pays his taxes for the support of our Government. Mr. Chairman, is it not about time that somebody in this country give some thought to looking out for America first instead of laying awake nights figuring out how we can give away our sum and substance to every other nation in the world? And I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the Maritime Commission itself, who are supposed to be the ship operating and construction experts in charge of our maritime industry, themselves thoroughly disagree with the policies of the State Department and of Mr. Snyder.

Yet in this connection, it is well to call the attention of the gentleman from Kansas to the fact that the first bill we got from the Maritime Commission provided that we would discriminate against an American buyer to the extent of making an unsubsidized American buyer pay 100 percent more than a foreign purchaser of these ships.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Who in the world would want to do that?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The Maritime Commission sent that in as their first bill. They wanted to penalize the American operator who is operating without a subsidy, to the extent of having him pay 100 percent more than a subsidized operator or a foreign purchaser.

In the first bill presented to us in the Seventy-eighth Congress by the Maritime Commission, they proposed that the subsidized operator and the alien purchaser would be permitted to buy our ships at 50 percent of the prewar domestic cost and would be required to make a cash down payment of 12½ percent, the balance to be spread out over 20 years at 3½ percent. And they proposed further that the foreign purchaser would be permitted, with the approval of the President, to take advantage of the lending facilities of any agency of the Government that the President specified, to borrow the money to make his down payment and his future payments and furthermore that the President could suspend the payments any time he chose to do so; but the nonsubsidized operator would have to pay the full prewar domestic cost, exactly double that of the other two groups, would have to pay 25 percent down in cash and spread the balance out over 20 years but he would presumably not be given the privilege of borrowing the money either from the Government or from any private institution at any such low rate of interest as the foreign operator.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman could not find justification for doing that.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I should say not, nor could any member of the committee on either side of the aisle. But here is Mr. Snyder proposing almost the same thing, and he also wants us to take in for trade-in the old foreign hulks and, as the Maritime Commission bill first provided for, let them come to an agency of this Government and borrow the money to pay for them.

And just this past week, under date of September 26, none other than Mr. Harold D. Smith, Director of the Budget, on the stationery of the Executive Office of the President—so we can assume that he speaks for the President—brought forth very much the same proposals as Mr. Snyder advances.

I also want to point out to the gentleman from Kansas that at the very time we were discussing the first bill, with its outlandish proposals to favor the foreign purchaser, our State Department, with all the magnanimity in the world, executed a lend-lease agreement with France in which they proposed to turn over to them $200,000,000 worth of ships at 1½ percent interest when we are charging our own buyers 3½ percent interest on the balance. They had that written into the lend-lease agreement. But you can thank this committee for causing the canceling of that agreement right then and there.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gracious gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. May it not be said that this is a committee bill prepared by the committee from all of the information it could get?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman and it has been brought forth by the committee despite bureaucratic efforts to emasculate it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman spoke of Mr. Snyder. Did he appear before the committee and testify with respect to this matter?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. He has not been before the committee, and in view of the fact that this Congress specifically took out of the control of his organization the disposal of these ships, what we are trying to find out in committee, all the way from the chairman down, is what right he has to stick his nose in here. He was specifically cut out of the picture by act of this Congress. As a matter of fact, he was not even in office until after all the hearings had been completed on this bill and most of the bill perfected as near as we could get it.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. With respect to the proposed French sale that he just spoke of, the gentleman, of course, will include in the RECORD the statement that that was by unanimous action of the committee?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Absolutely.

Mr. BONNER. All sides agreed.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Absolutely. The committee was up in arms on that particular sale to the French, and we also knew that it was the apparent intent of some other allies to come in and ask for ships themselves, if we were generous enough to let them have them at 1½ percent, with the additional proviso that the President, who at that time was Mr. Roosevelt, could suspend the payment for these ships indefinitely.

Mr. BONNER. The same condition existed as to discrimination between citizens and noncitizens.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Absolutely. Our committee has been seeing eye to eye on this legislation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I feel that I have been led somewhat afield by these very timely and important questions that other members of the committee sitting here today have asked. I stated some time ago that our first interest in the consideration of this important legislation was to keep the American merchant marine on the high seas and in its present dominant position, the State Department to the contrary notwithstanding. Our second consideration is in protecting the taxpayers of this country, to see to it that they get just as much return from the sale of these ships as it is possible to receive and still maintain our primary objective of keeping the American merchant marine paramount. So, in our consideration of this second point, we must appreciate that we are in the position today of a merchant who has his shelves heavily overstocked and has to conduct a bargain sale in order to reduce his inventory of goods which will otherwise spoil and go to rot. We could, of course, set a high price on these vessels that would theoretically return to the taxpayer every dollar he put into them but they would not be salable at that price. Our basic yardstick throughout this question of price determination is, of course, the competition from foreign shipyards. Representatives of the Maritime Commission, who are supposed to know, have told us that in the prewar days, foreign yards could build ships at just about one-half the cost of our American yards with our shorter working hours, higher wages, and high overhead, to say nothing of possibly higher taxes. As I previously noted our own operators are faced with low-cost foreign competition in the operation of their ships and, consequently, unless they can buy these ships at a price that will permit them to compete with the low foreign costs and return them a reasonable return on their investment, they are certainly not going to be in the market. Therefore, we started out on the basic

premise that in fixing the statutory sales price, we had to meet the prewar foreign cost, which was one-half our prewar domestic cost. Now as I have said previously, the Maritime Commission in their first proposal would have penalized the nonsubsidized citizen purchaser to the extent of 100 percent of the price they set for the subsidized citizen or alien purchaser. The committee was unanimously opposed to that principle, of course; and we jockeyed back and forth with various proposals to narrow this differential and the figures we have arrived at in setting up the statutory sales price is a compromise—but a compromise that has been generally acceptable to the industry and was to the Maritime Commission until just recently in the hearings over on the other side of the Capitol on this same legislation. They now recommend "all buyers be treated alike"—despite the fact that they have permitted in wartime the subsidized operators to continue to pile up a huge tax-exempt fund from charter hire paid them.

Starting with the basic premise of 50 percent of prewar domestic cost equaling the price at which the Commission felt the foreign yards presumably could build these ships in the postwar world—as they did in the prewar world—nevertheless, we felt that their costs would be bound to rise in the postwar world and, therefore, penalized the foreign buyers and the subsidized operator a matter of 5 percent so that the statutory sales price to them is 55 percent of the prewar domestic cost, and to the nonsubsidized citizen, 50 percent of the prewar domestic cost. This, of course, leaves out all costs which have gone into the defense features which items will, of course, be removed by the Maritime Commission.

In the case of tankers we had a great deal of discussion. Admiral Vickery, vice chairman of the Maritime Commission, told our committee that tankers should under no consideration be chartered to foreigners nor to our own citizens; that they could all be sold outright at 100 cents on the dollar of the prewar domestic cost and would then still represent a distinct saving to our purchasers. The tanker operators are not subsidized and no tankers have ever been constructed with the aid of construction differential subsidies. About 74 percent of all our prewar tankers under our flag were operated by the major oil companies and carry their own products. The remaining 26 percent—most of which were operating on coastwise service—were operated by independent operators who are contract carriers for some of the larger companies and other independent oil producers, and in addition carry quite a few allied liquid cargoes, such as molasses. So far as I can recall, none of the major oil companies has made any representations before our committee complaining about the cost of the proposed price on these tankers. However, some of the independent tankers did make representations to us in our early hearings, and just recently have become vociferous in their demands, that they be treated on a par with the dry-cargo vessels and that the 75 percent of prewar domestic cost, as set out in this bill as their statutory sales price, be reduced to 50 percent. Frankly, our committee discussed this tanker price question at considerable length and the 75-percent figure was thought to be a fair compromise.

There is also this question of chartering tankers, which as I have said was definitely recommended against by the Maritime Commission and others because of the fact that tankers deteriorate very rapidly and carry a high maintenance cost. Obviously then, if provision were made for chartering out tankers, the operators might conceivably wear them out rather quickly, turn back junk to the Commission, and then purchase them from foreign yards and for operation under foreign flag in the off-shore postwar trade. They will probably do that anyway if we were to follow the original recommendation of the Maritime Commission and sell them at 100 percent of the prewar domestic cost, as they have every right to assume that the foreign shipyards will in all probability be able to build these at approximately half our cost if they can build a dry cargo ship at half our cost.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that if the amendments which have been adopted by our full committee are accepted by the House tomorrow this bill is just about as good as can be turned out, having in mind, first of all, the welfare of the American taxpayer, American labor, and our American operators; secondly, the welfare and maintenance of the American merchant marine on the high seas and, thirdly, the national defense and well-being of this country.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the problem has been discussed here as relates to the question of subsidies. Of course, this particular bill has nothing to do with subsidies as such. Subsidies, of course, were provided under the Merchant Marine Act, and the purpose of that originally was to have a construction differential and an operating differential. The purpose of the construction differential was to assist domestic shipowners in the difference in costs of ships construction in American yards and employing American labor as compared with foreign yards and labor. There were those in this country who went so far as to openly express statements that they could get cheaper ships in foreign yards. We knew that to be true. But, at the same time, there was unemployed American labor. There was this important feature, too. Had American ships been constructed in foreign yards, if war had come, as it did subsequently, we would have been caught, and those ships would have been in those foreign yards and could have been seized by these foreign governments.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. It was the men who learned the know-how in American yards that permitted the necessary expansion of those yards.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. That is right. The original yards built for the purpose of constructing American ships under construction subsidies became the yards that ultimately trained the workers in the other yards of this country, because we had gotten to the point where we failed to build ships and we failed to provide the necessary ship-construction workers in this country.

For a period of 15 years immediately prior to the passage of the Merchant Marine Act there were only two American merchant ships built in American yards. We had gradually gone down so that we were almost ashamed of the record in this country, until we did make an honest effort to provide a United States Merchant Marine Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It is also a fact that at that time we were carrying only about 9 percent of our foreign trade in American bottoms.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. That is correct. To give you some idea of the difference at that time and as of today, and as to the prewar situation, out of the world tonnage of 82,000,000 tons we had only 12,000,000. Today, out of the estimated 96,000,000 that there will be under the 1945–46 program 58,000,000 tons will be American ships as against 38,000,000 foreign ships. The figures stand a little bit more in our favor right as of today.

As to the operating differential, the purpose of that was to have American shipping so we would have a merchant marine on the high seas, in order to have a reserve fleet in time of war and to train merchant seamen. Naturally, the American merchant marine could not compete with the low living conditions of the sailors on many of the foreign ships, with the type of food they served, with the cheap maintenance costs, and with the low wages. The only way to have American ships on the high seas, manned by American sailors, was to have that differential provided. Congress provided for it in an open, straightforward way, calling it that, and that was what it did. It assisted us in training merchant seamen, building ships and training workmen, and building yards that could expand and train others.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not also true that prior to the war some of our cargoes were being carried by Axis ships?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. That is right.

I want to pay tribute at this time to the Congress that passed that act, and to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], and its distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]. These two Members of Congress deserve great praise from the American people for their foresight. The Merchant Marine Act was not passed without considerable objection. Week after week they had to study and take testimony and then present it to the Congress. It was one of the great, important things we did, because when war came on those ships that were built were worth more than their weight in gold. We can every day be thankful for the fact we did that because of the experienced seamen and experienced workmen who were developed and who trained others.

Now we approach the time when today we have the greater portion of the world's shipping. We have more ships than we can use. What does this bill say? It provides for a national defense reserve fleet:

The Commission shall place in a national defense reserve (1) such vessels owned by it as, after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, it deems should be retained for the national defense, and (2) all vessels owned by it at the expiration of 2 years from the cessation of hostilities.

First, what happens? There is a national reserve fleet. Then we sell to our American buyers, and then we sell to foreign buyers. There is a recognition of the fact that we need these ships for that purpose.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Under this act we can sell ships abroad, but there is nothing in here that gives anything away to any other power?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No; it does not give them away. The purpose of this committee was to give the advantage as far as possible to American shipping.

As stated very ably a few minutes ago, this is a committee bill. It is the result of considerable study. Subcommittees were appointed and subcommittees took days and days on a single section—in some instances on a single subsection—and then the full committee took days, weeks, and even months of consideration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This bill provides the method by which these ships are to be disposed of?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Statements have been made on the floor of the House that quite a number of the ships have already been sold or have been negotiated for. Can the gentleman give us any idea as to the amount involved with respect to those that have been sold?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I do not have that. I think a portion of that is in the RECORD. But they have not been sold under this act. Under the regular Merchant Marine Act, as ships were constructed they were sold under that act. There is a provision in this for certain adjustments of those who went ahead because there was a provision in those contracts that adjustments would be made. It would be manifestly unfair to have a man to go ahead 3 months ago with this act coming and charge him without having some formula by which there could be an adjustment made.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I understood the chairman to say there was about $15,000,000,000 worth of property involved in this legislation.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. That is the total over-all cost of the ship-building program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the estimated cost.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes, but the cost with reference to the actual sales of properties is not necessarily relative any more than would be the cost of a cannon or an armored tank or a truck or a small boat if you were to sell that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I understand that.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Of course, that is true because war costs are many times what the prewar costs were.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Then we have another element. We are dealing with surpluses. We have so many ships and we are trying to sell them. We would rather have them on the high seas carrying American goods as well as carrying on foreign commerce than to have them placed in the mouths of rivers and bays. We are going to have to put some of them in the mouths of rivers and bays anyway. We are going to have to build that reserve fleet, but we want an active merchant fleet.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. The reserve fleets in the river will cost about $5,000 a ship to get in condition and they would not be in good condition even then.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. That is right. We are going to try to get them on the high seas so that they can carry American commerce and thus afford employment and wages to American seamen and carry goods and good will and build up trade throughout the world.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. When the money necessary for the building of these ships was required, the merchant marine came before the proper committee of Congress and asked for the appropriation of these funds. Is that not correct?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. In part, yes. In part, no. They had a revolving fund. Once you gave them an appropriation, and they built a ship and then sold that ship, they could go to that fund and build again.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Could the gentleman tell us approximately how much you have already recovered from this $15,000,000,000?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I do not have those figures. A portion of that is in the record and will probably be developed. It changes frequently.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL].

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the pending ship bill it becomes not only desirable but necessary to have the facts and the background on what is to be sold; and also to have some picture of the situation as it appears based on meager data offered by the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration.

The elementary facts may be simply stated. Because of having had to fight a global war, the United States has built and operated the world's largest merchant fleet at a cost of over $21,000,000,000, consisting of more than 5,000 ships. With the war ended, it is proposed to sell and dispose of the Government's war-built fleet, because it is a fundamental American principle that our merchant marine should be privately owned and operated by free Americans. However, it goes without saying that the proposal to sell these ships contemplates provision for an adequate military reserve.

With private ownership and operation being a settled American principle, the manner of sale of such war-built ships, is the purpose of this legislation.

As to whether the present bill constitutes the best method of assuring the maintenance of an American merchant marine, sufficient to carry our domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce, and in addition sufficient to serve as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war, is the matter under consideration.

At this point it should be said that at no time during the extended hearings on this bill, no one suggested that we should change the principle of private ownership and operation for one of Government ownership and operation.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. It is true, however, that where we have a subsidized route the Maritime Commission has very close control over that operation, has it not?

Mr. WEICHEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. It was also indicated to us many times by members of the Maritime Commission from Admiral Land down that seemingly they favored the subsidized operator so that they could keep closer control over our merchant marine?

Mr. WEICHEL. The Maritime Commission seemed to act as if they were guardians of the subsidized lines, and are forever looking out for their welfare.

Of course, we are all aware that Government ownership and operation will probably come unless peacetime merchant shipping can be restored as a desirable American business.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. Was not that the result of the operation of our merchant marine after the last war? We had disastrous operation by the Government, at a considerably larger cost than even subsidies.

Mr. WEICHEL. It was most disastrous, and insofar as we can, as the chairman knows, this bill is designed to stop the chaos that occurred at the end of the last war.

While this bill is being considered as a means of taking these war-built ships from Government ownership and operation to private ownership and operation, a brief review of what the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration have done with more than $21,000,000,000 might be desirable in order to understand and present proposals of the disposition of this war-built fleet.

Previous to the war emergency, the Maritime Commission was the governmental agency dealing with merchant marine affairs. As the emergency developed the First War Powers Act was enacted by the Congress and under its authority the President established by Ex-

ecutive order the War Shipping Administration. When this was accomplished the supposed arrangement was, that the Maritime Commission would devote its efforts to the construction of ships and the War Shipping Administration to the operation of ships. These two agencies have had under their control the expenditure of more than $21,000,000,000. However, the personnel of both agencies was identical in many instances and it was hard to determine when the same people were speaking for the Maritime Commission or were speaking for the War Shipping Administration. These vast expenditures might bear further examination, for they surely got off to a fine start in May 1941, when they approved approximately $32,000,000 for 119 trips from the Atlantic coast to the Red Sea and back, out of which the admitted profits were nearly $27,000,000. The charters approved were so lavish that one owner whose ship had a depreciated value of $3,100 was given the huge sum of $338,000 for one round trip taking less than 200 days and still had his own ship. Since the public exposure of the giving away of approximately $27,000,000, spokesmen for the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration now say the rates were too high. When legislation was introduced in an effort to bring back these moneys to the Public Treasury the report claimed that it was not necessary to enact legislation for the recovery of money from specific persons and that the money was being voluntarily returned.

Up to this time there has been one voluntary contribution of $100,000, and that by the American President Lines, the stock of which is almost entirely owned by the Maritime Commission. While Admiral Land now says that the Red Sea profits of $27,000,000 were exorbitant, this is a small sum in comparison with the $329,000,000 tax-exempt fund built up in the Maritime Commission. The Commission well knew that the act of 1936 did not contemplate placing huge wartime profits in tax-exempt funds, while others paid as high as 95 percent on their profits. This information was not offered to the committee by the Maritime Commission but was only secured by request when it was brought out in questioning by the testimony of the subsidized lines as to the existence of this vast tax-exempt fund.

I wonder how much information is locked in secrecy with the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration that should have been given to the committee for the consideration of this legislation.

Coming now to the building of ships by the Maritime Commission, in many instances the Commission purchased the land upon which the yards were built, erected the buildings, installed the machinery and equipment, paid for all the material and labor used in the building of ships, and paid executive salaries as high as $25,000 each for merely carrying out the blueprint instructions provided by the Maritime Commission. With the Treasury of the United States paying for each item that went into the building of the yards, the building of the ships, and the payment of labor, yet the Maritime Commission paid out millions of dollars to people who had absolutely no investment whatsoever in the yard, the material, or any other item connected with the building of the ships, and the Maritime Commission gives the simple answer that they paid these people vast sums simply because of moral assets, a new kind of theory and excuse for the paying out of Government money.

I want to say at this point that we have a statement that has been prepared, although it seems they might have confused the investigator. We received this information in 1944. God only knows what happened after that. Here is what the Maritime Commission did.

There are a number of yards set forth in this memorandum that the Maritime Commission paid $371,000,000 to build and equip, and, as I told you before, it paid for the labor, material, and everything that went into the yards, so that the Government owned every stick in the yards. They owned the complete ship. In spite of that, the Maritime Commission up to November 30, 1944, paid or agreed to pay the contractor who did not have a dime in it, for whom everything was paid, over $150,000,000 for doing nothing, for having no investment. It is the first time that I ever heard of such a theory in the paying out of Government money.

Admiral Land said in his testimony before the committee one day, in talking about paying these people $150,000,000 when they did not have a penny of investment:

> I have been arguing all morning that it is not based on principle, practice or statutory requirement.

Can you imagine giving away up to that time $150,000,000? Nobody knows how much more has been given away. It is the first time that any one has heard of paying somebody $150,000,000 for blessing the spending of Government money. That has been unheard of up to this time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The story the gentleman is telling is not only interesting but it is astounding.

Mr. WEICHEL. It is all printed in the record.

Mr. MICHENER. I wonder what this $150,000,000 was for? Cannot the gentleman give us anything more definite than the statement that it was to strengthen and secure moral assistance or was considered as a moral asset payment?

Mr. WEICHEL. The statement of the Maritime Commission was that these contractors had absolutely not a single penny of investment in these yards, and, in addition, the Maritime Commission paid for all the labor, it paid for all the help and it paid for so-called executive brains up to $25,000 a year for simply following a blueprint. As if that was not enough, the Maritime Commission bestowed upon these gentlemen $150,000,000 more, as a sort of a blessing, you know, for their good will. They must have been very fond of them.

After the President had declared an emergency, the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration had the right under sections 802 and 902 of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, to requisition for title every ship flying the American flag. Section 802 applies to ships built under the 1936 act and provides that in the event of the requisition for title, the ship owner should have his investment returned. Section 902 applies to unsubsidized ships and provides that "just compensation" shall be paid in the event of requisition for title. As to the ships built by the Maritime Commission for the subsidized lines and for which the United States Treasury paid one-half of the cost of construction, the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration did not make full use of their statutory authority and requisition all the ships of the subsidized lines. That was the very purpose of paying for half of them in the first place, so that when the war came on you could take them for title. They had the authority but they did not do it. They took a few of them. They did not take for title the ships of the subsidized lines but only requisitioned them for use, paying lavish charter hire and secret subsidies by way of excess insurance and other arrangements.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I might say to the gentleman that I have an amendment which will adjust the insurance allowances that have been paid during this war period to conform with the trade-in allowances of section 8 as amended by the committee amendment for the ships; that will place these people who have been paid insurance allowances under wartime valuations on the same basis as provided in the committee amendment to section 8.

Mr. WEICHEL. That would probably fit in.

Mr. JACKSON. That will make a saving, incidentally, of approximately $135,000,000 to the United States Treasury.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Is it not a fact that considerable controversy arose with respect to the interpretation of section 902 and finally the President appointed a committee consisting of Judge Hand, Judge Hutchison, and Judge Parker, who rendered findings and thereafter payments were made in accordance with their findings?

Mr. WEICHEL. Yes. There was considerable difficulty with reference to arriving at fair value. The only way provided by law and the Constitution of the United States is through the courts, and the Maritime Commission appeared before the committee and are now over in the other body demanding that you give them a right to handle affairs coming from the Maritime Commission. And if you do not take their figures and demands, you cannot purchase under this bill.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman knows I am not in favor of that.

Mr. WEICHEL. I know that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I observe from the report of the committee that all of these ships, all this tonnage, have been put into a pool for use by the United Nations. How many tons does the United States have in this pool?

Mr. WEICHEL. To answer that question, I will say that that has always been considered a military secret up to the time of the war, and I think it is still a military secret. Nobody will tell you anything about it. I remember asking a representative of the Maritime Commission appearing before the committee that question, and when you ask them how many tons they evade the question. Every American ship that floats is under the control of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration and flying the American flag is in the pool. Not only that, but as fast as we built ships and needed them, we chartered them to certain foreign nations for a nominal sum, and the Maritime Commission would never tell us whether it was $1 or $10 a year. But I do know this, that after they were in the pool, our ships, ships which we built with our money, we had to pay for every American soldier who was hauled across as well as paying for hauling supplies to help the other nations.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understand we have around 58,000,000 tons.

Mr. WEICHEL. That is what I understand.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is, 58,000,000 tons of American ships, either owned by the Government——

Mr. WEICHEL. No; these are the ones that are owned by the Government that we are talking about, absolutely owned by the Government.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They are in this pool?

Mr. WEICHEL. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What does this bill do with this 58,000,000 tons? Do we get our ships back?

Mr. WEICHEL. We get the ships back after it is agreed that the pool be dissolved. The pool can run for 6 months after the cessation of hostilities. The selling of these ships would be subject to the agreement entered into by this Government with reference to the pool.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How many millions of tons will be required for the American merchant marine in peacetime? How much of this will be surplus, and how much will our Government need to carry on its merchant trade?

Mr. WEICHEL. According to some people in the State Department and according to some in the Maritime Commission who are following instructions for the administration, we would be right back where we were at the beginning of the war, to the pitiful tonnage of about 9,000,000 tons, and subject to the great maritime nations like Great Britain.

With reference to these 58,000,000 tons, it has been the contention of the committee on both sides that we should retain our maritime supremacy, but on the other hand the Maritime Commission and the State Department have devised all kinds of ways of either giving it away for nothing or giving it away in a manner which amounts to nothing, and getting us back to 9,000,000 tons. The gentleman referred to how much of this tonnage we should keep. One spokesman in making an analysis said, "If I have an apple, the greater the part I give away to you the better you will like me." So that is the philosophy the State Department and some people in our Government are following. They believe the more of our merchant marine we give away the better we will be liked.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We followed that policy with money and other things.

One other question: How much merchant-marine tonnage does Great Britain have? How much does she have in this pool?

Mr. WEICHEL. At the present time that would seem to be a military secret. We have never been informed how much each other nation has in the pool. But we have nearly as much tonnage as all the rest of the world put together.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. According to the testimony before the committee, the Maritime Commission had 40,000,000 tons of shipping under its control, which is all in the pool.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How much does Great Britain have in the pool?

Mr. JACKSON. All of it is in the pool. Every nation in the world, including the neutral nation of Sweden, is in the pool.

Mr. WEICHEL. It did not requisition for title the ships of the subsidized lines but only requisitioned them for use paying lavish charter hire and secret subsidies by the way of excess insurance and other arrangements, thereby creating for deposit with the Maritime Commission an enormous tax-exempt fund which has amounted to as much as 329 millions of dollars. Now that these vast funds are publicly exposed like those of the Red Sea charters, I do not know what excuse the Maritime Commission is now offering for the piling up of this huge tax-exempt fund.

However, this great tax exempt fund now becomes important in that the Maritime Commission would have the war-built ships sold to the very people who have already purchased their ships for 50 percent of the cost, the Treasury of the United States paying the other one-half. These subsidized ship companies would buy the ships offered for sale under this bill, out of the enormous profits upon which they have paid no taxes and were deposited with the Maritime Commission.

With the claim of the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration in 1941, that there was a vast shortage of merchant tonnage, the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration said that it was necessary to take the ships of American owners. However, they did not requisition for title the very ships on which the Treasury of the United States had paid one-half of the cost. Instead of taking for title they requisitioned for use and paid lavish sums for charter and insurance adjustments. On the other hand, they requisitioned a great number of ships from unsubsidized owners upon whom they had no claim by virtue of paying one-half of the cost of their ships. With the shortage and need of merchant tonnage and the taking of private ships for the emergency, yet the Maritime Commission immediately proceeded to sell all during the war, to the subsidized owners, every desirable ship built with Government money, as fast as they were launched.

The quick sale of these war-built ships to subsidized companies is unexplainable, but it is well to know that the Maritime Commission immediately after the sale, chartered back for use its own built ships and paid these subsidized companies a charter hire of at least 15 percent of the amount they paid on the ship. In other words the Maritime Commission gave the subsidized companies 15 percent on their investment while the Government was giving 2 percent to the buyers of War Bonds.

In addition to giving the subsidized companies 15 percent on their investment, on the ships hired for use, the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration hired and paid them as agents to operate these very ships that the Government built and owned.

The Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration were not even satisfied with this unholy arrangement, but in the sales contract of these Government-built ships they put in a clause whereby they would adjust the price to that which war-built ships might be sold in the future. That little arrangement is covered by section 9 of the bill and will cost the tidy sum of $89,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this is a part of what happened to $21,000,000,000 and we are now trying to legislate for the disposal of these war-built ships on the basis of some information offered by the Maritime Commission. Three bills covering the disposal of the war-built fleet were brought to the committee, covering some 58,000,000 dead-weight tons and costing many billions of dollars.

The first bill presented by the Maritime Commission provided for the sale of ships constructed within the continental United States; that sales to American purchasers should be made on a restrictive basis, while sales to foreigners contemplated no restrictions; that unsubsidized purchasers should pay twice as much for war-built ships as subsidized purchasers and favored sales to foreigners on terms much more favorable than to American citizens. In fact, it was stated in the bill that the foreign buyer could make use of all the Government lending agencies, while the American buyer would have to lay down cash and security.

The clause in the first bill providing for the sale of ships "built inside of continental United States" had an undisclosed meaning and remained in all the bills

up until the very last. After continued probing over a period of months it was finally disclosed that the Maritime Commission intended to exclude from the operation of this bill and secretly keep from the committee the $100,000,000 worth of ships which the United States had built in Canada. The Maritime Commission continually reciting that they had not built ships outside of the United States, but now admitted that these ships were built in Canada and the Commission called them purchased ships and not ships built outside the United States. It can only be concluded that the Commission intended to dispose of these ships in some manner unknown to the Congress. Inquiry might be made as to what country these ships were to be transferred.

The committee has rejected all such unworthy proposals and the bill under consideration is much better than the bills the Maritime Commission requested the committee to report for passage.

We have stricken out provisions favoring foreign purchasers as against American citizens, we have stricken out provisions which might have enabled foreign purchasers to obtain ships through other agencies of the Government, we have stricken out provisions whereby the foreigner could borrow his money from our Government and the American citizen would be obliged to pay cash or security, we have stricken out provisions placing restrictions on the use of ships sold to American citizens and we have stricken the proposal that unsubsidized American citizens pay double the purchase price for ships.

Recognizing the tremendous advantage accruing to the subsidized lines by virtue of the great tax-exempt fund a differential of 5 percent has been made in the statutory sales price in favor of unsubsidized Americans. It has been my belief that 5 percent is not enough to make up for the tax exemption to the subsidized lines. The committee did not share my belief, but I have no quarrel on that account.

As to the adjustment of prior sales, I believe that if anyone is to receive adjustment money they should be made in favor of those who have invested their own money in ships rather than those who have recourse to the $329,000,000 tax-exempt reserve fund.

Mr. Chairman, I say all this in the face of the proposals of the administration speaking through the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, and just recently in the other body by the recent appointee of the President, Mr. Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, that unsubsidized Americans pay more than subsidized Americans, that ships not required should be scrapped, that there should be Government operation of the American merchant marine instead of private operation of the American merchant marine, that we should trade in our new ships for worn-out foreign ships, that new American ships should be chartered to foreigners to compete with our own American merchant marine, that no restrictions should be made on sales to foreigners, and that American ships shall not be exclusively paid for hauling gifts to foreign countries.

Thereby again putting the United States, with a pitiful prewar tonnage of 9,000,000 tons, under the subjection of other maritime nations. I believe we should keep our vast merchant marine and not reduce it to the subjection of any foreign nation, not only for peace and security but to give employment to the 300,000 men now engaged in the industry.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 157]

Auchincloss	Gathings	Mundt
Baldwin, Md.	Geelan	Murphy
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	Murray, Tenn.
Barrett, Pa.	Gifford	Norton
Barry	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Beall	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Bender	Green	O'Neal
Bennet, N. Y.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pfeifer
Bolton	Hagen	Philbin
Bradley, Pa.	Hall, Leonard W.	Ploeser
Brumbaugh	Hand	Powell
Buckley	Harness, Ind.	Quinn, N. Y.
Bunker	Harris	Rabaut
Butler	Hart	Rabin
Byrne, N. Y.	Hedrick	Rains
Camp	Heffernan	Ramey
Campbell	Hendricks	Randolph
Cannon, Fla.	Herter	Rich
Carnahan	Hess	Rivers
Celler	Hill	Robertson, N. Dak.
Chelf	Hoeven	Robinson, Utah
Chiperfield	Holifield	Roe, N. Y.
Clark	Hook	Rooney
Cole, Kans.	Hope	Sharp
Cole, Mo.	Jenkins	Sheridan
Colmer	Jennings	Short
Cooley	Kefauver	Simpson, Ill.
Corbett	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Curley	Keogh	Slaughter
Davis	Kerr	Smith, Ohio
Delaney, James J.	Kilburn	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney, John J.	King	Sparkman
Dickstein	Kirwan	Sumner, Ill.
Dolliver	Kunkel	Tarver
Douglas, Ill.	Latham	Taylor
Drewry	Lea	Thom
Durham	LeFevre	Thomas, N. J.
Earthman	Lesinski	Thomas, Tex.
Eaton	Link	Torrens
Elliott	Luce	Vinson
Ellsworth	Lynch	Voorhis, Calif.
Elsaesser	McGehee	Vorys, Ohio
Fenton	McGlinchey	Weiss
Flannagan	McKenzie	White
Flood	Madden	Wigglesworth
Fogarty	Maloney	Winter
Fulton	Marcantonio	Wolcott
Gamble	Morgan	Wolverton, N. J.
Gary	Morrison	Wood
	Mott	Zimmerman

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STIGLER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3603, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 279 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, 16 months ago I addressed the House on the subject of the American merchant marine. In my remarks at that time I stressed, among other things of comparable import, the then almost unanimous view that "no one knows how many ships we can maintain in profitable postwar service."

My thought was that if Admiral Land, who made the observation just quoted by me, was wrong about it and someone actually did know, or could find out, how many ships we could profitably operate we should seek out that person and have him tell us. Today the question of how many ships we can profitably operate remains unanswered. No one came forward during the long period of public hearings on this bill with any worthwhile information on this most important question. Admiral Land and the Maritime Commission had only vague estimates which at best could be regarded only as proposed objectives.

Meanwhile the so-called Harvard report—to which our able chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], has referred—and which the Maritime Commission and the Navy Department jointly financed was completed. In this report it was estimated that the American merchant fleet of the future will range somewhere between a minimum of 860 vessels aggregating 8,900,000 dead-weight tons and a maximum of 1,325 ships aggregating 13,350,000 dead-weight tons. These figures are exclusive of Great Lakes shipping. Parenthetically, the Harvard report is the most thorough and most ably prepared study of shipping made in recent years. In my opinion it surpasses anything of that nature that the Maritime Commission has done.

It has, of course, now become clear that there is no one at this time who can say with any assurance "how many ships we can maintain in profitable postwar service," and for the obvious reason that so much depends on so many things. The volume of trade, the manner of its division among the several maritime nations, operating costs, taxes, the cost of ships, and Government policy with respect to the other matters which directly and indirectly affect shipping, are highly important considerations in determining the amount of tonnage that can be profitably operated.

Who, for example, can tell us what the volume of trade is going to be during the next decade? Who can tell us how it will be eventually divided between the maritime nations? Who can tell us what operating costs will be? Or what Government policy will be with regard to other matters affecting shipping? It is at least doubtful if there is anyone who can give us the answer to any one of these questions, and it is all the more doubtful if there is anyone who can give us the answers to them all.

All of this indicates that there is a vast area of uncertainty about these questions. There is no uncertainty, however, about one thing at least—that is the cost of ships. Under this bill the price of ships is fixed by statute. Whatever happens in the economic world to raise or lower values, and prices of commodities, the price of ships will remain the same. Conditions favorable to the profitable shipping operations will not increase the value of American tonnage, and conse-

quently conditions unfavorable to profitable shipping operations will not affect the price of American ships.

The number of ships that can or will be sold under this bill is still another question to which we have not had an answer. Admiral Land's most recent statement on this question was made to the subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee about 2 weeks ago. He said that he originally expected to sell about 1,000 ships but that now he expects to sell a smaller number. He told the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House that he expected to sell between 60 and 120 ships to the American subsidized lines, and that up to that time he had had no inquiries from the nonsubsidized American lines with respect to purchases from the war-built fleet.

Admiral Land's statements in this connection seem to me to constitute an unsatisfactory, if not an alarming, situation so far as the future of the American merchant marine is concerned. It is obvious that something is wrong somewhere. Here the Government has some 4,000 ships on its hands, and, on the basis of information presently in the hands of the Maritime Commission, no more than 120 ships are being sought for purchase, and perhaps only 60, by American steamship companies, and only the subsidized lines are in the market for these.

Certain questions necessarily arise. Why have not the nonsubsidized American lines, representing, as they do, about 75 percent or more of the American merchant marine, come forward and signified their intentions to purchase ships? Can it be that this bill is not favorable to purchases by them, or are there other reasons outside of this bill which makes them hesitate?

The committee has worked long and hard to make this bill more realistic and more desirable from a sales standpoint, and accordingly has rejected several restrictive proposals advanced by the Maritime Commission. Moreover, we have provided a 5-percent price differential as between the subsidized and nonsubsidized lines in the hopes of encouraging purchases. This price differential in favor of the nonsubsidized lines is a recognition of the fact that the subsidized lines have substantial advantages by reason of the tax exemption accorded them in section 607 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. By virtue of tax exemption, the subsidized lines have built up capital and special reserves of substantial size. It is out of these funds that purchase price of ships purchased under this bill will come.

Because the nonsubsidized lines have no such tax-exemption privileges, and also mainly to encourage nonsubsidized operations, the committee wrote into the bill the 5-percent price differential feature. It is not my thought that any of the funds of the subsidized lines be taken away from them, or that any obstacles be put in the path of the subsidized lines in the purchase of ships under this bill. Rather, it is my thought that in the building up of the American merchant marine to the strength contemplated by the 1936 and preceding acts similar encouragement should be given to the nonsubsidized lines. After all, they constitute the biggest part of our merchant fleet.

Whether this price differential is sufficient to encourage the sale of ships is a question requiring special consideration. In this connection—and also in connection with my earlier remarks about the fixed price of ships which this bill provides—I should like to read a few paragraphs from the Harvard report. I subscribe to the doctrine outlined therein and it is my opinion that it is unfortunate that the Harvard report was not completed and put into the hands of the committee during the early stages of the hearings on this bill:

It has already been pointed out that, if prospective purchasers make the proper analysis of their ability to pay for ships, ships should be sold at a price which approximates their real value as determined by their future earning power. If this is true, and if the Government wants to sell ships, it will have to price them at about what reasonably approximates their value thus determined.

Ships which have a price tag on them substantially higher than their real value will not sell unless one of two things occurs:

1. If prospective purchasers do not properly appraise their ability to pay, they may unwittingly enter into contracts to purchase ships at prices which really are too high, even though they do not know it. From the standpoint of the national welfare, such a situation is undesirable because, just as occurred after the First World War, the ships will not stay sold; in other words, they will not be paid for and will be returned to the Government in default.

2. If for some reason it is decided to put a price upon a particular ship which substantially exceeds its value, that ship can be sold, provided some other measures are taken either to reduce costs or to increase the revenues which the prospective operator can gain. In other words, the Government could continue with the payments to private operators—commonly called subsidies—that it has been granting since the passage of the 1936 act. These subsidies artificially raise the revenues derived by a private operator and thereby enable him to pay higher prices for ships. The ocean-mail contracts granted under the 1928 act accomplished exactly the same thing by guaranteeing income above what would normally accrue to any particular operator.

The Government may also be in a position to help operators reduce certain costs which they could not do by themselves. Less stringent safety requirements and the employment of smaller crews would both be measures in this direction. It should be noted at this point that these examples are cited merely to indicate what might be done to increase revenues or to decrease costs and thereby to raise the amount which an individual operator could pay for a particular ship. They are not to be taken here as recommendations.

It should also be noted that the value of a particular ship in particular uses can at times be a minus quantity. In other words, a prospective purchaser could be given a particular ship for nothing and still not be able to operate it at a profit. In some instances operating expenses, especially of United States-flag operators, are so high that they cannot be met by operating revenue, and less than nothing is left over to pay for a ship. Investigation seems to indicate that this is true, or at least is almost true, with respect to passenger vessels operated under the United States flag in accordance with legislative restrictions.

While it is true that a ship whose price is substantially above its value as determined by the difference between future revenue and future cost will not readily sell, this does not mean that actual price calculations necessarily must be made according to that formula. Since the value depends upon two estimates of the future, it is especially difficult to calculate. Partly for this reason, cost is frequently used as a basis for pricing. Price calculations must also take into consideration a number of other considerations, because, as this report has recommended, price should be considered as a tool to aid in accomplishing objectives. The objectives include the development and maintenance of the United States merchant marine, a fair return to the taxpayer, fair world prices for ships, and consistency with other Government policies both domestic and foreign.

It seems to me that the House should take this question of legislating a price for ships under serious consideration now, or else be prepared to legislate on this subject from time to time in the future. It further seems to me that Congress will not wish, nor should it be required to be continually legislating on the price of ships. The alternative is to charge the Maritime Commission with the responsibility of disposing of the Government's war-built fleet at the best possible prices consistent with the economic value or earning power of the ships.

It is not in the best interest of the Government to sell ships at prices which might lead to their eventual repossession by the Government. Nor, of course, is it in the best interest of the Government to sell ships at prices below the value of the ships. The value, therefore, must be determined by physical appraisal of the ships themselves and by market conditions. The Maritime Commission should take the responsibility of making these determinations under the broad directions of Congress. Otherwise, the subject of ship disposal will repeatedly be in the lap of Congress.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, this Nation has built a mighty fleet of nearly 5,000 merchant vessels. Today we are faced with the problem of how to convert this war fleet into a strong and permanent American merchant marine.

We entered the war with approximately 11,000,000 dead-weight tons of merchant shipping. On VJ-day the War Shipping Administration had well over 40,000,000 dead-weight tons under its control.

Our shipyards, our ships, and our skilled maritime labor supply cost us in excess of $17,000,000,000. Much of this total must be written off as war cost as much as the tanks, shells, and supply trucks. If we are wise, we will apply a part toward future security of our Nation by conserving our maritime resources.

The ship-sale bill before the House today is the major prerequisite to an orderly transition to an expanding American merchant marine.

The problem of postwar disposition of our merchant fleet was first called to the attention of Congress in December 1943. On the 9th of that month Admiral Land told an Appropriation Subcommittee:

My idea is that we should ask the Congress to freeze the prices of all of our fleet. If a Liberty ship costs $2,000,000, and Congress approved, we could freeze the price at some equitable figure discounting excess war costs and sell it at that price to anybody to whom the Government wished to sell it. Certainly

we would not want an American citizen buying a ship immediately after the war for $200 a ton and then a year or two later have a rival buy it at $5 to $15 a ton, as happened after the last war. I would not want it left to the Maritime Commission or to any shipping board, but I want it on the statute books where it is frozen.

That statement made sense to me. We have enough ships to completely demoralize the market unless we are wise in choosing a sales policy.

Such a sales policy should:

First. Provide the maximum return to the Government consistent with the development of the American Merchant Marine.

Second. Assure stability and predictability to the ship-sales market.

Third. Afford preference to reliable American operators who have given faithful service during the war and whose ships have been lost or taken.

Fourth. Afford an opportunity for our allies to at least replace their war losses.

Fifth. Foster the maintenance of the American shipbuilding industry.

The first ship-sales bill, H. R. 4486 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, was introduced on March 27, 1944, by our chairman, Judge BLAND. In the 18 months that have followed our committee has held many hearings and heard the interested Government agencies, the operators, and maritime labor at length. We have considered four separate bills and a larger number of committee prints, substitute texts, and working drafts.

I should like at this time to pay a brief word of tribute for the work done by our distinguished chairman on this bill. He has shouldered the burden of this legislation for the past 18 months. He, more than any other Member of Congress, has been responsible for the rebirth of the American merchant marine. His leadership and absolute fairness have been appreciated by every member of the committee. We are all grateful to him for his untiring patience and judicial approach to the problems that have arisen in connection with this legislation. The same applies to the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. WELCH].

When our committee reported H. R. 3603 last June, I could not go along with the bill. Chairman BLAND subsequently appointed me chairman of a subcommittee to prepare amendments to H. R. 3603. Our subcommittee prepared three amendments which have been accepted by the full committee. I have two additional amendments which were discussed but not acted upon by the committee.

The pricing principle of H. R. 3603 is to use the prewar construction costs as a base for the establishment of sales prices. This procedure eliminates the excess war costs. In the case of dry cargo vessels, the statutory sales price is set at 55 percent of prewar domestic costs to the subsidized operator and at 50 percent to the unsubsidized owners. This is an approximation to the prewar foreign cost of vessels comparable to those now owned by the Government. Two observations are necessary here. The first is that all dry cargo vessels will be sold in reality as vessels on which a construction differential has been granted under the terms of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The second is that the statutory floor price is very liberal particularly in comparison with reproduction costs today either here or abroad.

From the statutory sales price depreciation is deducted at 5 percent per annum with an additional 3 percent per annum for excess wartime wear and tear. At this liberal rate of depreciation the favorable statutory sales prices set by the bill were very rapidly brought down to extremely low levels; thus defeating the purpose of the bill which was to establish a price floor. Accordingly, I submitted an amendment providing for a floor for all war-built vessels. This amendment has been incorporated in the bill and is set at 35 and 40 percent of the average 1944 construction costs respectively for unsubsidized and subsidized dry cargo operators.

In the case of tankers the statutory sales prices were set at 75 percent of the prewar domestic construction cost and the floor at 50 percent of the average 1944 construction costs. In the case of tankers, the difference between the sales price for a new vessel and the floor is less than 2 years' depreciation.

In establishing a higher statutory and floor price for tankers, the committee recognized the basic differences between the dry cargo and tanker industries. By far greatest proportion of ocean-going dry cargo operators, probably over 90 percent, are common carriers. On the other hand, by far the largest proportion of tanker operators, well over 75 percent, are industrial carriers. To my knowledge, none of them are common carriers.

Prior to the war, in contrast with dry cargo vessels, nearly all tankers were sold at full domestic cost. There was never any question about the willingness or ability of tanker operators to purchase vessels at this price.

In the many hearings held by our committee over a period of a year and one-half, to my knowledge, no tanker operator appeared. Apparently they dared not hope for special concessions.

H. R. 3603 grants such concession nonetheless. The first amendment which I propose to introduce tomorrow raises the statutory sales price for tankers to 100 percent of prewar domestic cost. My amendment relating to tanker prices will save the Government a minimum of $75,000,000 and a maximum of $200,000,000.

When H. R. 3603 was reported by our committee last June, there were many weaknesses and loopholes to which I could not accede. These were in the nature of much too liberal trade-in allowances, much too generous returns of funds to wartime purchasers of vessels, and inadequate protection for the Treasury in event of future reacquisition of vessels.

The three committee amendments tighten up these loopholes. The first relates to trade-ins. Under the date of June 7, 1945, Admiral Land addressed a communication to our committee in which he stated:

> It may also be desirable in order to eliminate this old tonnage from the market and stimulate replacements, to give all owners the privilege of turning in such overage tonnage, within a limited period after enactment of the bill on a liberal basis, perhaps equal to some substantial percentage of preexisting insurance values.

As I read the admiral's statement, he was proposing an incentive to the trade-in of old vessels. Allowances equal to some substantial percentage of insurance values would mean 60 or 70 percent. Insurance values for 20-year-old 10-knot vessels are now $47 per dead-weight ton. The admiral's proposal would approximate a trade-in credit of approximately $28 to $32 per dead-weight ton. This suggestion has merit. True, under the various criteria established in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 for evaluation of trade-ins, these vessels are not worth $28 to $32 per dead-weight ton. However, the Government does have an obligation to recondition the old fleet before returning it to the operators and a considerable sum of money is involved. Moreover, these vessels can earn considerable charter hire before the shipping emergency is over.

H. R. 3603 grants the full insurance values rather than some percentage as trade-in allowances. This provision defeats the purpose of a price floor and reduces sales prices to extremely low levels. At stake is as much as $100,000,000.

Last June I requested the Maritime Commission to submit a list of all the vessels which would be available for trade-in under the provisions of section 8. Under unanimous consent, I now insert that list in the RECORD at this point:

EXHIBIT A

3. VESSELS AVAILABLE FOR EXCHANGE UNDER SEC. 8 OF H. R. 3603

Dry-cargo vessels available for exchange under sec. 8 of H. R. 3603

Vessel	Owner	Date of construction	Tonnage, dead weight	Date of acquisition [1]	Cost of acquisition [1]	Credit allowable [1]
Built prior to 1935:						
A. L. Kent	Eastern Gas & Fuel Association	1921	9,350	Jan. 1, 1924	$285 000.00	$415,625.00
A. M. Baxter	Horace X. Baxter Steamship Co	1919	4,200	November 1922	199,867.22	169,175.00
Abangarez	United Fruit Steamship Corp	1909	4,590	November 1909	1 053,383.18	(2)
Absaroka	Pope & Talbot, Inc. (McCormick Steamship Division).	1918	8,538	Apr. 25, 1927	129,266.00	(2)
Acadia	Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc	1932	2,500	June 1932	3,144,877.62	(2)
Achilles	American Steamship Co., Inc	1915	14,396	1935	200,000.00	(2)
Admiral Halstead	Pacific Mail Steamship Co	1920	5,354	(4)	(4)	252,562.50
Admiral Nulton	do	1920	5,354	(4)	(4)	252,562.50
Agwidale	Agwilines, Inc	1918	7,415	Nov. 18, 1919	1,394,633.22	(2)

Footnotes at end of table.

Dry-cargo vessels available for exchange under sec. 8 of H. R. 3603—Continued

Vessel	Owner	Date of construction	Tonnage, dead weight	Date of acquisition [1]	Cost of acquisition [1]	Credit allowable [1]
Built prior to 1935—Continued						
Agwistar	New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co	1919	7,410	Dec. 9, 1919	$1,396,394.92	$347,343.75
Alabaman	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co	1921	10,380	June 25, 1936	288,474.22	486,562.50
Alamo	Agwilines, Inc	1919	4,220	May 6, 1925	25,000.00	[3]
Alcoa Cutter	Alcoa Steamship Co., Inc	1918	8,000	May 19, 1941	691,875.00	393,000.00
Alcoa Master	do	1919	8,000	May 29, 1940	105,000.00	375,000.00
Alcoa Pilot	do	1919	7,800	Dec. 11, 1939	200,000.00	354,562.50
Alcoa Scout	do	1919	7,800	Jan. 29, 1940	200,000.00	354,562.50
Alcoa Trader	do	1920	8,000	May 29, 1940	105,000.00	375,468.75
Alcoa Voyager	do	1919	8,850	Oct. 16, 1940	87,000.00	[3]
Algic	Seas Shipping Co., Inc	1920	8,830	Mar. 22, 1940	230,000.00	[3]
Algonquin	Agwilines, Inc	1926	2,800	Dec. 10, 1926	1,962,228.87	[3]
American Press	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	1920	7,999	Jan. 23, 1937	40,000.00	393,000.00
American Star	Red Salmon Canning Co	1919	7,601	1935	92,500.00	354,562.50
Anne Hanify	J. H. Hanify Co., Inc	1920	2,400	March 1920	323,691.88	[3]
Anniston City	Isthmian Steamship Co	1921	9,370	May 26, 1921	1,426,694.52	486,068.75
Argual (Honduran registry)	Empressa Hondurena De Vapores	1927	2,615	June 1927	378,025.38	[3]
Arizonan	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co	1920	11,600	Apr. 26, 1929	493,275.86	543,750.00
Astoria	Hammond Shipping Co., Ltd	1918	3,493	Mar. 11, 1941	200,000.00	164,062.50
Atenas	United Fruit Co	1909	4,600	1909	1,031,816.06	[3]
Atlanta City	Isthmian Steamship Co	1921	9,370	May 23, 1921	1,245,223.25	486,068.75
Atlantic Trader	Saginaw Dock & Terminal Co	1918	3,200	April 1936	45,728.00	157,687.50
Aztec (Honduran registry)	Empressa Hondurena De Vapores	1929	4,878	Dec. 20, 1929	850,000.00	[3]
Badger State [5]	Federal Motorship Corp	1912	2,683	[4]	[4]	[3]
Barbara Olson	Oliver J. Olson & Co., Inc	1918	3,420	1940	171,831.41	139,443.75
Bering	Alaska Packers Association	1920	11,167	1927	599,527.00	523,453.12
Berkshire	Sprague Steamship Co	1920	6,780	1927	252,761.67	309,843.75
Berwindglen	Wilmore Steamship Co., Inc	1929	7,230	August 1929	720,800.00	459,000.00
Berwindvale	do	1929	7,320	September 1929	776,000.00	459,000.00
Bethore	Ore Steamship Corp	1922	22,320	February 1922	2,684,755.00	1,096,470.00
Bylayl	Pocahontas Steamship Co., Inc	1916	5,710	April 1923	187,057.84	242,812.50
Cadrette	Hart Wood Lumber Co	1918	3,964	[4]	[4]	177,656.25
Calamares	United Fruit Co	1913	6,460	1913	1,039,806.26	[3]
Carolinian	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co	1921	10,380	June 27, 1936	304,950.69	486,562.50
Carrillo	United Fruit Co	1911	4,290	[4]	1,045,705.40	[3]
Cartago	do	1908	3,935	1908	631,226.25	[3]
Cathlamet	American West African Line	1919	8,852	Oct. 8, 1928	238,621.35	[3]
Chagres (Panamanian registry)	United States Lines (chartered owner)	1919	8,542	[4]	[4]	400,406.25
Charles H. Cramp	American South African Line, Inc	1920	9,395	Dec. 22, 1922	367,654.53	472,053.22
Charles L. O'Connor	M. & J. Tracy, Inc	1918	4,062	1922	76,000.00	114,806.25
Charles R. McCormick	Pope & Talbot, Inc. (McCormick Steamship Division)	1920	9,642	Apr. 11, 1923	288,150.00	451,968.75
Chester	Ford Motor Co	1931	2,500	Aug. 10, 1931	518,606.84	[3]
Chester Valley	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	1919	7,999	Sept. 9, 1933	40,075.00	193,491.25
Chipana	States Marine Corp	1920	5,100	1929	25,666.06	[3]
Chippewa	Chippewa Steamship Corp	1920	3,600	July 1929	55,000.00	154,100.00
Chirripo (Honduran registry)	United Fruit Co	1920	6,260	July 1920	[4]	[3]
Choluteca (Honduran registry)	Empressa Hondurena De Vapores	1921	2,150	[4]	[4]	[3]
City of Dallas	Southern Steamship Co	1919	4,100	1924	52,231.00	174,995.62
City of Fort Worth	do	1919	3,554	1929	25,666.66	[3]
City of Houston	do	1919	4,229	1924	58,230.00	173,781.25
City of Omaha	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	1920	9,841	June 1933	49,205.00	461,250.00
City of Philadelphia	Southern Steamship Co	1919	4,440	April 1923	75,000.00	189,936.87
Clevelander [5]	National Motorship Corp	1923	2,265	[4]	[4]	[3]
Coast Shipper	Coastwise (Pacific Far East) Line	1920	5,400	March 26, 1937	45,000.00	252,187.50
Coastwise	Sprague Steamship Co	1910	6,800	1922	175,000.00	259,374.20
Colabee	Illinois Atlantic Corp	1920	8,930	Oct. 4, 1937	266,571.31	[3]
Colorado	Agwilines, Inc	1920	4,250	June 13, 1924	64,000.00	272,043.75
Cornelia	A. H. Bull & Co., Inc	1916	4,703	August 1916	417,505.33	462,846.87
Corozal	New York & Puerto Rico Steamship Co	1911	4,675	Feb. 21, 1911	321,397.06	[3]
Craigsmere	M. & J. Tracy, Inc	1919	4,125	1927	85,000.00	113,208.33
Cricket	Owens Park Lumber Co	1913	2,000	January 1935	152,912.13	[3]
Cubore	Ore Steamship Corp	1920	11,340	1920	1,025,573.00	531,562.50
Curaca	States Marine Corp	1920	5,100	1929	25,666.66	[3]
Cygnus	Munargo Line Co	1925	2,968	July 1925	1,427,245.22	[3]
Daisey Gray [5]	S. S. Freeman & Co	1923	2,350	[4]	[4]	[3]
Darien (Panamanian registry)	Balboa Shipping Co	1924	3,320	1930	1,037,338.41	[3]
Delarof	Alaska Packers Association, Inc	1919	8,250	[4]	[4]	[3]
Delmar	Mississippi Shipping Co	1920	8,010	June 19, 1929	219,480.00	375,000.00
Delrio	do	1919	8,010	Aug. 19, 1929	219,480.00	375,000.00
Delsud	do	1919	7,610	Oct. 14, 1929	219,480.00	382,890.22
Derblay	Alaska Steamship Co	1920	5,100	Dec. 30, 1925	91,495.15	246,864.97
Detroiter [5]	National Motorship Corp	1923	2,265	[4]	[4]	[3]
Diamond Cement	Pacific Coast Coal Co	1919	6,291	May 25, 1938	164,748.22	297,562.50
Diamond Head	Matson Navigation Co	1919	8,000	Dec. 31, 1934	420,950.10	411,962.25
Dorothy	A. H. Bull & Co., Inc	1918	7,330	December 1929	279,686.05	346,875.00
Dorothy Philips	Dorothy Philips Steamship Co	1918	3,400	July 1933	76,371.00	138,187.50
Delphinus	United Fruit Co. (chartered owners)	1915	3,335	1915	694,629.89	[3]
Eastern Crown	Sprague Steamship Co	1920	7,900	1936	140,529.14	406,755.00
Eastern Guide	Prudential Steamship Co	1919	6,500	January 1933	65,000.00	304,687.50
Edgewater	Ford Motor Co	1931	2,500	Aug. 10, 1931	516,957.03	138,281.25
Edward Pierce	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	1914	6,600	Jan. 1, 1924	216,000.00	283,968.75
Edwin Christenson	Arthur B. Cahill, managing owner	1918	8,565	Mar. 20, 1926	[4]	401,484.37
Ellenor	A. H. Bull & Co., Inc	1920	5,107	July 7, 1922	168,256.02	243,750.00
Emilia	do	1918	7,230	May 1929	255,000.00	346,875.00
Empire State [5]	Federal Motorship Corp	1929	2,610	[4]	[4]	[3]
Ensley City	Isthmian Steamship Co	1920	9,830	July 7, 1920	1,653,829.52	460,781.25
Everett	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	1907	8,240	Jan. 1, 1924	249,000.00	248,333.33
Exminster [5]	Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc	1919	8,008	[4]	[4]	[3]
Exmoor	American Export Lines, Inc	1919	8,000	[4]	[4]	[3]
F. J. Luckenbach	Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc	1917	11,552	May 1918	1,260,906.64	599,260.00
Falmouth	Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc	1920	4,150	1925	25,000.00	[3]
Felix Taussig	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	1917	9,400	Jan. 1, 1924	285,000.00	420,000.00
Firmore	Ore Steamship Corp	1918	12,360	July 1918	957,791.00	579,375.00
Floridian	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co	1921	10,380	June 25, 1936	317,736.27	486,562.50
Fluor Spar	South Atlantic Steamship Co	1919	8,000	[4]	[4]	375,000.69
Freeman	Pocahontas Steamship Co., Inc	1918	5,712	April 1923	241,149.93	242,812.50
Genevieve Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	1919	4,050	Oct. 14, 1924	71,000.00	189,843.75
George L. Olson [5]	Oliver J. Olson & Co., Inc	1917	2,300	[4]	[4]	[3]
Georgeanna	Empressa Hondurena De Vapores	1916	2,000	Mar. 23, 1942	251,982.64	[3]
Georgian	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co	1920	11,600	June 13, 1929	515,645.47	543,750.00
Glen White	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	1918	8,640	May 1, 1926	367,559.53	406,875.00
Governor John Lind	Baltimore-Insular Line, Inc	1918	5,080	June 1925	150,000.00	239,063.50

Footnotes at end of table.

Dry-cargo vessels available for exchange under sec. 8 of H. R. 3603—Continued

Vessel	Owner	Date of construction	Tonnage, dead weight	Date of acquisition [1]	Cost of acquisition [1]	Credit allowable [2]
Built prior to 1935—Continued						
Green Mountain	States Marine Corp	1919	7,997	(4)	(4)	$415,000.00
Guardian (Honduran registration)	West India Fruit & Steamship Co	1907	2,500	Nov. 10, 1939	$50,000.00	(3)
Hammondsport	Seatrain Lines, Inc	1932	10,900	October 1932	1,591,673.00	(3)
Hamlin F. McCormick	North American Steamship Co	1919	9,500	July 1944	400,000.00	(3)
Hampden	Sprague Steamship Co	1914	7,800	1922	200,000.00	309,968.75
Hanley	Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co	1920	11,900	1923	352,714.46	549,562.50
Harry Bowen	Pocahontas Steamship Co	1913	5,750	November 1929	125,000.00	247,718.00
Hawaiian	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co	1919	9,500	Aug. 14, 1925	393,052.17	464,722.50
Hegira	Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co	1919	11,900	1925	250,000.00	543,750.00
Helen	A. H. Bull & Co., Inc	1916	4,703	Oct. 27, 1916	409,646.38	(3)
Henry D. Whiton	Union Sulphur Co	1921	7,346	1921	1,368,945.02	344,343.75
Henry S. Grove	American South African Line	1921	9,412	Dec. 22, 1922	408,081.99	472,888.35
Herman Frasch	Union Sulphur Co	1920	7,304	1920	1,502,146.99	344,531.25
Hibueras	United Fruit Co	1920	1,355	(4)	(4)	(3)
Hilton	A. H. Bull & Co., Inc	1918	7,369	April 1936	97,977.54	(3)
Hollywood	Pope & Talbot, Inc. (McCormick Steamship Division)	1920	8,545	May 14, 1926	84,662.30	(3)
Horace Luckenbach	Luckenbach Steamship Co	1919	11,146	December 1922	522,241.81	578,198.75
Howard	Empressa Hondurena De Vapores	1895	1,650	Mar. 23, 1942	266,222.72	(3)
Iriona (Honduran registry)	do	1927	2,159	May 1927	662,457.24	(3)
Isaac T. Mann	Pocahontas Steamship Co., Inc	1917	9,030	April 1923	295,931.75	409,687.50
J. L. Luckenbach	Luckenbach Steamship Co	1919	11,953	(4)	(4)	620,061.87
Jacob Luckenbach	do	1918	11,600	June 1918	265,467.02	543,750.00
James Ellwood Jones	Pocahontas Steamship Co., Inc	1918	5,710	December 1928	250,000.00	242,812.50
James Griffiths	Coastwise Steamship & Barge Co	1920	5,303	December 1927	118,725.90	249,281.25
James L. Richards	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	1916	6,540	February 1936	161,155.58	276,656.25
Jason	American Steamship Co., Inc	1913	14,599	1936	968,800.00	(3)
Jean	A. H. Bull & Co., Inc	1918	7,280	April 1929	250,000.00	348,281.25
Jefferson Myers	Pacific Atlantic Steamship Co	1920	11,775	(4)	(4)	(3)
Jonancy	Pocahontas Steamship Co., Inc	1915	5,710	April 1923	186,785.62	242,812.50
Juniata	Empressa Hondurena De Vapores	1897	1,650	Mar. 23, 1942	265,432.72	(3)
K. I. Luckenbach	Luckenbach Steamship Co	1918	11,552	May 1918	1,411,829.95	599,260.00
Kansan	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co	1918	9,500	Sept. 4, 1925	389,029.98	464,722.50
Katrina Luckenbach	Luckenbach Steamship Co	1918	11,552	(4)	(4)	599,260.00
Kenmar	Calmar Steamship Corp	1919	10,300	November 1938	125,000.00	482,812.50
Kittyhawk	Seatrain Lines, Inc	1932	10,900	September 1932	1,591,673.00	(3)
Kopperston	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	1919	7,250	December 1937	374,718.37	347,343.75
Lake Francis	Coastal Steamship Co	1918	3,000	1923	187,700.00	(3)
Lake Ormoc	Ford Motor Co	1918	3,500	Aug. 18, 1925	16,883.60	147,818.75
Lake Traverse (Panamanian registry)	West India Steamship Co. (chartered owner)	1918	2,800	(4)	(4)	119,636.87
La Playa (Panamanian registry)	Balboa Shipping Co	1924	3,238	January 1924	1,052,095.00	(3)
Lawrence Philips	A. C. Penberthy and M. W. Crook	1918	3,310	December 1924	76,868.00	138,187.50
Liberty Glo	American Foreign Steamship Co	1919	8,000	1937	98,069.69	375,000.00
Lone Star	States Marine Corp	1919	7,980	Oct. 30, 1940	425,000.00	393,000.00
Lumberlady	Owens-Park Lumber Co., Inc	1919	4,200	April 1940	100,000.00	169,384.37
M. & J. Tracy	M. & J. Tracy, Inc	1917	4,185	1922	76,000.00	114,860.42
Mahimahi	Matson Navigation Co	1921	10,600	Oct. 11, 1937	252,000.00	538,901.25
Makiki	do	1917	9,060	Oct. 27, 1923	178,909.72	(3)
Makua	do	1920	5,050	May 2, 1928	66,666.66	252,093.75
Maliko	do	1918	10,200	May 4, 1926	304,040.00	(3)
Mangore [5]	Ore Steamship Co	1918	6,060	(4)	(4)	(3)
Manuki	Matson Navigation Co	1921	13,180	June 8, 1921	2,463,067.96	798,388.75
Manulani	do	1921	13,180	Apr. 29, 1921	2,458,622.12	796,220.25
Marari (Panamanian registry)	Balboa Shipping Co	1921	3,965	1921	792,463.98	185,812.50
Margaret Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	1919	5,000	Feb. 13, 1929	21,842.32	259,871.25
Margaret Schafer	Schafer Bros. Steamship Co	1918	3,200	Oct. 1, 1934	40,000.00	(3)
Marjory	A. H. Bull & Co., Inc	1919	3,626	December 1929	60,000.00	151,168.75
Mary D	Pac. American Fisheries, Inc	1920	7,500	1927	250,000.00	350,484.37
Marymar	Calmar Steamship Corp	1919	10,280	December 1938	125,000.00	481,875.00
Mauna Kea	Matson Navigation Co	1919	9,100	Apr. 5, 1934	91,682.61	454,171.87
Maunalei	do	1921	9,900	Mar. 23, 1925	300,000.00	592,533.07
Maunawili	do	1921	9,900	do	300,000.00	592,938.52
Maya (Honduran registry)	Empressa Hondurena De Vapores	1929	4,878	Dec. 20, 1929	850,000.00	(3)
Mayari (Panamanian registry)	Balboa Shipping Co	1921	3,965	May 1921	884,370.32	185,812.50
Medina	Agwilines, Inc	1914	5,030	September 1914	665,419.38	(3)
Melrose	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	1907	8,470	January 1924	249,000.00	253,333.33
Memphis City	Isthmian Steamship Co	1921	9,370	July 28, 1921	1,229,192.94	486,068.75
Mexican	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co	1907	13,825	Apr. 30, 1907	795,300.54	428,336.76
Michael Tracy	M. & J. Tracy, Inc	1918	4,062	1922	76,000.00	114,806.25
Middlesex	Sprague Steamship Co	1912	7,800	1922	200,000.00	328,439.90
Minnesotan	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co	1912	10,175	Sept. 16, 1912	668,041.20	485,449.25
Mobile City	Isthmian Steamship Co	1920	9,830	Aug. 3, 1920	1,615,149.78	460,781.25
Mokihana	Matson Navigation Co	1921	10,600	Oct. 11, 1937	252,000.00	538,901.25
Monroe	A. H. Bull & Co., Inc	1920	8,886	(4)	(4)	(3)
Montgomery City	Isthmian Steamship Co	1920	9,370	Oct. 27, 1920	2,231,688.81	486,068.75
Montoso	Agwilines, Inc	1911	4,675	Mar. 8, 1911	321,231.24	180,174.50
Morlean	Lendal G. Gray	1918	3,760	August 1940	125,697.54	176,250.00
Musa (Panamanian registry)	Balboa Shipping Co., Inc	1930	5,280	July 1930	1,307,849.68	(3)
Narbo	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	1920	9,402	June 2, 1933	47,010.00	440,718.75
Nemaha	do	1920	9,841	Aug. 29, 1933	49,205.00	461,250.00
Newton	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	1911	8,000	January 1924	246,600.00	318,725.80
Nira Luckenbach	Luckenbach Steamship Co	1919	7,634	January 1941	500,000.00	415,000.00
Nishmaha	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	1919	9,412	Apr. 14, 1933	47,060.00	441,093.75
Norfolk	New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co	1916	2,535	November 1916	201,296.67	(3)
Norlago	Merchants & Miners Transportation Co	1920	4,200	1933	40,300.00	196,406.25
North Bend [5]	W. H. Wood	1917	2,200	(4)	(4)	(3)
North Haven	Northland Transportation Co	1919	6,700	Jan. 16, 1942	259,502.01	311,531.25
North Pacific	Santa Ana Steamship Co	1919	3,784	June 26, 1940	189,200.00	181,481.25
Oakey L. Alexander	Pocahontas Steamship Co	1915	9,030	October 1926	271,529.00	409,687.50
Octans	United Fruit Co	1917	4,250	1917	2,227,000.00	(4)
Orbis	Orbis Steamship Co	1899	6,913	January 1942	672,898.92	(4)
Oremar	Calmar Steamship Co	1919	10,305	Nov. 12, 1938	125,000.00	(4)
Orotava (Honduran registry)	Empressa Hondurena De Vapores	1927	2,810	(4)	(4)	(4)
Osage	Agwilines, Inc	1919	4,080	Apr. 16, 1923	75,000.00	(4)
Ozark	do	1919	4,288	Oct. 24, 1924	55,856.97	179,560.00
Pan Crescent	Pan-Atlantic Steamship Co	1901	5,769	Mar. 17, 1941	705,021.11	(3)
Pan Orleans	do	1907	2,425	May 9, 1940	291,990.19	(3)
Pan York	do	1901	5,759	Mar. 13, 1941	677,082.21	(3)
Panaman	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co	1913	10,175	Sept. 17, 1913	715,171.37	485,449.25
Panay	Alaska Transportation Co	1920	1,235	Feb. 21, 1939	195,079.46	113,404.87
Pastores	United Fruit Co	1912	6,720	1912	1,622,000.00	(4)

Footnotes at end of table.

Dry-cargo vessels available for exchange under sec. 8 of H. R. 3603—Continued

Vessel	Owner	Date of construction	Tonnage, dead weight	Date of acquisition [1]	Cost of acquisition [1]	Credit allowable [2]
Built prior to 1935—Continued						
Pennsylvania	Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co	1920	8,800	1937	$140,000.00	$401,203.13
Permanente	Permanente Steamship Co	1902	11,114	Oct. 30, 1940	150,000.00	[3]
Peter Helms	Pope & Talbot (McCormick steamship division)	1920	5,233	Feb. 7, 1929	122,645.82	244,687.50
Platano (Panamanian registry)	Balboa Shipping Co	1930	5,270	1930	1,307,333.34	[3]
Plymouth	Sprague Steamship Co	1915	8,900	1936	102,096.00	409,687.50
Point San Pablo	Pope & Talbot (McCormick steamship division)	1920	5,251	Feb. 18, 1931	116,719.47	242,718.75
Pomona	Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co	1920	11,900	1923	352,709.15	[3]
Quinault [5]	W. H. Wood	1921	2,000	[4]	[4]	[3]
Remsen Heights	Isbrandtsen Steamship Co	1920	3,450	April 1941	335,000.00	144,468.75
Robert Luckenbach	Luckenbach Steamship Co	1919	12,955	[4]	459,732.56	578,198.75
Robin Adair	Seas Shipping Co., Inc	1920	10,400	July 7, 1920	1,500,000.00	[3]
Ryder Hanify [5]	Sudden & Christenson	1920	2,400	[4]	[4]	[3]
Sagua (Honduran registry)	Empressa Hondurena de Vapores	1914	3,386	Dec. 20, 1929	150,000.00	[3]
San Antonio	Southern Steamship Co	1920	4,211	1926	25,000.00	[3]
San Bruno (Panamanian registry)	Balboa Shipping Co	1920	3,335	1920	1,595,996.77	[3]
Sandwich	Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc	1920	4,150	1925	25,000.00	[3]
Santa Cruzcement	Santa Cruz Portland Cement Co	1920	7,757	August 1933	530,437.05	[3]
Schoharie	South Atlantic Steamship Co	1919	8,000	[4]	[4]	393,000.69
Seatrain New Orleans	Seatrain Lines, Inc	1928	10,510	July 31, 1936	1,049,965.25	[3]
Sewalls Point	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	1918	8,640	May 1, 1926	367,559.53	409,687.50
Shickshinny	South Atlantic Steamship Co	1919	7,920	[4]	[4]	446,025.00
Sinaloa (Honduran registry)	Empressa Hondurena de Vapores	1915	2,475	Dec. 20, 1929	100,000.00	[3]
Stanley A. Griffiths	Griffiths Steamship Co	1920	5,311	December 1937	167,396.52	249,656.25
Stanwood [5]	W. R. Chamberlain & Co	1916	2,034	[4]	[4]	[3]
Steel Electrician	Isthmian Steamship Co. (chartered owners)	1926	2,740	Apr. 1, 1938	322,046.65	[3]
Steel Engineer	Isthmian Steamship Co	1920	9,400	Aug. 12, 1920	1,236,374.97	487,625.00
Steel Inventor	do	1920	9,400	Nov. 19, 1920	1,290,310.52	487,625.00
Steel Mariner	do	1920	9,400	June 25, 1920	1,331,497.37	487,625.00
Steel Motor	do	1923	2,740	July 6, 1940	233,970.13	[3]
Steel Ranger	do	1920	9,400	Sept. 20, 1920	1,192,309.23	487,625.00
Steelore	Ore Steamship Corp	1922	22,980	1922	2,314,788.00	1,128,892.50
Southerland	Alaska Steamship Co	1918	7,305	Mar. 2, 1937	126,451.79	346,265.62
Susan V. Luckenbach	Luckenbach Steamship Co	1918	11,020	January 1930	534,576.45	571,662.50
Taku	Alaska Transportation Co	1920	1,235	Jan. 23, 1939	194,182.35	114,932.85
Tanamo (Honduran registry)	Empressa Hondurena de Vapores	1914	3,386	Dec. 29, 1929	150,000.00	[3]
Taurus	Balboa Shipping Co	1921	3,160	1921	1,911,404.17	[3]
Teapa	Standard Fruit & Steamship Co	1919	1,000	1931	215,465.06	[3]
Telde (Honduran registry)	Empressa Hondurena de Vapores	1927	2,615	1927	379,080.00	[3]
Texada	Kingsley & Co. of California	1917	3,533	1928	109,990.05	[3]
Thomas P. Beal	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	1921	9,500	Jan. 1, 1924	285,000.00	421,312.50
Toltec (Honduran registry)	Empressa Hondurena de Vapores	1929	4,878	Dec. 20, 1929	850,000.00	[3]
Tongass	Alaska Transportation Co	1915	3,035	Nov. 26, 1937	35,000.00	[3]
Tulsa	South Atlantic Steamship Co	1919	7,820	[4]	[4]	446,025.00
Turrialta	United Fruit Steamship Co	1909	4,575	[4]	1,097,764.63	[3]
Unaco	Universal Navigation	1918	5,881	June 27, 1941	515,000.00	281,250.00
Utahan	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co	1919	10,300	Oct. 11, 1937	213,000.00	509,405.47
Victoria	Alaska Steamship Co	1870	2,840	[4]	[4]	[3]
Virginian	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co	1903	12,250	July 2, 1907	820,123.61	327,500.26
Volunteer	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	1918	11,850	Jan. 20, 1937	59,250.00	554,868.75
Waimea	Matson Navigation Co	1919	8,100	Oct. 11, 1937	170,000.00	400,781.25
Waipio	do	1918	8,300	do	140,000.00	428,612.47
Walter A. Luckenbach	Luckenbach Steamship Co	1918	11,284	May 1918	1,210,977.34	622,030.50
Walter D. Noyes	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	1915	6,600	Jan. 1, 1924	216,000.00	280,718.75
Wellhart [5]	Wellhart Steamship Corp., Inc	1893	4,500	[4]	[4]	[3]
West Cactus	Pope & Talbot (McCormick Steamship Division)	1919	8,584	Sept. 16, 1926	49,358.00	[3]
West Coast [5]	West Coast Steamship Co	1917	2,239	[4]	[4]	[3]
West Texas	Southern Steamship Co	1920	4,295	1926	25,000.00	179,476.25
Western Queen	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	1918	8,614	May 17, 1933	43,070.00	402,187.50
Western Sword	Sword Line, Inc	1920	7,684	[4]	[4]	[3]
Whitney Olson [5]	Oliver J. Olson & Co., Inc	1917	2,700	[4]	[4]	[3]
Wichita Falls	Southern Steamship Co	1920	4,095	1926	25,000.00	174,995.62
Wildwood	American Foreign Steamship Co	1919	8,000	1936	101,831.05	375,468.75
William Luckenbach	Luckenbach Steamship Co	1913	10,901	August 1934	532,616.70	520,086.71
William N. Page	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	1918	8,640	May 1, 1926	367,559.53	406,875.00
Winding Gulf	do	1918	8,850	do	367,559.53	415,781.25
Winston-Salem	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	1920	9,841	Jan. 23, 1937	49,205.00	461,250.00
Wolverine	States Marine Corp	1919	8,000	Dec. 26, 1940	440,000.00	375,000.00
Yankee Sword [5]	Sword Line, Inc	1909	7,850	[4]	[4]	[3]
Yoro (Honduran registry)	Standard Fruit & Steamship Co	1911	2,000	[4]	[4]	[3]
Zacapa	United Fruit Steamship Corp	1909	4,730	[4]	1,205,545.34	[3]
Zarembo	American West-African Line, Inc	1919	7,632	Aug. 2, 1928	207,208.80	[3]
Built from 1935 to 1940:						
Dorothea L. Dix	American Export Line, Inc	1940	10,800	Aug. 1, 1940	[4]	[3]
Exchange	do	1940	9,514	Apr. 8, 1940	1,362,436.97	[3]
Exhibitor	do	1940	9,902	Sept. 9, 1940	1,363,293.71	[3]
Explorer	do	1939	9,514	Nov. 16, 1939	1,361,336.92	[3]
Frederick Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co	1940	12,527	Apr. 11, 1940	1,406,386.12	[3]
James Lykes	do	1940	9,260	Dec. 4, 1940	992,726.68	[3]
Joseph Lykes	do	1940	9,290	Oct. 15, 1940	984,552.87	[3]
Lakehurst	Seatrain Lines, Inc	1940	10,969	July 1940	2,219,259.00	[3]
Mormacmoon	Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc	1940	13,090	Dec. 31, 1940	1,509,565.35	[3]
Mormacport	do	1940	12,995	Oct. 18, 1940	1,357,546.79	[3]
Mormacswan	do	1940	9,961	do	1,280,224.34	[3]
Norfolk	Ford Motor Co	1937	3,000	July 1937	493,923.80	378,090.86
Santa Ana	Grace Line, Inc	1940	9,703	Feb. 15, 1940	1,397,731.22	[3]
Santa Isabel	do	1939	9,390	July 11, 1942	1,283,857.57	[3]
Santa Monica	do	1939	9,193	Dec. 5, 1940	1,246,937.42	[3]
Santa Teresa	do	1940	9,703	Mar. 27, 1940	1,392,616.27	[3]
Seatrain Texas	Seatrain Lines, Inc	1940	10,965	May 1940	2,214,437.00	[3]
Zoella Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co	1940	9,307	Nov. 7, 1940	992,531.82	[3]

[1] From owners' statements, ordinarily includes items not furnished by Maritime Commission.
[2] Subject to revision Apr. 20, 1946, credit allowable is value as of Apr. 20, 1945.
[3] Not determined.
[4] Not available.
[5] Available for exchange under sec. 8 (a) only.

Dry-cargo vessels built 1941-45 available for exchange under sec. 8 of H. R. 3603

Vessel	Owner	Type	Tonnage	Date of acquisition [1]	Cost of acquisition [1]	Credit allowable [2]
Built during 1941:						
Agwiprince	New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co	C1B	8,958	Nov. 1, 1941	$1,099,004.50	[3]
Alcoa Patriot	Alcoa Steamship Co	C1B	9,395	Aug. 11, 1941	1,082,077.19	[3]
Alcoa Pennant	do	C1B	8,958	Dec. 16, 1941	1,099,420.67	[3]
Alcoa Pioneer	do	C1B	9,395	Mar. 27, 1941	1,064,321.26	[3]
American Builder	United States Lines Co	C1B	9,140	July 25, 1941	1,143,664.98	[3]
American Manufacturer	do	C1B	9,140	Apr. 11, 1941	1,123,855.25	[3]
American Packer	do	C1B	9,140	Oct. 8, 1941	1,160,658.21	[3]
Cape Cod	United Fruit Co	C1B	9,316	June 19, 1941	1,012,198.19	[3]
Cape Neddick	do	C1B	9,316	May 20, 1941	1,013,882.66	[3]
Excellor	American Export Lines, Inc	C2-S-A1	7,878	Aug. 13, 1941	1,229,596.19	[3]
Extavia	do	C2-S-A1	8,100	Oct. 7, 1941	1,225,518.46	[3]
Idaho	Pacific Atlantic Steamship Co	C1B	9,055	Sept. 8, 1941	2,247,054.61	$1,840,830.41
Island Mail	American Mail Line, Ltd	C2-SU	9,600	Dec. 12, 1941	1,322,627.15	[3]
John Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C1B	9,227	Jan. 31, 1941	998,168.46	[3]
Mormacsea	Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc	C3M	12,570	Mar. 14, 1941	1,650,627.57	[3]
Mormacstar	do	C3—cargo	12,537	Jan. 30, 1941	1,720,651.84	[3]
Mormacsun	do	C3M	12,574	June 6, 1941	1,664,581.90	[3]
Mormactide	do	C3—cargo	12,542	Apr. 10, 1941	1,671,008.91	[3]
Mormacyork	do	C3—cargo	12,599	Feb. 7, 1941	1,595,793.21	[3]
President Polk	American President Lines, Ltd	C3—passenger	10,470	Nov. 6, 1941	2,187,661.65	[3]
Robin Sherwood	Seas Shipping Co., Inc	C2-S	10,048	July 16, 1941	1,380,772.79	[3]
Robin Tuxford	do	C2-S	10,048	Sept. 22, 1941	1,382,015.86	[3]
Robin Wentley	do	C2-S	10,048	Nov. 3, 1941	1,371,755.14	[3]
Santa Cruz	Grace Line, Inc	C1B	9,344	June 26, 1941	1,035,866.69	[3]
Thompson Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C1B	9,260	Apr. 25, 1941	1,012,332.76	[3]
Built during 1942:						
Adabelle Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C1A	7,235	Mar. 20, 1942	1,045,045.47	[3]
African Dawn	American South African Line	C2-S-B1	8,887	Nov. 25, 1942	1,537,837.50	[3]
African Sun	do	C2-S-B1	9,193	Dec. 22, 1942	1,557,494.53	[3]
Alcoa Polaris	Alcoa Steamship Co., Inc	C1B	8,958	Feb. 13, 1942	1,100,060.78	[3]
China Mail	American Mail Line, Ltd	C2-S-U	9,600	Feb. 2, 1942	1,322,006.33	[3]
Delaries	Mississippi Shipping Co	C2-F	9,200	Sept. 30, 1942	1,429,969.46	[3]
Examiner	American Export Lines, Inc	C3-E	9,848	Jan. 23, 1942	1,601,303.77	[3]
Exanthia	do	C2-S-A1	7,878	Jan. 21, 1942	1,223,845.22	[3]
Exiria	do	C2-S-A1	7,878	Feb. 13, 1942	1,227,488.47	[3]
Fairiele	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2—modified	10,875	July 31, 1942	3,023,805.28	2,671,010.85
Fairland	do	C2—modified	10,875	Aug. 31, 1942	3,036,211.74	2,654,597.00
Marina	A. H. Bull & Co	C1-A	7,270	Jan. 29, 1942	2,293,600.38	2,178,920.36
Mormacdale	Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc	C1-A	7,573	Feb. 20, 1942	1,081,514.07	[3]
Mormacdove	do	C1-B	9,275	Dec. 31, 1942	1,400,408.12	[3]
Mormachawk	do	C1-B	8,958	Dec. 14, 1942	1,395,885.79	[3]
Mormactern	do	C1-B	9,075	Dec. 29, 1942	1,400,215.33	[3]
Mormacwren	do	C1-B	8,958	Dec. 26, 1942	1,399,098.49	[3]
Raphael Semmes	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,875	Oct. 30, 1942	3,040,284.76	2,664,330.87
Shooting Star	United States Lines Co	C2-S-U	8,595	Aug. 14, 1942	1,291,444.01	[3]
Built during 1943:						
Afoundria	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,875	Nov. 8, 1943	2,698,763.77	2,503,822.81
Alcoa Partner (Auriga)	Alcoa Steamship Co., Inc	C1-B	9,075	Mar. 13, 1943	1,472,605.43	[3]
Alcoa Pegasus	do	C1-B	9,047	Apr. 6, 1943	1,410,444.16	[3]
Alcoa Pilgrim	do	C1-B	9,047	Mar. 20, 1943	[4]	[3]
Alcoa Planter	do	C1-B	9,047	Mar. 22, 1943	1,468,900.39	[3]
Alcoa Pointer	do	C1-B	9,047	Apr. 3, 1943	1,409,506.71	[3]
Alcoa Puritan	do	C1-B	9,047	Mar. 29, 1943	1,412,408.30	[3]
Azalea City	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,875	July 2, 1943	3,001,657.44	2,729,712.55
Bienville	do	C2-S-E1	10,875	May 31, 1943	3,000,000.00	2,716,561.87
Cape Alexander	New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co	C1-B	9,047	Dec. 24, 1943	1,447,255.57	[3]
Cape Chalmers	do	C1-B	9,047	Aug. 30, 1943	1,446,402.89	[3]
Excelsior	American Export Lines, Inc	C3-S-A3	9,902	Aug. 23, 1943	1,681,176.14	[3]
Exchequer	do	C3-S-A3	9,902	Oct. 7, 1943	1,681,032.00	[3]
Fred Morris	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C1-B	9,075	Feb. 26, 1943	1,467,523.10	[3]
Jean Lafitte	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	9,750	Sept. 10, 1943	2,808,924.50	2,582,760.47
Jean Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Corp	C1-B	9,104	Feb. 19, 1943	1,469,950.49	[3]
Mormacgull	Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc	C1-B	9,075	Feb. 9, 1943	1,351,104.18	[3]
Mormaclark	do	C1-B	9,275	Feb. 4, 1943	1,337,618.33	[3]
Nancy Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C1-B	9,275	Feb. 13, 1943	1,337,195.90	[3]
Sea Pike	Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc	C3-S-A2	12,505	do	1,742,250.23	[3]
Solon Turman	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C1-B	9,075	Feb. 28, 1943	1,469,474.30	[3]
Warrior	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	9,750	July 26, 1943	2,991,127.82	2,731,760.16
Built during 1944:						
Antinous	Pan Atlantic Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,875	July 27, 1944	2,627,400.00	2,531,237.16
De Soto	do	C2-S-E1	10,875	May 26, 1944	2,628,355.94	2,496,938.14
Examiner	American Export Lines, Inc	C3-S-A3	9,848	Feb. 17, 1944	[4]	[3]
Flying Eagle	Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc	C2-S-AJ1	10,445	Jan. 15, 1944	1,592,778.31	[3]
Hastings	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,979	Nov. 17, 1944	2,642,706.03	2,586,944.92
Memnon	Mississippi Shipping Co	C2-S-AJ1	10,445	Apr. 12, 1944	[4]	[3]
Napier	Grace Line, Inc	C2-S-AJ2	10,759	Apr. 20, 1944	[4]	[3]
Santa Catalina	do	C2-S-AJ2	10,752	July 19, 1944	1,800,089.94	[3]
Santa Elisa	do	C2-S-AJ2	10,694	July 31, 1944	1,414,037.40	[3]
Santa Ines	do	C2-S-AJ2	10,769	Aug. 11, 1944	1,800,200.13	[3]
Santa Leonor	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,386	May 18, 1944	[4]	[3]
Santa Rita	do	C2-S-AJ2	10,774	June 26, 1944	1,458,446.03	[3]
Sturdy Beggar	Mississippi Shipping Co	C2-S-AJ1	10,445	Apr. 6, 1944	[4]	[3]
Talisman	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,445	1944	[4]	[3]
Wacosta	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,591	Apr. 6, 1944	2,660,169.32	2,526,430.00
Yaka	do	C2-S-E1	10,875a	Sept. 22, 1944	2,615,351.63	2,540,029.50
Built Jan. 1 to June 1, 1945:						
American Banker	United States Lines Co	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	Apr. 12, 1945	1,347,067.34	[3]
American Farmer	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	Apr. 19, 1945	1,347,002.53	[3]
American Ranger	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	Apr. 5, 1945	[4]	[3]
Andrew Jackson	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,875	Mar. 23, 1945	2,691,194.97	2,678,815.47
Canvasback	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C2-S-AJ1	10,821			
City of Alma	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,875	May 4, 1945	2,626,493.54	2,626,493.46
Elizabeth Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	May 17, 1945	1,334,862.16	[3]
Fra Perlango	United Mail Steamship Co	R2-ST-AU1	7,606	Feb. 21, 1945	2,652,766.57	[3]
Harry Culbreath	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	May 30, 1945	1,334,785.11	[3]
Kenneth McKay	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,826	Apr. 26, 1945	1,334,390.64	[3]
Built Jan. 1 to June 1, 1945:						
Limon	United Mail Steamship Co	R2-ST-AU1	7,665	May 10, 1945	2,652,766.67	[3]
Louise Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	do	1,334,911.35	[3]
Madaket	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,979	Jan. 19, 1945	2,641,046.21	2,608,122.93
Red Gauntlet	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co	C2-S-AJ1	10,821			
Reuben Tipton	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	May 24, 1945	1,334,893.68	[3]
Ruth Lykes	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	Mar. 27, 1945	1,346,183.27	[3]
San Jose	United Mail Steamship Co	R2-ST-AU1	7,665			
Stella Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C2-S-AJ1	10,516	Mar. 21, 1945	[4]	[3]
Simoon	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,821			
Tyson Lykes	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,820			
Velma Lykes	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	May 3, 1945	1,334,832.13	[3]

[1] From owners' statements, ordinarily includes items not furnished by Maritime Commission.
[2] Subject to revision Apr. 20, 1946, credit allowable is value as of Apr. 20, 1945.
[3] Not determined.
[4] Not available.

Combination vessels available for exchange under sec. 8 of H. R. 3603

Vessel	Owner	Type	Tonnage	Date of acquisition [1]	Cost of acquisition [1]	Credit allowance [2]
Built prior to 1935:						
Alaska	Alaska Steamship Co	Passenger	2,420	June 9, 1923	$985,074.21	[3]
Alutian	do	do	3,210	Aug. 22, 1929	1,688,959.81	[3]
Antigua	United Fruit Co	do	4,750	March 1932	3,593,628.00	[3]
Ariel	do	do	4,610	February 1933	[4]	[3]
Atlantida (Honduran registry)	Standard Fruit and Steamship Co	do	3,380	[4]	[4]	[3]
Barouof	Alaska Steamship Co	do	4,300	Feb. 15, 1936	559,173.35	[3]
Boringueen	Agwilines, Inc	do	5,138	Feb. 20, 1931	2,865,717.74	[3]
Cefalu (Honduran registry)	Standard Fruit & Steamship Co	do	4,500	[4]	[4]	[3]
Chirikoff	Alaska Packers Association, Inc	do	7,175	[4]	[4]	[3]
Columbia	Alaska Steamship Co	do	2,700	Mar. 4, 1937	359,994.88	[3]
Contessa (Honduran registry)	Standard Fruit & Steamship Co	do	4,500	[4]	[4]	[3]
Cordova	Alaska Steamship Co	do	1,930	Oct. 31, 1912	268,856.45	[3]
Cuba	Peninsular & Occidental Steamship Co	do	1,000	June 1, 1921	2,226,151.66	[3]
David W. Branch	Libby, McNeil & Libby	do	5,725	1936	160,000.00	[3]
Delnorte	Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc	do	7,610	July 9, 1929	219,480.00	$382,890.22
Denali	Alaska Steamship Co	do	3,100	Jan. 31, 1938	723,570.23	[3]
Evangeline	Eastern Steamship Line, Inc	do	2,080	October 1927	1,893,756.00	[3]
Fairfax	Merchants & Miners Transportation Co	do	3,250	1926	1,191,189.00	[3]
Florida	Peninsular & Occidental Steamship Co	do	1,280	May 10, 1931	2,552,093.90	[3]
Gatin (Honduran registry)	Standard Fruit & Steamship Co	do	2,843	[4]	[4]	[3]
Granadra (Honduran registry)	do	do	2,943	Oct. 24, 1941	650,000.00	[3]
Haleakala	Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., Ltd	do	1,800	1923	1,240,682.45	[3]
Hualalai	do	do	3,088	1929	1,238,231.55	[3]
Lakina	Alaska Steamship Co	do	1,900	Sept. 8, 1925	136,495.67	[3]
Lurline	Matson Navigation Co	do	11,176	June 1933	7,990,098.17	[3]
Madison	Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc	do	2,515	1928	315,434.83	[3]
Mariposa	Oceanic Steamship Co	do	11,295	Dec. 14, 1931	8,323,859.97	[3]
Matsonia	Matson Navigation Co	do	6,700	October 1927	7,843,185.41	[3]
Merak	United Fruit Co	do	4,750	1927	3,554,145.00	[3]
Mexico	New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co	do	4,545	November 1932	2,348,037.67	[3]
Mizar	United Fruit Co	do	4,825	[4]	3,593,628.00	[3]
Monterey	Oceanic Steamship Co	do	11,295	April 1932	8,300,491.79	[3]
North Coast	Northland Transportation Co	do	5,604	Jan. 16, 1942	339,338.95	[3]
North Sea	do	do	3,050	do	358,176.85	[3]
Northland	do	do	815	do	144,680.38	[3]
Philippa	Permanente Steamship Co	do	11,158	Oct. 23, 1940	75,000.00	[3]
President Johnson	American President Lines, Ltd	do	12,300	Feb. 7, 1930	975,000.00	[3]
Santa Marta	United Fruit Co	do	2,650	1909	1,082,000.00	[3]
Santa Paula	Grace Line, Inc	do	7,424	Dec. 23, 1932	4,472,183.22	[3]
Santa Rosa	do	do	7,424	Oct. 27, 1932	4,474,438.27	[3]
Shawnee	Agwilines, Inc	do	3,005	July 21, 1927	2,468,902.61	[3]
Stratford	A. H. Bull & Co	do	485	[4]	[4]	[3]
Talamanca	United Fruit Co	do	4,610	1931	3,554,145.00	[3]
Tarazed	do	do	4,000	[4]	3,593,628.00	[3]
Toloa	do	do	4,250	1918	2,216,000.00	[3]
Warabale	Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., Ltd	do	3,092	1928	1,307,527.73	[3]
William Thompson	Thompson Salmon Co	do	8,739	1938	50,000.00	[3]
Yarmouth	Eastern Steamship Lines	do	2,000	July 1927	2,016,056.18	[3]
Yukon	Alaska Steamship Co	do	2,620	July 27, 1923	635,187.48	[3]
Built 1935 to 1940:						
President Monroe	American President Lines, Ltd	C-3	10,500	Dec. 19, 1940	2,187,012.74	[3]

[1] From owners' statements, ordinarily includes items not furnished by Maritime Commission.
[2] Subject to Revision Apr. 20, 1946; credit allowable is value as of Apr. 20, 1945.
[3] Not determined.
[4] Not available.

Tankers available for exchange under sec. 8 of H. R. 3603

Vessel	Owner	Date of construction	Tonnage, dead weight	Date of acquisition [1]	Cost of acquisition [1]	Credit allowable [2]
Built prior to 1914:						
Alabama [5]	The Texas Co	1901	4,270	[4]	[4]	[3]
Ardmore	Bessemer Trust Co	1914	7,000	Jan. 2, 1914	[4]	$514,218.75
Caloria	Standard Navigation Corp	1906	6,050	1906	[4]	[3]
Capt. A. F. Lucas (Panamanian flag)	Balboa Transport Corp	1904	5,882	Feb. 29, 1940	$57,692.00	101,600.00
Ceylon (Panamanian flag)	do	1901	4,150	Sept. 19, 1940	184,370.00	86,800.00
El Segundo (Panamanian flag)	do	1912	5,082	Dec. 17, 1938	64,365.00	217,052.22
Esso Caracus [5]	Standard Oil Co. of Venezuela (subsidiary, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey).	1913	6,900			[3]
Richmond	Standard Oil Co. of California	1913	9,270	September 1913	701,303.00	388,683.75
Topila	Richfield Oil Co	1913	7,900	July 1913	[4]	350,326.25
Built 1914 through 1928:						
A. C. Bedford	Standard Oil Co	1918	15,575	Dec. 1, 1935	161,599.00	739,453.12
Acosta [5]	Mene Grande Oil Co. of Central America (Gulf Oil Co.)	1928	3,700	[4]	[4]	[3]
Agwiworld	Richfield Oil Corp	1921	11,360	January 1921	[4]	528,187.50
Albert Hill (Panamanian flag)	Atlantic Refining Co	1917	11,060	January 1917	1,023,435.00	512,812.50
Algonquin (British flag)	Petroleum Shipping Co., Ltd. (Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.)	1920	10,810	Feb. 26, 1941	675,130.54	505,781.25
Alpha	Standard Brands, Inc	1919	9,275	July 29, 1941	1,000,000.00	455,880.00
American Fisher	First National Oil Corp	1912	7,350	June 23, 1941	604,414.00	[3]
American Trader	American Trading & Production Corp	1928	14,426	May 12, 1938	653,191.03	721,062.50
Apure [5]	Mene Grande Oil Co. of Central America (Gulf Oil Co.)	1928	4,400	[4]	[4]	[3]
Aragua	do	1927	3,700	[4]	[4]	[3]
Arizona	The Texas Co	1919	7,465	July 1, 1928	270,000.00	543,750.00
Arkansas	do	1919	10,026	Jan. 2, 1920	1,837,500.00	467,812.50
Axtell J. Byles	Tidewater Associated Oil Co	1927	14,362	Sept. 17, 1927	1,591,729.90	717,716.25
Bahrein (Panamanian flag)	Foreign Tankship Corp	1921	10,659			
Baltic (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1920	13,580	June 30, 1935	332,138.00	636,562.50
Beacon	do	1921	16,150	Dec. 1, 1935	514,028.00	756,093.75
Beaconhill (Panamanian flag)	do	1919	11,030	Nov. 1, 1939	289,510.00	517,031.25
Beaconoil (Panamanian flag)	do	1919	10,665	Jan. 20, 1940	268,490.00	499,921.87
Bidwell	Sun Oil Co	1920	10,880	Sept. 5, 1923	800,294.33	534,480.00
Bohemian Club	Atlantic Refining Co	1921	10,626	1923	548,920.00	499,687.50
Bolivar [5]	Mene Grande Oil Co. of Central America (Gulf Oil Co.)	1927	3,400	[4]	[4]	[3]
Brandywine [5]	Hillcone Steamship Co	1919	7,582	[4]	[4]	[3]
Brunswick (Panamanian flag)	Atlantic Refining Co	1928	14,180	August 1928	915,000.00	664,687.50
Cacalilao	Mexico Shipping & Trading Co	1919	10,700	March 1942	800,000.00	[3]
Caroni [5]	Mene Grande Oil Co. of Central America (Gulf Oil Co.)	1928	4,400	[4]	[4]	[3]
Catatumbo [5]	do	1928	4,400	[4]	[4]	[3]

Footnotes at end of table.

Tankers available for exchange under sec. 8 of H. R. 3603—Continued

Vessel	Owner	Date of construction	Tonnage, deadweight	Date of acquisition [1]	Cost of acquisition [1]	Credit allowable [2]
Built 1914 through 1928—Continued						
C. B. Watson	Sabine Transportation Co	1920	8,500	Jan. 6, 1936	$233,617.16	$398,437.50
Calliope (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1926	13,070	June 30, 1935	521,392.00	612,656.25
California	The Texas Co	1921	16,400	April 30, 1930	1,310,727.86	756,093.75
Castana	Commercial Molasses Corp	1920	8,130	September 1920	(4)	391,093.75
Cities Service Kansas	Cities Service Oil Co	1920	10,930	July 1920	(4)	512,343.75
Cities Service Koolmotor	do	1918	10,810	August 1918	(4)	507,187.50
Cities Service Ohio	do	1921	10,930	March 1921	(4)	511,405.75
Cities Service Oklahoma	do	1920	10,930	December 1920	(4)	512,343.75
Clio (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1926	12,650	June 30, 1935	470,476.00	592,968.75
Comol Cuba (Panamanian flag)	Commercial Molasses Corp	1919	8,063	Feb. 20, 1935	(4)	384,843.75
D. G. Scofield	Standard Oil Co. of California	1916	12,333	Aug. 15, 1916	1,016,582.00	579,609.37
Dean Emery (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1919	11,310	Nov. 24, 1939	125,143.00	530,156.25
Delaware Sun	Sun Oil Co	1922	14,210	Jan. 23, 1922	1,780,017.34	666,093.75
Duiano	American Sugar Refining Co	1921	6,734	(4)	(4)	315,703.12
Durango	Durango Steamship Corp	1920	10,700	July 1920	(4)	503,437.50
E. R. Kemp	Sinclair Refining Corp	1921	7,435	March 1921	1,475,148.66	348,515.62
Edward L. Shea	Tidewater Associated Oil Co	1924	10,544	Oct. 1, 1926	643,466.95	490,171.87
Edwin B. de Golia	Hillcone Steamship Corp	1917	5,238	November 1917	(4)	220,681.25
Elisha Walker (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1920	11,365	Nov. 17, 1939	230,090.00	532,734.37
Esso Dover	Standard Oil Co	1921	13,860	Dec. 1, 1935	384,549.00	680,872.50
Esso Providence	do	1921	13,860	do	460,197.00	680,872.50
F. H. Hillman	Standard Oil Co. of California	1921	16,036	October 1921	2,930,480.00	750,000.00
Fred W. Weller	Standard Oil Co	1917	16,075	Dec. 1, 1935	193,927.00	753,515.44
Garnet Hulings	Continental Steamship Co	1920	10,625	October 1928	394,067.73	498,046.87
Gulf of Mexico	Gulf Oil Corp	1917	13,350	August 1917	1,022,749.98	634,218.75
Gulf of Venezuela	do	1919	10,520	October 1925	728,794.29	492,421.87
Gulfbird	do	1928	16,420	June 1928	1,133,436.51	806,632.50
Gulfbreeze	do	1923	10,480	May 1926	615,000.00	491,250.00
Gulfcrest	do	1926	14,875	April 1926	1,441,407.99	697,265.62
Gulfgem	do	1920	11,280	April 1929	577,419.50	528,750.00
Gulfhawk	do	1928	16,420	August 1928	1,132,504.45	806,632.50
Gulfking	do	1921	10,600	February 1921	1,713,078.95	496,875.00
Gulfmaid	do	1917	7,790	March 1917	635,393.02	365,156.25
Gulfpoint	do	1920	10,910	June 1923	486,205.00	511,406.25
Gulfpride	do	1927	20,000	April 1927	1,712,950.72	939,843.75
Gulfstar	do	1920	11,250	July 1920	1,928,689.72	527,343.75
Gulfwax	do	1921	13,840	April 1929	764,234.70	679,890.00
Gulfwing	do	1921	16,420	October 1928	1,135,355.42	806,632.50
H. M. Flagler	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1918	12,430	Oct. 27, 1939	43,111.00	582,656.25
H. T. Harper	Standard Oil Co. of California	1921	4,935	1921	1,400,682.00	231,890.62
Hadnot	Cities Service Oil Co	1919	9,860	October 1919	(4)	462,187.50
Hagood	do	1919	10,920	December 1919	(4)	511,875.00
Henry M. Dawes	Sabine Transportation Co	1916	8,000	Dec. 20, 1916	124,752.59	368,437.50
Herbert L. Pratt	Atlantic Refining Co	1918	10,850	February 1918	1,582,019.00	533,006.25
Icotea [5]	Cia. de Petroleo Lago (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1927	3,200	(4)	(4)	(3)
Illinois	The Texas Co	1921	8,859	July 1921	(4)	462,656.25
J. A. Moffett	Standard Oil Co. of California	1915	9,115	March 1915	793,954.00	435,093.75
J. C. Donnell	The Atlantic Refining Co	1918	15,886	January 1918	1,242,409.00	756,093.75
J. J. Coney	Hillcone Steamship Co	1920	7,850	December 1920	(4)	370,312.50
John D. Archbold	Standard Oil Co	1921	22,600	Dec. 1, 1935	948,630.00	1,059,375.00
Josiah Macy (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1917	9,750	June 30, 1935	285,343.00	457,031.25
Jusepin [5]	Lago Petroleum Corp. (StandardOil Co. of New Jersey)	1928	4,200	(4)	(4)	(3)
K. R. Kingsbury	Standard Oil Co. of California	1921	12,049	April 1921	2,546,828.00	566,671.87
Kekoskee	Richfield Oil Co	1920	8,200	October 1920	(4)	373,125.00
L. L. Abshire	Sabine Transportation Co	1917	11,150	Oct. 15, 1935	185,623.52	522,656.25
L. V. Stanford	Sinclair Refining Co	1921	11,398	January 1921	2,099,651.79	534,375.00
La Salina [5]	Cia de Petroleo Lago (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1927	3,200	(4)	(4)	(3)
Lagunilla [5]	do	1927	3,200	(4)	(4)	(3)
Livingston Roe [5]	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	1921	12,500	(4)	(4)	(3)
Makaweli	Matson Navigation Co	1919	4,100	1919	(4)	(3)
Malabar	Grosvenor Dale Co	1914	11,920	September 1914	(4)	558,750.00
Malay	do	1921	12,585	June 1921	(4)	588,937.50
Massachusetts	The Texas Co	1920	10,736	June 1920	(4)	503,906.25
Matinicock	Matinicock Steamship Co	1914	11,200	June 1914	(4)	523,593.75
Maturines [5]	Standard Oil Co. of Venezuela (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1918	8,600	(4)	(4)	(3)
Mericos H. Whittier	Tidewater Associated Oil Co	1919	10,844	1923	558,126.60	511,406.25
Mississippi	The Texas Co	1920	9,940	Apr. 3, 1929	1,733,517.67	465,937.50
Motocarline (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1925	12,415	Dec. 31, 1936	278,750.00	581,953.12
Nevada	The Texas Co	1919	11,061	Apr. 30, 1930	813,768.32	518,484.37
New York (Panamanian flag)	do	1916	9,830	(4)	(4)	460,781.25
Niobe (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1915	11,745	June 30, 1935	280,803.00	550,546.87
Paez [5]	Mene Grande Oil Co. of Central America (Gulf Oil Co.)	1927	3,700	(4)	(4)	(3)
Pan Delaware	National Bulk Carriers, Inc	1918	12,600	Converted 1938	(4)	730,406.25
Pat Doheny	Richfield Oil Co	1921	11,550	January 1921	(4)	528,187.50
Paul H. Harwood	Standard Oil Co	1918	10,840	Dec. 1, 1935	478,255.00	532,515.00
Paul Shoup	Tidewater Associated Oil Co	1921	10,815	1922	523,350.00	505,781.25
Perija [5]	Mene Grande Oil Co. of Central America (Gulf Oil Co.)	1927	3,700	(4)	(4)	(3)
Phoebus (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1923	13,370	June 30, 1935	141,240.00	626,718.75
Prometheus (Panamanian flag)	do	1924	13,370	do	71,844.00	622,031.25
Pueblo	Gulf Oil Co	1920	6,348	October 1941	578,807.16	297,656.25
R. J. Hanna	Standard Oil Co. of California	1921	10,670	1923	466,212.60	498,281.25
R. P. Smith	Sabine Transportation Co	1916	11,150	June 26, 1936	154,441.16	522,656.25
Reaper	The Texas Co	1920	9,940	Apr. 3, 1929	1,742,680.30	465,937.50
Roanoke	do	1920	10,038	April 1929	1,533,584.64	470,156.25
Royal Arrow (Panamanian flag)	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. (chartered owners)	1916	13,425	1916	(4)	754,312.50
Samuel L. Fuller	Sinclair Refining Co	1921	11,750	January 1921	2,101,810.76	(6)
Shikellamy [5]	do	1921	10,800	(4)	(4)	(3)
Solana	Tidewater Associated Oil Co	1921	10,525	1925	550,787.00	491,015.62
Spencer Kellogg	Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc	1919	7,965	(4)	(4)	373,125.00
Spidoleine)Panamanian flag)	Gulf Oil Corp	1928	8,510	November 1940	499,233.15	417,316.87
Standard (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1914	18,075	Nov. 18, 1939	289,421.00	847,265.62
Stonewall [5]	Tidewater Associated Oil Co	1921	11,049	(4)	(4)	(4)
Sucre [5]	Mene Grande Oil Co. of Central America (Gulf Oil Co.)	1926	3,800	(4)	(4)	(4)
Sun	Sun Oil Co	1928	14,586	July 1928	(4)	716,537.25
Swithoid (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1917	9,650	June 30, 1935	421,098.00	452,343.75
Swiftarrow	Grosvenor Dale Co	1921	11,980	Ferbuary 1921	(4)	563,437.50
Swiftlight	Swiftlight Steamship Co	1921	11,980	May 1921	(4)	563,437.50
Tennessee	The Texas Co	1920	10,038	Apr. 3, 1929	1,704,160.14	470,156.25
Tide Penn	Tidewater Associated Oil Co	1920	11,024	1925	542,398.00	513,750.00

Footnotes at end of table.

Tankers available for exchange under sec. 8 of H. R. 3603—Continued

Vessel	Owner	Date of construction	Tonnage, deadweight	Date of acquisition [1]	Cost of acquisition [1]	Credit allowable [2]
Built 1914 through 1928—Continued						
Toas [5]	Mene Grande Oil Co. of Central America (Gulf Oil Co.)		3,100	[4]	[4]	[3]
Torres	Bernuth-Lembcke Co., Inc	1917	8,300	June 8, 1940	$500,000.00	$392,156.25
Toteco	Mexico Shipping & Trading Co	1916	10,676	March 1941	800,000.00	497,343.75
Trimountain	Trimountain Steamship Corp	1919	9,910	July 10, 1923	418,410.00	462,187.50
Tustena	Atlantic Refining Co	1921	10,626	1923	540,744.00	499,687.50
Tydolgas	Tidewater Associated Oil Co	1921	11,030	1925	469,744.00	513,750.00
Urdaneta [5]	Mene Grande Oil Co. of Central America (Gulf Oil Co.)	1927	3,700	[4]	[4]	[3]
Vera Cruz	Mexico Shipping & Trading Co	1919	11,050	[4]	[4]	[3]
Vermont	The Texas Co	1919	10,686	Apr. 4, 1923	477,694.51	501,562.50
Victoria	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1917	11,000	[4]	[4]	[3]
W. H. Libby (Panamanian flag)	do	1921	12,485	Nov. 18, 1939	291,392.00	585,234.37
W. M. Burton	Atlantic Refining Co	1918	10,850	December 1918	1,826,043.00	533,006.25
W. S. Miller	Standard Oil Co	1920	10,713	Dec. 23, 1920	2,061,750.01	512,578.12
W. S. Rheem	do	1922	16,036	January 1922	2,934,586.00	750,000.00
W. W. Mills	Pure Oil Co	1918	10,743	March 1918	[4]	528,281.25
Washington	The Texas Co	1920	10,620	Apr. 30, 1930	797,043.54	497,812.50
Yorba Linda (Panamanian flag)	Petroleum Shipping Co., Ltd. (Socony-Vacuum Oil)	1921	10,760	Feb. 26, 1941	983,034.00	515,625.00
Zapara [5]	Mene Grande Oil Co. of Central America (Gulf Oil Co.)	1926	3,100	[4]	[4]	[4]
Built 1929 through 1934:						
Belgium Gulf (Panamanian flag)	Gulf Oil Corp	1929	11,686	November 1940	712,868.41	664,641.25
California Standard (Panamanian flag)	Foreign Tankship Corp	1929	17,172	Dec. 11, 1935	1,269,736.00	938,020.50
Chester Sun	Motor Tankship Corp	1930	14,540	Mar. 1, 1935	1,694,006.13	960,721.00
Comet	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	1930	14,416	December 1930	[6]	946,162.62
Daylight	do	1931	14,606	June 1931	1,809,693.00	1,093,624.25
Eastern Sun	Motor Tankship Corp	1930	14,584	June 1930	1,705,017.59	960,721.00
Esso Aruba	Standard Oil Co	1931	15,145	Dec. 1, 1935	1,045,005.00	1,133,981.87
F. H. Bedford, Jr. (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co., New Jersey)	1930	17,460	June 30, 1935	986,224.00	1,198,192.50
Franz Klaesen (Panamanian flag)	do	1932	18,070	do	1,016,761.00	1,515,621.25
G. Harrison Smith	Standard Oil Co	1930	20,615	Dec. 1, 1935	1,525,211.00	1,358,013.12
J. A. Mowinckel (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co., New Jersey)	1930	17,755	June 30, 1935	1,004,250.00	1,218,435.87
J. H. Senior (Panamanian flag)	do	1931	17,620	do	995,894.00	[6]
Northern Sun	Motor Tankship Corp	1931	14,677	Feb. 12, 1931	1,695,826.56	1,098,940.37
Orville Harden (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1933	17,990	June 30, 1935	1,091,575.00	1,839,477.50
Pacific Sun	Motor Tankship Corp	1929	14,540	Dec. 27, 1929	1,694,884.03	826,962.50
Permian (Panamanian flag)	Atlantic Refining Co	1931	14,035	June 1931	987,654.00	1,018,202.50
Peter Hurll (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1930	17,585	June 30, 1935	993,713.00	1,206,770.62
Southern Sun	Motor Tankship Corp	1931	14,828	Apr 4, 1931	1,701,070.51	1,110,246.50
Surinam [5]	Standard Oil Co. of Venezuela (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey).	1929	4,200	[4]	[4]	[3]
Tamare [5]	Cia de Petroleo Lago (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1929	4,200	[4]	[4]	[3]
Tidewater	Tidewater Associated Oil Co	1930	14,704	Aug. 15, 1930	1,787,240.47	968,626.00
Tidewater Associated	do	1930	14,704	Sept. 15, 1930	1,799,728.23	968,626.00
Tydol II [5]	do	1929	2,500	[4]	[4]	[3]
Ule [5]	Standard Oil Co. of Venezuela (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey).	1929	4,200	[4]	[4]	[3]
W. S. Farish	Standard Oil Co	1930	20,615	Dec. 1, 1935	1,544,164.00	1,358,013.12
Western Sun	Motor Tankship Corp	1930	14,521	May 17, 1930	1,693,719.02	960,721.00
Built 1935 through 1940:						
American Sun	Sun Oil Co	1940	17,955	Nov. 5, 1940	2,471,467.72	2,557,619.10
Associated	Tidewater Associated Oil Co	1938	12,725	June 28, 1938	1,983,452.00	1,614,519.69
Avila [5]	Cia de Petroleo Lago (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1938	2,500	[4]	[4]	[3]
China (Panamanian flag)	Balboa Transport Corp	1937	17,432	Jan. 8, 1938	1,390,381.00	1,609,107.70
E. J. Henry	Atlantic Refining Co	1939	19,200	Sept. 15, 1939	2,299,232.00	[6]
Esso Augusta	Standard Oil Co	1940	17,950	Oct. 7, 1940	2,519,363.00	2,159,590.86
Esso Balboa (Panamanian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1939	14,750	Oct. 31, 1939	959,416.00	[6]
Esso Baltimore	Standard Oil Co	1938	15,960	Sept. 21, 1939	1,846,563.00	1,518,436.18
Esso Bayonne	do	1937	13,075	Oct. 2, 1937	1,759,223.00	1,391,224.40
Esso Baytown	do	1937	13,045	Nov. 30, 1937	1,760,313.00	1,391,020.34
Esso Bayway	do	1937	13,075	Nov. 24, 1937	1,762,869.00	1,391,224.40
Esso Belgian (Belgian flag)	Panama Transport Co. (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey)	1937	15,250	1937	[4]	[3]
Esso Bolivar (Panamanian flag)	do	1937	15,255	July 8, 1937	1,102,568.00	[6]
Esso Charleston	Standard Oil Co	1938	12,950	Oct. 19, 1938	1,856,618.00	1,535,431.49
Esso Concord	do	1940	13,080	July 18, 1940	1,928,260.00	1,668,149.44
Esso Montpelier	do	1940	13,000	July 2, 1940	1,928,411.00	1,663,495.64
Esso Nashville	do	1940	13,000	Aug. 7, 1940	1,866,472.00	1,582,757.31
Florida	The Texas Co	1937	12,382	Oct. 19, 1937	1,969,016.35	1,543,803.46
Francis R. Hart (Honduran flag)	Empressa Hondurena de Vapores	1938	11,135	December 1938	745,272.50	[3]
Good Gulf (Panamanian flag)	Gulf Oil Corp	1938	11,190	November 1940	1,015,991.91	[6]
Gulfcoast	do	1937	11,381	Feb. 28, 1937	1,420,942.67	1,078,494.33
Gulfdisc	do	1938	11,381	Jan. 29, 1938	1,502,830.44	1,203,033.26
Gulftide	do	1937	11,381	Apr. 12, 1937	1,424,387.90	1,082,405.21
Gulfwave	do	1937	11,381	Dec. 1, 1937	1,503,785.16	1,205,380.99
J. W. Van Dyke	Atlantic Refining Co	1938	18,640	Feb. 27, 1938	2,395,473.00	1,929,529.18
L. P. St. Clair	Union Oil Co. of California	1939	12,945	Mar. 1, 1939	1,770,666.25	1,500,752.75
M. E. Lombardi	Standard Oil Co. of California	1940	7,692	Dec. 17, 1940	2,007,776.88	1,712,348.08
Magnolia	Socony Vacuum Oil Co	1935	14,880	Sept. 27, 1935	1,755,639.70	1,179,062.28
Mobilfuel	do	1939	16,550	May 24, 1939	2,172,634.72	1,857,712.70
Mobilgas	do	1937	15,515	Feb. 7, 1937	2,047,412.03	1,533,067.75
O. M. Bernuth	Bernuth-Lembcke Co., Inc	1938	12,950	May 11, 1938	1,895,879.31	1,527,893.55
Pan American	American Oil Co	1936	15,515	Nov. 23, 1936	2,081,101.67	1,536,648.89
Pan Amoco	do	1936	15,515	Oct. 14, 1936	2,079,933.81	[6]
Pan Florida	Pan American Petroleum & Transportation Co	1936	12,937	Dec. 23, 1936	1,726,411.32	1,311,799.63
Pan Maine	do	1936	12,937	Oct. 23, 1936	1,726,433.05	1,281,559.98
Pan Maryland	do	1938	13,108	Aug. 16, 1938	1,866,539.24	1,534,868.06
Pennsylvania Sun	Sun Oil Co	1938	17,870	July 9, 1938	2,367,775.00	1,931,821.12
Rhode Island	The Texas Co	1937	12,382	Dec. 23, 1937	1,969,016.35	1,567,958.10
Robert C. Tuttle	Atlantic Refining Co	1940	19,200	July 15, 1940	2,292,583.00	[6]
Socony Vacuum	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	1935	14,880	Apr. 2, 1935	1,755,639.69	1,123,967.35
South Mountain		1940	16,290			
Texas Sun	Sun Oil Co	1937	15,800	Mar. 26, 1937	2,133,000.00	1,519,879.15
Victor H. Kelly	Union Oil Co. of California	1940	12,920	Mar. 8, 1940	1,886,219.55	1,622,396.92
W. H. Berg	Standard Oil Co. of California	1937	12,700	Dec. 31, 1937	1,888,808.26	1,528,643.05
Wallace E. Pratt	Standard Oil Co	1937	13,055	Nov. 4, 1937	1,762,835.00	1,385,145.33

[1] From owners' statements, ordinarily includes items not furnished by Maritime Commission.
[2] Subject to revision Apr. 20, 1946, credit allowable is value as of Apr. 20, 1945.
[3] Not determined.
[4] Not available.
[5] Available for exchange under sec. 8 (a) only.
[6] Just compensation.

Tankers built 1941–45 available for exchange under sec. 8 of H. R. 3603

Vessel	Owner	Type	Tonnage	Date of acquisition [1]	Cost of acquisition [1]	Credit allowable [2]
Built during 1941:						
A. C. Rubel	Union Oil Co. of California	Private tanker	12,705	Dec. 30, 1941	$1,987,640.00	[3]
Albert E. Watts	Sinclair Refining Co.	do	16,928	June 27, 1941	2,709,111.73	$2,277,495.73
Charles S. Jones	Richfield Oil Corp.	do	12,862	Nov. 28, 1941	1,977,813.24	2,687,130.00
E. H. Blum	Atlantic Refining Co.	do	19,200	Apr. 2, 1941	2,363,098.00	[3]
Esso Little Rock	Standard Oil Co.	do	17,950	Jan. 7, 1941	2,527,279.00	2,163,313.92
Flying A. (Kalili)	Tidewater Associated Oil Co.	do	2,449	Aug. 19, 1941	526,553.21	[4]
Pan Rhode Island	Pan American Petroleum & Transportation Co.	do	13,100	Mar. 4, 1941	2,078,503.81	1,750,766.19
Petrofuel	National Bulk Carriers, Inc.	do	12,600	Mar. —, 1941	[5]	[5]
Sinclair Opatene	Sinclair Refining Co.	do	12,160	Aug. 16, 1941	2,347,435.11	1,948,797.58
Sinclair Rubilene	do	do	12,160	Sept. 20, 1941	2,354,841.41	1,966,431.74
Sinclair Superflame	do	do	12,214	Nov. 7, 1941	2,354,857.24	1,948,459.39
Stanvac Capetown	Petroleum Shipping Co., Ltd.	do	16,625	June 25, 1941	2,403,094.79	2,018,662.71
Stanvac Wellington	do	do	16,725	Aug. 9, 1941	2,328,073.23	1,930,452.68
W. C. Yeager	Atlantic Refining Co.	do	19,165	Aug. 15, 1941	2,571,049.00	[3]
Built during 1942:						
Bennington	Seamar Tankers, Inc.	T2-SE-A1	16,770	Oct. 10, 1942	2,952,565.00	2,584,627.09
Bunker Hill	Kaymar Tankers, Inc.	T2-SE-A1	16,770	Apr. 30, 1942	2,891,016.47	2,461,047.29
Calusa	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.	T2-SE-A1	16,765	July 31, 1942	2,949,490.00	2,547,995.94
Caribbean	Barber Asphalt Corp.	T2-SE-A1	16,572	Dec. 15, 1942	3,054,960.86	2,696,442.61
Cherry Valley	Kaymar Tankers, Inc.	T2-SE-A1	16,770	Nov. 27, 1942	3,037,195.00	2,673,272.70
Colorado	The Texas Co.	Private tanker	14,140	June 12, 1942	2,735,295.86	2,344,598.45
E. W. Sinclair	Sinclair Refining Co.	do	16,853	Jan. 23, 1942	2,730,298.91	2,287,953.28
Esso Annapolis	Standard Oil Co.	do	16,585	May 4, 1942	2,909,024.00	2,477,970.65
Esso Hartford	do	do	16,585	July 10, 1942	2,557,074.00	2,201,640.92
Esso Manhattan	do	T2-SE-A1	16,765	Aug. 22, 1942	2,951,386.00	2,558,528.44
Esso New Orleans	do	Private tanker	16,640a	Nov. 23, 1942	2,959,540.00	2,603,300.80
Esso Norfolk	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800	Dec. 30, 1942	3,057,263.00	2,704,756.61
Esso Paterson	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800	Nov. 30, 1942	2,991,940.00	2,634,069.80
Esso Philadelphia	do	Private tanker	17,957	Dec. 28, 1942	2,869,276.00	2,537,658.67
Esso Raleigh	do	do	16,640	Dec. 19, 1942	2,996,405.00	2,646,400.50
Esso Richmond	do	do	18,450	June 30, 1942	2,761,915.00	2,374,225.59
Esso Washington	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800	Oct. 31, 1942	2,994,059.00	2,624,231.45
Esso Wilmington	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800	Nov. 14, 1942	3,002,307.00	2,637,218.49
Flagship Sinco	Sinclair Refining Co.	Private tanker	17,229	Jan. 28, 1942	2,824,902.01	2,369,164.25
Gulf Caribbean	Gulf Oil Corp.	do	14,200	Dec. 31, 1942	2,800,910.17	2,478,345.29
Gulf Maracaibo	do	do	14,200	Sept. 30, 1942	2,782,292.94	2,426,807.58
Gulfport	do	do	12,882	Sept. 30, 1942	2,377,039.12	2,068,773.15
Markay	Keystone Tankship Corp.	do	16,550	Oct. 13, 1942	3,030,588.09	2,656,828.19
Monmouth	do	T2-SE-A1	16,770	Oct. 31, 1942	2,972,190.00	2,605,063.68
Montana	The Texas Co.	Private tanker	14,140	July 23, 1942	2,752,323.67	2,374,652.29
Sabine Sun	Sun Oil Co.	do	17,955	May 3, 1942	2,784,767.40	2,371,744.64
Sheldon Clark	Sinclair Refining Co.	do	17,134	Mar. 27, 1942	2,855,485.89	2,417,501.51
Sinclair, H. C.	do	do	12,214	Jan. 21, 1942	2,328,207.92	1,950,368.64
Ticonderoga	Seamar Tankers, Inc.	T2-SE-A1	16,770	Sept. 18, 1942	2,949,610.00	2,567,911.05
Virginia	National Bulk Carriers, Inc.	Private tanker	18,800	Nov. —, 1942	[5]	[5]
W. H. Ferguson	Continental Steamship Co.	do	13,018	Aug. 23, 1942	2,174,527.68	1,885,375.25
Built during 1943:						
Atlantic States	Atlantic Refining Co.	do	13,100	Mar. 9, 1943	2,695,498.00	2,410,181.58
Atlantic Coast	do	do	13,332	May 26, 1943	3 07 ,080.00	2,785,040.72
Buena Vista	The Texas Co.	T2-SE-A1	16,760	Mar. 31, 1943	3,020,000.00	2,679,935.40
Bulktube	National Bulk Carriers, Inc.	T3-S-BF1	18,900	Nov. 12, 1943	2,800,000.00	[3]
Cerro Gordo	Texas Co.	T2-SE-A1	16,760	Apr. 20, 1943	3,200,000.00	2,687,130.00
Chancellorsville	Paco Tankers, Inc.	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Oct. 30, 1943	3,000,928.58	2,779,887.81
Colina	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.	T2-SE-A1	16,770	Jan. 14, 1943	3,146,801.00	2,790,436.85
Conastoga	do	T2-SE-A1	16,752	Feb. 19, 1943	3,142,959.00	2,783,860.72
Contreras	The Texas Co.	T2-SE-A1	16,760	Apr. 30, 1943	3,020,000.00	2,690,613.56
Cross Keys	Gulf Oil Corp.	T2-SE-A1	16,560a	July 17, 1943	3,017,147.52	2,751,514.77
Churubusco	Texas Co.	T2-SE-A1	16,760	Apr. 8, 1943	3,010,000.00	2,681,044.63
Dartmouth	Standard Oil Co.	T3-S-A1	16,400	Apr. 9, 1943	3,077,276.00	2,704,616.61
Delaware	The Texas Co.	Private tanker	14,140a	July 31, 1943	3,070,567.86	2,806,120.70
Esso Buffalo	Standard Oil Co.	do	18,605	May 29, 1943	2,863,328.00	2,592,018.09
Esso Pittsburgh	do	do	17,950	Feb. 26, 1943	2,901,087.00	2,589,637.64
Esso Rochester	do	do	18,604	Jan. 29, 1943	2,828,639.00	2,514,117.80
Fredericksburg	Paco Tankers, Inc.	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Oct. 19, 1943	3,005,379.64	2,779,482.36
Gaines Mill	Charles Kurz & Co., Inc.	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Oct. 23, 1943	3,003,115.29	2,779,033.75
Georgia	The Texas Co.	Private tanker	14,162	May 25, 1943	3,084,875.84	2,790,883.18
Indiana	do	do	14,146	Sept. 15, 1943	3,069,488.92	2,824,476.65
J. H. Tuttle	Standard Oil Co.	do	18,225	Feb. 27, 1943	3,406,246.28	3,041,031.62
Jalapa	Gulf Oil Corp.	T2-SE-A1	16,782	June 21, 1943	3,011,675.15	2,735,797.68
Kenyon	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.	T3-S-A1	16,543	Nov. 24, 1943	3,128,648.00	2,908,914.35
Kittanning	Paco Tankers, Inc.	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Oct. 23, 1943	2,997,730.83	[4]
Mill Spring	Charles Kurz & Co., Inc.	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Oct. 13, 1943	2,997,730.83	2,774,051.06
Mobilight	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.	Private tanker	16,550	Apr. 26, 1943	2,940,357.40	2,648,483.68
Mobiloil	do	do	16,580	Mar. 31, 1943	2,850,000.00	2,556,918.71
Occidental	do	T3-S-A1	16,528a	Sept. 29, 1943	3,143,826.00	2,898,909.27
Pan Massachusetts	National Bulk Carriers, Inc.	Private tanker	18,900	Apr. 19, 1943	[5]	[5]
Perryville	Paco Tankers, Inc.	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Nov. 16, 1943	3,003,179.20	2,788,966.36
Petersburg	do	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Nov. 13, 1943	3,001,336.72	2,786,021.87
R. C. Stoner	Standard Oil Co. of California	Private tanker	18,225	Apr. 15, 1943	3,432,371.54	3,086,454.57
Sachem	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.	T3-S-A1	16,535	May 27, 1943	3,212,405.00	2,907,138.75
Samoset	do	T3-S-A1	16,535	May 7, 1943	3,146,820.00	2,839,164.70
San Antonio	Gulf Oil Corp.	T2-SE-A1	16,555	Apr. 28, 1943	3,009,575.48	2,711,627.74
Shabonee	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.	T3-S-A1	16,400	Aug. 30, 1943	3,217,418.08	2,953,545.97
Vera Cruz	The Texas Co.	T2-SE-A1	16,760	Feb. 24, 1943	3,104,384.96	2,770,259.81
Wellesley	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.	T3-S-A1	16,543	Dec. 14, 1943	3,118,690.00	2,908,200.02
Built during 1944:						
Bulkcrude	National Bulk Carriers, Inc.	T3-S-BF1	18,900	Apr. 12, 1944	2,803,073.80	[3]
Bulkero	do	T3-S-BF1	18,900	June 23, 1944	2,800,018.12	[3]
Bulkfuel	do	T3-S-BF1	18,900	Jan. 31, 1944	2,800,000.00	[3]
Duquesne	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.	T3-S-A1	16,543	Mar. 13, 1944	2,700,000.00	2,550,938.61
Esso Camden	Standard Oil Co.	T2-SE-A1	16,625	June 5, 1944	2,854,768.73	2,730,015.34
Esso Memphis	do	T2-SE-A1	16,613	June 28, 1944	2,853,300.77	2,737,741.99
Esso New Haven	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800a	Mar. 27, 1944	2,840,000.00	2,688,688.52
Esso Portland	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800	Mar. 14, 1944	2,870,000.00	2,711,993.17
Esso Roanoke	do	T2-SE-A1	16,611	July 14, 1944	2,851,921.00	2,742,407.23
Esso Scranton	do	T2-SE-A1	16,610	June 20, 1944	2,853,375.03	2,754,674.63
Esso Springfield	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800a	Mar. 27, 1944	2,840,000.00	2,688,688.72
Esso Utica	do	T2-SE-A1	16,619	Apr. 29, 1944	2,835,000.00	2,696,652.00
French Creek	Cities Service Oil Co.	T2-SE-A1	16,608	Dec. 20, 1944	2,866,246.99	2,818,724.61
Phoenix	National Bulk Carriers, Inc.	T3-S-BZ1	23,598	Oct. 31, 1944	[3]	[4]
Saconnet	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.	T3-S-A1	16,543	Apr. 27, 1944	2,874,000.00	2,733,174.00
South Mountain	The Texas Co.	T2-SE-A1	16,617	Feb. 15, 1944	2,999,835.00	2,823,205.37
Spottsylvania	Gulf Oil Corp.	T2-SE-A1	16,756a	July 15, 1944	3,009,864.31	2,797,648.48
Stanvac Calcutta	Petroleum Shipping Co., Ltd.	Private tanker		Sept. 16, 1944	2,900,000.00	2,814,189.00
Williamsburg	The Texas Co.	T2-SE-A1	16,617	Feb. 26, 1944	2,998,290.00	2,826,256.97

Footnotes at end of table.

Tankers built 1941–45 available for exchange under sec. 8 of H. R. 3603—Continued

Vessel	Owner	Type	Tonnage	Date of acquisition [1]	Cost of acquisition [1]	Credit allowable [2]
Built during 1945:						
Amacuro	Creole Petroleum Corp	Private tanker		May 23, 1945	(4)	(4)
Amtank	National Bulk Carriers, Inc	T3-S-BZ1	23,814	May 25, 1945	(3)	(4)
Mara	Creole Petroleum Corp		5,650	Apr. 21, 1945	(3)	(4)
Nashbulk	National Bulk Carriers, Inc	T3-S-BZ1	23,814	Feb. 14, 1945	(3)	(4)
Santa Paula	Union Oil Co. of California	T2-SE-A1		Apr. 20, 1945	$2,861,543.71	$2,861,543.71
Stanvac Palmbang	Petroleum Shipping Co., Ltd	Private tanker		Jan. 30, 1945	(5)	(4)
Syosset	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	T3-S-A1	16,543	Mar. 12, 1945	3,006,565.39	2,990,630.59

[1] From owners' statements, ordinarily includes items not furnished by Maritime Commission.
[2] Subject to revision Apr. 20, 1946; credit allowable is value as of Apr. 20, 1945.
[3] Just compensation.
[4] Not determined.
[5] Not available.

A perusal of the list will show many vessels would, under the provisions of section 8 of H. R. 3603, be credited far in excess of their acquistion cost years ago. For instance, the *City of Houston*, a 4,200-dead-weight-ton vessel built in 1929 and acquired in 1924 for $58,000, would be credited at $173,000. The *City of Omaha*, a 9,800-dead-weight-ton vessel built in 1920 and purchased in 1933 for $49,000, would be credited at $461,000. The tanker *El Segundo*, of 5,000 dead-weight tons built in 1912, was acquired in 1938 for $64,000. It would be credited at $217,000 under H. R. 3603.

Many of these vessels purchased for less than $100,000 received charter hires in excess of that figure for each year of war service.

The first committee amendment, which was drafted by my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], corrects this situation by placing a strict limitation on trade-in allowances. By providing a maximum of 10 percent of the 1944 construction cost of the new vessel purchased as the top exchange allowance, this committee amendment places an absolute floor below which no further concession will be made. The exchange allowances provided in this amendment approximate the allowances suggested by Admiral Land in his June 9 communication.

A further limitation is provided in any case where the vessel offered in exchange was acquired from the United States. In such cases the exchange allowance may not exceed the cost of acquisition plus the depreciated cost of improvements.

It is estimated that this committee amendment reduces the exchange allowances provided in section 8 by an average of $20 a dead-weight ton. With approximately 5,000,000 dead-weight tons before 1935 available for trade-in, this amendment may save the Government up to $100,000,000.

In addition to the proposal offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], I have proposed another limitation on the exchange of vessels which has been incorporated into the committee amendment. This limitation would prevent operators from requiring the Government to recondition their old vessels pursuant to the present charter agreement, only to have the operators turn around and trade these old vessels in. This additional limitation may save the Government between $15 and $20 a ton for reconditioning as much as 5,000,000 dead-weight tons.

Acceptance of the committee amendment to section 8 will provide trade-in allowances which will be fair to the operators and to the Treasury.

Section 9 of H. R. 3603 provides for a refund to operators who purchased vessels during the war, at war cost, back to the statutory sales price contained in section 3 of the bill. Such an adjustment is fair. We do not want to place the wartime purchaser at a disadvantage with his competitor who acquires a similar vessel under the provisions of this bill.

However, section 9 contains many loopholes which in my opinion places the wartime purchaser in a far better position than future purchasers. For one thing, the wartime purchaser, under section 9, would be allowed trade-in allowances far in excess of those provided under the committee amendment to section 8.

If there is to be equality between past and future purchases there must be comparable terms and nothing less. For the information of the Members, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD at this point a full list of vessels on which an adjustment may be made under section 9, and certain pertinent trade-in data on these adjustments:

EXHIBIT B

VESSELS ON WHICH AN ADJUSTMENT MAY BE MADE UNDER SEC. 9, H. R. 3603

Dry-cargo vessels—Adjustment on which may be made under sec. 9, H. R. 3603

Vessel	Owner	Type	Tonnage	Date of acquisition [1]	Original cost of acquisition [1]	Trade-in data	Estimated adjustment under sec. 9 of H. R. 3603 [2]
Build in 1941:							
Aguirprince	New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co	C1B	8,958	Nov. 1, 1941	$1,099,004.50		
Alcoa Patriot	Alcoa Steamship Co	C1B	9,395	Aug. 11, 1941	1,082,077.19		
Alcoa Pennant	do	C1B	8,958	Dec. 16, 1941	1,099,420.67		
Alcoa Pioneer	do	C1B	9,395	Mar. 27, 1941	1,064,321.26		
American Builder	United States Lines	C1B	9,140	July 25, 1941	1,143,664.98		
American Manufacturer	do	C1B	9,140	Apr. 11, 1941	1,123,855.25		
American Packer	do	C1B	9,140	Oct. 8, 1941	1,160,658.21		
Cape Cod	United Fruit Co	C1B	9,316	June 19, 1941	1,012,198.19		
Cape Neddick	do	C1B	9,316	May 20, 1941	1,013,882.66		
Excellor	American Export Lines, Inc	C2-S-A1	7,878	Aug. 13, 1941	1,229,596.19		
Extavia	do	C2-S-A1	8,100	Oct. 7, 1941	1,225,518.46		
Idaho	Pacific-Atlantic Steamship Co	C1B	9,055	Sept. 8, 1941	2,247,054.61		
Island Mail	American Mail Line, Ltd	C2-SU	9,600	Dec. 12, 1941	1,322,627.15		
John Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C1B	9,227	Jan. 31, 1941	998,168.46		
Mormacsea	Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc	C3M	12,570	Mar. 14, 1941	1,650,627.57		
Mormacstar	do	C3-Cargo	12,557	Jan. 30, 1941	1,729,651.84		
Mormacsun	do	C3M	12,574	June 6, 1941	1,664,581.90		
Mormactide	do	C3-Cargo	12,542	Apr. 10, 1941	1,671,008.91		
Mormacyork	do	C3-Cargo	12,599	Feb. 7, 1941	1,595,793.21		
President Polk	American President Lines, Ltd	C3-Passenger	10,470	Nov. 6, 1941	2,187,661.65		
Robin Sherwood	Seas Shipping Co., Inc	C2-S	10,048	July 16, 1941	1,380,772.79		
Robin Tuxford	do	C2-S	10,048	Sept. 22, 1941	1,382,015.86		
Robin Wentley	do	C2-S	10,048	Nov. 3, 1941	1,371,755.14		
Santa Cruz	Grace Line, Inc	C1B	9,344	June 26, 1941	1,035,866.69		
Thompson Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C1B	9,260	Apr. 25, 1941	1,012,332.76		
Built in 1942:							
Adabelle Lykes	do	C1A	7,235	Mar. 20, 1942	1,045,045.47		
African Dawn	American South African Line	C2-S-B1	8,887	Nov. 25, 1942	1,537,837.50		
African Sun	do	C2-S-B1	9,193	Dec. 22, 1942	1,557,494.53		
Alcoa Polaris	Alcoa Steamship Co., Inc	C1B	8,958	Feb. 13, 1942	1,100,060.78		
China Mail	American Mail Line, Ltd	C2-SU	9,600	Feb. 2, 1942	1,322,006.33		

Footnotes at end of table.

Dry-cargo vessels—Adjustment on which may be made under sec. 9, H. R. 3603—Continued

Vessel	Owner	Type	Tonnage	Date of acquisition [1]	Original cost of acquisition [1]	Trade-in data	Estimated adjustment under sec. 9 of H. R. 3603 [2]
Built in 1942—Continued							
Delaries	Mississippi Shipping Co	C2-F	9,200	Sept. 30, 1942	$1,429,969.46		
Examiner	American Export Lines, Inc	C-3-E	9,848	Jan. 23, 1942	1,601,303.77		
Exanthia	do	C2-S-A1	7,878	Jan. 21, 1942	1,223,845.22		
Exiria	do	C2-S-A1	7,878	Feb. 13, 1942	1,227,488.47		
Fairisle	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2—modified	10,875	July 31, 1942	3,023,805.28		
Fairland	do	C2—modified	10,875	Aug. 31, 1942	3,036,211.74		
Marina	A. H. Bull & Co	C1-A	7,270	Jan. 29, 1942	2,293,600.38		
Mormacdale	Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc	C1-A	7,573	Feb. 20, 1942	1,081,514.07		
Mormacdove	do	C1-B	9,275	Dec. 31, 1942	1,403,408.12		
Mormachawk	do	C1-B	8,958	Dec. 14, 1942	1,395,885.79		
Mormactern	do	C1-B	9,075	Dec. 29, 1942	1,400,215.33		
Mormacwren	do	C1-B	8,958	Dec. 26, 1942	1,399,098.49		
Raphael Semmes	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,875	Oct. 30, 1942	3,040,284.76		
Shooting Star	United States Lines	C2-S-U	8,595	Aug. 14, 1942	1,291,444.01		
Afoundria	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,875	Nov. 8, 1943	2,698,763.77	[3]	
Alcoa Partner (Auriga)	Alcoa Steamship Co., Inc	C1-B	9,075	Mar. 13, 1943	1,472,605.43		
Alcoa Pegasus	do	C1-B	9,047	Apr. 6, 1943	1,410,444.16		
Alcoa Pilgrim	do	C1-B	9,047	Mar. 20, 1943	[4]		
Built in 1943:							
Alcoa Planter	do	C1-B	9,047	Mar. 22, 1943	1,468,900.39		
Alcoa Pointer	do	C1-B	9,047	Apr. 3, 1943	1,409,506.71		
Alcoa Puritan	do	C1-B	9,047	Mar. 29, 1943	1,412,408.30		
Azalea City	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,875	July 2, 1943	3,001,657.44		
Bienville	do	C2-S-E1	10,875	May 31, 1943	3,000,000.00		
Cape Alexander	New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co	C1-B	9,047	Dec. 24, 1943	1,447,255.57		
Cape Chalmers	do	C1-B	9,047	Aug. 30, 1943	1,446,402.89		
Excelsior	American Export Lines, Inc	C3-S-A3	9,902	Aug. 23, 1943	1,681,176.14		
Exchequer	do	C3-S-A3	9,902	Oct. 7, 1943	1,681,032.00		
Fred Morris	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C1-B	9,075	Feb. 26, 1943	1,467,523.10		
Jean Lafitte	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	9,750	Sept. 10, 1943	2,808,924.50	[3]	
Jean Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Corp	C1-B	9,104	Feb. 19, 1943	1,469,950.49		
Mormacgull	Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc	C1-B	9,075	Feb. 9, 1943	1,351,104.18		
Mormaclark	do	C1-B	9,275	Feb. 4, 1943	1,337,618.33		
Nancy Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C1-B	9,275	Feb. 13, 1943	1,337,195.90		
Sea Pike	Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc	C3-S-A2	12,505	do	1,742,250.23		
Solon Turman	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C1-B	9,075	Feb. 28, 1943	1,469,474.30		
Warrior	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	9,750	July 26, 1943	2,991,127.82	[3]	
Built in 1944:							
Antinous	Pan Atlantic Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,875	July 27, 1944	2,627,400.00	[3]	
De Soto	do	C2-S-E1	10,875	May 26, 1944	2,628,355.94	[3]	
Exminister	American Export Lines, Inc	C3-S-A3	9,848	Feb. 17, 1944	[4]		
Flying Eagle	Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc	C2-S-AJ1	10,445	Jan. 15, 1944	1,592,778.31		
Hastings	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,979	Nov. 17, 1944	2,642,706.03		
Memnon	Mississippi Shipping Co	C2-S-AJ1	10,445	Apr. 12, 1944	[4]		
Napier	Grace Line, Inc	C2-S-AJ2	10,759	Apr. 20, 1944	[4]		
Santa Catalina	do	C2-S-AJ2	10,752	July 19, 1944	1,800,089.94		
Santa Elisa	do	C2-S-AJ2	10,694	July 31, 1944	1,414,037.40		
Santa Ines	do	C2-S-AJ2	10,769	Aug. 11, 1944	1,800,200.13		
Santa Leonor	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,386	May 18, 1944	[4]		
Santa Rita	do	C2-S-AJ2	10,774	June 26, 1944	1,458,446.03		
Sturdy Beggar	Mississippi Shipping Co	C2-S-AJ1	10,445	Apr 6, 1944	[4]		
Talisman	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,445	1944	[4]		
Wacosta	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,591	Apr. 6, 1944	2,660,169.32	[3]	
Yaka	do	C2-S-E1	10,875a	Sept. 22, 1944	2,645,351.63		
Built Jan. 1 to June 1, 1945:							
American Banker	United States Lines Co	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	Apr. 12, 1945	1,347,067.34		
American Farmer	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	Apr. 19, 1945	1,347,002.53		
American Ranger	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	Apr. 5, 1945	[4]		
Andrew Jackson	Waterman Steamship Corp	C2-S-E1	10,875	Mar. 23, 1945	2,691,194.97		
Canvasback	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C2-S-AJ1	10,821				
City of Alma	Waterman Steamship Corp	CS-2-E1	10,875	May 4, 1945	2,626,493.54		
Elizabeth Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C-2-S-AJ1	10,821	May 17, 1945	1,334,862.16		
Fra Berlanga	United Mail Steamship Co	R2-ST-AU1	7,606	Feb. 21, 1945	2,652,766.57		
Harry Culbreath	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	May 30, 1945	1,334,785.11		
Kenneth McKay	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,826	Apr. 26, 1945	1,334,390.64		
Limon	United Mail Steamship Co	R2-ST-AU1	7,665	May 10, 1945	2,652,766.67		
Louise Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	do	1,334,911.35		
Madaket	Waterman Steamship Corp	C-S-E1	10,979	Jan. 19, 1945	2,641,046.21		
Red Gauntlet	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co	C2-S-AJ1	10,821				
Reuben Tipton	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	May 24, 1945	1,334,893.68		
Ruth Lykes	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	Mar. 27, 1945	1,346,183.27		
San Jose	United Mail Steamship Co	R2-ST-AU1	7,665				
Stella Lykes	Lykes Bros. Steamship Corp	C2-S-AJ1	10,516	Mar. 21, 1945	[4]		
Simoon	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,821				
Tyson Lykes	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,820				
Velma Lykes	do	C2-S-AJ1	10,821	May 3, 1945	1,334,832.13		

[1] From owners' statements, ordinarily includes items not furnished by Maritime Commission.
[2] See chart No. 5 for adjustments under sec. 9 for standard-type vessels.
[3] See attached for data regarding trade-in.
[4] Not available.

Trade-in data on dry-cargo vessels—Adjustment on which may be made under sec. 9, H. R. 3603

Owner	Name of new vessel	Distribution of trade-in allowance	Vessel traded in	Date of construction	Tonnage		Allowance on vessel traded in
					Gross	Dead weight	
Pan Atlantic Steamship Co	Antinous	$548,000	Panama City	1920	4,846	7,669	$548,000
	De Soto	541,000	Pan Gulf	1918	5,599	8,549	541,000
Waterman Steamship Co	Afoundria	686,900	Arizpa	1920	5,437	8,804	686,900
	Jean Lafitte	676,000	Lafayette	1919	5,887	11,240	676,000
	Wacosta	686,700	Kofresi	1920	4,934	7,999	686,700
	Warrior	560,000	West Kyske	1918	5,552	8,450	560,000

Tankers—Adjustment on which may be made under sec. 9, H. R. 3603

Vessel	Owner	Type	Tonnage	Date of acquisition [1]	Original cost of acquisition [1]	Trade-in data	Estimated adjustment under sec. 9 of H. R. 3603 [2]
Built during 1942:							
Bennington	Seamar Tankers, Inc	T2-SE-A1	16,770	Oct. 10, 1942	$2,952,565.00		
Bunker Hill	Kaymar Tankers, Inc	T2-SE-A1	16,770	Apr. 30, 1942	2,891,016.47		
Calusa	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	T2-SE-A1	16,765	July 31, 1942	2,949,490.00		
Caribbean	Barber Asphalt Corp	T2-SE-A1	16,572	Dec. 15, 1942	3,054,960.86		
Cherry Valley	Kaymar Tankers, Inc	T2-SE-A1	16,770	Nov. 27, 1942	3,037,195.00		
Esso Manhattan	Standard Oil Co	T2-SE-A1	16,765	Aug. 22, 1942	2,951,386.00		
Esso Norfolk	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800	Dec. 30, 1942	3,057,263.00		
Esso Paterson	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800	Nov. 30, 1942	2,991,940.00		
Esso Washington	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800	Oct. 31, 1942	2,994,059.00		
Esso Wilmington	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800	Nov. 14, 1942	3,002,307.00		
Monmouth	Keystone Tankship Corp	T2-SE-A1	16,770	Oct. 31, 1942	2,972,190.00		
Ticonderoga	Seamar Tankers, Inc	T2-SE-A1	16,770	Sept. 18, 1942	2,949,610.00		
Built during 1943:							
Buena Vista	The Texas Co	T2-SE-A1	16,760	Mar. 31, 1943	3,020,000.00		
Bulklube	National Bulk Carriers, Inc	T3-S-BF1	18,900	Nov. 12, 1943	2,800,000.00	[3]	
Cerro Gordo	The Texas Co	T2-SE-A1	16,760	Apr. 20, 1943	3,200,000.00		
Chancellorsville	Paco Tankers, Inc	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Oct. 30, 1943	3,000,928.58	[3]	
Colina	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	T2-SE-A1	16,770	Jan. 14, 1943	3,146,801.00		
Conastoga	do	T2-SE-A1	16,752	Feb. 19, 1943	3,142,959.00		
Contreras	The Texas Co	T2-SE-A1	16,760	Apr. 30, 1943	3,020,000.00		
Cross Keys	Gulf Oil Corp	T2-SE-A1	16,560a	July 17, 1943	3,017,147.52		
Churubusco	The Texas Co	T2-SE-A1	16,760	Apr. 8, 1943	3,010,000.00		
Dartmouth	Standard Oil Co	T3-S-A1	16,400	Apr. 9, 1943	3,077,276.00		
Fredericksburg	Paco Tankers, Inc	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Oct. 19, 1943	3,005,379.64	[3]	
Gaines Mill	Chas. Kurz & Co., Inc	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Oct. 23, 1943	3,003,115.29	[3]	
Jalapa	Gulf Oil Corp	T2-SE-A1	16,782	June 21, 1943	3,011,675.15		
Kenyon	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	T3-S-A1	16,543	Nov. 24, 1943	3,128,648.00	[3]	
Kittanning	Paco Tankers, Inc	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Oct. 23, 1943	2,997,730.83	[3]	
Mill Spring	Chas. Kurz & Co., Inc	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Oct. 13, 1943	2,997,730.83	[3]	
Occidental	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	T3-S-A1	16,528a	Sept. 29, 1943	3,143,826.00	[3]	
Perryville	Paco Tankers, Inc	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Nov. 16, 1943	3,003,179.20	[3]	
Petersburg	do	T2-SE-A1	16,756	Nov. 13, 1943	3,001,336.72	[3]	
Sachem	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	T3-S-A1	16,535	May 27, 1943	3,212,405.00		
Samoset	do	T3-S-A1	16,535	May 7, 1943	3,146,820.00		
San Antonio	Gulf Oil Corp	T2-SE-A1	16,555	Apr. 28, 1943	3,009,575.48		
Shabonee	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	T3-S-A1	16,400	Aug. 30, 1943	3,217,418.08		
Vera Cruz	The Texas Co	T2-SE-A1	16,760	Feb. 24, 1943	3,104,384.96		
Wellesley	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	T3-S-A1	16,543	Dec. 14, 1943	3,118,690.00	[3]	
Built during 1944:							
Bulkcrude	National Bulk Carriers, Inc	T3-S-BF1	18,900	Apr. 12, 1944	2,803,073.80	[3]	
Bulkero	do	T3-S-BF1	18,900	June 23, 1944	2,800,018.12	[3]	
Bulkfuel	do	T3-S-BF1	18,900	Jan. 31, 1944	2,800,000.00	[3]	
Duquesne	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	T3-S-A1	16,543	Mar. 13, 1944	2,700,000.00	[3]	
Esso Camden	Standard Oil Co	T2-SE-A1	16,625	June 5, 1944	2,854,768.73	[3]	
Esso Memphis	do	T2-SE-A1	16,613	June 28, 1944	2,853,300.67	[3]	
Esso New Haven	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800a	Mar. 27, 1944	2,840,000.00	[3]	
Esso Portland	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800	Mar. 14, 1944	2,870,000.00	[3]	
Esso Roanoke	do	T2-SE-A1	16,611	July 14, 1944	2,851,921.00	[3]	
Esso Scranton	do	T2-SE-A1	16,610	June 20, 1944	2,853,375.03	[3]	
Esso Springfield	do	T2-SE-A1	16,800a	Mar. 27, 1944	2,840,000.00	[3]	
Esso Utica	do	T2-SE-A1	16,619	Apr. 29, 1944	2,835,000.00	[3]	
French Creek	Cities Service Oil Co	T2-SE-A1	16,608	Dec. 20, 1944	2,866,246.99		
Phoenix	National Bulk Carriers, Inc	T3-S-BZ1	23,598	Oct. 31, 1944	[4]	[3]	
Saconnet	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	T3-S-A1	16,543	Apr. 27, 1944	2,874,000.00	[3]	
South Mountain	The Texas Co	T2-SE-A1	16,617	Feb. 15, 1944	2,999,835.00	[3]	
Spottsylvania	Gulf Oil Corp	T2-SE-A1	16,756a	July 15, 1944	3,009,864.31		
Williamsburg	The Texas Co	T2-SE-A1	16,617	Feb. 26, 1944	2,998,290.00	[3]	
Built during 1945:							
Amtank	National Bulk Carriers, Inc	T3-S-BZ1	23,814	May 25, 1945	[4]	[3]	
Nashbulk	do	T3-S-BZ1	23,814	Feb. 14, 1945	[4]	[3]	
Santa Paula	Union Oil Co. of California	T2-SE-A1		Apr. 20, 1945	2,861,543.71		
Syosset	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	T3-S-A1	16,543	Mar. 12, 1945	3,006,565.39	[3]	

[1] From owners' statements, ordinarily includes items not furnished by Maritime Commission.
[2] See chart No. 5 for adjustments under sec. 9 for standard type vessels.
[3] See attached for data regarding trade-in.
[4] Not available.

Trade-in data on tankers—Adjustment on which may be made under sec. 9, H. R. 3603

Owner	Name of new vessel	Distribution of trade-in allowance	Vessel traded in	Date of construction	Tonnage		Allowance on vessel traded in
					Gross	Dead weight	
Chas. Kurz & Co., Inc	Gaines Mill	$1,104,500.00	Beta	1917	5,665	9,000	$670,000
	Mill Spring	1,104,500.00	Olney	1920	7,294	10,760	690,000
			Elwood	1918	7,098	11,240	849,000
National Bulk Carriers, Inc	Amtank	795,000.00	Pan Georgia	1918		14,210	795,000
	Bulkcrude	513,650.00					
	Bulkero	513,650.00	Pan Carolina	1919	7,761	13,800	949,300
	Bulkfuel	513,650.00	William Penn	1920	8,447	13,614	1,105,300
	Bulklube	513,650.00					
	Phoenix	355,000.00	Pan Virginia	1919	8,143	13,935	710,000
	Nashbulk	355,000.00					
Paco Tankers, Inc	Fredericksburg	1,030,500.00	Chas. Kruz	1918	5,731	9,300	653,000
	Kittanning	1,030,500.00	Chilbar	1919	5,030	7,900	602,000
			Delworth	1919	7,045	10,671	806,000
			Antietam	1919	6,972	10,910	754,620
	Chancellorsville	1,257,960.00	Baldbutte	1919	6,295	9,862	696,670
	Perryville	1,257,960.00	Baldhill	1919	6,413	9,860	696,670
	Petersburg	1,257,960.00	Dannedaike	1919	4,310	6,350	461,550
			Paco	1920	5,186	7,900	637,520
			Thermo	1920	4,487	6,710	526,850
			Argon	1920	6,952	10,790	691,600
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	Duquesne	1,306,894.50	Mojave	1921	6,901	10,725	753,300
	Saconnet	1,306,894.50	Paulsboro	1916	6,699	10,647	473,189
			Tejon	1920	7,005	10,687	695,700
			Acme	1916	6,878	10,670	468,250
	Kenyon	1,387,457.00	Birkenhead	1921	6,960	10,698	820,570
	Occidental	1,387,457.00	Gargoyle	1921	7,003	10,630	774,750
	Wellesley	1,387,457.00	Libre	1921	7,058	11,077	795,301
			Standard Arrow	1916	7,794	13,380	575,250
			Vacuum	1920	7,009	10,680	728,250
			American Arrow	1920	8,328	13,400	753,750
	Syosset	1,361,250.00	Lebec	1921	6,893	10,800	607,500

Trade-in data on tankers—Adjustment on which may be made under sec. 9, H. R. 3603—Continued

Owner	Name of new vessel	Distribution of trade-in allowance	Vessel traded in	Date of construction	Tonnage		Allowance on vessel traded in
					Gross	Dead weight	
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	Esso Camden	$1,338,858.75	C. A. Canfield	1913	6,162	10,320	$304,000
	Esso Memphis	1,338,858.75	Edward L. Doheny	1913	5,872	10,440	315,240
	Esso New Haven	1,338,858.75	Glenpool	1913	5,445	8,370	224,470
	Esso Portland	1,338,858.75	F. Q. Barstow	1917	9,004	15,955	753,970
	Esso Roanoke	1,338,858.75	Frederick R. Kellogg	1917	7,127	11,050	593,340
	Esso Scranton	1,338,858.75	R. G. Stewart	1917	9,229	13,640	624,770
	Esso Springfield	1,338,858.75	George W. Barnes	1918	6,214	9,750	575,650
	Esso Utica	1,338,858.75	S. B. Hunt	1919	6,841	11,205	735,340
			Vistula	1920	8,537	13,725	969,230
			E. T. Bedford	1921	9,564	15,655	1,127,890
			Walter Jennings	1921	9,564	16,075	1,150,200
			Christy Payne	1921	8,156	12,475	910,220
			Chester O. Swain	1921	8,146	12,450	908,380
			Thomas H. Wheeler	1921	6,950	10,450	793,170
			Wm. G. Warden	1917	9,115	15,955	725,000
The Texas Co	South Mountain	1,249,290.00	Idaho	1919	6,418	10,020	672,640
	Williamsburg	1,249,290.00	Pennsylvania	1917	6,390	9,830	566,100
			Shenandoah	1919	6,414	9,980	693,740
			Virginia	1917	6,390	9,830	566,100

I have proposed certain modifications to section 9 of H. R. 3603 which has been accepted as a committee amendment. The effect of this amendment is to treat prior sales as having taken place on the date of the enactment of this bill. The operator is compensated for all actual money investment to date by an allowance of 3½ percent interest thereon.

The adjustments to be made under section 9 of H. R. 3603 would amount to a refund of over $89,000,000 to wartime purchasers. The modifications I proposed would reduce this sum to approximately $60,000,000. The committee amendment changes certain of my modifications over my opposition, granting an additional refund of $8,000,000 above the $60,000,000. I should like to state that my amendment to be offered tomorrow, raising the statutory sale price of tankers would further reduce the refunds by about $15,000,000.

The third principal committee amendment is also one which I originally offered. It relates to the cost to the Government of reacquiring the war-built fleet in time of future emergency.

During the war our Government requisitioned virtually all of the private fleet. For those vessels on which a construction subsidy had been paid, the requisition values were determined under section 802 of the 1936 act. Under this section such vessels can be reacquired at depreciated construction cost.

For the so-called unsubsidized portion of the fleet, just compensation values were paid under the provisions of section 902 of the 1936 act. Much of the so-called unsubsidized fleet was purchased from the Government at phenomenally low prices. Just compensation determination afforded great windfalls to the operators at the public expense.

In all considerations of ship-sales legislation prior to H. R. 3603, it was provided that in event of emergency the Government could reacquire the war-built vessels under provisions similar to section 802.

In H. R. 3603 such reacquisition at depreciated purchase price was limited to a period of 5 years. Thereafter, vessels would have to be reacquired at so-called just compensation values under section 902 of the 1936 act.

Should an emergency arise necessitating a requisition of the ships, it would in all likelihood take place 10 to 20 years from now. If the experience of this war is indicative of the values which would prevail under section 902 of the 1936 act in the event of future emergency, our Government will again be forced to pay out millions of dollars in excess of what the Government is getting under this bill.

The committee amendment to section 12 establishes that vessels sold under this bill should be treated as vessels on which a construction differential subsidy was paid.

This concludes my discussion of the amendments approved by the committee.

In addition to the three committee amendments and the amendment I propose to introduce raising the tanker prices, I propose to introduce an amendment relating to a revaluation of claims for insurance and just compensation.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Does the gentleman anticipate that there will be many tankers offered for sale?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. We have roughly over 400 tankers now owned by the Maritime Commission that will be made available, and they are the finest and best. They are new, a majority of them not more than 2 years old.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Does the gentleman know how many will be required by our Navy?

Mr. JACKSON. Admiral Land says there will be a surplus after meeting the needs of the American operators and our armed services. I will come to that a little later when I refer to my amendment in connection with the tankers. I will discuss it fully at that time.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, in essence we have three classes of citizen purchasers for our war-built fleet. One is the operator who today owns a certain number of old vessels and proposes to trade them in for new tonnage. Under the committee amendment to section 8 we have established what I consider to be a fair standard for such a transaction. Second is the operator who traded in his old vessels last year or some year during the war and purchased war-built tonnage at full war cost. Under the committee amendment to section 9 we approximated equality between this category of operators and the first group. In both cases trade-in allowances were limited to standards prescribed in the committee amendment to section 8.

Third is the operator who had his ship requisitioned or lost during the war. This operator received compensation far in excess of the first and second groups of operators who had similar vessels.

On pages 380 to 387 of the hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the national war agencies appropriation bill, 1946, is a list of the wartime losses of large chartered vessels:

EXHIBIT C

FUND 11x0521, TOTAL AND CONSTRUCTIVE TOTAL LOSSES, CHARTERED LARGE VESSELS, TO MARCH 31, 1945

LEGEND

*—Charter provides for valuation under G. O. 9.
A—(adj.). Adjustment provided for in payment and requested in writing.
C—(contest). Owners contesting G. O. 10, supp. 2.
F—(foreign). Foreign vessel—foreign owner.
H—(high). Payment probably exceeds G. O. 10, supp. 2.
I—(irrelevant). G. O. 10, supp. 2, does not apply (compromise settlement).
J—(justice). Referred to Department of Justice.
M—(missing). Collision re which advance of 50 percent of commercial marine insurance was made under missing vessels supplemental agreement.
N—(no). A. B. certificate under G. O. 10, supp. 2, not received.
OK—Net amount paid is per G. O. 10, supp. 2, including those approved for payment under supp. 1.
S—(signed). Owners have signed second disputes addendum.
U—(up). Owners endeavoring to prove higher speed.
Y—(yes). A. B. certificate or A. B. letter received giving G. O. 10, supp. 2, speed.

Summary—Total and constructive total losses, chartered large vessels, to Mar. 31, 1945

	Sheet No.	Paid	Outstanding
Fund 11x0521	1	$13,663,300.12	$5,766,075.00
Do	2	17,264,119.22	4,990,710.00
Do	3	24,466,973.33	5,188,085.00
Do	4	25,260,082.42	2,695,600.00
Do	5	27,049,783.96	7,540,253.56
Do	6	18,877,368.76	1,749,837.50
Do	7	28,416,679.94	4,883,480.81
Do	8	31,139,085.69	7,471,190.00
Do	9	21,625,241.84	8,466,583.04
Do	10	8,632,633.75	969,220.00
Subtotal		216,396,169.03	49,721,034.91
Fund 11x4000	10	744,266.03	380,200.00
Grand total		217,140,435.06	50,101,234.91

Vessel	Casualty	Assured	Amount paid	Amount outstanding	Basis of valuation	Form of charter	Dead-weight tonnage	Year built
African Star	July 12, 1943	American South African Line, Inc	$1,494,180.18		JC	RTC	8,890	1942
Agwimonte	May 28, 1943	New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co	1,109,528.37		GO 24	RTC	8,675	1941
Alaskan	Nov. 28, 1942	American Hawaiian Steamship Co	414,000.00	$465,750.00	JC	RTC	10,350	1918
Alcoa Mariner	Sept. 28, 1942	Alcoa Steamship Co., Inc	241,847.37		Deprec	TC	8,750	1919
Alcoa Pathfinder	Nov. 23, 1942	do	933,986.58		GO 24	RTC	9,400	1941
Alcoa Prospector	July 5, 1943	do		950,000.00	JC	RTC	9,400	1941
Alcoa Rambler	Dec. 14, 1942	do	330,531.53		Deprec	RTC	8,850	1919
Alcoa Transport	Oct. 2, 1942	do	220,350.00		*—OK	RTC	3,400	1918
Almeria Lykes	Aug. 14, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	1,305,964.64		GO 24	RTC	12,489	1940
Amatlan	Sept. 5, 1942	Petroleos Mexicanos	621,600.00		*—FI	TC	8,965	1922
American Leader	Sept. —, 1942	United States Lines Co	1,063,126.53		GO 24	RTC	9,140	1941
Andrea F. Luckenbach	Mar. 10, 1943	Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc	1,289,970.00		*—OK	RTC	14,333	1919
Andrew Jackson	July 12, 1942	Waterman Steamship Corporation	168,855.00		Deprec	RTC	8,804	1920
Angelina	Oct. 18, 1942	A. H. Bull Steamship Co		703,075.00	JC	RTC	7,580	1934
Antinous	Sept. 24, 1942	Waterman Steamship Corporation	772,000.00		*—OK	RTC	9,650	1920
Arcata	July 14, 1942	Hammond Lumber Co	284,250.00		*—CYHS	RTC	3,782	1919
Arlyn	Aug. 27, 1942	A. H. Bull Steamship Co	359,870.00		*—OK	RTC	5,040	1919
Atlantic Sun	Feb. —, 1943	Sun Oil Co		2,716,000.00	JC	RTC	17,955	1941
Aurora	May 10, 1942	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	800,000.00		*—I	RTC	10,829	1920
Baja California	July 18, 1942	Empresa Hondurena de Vapores		200,000.00	JC	TC	2,475	1914
Beaconlight	July 16, 1942	Panama Transport Co	805,500.00		*—OK	TC	10,745	1920
Beatrice	May 25, 1942	A. H. Bull Steamship Co	357,000.00		*—OK	RTC	5,046	1917
Bellingham	Sept. 19, 1942	Waterman Steamship Corporation	72,310.00		*—OK	RTC	8,366	1920
Benjamin Brewster	July 9, 1942	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	644,625.00		*—OK	RTC	8,595	1917
Birmingham City	Jan. 8, 1943	Isthmian Steamship Co		731,250.00	*—CYS	RTC	9,720	1920
Brilliant	Nov. 18, 1942	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	373,804.92		*—I	RTC	14,533	1930
Broad Arrow	Jan. 9, 1943	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	1,003,350.00		*—OK	RTC	13,378	1918
C. O. Stillman	June 5, 1942	Panama Transport Co	1,813,875.00		*—OK	TC	24,185	1928
Caddo	Nov. 23, 1942	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	2,907,069.22		JC	RTC	16,765	1942
Camden	Oct. 4, 1942	Chas. Kurz & Co., Inc	839,200.00		*—HSY	RTC	10,510	1921
Capira	Aug. 31, 1942	North Atlantic Transportation Co., Inc	644,325.00		*—OK	RTC	8,591	1920
Carrabulie	May 26, 1942	Cuba Distilling Co	609,750.00		*—OK	RTC	8,150	1920
Caribstar	Oct. 4, 1942	Stockard Steamship Corporation	293,300.00		*—OK	RTC	4,155	1919
Carlton	July 5, 1942	Tampa Interocean Steamship Co., Inc	120,000.00		*—OK	TC	8,000	1920
Carolyn	Mar. 27, 1942	A. H. Bull Steamship Co	251,550.00	100,520.00	*—OK	BB	4,955	1912
Castilla	June 6, 1942	Empresa Hondurena de Vapores		700,000.00	JC	TC	2,159	1927
Challenger	May 17, 1942	American South African Line, Inc	871,500.00		*—OK	TC	11,620	1918
Chatham	Aug. 27, 1942	Merchants & Miners Transportation Co		1,150,000.00	JC	BB	3,960	1926
Chattanooga City	Feb. 22, 1943	Isthmian Steamship Co	796,450.00		*—OK	RTC	9,370	1921
Cherokee	June 15, 1942	Agwilines, Inc	750,000.00	450,000.00	JC	RBB	2,934	1925
Chickasaw City	Oct. 7, 1942	Isthmian Steamship Co		731,250.00	*—CYS	RTC	9,720	1920
Chilore	July 15, 1942	Ore Steamship Corporation	1,777,600.00		*—OK	RTC	22,220	1923
Cities Service Missouri	Mar. 13, 1943	Cities Service Oil Co	819,750.00		*—OK	RTC	10,930	1920
Cities Service Toledo	June 12, 1942	do	1,008,800.00		*—YH	RTC	12,615	1918
City of Birmingham	June 30, 1942	Ocean Steamship Co. of Savannah		875,000.00	JC	BB	4,400	1923
City of Joliet	May 27, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	218,000.00		*—OK	TC	9,840	1920
Clare	May 20, 1942	A. H. Bull Steamship Co	258,100.00	103,240.00	*—OK	RTC	5,049	1915
Coamo	Dec. —, 1942	Agwilines, Inc	940,000.00	560,000.00	Agreed	BB	5,340	1925
Coast Farrer	July 21, 1942	The Coastwise Line	403,500.00		*—CNH	RTC	5,400	1920
Coast Trader	June 7, 1942	do	403,500.00		*—CNH	RTC	5,400	1920
Coloradan	Oct. 9, 1942	American Hawaiian Steamship Co	534,500.00	320,700.00	*—UY	RTC	10,700	1920
Total			17,264,119.22	84,990,716.00				
Commercial Trader	Sept. 16, 1942	Moore-McCormack Lines	312,750.00		*—AN	RTC	4,220	1920
Connecticut	Mar. —, 1942	The Texas Co	2,500,000.00		00 53	TC	12,785	1938
Cripple Creek	Aug. 13, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	728,250.00		*—OK	RTC	9,707	1919
David McKelvy	May 13, 1942	Tide Water Associated Oil Co	848,250.00		*—OK	RTC	11,355	1921
Delfina	June 5, 1942	Baltimore Insular Line, Inc	265,000.00	132,500.00	*—SY	RTC	5,110	1919
Delisle	Oct. 21, 1943	do	265,000.00	92,700.00	*—SY	RTC	5,110	1919
Dellwood	July 20, 1943	Alaska Steamship Co	400,000.00	127,000.00	JC	RBB	4,070	1919
Delmundo	Aug. 3, 1942	Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc	638,945.00		*—OK	RTC	7,610	1919
Dona Aurora	Dec. 25, 1942	De La Rama Steamship Co., Inc		1,500,000.00	JC	RTC	8,915	1939
Don Isidro	Feb. 19, 1942	do		1,000,000.00	00 53	RTC	1,140	1939
Dorchester	Feb. 3, 1943	Merchants & Miners Transportation Co		1,150,000.00	JC	BB	3,960	1926
E. G. Seubert	Feb. 22, 1944	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	1,092,000.00		JC	RTC	14,560	1918
E. J. Sadler	June 22, 1942	do	1,200,000.00		*—OK	RTC	16,000	1921
East Indian	Nov. 3, 1942	Ford Motor Co	953,700.00		*—OK	RTC	11,600	1918
Edith	June 7, 1942	A. H. Bull Steamship Co., Inc	258,100.00	103,240.00	*—OK	RTC	5,049	1915
Edward Luckenbach	July 1, 1942	Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc	1,041,250.00		*—OK	RTC	12,250	1916
Effingham	Mar. 30, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	727,050.00		Agreed	TC	9,694	1919
Elizabeth	May 20, 1942	A. H. Bull Steamship Co	292,920.00	196,455.00	JC	RTC	6,525	1918
Elizabeth Kellogg	Nov. 23, 1943	Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc	592,500.00		*—OK	RTC	7,899	1920
Esso Baton Rouge	Feb. 23, 1943	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	1,708,151.79		JC	RTC	12,950	1938
Esso Gettysburg	June 10, 1943	do	2,708,429.55		JC	RTC	16,765	1942
Esso Harrisburg	July 7, 1944	do	2,328,800.00		JC	RTC	16,585	1942
Esso Houston	May 12, 1942	do	1,750,694.08		JC	RTC	13,085	1938
Esso Williamsburg	Sept. 22, 1942	do	2,553,682.91		JC	RTC	17,950	1941
Elna	Dec. 27, 1943	J. Ramselius, etc	100,000.00	87,500.00	*—CY	RBB	2,500	1920
Everalda	June 29, 1942	F. Grauds		394,890.00	Agreed—J	TC	6,850	1912
Everelza	Aug. 13, 1942	do		403,800.00	Agreed—J	TC	6,730	1921
Examelia	Oct. 8, 1942	American Export Lines, Inc	600,750.00		*—OK	RTC	8,008	1920
Excello	Nov. 13, 1942	do	600,750.00		*—OK	RTC	8,008	1919
Executive	Mar. 5, 1943	do	600,000.00		*—OK	RTC	8,008	1920
Exmouth	July 31, 1944	do	450,000.00		Agreed	RRTC	8,008	1920
Expositor	Feb. 22, 1943	do	600,000.00		*—OK	RTC	8,008	1919
Fairfield City	July 5, 1942	Isthmian Steamship Co	409,937.00		*—OK	RTC	9,370	1921
Fairport	July 16, 1942	Waterman Steamship Corporation	2,944,766.49		JC	RTC	10,850	1920
Franklin K. Lane	June 6, 1942	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	880,800.00		*—AYHS	TC	11,010	1924
F. W. Abrams	June 11, 1942	do	1,078,500.00		*—OK	RTC	14,380	1920
George H. Jones	do	Panama Transport Co	840,375.00		GO 53	TC	11,205	1919
Greylock	Feb. 3, 1943	Seas Shipping Co., Inc	878,400.00		*—OK	RTC	11,000	1921
Gulfoil	May 16, 1942	Gulf Oil Corporation	584,250.00		*—OK	RTC	7,790	1912
Gulfpenn	May 13, 1942	do	1,107,200.00		*—OK	RTC	13,840	1921
Gulfstate	Apr. 3, 1943	do	806,250.00		*—OK	RTC	10,735	1920
Gurney E. Newlin	Oct. 27, 1942	Union Oil Co. of California	2,175,000.00		JC	RTC	12,730	1942
H. D. Collier	Mar. 12, 1944	Standard Oil Co. of California		2,000,000.00	JC	RTC	12,700	1938
H. H. Rogers	Feb. 21, 1943	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	1,116,850.00		*—OK	TC	15,955	1916
H. M. Storey	May 18, 1943	Standard Oil Co. of California	1,200,000.00		*—OK	RTC	16,036	1922
Hagan	June 10, 1942	Paco Tankers, Inc	788,800.00		*—CNS	RTC	9,877	1919
Hahira	Nov. 3, 1942	The Atlantic Refining Co	818,250.00		*—OK	RTC	10,885	1920
Halo	May 19, 1942	Cities Service Oil Co	805,500.00		*—OK	RTC	10,740	1920
Halsey	May 6, 1942	Alex Smith, etc	805,500.00		*—OK	RTC	10,700	1920
Hampton Roads	June 1, 1942	Polar Steamship Corporation	293,300.00		*—OK	RTC	4,165	1920
Harry Luckenbach	Mar. 16–17, 1943	Luckenbach Steamship Co	1,035,810.00		*—OK	RTC	12,170	1919

Vessel	Casualty	Assured	Amount paid	Amount outstanding	Basis of valuation	Form of charter	Deadweight tonnage	Year built
Harry G. Seigel	Apr. 28, 1942	Panama Transport Co	$1,300,500.00		*—OK	TC	17,340	1930
Hastings	Feb. 23, 1943	Waterman Steamship Corporation	771,967.50		*—OK	RTC	8,690	1920
Heffron	July 5, 1942	Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co	870,000.00		*—OK	RTC	11,900	1919
Henry R. Mallory	Feb. 7, 1943	Agwilines, Inc	432,626.43		JC	BB	5,730	1916
Honomu	July 5, 1942	Matson Navigation Co	512,000.00	$256,000.00	*—CY	RTC	10,100	1919
Honolulan	July 22, 1942	American Hawaiian Steamship Co	438,000.00	439,000.00	JC	RTC	10,970	1921
Hoosier	July 9, 1942	Hoosier Marine Corporation	715,500.00		*—AHU	RTC	7,997	1920
Hybert	July 5, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	279,000.00		*—OK	RTC	9,841	1920
I. C. White	Sept. 27, 1941	Panama Transport Co	1,234,275.00		Agreed	TC	11,720	1920
Ile de Brkhkt	Feb. 11, 1944	French Committee of National Liberation	378,092.00		Agreed	BB	8,593	1919
India	Sept. 10, 1943	Netraship	1,696,630.00		Agreed	Hognanay	14,250	1939
Irenee Dupont	Mar. 17, 1943	International Freight Corporation, Inc	2,600,000.00		Agreed	RTC	9,745	1941
Isabela	May 19, 1942	Agwilines, Inc	327,250.00		*—OK	RTC	4,675	1911
J. A. Moffett, Jr	July 8, 1942	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	1,171,500.00		*—OK	RTC	15,620	1921
Jack Carnes	Aug. 30, 1942	Sinclair Refining Co	2,752,353.66		JC	RTC	16,844	1942
James McKay	Dec. —, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	990,337.72		GO 24	RTC	9,260	1941
Java Arrow	May 5, 1942	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	1,005,000.00		*—OK	RTC	13,325	1921
John A. Holloway	Sept. 6, 1942	Upper Lakes & St. Lawrence Transportation Co., Ltd.	195,000.00		*—F	TC	3,100	1925
Joseph M. Cudahy	May 4, 1942	Sinclair Refining Co	846,750.00		*—OK	RTC	11,350	1921
Kahuku	June 15, 1942	Matson Navigation Co	483,500.00	290,100.00	*—CY	RTC	9,140	1920
Kaimoku	Aug. 8, 1942	do	485,000.00	242,500.00	*—CY	RTC	9,430	1919
Kentucky	Sept. —, 1942	States Steamship Co	669,280.00		*—OK	RTC	8,412	1921
Keystone	Mar. 13, 1943	States Marine Corporation	643,500.00		*—OK	RTC	8,425	1919
Knoxville City	June 1, 1942	Isthmian Steamship Co	796,450.00		*—OK	RTC	9,370	1921
L. J. Drake	July 22, 1942	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	738,375.00		*—OK	RTC	9,845	1918
Laertes	May 3, 1942	Royal Netherlands Government	661,134.00		Agreed	TC	5,825	1919
Lancaster	Dec. 30, 1942	American South African Line, Inc	44,250.00	434,250.00	*—OK	RTC	11,580	1918
Larry Doheny	Oct. 6, 1942	Richfield Oil Corporation	837,000.00		*—OK	RTC	11,550	1921
Lasalle	Oct. —, 1942	Waterman Steamship Corporation	149,514.30		Deprec	RTC	8,837	1920
Lebore	June 14, 1942	Ore Steamship Corporation	1,792,800.00		*—OK	RTC	22,410	1924
Leda	Nov. 5, 1942	Panama Transport Co	968,625.00		*—OK	TC	12,915	1925
Leedstown, ex Santa Lucia	Nov. 9, 1942	Grace Line, Inc		5,335,000.00	Agreed	BB	9,135	1933
Lillian Luckenbach	Mar. 26, 1943	Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc	418,355.00	597,650.00	*—OK	RTC	11,953	1919
Lipscomb Lykes	Jan. 18, 1943	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	911,097.54		GO 24	RTC	9,260	1941
Losmar	Sept. 24, 1942	Calmar Steamship Corporation	430,000.00	258,000.00	*—CN	RTC	8,600	1919
Louise Lykes	Jan. —, 1943	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	1,192,704.08		GO 24	RTC	9,441	1941
Louisiana	Aug. —, 1942	The Texas Co	1,148,260.66	382,753.56	JC	RTC	12,380	1937
Lubrafol	May 9, 1942	Gulf Oil Corporation	813,750.00		*—OK	TC	10,845	1924
M. F. Elliot	June 3, 1942	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	783,750.00		*—OK	RTC	10,450	1921
Macabi	Oct. 29, 1942	Balboa Shipping Co., Inc	297,300.00		*—OK	RTC	3,965	1921
Mae	Sept. 17, 1942	A. H. Bull Steamship Co	428,000.00	256,800.00	*—CN	RTC	8,560	1918
Maiden Creek	Mar. 17, 1944	Waterman Steamship Corporation	2,778,604.81		JC	BB	7,984	1919
Malantic	Mar. 9, 1943	F. W. Bergen, Ellis, Knowles, etc	600,000.00		Agreed	RTC	6,700	1929
Maltran	July 5, 1943	The Solvey Process Co	424,950.00		*—OK	RTC	5,790	1920
Mambi	May 13, 1943	Compania Cubana de Transporte de Mieles	150,000.00		Agreed	TC	3,166	1882
Manuela	June 24, 1942	A. H. Bull Steamship Co	1,500,000.00		GO 53	TC	7,580	1934
Mary Luckenbach	September 1942.	Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc	680,000.00		*—OK	RTC	7,997	1918
Masaya	Mar. 28, 1943	Standard Fruit & Steamship Co	201,924.20		Agreed	BB	750	1920
Massmar	July 5, 1942	Calmar Steamship Corporation	684,000.00		*—CN	TC	9,117	1920
Mathew Luckenbach	Mar. 19, 1943	Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc	856,500.00		*—OK	RTC	11,420	1918
Maurice Tracy	June 17, 1944	M. & J. Tracy, Inc		200,000.00	JC	RRTC	4,000	1916
Mercury Sun	May 18, 1942	Motor Tankship Corporation	1,186,240.00		*—OK	RTC	14,828	1931
Metapan	Oct. 1, 1943	United Fruit Steamship Co	496,204.75		JC	BB	3,900	1909
Meton	Nov. 5, 1942	Pace Tankers, Inc	589,050.00	214,200.00	*—CYS	RTC	10,760	1920
Michigan	Apr. 20, 1943	States Steamship Co	646,500.00		*—OK	RTC	8,625	1919
Millinocket	June 17, 1942	A. H. Bull Steamship Co	332,710.00		*—OK	RTC	4,753	1910
Mobiloil	Apr. 29, 1942	Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	2,180,165.00		GO 53	TC	16,580	1943
Montanan	June 3, 1942	American Hawaiian Steamship Co	379,600.00	427,900.00	JC	RTC	9,500	1917
Mont Viso	Nov. 2, 1943	French Committee of National Liberation	348,920.00		Agreed	BB	7,930	1921
Munger T. Ball	May 4, 1942	Sabine Transportation Co., Inc	592,500.00		*—OK	RTC	8,000	1920
Nashaba	Feb. 26, 1945	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc		525,937.50	Agreed	RRBBC	9,349	1921
New Jersey	May 28, 1942	The Texas Co	740,250.00		*—OK	RTC	9,870	1921
Nicholas Cuneo	July 9, 1942	Empresa Hondurena de Vapores		125,000.00	JC	TC	1,150	1907
Nickeliner	May 13, 1943	All-Waterways Navigation Corporation	525,000.00		Agreed	RTC	3,800	1938
Nordal	June 24, 1942	The Viking Corporation	972,000.00		Agreed	TC	7,200	1939
Norfolk	Sept. 18, 1942	Canada Steamship Lines, Ltd	201,500.00		*—F	TC	3,100	1923
Norlandia	July 3, 1942	Merchants & Miners Transportation Co	301,700.00		*—OK	RBB	4,300	1919
Norness	Jan. 14, 1942	Tanker Corporation	1,850,000.00		Agreed	TC	14,800	1939
Nortun	Mar. 20, 1943	Viking Corporation	720,000.00		Agreed	TC	7,200	1940
Olancho	Mar. 11, 1943	Empresa Hondurena de Vapores		300,000.00	JC	TC	2,125	1921
Olopana	July 4, 1942	Matson Navigation Co	612,300.00	141,300.00	*—CY	RTC	6,100	1920
Onandaga	July 24, 1942	Ford Motor Co	261,800.00		*—HUY	RTC	3,767	1920
Oneida	July 13, 1942	do	261,800.00		*—HUY	RTC	3,500	1920
Oregonian	Sept. 13, 1942	American Hawaiian Steamship Co	379,600.00	427,900.00	JC	RTC	9,500	1917
Pan Atlantic	July 6, 1942	Pan Atlantic Steamship Corporation	93,500.00		*—OK	RTC	8,582	1920
Pan Kraft	July 4, 1942	do	643,500.00		*—OK	RTC	8,584	1920
Pan New York	Oct. 29, 1942	Pan American Petroleum Transportation Co	1,777,693.85		JC	RTC	13,083	1938
Pan Pennsylvania	Apr. 16, 1944	National Bulk Carriers, Inc	2,705,754.92		JC	TC	18,900	1943
Pan Royal	Feb. 9, 1943	Pan Atlantic Steamship Corporation	225,000.00	416,625.00	*—M	RTC	8,555	1919
Parishina	Nov. 18, 1942	United Fruit Steamship Corporation	543,296.75		JC	BB	4,520	1908
Patrick J. Hurley	Sept. 12, 1942	Sinclair Refining Co	2,657,364.87		JC	RTC	16,851	1941
Paul Luckenbach	Sept. 22, 1942	Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc	939,250.00		*—OK	RTC	11,040	1913
Penmar	Sept. 23, 1942	Calmar Steamship Corporation	457,000.00	274,200.00	*—CN	RTC	9,140	1919
Persephone	May 24, 1942	Panama Transport Co	930,111.98		*—OK	TC	12,445	1925
Peter Kerr	July 15, 1942	Pacific Atlantic Steamship Co	801,000.00		*—OK	RTC	10,675	1920
Potlatch	June 27, 1942	Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co	707,625.00		*—OK	RTC	9,467	1920
President Coolidge	Oct. 25, 1942	American President Lines, Ltd	7,000,000.00		Agreed	BB	14,800	1931
President Grant	Feb. 26, 1944	do		1,265,280.00	(?)	BB	13,240	1921
President Taylor	Feb. 26, 1942	do		1,260,960.00	Agreed	TC	13,240	1921
Puerto Rican	Mar. 9, 1943	American Hawaiian Steamship Co	753,600.00		*—CNM	RTC	9,400	1919
R. M. Parker, Jr	Aug. 13, 1942	Hartol Steamship Corporation	813,000.00		*—OK	RTC	10,770	1919
R. W. Gallagher	July 13, 1942	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	1,792,480.38		JC	RTC	12,950	1938
Rawleigh Warner	June 26, 1942	Sabine Transportation Co., Inc		312,500.00	JC	RTC	5,750	1912
Reuben Tipton	Oct. 23, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	676,502.19	484,715.81	GO 53	TC	9,258	1940
Robert E. Hopkins	Feb. 7, 1943	Tide Water Associated Oil Co	814,500.00		*—OK	RTC	10,897	1921
Robert E. Lee	July 30, 1942	Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc		1,250,000.00	JC	BB	2,475	1925
Robert H. Colley	Oct. 4, 1942	The Atlantic Refining Co	2,193,568.33		JC	RTC	18,640	1938
Robin Goodfellow	July —, 1944	Seas Shipping Co		750,000.00	JC	RTC	10,400	1920
Rosario	Feb. 21, 1943	A. H. Bull Steamship Co	370,000.00	185,000.00	*—CN	RTC	7,230	1920
Samuel Q. Brown	May 23, 1942	Tide Water Associated Oil Co	814,500.00		*—OK	RTC	10,897	1921
San Blas	June 16, 1942	Balboa Shipping Co	500,000.00		Agreed	TC	3,335	1920
San Jacinto	Apr. 21, 1942	Agwilines, Inc		279,000.00	JC	BB		
San Pablo	July 2, 1942	Balboa Shipping Co	413,100.00	85,000.00	JC	TC	2,940	1915
Sainte Maxime	Jan. 14, 1944	French Committee of National Liberation	221,400.00		Agreed	BB	6,150	1911

Vessel	Casualty	Assured	Amount paid	Amount outstanding	Basis of valuation	Form of charter	Deadweight tonnage	Year built
Santa Catalina	Apr. 23, 1943	Grace Line Inc		$1, 559, 000. 00	JC	RTC	9, 193	1943
Santa Elena	Nov. 6, 1943	do	$4, 350, 000. 00		JC	BB	7, 716	1933
Santa Elisa	Aug. 13, 1942	do		1, 365, 775. 00	JC	RTC	9, 597	1941
Santa Rita	July 9, 1942	do		1, 404, 665. 00	GO 53	TC	9, 036	1941
Santore	June 17, 1942	Ore Steamship Corporation	611, 500. 00	305, 750. 00	*—CN	RTC	12, 230	1918
Scotia	Dec. 23, 1943	P. L. Transportation Co		296, 000. 00	JC	BB	4, 230	1919
Scotia	Nov. 27, 1943	Netraship	1, 744, 990. 00		Agreed	Hegmanay	14, 900	1939
Scottsburg	June 14, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	918, 675. 00		*—OK	RTC	12, 249	1919
Seakay	Mar. 18, 1944	Keystone Tankship Corporation	2, 789, 398. 51		JC	RTC	16, 550	1942
Sea Thrush	June 28, 1942	Shepard Steamship Co	702, 720. 00		*—OK	RTC	8, 784	1920
Silver Sword	Sept. 22, 1942	Sword Line Inc	571, 500. 00		*—OK	RTC	7, 817	1919
Sixaola	June 12, 1942	United Fruit Steamship Corporation	604, 702. 75		JC	BB	3, 285	1911
Solon Turman	June 13, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	968, 615. 73		GO 24	RTC	9, 260	1941
South America	Apr. 6, 1944	Notraship	1, 027, 650. 00		Agreed	Hoguansy	9, 300	1931
Staghound	Mar. 3, 1943	United States Lines Co	1, 283, 990. 20		GO 24	RTC	8, 595	1942
Stanvac Calcutta	June 6, 1942	Petroleum Shipping Co., Ltd	2, 900, 727. 65		JC	TC	16, 625	1941
Stanvac Manila	May 23–24, 1943	do	2, 208, 522. 93		JC	TC	16, 625	1941
Stanvac Melbourne	Sept. 12, 1942	do	2, 218, 723. 84		JC	TC	16, 725	1941
Stanvac Palembang	July 10, 1942	do	2, 926, 700. 75		JC	TC	16, 725	1941
Steel Navigator	Oct. 19, 1942	Isthmian Steamship Co	799, 000. 00		*—OK	RTC	9, 370	1921
Steel Scientist	Oct. 11, 1942	do	799, 000. 00		*—OK	RTC	9, 370	1921
Steel Traveler	Dec. 18, 1944	do		600, 000. 00	JC	RRTC	10, 130	1922
Steel Voyager	Sept. 23, 1943	do		735, 750. 00	*—CYS	RTC	9, 770	1920
Steel Worker	June 3, 1942	do	799, 000. 00		*—OK	RTC	9, 400	1920
Stella Lykes	July 27, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	748, 959. 96	520, 114. 04	GO 53	TC	9, 230	1941
Sunoil	Apr. 5, 1943	Sun Oil Co	1, 163, 920. 00		*—OK	RTC	14, 549	1927
Susana	Oct. 14, 1942	Vicente Madrigal	707, 550. 00		*—F	RTC	9, 434	1914
Susan B. Anthony, *ex* Santa Clara.	June 7, 1944	Grace Line, Inc	2, 525, 000. 00		JC	BB		1930
Swiftsure	Oct. 8, 1942	Grosvenor Dale Co., Inc	901, 500. 00		*—OK	RTC	11, 980	1921
Sylvan Arrow	May 20, 1942	Brilliant Transportation Co. S. A	1, 001, 250. 00		*—OK	RTC	13, 358	1918
Syros	May 26, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	398, 000. 00		*—OK	RTC	9, 841	1920
T. J. Williams	Sept. 19, 1941	Panama Transport Co	1, 437, 100. 00		Agreed	TC	12, 955	1921
Tachira	July 12, 1942	Grace Line Inc	274, 500. 00		*—AYH	RTC	3, 660	1920
Tela	June 8, 1942	Empresa Hondurena de Vapores		350, 000. 00	JC	TC	2, 159	1927
Texan	Mar. 11, 1942	American Hawaiian Steamship Co	1, 116, 000. 00		*—CYH	RTC	13, 950	1902
Tillie Lykes	June —, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	293, 300. 00		*—OK	RTC	4, 145	1920
Tivives	Oct. 21, 1943	United Fruit Steamship Corporation	505, 795. 75		JC	RBB	4, 290	1911
Topa Topa	Aug. 28, 1942	Waterman Steamship Corporation	757, 206. 25		*—OK	RTC	8, 366	1920
Velma Lykes	June 4, 1942	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc	293, 300. 00		*—OK	RTC	4, 100	1920
Virginia	June 12, 1942	National Bulk Carriers, Inc	1, 265, 609. 88	1, 000. 000. 00	JC	RTC	18, 800	1942
Virginia Sinclair	Mar. 10, 1943	Sinclair Refining Co	841, 500. 00		*—OK	RTC	9, 345	1930
W. C. Teagle	Oct. 16, 1941	Panama Transport Co	2, 388, 000. 00		Agreed	TC	16, 585	1917
Wacosta	Sept. 13, 1942	Waterman Steamship Corporation	86, 525. 00		*—OK	RTC	8, 804	1920
Wakefield	Sept. 3, 1942	United States Lines Co		4, 983, 394. 00	Agreed	BB	14, 331	1932
Warrior	July 1, 1942	Waterman Steamship Corporation	961, 725. 00		*—OK	RTC	12, 823	1920
Washington	July 5, 1942	States Steamship Co	640, 500. 00		*—OK	RTC	8, 576	1919
West Humhaw	Nov. 8, 1942	American West African Line, Inc	637, 500. 00		*—OK	RTC	8, 470	1918
West Ira	June 21, 1942	Pope & Talbot, Inc	442, 000. 00	277, 325. 00	*—SY	RTC	8, 834	1919
West Kebar	Oct. 29, 1942	American West African Line, Inc	640, 500. 00		*—OK	RTC	8, 591	1920
Total			21, 625, 241. 84	8, 466, 583. 04				
West Lashaway	Aug. 30, 1942	American West African Line, Inc	639, 750. 00		*—OK	RTC	8, 448	1918
West Madaket	May 5, 1943	Waterman Steamship Corporation	642, 975. 00		*—OK	RTC	8, 573	1918
West Portal	Feb. 5, 1943	Pope & Talbot, Inc		704, 320. 00	*—SY	RTC	8, 804	1920
William A. McKenney	Oct. 5, 1942	Eastern Gas & Fuel	705, 000. 00		*—HY	RTC	9, 400	1916
William Boyce Thompson	July 7, 1943	Sinclair Refining Co	855, 000. 00		*—OK	RTC	11, 398	1921
William F. Humphrey	July 16, 1942	Tide Water Associated Oil Co	1, 005, 750. 00		*—SN	RTC	13, 478	1921
William Rockefeller	June 28, 1942	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	1, 679, 250. 00		GO 53	TC	22, 390	1921
Winkler	Feb. 23, 1943	Atlantic Refining Co	884, 000. 00		*—OK	RTC	11, 037	1930
Wyoming	Mar. 15, 1943	French African Authority	1, 034, 480. 00		Agreed	BB	9, 350	1930
Yaka	May 11, 1942	Waterman Steamship Corporation	744, 928. 75		*—OK	RTC	8, 804	1920
Yorkmar	Oct. 9, 1943	Calmar Steamship Corporation	441, 500. 00	264, 900. 00	*—CN	RTC	9, 216	1919
Total			8, 632, 633. 75	969, 220. 00				

FUND 11X4000

Matagalpa	June 27, 1942	Standard Fruit & Steamship Co	$203, 237. 90		Agreed	BB	750	1920
Norluna	Oct. 24, 1942	Merchants & Miners Transportation Co	294, 700. 00		*—OK	RBB	4, 210	1920
Northern Sword	Feb. 8, 1943	Sword Line, Inc		$305, 200. 00	JC	BB	14, 677	1931
Oneida	May 4, 1943	Agwilines, Inc	246, 328. 13		JC	BB	4, 092	1919
Port Orford	Dec. 22, 1942	Port Orford Lumber Co		75, 000. 00	JC	RBB	1, 600	1917
Total			744, 266. 03	360, 200. 00				

My arithmetic adds up to $215,000,000 paid out by the Government on these losses with another $50,000,000 outstanding. I estimate that under section 8 of this bill this group of ships would have been valued at no more than $130,000,000.

My amendment would require that each contract of sale shall provide for a readjustment of the loss of a vessel requisitioned for war use, or taken for title, to that which would have been permitted under the amended section 8.

This amendment places all operators on equal footing and will save the Government up to $130,000,000. So that the Members of the House will have an opportunity to study my amendment, I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

EXHIBIT D

Amendment proposed by Mr. JACKSON: Page 7, after line 20, insert:

"(d) The contract of sale shall provide that if the purchaser owns or owned one or more vessels constructed prior to January 1, 1925, which were requisitioned for title or for use by the United States after December 31, 1940, the purchaser shall, for some one of such vessels—

"(1) if requisitioned for use, and lost prior to the date of such contract by reason of causes for which the United States was responsible, readjust the compensation paid or payable to him on account of such loss to an amount equal to the exchange allowance which would be permitted under section 8 if such vessel had not been lost and were being exchanged upon such purchase.

"(2) if requisitioned for title, readjust the compensation paid or payable to him on that account to an amount equal to the exchange allowance which would be permitted under section 8 if such vessel had not been so requisitioned and were being exchanged upon such purchase."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the very fine and able work he has done on this bill. His

speech is certainly enlightening. May I inquire if his amendments are to be offered as committee amendments?

Mr. JACKSON. The two amendments I refer to, the one on the adjustment of tanker sales and the one relating to insurance, were not acted upon by the committee and they are not being offered as committee amendments but are being offered by me individually.

Mr. GORE. I will certainly support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. I appreciate very much the statement that the gentleman from Tennessee has made.

If the House accepts the three committee amendments and my two amendments, I believe we shall have a good bill, at least one in which we endeavored to plug up all holes. The two committee amendments relating to trade-ins and adjustment of prior sales, and my two amendments relating to price of tankers and the adjustment of wartime insurance values are calculated to save the Government from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000 which might otherwise have been lost to the Treasury. The committee amendment to section 12, relating to reacquisition of vessels, may, at some future time, save the Government an untold amount of money.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill H. R. 3603 which has for its purpose the sale of surplus war-built vessels is most important to our postwar economy as well as our national defense. We must maintain an adequate postwar merchant marine. The proper disposal of the war surplus ships will have an important bearing on postwar shipping.

There is, however, another problem dealing with disposal of surplus war property I wish to discuss for a few minutes. I refer to the war industry plants in the Columbia River area which are especially important to my congressional district as well as the whole Northwest.

Mr. Chairman, on numerous occasions during the past 6 years, I have presented on this floor and before committees the opportunities that can be developed for the full utilization of the federally owned Columbia River plants.

I made a detailed analysis of certain defense deficiencies on this floor on May 8, 1940—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5786—and pointed out how these deficiencies could be met by adequate use of the resources of the Columbia River Basin. This presentation was made nearly 2 weeks in advance of the first defense speech of the late President Roosevelt before the joint session of the Congress. A review of these records will show that I have always approached the utilization problem from five viewpoints: namely, first, national security; second, national defense; third, employment; fourth, world position; and fifth, opportunities for my State and region.

With the termination of the war, the RECORD is now an open book. This RECORD will show how the termination of the war was accelerated by the early constructive vision for the full use of our natural resources and particularly hydroelectric power. Two House committees contributed greatly to this end. I refer to the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and the War Department Subcommittee. I am grateful for the opportunity given to me to present factual material on all of these items bearing on Columbia River power utilization when under consideration by these committees.

In April of this year, I outlined for the benefit of this House the war contributions resulting from the utilization of Columbia River power. For security reasons, I could not then include the atomic bomb and the part that the Columbia River power played in this development. I well remember the remark made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] on this floor last April when he said, "I shudder to think where the Nation would have been in the war effort without the Columbia River power." I only wish that the decisions of the War Production Board had been based on the same broad vision and sound analysis as those of the House committees. If they had been our reconversion problem would now be materially reduced.

Since the war is now largely behind us, I want to point out ways and means to continue to utilize this power effectively in the postwar period by stressing the human side of reconversion.

In my presentation of May 8, 1940, I covered the employment situation by classes of effort. Since then, I have been bringing this data down to date through year-by-year analysis of numbers employed. It is interesting to note that.

The period from 1929 to 1941 was one of continuous unemployment, the low point occurring in 1933 when there were less than 38,000,000 of our people gainfully employed. The period from 1941 to date saw the war effort wipe out unemployment and generate mass employment to the limit of availability. It is interesting to note that the man-years lost through unemployment during the depression is approximately the same quantity of man-years expended from 1941 to 1945 on the war effort.

We know from our own personal experience how much was put into the war effort. We know from daily contact its cost in dollars to the Federal Treasury. We know we only achieved this full employment by piling up a huge war debt for future generations to pay. As believers in the free enterprise system we cannot again tolerate such a tailspin as was started in 1929. On the other hand we cannot buy full employment by deficit spending with a $300,000,000,000 debt to pay. Repeating such a long period of unemployment will shake the very foundations of our national economy. Therefore, every means available should be taken to avoid such a repetition.

Although we have had full employment during the war period, our average standard of living has not risen appreciably over that which existed in the depression years because of the demands of war for materials, manpower, and resources. If we can apply the same principles which achieved full employment during the war to postwar developments, we can attain a standard of living which would be double that ever enjoyed before.

In the Pacific Northwest, the greatest present opportunity for reemployment lies in the proper disposition of unused federally owned defense plants. However, it should be noted that the direct employment in these plants is only a small portion of the total employment which would be indirectly created by keeping these plants in operation.

The Northwest federally owned aluminum plants now employ about 6,000 men. One hundred thousand new jobs are needed in the region on the basis of facts I presented to this House last April. The bauxite mining industry in the United States, according to latest reports, employed about 1,000 pepole. The conversion of bauxite into alumina required about 5,000 employees, and the primary ingot reduction plants about three times as many, or approximately 12,000. This is a relatively small number engaged in the basic light metal industry.

Let us now note what resulted from this relatively small basic employment. During the war, 70,000 people were employed in the primary fabrication of aluminum. All the aluminum satellite industries employed about 2,000,000 men.

I have pointed out on numerous occasions that it will be a relatively short time before our high-grade iron ores are exhausted. We need substantial substitute materials, one of the principal ones being aluminum. Nevertheless, during the peak of the war effort, this Nation's production of aluminum was only about 1 percent of its steel production.

In the Pacific Northwest the greatest opportunity for reemployment lies in the proper use of these federally owned defense plants as a means to create satellite industries.

On September 7 last, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Aluminum Co. of America gave out press releases covering the cancellation of certain operating agreements between these two agencies. The RFC, effective October 31 next, will cancel out the operating agreements covering seven aluminum ingot plants built and operated by the Aluminum Co. of America at Federal expense. The construction costs of these plants in round numbers totals $250,000,000. The Aluminum Co. of America has been operating these plants under leases with expiration dates falling in 1947 and 1948. The RFC, by its correspondence, indicated to Alcoa a willingness to allow Alcoa to continue operations under one condition: namely, that the company would relinquish any or all of these plants at any time on 60 days' notice when a purchaser or lessee was found to take any of these plants off the hands of the Government. When Alcoa refused to accede to such a request, RFC canceled the leases as they were required to do by law.

It was indicated that no operators could be found for these plants for the reason that the opportunities of securing new operators in the aluminum field were almost nonexistent. It was reasoned that the highest prewar aluminum consumption in the United States was

about 360,000,000 pounds annually and that today Alcoa has in its own privately owned plants the capacity to produce 860,000,000 pounds annually; and, in addition, the Reynolds Metals Co. has another 160,000,000 pounds in ingot plant capacity and that war-built stock piles now amount to 1,000,000,000 pounds.

Such conclusions do not follow. The reason being that the price and market situation have not been fully covered. At this point I want it clearly understood that my principal interest is reemployment—keeping in operation the Columbia River plants. I have no desire to see punitive measures taken against any company. Any organization that can demonstrate its ability to keep any of these plants in operation should have its day in court, keeping in mind that the Congress will not, of course, permit any industry to be bottled up by a monopoly to the detriment of the public interests.

It was only in the middle of the last century that aluminum was first produced by a chemical process. The first metal produced sold for $17 an ounce, which was then the existing price of gold. Thirty years later, Charles M. Hall, in this country, and P. L. T. Heroult, in France, simultaneously and independently discovered and developed the modern electrolytic reduction process.

Modern commercial production of this metal was not commenced until 1888 with metal then selling for $4 per pound. By the turn of the century the pound price had dropped to 33 cents but under the heavy demands of World War I, the price fluctuated between 40 and 64 cents per pound.

In May 1940, the market price was 20 cents per pound. Due to the influence of the low-cost production plants on the Columbia River, all the Government aluminum used during the war averaged around 15 cents per pound, although the production costs in the Columbia River plants, under heavy transportation charges, ranged from 11 cents to 12 cents a pound. There is no reason why, under existing power costs and ship transportation, that the production cost in the Troutdale plant cannot be made to equal 10 cents a pound. I am convinced that through thorough-going research, this Troutdale pound price can be materially reduced below the 10-cent level.

About 25 years ago the automobile industry started to take aluminum out of the construction of automobiles. There have been two stated reasons for such an elimination; namely, price and dependence on one manufacturer. The latter reason has been removed by the entrance of Reynolds into the field of aluminum production.

From 1920 on, the amount of aluminum used per car has dropped on the average from 100 to 8 pounds. The automobile industry has indicated that it expects to produce 5,000,000 cars next year. If the 1920 unit amount per car could be reinstated, all of the Federally owned aluminum-ingot plants in the Northwest could be kept in continuous full operation to meet such an indicated need, together with other area requirements. Since this Nation is approaching the point of diminishing iron reserves, there is every reason to urge the ultimate use of a thousand pounds of aluminum per car. With aluminum available at low Columbia River costs, many new uses for it will arise. There are great opportunities for the utilization of aluminum in the railroad field as well as in marine construction. I realize that it will take at least 2 or 3 years to create such markets, but under sound appraisal the market potentialities indicate that there are possibilities for the use of aluminum in amounts triple the capability of all private and federally owned plants.

The testimony before the Senate Small Business Committee by practical men indicates the soundness of such a proposal. Aluminum can also be used extensively in automotive trucks, in building construction, and in packaging a large number of items needed in the distribution of consumer's goods. I also realize that a cushion is needed in the transitory period. This can be accepted through the proper exercise of Federal stock-piling policies. Bills are now pending before Congress bearing upon this phase of the strategic metal problem. Senate Document No. 5, released early this year, sets out the recommendations of the Army and Navy Munitions Board covering the stock piling of bauxite. Why stock pile this raw material which is subject to deterioration while opportunities are right before us to use Federal facilities to stock pile the basic metal, which has eternal life? I urge stock piling of the basic metal itself and not the bulky perishable bauxite.

The total investment of the Federal Government in the seven aluminum plants previously referred to represents, in round numbers, $250,000,000. Reynolds and the Aluminum Co. of America have invested about $25,000,000 in privately owned facilities in the Northwest. The three federally owned northwestern plants represent a Federal investment of $110,000,000. The stake in the aluminum industry in the Northwest, therefore, represents about $135,000,000.

The Troutdale reduction plant, which is in my district, consists of four pot lines, each with a designed annual capacity of 32,000,000 pounds annually per pot line. However, past operations have given a proven capacity of 36,000,000 pounds per pot line. The carbon electrode plant, adjacent to the Troutdale plant, has a capacity of 86,400,000 pounds of electrodes per annum. The first cost of the Troutdale plant is as follows:

Land	$283,455
Buildings	5,789,100
Equipment	12,785,475
Tools and other equipment	39,724
Total	18,897,754

It takes about 10 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy to produce a pound of aluminum; therefore, a differential of 1 mill per kilowatt-hour in power cost is equivalent to adding 1 cent a pound to the metal cost. From this it is obvious that if the aluminum price structure is to move downward in order to induce consumption, those plants must be operated where the power costs are the lowest obtainable.

The average power cost of all the Government-owned aluminum plants during the war was, in round numbers, $35 per kilowatt-year, or double the price of energy obtained from the Columbia River plants. Forty-seven percent of all the war-load utilization of the two power plants on the Columbia went into aluminum-ingot production. This is equivalent to 650,000 kilowatts, or, roundly, 650,000,000 pounds of basic metal annually. This amount of power is equivalent to a revenue of eleven and one-half million dollars annually to the Federal Government. Therefore, from the standpoint of security, employment, and good business, every move should be made by Congress to keep these federally owned plants in production.

Prior to 1940 the aluminum plant and sheet capacity in the United States was approximately 530,000,000 pounds per annum. Since that time, Alcoa has constructed, at its own expense, a large plant at Alcoa, Tenn., with a rated capacity of about 420,000,000 pounds annually. In addition, the Defense Plant Corporation has built and leased Government-owned plants with a capacity of 654,000,000 pounds annually. Thus, the combined private and federally owned plant and sheet capacity is around 1,600,000,000 pounds annually which is only about one-third of the needed capacity, if the automobile industry should assume its true proportionate part.

Each of these federally owned plants constitutes a link in the process of transforming metal resources into useful products and bringing them to the ultimate consumer. Properly utilized, as has been pointed out, each of these plants have opportunities for multiplying employment.

Before any operator can take over any of these plants, he must have access to the necessary raw material and have access to the products of the alumina plants. Reserves of bauxite now exist in South America, in the islands of the Caribbean Sea, in the Pacific Islands, and or the southern coast of Asia. Prior to the war, the Japanese mined aluminum ore at Babelthaup in the Palau Island group. The mandated Pacific islands, especially the Caroline Islands, are known to possess undeveloped bauxite fields. Ships taking lumber out of Portland can return with bauxite ballast, therefore reducing transportation costs on the raw materials to the lowest point possible. To accomplish this result, one of the federally owned and idle alumina plants should be moved to the Columbia River area or a new plant built there.

I was instrumental in securing the authorization for the Salem clay plant, with an investment totaling $3,356,888. This plant has a designed capacity of 36,000,000,000 pounds of aluminum annually. Local clays are used as a raw material which is treated with ammonium sulfate to produce alumina. In addition, the Salem plant produces a by-product which can be successfully used by cement plants. The experimental alumina plant at Salem is a highly commendable operation. A successful demonstration at this point would go far in solving this country's vanishing supply of bauxite by discovering economical processes for converting ordinary abundant clays into alumina. This plant is only a semipilot plant and, therefore,

cannot furnish the amounts of the requisite raw materials to keep the Northwest ingot plants in operation, but the Salem plant should by all means be continued as a permanent operation and a part of our national defense set-up.

Cost of power has a substantial influence on aluminum production, as I have previously pointed out. On July 6, 1945, on this floor, I discussed this subject in some detail. It is not my purpose to now repeat that analysis, but I do want to reemphasize the effect of the Shipshaw development on our own national security and our own world position. The previous handling of the Shipshaw transaction by the War Production Board and the RFC has eliminated this country from the postwar foreign light-metal market unless remedial measures are applied. The subsidizing of Shipshaw by our Government amounts in the long run to an outright equivalent gift of aluminum-producing power to the extent of about $8 per kilowatt-year, which is approximately half the cost of the lowest-priced power available in this country. This transaction will be tantamount to placing the control of one of the most vital tools of defense into foreign hands, although this country is traditionally friendly with Canada. Rightful American markets should not, of economic necessity, be forced to go outside of the United States for processing. We owe this protection to our own labor. Since in the final analysis the disposition of these defense plants will rest with Congress, I trust that no disposition formula will be developed without taking Shipshaw into consideration.

At some later date, I propose to cover this subject more fully. However, it should be noted at this time that the potentialities of the atomic age need not deter the Federal Government from proceeding with a sound light-metal program. Light metal for aircraft production is of first importance for atomic offensive or defensive warfare. Due to the nature of the secret and the security measures behind atomic development, no one but the handful of atomic physicists can presently speak with full authority on this subject. Investigations thus far made lead me to believe that atomic energy will not displace presently low-cost energy during the next decade. The experts of General Electric research laboratory have recently come out with the release sustaining this viewpoint.

Regardless of these possibilities, Congress should thoroughly and completely examine the place of atomic development in the economy of this country. Atomic energy is just another form of heat energy which has its source in the sun. Those few physicists who have dealt with this problem feel that the heat of the sun, amounting to millions of degrees of temperature, results from atomic action within the sun. From present indications, the competitive fuel value of atomic energy will not displace coal in the predictable future. The bulk of our railroad traffic comes from the hauling of coal. If fuels are replaced by use of atomic energy, the unemployment problem would be multiplied many times over that which existed in the worst of the depression years.

I mention these potentialities mainly to offset the use of atomic arguments to deter remedial reconversion measures. However, it is only necessary to say that the implications of atomic energy are not sufficiently demonstrated to let them stand in the way of the human side of reconversion. However, I do expect many other commercial developments to materialize out of atomic energy as this Nation has just experienced the greatest amount of technological progress in all history.

Under the Surplus Property Act, the disposition of the federally owned light-metal plants rests with Congress. Before any disposal formula can be written, there are certain factors that need further investigation. I am presenting these observations for consideration in seeking a solution to the reconversion problems. In so doing, I might state that my own investigation was made prior to the release of the recent report of the Attorney General on these war plants.

Mr. Chairman, for clarity, I am presenting the following summary for consideration:

First. The bauxite deposits in the former mandated Pacific Islands should be made available to all operators. The Government should investigate these deposits through the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey and report to the Congress, giving full information on the quantity and grade of reserves that can be secured from these former Japanese possessions.

Second. Policy should not restrict the exhaustion of raw-material reserves. American operators should rely on a combined stock pile of metal and imported bauxite ores.

Third. The production of alumina from clay should be promoted if the clay pilot plants can demonstrate practical economical processes.

Fourth. In addition to following the recommendations of the Army and Navy Munitions Board, as set out in Senate Document No. 5, Congress should also authorize a policy covering arrangements to insure procurement of ore and the production of stock-piling ingot metal.

Fifth. Import duty on bauxite should be removed in order to permit the unrestricted use of high-grade foreign importations. This is necessary in view of the deficiencies of domestic reserves.

Sixth. RFC, with the assistance of the United States Bureau of Mines, should ascertain the quantity of medium-grade bauxite available in Arkansas or elsewhere in the United States for possible use in the Hurricane Creek alumina plant.

Seventh. RFC and Surplus Property Board should report to Congress the possible cost of production in each of the Government-owned plants, when operating, under varying capacity outputs. This investigation should also include the necessary cost to revamp such plants and accessory facilities in order to produce alumina at the lowest levels. These agencies should also report to Congress on the feasibility on integration the alumina and ingot-plant capacity.

Eighth. If sales of ingot plants are not possible because of postwar operation of the alumina plants, the RFC should offer all plants for lease, the award being determined by operation and employment opportunities.

Ninth. One of these alumina plants should be located in the Pacific Northwest as a means of salvaging the entire Federal investment.

Tenth. The four small Government-owned clay pilot plants should be retained by the Government and given ample opportunity to test and demonstrate future processes. If changes in design are necessary to secure results this should be done before any decision is made as to disposition of the clay plants.

Eleventh. The Surplus Property Board should make every effort to locate prospective operators of the reduction plants and to provide them with comprehensive information and technical assistance. I assume that this is being carried forward, but no information is presently available.

Twelfth. The RFC should provide that temporary operation of federally owned plants be maintained in order to reduce future costs to any prospective purchaser or lessee.

Thirteenth. The RFC should make reports to Congress covering the operating costs of all the ingot plants under different output ratios.

Fourteenth. The Surplus Property Board and the RFC should offer liberal disposal terms to all interested prospects. These terms should not go below the point where the costs of the delivered product would be lower than that of established producers.

Fifteenth. Congress should authorize the war surplus disposal agency to purchase portions of the annual output of metal not needed in commercial markets and stock-piled for national defense.

Sixteenth. Surplus metal stocks should not be disposed of in a way to discourage new operators.

Seventeenth. The Surplus Property Board and the RFC should report to Congress on existing barriers and practices that might possibly retard future operation.

Eighteenth. Price fixing to limit production should be outlawed.

Nineteenth. Federal assistance through existing agencies should be given to any prospective purchaser covering technological research.

Twentieth. The disposal agencies should report to Congress how full and fair employment can be secured by adopting a wise and sound national policy to achieve such results.

Twenty-first. Flexible lease terms should be encouraged.

Twenty-second. The two agencies having control over these plant disposals should report to Congress on ways and means to provide effective credit in order that full operation can be continued.

Twenty-third. Disposal policy should also include a plan that will result in the decentralization of the industry.

This country has just learned the greatest lesson in its history, namely, the application of science and technology to mass employment. Let us take full advantage of this experience in order that we may now use the tools that

the Nation has developed to secure full employment.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 3603, is perhaps the most complicated and technical measure which has been before this body in more than a year. Committee consideration began back in the Seventy-eighth Congress. Prolonged hearings have been held. For weeks on end committee sessions were held every morning. The bill was finally reported to the House on June 27, 1945.

The magna carta of the American Merchant Marine is the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. That bill well sets forth its purpose. The last sentence of title I reads:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of * * * a merchant marine.

The purpose of H. R. 3603 is identical. I am convinced that the bill before you is in accordance with that objective. It should be enacted.

The bill, as it stands, is nonpolitical. Differences in the committee, and there have been plenty of them, have had no relationship whatever to the political beliefs of the committee's members.

The bill as introduced embraced one glaring weakness, that weakness being section 8 which provides for the exchange of old and obsolete vessels. That weakness will be corrected by a committee amendment to be offered. There will also be a number of committee amendments of a clarifying nature which are desirable.

At a session of the committee only last Friday morning, however, two far-reaching amendments were adopted by the committee which should be defeated. These amendments rewrite and completely change sections 9 and 12.

The circumstances under which the committee adopted these two amendments are interesting and remarkable. Twenty-one members comprise the committee. The committee amendment to section 9 was adopted by positive vote of but 7 members. The amendment to section 12 was adopted by positive vote of but 8 members. Thus 7 and 8 members, respectively, out of a committee of 21, made fundamental last-minute changes in a bill on which the committee had labored for months on end.

I first discuss section 9, which covers adjustment of prior sales to citizens.

As set forth in the report, a substantial number of war-built vessels have already been sold to citizens of the United States. Such sales were made under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, but no prudent man, knowing that the surplus of vessels would bring a drop in value at the war's end, would invest his own money and commit himself to a great indebtedness were he not granted protection against such fall in value. Accordingly, article 12 of the sales contract which the Maritime Commission made with such operators contained a provision protecting purchasers against loss. The clause is plain and understandable. I include its text herewith:

> ARTICLE 12. Future legislation: The Commission agrees that in the event of the enactment of legislation authorizing the sale by the United States of vessels, constructed or sold under conditions similar to the construction and sale of the vessel herein agreed to be sold, at a price less than the actual construction cost thereof, exclusive of the cost of national defense features installed in any such vessel, the buyer shall be granted the benefit of such legislation with respect to the sale price of the vessel, in which event the Commission shall make an appropriate adjustment with the buyer on the purchase price of the vessel.

Article 9 of the bill before the House spells out the adjustment to which the good faith of the Maritime Commission was committed under the clause I have just cited. It gives equitable adjustment to those buyers who, irrespective of the provisions that would sometime be incorporated into a ship disposal bill, were willing to invest their money in an American merchant marine. Very obviously since the present bill was introduced on June 27, the Maritime Commission, the Government departments, and all segments of the shipping industry have become familiar with the provisions of article 9. I know of no responsible objections which were registered thereagainst.

But now at the eleventh hour and the fifty-ninth minute, the committee proposes an amendment thereto, the text of which was not presented to the committee until last Friday morning. Those favoring the amendment claim that it will save the Government $30,000,000. They state that its terms are simple, that it merely places every prior sale on the basis that each sale took place on the date of the enactment of this bill. Yet, this "simple" amendment requires three and one-half pages of closely typed text so involved and complicated as to require the services of a corps of Philadelphia lawyers, certified public accountants, and statisticians for clear understanding. I asked those responsible for the amendment to let me see in parallel columns a dollar by dollar comparison with section 9 as embraced in the bill. I was told that such a comparison was impossible to compile. I am not surprised. The amendment is mumbo jumbo to the nth degree. I hope the Members of the House will read it and attempt to understand it.

The amendment was seen prior to committee action by one segment—shall I say favored segment?—of the shipping industry. I am advised that this segment favors the amendment because under its terms these owners receive greater adjustments than they would have received under section 9 as introduced. Presumably, the conjectural $30,000,000 saved to the Government therefore comes out of the hides of the other segments of the shipping industry who were not privileged to see and study the proposed amendment. They, the parties most interested, have never had their day in court. I have not even been advised that the War Shipping Administration or the Maritime Commission have expressed opinions on the amendment. A representative of War Shipping was present, it is true, when the committee approved the amendment. He expressed no opinion one way or the other. Possibly he did not understand the amendment either.

Members of the Congress, this committee amendment to section 9 should be defeated. If the amendment has merit, it can be included in the companion bill now under consideration in the other body after those concerned have had opportunity to study the amendment's provisions and present their views to those who write the bill in the other body.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is in error, is he not, when he knows that this amendment to section 9 was discussed before the subcommittee, even though the gentleman and myself are not members of that subcommittee? We were present for several days when it was thoroughly discussed.

Mr. BUCK. But it was not presented to the committee until Friday morning, however.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I prefer to proceed with my statement at this time.

I now discuss section 12—a far-reaching amendment which the committee also adopted under similar circumstances last Friday morning.

The purpose of section 12 is simple. Its sole purpose is to protect the United States, within a reasonable period, against the necessity in a new national emergency of reacquiring at a high price vessels which it has sold to its citizens under this bill at a low price. This is entirely proper.

The bill before you, however, provides for sales of ships to foreigners, as well as to citizens of the United States. Obviously, a sale to a foreigner is final. There can be no compulsory reacquisition by the United States. Thus, a foreigner buying a ship at the low price to which he is entitled under the bill would reap an astronomical profit were he to resell to the United States should our country become involved in another great war, which God forbid. Under the terms of section 12, as written, the Government is protected against such a price rise as to ships sold to citizens for a period of 5 years. The amendment to section 12 adopted by the committee last Friday extended that protection as against American purchasers for the life of the ship. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and the present bill have for their purposes the fostering and development of the American merchant marine, yet here is a proposed amendment which discriminates, not against foreign buyers but against American buyers. It denies to American purchasers the profit which would accrue to foreign purchasers under a new emergency. It is discriminatory against our own people.

Here is a situation where compromise against two extremes is the only proper course. The Government must have reasonable protection against buying back at a high price that which it sold to its citizens at a low price. On the other hand, American buyers should not be denied profits which might accrue to foreign buyers. Section 12 as written provides this compromise. The discriminatory committee amendment should be defeated.

There is one other weakness in the bill before you which will doubtless be corrected in the bill as written in the other body. I propose to offer here, however, a corrective amendment.

There is nothing in the bill before you granting positive right to the War Department and the Navy Department to acquire for national defense purposes such vessels as are not sold or chartered to American operators. Surely the needs of these departments should come ahead of acquisition by foreigners.

On June 21, 1945, the Secretary of War wrote the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries urging that the War Department be given acquisition rights as I have mentioned above. For some reason, which at the moment is not clear to me, the committee failed to act on Mr. Stimson's recommendation.

Since the position of the Navy Department is undoubtedly identical with that of the War Department the amendment which I shall offer grants similar rights to both departments.

I ask unanimous consent to insert my amendment at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 1, add a new section reading:

"TRANSFER OF VESSELS TO WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

"SEC. 6. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the Commission shall transfer to the War Department or to the Navy Department such war-built vessels under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission as may be nominated by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, which have not been previously sold to, or are not then under charter to, citizens of the United States pursuant to the provisions of section 4 or section 5 of this act.

"(b) Nominations under this section may be made at any time, but in the case of any vessel other than a Liberty-type vessel transfer to the War Department or to the Navy Department will be made under this section only if such vessel shall not have been sold or chartered to a citizen of the United States u der section 4 or section 5 hereof within such reasonable period as the Commission may fix not in excess of 4 months after the receipt by the Commission of the nomination of such vessel by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy."

Page 9, line 3, strike out "6" and insert "7."

Page 10, line 5, after the semicolon insert the word "and."

Page 10, line 6, add a new paragraph reading:

"(5) that such a vessel has not been nominated for transfer to the War Department or the Navy Department under section 6."

Page 10, line 24, strike out "7" and insert "8."

Page 11, line 2, after the word "over", insert the word "other."

Page 11, line 2, strike out the word "noncitizen."

Page 11, line 3, after the comma insert "and to the War Department and to the Navy Department over noncitizen applicants.

Page 11, line 23, strike out "8" and insert "9."

Page 14, line 18, strike out "9" and insert "10."

Page 17, line 18, strike out "10" and insert "11."

Page 18, line 10, strike out "11" and insert "12."

Page 19, line 5, strike out "12" and insert "13."

Page 20, line 4, strike out "13" and insert "14."

Page 21, line 15, strike out "14" and insert "15."

Page 21, line 21, strike out "15" and insert "16."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, the House should know the long and tedious work the Merchant Marine Committee has given the four different bills that have been presented to it dealing with this subject. Two bills were introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress. Lengthy hearings were held and were well attended. To the confusion of at least one member of the committee the trade could never unite on any one part of the proposed bills. It is difficult for any layman who has had no experience in the shipping industry to understand the variance that exists between subsidized and nonsubsidized shippers. One group tells you that you do not need a subsidy, the other group tells you that we must have subsidies. That brought confusion to start with.

It was always my thought in the consideration of this legislation that we should forget the act of 1936 and specifically give our attention to disposing of something that was created as a necessity to help us win the war. I tried always therefore and I think the committee tried to give their sole attention to disposing of this material which we may compare—though this has a greater value—to a cannon or any other war materials or implements that are now in France or the Philippines. They have no earthly value other than the value for which they were built. These ships were built for a specific purpose. We were not at the time trying to enlarge the maritime fleet, we were trying to win the war through the use of these ships. I therefore came to the conclusion that these ships should be discounted just as any other war material is discounted; yet we are endeavoring to recover for the Government and for the Treasury of the United States and for the taxpayers all the money that is possible. At the outset we stated in the bill as now presented to the House that we would get 35 percent of the prewar domestic cost of the ships scaled down.

That was not correct. Then certain amendments were offered and other amendments have been proposed. As the bill is presented to you on the floor it is not the bill that the majority of the committee hoped to see passed by the House.

Portions of amendments or certain ones have been adopted. That amendment which assured that 25 percent of the prewar domestic cost as scaled down will be returned to the Treasury has been agreed to. Another amendment has been agreed to, also. Then come the amendments which will be offered that have not been agreed to by the committee.

I have prepared what I think is a fair digest of the bill as presented. So much reference has been made in a similar way to it that I certainly will not tire or bore the committee by reading my digest but, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

(The document referred to follows:)

RE H. R. 3603 (MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1945)

The present bill is at least the fourth to be introduced dealing with the same subject matter. During the Seventy-eighth Congress the committee held hearings on two similar bills, H. R. 4486 and H. R. 5213. Subsequently, there was introduced H. R. 1425 upon which hearings also were held in March of this year and which bill is quite similar in form and text to the bill now being considered.

At the outset, it should be pointed out that this proposed legislation involves serious and far-reaching questions of policy as to which an intelligent and useful decision can be made only after a thorough study of the problem. In fact, the difficult nature of the problem with which the Congress has to deal is illustrated by the number of bills which have been introduced on the subject and the varying nature of the terms of such bills.

First, what does the bill provide?

Section 1 contains the title.

Section 2, entitled "Declaration of Policy," merely reiterates, in substance, the provisions of section 101 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (hereinafter called the 1936 act).

Section 3, entitled "Definitions," is extremely important inasmuch as it defines the terms "prewar domestic cost" and "statutory sales price," such terms constituting the crux of the price-fixing feature of the bill. "Prewar domestic cost" is the amount determined by the Commission to be the cost of construction of a standard vessel of a particular type in the United States "under normal conditions relating to labor, materials, and other elements of cost, obtaining on or about January 1, 1941." "Statutory sales price" is, in the case of a dry-cargo vessel, an amount equal to 55 percent of the "prewar domestic cost"—50 percent if it is sold or chartered to an unsubsidized operator and 75 percent in the case of a tanker—adjusted as follows:

1. Subtract amount necessary to put the vessel in class.

2. Subtract amount necessary to add standard features to the particular vessel.

3. Add amount equal to value of features the particular vessel contains which are not contained in a standard vessel.

4. Subtract normal depreciation of 5 percent per annum and excessive war depreciation not in excess of 3 percent per annum for vessels other than tankers and not in excess of 4 percent per annum in the case of a tanker.

It also is provided under this section that in no event shall the statutory sales price be less than 35 percent for an unsubsidized operator or 40 percent for any other operator of the average cost of constructing such type of vessels during the year 1944 (50 percent for tankers). The other definitions contained in this section are relatively unimportant.

Section 4 provides that any citizen of the United States may make application to the Commission to purchase a war-built vessel at the statutory sales price and that if the Commission determines that the applicant possesses the necessary ability, experience, financial resources, etc., the Commission shall sell such vessel to the applicant at the statutory sales price. The said section also

provides that the purchaser shall make a down payment of at least 25 percent of the statutory sales price, the balance to be payable in not more than 20 equal annual installments with interest on the unpaid balance at 3½ percent per annum (or shall be payable under such other amortization provisions which permit the purchaser to accelerate payment of the unpaid balance as the Commission deems fit). Such obligation is to be secured by a preferred mortgage on the vessel sold. Subsection (c) of this section provides that neither the contract of sale nor the mortgage shall restrict the use or operation of the vessel, except where necessary to preserve the value of the vessel as security for the payment.

Section 5 provides for the chartering of war-built vessels to citizens of the United States where the Commission finds that such chartering would be consistent with the policies of the act and where the vessel has been offered for sale for at least 3 months. Subsection (b) provides that the Commission shall fix the charter rate, but prohibits a rate of less than 15 percent per annum of the statutory sales price unless approved by a vote of not less than four members of the Commission. Subsection (c) makes applicable to such charters the operating-differential subsidy provisions of the 1936 act.

Section 6 provides for the sale of vessels to noncitizens. It excepts P–2 type or other passenger-type and bulk dry-cargo Liberty-type vessels. The conditions precedent for such sales are (1) that the applicant has the necessary resources, ability, experience, etc.; (2) that the vessel is not necessary to the defense of the United States; (3) that the vessel is not necessary to the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and (4) that for a reasonable time the vessel has been up for sale to citizens of the United States or for charter to citizens of the United States. Subsection (b) provides that no foreign sale shall be on terms or conditions more favorable than those at which the vessel is offered to a citizen of the United States.

Section 7, entitled "Order of Preferences," provides that the Commission shall give preference to American citizens, and to applications for purchase rather than charter, and to owners whose prewar tonnage has been diminished by losses and requisitions. Subsection (b) provides that after the war the United States shall not operate vessels in public service except to the extent necessary to effect the orderly transfer of vessels to private operation.

Section 8 authorizes the Commission to grant an allowance of credit toward the purchase of a war-built vessel for any vessel owned by a citizen of the United States other than a vessel purchased under the act, or any vessel owned by a foreign corporation if such vessel was constructed in the United States and was chartered to or taken by the United States after December 7, 1941, and the controlling interest in such corporation is owned by citizens of the United States and if such corporation agrees that the war-built vessel purchased with the use of such credit shall be documented under the laws of the United States. Certain subsections of the "turn-in and build" section (510) of the 1936 act are made applicable. Under subsection (b) (1) if the owner of a vessel under charter to the United States on the date of enactment of the act makes a "firm offer" to transfer the vessel to the Commission in exchange for a credit allowance, the amount of such allowance may be increased to (A) the previously agreed insurance value of the vessel or (B) in the absence of such agreement the amount for which the United States would have been liable if the vessel had been lost. Subsection (b) (2) provides that if such an offer is made but not accepted and the vessel is lost by reason of causes for which the United States is responsible, then the offer shall be considered as having been accepted and the vessel as having been acquired. Subsection (c) authorizes the Commission to settle claims for just compensation or for vessel losses by transferring to the claimant a war-built vessel. Subsection (d) provides that a war-built vessel shall be deemed a "new vessel" under sections 510 and 511 of the 1936 act.

Section 9 authorizes adjustments with respect to the purchase price paid by citizens of the United States for vessels purchased from the Commission and delivered after December 31, 1940, or having a contract with the Commission to purchase a vessel and not yet delivered or who has received a construction-differential subsidy on a vessel delivered after December 31, 1940. The effect of this section is to refund or credit to the purchaser any amount in excess of the amount for which the purchaser could have purchased the vessel if the present act had been law at the time of his purchase. There are certain conditions imposed upon the making of such adjustments, namely, (1) that if the vessel was under a charter to the United States prior to the date of this act the charter rate shall be limited to 15 percent of the statutory sales price; (2) that the liability of the United States under any such charter for loss of the vessel shall be determined on the basis of the statutory sales price depreciated, or (3) that in the event the United States during the existing emergency uses such vessel after the date of enactment of the act, compensation for such use shall be limited to 15 percent of the statutory sales price.

Section 10 provides that no person shall be eligible to purchase or charter a war-built vessel under the act or receive an adjustment under section 9 unless he agrees that the liability of the United States under any charter party or taking for use prior to the act for the loss on or after such date of enactment and prior to the expiration of 2 years after the end of the war of any vessel owned by such person or under charter to the United States shall be limited to an amount equal to just compensation under section 902 of the 1936 act "or such valuation as may be agreed upon subsequent to the date of the enactment of this act."

Section 11 authorizes the Commission to place such vessels as may be determined, after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, to be necessary for national defense, as well as all vessels owned by it 2 years after the war, in a national-defense reserve.

Section 12 entitled "Reacquisition by United States" requires that there be included in every contract of sale a provision whereby if the United States prior to the termination of the present national emergency and 5 years thereafter charters or takes such vessels for use the charter rate shall be no greater than 15 percent of the adjusted basis of the vessel determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code and in the case of a purchase or requisition for title the compensation paid shall not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel likewise determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 13 entitled "General Provisions" provides (a) that the Commission may reconvert or restore for commercial service any vessel authorized to be sold or chartered under the act, as well as make certain replacements, alterations, and modifications therein; (b) that the provisions of section 202 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 shall not apply to contracts of the Commission for or relating to construction of ships; (c) that the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, shall not operate to prohibit a vessel sold or chartered under the act to a citizen of the United States from engaging in the coastwise trade of the United States while so owned merely because it was under foreign registry on May 27, 1941, and (d) that all moneys received by the Commission under the act shall be deposited in the construction fund of the Commission and all disbursements made by the Commission in carrying out the act shall be paid from such fund. Certain specific sections of the 1936 act are made applicable to activities and functions under the act.

Section 14 requires the Commission to make periodical reports to Congress concerning activities and transactions under the act.

Section 15 provides that no sale or charter shall be made after 2 years from the end of the war.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Has the gentleman a list that he will put in the RECORD of the ships involved in this bill?

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has secured from the Maritime Commission an extensive tables list dealing with all ships pertaining to this bill, which I understand he will insert in the RECORD. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct. I could not insert it in the Committee of the Whole, but I shall get permission to do so when the Committee rises.

Mr. REED of New York. How many ships are involved?

Mr. JACKSON. I would say there are about 700 ships taken over by the Maritime Commission for their use.

Mr. REED of New York. Taken over by them?

Mr. JACKSON. Taken over from private owners.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I think due tribute has been paid to the chairman of the committee, but I want to lend my voice to the praise of the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee for the patient manner in which they have labored with this subject. It has been confusing, it has been tiring, it has been difficult, and added to that, as we come into the House I do not think the errors that may have been made by the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration should be permitted to confuse the issue that we have before us. Credit is due to both sides of our committee that the Maritime Commission was called in and asked to explain certain transactions with respect to charters during the war period, with respect to ship construction and other dealings that they had in their effort to be a part of winning the war. Were we to go farther along this line, we could also point out other agencies of the Government that other committees have had investigations of and those investigations did not come up in the consideration of subsequent legislation.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I am glad to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. BLAND. The Maritime Commission was very diligent to give us all the information we called for, and sometimes more voluminously than the chairman expected.

Mr. BONNER. I have found the Maritime Commission so far endeavoring to give us the information we asked for, but there were occasions when I thought they were unable to give the information that we sought. Since this question has been raised, I particularly point out the time when we called for an expert on tankers. If you will read the hearings, you will find, I think, that the committee got very little information regarding tankers and tanker operations at that day's sitting. It is unfortunate that the Red Sea charters and other things pertaining to the operation of the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration should come into this debate.

As the gentleman on the left side of the aisle has recently said to me, this is a serious piece of legislation. Mr. KEEFE is the gentleman I refer to. It is a pity that this legislation is being debated without a larger membership of the House present.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WEICHEL. The gentleman made reference to the Red Sea Charter. I certainly mentioned it in a most serious vein, as well as mentioning the $150,000,000 to ship contractors who had no investment. I think that that should be exposed here on the floor of the House. Does not the gentleman think so?

Mr. BONNER. I think all matters that any Member of Congress may have information about which he thinks are not proper transactions should be brought to the floor of this House. I am not criticizing the gentleman for what he said, and I am not saying that what he said is correct or incorrect.

Mr. WEICHEL. Does the gentleman not believe in calling a spade a spade?

Mr. BONNER. Yes; I believe in calling a spade a spade at the proper time. The subject at hand is sufficiently large for us to deal with it as a specific subject: The disposal of these ships; not to tie the disposal of these ships up with something that has happened in the past, but instead, with something that will happen in the future.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. It may be entirely possible and quite probable that some of these ship charterers and owners who have been the beneficiaries of these huge sums that the gentleman from Ohio mentioned may be the purchasers under this program; is that not true?

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman has a quick and active mind, and I agree with him. We intend to offer amendments to this bill that will so pin it down that I hope it cannot happen in the future.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, to that extent then it is quite proper, is it not, to bring to the attention of Congress the facts which the gentleman from Ohio brought to the attention of the House so that it cannot be said that these people may come in now under the terms of this bill and use their ill-gotten gains for the purpose of purchasing these ships at a discount. It seems to me that the gentleman from Ohio was clearly within his rights, and it is very proper that the information should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, does he not know and very well know as well as everybody on the committee knows that out of this $329,000,000 tax-exempt fund which has risen to that height, and it is not all in there now, that these very people who have the tax-exempt fund have purchased ships and expect to purchase more ships out of the tax-exempt fund? That is why it becomes important as to what the price of these ships should be, just as I mentioned about the shipyards.

As to these nominal figures the Maritime Commission gives us and calls ship costs, saying that a Liberty ship, for instance, cost $1,500,000 or $1,600,000, they do not include that $150,000,000 or the $400,000,000 that they paid the shipyards. That is not in that cost. That is why I want to bring it out. Does not the gentleman believe it ought to be brought out?

Mr. BONNER. I will leave that to the gentleman to decide for himself. The gentleman will remember that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] and I conducted the investigation of the purchase of the Morgan Line and certainly the report we made on that transaction should be sufficient for the House to understand that both sides of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries were trying to protect and do the proper thing for the welfare of the Government and the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I could discuss the bill page by page. As I said, I am just as anxious to see the largest merchant marine possible and I am just as anxious to see the funds of our Government protected as is any other member of the committee, yet I take the view that we must look at the disposal of these ships in a broad way, as we will have to look at the disposal of other war-built property that has no value whatsoever, to get the best we can for the ships, to let them serve to the best purpose, and to inure to us the best benefit possible.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have great confidence in the gentleman's opinion on the subject of this bill. May I ask him whether or not I understood correctly that the gentleman approves an amendment to this bill that would require the return of the proceeds of the sales to the Treasury of the United States rather than to the revolving fund of the Maritime Commission?

Mr. BONNER. I do.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I correctly under stand that such an amendment will be offered?

Mr. BONNER. I may say to the gentleman that a point of order may be made against the amendment. If it is not in order to make the point of order, then such an amendment will be offered to the bill.

Mr. BLAND. I am advised that the point of order is good, but I do not know.

Mr. BONNER. If the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the committee, agrees to the point of order, the gentleman's and my trouble is settled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, the bill now presented to the House (H. R. 3603) is in every sense a major piece of legislation and by no means a simple one. It represents the earnest attempt of our Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to solve the great problem presented by our unprecedented fleet of merchant ships. The number of war-built ships as defined in the act is now around 5,000, and their tonnage is in the neighborhood of 50,000,000 tons. They stand us around $30,000,000,000 without taking into account the capital investment in shipyards.

Our committee was unanimous in opposition to the principle of Government ownership and operation and I call particular attention to the language occuring in section 7 (b) of the bill—page 11. Of course, we, all of us, wish to see these ships or as many as possible of them in use. If it be conceded that they are not to be owned and run by the Government, then you have the question, who is going to own them and run them, how are they to be transferred into the ownership of the people who are to own them and run them, who are the people you wish to have own them and run them, under what conditions, with what restrictions, and at what profit. For, of course, if private owners cannot make money they will not run ships. Then the Government must run them or they will not be run.

In section 2 of the bill we recite as the policy of this act to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of a merchant marine sufficient to carry the domestic water-borne commerce of the United States, and a substantial portion of its water-borne foreign commerce and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such commerce. We recite that such a merchant marine owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States should be capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency and should be composed of the "best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel and supplemented by American-owned facilities for repairs, merchant marine insurance, and other auxiliary service.

I should like to emphasize at the outset that these war-built ships are weapons which have been used and successfully used to achieve the great victory that we have won. They are weapons every bit as truly as the bombers, tanks, artillery, and ammunition which we have poured out so profusely to attain victory. This does not, of course, mean that we are therefore justified in throwing away or giving away ships which represent a national investment of $30,000,000,000. On the other hand, I think it should be borne in mind that these ships as of this moment have justified their existence. If they were all to sink tomorrow, we should have nothing to regret for having constructed them.

Accordingly, when we consider disposing of these ships I do not think it altogether realistic to look upon them as if they had been constructed for ordinary peacetime purposes. Everybody agrees that the aggregate amount which we can hope to realize from the sale of these ships is pitiably small compared to the amount of our original investment.

If all these ships were offered for sale at auction with no upset price or simply offered at private sale, they would presumably excite comparatively little interest, because every prospective purchaser would delay purchasing on the theory that this would inevitably be a falling market and he could buy next year more advantageously than this.

Accordingly, the committee agreed as did the Maritime Commission and the shipping interests generally that the bill would have to name some statutory sales price. What should that price be in order to fulfill the provisions of the act? Obviously if the price is too low, then the United States makes a needless sacrifice of its financial interests and the Treasury suffers. On the other hand, if the price is too high, then the ships will not be sold in sufficient numbers and we shall neither in any way realize the objectives set forth in the bill nor get a high aggregate return for our fleet.

The committee spent many months in hearing evidence as to what should be the statutory sales price and in discussing the evidence presented to it. There were sharp divisions of opinion among our committee. My own view very emphatically is that it is better to err on the side of selling ships too cheap and getting them on the ocean, than to hold for too high a figure and leave them at the wharves. Furthermore, if the ships are sold cheap the net earnings of the shipping companies will be correspondingly enhanced and the United States will derive benefits from those enhanced earnings through the revenue from income taxes.

I emphatically think that none of the provisions of this bill is too advantageous to prospective purchasers. I am rather fearful that some of the provisions may not be advantageous enough to stimulate sales. After all, we must bear in mind that the shipping business is seldom fantastically profitable. If I were a great capitalist, seeking an ultraconservative investment for my capital, I certainly should not buy ships. On the other hand, if I wished to employ my capital in the most venturesome way so as to make great profits, I think that there are other possibilities, notable in the way of new inventions and new techniques, infinitely more intriguing than these ships.

Anybody who buys a ship today takes a big gamble, for losses may well be substantial and the chances of great gains very small. Nobody can tell at the moment what cargoes there will be to carry in the next 2 years or what freight and charter rates will prevail. With respect to foreign commerce, there are very difficult questions of credit to be fixed.

The statutory sales price established in this bill necessarily is a stab, more or less, in the dark. But we have finally established in section 3 (d) of the bill a statutory sales price in the case of dry-cargo vessels at 55 percent of the prewar domestic cost to a subsidized operator and 50 percent to an unsubsidized operator. In the case of tankers, the price is fixed at 75 percent on the prewar domestic cost of that type of tanker. In all cases adjustments are to be made for depreciation, but the extent of those adjustments is limited by language to be found at the foot of page 5 of the bill, to which I direct your attention.

Experience has shown that prewar domestic cost represents about twice prewar foreign cost. So that a foreign purchaser would pay for a ship under this bill somewhere nearly what it would have cost him to build in his own country in 1939. Obviously, if we are to move these ships, they must be sold at prices very materially less than it would cost to build new ships today.

The reason for the 5-percent differential between the statutory sales price to the unsubsidized operator over the sales price to the subsidized operator represents an attempt to offset to some extent the advantage that the subsidized operators have obtained under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 through being able to set aside out of earnings a tax-free reserve of around $157,000,000 for the purchase of new ships. The unsubsidized operators had no such advantage, and I repeat that this bill represents an attempt to equalize to some extent the terms on which these two types of domestic purchaser could purchase. I myself would have preferred a 10-percent differential to a 5-percent differential, but the 5 percent was finally agreed upon after very long discussions and controversies.

It will be noted that the statutory sales price of tankers is very much higher than that of dry-cargo ships. There are several reasons for this. In the first place, tankers are more saleable ships; in the second place, very large numbers of tankers are industrial carriers rather than contract carriers. By this is meant that the owners of tankers are, in a preponderance of cases, oil companies which employ the tankers in the prosecution of their own businesses and not in the carriage of cargo for others. There are, of course, independent tanker operators but even they may be presumed to have better defined earnings prospects than the owners of dry-cargo ships. A good deal of testimony favored having tankers sold on the same basis as dry-cargo ships. On the other hand, some members of the committee thought that tankers should be sold at 100 percent of prewar domestic cost. The provisions of the bill with respect to tankers represent as other cases a compromise.

Obviously, I haven't time to attempt an exhaustive discussion of this bill, but I want to comment on some of its other features.

Our surplus of ships is so large that it seemed highly desirable to sell to foreigners as well as to citizens. Of course, if no foreigner could acquire a ship in any other way we would be in a position to say to all foreigners, "You must ship your goods in American ships and pay freight to the American owners. We will not sell you any ships." However, we are not in a position to dictate. The foreigner will not buy American ships unless he can buy them materially cheaper than he can build in his own country. Bear in mind that foreign countries which have ship-building industries are desirous of keeping them occupied and will not encourage their nationals to purchase in this country.

We have not, however, deemed it advisable to sell to foreigners every type of war-built ship. There are certain passenger types of vessels and bulk dry-cargo Liberty types which, under the bill, no foreigner may purchase. These are reserved absolutely to our own citizens. See section 6 (a). Another class of ships not to be sold to foreigners until citizens of the United States shall have had a preemptive opportunity for at least 6 months to make purchases. In this class in which the American purchaser enjoys a preemptive right you find all tankers and all the so-called C-type vessels which represent our best class of cargo ships, universally believed to be more salable than the Victory or the Liberty types. The Victorys and the Libertys we will sell to any foreign purchaser at the statutory sales price "after a reasonable time," which is so precisely defined and which presumably would be very brief. But no vessel is to be sold to a foreigner unless the Maritime Commission determines that the purchaser has the financial resources, ability, and experience necessary to enable him to fulfill all obligations with respect to the payment of any deferred portion of the purchase price, and unless it finds that the vessel is not necessary to the defense of the United States, that the sale would not be inconsistent with any policy of the United States in respect to its relation with other countries, and that the ship is not necessary for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine. See section 6 (a). In no event is the foreigner to have terms more advantageous than the citizen. See section 6 (b).

The bill also provided in section 5 for the charter of war-built ships to citizens at a statutory charter hire. There is no provision for chartering to foreigners. Obviously we desire to sell ships rather than to charter them, but the committee did not feel that we should refuse to charter. In a time of such great economic unrest we recognize that many domestic shipping interests will prefer to charter and await developments rather than to buy. The chartering provisions

are limited to citizens. Aliens may not charter.

Section 8 of the bill applies to the exchange of vessels, of old vessels for new, and as to this section a rather elaborate committee amendment will be offered. I have not the time to discuss this provision at great length, but I think that the House will readily recognize and respect some provision for the turn-in of old vessels. We definitely want to get the older ships off the seas so as to make room for the newer and better ones.

Then in section 9 of the bill we have provided that a citizen who has bought a war-built ship since December 31, 1940, may readjust the transaction in such a way that it may be deemed to have occurred at the time of the enactment of this bill. That is to say, we scale down the price which he paid to the price which he would have paid under this bill, and make corresponding adjustments with respect to charter hire, depreciation, and so on. A very elaborate committee amendment will be offered likewise to this section of the bill upon which the committee has spent an enormous amount of time and discussion. Whether the provisions of the bill are the best possible in this respect, nobody can say, but I feel perfectly confident in saying that no one is likely hastily to improvise anything better.

The bill provides in section 11 for a national-defense reserve fleet, the vessels thereof to be selected by the Commission after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. This reserve will also include all of the vessels owned remaining unsold on September 2, 1947. Unless otherwise provided by law, all vessels placed in such a reserve shall be purchased and maintained by the Commission for the purpose of national defense. A vessel placed in such reserve is in no case to be used for commercial operation.

Section 12 of the act represents an attempt to provide for the compensation to be paid to the owner of these war-built ships in the event that they are reacquired by the United States for use in some future national emergency. I myself think that the provisions of section 12 represent a clumsy and ill-conceived attempt to evade the spirit of that provision of the Federal Constitution which recognizes the right of a man to full compensation for whatever the Government takes away from him under the right of eminent domain. Under section 12 the price which an owner has paid for a war-built ship is conclusively adjudged to be the value of the ship in his hands. This provision is of very little value to the United States as the assumed value of the ship may change with every sale, and it may discriminate harshly against an owner who buys at a low figure. Under some conditions a ship may appreciate in value in terms of dollars and cents and we must remember that the purchasing power of the American dollar is likely to fluctuate even more violently in the future than it ever has in the past. At the appropriate time I expect to offer an amendment which will strike section 12 from the bill. I believe that other amendments will be offered to it.

I hope the bill will be most thoroughly discussed. There are a number of its provisions which demand close scrutiny. But I submit that some measure of this sort must be passed, if we are to deal effectively with this great problem of our surplus merchant marine.

I will obtain leave of the House to add at this point a summary of recommendations made by the Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University on the use and disposition of our ships and shipyards at the end of World War II. The House will see that our bill adopts many of these recommendations.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Inasmuch as this report was prepared for the purpose of developing a surplus-disposal program for ships and shipyards, the major recommendations contained in the report are summarized here. This summary contains no evidence to support the recommendations and but few explanations of the finer details of the programs. Such evidence and explanations are contained in the body of the report.

With respect to ships we recommend:

1. That as a basic policy the Government should—

(a) Sell ships.

(b) Avoid delay in selling ships.

(c) Fulfill contractual obligations.

(d) Refrain as a general rule from operating commercial services.

(e) Adopt a one-price policy.

(f) Make the adopted price policy firm.

(g) Put some ships in reserve and effectively sterilize them.

2. That, based upon these policies, the Government should adopt the following program:

(a) Survey and repair:

(1) All ships should be surveyed and those which are obviously unfit should be scrapped immediately.

(2) For some ships, the cost of conversion from military use to commercial use will be greater than the price which could be obtained for the ship. Obsolete ships in this category should be scrapped. Good ships in this category that have been declared surplus by the armed forces should be sold immediately to the Reserve Fleet Maintenance Corporation.

(3) All ships, except Liberty ships, which are sold to private operators should be converted from military condition to commercial operating condition.

(4) All ships that are sold should be placed in safe operating condition and all war damages should be repaired.

(5) The costs of repair and conversion should be paid by the Government, which should arrange for private shipbuilding and ship-repair companies to do the work.

(b) Pricing:

(1) Ships less than 15 years old, except Libertys, should be priced as follows:

A basic price should be established for each type of ship, including important variations of each type.

The basic price should be the estimated postwar reproduction cost in a representative foreign yard.

The sales price for each ship should be the basic price less depreciation at the rate of 5 percent per annum from the date of construction.

(2) Liberty ships should be priced as follows:

The sales price for each and every Liberty ship should be identical.

The price should be determined by the Maritime Commission in the light of conditions prevailing at the time of setting the price.

There should be no deduction from that price for normal or excessive depreciation.

(3) Ships over 15 years old should be priced as follows:

The sales price for these ships should be established by appraisal of each individual ship; however, the price should not be less than 20 percent of the postwar foreign-reproduction cost of a similar ship.

(c) Calculating and adjusting prices:

(1) No allowances should be made for wartime damages or excess wear and tear, since all such damages should be repaired at the expense of the Government.

(2) The basic price of the various types of ships, including important variations of each type, and the established price of the Liberty should be published in the Federal Register as soon as possible, but not later than 3 months before the expiration of the United Maritime Council agreement.

(3) If insufficient data on postwar foreign construction costs are available at the time that publication is required, the basic price should be established by increasing prewar foreign costs by an arbitrary percentage, based upon pertinent data, such as the percentage increase in the costs of construction in United States yards and increases in foreign wage rates.

(4) The price of ships which have been sold to United States operators during the war should be adjusted, if necessary, to bring them into accord with the above program. Care should be taken, however, to prevent any purchaser from securing any windfalls in the course of such adjustment.

(d) Sales procedure:

(1) Ships should be offered for sale immediately upon the termination of hostilities with Japan. Some types may be offered earlier, if this can be done without favoritism to any group of purchasers. Until the end of the United Maritime Council agreement, sales must consist of a passing of title without a release of Government control.

(2) Ships, except Libertys, T–2's, and those over 15 years old, should be offered for sale at the above prices to prospective purchasers in the following order:

(a) Contractual obligations.

(b) United States-flag operators.

(c) Reserve Fleet Maintenance Corporation for balanced reserve.

(d) Foreign-flag operators.

As many ships as possible should be offered to each group as soon as possible; each ship which has not been purchased by the first three groups should be made available to foreign operators not later than 6 months after its original offering. If the supply of any type obviously exceeds the demand, the 6 months' period should be shortened.

(3) Libertys, T–2's, and ships over 15 years old should be offered to all purchasers, both domestic and foreign, simultaneously.

(e) Charter:

(1) Some ships should be made available on a charter (lease) basis to both domestic and foreign operators who need ships temporarily until ships suited to their requirements can be built.

(2) Liberty ships and ships over 15 years old should be made available for charter as soon as for sale. Other type ships should not be chartered until they have been offered for sale to all classes of purchasers and have not been sold.

(3) The charter price should be sufficiently high, as compared with the sales price, so that long-term chartering is discouraged.

(4) The charter period should be not less than 1 year.

(f) Ships not sold or chartered:

(1) Ships should not be offered for sale or charter indefinitely. The offering should be discontinued as of some definite, early date which has been announced in advance.

(2) The good ships which have not been sold or chartered under the above procedures should be sold to the Reserve Fleet Maintenance Corporation for the residual reserve.

(3) Remaining ships which are in need of substantial repairs or whose usefulness is doubtful should be scrapped.

(g) Terms and restrictions:

(1) Terms of payment should differ as between United States and foreign purchasers. Foreign purchasers should be required to pay cash, but United States operators should be allowed either cash or installment terms.

(2) No restrictions on operations should be included in the sales agreements with the purchasers.

(3) No agreement giving the Government the right to recapture a ship in case of emergency should be included in the sales contract.

(4) United States citizens who purchase and operate ships under the United States flag should have the privilege of returning the ships to the Maritime Commission at purchase price less depreciation, at 5 percent per annum to the date of return, provided, that at the time of return they enter into a contract with a United States shipyard for the construction of a new ship to replace the one returned to the Government.

With respect to shipyards we recommend:

1. That the Government adopt the following program:

(a) Offer for sale to the yard owners at low prices the facilities owned by the Government in private yards (scrambled facilities).

(b) Enter into contracts with the private-yard owners for the maintenance, idle, of any scrambled facilities not sold in (a).

(c) Survey the results of steps (a) and (b) prior to disposing of new Government-owned emergency yards. The military authorities should select from the emergency yards those additional facilities necessary as stand-by capacity for strategic reasons, for balanced capacity, or overflow from navy yards.

(d) Offer for sale at "fair value" all new yards not to be preserved as a result of (c). "Fair value" should be based on an appraisal of normal prewar cost less depreciation.

(e) Transfer to the Surplus Property Board for sale for other than shipbuilding purposes all facilities not preserved to be sold in steps (a) to (d).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL].

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, for many weary months, since the Seventy-eighth Congress convened, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has worked to bring out a ship sales bill which would accomplish various purposes, and be equitable to the many groups concerned in the industry. The result is not ideal, but a solution favorable to everyone would be an impossibility. That we have succeeded as well as we have is due in no small measure to the fair and judicial actions of our beloved chairman the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] and the cooperative spirit of the various members of the committee.

Americans are justly proud of the accomplishments of our merchant marine; of the men who produced our ships, and of the personnel who so courageously manned them.

The start of the war in Europe in September 1939, followed later by the attack on Pearl Harbor on that day of infamy, December 7, 1941, imposed problems and responsibilities of unbelievable magnitude upon the maritime industries of the United States. The United States Maritime Commission had been established under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to direct and control all phases of overseas shipping and shipbuilding.

When this Nation entered the war, the need for a special agency to deal with operational problems aggravated by war, soon became apparent. On February 7, 1942, the War Shipping Administration was created, which became the Government's ship-operating agency, and the Maritime Commission its shipbuilding agency.

On April 18, 1942, all American-flag vessels were made subject to requisition and operation by the Government. The entrance of the United States into the war necessitated total Government control rather than a continuance of the voluntary basis which had prevailed up to that time. Pronounced progress developed both in increased production and in efficient ship operation. The greatest shipbuilding in the history of the world occurred in the United States during the ensuing months and years.

In 1942 there were approximately 900 dry cargo ships totalling about 6,700,000 dead-weight tons and approximately 440 tankers of 5,150,000 dead-weight tons. The United States has come out of the war with over 5,000 ships, totaling over 50,000,000 tons of merchant shipping, far more than the rest of the world combined.

The success of that program has brought us a very difficult problem, namely, what to do with our surplus ships.

Great and important decisions now face this Nation. No. 1 concerns the amount of merchant marine this country intends to keep and the number of ships they intend to operate in the postwar years. No. 2, the cost of operating and maintaining our high price and high operating cost ships in competition on the world sea lanes. No. 3, the international shipping relations.

Opinions differ widely, one group suggesting that we give away all our merchant fleet to maritime nations who are friendly, and another group advocating that we send out our huge tonnage of American ships, loaded with American goods to the far corners of the world. Neither extreme is reasonable, and would not be accepted by the public. Sound business judgment and international relations must be considered. An adequate merchant marine is important to the development of commerce, and also essential for our national defense. These were some of the problems confronting the committee when it commenced consideration of a bill to dispose of our surplus war-built vessels.

The first necessity was to agree on a policy. The policy, as set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, provided the answer and is summarized as follows:

It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce, that the United States have a merchant marine, first, sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of its water-borne export and import foreign commerce and to provide shipping service on all essential routes for such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce; second, capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; third, owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States; fourth, composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manner with a trained and efficient citizen personnel; fifth, supplemented by American-owned facilities for repairs, marine insurance, and other auxiliary services. It is the policy of this act to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine, and to facilitate the adjustment of the merchant marine from war service to peacetime operations.

Private ownership and operation of our American merchant marine has been a cardinal principle of the United States in the past. At the present time, due to the war, our fleet is substantially Government-owned and Government-operated. This bill is presented to facilitate in a sound and sensible manner, not only the adjustment of the merchant marine from war service to peacetime operation, but also to transfer our fleet from Government to private hands.

My allotted time being limited, and since the main features of the bill have been explained by the chairman and other members of the committee, I shall confine my remarks to sections that I believe are important to the accomplishment of the purposes of the bill.

A most essential element in any plan to sell surplus war-built ships is the price to be charged potential purchasers. Ships could be placed on the auction block, as was done in the last war, or a reasonable price could be established at which vessels would be offered for sale. If the former method were adopted, the abnormally large supply of ships, due to war conditions, would cause the prices to drop to very low figures on certain vessels. The health of the entire industry would be adversely affected for years, as the experiences after World War I have proven. Furthermore, the amount realized would yield very little to the taxpayers. The hearings and discussions favored the adoption of a fixed price policy which would induce the sale of the maximum number of vessels, and which would not cause harm to the future welfare of the maritime industry.

What should that price be? Realizing the importance of this section of the bill, considerable thought was given to the matter. Many factors were studied carefully before making a decision.

The wartime costs were obviously high, exceeding the prewar costs by as much as 35 percent. Purchasers should not be asked to absorb these high war costs.

Foreign construction costs prior to the war had always exerted a tremendous influence on all shipbuilding activities. Being substantially lower than American construction costs, shipowners purchased abroad. It seemed likely that the amount we could charge for these war-built vessels in the postwar years would be limited by the foreign construction costs.

Also, since noncitizens would probably buy abroad, and since it would not be proper to sell vessels to citizens at a higher price than to noncitizens, our prices would have to be in line with foreign prices.

Prewar foreign construction costs appeared to offer a fair basis for selling these war-built ships. The prewar foreign construction costs were determined to be approximately one-half the prewar domestic construction cost.

The committee then debated the merit of a price differential to various types of operators.

Should all operators, subsidized and unsubsidized, be treated alike? For several reasons which are set forth in the report, a price differential in favor of the unsubsidized operator was adopted. Also, because of their special nature, tankers were placed in a separate category and treated differently.

Finally, a sales price formula was adopted and the method of computation is as follows:

First. The Commission ascertains the prewar domestic cost of a standard vessel of a particular type prevailing on or about January 1, 1941. This date was chosen as the latest date prior to general increases in costs due to wartime conditions.

Second. The Commission then ascertains the statutory sales price by applying to the prewar domestic cost 50 percent in the case of unsubsidized operators, 55 percent in the case of all other types of operators, and 75 percent in the case of tankers. The amount obtained is specified in the bill as the statutory sales price.

Third. The Commission makes adjustments by subtracting from the statutory sales price (a) the amount necessary to put the ship in class—good operating condition; (b) normal depreciation figured at the rate of 5 percent per annum for the period beginning with the date of original delivery of the vessel by the builder and ending with the date of sale to the applicant; (c) special depreciation for extra wear and tear from war service, the amount to be determined by the Commission, and not to exceed 3 percent in the case of a vessel other than a tanker, and 4 percent in the case of a tanker; (d) if the Commission decides the vessel possesses or lacks desirable features which are or are not contained in a standard vessel of a particular type, the difference shall be added to or subtracted from the statutory sales price.

However, no adjustment is to be made under this act which will result in a statutory sales price for a dry-cargo vessel of less than 35 percent to an unsubsidized operator, or 40 percent to any other operator, or 50 percent in the case of tankers, of the average construction costs of vessels of the tame type delivered during the calendar year 1944. Thus, the bill establishes a floor price below which sales cannot be made.

I have devoted more space to a discussion of the price policy than to any other section of the bill in order to emphasize its provisions. I deem it the most important of several major decisions of the committee.

Other significant questions dealt with sales to citizens and to noncitizens, their order of preference, and treatment as to terms. Whether vessels should be chartered or sold to noncitizens and whether all types of vessels should be made available to them.

National defense and the interest of our ship operators and our own commerce should receive prior attention. If we wish to have a Merchant Marine operated by private operators and competing on the world sea lanes, then no matter how generous we may feel, we should not handicap those operators by selling to foreign operators on better terms than to our own citizens, nor should we sell certain types of vessels to foreign operators that we may need ourselves. To provide this protection the following provisions were agreed to by the committee:

First. Citizen applicants to purchase or charter shall be given preference over noncitizen applicants to purchase—no vessels are to be chartered to noncitizens.

Second. Certain vessels of the P–2 type, other passenger types and bulk dry cargo Liberty vessels shall not be sold foreign.

Third. Tankers and C-type vessels shall not be sold foreign until 6 months after cessation of hostilities—except 5 C-type vessels under charter for at least 1 year prior to date of enactment of this bill.

Fourth. General cargo Liberty vessels, the Victory-type vessels and some miscellaneous types, can be sold foreign after such types of vessels have been available for sale or charter to citizens for a reasonable time and no responsible offer has been made by a citizen to purchase or charter such war-built vessel.

Fifth. No vessel shall be sold foreign if the Commission determines it is necessary to the defense of the United States or to the promotion and maintenance of an American Merchant Marine.

Sixth. No vessel shall be sold to foreign applicants upon terms and conditions more favorable than those at which such a war-built vessel is offered to a citizen of the United States.

Two very controversial sections of the bill are sections 8 and 9, which deal with "Exchange of vessels" and "Adjustment for prior sales to citizens."

The committee, having in mind the development of a more modern and efficient American merchant marine, has set forth certain provisions to encourage citizens and certain foreign corporations controlled by citizens to turn in their older vessels in exchange for the newer and faster ships. The Commission is authorized to accept any vessel, other than one purchased under this bill, in exchange for an allowance of a credit on the purchase of any war-built vessel. After the bill was reported, the committee decided that the provisions in the bill permit too much opportunity for a too liberal allowance, and, therefore, will offer an amendment which will restrict the amount of credit that may be given on the purchase of a war-built vessel. It is hoped that this will alleviate much of the criticism of this section of the bill.

Many war-built vessels have been sold during this war to citizens of the United States who then have chartered them to the United States for war use. The prices paid by the purchasers have varied, some paying approximately 50 percent of the war-construction cost, and others paying the full wartime costs.

It would obviously be unfair to those purchasers unless adjustments were made in the prices to give them the benefit of the statutory sales price as provided in the bill.

The adjustment to be made would treat a previous sale as if the statutory sales price were in effect at that time. This might entail a large amount of refund to the purchaser. However, an off-setting sum would come back to the Government due to the lower amount of charter hire to be paid by the United States on the basis of the readjusted price. Since charter hire is figured at 15 percent of the sales price, a lower adjusted price would mean that a former purchaser would have been entitled to less money from the Government for charter hire to the United States. Furthermore, provision is also made for a smaller amount of Government liability to the owner for loss of the vessel, on the basis of the readjusted price.

A committee amendment will be offered which will endeavor to correct certain discriminations which could occur as a result of the readjustments, and to insure equitable settlements. These ideas will be discussed when section 9 is being read for amendment.

An important decision of the committee which will be of interest to all Members of Congress at the present time because of unsettled world conditions is the provision which calls for a national defense reserve fleet. In that fleet will be placed such vessels as the Commission, after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, deem necessary for the national defense and all vessels for which, at the expiration of 2 years from the cessation of hostilities, no contract for sale has been made and which are considered of sufficient commercial and defense value to preserve and maintain.

There are several provisions in the bill which my allotted time will not permit me to discuss in detail. However, I believe I have mentioned the provisions that, in my judgment, represent the most important decisions of the committee, namely, a general policy, determination of sales prices, preference as to purchases between citizens and noncitizens, protection to American interests in sales to noncitizens, exchange of vessels, adjustments of prior sales, and the establishment of a national defense reserve fleet.

Although the many divergent interests that are involved may disagree with some of the sections in the bill, there can be no quarrel with the committee's main objective, which is to protect the general welfare of our own country by not throwing away the opportunity to have an adequate merchant marine for commerce and national defense.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose at the conclusion of my statement to ask that the Clerk proceed to read the bill for amendment. It is then my purpose to have the Clerk read to section 4. That will include section 3. I have three committee amendments to section 3, and when I have offered those amendments and they are acted upon I shall move, without closing the opportunity to offer

further amendments to section 3, that the Committee rise. I know the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] desires to offer the so-called tanker amendment to section 3, and that will be controversial and will probably evoke considerable debate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask now that the Clerk proceed to read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1945."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) It is necessary for the national defense and development of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States that the United States have a merchant marine (1) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of its water-borne export and import foreign commerce and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times; (2) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (3) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States; (4) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel; and (5) supplemented by American-owned facilities for repairs, marine insurance, and other auxiliary services.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine, and to facilitate the adjustment of the merchant marine from war service to peacetime operations.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act the term—

(a) "Commission" means the United States Maritime Commission.

(b) "War-built vessel" means an ocean-going vessel of 2,000 gross tons or more, owned by the United States and suitable for commercial use—

(1) Which was constructed or contracted for by or for the account of the United States during the period beginning January 1, 1941, and ending with the date of the cessation of hostilities; or

(2) Which, having been constructed during the period beginning September 3, 1939, and ending with the date of the cessation of hostilities, was acquired by the United States during such period.

(c) "Prewar domestic cost" as applied to any type of vessel, means the amount determined by the Commission, and published by the Commission in the Federal Register, to be the amount for which a standard vessel of such type could have been constructed (without its national defense features) in the United States under normal conditions relating to labor, materials, and other elements of cost, obtaining on or about January 1, 1941. In no case shall the prewar domestic cost of any type of vessel be considered to be greater than 80 percent of the average construction cost of vessels of the same type delivered during the calendar year 1944.

(d) "Statutory sales price," as applied to a particular vessel, means, in the case of a dry-cargo vessel, an amount equal to 55 centum of the prewar domestic cost of that type of vessel, unless it is being sold or chartered to an unsubsidized operator, in which case such term means an amount equal to 50 percent of such cost, and in the case of a tanker, such term means an amount equal to 75 percent of the prewar domestic cost of a tanker of that type, such amount in each case being adjusted as follows:

(1) If the Commission is of the opinion that the vessel is not in class, there shall be subtracted the amount estimated by the Commission as the cost of putting the vessel in class.

(2) If the Commission is of the opinion that the vessel lacks desirable features which are incorporated in the standard vessel used for the purpose of determining prewar domestic cost, and that the statutory sales price (unadjusted) would be lower if the standard vessel had also lacked such features, there shall be subtracted the amount estimated by the Commission as the amount of such resulting difference in statutory sales price.

(3) If the Commission is of the opinion that the vessel contains desirable features which are not incorporated in the standard vessel used for the purpose of determining prewar domestic cost, and that the statutory sales price (unadjusted) would be higher if the standard vessel had also contained such features, there shall be added the amount estimated by the Commission as the amount of such resulting difference in statutory sales price.

(4) There shall be subtracted, as representing normal depreciation, an amount computed by applying to the statutory sales price (determined without regard to this paragraph) the rate of 5 percent per annum for the period beginning with the date of the original delivery of the vessel by its builder and ending with the date of sale or charter to the applicant in question, and there shall also be subtracted an amount computed by applying to the statutory sales price (determined without regard to this paragraph) such rate not in excess of 3 percent per annum in the case of a vessel other than a tanker, and not in excess of 4 percent per annum in the case of a tanker, for such period or periods of war service as the Commission determines will make reasonable allowance for excessive wear and tear by reason of war service which cannot be or has not been otherwise compensated for under this subsection.

No adjustment shall be made under this act which will result in a statutory sales price which, in the case of any dry-cargo vessel, will be less than 35 percent for an unsubsidized operator, or 40 percent for any other operator, of the average construction cost of vessels of the same type delivered during the calendar year 1944, or in the case of a tanker will be less than 50 percent of the average construction cost of tankers of the same type delivered during the calendar year 1944, in each case as determined by the Commission. For the purposes of this act all dry-cargo Liberty vessels shall be considered to be vessels of one and the same type.

(e) "Unsubsidized operator" means a citizen of the United States other than one who, on the date of the enactment of this act, is a contractor under an operating-differential subsidy contract made under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

(f) "Cessation of hostilities" means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war, or the date so specified in a concurrent resolution of the two House of the Congress, whichever is the earlier.

(g) "Citizen of the United States" includes a corporation, partnership, or association only if it is a citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 3, in line 2 and in line 5, strike out "the date of the cessation of hostilities" and insert "June 30, 1945."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the first of a series of amendments made necessary by events which have transpired since the bill was reported, particularly the surrender of Japan. Since June 30, 1945, contracting for new construction of vessels for war purposes has not been authorized, and hence this amendment is proposed for the purpose of limiting the vessels which are to be considered as war-built vessels to those contracted for prior to July 1, 1945.

Amendment No. 1 is offered so as to make the bill strictly applicable to vessels built for war purposes. In a letter from Admiral Land, dated July 4, 1945, he said:

H. R. 3603 is primarily and inherently a ship sales bill and should affect only war-built ships. We interpret this to mean ships built for war purposes in general accordance with congressional, Presidential, and Chiefs of Staff's programs. All of these programs have been contracted for and the bill covers them. The question is now raised as to ships which will be contracted for now and until the end of the war. We should readily assume that such ships will not get into the war and are, therefore, not part of the war effort. The Commission is of the opinion that ships contracted for from now on should not have the benefits of the Bland bill, but should be built under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. It is my understanding that this conclusion is in accordance with your ideas and in general accordance with the ideas of other members of your committee. In other words, the bill covers ships that were contracted for and built as part of the war effort but is not intended to cover ships contracted for from now on and therefore not part of the war effort.

The Commission suggested an amendment applicable to section 9 (a) relating to adjustments and the committee accepted the principle involved in fixing the date June 30, 1945, in applicable cases and suggested amendments accordingly. This is one.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 5, line 18, strike out the comma and insert "(1)"; and in line 21 and in line 24, after "cost", insert "(without national defense features)."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a clerical amendment to insure that in computing the floor price on war-built vessels the cost of national defense features will not be included in determining the war construction costs. The cost of national-defense features incorporated in vessels built under title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, has always been borne by the United States. In addition, the cost of such features is excluded in computing the statutory sales price under the bill. This amendment carries out the intention of the committee that the same policy shall apply in determining the floor price.

This amendment is just corrective to strike out a comma improperly inserted, and next to make it plain that the price floor cost determinations provided for in the last part of section 3 (d) should be computed without including the cost of national defense features. It will be noted that in 3 (c), in determining "prewar domestic cost" it is provided that the amount is determined "without its national defense features" and the actual average construction cost should be ascertained in the same way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 5, line 22, strike out "1944, or" and insert "1944, except in the case of any type of dry-cargo vessel the principal deliveries of which were made after the calendar year 1944, there shall be used in lieu of such year 1944 such period of not less than six consecutive calendar months as the Commission shall find to be most representative of war production costs of such type, or (2)."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has the effect of providing that in the computation of the floor price on a vessel of a type whose principal deliveries were made after 1944, the period used for averaging the construction costs shall be such period of not less than six consecutive months as the Commission determines to be most representative. The amendment applies principally to smaller type vessels built for the coastwise trade.

This amendment provides that in the case of any type of dry cargo vessels the principal deliveries of which were made after the calendar year 1944, there shall be used in lieu of the year 1944, such period of not less than six consecutive calendar months as the Commission shall find to be most representative of war-production costs of such type. Admiral Vickery pointed out in a letter to the chairman dated July 26, 1945, that floor prices based on 1944 figures would not be fair nor typical in certain types of vessels. For that reason the substitute period leaving some discretion in the Commission for fixing the exact period is both necessary and desirable.

Admiral Vickery said in his letter:

The estimated cost of 1944 deliveries, based upon the best information obtainable at this time, is necessarily, to some extent, fragmentary, since most of the contracts involved are still open for purposes of audit, and some are still in course of execution. Here again, however, it is not believed that there will be any substantial change in the figures. While the calendar year 1944 is a typical period for use in fixing floor prices for the bulk of the ship construction covered by the bill, it has been found that in the case of the small cargo vessel (C1-M-AV1) figures based on 1944 construction would not be typical, since a very small number of this type were built in 1944, the bulk of the deliveries being in the middle part of 1945. For this reason floor prices based on 1944 are not shown for this type in the table. We have in mind suggesting an amendment which would enable the Commission to use a typical 6 months' period for this type. Preliminary indications are that the cost of building the small cargo ships based on a typical 6 months' period in 1945 covering the major deliveries of this type will be about $1,750,000, which would result in floor prices for this vessel of about $700,000 for subsidized citizens and about $612,000 for unsubsidized citizens.

The amendment is the amendment that was desired by Admiral Vickery. I move its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk, which appears on page 3, line 25.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON: On page 3, line 25, strike out "75" and insert "100."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STIGLER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3603 had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO BE OFFERED TO H. R. 3603

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the committee amendments which have been agreed to by the committee and which will be offered tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

(The committee amendments follow:)

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 3603

Page 7, strike out lines 18, 19, and 20, and insert: "price, shall not restrict the lawful or proper use or operation of the vessel."

Page 9, lines 23 and 24, strike out "cessation of hostilities" and insert "date of the enactment of this act."

Beginning with line 19, page 12, strike out down through line 16 on page 14, and insert:

"Such allowance shall not be applied upon the cash payment required under section 4. The amount of such allowance shall be determined by the Commission, having regard to the tonnage of the vessel being exchanged, but shall in no event be greater than 10 percent of the average construction cost (without national-defense features) of war-built vessels (of the same type as that being purchased) delivered during the calendar year 1944, except that in the case of any type of dry-cargo vessel the principal deliveries of which were made after the calendar year 1944, there shall be used in lieu of the year 1944 such period of not less than six consecutive months as the Commission shall find to be most representative of war production costs of such type. In any case where the vessel offered in exchange was acquired from the United States, the exchange allowance under this section shall, unless subsequent to its sale by the United States it was acquired by a bona fide purchaser for value, in no event be greater than the price at which the vessel was acquired from the United States plus the depreciated cost of any capital improvements thereon. No vessel which is under charter to the United States on the date of the enactment of this act and which, pursuant to the terms of such charter, has been restored to condition by the United States, or for the restoring of which pursuant to the terms of such charter a cash allowance has been made to the owner, may be exchanged under this section.

(b) The Commission is also authorized to make available any war-built vessel for transfer to any citizen in complete or partial settlement of any claim of such citizen against the United States (1) for just compensation upon the requisition for title of any vessel which he owned, or (2) for indemnity for the loss of any vessel owned by him and taken by the United States for use.

"(c) Except as hereinafter provided, a war-built vessel shall not be deemed to be a new vessel for the purposes of section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, but shall be deemed a new vessel for the purposes of section 511 of such act. Section 510 (e) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall be applicable with respect to vessels exchanged under this section to the same extent as applicable to obsolete vessels exchanged under section 510 of such act."

Page 15, line 12, after "shall" insert ", except as hereinafter provided," and after the period in line 15 insert "No adjustment shall be made under this section in respect of any vessel the contract for the construction of which was made after June 30, 1945, under the provisions of title V (including sec. 504) or title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended."

Beginning with line 16 on page 15, strike out down through line 23 on page 16, and insert:

"(b) Such adjustment shall be made, as hereinafter provided, by treating the vessel as if it were being sold to the applicant on the date of the enactment of this act, and not before that time. The amount of such adjustment shall be determined as follows:

"(1) The Commission shall credit the applicant with the excess of the cash payments made upon the original purchase price of the vessel over 25 percent of the statutory sales price of the vessel as of such date of enactment. If such payment was less than 25 percent of the statutory sales price of the vessel, the applicant shall pay the difference to the Commission.

"(2) The mortgage indebtedness of the applicant with respect to the vessel shall be canceled, and a new mortgage indebtedness, payable in not more than 20 equal annual installments, with interest on the portion of the statutory sales price remaining unpaid, at the rate of 3½ percent per annum, shall be assumed by the applicant.

"(3) The new mortgage indebtedness shall be in an amount equal to the excess of the statutory sales price of the vessel as of the date of the enactment of this act over the sum of the cash payment retained by the United States under paragraph (1) plus the readjusted trade-in allowance (determined under paragraph (6)) with respect to any vessel exchanged by the applicant on the original purchase.

"(4) The Commission shall credit the applicant with the excess, if any, of the sum of the cash payments made by the applicant upor the original purchase price of the vessel plus the readjusted trade-in allowance (determined under paragraph (6)) over the statutory sales price of the vessel as of the date of the enactment of this act to the extent not credited under paragraph (1).

"(5) The Commission shall also credit the applicant with an amount equal to interest at the rate of 3½ percent per annum (for the period begining with the date of the original delivery of the vessel to the applicant and ending with the date of the enactment of this act) on the excess of the original purchase price of the vessel over the amount of

any allowance allowed by the Commission on the exchange of any vessel on such purchase; the amount of such credit first being reduced by any interest on the original mortgage indebtedness accrued up to such date of enactment and unpaid. Interest so accrued and unpaid shall be canceled.

"(6) The applicant shall credit the Commission with all amounts paid by the United States to him as charter hire for use of the vessel (exclusive of service, if any, required under the terms of the charter) under any charter party made prior to the date of the enactment of this act, and any charter hire for such use accrued up to such date of enactment and unpaid shall be canceled; and the Commission shall credit the applicant with the amount that would have been paid by the United States to the applicant as charter hire for bare boat use of vessels exchanged by the applicant on the original purchase (for the period beginning with date on which the vessels so exchanged were delivered to the Commission and ending with the date of the enactment of this act).

"(7) The allowance made to the applicant on any vessel exchanged by him on the original purchase shall be readjusted so as to limit such allowance to the amount provided for under section 8.

"(8) There shall be subtracted from the sum of the credits in favor of the Commission under the foregoing provisions of this subsection the amount of any overpayments of Federal taxes by the applicant resulting from the application of subsection (c) (1), and there shall be subtracted from the sum of the credits in favor of the applicant under the foregoing provisions of this subsection the amount of any deficiencies in Federal taxes of the applicant resulting from the application of subsection (c) (1). If, after making such subtractions, the sum of the credits in favor of the applicant exceeds the sum of the credits in favor of the Commission, such excess shall be paid by the Commission to the applicant. If, after making such subtractions, the sum of the credits in favor of the Commission exceeds the sum of the credits in favor of the applicant, such excess shall be paid by the applicant to the Commission. Upon such payment by the Commission or the applicant, such overpayments shall be treated as having been refunded and such deficiencies as having been paid.

"For the purposes of this subsection, the purchase price of a vessel on account of which a construction differential subsidy was paid or agreed to be paid under section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall be the net cost of the vessel to the owner.

"(c) An adjustment shall be made under this section only if an adjustment is applied for on all vessels of the applicant with respect to which an adjustment may be made under this section, and then only if the applicant enters into an agreement with the Commission to the effect that, in the case of each such vessel—

"(1) depreciation and amortization allowed or allowable with respect to the vessel up to the date of the enactment of this act for Federal tax purposes shall be treated as not having been allowable; amounts credited to the Commission under subsection (b) (6) shall be treated for Federal tax purposes as not having been received or accrued as income; amounts credited to the applicant under subsection (b) (6) shall be treated for Federal tax purposes as having been received and accrued as income in the taxable year in which falls the date of the enactment of this act; and the amount credited by the Commission under subsection (b) (5) shall be treated for Federal tax purposes as having been received and accrued as income ratably over the period beginning with the date of the original delivery of the vessel to the applicant and ending with the day before the date of the enactment of this act;

"(2) the liability of the United States for use (exclusive of service, if any, required under the terms of the charter) of the vessel on or after the date of the enactment of this act under any charter party shall not exceed 15 percent per annum of the statutory sales price of the vessel as of such date of enactment; and the liability of the United States under any."

Page 17, line 14, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)."

Beginning in line 25 on page 17, strike out "the expiration of 2 years from the date of the cessation of hostilities" and insert "September 3, 1947."

Page 18, lines 14 and 15, strike out "at the expiration of 2 years from the cessation of hostilities" and insert "on September 3, 1947."

And in lines 19 and 20, strike out "at the expiration of such 2 years" and insert "on that date."

Page 19, strike out lines 5 to 24, both inclusive, and page 20, strike out lines 1 and 2, and insert:

"SEC. 12. There shall be included in every contract for the sale of a vessel under section 4 to a citizen of the United States provisions, binding on, and running with the title of, the vessel, to the effect that if, during any period during which the vessel may be requisitioned under section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended—

"(1) the vessel is repurchased or requisitioned by the United States, or is lost by reason of causes for which the United States is responsible, the compensation paid to the owner shall not exceed that which would be applicable under section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, if the difference between the construction cost of the vessel (exclusive of national-defense features), and the price at which such vessel was sold by the United States, constituted a construction differential subsidy; or

"(2) the vessel is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid to the owner for bare-boat use of the vessel shall not exceed 15 percent per annum of the compensation permitted to be paid to the owner under clause (1) upon repurchase or requisition."

Page 21, lines 22 and 23, strike out "the expiration of 2 years from the date of the cessation of hostilities" and insert "September 2, 1947."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may have permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include certain material.

Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole during the consideration of the bill H. R. 3603, and to include certain exhibits from the Maritime Commission and from the Appropriations Committee together with a proposed amendment which he will offer tomorrow.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he received from the Worcester chapter of the Order of Ahepa and a resolution which accompanied the letter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD, notwithstanding the estimated cost of $78 submitted by the Public Printer, an address recently delivered in Boston by General William O'Dwyer at the Commodore Barry commemoration exercises.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend in the RECORD pages 1, 2, 3, and 4 from the report of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University on the use and disposition of ships and shipyards at the end of World War II.

OPA HEADACHES

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, that the OPA, with the termination of most rationing by about the end of the year, is planning to close 3,600 of its 5,600 war price and rationing boards.

Roughly speaking, he stated 15,000 positions, covering $27,000,000 in annual salaries will be abolished by the move.

This, I would say, is great news; not alone because of saving $27,000,000 but the millions of headaches that it will also save.

I want to call your attention to the Federal Register of September 19, 1945, page 11897, part 1364, "Fresh, cured, and canned meat and fish products." It takes nine full pages to tell the story and it is interesting reading because it becomes quite evident that the meat packers, Armour, Swift, Cudahy, and others have a lot to learn because the OPA has listed a lot of meat products that I do not believe the packers ever heard of—and this is the kind of regulation that is driving people to the psychiatrists.

They cover everything—the purpose and scope of the regulation, how maximum prices are fixed, determine the zone in which point of delivery is located, quality and description labeling requirements, where the regulations apply, record keeping and enforcement, indirect price increases, licensing and registration, enforcement, miscellaneous provisions, zones, prices and definitions, transportation, launch delivery, hotel supply houses' selling addition; peddler truck selling addition; and they even get into figuring the cost that the buyer pays for slicing livers, which states "for slicing livers at the request of the purchaser, $2 per hundredweight."

They cover everything, from peddler's trucks to ocean-plying vessels; from

slaughter to consumption. There is some very informative material such as:

"Blood" which means entirely defibrinated blood which may contain salt or other curing agents.

"Brains" means both brain lobes, the small knob at the base of the brain, and a short piece of spinal cord approximately three-quarters of an inch in length.

"Cheek meat, lips on," of cattle or calves means the lean muscle on the inside and outside of the lower jaw, with the lip attached.

"Hearts, cap off" means bright colored beef, and "veal hearts" free from blood clots, trimmed free of large gristly blood vessels, and "heart cap" with trimmable fat not in excess of 20 percent.

So, I suppose the packers will have to look over the heart of each animal to determine if there is evidence of a blood clot as the animal may have had a heart attack before being slaughtered.

And it goes on with "kidneys," "lips," "livers." A description of livers is a very beautiful piece of writing. "Livers, veal or calf" unblemished, means all veal livers—obtained from the slaughter of calves—weighing not more than 5½ pounds, bright and uniform in color, from light to chocolate brown, moderately short and plump, and which are free from all mutilations other than minor cuts or slight skin breaks, and so forth, and so on, to the "lungs" and the oxtail, and "melts" and down to "oxtail split joints" which means the first two caudal vertebrae removed in making boneless beef for war procurement agencies.

Then we get into "snouts," "sweet breads," and "tails" and "tongue," down to "udders." Now the "udder" means the severed mammary glands from cows, and shall be carefully drained by slicing according to good commercial practice.

Now one of my good friends, a small packer, who has been in the business most of his life, writes me as follows:

Now here is the "grand champion" on the OPA ceilings pertaining to food products. If you will have somebody in your office lay open the Federal Register of September 19, page 11,897, you will see the beginning of a ceiling on meat items and offal products that you and I never heard of, and I, being an old buzzard, having been around the meat business about 30 years, still must admit the OPA "brain trusters" and perpetual job holders are teaching me something.

They have ceiling prices, among about 50 other items, on blood, crown meat, fries, gullet meat, melts, lungs, palates, and udders, and also unblemished livers. Now, all I can add is that I noticed the ceiling on beef brains is 7 cents per pound, calf and mutton brains 10 cents per pound, and pork brains 11 cents per pound. So, you may take your choice, and figure for yourself how much value to put on the brains of the individual who wrote up this regulation.

It only covers nine pages of the Federal Register, which means to me that after putting in about 10 hours a day, I must sit up about 2 hours additional at home in the evening and try to figure out what some flathead in Washington, who probably was an insurance salesman, ex-used-car salesman, or even an ex-packing-house salesman, has cooked up when he had one of his frequent brainstorms.

I venture to say the same individual who wrote it could not select 50 percent of the items if they were all placed on trays side by side, and this is only a sample of what we have to put up with and what received the blessing of the other bureaucrats in the Nation's overpopulated city in which Chester Bowles told Clinton Anderson he couldn't take off rationing because he had too much manpower and they wouldn't have anything to do.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are entitled to some relief from these regulations which are strangulating business.

I would say that it is about time that the Congress takes the shackles off American business and permit business to operate with some degree of freedom to put the country on a sound basis.

This order is merely another attempt to saddle administrative bureaucracy on a group of people, the packers, who are trying to put meat on the tables of the American people.

The Congress should take action to rid the Government of this element who are restraining a free flow of trade. I feel quite certain there are hundreds of policy makers and writers in the OPA who are putting out ridiculous orders, such as I have referred to, who could be taken off the pay roll without any damaging effect to OPA operations and to great savings to the American taxpayers.

Now that the colossal war demands have ceased there is no need to continue the restrictions and fool orders that are being imposed upon business.

Here we have some brilliant minds, who I doubt ever saw the inside of a packing house, issuing orders on meat-packing products some of which, I feel certain, the packers never heard of.

I wonder how the American people would like to sit down to an order of "grilled udders," with hashed brown potatoes; or, better still, a nice order of "unblemished livers." I am of the opinion from the beautiful description given of these meat products the writer who prepared this order would have no difficulty in securing a splendid position with some advertising agency interested in streamlining and beautifying meat products.

Meat should go off the rationing list right now, and not next January, as there is no further need, in my estimation, for continuing meat rationing.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE RURAL INDUSTRIALIZATION BILL

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, last week Senator BAILEY, of North Carolina, and I introduced identical bills, S. 1385 and H. R. 4068, to provide for aid in the industrialization of underdeveloped areas of the United States. The bill has been referred to as the rural industrialization bill and that is a fair characterization.

Today I want to explain some of the provisions of this measure, but before doing so let me give the background and sketch for the House a brief personal history of my interest in this proposal.

Of course, the idea of industrial development in those areas where agriculture and industry are not in proper balance is not a new one. But it has an obvious timeliness and in my judgment is one of the most important matters to be considered by the present Congress.

My interest in the matter goes back to some of the discussions emanating from the subcommittee of the Committee of Agriculture, headed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] to study the cotton problem. It is apparent from the testimony presented to the subcommittee that the problem of cotton, so vital to the welfare of the South, could not be properly considered without reference to many other factors in our economic life. There is no single solution to the problem. It has no simple, short answer. Many things must be done to protect the South against a severe shock resulting from changes that will inevitably come in the cotton economy of many regions.

I am not critical of the temporary devices to which Congress resorted for the protection of hundreds of thousands of cotton farmers. The situation was and still is a desperate one. Artificial price supports had to be provided or there would have been tragic consequences. It does not follow, however, that we can go on indefinitely depending upon these artificial props. Sooner or later, and I fear sooner than we had thought, some adjustments must be made.

CHANGES ARE INEVITABLE

We cannot permanently disregard the sound economic law that agricultural commodities must be grown in land best adapted to their production and marketed under competitive conditions. Twenty years ago American cotton farmers supplied 53 percent of the cotton consumed in world markets. We now supply only 43 percent, and if synthetic fibers are included we account for but 33 percent at present.

As one economist observed, "When we raised the umbrella over domestic producers the producers of competing nations got under the same umbrella," and we have only encouraged that competition which will prove to be ruinous unless we reexamine our policy and make necessary changes in it.

It was that fact that led the Secretary of Agriculture, for whom the Members of this House entertain great respect, to say recently that "Present prices cannot be expected to hold their present high level." Mr. Anderson told cotton growers at Stillwater, Okla., that the Government cannot maintain for more than a year or two after the war even 90 or 92½ percent of parity for "all the cotton and wheat that farmers can produce."

We should not be unprepared for a sudden departure from present price policies relating to cotton, and since the welfare of such a large population is involved the Congress should begin now to extend every conceivable help in a difficult transition. A number of things have already been done and are proving highly beneficial. I refer to the soil-conservation program and the educational programs conducted by various agencies within the Department of Agriculture. But something more substantial and fundamental is necessary. Even

under present methods of cultivation, we have a larger number of people in cotton production than can possibly maintain a fair standard of living. This is reflected in a low per capita income, not alone on the agricultural side but also carrying an impact upon the industrial population. This constitutes a threat to wage standards in every industrial city within or adjacent to the cotton-production area.

THE ENTIRE NATION IS AFFECTED

Even the west coast felt the influence of this condition when thousands of southern farmers migrated to the West in search of farming opportunities, or failing in that, to seek industrial employment. Northern cities have observed these influences and recognize that they, too, are involved in these great readjustments that lie ahead.

Since neither the agricultural South and West, nor the industrial North and East stand to gain by a continuation of present trends, the problem is resolved into the question of determining a sound national policy for the absorption in industry of those who need opportunities outside of agricultural production.

What kind of industrial development do we want and how can it be achieved without producing new social and economic problems? I am confident that those with a primary interest in industry will not withhold support from sound measures to promote new industries at the farmer's doorstep. To supply industrial opportunities in the smaller towns of the underdeveloped areas will not take away from more favored regions the development and prosperity that they now enjoy. It is with that in mind that Senator BAILEY and I introduced our bills to establish certain procedures in the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor that would encourage and promote a sound development in all of the underdeveloped areas of the country, and while the South and certain sections of the West might benefit more significantly than the highly industrialized regions, it should be pointed out that as defined in the bills which we have introduced, underdeveloped areas are located throughout the United States. The bill defines these areas as those which:

(1) Have workers available for employment in excess of those which can be employed efficiently on farm or in existing industrial or other enterprises; (2) have insufficient industrial, commercial, or service enterprises in the area to provide employment for such workers, and (3) where the prospects are that additional or expanded private enterprises would prove successful and would raise the levels of employment, production, and incomes in the region or area.

I recall, for example, my first visit to New England. I was at the time employed by the Department of Agriculture and was on a mission related to rural rehabilitation. If there is a more attractive agricultural region in the world than New England, I do not know where it is, but even in that beautiful and historic region there are stranded populations. It is obvious that a comparatively thriving industrial system has been unable to absorb all of the workers from the farms. No industrial program predicated upon the assumption that New England and the industrial Northeast are free from the problems of surplus farm populations and underdevelopment would be sound. Each area has its distinctive features and each presents complications requiring special treatment, but it all adds up to the need of a national policy aimed at creating a wholesome industrial and agricultural balance for America with emphasis upon industrial expansion in the smaller cities and towns rather than in the already mature and congested industrial centers far removed from the sources of the difficulties which we seek to correct.

THE VETERANS HAVE A STAKE IN THE PROGRAM

Returning veterans have a primary interest in this effort. A recent survey indicated that 700,000 of them said in response to questioning that they would like to establish themselves in some type of business or industrial enterprise. Six hundred thousand expressed a preference for farm pursuits. Many of those preferring industry have a farm background and have despaired of a decent standard of living there, and it is doubtful that all of the six hundred thousand preferring agricultural pursuits can be afforded opportunities on the land. Thus the necessity for an expansion of industry is doubly intensified.

We must, at the same time, consider the returning war plant workers. In dealing with the southern aspect of this problem I am also aware of the fact that many western States are confronted with similar problems. Between 1940 and 1945 every State in the South except Florida and Virginia suffered a decline in population considerably in excess of the 3.1 percent average occasioned by enlistments in the armed forces. Southern States with shipyard and aircraft factories here had some advantages, but may not retain them. Some northern States lost heavily. New York, for example, lost over 1,000,000 population in the 5-year period, or 7.4 percent. But most of those who went from New York to surrounding States for war work will probably return home and many of these same workers in the rural sections will eagerly seek the opportunities conceived of in this legislation. Table No. 1 which I will include shows the percentage of population losses for all of these States. The significance of these figures should be apparent.

Students of agricultural problems have repeatedly pointed out the close relationship between income and percentage of workers in agriculture. Table No. 2 indicates this relation for all States and table No. 3 for the Southern States. Table No. 4 gives the number of workers by occupation division. You will observe from table No. 3 that without exception the States having a small ratio of industrial workers considered in relation to agriculture have a low per capita income. I am including this table with some reluctance because it carries certain deceptive aspects requiring more elaborate treatment that the necessities of the present measure call for. I insist that there are certain attractions in agriculture that cannot be described in statistical charts. Nevertheless, there are inescapable conclusions to be drawn from these tables and they are related to the problems before us and further delay in consideration of problems of this magnitude can hardly be defended.

MECHANIZATION OF COTTON PRODUCTION IS AHEAD

Another threat to our present system of farming which cannot be ignored is the mechanization of cotton production which will shortly be accelerated with the release of improved machinery not available during the war. We cannot appeal for a postponement of mechanized operations for cost factors are involved and the resultant pressure upon cotton farmers is terrific. This process will inevitably result in the displacement of hundreds of thousands of farm workers and unless they can be absorbed the unemployment problem in many areas will become acute.

The entire Nation has a tremendous stake in the correction of economic maladjustments that are now encouraging migration of workers on a huge scale from one section of the country to another. This House very profitably spent a large sum of money a few years ago to ascertain the facts in connection with interstate migration and under the splendid leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN] secured considerable light on this question.

Admitting that the free movement of workers is necessary, the fact remains that too many constantly shifting families constitute an unwholesome condition from a national standpoint. We do not want our people to be uprooted in great numbers and I believe it is fair to say that the people of the congested centers do not want a continuation of this condition. Two newspaper items which have just come to my attention dramatize the very thing I am speaking of:

First, an advertisement by a great corporation saying that the health of children, and obviously children's health is directly involved, is more important even than the atomic bomb; and, second, an address by Mrs. Eugene Meyer to Washington's churchwomen which drew heavily upon the report to which I have just alluded.

America is awakening to the great human problem of displaced persons in our own country, and we of the Congress cannot shirk our responsibilities in providing guidance and assistance in the efforts to reach a solution.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in tribute to the fine vision of the gentlemen who have organized in their respective cities and States a campaign to study and prepare for the unemployment problems that are affecting these areas. I refer, for example, to the Greater South Dakota Association and a survey made by that group in conjunction with other civic bodies, pointing out the resources that the State has, appraising their potentialities, and suggesting remedies. The work of the Arkansas Economic Council is another notable example of civic cooperation. Also the city of Anderson, S. C., and a very splendid study that has been made by the businessmen and the civic bodies of that city. Also the city of Fort Smith, Ark., and a pamphlet en-

titled "Forward by Planning," sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce in cooperation with the Committee for Economic Development, Bureau of Research of the University of Arkansas, the United States Department of Agriculture, the Arkansas Economic Council, the Arkansas State Planning Board, and the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

These are but a few of the splendid activities that are now under way in various parts of the United States designed to cushion the shock of unemployment which will be intensified by the developments in agriculture which I am discussing. The purpose of this legislation is not to supplant but to encourage and to supplement these activities.

I shall not elaborate at this time, Mr. Speaker, but I am urging the type of industrialization described by the Progressive Farmer of Birmingham, Ala., a splendid pamphlet entitled "New Rural Industries That Fit Your Community." Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of the bill H. R. 4068 with four tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

COTTON PRODUCERS NOT DEFEATISTS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, let us help the people find opportunities where they are—not to become industrially prosperous by taking away opportunities at the expense of other regions, but by utilizing the resources close to them and by sharing in the increment of wealth that goes with the processing and manufacturing phases of production. In spite of the fact that imperative and drastic readjustments in the cotton industry loom ahead, the cotton producers of this country are not defeatists. They are aware of the magnificent contribution made by the Federal Government in preserving cotton's position in the world and to the stimulation of new uses for cotton and cottonseed. In urging action of the type contemplated by this bill, we are simply dealing with the economic and social repercussions of profound market changes. The future of cotton is secure. The bill concedes nothing to the defeatists. There is a bright future for American industry, and the provisions in the bill are directed strictly to considerations of the placement and diffusion of new industries and to the purpose of achieving maximum results for the entire Nation. The bill is not a cure-all. It is not presented as a substitute for any full employment bills that have been introduced, and there is no overlapping with programs already authorized by the Congress.

I should make it clear that I am not envisioning for the underdeveloped areas the building of new Pittsburghs or Birminghams. I am not even thinking of heightened industrial activity for the chief community of my district—Little Rock—but I am sure that if we wisely plan an industrial expansion, Little Rock will share in that development and its business will reflect the stability and balance that will accompany the right kind of industrial growth.

The only opposition to this bill that I can conceive of would come from those who believe that the great industrial cities should be bigger, that Detroit ought to grow at the expense of the rural sections. It is time to arrest this trend in American life not to take from our Detroits anything that they have or to adopt a policy of decentralization. We shall not scatter the industries that have already been built around strategic centers, but to provide for such information and assistance that people may improve their situations where they are—that they may be helped to help themselves. At the same time this will offer new prospects to thousands of businessmen and investors throughout the country.

TABLE 1.—*Index of States*

State	Population, 1940	Change since 1930	Percent change
Alabama	2,828,166	−109,893	−3.9
Arizona	497,068	+72,289	+14.5
Arkansas	1,948,250	−212,686	−10.9
California	6,868,065	+1,013,629	+14.8
Colorado	1,119,274	−52,179	−4.7
Connecticut	1,707,406	+40,996	+2.4
Delaware	265,343	+8,271	+3.1
District of Columbia	658,018	+158,964	+24.2
Florida	1,891,085	+120,961	+6.4
Georgia	3,102,584	−125,039	−4.1
Idaho	524,709	−51,643	−9.8
Illinois	7,882,054	−318,284	−4.0
Indiana	3,424,319	−41,007	−1.2
Iowa	2,537,008	−260,132	−10.3
Kansas	1,794,950	−116,228	−6.5
Kentucky	2,835,841	−296,733	−10.1
Louisiana	2,358,769	−42,088	−1.8
Maine	843,924	−61,612	−7.3
Maryland	1,806,485	+176,462	+9.8
Massachusetts	4,311,918	−218,846	−5.1
Michigan	5,250,636	+126,693	+2.4
Minnesota	2,788,956	−263,398	−9.4
Mississippi	2,183,509	−187,176	−8.6
Missouri	3,783,666	−258,876	−6.8
Montana	558,270	−88,237	−15.8
Nebraska	1,313,438	−137,415	−10.5
Nevada	108,761	+21,876	+20.1
New Hampshire	491,375	−38,042	−7.7
New Jersey	4,153,956	−73,471	−1.8
New Mexico	530,662	−40,543	−7.6
New York	13,444,022	−1,001,238	−7.4
North Carolina	3,562,592	−215,605	−6.1
North Dakota	641,692	−105,182	−16.4
Ohio	6,904,423	−76,071	−1.1
Oklahoma	2,329,522	−341,581	−14.7
Oregon	1,088,284	+84,390	+7.8
Pennsylvania	9,895,697	−622,455	−6.3
Rhode Island	708,536	−14,220	−2.0
South Carolina	1,892,742	−103,080	−5.4
South Dakota	642,682	−97,816	−15.2
Tennessee	2,915,742	−97,516	−3.3
Texas	6,381,862	−122,278	−1.9
Utah	549,722	+33,850	+6.2
Vermont	357,277	−41,203	−11.5
Virginia	2,642,729	+127,099	+4.8
Washington	1,719,143	+186,096	+10.8
West Virginia	1,901,723	−169,368	−8.9
Wisconsin	3,137,104	−191,749	−6.1
Wyoming	244,745	−9,006	−3.7
United States total	131,329,104	−4,021,220	−3.1

TABLE 2.—*Percentage of employed workers in agriculture, forestry, and fishing, and average income per capita of entire population, by States, 1940*

State	Per capita income, 1940 [1]	Percent in agriculture, forestry, and fishing [2]	Percent in other industries
United States or total	$579	19	81
Alabama	266	40	60
Arizona	473	22	78
Arkansas	257	53	47
California	808	11	89
Colorado	530	21	79
Connecticut	839	4	96
Delaware	923	14	86
Florida	472	20	80
Georgia	317	36	64
Idaho	442	37	63
Illinois	727	10	90
Indiana	537	18	82
Iowa	488	36	64
Kansas	421	32	68
Kentucky	313	37	63
Louisiana	365	34	66

TABLE 2.—*Percentage of employed workers in agriculture, forestry, and fishing*—Con.

State	Per capita income, 1940 [1]	Percent in agriculture, forestry, and fishing [2]	Percent in other industries
Maine	$503	14	86
Maryland	707	10	90
Massachusetts	769	3	97
Michigan	652	12	88
Minnesota	514	30	70
Mississippi	205	59	41
Missouri	508	24	76
Montana	584	32	68
Nebraska	431	38	62
Nevada	843	14	86
New Hampshire	569	10	90
New Jersey	894	3	97
New Mexico	359	32	68
New York	848	4	96
North Carolina	320	34	66
North Dakota	368	53	47
Ohio	647	11	89
Oklahoma	360	33	67
Oregon	579	19	81
Pennsylvania	635	6	94
Rhode Island	715	2	98
South Carolina	289	40	60
South Dakota	378	48	52
Tennessee	319	34	66
Texas	419	30	70
Utah	489	19	81
Vermont	513	25	75
Virginia	447	25	75
Washington	644	14	86
West Virginia	409	16	84
Wisconsin	519	26	74
Wyoming	599	30	70

[1] Survey of Current Business, June 1943, p. 11.
[2] Computed from Statistical Abstract, 1943, pp. 120 and 122.

TABLE 3.—*Workers engaged in farming and average income per person, 1940*

State	Proportion of workers engaged in farming	Average income per capita of population
	Percent	*Dollars per year*
Mississippi	59	205
Arkansas	53	257
Alabama	40	266
South Carolina	40	289
Kentucky	37	313
Georgia	36	317
Tennessee	34	319
North Carolina	34	320
Oklahoma	33	360
Louisiana	34	365
West Virginia	16	409
Texas	20	419
Virginia	25	447
Florida	20	472

TABLE 4.—*Gainful workers 10 years old and over, by general divisions of occupations, for 14 Southern States, 1910–40*

[All data in thousands of workers]

Divisions of occupations	Census data (adjusted) [1]			
	1910	1920	1930	1940
Total	11,510	11,438	13,295	[2]12,558
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing	6,906	5,676	5,575	4,356
Nonagricultural	4,604	5,762	7,720	8,202
Mining	181	315	334	367
Manufacturing and mechanical industries [3]	1,611	2,028	2,554	2,308
Transportation and communication	521	662	857	644
Trade	663	833	1,224	1,688
Public service	88	192	185	290
Professional service	326	420	651	734
Domestic and personal service	1,001	911	1,361	1,333
Clerical occupations	213	401	554	538

[1] Data adjusted to secure maximum comparability between classifications used in different census years. In 1940, data are for employed workers 14 years old and over.
[2] In addition, 1,821,804 workers in these States were on public emergency work, or were unemployed and seeking work, in 1940.
[3] Includes workers in construction.

H. R. 4068

A bill to provide for aid in industrialization of underdeveloped areas, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS AND AUTHORITY

PURPOSES

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, in order to expand the volume of interstate and foreign commerce and to provide for the general welfare of the United States of America, to stimulate development and industrialization of regions and areas of the United States, including its Territories and possessions, which heretofore have been without adequate industrial employment; (1) by assisting in providing jobs for returning servicemen and war workers, and in increasing employment opportunities for surplus farm and other workers in such regions and areas; (2) by raising production, employment, incomes, and standards of living in such regions and areas; (3) by encouraging and expanding employment through private enterprise in such regions and areas; (4) by encouraging and stimulating existing and new small business enterprises in such regions and areas; (5) by supporting and complementing other measures aimed at full employment; and (6) by aiding in making effective use for peacetime production through private industry of surplus war plants and equipment in such regions and areas.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term "regions or areas of the United States without adequate industrialization" shall mean any regions or areas in the 48 States of the United States of America; in the District of Columbia or in any Territory or possession of the United States of America, which (1) have workers available for employment in excess of those which can be employed efficiently on farms or in existing industrial or other enterprises; (2) have insufficient industrial, commercial, or service enterprises in the area to provide employment for such workers; and (3) where the prospects are that additional or expanded private enterprises would prove successful and would raise the levels of employment, production, and incomes in the region or area.

TITLE II—APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) The funds authorized to be appropriated by this act shall be used by the Federal agencies to which such funds are appropriated or transferred and in cooperation with State and other agencies to which payments or grants-in-aid are made, to encourage and aid the expansion of established, and the development of new, private enterprise and industrial employment in regions or areas of the United States without adequate industrialization, by—

(1) providing technical aid and assistance to, and consulting and cooperating with farmers, businessmen, workers, cooperatives, civic organizations, clubs and committees, community study groups, and local and State governmental agencies in order to carry out the purposes of this act;

(2) preparing and distributing technical and economic information on opportunities in private enterprise in various industries and regions in order to aid individuals, business firms, civic organizations, and local units of government in developing new industries best suited to their conditions;

(3) providing aid and assistance to authorized Federal, State, local, and private agencies engaged in training of returning servicemen, war workers, farmers, or other workers to fit the needs of new or expanding industries, and aiding such agencies in providing or expanding placement and relocation services in order to aid such persons in finding new employment, in moving to new locations, and in establishing themselves in such new employment;

(4) giving advice to expanding or new enterprises in finding adequate financing either through local capital or other means;

(5) cooperating with public utilities, transportation systems, and other enterprises in making provisions to improve or enlarge their facilities to care for expanding or new local enterprises; and

(6) using all appropriate means to encourage the maximum expansion in private employment and private enterprise.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor shall work together in carrying out the purposes of this act. In order to facilitate the coordination of their work thereunder, the President may establish a committee to study ways and means of bringing about proper coordination among the departments authorized to receive moneys and such other Federal, State, or other agencies which may receive transfers of funds or payments or grants-in-aid. Such committee shall include one policy-making official from each of the departments receiving appropriations authorized by this act and may be the heads of such departments, and the chairman shall be the Secretary of Commerce or his designee.

(c) In carrying out the purposes of this act, and in full cooperation with other appropriate agencies as specified in section 6 (c)—

(1) the Secretary of Agriculture shall give special attention to encouraging a proper balance between agriculture and industry in each region; developing adequate marketing and processing facilities for the present and prospective farm products of areas and regions; encouraging sufficient part-time or industrial employment for farm people; development of local industries needed to supply farm people adequate and modern farm and home equipment, housing, and industrial products and services; maintaining and encouraging full participation of farmers and their representatives in community-wide efforts to deal with industrial and employment problems;

(2) the Secretary of Labor shall give special attention to developing effective employment for all available workers; appraising the size, nature, and skill of the present and prospective labor force in relation to employment opportunities on a local and regional basis for particular industries; training workers to take advantage of industrial job opportunities; informing workers of present and potential job opportunities, both locally and nationally; aiding in any necessary shift of workers to new employment; and encouraging full participation of workers and their represenitatives in community-wide efforts to deal with industrial and employment problems; and

(3) the Secretary of Commerce shall give special attention to encouraging present and future business and industrial opportunities; obtaining and analyzing factual information on prospects in various industries and regions; providing technical services and facilities to community groups or businessmen in selecting new industries; cooperating with schools of business, commerce, and engineering in land-grant institutions and other colleges or universities to provide businessmen needed research, educational, and informational services; assisting small business, with special attention to financial and technical needs; aiding in the general expansion of idustry ad commerce to provide full employment in peacetime activities; recommending loans to financial authorities in support of small business and industrialization; and encouraging full participation of businessmen and their representatives in community-wide efforts to deal with industrial and employment problems.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly study and recommend to Congress further action with respect to—

(1) facilities for financing new business enterprises in regions and areas of the United States without adequate industrialization in order to provide more adequate financing where needed;

(2) rates or charges for, and services or facilities provided by, railway, water, road, and other transportation facilities, and electrical, communication, and other utilities; limitations upon and handicaps to local industrialization created by such rates, charges, or services, and steps to correct excessive charges or to improve inadequate services;

(3) internal trade barriers affecting the opportunities for new industries or limiting the expansion of existing industries; and

(4) other matters affecting the development of new private enterprises in regions or areas of the United States without adequate industrialization, including patent rights, industrial research, monopoly controls, and other restrictions.

(b) The reports required by this section shall be made to Congress within 2 years after the approval of this act, provided that interim reports may be made from time to time in the discretion of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor.

SEC. 5. In conducting studies under this bill, and in providing aid and advice to individual communities or businessmen, due allowance shall be made for regional trends in population, location of industry, and similar economic growth and development, and for interdependent and complementary economic activity in the different regions of the country.

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, the sum of $3,000,000 to be available to the Department of Commerce, the sum of $1,000,000 to be available to the Department of Labor, and the sum of $1,000,000 to be available to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, and Department of Labor for each fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, such sums as the Congress may from time to time find to be necessary for the purposes of this act.

(c) The appropriations authorized by this section shall be available for transfer to other Federal departments, agencies, corporations, and independent establishments and for payment of grants-in-aid to any State government or any agency or subdivision thereof, any municipal or other local governmental institution, land-grant colleges, and universities, colleges, and schools of business, engineering, commerce, and agriculture, for specific activities in performing functions authorized by this act. None of such funds shall be transferred, paid, or granted-in-aid except with the approval of the Secretary of the department to whose department such funds were appropriated and of at least one of the other secretaries of the departments receiving appropriations authorized by this act and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget except that only the approval of the secretary of the department to which the funds are appropriated is needed to approve payments and grants-in-aid in amounts specially authorized by Congress in appropriation items.

(d) Funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for necessary administrative expenses, including rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding, lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, and purchase, exchange, operation, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles. Such funds may be used for employment of persons and organizations in the District of Co-

lumbia and elsewhere, by contract or otherwise, and in payment for services rendered by private research organizations or businesses under contracts for specific research or other services necessary under this act, and compensation for all such employment and services may be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

(e) None of the funds authorized under this act shall be used for the establishment of any publicly owned commercial enterprise.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 7. This act may be cited as the "Industrialization of Underdeveloped Areas Act of 1945."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 20 minutes.

OUR AMERICAN SOLDIER

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the men who follow the lines of battle to bury our dead soldiers, so we are told, state that in their dying hour the soldier unclasps his weapon, reaches to an inner pocket to touch some faded letter or some keepsake, a picture of wife or mother. This pathetic fact teaches us that our boys have not been fighting for the abstract rights of men alone. They have been fighting for love of God, and home, and native land. They fought a grand and glorious battle and they brought a great victory to the Nation. All over this great land of ours, in the valleys and on the hills, in the cities and on the farms, parents, wives and little ones in many cases are waiting for the return of the fathers now stationed all over this globe. These boys are clamoring to get home, and rightfully so. There is no reason on earth why they cannot be brought home and be brought home quickly. It is for that purpose that I have introduced a bill (H. R. 4010) which provides that every soldier who has served his country honorably for 18 months or more shall be demobilized and permitted to return home to his family.

As I stated previously on the floor of this House, there is a great moral question involved, and that question looms much larger now that there is uncertainty as to when and how soon these boys are going to be permitted to get home. I do not know of anybody better able to judge this question than the boys themselves. They know that they ought to be home. They know it is dangerous for them not to be home. I have letters from them as well as letters from their wives and from their mothers and fathers urging that they come home. There seems to be an indifference on the part of the Army and the Navy as to whether or not these boys should be permitted to come home and attend school. Here is a generation of brave lads who have done their duty. They want an education. They want to go into this so-called new world with proper preparation. They are going into a highly technical age, and they want to make most of their brain power. They have been using their physical as well as their brain power for their country. They have been suffering untold hardships, and there is no reason why those in authority should not exert themselves to let these boys out. I have repeated that statement once before, and I know that I am voicing what is occurring all over this country when I say to you that there are great areas where there are many diseases rampant, like polio, where doctors are not available for a distance of 25 or 30 miles, and yet you cannot get these men released to come home to their communities. Our hospitals are greatly understaffed at the present time.

I have here a series of letters which I have received not only from this country but from all over the world. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include these letters at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. The first letter I have is dated September 13, 1945:

SEPTEMBER 13, 1945.

The Honorable DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: We have noted with approval your suggestion in Congress that the Army release immediately all men with over 2 years' service. Many of us over here are of the same opinion as Senator JOHNSON, that the point system is a mathematical monstrosity. I have served in the Army for 4 years, yet I have only 59 points, 26 below that required for the release of company grade officers. It looks as though I might have to spend another entire year in service before being eligible for release. No one would object to remaining in the Army as long as there was a war on, even if it meant 10 or 15 years of service, but now that it is over it certainly seems only fair to release immediately those who have rendered service for long periods of time.

There are certain other injustices of which you may not be aware. One of those is in regard to redeployment. I am with a unit which was redeployed directly to the Pacific after extended service in the ETO without a furlough in the States. Combat units, with far less time overseas than mine were sent home on furlough and when the war ended, it was decided that no men with over 45 points in those units would have to go overseas. Is it fair to allow 45-point men now in the States to remain there when there are many of us with points ranging from 50 to 80 who are overseas with little hope of returning for 6 months to a year? Had my particular unit been fortunate enough to have had a low priority for redeployment instead of a high one, we would never have had to come here, for redeployment was stopped when Japan surrendered. Are we then to be made to suffer because of the laws of chance?

The War Department has stopped drafting all men over 26 years of age. Is it logical to say that a man 26 need not be compelled to serve when there are large numbers of us in the service now over 26 for whom no provision for release is being made?

My unit's job is to load and unload ships. We are stationed at the port of Batangas on Luzon. Every day, we unload equipment which has absolutely no value over here now that the war has ended. For example, we unload ammunition, heavy-lift cranes, vehicles, and trailers, and miles and miles of pipe and cable, all brand new matériel which can only either be left in the Philippines or reloaded on ships to be sent home, a waste of taxpayer's money in either case. Just last week, we loaded a certain commodity on an outbound ship and the very next ship we worked we unloaded the same commodity. In my opinion, the only cargo which should be unloaded now is food, gasoline, and medical supplies and there is adequate Filipino labor available for that work.

Of all the men I know in the Army, every one agrees that the British policy of demobilization is far simpler and far superior to ours. They release the wounded first, and after that it's first in—first out. Granted that the point system had its value as a plan for demobilization of a certain number of men after the European war was over and before the Pacific war was over, that situation no longer exists and with the Japanese surrender, the point system should have been discarded and a more sensible plan for demobilization adopted.

To each man in the Army, his personal reasons for release are as important as any other man's. Therefore, it is an absurdity for the War Department to decide arbitrarily that it is more important for a parent to be returned to civilian life than it is for a single man. To use myself as an instance again: I was in Harvard Law School at the time of my induction. I am as anxious to return and complete my education as any father is anxious to return to his children. The only fair way to determine who is eligible to be discharged first is to measure the amount of service to the country. Certainly it does not seem fair to me that a man with three children and 1 year's service in the States is entitled to the same 43 points that I have earned through 4 years' service.

I do not think that the War Department is the proper agency to determine the method of demobilization. This is a job for Congress, the elected Representatives of the people. It was the Congress which created selective service, bringing into being our great civilian Army. I should be the Congress which returns the Army to civilian life.

I am writing this letter to you, sir, because of the interest you have shown in a more liberal demobilization policy. May I suggest that, if the War Department will not agree to the release of all men with over 2 years' service, at least something should be done for those with over 4 years' service. Certainly, it would seem fair to make eligible for immediate discharge all officers and men who were in the service prior to Pearl Harbor. If you will bend your efforts in this direction, Mr. REED, I can assure you that you will earn the gratitude of many thousands of men, and I can guarantee you the vote of one man for years to come.

This letter comes from a serviceman whose postoffice address is San Francisco:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1945.

DEAR SIR: I have recently read of your activities in the campaign to "bring home the veterans," and while we do not have the facilities for a thorough news coverage, still we have been able to determine beyond a doubt, that you are definitely on our side. Knowing that we have the help where it can be best put to practical ends, has imposed upon us a feeling of relief and satisfaction. Yes, we want to return to our homes, and we want to do so as quickly and expeditiously as conditions will permit. Is such the case at present?

We believe that we have well grounded facts for our gripes on the present Navy discharge plan. As you know, a critical score of 44 is necessary. Certainly the dependency angle is overplayed. Ten points. Why that is equal to 3 years and 4 months of overseas duty. Which, believe me, and pardon the expression "is a hell of a long cruise." Take for example our particular cases: We have all been aboard this ship since commissioning (October 1943). Since that time we have had but one overnight

liberty, that being in San Diego in December 1943. Immediately thereafter we left for overseas, and here we have been ever since. Now I'm not trying to impress you with our saltiness, but here is a record of our activities: We participated in the D-day initial assault landings on Kwajalein (Marshalls), Saipan, Guam, and Tinian (Marianas), Leyte, Luzon (Philippines), and then came Zamboanga, Tarakan, and Brunei Bay. Needless to add, we have undergone not a few ordeals and have had our narrow escapes during that period. Well, the war ended when we were in the Philippines preparing for further invasions. After our demonstrations of joy at the end of hostilities, we all had the spontaneous thought, "will we go home now"? But, no, we headed for Korea, then to Shanghai, from which point I am writing to you. Pardon the repetition but allow me to comment on the dependency angle again. Many of the servicemen whom I know, and whom you also know, deliberately postponed their matrimonial plans for the very reason that they knew they would be separated from their wives due to the uncertainty of wartime existence. Are these men, who displayed some form of intelligence, to be penalized for their thoughtful judgment? Then, too, think of the men out here who would have been married in the last 2 years if they had been back in the States. I know of many, but they can't very well get married in Borneo, New Guinea, or Korea. But still, under the present plan the more fortunate sailors, who have had opportunity to be wed, because of their State-side duty are now given all the benefits. To demonstrate how the point system works: I have been in the service over 3 years, have participated in 9 invasions, and have been on continuous overseas duty for 22 months. Yet, because I am only 23, and have no dependencies, I have but 36 points. Think how long it will take me to accumulate 8 more. Why, I will be pensioned off in this outfit. The same is true of all the undersigned, whom I have picked from our division of 12 men. All of these men have 22 continuous months of overseas duty. Can't we even get home for leave? I have missed three Christmases from home now, due to service life. Will I be missing number four? I left college in 1942 to enlist in the Navy. Since that time my class has been graduated. Needless to say, I wouldn't relish the idea of missing the next school term.

Perhaps by the time you receive this a new system will have been invoked, and I will have no cause for discontent. I sincerely hope this is the case. However, if it isn't we certainly would appreciate your continued and increased activities along legislative lines. Keep up the good work, you certainly have the backing of the servicemen. Oh, yes, we like your ideas about sending home veterans who have served for 2 or 3 years with overseas time. And how about credit for campaign stars?

Kindly forgive all the excessive "beefing" in this letter, and any other remarks you may find objectionable. I realize that you have probably been flooded with similar letters from other discontented servicemen. But we kind of figure that a small fraction adds to a gigantic whole, and after all that is the way democracy is supposed to function. Truly, we do not mean to be overderogatory. Perhaps it is the effects of our Asiatic existence, or the fact that while the people back home were celebrating the end of two wars, we were out here scratching our heat rash, and watching men die. Thanking you for your efforts—those past, and those to come—we remain.

This next letter was written by a serviceman who is on the island of Luzon:

SAN JOSE, LUZON,
September 21, 1941.

DEAR SIR: I rather imagine that mine is one of the countless letters that you have received in the past few months. But I sincerely hope that it will not be untouched, for it has a definite meaning which pertains to many men in the S. W. P. A.

I, for one, am not the kind to complain or argue about every little question that might arise, but in the past few months I listened to this and that concerning the point system, and I would like to have my opinions known.

Perhaps it is too late in the game to say this, but I believe with sincerity that the point system is partially in a rut. What I mean to say is, that there are parts that are absolutely unfair to the majority of the men in the service. To be frank, I haven't followed the Navy or the Marines too closely, but I should think this holds true for them also.

I believe the main thing that should give credit toward points more than anything else is service overseas, of which there are two parts: First, combat duty, and secondly, service troops behind the lines. Unfortunately, I am placed in the latter category. Let me state my case:

I have been in the Army a little over 27 months, and of these 27, almost 21 have been spent overseas. Believe me, this is not a complaint, but merely to point out certain facts. If a survey were to be made you would find that there are many cases such as mine. To continue: Being 18 years old with 6 months' training under my belt does not seem like much now that I look back, not that it mattered. In fact, to me it was actually my first big thrill. I came overseas as an infantry replacement with the idea that "this is it." At my staging area I found that I was to be put in an antiaircraft unit. To me it sounded like a good deal, but in the months to come I found out differently. For 15 solid months my outfit did nothing but have classes and work dock details every day of the week. We were on the go from sunrise till sunset. We had planned to be in on the invasion of the Philippines, but orders were changed and we were out of luck. So we moved to New Guinea and trained and worked for another 7 months. From there we moved to Luzon where we were grouping for the main assault on the mainland of Japan. VJ-day. But the principle of the thing is that we have worked just as hard as the next man and what do we have to show for it? There isn't many decorations to go on our tunics, not that we take pride in sporting stars or medals, but they do count in the present point system. May 12 of this year I had 39 points, which when I speak of it, actually blush. It's not our fault for not seeing action. Twice I tried to join the American division when it was on Bougainville, but it seems that I was a necessity to my organization.

Another thing, it isn't any fault of ours that we don't have 2 or 3 children. Up to date that would give me 83 points. Nice work if you can get it. Anyway, we are for you 100 percent, Mr. REED.

A sergeant on Okinawa writes to me as follows:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1945.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my hearty approval and appreciation of your recent statement in regard to faster release of men from the armed forces.

I have just arrived here on Okinawa after a 60-day voyage direct from Europe. We heard your statement over the public-address system aboard ship. It was given during our daily news résumé. It was greeted by cheers all over the troopship.

We have been hoping that Congress would take a hand in demobilization. Many of us question the fairness of the Army's point system. It hardly seems fair that a battle wound should rate a scant 5 points while parenthood credit draws down 12 points. Moreover, many men with long service in the States or overseas in service units have barely half the points required for discharge.

May I again applaud your action and say that you have gained my sincere respect.

This soldier has had 30 months' service—15 months in Europe.

Here is a serviceman who has the qualifications for discharge, but still cannot get home. He writes from Ie Shima:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1945.

Congressman REED.

DEAR SIR: One of the reasons for my writing to you is due to the fact that I am a native New Yorker. I know that you have many more important things to occupy your time than what I am writing about but through your action it might help others in the future.

October 10 will end 36 months for me in the service with close to 7 months overseas, so you can see that I have spent most of my Army career in the States. When I came over here I was resigned to the idea that I'd be lucky if I was back in the States in 18 months. Then over the radio it was announced sometime about August 15 that all men over 38 would be eligible for discharge in 90 days after applying. It was the 25th of August before anything official was posted here on Ie Shima and those eligible signed up.

Once again by way of the radio we heard on or about September 1 that all men 35 and over could apply for discharge, etc. At this writing no one on this island knows a thing about the 35-year deal. As far as I was concerned it did not mean very much, not hearing about the 35-year set-up, since hearing about it over the radio as I would be eligible for the 38-year-old discharge today as it is my thirty-eighth birthday.

To get down to my complaint and make this short: I went into our orderly room to sign up but was informed that I could not, as a cablegram or such had been received 3 or 4 days ago from the FEAF (Far Eastern Air Forces) stating that no more applications for discharge for men 38 or over would be accepted. I realize that FEAF might have some sort of a plan whereby they plan on having one type of application for all men over 35, but nothing to that effect was stated in the cablegram.

As I mentioned earlier in this letter I was perfectly willing to stay here so long as it was necessary but when the War Department decided that men of my age were eligible for discharge why naturally I want out and the quicker the better.

The mother of a lad in the service writes from Missouri:

BOONVILLE, MO., *September 19, 1945.*

DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. REED: As one mother, I wish to thank you sincerely for your efforts to aid our boys who are being kept in the Army when we know there can be no valid reason whatever for it.

It certainly is enough to make mothers and fathers suspicious and cynical when many Washington spokesmen declare that they have to continue the draft because General Eisenhower will need almost 2,000,000 troops for his occupation in Europe, then the next day the general says he will need about one-half million. And right on the heels of the announcement from Washington that General MacArthur will need almost a million soldiers, he announces that a mere 200,000 will suffice.

What are we to believe, except that certain forces in Washington desire to keep as many in uniform as possible, for reasons too numerous and complicated to mention?

Our boys should be in school, and we are somewhat puzzled by an article over Mrs. Roosevelt's signature, in which she attempts to soothe our worries by telling us that they must have those teen-age boys for various Army duties, and then in the same article she assures us that they will be sent to school

by the Government and trained as professional men and scientists. Just how can they serve in the Army and go to school? And does she speak for the administration?

Here is a letter from a corporal:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1945.

DEAR SIR: When I came to this Army in March of 1943 I took a vow to fight for my country even if it meant my life. Well, I fought for my country and missed death a dozen times. In all the time that I have been in the Army there has been one thought in my mind and that was to get home after it was all over with. That thought I have taken across the seas with me and went through combat with it. Now that it is all over with I understand that I have to stay over here until next June before I can get out. Sir, I just don't understand what the hell I fought for. To me it seems as if they forgot us boys over here.

True they have the point system, but that's the most unfair system I ever heard of for discharging men. If a man was on the good side of his company commander then he was sure of getting the Bronze Star which meant five points. Why I've seen cooks get the Bronze Star and men who deserved it got nothing. Take us married men over here, didn't we go through combat with the thought of never seeing our wives and children again; haven't we suffered mental agony enough? Now we got to suffer it again with the thought of not coming home for at least 7 or 8 months more.

What about the men who never seen overseas? When are they coming over, or are they going home before us boys. For God's sake, I always thought we had smart men in Washington. But the way the discharge system is going I'm beginning to wonder. So tell those men in Washington to get us home. That's all us boys are asking is to get us home fast.

A private first class writes from Saipan:

SAIPAN, MARIANAS ISLANDS,
September 12, 1945.

Honorable Mr. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: It was indeed encouraging to us who are literally "sweating it out" to read your statement in regard to the demobilization.

You were 100 percent right in that our slogan has been "Wait till Congress meets," and we are depending on you, our duly elected Representatives, to do just that.

I myself am a family man, having two children (pre-Pearl Harbor), and have been in the service 20 months, having voluntarily enlisted, as I didn't believe in deferments, although my position would have rated continuous deferments. While the war was in progress I tried to do my job conscientiously, even though my family was enduring many hardships caused by my absence. You can appreciate that a wife and two children cannot possibly provide themselves with adequate food; shelter, clothing, and medical care, etc., on $100 a month.

Now that the conflict is over, I and others like me feel that we are entitled to return and shoulder the responsibility of reestablishing a peaceful, productive America, and relieve the wives who have so nobly borne the load.

This is a soul-consuming desire out where we know that there are countless thousands who can replace us in carrying out the matter-of-fact tasks we are doing.

Under the present point discharge plan for the Marine Corps, the majority of those eligible cannot take advantage of it because they have unexpired enlistments to serve. Yet, we who are reserves and not essential are kept out here.

It is a common fact that the armed forces are the worse wasters of manpower. Being a production engineer before the war, I feel qualified to make that statement. In my own experience I have seen six men assigned to a job that wouldn't keep one man busy. Yet I realize that while the war was going on it was better to have the men and not need them than to need them and not have them.

Now, however, that condition has been eliminated and we are counting and depending on persons such as you, who have the courage and initiative to see that justice is swift and true. We shall not forget.

May God guide your way and speed the happy day of our glorious reunion with those we love and who need us very much.

Two Navy men wrote the following letter from somewhere in the Pacific:

THE PACIFIC, *September 12, 1945.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REED: While we are not residents of your congressional district, we would like to take this opportunity to express our sincere thanks for the efforts of you and other equally able Members of Congress on our behalf. And though as yet your attempts to speed the unraveling of the masses of so-called red tape surrounding every movement of the United States Navy, have met with little success, we feel that before long, spurred by incessant public opinion and by congressional demand, surely the Navy will realize that the war is over and that those of us who do not wish to make a career of militarism, but who simply arose when our country needed us, want only to get home. Home to all those we hold dear and for whom we have been fighting.

Your proposed plan for releasing all servicemen with 2 or 3 years of service immediately has met with whole-hearted approval, both by those of us who have served the required time and those who have been in for shorter periods of time. This plan would be more in line with the wishes of those affected, than those of the Navy career men who draw up such plans as the present demobilization system. Above all, such a plan would enable us to ascertain just where we stand instead of being given a new list of promises each day and nothing in the way of action.

Again we want to thank you, and to let you know that we are proud to know that people such as you are Members of the governing body of the greatest nation on earth.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DREWRY (at the request of Mr. BURCH), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 380. An act to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to investigate the matter of the development, control, and use of atomic energy; Rules.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 2, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m., on Tuesday, October 2, 1945, on H. R. 2202, in room 362, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the full Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, October 2, 1945, at 10 a. m., at which time consideration will be given to H. R. 3709 and H. R. 4127, also to receive a report from subcommittee No. 2, on H. R. 2543.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, October 4, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3367) to amend Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing Tuesday, October 2, 1945, at 10:30 a. m. on H. R. 2111 and H. R. 4079, to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, and for other purposes. Hearings will be held in the committee room, 416 Old House Office Building. Anyone desiring to give testimony should notify the clerk of the committee prior to date of hearing.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in open session, on Wednesday, October 3, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the committee room 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, will meet at 10 a. m. Tuesday, October 9, to begin hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

Various groups who have representation in Washington will be heard during the first week, such as Members of Congress first, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Association of American Railroads, railroad traffic organizations, railroad labor, and truck and bus associations.

The second week will be devoted to various State commissions, agricultural associations, National Industrial Traffic League, and various citizens' traffic associations, and traffic boards and chambers of commerce.

It is going to be necessary to limit the time for this hearing as much as possible.

It is also desired to avoid any repetition in statements before the committee.

The committee would be pleased to have those who are intending to appear to advise the clerk promptly the least amount of time they will need in which to present their testimony.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

700. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 10, 1945, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Withlacoochee River, Fla., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted May 20, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 293); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

701. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 16, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Heart River, N. Dak., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 2, 1939, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on June 22, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 294); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

702. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 31, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Atchafalaya River and the Atchafalaya Bay ship channel, La., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 4, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

703. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 31, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Pascagoula Harbor and Horn Island Pass, Miss., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

704. A letter from the General Manager, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to Public Law No. 9, Seventy-seventh Congress, the final report of operating revenues and expenses, ending August 31, 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

705. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

706. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $2,300 for the American Battle Monuments Commission (H. Doc. No. 706); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

707. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1945, together with a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 for the National Mediation Board (H. Doc. No. 296); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

708. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 for the Federal Security Agency, amounting to $206,000 (H. Doc. No. 297); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

709. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for fiscal year 1943 in the amount of $202,180, for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 298); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. Reporting the matter of the loan of John A. Hartford to Elliott Roosevelt (Rept. No. 1033). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1034. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MASON: H. R. 4191. Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. A bill to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1035). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Patents was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3796) to quiet title to certain school-district property in Enid, Okla., and the same was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 4218. A bill to provide additional compensation to veterans who have suffered the loss of limbs, or who are totally blind, as a result of military or naval service; to the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4219. A bill relating to the furnishing of transportation and housing facilities for the immediate family of members of the armed forces on duty outside the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 4220. A bill correcting a wage adjustment for Navy Department molders and coremakers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4221. A bill to provide for excluding officers and directors of corporations, who perform nominal services without compensation, in determining whether such corporation is subject to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4222. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 4223. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for retirement after 25 years of service, irrespective of age; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4224. A bill to limit the size of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 4225. A bill to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4226. A bill to amend the act entitled "Providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, for the purpose of making section 3 thereof permanently effective; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4227. A bill allowing point credit for members of the armed forces who shall have lost by death in the armed forces one of his immediate family; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4228. A bill to terminate the war-tax rate on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 4229. A bill to provide appropriate pins for mothers whose children served in the armed forces during time of war and died as the result of such service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4230. A bill to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4231. A bill to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4232. A bill to regulate habeas corpus proceedings in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4233. A bill to regulate the review of judgments of conviction in certain criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4234. A bill to repeal the automobile-use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 362. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3384, a bill to protect honorably discharged veterans in their rights to join or refrain from joining labor and other organizations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal the emergency war time law forthwith; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to abolish rationing of butter and cheese; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation providing that grazing lands, timber-growing lands, and agricultural lands now owned by the United States Government within the national-forest areas in northern and western Arkansas, be placed back on the market for sale, homestead, donation, or other methods of disposal to private ownership, with extended priorities given to World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Ben Holte; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4236. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Walter Montgomery; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 4237. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine I. Brooks and Sally Brooks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4238. A bill to restore Lt. Col. Sidney R. Williamson, United States Marine Corps (retired), to the active list of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4239. A bill granting to Guy A. Thompson, trustee, Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., debtor, and to his successors and assigns, authority to relocate, maintain, and operate a single-track railway across United States Government reservation at lock No. 3, White River, Independence County, Ark., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4240. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Wilmot; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4241. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Gabellieri, Bruno Gabellieri, Celestine Gabellieri, and Ilia Gabellieri; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PIÑERO:

H. R. 4242. A bill for the relief of Antonio Rojas Velez; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4243. A bill for the relief of the estate of Anastacio Acosta; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4244. A bill for the relief of Fundador Nieves Del Valle; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of José Villafane Muñoz; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4246. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Francisco J. Cordova; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 424. A bill for the relief of Jesús Lassalle; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of Irma M. Delgado; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of Lucy Delgado; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4250. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Domingo Acosta Arizmendi; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4251. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Francisca Sanchéz Figueroa; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4252. A bill for the relief of Jose Cotto Santiago; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 4253. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Brisbin, and the legal guardians of Wynona Gene Brisbin, Nelda Elaine Brisbin, Gwendoline Louise Brisbin, and Jacqueline Nadine Brisbin, minors; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4254. A bill for the relief of Sarah Holmes Beeman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1204. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of citizens of the twenty-second ward of Detroit, Mich., that all servicemen who have been in the overseas armed forces prior to VJ-day (with the exception of those who volunteer for extended service for the war), irrespective of points, these men to be returned as quickly as possible to the United States; and their places taken by those who have not had overseas duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1205. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Boston Chapter, No. 10, Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, regarding war service regular clerk appointments; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1206. Also, petition of Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, regarding war service regular clerk appointments; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1207. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mrs. Josie Knapp and other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging enactment of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1208. Also, petition signed by Mrs. Carrie H. Ferguson and numerous other citizens of Yamhill County, Oreg., urging enactment of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1209. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition signed by Mrs. Nellie G. Saunders and other citizens of Rockland, Maine, asking that the Townsend plan gets a quick and complete hearing by the Ways and Means Committee and then by the Congress as a whole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1210. Also, petition signed by Miss Stella A. Kimball and other citizens of Skowhegan, Maine, asking that the Townsend plan gets a quick and complete hearing by the Ways and Means Committee and then by the Congress as a whole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1211. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of Wisconsin State Legislature, to abolish rationing of butter and cheese; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1212. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Potomac Cooperative Federation, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to retention of all necessary rationing of scarce food items; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1213. Also, petition of Local Union 3500, United Steelworkers of America, CIO, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to private operation of naval ordnance plant, Milledgeville, Ga.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1214. Also, petition of Board of County Commissioners, Hennepin County, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of Cannon Federal insurance bill H. R. 2229; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1215. Also, petition of the Council of the City of Niagara Falls, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of legislation relative to extensive improvements and particularly a new administration building and hangars at the Niagara Falls Municipal Airport; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we come to Thee at the noontide hour when from the Nation's beginning our fathers have turned aside to seek Thy face. Commissioned to be peacemakers for a war-torn world, we first need a peace within our own hearts far deeper than the world can give. For never does a new day find us fit for the highest service until we have cleansed ourselves by communion with Thee.

We come with confession and contrition. There haunt us memories of duties unperformed, noble promptings disobeyed, deeds of kindness and of pity that we have left too late; words untrue, acts unkind, thoughts impure—the stain of these is on us all. Make us brave enough to bear the truth, even about ourselves, and clean and sincere enough to rise with our dead selves as stepping stones to higher things—our climbing feet upon the path of the just and our faces bathed with the shining light that groweth more and more unto the perfect day. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, September 28, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ANDREWS of New York, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LEASE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain public lands in Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

REPORT OF THE WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION RELATING TO WATER-BORNE EXPORT AND IMPORT FOREIGN COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, transmitting, pursuant to the provisions of section 217 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (Public Law No. 498, 77th Cong.), the eleventh report of the War Shipping Administration relating to water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF LANDS ACQUIRED FOR NAVAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Director of Budget and Reports of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of lands acquired for naval purposes out of appropriations (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORT ON ABORIGINAL RIGHTS OF ALASKA INDIANS

A letter from the Attorney General for Alaska, transmitting a report on aboriginal rights of Alaska Indians (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

WAR STRICKEN PEOPLE OF GREECE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted by the Omaha Chapter, No. 147, of the Order of Ahepa of the United States of America, relating to the war-stricken people of Greece.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Omaha Chapter, No. 147, of the Order of Ahepa of the United States of America, in meeting duly assembled at the Rome Hotel in Omaha, Nebr., September 23, 1945, unanimously adopted the following resolution.

Whereas Omaha Chapter, No. 147, of the Order of Ahepa and nearly all of the members of said chapter are being besieged by their relatives living in the land of Greece to send shoes, clothing, and food. The description of the people and country are appalling. Dreadful conditions exist throughout the country. People live in want without homes, food, and clothing.

That the Order of Ahepa deeply deplores the wretched condition in which the people of Greece now find themselves as the terrible results of the war inflicted upon them. These, brave and fearless people resisted with all their might and to their very last drop of blood forceful enemies on all sides until they were overwhelmed by superior strength. The people of Greece upon being conquered were horribly treated and afflicted with unbearable torture and death, and had depraved conditions forced upon them; driven from their homes, and homes destroyed, left them wandering through the streets and hills of their own beloved country, as browbeaten animals. All this and more, the brave people of Greece have stood and fought and endured for the price of freedom; and

Whereas since hostilities have ceased for more than 1 year last past in that country, want and hunger tramps in the streets, the naked go unclothed and the hungry are unfed, and immediate action will be required to save these people from a terrible winter; and

Whereas this small country of Greece has suffered so terribly from its enemies that unless the victorious Allied Nations of the world pause and hesitate in the march towards a rightful peace, the small country of Greece will not receive its full measure of justice and reparation from its vicious enemies. Thus it may be left a helpless and defeated nation in the hour of victory, for which this small nation struggled and bled alongside of its victorious Allied Powers of the world. The enemy nations fought and killed the flesh and blood of the soldiers of the Allied Powers and are now engaged by intrigue and subtle means in ingratiating themselves into the good graces of the representatives of the victorious Allied Nations for the avowed purpose of depriving this mighty and little nation of Greece of being restored to her just and rightful place among the nations of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Omaha Chapter, No. 147, of the Order of Ahepa in meeting assembled do beg and implore the representatives of the victorious Allied Nations of the world to immediately bring relief to the war stricken people of Greece and in their deliberations of the peace to come to see that the country of Greece is restored to her lawful place among the nations of the world. That reparation in full measure be exacted from all enemies and that the nation of Greece and its possessions be restored unto her, and therefore be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. KENNETH WHERRY, United States Senator from Nebraska, Washington, D. C., Hon. HUGH BUTLER, United States Senator from Nebraska, Washington, D. C., and Hon. HOWARD BUFFETT, Congressman from District No. 2, State of Nebraska, Washington, D. C.

FELIX MELONIS,
President Chapter No. 147, Order of Ahepa, Omaha, Nebr.

Attest:

GUST PSERROS,
Secretary.

DEDUCTIONS UNDER WITHHOLDING TAX

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter from Raymond M. Shipman, secretary, North Central Jurisdictional Conference of the Methodist Church, Muscatine, Iowa, relating to the withholding tax.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE METHODIST CHURCH NORTH CENTRAL JURISDICTIONAL CONFERENCE,
Muscatine, Iowa, September 27, 1945.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The north central jurisdiction of the Methodist Church includes the nine States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, and South Dakota, in which States the total Methodist membership, ministerial and lay, is 1,927,377. At the session of the north central jurisdictional conference, composed of 360 delegates, equally divided between laymen and ministers, the following resolution was passed, which the secretary of the body was directed to send to the Senators and Representatives from the States mentioned.

I have, therefore, the honor to submit to you the resolution:

Whereas withholding tax bill H. R. 4646, in the interest of simplification, has used the principle of granting an average of 10 percent to every taxpayer with an income of $5,000 or less for allowable deductions for contributions, interest, and taxes, whether or not such credits are earned; and

Whereas this may seriously impair the operation of the basic principle in the tax law which allows a deduction of 15 percent for religious, educational, and charitable gifts actually donated; and

Whereas this bill in the withholding process collects a tax on income, including amounts contributed for religious, educational, and charitable purposes, thus requiring the contributor to file application for refund of such tax collected on deductions in excess of 10 percent; and

Whereas this process may jeopardize the support of our religious, educational, and charitable institutions.

We therefore respectfully convey to the Congress of the United States our disagreement with the principle of granting an average deduction to all, whether or not such credits are earned, and request the Congress to initiate corrective legislation in this regard in order that contributions to religious, educational, and charitable institutions may be fully protected.

Sincerely yours,

R. M. SHIPMAN.

JURISDICTION OVER WATERWAY, RIVER, AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—RESOLUTION OF MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF SHEBOYGAN, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the mayor and Common Council of the City of Sheboygan, Wis., relating to the retention of jurisdiction over waterway, river, and harbor improvements in the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has for more than a century vested in the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, jurisdiction over the improvement of waterways, rivers, and harbors, flood control, and allied matters; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has carefully carried out these responsibilities with great fidelity to the public interest and with unsurpassed technical ability, and it is manifest to all concerned with our national commerce and transportation and familiarity with the requirements of navigation and shipping that these activities should be continued under the same jurisdiction and the same high standard now in effect: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and Common Council of the City of Sheboygan, Wis., That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to retain jurisdiction over waterway, river, and harbor improvements in the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, which has ably and impartially met this responsibility for more than a century, with the highest standards of efficiency and economy, and with high regard for the public interest; and be it further

Resolved, That by the passage and adoption of this resolution, the mayor and common council hereby go on record as opposed to the transfer of these duties and functions of the Corps of Engineers to any other agency of Government; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of War, to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

W. H. SPRENGER.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO GOVERNMENT OF POLAND

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the state department of Polish-American Congress at the Polish National Alliance Home, at Milwaukee, Wis., on September 9, 1945, relating to the government of Poland.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the representatives of parishes, organizations, clubs, and groups of 300,000 Americans of Polish descent in the State of Wisconsin, gathered at the annual convention of the Polish-American Congress, Inc., solemnly declare as follows:

Our Government, together with the governments of Great Britain and the U. S. S. R. (Russia), is responsible for depriving Poland, the first country to fight Axis aggression, of her rightful constitutional government, and for establishing on Polish soil the present

provisional government of Poland. Our Government is responsible also, as well as the governments of Great Britain and U. S. S. R. (Russia), for depriving Poland of her eastern lands and for arbitrarily moving Poland's western frontier farther west.

It is because of this responsibility assumed by our commitments at Yalta and at Potsdam that we respectfully request the administration of President Harry S. Truman and the Congress of our United States immediately take steps to:

1. Demand that Russian troops and secret police leave Poland immediately.

2. Enable our Polish War Relief Organization and League for Religious Assistance to Poland to give relief and bring help to Poland immediately, otherwise we shall be responsibile for the starvation and death of many of the people of Poland this coming winter. Our organizations have large amounts of clothing, food, and money available to give substantial help to Poland. We demand that this help be distributed under the direction of representatives of the Polish Relief Agencies or the American Red Cross.

3. See to it that the conditions of the Potsdam agreement be fulfilled and all the Poles serving or living abroad who are willing to return to Poland could do so with absolute guaranty of their lives and safety.

4. Assure the material assistance of the United States to those Poles who, because of the transfer of Polish soil to Russia, must seek settlements in the west of Poland.

5. Demand free and democratic elections in Poland in the immediate future, under joint Allied control, which would make sure that the elections are really free and unfettered, as promised by the Potsdam declaration.

We claim that the Polish nation, which fought so heroically and suffered so greatly, will not really be free and independent until our Government takes the steps which we ask it to take.

THADDEUS BORUN,
JOSEPH KOSCIUK,
Bp. FRANCIS BONCZAK,
Committee on the Resolution of the State Department of the Polish-American Congress, Inc.

BUSINESS, EMPLOYMENT, AND SECURITY INSURANCE ACT—PETITION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a petition from Mr. and Mrs. Leslie Durkee and sundry other citizens of Fort Atkinson, Wis., addressed to Representative ROBERT K. HENRY, Senator LA FOLLETTE, and myself, in relation to House bills H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, and Senate bills S. 690 and S. 809, relating to the so-called Business, Employment, and Security Insurance Act.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. ROBERT K. HENRY,
Congressman from the Second District of Wisconsin.
Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.

GENTLEMEN: With millions of employees being dropped from industry's pay rolls during this transition period and with millions of soldiers being returned jobless to civilian life, we fear that American business may go into a downward spiral leading toward great depression unless Congress quickly adopts some program to keep purchasing power at high levels among the masses of the people. A bi-partisan measure represented by twin bills, one introduced by a Democrat and one by a Republican, which I believe would accomplish this end, is now before the House. The House bills are H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, respectively. Senate bills are numbers S. 690 and S. 809, respectively. It would provide high monthly annuities, as they retire from the labor market, for men and women past 60, for the blind and disabled, for mothers with dependent minor children. It would raise the money for such annuities by a 3-percent tax levied monthly upon the gross incomes of all business and upon that portion of gross individual incomes in excess of $100 a month. Please use your influence to see that this measure, embodying principles of the Townsend plan, gets a quick and complete hearing by the Ways and Means Committee and then by the Congress as a whole. Please demand a roll-call vote upon it. Please vote for its enactment when it comes upon the floor. I am authorizing the distributors of this petition to inform me, by mail, of your helpful action on this measure, so that I can reciprocate in the only way I, as a voter, know how. Thank you.

THE ATOMIC BOMB—STATEMENT BY FORMER PRESIDENT HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement recently issued by former President Herbert Hoover in relation to his views on national policies concerning the atomic bomb be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the secret of the atomic bomb is only the "know-how" of manufacture, the scientists of other nations could make it if they had uranium ore, a billion or so of money, and some 2,000 contributing industries at their disposal. All this would take several years and would be even longer if we keep the practical methods of manufacture a secret.

In the meantime it gives the United States and Britain the power to dictate political policies to the whole world if we want to use it. No matter how desirable these policies might be we are not going to use it for this purpose. Therefore we should consider how we can prevent anyone else doing it.

This is the most terrible and barbaric weapon that has ever come to the hand of man. Despite any sophistries its major use is not to kill fighting men, but to kill women, children, and civilian men of whole cities as a pressure on governments. If it comes into general use, we may see all civilization destroyed.

The whole subject needs an entirely different approach. Aside from trying to prevent war, what we ought to be doing is to devise methods to prevent nations from using the bomb in any event. In the meantime we ought to keep the secret if for no other reason than to give time to devise methods for its control. Also possessing the secret gives power in negotiating on the subject.

If we consider methods of control, we have one precedent of some interest. We made international agreements among practically all nations not to use poison gas in war. Those agreements were generally adhered to during this last war. It was about the only agreement that was not seriously violated. The reason was not the sacred honor of our enemies, not perhaps of ourselves. It was the fear of reprisals upon the first to break the agreement. Such an agreement and such a fear would be no complete guaranty that the atomic bomb would not be used in case of war, but at least it would cause hesitation.

Another approach might be through control of uranium ores by the Security Council of the United Nations. That idea would be for all nations to agree that any uranium ores in their territory should be placed under the jurisdiction of joint representatives of other nations with resident inspectors in each country possessing such ores. This, if faithfully carried out, would limit their use to the peaceful arts. In consideration of such an agreement and its faithful adherence, the United States and Great Britain could agree not to use the bomb nor to disclose the method of manufacture.

Certainly the idea that the making of this hideous instrument should be encouraged by giving any other nation or the world the method of its making is the negation of trying to keep it under control in the interest of civilization as a whole.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1097. A bill to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 600);

S. 1308. A bill to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 601);

S. 1364. A bill to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damage to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 602); and

S. 1420. A bill to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 603).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; without amendment (Rept. No. 604).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution providing that the war emergency has been relieved to an extent which will justify proceeding with the highway-construction program under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 605).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 131. A bill to authorize the conveyance of the United States Fish Hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon; without amendment (Rept. No. 606);

S. 927. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont.," approved July 28, 1937; without amendment (Rept. No. 607);

S. 1219. A bill authorizing the city of St. Francisville, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 608);

H. R. 476. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.," approved June 14, 1933, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 609);

H. R. 3150. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River, between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 610); and

H. R. 3373. A bill authorizing the reconstruction of the Spring Common Bridge on Mahoning Avenue, across the Mahoning River in the municipality of Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 611).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 1123. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 612).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 2525. A bill to include stepparents among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 613).

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relating to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

OCTOBER 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Louis J. Meyerle	612 Bennington Drive, Silver Spring, Md	Veterans' Administration	$5,600

JAMES M. TUNNELL, *Chairman.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

OCTOBER 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April	2714 Quarry Rd., NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, 3d St. and Independence Ave. SW	$4,300
Charles Bragman	Arlington Village Apartments, Arlington, Va	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave	6,440
Betty Brimberg	5331 16th St., Washington, D. C	Farm Security Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture	2,100
Groff Conklin	514 2d St., NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, 3d St. and Independence Ave. SW	6,230
Philip C. Curtis	4303 Russell Ave., Mount Rainier, Md	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave	4,600
Patricia Daines	2000 F St. NW., Washington, D. C	Department of Labor, 14th St. and Constitution Ave. NW	2,320
Richard P. Daniels	1743 Columbia Rd. NW., Washington, D. C	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW	1,704
Marion L. Dillon	3659 Minnesota Ave., Washington, D. C	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave	3,200
Rose Gerber	2513 14th St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,000
Joseph McMurray	120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C	Department of Labor, 14th St. and Constitution Ave	5,180
Carl Malmberg	1813 F St. NW., Washington, D. C	Federal Security Agency, 1825 H St. NW	7,175
Love Morgan	1607 18th St. SE., Washington, D. C	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW	2,320
Ruth Morgenstein	3022 Rodman St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,980
Dolores B. Raschella	3028 Wisconsin Ave. NW., Washington, D. C	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW	2,320
Milton Rossoff	2712 25th St. SE., Washington, D. C	Office of Labor, U. S. Department of Agriculture	4,500
Capt. Leslie Falk, Medical Corps, AUS.	2804 Terrace Rd. SE., Washington, D. C	War Department, Pentagon Bldg	2,000
Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow, Medical Corps, USNR.	2007 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW	3,000
Olivia F. Caldbeck	227 Mississipp Ave. SE., Anacostia 20, D. C	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW	2,320

CLAUDE PEPPER, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

OCTOBER 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Alice M. Allen	2000 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	$2,320.00
Emerald G. Devitt	2425 27th St. South, Arlington, Va	do	2,430.00
Parley P. Eccles	4408 1st Pl. NE., Washington, D. C	Foreign Economics Administration, Washington, D. C	7,175.00
Herman Edelsberg	2141 Suitland Ter. SE., Washington, D. C	do	7,175.00
Harry J. Evans	3010 Gainesville St. SE., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	7,175.00
F. Preston Forbes	502 Four Mile Rd., Alexandria, Va	Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C	5,180.00
Scott K. Gray, Jr	119 Joliet St. SW., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	5,390.00
Stella J. Groeper	1127 Branch Ave. SE., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,980.00
John W. Nelson	The Delano Apartments, Washington, D. C	do	6,440.00
Martha G. Ray	5909 32d St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,430.00
Lt. George H. Soule	4020 Beecher St. NW., Washington, D. C	Navy Department, Washington, D. C	2,400.00
L. Evelyn Spicer	1708 Kilbourne Pl. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	3,090.00
Frederick W. Steckman	4000 Cathedral Ave. NW., Washington, D. C	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C	5,000.00
Margie L. Strubel	4632 12th St. NE., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,320.00
Allen G. Thurman	9729 Bexhill Drive, Rock Creek Hills, Md	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C	7,175.00
Alfred J. Van Tassel	1622 Mount Eagle Pl., Alexandria, Va	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	7,437.50

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
September 29, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith, for the months of August and September 1945, a list of employees of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee.

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or agency by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Bertram M. Gross	613 South Quincy St., Arlington, Va	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	$8,750
Violet Abraham	2300 19th St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,300
Betti C. Goldwasser	305 East George Mason Rd., Falls Church, Va	Smaller War Plants Corporation	5,180
Doris Phippen [1]	McLean Gardens, Washington, D. C	Navy Department	2,650
Ruth C. Steele	4609 Quarles St. NE., Washington, D. C	Treasury Department	1,704
Samuel H. Thompson	3535 R St. NW., Washington, D. C	Commerce Department	8,750
Eve Zidel	24 C Crescent Rd., Greenbelt, Md	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,650

[1] Temporarily borrowed from Surplus Property Subcommittee (S. R. 129).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REED:

S. 1446. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to authorize grants to the States for the operation of employment services, to provide for returning employment-service operations to the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1447. A bill to grant to personnel in the naval forces certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1448. A bill for the relief of William Wilson Wurster; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. MURRAY introduced Senate bill 1449, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1450. A bill to amend sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Nebraska-Iowa Bridge Corp., a Delaware corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River between Washington County, Nebr., and Harrison County, Iowa," approved March 6, 1928; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BROOKS introduced Senate Joint Resolution 102, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. HILL introduced Senate Joint Resolution 103, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARKLEY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. HILL, and Mr. TAYLOR):

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the investigation through the Department of State and with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADVANCE PLANNING OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to aid in the stabilization of construction by advance planning of public works, and so forth, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. At a later time I shall present a statement in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Montana will be referred as requested.

The bill (S. 1449) to aid in the stabilization of construction by advance planning of public works; and to reduce, by timing of public construction and by other means, the violence of seasonal and long-term fluctuations in the total volume of new construction, maintenance, and repair work in the United States, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

CEREMONIES TO HONOR ENLISTED MEN

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent to speak about 6 minutes to explain it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present order is the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and the Senator from Illinois is recognized for the purpose of introducing the joint resolution.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the plans are being laid for the triumphant return of Admiral Chester W. Nimitz into the Capital City. Out of the dark course that ran through hail of bombs, torpedoes, shells, ships, and planes from the dismal day of Pearl Harbor to the dawn of the day when Japan came meekly to surrender on the decks of the U. S. S. *Missouri*, comes this senior fighting man of the sea to receive the plaudits and appreciation of those who will be privileged to participate in the Capital City of the Nation which he has served so well.

Throughout the entire war, Washington has been the host city to the leaders of the nations of the world who came to seek the friendship and aid of free America. The halls and rostrums of both Houses of Congress flew open upon their appearance—Winston Churchill from England; Madame Chiang Kai-shek from China; George II, King of Greece; Peter II, King of Yugoslavia; Edward Beneš, President of Czechoslovakia; Wilhelmina, Queen of the Netherlands; Manuel L. Quezon, President of the Philippine Islands; and many others, reached the Nation's ears through the facilities of the Halls of Congress.

As the wars came to an end, the conquering heroes began to appear—Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, the Allied commander in Europe; Gen. Charles de Gaulle, from France; Gen. Jonathan Wainwright, from the tragedies of the prisons of Japan, the hero of Corregidor; and now comes Admiral Nimitz, the hero of the Navy's unprecedented triumph across the vast reaches of the dangerous Pacific. There may be more of these professional leaders of military and naval strategy and tactics who will come, and they, too, should share in the overflowing appreciation of a grateful people.

However much we bestow our demonstrated devotion on these professional military and naval heroes and the professional dignitaries of the governments of the world, we should always remember that American might and main was developed by the superior, courageous contribution of our American civilian servicemen. We honor the ability of our professional leaders, trained through a lifetime at Government expense, to lead the American people who temporarily laid aside their peaceful pursuits to face death in the defense of their loved ones, their homes, and their country. More than 12,000,000 enlisted men left their schools, stores, farms, and factories to meet and defeat the forces of evil in the cause of common men. The great majority of the officers of the armed forces came from civilian life; the overwhelming majority of our enlisted men gave up their civilian homes and happiness to serve humbly, far removed from high places where generals and statesmen ordered events. These men filled the ranks of combat forces, they met our country's enemies face to face, matched brain and brawn and brought them to their knees. These men undoubtedly will, and surely should, receive a hearty welcome in their home towns.

Up to now, they have not adequately shared in the parade, the glamor, and glory of their returning leaders, yet it was they who sacrificed the most, suffered the greatest hardships, and performed the miracles in courage that brought victory to their leaders and to their country.

After the last World War, a grateful America recognized these common men and set a pattern for the world. We did not build great monuments to military and naval leaders. We built a tomb to the Unknown Soldier as our national shrine, to which Presidents and foreign dignitaries and diplomats have journeyed for 27 years to place wreaths to the glory of the common soldier—a shrine to which countless thousands of Americans have journeyed to do honor to the common man who sacrificed so much for our beloved country.

Today we welcome the professional leaders, and well we should, but I suggest that we open the Halls of our National Congress—the Senate and the House—to honor enlisted men from civilian life who distinguished themselves in combat as symbolic of the might of free America.

I introduce a joint resolution which will direct the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard each to select one enlisted man from its combat service to be symbolic of all of the enlisted men of their respective services, to be honored as official guests of the United States Senate and House of Representatives on a date to be set within 60 days, and designated as Welcome Home Day to the millions of enlisted men who faced death that the Congress, the Nation, and the form of government it represents might live to make its continuing contribution to the future welfare of free mankind.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Illinois will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) providing for the reception by the Senate and the House of Representatives of representatives of enlisted men who have served in the armed forces of the United States in World War II, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EXPERIMENTS WITH ATOMIC BOMBS, ETC.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution authorizing experiments with bombs or other weapons utilizing atomic energy to determine their effect on naval vessels. I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration and after consideration by the Committee on Military Affairs that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs before going to the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and when reported by that committee it will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) authorizing experiments with bombs or other weapons utilizing atomic energy to determine their effect on naval vessels, introduced by Mr. HILL, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BILBO submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS OF COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION ON MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use nine thousand additional copies of the hearing held before said committee on S. 555 entitled "a bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority."

STIMULATION OF VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the Chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, and request a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REVERCOMB conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MCMAHON

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Controlling Atomic Energy," delivered by Senator MCMAHON on September 25, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION—ADDRESS BY JOHN S. TILLEY

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Emancipation Proclamation," delivered by John S. Tilley, of Montgomery, Ala., before the Jonesboro Historical Society, January 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUTTER RATIONING—EDITORIAL FROM CRESTON (IOWA) NEWS-ADVERTISER

[Mr. WILSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "How Endless-Spenders Bungled Butter Trade," published in the Creston (Iowa) News-Advertiser, on September 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES AND TAXES—EDITORIAL FROM CENTERVILLE (IOWA) IOWEGIAN

[Mr. WILSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Centerville (Iowa) Iowegian, on The Most Discouraging Thing of the Age, which appears in the Appendix.]

RETIREMENT OF CHARLES M. GALLOWAY

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Galloway Retires," published in the State, of Columbia, S. C., on August 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ATOMIC SECRET—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Atomic Secret" by Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post of October 2, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY MIGHT AID STEEL MILLS—EDITORIAL FROM ROCHESTER (N. Y.) TIMES-UNION

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway Might Aid Steel Mills," from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of September 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHORTAGE OF CORN SUGAR

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD a telegram dated Nashville, Tenn., September 29, addressed to me. It reads:

NASHVILLE, TENN.,
September 29, 1945.

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.:

We are wondering why whisky is more important than bread. Corn-sugar plants closed down account no corn. Distillers granted three-quarters of a million bushels. Bakers operating with far too little sugar to bake quality bread with prospects of no sugar in the immediate future. Prompt action is necessary to insure the continued flow of corn sugar to bakers if we are to continue supplying the public with a good and low-priced food.

COLONIAL BAKING CO.,
C. J. MURPHY, *President.*

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on September 27, 1945, the House of Representatives passed House Concurrent Resolution 81, and such action, it will be remembered, was recommended by the President. The concurrent resolution is very short, and I wish to read it. It is as follows:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That for the purposes only as specified in section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (Public Law 521, 78th Cong.), it is hereby found as a fact that the war emergency has been relieved to an extent that will justify proceeding with the highway-construction program provided for by said act, and for the purposes of said act the first postwar fiscal year referred to therein shall be the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that last December Congress passed a road bill authorizing the appropriation of about a billion and a half dollars, to be matched by the States, providing approximately $3,000,000,000 in all, for the building of roads and for the repair of roads, on which practically nothing has been done during the years of the war. The President recommended that the consent of Congress to proceed be given by concurrent resolution.

The House has adopted Concurrent Resolution 81, and yesterday the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads unanimously recommended that the Senate agree to it. I do not think there is a Senator who is not in favor of our proceeding as soon as possible with the building of roads under the law of 1944.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has just reported the concurrent resolution, and submitted a full report, indicating the unanimous action of the committee, and I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be reported to the Senate for its information, and that it then be passed. I hope there will be no objection to the measure. It is recommended by the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 81) providing that the war emergency has been relieved to

an extent which will justify proceeding with the highway-construction program under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Of course, Mr. President, this is a matter of substantial importance, and I think it is one in which all Members of the Senate have a real interest. As I understand, this is a House concurrent resolution, adopted by the House, and it is reported to the Senate unanimously by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just as it passed the House.

Mr. WHITE. I have just this moment seen a copy of the concurrent resolution. It refers to the war emergency, but it touches the war emergency only with respect to the highway program.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. It does not remove any other inhibitions which we have imposed?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all. It applies only to roads, and it refers only to the war program to the extent of saying it is sufficiently relieved to permit our going forward.

Mr. WHITE. I take it that when the Senator says there was a unanimous report from the committee, he includes the minority members of the committee in the action?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do, and I wish to say that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] was present, the matter was gone over most carefully, really meticulously considered, and I am sure that every member of the committee, as well as every Member of the Senate, will be glad to see the concurrent resolution adopted.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to join with the Senator from Tennessee in the request he has made.

When Congress passed the Highway Act last December there was included in it a provision that no part of the funds recommended to be appropriated should be used for the construction of roads or the improvement of roads until after the President by proclamation, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, had found as a fact that the emergency had diminished to such a point that such construction could properly begin. The House concurrent resolution declares as a fact that we have reached the point where we can proceed with the road work without detriment to any other activity.

Yesterday the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, including myself, unanimously voted to report the concurrent resolution; indeed, I think I made the motion to report it——

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator did.

Mr. REED. And all members of the minority, as well as of the majority, of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads favored the concurrent resolution. I hope there will be no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 81) was considered and agreed to.

THE PALESTINE PROBLEM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a year ago, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and I introduced a resolution calling on our Government to take up with the British Government the solution of the Palestine problem. We asked that the British be requested to carry out the Balfour declaration, to repudiate the white paper of 1937, to reopen Palestine to Jewish immigration, and to resume the policy leading to an independent commonwealth with a majority of Jewish citizens. The administration then opposed the passage of such a resolution, and promised to take quiet steps to accomplish its purpose. Such steps, if taken, however, proved a complete failure.

Now I wish to express my strong approval, and I think that of a majority of the Senators, of President Truman's action in suggesting to the British Prime Minister that 100,000 immigration certificates to Palestine be issued to the homeless Jews of Europe. If the British Government follows this suggestion of the President, it will provide relief for many of the Jews who survived the horrible persecution and torture of the Nazis.

I may add, too, that such a step would be some atonement for what we have failed to do during the war, for during the war period we did little more than express a polite sympathy for the Jews in Germany and in the occupied countries. They were Hitler's first victims, and more than half of them were exterminated. We sent them hearty messages on their holidays, we convened conferences and formed governmental boards to discuss the refugee problem, but the number of those whom our War Refugee Board and other governmental agencies saved in Europe was insignificant, not only in comparison with the overwhelming numbers of Jewish victims in Europe, but even in comparison with the numbers we might have saved if there had been a determination to do so, carried through with ability and careful planning. There was a time when thousands of Jews could have been rescued from Rumania, Hungary, and other countries in Europe. But whenever such a possibility arose, it was invariably linked with Palestine, for only Palestine offered a safe haven for those Jews. And whenever the question of Palestine arose, we refused to tackle the problem, or even urge its solution on the British.

I think we should realize, however, that President Truman's request, even if acted upon by the British Government, will not solve the problem. It is still a belated emergency measure. The problem of the surviving Jews of Europe will not be solved by a hundred thousand immigration certificates. There are, perhaps, 3,000,000 Jews left in central and eastern Europe. They face a terrible aftermath of war in a continent still imbued with bitter Jewish hatred. Palestine is still closed to them.

Both England and the United States are pledged to establish Palestine as a Jewish national home. It cannot be that if it is ruled by a majority of an anti-Jewish population, and so this pledge can only be fulfilled by permitting immigration which will create a majority of Jewish citizens. Great Britain pledged itself to this policy by the Balfour Declaration. As long ago as 1922 the Congress endorsed the same policy, and it has been repeatedly endorsed by American Presidents. We became a party to Great Britain's mandate in Palestine, which was based upon the Balfour Declaration.

Now is the time to carry out these obligations. If they are not carried out in this postwar settlement, they probably never will be carried out.

Thus far we have received no indication that the new Government of Great Britain is determined to alter British policies in Palestine. On the other hand, in spite of the fact that the British Labor Party is officially committed to a Zionist solution of the Palestine problem, it is reported that the Labor Government intends to continue, with slight modifications, the policy of excluding further Jewish immigration into Palestine. I believe we should continue to exercise our influence, as President Truman has begun to do, toward securing from Great Britain a pledge to carry out the Balfour Declaration. We are in constant touch with Great Britain. They are asking us for assistance and support in various matters where their vital interests are at stake. It seems to me that we have the right, and in view of the historical position of both nations, the duty, to insist that Great Britain do justice to the long-suffering Jewish people and that Palestine be opened to them without any reserve or restriction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at the end of my remarks the report made by Mr. Earl G. Harrison on the conditions among refugees in western Europe, for the most part Jews, and the letter of the President to General Eisenhower dated August 31, 1945.

There being no objection, the report and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 30, 1945]

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY EARL G. HARRISON ON CONDITIONS AMONG REFUGEES IN WESTERN EUROPE

Pursuant to your letter of June 22, 1945, I have the honor to present to you a partial report upon my recent mission to Europe to inquire into (1) the conditions under which displaced persons, and particularly those who may be stateless or nonrepatriable, are at present living, especially in Germany and Austria, (2) the needs of such persons, (3) how those needs are being met at present by the military authorities, the governments of residence and international and private relief bodies; and (4) the views of the possibly nonrepatriable persons as to their future destinations.

My instructions were to give particular attention to the problems, needs, and views of the Jewish refugees among the displaced people, especially in Germany and Austria. The report, particularly this partial report,

accordingly deals in the main with that group.

On numerous occasions appreciation was expressed by the victims of Nazi persecution for the interest of the United States Government in them. As my report shows, they are in need of attention and help. Up to this point, they have been liberated more in a military sense than actually.

For the reasons explained in the report their particular problems to this time have not been given attention to any appreciable extent; consequently, they feel that they, who were in so many ways the first and worst victims of nazism, are being neglected by their liberators.

Upon my request the Department of State authorized Dr. Joseph J. Schwartz to join me in the mission. Dr. Schwartz, European director of the American joint distribution committee, was granted a leave of absence from that organization for the purpose of accompanying me. His long and varied experience in refugee problems as well as his familiarity with the Continent and the people made Dr. Schwartz a most valuable associate. This report represents our joint views, conclusions, and recommendations.

During various portions of the trip I had, also, the assistance of Mr. Patrick M. Malin, vice director of the intergovernmental committee on refugees, and Mr. Herbert Katzski of the war refugee board. These gentlemen, likewise, have had considerable experience in the refugee matters. Their assistance and cooperation were most helpful in the course of the survey.

I. GERMANY AND AUSTRIA—CONDITIONS

1. Generally speaking, 3 months after VE-day, and even longer after the liberation of individual groups, many Jewish displaced persons and other possibly nonrepatriables are living under guard behind barbed-wire fences in camps of several descriptions (built by the Germans for slave laborers and Jews), including some of the most notorious of the concentration camps, amid crowded, frequently unsanitary and generally grim conditions, in complete idleness, with no opportunity, except surreptitiously, to communicate with the outside world, waiting, hoping for some word of encouragement and action in their behalf.

2. While there has been marked improvement in the health of survivors of the Nazi starvation and persecution program, there are many pathetic malnutrition cases, both among the hospitalized and in the general population of the camps. The death rate has been high since liberation, as was to be expected. One Army chaplain, a rabbi, personally attended, since liberation, 23,000 burials (90 percent Jews) at Berger Belsen alone, one of the largest and most vicious of the concentration camps, where, incidentally, despite persistent reports to the contrary, 14,000 displaced persons are still living, including over 7,000 Jews. At many of the camps and centers, including those where serious starvation cases are, there is a marked and serious lack of needed medical supplies.

3. Although some camp commandants have managed, in spite of the many obvious difficulties, to find clothing of one kind or another for their charges, many of the Jewish displaced persons, late in July, had no clothing other than their concentration-camp garb—a rather hideous striped pajama effect—while others, to their chagrin, were obliged to wear German SS uniforms. It is questionable which clothing they hate the more.

4. With a few notable exceptions, nothing in the way of a program of activity or organized effort toward rehabilitation has been inaugurated, and the internees, for they are literally such, have little to do except to dwell upon their plight, the uncertainty of their future, and, what is more unfortunate, to draw comparisons between their treatment under the Germans and in liberation.

Beyond knowing that they are no longer in danger of the gas chambers, torture, and other forms of violent death, they see—and there is—little change, the morale of those who are either stateless or who do not wish to return to their countries of nationality is very low. They have witnessed great activity and efficiency in returning people to their homes, but they hear or see nothing in the way of plans for them, and consequently they wonder and frequently ask what liberation means.

This situation is considerably accentuated where, as in so many cases, they are able to look from their crowded and bare quarters and see the German civilian population, particularly in the rural areas, to all appearances living normal lives in their own homes.

5. The most absorbing worry of these Nazi and war victims concerns relatives, wives, husbands, parents, children. Most of them have been separated for 3, 4, or 5 years and they cannot understand why the liberators should not have undertaken immediately the organized effort to reunite family groups. Most of the very little which has been done in this direction has been informal action by the displaced persons themselves with the aid of devoted Army chaplains, frequently rabbis, and the American Joint Distribution Committee.

Broadcasts of names and locations by the Psychological Warfare Division at Luxemburg have been helpful, although the lack of receiving sets has handicapped the effectiveness of the program. Even where, as has been happening, information has been received as to relatives living in other camps in Germany, it depends on the personal attitude and disposition of the camp commandant whether permission can be obtained or assistance received to follow up on the information. Some camp commandants are quite rigid in this particular while others lend every effort to join family groups.

6. It is difficult to evaluate the food situation fairly because one must be mindful of the fact that quite generally food is scarce and is likely to be more so during the winter ahead. On the other hand, in presenting the factual situation, one must raise the question as to how much longer many of these people, particularly those who have over such a long period felt persecution and near starvation, can survive on a diet composed principally of bread and coffee, irrespective of the caloric content.

In many camps, the 2,000 calories included 1,250 calories of a black, wet and extremely unappetizing bread. I received the distinct impression and considerable substantiating information that large numbers of the German population—again principally in the rural areas—have a more varied and palatable diet in their requisitions with the German burgomeister and many seemed to accept whatever he turned over as being the best that was available.

7. Many of the buildings in which displaced persons are housed are clearly unfit for winter use and everywhere there is great concern about the prospect of a complete lack of fuel. There is every likelihood that close to a million displaced persons will be in Germany and Austria when winter sets in. The outlook in many areas so far as shelter, food and fuel are concerned is anything but bright.

II. NEEDS OF THE JEWS

While it is impossible to state accurately the number of Jews now in that part of Germany not under Russian occupation, all indications point to the fact that the number is small, with 100,000 probably the top figure; some informed persons contend the number is considerably smaller. The principal nationality groups are Poles, Hungarians, Rumanians, Germans and Austrians.

The first and plainest need of these people is a recognition of their actual status and by this I mean their status as Jews. Most of them have spent years in the worst of the concentration camps. In many cases, although the full extent is not yet known, they are the sole survivors of their families and many have been through the agony of witnessing the destruction of their loved ones. Understandably, therefore, their present condition, physical and mental, is far worse than that of other groups.

While SHAEF (now combined displaced persons executive) policy directives have recognized formerly persecuted persons, including enemy and ex-enemy nationals, as one of the special categories of displaced persons, the general practice thus far has been to follow only nationality lines. While admittedly it is not normally desirable to set aside particular racial or religious groups from their nationality categories, the plain truth is that this was done for so long by the Nazis that a group has been created, which has special needs. Jews as Jews (not as members of their nationality groups) have been more severely victimized than the non-Jewish members of the same or other nationalities.

When they are now considered only as members of nationality groups, the result is that special attention cannot be given to their admittedly greater needs because, it is contended, doing so would constitute preferential treatment and lead to trouble with the non-Jewish portion of the particular nationality group.

Thus there is a distinctly unrealistic approach to the problem. Refusal to recognize the Jews as such has the effect, in this situation, of closing one's eyes to their former and more barbaric persecution, which has already made them a separate group with greater needs.

Their second great need can be presented only by discussing what I found to be their wishes as to future destinations.

1. For reasons that are obvious and need not be labored, most Jews want to leave Germany and Austria as soon as possible. That is their first and great expressed wish and while this report necessarily deals with other needs present in the situation, many of the people themselves fear other suggestions or plans for their benefit because of the possibility that attention might thereby be diverted from the all-important matter of evacuation from Germany.

Their desire to leave Germany is an urgent one. The life which they have led for the past 10 years, a life of fear and wandering and physical torture, has made them impatient of delay. They want to be evacuated to Palestine now, just as other national groups are being repatriated to their homes. They do not look kindly on the idea of waiting around in idleness and in discomfort in a German camp for many months until a leisurely solution is found for them.

2. Some wish to return to their countries of nationality, but as to this there is considerable nationality variation. Very few Polish or Baltic Jews wish to return to their countries; higher percentages of the Hungarian and Rumanian groups want to return, although some hasten to add that it may be only temporarily, in order to look for relatives. Some of the German Jews, especially those who have intermarried, prefer to stay in Germany.

3. With respect to possible places of resettlement for those who may be stateless or who do not wish to return to their homes, Palestine is definitely and preeminently the first choice. Many now have relatives there while others having experienced intolerance and persecution in their homelands for years, feel that only in Palestine will they be welcomed and find peace and quiet and be given an opportunity to live and work. In the case of the Polish and the Baltic Jews, the desire to go to Palestine is based in a great majority of the cases on a love for the country and devotion to the Zionist ideal. It is

also true, however, that there are many who wish to go to Palestine because they realize that their opportunity to be admitted into the United States or into other countries in the Western Hemisphere is limited, if not impossible. Whatever the motive which causes them to turn to Palestine, it is undoubtedly true that the great majority of the Jews now in Germany do not wish to return to those countries from which they came.

4. Palestine, while clearly the choice of most, is not the only named place of possible emigration. Some, but the number is not large, wish to emigrate to the United States, where they have relatives, others to England, the British Dominions, or to South America.

Thus the second great need is the prompt development of a plan to get out of Germany and Austria as many as possible of those who wish it.

Otherwise the needs and wishes of the Jewish groups among the displaced persons can be simply stated: Among their physical needs are clothing and shoes (most sorely needed), more varied and palatable diet, medicines, beds and mattresses, reading materials. The clothing for the camps, too, is requisitioned from the German population, and whether there is not sufficient quantity to be had or the German population has not been willing or has not been compelled to give up sufficient quantity, the internees feel particularly bitter about the state of their clothing when they see how well the German population is still dressed. The German population today is still the best-dressed population in all of Europe.

III. MANNER IN WHICH NEEDS ARE BEING MET

Aside from having brought relief from the fear of extermination, hospitalization for the serious starvation cases and some general improvement in conditions under which the remaining displaced persons are compelled to live, relatively little beyond the planning stage has been done, during the period of mass repatriation, to meet the special needs of the formerly persecuted groups.

UNRRA, being neither sufficiently organized or equipped nor authorized to operate displaced persons camps or centers on any large scale, has not been in position to make any substantial contribution to the situation. Regrettably there has been a disinclination on the part of many camp commandants to utilize UNRRA personnel even to the extent available, though it must be admitted that in many situations this resulted from unfortunate experiences Army officers had with UNRRA personnel who were unqualified and inadequate for the responsibility involved. Then, too, in the American and British Zones, it too frequently occurred that UNRRA personnel did not include English-speaking members and this hampered proper working relationships.

Under these circumstances, UNRRA, to which has been assigned the responsibility for coordinating activities of private social welfare agencies, has been in an awkward position when it came to considering and acting upon proposals of one kind or another submitted by well-qualified agencies which would aid and supplement military and UNRRA responsibilities. The result has been that, up to this point, very few private social agencies are working with displaced persons, including the Jews, although the situation cries out for their services in many different ways.

It must be said, too, that because of their preoccupation with mass repatriation and because of housing, personnel, and transport difficulties, the military authorities have shown considerable resistance to the entrance of voluntary agency representatives, no matter how qualified they might be to help meet existing needs of displaced persons.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Now that the worst of the pressure of mass repatriation is over, it is not unreasonable to suggest that in the next and perhaps more difficult period those who have suffered most and longest be given first and not last attention.

Specifically, in the days immediately ahead, the Jews in Germany and Austria should have the first claim upon the conscience of the people of the United States and Great Britain and the military and other personnel who represent them in work being done in Germany and Austria.

2. Evacuation from Germany should be the emphasized theme, policy, and practice.

(A) Recognizing that repatriation is most desirable from the standpoint of all concerned, the Jews who wish to return to their own countries should be aided to do so without further delay. Whatever special action is needed to accomplish this with respect to countries of reception or consent of military or other authorities should be undertaken with energy and determination. Unless this and other action, about to be suggested, is taken, substantial unofficial and unauthorized movements of people must be expected, and these will require considerable force to prevent, for the patience of many of the persons involved is, and in my opinion with justification, nearing the breaking point. It cannot be overemphasized that many of these people are now desperate, that they have become accustomed under German rule to employ every possible means to reach their end, and that the fear of death does not restrain them.

(B) With respect to those who do not, for good reason, wish to return to their homes, prompt planning should likewise be undertaken. In this connection the issue of Palestine must be faced. Now that such large numbers are no longer involved, and if there is any genuine sympathy for what these survivors have endured, some reasonable extension or modification of the British white paper of 1939 ought to be possible without too serious repercussions. For some of the European Jews there is no acceptable or even decent solution for their future other than Palestine. This is said on a purely humanitarian basis with no reference to ideological or political considerations so far as Palestine is concerned.

It is my understanding, based upon reliable information, that certificates for immigration to Palestine will be practically exhausted by the end of the current month (August, 1945). What is the future to be? To anyone who has visted the concentration camps and who has talked with the despairing survivors, it is nothing short of calamitous to contemplate that the gates of Palestine should be soon closed.

The Jewish Agency of Palestine has submitted to the British Government a petition that 100,000 additional immigration certificates be made available. A memorandum accompanying the petition makes a persuasive showing with respect to the immediate absorptive capacity of Palestine and the current, actual manpower shortages there.

While there may be room for difference of opinion as to the precise number of such certificates which might under the circumstances be considered reasonable, there is no question but that the request thus made would, if granted, contribute much to the sound solution for the future of Jews still in Germany and Austria and even other displaced Jews, who do not wish either to remain there or to return to their countries of nationality.

No other single matter is, therefore, so important from the viewpoint of Jews in Germany and Austria and those elsewhere who have know the horrors of the concentration camps as is the disposition of the Palestine question.

Dr. Hugh Dalton, a prominent member of the new British Government, is reported as having said at the Labor Party conference in May 1945:

"This party has laid it down and repeated it so recently as last April * * * that this time, having regard to the unspeakable horrors that have been perpetrated upon the Jews of Germany and other occupied countries in Europe, it is morally wrong and politically indefensible to impose obstacles to the entry into Palestine now of any Jews who desire to go there. * * *

"We have also stated clearly that this is not a matter which should be regarded as one for which the British Government alone should take responsibility, but as it comes, as do many others, in the international field, it is indispensable that there should be close agreement and cooperation among the British, American and Soviet Governments, particularly if we are going to get a sure settlement in Palestine and the surrounding countries. * * *"

If this can be said to represent the viewpoint of the new Government in Great Britain, it certainly would not be inappropriate for the United States Government to express its interest in and support of some equitable solution of the question, which would make it possible for some reasonable number of Europe's persecuted Jews, now homeless under any fair view, to resettle in Palestine. That is their wish and it is rendered desirable by the generally accepted policy of permitting family groups to unite or reunite.

(C) The United States should, under existing immigration laws, permit reasonable numbers of such persons to come here, again particularly those who have family ties in this country. As indicated earlier, the number who desire emigration to the United States is not large.

If Great Britain and the United States were to take the actions recited, it might the more readily be that other countries would likewise be willing to keep their doors reasonably open for such humanitarian considerations and to demonstrate in a practical manner their disapproval of Nazi policy which unfortunately has poisoned so much of Europe.

3. To the extent that such emigration from Germany and Austria is delayed, some immediate temporary solution must be found. In any event there will be a substantial number of persecuted persons who are not physically fit or otherwise presently prepared for emigration.

Here I feel strongly that greater and more extensive effort should be made to get them out of camps, for they are sick of living in camps. In the first place, there is real need for such specialized places as (a) tuberculosis sanitaria and (b) rest homes for those who are mentally ill or who need a period of readjustment before living again in the world at large—anywhere. Some will require at least short periods of training or retraining before they can be really useful citizens.

But speaking more broadly, there is an opportunity here to give some real meaning to the policy agreed upon at Potsdam. If it be true, as seems to be widely conceded, that the German people at large do not have any sense of guilt with respect to the war and its causes and results, and if the policy is to be "to convince the German people that they have suffered a total military defeat and that they cannot escape responsibility for what they have brought upon themselves," it is difficult to understand why so many displaced persons, particularly those who have so long been persecuted and whose repatriation or resettlement is likely to be delayed, should be compelled to live in crude, overcrowded camps while the German people, in rural areas, continue undisturbed in their homes.

As matters now stand, we appear to be treating the Jews as the Nazis treated them, except that we do not exterminate them. They are in concentration camps in large numbers under our military guard instead of SS troops. One is led to wonder whether

the German people, seeing this, are not supposing that we are following or at least condoning Nazi policy.

It seems much more equitable, and as it should be, to witness the very few places where fearless and uncompromising military officers have either requisitioned an entire village for the benefit of displaced persons, compelling the German population to find housing where they can, or have required the local population to billet a reasonable number of them.

Thus the displaced persons, including the persecuted, live more like normal people and less like prisoners or criminals or herded sheep. They are in Germany, most of them and certainly the Jews, through no fault or wish of their own. This fact is, in this fashion, being brought home to the German people, but it is being done on too small a scale.

At many places, however, the military government officers manifest the utmost reluctance or indisposition, if not timidity, about inconveniencing the German population. They even say that their job is to get communities working properly and soundly again, that they must "live with the Germans while the DP's (displaced persons) are a more temporary problem."

Thus (and I am ready to cite the example) if a group of Jews are ordered to vacate their temporary quarters, needed for military purposes, and there are two possible sites, one a block of flats (model apartments) with conveniences and the other a series of shabby buildings with outside toilet and washing facilities, the burgomeister readily succeeds in persuading the town mayor to allot the latter to the displaced persons and to save the former for returning German civilians.

This tendency reflects itself in other ways, namely, in the employment of German civilians in the offices of military government when equally qualified personnel could easily be found among the displaced persons whose repatriation is not imminent. Actually, there have been situations where displaced persons, especially Jews, have found it difficult to obtain audiences with military government authorities because, ironically, they have been obliged to go through German employees who have not facilitated matters.

Quite generally, insufficient use is made of the services of displaced persons. Many of them are able and eager to work, but apparently they are not considered in this regard. While appreciating that language difficulties are sometimes involved, I am convinced that, both within and outside camps, greater use could be made of the personal services of those displaced persons who, in all likelihood, will be on hand for some time. Happily, in some camps every effort is made to utilize the services of the displaced persons, and these are apt to be the best camps in all respects.

4. To the extent that (a) evacuation from Germany and Austria is not immediately possible and (b) the formerly persecuted groups cannot be housed in villages or billeted with the German population, I recommend urgently that separate camps be set up for Jews, or at least for those who wish, in the absence of a better solution, to be in such camps. There are several reasons for this: (1) A great majority want it; (2) it is the only way in which administratively their special needs and problems can be met without charges of preferential treatment or (oddly enough) charges of "discrimination" with respect to Jewish agencies now prepared and ready to give them assistance.

In this connection, I wish to emphasize that it is not a case of singling out a particular group for special privileges. It is a matter of raising to a more normal level the position of a group which has been depressed to the lowest depths conceivable by years of organized and inhuman oppression. The measures necessary for their restitution do not come within any reasonable interpretation of privileged treatment and are required by considerations of justice and humanity.

There has been some tendency at spots in the direction of separate camps for those who might be found to be stateless or nonrepatriable or whose repatriation is likely to be deferred some time. Actually, too, this was announced some time ago as SHAEF policy, but in practice it has not been taken to mean much, for there is (understandably, if not carried too far) a refusal to contemplate possible statelessness and an insistence, in the interests of the large repatriation program, to consider all as repatriable. This results in a resistance to anything in the way of special planning for the "hard core," although all admit it is there and will inevitably appear.

While speaking of camps, this should be pointed out: While it may be that conditions in Germany and Austria are still such that certain control measures are required, there seems little justification for the continuance of barbed-wire fences, armed guards, and prohibition against leaving camp except by passes, which at some places are illiberally granted. Prevention of looting is given as the reason for these stern measures, but it is interesting that in portions of the Seventh Army area, where greater liberty of movement in and out of camps is given, there is actually much less plundering than in other areas where people, wishing to leave camp temporarily, do so by stealth.

5. As quickly as possible the actual operation of such camps should be turned over to a civilian agency—UNRRA. That organization is aware of weaknesses in its present structure and is pressing to remedy them. In that connection, it is believed that greater assistance could be given by the military authorities, upon whom any civilian agency in Germany and Austria today is necessarily dependent, so far as housing, transport, and other items are concerned. While it is true the military have been urging UNRRA to get ready to assume responsibility, it is also the fact that insufficient cooperation of an active nature has been given to accomplish the desired end.

6. Since, in any event, the military authorities must necessarily continue to participate in the program for all displaced persons, especially with respect to housing, transport, security, and certain supplies, it is recommended that there be a review of the military personnel elected for camp commandant positions. Some serving at present, while perhaps adequate for the mass repatriation job, are manifestly unsuited for the longer-term job of working in a camp composed of people whose repatriation or resettlement is likely to be delayed. Officers who have had some background or experience in social-welfare work are to be preferred, and it is believed there are some who are available. It is most important that the officers selected be sympathetic with the program and that they be temperamentally able to work and to cooperate with UNRRA and other relief and welfare agencies.

7. Pending the assumption of responsibility for operations by UNRRA, it would be desirable if a more extensive plan of field visitation by appropriate Army group headquarters be instituted. It is believed that many of the conditions now existing in the camps would not be tolerated if more intimately known by supervisory officers through inspection tours.

8. It is urgently recommended that plans for tracing services, if on open postal card only, be made available to displaced persons within Germany and Austria as soon as possible. The difficulties are appreciated but it is believed that if the anxiety of the people, so long abused and harassed, were fully understood, ways and means could be found within the near future to make such communication and tracing of relatives possible. I believe also that some of the private agencies could be helpful in this direction if given an opportunity to function.

V. OTHER COMMENTS

While I was instructed to report conditions as I found them, the following should be added to make the picture complete:

1. A gigantic task confronted the occupying armies in Germany and Austria in getting back to their homes as many as possible of the more than 6,000,000 displaced persons found in those countries. Less than 3 months after VE-day, more than 4,000,000 of such persons have been repatriated—a phenomenal performance. One's first impression, in surveying the situation, is that of complete admiration for what has been accomplished by the military authorities in so materially reducing the time as predicted to be required for this stupendous task. Praise of the highest order is due all military units with respect to this phase of postfighting jobs. In directing attention to existing conditions which unquestionably require remedying, there is no intention or wish to detract one particle from the preceding statements.

2. While I did not actually see conditions as they existed immediately after liberation I had them described in detail sufficient to make entirely clear that there had been, during the intervening period, some improvement in the conditions under which most of the remaining displaced persons are living. Reports which have come out of Germany informally from refugees themselves and from persons interested in refugee groups indicate something as a tendency not to take into account the full scope of the overwhelming tasks and responsibilities facing the military authorities. While it is understandable that those who have been persecuted and otherwise mistreated over such a long period should be impatient at what appears to them to be undue delay in meeting their special needs, fairness dictates that, in evaluating the progress made, the entire problem and all its ramifications be kept in mind. My effort has been, therefore, to weigh quite carefully the many complaints made to me in the course of my survey, both by displaced persons themselves and in their behalf, in the light of the many responsibilities which confronted the military authorities.

3. While for the sake of brevity this report necessarily consisted largely of general statements, it should be recognized that exceptions exist with respect to practically all of such generalizations. One high-ranking military authority predicted, in advance of my trip through Germany and Austria, that I would find, with respect to camps containing displaced persons, "some that are quite good, some that are very bad, with the average something under satisfactory." My subsequent trip confirmed that prediction in all respects.

In order to file this report promptly so that possibly some remedial steps might be considered at as early a date as possible, I have not taken time to analyze all of the notes made in the course of the trip or to comment on the situation in France, Belgium, Holland, or Switzerland, also visited. Accordingly, I respectfully request that this report be considered as partial in nature. The problems present in Germany and Austria are much more serious and difficult than in any of the other countries named and this fact, too, seemed to make desirable the filing of a partial report immediately upon completion of the mission.

In conclusion, I wish to repeat that the main solution, in many ways the only real solution, of the problem lies in the quick evacuation of all nonrepatriable Jews in Germany and Austria, who wish it, to Palestine. In order to be effective, this plan must not be long delayed. The urgency of the situation should be recognized. It is inhuman to

ask people to continue to live for any length of time under their present conditions. The evacuation of the Jews of Germany and Austria to Palestine will solve the problem of the individuals involved and will also remove a problem from the military authorities who have had to deal with it.

The Army's ability to move millions of people quickly and efficiently has been amply demonstrated. The evacuation of a relatively small number of Jews from Germany and Austria will present no great problem to the military. With the end of the Japanese war, the shipping situation should also become sufficiently improved to make such a move feasible.

The civilized world owes it to this handful of survivors to provide them with a home where they can again settle down and begin to live as human beings.

AUGUST 31, 1945.

MY DEAR GENERAL EISENHOWER: I have received and considered the report of Mr. Earl G. Harrison, our representative on the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, upon his mission to inquire into the condition and needs of displaced persons in Germany who may be stateless or nonrepatriable, particularly Jews. I am sending you a copy of that report. I have also had a long conference with him on the same subject matter.

While Mr. Harrison makes due allowance for the fact that during the early days of liberation the huge task of mass repatriation required main attention, he reports conditions which now exist and which require prompt remedy. These conditions, I know, are not in conformity with policies promulgated by SHAEF, now combined displaced persons executive. But they are what actually exist in the field. In other words, the policies are not being carried out by some of your subordinate officers.

For example, Military Government officers have been authorized, and even directed, to requisition billeting facilities from the German population for the benefit of displaced persons. Yet, from this report, this has not been done on any wide scale. Apparently it is being taken for granted that all displaced persons, irrespective of their former persecution or the likelihood that their repatriation or resettlement will be delayed, must remain in camps—many of which are overcrowded and heavily guarded. Some of these camps are the very ones where these people were herded together, starved, tortured, and made to witness the death of their fellow inmates and friends and relatives. The announced policy has been to give such persons preference over the German civilian population in housing. But the practice seems to be quite another thing.

We must intensify our efforts to get these people out of camps and into decent houses until they can be repatriated or evacuated. These houses should be requisitioned from the German civilian population. That is one way to implement the Potsdam policy that the German people "cannot escape responsibility for what they have brought upon themselves."

We quote this paragraph with particular reference to the Jews among the displaced persons:

"As matters now stand, we appear to be treating the Jews as the Nazis treated them, except that we do not exterminate them. They are in concentration camps in large numbers under our military guard instead of SS troops. One is led to wonder whether the German people, seeing this, are not supposing that we are following, or at least condoning, Nazi policy."

You will find in the report other illustrations of what I mean.

I hope you will adopt the suggestion that a more extensive plan of field visitation by appropriate Army group headquarters be instituted, so that the humane policies which have been enunciated are not permitted to be ignored in the field. Most of the conditions now existing in displaced persons camps would quickly be remedied if through inspection tours they came to your attention or to the attention of your supervisory officers.

I know you will agree with me that we have a particular responsibility toward these victims of persecution and tyranny who are in our zone. We must make clear to the German people that we thoroughly abhor the Nazi policies of hatred and persecution. We have no better opportunity to demonstrate this than by the manner in which we ourselves actually treat the survivors remaining in Germany.

I hope you will report to me as soon as possible the steps you have been able to take to clean up the conditions mentioned in the report.

I am communicating directly with the British Government in an effort to have the doors of Palestine opened to such of these displaced persons as wish to go there.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I may say that since that report the conditions have been considerably improved. I offer it only as evidence of what they were some months after our occupation.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a United Press article published in the New York Times of today relative to the Harrison report. The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] today placed in the RECORD the Harrison report dealing with alleged conditions in the camps in Germany where some of the displaced persons were still being kept. I think in fairness to the military authorities in Europe—and I have the greatest confidence in General Eisenhower and the men conducting the military government there—that the facts as brought out by this press report should be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the entire picture may be before the Senate and the military authorities.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from California. Does the Senator from California request that the article be placed in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from Ohio today?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I should like that to be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 2, 1945]

JEWS IN ONE UNITED STATES CAMP RIDICULE CHARGES OF ABUSE BY AMERICANS

FELDAFING CAMP, BAVARIA, GERMANY, October 1.—The ragged inmates of this sprawling home for Jewish displaced persons ridiculed today the Harrison report to the White House that Jews in American-occupied Germany were treated almost as badly as they had been under the Nazis.

They said that until 2 weeks ago their camp had been crowded and unpleasant but that the conditions could not be put in the same category as the filthy Nazi concentration camps where they had been beaten and tortured.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower visited this and other Bavarian camps 2 weeks ago and immediately ordered Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., American commander in Bavaria, to seize many neighboring German residences to relieve the congested condition at the camp.

"Things have been better for Jews since our liberation," red-bearded Rabbi Ezekial Ruttner told correspondents who flew here on an inspection trip.

"Now, today, it seems even more things are being done to make things better."

Until General Eisenhower's visit, however, it appeared that General Patton had taken little interest in Jewish welfare. The camp commander, Col. James H. Polk, of El Paso, Tex., admitted that "the heat has been turned on" in the past 14 days.

"I have been getting orders fired at me so fast since then that I have been unable to keep up with them," he said. He was unable to recall having received specific directives from General Patton's headquarters ordering improvements in camp conditions until after General Eisenhower's visit.

Colonel Polk said that General Patton had visited the camp earlier today and had seemed to be pleased with results that had been accomplished in the past 2 weeks.

JEWS FOUND WELL TREATED

Here is the situation found during a brief inspection of the rain-soaked camp this afternoon:

The Jews are unhappy but they are not being victimized.

They are living in crowded quarters but they are not dangerously overcrowded.

Every effort is being made to improve their living conditions before winter.

They perhaps are not getting the best food, but their diet of 2,600 calories daily is twice that of the average German.

They are well cared for medically and hundreds are being nursed back to the health they lost in concentration camps.

About 20 percent of the camp's total of 4,300 inmates have some form of tuberculosis. A Jewish doctor said they were being carefully cared for and that most were recovering.

The majority of the Jews here live in bleak apartments, but they are well protected from the cold. Some rooms are occupied by 12 persons sleeping in bunks. Other large rooms have been turned into dormitories that hold 40 persons—admittedly crowded but still livable.

They are relatively free people. There is no barbed wire and no Gestapo-type guards confining them. They have their own synagogue.

They appear to be living better than many Americans in slum areas, and the conditions here are similar to every other displaced persons camp throughout Germany.

This camp was chosen at random for inspection only 2 hours ago and there has been no time to change things to make a false showing for the inspection.

It was chosen by a group of correspondents interviewing Lt. Gen. Walter B. Smith, General Eisenhower's chief of staff, at his headquarters in Frankfort on the Main. General Smith offered his personal plane to the newsmen for an immediate inspection tour of the "worst known camps" in the American zone.

General Smith had nothing to say on the report by Earl G. Harrison, American representative on the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees, which said conditions were appalling among Jews in American camps, but he offered to let the newsmen "visit the camps immediately and make their own report."

Rabbi Ruttner summed up the situation in these words:

"We are still living in camp. We are without a place we can call home. We hope the doors of the world will open to us—just some land where we can live together in peace. Until then we are making the best of it here, where conditions are improving all the time."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to supplement what the Senator from Ohio has

just said by reading evidence adduced at the hearings which we held in Augsburg, Germany, during June of this year. In the evidence which I have in my hand, given by the burgomeister of Augsburg, a city of some 300,000, selected to be under our occupation, he testified that he had been burgomeister there or a high-ranking alderman throughout the past 20 years, having in charge in recent years both the police and finance.

His name is Dr. Ott. He said:

I had the police until 1929, that is, from 1919 to 1929, and then I was in charge from 1929 on of all personnel of the city administration.

I read further from the testimony:

Dr. OTT. I myself, as oberburgomeister, am the police president now.

Senator BREWSTER. How many police have you here now?

Dr. OTT. One hundred and seventy.

Senator BREWSTER. How many of them have had previous police experience?

Dr. OTT. I am not certain but I believe 140 of the 170 have had previous police experience.

Senator BREWSTER. Under the city or the state?

Dr. OTT. Under the state.

Senator BREWSTER. So that 145 of the present city police were former state policemen?

Dr. OTT. Yes; that is correct.

I asked him who was the chief of the state police during the service of these 140 out of 170 men, and he replied:

Dr. OTT. Heinrich Himmler.

Senator BREWSTER. He was chief of the state police?

Dr. OTT. Yes.

Senator BREWSTER. And he was chief of the Gestapo, also?

Dr. OTT. Yes.

Senator BREWSTER. So that he had both under his jurisdiction?

Dr. OTT. Yes.

In other words, of the 170 police in Augsburg under American occupation, 140 of them had been serving under Heinrich Himmler as chief of the state police during the period immediately preceding our occupation.

It is little to be wondered at that we read the stories which we do of the misunderstandings in Germany as to the course of our occupation.

We visited Dachau, the prison concentration camp, and at that time, 1 month after our occupation, more than 10,000 persons were still herded there. And going to the crematory we saw stacked up the bodies of 60 individuals who had died during the preceding 24 hours. The bodies were stacked up exactly like cordwood. That was the treatment accorded to the poor unfortunates who had died a month after our occupation.

I do not charge that we were responsible, but certainly the care which had been provided for their mortal remains was far at variance with the Christian character which we would contemplate would be provided.

So it has seemed to me, supporting the suggestions made by the Senator from Ohio, that we may commend the effort to give 100,000 permits for Jews to enter Palestine, even if we place it on no higher a level than the very practical one that we are obligated to the support of these displaced persons under our occupation. They are in the care of our Army. They are under guard. We have to provide for them. If we permit them to go to Palestine in accordance with the pledge of the Balfour Declaration and with the Coolidge convention of 1925, both of which were absolutely at variance with the so-called white paper as denounced by Winston Churchill himself as a back-bencher before he became Prime Minister, then not only does a great vista of hope open to them, but we incidentally are relieved of the responsibility of their care, as they are offered home and hospitality there. Under the Lowdermilk report made by our Assistant Commissioner of Irrigation, it is demonstrated there is ample opportunity there to provide for these people, with the vineyards and the cultivation which has been carried forward in such an amazing way.

So I join with the Senator from Ohio in commending what has been done, but urge that we go much farther in redeeming our solemn pledge.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. I wish to say that I am entirely in sympathy with the declaration and aims of the resolution discussed informally by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. We had that question before the Foreign Relations Committee, but action on it was postponed at the request of the military authorities because the British said it would raise a very troublesome problem for them in the Far East. Now that the war is over I hope we can take some action that will bring relief to the long suffering Jews in Europe.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. To the statement just made by the Senator from Ohio on this very serious problem, I want to add my own word, and a word on behalf of many of my constituents in New Jersey who feel very strongly that President Truman should be supported in his recommendation that the British immigration restrictions be lowered to the end that at least 100,000 more Jews may be permitted to enter Palestine immediately.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to join in the statement made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I particularly join in what the Senator from Maine said as to conditions in Germany, as I saw some of the conditions at the time I was there.

I think our great mistake at that time was to try to determine who was a Nazi, or who would carry out Nazi principles, by simply asking individuals to fill in a questionnaire. I think it is clear that those who served as police and SS troopers had shown by their acts that they were in sympathy with and were carrying out the provisions of the Nazi doctrine; that no questionnaire was necessary to determine that fact, and a questionnaire would not determine it.

I join the Senators who have spoken today in urging that at least 100,000 or more permits be granted so that at least that many individuals can be saved. I hope we can do many things all over Europe to preserve the rights of all peoples there. I hope we may establish freedom of news and expression so as to be able to determine just what is going on, and how the people of Europe are being treated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McMAHON. Can the Senator from Ohio farm out the floor for a couple of hours?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business has not been concluded. Debate is not in order now, upon objection.

Mr. McMAHON. I understand the rule to be that the Senator can yield for a question. He has yielded now for three or four speeches. There are other Senators who wish to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business has not been completed, and the morning hour is not ended. The point of order is sustained.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like merely to add my word of commendation of what the Senator from Ohio has said. As one who has received many communications on this subject, and who has done considerable reading concerning it, I heartily commend what the Senator from Ohio has just said, and I join with him in his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The routine morning business is concluded.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA AMONG AMERICAN SOLDIERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for many years we have watched the insidious infiltration of un-American propaganda into countless channels of public opinion, including some of the textbooks of our Nation's schools.

We have seen American history distorted. American institutions misrepresented, American constitutional government besmirched. Why? Is it not time we asked ourselves why?

Now a new channel of public opinion has apparently become the funnel for synthetic "ism" doctrines. It is shocking to note that this new channel is among the Nation's own heroic defenders! It is now reported that the almost 8 million enlisted men of the United States Army were impacted by Communist propaganda foisted upon them in weekly, compulsory "orientation" lectures.

This report is substantiated in a series of articles written by Mr. Kent Hunter and Mr. David Sentner of the Washington Bureau of the Hearst Newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the articles will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WILEY. William Randolph Hearst and the Hearst Newspapers are to be congratulated for making this exposé. It is but one more of a long series of documented disclosures of subversive activities fearlessly carried by the Hearst Newspapers.

It is my understanding that the House Committee on Un-American Activities intends to investigate the charges made in this series of articles. But the mere existence of such Communist propaganda points up the necessity of some new instrumentality which would affirmatively combat such propaganda. Such a new instrumentality would, I believe, be the Special Senate Committee on the Promotion of American Activities which I have proposed in Senate Resolution 165, which is now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

In my judgment, the time for action on this resolution is long overdue. Every passing day we are allowing more American minds to be poisoned by alien ideas and neglecting to sell our own goods—the American system—to our citizens. We are allowing all that we hold dear to be smeared and befouled, to become the target for the rotten eggs of false ideas.

We are allowing the public confidence and faith in our American way of life to be undermined. This is a challenge we can no longer afford to ignore.

Let us have the courage of our convictions by proceeding to promote constitutional Americanism. Let this new Senate committee be established and let it initiate a legislators' and citizens' crusade for the protection of the American way. Let us demonstrate in action as deep and abiding an American zeal as was displayed by the fighting forces of the nation which sustained more than 1 million casualties in the name of Americanism.

Let us moreover evaluate every piece of legislation that comes to the Senate by these criteria: Is it constitutional? Is it American?

With wildcat and other strikes exploding all over the American scene in accordance with a master plan, with the "heat" being placed on Congress to force it to enact wild, unsound legislation, with the national indebtedness approaching 300 billion dollars, we need to have Constitutional Americanism preached from every rooftop and taught in every school. The alternatives are chaos and collectivism.

The President recently said that we are the trustees of the atom bomb. Let us not forget that we are also the trustees of something else—of the American Republic, with its Constitution, its Bill of Rights, its Declaration of Independence, its way of life.

What are we going to do about it? This is a matter of life and death for our country. We must not let our Nation down.

EXHIBIT A

[September 25, 1945]

RED PROPAGANDA FOR UNITED STATES FIGHTING MEN

(By David Sentner and Kent Hunter)

WASHINGTON.—An atomic propaganda bomb with a thick red coating has been dropped into the American armed forces.

Every American soldier has been getting a subtly administered weekly dose of subversive Communist doctrines.

Furthermore, the treatment is compulsory and under official auspices.

One hour each week, every American soldier has been required to attend an orientation course.

The apparently laudable objective was to provide an educational and informational service, including the discussion of current events, for the member of the armed forces.

However, much of the text and prepared material used in these orientation courses have been shot through with marxism and the Communist Party line as preached by the prophets and advocates of a Sovietized United States.

In view of the potential effect on millions of impressionable young Americans returning to civil life from service, it would appear that the congressional uproar over the commissioning of Communists in the Army is like failing to see the forest for the trees.

Through specific extracts and references contained in many of the hundreds of books, pamphlets, and other publications used in this Army orientation course, these articles will show:

That many authors or contributors are listed in congressional committee files as members of Communist front organizations.

That the tenets of communism are promoted continuously.

That military aggression of the Soviet Union against Finland, Poland, China, and other nations are either ignored or defended.

That it is attempted to justify the Hitler-Stalin pact.

That the failure of the Soviet Union to join in the war against Japan until the very last moment is excused.

That the Battle of Russia is glorified in detail in one of the books while the gallant fighting of the American forces at Bataan, Wake Island, Midway, and in the Coral Seas is dismissed with brief references.

That the Soviet Union is presented as a democracy with responsibility for early Communist terrorism and bloodshed placed on capitalist nations because of their hostility.

That while communism is never referred to unfavorably, private enterprise and the democracies are pictured as exploiting the masses and engaging in imperialistic diplomacy.

That the Communists are portrayed as the champion of the oppressed in China while Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is etched as a totalitarian tool of the "reactionary" middle class.

That internationalism is consistently promoted while sovereignty is scoffed at under such Red party line epithets as "isolationism" and "war-mongering."

The modern army orientation system is operated under the Information and Education Division, headed by Maj. Gen. Frederick H. Osborn.

Each week in the field, the Information and Education officers receive an issue of the orientation fact sheet Army Talks to guide them in their conduct of orientation themes with the troops.

The thread of Red propaganda runs through them.

In addition, the Information and Education officer receives from time to time "orientation kits" containing background material in the form of books, pamphlets, and memoranda.

It is in this mass of literature that the Communist Party line is embedded.

Two books in use of "orienting" our troops in the Pacific are Changing China, authored by George E. Taylor and edited by Maxwell S. Stewart, and The Making of Modern China by Owen and Eleanor Lattimore.

Stewart and the Lattimores are listed in the files of the House Committee on un-American Activities as having Communist Front affiliations. Owen Lattimore was formerly deputy director of the OWI's Far East Division and later served as an OWI consultant.

Both books minimize thought other than that in keeping with the Communist "party line" and will be discussed in future articles of this series.

[September 26, 1945]

RED PROPAGANDA FOR UNITED STATES FIGHTING MEN

(By Kent Hunter and David Sentner)

WASHINGTON.—A pretty picture of the purported aims and achievements of communism in China is a facet of the compulsory indoctrination in the Red Party line to which multiple millions of young Americans in our armed forces have been subjected.

Camouflaged but lightly, the Communist propaganda has been ladled out through the weekly orientation lectures which all enlisted Army personnel has been required to attend.

At these lectures, prescribed material is used by the instructors. One of the books used in orienting the members of our armed forces on China is entitled "Changing China," authored by George W. Taylor.

This literary pep talk for collectivism and the heaping of ridicule on the landlord class is edited by Maxwell S. Stewart, whose affiliations with 25 Communist-controlled groups are listed in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

This textbook for Army instructors is brazenly labeled a co-operative project with the institute of Pacific relations, listed in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as having Communist-front affiliations.

In a typical Red Party line lesson in American history to members of the armed forces, the United States is depicted as having deliberately stirred up a revolution in China which put the Nationalists in power and resulted in thousands of noble Communists being killed.

Portraying the split between the right and left wings of the Koumintang with soft words for the "fellow travelers" of communism, the volume asserts:

"The left wing included, besides Communists, students and intellectuals who sympathized with them; they wanted to base their power on the peasants and workers of China * * *.

"During the victorious march to the north, the left wing, with the Communists, had stirred up the peasantry to violent action against the landlords, and when Hankow was reached the workers of central China were encouraged to go on strike.

"The right wing, under Chiang Kai-shek, was alarmed, for many of the army officers came from the families of the local gentry, and many of their business and banker supporters did not favor the development of a strong labor-union movement.

"Nor did England and America wish to see a new government in China under Communist, and especially Russian, influence. They used their diplomatic influence to help a revolution already deeply divided from within.

"The revolution split, the Russians fled to the Soviet Union, many thousands of Chinese Communists were killed, and the right wing of the Koumintang, backed by a majority of the party and the army, set up a government in Nanking without the Communists. Thus, in 1928, the present Nationalist Government of China was founded and was immediately recognized by most of the great powers."

Then, painting the regime of Chiang Kai-shek as a one-man show backed by the army and the reactionary landed gentry, the book asserts:

"They did not have the same interests as the intellectuals in democracy, and they hated communism."

The efforts of the Chinese Soviet Republic from 1923 to 1935 to bring democracy to the masses is described as follows:

"They redistributed the land of the rich among the poor, especially the landless peasants. They set up cooperatives. They tried to change many of the social habits and customs of the people, such as the marriage systems."

In passing, the Taylor-Stewart opus relates that it was necessary to kill or drive the landlords from most of Kiangsi Province in order that the Communists accomplish their purpose.

"The Communists have not arrived at a solution of the land problem but they have made the lot of the peasant easier than it was before," the volume remarks with obvious admiration.

The big pay-off in the volume appears in the thinking-it-all-over section, intended to stimulate discussion among our GI's, in which the following loaded question is asked:

"Could a government along the lines of that in Russia be made to work in China?"

And the author and the editor of Changing China were not content to let this leading question seep in on the subject of collectivism. They urged:

"Think of all sides of the question when you discuss this."

[September 27, 1945]

RED PROPAGANDA FOR UNITED STATES FIGHTING MEN

(By David Sentner and Kent Hunter)

WASHINGTON.—Is it the American concept that Communist Russia represents a ruthless, totalitarian form of government, similar to nazism or fascism, which purges all opposition, liquidates private property, levels off individual initiative, controls the press, religion, and free speech, and attempts to subvert the rest of the world to its sinister and un-American doctrines?

Join the United States Army and get "oriented" to the contrary.

The greatest sales campaign in the global history of Red revolutionary propaganda has been conducted among the millions of Americans in the armed forces with the guileless or inspired cooperation of our own War Department.

In books, pamphlets, and instruction materials connected with the compulsory "orientation" course which each enlisted member of the Army must attend once a week, the Communist Party line with its poisonous ideology has been permitted to slither like a rattlesnake in a jungle of words.

Perish the thought that the dear old Soviet Union has the slightest similarity with the deceased totalitarian Reich.

In the "Army talk" orientation fact sheet 53, entitled "Checking Our Soviet Ally," the brutal, bloody history of Soviet communism is blandly described to American troops as merely a necessary milestone along the path to democracy.

This guide sheet for conducting a compulsory discussion on the subject among our millions of soldiers exhorts that the Soviet Union is entitled to a break and proceeds to provide it through distortion, indirection, and factual omissions.

"Although they (the Soviet Communists) now have a secret police," the orientation fact sheet states, "and a government-controlled press, their ultimate political ideals are directly opposite to the stated ideals of Fascist dictatorship, and their hope is to drop the appurtenances of dictatorship in the process of democratic evolution."

The Communists in the Soviet Union are simply political organizers, it is pointed out, whose aims are merely "to spread and strengthen belief in their principles among the great majority of citizens who are not party members."

The "orientation" sheet, dedicated to presenting the truth and removing confusion of ideas and lack of facts from the minds of our fighting men, continues to croon:

"They (the Communists) have two basic ideas. One is state ownership of factories, farms and all other productive agencies, with distribution of the proceeds among all the workers according to their productivity.

"The other idea is political. They early believed that a dictatorship 'of the proletariat' was necessary in order to destroy capitalism and set up socialism; that then the dictatorship should gradually evolve into a democracy as now provided by their constitution."

This attempt to parallel communism and democracy should knock any veteran member of the Communist Party right off his soap box, not to mention the certainty of making Karl Marx turn in his proletariat grave.

Regarding the reference to the Soviet constitution, an array of historical facts was omitted from the orientation sheet.

In 1936, when discontent was seething throughout Communist Russia and a counter-revolution was brewing as a result of famine and the break-down of production and distribution under the proletariat oligarchy, "Stalin's constitution" was announced.

Among other nothings in this intended stop to the growing anti-Communist sentiment among the Russian masses, there was mention of a new national assembly called the "Supreme Soviet" to be voted by the whole population instead of the few million Communists ruling the U. S. S. R.

However, the Communist Party was given the dominating niche in the constitution, and Stalin further set the tone of his new constitution by proclaiming that in each constituency, there would be only one candidate put up for the national assembly for whom the populace could either vote for or against. Of course, the Communists handpicked the lone candidate.

To further bulwark his synthetic constitution, Stalin then began his notorious series of purge trials which included the mass liquidation of army generals and others who were opposed to his regime.

There is an unintended touch of satire recorded in the orientation sheet in connection with the purported functioning of constitutional democracy in the Soviet Union.

A conspicuously printed "box" glorifies Stalin's place in the U. S. S. R. by listing numerous government and military positions he occupied. The Stalin build-up concludes with the parenthetical remark that "the regular elections for the Supreme Soviet have been postponed during the war."

[September 28, 1945]

RED PROPAGANDA FOR UNITED STATES FIGHTING MEN

(By Kent Hunter and David Sentner)

WASHINGTON.—American troops, under orders to attend weekly orientation classes, have been and still are being fed the language, economic philosophies, and the mental motivation of the Communist party line.

The Making of Modern China by Owen and Eleanor Lattimore, is a book in the Army orientation library.

An attempt has been made in this volume to sell a bill of goods on the unselfish treatment of China by the Soviet Union compared to the so-called exploitation of China by the United States and Britain, plus a miscellany of lineage from standard Red propaganda.

American troops who have believed that our war against Japan was the result of Nipponese militarism and the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, are informed in this orientation reference volume that it is really an imperialistic battle between the United States and Japan for the control of China.

Owen Lattimore, a former OWI top executive, is recorded in the House Committee on un-American Activities files as having been affiliated with the following Communist-front groups: Hollywood Writers Mobilization, Maryland Association for Democratic Rights, Washington Committee for Aid to China, and on the editorial board of Amerasia, some of whose editorial associates were charged recently with improperly possessing State Department documents.

The Lattimores give a typical Red Party line twist to the famous American open-door policy declared in 1899 by Secretary of State John Hay by which the United States gained recognition of the right of trade equality with other nations in China.

"Essentially," the Lattimores state, "the open door was a further development of the permanent American policy which may be called a policy of hitch-hiking imperialism in preference to active imperialism.

"That is to say, America did not take the lead in seizing Chinese territory or imposing legal disabilities on the Chinese but did demand that whatever was gouged out of China by any other nation should not be monopolized by that nation alone but shared with all comers."

In contrast to the portrayal of the United States as an imperialistic interloper in the affairs of China, the Soviet Union is exuberantly promoted as follows:

Having a deep, disinterested sympathy for China:

The only nation which made political agreements with the Sun Yat-sen government with "no strings attached to them" (other than sending Soviet Communists to China to aid in organization of the Government):

Sending more war materials to China than the United States ever sent in lend-lease over the Burma Road (carefully ignoring the tremendous tonnage flown to China from India):

The natural outlet for Chinese postwar trade rather than the shipping link with the United States and Britain.

The multitudinous record in history of how Russia has clipped huge territories and resources from China goes unmentioned.

Neither the Lattimore book nor other "orientation" material tells our American troops:

That the Soviet Union, although stalling until the very last moment before declaring war against Japan, is in there with Gargantuan territorial demands in the Pacific and is already stirring up strife between the Chinese Communists and the Chiang Kai-shek government.

Included in the footage borrowed from the Communist Party line, the volume pictures:

The Chinese middle class as a "landlord" type, living only to collect rents and tax tribute from the "oppressed" peasants and workers:

The First World War was as a result of the lining up of the great powers for the savage battle over colonies, markets, and investments:

Chinese in the United States being "held back by race prejudice":

The virtues of industrial cooperatives:

Postwar China turning to state ownership in the heavy industries, public utilities, and banking.

Perhaps one of the most impudent ideological passages in this "orientation" volume is the placing of responsibility on the shoulders of other powers, including the United States, for the wholesale murders, terrorism, and annihilation of the party owning class conducted by the Communists in the U. S. S. R.

The authors assert:

"It is time for the rest of us to admit something which is as important for us as it is for the Russians, that many of the harsh and

cruel aspects of the Soviet order are in fact scars inflicted on it in its youth by the intolerance and active hostility against which it had to struggle to survive.

"For this part of the environment of the early years of Soviet history it was the rest of the world that was responsible."

THE PALESTINE PROBLEM

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on March 28, 1944, I said on the floor of the Senate that Hitler had been exterminating Jews at an estimated rate of 10,000 a day throughout Germany and throughout his satellite countries. I asserted that Hitler was killing more Jews a day—every day—than Great Britain in a whole year was permitting to find refuge in Palestine.

As the victorious American and British armies moved into Germany the details of Hitler's premeditated ravages have partially come to light. We do not yet fully comprehend them. During the years between the invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939, and the collapse of Germany on May 8 of this year, more than 5,000,000 Jewish lives were snuffed out by Hitler. Unhappily, my earlier estimate of the number of the victims of Hitler's diabolical plan of mass extermination of a people was an underestimate.

During all those horrible years, Mr. President, the British white paper was in force. This paper restricted immigration into the Jewish homeland, and authorized the admission of only 10,000 Jews a year. Unquestionably, many hundreds of thousands of these 5,000,000 Jews might have been saved had it not been for the white paper.

So thorough was Hitler's work and so effective was the British prohibition against admission of Jews into the land which was set aside after the First World War as a haven for them that there remain in Europe today less than a million and one-half Jews. In many large areas of Germany and elsewhere in Europe there is not a single living Jewish child. Hitler was determined to wipe out a whole people, and he would have succeeded completely but for the timely arrival of General Eisenhower and his American and British troops.

The war in Europe has come to a close and we are now confronted with another tragedy. Most of the Jews who are still alive have no place to go. They cannot renew their lives in their old homes. Their families are dead, their businesses and professions are wiped out, and they are still—despite the end of the war and the decisive defeat of the Nazis—confronted with the most violent sort of anti-Semitism.

President Truman was given a most forthright report by former Immigration Commissioner Earl Harrison, whom he sent on a special mission to Europe to investigate the condition of displaced persons. Mr. Harrison's report so shocked the President that he personally sent a letter through Secretary of State Byrnes to Prime Minister Attlee, recommending that 100,000 of the unfortunate Jews who still are in concentration camps be sent to Palestine immediately.

The President's courageous and straight-from-the-shoulder action is most refreshing and reassuring. For years we have had nothing but vague and glittering generalities from official Washington. I heartily commend President Truman without reservation.

Evidently assuming that Mr. Attlee would see eye to eye with him on such a humanitarian gesture, the President instructed General Eisenhower to make immediate arrangements for the transportation of these people. But to the great astonishment of everyone, the new Labor Government of Britain has rejected Mr. Truman's proposal. Frankly, I am horrified at this unexpected development.

Britain, which has made the Jew a political football since the promulgation of the Balfour Declaration, seems determined to pursue this policy to the bitter end. Instead of taking steps for the immediate termination of the iniquitous white paper—which should never have been imposed in the first place—Britain now proposes to admit only 1,500 Jews a month. I am further informed that the British Government contemplates formally announcing this policy when Parliament reconvenes on October 9.

I repeat, it is time for the Senate and for the United States Government to strengthen the hand of the President vigorously, and to face the realities of Palestine. The determination to establish in Palestine a homeland for the Jews in which Jews would eventually have nationhood status in common with the other peoples of the earth was a joint policy of the United States and the British Governments during World War I. Its implications were fully contemplated by the chief architects of the plan, Mr. Woodrow Wilson and Mr. David Lloyd George. In brief, it would permit the Jewish people to be the masters of their own destinies in at least one small piece of this earth. That equitable and just resolve should not be abandoned now by either America or Britain.

Britain, with the wholehearted approval of this Nation, became the mandatory nation for Palestine and was charged by the Allies with the administration of such a policy. Instead of carrying out its solemn obligation to the Allied and associated nations, Britain immediately began a policy of evasion and political jockeying. She assumed that Palestine was a colonial possession and that the men and women who migrated there during the years when immigration restrictions were not so severe would be content to assume the status of the illiterate native peoples she rules in other parts of the world. But when the Jew began to bring culture, science, education, and progress into Palestine, instead of encouraging such a development in the Near East, where culture, science, and progress are sorely needed, Britain adoped a policy of obstruction. Frankly, she sought in every way to discourage the development of Palestine. Unbelievable as it is, the United States prior to President Truman's forthright action the other day, has acquiesced in Britain's deadly policy of retardation. It must be remembered that we have a special treaty with Britain pertaining to Palestine and in it the stipulation is made that no change whatsoever shall be made in the mandatory policy without the prior consent of the United States. Our State Department, so far as I know, has never protested officially the violation of that sacred treaty nor has it raised its voice against the white paper. The time is here for a showdown.

When the Congress last year endeavored through the so-called Wagner-Taft resolution to express its sentiments on Palestine, the State Department effectively intervened. Congress was bluntly told that such an expression would interfere with the war effort—despite the fact that the war had long since passed from Africa and the Middle East into Europe proper. Now the war is over, and as a first step toward living up to its pledges this Government is endeavoring to transport immediately 100,000 of the most destitute of the displaced persons of Europe. Again the British Government finds excuses.

How long, Mr. President, are the American Government and the American people going to remain callous to the suffering of the homeless Jews of Europe? How long, Mr. President, will the American people remain indifferent to the imperative need to set up the long-contemplated Jewish state in Palestine? Surely, our people are in no mood to have President Truman's recommendation vetoed by the British. Surely, the Balfour Declaration is not a scrap of paper. Surely, Britain is not going to "welsh" on her solemn pledges to us. Patience has ceased to be a virtue. The time is at hand to put an end to the centuries of suffering and persecution. The time is at hand for the Jewish people to reestablish themselves in the independent and dignified status of ancient days.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES

Mr. BILBO, Mr. McMAHON and Mr. WHEELER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the Chair). The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry before I begin to speak. My understanding of the rule is that any motion made before 2 o'clock is not subject to debate, but that a Senator has a right to speak on any subject he sees fit to discuss, provided it does not involve the making of a motion. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that that practice has been followed, where objection has not been made.

Mr. BILBO. Very well, Mr. President.

Now, with the understanding that I have the floor, I wish to say that my information is that some time today my distinguished friend the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] proposes to make a motion to take up Calendar No. 550, House bill 694, known to those who have been keeping up with the situation as the land-grant railroad bill. I wish to point out in connection with this matter that the Members of the House of Representatives—I do not know whether this is true of the Members of the Senate—have been interviewed——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say that I was called out of the Chamber; I intended to obtain recognition from the Senator from Colorado, when he had the floor, on another matter.

Mr. BILBO. I am sorry. I have the floor now.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that the Senator has the floor; if he did not have it, I should not have asked him to yield.

Mr. BILBO. Very well; I yield for a question only.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I have to say is not a question.

Mr. BILBO. Then I decline to yield; I am sorry.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Mississippi to state his views regarding the propriety——

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor. I am willing to yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. I am stating a parliamentary inquiry for the benefit of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. Very well.

Mr. McMAHON. I wish to understand correctly the ruling of the Chair as to the propriety of having the Senator from Mississippi proceed on this matter at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair ruled, on the advice of the Parliamentarian, that it has been customary to proceed as the Senator from Mississippi has been doing, in the absence of objection; but, strictly speaking, a point of order would lie unless some business is pending before the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Then, I make the point of order.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I object. No business is pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will state the point of order.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, does the Chair recognize the Senator from Connecticut?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut for the purpose of stating a point of order, but not for the purpose of engaging in argument or debate.

Mr. McMAHON. The point of order is that the Senator from Mississippi is attempting to discuss a matter which is not now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The germaneness of the debate does not enter into the question.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Mississippi is now preventing the discussion of other business which is germane at this time.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. BILBO. I do not relish the last statement made by the Senator from Connecticut. I think what I have in mind is just as important to me and to my constituency and to the people of this country as is anything which may be resting in the mind of the Senator from Connecticut. So I insist that I be permitted to proceed.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not doubt, Mr. President, that it will be proper for the Senator to proceed when the matter about which he is speaking properly comes before the Senate. At the present time there is nothing pending before the Senate.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator from Mississippi is pending. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order which was made a few minutes ago was that the subject about which the Senator from Mississippi is speaking is not germane. Does the Senator from Connecticut make another point of order?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I make the point of order that there is nothing pending before the Senate.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I have the floor and I desire to speak.

Mr. WHEELER. I am making the point of order that there is no business now pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana makes the point of order that at the present time no business is pending before the Senate.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I shall continue with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is not entitled to the floor, the point of order having been made.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, was it not the Chair's ruling that there is no business now pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no business pending before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Mississippi did not seem to catch the force of the ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling is that no business is now pending before the Senate, and if objection is made the Senator from Mississippi may not proceed until after the expiration of the morning hour. A motion is in order.

Mr. BILBO. I am not making a motion; I am speaking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has stated that prior to the expiration of the morning hour, which will be at 2 o'clock, if a Senator speaks upon a subject when there is no business pending before the Senate, his action is subject to a point of order. A point of order has been made in that regard.

Mr. BILBO. I am speaking on a subject which is before the Senate. It is on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not pending before the Senate. The Chair rules that the Senator from Mississippi may not proceed, objection having been made.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Chair rule that I am out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. BILBO. Very well. That makes a little more history.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 550, House bill 694.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a motion for the consideration of a bill is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 694.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment, on page 2, line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this act.

And insert:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect 90 days after the date of the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, whichever is the earlier: *Provided, however,* That any travel or transportation contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, am I now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has been recognized.

Mr. BILBO. I was taken off the floor, but I thought I might be recognized at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has no power to restore the floor at this point to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. The Chair had the power to take me off, but apparently not the power to put me on. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the proper time the Chair will be delighted to recognize the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, this bill proposes to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic. It is a bill to repeal the so-called land-grant rates.

This bill, which in effect repeals the special land grant privileges accorded to Government military traffic, was passed by the House on May 4, 1945, reached the Senate on May 7, 1945, was favorably considered by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, and reported with an amendment on July 28, 1945. The report was unanimous. The House bill amends section 321, title III, part II of the Transportation Act of 1940 by strik-

ing out certain language. The 1940 act to which reference is made contains a section 321, the significant part of which reads as follows:

Sec. 321 (a) (54 Stat. L. 954, U. S. C., title 49, sec. 66). Notwithstanding any other provisions of sections 1 (7) and 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, the full applicable commercial rates, fares, or charges shall be paid for transportation by any common carrier subject to such act of any persons or property for the United States, or on its behalf, except that the foregoing provision shall not apply to the transportation of military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use or to the transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States (or of property of such members) when such members are traveling on official duty; and the rate determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission as reasonable therefor shall be paid for the transportation by railroad of the United States mail, etc.

The bill now before the Senate strikes out the exception. It also recites precisely, in the second paragraph, just how the law will read if this bill is enacted. As a practical matter, the effect of the bill is to abolish the special rates which the Government up until 1940 enjoyed on all Government property shipped by land grant railroads, and since 1940 on all military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use.

The amendment adopted by the Senate committee changes the effective date of the bill. As the bill passed the House on May 4, 1945, it provided that it should become effective 90 days after its enactment. The amendment of the committee, which was adopted and reported to the Senate before the conclusion of hostilities with Japan, made the effective date 90 days after the cessation of hostilities.

I may say, Mr. President, that this bill was reported by the Senate committee during the last session of Congress while the war was still in progress, and would have taken effect 90 days after its enactment. At that time I opposed the bill and voted against it on the ground that during the war I did not believe the railroads should ask for a repeal. I stated, however, that I believed it would be a just bill for consideration 90 days after the cessation of hostilities. I invite attention to the fact that the railroad brotherhoods throughout the United States have endorsed the bill in its present form, and many shippers from one end of the country to the other, as well as shipping organizations, have also endorsed it.

The bill as reported by the committee contains a proviso which was not in the House version of the bill, reading as follows:

Provided, however, That any travel or transportation contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract.

In other words, where the Government has entered into contracts for the shipment of freight over a period of time, this bill would not change the rate with respect to any such contracts.

The conclusion of hostilities with Japan probably makes the amendment having to do with the effective date no longer of great importance. The purpose of the committee was to make sure that during the progress of the war, and for 90 days thereafter, the reduced rates on Government military traffic should be continued.

In explanation of this bill, it should be pointed out, as indicated in reports of the House and Senate committees, that in the 1850's and 1860's a series of measures were enacted by Congress for the purpose of encouraging the building of railroads through unsettled portions of the West and South.

At that time, vast areas of Government land were held for disposition to settlers and it was recognized by Congress that the land could not be made valuable or contribute to the welfare of the citizens of the country unless means of transportation were provided throughout the unsettled regions.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator spoke a moment ago of various persons and organizations favoring the passage of the pending bill. As I heard him he did not mention the Interstate Commerce Commission. That Commission also favors the passage of the bill, I believe.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. The Interstate Commerce Commission has recommended this bill on numerous occasions. It recommended the repeal of this provision of the law as early as 1940, and has repeatedly since that time made recommendations for its repeal both to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The most distinguished statesmen of the time, serving in Congress in the 1850's and 1860's, therefore advocated conditional grants of land to railroad companies, in order to encourage the construction of railroads through these uninhabited sections. Such statesmen as Senators Clay, Douglas, and President Lincoln were particularly interested in this phase of our national development. The first land grant was made to the State of Illinois, for the purpose of constructing a railroad from the Great Lakes to the Gulf and this grant was sponsored by Senator Douglas, who pioneered in advocating these grants.

By a series of acts extending through the decades of 1850, 1860 and to a certain extent 1870, altogether about 130,000,000 acres of land were granted to certain railroads, with an aggregate mileage of 21,500 miles. This land, according to a study made by the late Joseph B. Eastman while Federal Coordinator of Transportation, was valued at about 97 cents an acre. The award to the railroads, therefore, on the basis of actual value at the time of the grant, aggregated about $126,000,000. Unquestionably, when the land was sold by the railroads, it yielded a greater amount than the sum stated. The effect of the construction of the railroads was naturally immensely to increase the value of the remaining lands held by the Government. In the report made by the House committee on May 2, 1944, this statement is made:

The Government, on the other hand, while granting much land, retained very much more. The lands retained by it were enhanced in value many times over as the result of the building of the railroads. However, it was from the settlement of the territory, the general increase in wealth, and the strengthening of the Nation that the Government expected, and actually realized, its major reward for these grants of land.

It has been estimated that the Government lands were, to speak conservatively, doubled in value and the amount granted to the railroads was but a small portion of the lands retained. Of course, they not only doubled, but in many instances tripled in value, and even became a hundred times more valuable as time went on. It is a fact that while 130,000,000 acres were granted to the railroads, the Government retained 1,300,000,000 acres, the value of which was greatly enhanced by the settlement of the country. While it cannot be said that the railroads are entitled to all the credit for this enhancement, yet it is true that they contributed very substantially to the increase in the value of lands. It would seem, therefore, that the Government made a good bargain, even if the land had been granted to the railroads as an outright gift.

Of course, the reason why the lands were given to the railroads was to encourage them to build railroads throughout the Northwest and West, vast areas of which at that time were unsettled; and very few people wanted to put up money to build railroads through that territory unless they were given some help by the Government.

However, while the term "land grant" is commonly used, as a matter of fact this land was not presented to the railroads. The various acts which from time to time granted land to individual railroads all provided that the Government should have the use of the railroads "free of tolls." This rather inapt expression was a survival from legislation previously enacted making grants for the construction of canals. These early canal acts provided that Government boats might move over the canals "free of tolls." This expression was carried over into the railroad land-grant acts.

In the course of time a dispute arose between the railroads, on the one hand, and the Government, on the other, as to just what this expression meant. The Government contended originally that the railroads were obliged to haul all Government freight free of any charges. The railroads contended, however, that the Government was entitled only to the free use of the right-of-way and that the railroads were entitled to some compensation for the expense which they incurred in transporting freight and troops in vehicles provided by the railroads.

This dispute ultimately reached the Supreme Court and it was held that the expression did not require the railroads to move the freight free of charge, but that the proper construction was that a reduced rate should be applied which

should take into consideration how much of the expense was attributable to the right-of-way and how much to the actual transportation cost. The case was remanded to the Court of Claims to make a finding as to how the expense should be divided. The Court of Claims concluded that 50 percent of the cost might be attributed to the right-of-way and 50 percent to the cost of operation. Thereafter, Congress by a series of acts adopted the views of the Supreme Court and the Court of Claims, and fixed the rate to be applied to all Government traffic at 50 percent of the normal or commercial rate.

The law remained in this status until 1940. In considering the Transportation Act of that year, Congress was advised that in the depression period, extending roughly from 1930 to 1940, the Government had been a very large shipper of civilian goods, which were being distributed for relief purposes. There had been a great increase in the amount of land grant deductions since, under the law prior to 1940, the reduced rates applied to all Government property, whether military or civilian. Congress reached the conclusion in 1940 that it was unfair to the railroads to require them to apply reduced rates to ordinary civilian goods, and the law was amended so as to provide, in section 321 heretofore referred to, that the reduced rates should apply only to military and naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use and to the transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States.

I might say in this connection that the present President of the United States, who was a member of the committee considering the 1940 act, and who was one of those who joined me in introducing the bill, was very strongly in favor of this provision of the law as it was passed at that time.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator remember whether there was any opposition at all to the passage of the Transportation Act of 1940?

Mr. WHEELER. In 1940?

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. My recollection is that there was very little. I do not recall any opposition to it.

Mr. BILBO. Was there no opposition in the committee?

Mr. WHEELER. I recall no opposition in the committee.

Mr. BILBO. And none on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. WHEELER. I recall none on the floor of the Senate with reference to this particular provision.

Mr. BILBO. In 1940?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. BILBO. I wish to have that made clear.

Mr. WHEELER. There was opposition to the bill in general on the ground that we were at that time including the regulation of water carriers, and of course there was tremendous opposition by the water carriers. They did not want to be regulated under the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. That proposal was fought out here in the Senate; but when the bill finally passed, I think it passed with only about 16 votes in opposition.

The question naturally arises as to how much the railroads have paid to the Government in the way of reduced rates during the years in which these land-grant rates have been in effect. It was stated in the House report of May 2, 1944, that the Board of Investigation and Research, a public body created by section 301, part I, title III, Transportation Act of 1940, concluded that up to June 30, 1942, the deductions amounted to $340,782,000. In the same report it was stated, however, that by reason of the war activities, the deductions were running, subsequent to June 30, 1942, at the rate of about $18,500,000 per month. The House report states further:

> As the trend was still upward at that time, it (Investigation and Research Board) thought it entirely probable that the monthly rate during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1942, would average as much as $20,000,000. If the Board was correct in that conclusion, then, during the more than 20 months that have passed since the end of the period covered by its study, the Government has exacted from the railroads an additional $400,000,000, or more for these lands which it may well have thought originally it was giving away.

It is clear, therefore, that for lands which were originally worth $126,000,000 the Government had received, up to May 2, 1944, about $740,000,000. If to that figure are added the deductions in the period extending from May 1, 1944, to the end of the war, the deductions would be in the neighborhood of a billion dollars. If the property is valued, not at what it was worth when the grants were made, but at a figure representing what the railroads realized from its sale after the country had been developed, it would still be true that the Government has received more than twice the value of the lands, whatever may be the basis of valuation.

The demand for the repeal of the land-grant statutes is not new. The matter has been before Congress in one form or another for a great many years. The urge for the repeal comes primarily from shippers, who have long been dissatisfied with the discriminations which result from the application of land-grant rates. This discrimination is obvious when we remember that persons selling material to the Government located on land-grant roads have a decided advantage over competing shippers selling the same commodities to the Government located on roads that are not affected by the land-grant legislation.

It must be remembered that only 17,600 miles out of the 230,000 miles of railroad are, strictly speaking, subject to land-grant deductions.

I hope the Senator from Mississippi, who is so much interested, will bear that in mind.

Mr. BILBO. I beg the Senator's pardon. I was engaged for the moment. Will he repeat what he said? I shall have plenty of time to develop it, if he will mention it.

Mr. WHEELER. I said that it must be remembered that only 17,600 miles out of 230,000 miles of railroad are, strictly speaking, subject to land-grant deductions.

Mr. BILBO. I think the railroad mileage in the United States is nearer 240,000. However, I shall attend to that.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator probably knows more about it than I do.

While, as I stated before, 21,500 miles of railroad were aided by land grants, the Union Pacific, which received land grants, is not actually at this time a land-grant road. This grows out of the fact that the Union Pacific settled with the Government many years ago for the lands granted and it is no longer in the category of railroads that are required to grant deductions on Government traffic.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's line of thought, unless he is agreeable to it.

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If I heard correctly and interpreted correctly what the Senator said, he stated in substance that about 130,000,000 acres of land were granted certain railroads for the original purposes of the legislation, and that that land was valued at about 97 cents an acre at the time the grants were made, but that the railroads have lost in income, through reduced rates, approximately a billion dollars.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, how was that matter settled?

Mr. WHEELER. The railroads may have turned some lands back to the Government; but I am not familiar with what the settlement was. When this matter came before the Senate, I urged at one time, without any consideration of the repeal of the land-grant provisions of the law, that lands which were now owned by the railroads be turned back to the Government. However, upon an examination of the situation I found that in a great many instances the lands had been mortgaged by the railroad companies and, furthermore, the States through which the railroads ran were violently opposed to turning lands back to the Government, because it would have meant that they would not be subject to taxation in many of the northwestern States, where the Government already owned so much of the land. It was said that if it took over the land in some counties, the counties would not have sufficient money to maintain the schools.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. Has the Senator much patience with the objections enunciated by the citizens of the States where these unsold lands are now lying, when it is a fact that if the lands were deeded back to the Government, they would be subject to homesteading by American citizens?

Mr. WHEELER. Not at all; much of the land that is held by the railroads——

Mr. BILBO. I am not going to discuss the details of it; but as a matter of principle, is that not true?

Mr. WHEELER. I think I know something about the sections of the country where much of the land is located. I know the land, and the Senator does not know it; that is the difference. He has not had an opportunity to know anything about the land.

Mr. BILBO. Yes; I have been out in the West several times.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator has ridden through on a railroad, and it is not possible to see much of the land in that way. The Government now owns a tremendous amount of land in forest reservations that is not subject to taxation and is not subject to homesteading, and is not even subject to mineral location by anyone who wishes to locate mineral lands. In many States, including Montana, Idaho, Colorado, and other Pacific and Mountain States, the Government of the United States has now a great deal of land. The land which the railroads hold is the poorest kind of land, with the exception of some of the forest lands, and if it were turned back to the Government it would not be homesteaded. The only valuable land the railroads have, land that is worth anything at all at the present time, is, generally speaking, timberland, which would not be subject to homesteading.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator happen to know whether there are any coal mines or oil fields on any of this land——

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know of any oil land.

Mr. BILBO. Which the railroads cannot use for their railroad rights-of-way?

Mr. WHEELER. The Union Pacific has some oil lands, but I do not know of any oil lands in Montana or any other State which the railroads now own. As I have stated, they have sold at $2.50 an acre generally all the land that anyone wanted to buy. The remaining lands which they now have, aside from those on which there are forests, no one particularly wanted to buy, because they were generally considered not to be worth $2.50 an acre.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator from Montana means to convey the idea, does he not, that the railroads have sold some particular tracts at $2.50 an acre? He does not mean to say that they have disposed of all the 130,000,000 acres at $2.50 an acre?

Mr. WHEELER. I mean to say that all the dry-farming land which the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. had throughout that section either was sold at $2.50 an acre or the railroad was willing to sell at that figure.

Mr. BILBO. At what time?

Mr. WHEELER. At any time. The Senator from Mississippi can go out there and buy some land now at $2.50 an acre. The railroad would be glad to sell it to him.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the Senator to give me some information. I read the other day that 10 percent of all the land area of the United States had been granted to the railroads. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. WHEELER. Not at all.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure I read it in some official document.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not care where the Senator read it; it is not true.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator spoke of 130,000,000 acres.

Mr. WHEELER. I gave the figures a moment ago.

Mr. AIKEN. I was asking the Senator if the statement I had read was true.

Mr. WHEELER. No; it is not true. I have the figures and will give them to the Senator. Approximately 130,000,000 acres were granted to the railroads.

Mr. AIKEN. And is that land located principally west of the Mississippi?

Mr. WHEELER. I think the bulk of it is west of the Mississippi. Some land was granted in Illinois and some in the South.

Mr. AIKEN. How much land is now held by the railroads?

Mr. WHEELER. The figures can be obtained. I do not have them now at hand.

Mr. AIKEN. Probably someone will answer that question in the course of the debate.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I said it must be remembered that, strictly speaking, only 17,600 miles of railroad out of 230,000 miles are subject to land-grant deduction. However, the situation is affected profoundly by the so-called equalization agreements into which railroads have voluntarily entered and under which a nongrant railroad which is in direct competition with a land-grant railroad has agreed to apply the reduced land-grant rates on such competitive traffic. The reason, of course, is that if that were not done then the Government would have routed all the traffic from Chicago to Seattle over the Northern Pacific, and it could not possibly have handled it. The Milwaukee and the Great Northern, which are not land-grant roads, would practically have been put out of business, and the greatest congestion of railroad traffic that ever occurred in the United States would have resulted.

The agreements do not, however, extend to eastern roads to which land was not granted, and a considerable number of the southern railroads are not bound by the equalization agreements. Such agreements so far as they apply to non-land-grant lines are in effect only when there is from one point to another direct immediate competition with land-grant lines which serve the particular points of origin and destination.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question for information. One of the Members of the Senate told me the other day that in looking over some titles having something to do with reclamation or similar matters, he found that eighty-some percent of all the land in my home State of Iowa had at one time or another come under land grant. I told him that while I am not an authority on the land-grant subject yet because of some historical facts it was difficult for me to believe the statement to be true. I know that there is very little land-grant mileage in my State. He then tried to explain that in the early days of railroad construction there was a very prolific granting of land rights or patents which perhaps were not taken up. Is the Senator familiar with that situation, and can he explain it?

Mr. WHEELER. I am not familiar with it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Perhaps I had better see the individual who made the statement and have him amplify the matter a little more. He made the flat statement that in examining titles he found that some 80 percent of all the land of the State of Iowa at one time had been either subject to railroad grants, which probably never were utilized, or——

Mr. WHEELER. That could not possibly be. On the face of it it seems to me it could not be possible.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is my own reaction that it could not be possible.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. What is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House bill 694.

Mr. OVERTON. Is it a printed bill?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. It is a House bill.

Mr. OVERTON. There is not a copy of it on my desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is on the calendar.

Mr. OVERTON. There is no printed copy of the bill on my desk.

Mr. WHEELER. It is a House bill which has come over to the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Are there no copies available to Senators?

Mr. WHEELER. There should be. I have asked the pages to place copies on every Senator's desk, together with the report of the committee.

As an example of what I called attention to a moment ago, the Northern Pacific is a land-grant road practically all the way from the Twin Cities to the Pacific coast. As a result the transcontinental railroads generally, by reason of the equalization agreements, apply the land-grant rates between Chicago and Mississippi River points on the one hand and the Pacific coast points on the other. However, railroads extending from the Mississippi River to the East are not in direct competition with land-grant roads, and for that reason the land-grant rates do not apply on Government traffic in eastern or official classification territory. If, however, a shipper is located at Denver, Colo., and is selling goods to the Government to be delivered to Chicago, such a shipper has a great advantage over a shipper located at Pittsburgh or Cleveland or New York seeking also to make a contract for the sale of goods to the Government at Chicago.

I might say that that would also apply to the South. If, for instance, a manufacturer residing in proximity to a land-grant road in the West was producing a

given article, an individual in Mississippi producing a similar article was not located on a land-grant road, the individual living on the land-grant road in the West would have a very great advantage over the individual living in Mississippi, who could not compete with the manufacturer who had the benefit of the land-grant rates. I point that out because it shows the result of the inequality of the rates. If a shipper lives on a land-grant road he has preference providing he is selling to the Government of the United States over the individual who lives in a section from which he cannot ship over a land-grant road. That is a discrimination in freight rates which the Interstate Commerce Commission has constantly tried to correct, and that is why the Commission has repeatedly suggested that in order to effect equality of rates throughout the United States it is necessary to repeal the land-grant rates.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would that have the effect of raising rates for civilian shipments on the land-grant roads? In other words, would such roads be compensated by higher rates on other traffic?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know; but it is established, for example, that when the Government is shipping goods from the Mississippi River over a land-grant road to the west coast, and a great deal of the traffic is Government freight, on which the railroad receives such low rates that it cannot make any money, naturally the Interstate Commerce Commission, if it is to do its duty and make it possible for that road to exist, must maintain higher rates on goods which are shipped by private shippers, in order that the railroad may earn an income on its investment. So in that respect the Senator is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Were hearings held before the Senate committee?

Mr. WHEELER. Not at this session. However, hearings were held before the Senate committee at the last session, and long hearings were held in the House committee during the last session of Congress.

Mr. OVERTON. Are copies of those hearings available?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. Copies of both the House hearings and the Senate hearings are available?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should like to get this matter clear. There were only a selected few land-grant railroads.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. But the rate rule, under the law, applies to all the railroads.

Mr. WHEELER. No; it does not apply to all the railroads. The Government does not require non-land-grant rate roads to give the same rate; but the effect is this: Take the Northern Pacific as a concrete example. That is a land-grant road. The Great Northern is not a land-grant road. Neither is the Milwaukee. The three roads run parallel, let us say, from Chicago to Seattle. When Government goods are shipped over the Northern Pacific, that road must grant a 50-percent reduction in rates. The other roads must compete with the Northern Pacific. Otherwise they would not get any of the traffic, and all the traffic would go over the Northern Pacific. If that had been true during the war, the Northern Pacific never would have been able to carry all the freight. There would have been a complete breakdown of transportation. So the railroads agreed among themselves to an equalization fee. However, the Government did not require it.

Mr. BAILEY. I was reading the language on page 3 of the report, which is as follows:

> Section 321 (a) of the Transportation Act of 1940 embodies the general rule that the transportation of persons or property by a common carrier for the United States, or on its behalf, shall be at the full applicable commercial rates.

Mr. WHEELER. That is with reference to nonmilitary traffic.

Mr. BAILEY. I read further from the report:

> This general rule is subject to the following exceptions:
>
> (1) It is provided "that the foregoing provision shall not apply to the transportation of military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use, or to the transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States (or for property of such members) when such members are traveling on official duty;"

That seems to me to be applicable, without exception, to railroads throughout the country.

Mr. WHEELER. No. That is applicable only to the land-grant roads.

Mr. BAILEY. I have not read the law in the book, but I am reading the law as cited in the report.

Mr. WHEELER. That was cited as an amendment to a certain section of the law, applying to land-grant roads.

Mr. BAILEY. If I am misled, I am misled by the report. The subtitle on page 3 over the language which I have just read is "Present Law and Proposed Change." There is no statement that any roads are excepted. It seems to be a general rule as to common carriers for the United States. If I am mistaken in that regard, it is the report which has misled me.

Mr. WHEELER. I cannot conceive of the report making such a statement. The report says:

> Section 321 (a) of the Transportation Act of 1940 embodies the general rule—

Which is correct—

> that the transportation of persons or property by a common carrier for the United States, or on its behalf, shall be at the full applicable commercial rates. This general rule is subject to the following exceptions:

The report does not speak of land-grant roads. The Senator is correct in assuming that there is a mistake in the report.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me make a request of the Senator in charge of the bill. My mind is not made up with regard to this proposed legislation. I am studying it. I should like to have a fair statement of the law on the whole subject. It is proposed to change the law. The Senator agrees that the report is calculated at least to create a fog, if not actually to mislead.

Mr. WHEELER. I have been trying to make a fair statement with reference to the law.

Mr. BAILEY. Let us see if we can have a fair statement of the law. Let us take an example which is local to my own experience, so that I can understand it. Take the Seaboard Air Line, for example, which runs through North Carolina, and south from that State. I do not think it ever had any land grant. I feel sure it did not. The land grants relate to western roads.

Mr. WHEELER. Not entirely. Some of the southern roads had land grants.

Mr. BAILEY. Let us assume that the Seaboard Air Line never had any land grant. I happen to know something of its history, because I live on that railroad. Assume that the Seaboard Air Line never had a land grant, or that the Atlantic Coast Line never had a land grant. Are they not, as a matter of fact, under the general transportation law?

Mr. WHEELER. They are under the general transportation law; but if they are not land-grant roads, the government does not exact and cannot exact from them the 50-percent reduction in rates.

Mr. BAILEY. But do they not yield to the Government demand to charge only 50 percent?

Mr. WHEELER. No; that is not true.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not questioning the correctness of the Senator's statement. However, representatives of at least one of the railroads have made statements to the contrary. So I should like to have the question cleared up.

Mr. WHEELER. If railroad representatives made the statement that roads which are not land-grant roads are subject to land-grant rates, they are entirely mistaken, because that is not true.

Mr. BAILEY. The point is that they are subject to the 50-percent deduction on military and naval articles.

Mr. WHEELER. No; not unless they have to compete. There are some roads in the South which have land grants. I do not know which roads they are.

Mr. BAILEY. Let us get to the point. Take, for example, the Atlantic Coast Line. It runs from Washington through eastern North Carolina and down to Florida. Does the Senator mean to tell me that the Atlantic Coast Line, carrying soldiers or military or naval matériel, as we call it, from Richmond to Miami, for example, or to Fort Bragg in North Carolina, charge the full rates?

Mr. WHEELER. No. First, let me say that the railroads which are not land-grant roads, as distinguished from the land-grant roads, carry soldiers at a lower rate than that at which they carry the general public. But that is not because of the land-grant provision. I cannot give the Senator the specific details because I do not remember all the land-grant roads. There are some roads in the South which have had land grants. As a result, when traffic is shipped to certain points over one of the southern roads

such as the Atlantic Coast Line, because of the fact that the traffic could be shipped at the land-grant rate on some other road, no matter how circuitous the route might be, the Atlantic Coast Line, if it wishes to get any of that traffic, must give the Government the land-grant rate. That is probably what the Senator's informant has in mind, and the reason is that the railroad has to give the land-grant rates in order to get the business because some other railroad in that section of the country is subject to the land-grant provision.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me ask a question with a view to concluding. The Senator has been telling me that there are railroads which are absolutely free from this obligation.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to understand the distinction, because I say to the Senator that what I am thinking about is the matter of the contract. If the Federal Government made a contract with certain railroads, I should be very strongly inclined to maintain the contract. If the contract lies in the land grant, that is one question. If it lies by way of the right of the Government to receive a reduced rate, that is another question. But I wish to make a separation as between the sources of the rule of law that the United States Government pays only 50 percent of the ordinary freight rate on naval and military material. If that applies to the land-grant railroads, there was a consideration. But if it applies to a railroad which received no land grant, where is the consideration?

Mr. WHEELER. It does apply to the land-grant railroads. Consider the Northern Pacific Railroad. It is a land-grant railroad, and it is required to give the 50-percent rate. Consider the Great Northern Railroad or the Milwaukee Railroad. They are not land-grant railroads. The Government business has, let us say, amounted to probably 75 percent or, as some persons say, 90 percent of their traffic. In view of the reduced rate, the Government would normally ship all its freight over the Northern Pacific Railroad. The Northern Pacific Railroad could not possibly handle all of it; there would have been a complete break-down if an attempt to have it handle all the Government freight had been made. So the Great Northern Railroad, in order to get some of that Government traffic and in order to compete with the Northern Pacific Railroad, has to give the Government the same rate as that given by the Northern Pacific Railroad.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand that; it is a matter of competition. But I am concerned with the law. From the Senator's statement, it appears that the law is not accurately applied. But the general rule, as provided in the Transportation Act of 1940, declares that a common carrier of the United States—and that would include trucks because a truck is a common carrier——

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. I should think it would include steamboats and barges. They are common carriers, and the rule certainly should be universal in its application.

The argument here is based on the making of land grants. I wish to get into the universal aspect of the matter.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will permit, I should like to suggest to the Senator from North Carolina that to some extent truck operators do equalize the land-grant rates.

Mr. WHEELER. They do. They have to, if the trucks are to get some of the business.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the whole point seems to be that it is a voluntary act, let us say, by the Atlantic Coast Line, in the South, although it never had a land grant. But it is in the nature of a contractual obligation, not a voluntary action, on the part of a land-grant railroad, and the Senator from Montana just now brought out the point that one of the western railroads—the Great Northern—is not a land-grant railroad.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. But it is in a competitive situation. I should say that a steamboat line running from Raleigh, N. C., along the coast down to Miami is in too remote a location to compete with the land-grant railroads.

Mr. WHEELER. I know definitely that there are in the South some land-grant railroads which apply the land-grant rates. I cannot give the Senator a particular illustration at the present time; but we shall say, for purposer of illustrating the point, that there is a short-line railroad which received a land grant in that section of the country.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to have the Senator explain how a railroad in the South could receive a land grant. For many years there were no lands there which belonged to the United States Government, although the United States has purchased great quantities of land in that area since the days when it made the land grants.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know how the railroads got it, but in the South there are some short lines that are land-grant railroads. I shall get the information for the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to know about the railroads in North Carolina. The United States Government never had any land in North Carolina, except what it purchased recently.

Mr. WHEELER. It does not make a particle of difference whether the railroad is in North Carolina or whether it is in some one of the neighboring States.

Mr. BAILEY. Of course that is so. I say the same thing about Virginia. Virginia is not a public-land State.

Mr. WHEELER. But we do not need to refer only to North Carolina and Virginia. Suppose such a railroad exists in some one of the States farther west, which ships traffic through the Southern States. If the Government was shipping traffic through that section of the country and there was a land-grant railroad, the Government would be forced to ship its freight that way, over that circuitous route, rather than to ship it along the straight line, and that would force the Seaboard Airline, for instance, to take a lower rate because of the other, circuitous route, no matter how far it might be.

Mr. BAILEY. I can understand that. But as I read the law, it is not a matter of being forced by way of a cheaper rate, but it is a matter of being forced by virtue of the law.

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Montana, I should like to refer the Senator from North Carolina first to the transcontinental railroads and then to the railroads of the Southeast, from which area the Senator from North Carolina comes. There are seven transcontinental railroads. The Great Northern, the Milwaukee, the Denver, Rio Grande, and Western Pacific, and the Central Pacific and Union Pacific are not land-grant routes. The Northern Pacific, the Santa Fe, and the Southern Pacific line through El Paso are land-grant routes. With the great burden of traffic which has been moved for the Government because of wartime conditions, it would have been utterly impossible for the three land-grant railroads—the Southern Pacific, the Santa Fe, and the Northern Pacific—to have moved all the traffic. So not only was there a question of competition but there was a question of war necessity. It was necessary to use all the railroad facilities in order to move the traffic.

After the Senator from Montana concludes his remarks, I intend to discuss the matter in my own time. But the Senator from North Carolina raised a very interesting point, and, with the permission of the Senator from Montana, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to a specific instance occurring in his own section of the United States. In one instance involving a shipment which actually moved over a single line from Sheffield, Ala., to Corinth, Miss., a distance of only 54 miles, the Government insisted upon land-grant deductions based on a roundabout route 484 miles in length and involving numerous lines of railroads. That is what the railroads call equalizing.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me propound a question to the Senator. If the argument for the proposed legislation is based on the land grants, that is to say, the fact that we gave the railroads certain lands and the railroads have paid us back by means of reduced rates—a good argument—if that argument is sound, and if there are in America railroads which have been giving the Government such reduced rates, although they never received any land grants, then the argument is equally sound that the Government should make an appropriation for those railroads, because they have been paid nothing; they received no land.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall speak when the Senator from North Carolina has concluded.

Mr. BAILEY. The trouble is that I am working along nontraffic considerations.

Mr. REED. Of course, Mr. President, the number of railroads which have received no land grants is much greater

than the number of railroads which have received land grants.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the Senator follow me, then, when I say that if the proposed legislation is based on repayment by means of reduced rates for the public lands taken by the railroads, now they are all paid for and we are going back to the normal rates, on the ground that those railroads were paying for the land we gave them? However, as the Senator said, there are many railroads which did not receive any land, and therefore they have been making reduced rates with no consideration. If we intend to be fair in the matter we should say to the railroads which received land grants, "Now the account is balanced," and we should say to the railroads which received no land grants, "We shall make you an appropriation in order to repay you for allowances you made us, although you were not obligated to do so."

I wish to know about the difference.

Mr. REED. The Senator is discussing another angle of the subject. When I take the floor I shall discuss the subject from the standpoint of the shippers as well as the railroads. I believe that every shipping organization in the United States, of any standing whatever, is in favor of the passage of the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand that non-land-grant railroads give a reduction because of the competitive situation. The Senator gave an illustration of a 50-mile shipment.

Mr. REED. Yes.

(At this point Mr. WHEELER yielded to Mr. TYDINGS, at whose request Senate bill 1281 was considered and passed. The proceedings in connection with the bill appear at the conclusion of Mr. WHEELER'S speech.)

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, as the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has stated, every shipping organization in this country of which I know anything about has petitioned the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives to repeal the land-grant rates. I have received letters from persons in Montana, my own State. I have also received letters from every shipping organization throughout the country requesting repeal. Moreover, the railroad brotherhoods have urged repeal. I do not know of any individual or organization who is opposed to the repeal except some persons in the Government service in Washington.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator has enumerated the persons and organizations who are supporting this measure, as set forth on page 13 of the committee report.

Mr. WHEELER. I intended to invite attention to them later on. I shall be glad to have the Senator read them into the RECORD at this time, however.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on page 13 of the Senate report, which includes a portion of the report of the House committee, is language which I think is pertinent and should be brought to the direct attention of Senators. It is as follows:

It is thus easy to understand the virtually unanimous support which this bill has from regulatory bodies and various organizations representing the farmers and the principal shippers located throughout the country. Among those urging its enactment, in addition to the railroads and innumerable individuals and industrial concerns, are the Interstate Commerce Commission; the Office of Defense Transportation; the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners; the Mountain-Pacific States Conference of Public Service Commissions; various individual State regulatory commissions; numerous farm organizations; the National Industrial Traffic League; the National Association of Shippers' Advisory Boards; the United States Chamber of Commerce and chambers of commerce and traffic associations of numerous cities and States; the 21 national railway labor organizations; the American Short Line Railroad Association; the National Trucking Association; and the Freight Forwarders Institute.

That is a formidable list in support of any legislation.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator very much. As a matter of fact, with few exceptions I know of no organization and no group of persons in the United States who are in opposition to the pending bill. On the contrary, they advocate its passage. The exceptions, as I have said, are certain persons in Government service in Washington.

Mr. President, the demand for repeal of the land-grant statute is not new. In addition to the desire of the shipper to have the land-grant statute repealed, the Interstate Commerce Commission has always favored repeal in the interest of an orderly transportation system.

There has been numerous hearings by the Senate and House Committees on Interstate Commerce, and many favorable reports by these committees have from time to time been issued. One hearing was held by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the third session of the Seventy-fifth Congress. Those hearings were had on May 31, and June 1 and 2, 1938. The hearings were printed. At that time, there appeared in support of the bill a great number of representatives of manufacturing concerns, mercantile associations, and traffic organizations, in urging the repeal of the land-grant rates.

Another hearing was had before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce at the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Those hearings were had on June 5, 1939. The matter was fully discussed by transportation companies and by shippers in connection with the extended hearings which were held while the Transportation Act of 1940 was under consideration both by the Senate and House committees.

As a result of these hearings and the action of Congress, section 321 was adopted limiting the application of the rates to military and naval property, as has been heretofore stated.

Not long after the effective date of the 1940 act the country began its intensive preparation for war, and the United States became a party to the world conflict shortly after Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941. Thereupon the movement of military traffic greatly increased, and the interest of the shippers in the matter was quickened immensely by reason of the volume and importance of Government shipments of military material.

In the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress Chairman LEA, of the House committee, introduced a bill precisely in the form of the pending bill as it reached the Senate. Hearings were had on this measure by the House committee on February 19 and 20, 1942. That hearing was characterized by the appearance in favor of the bill of Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, then Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, and a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Mr. Eastman strongly advocated the repeal as a matter of war policy. Mr. Eastman's function at that time was limited to the furtherance of the war effort.

Testimony was also offered at that time in favor of the bill by Hon. Charles D. Mahaffie, representing the Interstate Commerce Commission; by the secretary of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners; by the general solicitor of this national association; by the chairman of the legislative committee of the National Industrial Traffic League, a national association of shippers; by the Director of Rates of the Office of Defense Transportation; by the manager of the transportation and communication department of the United States Chamber of Commerce; by the National Association of Shippers Advisory Boards; by the American Trucking Association; by the railroad labor unions; and by a large number of freight bureaus and chambers of commerce throughout the country. The bill was favorably reported by the House committee, but failed to pass the House at that session.

In the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress the same bill was introduced by Representative BOREN, of Oklahoma, as H. R. 4184, and elaborate hearings were had on it on March 16, 18, 21, 22, and 23, 1944. These printed hearings are available. At that time, Mr. Eastman had passed away, but his 1942 testimony was introduced, and this was supplemented by evidence in favor of the bill by Commissioner Mahaffie; the national representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; the president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Mr. Robertson; the executive secretary of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, Mr. Luhrsen; the general solicitor of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners; the manager of the Transportation and Communication Department of the United States Chamber of Commerce; the general counsel of the American Trucking Association; the executive secretary of the Freight Forwarders Institute; the assistant grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Mr. Corbett; as well as representatives of the Association of American Railroads and the American Short Line Railroad Association. Resolutions and statements were also presented on behalf of the New York Board of Trade, the Transportation Bureau of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, the Montana Railroad and Public Service Commission, the Chicago Association of Commerce, the Indiana

State Chamber of Commerce, the National Industrial Traffic League, the National Association of Shippers Advisory Boards and many other shippers' organizations and representatives. The repeal was also endorsed by the Board of Investigation and Research.

Opposition was expressed by the War Department on the ground of expense to the war effort, and by the Director of the Budget for essentially the same reasons as those expressed by the War Department. Both the War Department and the Director of the Budget laid emphasis upon the heavy cost of the war effort and opposed any change at that time. To quote the Secretary of War:

> It is realized also that, from the standpoint of the total national economy, substantial grounds may be urged in support of the bill, but it seems highly doubtful that such grounds can be regarded as compelling during the present period of increased revenues accruing to the carriers.

At that particular time I opposed the legislation in the committee, and voted against it. The committee voted to report it, but it was held up on the floor of the Senate largely at my instigation.

I read further from the Secretary of War:

> In view of the increased costs which the bill would entail, the War Department does not feel that it can recommend its passage. If, however, the Congress should feel that some legislation along the lines proposed is desirable at this time, it is suggested that consideration be given to the addition of a proviso which would preserve land-grant rates for the duration of the present state of war.

That is exactly what this bill does. The letter was signed by Secretary Stimson.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill in the previous Congress provided, did it not, that the land-grant rates would apply during the present war?

Mr. WHEELER. It provided that they would not apply. The bill before the Senate at the last session, which was reported by the committee over my objection, proposed to repeal the law during the war. I opposed it at that time. But the pending bill provides that the law shall not go into effect until 90 days after the cessation of hostilities, as proclaimed by the President of the United States, or by concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then the objections of the Secretary of War and the Director of the Budget would not apply, because it was not costing the Government any money during the present war emergency?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

The bill was approved by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in an exhaustive report bearing date May 2, 1944, in which the whole matter is fully reviewed under the headings: "Object of the bill," "Present law and proposed change," "History of land-grant legislation," "The equities of the situation." "Effect on other carriers," "Added clerical work," "Uncertainties of accounting and taxation," "Discriminations among shippers," and so forth.

The bill was amended by the House committee, however, so as to include the significant provision which is now section 3 of the bill, which provides:

> SEC. 3. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable rates, fares, and charges, shall give due consideration to the increased revenues which carriers will receive as a result of the enactment of this act, so that such increased revenues will be reflected in appropriate readjustments in rates, fares, and charges to shippers.

The bill reached the House and was debated and considered on May 23, 1944. There was an extended argument, and as a result the House passed the bill, without a roll call but upon a division, by a vote of 236 "ayes" to 16 "noes." This vote resulted after certain amendments had been rejected in the Committee of the Whole.

After the passage of the bill by the House, hearings were had by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, these hearings being had on June 8, 9, 13, and 14 and August 18 and 19, 1944. The hearings were quite elaborate, and, generally speaking, there appeared before the Senate subcommittee the same witnesses who testified before the House committee. The repeal of the bill was advocated generally by the shipping interests, by railroad labor unions, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, by the Office of Defense Transportation, by State railroad commissioners, and commercial interests throughout the country. It was opposed by the War Department, the Navy Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and other departments of the Government, principally by reason of the fact that it was deemed inadvisable by these departments to repeal the law during the war period.

The subcommittee reported the bill favorably to the full Senate committee and the full committee, in turn, on November 28, 1944, reported the bill favorably, with an amendment not now considered germane. For the most part, the Senate committee adopted the report of the House committee as being a full statement of the matters involved. Due, however, to the lateness in the session, in which the bill reached the Senate no action was taken by this body in 1944.

As I have said, I opposed the bill in the form in which it was at that time, because it was during the war, and I felt the law should not be repealed during the war.

Early in the present session, the bill was reintroduced by Mr. BOREN and was favorably reported by the House committee without further hearings, in a report presented by Mr. BOREN bearing date of March 26, 1945, which report very largely reiterated the elaborate report of the House committee in 1944. The report is numbered 393. This bill H. R. 694 was considered by the House on May 4, 1945, and after an extended debate it was passed, without a roll call, but upon a division, the vote being 176 ayes to 40 noes.

The bill reached the Senate in due course and was reported favorably by the Senate committee on July 28, 1945, in a report by the chairman numbered 552. The bill as reported contained the amendment heretofore stated, fixing the effective date of the repeal. It appears therefore that the bill has been considered over a period of years, has been the subject of exhaustive hearings and numerous reports, and is now before the Senate for final action.

As has been stated, most of the serious objections grew out of the fact that it was considered inexpedient to repeal the land grant laws and thereby increase the expense of the war effort. That objection has, of course, now disappeared.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. During the normal year after the war, what would be the cost to the Government if Congress should pass the bill?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not suppose anyone can estimate that.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wondered if the Senator had any figures on it at all.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has some figures, which he will no doubt present to the Senate later. Frankly, I have not the figures offhand, except in the most general way, and I shall call attention to them later.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. I am coming to that right now.

One important question is as to the probable cost to the Government if the law is repealed now. Of course, no one can state definitely just how much military property will be transported in the future. We do have, however, definite information as to what the deductions amounted to in the prewar period. The most reliable source of information on the subject probably is the report of the Board of Investigation and Research, which was offered in evidence in both the House and Senate hearings. That Board estimated that from the beginning of the land grant era to December 31, 1927, the total deductions amounted to $56,000,000. This extended over a period of about 50 years. As has been stated, the period from January 1, 1928, to December 31, 1940, was a period of extended shipments of civilian material for relief purposes and the Investigation and Research Board calculated that, exclusive of mail, on the movement of troops and property, the deductions in that 12-year period amounted to $85,964,000. Then came the period of preparation for war and actual war, so that, as heretofore stated, including mail and express, up to June 30, 1942, the figure had grown to $340,783,000. The special rates on mail were abolished by the 1940 act.

It is a fair assumption, therefore, to say that in the pre-depression period, the deductions amounted to something like a million dollars a year; that in the depression period the deductions ran something like $7,000,000 a year. That was when the Government started shipping. Of course, when the roads were given the land it was never thought that the Government of the United States would go into the shipping of civilian goods. I

am sure that never was in mind. But with the expansion of the Government, and the depression which came along in 1932, when the Government embarked on relief measures, the amount of freight which was shipped by the Government for relief grew enormously and continued until we began to prepare for defense when it increased by leaps and bounds. I have heard it estimated that the Government property which was being shipped ranged all the way from 75 to 90 percent of the amount carried. Perhaps the Senator from Kansas has some figures on that.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana no doubt recalls that the estimate, at the peak of movement on land-grant roads, was that Government property of the value of $20,000,000 was being shipped each month. The land-grant deductions the Government was getting amounted to $240,000,000 a year. That was the measure of the amount of use during the war period. As a matter of fact up to 1940, when the Transportation Act of 1940 was enacted, all Government property moved on the rate basis of the land-grant roads. The Senator will remember that by the Transportation Act of 1940 the law was amended so as to exclude from benefits of the land-grant rates all property except strictly military property. Such legislation as this has only become important because of the war.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. President, it is idle to contend that the repeal of the land-grant statutes would mean any great increase in Government expenses in comparison with the total expenses of the Government. A statement was made on the floor of the Senate recently that $1,000,000,000 was involved in this bill. Of course that is perfectly preposterous. No such figure is involved.

Another matter might be mentioned. The act of 1940 which, as I said a moment ago, the present President of the United States, as a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, was very much interested in having enacted, amended the prior act so as to exempt from the land-grant rates the civilian goods which were being shipped for relief purposes, because it was contended by him and by everyone else who gave the subject thought, that it was never intended in the original act that civilian goods should receive the deduction provided by land-grant rates. So the law was amended without any debate at the time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. As I recall, and I think the Senator from Montana will agree, President Truman, then Senator Truman, was the most active member of the Interstate Commerce Committee in the Senate in advocating an aendment to the law which would restrict the application of land-grant rates to strictly military goods.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true. After the enactment of the act of 1940 and beginning with the extended movement of military material, a dispute arose as to what constituted military and naval property moving for military and naval and not for civilian use. The railroads are contending that property which is essentially civilian in its nature is not subject to land-grant deductions, even though it may have some indirect and remote connection with the war effort. On the contrary, the General Accounting Office and other departments of the Government are inclined to the view that in this classification falls a great quantity of food and building and other material moving under lend-lease arrangements, and in some cases used in the construction of military camps, for vessels assigned to the merchant marine, and the like.

It has been suggested that from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 is involved in these disputed claims. It should be made perfectly clear that the passage of this bill resulting in the repeal of land-grant rates will have no effect whatever upon the controversy as to the proper classification of this material, provided it is moved prior to the effective date of this proposed act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is because of the provision which has been inserted by the committee on page 3:

Provided, however, That any travel or transportation contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. We inserted that language so that if there are any contracts even now outstanding, or any shipments en route, there will be paid on them the rate which was paid at the time the contract was made. I call attention to the fact, furthermore, that the measure does not go into effect until 90 days after the cessation of hostilities. Some have thought that that meant when the fighting in Japan stopped. That is not true, for the bill specifically says:

Ninety days after the date of the cessation of hostilities, * * * as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The language of the bill is:

Ninety days after the date of the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not the same language as that which has been placed in other bills, namely, "90 days after the termination of the war, as declared by the President." This language is "cessation of hostilities," and that occurred about August 30.

Mr. WHEELER. The language is:

Cessation of hostilities * * * as proclaimed by the President.

The President has not declared the cessation of hostilities. I would have no objection to changing that language if there is any question about it in the mind of any Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think this bill is peculiar in its wording because there is some doubt in my mind that the President will ever proclaim such a thing as this language apparently contemplates—that is, that the President will declare that the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan was of a certain date. I think we have taken for granted more or less that when the terms of surrender were signed hostilities ceased in the Japanese war. The wording of the bill would require either the President to act or the Congress to act.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. I feel that that is what should be done. Otherwise a dispute might arise as to the date. So we wrote the specific language into the bill:

The cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Without that language in the bill there would be constant friction and misunderstanding. On the one hand it might be claimed that hostilities had ceased on a certain day and on the other that they had ceased on another day, and so on. Therefore, in order to make it definite we placed in the bill the words:

Cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. There are two or three phases in connection with this particular point. A national emergency was declared before war actually broke out. Sometimes in enacting legislation we refer to a declaration by the President or to a concurrent resolution of the two Houses declaring the emergency to be at an end, or, to refer to the highway measure which we passed earlier today, when the authorization bill was passed last December there was written into it a provision that none of the money should be spent until either the President had found that the emergency had ended or the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution had declared that the emergency had been minimized to such a point that the program could be undertaken. So earlier today the Senate agreed to a House concurrent resolution which was a finding of fact by the two Houses that so far as the highway program is concerned the emergency was over.

I think the Senator from Montana probably intended to put something of that kind in this bill. He put in it language which provided that it shall take effect when the President or the Congress declared that hostilities with Japan had ceased. That does not mean when a treaty of peace has been signed. Perhaps a treaty of peace never will be signed. Nor does it mean when the national emergency is over, because it covers more territory than merely hostilities with Japan.

I am glad the Senator from Michigan brought this matter up. It seems to me, however, that the present language

of the bill is such that the President could very easily make this law effective at any time when in his judgment it was desirable to do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am assuming for the present that this is the only bill which contains this particular language, and it means, as I see it, that if the President should never act to declare the cessation of the particular hostilities in the war with Japan, or if Congress should fail by a concurrent resolution to make such a declaration, the bill would never become effective. So it will be necessary for the President to act, or for Congress to act by concurrent resolution, in order to give this measure effect. On the question as to the termination of war could we not use language which would put this bill in the category of other bills which we have every reason to believe Congress sooner or later will pass?

Mr. WHEELER. If the Congress should adopt a resolution dealing with the termination of the war, or if the President should proclaim the termination of the war, either would make the bill effective.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. Earlier today I suggested, if the Senator from Michigan please, that the provision should read "6 months after the enactment of this act." That would fix a definite date. I found some objection to the present language because after all we are hanging the effectiveness of this law and the termination of the land-grant rates on an event not necessarily related at all to the purpose of the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would rather see the date July 1, 1946, placed in the bill, because it is anticipated that by that date the great percentage of our Army, if not practically all of it, will have been demobilized.

Mr. REED. As the Senator from Montana knows, that would be perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have a great deal of sympathy with fixing a definite date, as the Senator from Michigan has suggested. The matter came up in this way: As I said a moment ago, I opposed the proposed repeal of the legislation during the war. There was powerful agitation for it, as Senators can readily understand from reading the House report. At that time a bill was passed by the House, and was reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate Commerce over my opposition. But I said that, in justice to the shippers of the country and in justice to everyone else, I felt that after the war such legislation ought to be passed. I made the statement at that time that I would agree to support a bill which provided that the land-grant rates should be repealed 90 days after the cessation of hostilities. That is the way it came to be written into the bill. I have no pride of authorship. I am perfectly willing to adopt any suggestion looking to a better statement. I merely wished to make my position clear. At that time no one thought that hostilities would end as quickly as they did.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I believe that the present language of the bill would require the President specifically to declare a cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, because that is the explicit statement contained in the bill. Even the termination of the war would not necessarily put the bill into effect, because of its wording. If we could agree on a specific date, then it would be certain that the railroads and the Government would know what date the law would take effect, and they could act accordingly.

Mr. WHEELER. I think there is much force in what the Senator has said.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator accept an amendment which would set a specific date?

Mr. WHEELER. I myself would be unable to accept it on behalf of the entire committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator from Michigan will submit a proposed amendment, I shall be glad to look into it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall submit the amendment to the Senator later.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, one of our fundamental conceptions with respect to rates and rate-making is that rates shall be just and reasonable and shall be nondiscriminatory and nonpreferential. Has the Senator from Montana discussed the character and extent of the discriminations and preferences which inhere in the present situation?

Mr. WHEELER. I have not gone into that question in detail. I went into it in a general way, showing how the shipper located on a land-grant road who is selling merchandise to the Government has a great advantage over a shipper located an identical distance away from the point to which the goods are shipped, but off a land-grant road. For example, take the case of a shipper located on a land-grant road such as the Northern Pacific Railroad or the Southern Pacific Railroad, as compared with a shipper located on the New York Central, at a point equally distant from Chicago. In selling his goods to the Government, to be delivered in Chicago, the manufacturer located on the land-grant railroad would have a great advantage over the manufacturer located an equal distance from Chicago in the other direction.

Mr. WHITE. I take it the Senator would agree that the present situation results in discriminations and preferences as between communities, as between railroads, as between shippers, and as between American citizens, to an extraordinary degree.

Mr. WHEELER. There can be no question whatsoever about it. There is not the slightest doubt of it.

Frankly, much of the agitation with reference to this question, and many of the statements which have been made, come from those who do not know anything about making railroad rates. The Interstate Commerce Commission and every State commission I know of is in favor of the bill, simply because of the discriminations which have existed. That is the reason why shippers all over the country are in favor of it. The Railroad Brotherhoods are in favor of it. I have heard of no opposition anywhere from anyone except in one or two of the departments. That is the only opposition of which I am aware.

No Senator rises on the floor of the Senate and shouts when we appropriate millions of dollars to build airports. The other day the Senate passed a bill providing for the construction of airports, a competing form of transportation. No one complains when we appropriate millions of dollars every year to deepen and widen channels in our rivers, when the only ones who use the channels and get the benefit of them are the large shippers and a few chambers of commerce. When oil companies, cement companies, lumber companies, and other large shippers make shipments by barge over our inland waterways, most of them handle the traffic in their own barges. They do not pass the savings on to the consuming public, nor do they give them to the producers. They put them in their own pockets. So the Government of the United States subsidizes them.

We have spent billions of dollars for public roads, in order to enable trucks and busses to carry traffic in competition with the railroads. After all, the railroads must pay taxes on their rights-of-way. The man who operates a bus does not pay taxes on the right-of-way. The man who operates a barge on the Mississippi River or the Missouri River, in a widened and deepened channel, does not pay any taxes except on the tug or barge which he owns.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator must not overlook the fact that there is a Federal tax on gasoline.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true.

Mr. BAILEY. The gasoline tax amounts to a sufficient contribution to pay for the use of the highways.

So far as airports are concerned, I voted for the airport construction bill, but I voted for it—and so expressed myself on the floor of the Senate—with the expectation that a tax would be placed on air carriers to discharge that obligation. The Senate cannot alone impose a tax; but I would not spend $375,000,000 by way of a gift to air transportation. I expect the Government to get it all back in taxes on gasoline and taxes on the operations.

Mr. WHEELER. Frankly, I do not think we will ever get it back, either in the form of taxes on gasoline, or taxes on the transportation itself. Nor do we get back the billions of dollars we have spent on public roads. We do not get it back by way of the tax on gasoline used by trucks and busses, because we spent millions of dollars before such a tax was ever imposed. I am not complaining. We had to do it at the time because no private institution could possibly do it.

We had to do it because it meant progress. I supported the legislation with respect to waterways. But when we widen and deepen the channels of rivers, those who get the benefit charge the consuming public the same rates which the railroads charge, and they put the difference in their pockets. That is shown by the testimony before the Interstate Commerce Commission itself.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator has one view and I have another. But I believe the fact is that rates for transportation by water, unless the Interstate Commerce Commission chooses to raise them, are only about one-fifth of the rail rates.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. I am saying that the oil companies and other big shippers get cheaper rates than they could get if they shipped by railroad; but they do not pass the saving on to the consuming public.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator would not say that the water rates are not lower than the rail rates, would he?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, they are lower. They should be lower. But those who get the benefit of the lower rates which are made possible by reason of the fact that the Government widens and deepens the channels, and builds docks and other facilities, do not pass the saving on to the consuming public. They ought to pass it on to the consuming public or give the producers the benefit of it, but that does not happen. They put the money in their own pockets.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know how the Senator stands on the question of the St. Lawrence seaway; but the whole argument in behalf of that project, from the commercial aspect, is that wheat for example, could be shipped from Minnesota and other Western States at much lower rates.

Mr. WHEELER. I have heard that argument. I believe that it could be transported at lower rates; but I do not believe that the farmer in Montana would get any benefit from it.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not sure about that. He might not get the benefit, but the consumer would get the benefit.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not even believe that the consumer would get any benefit from it.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator has just said that the cost of production and transportation can be reduced, and yet the public will not get the benefit of it.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Mr. BAILEY. Is there someone who absorbs the saving?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the Senator say the same thing about the railroads? I do not believe that the railroads are making great profits, although they have done very well lately.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not believe I understand the Senator's question. What I am saying is that when the oil companies ship oil up the Mississippi River, and when the steel companies ship cement down the river, they charge the consuming public as though those commodities were being shipped by rail. There are no "ifs" or "ands" about it. They absorb the saving themselves. If there is any question in the Senator's mind, all he has to do is to read the testimony taken before the Interstate Commerce Commission in certain cases.

Mr. BAILEY. I cannot agree to the Senator's argument. It will not hold water, as a matter of common reason.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator says that it will not hold water. Let me give him an illustration. Gasoline is produced in the State of Montana. But what do we pay for gasoline in Montana? For the gasoline which is produced in Montana we pay the Oklahoma price, plus the freight to Montana, although the gasoline is produced in the State of Montana.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator has cited a single instance——

Mr. WHEELER. That is true not only in Montana, but practically all over the country.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me submit the question as a matter of ordinary reason. If I could ship goods to myself by water at 50 percent less than the rail rate, and get a price based on the rail rate, everyone who could do so would ship by water and make a profit. I do not believe that argument will stand up.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is theorizing as to what ought to take place, but he is not stating what the facts are in that connection.

Mr. BAILEY. Let us examine the question further. The Senator produces some facts to show that the man who ships steel or ore by water charges a price based upon the rail rate. We know that the water rate is far less than the rail rate. There is no such thing as a fixed price so that a man who ships by water will take for his own profit the difference between the water rate and the rail rate.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is simply mistaken, because that is exactly what has happened in many cases, and that has been the testimony of the representative of the Standard Oil Co. of Kentucky before the Interstate Commerce Commission. When he was asked what they did with the difference, he said they put it in their pockets. He was asked if they passed it on to the consumers, and he said, "No."

Mr. BAILEY. Then that would put them in the position of making an exorbitant profit.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am not talking about an exorbitant profit. I am stating the facts according to the testimony before the Interstate Commerce Commission and before the Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to throw a little light on the point which is being made.

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I think the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Montana are talking about two different things. I happen to know that when a price is a delivered price in a certain territory, if the shipper or the seller then ships by water, he puts in his pocket the difference between the rail rate and the water rate.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. But if the price is an f. o. b. price, whether it be f. o. b. New York, f. o. b. Chicago, or f. o. b. any other place, the buyer often has the right to decide whether the shipment shall be made by water or by rail. If it is shipped by water, the buyer receives the difference between the rail rate and the water rate.

So in many cases the Senator from Montana is correct, and that was probably the testimony before the committee.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. But there are other cases in which the Senator from North Carolina is correct, both in practical application and in theory.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand that. But there is a contractual price.

Mr. HAWKES. I have referred to the case of a delivered price.

Mr. BAILEY. But if it is to be uniform, there must be some way by which the other fellow, the third man, can come in and let the public have it. Is the Senator saying that there is such a combination in the United States?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, there is a combination in the United States. Does the Senator from North Carolina think for a moment that the Standard Oil Co. does not fix the price of gasoline? Does the Senator think for a moment that the cement trust does not fix the price of cement, whether it is produced in Montana or in Colorado? Does the Senator think the consumer does not have to pay the price in Colorado, plus the freight to Montana?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator has asked whether I know. I do not know.

Mr. WHEELER. Not only is what I have said true with respect to cement, but it is also true with respect to steel, gasoline, and hundreds of other products.

Mr. BAILEY. Then the Senator from Montana is taking the position that the United States Department of Justice is tolerating the existence of a great many trusts and combines which control prices. I did not think that was so.

Mr. WHEELER. Frankly, Mr. President, I am amazed, that the Senator from North Carolina is so unfamiliar with the practices of many companies. Let me say to him that hearings on those subjects have been held before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate. As a matter of fact, I venture to say that in most instances the steel and cement and oil companies will not even challenge the statement I have made.

Mr. BAILEY. Then I ask the Senator as a public servant why he does not turn that evidence over to the Department of Justice?

Mr. WHEELER. It has been turned over to the Department of Justice. Public hearings were held before the Interstate Commerce Committee. Secretary Ickes himself testified before the committee relative to proposed legislation bearing on the subject, and every department of the Government knows about it.

Mr. BAILEY. But the Government is not supposed to permit the existence of monopolies and trusts.

Mr. WHEELER. Well, Mr. President, the Department of Justice has full knowledge of the situation and of the information. If I took it down to them and

handed it to them on a silver platter, in my judgment, it would not make any difference to them.

Mr. BAILEY. Either they are not responsive to the law or there is some other reason. I am not prepared to indict them. But if what the Senator has said is true, we might get impeachment proceedings brought against the Attorney General.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am amazed that any Member of the Senate would say he is not familiar with the facts I have cited, because they are common knowledge from one end of the country to the other. I cannot conceive that any Member of the Senate who knew anything about the multiple basing point, on the strength of which the steel companies, the cement companies, and others have fixed their prices, was unaware of the situation I have stated. Testimony in that connection has been given before various congressional committees.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I said a moment ago. It should be made perfectly clear that the passage of this bill resulting in the repeal of the land-grant rates will have no effect whatever upon the controversies as to the proper classification of this material, provided it has moved prior to the effective date of the act. These controversies, which were discussed extensively at the hearings, will have to be settled by the courts; and action on the present bill, if favorable, will have no effect whatever upon the question of whether materials that have moved prior to the repeal fall within or without the classification of military or naval property.

It has also been suggested from time to time by a small minority of Members of the House and also by the Department of the Interior that the land still owned by the railroads, approximating 15,000,000 acres, should be returned to the Government if the bill repealing the land-grant rates is enacted. At one time I myself took that position, and I was very much in favor of it; but, upon a further examination, I came to the conclusion that much of the land was bonded by the various railroads and that the situation is such that the railroads would be in an almost impossible position if they were required to turn back the land. Second, there was opposition from the States because of the fact that they did not want the land turned back to the Government of the United States.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator contend that the railroads that own the 16,000,000 acres of land are so impoverished—although today they are, and they have been since the beginning of the war, making more money than ever before in their history—that they are not able to pay off the bonds on the 16,000,000 acres of land and turn the land back to the Federal Government?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, Mr. President, many of the railroads are not able to pay off their bonded indebtedness.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator mean the railroads are not able to pay off their bonded indebtedness on the 16,000,000 acres of land?

Mr. WHEELER. Perhaps they would be able to pay off the indebtedness on the 16,000,000 acres of land. The trouble is that the Senator is referring to their bonded indebtedness on only the 16,000,000 acres of land, but their indebtedness on the 16,000,000 acres of land is interwoven with all the rest of the railroads' property. Probably the railroads could pay off that part of the indebtedness, if it could be segregated.

Mr. BILBO. Very well.

Mr. WHEELER. But the indebtedness on the 16,000,000 acres of land cannot be separated from the indebtedness on the roadbeds and the remainder of the plants which goes to make up the railroads. All of it is interwoven. It is not a situation of having a certain bonded indebtedness based on so many acres of land. The bonded indebtedness is based on all the railroads' property, including the roadbeds and everything else.

Mr. BILBO. If the railroads in question are so precarious in their financial condition or structure, I am sure their bondholders would be glad to negotiate a deal by which they could fix a definite price for the land received under the land grant, so as to let them pay off that part, and continue to hold the roadbeds, the rights-of-way, and the rolling stock. I do not see anything to prevent them from clearing it up.

Mr. WHEELER. In the first place, Mr. President, as I said to the Senator a while ago, not only would it be a very complicated matter, but also I do not know of any State in the Union having lands owned by the railroads which would wish to see them turned back to the Government and removed from the tax rolls.

Mr. BILBO. That is a different question.

Mr. WHEELER. I have made that statement before. I hope I made the point clear to the Senator from Mississippi. Probably it is my fault that I did not do so.

Mr. President, at the present time the record shows that the railroads own about 15,000,000 acres of land. Practically all that land is owned by the Southern Pacific, the Santa Fe, the Northern Pacific, and the Union Pacific. However, the Union Pacific, as has heretofore been stated, is not a land-grant line and is not directly involved in the pending bill. Furthermore, if the land were returned to the Government, it would be taken off the tax rolls—by no means a desirable end. The greater part of the land lies in Western States where the Government already owns vast areas of land.

In the debate in the House of Representatives on May 23, 1944, Mr. Anderson, then a Member of the House from the State of New Mexico, and now Secretary of Agriculture, made the following statement in discussing a proposed amendment, the purpose of which was to require the railroads to return the land:

> Mr. Chairman, I think it is a strange theory under which the gentleman suggests that we should take from one person and not take from those who have already turned back their property. I think it is a strange thing to suggest that one group of people, having received lands under a land-grant contract and having sold that land, should be left absolutely alone, but those who have husbanded those resources and stayed with them over a long period of years, should suddenly find the United States Government reaching out and taking that land away. That does not strike me as justice.
>
> May I suggest to the gentleman that in the particular State I represent, we do not want this land to revert to the Government of the United States, and we have a strong reason for it. More than 70 percent of the public domain in Arizona and more than half the public domain in my State of New Mexico now belongs to the State or Federal Government. We are trying to get land on the tax rolls of our State. A short time ago, some of it went back to the Federal Government. The Department of the Interior took it over and gave it to needy Indians that it felt were entitled to it. But they removed cattlemen who had operated there for a long time. Most responsible citizens in my State opposed it, but there was nothing we could do about it. If returned to the Government, this land passes off the tax rolls of our State and we suffer thereby. I say it is not a good idea to take this land belonging to the railroads and turn it back to the public domain.

Mr. President, let me call attention to the fact that one of the most informative discussions of the effects of the land-grant rates upon shippers is to be found in the general argument of Mr. Anderson, now Secretary of Agriculture, delivered by him when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, at a time when the bill was under consideration by the House in 1944. Mr. Anderson discussed at length the reasons why it was necessary to pass the bill in the interests of the shippers. I hold in my hand two pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing an elaborate discussion by Mr. Anderson of the interest of shippers in the bill.

One of the reasons why shippers are so anxious to have the provision for land-grant rates repealed was dealt with by Mr. Anderson in his very informative address. Not only is there discrimination which is impossible to justify; there is doubt always in the mind of the shipper as to what the rate actually is. This grows out of the peculiarities of the land-grant adjustments. As has been heretofore stated, we have these equalization agreements under which all railroads agree to apply between two points the lowest land-grant rate. Most of the tariffs are what is known as open tariffs. This means that the rates apply over a multiplicity of routes, sometimes amounting to dozens of different routes.

The land-grant rates apply on all mileage which was constructed with the aid of grants of lands. Many of the railroads have fragments or sections of their line which are land grant, and the rest of the line is nonland grant. Most of the American railroads are the result of consolidation of small, original, local lines, some of which were built with the proceeds of the sale of Government lands, and others were not. For that reason the General Accounting Office, when it makes the final audit of railroad bills, using complicated maps, charts, diagrams and what not, figures out what

would be the lowest rate which could possibly apply on Government freight between two points and that rate is applied, regardless of how the traffic actually moves.

This is fairly well illustrated by reference to a diagram which appears on page 47 of the House hearings in March 1944. Reference is there made to an actual movement of freight from Sheffield, Ala. to Corinth, Miss., a distance of 54.3 miles. This was not land-grant mileage. However, the experts in the General Accounting Office, looking at their land-grant maps and consulting the open tariffs, found that in this case they could have shipped the material from Sheffield to Birmingham over non-land-grant mileage, thence by the Alabama Great Southern from Birmingham to Meridian, Miss., most of which is land grant, and from Meridian, Miss., back to Corinth, all land grant, and thereby produced a lower rate than by the direct shipment from Sheffield to Corinth. The distance over the theoretical route was 485 miles, whereas the traffic really moved 54 miles. That seems impossible, but it is a fact.

The record abounds in instances of this kind. No one other than a land-grant expert could possibly determine what the rate would be between two points, if land grant mileage were involved. This has led to the great confusion and uncertainty referred to by Mr. Anderson.

Mr. BAILEY. It was not a fair way by which to do it.

Mr. WHEELER. Nevertheless, that is exactly what was done.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not saying that I will not vote for this bill. But must we vote for the bill in order to overcome the situation to which the Senator refers?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. We can stop that by going down the street——

Mr. WHEELER. That is why the Interstate Commerce Commission and every public utility company in the United States, as well as every shipping organization in the country, have appeared before the committee and asked for the repeal provided for by this bill.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator will agree that the solution of the difficulty would be much easier by the use of some other method than that of passing this bill, will he not?

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. BAILEY. We control the General Accounting Office.

Mr. WHEELER. How can we control it?

Mr. BAILEY. We control it by an act of Congress which the General Accounting Office must obey.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; we have enacted legislation which says, in effect, that a shipment must be sent this way instead of that way.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I think a rule could be framed that would cover the situation.

Mr. WHEELER. We cannot frame a rule which will cover the situation, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has been working on this problem for many years, has not been able to perfect a rule which would be fair and equitable with respect to the shippers throughout the country.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the Senator mean that I could not frame a rule on the basis of the rate for 450 miles?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think the Senator could do so under the present law.

Mr. BAILEY. Well, we can amend the law.

Mr. WHEELER. That is exactly what we are seeking to do.

Mr. BAILEY. What the Senator is seeking to do is to put the railroads back on a civil basis of freight rates and passenger rates. The argument now is that we are doing that because the General Accounting Office is pursuing what, in my judgment, is a bad policy.

Mr. WHEELER. No; that is not the purpose. I am seeking to have the law changed because of the fact that what the General Accounting Office is doing is what they must do under the law as it now exists. There is nothing else for them to do. The present provision of the law must be repealed. Otherwise the General Accounting Office must comply with the law as it has been passed by Congress, and so must the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator is agreeing with me now that the General Accounting Office will have to obey the law. The fault lies with Congress for ever having enacted such a law. However, the law can be changed.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but a law cannot be passed which will satisfactorily apply to one situation only without dealing fairly with other situations as well. The Senator may carry out the idea which he has in mind; but if he does so, he will have a hodge-podge which will be so bad that neither the Interstate Commerce Commission nor any other organization will be able to put into effect fair and reasonable rates for the shippers of this country.

Mr. BAILEY. I was merely trying to suggest that a calculation cannot be made in the General Accounting Office or anywhere else whereby the charge is related to 450 miles when the haul is only 54. A calculation cannot be made on more mileage than the length of the haul.

Mr. WHEELER. The rule which the Senator has in mind would say to the General Accounting Office that, regardless of whether freight could be shipped cheaper by the longer route, it must be given to the carrier which would transport it over the short route, even though it cost more money.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I said that the freight must be shipped over the cheapest route.

Mr. WHEELER. Then the Senator would ship it 450 miles instead of 54 miles.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I was not speaking of the cheapest route in the sense of the cheapest rate.

Mr. WHEELER. If freight had to be shipped according to the lowest rate per mile, what would happen to the freight of this country? If such a rule were adopted, then the Senator would say, for example, to the Northern Pacific Railway that all shipments going west must go over the Great Northern because it is the shortest route, and the Southern Pacific, the Northern Pacific, and the Milwaukee are longer routes. In that event what does the Senator think would happen to the Milwaukee and the Northern Pacific railroads?

Mr. BAILEY. I would require that the shipment should not be sent 450 miles in order to make the calculation to which reference has been made.

Mr. WHEELER. The trouble with the Senator's argument is that he uses the basis of 54 miles, but when he applies the rule he cannot apply it to a particular case or situation. A general rule must be used and applied to all railroads under all circumstances. That is what the Interstate Commerce Commission seeks to do.

We have had before us this question of circuitous routes. I know the Senator thinks it is a very simple problem to work out, and he feels that in his own mind he could work it out with a very simple rule. But let me say that if he will study the subject of railroad rates and the rate-making policy, he will agree with me that it is one of the most intricate of problems. After studying it as long as I have I feel that I do not know very much about it—though I have given much consideration to it I do not think there is anyone else who can stand on the floor of the Senate and say that by some magic or simple rule he can straighten out all the intricacies of the circuitous routes, the long and short haul, and the other problems.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator has carried me pretty far from my base. I started out with a very simple question. Now he says I am thinking I could draw a rule that would straighten out the entire freight structure of America. I agree he cannot do it, and I cannot, either; and he could do it much more readily than I could.

Now I wish to get back to my proposition. The Senator's theory and argument is that we have to repeal the existing law allowing the railroads only 50 percent by way of freight for military transportation, in order to get rid of this little situation. He will not stick to that.

Mr. WHEELER. What I am saying is that if we want equality of rates and fair rates in the United States, as the Interstate Commerce Commission, every shipping organization, and every traffic expert have said are needed, we must repeal the present law. So far as I am personally concerned, I am not interested in the proposed legislation. I have opposed it repeatedly in my committee. I opposed it in 1938, 1940, and 1944. But the bill passed the House of Representatives on two different occasions by an overwhelming majority. I opposed it during the war because I felt it was unfair to put it into effect during the war. But I do say that when all the shippers of the United States, when every single traffic expert in the United States that I know of, and every shipping organization, when the railroad brotherhoods, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has given great study to this problem, when every single organization which deals with it, says it is unfair to the shippers of the country when

we are considering the equalization of rates, I cannot stand here and oppose it.

The Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate, over my objection, reported the bill at the last session with only three votes against it, and this time they voted it out without an objection.

I am not married to this measure or to any other, but, against the repeated resolutions of every traffic organization, of every shipping organization that has ever taken it up, of the railroad and public-utilities commissions in every State, and of the recommendations of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I cannot stand in the Senate, set up my judgment against theirs, and say that the law should not be repealed in the interest of giving fair rates to the shippers of the United States. If the Senator from North Carolina or any other Senator wants to do that, I have no objection; they can do as they please; but I am not going to put up my judgment against that of the experts.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator having confessed he has always opposed such a legislative proposal, he will sympathize with those of us who manifest just a little doubt. The Senator said he was not married to it. He has said he was yielding to the opposition.

Mr. WHEELER. All I am seeking to do is to lay the facts before the Senate, to call attention to the statements which have been made, to the testimony before the committee, and then it will be up to the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Mississippi to do as they please with reference to it.

Mr. BAILEY. I may say to the Senator—and I do not mean to interrupt him any more—that I do not know what conclusion I shall reach about the proposed legislation. I am hoping, however, to act intelligently and honestly about it, and treat the railroads and the public justly. I was making my inquiries today by way of questioning the argument in order to enlighten my own mind. I have gotten some light, but I must say I have a long way to go in this matter before I see the equities in it and see why we should do the thing that is proposed.

What has really troubled me is that while the bill applies to land-grant railroads, the benefit will go to all the railroads, most of which never had any land grants. That is troubling me.

Mr. WHEELER. The great bulk of them never had any.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator's argument relates to the whole freight structure. I believe I shall ask the Senator a question, not exactly on this point, but he does know about the freight structure and freight rates.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know a great deal about them.

Mr. BAILEY. No one knows a great deal, but I give the Senator credit for knowing more about them than anyone else in the Senate. He has been chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce a long time.

There has been a great hurrah in the press during the last 5 or 6 weeks, perhaps 2 months, about how the South had gotten equalized rates. I read in the United States News that, after all, the total reduction related to only 5 percent of the cost of the freight. Will the Senator tell me about that? I should like to know what the truth about it is.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not intend to get into an argument about the southern class rates at this time.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator tell me whether there was such a great victory?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think there was. If that is what the Senator wants to know, I may say that I do not think it was such a great victory by any manner of means. Frankly, I asked the Interstate Commerce Commission recently to investigate rates, not only in my own State, but rates through the Pacific Northwest, including all States. I have thought and now think that the Northwestern States have been discriminated against, just as the South has, and I have supported every legislative proposal aimed not only at correcting rates in the West, but also those in the South. There has been no Southerner who has been any more anxious to help correct the rates in the South than has the Senator from Montana whenever that question has come before the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BAILEY. What I wanted to get at was the truth about the matter. I understood from what I read—and this was a digest of the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission—that the reduction applied to only a very small percentage of the freight, as I recall, to 2 percent.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct—a very small percentage.

Mr. BAILEY. And that the great field of commodity rates was not affected at all. Is that correct?

Mr. WHEELER. I think the great field of commodity rates has not been affected. I do not intend to go into the reasons for that because it is a very complicated subject, and only one who is an expert on rates could give correct information, and I am far from being an expert on rates. I make no such claim. I know very little about rates; not only that, but there are a great many who claim to be experts who do not know much about the subject. It is a very complicated matter.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the public has been led to believe, from one motive or another, that there was a great alteration. The Senator is saying that the change related only to the class rates and was a very small percentage of the whole field of rates. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. WHEELER. I have said so repeatedly.

Mr. President, it must not be inferred from what has been said before that the discrimination between shippers is limited to shippers in eastern territory competing with shippers in western territory. The same unreasonable discrimination arises all over the country.

One illustration mentioned in the testimony relates to the shipment of freight from Birmingham, Ala., to Jacksonville, Fla., in comparison with the shipment of the same freight from Clinchfield, Ga., to Jacksonville, Fla. Birmingham is 628 miles from Jacksonville and Clinchfield, Ga., is 271 miles from Jacksonville. Ordinarily, distance being a factor in rate making, the rate would be much lower from Clinchfield to Jacksonville than from Birmingham to Jacksonville.

As a matter of fact, the commercial rate on cement from Clinchfield to Jacksonville is 16 cents and the rate from Birmingham to Jacksonville is 22 cents. Cement is produced at both Birmingham and Clinchfield. However, it so happens that in shipping from Birmingham to Jacksonville a great deal of land-grant mileage is used, while there is considerably less land-grant mileage available between Clinchfield and Jacksonville. By reason of this fact, the Government rate for the 628 miles is 11 cents, while the Government rate from Clinchfield, 271 miles, is 12.72 cents. In other words, while ordinarily the Clinchfield man, by reason of his location, has a rate advantage of 6 cents over Birmingham by using the land-grant mileage, he is at a disadvantage on Government material of 1¾ cents. Situations of this kind are to be found all over the country.

So, as I have said, the whole country is permeated with similar situations. When the Government is a large purchaser it is impossible for the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates which apply equally, or give the individual whose goods must be hauled a shorter distance the advantage which his location should give to him.

It was stated earlier that the situation does not apply to many of the States in the South. But there are pieces of railroad throughout the South which are land-grant roads. They exist in Georgia, in Alabama, and are scattered through various States in the South. How they came to be land-grant roads, I do not know, but the fact is they are.

I conclude by saying that no measure involving any controversial features has been presented to Congress recently which has been so overwhelmingly endorsed by the shippers of the country as has this bill. No controversial measure has been presented to the Congress of the United States which has been backed by such an overwhelming majority of the railroad workers. Every single one of their organizations has endorsed the measure. The Interstate Commerce Commission has for years urged the enactment of such a measure. So has every organization of shippers throughout the country. Not only that, but every railroad commission in the United States, so far as I know, has recommended the passage of this bill. Their representatives and lawyers appeared before the committee time and again recommending the enactment of the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD one of the ablest statements made on this subject. It was a statement made by former Representative Anderson of New Mexico on the floor of the House. He is now Secretary of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I shall discuss only a single feature of this bill, but that is a feature of paramount importance—one which, in my opinion, is sufficient, standing alone, to guide our action and determine our judgment.

I refer to the effect of the bill upon private shippers—all shippers except the Federal Government—located in every State and every county of this country.

So far as private shippers are concerned, an intolerable situation of injustice and discrimination has grown up and is being kept alive as a result of land-grant rates. It can be eliminated only by eliminating all such rates, and that is what this bill would do.

Before land-grant rates were understood as well as they are today, it was the general impression that such rates were a matter of concern only to the railroads and the Government. It was thought that there was involved no question of public interest, except insofar as the public interest requires the Government to deal fairly with all its citizens, including those who operate the railroads and those who are employed by the railroads.

But it has now become clear that this view of the problem presented by land-grant rates was much too narrow. It overlooked completely fundamental principles which must govern a sound national transportation policy. It has become clear that our entire philosophy and scheme of railroad-rate regulation, designed chiefly for the purpose of protecting shippers, is endangered and impaired by rates of this character.

Shippers from every section of the United States, without important exception so far as I can learn, are urging the enactment of the measure we have under consideration. The record of hearings leaves no doubt about the position of these shippers, or about their deep dissatisfaction with existing conditions. This is a significant fact which should challenge and arrest our contention.

And we are confronted with another and related fact which is equally significant. The Interstate Commerce Commission and the State commissions throughout the country are unanimous in their support of the bill. These commissions are the duly authorized governmental agencies charged with the responsibility of prescribing and maintaining a reasonable and nondiscriminatory railroad rate structure—a rate structure which provides fair opportunities for all shippers and special favors for none.

It would seem to be reasonably obvious that the private shippers and the Federal and State regulatory bodies would not be concerned, as they are concerned about this bill, if the only question involved were one between the railroads and the Federal Government. It is plain enough that private shippers, and Government authorities having control over railroad rates, would not be deeply interested in doing away with land-grant rates—and the record of hearings shows how deeply interested they are—unless rates of this character resulted in conditions directly and immediately injurious to shippers and widespread and far reaching in their adverse effects.

Since land-grant rates are available only to the Federal Government, and since the Government is ordinarily not in competition with private enterprise, it might appear at first glance that these rates could have no impact upon private shippers or upon competitive relationships between private shippers.

But nothing could be further from the truth. After examination and analysis of the practical conditions brought about by rates of this kind, there is no difficulty in readily understanding why "land-grant rates are practically friendless among the shippers" or in understanding why, I quote again, "land-grant rates have been a matter of grave concern to shippers for many years," and that ends the second quotation. The language I have just quoted is that of a witness who appeared at the hearings, Mr. John B. Keeler, president, National Industrial Traffic League, who spoke for great numbers of shippers in every part of the United States.

At the outset, let me summarize in a few words the objections of private shippers to land-grant rates. Later I shall seek to illustrate these objections by actual concrete cases so far as time permits.

In the first place, land-grant rates deprive shippers of fair and equal opportunities to bid on Government contracts for materials.

In the second place, land-grant rates result in the payment by the Federal Government, as a shipper, of less than its fair share of the cost of providing and maintaining railroad transportation, and, therefore, place the burden upon the general shipping public, including all farmers and all commercial shippers, of contributing more than its just share. In short, private shippers are forced to pay a part of the cost of transportation for the Federal Government.

Coming back to the first objection of the private shippers—that is, the injustice caused by land-grant rates to producers who bid or desire to bid for Government contracts. A purchaser of goods, whether it be a private interest or the Government, determines from whom it will buy on the basis of the delivered cost of the goods, other things being equal. One of the factors entering into the delivered cost is, of course, the cost of transportation.

When competing producers located at different points wish to bid on goods to be bought by a private interest, the transportation cost is calculated upon the basis of just and nondiscriminatory rates for the services performed—rates fixed or subject to being fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission or a State commission. Moreover, the transportation rate which each competitor for private business must pay is known to him and to every other competitor—in fact, it is openly published and known to the general public. For more than half a century this has been fundamental in our system of railroad regulation.

Under the conditions I have described with respect to sales to private concerns, every producer, in making his bid, takes into account a transportation cost for his product which properly reflects the transportation service he will receive and takes into account a transportation cost for his competitor's product which properly reflects the transportation service it will receive. As I have said, each bidder knows exactly what his transportation cost will be and what his competitor's costs will be. Accordingly, he is able to bid intelligently, and the natural advantage or disadvantage of his location is reflected in the amount of his bid.

Contrast this situation involving sales to private interests with that which prevails, because of land-grant rates, when the Federal Government is the purchaser. The Government accepts or rejects bids, generally speaking, as do private interests, on the basis of delivered cost. In determining the delivered cost, it takes into account the transportation rate from point of shipment to point of delivery, which means the lowest land-grant rate, if land-grant rates are available.

The bidder does not know—he can only estimate or guess—what land-grant rate will be used in evaluating his bid. Furthermore, he is almost completely in the dark with respect to the land-grant rates which will be used in evaluating the bids of his competitors located at other producing points. The difficulties of his position need no elaboration.

At this time perhaps I should point out briefly why land-grant rates are, in large degree, secret rates, so far as the bidders on Government contracts are concerned.

The land-grant rate applicable to a railroad route made up wholly of land-grant mileage is 50 percent of the commercial rate. If a railroad route is made up of both land-grant mileage and mileage in connection with which there was no land grant, then the through land-grant rate represents 50 percent of that part of the commercial rate applicable to the land-grant mileage and 100 percent of that part of the commercial rate applicable to the non-land-grant mileage.

Thus, the greater the proportion of land-grant mileage contained in a railroad route, the lower the land-grant rate in comparison with the commercial rate. Between any point of shipment and any point of destination, there are generally innumerable routes, running in many cases into the hundreds. It is necessary to check every possible route, no matter how long or fantastic it may be, and to determine the proportion of land-grant mileage contained therein, before the applicable land-grant rate can be ascertained. The record of committee hearings contains reference to a shipment from Corinth, Miss., to Sheffield, Ala. The route of actual movement was 54 miles in length, including no land-grant mileage, but the land-grant rate was calculated on the basis of a theoretically possible route, 485 miles in length, which included a large amount of land-grant mileage.

After the land-grant rate has been ascertained, in the manner described, it becomes applicable over all routes between origin and destination, as a result of equalization agreements. The determination of land-grant rates is a strange and wonderful process which, as a rule, is far beyond the powers or possibilities of private shippers or producers.

The result, as has already been stated, is that the bidder on Government contracts must, to a very large extent, bid blindly in those cases where land-grant rates are involved.

But blind bidding is by no means the only evil which a bidder for Government business must face because of land-grant rates. This brings me again to the unwarranted discrimination between bidders for Government business which is an unavoidable result of land-grant rates. Such discrimination is entirely without economic justification. It arises from the purely adventitious circumstance that the land-grant mileage available from one producing point to a given market is greater than that available from a competing producing point. It gives one producer an artificial advantage and deprives another of a natural advantage.

For the purpose of ready understanding, I shall consider an actual, concrete example, arising in my own neighborhood and included in the record of the hearings along with a great many similar examples.

Iron and steel is produced at Chicago, Ill., and also at Minnequa, Colo., just outside of Pueblo. Portland, Oreg., is a market for these products. From Chicago to Portland, the distance is 2,169 miles, while from Minnequa or Pueblo, in the district adjoining mine and so ably represented here by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], to Portland, the distance is only 1,306 miles. Quite naturally, the commercial rate from Chicago to Portland is considerably higher than from Minnequa to Portland—$1.10 as compared with 85 cents. It follows that, as to ordinary commercial business, the Minnequa producer has, due to his location, an advantage of 25 cents in transportation costs in the Portland market.

But what is the situation on iron and steel purchased by the Government for delivery at Portland? The land-grant rate from Chicago is only 56 cents, while the land-grant rate from Minnequa is 62.8 cents, or about 7 cents higher. Therefore, on Government business, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., at Minnequa, loses its natural advantage of 25 cents and becomes subject to an artificial disadvantage of 7 cents merely because there is more land-grant railroad mileage between Chicago and Portland than between Minnequa and Portland.

I regret I have no time for additional examples—the record is full of them. But the one I have given will serve, I hope, to demonstrate the crippling handicap which

land-grant rates impose upon an unfortunate bidder for Government business, whose plight is due not to any fault of his or to any economic consideration, but solely to an artificial rate condition for which he has no responsibility and over which he has no control.

Before leaving the Chicago-Minnequa-Portland situation, I should call attention to an extremely interesting fact—one of serious import during wartime when the volume of traffic is swollen and the capacity of the railroads necessarily strained. In that situation, the land-grant rate aid the distant-producing point as against the nearby producing point and thus encourage wasteful and uneconomical transportation service.

So much for the unjustifiable discrimination between producers caused by land-grant rates. I shall now revert for a few moments to the other objection to those rates which has been emphasized by the private shippers. This objection may be stated as follows: Subnormal rates for the Government result in a higher level of rates for private shippers than would otherwise be necessary.

Manifestly, the railroads must receive as freight and passenger revenues a sufficient amount of money to keep themselves in financial and physical condition to serve the public efficiently. If a substantial part of the total traffic—and I have in mind that part of the traffic which is transported for the Government—pays less than its just share of the necessary revenues, as a result of land-grant rates, then the remainder of the traffic—that part which is transported for private shippers—must pay more than its just share of the revenues required to support the railroad system.

I see no reason, and I have never heard any advanced, why the Government should cast upon the general shipping public a part of the cost of transportation performed for the Government. It will not be forgotten that this bill expressly directs the Interstate Commerce Commission, in fixing the level of rates and fares for private shippers, to give consideration to the increased revenues which the railroads will receive as a result of the elimination of subnormal land-grant rates. This provision in the bill serves to preclude any possible doubt that the general shipping public will benefit in the long run as a result of the abolition of land-grant rates and the payment by the Government of its fair share of transportation costs.

For reasons I have attempted to explain the interests of the shippers of this country demand that all vestige of land-grant rates be removed as promptly as possible from the rate structure. When such rates are done away with, at the same time and by the same token we shall also do away with the economic crazy quilt, or perhaps I should say the "uneconomic crazy quilt," which has developed in connection with Government purchases. And in addition, we shall remove from the back of private shippers the burden of paying a part of the cost of Government transportation. After all, the transportation charges which the Government escapes because of subnormal land-grant rates are paid instead by the private shippers of this country and must continue to be paid by them so long as such preferential rates are permitted to exist.

We have settled the famous Northern Pacific case. We have arranged to have unpatented lands received in grants returned to the Government. We should now complete the cycle and pass this bill not only to insure the continued solvency of our railroads in the years following the war but to do justice to the shippers of the Nation who now suffer from the jumbled pattern of freight tariffs brought into existence by land-grant rates.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator a question in order that the effective date of the measure might be cleared up. Under the Senator's interpretation when would the measure become effective?

Mr. WHEELER. That matter was discussed a while ago, when the Senator was not present. The discussion took place between the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. My interpretation of the effective date is just what the language says, that it must be 90 days after cessation of hostilities, as declared by the President or by joint resolution adopted by the Congress. The junior Senator from Michigan suggested to me that he thought a definite date should be fixed. He suggested July 1, 1946, as I recall. Some other Senators suggested 6 months after the cessation of hostilities. I called attention to the fact that the reason for placing in the bill the language which is now in it is that when the previous bill was before the committee I opposed it because I felt it was wrong to repeal the land-grant rates during the war. I suggested then that I would not oppose such action if it were proposed after the war, and if the bill contained a provision making it effective 90 days after the cessation of hostilities. I am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, to accept any language fixing a more definite time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought an interpretation should be given by the chairman of the committee, so as to clarify in our minds the effective date of the measure. Let us assume that the President should declare the war to be over as of September 14. That would be the effective date, even though the President made the actual declaration at a later date.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the effective date would be the date on which he made the declaration of cessation of hostilities. Otherwise it would be retroactive, and I doubt if the measure could take effect on a retroactive date. However, as I have said, that may be a matter to consider. It is entirely possible that a specific date, such as 6 months from now, or some other date, should be inserted in place of the language now in the bill. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] suggested to me that he was going to offer an amendment on the subject. I asked him not to do so until he had submitted it to me.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

FUNDS FOR THE PHILIPPINE GOVERNMENT

During the delivery of Mr. WHEELER's speech,

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator from Montana will indulge me for a moment in order to make a short statement.

As Senators all know, the government of the Philippine Islands has had no revenue for 3 or 4 years. It is completely without its usual funds and has very little money with which to meet its expenses. Representatives of the Philippine government are in Washington asking for a loan from our Government in order to tide them over. However, on examination it has been found that approximately $70,000,000 which our Government has collected as trustee for the Philippine Islands, is now in our Treasury. Under the law it will automatically be turned over to the Philippine government on July 4, 1946. It therefore seems to be somewhat unbusiness like for them to come and ask for money when they have money of their own, but which is in the Treasury of the United States.

The Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs has unanimously reported to the Senate Calendar No. 594, Senate bill 1281, which would enable the Philippine government to avail itself of the money which is now in our Treasury. Both the Treasury Department and the Interior Department are in favor of the bill, and I believe I may say that the President of the United States is also in favor of it.

Mr. President, the bill is noncontroversial, and has been reported by the committee unanimously. Due to the extreme exigencies of the case, after having consulted with the majority leader, and the acting minority leader I ask the indulgence of the Senator from Montana to have the bill immediately considered with the understanding that if it causes any debate I shall withdraw it.

Mr. WHEELER. I have no objection if it does not result in any protracted debate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senator proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 594, Senate bill 1281.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCMAHON in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1281) to provide for covering into the treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I have just entered the Chamber. I did not hear the request of the Senator from Maryland. Was it for the consideration of a bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. I tried to find the Senator from Maine, but he was not present in the Chamber. I would have tried at a subsequent time to obtain consideration of the bill, but there will be held a hearing this afternoon on the St. John College Naval Academy controversy, and I must be present.

Mr. WHITE. Was the bill reported by the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, unanimously.

Mr. WHITE. Did the minority members join in the report?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I inquire if the enactment of the bill will remove the necessity of granting a loan to the Philippines?

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe so, and I hope so.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, what is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. The purpose of the bill is to return to the Philippine Government approximately $70,000,000 of its own money which is now in our Treasury, instead of waiting until the Fourth of July next year.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1281), to provide for covering into the Treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the proceeds of the excise taxes imposed by section 2470 of the Internal Revenue Code, and of the import taxes imposed by sections 2490 and 2491 of the Internal Revenue Code, heretofore or hereafter collected, which but for the enactment of this act would have been required to be held in separate or special funds and paid into the Treasury of the Philippines, together with any moneys which but for the enactment of this act would be authorized to be appropriated in accordance with section 503 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, including the unexpended balance of the amount subsequently appropriated under Public Law 371, Seventy-seventh Congress, and any accruals of any of the foregoing, shall be immediately paid into the general funds of the Treasury of the Philippines, to be used for the benefit of the people and government of the Philippine Islands as they may be law provide.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Montana, and the Senator from Maine.

PLIGHT OF THE JEWS OF EUROPE AND THE PALESTINE PROBLEM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not taking the time of the Senate for the purpose of discussing the pending bill. I had earlier in the day expected to make a statement on a matter of universal interest to all of us here and throughout the country, but unfortunately the Senate got into a parliamentary snarl on account of the morning hour not having been completed, and it was impossible for me to address myself earlier than at this time to the subject upon which I now wish to make a very brief statement. It has reference to the predicament of Jews in Europe, with particular reference to Palestine as a possible home refuge for them.

Mr. President, I have no intention to repeat the horrible things which have been said to have existed and which we know have existed in regard to the treatment of the Jews throughout Europe by Hitler, by the Nazis, and by all those who were associated with them. It has been reliably estimated that more than five million Jews were absolutely exterminated in Europe during the Hitler regime. In the report of the committee which went to Europe to observe the atrocities in the concentration camps we touched upon that subject. There cannot be any dispute about the facts. One of the things which Hitler did his best to carry out was his threat to exterminate the Jewish people, and upon his rise to power he came nearer to accomplishing that threat than any other threat he made.

There are now remaining in Europe probably between one million and a million and a half Jews, most of them homeless, most of them wandering around from place to place, seeking a haven of refuge. I am glad to note that the Army of the United States in its occupation of that area of Germany under its control has materially improved the conditions which they found in that area with respect to the treatment of the Jews. Vast improvements may yet be made, and I hope they will be speedily made. I commend the President of the United States upon the prompt steps which he has taken to bring about the necessary improvement and alleviation in the conditions which were found there, and which were without dispute.

There are two phases of this question: One is the immediate relief and rescue of Jews who under present conditions are homeless, many of them afraid or unwilling to go back to their original homes because they will find no homes there and that their families have all been murdered, and therefore they are in some respects almost as helpless today as they have been at any time within the last 12 or 13 years. That is an immediate problem which faces the world and appeals to the generous humanitarian sentiments of all men and women everywhere.

The other problem is that of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. I shall not now discuss that phase of the Jewish problem except to say that it is a hope and an ambition which has been cherished not only by Jews in Europe who might inhabit such a commonwealth, but I think by a vast majority of the Jewish people all over the world, and that is especially true of those in the United States.

It had been my hope and expectation that when the war ended and the nations should assemble somewhere to write the peace, that the question of an independent Jewish commonwealth might be given the consideration to which it is entitled and that it might be worked out in a way that would be satisfactory to the Jewish people and to the people of Palestine as well as to the people of the world.

Whether there will be an over-all international peace conference such as there was after the last war, I do not know. This war has been so vast and has covered so great a territory, and has involved so many nations that I am informed that serious consideration has been given to the question whether all of them should be assembled in one body in order to try to rewrite the map of the world and remake the nations and the peace. But whether it comes about by an over-all international convention undertaking to deal with the world as a whole, or whether by regional peace conferences such as those which have been provided for under the Potsdam arrangement, it is my belief that serious consideration should be given to the question of establishing an independent homeland in Palestine for the habitation of the Jewish people, and of establishing there a self-governing nation.

But the immediate problem which faces Christendom, as I see it, is that of porviding a refuge and a haven for the displaced, distressed, and distraught people of that great race who even yet are wandering over the fact of Europe looking for homes.

When Lord Balfour pronounced what has come to be known as the Balfour Declaration, it was hailed everywhere in the world as a wise, statesmanlike act on his part. It undoubtedly had the approval of the English people. Time and time again it has been endorsed by the American people. Every President from that day until now, the Congress of the United States, and all branches of our Government endorsed it as a happy augury of peace and accord among not only the Jewish people of the world, but all the people and all the nations with whom they have contact.

More recently the British Government issued what has been called a white paper, limiting the restricting migration into Palestine to 75,000 people. Recently the suggestion has been made that it be modified so as to embrace 100,000 people. That question is now pending not only before the Government of Great Britain, but before the international mind, and before our Nation as a nation. Our Government has expressed itself in terms which cannot be misunderstood with respect to the advisability and justice of either modifying or nullifying entirely the so-called white paper under which Jewish migration into Palestine is restricted.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the delicate international situation which exists everywhere as a result of this war. I have no desire to utter any sentence or any sentiment which would embarrass our Government, and I have no intention of doing so. I do not wish to be understood as in any way undertaking to dictate—if I had the power to do so, which, of course, I have not—to any of the governments involved in this delicate situation. But I express my belief as an American citizen as well as a United States Senator, and as a friend of the great Jewish race which has come down to us from antiquity, which has contributed so much to the civilization of the world, and which has enriched every land where its blood has flowed, that from the standpoint of humanity and justice, from the standpoint of Christianity, the plight of the Jews in Europe cries out now for the pursuit of such a course on the part of those responsible as will permit the Jews to go into Palestine and find homes there free from oppression, free from hunger, free from want, and free from the fear of further pogroms which may be visited upon them. They are entitled to peace and comfort, and to homes.

It is my belief, from the knowledge which I have of that country, that it can absorb many more Jews than are there now. I believe there are now about 600,000 Jews in Palestine. It is estimated by those who are familiar with the situation that it could absorb and support 3,000,000 people. A marvelous work has been done in Palestine in the develop-

ment of that country, through reforestation, irrigation, reclamation, and the building of industries. As a result of the productivity of the people of that section, nearly all the nations of the world, even as far away as India and China, have received implements of warfare produced in Palestine by the work of Jews.

So, Mr. President, I join all those who, here or elsewhere, express the hope that this restrictive measure will be modified, and the unreserved belief that it ought to be modified, regardless of what may ultimately come from the hope for a permanent independent Jewish homeland in Palestine. That question will no doubt have to be settled by international conference, conciliation, and agreement. At the moment there is a great crying need that this place, of all places in the world, shall be reopened as a refuge and home for those who are seeking escape from the intolerable conditions which have been brought about by the cruelty and brutality under the leadership of the Nazi power. I express that fervent wish here on the floor of the United States Senate in the hope that through our cooperation, through our realization of the problem, and through our intense interest in its proper solution, the Christian world will no longer be justly chided for negligence and indifference toward this great human problem of rescue and salvation.

Mr. President, I have no personal or political interest which could be served in any way, shape, or form by the nature of the solution which may come to this problem. But I am a human being, and I feel that I have in my heart humanitarian sentiments. I do not believe that the civilized nations of the world ought longer to be content to see a great race of people hunted like beasts of the field and denied the ordinary comforts, the ordinary safety, and the ordinary dignity which mankind is entitled to enjoy. The Jews are no less created in the image and likeness of God than are we ourselves. Those who would deny that impugn our own good faith and our own vaunted generosity and tolerance.

So, Mr. President, I am glad to share in the sentiments which have been expressed today, and which I have heretofore expressed, here and elsewhere, and the hope that there may be no further delay in solving this great problem which knocks at the door of every civilized nation and every Christian home in all the world.

JUDGE WILBUR K. MILLER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago the President of the United States sent to the Senate the nominations of three distinguished men to be members of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. One of them was Mr. Prettyman, an outstanding lawyer of the District of Columbia; the second was a former colleague of ours, former Senator Clark of Missouri; and the third was a distinguished lawyer from my State, Hon. Wilbur K. Miller.

In the Washington Merry-Go-Round of yesterday, October 1, there is comment which I think does a great injustice to Judge Wilbur K. Miller, whom I have known for 20 or 25 years as one of the ablest, most outstanding, and finest lawyers and citizens in the State of Kentucky. This particular part of the Merry-Go-Round reads as follows:

TRUMAN DESERTS F. D. R.

How drastically Harry Truman and Attorney General Tom Clark are deserting one of Franklin Roosevelt's principles was indicated by a recent incident which few people noticed.

One of the great battles Roosevelt fought was against the big utility companies. But the other day a judge appointed by Truman to one of the most important courts in the country handled a case, even after his confirmation, on behalf of one of the big power companies. He is Judge Wilbur Miller, recently appointed to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which handles more important test cases than any other appeals court in the Nation.

However, even after Miller was confirmed by the Senate, he appeared last week before the Federal Power Commission on behalf of the Kentucky Natural Gas Co.

This makes it unanimous. For both of the other two judges Truman appointed to this important appeals court, former Senator Bennett Clark of Missouri and Barrett Prettyman, also have been attorneys for the big power companies or have been antipublic power.

(NOTE.—Bennett Clark was defeated for the Senate by the people of Missouri last year after many bitter years of isolationist opposition to Roosevelt's foreign policies. However, he worked valiantly for Truman's nomination at Chicago.)

Mr. President, I rise to take note of this comment because it does a great injustice to a citizen of my State who happens to be one of the three men appointed by the President to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. His nomination has been confirmed by the Senate, and he will soon take the oath of office as a judge of that high court.

Judge Miller was elected prosecuting attorney of Daviess County, of which Owensboro is the county seat, and he served for 8 years as prosecuting attorney of that county. He made an outstanding record. At the end of his second term as prosecuting attorney he voluntarily retired. Subsequently, he served 4 years as chairman of the Kentucky Utilities Commission, a commission set up by the Kentucky Legislature to regulate the utilities of the State. He was chairman of that commission under the appointment of the Governor, and he served 4 years. During his 4-year tenure as a member and chairman of the Kentucky Utilities Commission, not a complaint was ever registered against his fairness, his good faith, or his fidelity to the people of that State, so far as I recall, in administering the laws of Kentucky as chairman of the public utilities commission of the State. At the end of 4 years he retired from that commission.

He has been a practicing attorney in Owensboro for 20 or 25 years. He engaged in the general practice of law. For a number of years he represented the Kentucky Natural Gas Corp. The Kentucky Natural Gas Corp. is a pipeline company which pipes natural gas into Owensboro and other communities which use natural gas developed in that section of Kentucky and, I think, probably in the southern part of Indiana. For a number of years he has represented that corporation as local attorney. It had a case pending before the Federal Power Commission; it has been pending there for a long time. In order to wind up his legal practice, in order that he might not leave his clients with, so far as he was concerned, services half performed, he came to Washington last week and represented that pipe-line company, which is not an octopus, which is not a part of any great public utility moguls' holdings, but is a small, local pipe-line company transmitting natural gas into the city of Owensboro and probably into a few towns in that community.

Because Mr. Miller came to Washington to wind up his employment as attorney for that small, natural gas pipeline company, he is described in this article as a great attorney for the power interests, and he is described as being antipublic power. I may also say that he has been attorney for the Owensboro Public Utilities Co., which is a publicly owned municipal light, water, and gas company in the city of Owensboro. He has represented that public utility, owned by the people, for a number of years. He has tried to wind up his employment as attorney for that company, which is a public-utility company owned by the city, after being voted for by the people of Owensboro.

It seems to me that in fairness to Judge Miller, while recounting the fact that he represented a small pipe-line company bringing natural gas into Owensboro, it should also be pointed out that he represented the people of Owensboro as attorney for the municipally owned water, gas, and light plant for that city, if the true picture is to be drawn regarding this man who is about to go on the bench of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Judge Miller has frequently been appointed as special judge in the trial of cases in various parts of Kentucky. About a year ago he was appointed as special judge of the court of appeals to pass upon a constitutional question. The entire court of appeals was disqualified because of the interest of the members of the court in the question. A completely new court was appointed, with special judges, and Judge Miller was appointed as one of the special judges of the court of appeals to try that case.

He is one of the outstanding lawyers in the State of Kentucky and is so recognized by the bar. He is one of the finest, fairest, most public-spirited men with whom it has ever been my pleasure to come in contact.

Mr. President, I do not refer in any sense of bitterness at all to the comment appearing in the column Merry-Go-Round. I feel that if Mr. Pearson had known all the facts, he would not have made the comment; and I am calling attention to the facts because the column entitled "Merry-Go-Round" appeared in the Louisville Courier Journal, published in Louisville, Ky., and it circulates all over the State. I think the article appeared in the Louisville Courier Journal; it was published either in

the Louisville Courier Journal or the Louisville Times. At any rate, it was published in a newspaper which circulates widely in all parts of Kentucky, including Owensboro, and also in Ohio and probably all over the West.

Mr. Lawrence W. Hager is the owner and publisher of the Inquirer and Messenger, of Owensboro, Ky. I wish to read a telegram I have received from him today commenting upon the article appearing in Mr. Pearson's column. Let me say that the telegram refers to an editorial appearing in the Owensboro Inquirer and Messenger, published in the home town of Judge Miller. The telegram reads as follows:

OWENSBORO, KY., *October 1, 1945.*

Senator A. W. BARKLEY,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Owensboro Inquirer and Messenger, under title "Pearson Didn't Have All of the Facts," are saying editorially:

"Drew Pearson's reputation for factual reporting may suffer in this area as a result of his characterization in today's Merry-go-Round of Wilbur K. Miller as 'antipublic power' and the columnist's inference that Mr. Miller is a 'big utility' lawyer by virtue of the fact that he has been attorney for the Kentucky Natural Gas Corp.

"The Kentucky Natural Gas Corp. is not a power colossus, but a comparatively small pipe-line company which distributes nothing but natural gas. An even more unfortunate oversight on Mr. Pearson's part, however, is the fact that Mr. Miller also is attorney for Owensboro's municipal utilities, the biggest municipally owned producer of electric power in Kentucky. The Owensboro municipal light and water plant had total sales of $1,038,132.86 in 1944. Sales of the Kentucky Natural Gas Corp. were $1,728,922.36 for the same period. Profits from the operation of the publicly owned plant pay three-fourths of the operating expenses of the city of Owensboro. Due to the earnings of this plant, from which transfers to the city's general fund were $426,097.03 in the last fiscal year, Owensboro city taxes and property assessments are low, and light and water consumers—domestic, commercial, and industrial—have very favorable rates, hence Mr. Miller is fully cognizant of the benefits to be derived from publicly owned utilities plants.

"Too, Mr. Pearson is unaware, and perhaps could not be expected to know, that Mr. Miller and his deceased law partner, the late Judge A. D. Kirk, as legal consultants and general advisers to the Owensboro Utility Commission, contributed a great deal to the development of our municipal utilities, receiving in return for their services what probably was a smaller retainer than was ever collected by any lawyer for the amount of work involved. We suspect that if Mr. Pearson had been in possession of all of the facts about the services of Mr. Miller and the late Mr. Kirk to Owensboro's municipal utilities, the columnist's method of deduction would have had him to classify the new United States Court of Appeals justice as 'propublic power' instead of 'antipublic power.'

"Mr. Pearson's criticism of Mr. Miller for representing the Kentucky Natural Gas Corp. after the latter's confirmation by the Senate, moreover, was without justification, in view of the fact that the Federal Power Commission hearing already was in progress when the Senate acted on President Truman's appointment of the Owensboroan. Mr. Miller, as chief counsel for the Kentucky Natural Gas Corp., could not have walked out on his client after the hearing began. Additionally, he still was a private citizen and will remain such until he takes the oath of office. Some attorneys, after appointment to Federal judgeships, have delayed taking the oath of office for months in order to wind up their private practice. Mr. Miller expects to have his affairs in order to be sworn in as justice in a few days.

"While the Owensboro municipal utilities and the Kentucky Natural Gas Corp. are enterprises represented by Mr. Miller in the utility field, he is also attorney for a number of other corporations, because he is one of the ablest lawyers in Kentucky and much business of this kind has gravitated to him. In this connection, however, it should interest Mr. Pearson to learn that while most of Mr. Miller's corporation clients were opponents of the late President Roosevelt, Mr. Miller himself was a stanch supporter of Roosevelt and his policies in all four of his Presidential campaigns. Under auspices of Daviess County Democratic campaign committees, Mr. Miller made a number of speeches in behalf of Mr. Roosevelt.

"We believe that Mr. Pearson will discover, when he becomes acquainted with Mr. Miller—as he undoubtedly will when the latter becomes a resident of Washington, D. C.—that the Owensboroan is one of the most conscientious men ever named to a Federal judgeship. The Washington columnist might be interested in a comment on the Miller appointment uttered on the day it was announced by a labor leader who organized the plants of one of Mr. Miller's clients, and who sat across the consultation table from the United States Court of Appeals justice during the prolonged and difficult negotiations for a union contract. 'I want to see Wilbur and congratulate him,' the union organizer said. 'In all of our dealing with him, he has been fair. There is one thing about him—whenever he reaches a decision on that court, it will be an honest one.' "

LAWRENCE W. HAGER,
Publisher, Inquirer and Messenger,
Owensboro, Ky.

I am sure that the Senate will never have cause to regret confirming the nomination of Judge Miller, and that the President will never have cause to regret having made the appointment. Any intimations that Judge Miller will not discharge his duties with justice and fairness while on the bench are entirely without justification.

THE JEWISH-PALESTINE ISSUE

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, from the magnificent analysis and statement with respect to the Jewish-Palestine issue, made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], it would perhaps seem superfluous for me to speak further upon the subject. I would not do so if it were not for the fact that for a long time I have been deeply concerned about this great and paramount issue.

President Truman has proposed the greatest single act of humanitarianism since the outbreak of World War II, but the British Government, I am shocked to say, is seeking to prevent its execution.

The President has advised Prime Minister Attlee, through Secretary of State Byrnes, of his desire to remove 100,000 Jewish refugees from concentration camps in occupied Germany so that they may begin life anew in Palestine. It is a magnificent gesture the President proposes, one which produces an applauding echo throughout the length and breadth of this land. But the British, who have endeavored for the past 20 years, with one excuse after another, to make Palestine a ghetto of the Arab world, are willing to admit only 1,500 refugees a month—a mere 18,000 during the next year.

This seems difficult, Mr. President, to believe, but Reuter's, the official British news agency, says it is so.

How tragic this is.

Instead of trying to cooperate with the Government of the United States in salvaging some of the survivors of the greatest mass tragedy of the ages, the British, it would seem, are endeavoring to prolong this tragedy.

It is indeed unfortunate that a people who, all alone, stood off Hitler for more than 9 months, and whose magnificent courage during the darkest days of the blitz proved them to be a people who will willingly die in the cause of justice, are permitting their escutcheon to be blotted because of their attitude toward Palestine.

From the advent of Hitler back in 1933, more than 5,000,000 Jews have been victims of his mad determination to wipe out an ancient people. Of approximately 7,000,000 Jews who lived in Nazi-occupied Europe and Russia before the war, not more than 1,400,000 now survive.

Had the war in Europe continued another 4 months, it is a fair assumption that Hitler would have succeeded completely in his diabolical scheme.

Of those who survived more than 100,000 are still in concentration camps in Germany, and 65,000 in camps under the supervision of the American Army.

These people have no place to go. They are a destitute, homeless people, afflicted with memories of a tragic past. Most of them have lost all of their loved ones, and all their earthly possessions. They are alive today only because Eisenhower, Bradley and Patton got to Germany before they, too, were removed from concentration camps to the crematories. Otherwise, their bones, also, would have been included in the piles of human ashes discovered by the onrushing American armies.

It is these survivors whom President Truman, reflecting the unquestioned wishes of the American people, wants to help right now by getting them to Palestine, the only place on God's green earth where they can again live as free men and women. But Britain does not want them to go there.

I have said that nearly 5,000,000 Jews lost their lives under Hitler. Many of them—I do not know how many, but surely many hundreds of thousands, and perhaps more than a million—could have been saved but for the rigid, tragic application of the British white paper.

The white paper was a part of the British policy of appeasement promulgated by the late Prime Minister Chamberlain as a part of his futile endeavors to appease Hitler. In those days Hitler's anti-Jewish propaganda was being industriously circulated in the Near East. He found a fertile field among Arab politicians who saw in the presence of the Jews in Palestine a substantial betterment of the condition of the lowly and poverty-stricken Arabs. The Jew brought to Palestine vision, medicines, schools, modern living and more employment at higher wages. Naturally, the Arab peasants welcomed the Jew, but by the same token, the Arab politicians viewed with horror and with apprehension the magnificent physical and cul-

tural development which followed the Jew into that ancient and barren land.

Those politicians and Hitler had much in common and the politicians, like Hitler in Europe, set up a hue and a cry against the Jews. They did not want any more Jews in Palestine. Thus, when Prime Minister Chamberlain, back in 1939, promulgated the white paper limiting immigration into Palestine to a mere 75,000 during the course of the succeeding 5 years, and none at all after that time, Mr. Chamberlain and the British Government were following sheeplike behind Hitler's leadership.

Mind you, Mr. President, Chamberlain imposed this restriction on Jewish immigration into the one country which had been set aside by the Versailles Treaty as a Jewish homeland at a time when it was more necessary than ever in the world's history for the unfortunate Jews of Europe to find a haven of refuge. A few months after promulgation of the white paper, Hitler proved to Chamberlain the futility of all his appeasement policies. The need for unrestricted immigration into Palestine then was greater than ever before because with the advent of the formal state of war, Hitler's atrocities against the Jews increased one-hundredfold. Protests against the application of the white paper were renewed but the British excuse then was that tampering with the white-paper policy might inflame the Arabs and upset the progress of the war in Africa and the Near East. Mind you, Senators, at that time hundreds of thousands of Jews, caught like rats in a trap, were endeavoring to escape from Hitler. They could have gotten to Palestine, not only from Germany, but from Poland and from all of the satellite countries, but the British Government through the white paper said, "No, you must remain where you are." They did—and more than 5,000,000 of them were exterminated.

Even after the Germans had been driven from North Africa, and all prospects of war in that area had disappeared, the British continued to remain adamant in the enforcement of the white paper. They still found excuses to prevent homeless Jewish refugees from going to Palestine.

In the meanwhile, because of the brutal application of this immigration policy, hundreds of thousands of Jewish lives were needlessly sacrificed. Hundreds of thousands of these people might have been saved.

Now the war is over. There has been peace in Europe since May 8, and still Britain enforces the white paper.

Mr. President, let us look at another aspect of the situation. As a part of the deliberate policy of the United States and the British Government, Palestine was legally designated during 1917 as a national homeland for the Jews. There were prolonged negotiations between President Woodrow Wilson and Prime Minister David Lloyd George, and the Government policy, since known as the Balfour Declaration, was proclaimed. According to all of the writings of Mr. Wilson and Mr. David Lloyd George, it was the full intent of our Governments at the time to make Palestine eventually into a free and independent state in which the rights of all peoples would be equal under the law, but in which a majority of the population would be Jews. There is no question about this. It is as factual as any historic record can be.

At the Versailles Treaty, His Majesty's Government was given a mandate over Palestine to continue until such time as a sufficient number of Jews had arrived in Palestine to established a proposed commonwealth.

The United States Government was not a signatory to the Versailles Treaty but we were very much a factor in the British mandate over Palestine, because in 1924 the Coolidge administration negotiated a treaty with Great Britain in which the British administraton of the mandate was confirmed. This treaty, however, specifically stipulated that Britian would make no change in the immigration policy into Palestine without prior consultation with the United States. But Britain has, as the record shows, completely ignored the United States in all matters pertaining to Palestine. On March 9, last year, President Roosevelt asserted in the White House that the United States had never given its approval to the white paper of 1939. Despite this strong hint from an Allied and Associated Nation, Britain continued to enforce the white paper, and it is doing so to this day. In the meanwhile, last year the Democratic and Republican National Conventions went on record favoring the immediate creation of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth. The majority of Members of this Congress have gone on record favoring this policy, and insofar as I know, none of us differ on the question of relief to those unfortunates whom President Truman would transplant to Palestine.

During its long climb up the political ladder, the British Labor Party espoused the cause of the free and democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. During all this time the Labor Party challenged the Churchill government's application of the white-paper policy. Only a few months ago, in May 1945, the British Labor Party—the same party which now rules the destinies of the British Empire—adopted an official declaration on Palestine which reads:

> There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a "Jewish national home," unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe. * * * The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must now claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine less than the size of Wales.

Mr. President, that was the statement of the Labor government before it came to power.

When the Labor government came into power, we in the United States who believe in the validity of the Jewish claims to Palestine had the right to think that at long last the pledges of the British and the American Governments would be carried out. But once more we were doomed to further and more bitter disappointment and disillusionment. Not only is the Labor government ignoring its pledges, but, of even greater distress, it is seeking to block President Truman in his efforts to furnish relief to 100,000 people who are in such dire distress.

This attitude of the British Government is a horrible commentary and a great shock to those of us who had always admired the British for their traditional belief in fair play. This is anything but fair, and it cannot help but lessen the prestige of the British in this country.

I hope the British Government will appreciate the depth of American feeling on the subject of Palestine, and take immediate steps, not only to comply with President Truman's great humanitarian objectives but also to carry out the historic pledges of our Governments.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this morning while the Palestine question was under discussion I had intended to express some thoughts on the subject, but was precluded from doing so by the intrusion of the bill, which has been under discussion during the day. I should now like to submit some brief remarks in connection with that matter.

Mr. President, when we review the history of the Palestine problem we find that there was hardly another instance in the memory of our generation where promises have been so lavishly made and so consistently violated. Between 1917 and 1920 most governments of the world, including our own, gave careful consideration to the future of Palestine. After much soul-searching a decision was arrived at in the light of the needs of the Jews, of the position of the Arabs, and of the interests of the entire civilized world.

The Arabs, until then subjects of the Turkish Empire, were put on the road to freedom. In the case of the Jews it was recognized that this group of people, living scattered all over the world, who found equality of rights and decent treatment in some countries, but unending sorrow and persecution in others, also deserved to have a country where those of them who wished to emigrate would be truly at home. Palestine, because of its historic connection with the Jewish people, was recognized as the place which should become the national home of the Jewish people.

This was the basis on which the nations of the world decided to entrust the mandate over Palestine to England, with the understanding that Great Britain would use its position to further the immigration and settlement of Jews in Palestine. It was understood, of course, that all inhabitants of Palestine, whatever their race or religion, would enjoy perfect equality of rights and that particular attention should be paid to guaranteeing religious freedom and the protection of the holy places in that country, which is holy to so many faiths. But it was clearly understood at the same time that the Jews should be enabled to immigrate to Palestine in large numbers, so that its Jewish inhabitants would ultimately become a majority of its total population, and so that, in this sense, the state that would one day be established in Palestine would be a Jewish state.

Let me make it plain that the term "Jewish state" was never meant as a state in which Jewish religion should be controlling but simply a state in which the majority of the population were Jews. All this is very clear from the diplomatic correspondence surrounding the Palestine mandate. The American peace delegation in Versailles, President Wilson in person, British leaders such as Mr. Lloyd George and General Smuts, all made clear that this was their understanding of the purpose of the Palestine mandate.

A large number of governments, then united in the League of Nations, gave their formal approval to this policy, which became incorporated in the League of Nations mandate. The United States of America fully subscribed to this understanding by entering into a treaty with Great Britain in 1924. This treaty, which can be found on the statute books of the United States, gives our country the same rights to supervise the faithful execution of the provisions of the Palestine mandate as we would have had were we a member of the League of Nations. In addition, the treaty stipulates that no modification of the terms of the mandate by Great Britain could affect the validity of our treaty.

The legal position with regard to Palestine and the commitments which the nations of the world have undertaken with regard to the Jews who desire to enter Palestine were, therefore, quite clear 20 years ago. What happened since then that would have made the breach of these commitments and a change of policy justifiable or at least excusable? Has it been demonstrated that the Jews in Palestine were unable to do the job of settling the country? Has it been demonstrated that they have, in doing so, oppressed or contributed to the impoverishment of their Arab neighbors? Has the position of the Jews in the world become so much better that their need for a national home has become less than it was in 1917?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. As chairman of the committee of four which visited Palestine last June, I was very much surprised to see the great improvement which had taken place in that area since I had been there before. We stayed overnight at Tel Aviv, which is one of the cleanest and finest cities to be found there, much cleaner than any other city in the vicinity. It is a very beautiful place, built up entirely by the Jewish people. I can see no excuse for anyone saying the Jews should not be permitted to go to Palestine if they wish to go and buy land. I do not undertake to tell the British government what it should do, but I see no reason why, if the Jews desire to come to Palestine and stay there, they should not be permitted to do so.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his comment. I appreciate that he has made a very careful study of this problem on the ground, and that he is familiar with the facts. I am sure he is qualified to approve and corroborate what I am now saying.

Have the Arab peoples lost their chance at independence in other countries so that they could have looked only to Palestine as the one place where they could have a national state of their own?

Nothing of the sort. Quite the contrary, the Jews have shown remarkable success in peacefully colonizing Palestine. Their example and cooperation have resulted in a tremendous rise both of the numbers and of the economic standards of the Palestine Arabs. The Arabs in Palestine today enjoy a far higher economic standard than they did before the coming of the Jews and a far higher standard than that of Arabs in most neighboring countries. So beneficial did Jewish colonization prove to the Arabs that, far from leaving the country, as they used to in the days before the First World War, large numbers of Arabs from neighboring countries immigrated into Palestine in order to share in the prosperity brought by the Jews.

And what about the Jewish situation in the world? If it was bad in 1917, it has become immeasurably worse in the years since. All during the 1920's, anti-Semitism became stronger in one European country after another, in the 1930's the Nazi rule of Germany resulted in a world-wide campaign of hatred against the Jews, and in the early 1940's about 6,000,000 Jews in Europe were slaughtered, gassed, brutally murdered. Their survivors have lost all, and are finding it almost impossible to start life anew in the countries where they have met and are still meeting with so much hatred. If it was necesasry to have a Jewish national home in 1917, how much more has this necessity been demonstrated in 1945?

And what about the situation of the Arab-speaking peoples as a whole? They have progressed on the road to independence. They are rapidly freeing themselves from the last traces of foreign control. Five of the Arab countries—Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Syria, and the Lebanon—have become members of the United Nations. A sixth Arab State, Yemen, is also almost fully independent. The Arab position in the world has tremendously improved. The Jewish position in the world has tremendously deteriorated. If it was wise and just to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine in 1917, it is far more wise and just to do so today.

The American people, and its qualified representatives, time and again gave full expression to this point of view. As early as 1922, Congress went on record in a joint resolution as favoring the Jewish national home, and President Harding approved the resolution and made it part of the law of the land. Presidents Coolidge and Hoover expressed their approval of this policy. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties reaffirmed this policy most emphatically at their recent national conventions in the summer of 1944. In these conventions, they pledged themselves to a policy of large Jewish immigration and of a Jewish majority in Palestine that would result in the establishment of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. President Roosevelt publicly concurred in this policy, and pledged himself to carry it out. President Truman likewise has declared that he will pursue the same policy.

Mr. President, the chapter of British rule in Palestine contributes nothing to the honor of the British Government. It is a blank chapter in English history. It is a chapter full of evasion and duplicity. After having received the trusteeship over Palestine mainly in order to help the Jews establish their national home, British administrators did their best to prevent the Jews from doing so. For the present, and as it has been ever since 1939, Palestine is ruled under the notorious British document known as the Chamberlain white paper of 1939, under which no more Jews may enter Palestine, and under which, in this so-called national homeland of the Jews, Jews are not even permitted to live or to own property anywhere except a tiny part of the territory of Palestine.

This document is reviled and repudiated even in England. Winston Churchill, the man who pulled Great Britain through the war, called the white paper a unilateral breach of promises and a violation of international obligations.

But on the part of Mr. Churchill, too, just as on the part of many others, these were only words. For 4 long years Churchill was Prime Minister of England, and he had it within his power to right the wrong that was done. He did not do so. For most of those 4 years there was an explanation—the critical war situation. But for the last year and a half this explanation no longer held true.

During the past year and a half it would have been easily possible to abrogate the white paper, to open Palestine to the Jewish refugees of the Old World, and to lay the foundations of the Jewish state.

It was not done by Mr. Churchill's government, and now we hear that Mr. Attlee's government does not intend to do so, either. It is said to wish to maintain the white paper intact, with but slight and insignificant concessions. It is said to intend to "pass the buck" for the future of Palestine to a United Nations organization which has not yet started operating and which, God knows when, will be able to start operating effectively.

An overwhelming majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress, both political parties, the administration are publicly pledged to support the policy of a Jewish commonwealth, and yet in practice we are failing to carry this policy into execution. It is reported that the President of the United States has asked that 100,000 Jewish refugees be admitted to Palestine at once. This is, indeed, an elementary requirement of the mandate. The victims of our enemy's brutality who by some miracle survived in his concentration camps and who desire to go to the country that was promised to them should be enabled to go without the least delay.

But this is only the first step. Without shirking responsibility, our Government and the Government of Great Britain, who have made so many far-reaching decisions in the international field in the interest of peace and humanity, must not shirk this responsibility, either—the long-overdue responsibility of redeeming and carrying out a sacred obligation.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHEELER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John J. O'Connell, of Pennsylvania, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (new position);

J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice Charles Fahy, resigned;

Everett M. Evans, of Idaho, to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho, vice Edward M. Bryan, resigned;

Robert Grant, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois; and

Hubert J. Harrington, of New Jersey, to be United States marshal for the district of New Jersey.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Lt. Gen. Raymond Albert Wheeler (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Chief of Engineers, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, whose term of office expire September 30, 1945; and

Sundry officers for appointment, promotion, or transfer in the Regular Army.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Harrington Wimberly, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1948, vice Basil Manly, resigned; and

Richard Sachse, of California, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1947, vice John W. Scott, resigned.

RAYMOND S. McKEOUGH TO BE MEMBER OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION—REPORT OF COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I report adversely the nomination of Raymond S. McKeough, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for a term of 6 years from September 26, 1945, with the recommendation that the nomination be not confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair requests that all the nominations of postmasters on the calendar may be confirmed, the postmasters all being from Tennessee, and all being postmasters who have been promoted to be third class postmasters, and that the President may be immediately notified, and the postmasters congratulated.

The Chair hears no objection; and, without objection, it is so ordered.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. I have been speaking in the Senate from time to time about the situation with respect to the method by which surplus property is being handled. I have stated from time to time that it would never be possible to handle the surplus property problem, of which we have spoken so much and about which so much has been written, estimated variously at from $50,000,000,000 to $112,000,000,000, I believe, until and unless a central authority had been created charged with the responsibility of disposing of the surplus property.

I have said also that it would be necessary to have a central inventory in connection with the establishment of control of surplus property. I have introduced proposed legislation which has for its purpose the accomplishment of those very things along with other things set out in the bill, which I shall not now take time to discuss in detail, but which are looked upon more or less as corrective provisions of the surplus property law.

The story which appeared on the front page of this morning's Washington Post is as follows:

DEALERS CAN GET THEM—VETERANS AUTHORIZED TO BUY FIND NO ARMY TRUCKS FOR SALE

About 100 veterans, armed with letters authorizing them to purchase Army surplus motor vehicles, showed up at Fort Meade, Md., yesterday to find no vehicles for sale to them.

The men, many from distant parts of Pennsylvania and Virginia, were told simply, "We haven't anything for you." While the veterans waited, a stream of dealers filled the office at the Meade motor pool cleaning up purchases they made of trucks last Thursday and Friday.

In charge of the sales at Fort Meade was C. S. Thomas, representing the Smaller War Plants Corporation. He refused to tell veterans why they couldn't buy vehicles and declared he wouldn't talk to newspapermen about them.

Many of the veterans carried letters authorizing them to buy vehicles, dated September 27 and 28, from the SWPC offices at Philadelphia and Harrisburg.

There were 60 trucks parked in the pool. Those usable were tagged as sold to dealers.

Henry C. Leary, Lancaster, Pa., spokesman for a group of veterans from Pennsylvania, sounded the sentiments for his group.

"We were told to be here sure today. When we arrived we found that the only vehicles worth having had already been sold to dealers. One man offered $260 for a truck. He discovered it had been sold to a dealer for $370. He looked up the dealer and was offered the truck for $650."

In Washington the SWPC passed the buck to the Commerce Department who promptly passed it back to SWPC.

Mr. President, that is a fair example of what we are going to confront in the handling of surplus property from now on, and many other examples might be cited. First, when the veteran or the small businessman proceeds to the designated place to make a purchase he finds, and he will invariably find, that the truck has already been sold to somebody else, mysteriously sold under some kind of an arrangement or plan that nobody knew anything about.

Second, he is going to find that although he is a veteran no more attention will be paid to him than if he were not a veteran, in spite of the fact that there are provisions in the present law which require the veteran to be given preference.

Mr. President, sometime ago I introduced a bill on which, beyond referring it to the committee I suppose no action has been taken. At that time I spoke on the subject. The bill provides for a central authority to control the sale of surplus property. We created a Surplus Property Board by legislation more than a year ago. The Senate passed one kind of a bill. The House passed another kind of a bill. The legislation was finally written by the conference committee in conference. That legislation was almost totally different from the two bills the two Houses had passed. That shows the controversial nature of the subject. It was more or less controversial then, and it seems to be a matter of some controversy now. But the responsibility for the proper handling of surplus property rests upon this body and upon the body at the other end of the Capitol—the Congress. It is our duty to enact such legislation as will not only require, but compel, the proper and correct handling and disposal of surplus property. It is our duty to enact such legislation as will give to the veteran and to others what we said would be given to them when we undertook to write the original law, and when we debated the question.

I have stated before on this floor that this situation probably would outsmell Teapot Dome, and that the administration and the Congress would have to bear full responsibilty for the outcome of the surplus-property problem. I do not know how much of it has already been disposed of, but everywhere one goes he hears stories about it. Someone wishes to know why there happened to be a sale at Fort Meade, Richmond, New Orleans, or some other place in the United States, without the public knowing about it. No one seems to know how the sales are advertised, and yet there is always an adequate number of purchasers to buy, at their own figures, the various things offered for sale.

The other day a young man told me an amazing story. I shall not give his name because he has not as yet been discharged from the Navy. He had heard of a sale of automobiles, and he wanted to buy a jeep. He heard that a sale was taking place near the camp where he was located, not many miles from here. He had saved a little money and had what he thought was enough to purchase a jeep. He was very promptly told that he could not buy one jeep. He was told, "We are selling them in lots of 30." He said, "I thought preference was being given to

servicemen." He was told, "There are two answers to that. In the first place, we are glad to give you preference if you want to buy 30 jeeps, but we cannot sell you 1." How could that boy buy 30 jeeps? How could any average GI being discharged buy 30 new jeeps, and what would he want with them?

As I understand, the purpose of the surplus-property law which we enacted was to prevent speculation. If that was not the purpose, what was the purpose? If any Senator knows that there was any other purpose, or if I am misstating the purpose, I should like to be given to understand whether or not that is a correct statement.

If we are undertaking to prevent speculation we have certainly done a poor job of it up to date. Everyone with whom I talk about the sale of surplus property tells me that there is some sort of mystery about it all. Instead of being helpful to veterans, to the small businessman, and to the average citizen who wishes to purchase some of the $100,000,000,000 worth of surplus property, it seems to me that the agencies handling it are undertaking, by some sort of sleight of hand, to fool them, or prevent them from purchasing it. Imagine telling a boy from the Navy who had saved up two or three hundred dollars to buy a jeep to take back to his farm with him that he could buy 30, but could not buy 1. Later he was told, "You are not a veteran anyway, because you have not yet been discharged."

It is said that the Commerce Department "passed the buck" to the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation "passed the buck" back again. It is going to be a game of "buck passing" until the property is all gone. That is precisely what will occur. We could not expect anything else, with an army of agencies, all jealous of one another, trying to handle the property, each absolutely without any sort of purpose or intention to cooperate with the others. Mr. President, that is the problem with which we are faced. We shall be hearing stories of "buck passing" until the whole $100,000,000,000 worth of property is gone.

The other day I made the statement that I was very doubtful whether 5 percent of the value of the $100,000,000,000 worth of property would actually be channeled back into the Treasury of the United States. Congress enacted a provision requiring the money received from the sale of surplus property to be applied to the retirement of our war debt. When the final credit is entered upon the ledger, it will be a very small amount if some steps are not taken to place intelligent, purposeful, determined control, and full and complete control, in some one body. My own thought is that it ought to be in the Surplus Property Board. It should have full control of the operation. I have previously so stated. People write to them for information about the purchase of surplus property. They have started "passing the buck." They write to people who inquire and tell them, "We do not handle it any more. You will have to write to the Commerce Department or the RFC." Or perhaps they say, "That property has not yet been declared surplus. Through order No. 6 which we just issued, which we admit is a rather cleverly drawn order, we sell surplus property to certain persons who wish to buy it without its being declared surplus."

Many things are being done to thwart the will of Congress. The situation will bring shame upon the heads of all of us. It is our responsibility. We ought to assume the responsibility and enact such legislation as will compel the proper disposition of surplus property.

Numerous other instances have come to my attention. I could name a dozen in a very few minutes. I understand that hearings are to be held, possibly this week. Representatives of the purchasing departments of the various States will appear before the subcommittee of which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is chairman, and a group of purchasing agents from seven Southern States which have organized for a like purpose, will appear before my Small Business Subcommittee.

Recently in Nashville, Tenn., the following incident occurred: The State of Tennessee desired to purchase some desks. There was a warehouse full of them. According to my information, they had been declared surplus. It required more than a month to decide who had charge of them, whether the RFC or the Department of Commerce. I was asked to make an investigation of the question. I suppose that, finally, if something has not happened this week, perhaps the State of Tennessee will get some much-needed desks, which it is anxious to purchase.

All the confusion and uncertainty, and the proverbial Government red tape came about by the reason of the fact that, as I am informed, there was a controversy between two agencies as to which one had control of the disposal of the desks. One agency claimed to have partial control, and another claimed to have full control.

Mr. President, such a situation cannot continue indefinitely. I do not know how much of the surplus property has already been sold. I do not know whether we are going to lock the door after the horse has escaped or not. But I certainly wish to be placed on record. I intend to continue to talk about this matter. I wish to go on record as one who is opposed to the present secretive, fumbling method of handling the biggest business that this Government has ever undertaken. I shall discuss this question further next week—perhaps during this week. I hope to have the cooperation of the Senate in the enactment of some kind of legislation which will be in line with the bill which I introduced.

RECESS

Mr. WHEELER. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 3, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 2, 1945:

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. Lee Malcolm Hester, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from February 4, 1941.

Lt. Col. Howard Louis Peckham, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general), with rank from December 11, 1942.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

First Lt. Charles Dorsey Maynard, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Floyd Garfield Pratt, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1945.

First Lt. Milton Harvey Clark, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. Napoleon Robertson Duell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1939.

First Lt. Richard Cutler Miles, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1945.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

First Lt. Henry Harley Arnold, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1943.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

George Robert Stephens, vice Col. Clayton E. Wheat, retired.

IN THE NAVY

Medical Director George W. Calver to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to continue while serving as medical officer in attendance on the Congress.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 2, 1945:

POSTMASTERS

TENNESSEE

Lillian V. Proctor, Burlison.
Ona G. Matheny, Campaign.
Sandy B. Harris, Cunningham.
James C. Duke, Darden.
Jessye L. Williamson, Denmark.
Herbert C. Hurst, Eagan.
Una E. Fleming, Elbridge.
Mable E. Watkins, Fosterville.
Bessie Sutton, Frankewing.
Laura J. Keck, Goin.
Edna H. Butler, Goodspring.
Rebecca E. Fleming, Hartford.
James W. Cross, Hickory Point.
William R. Rice, Hollow Rock.
Mildred P. Smith, Huron.
Joe R. Pigg, Kelso.
Guy L. McHaney, Luray.
James L. Gooch, Michie.
Mabel Lowery, Ocoee.
Joyce Myrtle Stratton, Oldfort.
Charles H. Biggs, Palmersville.
Sinda Rector, Pioneer.
Margaret E. Harris, Pleasant View.
Betty L. Sharp, Seymour.
Frank S. Grizzell, Sharps Chapel.
Robert H. McFall, Slayden.
Zaida I. Fullwood, Stantonville.
Harvey M. Ewing, Tennessee City.
Lambert C. Idol, Westbourne.
Mary F. Hall, Westport.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the eternal and universal Father, Thy name be praised for the length, the breadth, and the intensity of divine love. We pray Thee to make us humble, worthy, and strong wherein we are weak. Create in us more fully the blessed virtues, showing pity where pity is deserved, patience where patience is needed, gentleness and forbearance wherever they give strength and encouragement. Help us to love when the temptation is to hate and at all times seek to alleviate another's weakness. Give Thy sheltering care to our President, our Speaker, and the Members of the Congress, and help us all to give the morning light of promise to our fellow countrymen, offering a release from their pressing problems. Subdue the spirit of any dissension and any dominating pride, and may we discern the coming of better and brighter days. And all glory be unto our Redeemer forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE IN DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post I read an article about some World War II veterans who had gone over to Fort Meade to buy some trucks. They had certificates, but when they got there they were unable to purchase any trucks. They found the trucks had already been disposed of. I think this is clearly in violation of the Surplus Property Act passed last year, and I am going to appoint a subcommittee to investigate the reasons why the veterans' preference provision in that act is not being carried out. I think every Member of Congress is probably having correspondence from veterans on this subject. They have been denied the right to purchase surplus property. I am going to insist and our committee will insist that this preference be carried out. We are going to get to the bottom of this thing at the earliest possible date.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Democrat and News of Cambridge, Dorchester County, Md., on the $25-a-week bill, which they call the national-vacation measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a statement has been issued by the scientists who worked on the atomic bomb. It is an epoch-making document. I want to read briefly from it:

> That the advent of the age of atomic energy signifies a revolutionary change in the nature of our civilization has been recognized to a greater or less extent by all men, but the crisis which we face will not be successfully overcome unless misconceptions are laid aside and the problem exactly defined. Either the leaders of mankind resolve the difficulties arising from the necessary integration of nuclear energy with the present international and national social structure, or the world will be faced with catastrophe.
>
> As a prelude to intelligent thought, a myth which has already taken considerable hold in the public mind must be dispelled. We do not have and never have had a monopoly on the scientific ability, fundamental principles, or the technological resources necessary for the large-scale release of nuclear energy.

And again from another portion of the statement of these very scientists who made the atomic bomb I quote again:

> There is no secret to be kept. It has been known for 40 years that this form of energy exists. The principle required for its release has been the common property of scientists throughout the world for the last 5 years. All the advanced civilized nations possess the scientists capable of working out the details required for the accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, these men know, if anyone does, the facts of this great overriding question. Their answer to the problem in one brief sentence is—and I quote again:

> Therefore we must urge among the nations a cooperative unified control of forces which would otherwise destroy us.

I hope to have an opportunity to read this entire statement to the House later this afternoon.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY CANAL AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GALLAGHER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a statement made by Secretary of the Treasury Vinson before the Committee on Ways and Means on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 363) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That MIKE MANSFIELD, of the State of Montana, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Foreign Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD with reference to John C. Floyd.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a column entitled "The Federal Diary" from the Washington Post.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS MATERIALS TO VETERANS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to hear the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, say that he was going to check into this proposition of our servicemen being unable to buy surplus materials. Last week I was down in Fort Sam Houston visiting a separation center. I talked to one of the men who had just been discharged and asked him where he was going. He said the first thing he was going to do was to get out here and buy himself a truck. I wondered if he was not destined to share with thousands of others a great disappointment. We have given the veteran the preference to buy those trucks, but we know that all over the country they are being refused that privilege. I do not know where the trouble lies. I have heard that it is the rivalry between the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the Department of Commerce. I do not

think we are concerned as to where the trouble lies, but that it is removed. There is an obligation upon us to check into this matter and to see that our discharged servicemen get the preference that we gave them and which we intended to give to them under the Surplus Property Act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

MEDICAL DOCTORS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE ATOMIC AGE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MERROW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of a grand jury report which is an indictment of bureaucracy.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

FOREIGN FINANCING

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ELLIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SHALL WE HAVE MORE BREAD OR MORE LIQUOR?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore called the attention of the House and the Department of Agriculture to the tremendous amount of corn that is being consumed by the distillers of this country instead of going for food. I want to read one of several telegrams I received today from large baking concerns in my district. Here is what it says:

We are informed corn-sugar plants are shut down because of lack of corn. The Department of Agriculture has announced distillers may use 750,000 bushels of corn during October. We believe the baking of bread is much more essential than the distilling of liquor. We and other bread bakers in this country will have to cut our percentage of corn sugar used in bread if this is not corrected. As corn sugar is an energy food, we feel that bread consumers are entitled to the amount we are now using in our bread. We feel sure the entire baking industry will appreciate any help you can give us in maintaining our present use of corn sugar, thereby making bread the most nutritious and economical food the consumer may buy. Bread making is more important to the health of the Nation than liquor.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a resolution to direct the Committee on Agriculture to investigate this very problem. The question is whether our Government is more interested in favoring the liquor industry by permitting it to have three-quarters of a million bushels of corn per month that ought to go for food or whether the people of this country shall have a sufficient amount of corn sugar for bread on the family table.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

COMMUNISM

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, if you want to know how badly Europe is seething with communism, you have only to look at the General Patton Bavarian incident. The fault of Fritz Schaeffer as Minister President of Bavaria was not that he was not sufficiently anti-Nazi. He was violently so. But his sin was that he is also anti-Communist, and you cannot be anti-Communist in practically any part of Europe and hold high office very long. Even Churchill found that out.

Is this true in the United States, and is that why President Truman refused a few days ago to say whether he is leading this country to the right or the left, when his actions are clearly veering to the left? Was it Truman whose hand reached out to get Schaeffer via Eisenhower and Patton, and if so, who is calling the signals to President Truman?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he received from a doughboy in London.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short summary.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, one entitled "Demobilizing," and the other on the subject of rationing butter and meat, and to include a letter from a merchant.

Mr. ADAMS (at the request of Mr. MERROW) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he received from the Administrator of Surplus Property.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a sermon delivered in Brooklyn last Thursday by the president of Villanova College.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a subcommittee report of the Committee on Military Affairs, on the result of a visit to two separation centers, Indiantown Gap, Pa., and Patterson Field, Ohio.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a set of resolutions and a newspaper article commenting thereon.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include certain printed excerpts.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article from the magazine, Veterans' Outlook.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today at the conclusion of the business of the day and special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MAKING SURPLUS PROPERTY AVAILABLE TO VETERANS

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear that the gentleman from Alabama is going to lay before his committee again the question of getting surplus property into the hands of servicemen. I think, while he is at it, it would be very well if he would consider having the limit raised on the amount he can buy from the Government without paying a commission to a dealer. A $2,500 limit, as it now is, is entirely too small. Any piece of equipment costing more than that amount cannot be purchased by a serviceman direct from the Government, but he has to have a dealer buy it and then he pays the dealer a commission.

Some of the boys have learned a great deal about construction and other heavy work while in the service and now they want to buy trucks, caterpillar tractors, bulldozers, and similar heavy machinery used in the construction industry. I believe those boys in the service ought not to have to pay any dealer a commission but should have the right to go directly to the Government storage center, look the equipment over, and buy it directly. Almost any piece of equipment will cost in excess of the present limit. I repeat, they ought not to be forced to pay a commission to a dealer; that is unfair to the serviceman. I believe we should make the limit sufficiently high to enable the serviceman to procure this equipment direct or else take the limit off entirely as far as the servicemen are concerned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

IS THE RIGHT TO WORK ENFORCEABLE?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the full employment bill accepts the right to work in dead earnest as fundamental to other human rights, and proposes to back it up with all of the resources of the Government.

There are some, however, like Ira Mosher, of NAM, and Senator ROBERT TAFT, who take it more lightly. As a "moral" right they grant it freely. But, they claim, it is impossible to confer the right to work by law and make it legally enforceable.

This, of course, is legalistic quibbling over terms.

The right to work can and will be enforced because the people demand it, and they will not again tolerate mass unemployment and depression. Both candidates in the last Presidential election were aware of this popular pressure and committed themselves to a full-employment policy. Any administration that fails to make good on this pledge will inevitably be turned out of office. And any economic system that fails to provide jobs will inevitably be repudiated by the people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

REORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a very excellent and comprehensive editorial by Miss Gene Lightfoot appearing in Sunday's Post-Dispatch of St. Louis, Mo., on the reorganization of the Congress. This editorial not only outlines many, many of our shortcomings but places the responsibility for correcting those shortcomings upon ourselves. Furthermore, the thing that I see so important about this editorial is that it voices the belief of the public and the press that they will not accept any half-hearted, weak-kneed, shortsighted reorganization of the Congress. They are expecting us to do a full, complete job when the Congress receives the report on the reorganization of the Congress.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] in asking the Members of the Congress to read the editorial to which he referred. I read it in the Sunday St. Louis Post-Dispatch that came to my desk last night. I later learned it was written by Miss Gene Lightfoot, a young lady who expresses her views in reference to the activities of the Congress and the necessary reorganization to make it more effective.

This editorial is critical in part, but I cannot conceive how a committee of Congress could spend months in investigating the workings of Congress and make better recommendations than she makes in this editorial. Miss Lightfoot has been a student of government for many years and has been interested not only in the reorganization of the legislative branch but also the executive branch of our Government.

The fact that this editorial is recognized by the chairman of the select committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], to consider this subject, is in my opinion a compliment to Miss Lightfoot.

Again I urge every Member of the House to read this editorial which will appear in tomorrow morning's RECORD.

MANAGEMENT-LABOR

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we hear every morning much talk about what we should do, but it seems to me one of the most important things that the President of the United States should, could, and must do immediately is to call a conference of industry and labor, get harmony and peace among workers. He should get them together and ask them to do the things that this country needs and demands if we are going to keep this country solvent, let those work who want to work, so they can earn and save.

Mr. Speaker, we have many strikes going on all over the country and men being constantly thrown out of work. Industry closed and jobs going begging, the country going communistic. Men will have to go on relief, which will involve taking money out of the Treasury, a bankrupt Treasury, whereas the money could be taken out of industry by jobs, and we cculd and would have a happy Nation. We need changes of laws and action by a Congress and the administration in power. If something is not done immediately in a very short time the Treasury will crack and chaos will follow. This business of having millions of jobs going begging, millions of men on strike, millions of dollars worth of production needs, millions of dollars being taken daily out of an empty Treasury, does not make sense. Your country is on fire. Put it out or the Communists will be in control. Wake up, America, wake up.

FRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, rule XXXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives reads, in part:

> The persons hereinafter named and none other shall be admitted to the halls of the House or rooms leading thereto.

Then follows a list of those permitted, including:

> Ex-Members of the House of Representatives who are not interested in any claim or directly in any bill pending before the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I propound two parliamentary inquiries. First, does the language "or rooms leading thereto" include the lobby and reading room adjacent to the House floor?

Second, does the quoted rule bar from the halls of the House or rooms leading thereto ex-Members of Congress who are in the employ of organizations, corporations, or individuals that have a direct interest in the defeat or passage of a bill pending and under debate in the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that the present occupant of the chair has always been very jealous of all the rules of the House, and especially this one.

The Chair thinks that no person who is not named in the rule should have the privilege of the floor of the House of Representatives or to the cloakroom or to the Speaker's lobby, so-called, where Members and the newspaper folk and others that are privileged to be in there confer.

The Chair thinks that not even an ex-Member of Congress when he has a bill he is personally interested in that is coming up for consideration in the House nor any other ex-Member of the House who is in the employ of an organization that has legislation before the Congress should be allowed the privilege of the House or the rooms that the Chair just said constitutes a part of the House of Representatives.

ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, to me it is deplorable to hear Members of Congress continuously clamoring for the American people to give away the secrets of the atomic bomb.

That propaganda is ringing in every communistic publication. It is being advocated by the same elements that are now abusing General Patton, trying to drive him from his command, and trying to embarrass General MacArthur in Japan.

Now, it may be that those foreign scientists have the secret. They also had the secret of how to make an airplane, but they could not compare with us.

They had the secret of the electric fuse, but they did not make them.

They have many other secrets that they have not been able to develop and put to use, but we are not supposed to give them the secrets as to how we went about constructing that vast machinery, not only on the Columbia River but on the Tennessee and in New Mexico, which enabled us to produce the atomic bomb.

We are not supposed to give them the secrets of how we produced the electric fuse or how we produced all our vast airplane equipments.

Let us keep the secrets of the production of the atomic bomb, as well as the supply we have and the machinery to make more. Let us keep the strongest air force on earth, as well as the strongest navy; then, if the international conference does collapse, as a result of communistic pressure from the other side, then let us look after America.

GENERAL PATTON

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I wondered how long it would take the gentleman from Mississippi to get around to taking a position upon the present controversy raging around one of his favorite generals, General Patton. I see that General Eisenhower has had to step into that situation. Although we hoped that he had straightened General Patton out, the Associated Press has just reported that Patton has been relieved of his command and transferred to other duties. We all hope Patton will now begin to do the kind of job that we know from his high military performance he can be capable of when he devotes his whole mind to a subject. The subject America wants attended to first in Germany is rooting out the Nazis.

ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SUMNERS of Texas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and other Members I wish to say that the Committee on Rules reported House Joint Resolution 83, providing for the creation of a joint committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States to study and investigate the control of the atomic bomb. The Committee on Rules agreed to an amendment of that resolution to increase the membership of the proposed committee to consist of 12 members, 6 from the House and 6 from the Senate. My committee made a favorable report on the resolution in the hope and expectation that the committee which will be appointed will make a thorough study of the atomic energy as disclosed by the development and use of the atomic bomb. I hope that until the investigation is completed and a report is made by the proposed investigating committee that the gentleman from Mississippi will desist from charging that Communists, upon whom he loves to unload and charge with being responsible for every inconceivable activity, as he has in this instance, as making the request for divulging to the world the secrets of atomic energy. The fact is that many recognized inventors and outstanding inventors have also advocated open disclosure to the world. It is my opinion that more Fascists in the United States advocate the revealing of the secrets of atomic energy than do the imaginary Communists in the mind of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Committee on Rules, believing that the matter is of vast importance to the future welfare of our country and to a permanent world peace, reported the resolution favorably. I wish to assure the House that I will endeavor to obtain its favorable consideration by the House as soon as possible, which, I hope, will be within a few days.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, right in line with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, may I say that while we are discussing the atomic bomb so much some of us might reflect and remember the time when there was such controversy over turning over helium gas to Germany. That was in the calm days when many on this floor and in the department were advocating that we turn this over to Germany. That did not work out so well.

Mr. RANKIN. That was also while the Reds in this country were sending scrap iron and oil to Japan.

Mr. SABATH. I opposed that situation at that time as much as any Member.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

REVISION OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that a rule has been granted on this bill, I object to its consideration on the Consent Calendar.

COMPLIANCE WITH STATE INSPECTION LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3231) to provide that the several States shall continue effective measures of control and protection against the importation, introduction, and spread of noxious weeds, injurious insects, and animal and plant diseases, and to guarantee that purchasers or recipients of seeds, livestock, and poultry feeds, nursery stocks, fertilizers, and other agricultural chemicals shall have the protection guaranteed them under the laws enacted by the several States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3370) to provide assistance to the States in the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of school-lunch programs, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the bill that it is not properly on the Consent Calendar. The record indicates that objection was registered to consideration of the bill on July 3, and also on September 18, which would indicate that if the rules governing the Consent Calendar are observed sufficient objection has been registered so that it is not eligible for consideration or for continuance on the Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would have to see whether or not there were three objections. If there were three objections, of course the bill is not eligible for consideration on the calendar.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is my recollection that there were not three objections. I raise the point at this time only to call to the attention of those who are in charge of keeping this calendar accurate that some mistake has been made, because a mistake has occurred not

only on this bill but on one or two others that will be called in the future. However, in order to remove any doubt, Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of this bill.

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Three objections have been heard. The bill is stricken from the Consent Calendar.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 319) to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SETTLEMENT OF RETURNING VETERANS ON FARMS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the Clerk call Calendar No. 144, the bill (H. R. 520) to facilitate settlement of returning veterans on farms in projects constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. That bill is erroneously on the calendar. It was passed on September 19 under a rule.

DEFENSE HIGHWAY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2840) to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill of such importance that it should not be considered on the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I object.

INVESTIGATION AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 83, Rept. No. 1036), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint committee for the purposes of making a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the control of the atomic bomb, to be composed of five Members of the Senate (but not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party), to be appointed by the President pro tempore, and five Members of the House of Representatives (but not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party), to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the control of the atomic bomb with a view of assisting the Congress in dealing with the problems presented by its development and control, and shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives, at the earliest practical date, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress; to employ such experts, consultants, clerical, stenographic, and other assistance whose compensation shall not exceed that prescribed under the Compensation Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties; to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid, one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

CONSENT CALENDAR

COOPERATION WITH STATE AGENCIES IN ADMINISTRATION OF LABOR LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 525) to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining safe and proper working conditions in industry and in the preparation, promulgation, and enforcement of regulations to control industrial health hazards.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is another bill which the record indicates has two previous objections registered against its consideration, which would indicate it is also not eligible for consideration at this time. Therefore, as in the other case, in order to remove any doubt and to make unnecessary references to the record, I object to its consideration at the present time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I object to its consideration.

Mr. KEAN. I object.

JURISDICTION OF CLAIMS UNDER TARIFF ACT OF 1922

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3437) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider certain claims arising after January 1, 1926, out of the Tariff Act of 1922.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected.

USE OF SURPLUS MATERIALS IN SOIL- AND WATER-CONSERVATION WORK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 538) to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil- and water-conservation work and to distribute such material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill if enacted into law would cut out the heart of the Surplus Property Act. It would give the Secretary of Agriculture regardless of existing law the power to requisition material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil and water conservation work and to distribute such material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies. This means that it would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to take over all the trucks, bulldozers, tractors, and other mechanical equipment regardless of the value thereof and give it away because when you loan such property it remains in the hands of the borrower until it is absolutely useless.

This House by a large majority provided in the Surplus Property Act that no surplus property of value could be given away and that even a Government agency would be required to purchase such surplus property as it needed within its appropriation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CHIEFS OF BUREAUS IN NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS AGREEMENT

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 204) requesting the President to use his good offices to the end that the United Nations invite Italy to be a signatory to the United Nations agreement.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 320) amending the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength," approved June 30, 1942 (57 Stat. 306).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a companion bill to No. 159 on the calendar relating to the proposed increase in the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy from the District of Columbia. This provides for a similar increase in the

number of cadets at the West Point Academy from the District of Columbia. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has just secured unanimous consent for the recommittal of the bill affecting midshipmen to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I think it is apparent that whatever legislation on this subject is passed should be fairly comparable as between the provisions made for the Naval Academy and those made for West Point. I think it would be appropriate that this bill should be committed also to the committee having jurisdiction, in this case the Committee on Military Affairs. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Miiltary Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the request made on the other bill was made by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Our committee has never discussed any such motion as this. The committee reported out the bill, and I do not believe it would be exactly the right thing to do to take this action now. Therefore if the gentleman insists, I must object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, then I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

RELEASE OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3772) to prevent a point system for the release of conscientious objectors performing assigned work under civilian direction pursuant to section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, from being put into effect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill is of a nature which should not be adopted by unanimous consent, and I therefore object.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 49, proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BIEMILLER, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mrs. DOUGLAS of California objected; and the bill was stricken from the Calendar.

ERADICATION OF MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3760) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was called the last time on the Consent Calendar, I explained some of the background concerning the measure. I would refer those who are interested in the bill now to those comments. While the bill does not expressly authorize the expenditure of $10,000,000, the report indicates that the cost would be approximately that amount.

Therefore, it obviously should not be considered by unanimous consent, and I object to its consideration.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3871) authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the judicial district of the State of Kansas, who shall possess the same powers, perform the same duties, and receive the same compensation and allowance as the present judge of said district.

SEC. 2. That whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of the district judge for the district of Kansas, by the retirement, disqualification, or death of the judge senior in commission, such vacancy shall not be filled, and thereafter there shall be but one district judge in said district.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "the judge senior in commission" and insert "any judge."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, to strike out the word "any" and insert the word "either."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I think that is clearly a typographical error. It should be "either." I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be corrected so as to read "either" instead of "any."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. CARLSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the preceding bill does not create a new permanent court in Kansas, but it does create a temporary judge. Kansas is the only State in the Union with a 1940 population of more than 1,800,000 which has but one United States district judge. This Federal court is ably presided over by Hon. Guy T. Helvering. All States in the Union with a 1940 population of 850,000 or more have two or more judges, except Colorado, 1,123,296, and Kansas, 1,861,028. The average population per United States judge in the 84 court districts in the United States is 735,988.

I want to state that Missouri with a population of twice as much as Kansas has 6 judges; Oklahoma with a population of 500,000 more than Kansas has 5 judges; Arkansas with a population of 148,000 more than Kansas has 3 judges; Nebraska with a population of 500,000 less has 2 judges.

In the period from July 1, 1944, to December 31, 1944, 40,308 criminal and civil cases were commenced in 84 districts presided over by 178 judges, or an average of 226 cases per judge. In Kansas 478 criminal and civil cases were filed in the same period with one judge.

Information from the clerk of the court advises me that Judge Helvering disposed of 491 cases in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945. This is considerably more than the average of 226 cases for the entire Nation.

RENEWAL OF CERTAIN TRADE-MARK REGISTRATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3424) to permit renewal of certain trade-mark registrations after expiry thereof, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the President shall find that foreign proprietors of trade-marks registered in the United States Patent Office who are nationals of countries which accord substantially equally treatment in this respect to trade-mark proprietors who are citizens of the United States are or may have been temporarily unable to comply with the conditions and formalities prescribed with respect to renewal of such registrations by section 12 of an act to authorize the registration of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States or with Indian tribes, and to protect the same, approved February 20, 1905, as amended (15 U. S. C. 92), because of the disruption or suspension of facilities essential for such compliance, he may by proclamation grant such extension of time as he may deem appropriate for the fulfillment of such conditions or formalities by such foreign proprietors: *Provided*, That the President may at any time terminate any proclamation authorized herein or any part thereof or suspend or extend its operation for such period or periods of time as in his judgment the interests of the United States may require.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "compliance", insert "because of conditions growing out of World War II"; page 2, line 13, insert "*Provided further*, That no such extension of time shall permit the filing of applications more than 3 years after the approval of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: On page 1, line 6, strike out the word "equally" and insert the word "equal."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE VICINITY OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT PENTAGON BUILDING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 888) to authorize the exchange of certain lands

in the vicinity of the War Department Pentagon Building in Arlington, Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to convey to the Rosslyn Connecting Railroad Company, its successors and/or assigns, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a parcel of land located within the boundaries of the War Department Pentagon grounds in Arlington, Va., aggregating four and three hundred and twenty-five one-thousandths acres, more or less; that the the Federal Works Administrator be, and he is hereby authorized, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to convey to the Rosslyn Connecting Railroad Company, its successors and/or assigns, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a parcel of land, aggregating one hundred and fifty-nine one-thousandths acre, more or less, immediately adjacent to the above described parcel of land, and that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized, under such terms and conditions as they may prescribe, to convey to the Rosslyn Connecting Railroad Company, its successors and/or assigns, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a parcel of land, aggregating seven hundred and ninety-four ten-thousandths acre, more or less, being a portion of the abandoned approach to the Highway Bridge, otherwise known as the Fourteenth Street Bridge (United States Highway Numbered 1), immediately adjacent to the next above-described parcel of land, and that in exchange therefor, the United States of America accept all right, title, and interest of the Rosslyn Connecting Railroad Company in twelve and two hundred and twenty-five one-thousandths acres of land, more or less, situate in the same vicinity.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT DAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3870) to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, "The Harry L. Englebright Dam."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I want to express my appreciation of my good friend, the chairman of the committee, and members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in reporting out this bill naming a dam after one of our former members, the late Harry L. Englebright.

It is eminently appropriate that one of our public works should be named after the distinguished native son of the West and a man who gave the best years of his life for its progress.

It was my privilege to enjoy for many years the close friendship of Harry Englebright. As Republican whip we were brought together and I came to love and admire him for his rugged Americanism and his devotion to the public service. He loved the West; he knew the problems of the West and at the same time he was devoted to the welfare of this country. He was a fearless, faithful public servant. His death came at an early date because of his devotion to public service. Several days before he died he came to my office. It was evident he was in poor health and I tried to dissuade him from further work. I advised him to go home and take care of himself; but those were strenuous days and he insisted upon completing an important assignment and that precipitated his death. So it can be honestly said he died for his country just as truly as any man who died in the field of battle.

This is only a small tribute but it will ever keep green the memory of a fine Christian gentleman; an able conscientious public servant and a great American. The country honors itself in honoring a man like Harry Englebright.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the dam constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, and known as the "Englebright Dam," shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Harry L. Englebright Dam." Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name of "Englebright Dam" shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name of "Harry L. Englebright Dam."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTING ERROR IN SECTION 342 (B) (8) NATIONALITY ACT, 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3087) to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. IV, title 8, sec. 742 (b) (8)), is amended by striking out "maximum fee of 50 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "minimum fee of 50 cents."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PROPERTY LOSS OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 559) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service", approved October 27, 1943, so as to make the provisions thereof effective with respect to losses occurring on or after October 31, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the report accompanying this bill does not comply with the rules of the House, in particular, rule 13, part 2 (a) I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN REAL ESTATE IN POLK COUNTY, ARK.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2677) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to accept and dispose of real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson, of Polk County, Ark., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to accept on behalf of the United States the real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson, of Polk County, Ark., and to deal with the same in the manner provided by the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 885; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 304a and the following), or the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 345b): *Provided*, That prior to disposition under authority of the aforesaid act, the Federal Works Administrator may offer to convey to James W. Rose, of Polk County, Ark., such real estate at one-half the appraised value thereof and execute in the name of the United States a quitclaim deed to the property.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL SECRETARYSHIPS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3864) to establish the Office of Under Secretary of Labor, and three offices of Assistant Secretary of Labor, and to abolish the existing office of Assistant Secretary of Labor and the existing office of Second Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, as indicated by the title, the bill authorizes two additional under or assistant secretaries of a department of the Government, a subject of too great importance to be considered by unanimous consent.

I therefore object.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR FIRE DAMAGE AT HARROWBEER AIRPORT, YELVERTON, SOUTH DEVON, ENGLAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 902) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in a Quonset hut at Harrowbeer Airport, Yelverton, South Devon, England, on December 26, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $272.90, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in a Quonset hut at Harrowbeer Airport, Yelverton, South Devon, England, on December 26, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent

thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR FIRE DAMAGE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 985) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires occurring at various naval shore activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,823.61, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires occurring in tents occupied by the Sixty-ninth United States Naval Construction Battalion, Omaha Beach, France, on October 17, 1944; in lucky bag storage hut used for storage of officers' gear at naval operating base, Dutch Harbor, Alaska, on September 10, 1943; in storehouse known as Walter Reid Building, Brisbane, Australia, on November 5, 1944; at amphibious training base, Camp Bradford, naval operating base, Norfolk, Va., on January 20, 1945, at naval hospital, Memphis, Tenn., on February 1, 1945; at naval section base, Fort Townsend, Wash., on December 27, 1942; and at base dispensary, naval base squadron, Rosneath, Scotland, on October 12, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY PERSONNEL FOR FIRE LOSS AT BUNKER HILL, IND.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 986) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in administration building at the naval air station, Bunker Hill, Ind., on December 28, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $379.20, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in administration building at the naval air station, Bunker Hill, Ind., on December 28, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY PERSONNEL FOR FIRE LOSS AT NORFOLK, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1062) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,049.18, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,049.18" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,216.78."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING NAVY WITH A SYSTEM OF LAWS FOR SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3759) providing the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the report accompanying this bill does not clearly set forth the changes made in existing law, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TERMS OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF CONNECTICUT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4100) to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The State of Connecticut shall constitute one judicial district to be known as the district of Connecticut. Terms of the district court shall be held at New Haven on the second Tuesday in February and the third Tuesday in September; and at Hartford on the second Tuesday in May and the first Tuesday in December."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, that completes the call of the bills on the Consent Calendar.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the bills on the Private Calendar.

RELIEF OF SETTLERS ON THE INTERNATIONAL STRIP AT NOGALES, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 69) for relief of settlers on the International Strip at Nogales, Ariz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SPRINGER objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

REVERE SUGAR REFINERY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1955) for the relief of the Revere Sugar Refinery.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, owing to the amount of money involved and the precedent we are establishing, I ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 693) for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, by reason of the importance of this bill and the matters it involves, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF GEORGE O'HARA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 90) for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,882.97 to the estate of George O'Hara, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said George O'Hara, late of Forest City, Ill., who was killed as the result of a collision with a United States Army truck between Manito and Forest City, Ill., on December 6, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: Page 1, line 5, strike out "$7,882.97" and insert "$5,382.97."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WIDOW OF JOSEPH C. AKIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 620) for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Joseph C. Akin, of Dolores, Montezuma County, Colo., widow of Joseph C. Akin, who, while in the discharge of his duty as a deputy United States marshal, was killed by a band of renegade Ute Indians while he was attempting to arrest one Tse-Ne-Gat, a Ute Indian charged with murder, on the 21st day of February 1915, the sum of $3,905, in addition to the sum paid to her under the act of March 1, 1921, on account of the murder of her said husband while in the regular discharge of his duties in the service of the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLIVER: Page 2, line 1, strike out "$3,905" and insert "$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN CLAIMANTS WHO SUFFERED LOSS BY FLOOD IN, AT, OR NEAR BEAN LAKE, MO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3574) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill be referred back to the Committee on Claims for further consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DR. ERNEST H. STARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 239) for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. Ernest H. Stark, Paris, Tex., the sum of $98. Such sum represents payment for services rendered the United States during the calendar year 1942 by the said Dr. Ernest H. Stark in making physical examinations of prospective employees for positions with the United States engineer suboffice, Paris, Tex. Such medical services were rendered pursuant to the terms of a contract with the United States engineer office, Denison, Tex., but payment under such contract was disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States on the ground that such contract had been entered into without authority of law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JAMES M. HOOKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 240) for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. James M. Hooks, Paris, Tex., the sum of $766. Such sum represents payment for services rendered the United States during the calendar year 1942 by the said Dr. James M. Hooks in making physical examinations of prospective employees for positions with the United States engineer suboffice, Paris, Tex. Such medical services were rendered pursuant to the terms of a contract with the United States engineer office, Denison, Tex., but payment under such contract was disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States on the ground that such contract had been entered into without authority of law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUITCLAIM TO CHANSLOR-CANFIELD MIDWAY OIL CO. OF CERTAIN SUBSURFACE MINERAL RIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1236) to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co., a corporation, all subsurface mineral and water rights existing in and under that certain tract of land consisting of approximately 211.36 acres described in that certain deed dated February 17, 1943, recorded June 9, 1943, in book 20047 at page 238 of Official Records of the county of Los Angeles, State of California, whereby the Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. donated said land to the United States of America, such quitclaim deed to provide, however, that the grantee, its successors and assigns, shall have no right to enter upon, or use the surface of said premises for the development, extraction, and removal of the minerals or water thereunder, or for any other purpose or purposes.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the comma insert "gratuitously, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe."

Page 1, line 6, insert "its successors and assigns."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "and water."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "17" and insert "27."

Page 2, line 11, strike out the words "or water."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLIVER JENSEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 787) for the relief of Oliver Jensen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Oliver Jensen, of Ogden, Utah, the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of an accident which occurred when the automobile which he was driving collided with a United States Army vehicle, at the intersection of Riverdale Road and Wall Avenue in Ogden, Utah, on September 19, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARGARET McWILLIAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1090) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret McWilliams.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JOSEPHINE BENHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Josephine Benham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Josephine Benham, of Springfield, Ohio, the sum of $426.13 for damage to personal property and to compensate her for medical expenses incurred, plus $5,000 for pain and suffering, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and personal property damage suffered as a result of being struck by a United States mail truck at about 10:20 antemeridian on December 18, 1943, while the driver of said truck was in the performance of his duty in connection with the pick-up and delivery of the United States mail: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", strike out the bill down to "*Provided*" on page 2 and insert in lieu thereof "$1,300, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and property damage sustained as a result of being struck by a United States post office truck in Springfield, Ohio, on December 18, 1943."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MYRTLE RUTH OSBORNE, MARION WALTS, AND JESSIE A. WALTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1636) for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Myrtle Ruth Osborne, widow of Levi Osborne, deceased, the sum of $9,000; to Marion Walts and Jessie A. Walts, father and mother of Beverly Gale Walts, deceased, the sum of $2,000; to pay to Marion Walts $1,500, and to Jessie A. Walts the sum of $2,500, all of Louisville, Ky., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Levi Osborne and Beverly Gale Walts, and for injuries sustained by Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts, as the result of a collision between the automobile in which they were riding and a United States Army truck on State Highway No. 60, near Grahampton Bridge, in Meade County, Ky., on November 6, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$9,000" and insert "$7,000."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,000."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLORENTINE H. KEELER, HAROLD S. KEELER AND GENEVIEVE M. KEELER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1961) for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler, Harold S. Keeler, and Genevieve M. Keeler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,500 to Florentine H. Keeler; to pay the sum of $17.50 to Harold S. Keeler, both of Arcadia, Calif.; and to pay the sum of $1,166.90 to Genevieve M. Keeler, of Garvey, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, loss of earnings, and property damage sustained as the result of an airplane crash at Huntington Beach, Calif., on June 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$3,000."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$1,166.90" and insert "$1,070.90."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARBARA JEAN TILLMAN AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2166) for the relief of Barbara Jean Tillman and Elizabeth Ann Tillman, minor daughters of Franz Tillman, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the guardian of the property of Barbara Jean Tillman and Elizabeth Ann Tillman, Hot Springs, Ark., minor daughters of Franz Tillman, deceased, the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall me in full settlement of all claims against the United States by reason of the death of the said Franz Tillman, on October 7, 1943, as a result of a collison on such day, near Leesville, La., between the vehicle in which he was riding and a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the comma, strike out the balance of the page down to and including line 4, page 2, and insert "to the estate of Franz Tillman, deceased, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of said Franz Tillman, who was killed in a collision of a civilian truck with an Army vehicle near Gandy, La., on October 7, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Franz Tillman, deceased."

J. CLYDE MARQUIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2172) for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. Clyde Marquis, a former employee of the Department of State, the sum of $2,075.82, in full settlement of all claims against the United States to reimburse him for the expense incident to the return of his wife and personal effects from Rome, Italy, in 1941.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLORENCE ZIMMERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2241) for the relief of Florence Zimmerman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the

United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Florence Zimmerman, who is alleged to have sustained injuries to her back in the line of her duties on June 23, 1942, while employed in the Navy medical supply depot, Brooklyn, N. Y., and her claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if she files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The monthly compensation which the said Florence Zimmerman may be entitled to receive by reason of the enactment of this act shall commence on the first day of the month during which this act is enacted.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT E. SEVERNS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2335) for the relief of Albert E. Severns.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Albert E. Severns, Seattle, Wash., the sum of $3,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Albert E. Severns against the United States on account of personal injuries only, which said Albert E. Severns sustained on June 19, 1943, when he was struck by a United States Army motor vehicle at the intersection of First Avenue South and Dearborn Street, Seattle, Wash.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the period, strike out the balance of the page down to and including the word "Washington" in line 2, page 2, and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on June 19, 1943, when he was struck by a United States Army command car near the intersection of First Avenue South and Railroad Avenue in Seattle, Wash.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD WOOLF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2362) for the relief of Edward Woolf.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward Woolf, Boston, Mass., the sum of $2,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Edward Woolf against the United States arising out of his being struck, on November 9, 1943, on Brattle Street, in Boston, Mass., by a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,500."

Page 2, line 1, after the colon, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM KALAK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2452) for the relief of Sam Kalak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sam Kalak, San Diego, Calif., the sum of $2,003.98. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Sam Kalak against the United States for damage to his home in San Diego, Calif., caused by the crash of a United States Navy airplane on June 14, 1944.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,003.98" and insert "$1,490.99."

Page 1, line 10, after the colon, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF ED EDMONDSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2481) for the relief of Ed Edmondson, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the administrator of the estate of Ed Edmondson, deceased, the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Ed Edmondson, who was fatally injured on September 11, 1943, when the automobile in which he was a passenger was struck by a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 27, near Spring City, Tenn.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following section:

"SEC. 2. Before payment is made under this act, the administrator of the estate shall furnish the Secretary of the Treasury with certificate of cancellation of judgment against Cris Lee Gray in the circuit court of Rhea County, Dayton, Tenn., rendered on January 4, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENSIGN ELMER H. BECKMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2684) for the relief of Ensign Elmer H. Beckmann.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 732, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $409.05 to reimburse Ensign Elmer H. Beckmann, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost in the fire in the junior bachelor officers' quarters at the United States naval air station, Brunswick, Maine, on August 4, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2684) was laid on the table.

JOHN R. JENNINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3754) for the relief of John R. Jennings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1265 be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. McGREGOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell us if this bill is identical with the bill before us?

Mr. BARDEN. I am informed that it is.

Mr. McGREGOR. As to the full amount?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands it is the same amount.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John R. Jennings, South Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John R. Jennings against the United States on account of personal injuries and damage to his automobile sustained on April 22, 1943, near Camp Blanding, Fla., when such automobile was struck by a United States Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3754) was laid on the table.

JOHN AUGUST JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 977) for the relief of John August Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and it is hereby, given jurisdiction to hear and determine the claim of John August Johnson, of Rockford, Ill., and to render judgment against the United States in his favor for such compensation and damage as may be found to be justly due, if any, as compensation and damage sustained by reason of the destruction by fire on October 4, 1923, of the dwelling house located on the farm lands of John August Johnson, situated near Camp Grant, Ill., while said farm lands were occupied by the War Department.

SEC. 2. Said claim shall not be considered as barred because of any existing statute of limitations with respect to suits against the United States: *Provided*, That suit is brought within 1 year of the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANDLER COBB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1781) for the relief of Candler Cobb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Candler Cobb, New York, N. Y., the sum of $506.10. The payment of such sum shall reimburse the said Candler Cobb for the expenditure of a like amount in payment of hospital and nurses' bills incurred in connection with an emergency operation undergone by him during May 1943, while a member of the United States Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEANNETTE C. JONES AND MINOR CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of Jeannette C. Jones and minor children.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MARDEN CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3674) for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. DOLLIVER objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ERNEST L. FUHRMANN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 711) for the relief of Ernest L. Fuhrmann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ernest L. Fuhrmann, of Bogalusa, La., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States (1) for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a block of ice thrown from a moving troop train at Elton, Miss., on May 24, 1943; and (2) for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him as a result of such injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELLIS DUKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3095) for the relief of Ellis Duke, also known as Elias Duke.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MYRTLE C. RADABAUGH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3987) for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ROBERT A. HUDSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4018) for the relief of Robert A. Hudson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert A. Hudson, the sum of $116.79 for reimbursement of expenses incurred in the repair of a Cadillac sedan car owned by Robert A. Hudson, which was damaged by a Government truck December 1, 1941, at Xenia, Ohio.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the comma, insert "of Xenia, Ohio."

Line 6, after "the sum of $116.79", insert the words "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Line 9, strike out the words "Government truck" and insert "United States Army vehicle."

On page 2, insert "*: Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. B. NELSON CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4048) to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decisions of the Court of Claims in two suits instituted by H. B. Nelson, doing business as the H. B. Nelson Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Margaret S. Nelson, as executrix of the last will and testament of H. B. Nelson (doing business as the H. B. Nelson Construction Co.), may, at any time within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act, appeal as of right to the Supreme Court of the United States from

the judgments of the Court of Claims of the United States in the suits Nos. 43574–A and 43574–B, respectively, heretofore instituted in the Court of Claims by said H. B. Nelson, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Supreme Court to consider and determine on such appeal all questions of law and fact upon the merits, and render judgment against the United States for the amount of any and all losses and/or damages suffered by said H. B. Nelson in justice and equity and without regard to technical bars, because of extra work and/or differences in conditions from those contemplated or misrepresentations or concealments of conditions or breaches of warranty, or arising otherwise howsoever prior to or during or subsequent to the performance of Government contracts Nos. NOY–2203 and 2248, dated June 19, 1934, and September 12, 1934: *Provided*, That said cases shall be determined separately upon the evidence and transcripts of the records heretofore agreed upon by the parties, approved and certified on November 27, 1940, by the Clerk of the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court of the United States. Any judgments rendered in favor of the claimant shall be paid in the same manner as other judgments of said Court of Claims are paid.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL BAUMANN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 451) for the relief of Carl Baumann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl Baumann, captain, Quartermaster Corps, Army of the United States (Army serial No. O–278586), the sum of $800, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of amounts collected from him in settlement of his liability for public funds which were lost or stolen from the subsistence warehouse building, Central Signal Corps School, Camp Crowder, Mo., on or about November 3, 1943, and for which he was accountable as mess and subsistence officer: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAFFEY ROBERTSON-SMITH, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 489) for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

LEE D. HOSELEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 573) for the relief of Lee D. Hoseley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lee D. Hoseley, of Klamath Falls, Oreg., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for injuries sustained by him on or about August 21, 1940, while he was engaged in fighting a forest fire on the Klamath Indian Reservation in the State of Oregon: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAN C. RODGERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 694) for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dan C. Rodgers, of Coquille, Oreg., the sum of $4,113, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when a United States Navy airplane crashed near his residence in Coquille, Oreg., on October 15, 1944, and for reimbursement of expenses incurred by him as a result of such injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: Page 1, line 6, strike out the sum "$4,113" and insert "$3,113."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM ANDREW EVANS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 729) for the relief of Willian Andrew Evans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Andrew Evans, of Wakulla County, Fla., the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Army car on State Highway No. 10 near Sopchoppy, Wakulla County, Fla., on December 6, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and any such payment, delivery, or receipt shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVERETT McLENDON, SR., ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 762) for the relief of Everett McLendon, Sr.; Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr.; Mr. and Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr., for the benefit of their minor daughter, Nadine McLendon; and Everett McLendon, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (1) the sum of $446.04 to Everett McLendon, Sr., of Savannah, Ga., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained by him and for the medical and hospital expenses incurred for the treatment of the personal injuries sustained by his wife, Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr., and his minor children, Everett McLendon, Jr., and Nadine McLendon; (2) the sum of $500 to Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr., of Savannah, Ga., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the personal injuries sustained by her; (3) the sum of $100 to Mr. and Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr., of Savannah, Ga., for the benefit of their minor daughter, Nadine McLendon, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the personal injuries sustained by said Nadine McLendon; and (4) the sum of $50 to Everett McLendon, Jr., of Savannah, Ga., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the personal injuries sustained by him, all as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle which occurred on May 11, 1942, at the intersection of Harris and Lincoln Streets in Savannah, Ga.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMOND W. FORD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 857) for the relief of Raymond W. Ford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to pay, from any unappropriated money in the Treasury, the sum of $97.25, in full payment of the claim of Raymond W. Ford for articles belonging to him lost by the Navy Department in the naval hospital at Seattle, Wash.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the

same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUGH EGAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 909) for relief of Hugh Egan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hugh Egan, of New Bedford, Mass., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by an Army vehicle near Fort Rodman, Mass., on November 30, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY H. HUFFMAN AND MRS. MARIE J. HUFFMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 929) for the relief of Henry H. Huffman and Mrs. Marie J. Huffman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Henry H. Huffman and Mrs. Marie J. Huffman, of Orlando, Fla., the sum of $1,027.66, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damage to their dwelling house and for personal injuries sustained by the said Mrs. Marie J. Huffman and medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred incident thereto, as a result of the crash of an Army airplane in the vicinity of said house in Orlando, Fla., on March 12, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. (JG) WILLIAM AUGUSTUS WHITE, U. S. N. R.

The Clerk called the next bill (S. 996) for the relief of Lt. (jg) William Augustus White, United States Naval Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $162, to reimburse Lt. (jg) William Augustus White, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost in a fire in a tent occupied as quarters at the United States naval supply depot, Navy No. 167, on November 30, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. EDWARD P. STANDLEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1007) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward P. Standley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Edward P. Standley, of Coquille, Oreg., the sum of $3,211.92, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by them as the result of a United States Navy airplane crash which destroyed their grocery in Coquille, Oreg., on October 15, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CATHERINE DRIGGERS AND HER MINOR CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 801) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled, "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States of America suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children, and claim for compensation for the death of her husband, Haven L. Driggers, who died on February 7, 1943, as a result of injuries sustained by him while in the performance of his duties as second assistant engineer in the employ of the United States of America, is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if claim is filed with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "17" and insert "15."

Page 1, line 10, after the word "Driggers", strike out the balance of line 10, all of line 11, and on page 2 all of line 1 down to and including the word "America" on line 2, and insert "alleged to have occurred on February 7, 1943, in the performance of his duties while he was serving as second assistant engineer on board a vessel under charter to the War Shipping Administration."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. WILMOTH HODGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 874) for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to L. Wilmoth Hodges, Dresden, Tenn., the sum of $15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said L. Wilmoth Hodges against the United States for damages for the personal injuries sustained by him, and the destruction of his personal property, on May 31, 1943, at the air base near Halls, Tenn., when an airplane in the service of the Army of the United States, in the course of landing, overshot the runway and crashed into the vehicle in which he was sitting.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "of", strike out the balance of line 6, all of lines 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, and on page 2 lines 1 and 2, and insert "$9,641.75, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital expenses, property damage, and loss of earnings as the result of an accident involving an Army plane crashing near Halls, Tenn., on May 31, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NANNIE BASS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 875) for the relief of Nannie Bass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nannie Bass, Halls, Tenn., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all

claims of the said Nannie Bass against the United States on account of the death of her husband, the late Sam Bass, as a result of being struck, on August 20, 1944, in his own house by machine-gun bullets fired from an airplane in the service of the Army of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,295."

Page 2, line 1, insert *"Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNIE M. LANNON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1956) for the relief of Annie M. Lannon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not heretofore appropriated, to Annie M. Lannon the sum of $137.64, an amount representing death payment based upon the wage record of her son, George T. Lannon, Jr.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the figures, strike out the balance of the line, all of line 6, and down to and including the word "Junior" and insert "of Jamaica Plain, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for social-security payment on account of the death of her son, George T. Lannon, Jr., who died on December 26, 1941: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF ALEXANDER McLEAN, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2027) for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,639.55 to the estate of Alexander McLean, of Boston, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Alexander McLean, deceased, as a result of being struck by a United States Navy vehicle, on Commercial Street, Boston, Mass., June 18, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following commitee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, insert "and John W. Meyer, the driver of the Navy vehicle."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN J. GALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2160) for the relief of John J. Gall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John J. Gall the sum of $1,799.31. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damage to the property and business of the said John J. Gall when the building located at 2137 State Highway No. 25, Rahway, N. J., leased by him and in which he conducted his said business, was damaged on November 5, 1943, by a United States Army motor vehicle: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$1,799.31" and insert "$603.40."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES A. BRADY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2310) for the relief of James A. Brady.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the account of James A. Brady, acting collector of internal revenue, tenth district of Ohio, in the sum of $91,400, representing the value of certain special tax stamp coupons unissued and remaining in book No. 927, gaming devices for the fiscal year 1945, which have been unintentionally lost or destroyed by his office.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY P. KING AND G. B. MORGAN, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2332) for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000 to Henry P. King, of Roduco, N. C., to pay the sum of $1,000 to G. B. Morgan, of Sunbury, N. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical expenses incident thereto as a result of a United States Navy tractor getting out of control and crashing into a State highway car in Gates County, N. C., on May 29, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$750."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$660."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARLETHIA ROSSER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2399) for the relief of Arlethia Rosser.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arlethia Rosser, 475 John Street, Northwest, apartment 268, Atlanta, Ga., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims of the said Arlethia Rosser against the United States as a result of having suffered a bullet wound from the pistol of a military policeman of the United States Army on July 15, 1943, while he was performing his official duties.

With the following committee amendment:

": *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. WERNER HOLTZ

The Clerk called the bill H. R. 2479, for the relief of Capt. Werner Holtz.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. Werner Holtz, Albany, N. Y., the sum of $546.30. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Capt. Werner Holtz against the United States for losses sustained as the result of personal injuries suffered by his wife and damage to his automobile when such automobile was struck near Hopkinsville, Ky., on September 1, 1943, by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendment:

": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any persons violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELEN ALTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2512) for the relief of Helen Alton.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $13,678.82, in full settlement of all claims of the said Helen Alton against the United States on account of personal injuries and property damage sustained by her as a result of a collision between an automobile in which she was a passenger and United States Army truck numbered 4310509, on the 5th day of May 1944, on Pulaski Skyway, Jersey City, N. J.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the dollar sign strike out the bill down to the colon on page 2, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof "$3,178.82 to Helen Alton; to pay the sum of $4,199.75 to Edwin Alton, of Newark, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, nursing expenses, and property damage sustained as the result of a collision between the car in which they were riding and a United States Army vehicle, on Pulaski Skyway, Jersey City, N. J., on May 5, 1944."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Helen Alton and Edwin Alton."

JOHN G. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2579) for the relief of John G. Johnson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John G. Johnson, of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $509.15, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incident to the packing, storage, and removal of his household goods from Washington, D. C., to Chicago, Ill., in connection with the change of his official station from Washington to Chicago: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

MRS. EVELYN JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2642) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Evelyn Johnson, of Chipley, Ga., unremarried widow of A. C. Johnson, deceased, the sum of $10,000; in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States arising out of the homicide of the said A. C. Johnson, who was killed when the automobile in which he was driving was involved in a collision with a United States Army truck-trailer on Troup Factory Bridge over Long Cane Creek, on United States Highway No. 27 approximately 10 miles south of La Grange, Ga., on or about January 24, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$5,000."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "arising out of the homicide of the said A. C. Johnson," and insert in lieu thereof "as compensation for the death of the said A. C. Johnson."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEN GREENWOOD AND DOVIE GREENWOOD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2686) for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood, of Nettleton, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of being struck by a United States Army vehicle, near Nettleton, Miss., on January 16, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,200."

Page 1, line 6, after the name "Greenwood and", insert "$500 to."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "sustained as a result of being struck by a United States Army vehicle, near Nettleton, Miss., on January 16, 1944", and insert in lieu thereof "and losses sustained as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle on United States Highway No. 45, near Nettleton, Miss., on March 16, 1944."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

I. H. BEASLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2723) for the relief of I. H. Beasley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to I. H. Beasley, Gallatin, Tenn., the sum of $446. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said I. H. Beasley against the United States for property damage sustained on January 8, 1944, when the negligence of the driver of a United States Army truck caused an employee of the said I. H. Beasley to lose control of a truck owned by the said I. H. Beasley so that it struck a guardrail of a bridge on United States Highway 31E near Bethpage, Tenn., and overturned.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$446", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$296."

At the end of the bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. STUART B. RILEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2810) for the relief of Mrs. Stuart B. Riley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Stuart B. Riley, of North Attleboro, Mass., the sum of $2,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained, and reimbursement of expenses incurred, and property damages to the automobile in which she was riding, belonging to her husband, Stuart B. Riley. The accident occurred on August 16, 1943, near the approach to the Bourne Bridge, along the south side of the Cape Cod Canal, near Bourne, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,141.17."

Page 1, line 8, beginning the word "compensation" strike out the bill through the name "Massachusetts" on page 2, line 2, and insert in lieu thereof "property damage and personal injuries sustained, and medical and hospital expenses incurred, as the result of an accident which occurred on August 16, 1943, involving an Army truck and an Army searchlight power plant, near the approach to the Bourne Bridge, along the south side of the Cape Cod Canal, near Bourne, Mass."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES LYNCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2835) for the relief of James Lynch.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James Lynch, Syracuse, N. Y., the sum of $10,764.60, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment of medical and hospital expenses and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of being struck by a United States mail truck while crossing Erie Boulevard East, at the corner of South Warren Street, in the city of Syracuse, N. Y., on September 30, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the language "faction of", strike out the remainder of the line and strike out lines 8 and 9, and insert in lieu thereof "all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses as the result of being struck by."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,764.60" and insert "$8,764.60."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELO GIANQUITTI AND GEORGE GIANQUITTI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2836) for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Angelo Gianquitti, of Syracuse, N. Y., the sum of $1,032, and to George Gianquitti, of Syracuse, N.Y., the sum of $2,992.25, in full settlement of all claims against the United States, arising out of a collision between a car owned and operated by George Gianquitti, and in which Angelo Gianquitti was a passenger, and a car operated in connection with the Syracuse Army Air Base, on July 1, 1943, at the corner of Court and Wadsworth Streets in Syracuse, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out all after "United States" in line 8, and all of lines 9, 10, and 11, and page 2 strike out lines 1 and 2 down to and including "New York" and insert in lieu thereof "for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of income as the result of a collision between the car in which they were riding and a United States Army vehicle, on July 1, 1943, at the intersection of Court and Wadsworth Streets, Syracuse, N. Y."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EVELYN MERRITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2927) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Merritt.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be referred back to the Committee on Claims for further consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

JOHN HAMES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3011) for the relief of John Hames.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to John Hames, Vincennes, Ind., the sum of $1,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John Hames against the United States on account of the serious and permanent personal injury sustained by him on October 8, 1943, in Vincennes, Ind., when he was struck by an Army truck, one of a convoy from Fort Knox, Ky.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$750."

Page 1, line 11, after the word "Kentucky", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

G. F. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3137) for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, in an amount not to exceed $212.69, for items suspended or disallowed.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of Frank White and W. O. Woods, former Treasurers of the United States, H. T. Tate, former Acting Treasurer of the United States, and W. A. Julian, Treasurer of the United States, for sums not to exceed $1,620, $4,718.36, $340, and $53,798.55, respectively, representing unavailable items in their accounts as former Treasurers, former Acting Treasurer, and Treasurer of the United States: *Provided*, That any recoveries heretofore or hereafter made in respect of any of the foregoing items may, in the discretion of the Comptroller General of the United States, be applied to offset unavailable items of a similar character hereafter arising in the accounts of the former Treasurers, former Acting Treasurer, and Treasurer, respectively, upon a showing that such unavailable items have occurred without fraud on the part of the former Treasurers, former Acting Treasurer, or Treasurer.

SEC. 3. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of W. A. Julian, Treasurer of the United States, for a sum not to exceed $8,236, representing unadjusted differences which occurred in the preparation of statements of disbursing officers' accounts during the period from January 1, 1940, to October 31, 1944.

SEC. 4. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed the sum of $980.88, which shall be credited to the Treasurer's account to the extent necessary to adjust unavailable items resulting from certain shortages, five checks lost after payment, double payment upon claim of nonreceipt of two original checks, and six checks of which both the originals and duplicates were paid.

SEC. 5. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed the sum of $143.56, of which the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay not to exceed $132.14 to William J. Gillin, payroll clerk and timekeeper, and not to exceed $11.42 to Harold Link, certifying officer, United States mint, Philadelphia, Pa., which amounts were paid by them to satisfy charges resulting from overpayments of salary to mint employees.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF SUE FLIPPIN BRATTON, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3198) for the relief of the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton, a minor, Lafayette, Tenn., the sum of $25,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by the said Sue Flippin Bratton on February 19, 1944, when the automobile in which she was riding as a passenger on the Macon County highway between Hartsville and Lafayette, Tenn., struck a steel guard rail projecting over the traveled part of a one-way bridge over the middle fork of Goose Creek. Such projecting steel guard rail pierced the body of said Sue Flippin Bratton, causing serious injuries and permanent disability. Such bridge had been damaged in January 1944, by United States Army vehicles participating in field exercises in Macon County, and, in attempting to repair such damage, military personnel left such guard rail projecting over the highway: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$10,030."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "injuries" insert "medical and hospital expenses."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,030" and insert "$8,030."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the work done by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] and the other members of the objectors' committee, not only on this bill but on all the other bills. I served on this committee for a year and I know how hard the work actually is. It is, therefore, with much reluctance that I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This girl for whom this bill provides relief was riding home from church in a car in an area where Army maneuvers were being held. While crossing a bridge the car struck a piece of steel which had been left protruding from the bridge railing by an Army unit which had improperly repaired the bridge and left this piece of steel protruding into the traffic right-of-way. The steel pierced the car and the body of young Miss Sue Bratton. It was a most tragic accident for which this bill seeks to bring relief. I do not think the amount can be made high enough. If the accident had occurred as the result of negligence on the part of an individual or a corporation, I am sure any jury in the United States would have awarded more than the committee amendment provides.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does not the gentleman feel that the driver of the vehicle was partly negligent in his driving because of the fact that the piece of steel only protruded about 14 or 15 inches from the edge of the pavement? Does not the gentleman recognize that the driver of the vehicle was partly responsible for the accident?

Mr. GORE. Of course, I was not there, but the neighbors do not think so. The Army had left this piece of steel projecting from the side of the bridge. This family was returning home from church and the car, driven at not an excessive speed, came upon this projecting piece of steel which was driven all the way through the girl's hip and into her very vitals. It is a wonder, a miracle of God, that she is even living. But she is a cripple, a total invalid, for the remainder of her life. I introduced the bill for $25,000, thinking that was little enough for the tragedy that this beautiful young girl has suffered. The committee cut it down to $10,000, and now the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] is offering this amendment, in all good faith, of course, making a further reduction. I only want justice done this girl for her pitiable plight. I do hope that the Congress will approve the amount recommended by the committee of $10,030.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all appreciate the statement made by the gentleman, and I take no exception to it whatsoever. I recognize it is a pitiful case, but we also must recognize, as Members of this body, that it is our duty to act fairly and impartially regardless of whose community the accident might have happened in. The evidence shows that the driver was partly to blame in this particular case. The War Department has made a recommendation in accordance with the amendment that I have introduced. They have recommended $8,000, plus the sum of $2,030, making a total of $10,030, which your committee recommended. This amendment recommends $6,000 for pain and suffering and $2,030 for medical and hospital expenses, or a total of $8,030.

I recognize this is a pitiful case. We have a number of such cases. You Members have them in your communities. But we must make a fair average of all of them, and that is what your committee has tried to do.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Does not the gentleman feel that the $6,000 for pain and injury is rather small to last the total life of a girl 18 years of age, beautiful, healthy, and strong, who, by the admitted negligence of the United States Government, is now an invalid for the remainder of her mortal days?

Mr. McGREGOR. I differ with the gentleman as to his statement with regard to the admitted negligence of the United States Government. It is a divided negligence, if the gentleman will refer to the committee report, because the driver was some to blame. I would respectfully call the gentleman's attention to the laws of Tennessee relative to the division of responsibility.

Mr. GORE. I am acquainted with this particular bridge. It is a narrow bridge, with the railing rather close to the side

of the car. The people in that community feel that the accident was entirely the result of the Army's leaving this piece of steel projecting from the side of the bridge.

Mr. McGREGOR. I believe we have confidence in our War Department. The testimony shows it has been admitted that the driver did share responsibility in negligence.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder if the gentleman has taken into consideration the fact that under the law of Tennessee contributory negligence on the part of the driver of the car, even if there were any, would not be imputed to the invited guest in the automobile. This girl had no charge or control over the operation of the automobile. Under the law of Tennessee, even if the driver was guilty of some contributory negligence, that would not prevent her from recovering nor would it diminish the amount of recovery she could get.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does not the gentleman believe, though, that in our consideration, where the War Department and the committee have decided that there is a division of responsibility, we should not pay an excessive amount for the injury?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It seems to me it has already been cut down, in view of what the gentleman from Tennessee has said.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think my very good friend will admit his error when he introduced the bill here for $25,000. If he was sincere at that time, certainly it seems rather peculiar that now he is willing to accept $10,000.

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman will yield, I am sure he does not impute to me any lack of sincerity.

Mr. McGREGOR. Indeed, not.

Mr. GORE. I believe now, as I believed when I introduced the bill, that this young lady should be paid no less than $25,000, but the committee has acted and cut it down to $10,000, and with reluctance I thought I would not offer any opposition. However, now that the gentleman offers an amendment to reduce it still further, I feel that in justice to this girl I should oppose that reduction.

May I read from the report of the War Department, signed by Secretary Stimson:

> The evidence fairly establishes that the accident and resulting personal injuries sustained by Sue Flippin Bratton were not caused by any fault or negligence on her part, but were caused solely by the combined negligence of the military authorities in failing properly to repair the guardrail of the bridge which had been damaged in connection with the operations of Army troops, and of Paul Keene, the driver of the vehicle.

Mr. McGREGOR. I agree with the gentleman's statement. The young lady who was injured was not driving the car and it was not her fault at all that the injury occurred. The division of the cause was between the driver and the military units.

Mr. GORE. The alleged negligence on the part of the driver—and that is a question of doubt, but even though he was admittedly negligent—is not imputable to Sue Flippin Bratton, the passenger, a minor, to whom the War Department attributes no negligence whatever. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wonder if the gentleman will agree to a unanimous-consent request that the bill be passed over without prejudice, so that we may give it further consideration. I hate to object to the bill, but I am afraid I shall have to object to the bill as amended if the gentleman insists on that amount.

Mr. GORE. I recognize the gentleman is an able lawyer.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am not a lawyer; I am just a simple layman.

Mr. GORE. Nevertheless, the gentleman is schooled in law as well as in the art of lawmaking. I believe the gentleman will agree that if he were a lawyer and had this case before a jury in his town or my town, or before a jury in any county in the United States, they would not hesitate to give this girl twice this amount.

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say in reply to my distinguished attorney friend that I am looking at this matter from the viewpoint, not of an attorney, but from the viewpoint of a layman, in all fairness to all parties concerned.

Mr. GORE. May I say, particularly answering the gentleman's question, that the bill is already up for consideration and cannot go over except by unanimous consent. Therefore, unless the gentleman withdraws his amendment, I shall have to ask for a vote on the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is it possible to ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice when the time comes to vote on the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A unanimous-consent request can always be made.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McGREGOR. Suppose the amendment is acted upon, whether it is passed or defeated, is it then within the power of two objectors to return the bill to the committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not. That stage of the proceedings has already passed.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question recurs on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANLEY J. LILLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3249) for the relief of Stanley J. Lilly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Stanley J. Lilly, Allentown, Pa., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Stanley J. Lilly against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on March 21, 1942, when the automobile which he was driving was in collision with a United States Army truck on United States Route No. 22, west of Allentown, Pa.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$6,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OREGON CAVES RESORT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 136) for the relief of the Oregon Caves Resort.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Oregon Caves Resort, Grants Pass, Oreg., is hereby relieved from its liability for franchise fees for the years 1934 and 1935 under contract with the Department of Agriculture in the amount and to the extent that these fees exceed those that would have been due for the years 1934 and 1935, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, under the terms of the renegotiated contract between the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, and the Oregon Caves Resort, dated January 1, 1936, had this latter contract been in full force and effect on January 1, 1934.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREAS ANDERSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 935) for the relief of Andreas Andersen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $649.15 to reimburse Andreas Andersen for the value of personal property lost in a fire on November 22, 1942, which destroyed Government quarters occupied by him at the Fort Howard Detention Station, Baltimore, Md.: *Provided*, That no part of the

amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "to", strike out the word "reimburse" and after the word "Andersen" strike out the words "for the value of" and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OHIO BRASS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1979) for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Ohio Brass Co., Mansfield, Ohio, the sum of $3,000. Such sum represents the amount of cargo war risk insurance which was issued by the War Shipping Administration to the Ohio Brass Co. under policy No. C23509, dated March 11, 1943, to cover a shipment of pole line construction material from Philadelphia to Puerto Alegre, Brazil, on the steamship *Industria*, which was lost by enemy action on March 23, 1943, en route to its destination.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of page 1 and down through the word "destination" in line 2, page 2, and insert: "That the War Shipping Administration is authorized and directed to determine and pay the claim of the Ohio Brass Co., Mansfield, Ohio, for the loss of a shipment of pole line construction material from Philadelphia, Pa., to Puerto Alegre, Brazil, on the steamship *Industria*, insured under policy No. C23509, issued by the War Shipping Administration, dated March 11, 1943, upon the production and filing of the necessary documents duly executed by the parties in interest as if the insurance premium on said policy had been in accordance with the requirements of the War Shipping Administration and with the provisions of said policy."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICK A. KELLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2595) for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Patrick A. Kelly, chief radio electrician, United States Naval Reserve, the sum of $683.50. Such sum represents the amount of per diem and mileage allowances (less a mileage payment already made) to which the said Patrick A. Kelly would have been entitled, if his orders had been accurate and complete, for the period from October 1, 1943, to January 10, 1944, while on temporary duty at Rocky Point, N. Y., from his regular post of duty at Patuxent River, Md.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "sum", strike out "represents the amount of" and insert in lieu thereof: "is in full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "Maryland", insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be ulawful, any contract to the cotrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESLIE O. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2620) for the relief of Leslie O. Allen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Leslie O. Allen, of Natchez, Miss., and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider under the remaining provisions of said act his claim on account of injury and disability alleged to have been incurred between October 26, 1937, and September 30, 1939, while serving with the Civilian Conservation Corps at Meadville, Miss.: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "injury", strike out "and disability" and insert "of his knee."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "incurred", strike out "between October 26, 1937, and September 30" and insert "in May 1939."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DONALD GEORGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2729) for the relief of Donald George.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Donald George, Fountain Head, Sumner County, Tenn., the sum of $300. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Donald George against the United States arising from the seizure and sale of his automobile by the United States while he was serving overseas in the Army of the United States. At the time of such seizure, such automobile was being operated by Amond L. George, brother of the said Donald George, who was charged with transporting unstamped intoxicating liquor. The said Amond L. George was subsequently exonerated of such charge: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of", strike out the balance of line 6 and down to and including the word "charge" on line 4, page 2, and insert "$235 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the value of his automobile which was seized by the United States Internal Revenue Department, on May 10, 1943, in Sumner County, Tenn."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk head as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER to the committee amendment: In line 4, page 2, strike out "$235" and insert "$150."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DON HICKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3008) for the relief of Don Hicks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Don Hicks, of Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of his right hand resulting from the explosion of a shell left lying in a house in an area of the Fort Leonard Wood Military Reservation, Mo., on February 22, 1942, which house was open to visitors but which was not posted with signs warning of the danger of unexploded shells: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,500."

Page 1, line 10, after the figures "1942", strike out the balance of line 10, all of line 11, and down to and including the word "shells", on line 1, page 2.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTIAN H. KREUSLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3302) for the relief of Christian H. Kreusler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Christian H. Kreusler, the sum of $20,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government for injuries sustained by him when struck by an Army truck on September 6, 1942, near Selma, Tex., on United States Highway No. 81.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$20,000" and insert "$7,500."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "Government" and insert "United States."

Page 1, line 10, after the figure "81", insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENEVIEVE LUND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3790) for the relief of Genevieve Lund.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Genevieve Lund, a resident of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for injuries sustained on December 8, 1942, in Chicago, Ill., when the car in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$500."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "Government of the."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MYRTLE C. RADABAUGH

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill (H. R. 3987) for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh for further consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of bills on the Private Calendar for today.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 158]

Allen, Ill.	Fellows	Norton
Baldwin, Md.	Fenton	Patman
Barry	Forand	Pfeifer
Bender	Gathings	Powell
Bolton	Gerlach	Quinn, N. Y.
Buckley	Granger	Rabaut
Buffett	Gwinn, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.
Butler	Hagen	Rivers
Byrne, N. Y.	Hall,	Roe, N. Y.
Camp	Leonard W.	Rogers, N. Y.
Campbell	Hedrick	Rooney
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Sharp
Carnahan	Hoffman	Sheridan
Celler	Holmes, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
Chelf	Hope	Somers, N. Y.
Clark	Jenkins	Thomas, N. J.
Colmer	Jennings	Torrens
Cooley	Kerr	Wadsworth
Curley	King	Weiss
Dawson	Lea	White
Delaney,	LeFevre	Wickersham
John J.	Lynch	Winstead
Dickstein	McGehee	Winter
Dingell	Madden	Wolcott
Douglas, Ill.	May	Wolverton, N. J.
Drewry	Merrow	Wood
Eaton	Mundt	Zimmerman
Elliott	Murray, Tenn.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 350 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SALE OF SURPLUS WAR-BUILT VESSELS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3603, with Mr. STIGLER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday there was pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] which the Clerk will again report.

The Clerk again reported the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases the statutory sales price for tankers from the figure of 75 percent of prewar domestic costs as provided in H. R. 3603 to 100 percent. I believe that an analysis of the following facts will demonstrate to all Members that the sale of tankers at less than the full prewar domestic costs will constitute a tremendous windfall to the petroleum industry at the expense of the United States Treasury. Here is the arithmetic of this amendment. One of our large 16,765 DWT tankers cost approximately $3,000,000 to build. Under prewar conditions a similar vessel could be built for $2,378,000. H. R. 3603 set the statutory sales price at 75 percent. Thus a new tanker would sell at $1,784,000. Depreciation would be $160,000 a year. Consequently a 1-year-old tanker would sell at $1,624,000, and a 2-year or older tanker would go at the floor price, which is $1,486,000. Under this amendment new tankers will sell for $2,378,000, an additional receipt to the Treasury of nearly $600,000. For a 1-year-old vessel the additional receipts will be $540,000; for a 2-year-old vessel, $464,000, and for a 3-year-old vessel, $250,000. The greatest portion of our tanker fleet is under 3 years of age. This amendment will probably yield an additional $100,000,000 from the sale of our tanker fleet. It will save the Government between $15,000,000 and $20,000,000 in adjustments on tankers sold at war cost.

Prior to the war, a very large proportion of the American-flag tanker fleet was operated in the domestic trades. This will undoubtedly be true of the postwar operations as well. It is required by law that the vessels operated in domestic trade be constructed in American yards. Moreover, no construction subsidies are allowed for vessels in such operations. Consequently, prior to the war, virtually all tankers were purchased at full domestic price.

In all drafts of the ship sales legislation prior to H. R. 3603, the sales price for domestic tanker purchases was set at the full prewar domestic costs. To my knowledge, and I was in attendance at nearly all hearings, no tanker operator appeared and none claimed hardship under the full prewar domestic cost.

There is no question about the ability of tanker operators to pay full domestic costs. The Harvard University Graduate Business School study, which was made at the request of Maritime Commission and United States Navy, has this to say about the ability of tanker operators to pay:

The greater portion of the demand for tankers will come from large oil companies. The financial position of these companies is so strong that there is no question as to their

ability to pay for any new ships they may wish to purchase. A smaller part of the demand will come from chemical companies, which are likewise in strong position.

During the war, 59 tankers were purchased from the Government at full war costs, demonstrating the willingness and ability of tanker operators to pay much higher prices than are proposed by my amendment.

This amendment will not limit the number of sales of tankers to foreigners for it changes only the statutory sales price, leaving the floor price at 50 percent of the average 1944 construction costs. Those foreign purchasers to whom price is the foremost consideration can purchase the 4-year and older tankers which will go at the floor price. The result of my amendment would be to substitute at the floor price, 4-year-old vessels for the 2-year-old vessels. Moreover it must be remembered that the only source of large scale replacements for tanker losses is the United States market.

This amendment will not act as an additional deterrant to United States operations of tankers in foreign trade. Several important reasons act against a large-scale increase in the use of American flag tankers in foreign trade making purchase price a secondary consideration. The principal reason for the use of foreign flag vessels is the lower operating costs. As many of the foreign operators of tankers will purchase our vessels, there is little likelihood that the American operators will be placed at a disadvantage in regard to capital charges. A very large proportion of the foreign flag tankers operated by subsidiaries of American companies prior to the war, were operated in the indirect trades. The Harvard Study states:

In September 1938, for instance, 187 foreign flag tankers with a gross tonnage of 1,198,000 were listed as owned by subsidiaries of large United States oil companies. There is a possibility that some of these foreign flag tankers can be replaced by United States flag tankers. A large and growing proportion of these foreign flag tankers which were controlled by United States companies, however, were engaged in indirect trade between two foreign countries. There seems to be little chance that any appreciable number of tankers engaged in indirect trade will fly the United States flag.

This amendment will not put tanker operators at a disadvantage with respect to competition with pipe lines. The Harvard Study states:

The most reliable evidence seems to indicate that the operating costs of the pipe lines and tankers are approximately equal.

If pipe line and tanker operating costs are equal, the oil companies prefer to use tankers since they are much more flexible than the pipe lines. The pipe line must deliver oil at a given terminal, whereas tankers can be sent to any one of a number of ports. A tankers can even be shifted to foreign trade should the occasion demand, and a tanker can carry a large number of different petroleum products at one time.

Sale of tankers at any price less than the full prewar domestic cost will set a new high in Government handouts to an industry which has long been infamous for its milking of the Government.

It is important to remember that the only testimony before the committee about tankers with the exception of the Bulk Carriers' Association is the testimony of Admiral Vickery and Admiral Land. They are the individuals who will be selling these tankers, and they testified unequivocally that they could get 100 percent of the prewar domestic cost for the tankers.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does the gentleman's amendment relate only to tankers and not to other craft?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If the Big Inch line is closed down there will be a great demand for these tankers, as I see it, and they will be the first ships sold.

Mr. JACKSON. There is no question about it, and not only that, the point I make is that not a single representative of the tanker companies even questioned the legislation as originally introduced which provided for 100 percent of prewar domestic costs. My amendment gives them an adjustment on a brand-new tanker from the war cost back to the prewar domestic cost. However, the bill as reported goes beyond that and makes an adjustment down to 75 percent of prewar domestic cost.

Mr. RICH. We ought to get every dollar that we can for these ships because the Treasury needs it.

Mr. JACKSON. If the gentleman is interested in economy, here is a chance to get $150,000,000 for the United States Treasury.

Mr. RICH. I am for that, too. I am going to be right here to vote for that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask the gentleman a question about trade-ins. The purchaser of a tanker turns in an old tanker. A short time ago there were some transactions carried on with a couple of oil companies where old tankers were traded in. I made as much inquiry about it as I could. I received a letter from the Comptroller General about the matter and among other things he states that in his opinion as to a number of these old tankers there was allowed as much as the company had paid for the vessels in purchasing them from the United States over 20 years ago. How will the gentleman's amendment affect that proposition?

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct and if he will look in the RECORD of yesterday he will find that I have set out tables showing the trade-in allowances which would have been available originally under this bill which to say the least, were in some cases scandalous. I have an amendment which was prepared originally by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. It is an amendment which takes care of that situation and scales back the trade-in allowances on these old vessels.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is not this amendment. That is a future amendment to be offered?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. It will be an amendment to section 8 adopted by the committee. The point is we are not accomplishing anything if we are going to turn around and allow a windfall of $150,000,000 to these people. It is nothing more or less than that.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman recall how many tankers have been sold under existing law, subject to the provisions of this bill?

Mr. JACKSON. I believe I stated there had been sold something like 68 tankers under existing legislation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Out of a total of how many available?

Mr. JACKSON. I understand there are approximately 400 tankers available.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. I am sure the gentleman from Washington will agree that this amount of $150,000,000 would not be realized unless the tankers are sold?

Mr. JACKSON. Where else are they going to buy them? Will the gentleman advise the House where else they can buy these tankers? The laws of the United States provide that ships constructed or purchased abroad cannot be used in domestic operations. They must buy them from American-owned yards. This is an open and shut case unless you want to be foolish enough to allow a windfall to these operators.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Information was handed to me a minute ago that if we sell these vessels at a higher price, the money will not come back into the Treasury, but will go into a revolving fund; is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. The section referred to by the gentleman is subject to a point of order and can be knocked out on that basis.

Mr. RICH. Then let us knock it out.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. First, I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine work and the deep study he has been giving to this subject, and the fine job he has been doing. Of course, we all want to see this surplus disposed of. Does the gentleman feel confident that under his amendment the trade can and will buy tankers at reasonable prices?

Mr. JACKSON. I will say to the gentleman that there can be no question about it. These people are given a price which they paid prior to the war. Under my amendment they are being sold at prewar domestic costs. The postwar domestic cost is certain to be higher than

the prewar domestic cost. This amendment relates to industrial carriers and not common carriers. It does not affect their operating costs. As a matter of fact, their operating cost under the provisions of my amendment will not be increased one iota. It is an entirely different situation from the common carriers who are in competition with railroads and foreign competitors.

Mr. GORE. Did any representative of the shipping interests appear before the committee who maintained that they should buy tankers at less than prewar domestic prices?

Mr. JACKSON. There was only one representative of a small bulk carrier group, but no representative from the large oil carriers. They had notice for over a year and a half now as to what the proposed costs of these tankers would be under the original bill. I hope the committee will vote for this amendment. If you are interested in seeing that the Treasury gets a fair break, I am sure that you will support it.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I do not question the majority of the statements made by my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I have always found him to be truthful, reliable, and dependable; generally I follow him in all directions. However, I do feel that as to this particular amendment I should at least present to the House the views that impelled the committee, after serious consideration for a considerable time, to report this provision in the bill. It is for you to determine what you want to do about the amendment.

The gentleman says that his amendment will save the United States $150,000,000. This statement assumes that we will sell as many tankers at the higher price as at the price fixed in the bill as reported. I hope that is true. I want to save money, but I want to see the merchant marine operated for national defense, for the promotion of our trade, and in the determination of these questions after considering all of these different phases it is obvious that the conclusions of my friend will not be true. You will make no foreign sales of tankers under the Jackson amendment. You will make no sales of tankers to citizens for operation in foreign trade. These citizens will buy their tankers abroad and put them under foreign flags. The trouble is that if they do not buy them they will be constructed abroad, and in a short time we shall have no opportunity to sell those we have.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that during the course of the discussion of this bill it has been admitted that it is a practice of the large oil companies to utilize the tankers of the countries from which they are receiving oil, and that it was the common practice for them to do so?

Mr. BLAND. I think so.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that there was no assurance from the officials of the Maritime Commission that even if we sold them for less they would be utilized in foreign trade? As a matter of fact, I believe Admiral Vickery stated explicitly that they should be sold for 100 percent, because they would not be used in foreign trade for the reason that they could not compete.

Mr. BLAND. I do not recall that statement on the part of Admiral Vickery. If the gentleman says he made it, I am ready to confess that that is true. I do not know.

Since we will meet our domestic oil requirements after the war to a much greater extent with oil imports, the domestic trade in oil may be smaller than it was before the war, and thus fewer tankers will be engaged in domestic trade than formerly.

I wish, however, particularly to call to the attention of the Committee the very impelling reasons assigned that gave us so much trouble. In a letter from Secretary Forrestal to the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, dated March 20, 1945, he said:

> With reference to the provision making special price concessions applicable in the case of tankers only when they are sold for operation in foreign trade of the United States, the Navy Department is of the opinion that the special price concession should be applicable when tankers are sold for operation in domestic trade. The Navy Department further feels that the provision for bare boat charter of vessels other than tankers should be liberalized to include tankers. The Navy Department, therefore, is in accord with your idea—

That is, Chairman VINSON—

> that we should sell and charter as many tankers as possible under as liberal terms as possible to American citizens. It might further be desirable to require that all vessels with the possible exception of Liberty ships should be offered for sale or for charter to American citizens prior to the offering of them to foreign operators.

I have one long telegram pointing out the reasons why no preference should be made in the sale of tankers, and stating that they should be sold as low as dry cargo freighters. That comes from Pacific Tankers, Inc., Mr. Dawson, President.

We had communications before us at the time we reconsidered this matter. Representatives of the Navy view had advocated an adequate tanker fleet under the American flag and said that the tanker tonnage now approximates 12,000,000 dead-weight tons, more than our Merchant Marine in 1939, and it would be the utmost folly not to exhaust every possibility of selling or chartering them to American citizens and selling or chartering them upon such terms and conditions that our American operators would successfully meet foreign competition.

The argument was further made that the Navy desires the selling and chartering of as many tankers as possible to American citizens, for the reason that Germany and Japan had possessed large tanker fleets carrying the oil of other countries, and the Navy desired that our citizens be given an approximate opportunity to absorb this business.

They said it was important to protect our national defense. Our attention was called to the testimony of Admiral Land that only industrial carriers would be interested in these tankers, and that is why he wished to keep the prices at the domestic limit. That is a very important question. It was said that the item of the $60,000,000 on the refund was not to be left out of consideration. But the Navy seemed to think, or the representatives of the Navy, that we were not raising our sights high enough for us to see into the more important future and that Admiral Land did not see the possibility of building up an entirely new industry by creating a new group of indipendent American operators who would be induced to engage in the oil-carrying business. It was said that it must not be forgotten that the enemy nations engaged extensively in the oil transportation trade before the war and that both Germany and Japan had large tanker fleets carrying the oil of other countries and that there was no reason, with the huge tanker fleet we had at hand, why we should not attempt to absorb this business; and that most or all of our oil companies had huge oil reserves in foreign countries, while our own reserves were being depleted rapidly. It was said that there is no healthier way of stimulating the flow of this foreign oil into this country than by enabling the oil companies and our independent American operators to maintain a sizable tanker fleet under the American flag, and that the best way was to enable the American operator to obtain our surplus tanker tonnage at a price which is sufficiently low to meet foreign competition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. It is said if these American operators can be induced to transport foreign oil into this country in huge quantities it will enable us to conserve—and this is an important point—our fast diminishing oil reserves such as the Elk Hills Naval Reserve which was of grave concern to the Committee on Naval Affairs. Everything possible should be done to stimulate the utmost growth of an independent group of American tanker operators. The American-flag industry would have far-reaching effects upon our future welfare. First, it would permit combined employment of large numbers of American seamen who otherwise would be thrown out of work when Government operations ceased at the close of the war, particularly if large numbers of our tankers are allowed to pass out from under the American flag. Second, it will necessitate continuous operation of

American repair yards. Third, that it was essential to the national defense. Fourth, that the best kind of assurance against another emergency was the sale of tankers at this price. Fifth, the $60,000,000 readjustment mentioned by Admiral Land would be small when it is considered that few if any tankers would be disposed of at the price he proposed and that the cost of their building would be borne by the Government without any possibility of recouping any part of it through sale or charter. In other words, that the price would be so high there would be no sale for tankers. The figure of 75 was reached as a compromise and rather arbitrarily. We considered it many days. We were persuaded and impelled more by the views of the Navy Department as they are submitted at our hearings, our desire was to protect our reserves and also our desire was to establish a new business in America.

I am simply given you the reasons which induced us to report this committee amendment. I feel, as chairman of the committee, the matter having been considered by the committee, it is my duty to present those views to you. However, it is entirely agreeable to me that you shall do what you please.

In conclusion, all I would say is, you are the judges. If the question of national defense and the preservation of national reserves is as great as it was presented to us, you must take that into consideration. If the argument of my friends is correct, and there may be an immediate saving of money, the only question is, Shall we save or shall we raise our sights higher than we have done in the past?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that it is well in considering any amendment to give thought to the effect of the amendment on the basic purpose of the bill. The purpose of H. R. 3603, as it clearly sets forth, is to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of an American merchant marine. In other words, we are striving to write a bill which will put American-built ships into operation on the high seas under the American flag and manned by American crews.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington not only fails to further the objectives of the bill but it is in fact directly destructive to the purposes of the bill.

There is no feature of H. R. 3603 to which the committee gave more careful consideration than it did to tanker sales. The basis finally incorporated into the bill was the result of much testimony and discussion which at times seemed to be endless. The figures as finally arrived at represent a compromise which the great majority of the committee regard as fair both to the Government and to the tanker operators and which at the same time will further the bill's purposes.

All the Members of the House have read much of how requirements of war have depleted our country's petroleum reserves. There is no doubt but that in the years ahead the United States must rely upon foreign sources of petroleum to an increasing extent. That means a constantly increasing number of tankers engaged in foreign trade.

The question for you to decide in voting on this amendment is whether our increasing imports of petroleum shall be carried in American ships, built and repaired in American yards, flying the American flag, and giving employment to American crews, or whether that tonnage shall be carried under foreign flag in ships manned by underpaid foreign seamen, each one of whom deprives an American seaman of a job.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there any testimony in the record which indicates that the oil companies can compete with foreign operators in the transportation of oil from foreign countries to the United States?

Mr. BUCK. I was about to cover that point.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that those people are industrial operators, and in any event would require a subsidy, and they would not be eligible for a subsidy because they are not common carriers?

Mr. BUCK. I will say that in this bill we put the price low so they will be able to compete.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there any testimony in the record? Did any of these companies say that that is true?

Mr. BUCK. There is no doubt but that under conditions as they existed American tanker operators were unable to compete with foreigners. I should like to finish my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. I just wondered whether the gentleman would say there was anything in the record to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BUCK. Let us not fool ourselves. Tankers can be built in foreign yards at half the cost of building them in American yards. Foreign-flag tankers can be manned by crews receiving less than half the pay received by American crews. How then can American-flag tankers compete in overseas trade? They cannot and they have not.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The record is full of that kind of testimony, is it not?

Mr. BUCK. It is; I thank the gentleman.

My home on Staten Island overlooks the Narrows, the entrance to New York Harbor. What tankers over the years have I seen entering and leaving the Port of New York in the overseas trade? There have been Dutch tankers and Swedish tankers and Norwegian tankers and Danish tankers and British tankers and Panamanian tankers and German tankers and Japanese tankers. American tankers were frozen out. They will continue to be frozen out under the Jackson amendment.

I do not say that the tanker sales provisions as embraced in the bill will give American operators and American crews clear entry into this trade. Sale of tankers on the same basis as dry-cargo ships, as advocated by the able chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, is a minimum step in that direction.

But I assure you that the Jackson amendment will bar American participation and American employment in the overseas petroleum trade.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I hope very much that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Washington will not prevail. I doubt if the House realizes what a great amount of time was spent by the committee in its consideration of this question of the statutory sales price for tankers. The provision which was finally inserted in the bill was the result of the best compromise we could make on all the views that were expressed.

The bill was reported last June with no dissent on this provision and no attempt was made even this fall when we were considering committee amendments to the bill to raise this tanker price back to 100 percent of the prewar domestic cost. The suggestion was brought forth only late last week. It is really shocking to me that there should be any attempt to undo at this late hour so much painstaking work on the part of the committee.

The gentleman from Washington has suggested that there is nothing in the record from the independent tanker owners.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I fancy the gentleman is going to answer the question I shall ask him, but I would like to have him comment on the assertion of the gentleman from Washington that the prospective purchasers of these tankers raised no complaint about the percentage of 100.

Mr. HALE. That is what I am going to talk about. Of course, the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington is simply to make things easier for the large oil companies and harder for the small tanker companies which are engaged in carriage for hire and not in any industrial operation.

Here is a letter from the Hillcone Steamship Co., which owns three small tankers. They say:

> Under the bill, as presently drafted, tankers are to be sold at 75 percent of the prewar domestic cost, as compared to the sale of dry cargo vessels at 50 and 55 percent of their prewar domestic cost, to unsubsidized and subsidized dry cargo operators respectively. The reason for this differential is expressed at page 5 of the report:
>
> "Since tankers present a special problem, being operated for the most part by industrial concerns for the carriage of their own products, the price consideration applicable to dry-cargo vessels are inapplicable to tank-

ers. Thus in the case of tankers, the statutory sales price is fixed on the basis of 75 percent of the prewar domestic cost."

Without admitting, and in fact denying, the logic of the argument advanced for the discrimination, the ownership of a part of the tanker fleet should not militate against the interests of the independent owners. The result would be an utter disregard for the small owner and a consignment, by legislation, to oblivion. Prior to the war the independent tanker operators owned between 16 and 17 percent of the entire American tanker fleet. This percentage totaled in excess of 700,000 dead-weight tons, which, in turn, is equal to over seventy-one 10,000-dead-weight-ton ships. No other law drafted by this or any other Congress has been designed to eliminate the smaller business interest from continued existence and participation in its services, nor is that the purpose of this bill. Your attention is accordingly directed to the result. The fact that most tankers are operated by industrial concerns should not place them in a different category from the dry cargo operators. That same situation prevails in the operation of both types of vessels. Among the larger and, tonnage wise, more important dry cargo vessel operators are several which are engaged mainly in carrying the goods or implementing the commercial trading activities of their own or their parent company activities. They may be divided into the following general groups: The steel companies, the coal companies, the fruit companies, the trading companies. There is no price or protection differential in such cases.

The cost of transportation of petroleum products is a factor in the final retail cost of petroleum products sold by the major oil companies—it is not an absolute norm for continued ship operation. Conversely, that factor is the absolute norm in the case of an independent tanker operator. The effect of the price differential is to make it an impossibility for any but the major oil companies to continue tanker operations. This is not, and should not be, the result contemplated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL].

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment under consideration is based on a so-called saving. The question is, therefore, Will there be a saving? It proceeds on the assumption that somebody must buy the tankers regardless of whether you sell them at 100 percent, 75 percent, or 50 percent. It seems to me that is not the question at all. If we are going to follow the philosophy of the Merchant Marine Act and have an American merchant marine, we should sell the tankers at such a price so as to induce people to buy them, and the primary question should not be how much we will save. The question is how low a price should be fixed in order to make a sale. Admiral Land testified they could be sold at 100 percent, but he did not say whether you could sell 1 or 50. The gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, who should have some information with reference to the use of tankers, suggested that they be sold at 50 percent. The committee, after due consideration, felt that 75 percent might be a price low enough to sell surplus tankers. Talk about saving! Section 9 of this bill, which refers to the adjustment of prices, calls for paying $87,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States to people who have already purchased ships, including the tanker buyers. My idea of saving some money is this: First of all, we should keep the ships in the hands of American buyers, and to do that you must sell them cheap enough so that they can buy them, and 75 percent of the cost is believed to be a price low enough to do that. If you really want to save, look at section 9, which will cost $87,000,000 to adjust the price of the ships sold. Out of that the tanker people would get around $57,000,000. My suggestion is not to adopt this amendment; but when it comes to section 9, let us limit the adjustment of prices to those people who are unsubsidized—and by that I mean the unsubsidized dry-cargo purchasers. If you limit section 9 to the unsubsidized dry-cargo purchasers, you will save around $60,000,000, $50,000,000 of which would go to the tanker buyers. The tanker buyers have not asked for this gift in section 9. Therefore, I would suggest that the saving come in section 9 and the price be left as it is. At 75 percent it might be low enough to keep these tankers operated by American operators. I am against the amendment for the reasons I have stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, this is a most interesting part of this bill. We held hearings day in and day out. We held hearings on three different bills, and this question was never mentioned. Nobody from the tanker industry or the oil industry appeared before the Merchant Marine Committee in behalf of the tanker proposition. Nobody ever gave it a thought. Later on the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs came before the Merchant Marine Committee with a proposition that tankers be treated as dry-cargo vessels were to be treated in the bill. To say the least, it took the committee by surprise. There was considerable debate in committee. There were statements made within the committee that reductions in price would not add the sale of one single vessel. If I am incorrect in any statement I make, I would like to have a Member of the committee correct me.

In addition to that we brought down what we thought was the best authority in the Government on shipping. We asked Admiral Vickery, we asked Admiral Land, and we asked others from the Maritime Commission to appear before the committee and give us advice on this tanker proposition. It was continuously and substantially testified, and shown by facts and figures, that the price would not ever enter into the sale of one of these tankers. It is argued here about a foreign tanker fleet, when we know perfectly well that our tankers, flying our flag, cannot economically operate against foreign tankers in foreign transportation.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. Is not the great problem in competition the cost of the maintenance or operation rather than the original cost price? Is not that what is facing the owners of the tankers?

Mr. BONNER. Certainly it is. I am just as anxious to see these ships put in operation as any man on the floor of the House. I am just as willing as anyone to reduce the cost due to the construction in view of the reason for the construction of these ships, and charge that cost to the war, but to be reasonable and frank, there is no reason on earth to give a windfall to certain operators as commercial carriers; when they are industrial carriers.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that even under my amendment they still get a refund of approximately $500,000 on a new $3,000,000 tanker?

Mr. BONNER. That is well understood. If anybody will read the figures here that have already been inserted in the RECORD, that is perfectly clear.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. The gentleman from Washington who offered this amendment indicated that a percentage of the prewar domestic cost was never in any preliminary draft of this bill. I should like the record to show that I am informed that it appears in one of the early preliminary drafts and was the subject of considerable discussion.

Mr. BONNER. I will answer the gentleman from New York in this way. There was so much in the various bills that were presented to this committee and it caused so much confusion that I doubt whether anybody today knows all the varied and ramified features of the four different bills that were offered.

May I say that I have no interest pro or con as to the oil transportation features of this country. I have no interest one way or the other on that matter. I only want to see the Government get the best it can for these ships. I want to see fair play to our own operators.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that one of the greatest immediate needs we will have for shipping will be for oil transportation?

Mr. BONNER. Of course.

Mr. RICH. Then if there is that great need, is it not plausible that we will get a larger price for vessels that are in such demand by putting them on the market?

Mr. BONNER. Yes; that is right. It was stated in the committee that no matter what the price was it would be necessary for certain foreign countries to have their own tankers, and that we would not be permitted to bring into their area more than a small percentage of our tankers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 76, noes 55.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALES OF WAR-BUILT VESSELS TO CITIZENS

SEC. 4. (a) Any citizen of the United States may make application to the Commission to purchase a war-built vessel, under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission, at the statutory sales price. If the Commission determines that the applicant possesses the ability, experience, financial resources, and other qualifications, necessary to enable him to operate and maintain the vessel under normal competitive conditions, and that such sale will aid in carrying out the policies of this act, the Commission shall sell such vessel to the applicant at the statutory sales price.

(b) At the time of sale, the purchaser shall pay to the Commission at least 25 percent of the statutory sales price. The balance of the statutory sales price shall be payable in not more than 20 equal annual installments, with interest on the portion of the statutory sales price remaining unpaid, at the rate of 3½ percent per annum, or shall be payable under such other amortization provisions which permit the purchaser to accelerate payment of the unpaid balance as the Commission deems satisfactory. The obligation of the purchaser with respect to payment of such unpaid balance with interest shall be secured by a preferred mortgage on the vessel sold.

(c) The contract of sale, and the mortgage given to secure the payment of the unpaid balance of the purchase price, shall not restrict the use or operation of the vessel except insofar as may be necessary to preserve the value of the vessel as security for such payment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 7, strike out lines 18, 19, and 20, and insert "price, shall not restrict the lawful or proper use or operation of the vessel."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, this is a clarifying amendment. There was some question on the part of some members on the committee as to whether it was entirely clear. The amendment is offered for the purpose of making sure that the intention of the committee, that no restriction shall be imposed on the operation of vessels by reason of any provisions of this bill, will be carried out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, if we start this, it is just going to delay the consideration of the bill and run into tomorrow and Friday. I am very sorry. I object.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON: Page 7, after line 20, insert:

"(d) The contract of sale shall provide that if the purchaser owns or owned one or more vessels constructed prior to January 1, 1925, which were requisitioned for title or for use by the United States after December 31, 1940, the purchaser shall, for some one of such vessels—

"(1) if requisitioned for use, and lost prior to the date of such contract by reason of causes for which the United States was responsible, readjust the compensation paid or payable to him on account of such loss to an amount equal to the exchange allowance which would be permitted under section 8 if such vessel had not been lost and were being exchanged upon such purchase.

"(2) if requisitioned for title, readjust the compensation paid or payable to him on that account to an amount equal to the exchange allowance which would be permitted under section 8 if such vessel had not been so requisitioned and were being exchanged upon such purchase."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, shortly after Pearl Harbor the United States requisitioned, either for title or for use, virtually the entire American merchant marine.

The compensation to be paid to the owner on requisition for title and on loss of a vessel requisitioned for use, in the absence of judicial proceedings, was fixed by the War Shipping Administration on the recommendations of a just compensation board appointed by the President.

The compensation paid for vessels 20 or more years old was extremely high. Thus the United States is being placed in the position of paying an operator full wartime values for old ships and at the same time selling him new ships at less than half of their cost.

The amendment I have proposed will take the United States out of this position. It is very simple. It provides that for each war-built vessel purchased by an operator he must readjust the compensation he received with respect to some one old ship as follows:

If the old ship was requisitioned for title, or was requisitioned for use and lost, he must readjust the compensation he received to that provided in section 8, namely, 10 percent of the value of the new ship being purchased.

I think this amendment is quite simple. Its purpose is to take care of certain inflated insurance valuations which were paid during the war. Under section 8 of the bill as amended by the committee amendment and approved by the committee, we require old ships that are being turned in to be readjusted in accordance with the formula provided in that section, namely, that the trade-in value cannot exceed 10 percent of the construction cost of the vessel to be purchased.

I do not know whether the Congress realizes the true picture of these old vessels. Many old vessels were purchased from the Maritime Commission in 1937 and 1938 for $5 a ton, and a short time after hostilities broke out were requisitioned for title by the Maritime Commission. They paid as high as $60 a ton for some of those ships.

The same is true of insurance. They paid around an average of $47 per deadweight ton for ships that had a value of only $5 a ton before the war, and many of them were actually purchased from the Commission directly. It is to correct that situation that I have offered the amendment which I submit to you for your consideration.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. In 1937 and 1938 nobody thought we were going to get into war. They did not figure we were going to get into war. Suppose some fellow went out and bought a vessel from the Maritime Commission at $5 a ton. That man wanted to buy something that he thought he could use to probably earn a livelihood for himself. Then the war came on, and because of the war the Maritime Commission offered him $60 a ton. What was wrong with that, as far as an honest, legitimate business transaction is concerned?

Mr. JACKSON. I think it is a sort of two-way street. I think when the Government is giving price concessions, it is not more than fair to ask of the purchaser the same thing that the Government is giving him. The gentleman should look at the tables which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. RICH. I do not know anybody in the business, I do not know of any cases, but there are many times when a man's foresight gives him an opportunity to make a business transaction and then, by some circumstances, he falls into the category where somebody wants to buy what he has invested in. There is nothing crooked about that, is there?

Mr. JACKSON. We are not penalizing him. The only thing we are saying to him is, "If you want to buy one of these old vessels at 50 percent of the prewar domestic cost, then you have got to shell back."

Mr. RICH. I want to get every dollar for these ships that we can get, but I thought the gentleman was insinuating that that fellow had done something wrong.

Mr. JACKSON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] if it is not a fact that in many instances the insurance was actually placed with commercial underwriters, such as the American Insurance Syndicate, and therefore the insurance indemnities in such instances were paid to the private owner by the commercial underwriter and not by the Government.

Mr. JACKSON. I will answer the gentleman by saying that it is my understanding that virtually all the war risk—that is what we are dealing with here, not marine risk—since 1942 has been

paid by the Maritime Commission. All the so-called marine risks were taken care of by private companies.

A provision similar to the one I have offered to the House today is contained, I understand, in the Senate bill written by the Maritime Commission. They do not have to adjust on all of the lost vessels—only on the one that they are coming in to bargain for. They can elect the one they wish to readjust.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I will yield to the gentleman, although he did not always yield to me.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman has offered his amendment only to the section that applies to the sale of war-built vessels to citizens. I wonder if he proposes to offer a similar amendment to the section that deals with the sale of vessels to noncitizens?

Mr. JACKSON. I believe the gentleman understands that the amendment would not be enforceable against noncitizens; I believe he understands the reason for not offering it to that section.

Mr. BUCK. Then the amendment discriminates against the American operator as compared with the foreign operator.

Mr. JACKSON. No; I would not say that because I do not know of any foreign purchasers.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the meaning of "dead weight" as the gentleman used it during his address to the House?

Mr. JACKSON. That would take us into quite a long discussion. As I understand it, dead-weight tonnage is the actual displacement weight of the ship, and dead-weight tonnage is more than gross tonnage. In the United States ship tonnage is figured on the dead-weight basis, but in Europe ship tonnage is figured generally on the gross-tonnage basis. I am not an expert on tonnage and do not pretend to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that this amendment is one that calls on the United States Government to welsh on the agreement it has already made. Another amendment was proposed that provided that unless a person made certain agreements that certain things could not be considered in the purchase of these ships he could not qualify. It was distinctly a bludgeoning amendment, and to that I would never subscribe. A man has his rights in court; let him go there; if not, and the matter is squarely presented in a legislative way it may be considered.

This amendment never came before the committee in all of our many months of work on the different phases of the bill. I think it would be most unwise to accept it now. The bill is so drawn in its many provisions that one section so integrates with another that sometimes we found when we were reaching the end of the consideration of the bill, we had agreed to put something in which carried us back to the beginning and a rereading of the whole bill became necessary to determine that no injustice would be done. Under this amendment an operator might be required to accept less than the courts of the United States might hold him to be entitled to as just compensation under the Constitution. If he refuses to accept the lesser amount he will be prevented from purchasing a war-built vessel.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I just appealed to Webster's Dictionary to find out what "dead weight" means as it was used by the gentleman from Washington in reference to the price per ton paid for these ships. Can the distinguished gentleman from Virginia tell the Committee what "dead weight" means?

Mr. BLAND. This question of tonnage is one of the hardest possible and there is now a movement to have something that you can fix upon definitely. I have the definition and I will give it as soon as I can find it as taken from one of the volumes on the subject.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that under section 8 of the committee amendment readjustments are required in the cost of tradeins similar to that required in my amendment?

Mr. BLAND. I do not know that it goes that far.

Mr. JACKSON. I may say to the gentleman that the way it stands now the fellow who has lost his ship and received payment from the Government will get twice as much as the fellow who saved his ship and trades it in. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. BLAND. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania put his finger on it a few moments ago. When acquisitions were made at a low cost for the ships, they went up to a much higher cost thereafter. Immediately after war was declared in 1939, and we passed the Neutrality Act, the value of ships went down. They were quickly affected. I really do not think we ought to adopt this amendment without knowing something about it and more about it than we can in this consideration.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from Washington said this involves foreign ships. It does, but may I say that our country requisitioned such ships as the *Rex* and the *Normandie*, foreign ships; therefore the gentleman from Washington has not the correct information.

Mr. BLAND. The truth of the matter is no one of us has sufficient information as to the effect of the amendment to adopt it now.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Is there not quite a difference in establishing a formula for trading in a ship than, as this amendment proposes, to go back to those losses that have been agreed on in accordance with established law?

Mr. BLAND. I quite agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I believe that my good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], has conceived this amendment possibly through some ill or mistaken advice. I do not question his integrity whatsoever. The facts of the matter are these, as pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. Some years ago when there was no market for these ships some of these operators bought them at a sacrifice price from the Government. Then they had to put up considerable money to make those ships usable. In those days we were told we were being kept out of war, but instead of that we got into the war and a tremendously increased demand for shipping came up; as a matter of fact, the demand for ships—every available ship—leaped as soon as we lifted the arms embargo.

The Members will recall that when we were debating the arms embargo, the great cry from our friends over in Europe was: "Give us the arms and we will do the job, just simply put them on the docks and we will come and get them." Then you will recall Britain started a delightful campaign in this country, putting signs in store windows and signs on each bottle of Scotch that they brought back in ships carrying our arms to them, that "Britain delivers the goods," implying that we ought to deliver the goods. And it was not long before we endeavored to do just that. The Maritime Commission had to have ships and they got them back from the owners as fast as they could just as soon as the President declared a national emergency faced this country, but before the Maritime Commission acquired these ships by acquisition of title or charter, millions of tons of our merchandise and munitions went overseas in ships that were being torpedoed by the Germans and so naturally ships greatly enhanced in value. Then, as the chairman of the committee pointed out, we entered into definite insurance agreements with those operators at the time that we requisitioned those ships for title or charter.

War-risk and other insurance was not carried by the Government in a great many instances. They were carried in

three ways: First, by the private companies; second, by the war-risk insurance of the Government; and, third, by a combination of the two when the Maritime Commission specifically asked these operators to share their insurance with private firms. How are you going to ask these men to return that insurance to the insurance companies now when they apply for insurance on the purchase of a new ship? The gentleman says that it does not apply to foreign ships. That was purely an error on his part because we did requisition a great many foreign ships for title. Our own committee reported out a bill authorizing their acquisition. Of course, those foreigners will come in, I hope, to buy some of these ships, and if, as the gentleman says, we cannot make the foreigners return the insurance money due us, then he is discriminating against the American operators.

There is one other point. I am talking now about ships that were lost during the war. All the time after these ships were lost up to the present time, when the owners hope to acquire new vessels under this act, the owners have been deprived of the earning power of those vessels ever since they went to the bottom. I do not think it is fair now, as the chairman so clearly stated, to welch on a Government contract with these private operators.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman is familiar with the provisions of section 8?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that under the committee amendment the adjustments must be made by the very people the gentleman refers to, the people that bought ships for $5 a ton in 1937 and 1938? They must readjust according to the formula provided in that section, namely, 10 percent of the construction cost, whereas the operator who lost his ship——

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I do not yield for a speech. Those men have been getting the earning power of these ships right up to the date they turned them in, and the man who lost his ship 4 years ago by enemy action has been denied that earning power.

Mr. JACKSON. Most of these companies used that money to buy these ships again on which they are getting readjustments under the bill; is that not true?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. They may.

Mr. JACKSON. They have had the full use of their money. They have had twice as much.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. We are telling them in section 9 that they have to pay back that money that they earned from the Government; do not forget that.

Mr. JACKSON. And they are not obligated to do that unless they trade in under section 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that this amendment will not be adopted. I can understand why the gentleman from Washington offered it. He is trying to readjust at this late date some of what you might call the inequities which occurred in the early stages of the war years. To my mind it is absolutely impossible to do that at this time in fairness to everyone without essentially defeating the purposes of this bill which is to get as many ships in American hands to be operated profitably for the sake of the future of the merchant marine.

Before we entered the war and during the early days of the war a good many American operators of American-flag ships sold their ships at the urging of the Maritime Commission to foreign interests, and they sold them at going tonnage rates, running anywhere from $50 to $100 a ton. Later the Maritime Commission took over the entire American-flag tonnage under two methods, one, requisition for title, and the other, requisition for use. There was absolutely no uniformity in the way it was done. When they took over for title they paid outright a going rate for the ships, in spite of the fact that the law said that the value of the ship should not be enhanced by the circumstances under which it was taken. The courts under the special tribunal to which the gentleman from Washington referred set up a series of criteria by which the value of those ships was determined, and those criteria have been accepted by everyone. If we try to go back now and readjust what was previously done at the beginning of the war by putting all kinds of amendments into this bill, I think we will have a bill which will sell no American ships to American operators.

Furthermore, the amendment that was adopted by the committee, which will be voted on later—and I am sorry I was out of the country at the time it was adopted—to my mind is an amendment that is entirely unworkable. It is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington. He hitches this amendment with that amendment. I think they are both equally bad. His second amendment is one which will preclude the Government from paying more than 10 percent of war tonnage costs on the turn-in value of ships regardless of the amount of money that has been spent on those ships and regardless of the condition in which they have been kept. In other words, Congress will be setting a fixed price for trade-in of vessels as though all vessels were of identically the same kind and make and of the same age. That just cannot be done. It is not the way you can trade in ships. You have to allow some leeway in the trade-in of ships, exactly as you do in the trade-in of anything else.

The primary purpose of this bill was not to wring every last penny out of the American operator so that he could not possibly operate a merchant marine in the future; it was to try to get rid of this colossal surplus of ships on a fair basis so that we would have a future merchant marine.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON) there were—ayes 30, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHARTER OF WAR-BUILT VESSELS TO CITIZENS

SEC. 5. (a) Any citizen of the United States may make application to the Commission to charter a war-built dry-cargo vessel, under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission, for bare-boat use. The Commission may, in its discretion, either reject or approve the application, but shall not so approve unless in its opinion the chartering of such vessel to the applicant would be consistent with the policies of this act. No vessel shall be chartered under this section unless it has been offered for sale under section 4 for a period of at least 3 months and no sale has been consummated under such section during such period.

(b) The charter hire for any vessel chartered under the provisions of this section shall be fixed by the Commission at such rate as the Commission determines to be consistent with the policies of this act, but, except upon the affirmative vote of not less than four members of the Commission, such rate shall not be less than 15 percent per annum of the statutory sales price (computed as of the date of charter). Except in the case of vessels having passenger accommodations for not less than 80 passengers, rates of charter hire fixed by the Commission on any war-built vessel which differ from the rate specified in this subsection shall not be less than the prevailing world market charter rates for similar vessels for similar use as determined by the Commission.

(c) The provisions of sections 708, 709, 710, 712, and 713, of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall be applicable to charters made under this section.

SALE OF WAR-BUILT VESSELS TO PERSONS NOT CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 6. (a) Any person not a citizen of the United States may make application to the Commission to purchase a war-built vessel (other than a P–2 type or other passenger type and other than a bulk dry-cargo Liberty type), under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission. If the Commission determines—

(1) that the applicant has the financial resources, ability, and experience necessary to enable him to fulfill all obligations with respect to payment of any deferred portion of the purchase price, and that sale of the vessel to him would not be inconsistent with any policy of the United States in respect of relations with other countries; and

(2) that such vessel is not necessary to the defense of the United States; and

(3) that such vessel is not necessary to the promotion and maintenance of an American merchant marine described in section 2; and

(4) that for a reasonable period of time, which in the case of tankers and "C" type vessels shall not end before 6 months after the cessation of hostilities, such vessel has been available for sale at the statutory sales price to citizens of the United States, or for charter under section 5 to citizens of the United States, and that no responsible offer has been made by a citizen of the United States to purchase or charter such vessel;

then the Commission is authorized to approve the application and sell such vessel to the applicant at not less than the statutory sales price. The determination of the

Commission under paragraph (2) shall be made only after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. Notwithstanding paragraph (4) of this subsection, not to exceed five "C" type vessels actually under charter to noncitizens for at least 1 year prior to the date of the enactment of this act may be sold to noncitizens at any time after such date of enactment at not less than the statutory sales price.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no war-built vessel shall be sold to any person not a citizen of the United States except in accordance with subsection (a), or upon terms or conditions more favorable than those at which such war-built vessel is offered to a citizen of the United States.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 9, lines 23 and 24, strike out "cessation of hostilities" and insert "date of the enactment of this act."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is another of the amendments made necessary by the surrender of Japan. It has the effect of preventing, for 6 months after the enactment of the bill, the sale foreign of C type vessels and tankers. Under this bill as reported, the 6-month period ran from the date of the cessation of hostilities.

The original bill was reported before the war ceased. The date of the cessation of hostilities may be confusing as to the specific date for which the period of time prescribed in the section may begin to run. Therefore, it is thought that a definitely ascertainable date free from dispute should be determined upon and as section 6 (a) (4) to which the language stricken out applies relates to a reasonable period of time wherein tankers and C type of vessels shall be first available to citizens for sales or for charters, within which time no responsible offers shall have been made by a citizen of the United States to purchase or charter such vessel, it is proposed to fix the time when the period of preference to citizens is to be operative on the date of the enactment of this act. That date is certain and accomplishes the purposes originally intended.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCK: Page 9, line 1, add a new section as follows:

"TRANSFER OF VESSELS TO WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

"SEC. 6. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the Commission shall transfer to the War Department or to the Navy Department such war-built vessels under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission as may be nominated by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, which have not been previously sold to, or are not then under charter to, citizens of the United States pursuant to the provisions of section 4 or section 5 of this act.

"(b) Nominations under this section may be made at any time, but in the case of any vessel other than a Liberty-type vessel, transfer to the War Department or to the Navy Department will be made under this section only if such vessel shall not have been sold or chartered to a citizen of the United States under section 4 or section 5 hereof within such reasonable period as the Commission may fix not in excess of 4 months after the receipt by the Commission of the nomination of such vessel by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy."

Page 9, line 3, strike out "6" and insert "7."

Page 10, line 5, after the semicolon insert the word "and."

Page 10, line 6, add a new paragraph as follows:

"(5) that such vessel has not been nominated for transfer to the War Department or the Navy Department under section 6."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. I understand some of the amendment is directed to a section of the bill that has not yet been read.

Mr. BUCK. That is not my understanding, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman be more explicit about his point of order?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I shall not require 5 minutes to explain this amendment.

On June 21, 1945, the Secretary of War wrote the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries urging that the War Department be given positive acquisition rights to certain war-built vessels for purposes of national defense. I think that it was due to inadvertence and the rush incidental to the impending recess that the committee failed to incorporate such a provision into the bill as introduced.

It is obvious that the Navy Department has similar need.

The amendment I have offered merely grants the War Department and the Navy Department the right to acquire ships essential for their purposes before such ships are offered to foreign buyers and after American citizens have purchased or chartered all the ships they wish to operate.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from New York says the amendment was not considered. Perhaps not in the exact language of his amendment, but the substance of it was considered in one form of the bill that was considered by the committee. During the consideration of the shipping bill in 1945, when the committee had amendments before it, there was an amendment suggested by the War Department which provided:

Nor shall any such vessel with respect to which such a determination, return or transfer has been made or any other vessel especially subject to this act be sold or chartered under this act until such vessel has been determined by the War Department also to be surplus to its needs.

There was also a letter—I believe the gentleman refers to a letter—which came before the committee just shortly before we had our last meeting. When the question was taken up the letter was read and the chairman called attention to the fact that it was before the committee for consideration. Some member of the committee said: "We thrashed that out several times. I do not see why we should go any further than we have already gone in the bill when we consider the wishes of the War Department and the Navy Department, and that we should not leave to them the determination of the particular vessels that will be declared to be surplus."

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York appears on its face plausible. The policy of the amendment was considered very carefully in the committee in the early days of its deliberations on the bill and decisively rejected. I think we spent some time on it.

It has always been the policy of the Congress, reaffirmed last year in the action of the Congress on the Surplus Property Act that there should be no transfer of property from one Government agency to another without reimbursement of appropriations; in other words, the acquiring agency before acquisition can take place must have appropriations available to it to pay for the acquisition. Any other policy would result in permitting agencies to acquire and operate property without any control whatsoever on the part of the Appropriations Committee and the Congress.

The War Department appears to have been trying for a long time to become the operator of a large merchant fleet. It seems to see an opportunity, through the medium of this bill, to achieve its desires in this respect—without the necessity of going through the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations. It would have you believe that its amendment is necessary to the national defense. If it is, let that decision be made in the proper way—first by the Committee on Military Affairs and then by the Committee on Appropriations.

Under section 11 of the bill—providing for a national defense reserve fleet—the War and Navy Departments can determine what vessels are necessary to the national defense and prevent their sale. If the War Department is interested only in the national defense, it has all the power it needs under section 11. The fly in the ointment, however, is that what the War Department really seems to want is the operation of a large merchant fleet, acquired by it without reimbursement of appropriations, and thus without congressional controls.

There was a similar question up when we had the surplus-property legislation before us for consideration and at that time it was provided that the United States Maritime Commission should be the sole disposal agency for surplus vessels which the Commission determined to be merchant vessels or capable of conversion to merchant use and that such vessels should be disposed of only in accordance with the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 as amended, and other laws authorizing the sale of vessels. I have a document which shows the interrogations in this body and in another body as to whether that

did leave with the Maritime Commission the determination of the sale of these vessels.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. Is it not a fact that this amendment or a similar amendment was considered by the committee and rejected?

Mr. BLAND. That is what I was trying to point out. I think the substance of the amendment has been considered and has been rejected; and it runs in my mind that when it was last brought up the committee declared that to be its opinion. I understand the sale of these vessels as used by the other departments may be had only when they are declared surplus.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. Is it not a fact that the letter from the Secretary of War was dated June 21; the bill, H. R. 3603, was introduced on June 27; and that the committee was in a considerable rush to get the bill completed at that time?

Mr. BLAND. That particular letter, yes; but it is my distinct recollection that before we finished our hearings and the day before we reported the bill the question rose again and the members were unanimously of the opinion that we had passed on that matter and did not propose to go into it again, as requested by the War Department. That being the case an amendment of this kind, I submit, should not be adopted at this time without the necessary consideration that the gentleman seems to think has not been given it. I think full consideration has been given it and on full consideration the committee decided against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDER OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 7. (a) In exercising its powers under this act and under other provisions of law with respect to the sale and charter of war-built vessels, the Commission shall give preference to citizen applicants over noncitizen applicants, and as between citizen applicants to purchase and citizen applicants to charter, shall, so far as practicable and consistent with the policies of this act, give preference to citizen applicants to purchase. In determining the order of preference between citizen applicants to purchase or between citizen applicants to charter, the Commission shall consider, among other relevant factors, the extent to which losses and requisitions of the applicant's prewar tonnage have been overcome and shall in all cases, in the sale and charter of a war-built vessel, give preference in such sale or charter, as the case may be, to the former owner of such vessel, or to the person for whom the vessel was constructed but to whom delivery thereof was prevented by the United States.

(b) After the cessation of hostilities, operation of vessels in commercial service by the United States, either for its own account or through operating agents under agency agreements, shall be continued only to the extent necessary to effect orderly transfer of vessels to private operation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON: Page 11, line 16, after the period, insert "in determining the order of preference between noncitizen applicants to purchase, the Commission shall consider the extent to which losses in prewar tonnage of the various member nations of the United Nations, incurred in the interests of the war effort, have been overcome, and the relative effects of such losses upon the national economy of such member nations."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to give certain preferences to a small country like Norway and some others that have lost heavily of their merchant fleet during the war. It applies the same theory of preference as is available to certain of our own citizens and it has the additional factor which the Commission is to take into consideration, namely, the effect of such losses upon the national economy of such nations. This does not affect the order of preference of our own citizens. This only has to do with the order of preference that will exist among foreign purchasers.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. It is well recognized by the committee, of course, that we have a certain obligation to Norway and also to Brazil, I believe, to make certain replacements of ships which we took over and lost; is that not correct?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct. I have discussed this with the committee, both the chairman and the ranking minority member, and there is no apparent objection to this amendment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. For instance, take the Norwegian situation as an example. Norway entered the war with 7,600,000 dead-weight tons. That country only has a population of 3,000,000. They have lost over half of their merchant fleet in this war. One can well imagine what effect those losses have had on her national economy. In addition to that, about 35 percent of Norway's foreign currency was derived from shipping service before the war.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. There is no objection to the amendment on this side, and there is no objection from the other side, so why debate it?

Mr. JACKSON. I appreciate that. I was just making a statement for the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON.]

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: Page 11, line 18, strike out "United States" and insert "Maritime Commission."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed the amendment with the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee. The amendment merely deals with the question whether we desire to effect some other legislation in this bill or not. By using the words "United States" we would affect a small amount of merchandise freight that is carried to Panama by the Panama Canal lines.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I do not desire to be supertechnical, but I believe the proper wording would be to insert "Maritime Commission" after the words "United States."

Mr. BONNER. I agree to the modification so as to have the amendment read "United States Maritime Commission", and ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment be so modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXCHANGE OF VESSELS

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission is authorized to acquire, in exchange for an allowance of a credit on the purchase of any war-built vessel under this act—

(1) Any vessel owned by a citizen of the United States, other than a vessel purchased under this act; or

(2) Any vessel owned by a foreign corporation, if—

(A) the vessel was constructed in the United States, and has, after December 7, 1941, been chartered to, or otherwise taken for use by, the United States; and

(B) the controlling interest in such corporation is, at the time of acquisition of such vessel hereunder, owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States, and has been so owned for a period of at least 3 years immediately prior to such acquisition; and

(C) such corporation agrees that the war-built vessel purchased with the use of such credit shall be documented under the laws of the United States.

Such allowance shall not be applied upon the cash payment required under section 4. Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the provisions of section 510 (c), (d), (e), and (f), of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall be applicable with respect to such acquisition to the same extent as such subsections are applicable with respect to the acquisition of obsolete vessels.

(b) (1) If, within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act, the owner of a vessel eligible for exchange under subsection (a) and on such date of enactment under charter to the United States pursuant to a charter party or taking for use made or effected prior to such date of enactment, makes a firm offer, binding for at least 90 days, to transfer the vessel to the Commission in exchange for the allowance provided in paragraph (1), the amount of such allowance may be increased to (A) the amount which the owner has, prior to the enactment of this act, agreed would have been the lia-

bility of the United States to him if the vessel had been lost, on the day before such date of enactment, by reason of causes for which the United States was responsible, or (B) in the absence of such an agreement, the amount which would have been the liability of the United States to him if the vessel had been so lost on such day and if the valuation of the vessel for the purpose of fixing such liability had been that generally applicable to vessels of similar age and type.

(2) If, after such offer is made, and prior to its acceptance, or prior to the acquisition of the vessel, by the Commission, the vessel is lost by reason of causes for which the United States is responsible, then in lieu of paying the owner any amount on account of such loss, the offer shall, for the purposes of subsection (a) and this subsection, be considered as having been accepted and the vessel as having been acquired by the Commission under subsection (a) immediately prior to such loss.

(c) The Commission is also authorized to make available any war-built vessel for transfer to any citizen in complete or partial settlement of any claim of such citizen against the United States (1) for just compensation upon the requisition for title of any vessel which he owned, or (2) for indemnity for the loss of any vessel owned by him and taken by the United States for use.

(d) A war-built vessel shall be deemed to be a "new vessel" for the purposes of section 510 and section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, provided it is documented, or agreed with the Commission to be documented, under the laws of the United States.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Beginning with line 19, page 12, strike out down through line 16 on page 14, and insert: "Such allowance shall not be applied upon the cash payment required under section 4. The amount of such allowance shall be determined by the Commission, having regard to the tonnage of the vessel being exchanged, but shall in no event be greater than 10 percent of the average construction cost (without national defense features) of warbuilt vessels (of the same type as that being purchased) delivered during the calendar year 1944, except that in the case of any type of dry-cargo vessel the principal deliveries of which were made after the calendar year 1944, there shall be used in lieu of the year 1944 such period of not less than 6 consecutive months as the Commission shall find to be most representative of war production costs of such type. In any case where the vessel offered in exchange was acquired from the United States, the exchange allowance under this section shall, unless subsequent to its sale by the United States it was acquired by a bona fide purchaser for value, in no event be greater than the price at which the vessel was acquired from the United States plus the depreciated cost of any capital improvements thereon. No vessel which is under charter to the United States on the date of the enactment of this act and which, pursuant to the terms of such charter, has been restored to condition by the United States, or for the restoring of which pursuant to the terms of such charter a cash allowance has been made to the owner, may be exchanged under this section.

"(b) The Commission is also authorized to make available any war-built vessel for transfer to any citizen in complete or partial settlement of any claim of such citizen against the United States (1) for just compensation upon the requisition for title of any vessel which he owned, or (2) for indemnity for the loss of any vessel owned by him and taken by the United States for use.

"(c) Except as hereinafter provided, a war-built vessel shall not be deemed to be a "new vessel" for the purposes of section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, but shall be deemed a "new vessel" for the purposes of section 511 of such act. Section 510 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall be applicable with respect to vessels exchanged under this section to the same extent as applicable to obsolete vessels exchanged under section 510 of such act."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with one of the most difficult questions which the committee had to decide—the amount of the trade-in allowance to be permitted on old vessels turned in to the Commission in connection with the purchase of war-built vessels.

The bill as reported contained two provisions dealing with the amount of the allowance—section 8 (a) and section 8 (b). Section 8 (a) stated the general rule—that is, that the Commission was authorized to allow, on a vessel traded in, the fair and reasonable value of the vessel, taking into consideration three factors: First, market value for operation in foreign and domestic trade; second, scrap value; and, third, book value.

Section 8 (b) of the reported bill authorized a value in excess of the section 8 (a) value under certain conditions:

First. The vessel must be under charter to the United States on the date of the bill's enactment; and

Second. The offer to trade the vessel in must be made within 90 days after the date of the bill's enactment.

If these two conditions were complied with, then the Commission was authorized to allow on the trade-in an amount not in excess of the "insurance valuation" of the vessel—which means the amount which the United States would have been required to pay to the owner if it had lost the vessel while under charter. This "insurance valuation" was equal to the "just compensation" value fixed by the War Shipping Administration, and in the case of vessels twenty or more years old averaged around $47 per ton.

There has been a feeling that the allowance permitted by the bill as reported is too high, and hence the committee has agreed to the committee amendment which has just been offered. Under the amendment the allowance for a vessel traded in on a war-built vessel cannot be greater than 10 percent of the war-construction cost of the war-built vessel being purchased. The amount of the allowance, subject to the 10-percent maximum, is to be fixed by the Commission, having regard to the tonnage of the vessel being exchanged as compared with the tonnage of the vessel being purchased. Under the amendment the maximum allowance, according to information given to the committee, will be in the neighborhood of $25 per ton. As a further limitation, the amendment provides that, if the vessel being turned in was once acquired from the United States, the allowance cannot exceed the price paid on such acquisition, unless subsequent to such acquisition the vessel was acquired by a bona fide purchaser for value.

A vessel which is under charter to the United States on the date of the bill's enactment cannot, under the terms of the amendment, be turned in if the United States has been required to fulfill its obligation to restore the vessel to condition for delivery back to the owner. The cost of restoration of these vessels has been estimated to run as high as $20 a ton. Since the reason for providing an increased trade-in allowance is, first, the saving of the cost of restoration and, second, the holding out of a reasonable inducement to the owner to replace his old tonnage with new tonnage in the interests of the merchant marine, it would be the height of folly to have the owner require the United States to expend large sums in restoring the vessel, and then permit him to turn it in at an attractive trade-in value and tell the United States he did not want it after all.

Under the amendment, no vessel may be traded in under section 510 of the 1936 act on a war-built vessel. On war-built vessels trade-ins must be made under section 8 of the bill, as proposed by the committee amendment, or not at all.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I find myself in opposition to the distinguished chairman of the committee and the majority of the committee on this amendment. I feel quite sincerely that in adopting this amendment the committee neglected to examine some of its more obvious provisions which, to my mind, are a complete absurdity if we are trying to modernize our merchant marine. The amendment, in effect, provides that for the turn-in of any vessels other than a war-built vessel in exchange for a war-built vessel there shall be a top limit of 10 percent of the construction costs during war conditions per ton for that old vessel. The reason, apparently, that the committee adopted that was that they were afraid the Chairman of the Maritime Commission might accept in certain deals old junk tonnage in exchange for new ships.

But as the bill is written and the way in which this amendment is made to apply to the bill, this limitation of 10 percent applies to any vessel owned by a citizen of the United States, other than a vessel purchased under this act. In other words, it does not apply necessarily to old tonnage. It may well apply to tonnage that is in first-class condition that is only 10 years old, but which for modernization purposes the owner would like to trade in for a new vessel.

Under this amendment, if adopted, the maximum trade-in price he can get is 10 percent. It was my understanding from the beginning that with this colossal surplus of vessels we have on our hands we were going to do our very best to make fair trade deals in order to get our merchant marine modernized so that we might compete, which we will have great difficulty in doing, with the merchant marines of other nations of the world. This amendment would completely prevent the modernization of our merchant fleet. It is a clear reflection on the trading ability of the Maritime Commission from the point of view of making a fair trade. I object to it on the same ground as to the other amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], in that

in order to try to correct an evil an amendment has been proposed to the bill which is likely to be a very serious deterrent to the modernization of our merchant marine.

If the Members are interested in this amendment, I wish they would read it as appears on page 9201 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. I defy any Member to tell me the meaning of the entire amendment.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. It is regrettable that the gentleman from Massachusetts was not present during the consideration of the amendment so that the committee could have had the benefit of his counsel but the fact still remains that the committee, by unanimous vote, approved what is known as the Bonner amendment.

Mr. HERTER. I fully share the regret at not having been present, but I still stick to my point, and in order that there be no misunderstanding as to my understanding of this amendment, I have just consulted with the counsel for the committee and he says that my interpretation is the correct interpretation.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I think it is only fair to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts was in committee at most of its hearings, and this amendment came up lately while the gentleman was away. The gentleman has been at all the hearings and has been very much interested in the hearings on this very subject and has been a very valuable member. I do not believe he has neglected one bit of this legislation.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman for that. I tried for 15 months to follow this bill.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. And the gentleman was a very great aid in preparing this bill. The chairman learned, and so did other members of the committee, to rely upon his excellent judgment and his knowledge of all matters pertaining to the bill. He was of great assistance and very valuable to the committee.

Mr. HERTER. I am very grateful to the chairman for those kind remarks, and am sorry I find myself in disagreement with other members of the committee on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH to the committee amendment: At the end of section (b), after the words "for use" insert *"Provided,* That the value or price attributed to any war-built vessel made available under the provisions of this subsection shall not be less than the price at and for which such vessel may be sold under the provisions of this act."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee amendment which has been offered is a tremendous improvement as compared with the text of the bill as reported. I do not purport to say whether or not 10 percent is the proper ceiling, but I do think the original ceiling proposed in the bill as reported is absolutely without justification. I emphasized that fact in my remarks on the floor yesterday. I agree with Mr. Snyder, Director of Mobilization and Reconversion, who, in a letter addressed to the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, stated that "certainly there should be some drastic limitation placed upon the maximum trade-in allowance permitted."

The amendment to the amendment which I have offered is a very simple one; I hope the committee will accept it. The amendment simply proposes to put a minimum valuation on the ship that is traded in; namely, the value at which it can be sold under the provisions of this act. Without this limitation, as I read the proposed amendment, any claim in respect to the requisition for title or indemnity for loss can be settled in the discretion of the Commission without any yardstick for the valuation of the vessel to be turned in. I hope the amendment to the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from North Carolina wishes to be heard on his amendment.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question.

Mr. Chairman, I offer a pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I address my remarks to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The reason this amendment was offered was to assure at least a 25 percent return to the Treasury of the reduced prices, as we might term the price mentioned in the bill, the prewar domestic cost reduced. I should like to be assured that in no case will the return be less than that amount.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina that the amendment which I offered goes only to section (b) of his amendment, that is to the section which authorizes the Commission to make available war-built vessels in complete or partial settlement of any claim that may now be outstanding. All it does is to provide that the ships so transferred shall not be transfered at a value less than the value which is provided in this bill for the sale of war-built vessels.

Mr. BONNER. And it still leaves the possibility for the Commission to get a higher amount than 25 percent.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I assume it does.

Mr. BLAND. I thought we had agreed to that; I thought the amendment to the amendment had been accepted. We hope they will not set a floor of 25 percent but will seek to get the highest price possible.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. I should like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if his amendment will bring a greater financial return to the Federal Government for the sale of the ships than is provided for in the Bonner amendment.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I can answer that only in terms of hope. I should hope it would, but I do not know how anybody can have any idea about the amount to be obtained under this bill.

Mr. WELCH. We are dealing with $17,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, and we are duty bound to secure for the Government the greatest possible financial return for its ships.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, we have agreed to the Wigglesworth amendment to the amendment. The question is whether debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is proper.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands the situation, the committee has agreed to the Wigglesworth amendment to the amendment. The question will recur upon the amendment as amended.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, that is what I understood. I wanted to be clear about it before I voted for or against my own amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADJUSTMENT FOR PRIOR SALES TO CITIZENS

SEC. 9. (a) A citizen of the United States who on the date of the enactment of this act—

(1) owns a vessel which he purchased from the Commission prior to such date, and which was delivered by its builder after December 31, 1940; or

(2) is party to a contract with the Commission to purchase from the Commission a vessel, which has not yet been delivered to him; or

(3) owns a vessel on account of which a construction-differential subsidy was paid, or agreed to be paid, by the Commission under section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and which was delivered by its builder after December 31, 1940; or

(4) is party to a contract with a shipbuilder for the construction for him of a vessel, which has not yet been delivered to him, and on account of which a construction-differential subsidy was agreed, prior to such date, to be paid by the Commission under section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; shall be entitled to an adjustment in the price of such vessel under this section if he makes application therefor, in such form and manner as the Commission may prescribe, within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

(b) Such adjustment shall be made by crediting the amount thereof against any mortgage indebtedness to the Commission with respect to such vessel (prorated over the unpaid installments thereof), and by refunding the balance, if any.

(c) The amount of the adjustment under this section shall be the excess of—

(1) the purchase price of such vessel, reduced by an amount representing both normal depreciation, and excessive wear and tear by reason of war service, at the same rate and for the same period as that used in computing the statutory sales price under paragraph (2) or in lieu thereof by the amount of any amortization applicable up to such date under section 23 (t) of the Internal Revenue Code if such amount is larger; over

(2) the statutory sales price of the vessel as of the date of the enactment of this act, determined as if the vessel were owned by the Commission.

For the purposes of paragraph (1), the purchase price of a vessel on account of which a construction differential subsidy was paid or agreed to be paid under section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall be the net cost of the vessel to the owner.

(d) An adjustment shall be made under this section only if there are included in the adjustment agreement provisions to the effect that—

(1) the liability of the United States for bare-boat use of the vessel under any charter party made prior to the date of the enactment of this act shall be limited to 15 percent per annum of the statutory sales price as of such date; and

(2) the liability of the United States under any such charter party for loss of the vessel shall be determined on the basis of the statutory sales price as of the date of the enactment of this act, depreciated to the date of loss at the rate of 5 percent per annum, plus not to exceed 3 percent per annum as representing excessive wear and tear by reason of war service; and

(3) in the event the United States, prior to the termination of the existing national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, uses such vessel pursuant to a taking, or pursuant to a bare-boat charter made, on or after the date of the enactment of this act, the compensation to be paid to the purchaser, his receivers, and trustees, shall in no event be greater than 15 percent per annum of the statutory sales price as of such date.

(e) Section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall not apply to any vessel with respect to which an adjustment is made under this section.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 15, line 12, after "shall", insert ", except as hereinafter provided," and after the period in line 15, insert "No adjustment shall be made under this section in respect of any vessel the contract for the construction of which was made after June 30, 1945, under the provisions of title V (including sec. 504) or title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, substantially a similar amendment was adopted yesterday after debate. This amendment is another of the amendments made necessary by the surrender of Japan and by the stopping of contract authority for new construction. It has the effect of preventing adjustments in the price of vessels contracted for under title V or title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, after June 30, 1945.

The amendments are merely clarifying amendments and consist first of the insertion on page 15, line 12, after the word "shall" of the words "except as hereafter provided" and then in line 15 inserts the matter contemplated by the exception, the language so inserted being as shown in this amendment. The insertion was recommended by the Maritime Commission and the reasons therefor have been discussed in connection with amendment No. 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Beginning with line 16 on page 15, strike out down through line 23 on page 16 and insert:

"(b) Such adjustment shall be made, as hereinafter provided, by treating the vessel as if it were being sold to the applicant on the date of the enactment of this act, and not before that time. The amount of such adjustment shall be determined as follows:

"(1) The Commission shall credit the applicant with the excess of the cash payments made upon the original purchase price of the vessel over 25 percent of the statutory sales price of the vessel as of such date of enactment. If such payment was less than 25 percent of the statutory sales price of the vessel, the applicant shall pay the difference to the Commission.

"(2) The mortgage indebtedness of the applicant with respect to the vessel shall be canceled, and a new mortgage indebtedness, payable in not more than 20 equal annual installments, with interest on the portion of the statutory sales price remaining unpaid, at the rate of 3½ percent per annum, shall be assumed by the applicant.

"(3) The new mortgage indebtedness shall be in an amount equal to the excess of the statutory sales price of the vessel as of the date of the enactment of this act over the sum of the cash payment retained by the United States under paragraph (1) plus the readjusted trade-in allowance (determined under paragraph (6)) with respect to any vessel exchanged by the applicant on the original purchase.

"(4) The Commission shall credit the applicant with the excess, if any, of the sum of the cash payments made by the applicant upon the original purchase price of the vessel plus the readjusted trade-in allowance (determined under paragraph (6)) over the statutory sales price of the vessel as of the date of the enactment of this act to the extent not credited under paragraph (1).

"(5) The Commission shall also credit the applicant with an amount equal to interest at the rate of 3½ percent per annum (for the period beginning with the date of the original delivery of the vessel to the applicant and ending with the date of the enactment of this act) on the excess of the original purchase price of the vessel over the amount of any allowance allowed by the Commission on the exchange of any vessel on such purchase; the amount of such credit first being reduced by any interest on the original mortgage indebtedness accrued up to such date of enactment and unpaid. Interest so accrued and unpaid shall be canceled.

"(6) The applicant shall credit the Commission with all amounts paid by the United States to him as charter hire for use of the vessel (exclusive of service, if any, required under the terms of the charter) under any charter party made prior to the date of the enactment of this act, and any charter hire for such use accrued up to such date of enactment and unpaid shall be canceled; and the Commission shall credit the applicant with the amount that would have been paid by the United States to the applicant as charter hire for bare boat use of vessels exchanged by the applicant on the original purchase (for the period beginning with date on which the vessels so exchanged were delivered to the Commission and ending with the date of the enactment of this act).

"(7) The allowance made to the applicant on any vessel exchanged by him on the original purchase shall be readjusted so as to limit such allowance to the amount provided for under section 8.

"(8) There shall be subtracted from the sum of the credits in favor of the Commission under the foregoing provisions of this subsection the amount of any overpayments of Federal taxes by the applicant resulting from the application of subsection (c) (1), and there shall be subtracted from the sum of the credits in favor of the applicant under the foregoing provisions of this subsection the amount of any deficiencies in Federal taxes of the applicant resulting from the application of subsection (c) (1). If, after making such subtractions, the sum of the credits in favor of the applicant exceeds the sum of the credits in favor of the Commission, such excess shall be paid by the Commission to the applicant. If, after making such subtractions, the sum of the credits in favor of the Commission exceeds the sum of the credits in favor of the applicant, such excess shall be paid by the applicant to the Commission. Upon such payment by the Commission or the applicant, such overpayments shall be treated as having been refunded and such deficiencies as having been paid.

"For the purposes of this subsection, the purchase price of a vessel on account of which a construction differential subsidy was paid or agreed to be paid under section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall be the net cost of the vessel to the owner.

"(c) An adjustment shall be made under this section only if an adjustment is applied for on all vessels of the applicant with respect to which an adjustment may be made under this section, and then only if the applicant enters into an agreement with the Commission to the effect that, in the case of each such vessel—

"(1) Depreciation and amortization allowed or allowable with respect to the vessel up to the date of the enactment of this act for Federal tax purposes shall be treated as not having been allowable; amounts credited to the Commission under subsection (b) (6) shall be treated for Federal tax purposes as not having been received or accrued as income; amounts credited to the applicant under subsection (b) (6) shall be treated for Federal tax purposes as having been received and accrued as income in the taxable year in which falls the date of the enactment of this act; and the amount credited by the Commission under subsection (b) (5) shall be treated for Federal tax purposes as having been received and secured as income ratably over the period beginning with the date of the original delivery of the vessel to the applicant and ending with the day before the date of the enactment of this act;

"(2) The liability of the United States for use (exclusive of service, if any, required under the terms of the charter) of the vessel on or after the date of the enactment of this act under any charter party shall not exceed 15 percentum per annum of the statutory sales price of the vessel as of such date of enactment; and the liability of the United States under any."

Page 17, line 14, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the chairman of the subcommittee will handle this amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment agreed to by the subcommittee and by the full committee, which considered amendments to the bill.

Section 9 of the bill as reported seeks to provide for adjustments in the price of vessels sold during the war period and prior to the enactment of the bill to the price provided under the bill. To make an adjustment of this character is plain simple justice. An operator who bought a vessel from the Commission before the enactment of the bill should not be penalized in comparison with one who waits until after the bill's enactment to buy.

There have been sold during the war, and prior to the bill's enactment, 153 dry-cargo vessels and 68 tankers. Of the dry-cargo vessels 139 were sold with a construction differential subsidy, and 19 were sold without any subsidy whatsoever. All of the tankers, of course, were sold without subsidy. The contracts for the sale of all these vessels contained a provision which purported to grant to the purchaser in the event legislation should be enacted to provide for the sale of war-built ships the benefits of any price fixed in that legislation. Whether or not the Commission had authority to make such a commitment, the fact is that it was made and the good faith of the United States is involved in section 9 of the bill.

There has been a feeling that the amount of the adjustment provided for in section 9 of the bill as reported is too high. The committee amendment seeks to cut down the amount of this adjustment and at the same time to be perfectly fair to all concerned—those who bought before the enactment of the bill, those who bought after the enactment of the bill, and the United States.

The committee amendment treats all of these prior sales as being made on the date of the bill's enactment and not before that time, so that the previous purchaser and a future purchaser will be put on exactly the same basis. In order to accomplish this result it is necessary to "unwind" a previous transaction, and most of the provisions of the committee amendment which appear complicated are the provisions describing how this unwinding is to be done.

First. The cash payments, which include the principal payments made on the mortgage, made in connection with the original transaction have to be readjusted to the cash payment requirements of the bill.

Second. The old mortgage indebtedness assumed on the original transaction must be canceled and a new mortgage indebtedness running from the date of the bill's enactment has to be assumed.

Third. The amount of the new mortgage indebtedness must be fixed in relation to the statutory sales price of the vessel under the bill—that is, the price at which it is now being sold.

Fourth. The Commission must credit the applicant with any amount of cash which he has already paid in excess of the statutory sales price.

Fifth. Since the United States has had the use of the applicant's money from the time of the original transaction to the date of the bill's enactment, the Commission must credit the applicant with interest on that money.

Sixth. The applicant must credit the Commission with amounts paid by the United States to him as charter hire for the use of the vessel from the date of the original transaction to the date of the bill's enactment, and if the applicant traded in any vessel on the original transaction, the Commission must credit him with the amount that he would have earned as charter hire on the old vessel traded in from the time when the old vessel was traded in up to the date of the bill's enactment.

Seventh. The trade-in allowance made to the applicant in the original transaction must be readjusted down to the allowance permitted under section 8 of the bill.

Eighth. Depreciation which the applicant has taken on the vessel purchased from the date of the original transaction to the date of the bill's enactment must be treated as not having been allowed and must be put back into the income account. Similarly, charter hire which the applicant received and which, under the terms of the amendment he is required to pay back must be taken out of the income account.

These are the provisions which the amendment includes for the purpose of unwinding the previous transaction. The basic principle of the amendment is very simple—the previous transaction is to be looked upon as having taken place not when it actually did but as taking place on the date of the bill's enactment and subject to all of the bill's provisions. The amendment reduces the amount of the adjustment under section 9 substantially and is fair to all concerned.

I might say incidentally that the adjustments under the bill as originally reported out amounted to $89,000,000. That included a scaling down of the mortgage indebtedness owing to the Maritime Commission and a small amount of cash. This amendment reduces that adjustment to the owners down to $68,000,000, or a total saving of $21,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this readjustment is made both in respect to contracted sale and sales which are actually executed?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. And the gentleman says it will involve the repayment of about $69,000,000?

Mr. JACKSON. Not in cash, no. It scales down their indebtedness. In other words, it treats the transaction as though it took place on the date of the enactment of this bill. Then they must go through all the necessary procedure set out in the amendment to make the adjustments.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is this $68,000,000 to be paid to nonsubsidized owners, to subsidized owners, or to tanker owners, or to all three?

Mr. JACKSON. The adjustment applies to subsidized and unsubsidized owners. If I understand the record correctly, there will be a very small amount to subsidized owners. I believe there will be about $200,000 to the subsidized owners and the rest to unsubsidized owners and to the tanker operators.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may proceed for another minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WEICHEL. With reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman, how much do you claim you will save out of the $87,000,000 now proposed to be given away by section 9?

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman will recall, that he was a member of the subcommittee which drafted this amendment. My original amendment which was approved by the subcommittee made a reduction of roughly $28,000,000. It brought it down from $89,000,000 to $60,000,000. Then the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] offered an amendment to the full committee which I did not agree to, which brought it up $8,000,000.

Mr. WEICHEL. Your amendment would reduce the $89,000,000 now proposed to be adjusted under section 9 by $29,000,000.

Mr. JACKSON. No. It would bring it from $89,000,000 to $68,000,000, or a saving of $21,000,000. This is not an entire cash outlay. A small amount of cash is involved, because these ships were purchased with a mortgage back to the Commission. Most of it involves a scaling down of mortgage indebtedness, and puts individuals on a parity with those who buy when this bill becomes law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

By his statement, the sponsor of this amendment tells us it involves some $20,000,000. This is a large sum of money in anyone's language. I suggest that it is too large a sum of money to be dealt with hastily in an eleventh hour amendment after 18 months of committee work on the bill. As I mentioned in my address of yesterday, those who would stand the $20,000,000 have not had their day in court and have had no opportu-

nity whatever to present their viewpoints thereon.

Those of you who read the amendment in two columns of fine print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning and those of you who have just heard it read will agree with me that it is involved and complicated. I have been told by those who helped draft it that a dollar by dollar comparison with section 9 as written is impossible to compile. Certainly no such compilation has been presented to the Congress thus far. The amendment is therefore a shot in the dark.

Let us examine for a moment the alleged $20,000,000 savings. From where was this figure obtained? I have seen no such compilation and no such compilation has been presented to the Congress.

I have been told, however, that as to one segment of the shipping industry—a favored segment under the amendment—the Government will pay out more money under the amendment than under the bill as written. Who then are those who suffer under the amendment? Is not the Congress entitled to know? Lacking such a break-down, can we be assured that the Government benefits at all? No one seems to know precisely. The Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration are silent. Are they, too, uncertain as to what the amendment means?

Mr. Chairman, if the House adopts this amendment, it will be acting without benefit of knowledge, without benefit of analysis. Under these circumstances the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Has the Maritime Commission been asked for an opinion in respect to this amendment that was read today, and which it is impossible for any Member to fully interpret?

Mr. BUCK. The text of the amendment was not completed until the committee went into session Friday morning.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We are being asked to vote on an amendment which covers at least three or four pages of very technical language, and apparently nobody is willing to say that the Maritime Commission is in favor of that amendment.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is exactly correct, as far as I know.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not correct that the gentleman was in attendance at the subcommittee meeting, although he was not a member of the subcommittee, and this amendment was presented and discussed, and a representative of the Commission stated that it would save, roughly, $21,000,000? I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] will bear me out in that.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is correct in saying I was present at the subcommittee meeting by invitation. At times the subcommittee was composed of four members. There are 21 members of the committee. The bill came to the committee on Friday morning and eight members adopted this complicated, involved amendment to which we have just listened.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Am I correct in understanding that the fundamental justification for paying these large adjustments are clauses inserted in every contract of purchase, without authority by the Maritime Commission?

Mr. BUCK. When a prospective purchaser was about to buy a ship during the course of the war, and knowing that he faced a drop in value at the end of the war, any prudent man would have been unwilling to buy a ship at war-cost prices. Therefore, the only way the Maritime Commission was able to sell ships during the war was to put in a protecting clause, which was put into every contract which the Maritime Commission made with the buyer.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Would the gentleman state the nature of that clause?

Mr. BUCK. In every contract for the sale of a ship made heretofore, and to which this amendment applies, there has been a clause stating that the Maritime Commission would adjust the price paid to the price as determined under a ship sale bill when, as, and if enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I believe the gentleman from New York unwittingly perhaps makes a very unfair charge against the full committee and against the subcommittee.

In answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] let me say that this clause was written into some of the purchase agreements that the Maritime Commission executed—not all of them—but in one particular transaction to which the gentleman from New York referred on yesterday this clause appears:

> ARTICLE 12. Future legislation: The Commission agrees that in the event of the enactment of legislation authorizing the sale by the United States of vessels, constructed or sold under conditions similar to the construction and sale of the vessel herein agreed to be sold, at a price less than the actual construction cost thereof, exclusive of the cost of national defense features installed in any such vessel, the buyer shall be granted the benefit of such legislation with respect to the sale price of the vessel, in which event the Commission shall make an appropriate adjustment with the buyer on the purchase price of the vessel.

I think in all fairness to the shipping interests, this kind of adjustment should be made and ought to be made in all fairness to everyone.

Whether or not the Maritime Commission had any legal right to insert such a clause in these contracts has been subject to question. However, that is not the point as I see it. The fact of the matter is that the Maritime Commission has been charged with the responsibility by Congress of disposing of ships and it is the duly recognized agent of the United States Government in its dealings with the operators. Therefore, after the operators have entered into a bona fide agreement, with the Maritime Commission acting as agents of the Government, and this clause appears, certainly it is up to us if it has not been done heretofore to write specifically into law the method by which these adjustments shall be made.

After prolonged discussion last spring in the full committee on this subject, section 9 as it appears in the bill seemed to be the answer. We now seek to amend it. Many discussions were held this fall in the full committee on this subject of fair adjustments, and the chairman, tiring of trying to get a quorum of the committee together day after day after day, appointed a subcommittee of six members, three on the majority side and three on the minority side. The chairman of the subcommittee was the very able gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. This subcommittee invited to attend its meetings any other member of the full committee who cared to attend. To my knowledge—and I think I attended every one of those meetings at the request of our senior minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]—the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] was also in attendance and made no suggestion or criticism of this amendment. And to prove the fairness of the committee, the committee itself considered the original Jackson amendment, and in addition several amendments I suggested myself; and in the full committee session of last Friday the full committee adopted an additional amendment which I offered and which the gentleman from New York supported; and then, as he said, with a quorum of 12 members of the committee present, seven, as I recall it, voted in favor of the amendment that is presently before us; one, the gentleman from New York, voted in opposition to it; and four others voted present.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true also that the subcommittee consisted of three Republicans and three Democrats?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I said so.

Mr. JACKSON. Most of the votes were unanimous.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. And is it not true that this particular amendment merely makes it possible for these people to get these ships at a price which other individuals would be entitled to get them at when the bill is enacted?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The purpose of the amendment is to put everybody on the same basis as of the date of the enactment of the legislation.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. It is perfectly true, as the gentleman says, that I was invited as a nonmember of the subcommittee to sit in with the subcommittee but I did not feel as a nonmember of the committee that it was my right to enter in an involved manner into the discussions of the committee.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Other Members, including myself, did not hesitate to express their views and I gathered they were always very welcome. But I can easily appreciate and I am sure all the other members of the committee appreciate that the gentleman from New York, being a relatively new member of the committee would undobtedly hesitate to be too forward in expressing himself before a subcommittee of which he was not a member. The gentleman from New York has always been very diligent in his attention to all matters coming before our committee and has been extremely regular in his attendance at all the full committee meetings and is doing a most commendable job in lending his views and fighting for his convictions at all times in all matters that come before the committee; and I want to say to him I consider him a very valuable member of our committee and in that, I know, I am joined by our chairman and the entire membership.

Mr. BUCK. As far as last Friday morning is concerned, it is true that I offered an amendment to improve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington, but that did not mean necessarily I was in favor of that amended amendment. I was trying to make it as good as possible.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman in fact offered and did support my amendment which I appreciated. I hope the amendment will be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revert to the committee amendment as amended by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and to offer an amendment at that point. I was through inadvertence misinformed by one of the reading clerks who told me my amendment would come up after disposition of that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I object, in view of the fact that my amendment fits in immediately after the one that has just been adopted. I would like to have my amendment considered, then the gentleman may make his motion.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I so amend my unanimous consent request.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I object for the present.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEICHEL: Page 14, line 18, strike out "a citizen of the United States" and insert "an unsubsidized operator", in line 20 and line 24, page 15, in line 1 and in line 7, before "vessels", insert "dry cargo."

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, up to this time no one has told the Members of this House that section 9 as now written in the bill will cost the taxpayers of this country $87,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States. Some of you gentlemen will say that this is merely a bookkeeping arrangement, but any time that you give credit to somebody out of the Treasury of the United States, even though they call it a bookkeeping arrangement, the taxpayers will pay the $87,000,000.

As I said yesterday, the Maritime Commission was not satisfied with putting up a fund that went up to $329,000,000 of tax-exempt funds. They were not satisfied with that, but in addition, they put a clause into every sales contract, which they had no authority to do, saying that they would refund to every purchaser money under section 9 to make it line up with sales under this bill.

With reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], which raised the tankers from 75 percent to 100 percent, the gentleman in answer to my question said all that would do would be to reduce the $87,000,000 only $29,000,000. In other words, his offer to raise the price did not do anything very much with reference to paying out $87,000,000 under section 9.

My amendment simply proposes to do this: It did not go through and it does not go through a long-winded statement of six pages. It is very simple and says this: The bill as now set up provides for returning $87,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States. I say that if you are going to adjust price to those who have purchased, if you are going to adjust it and give it to any one, I believe you should give it to the American citizen who put down his own dollars and bought his own ships; the person who is unsubsidized and not to the subsidized. If you adopt this amendment you will save $70,000,000; in other words this amendment says that the adjustment in price shall only be given to unsubsidized dry-cargo operators, and by that you will take away $57,000,000 from the tankers as a gift and you will take away the gift to the subsidized people who resort to pay for these very ships under this bill out of the tax exempt fund which amounted to $329,000,000. I plead with you to adopt this amendment and save the taxpayers of this country $70,000,000 and only adjust the price to the American citizen who bought ships with his own dollars.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I thought I cleared up the amount of refund allowable——

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for a speech. The gentleman said $25,000,000, and he made that speech once. I yield no further.

Mr. JACKSON. I have always yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. WEICHEL. I will yield for a question.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true as I stated that under this amendment the refunds are $68,000,000 less what we have allowed for tankers, bringing it down under $50,000,000? I just want the gentleman to be fair with the facts.

Mr. WEICHEL. I am fair with the facts. The gentleman said that under his amendment with reference to tankers it would help $29,000,000. This amendment will save $70,000,000, if you want to save it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I will yield for a question.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that the original section provided for a readjustment of $89,000,000?

Mr. WEICHEL. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that my amendment brought that down $21,000,000?

Mr. WEICHEL. The gentleman said so.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I assume the gentleman knows that to be true?

Mr. WEICHEL. That is all I know; the gentleman said so.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman recalls that he was at the committee meeting when a Maritime Commission representative stated that to be the fact. Is it not true also that the tanker adjustment which the committee has agreed to here will bring that down fifteen or twenty million dollars more? So we must deduct that also. The gentleman has been talking about $89,000,000 all the time.

Mr. WEICHEL. If the gentleman is satisfied with $21,000,000, why should he not be for this amendment which will save $70,000,000? It will save over three times as much as the gentleman's amendment. Why does the gentleman not agree to it; will he tell me that? Will the gentleman tell me why he will not agree to this amendment which saves two or three times as much?

Mr. JACKSON. If the gentelman will let me answer, I will tell him. The answer is simply this, that I do not believe in arbitrary and capricious legislation. I believe if we are going to allow an adjustment to one we should allow it to all. I see no reason why the dry-cargo people whether subsidized or unsubsidized and the tanker people should not be given the same fair treatment. I believe in being fair to all.

Mr. WEICHEL. The gentleman still believes in taking twenty or thirty million dollars from the fund to help those people but will not save an additional fifty or sixty million dollars. That is not a good answer.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman knows that a suit is pending in connection with that matter. I agree with him 100 percent that that adjustment ought to be made, but this is no way to do it by just being arbitrary and saying one group can have it and the other cannot.

Mr. WEICHEL. The gentleman wants to make a gift of $70,000,000, which I do not want to make, and this story about court action just confuses the issue.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, considerable mention has been made about certain tax-exempt funds. I am satisfied that if any funds have been exempted from taxation which should not have been exempted the Treasury Department will look into it, and the offending party made to put up money to the Treasury. The gentleman from Washington says there is a suit about this matter. I understand there is some question about tax-exempt funds. If so, it is a matter for the courts to decide. It is not for us now to undertake to say that persons shall be penalized if they have improperly received a tax exemption for they will be made to pay in the future. Shall we make them pay here? I do not care as to the result, as far as I am concerned, except that I want justice done.

Furthermore, many of the funds tax exempt were tax exempt under the regulations of the Treasury, funds representing depreciation funds that were received representing capital gains, or otherwise properly exempt and funds of that kind. Those sums would materially reduce the amount that has been mentioned. Those questions have not been decided. I say to you that if we were to hold our session another day we would not settle the question here before this Congress. It is for the courts to decide.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WEICHEL. Does not the gentleman believe it is desirable to adopt an amendment that will save $70,000,000, which is more than any other amendment that was proposed to this bill? The gentleman will admit that the bill as it now stands would cost the taxpayers $89,000,000 under the adjustment.

Mr. BLAND. I understand it would have been something like that except for the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], but I am not in favor of saving anything if it is unjust.

Mr. WEICHEL. The amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] does not cut it down to $70,000,000, it just cuts it down a little bit. It is a sort of a token amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I think the record is clear. I do not understand why the gentleman from Ohio keeps repeating the same thing over and over. My amendment cuts the readjustment from $89,000,000 to $68,000,000. In addition, there is between $15,000,000 and $20,000,000 that is readjusted below $50,000,000 due to the adjustment in tanker prices.

Mr. WEICHEL. Why does the gentleman object to cutting these down the whole way?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not believe in trying to pass legislation that is arbitrary and unjust to all the people concerned.

Mr. WEICHEL. The gentleman's amendment is just a token amendment. It goes only half way.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I thought I had the floor; maybe I do not have it. At any rate, I want to have the floor long enough to say, vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WEICHEL) there were—ayes 34, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revert in the consideration of the bill for the purpose of offering an amendment to the committee amendment as amended by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman has a perfecting amendment which has been agreed to by both sides and there is no reason why the amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. BLAND. Do I understand that the amendment to be offered is not objected to? Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. CHURCH. That is correct.

Mr. BLAND. If that is so, then let us hear the amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. There is no reason why the gentleman's amendment should not be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS to the committee amendment as amended by the Wigglesworth amendment: In section (b) of the committee amendment as amended by the Wigglesworth amendment after the words "United States", insert a semicolon and strike out the following: "(1) for just compensation upon the requisition for title of any vessel which he owned, or (2) for indemnity for the loss of any vessel owned by him and taken by the United States for use."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendment?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Alabama explain what his amendment does and what change it makes? It is impossible to know where we are without having that before us. We are dealing with an amendment to an amendment, neither of which is available in printed form.

Mr. BLAND. May I ask the gentleman first if this interferes with the Bonner amendment in inserting the words "Maritime Commission?"

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all.

I would be delighted to explain the amendment. The only purpose of this amendment and the only thing it does is to strike out two restrictions which appear in the bill and gives the United States through the Maritime Commission an opportunity to sell some vessels that they would not otherwise have the opportunity to sell.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does it change the terms under which they may be sold?

Mr. HOBBS. If I may be permitted to answer the gentleman's question, the first part of it now reads:

The Commission is also authorized to make available any war-built vessel for transfer to any citizen in complete or partial settlement of any claim of such citizen against the United States.

Then follow two restrictions which my amendment would strike out.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Restrictions on whom or what?

Mr. HOBBS. It limits the ones who have claims against the United States to those who have claims under two heads which are as follows: One, for just compensation upon the requisition for title of any vessel which he owned; or, two, indemnity for the loss of any vessel owned by him and taken by the United States for use. I see no reason, and no one else can, why we should so limit it. Anybody who has a just claim against the United States ought to be able to buy one of these vessels and get credit for it, if the Maritime Commission sees fit to make a trade on that basis that is fair and right.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to make this observation, that as I understand it, this is merely permissive. It is not mandatory. I mean, leaving the section as it is. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama strikes out the opportunity of the Commission to settle some of these claims with ships instead of cash. In other words, we are confronted with the situation where we have more ships than we have money, and we have an opportunity to make adjustments if people who desire to have that adjustment can receive a ship instead of money. I do not know that that is a desirable thing.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WEICHEL. In other words, the gentleman's amendment merely provides that the United States Government, in settling any claim, may give a ship in place of money, provided the value placed on the ship is no greater than set forth in this bill.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right. Provided it is to an American citizen who has an honest claim.

Mr. WEICHEL. Why not give it to anybody? If they can give them a ship instead of money, why not give it to a foreigner as well?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right. Please let me say I submitted this amendment

to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] and to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], and to the gentleman who is head of the drafting service, and there is no objection at all. It will benefit the bill by increasing our opportunity to permit the Maritime Commission to sell some of the Liberty ships, which are the least desirable.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I thoroughly understand the idea of permitting the Maritime Commission to use ships instead of money to settle claims, but as I understand this amendment, if adopted, it would give the Maritime Commission sole and exclusive jurisdiction, subject to no review at all, to decide what kind of claims they would settle by paying in ships. For instance, anyone that the Maritime Commission wanted to say had a claim—it could be a tort claim, somebody had a finger hurt, or something like that—if you wanted to go to the Maritime Commission instead of the Court of Claims or somewhere else, they would say, "We will give you a ship, and we have got the power to give you a ship if we find your claim is good." That is the part that concerns me about the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let me say I simply was reserving the right to object in order that we might know exactly what we were doing. With no printed text of the original amendment before us, it is difficult to determine what this would do to what we have already done. As I understand, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is seeking to make it possible for anyone who has a claim against the United States to settle that claim by taking ships instead of money. Now, does the gentleman's amendment require that that claim be reduced to a judgment, or could anyone who wants to assert a claim come before the Maritime Commission and say, "I have a claim against the United States and I will settle it for one of your boats"?

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all. It simply strikes out two of the restrictive categories.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; I understand that is what it does structurally; what I am trying to determine is the effect. The language of the amendment as it was adopted restricts the class of claimants who can settle to certain classes.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is seeking to eliminate those restrictions.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right. The purpose of the amendment is simply to permit, where a claim is definite and so decided by the Commission, if there is any question about it——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Just a moment. Does the gentleman's amendment make it possible for the Maritime Commission to determine whether or not the claim against the United States is just?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir; but here is an American citizen who is subject to the requirements of this act. That is, he must be a man in the shipping business. He must know his stuff and satisfy the Commission that he knows how to run a ship. Under those circumstances, if he is an American citizen and he has a claim which they recognize as just, then the Commission can, under the terms of this bill, not only in the two categories mentioned, but anyone else who qualifies, give one of these ships and do so by that kind of payment instead of in any other way.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It occurs to me that the purpose of the gentleman's amendment may be highly desirable as far as selling ships is concerned, but what I am afraid of is the judicial authority granted the Commission. What his amendment does is to confer jurisdiction on the Commission, so to speak, to consider and determine the justness and validity of claims that may not have any warrant for consideration by the Maritime Commission, claims that might not fall within the categories he has in mind, claims that should be passed upon by the Court of Claims or the Congress.

Mr. HOBBS. I do not think it is susceptible of that interpretation, if the gentleman will pardon me; and I believe it is wholly warranted if we mean to sell these ships.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say to the gentleman that in view of the discussion this has precipitated I believe this is a matter that ought to be considered more carefully and exactly than is possible here this afternoon without a printed copy of the amendments available. The gentleman can draw attention to his idea from this debate when the bill goes over to the other body. I question the advisability of trying to pass it by returning to the Bonner-Wigglesworth amendment at this time.

I therefore insist on my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS OF ACT

SEC. 10. No person shall be eligible to purchase or charter a war-built vessel under this act, or to receive an adjustment under section 9, unless such person makes an agreement with the Commission to the effect that the liability of the United States under any charter party or taking for use, made or effected prior to the date of the enactment of this act, for the loss, on or after such date of enactment and prior to the expiration of 2 years from the date of the cessation of hostilities, of any vessel owned by such person and under charter to the United States (excluding a vessel with respect to which an application under section 9 can be made) shall be limited to an amount equal to just compensation as of the date of said loss, determined pursuant to section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, or such valuation as may be agreed upon subsequent to the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Beginning in line 25 on page 17, strike out "the expiration of 2 years from the date of the cessation of hostilities" and insert "September 3, 1947."

Mr. BLAND. This is another one of the amendments made necessary by the surrender of Japan and in line with other amendments that have been offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 18, line 7, after the words "as amended" strike out the words "or such valuation as may be agreed upon subsequent to the date of the enactment of this act" and insert "or such amount as may be mutually agreed upon subsequent to the date of the enactment of this act as just compensation under the provisions of section 902."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I have submitted to the chairman of the committee and also to the ranking minority member.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE RESERVE FLEET

SEC. 11. The Commission shall place in a national defense reserve (1) such vessels owned by it as, after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, it deems should be retained for the national defense, and (2) all vessels owned by it at the expiration of 2 years from the cessation of hostilities, for the sale of which a contract has not been made by that time, except those determined by the Commission to be of insufficient value for commercial and national defense purposes to warrant their maintenance and preservation. A vessel under charter at the expiration of such 2 years shall not be placed in the reserve until the termination of such charter. Unless otherwise provided for by law, all vessels placed in such reserve shall be preserved and maintained by the Commission for the purpose of national defense. A vessel placed in such reserve shall in no case be used for commercial operation, except that any such vessel may be used during any period in which vessels may be requisitioned under section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND as a committee amendment: Page 18, lines 14 and 15, strike out "at the expiration of two years from the cessation of hostilities" and insert "on September 3, 1947"; and in lines 19 and 20, strike out "at the expiration of such two years" and insert "on that date."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, this is another one of the amendments made necessary by the surrender of Japan.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCONNELL: Page 19, after the period in line 3, insert a new paragraph reading as follows:

"( ) The Commission is authorized to lend to any State maritime academy, for

such period or periods, definite or indefinite, as the Commission may prescribe, any war-built vessel or vessels for use by such academy in connection with its course of instruction."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Page 18, lines 11 and 12, strike out "as, after consultation with", in line 12 strike out "and" and insert "or", and in line 13, strike out the comma and "it deems" and insert "deem."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has as its purpose the retention in both the Army and the Navy of those ships which those departments feel is in the interest of the national defense. I am speaking from some knowledge of the situation confronting the Navy, particularly in the postwar period, when we are about to lay up part of the fleet and to reorganize the Navy on a postwar basis. We want to be certain that the auxiliary fleet that supplies the combat fleet shall not be sold either to citizens or to aliens when there is a need for those ships in the interest of the national defense.

Mr. Chairman, the Navy, I know, is very much disturbed about this bill. They have spoken to me about it as they have to other members of the committee. Of course, there is some feeling that we ought to let this go to the other branch in order that they may give it further consideration over there; but I think we ought to take a definite stand here in the House.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Does this strike out the War Department from consideration?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It does not.

Mr. BLAND. It leaves it so that the War Department and the Navy Department may be considered?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes. The language of the bill, as it will be with my amendment, is as follows:

The [Maritime] Commission shall place in a national reserve such vessels owned by it which the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy deem should be retained for the national defense.

That is all my amendment means, and it ought to become part of this bill. The Army and the Navy ought to have something to say about the maritime ships that are presently in the service of the Army and Navy.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman's amendment takes away from the Maritime Commission authority over these ships.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The language of the bill itself implies what the intent of the Committee on the Merchant Marine is when they say that the "Commission shall place in a national-defense reserve such vessels owned by it as and after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy." What is going to happen? If the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy say they want these ships for national defense, the Maritime Commission is not bound to follow their request, and anything can happen to these ships. My amendment says that such vessels owned by the Maritime Commission which the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy deems necessary for the national defense shall be retained. It makes it mandatory that these ships cannot be taken away from either one of these war agencies. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be adopted so that the Navy particularly can depend on these auxiliary ships to maintain our active fleet. They can be put in a reserve fleet which we may need for the active operating fleet in the days to come.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment as offered leaves the Maritime Commission on a limb. It is entirely out of it. The Navy and the War Departments are going to determine just what they want and the Maritime Commission has no say. We are dealing with ships for the building up of the merchant marine. The best example is what has happened. It has been shown in this war that the Maritime Commission, cooperating with the Army and the Navy, has conducted the most magnificent defense in all the world's history, yet we are going to take away from these people who have cooperated with them that judgment which is necessary for the maintenance and the preservation and the continuance of a merchant marine which is also necessary for the defense of the country. I implore you that you should not do this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

REACQUISITION BY UNITED STATES

SEC. 12. There shall be included in every contract for the sale of a vessel under section 4 to a citizen of the United States provisions, binding on, and running with the title of, the vessel, to the effect that in the event the United States, prior to the termination of the existing national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, or prior to the expiration of 5 years from the termination of such emergency, charters or takes such vessel for bare-boat use, the charter hire paid to the person who is the owner of the vessel, shall be at a rate in no event greater than 15 percent per annum of the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hands of such owner as of the date of such charter or taking, determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, and that in the event, prior to the termination of such emergency or prior to the expiration of such 5 years, such vessel is repurchased or requisitioned for title by the United States, or is lost by reason of causes for which the United States is responsible, the compensation paid to the person who is the owner of the vessel shall not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hands of such person as of the date of requisition or loss, determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 19, strike out lines 5 to 24, both inclusive, and page 20, strike out lines 1 and 2, and insert:

"SEC. 12. There shall be included in every contract for the sale of a vessel under section 4 to a citizen of the United States provisions, binding on, and running with the title of, the vessel, to the effect that if, during any period during which the vessel may be requisitioned under section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended—

"(1) the vessel is repurchased or requisitioned by the United States, or is lost by reasons or causes for which the United States is responsible, the compensation paid to the owner shall not exceed that which would be applicable under section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, if the difference between the construction cost of the vessel (exclusive of national defense features), and the price at which such vessel was sold by the United States, constituted a construction differential subsidy; or

"(2) the vessel is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid to the owner for bare boat use of the vessel shall not exceed 15 percent per annum of the compensation permitted to be paid to to the owner under clause (1) upon repurchase or requisition."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment carries into this bill the policy of section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. That section provides that in the event it becomes necessary for the United States to requisition a vessel on account of which a construction differential subsidy has been paid, the compensation paid by the United States to the owner cannot exceed the construction cost of the vessel and of any capital improvements thereon minus the subsidy, in each case depreciated to the date of requisition. Under the committee amendment, the compensation paid upon requisition in any future emergency cannot exceed the original statutory sales price plus the cost of any capital improvements, in each case depreciated to the date of the taking. Similarly, if the vessel is taken for use, the charter hire cannot exceed 15 percent per annum of the original statutory sales price plus the cost of capital improvements, depreciated. Under the bill as reported, the owner, whether or not he was the original purchaser, was to be paid his depreciated cost, rather than the original statutory sales price depreciated, and this restriction applied only for 5 years after the termination of the existing national emergency.

This amendment carries into effect the substance, as I understand, of section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act. There was never any question about the application of that act. There was considerable question about the application of section 902, and there the President called in his board to advise him upon the determination of the rules and regulations upon which settlement was to be made.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Here is another amendment rushed through the committee last Friday morning at the eleventh hour. It is hasty legislation.

The purpose of the amendment is simple. It is to grant the Government reacquisition rights during the life of the vessel based on the sales price of the vessel under the act.

At first glance this is reasonable. It seems entirely proper that the Government, after selling a vessel at a low price, should not be required to pay a high price in the event of necessary reacquisition.

But what is not clear at first thought is that the bill also contemplates sales to foreigners at prices no higher than sales to American citizens. Sales to foreigners are final. There can be no compulsory reacquisition. Thus, in the event of an emergency which dictates reacquisition by the Government, the American owner receives a price based on the cost to him under the act, whereas the foreigner is entirely free to sell his vessel in the fabulously high war market which always accompanies a war emergency. This is discrimination against American citizens in favor of foreigners.

A compromise between the interest of the Government and the interest of the American ship owner is the only logical solution. Section 12 as written in the bill is such a compromise.

The amendment should be defeated because it is discriminatory against the American merchant marine.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, section 12 of the bill as drawn represents what I think is a clumsy and ill-conceived attempt to circumvent that provision of the Constitution which provides that when the United States takes under eminent domain my property or the property of any other citizen, it shall pay just compensation. Under the provisions of section 12 as drawn, the right to just compensation is modified only for a period of 5 years. Under the proposed committee amendment, there purports to be a perpetual inhibition running with the ship, an inhibition on the automatic operation of the Constitution when the United States requisitions the ship. For that provision of the Constitution is substituted the provision of section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. That is a restriction running with the title of the vessel. I appeal to the Members of this House who are members of the legal profession that restrictive covenants running with chattels are not a very wholesome legislative precedent. In this particular case, this restrictive covenant plainly contradicts the provision of section 6 (b) of the bill which provides that no foreign purchaser shall get a ship on terms or conditions more favorable than the citizen. Now, a foreign purchaser who takes one of these ships, of course, has no obligation ever to turn it in to the United States. He gets a clear title whereas our citizens get a title clouded with the necessity possibly of having to surrender his ship under the artificial provisions of this restriction. I think the effect of this restriction will be to drive vessels under foreign flags. But at any rate this is an attempt to circumvent the Constitution of the United States and I believe it is morally wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that this amendment will not be adopted. This question was debated in the committee for many, many months. We went through a great many different phases of it. In effect, what it does is this: You or I buy a ship under this ship-sales act. Every year, if the Government wants to take that ship back, it is worth to you 5 percent less than it was the year before. At the end of 20 years, no matter in which condition you have kept that ship, no matter what you have done to maintain it in good order, the Government can take it away from you and you will get no compensation for it whatsoever. A ship that may be built under the Merchant Marine Act or shortly after the ship-sale bill goes into effect will not have that same restriction applied to it.

In considering the matter, there were many of us who felt that the principle of just compensation for property taken by the Government ought not to be violated in this bill. We were willing to compromise on a 5-year basis so that within a 5-year period if a person bought a ship under this bill the Government could recapture and he could not make any profit out of that recapture. But for the Government to say in perpetuity that it has the right to buy that ship from a man at any time for a fixed and arbitrary price regardless of conditions the world over, seems to me to be legislating 20 years ahead. It seems to me to be legislating for the future and legislating in a way which will make the purchase of ships under this bill very much less desirable. It may, in fact, militate to a very great extent against a sound merchant marine.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. HALE. If this amendment is defeated, I shall offer an amendment to strike the entire section.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in connection with every ship that was purchased with a construction differential subsidy, a similar provision, such as is offered here, was contained in that contract of purchase?

Mr. HERTER. That is correct, and it was proved to be so unworkable during the present emergency that the President had to set up a special tribunal to determine what fair value was. Everybody was very doubtful of the constitutionality of that provision in the 1936 act.

Mr. JACKSON. The tribunal to which the gentleman refers has no reference to the 1936 act, but refers to vessels which were requisitioned for title.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is correct, but you did not hold to the requisition for title price.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON) there were—ayes 49, noes 49.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JACKSON and Mr. HALE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 56, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: On page 19, line 5, strike out section 12 and renumber accordingly sections 13, 14, and 15.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on his amendment?

Mr. HALE. I believe it is unnecessary, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. (a) The Commission is authorized to reconvert or restore for normal operation in commercial services, including removal of national defense or war service features, any vessel authorized to be sold or chartered under this act. The Commission is authorized to make such replacements, alterations, or modifications with respect to any vessel authorized to be sold or chartered under this act, and to install therein such special features, as may be necessary or advisable to make such vessel suitable for commercial operation on trade routes or services or comparable as to commercial utility to other such vessels of the same general type.

(b) The provisions of section 202 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 shall not apply to contracts of the Commission for or relating to construction of ships.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 883), no vessel sold or chartered by the Commission under this act to a citizen of the United States shall be prohibited from engaging in the coastwise trade of the United States while owned by or chartered to such citizen or citizen successors in interest merely because it was under foreign registry on May 27, 1941, and prior to its sale or charter under this act to such citizen, if it is otherwise entitled under the laws of the United States to engage in such trade.

(d) All moneys received by the Commission under this act shall be deposited in the construction fund of the Commission, and all disbursements made by the Commission in carrying out this act shall be paid from such fund. The provisions of sections 201 (d), 204 (b), 207, 209 (a), and 905 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended,

shall apply to all activities and functions which the Commission is authorized to perform under this act.

Mr. BLAND (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of this section be dispensed with, the section to be printed at this point.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Would this prevent the making of a point of order against a portion of the matter that otherwise would be read?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 21, line 6, first sentence, on the ground that it is an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BLAND. Reluctantly, upon advice from the parliamentarian on the point of order that I would be foolish to argue otherwise, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded; the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORTS

SEC. 14. The Commission shall, at the beginning of the second regular session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and every 6 months thereafter, make a report to Congress with respect to all activities and transactions under this act which have not been covered by any previous such report.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 15. No contract of sale or of charter shall be made under this act after the expiration of 2 years from the date of the cessation of hostilities.

Mr. BLAND (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the bill may be considered as read and be printed in the RECORD. I have a clarifying amendment to offer to section 15, but none before that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 21, lines 22 and 23, strike out "the expiration of 2 years from the date of the cessation of hostilities" and insert "September 2, 1947."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has the effect of preventing vessels from being sold under the bill after September 2, 1947. Under the bill as reported, the cut-off date was 2 years after cessation of hostilities.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Under other sections September 3 is the date. Here it is September 2?

Mr. BLAND. Yes, September 2. The other was fixing a date. This is after a date, which would be September 2, 1947.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STIGLER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution No. 358, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by Secretary of the Treasury Vinson before the Ways and Means Committee. According to the Public Printer, this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $208, but I ask that it may be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

AMERICA MUST BE ON THE ALERT

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, America must be on the alert. America has too long closed its eyes to those, who, while enjoying the best that is in our land, have been secretly plotting its downfall. The Communist, the Fascist, and Nazi in our midst, bent on spreading discontent, must be ferreted out and exposed.

Freedom of speech, freedom of opinion, we must preserve. But the abuse of these liberties by those who are boring from within, and who seek only the destruction of the American way of life, must be curbed by a firm Government hand and by a sound public opinion.

I wish to call the attention of the House to articles in the Hearst newspapers calling the attention of the American people to the communistic propaganda in our armed forces. I understand that Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, is inserting these articles in the RECORD today. I demand that an investigation into the facts and circumstances surrounding these charges be made immediately.

The first in a series of these articles shows how the Communists have succeeded in boring within the ranks of the 10,000,000 soldiers in the United States Army who went to war to protect the American Government and the American way of life. Every American soldier has been getting a subtly administered weekly dose of subversive, Communist doctrine. Furthermore, the treatment is compulsory and under official auspices. This has been done through the Army orientation course which every GI has been compelled to take once a week.

One hour every week every American soldier has been required to attend an orientation course. The highly laudable objective was to provide an educational and informational service, including the discussion of current events, for the members of the armed forces. However, much of the text and prepared material used in these orientation courses has been shot though with the Marxism and the Communist party line.

The proper committee to make this investigation is the Committee on Un-American Activities. They should determine who is responsible for it and whether the War Department has been cognizant of the use of this educational course as a Red transmission belt.

The return of the Communist Party of the United States to its old revolutionary tacts, calls for the Hitler technique of divide and conquer. It means stirring up religious and racial prejudices, fomenting a class warfare and turning on a smear campaign against all attackers of communism.

It will not be long before a Communist delegation is again picketing the White House, just as they did during the infamous Hitler-Stalin pact.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks made previously in the day.

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Mr. PATTERSON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, if a record vote had been taken on the bill just passed, I would have voted in the negative.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from Collier's.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address by Frank E. Gannett. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $117, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

OCTOBER 2, 1945.

Mr. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith resign from the following committees: Flood Control, Indian Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, Public Lands, Territories.

With best personal wishes, I am
Respectfully yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ADMINISTRATION OF AMERICAN SECTOR IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago General Eisenhower came triumphantly home to be feted, honored, and receive the thanks of a grateful Nation for directing the greatest and most difficult military operation probably ever achieved, certainly the greatest ever entrusted to one man by the American people. He was acclaimed by every American in the Nation for leading our troops and those of our allies to victory. He spoke to the Members of this House, winning the further admiration and confidence of all of us. He typifies and represents the American Government and the American people in the great problems confronting him in the administration and reconstruction of Germany.

General Eisenhower needs and deserves the continued support of this Government and the people in the trying days ahead. He has the overwhelming support of Congress and the people.

Notwithstanding the action of the President, he undoubtedly must still have the confidence of the President.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, and I believe the majority of the Members of Congress was disturbed and greatly disappointed with the publicity carried in the headlines of the papers here in Washington and throughout the country which might well put a doubt in the minds of a great many people as to the efficiency of his administration on the American sector of the administration of Germany under his direction of our Army of Occupation.

This news carried in foreign papers may weaken his position and that of the United States Government in such administration in the future. It seems most unfortunate and it is hard to understand why this unfavorable publicity should be given at this time.

The news came out of the fact that apparently the President, sometime back, sent to Europe one Earl G. Harrison, formerly an employee of the Federal Government, to make a survey of conditions in Germany for the purpose of bringing back a report to the President on the treatment of Jews in that part of Germany occupied by the American forces. Apparently, the President has had this report for some 30 days. The Congress and the people have no information as to whether General Eisenhower has been contacted during that time to ascertain if the conditions are as stated by Mr. Harrison.

Here, in substance, is one of the charges in his report made public by the President for the Sunday newspapers among other charges.

Mr. Harrison is quoted in the press supposedly released by the President that "As matters stand we appear to be treating the Jews as the Nazis treated them except that we do not exterminate them. They are in concentration camps in large numbers under our military guards instead of SS troops."

Mr. Speaker, to any American familiar with conditions when the camps were liberated, the implications of that remark are wholly untrue, libelous, unwarranted and are misleading. One newspaper says "it is about time that Americans called a halt on this type of rhetorical exaggeration which subjects a Nation to such invidious criticism."

The report further states that in food the Jews are receiving about 1,350 calories a day. This is also untrue and a gross misrepresentation. Since General Eisenhower took charge millions of Jews have been returned to their homes and it is said that there are only about 25,000 now that are homeless in the American zone. The report of dozens of Congressmen who have gone into Germany since General Eisenhower took charge attest to the desperate, deplorable, and chaotic conditions found there when General Eisenhower took charge. I doubt if any Member of Congress has had a report from one of these Congressmen criticizing the administration of General Eisenhower, or that any of them have found the conditions there since, as bad as are described in the report of Mr. Harrison.

The great majority of the Members of Congress would like to see England open up the gates of Palestine to these Jews in Germany and elsewhere so that those who so desire could make it their home in the future. Every Member of Congress will applaud the splendid work General Eisenhower and his staff have done in finding homes for the Jews and in reuniting their families since he has had charge of the affairs of administration in Germany and they have the confidence that he will continue to alleviate the suffering so far as it lies within his power.

Mr. Speaker, the most regrettable and unfortunate action has been that after such splendid work has been done by General Eisenhower and his staff, and further that most of the complaints of the report which was given to the President 30 days ago have already been corrected, is in the fact that the President at this late date has seen fit to give out to the press this report and by so doing has practically given it his confirmation as stating the facts as they exist today.

Certainly, in the interest of the prestige of our Government in European affairs, if conditions existed as reported by Mr. Harrison, an attempt should have been made to correct them without trying the case on the front pages of the newspapers, thereby weakening the administrative power of General Eisenhower and lowering the prestige of the Nation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Returning colleagues report that there are only two classes in Germany, Communists and anti-Communists. Those who are against the Communists are branded as Nazis, although many of them may have been violently opposed to the Nazi rule. I think the gentleman does not need to be convinced of the fact that all this we hear as to what is going on in Germany is propaganda to put the American forces in bad and promote the cause of the Russians.

Mr. VURSELL. I fear there is considerable truth in a lot the gentleman from Minnesota has just said. As long as we have an army of occupation in Germany, and as long as we have an administrator, with the terrible conditions that have existed, even though they become better, if the State Department, if the Congress, and if the President are swayed and persuaded not to stand behind the administrator and be sure of his facts, we will do harm to this Government, we will weaken ourselves in the eyes of the world, and we will not accomplish the result we are attempting and hoping to accomplish in the liberated countries.

Certainly, if the administration of General Eisenhower was called into serious question the President should have asked for a report from him, and a correction of such maladministration. There is no indication that such a course was pursued. General Eisenhower should have had a chance to answer such charges.

Mr. Speaker, billions of dollars were spent by the Government to defeat the Nazi, liberate our prisoners of war, the Jews, the Russians, Czechs, French, and

civilian and military prisoners from many of the countries being held in the concentration camps in Germany. Months of desperate fighting with the loss of many thousands of American boys killed on the battle fronts, many thousands of them wounded and crippled for life, yet, after the victory, the kindly and helpful American soldiers, who would harm no one except in the defense of their lives, are charged with treating these civilian refugees "as badly as they were formerly treated by the Nazis except that they did not exterminate them." And the administration of one of our foremost American citizens and one of the greatest generals who ever led an army in the field is brought into question. A regrettable mistake has been made. It is a shameful charge to place against the good-natured, friendly and kind GI soldier—it will not set well with the American people for it is not the truth.

General Eisenhower's headquarters is willing to prove it is not the truth. Has already proved it is not true. In the newspapers here in Washington under the date of October 1, 1945, is an article from Frankfort, Germany, by the United Press and I quote:

General Eisenhower's headquarters countered charges of inhuman treatment of Jews in the American occupation zone today by proposing that correspondents make an immediate investigation of the "worst" refugee camps.

You have all read the newspapers and you know these people are getting 2,500 to 3,000 calories a day over there, that they are being fed twice as well as this report indicates they are being fed, that there are only 25,000 of them left, and that Lt. General Smith, under General Eisenhower, has offered his own plane and enough planes for every correspondent to visit these camps at once to show the fallacy of this charge and to prove that it is not true.

We would like for the condition of the refugees to be improved and in fact it is being improved under the administration of the Army at the expense of the tapayers of America. But we cannot get them back to a living condition that might be likened to that before the war and before the persecution broke out in Germany. We would like to see the gates of Palestine opened and a haven provided for the refugees so that they would have a chance to work out their own salvation economically and financially. But those are things that the American Congress has not had a chance to help accomplish. May I remind you there has been before this House for quite some time a resolution dealing to a large extent with an attempt to get England to open the gates of Palestine for the refugees in Germany, and that very resolution I understand was not acted upon in this House at the suggestion of the administration. Certainly, if the President wants to help out, he will find that the Congress of the United States would like also to help him and cooperate with him in an effort to help get England into an attitude of mind where that government would be willing to admit more of these stricken people in Europe into Palestine.

Quoting further:

General Eisenhower's chief of staff, Lt. Gen. Walter B. Smith, said his own plane would be at the disposal of any newsmen who want to inspect the camps.

Smith refused to comment on President Truman's statement denouncing conditions in the camps, but other headquarters sources were indignant at the charges.

They contended that much of the criticism in the Harrison report was directed against refugee camps in Austria and in the British zone of Germany.

Representatives of the Jewish welfare agencies in Frankfurt also were surprised at the report. They said it was greatly exaggerated and out of date.

"It is not up to us to dispute what the President says," one high authority said, "but it seems that our Jewish camps are in splendid shape now compared with a few months ago."

Eisenhower's headquarters said Jews now were receiving a minimum 2,500-calory daily diet, almost twice that of German civilians. In camps, they have been allotted space per person even larger than the minimum required by American soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, yet, President Truman on this report a month old seems to give confirmation to it by releasing to the press the report and stating that he has directed General Eisenhower to correct conditions or, in substance, that was the meaning I got from reading the newspapers of Sunday and Monday.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a question as to why this publicity should come out at this time.

Cloakroom conjecture in the Halls of Congress is that there was an ulterior reason for this unfortunate publicity. Some suggest that it might have been intended to have a favorable bearing on the mayoralty election in New York, where some quick move was necessary to offset the successful settling of the elevator strike by Governor Dewey; and that some appeal was necessary to open the gates of Palestine to the Jews, to offset the speech by Governor Dewey in the Madison Square Garden Friday night urging the administration to take such action in the interest of Jewish refugees of Germany. I cannot agree with this reasoning—I cannot believe that the President would make such a move for political purposes, knowing that it would weaken the hand of General Eisenhower as a representative of the great American Government in the affairs of Europe, and that it would hurt the prestige of our Nation. Undoubtedly, the President was ill-advised and undoubtedly he made a grave mistake.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. I notice a condition that has a bearing on that situation in Europe. That is the terrible confusion and dilatory tactics caused by the Control Council as well as the American Military Government operating together and having a host of bureaucrats there. I was told by very capable military officers that when it became necessary to initiate a certain policy, if they were to wait and ask the Control Council for authority to initiate that policy, they would never get it. So the only alternative was to make it an accomplished fact and then see later whether they had permission from the Control Council on that. There is a myriad of bureaucrats that are confusing the whole situation. Then I think our military officers have one of the most difficult tasks you can imagine under all the circumstances.

Mr. VURSELL. There is not any doubt but that the gentleman is right. When we think of the conditions prevailing, and the destruction that was visited on that country, and when we remember that we have sent over there a man with the capabilities and the background of General Eisenhower, certainly we American people ought to be willing to be patient, because it will take a long time to get the machinery of government working smoothly and to the satisfaction of the people there. Those in charge of government in high places ought to move with great caution before they take any action that might weaken the hand of our administrator there, before the people of the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR MILITARY POLICY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 55, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy, to fill the existing vacancy thereon, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 3, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will continue public hearings on October 3, 1945, at 10 a. m., in the Banking and Currency hearing room, 1301 New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 2111 and H. R. 4079.

The Committee on Patents will continue public hearings on October 4, 1945, at 10 a. m. in the Rivers and Harbors hearing room, 1304 New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 2111 and H. R. 4079.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in open session, on Wednesday, October 3, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the committee room 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, will meet at 10 a. m. Tuesday, October 9, to begin hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

Various groups who have representation in Washington will be heard during

the first week, such as Members of Congress first, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Association of American Railroads, railroad traffic organizations, railroad labor, and truck and bus associations.

The second week will be devoted to various State commissions, agricultural associations, National Industrial Traffic League, and various citizens' traffic associations, and traffic boards and chambers of commerce.

It is going to be necessary to limit the time for this hearing as much as possible. It is also desired to avoid any repetition in statements before the committee.

The committee would be pleased to have those who are intending to appear to advise the clerk promptly the least amount of time they will need in which to present their testimony.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, October 4, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3367) to amend Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, October 4, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to consider the following bills: H. R. 608, H. R. 2418, H. R. 3028, H. R. 3444, and S. 504.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

710. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropirations for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $3,030,000, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 299); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

711. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting the eleventh report by the War Shipping Administration of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

712. A letter from the rear admiral, United States Navy, Director of Budget and Reports, transmitting a report of lands acquired for naval purposes out of various appropriations; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 83. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States to study and investigate the control of the atomic bomb; without amendment (Rept. No. 1036). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4160. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of brankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1037). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1633) for the relief of Raymond Crosby, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4255. A bill to amend section 33 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4256. A bill to permit extension of insurance of Federal Housing Administration loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 4257. A bill to terminate the rationing of beef and pork; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROE of Maryland:

H. R. 4258. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to authorize grants to the States for the operation of employment services, to provide for returning employment service operations to the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 4259. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Flood Control Act of June 15, 1936, as amended, so as to increase the amount paid to States from moneys received by the United States on account of certain leases; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 4260. A bill to provide the same exemptions from distraint on wages in connection with the collection of Federal taxes as are allowed under the applicable State laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4261. A bill to increase the compensation of certain officers of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 4262. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cancel War Department leases on State fairgrounds, and to deliver up possession of such grounds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4263. A bill to provide for the selection of an acting President in the case of failure to qualify of both President-elect and Vice President-elect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution declaring the date of termination of hostilities in the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution permitting federally owned alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 247. Joint resolution permitting federally owned alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties, authorizing the investigation through the Department of State and with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution requesting the President to declare November 10, 1945, a day for the observance of the creation of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4264. A bill for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 4265. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4266. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILLESPIE:

H. R. 4267. A bill for the relief of Solyman G. Hamlin; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

H. R. 4268. A bill for the relief of Grace M. Collins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4269. A bill for the relief of Ida Barger, Hazel A. Beecher, Etta Clark, Jesse Ruth France, John W. Nolan, Anna Palubicki, and Frank J. Schrom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 4270. A bill for the relief of Southern California Edison Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1216. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of the Massachusetts Public Utilities Commission, recommending the passage of H. R. 2536; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1217. By Mr. HALLECK: Resolution of Polish-American Congress of the State of Connecticut, adopted at a meeting held at Hartford, Conn., on September 9, 1945, urging action looking to the termination of conditions existing in Poland and eastern Europe as complained of in their resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1218. By Mr. IZAC: Petition of citizens of San Diego, Calif., residents of the Twenty-third California Congressional District, requesting the Army authorities to provide a system whereby men who have been in com-

bat in the European theater may not be sent to the Pacific theater for occupational duties but that those men in service in the States with no overseas service be sent instead. Submitted by Mrs. Ralph Stacy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1219. By Mr. LANE: Memorial of Boston Chapter, No. 10, Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1220. Also, resolution of the Massachusetts Public Utilities Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1221. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Brodhead, Wis., concerning payment and allowances to enlisted men of the Army of the United States for accrued furlough time; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1222. Also, petition of Seymour White, West Geneva Street, Burlington, Wis., on subject of occupational forces in Europe and Asia: to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1223. By Mr. WEISS: Petition sponsored by Local 601, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, in support of the Murray-Patman full employment bill, with signatures of approximately 3,000 in East Pittsburgh, Pa., and vicinity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1224. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Democratic Committee of Milwaukee County, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of the Kilgore legislation, providing employment compensation of $25 per week for 26 weeks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1945

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 2, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of law as well as of mercy, groping for light in this era shadowed by horror and for life in this dread day darkened by death, we but reap the harvest our hands have sown. Open our ears as the long centuries toll the knell of systems that have had their day and ceased to be.

O Thou before whose face nations wax and wane, Thou who wilt not be mocked, for tomorrow's weal make us to know and obey Thy will, that it may be done on earth as it is in heaven. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, October 2, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

PARADE IN HONOR OF ADMIRAL CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter just received by Mr. Biffle, the Secretary of the Senate, relating to the arrangements for the parade in honor of Admiral Nimitz, be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE,
Washington, D. C., October 2, 1945.

Hon. LESLIE BIFFLE,
Secretary of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington 25, D C.

DEAR MR. BIFFLE: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the citizens' committee for the reception to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz have arranged for the public parade immediately following the joint session of Congress on Friday, October 5, to form near the United States Capitol Building and to pass along the east front so that all Members of the Congress may have an opportunity to participate in this colorful feature on the program.

We shall be grateful if you will share this information with the officers and Members of the Senate.

According to the tentative schedule, the parade will begin as soon as Admiral Nimitz takes his place at the head of the procession, at approximately 1:10 p. m.

With appreciation of your unfailing interest and cooperation, I am,

Sincerely yours,
FLOYD D. AKERS,
General Chairman,
Citizens' Committee for the Reception to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Myers
Andrews	Hatch	O'Daniel
Austin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hill	Reed
Barkley	Hoey	Revercomb
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Brooks	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Buck	Knowland	Shipstead
Butler	La Follette	Smith
Byrd	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Cordon	McMahon	Wagner
Donnell	Magnuson	Walsh
Ellender	Maybank	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mead	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	White
George	Mitchell	Wiley
Gerry	Moore	Willis
Guffey	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent as a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Conference in Paris.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE BASIN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 302)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

As a part of our program of international cooperation, expanding foreign trade, and domestic progress in commerce and industry, I recommend the speedy approval by the Congress of the agreement of March 19, 1941, between the United States and Canada for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. When approved, the two countries will be able to harness for the public benefit one of the greatest natural resources of North America, opening the Great Lakes to ocean navigation, and creating 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectric capacity to be divided equally between the people of the United States and Canada.

The development, utilization, and conservation of our natural resources are among those fields of endeavor where the Government's responsibility has been well recognized for many generations.

During the war we were forced to suspend many of the projects designed to harness the waters of our great rivers for the promotion of commerce and industry and for the production of cheap electric power. We must now resume these projects and embark upon others.

The Congress and the people of our country can take just pride and satisfaction in the foresight they showed by developing the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers and the rivers in the Central Valley of California. Without the power from these rivers the goal of 50,000 airplanes a year—considered fantastic only five short years ago, but actually surpassed twice over—would have been impossible. Nor could we have developed the atomic bomb as early as we did without the large blocks of power we used from the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers.

The timely development of these rivers shortened the war by many years and saved countless American lives. We must ever be grateful for the vision of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the wisdom of Congress in urging and approving the harnessing of these priceless natural resources.

One of the great constructive projects of the North American Continent, in fact, one of the great projects of the world, which was delayed by the exigencies of war, is the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

For 50 years the United States and Canada, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, under liberal and conservative governments, have envisioned the development of the project together, as a joint enterprise.

Upon the expectation that we would join with them in completing this great engineering project, Canada has already built more than half its share of the undertaking.

We, however, still have our major contribution to make.

Every engineering investigation during the past 50 years, every economic study in the past 25 years, has found the project feasible and economically desirable. The case has been proved; the plans are ready.

The St. Lawrence seaway will make it possible to utilize our war expanded factories and shipping facilities in the development of international economic cooperation and enlarging world commerce. New and increasing opportunities for production and employment by private enterprise can be expected from this cheap water transportation.

It is the kind of useful construction which will furnish lucrative employment to many thousands of our people.

The completion of the seaway will bring many benefits to our great neighbor and ally on the north. The experience of two wars and of many years of peace has shown beyond question that the prosperity and defense of Canada and of the United States are closely linked together.

By development of our natural-water-power resources, we can look forward with certainty to greater use of electricity in the home, in the factory, and on the farm. The national average annual consumption of electricity by domestic consumers has almost doubled in the past 10 years. Even with that increase, the national average is only 65 percent as high as in the Tennessee Valley, where electric rates are lower. Increase in the consumption of electricity will mean more comforts on the farms and in city homes. It will mean more jobs, more income, and a higher standard of living. We are only on the threshold of an era of electrified homes and mechanical aids to better living. We can encourage this trend by using the bounty of nature in the water power of our rivers.

If we develop the water power of the St. Lawrence River, the United States share of that power will be available for distribution within a radius of 300 miles. This will include most of New York State and its neighbor States to the east. Public and private agencies will be able to pass on to the consumers in that area all the advantages of this cheap power.

Under the leadership of Governor and later President Roosevelt, the State of New York created the framework of a State power program. I have always been, and still am, in favor of that program.

Under it the power facilities are to be constructed by the Federal Government and turned over by it to the State of New York. The terms of allocation of costs to the State of New York have been agreed upon in a memorandum of agreement dated February 7, 1933, recommended for execution by the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Power Authority of the State of New York. This basis of allocation is fair and acceptable.

It has always been understood by the responsible proponents of this development that the water-power project should become the property of the State of New York, and that the electric power should be developed and handled by the State. That should continue to be the policy, and I recommend that it be so declared by the Congress.

Any agreement with the State of New York to this end must protect the interests of the United States as well as the interests of neighboring States and will, of course, have to be submitted for approval by the Congress before it can become effective.

I urge upon the Congress speedy enactment of legislation to accomplish these objectives so that work may start on this great undertaking at the earliest possible time.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 3, 1945.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to voting qualifications; without amendment (Rept. No. 614).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 3466. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; without amendment (Rept. No. 615).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1017. A bill for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse, Louette Rouse, and Rachel Rouse; with an amendment (Rept. No. 620);

H. R. 851. A bill for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert; with an amendment (Rept. No. 619);

H. R. 1393. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura May Ryan; without amendment (Rept. No. 616);

H. R. 1565. A bill for the relief of Inglis Construction Co., a corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 617); and

H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Anna Mattil and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 618).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1081. A bill for the relief of Aftab Ali; without amendment (Rept. No. 621); and

S. 1126. A bill for the relief of Alice A. Murphy; without amendment (Rept. No. 622).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of September 1945 from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relating to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

OCTOBER 2, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Ann S. Gertler	3721 39th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.	$2,980.00
Joan P. Karasik	1919 19th St., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	4,300.00
C. Theodore Larson	3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	6,230.00
Fritzie P. Manuel	1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	5,180.00
Darel McConkey	509 Fontaine St., Alexandria, Va.	do.	5,180.00
Cora L. Moen	5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,320.00
Elizabeth H. Oleksy	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	3,090.00
Mary Jane Oliveto	500 B St. NE., Washington, D. C.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	2,100.00
Francis C. Rosenberger	5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	5,180.00
Herbert Schimmel	3604 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	9,012.50
Marjorie J. Tillis	211 Delaware Ave. SW., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,640.00

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

SEPTEMBER 30, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired).	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$6,000
Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson (A. A.), U. S. Naval Reserve.	2405 Pennington Rd., Trenton, N. J	do	1,588

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

SEPTEMBER 30, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lieut. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve.	317 Lynn Drive, Chevy Chase, Md	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$2,400
Lieut. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2745 28th St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,400
Yeoman 2c Eleanor W. St. Clair, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2124 R St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	1,152
Yeoman 2c Loretto F. Jochman, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do	do	1,152

The above employees are representatives of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, to assist Senators on naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1451. A bill to regulate the review of judgments of conviction in certain criminal cases;

S. 1452. A bill to regulate habeas corpus proceedings in the courts of the United States; and

S. 1453. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1454. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1455. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from taxation all amounts received by members of the armed forces as compensation for military or naval service performed during World War II; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. McMAHON) introduced Senate bill 1456, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1457. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Theodore Manning; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. MEAD) introduced Senate bill 1458, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1459. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(Mr. HATCH (by request) introduced Senate bills 1460 and 1461, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1462. A bill to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado introduced Senate bill 1463, which was ordered to lie on the table, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate Joint Resolution 105, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide a national system of employment offices. I also ask that a statement in connection with the bill may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill and statement will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1456) to provide a national system of employment offices, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY, for himself, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. McMAHON, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have just introduced jointly with the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] the United States Employment Service Act of 1945.

Just a few days ago the Senate passed the Lucas employment service amendment to the Kilgore unemployment insurance bill. This amendment provided for the return of the United States Employment Service to the States 90 days after enactment. However, the House Ways and Means Committee indefinitely postponed consideration of the entire bill. Prior thereto a rider was attached in the Senate to the appropriation of the War Manpower Commission providing:

"That the employment service facilities property and personnel loaned by the States to the United States Employment Service shall be returned to the States not later than 3 months after the termination of hostilities in the war with Japan as determined by Presidential proclamation or by concurrent resolution of Congress."

Neither of these amendments provided for dealing with certain major problems and questions of policy that exist.

The existing legislation relating to the United States Employment Service, known as the Wagner-Peyser Act, provides for the States matching certain Federal funds for the employment service as a condition for State operation of employment service facilities as a part of the United States Employment Service. During the war most State legislatures did not appropriate the necessary State funds to match Federal funds, nor has the Congress appropriated Federal funds to match State funds. In other words, Congress has provided no specific method of financing the United States Employment Service if operated by the States. For this reason additional changes in existing Federal legislation are necessary.

Moreover, it is over 12 years since the Congress considered the basic legislation creating the United States Employment Service. During the war we have gained a great deal of experience in the operation of public employment services which probably requires changes in the basic legislation to make certain that the results of that experience are utilized. The large-scale interstate migration which has occurred during the war also necessitates strengthening the basic legislation to meet more adequately the needs of employers and workers.

Another development of recent years is that separate employment service activities

have been established for veterans, railroad employees, and farm workers—each under separate Federal agencies. This matter should be reviewed to ascertain how they should function with respect to each other. In particular, there has been a great deal of complaint about the difficulty of obtaining farm help through these various employment services.

HEARINGS TO BE HELD

All these matters need careful investigation. I am, therefore, arranging to hold hearings on this entire matter with a view to reporting out a bill as soon as possible. An opportunity will be given to all interested Federal and State agencies, and interested public and private organizations and individuals to testify before the committee so that a constructive and satisfactory solution can be found. In the meantime I trust that the Congress will postpone action on any amendment until the Education and Labor Committee has had an opportunity to act.

DESIGNATION AS OFFICERS OF CHIEF RADIOTELEGRAPH OPERATOR, ETC.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the definition of vessels of the United States and officers so as to include within the term "officers" chief radiotelegraph operator and assistant radiotelegraph operator.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1458) to amend the definition of vessels of the United States and officers so as to include within the term "officers" chief radiotelegraph operator and assistant radiotelegraph operator was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SALARY OF SOLICITOR OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, by request, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, and request that a letter from the Secretary of the Interior requesting the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from New Mexico will be received and referred as requested, and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1460) to fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The letter presented by Mr. HATCH is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., August 8, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President of the Senate

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: Enclosed is the draft of a proposed bill "To fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior." I request that this draft be referred to the appropriate committee, and recommend its enactment.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to provide that the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior shall be fixed by law at $10,000, instead of being determined by administrative action under the Classification Act of 1923.

The chief law officer for the Department of the Interior was for many years an Assistant Attorney General, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In 1914, the title of the position was changed from Assistant Attorney General to Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, but without affecting otherwise its status in the Department of Justice. During this period the Solicitor, like the Assistant Attorney General, exercised his functions under the supervision and control of the Attorney General, and his salary was specifically provided for each year in the appropriations for the Department of Justice. Beginning in 1926, however, the customary item for the salary of the Solicitor was omitted from the Department of Justice appropriations, and provision was made for the compensation of a chief law officer out of the gross sum for legal services included in the Department of the Interior appropriations under the description of Personal services in the Office of the Solicitor. This practice has been continued in the annual appropriation acts for each succeeding year. The action so taken by the Congress was in accord with the policy of decentralizing the responsibility for the performance of legal services in the executive departments—a policy evidenced by a whole series of measures taken at about the same time for the purpose of transferring legal officers from the Department of Justice to the establishments served by them.

The effect of the elimination of the specific appropriation for a Solicitor in the Department of Justice for the Department of the Interior was, of course, to prevent the subsequent filling of that position under the old authority for the appointment of Assistant Attorneys General by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. Conversely, the effect of the making of a general appropriation to the Department of the Interior for personal services in the Office of the Solicitor was to authorize the selection of a Solicitor in accordance with the procedures of the civil-service laws applicable to the appointment of legal personnel generally. Accordingly, since July 1, 1926, all appointments to the position of Solicitor have been made by the Secretary of the Interior. Moreover, as the position is not one for which a specific salary is prescribed by law, the rate of pay must be fixed under the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, which restrict administrative action in fixing salaries to a basic rate of $8,750 to $9,800 for employees in the highest classification bracket.

In the light of the heavy responsibilities laid upon the Solicitor, as well as of the foregoing history, it would appear to be desirable that his compensation be increased to the sum of $10,000 per annum. The position of Solicitor is one of key importance in the Department, and demands legal attainments of the highest order from its incumbent. Over a period of many years the duties of the position have consistently tended to increase in volume, complexity and variety as the Congress from time to time has imposed new functions upon the Department or established more exacting standards for the administration of old tasks. Only through action by the Congress can the salary of the Solicitor now be made commensurate with the burdens and responsibilities of his position.

Because of the highly diversified range of activities entrusted to the Department of the Interior, the duties of the Solicitor extend into almost every branch of law and almost every type of legal practice. In this respect his tasks are unlike those of the chief law officers of most other organizations—public or private—whose activities usually tend to be confined within a field of relatively limited scope. Just one phase of his responsibilities is the handling of administrative or court proceedings affecting the public lands or other proprietary interests of the Government—proceedings which present highly specialized legal problems, that frequently involve properties of large value, and where the opposing parties are, more often than not, represented by counsel of the highest degree of expertness.

A mere glance at a list of the functions of the Department of the Interior under existing laws would describe the situation about as well as any lengthy description could do, for they comprise activities which are scattered over half the globe from the Pribilof Islands of the Bering Sea to the Virgin Islands 1,500 miles off the coast of Florida, and which are to be found in virtually every section of the continental United States and its possessions. Such a list would include the regulation and management of the vast resources of the public domain, as administered by the General Land Office, the Grazing Service, the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Geological Survey, and the Bureau of Mines; the production of vital raw materials such as helium gas; the wartime coordination of the solid-fuels resources of the Nation; the administration of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act; the provision of comprehensive fisheries services; the problems of Government in the territories and island possessions; the duties and responsibilities of the Office of Indian Affairs in connection with segment upon segment of Indian life; the vast engineering projects under the supervision of the Bureau of Reclamation, many of which pose novel and unique problems in the highly intricate field of water law, or involve the drafting and interpretation of contracts for sums measured in millions; the marketing of hydroelectric power from the world's greatest dams; and many others. The necessity for sound legal counsel in connection with the myriad legal aspects of these activities makes the position of Solicitor an office calling for a lawyer of great capability and intellectual integrity, of proven administrative ability, and of experience and wisdom.

The Solicitor is responsible for the legal work of some 269 attorneys, 84 of whom are in the field. His position is classified in the P-8 bracket, the highest allowable by administrative action, with an entrance salary of $8,750 and a maximum salary of $9,800. There are five attorneys under him who are in the same grade and salary range. A number of chief law officers in other establishments of the Government are being paid salaries in excess of the Classification Act maximum pursuant to special legislative authorization. Upon a comparative basis, a salary of $10,000 for the Solicitor of this Department appears amply justified. In any event, I believe that the public significance of the work of the Department provides its own justification for remuneration commensurate with the type and caliber of lawyer that the job demands.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

LEASE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, by request, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain public lands in Alaska, and request that a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior requesting the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from New Mexico will be received and appropriately referred, and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1461) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain public lands in Alaska, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The letter presented by Mr. HATCH is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington 25, D. C.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: There is enclosed a draft of a bill which, if enacted, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease, or grant revocable permits for, any public lands in Alaska in tracts not to exceed 160 acres, any part of which is now or hereafter included in shore space reservations under the act of May 14, 1898, as amended (30 Stat. 409, 413, 48 U. S. C. secs. 371, 462). I request that the draft of bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and recommend its enactment.

Under the provisions of sections 1 and 10 of the act of May 14, 1898, supra, there were to be reserved at least 80 rods of shore space between each claim, entry, or location along the shore of any navigable waters in Alaska. Since this tended to hinder the proper development of the waterfront, the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1059, 48 U. S. C. sec. 372), authorized the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to restore to entry and disposition such reserved shore spaces as he might determine were not necessary for harborage uses and purposes.

The main objective of the proposed bill, which would not repeal the above-cited statutes, is to grant additional authority to this Department with respect to the management and use of the shore lands in Alaska. This additional authority would permit the better utilization of such lands with a view to the present as well as the future needs of Alaska. Provisions could thus be made for the space needed for business, commercial, or other enterprises as well as for the protection of recognized conservation policies.

The bill would not prevent appropriation or leasing of shore lands under the mining laws or the mineral-leasing acts. Nor would it prevent the disposal of such lands under other laws. Nor would it affect valid existing rights, including Indian occupancy rights.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ABE FORTAS,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

PROSECUTION OF CERTAIN RIVERS AND HARBORS PROJECTS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to provide for proceeding with certain rivers and harbors projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce, which has jurisdiction of matters dealing with rivers and harbors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from South Carolina will be received and referred as requested.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) to provide for proceeding with certain rivers and harbors projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in connection with the joint resolution, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press article entitled "Army Ready to Start Many Rivers, Harbors Projects," under a Washington, September 30, 1945, dateline.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY READY TO START MANY RIVERS, HARBORS PROJECTS

WASHINGTON, September 30.—Army engineers are ready to start work this fall on rivers and harbors flood-control projects whose estimated cost is $900,615,500, the War Department announced today.

By late spring of 1946 the engineers will be ready with additional projects of the same type, estimated to cost $593,054,965.

All of the projects have been authorized by Congress and work will begin when the necessary funds are appropriated.

Of the projects which can be started this fall, flood control accounts for $833,538,200 and rivers and harbors will require $67,077,300. Projects which can be ready in late spring include flood-control work amounting to $143,383,800 and rivers and harbors work estimated to cost $450,571,165.

Projects, the Department said, have been selected on the grounds of urgent need, readiness for starting operations, and for geographical reasons.

Before any work is started, requests for funds are submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, which, in turn, transmits them to Congress through the President.

At the present time the engineer deficiency estimates are in the hands of the Budget Bureau and will be submitted to Congress soon, the War Department said. The annual request of the engineers for 1946 projects will reach Congress early in January.

Of the projects which will be ready this fall, many have had some work done on them and the figures shown are the amounts estimated to be necessary for their completion. The new projects which will be ready next spring show the entire estimated cost.

The list of projects includes the following:

Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C., $35,300,000; Allatoona Reservoir, Ga., $16,335,000. Edistor River, S. C., $139,000.

Additional projects which can be initiated by late spring of 1946:

Winyah Bay, S. C., $1,260,000; Shipyard River, S. C., $246,500; Savannah Harbor, Ga., $28,000; Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Ala., $6,410,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD a proviso appearing on page 3 of Public Law 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session. It is necessary that this proviso be changed.

There being no objection, the proviso was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Provided, That no project herein authorized shall be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars in which the United States is engaged unless the construction of such project has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified the Congress to that effect.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MCFARLAND (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. O'MAHONEY) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADVANCE PLANNING OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced a bill which provides for using public works as a stabilizer in construction. I now desire to briefly explain the measure. It is proposed to aid in the stabilization of construction by the advance planning of public works and by timing of public construction so as to minimize the seasonal and long-term fluctuations in the total volume of new construction, maintenance, and repair work in the United States.

The bill will be effective in securing a steady expansion of construction activity and in maintaining a high level of employment in our most important nonagricultural industry. This industry can contribute a major share of employment in line with the recent action of this body. However, the goals sought by the legislation are vital to the economy by and of themselves.

The bill does not contemplate the use of construction to stabilize the total economy nor even to stabilize construction as a whole. Stability, moreover, does not mean fixing a level of activity and holding to it. It is expected that if this bill becomes law the violent fluctuations in the volume of construction can be reduced. It is expected also that the danger of overbuilding at the top of a boom will be greatly lessened by disseminating information on trends in the volume of construction and on the factors which govern the capacity of the market to absorb new construction. This will help provide local governments and private enterprise with the basis, now lacking, for sound judgment and intelligent planning.

It is difficult to overemphasize the importance of the role which construction plays in the national economy, and of this legislation and its objectives.

During the 20-year period, from 1920 and 1939, construction accounted for 11 percent of the national income. During the same period new construction and maintenance and repair furnished on-the-site employment amounting to 5 percent of total national employment, and directly or indirectly, approximately 12 percent of the total national employment. The great automobile industry with its maximum of less than a million employees is dwarfed by the construction industry which, with maintenance and repair, gave a top employment in 1942 to approximately 3,500,000 employees on the site, and to another 5,000,000 working in the mines, forests, mills, and factories producing the things with which buildings are constructed. Indeed, construction is an essential and indispensable ingredient of national prosperity. Inactivity in construction is synonymous with depression.

The bill creates a top policy board composed of the Secretary of Commerce as chairman, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture. The Construction Policy Board is a policy-forming agency which makes recommendations to the President and to Congress. In formulating policy it is aided by two committees: First, a Public Works Stabilization Committee, which is composed of the Federal Works Administrator as Chairman; the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army; the Reclamation Commissioner; the Director of the

Bureau of the Budget; two members representing States; two members representing municipalities; and two members representing other political subdivisions.

The bill also establishes a Construction Industry Advisory Committee, which performs a liaison function between the Construction Policy Board, the Public Works Stabilization Committee, and private enterprise. This advisory committee represents a complete cross section of the construction industry and includes representatives of labor, builders and contractors, architects and engineers, manufacturers and distributors of material, and other small business, and of the public interest.

The chairmen of these two committees sit with the Construction Policy Board giving the Board the benefit of information acquired by close contact with the field of public works and with the field of private enterprise.

I wish to emphasize the fact that the Construction Policy Board is not an administrative agency. It will make no decisions affecting any particular project. It will not collect source information or conduct research or indulge in publicity. The Board will use the facilities of appropriate, established agencies. When information on construction is required it will be secured from such agencies as the Department of Commerce, the Federal Works Agency, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Board's findings and recommendations will be announced through the Executive Office of the President.

The Board's primary responsibility is to advise the President and the Congress when it will be desirable to increase or decrease the volume of construction activity. The accomplishment of this will involve increasing or decreasing the rate at which contracts for public works are awarded. It does not mean that work already under contract will be interrupted, slowed down, or speeded up.

We need not be concerned with any possible repercussions from the slowing down of public construction. The strong probability is that we may be unable to expand construction activity rapidly enough to provide employment as fast as it is needed in the next few years. And, the total volume of new construction which will be required to satisfy the needs of our national economy, as we now see those needs for some years ahead, will have to reach the unprecedented total of more than $15,000,000,000 annually.

The bill also provides for advance planning of Federal and local public works. The advance planning of local public works is to be encouraged so that there will be at all times a shelf program of useful non-Federal public works amounting to not less than $5,000,000,000. To insure advance planning of this shelf program of non-Federal public works, the bill provides for a $150,000,000 revolving fund which may be used to make non-interest-bearing loans or advances to State and local governments to defray the cost, or a part of the cost, of advance planning.

The bill gives the President authority to direct Federal construction agencies to accelerate the prosecution of Federal public works already authorized or to defer starting authorized but postponable public works when such action is required to prevent unemployment or to prevent competition with private enterprise for available labor and materials.

If the Construction Policy Board recommends acceleration of construction, the President must still request the Congress to authorize the projects and to appropriate the funds needed for the work. Any program for acceleration of public-works construction recommended by the Public Works Stabilization Committee is subject to modification by the President and by the Congress. None of the powers of Congress are abridged by this proposed act. No work can be undertaken without congressional authorization and appropriation. Further, no program authorized by Congress can be arbitrarily set aside. The Federal-aid highway program, for example, or the new Federal-aid airport program, could not be halted or reduced by the President. Only Congress could take such action, and there will be, as I see it, little need for so acting. The job ahead is to increase construction activity, aiming at ever-higher levels consistent with the growth and needs of our country.

One important feature of this bill must be emphasized. Regimentation is not our goal. The Federal Government is not given authority to ride herd over State and local governments nor to compel private enterprise to conform to any bureaucratic program. We seek to establish a lasting framework for the effective and voluntary cooperation of industry, labor, and government.

This bill, for the first time, provides machinery for fostering close cooperation between the construction industry and government. Only through such cooperation can private enterprise be enabled to provide the bulk of employment in construction. The more private enterprise does, the less the Government will have to do to avert the possibility of widespread unemployment. Construction workers must not return from service with the armed forces to a WPA because we at home failed to plan adequately for tomorrow.

THE SERVICE CLUB—ITS HISTORY, OBLIGATION, AND RESPONSIBILITY—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Service Club—Its History, Its Obligation, Its Responsibility," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., before the Kiwanis Club of Camden, N. J., September 14, 1945, and two editorials relating to the address, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE LONDON CONFERENCE OF FOREIGN MINISTERS—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown dealing with the London Conference of Foreign Ministers, published in the Washington Evening Star of September 30, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

WINNING THE PEACE—EDITORIAL BY MAURICE R. FRANKS

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Can Win the Peace, Too," by Maurice R. Franks, published in the September 1945, issue of the Railroad Workers Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECONVERSION PROBLEMS—ARTICLES BY W. S. WOYTINSKY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD four articles by W. S. Woytinsky, on the general subject of reconversion, published in the Washington Post of August 23 and 30, and September 6 and 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT—ARTICLE IN PATERSON (N. J.) CALL

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the St. Lawrence seaway project, published in the Paterson (N. J.) Call of September 4, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on the occasion of the death of the late beloved Msgr. John A. Ryan, the President of the United States, many Members of the Congress, representatives of the daily press, and many distinguished citizens throughout the Nation expressed their deep sorrow and paid eloquent tribute to this great scholar and social thinker who had labored so long and so successfully for the improvement of the social conditions of our country.

On September 19 the Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, D. D., bishop of Grand Rapids, Mich., at the funeral mass for Monsignor Ryan held in St. Paul's Cathedral, St. Paul, Minn., delivered a funeral sermon which every Member of Congress should read. It was indeed a fitting tribute to this priest who will be recognized in history as one of the great Catholic social thinkers of all times.

Monsignor Ryan by his teachings greatly influenced my views on social problems. I have come to accept generally the ideas and proposals which he so courageously and convincingly advocated during his active and useful life. His ideas on social security, minimum wages, labor-management relations, the position of the Government in our economy, and like questions have come to be recognized as sound social philosophy by all thoughtful students in America.

Dr. Ryan, if he were alive today, would be very happy and grateful that this distinguished body saw the need and desirability of passing the full-employment bill, as it did last Friday.

Over 14 years ago, in 1931, in an article which was reprinted later in a volume of his entitled "Seven Troubled Years," Dr. Ryan discussed what we have frequently referred to as the soul of the full-employment bill, the right to work, over which so much debate and discussion took place last week and during the committee hearings on the full-employment bill. At that time he said:

> One frequently hears the assertion that the laborer has a right to work, in the sense that he has a right to a job. Obviously a man does not possess such a right against employers in general, nor even against his present or former employer if it cannot be realized without monetary loss. As stated above an employee has a right in distributive justice, because of the employer's social function, to be continued in his present employment so long as this does not involve loss to the employer. When any considerable number of workingmen are unable to find

employment the duty of supplying it devolves upon the state. The argument for this proposition may be summarily stated in the following terms: "Laborers have a right to obtain a livelihood from the common bounty of the earth on reasonable conditions; in the present system this right can be realized only through employment; the state is obliged to protect the rights and make adequate provision for the needs of every class; therefore, the principles of distributive justice oblige it to furnish jobs to the jobless."

I hope that Bishop Haas' eulogy of Monsignor Ryan may cause Members of Congress, who have not already done so, to study his writings on the many subjects with which we are so concerned today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the sermon of Bishop Haas be printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips: he walked with me in peace, and in equity, and turned many away from iniquity" (Malachi, 2: 6).

It is with deep sorrow and yet with a sense of privilege that we assist at the solemn obsequies of one of the few great men of our generation—John Augustine Ryan. You, Your Excellency, the Most Reverend Archbishop of St. Paul, and you his clergy, have lost a distinguished priest. You, his very reverend brother, you his sisters in religion, and you his other surviving brothers and sisters have lost a loving brother. To you our hearts go out in profoundest sympathy.

And yet your loss, if I may say it, does not begin to measure the loss today. The late Msgr. William J. Kerby once remarked: "The Catholic Church in the United States should fall on its knees and thank Almighty God for John Ryan." And when we recall the vast services that Monsignor Ryan rendered to the American people—to the poor in enabling them to acquire some little property, and to the rich in assuring them that the right to honestly won property is sacred and inviolable—our entire Nation should offer a prayer of thanksgiving to heaven that John Ryan lived and worked. There can be little question that future history will support this judgment.

Let me say something first of Monsignor Ryan's life, then of the secret of his life's work, and of the man himself. Although I speak as one of his former students, I shall endeavor to keep myself free from any bias that may arise out of my filial regard and affection for him.

I

The facts of his life are well known and call for no detailed recital. They can be summarized briefly, although, in a career as full as his, it is not easy to separate what is important from what is not. He was born on May 25, 1869, on a farm some 20 miles south of St. Paul, the son of God-fearing Irish immigrant parents from Tipperary. Of the 11 children, 2 became priests, and 2 nuns.

On the Ryan farm there was the usual pioneering thrift and hard labor, the farm mortgage with interest up to 12 percent, the little shelf of some five or six books, and first among them the Book of Books, the Life of Christ, and that of His Blessed Mother. In addition, a newspaper came to the farmhouse each week. It was the Irish World and American Industrial Liberator, which the boy John eagerly devoured and which, as he said, gave him his first interest in social questions and social betterment.

Later followed his training for the sacred ministry at St. Paul Seminary, and his ordination to the holy priesthood by Archbishop John Ireland in 1898. Then came 4 years of graduate study at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., followed by 13 years as professor of moral theology at St. Paul Seminary, and, still later, by 24 years as professor at the Catholic University, during which time, from 1919, he was director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Department until the time of his death.

Of his 24 years at the Catholic University, the late rector of the university, Bishop Joseph M. Corrigan, declared at the dinner attended by some 600 persons at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., on the occasion of Monsignor Ryan's seventieth birthday, May 25, 1939, "It would be difficult indeed to vision the Catholic University in the past quarter of a century without the pioneering work and untiring ability of Father John Ryan." (Ryan, Social Doctrine in Action, Harpers, 1940, p. 279).

This statement, however generous, should have been made very much stronger than it was. In my observation, it was through Father Ryan more than through any other individual, that the Catholic University during its first 50 years came to be known and recognized, here and abroad, as an institution of courageous scholarship and of service to humanity.

But he spoke not only in the lecture room. He spoke through the printed page, and literally to the whole civilized world. Beginning with the first edition of his Living Wage, in 1906, down to his last work, The Norm of Morality, which appeared only a few months ago, he managed to publish a small library of some dozen volumes, in addition to hundreds of pamphlets, and articles in encyclopedias, and in journals, religious and secular, here and in foreign countries.

Moreover there was hardly any major moral question of contemporary life into which Monsignor Ryan did not inquire, and upon which he did not pass judgment. I mention only some of them: Wages and hours, farm prices, monopoly, price fixing, interest taking, housing, divorce, birth prevention, population problems, human sterilization, church and state, and the ethical foundations of international life.

Pioneer, he was, in the sense that he dared to have opinions on subjects which, all too frequently, the less courageous shrunk back from having. Pioneer, he was not in the sense that he strove for novelty. On the contrary, his sole aim was to call men back to the ancient truths delivered by the Master of His Church.

It would be interesting to review the extent to which Monsignor Ryan's teachings have been put into operation in our country. Time will permit me to refer to only one. In 1910, he made two addresses, one in March in Milwaukee, and the other in May in St. Louis, in which he advocated the establishment of a minimum wage by law. Prior to that year, there is no record of any public statement by any person of standing in support of a legal minimum wage.

How much his addresses in 1910, together with his previous writings on the subject, contributed to the subsequent enactment of such legislation, is difficult to determine, but it is the fact that shortly thereafter minimum-wage bills were introduced into various State legislatures, and that he himself wrote the first minimum-wage bill presented to the Minnesota Legislature, and that this bill, in revised form, became law in this State in 1913. By 1917, 11 States had similar laws, and at present the number is 26. Moreover, in 1938, our Federal Congress enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act establishing national minimum-wage levels for men and women.

In all truth, his was a full life as priest and scholar. Teacher, thinker, author, lecturer, administrator—his record does not have to be made or to be built up. It is known to all the world. Without exaggeration, one can say that his social program is now the property of the American people, and even of some abroad, and that men are beginning to recognize its measured wisdom and even to live by it.

II

So much for his life. What was the source of his strength? What was the secret of his life's work?

Those who knew John Ryan will answer that the source of his strength was Almighty God Himself. Upon the great truths of divine revelation he exercised his splendid mind, and from them drew all his reasoned applications to everyday life. He was too clear-eyed not to see that man's relation to his Creator is far more important than man's relation to his fellow men, and that unless the first relation is right the second cannot be. With equal vision, he saw that by helping to bring the second nearer to what God intended, he was helping to bring the first to fuller reality.

In May 1891, when John Ryan was 22 years of age, the great Leo XIII issued his epoch-making encyclical on the condition of workers. In the following month the Review of Reviews carried a 7,000-word commentary on the encyclical, praising it lavishly and hailing it as "the book of the month." The reviewer, however, sounded a note of warning: "The encyclical opens a door through which we may see a great vista of social transformation. The Pope has taken the first step. He has put his hand to the plough. * * * Everything will depend upon how the lead, taken in the encyclical, is followed up" (p. 89).

That was a challenge and, almost alone in our country, the young Ryan took it up. In the encyclical he read a principle to which he clung to the last, and in it he observed a method, from which, scientist that he was, he never deviated.

The principle was this: The Catholic Church has jurisdiction over economic matters in everything touching men's lives, technical and mechanical activities only excepted. Leo had declared unequivocally: "Confidenter ad argumentum aggredimur ac plane iure nostro. (We approach the subject with confidence and surely by our right)" (par. 24).

But it was abundantly clear to the young Ryan that this principle rests on a much deeper one: that the Holy Father, as head of the Church, speaks for, and in the name of, and with the same authority as, Jesus Christ. As to this latter principle, John Ryan never entertained the slightest question. It was the basis and groundwork of all his doctrine. To him, it was the church and the church alone to which Christ, speaking to Peter, had given His own divine powers: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matthew 16: 18); "As the Father has sent me, I also send you" (John 20: 21); and to which He had given His comforting assurance of protection from error, "And behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world" (Matthew 28: 20). To him, the church was "the pillar and mainstay of the truth" (I Timothy 3: 15), and, as he once wrote, "It is the dearest thing in my life."

But young Ryan detected something else in Leo's encyclical besides its reassertion of the principle that the church has unquestioned jurisdiction over everything affecting men's lives in the social and economic field. That something else was the method that the Pontiff used. It was what we call today the scientific method. Leo, indeed, had a philosophy, as what scientist, deny it as he may, has not? Leo's procedure was: observation, experiment, induction, with proposals for change dictated by his philosophy. In a word, he first gathered before him certain verifiable data, and then only passed moral

judgment upon them and advocated remedial measures wherever, according to his philosophy, there was need of remedy. This was Leo's method. This was John Ryan's method.

Regarding the encyclical of 1891, years afterward Monsignor Ryan wrote: "At the beginning of the encyclical, he (Leo XIII) declared that the condition of the working classes had come to be little better than that of slavery. This was a statement of fact, not a repetition of a general principle. It was not arrived at by deductive reasoning. Throughout the encyclical, he deals constantly with the actual conditions of labor in all its relations. Hence, the concreteness and usefulness of his moral pronouncements." (Questions of the Day, Stratford Press, 1931, p. 223.)

This procedure of Leo XIII of combining divine truth and scientific method, and yet in giving each its fullest scope, Monsignor Ryan followed throughout his whole career. Needless to say, in doing so he was acting in the best Christian tradition.

Recall the touching incident in the synagogue at Capharnaum (John 6: 60–70). The Master had just proclaimed His divinity again, and had just declared to His disciples that He was going to give them His flesh to eat and His blood to drink. Some of them were scandalized at what He had said, and murmuring among themselves began to walk away. Turning to the twelve, He asked: "Do you also wish to go away?"

It is beside the point to inquire why our Saviour put this question to the apostles, whether He wished them to understand that He was leaving them free either to remain with Him or to go away, or that as Sovereign God He could readily secure substitutes in their place if they decided to leave, or whether He wished to stifle any thought in their hearts that by remaining with Him, they were extending a favor to Him rather than receiving one. The fact is He asked the twelve: "Do you also wish to go away?"

Simon Peter, speaking for the twelve, replied at once: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast words of everlasting life, and we have come to believe and to know that thou art the Christ, the Son of God." It is as if Peter had said: Thy words, O Lord, are sweet and life-giving; Thou art our only refuge; who but one who is dull and unbalanced of mind would leave Thee?

Peter made an act of faith, and Peter used his powers of reasoning. Peter believed, and Peter knew. He believed because he accepted Christ, true God and true man. He knew because he had heard with his own ears the preaching of the Baptist, and because he had seen with his own eyes and had witnessed with all his other senses the miracles and the sanctity of the Saviour. Peter believed, and Peter knew.

Like Simon Peter, John Augustine Ryan exemplified the faithful use of the twofold talent of faith and of reason. While his reliance on the teachings of Peter's successor was truly childlike, he yielded to no one in the complete and unfettered use of his vigorous intellect. Living answer, he was, to the shallow taunt that a Catholic cannot be a scientist. To him reason was the light of God's face. To him was given the Psalmist's joy: "The light of Thy countenance, O Lord, is signed upon us: thou hast given gladness in my heart" (4–7). That gladness, we may venture to say, gave him the extraordinary calm which he maintained in the face of hostile critics, and the satisfaction that was his to see no small part of what he had worked for coming to be accepted even during his lifetime.

To his success in combining in himself the moral teacher and the scientist, let one testify whose commendation may come to some as a bit of a surprise. In 1917, Dr. Alvin Johnson reviewing Monsignor Ryan's monumental work, Distributive Justice, in the New Republic, of February 17, wrote: "Few ethical authorities have had sufficient knowledge of economic facts to adapt ethical principles to the economic field; few economists are abreast of the best modern work in ethics. To this rule, the most notable is Dr. Ryan. His economic scholarship is unimpeachable; survey his writing, and you are forced to the conclusion that among the economists of today there are not many who can match him in command of the literature and in sanity of judgment."

A single formula then, guided him throughout his entire life: complete adherence to the teaching magisterium of the church, and painstaking use of the tools of the scientist. He did not merely accept the depositum fidei, the body of Christian faith, but worked and toiled in order to set it forth in its primeval purity.

In 1913, he became disturbed at the charge of certain Socialists that the early Fathers of the Church—Basil, Ambrose, and Jerome—denied the right of private property, and advocated a system of collectivism. He set himself to work on early Patristic literature and published the little volume, The Alleged Socialism of the Church Fathers, in which he revealed the true mind of the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries on ownership and private property.

Later, as students in his seminar at Catholic University can well bear witness, he was most meticulous in analyzing the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, both in directing dissertations and in publishing his own researches in this field, in order to discover the true position of the Angel of the Schools on the two main pillars of medieval economic doctrine, the just price and the prohibition of usury. Again, it was the theologian and the scientist at work.

There is one feature of John Ryan's thinking that may not be overlooked. Theologian though he was, he had a passion for facts. He took the perfectly rational position that no one can pass valid judgment on industrial or other questions unless he is acquainted with the facts concerning them. He adopted the homely common sense of the person in the street: When a man talks he should know what he is talking about.

Deductive reasoning alone, he held, is not enough. Convictions alone, even when they are sound and right, are not enough. "The general principles," he wrote, "are true, indeed, but they are practically useless unless they are applied specifically to the actual conditions and relations of industry. Unless we know the facts, we cannot apply the principles." (Questions of the Day, Stratford Press, 1931, p. 222.) Could the true scientist's freedoms and limitations be better formulated?

One other phase of his thinking might well be referred to here. It was his constant practice to view things in their causal relation to one another, and, in the case of social wrongs, to propose remedies to eliminate the causes of these wrongs rather than to wait until the causes had worked themselves out, and then merely to deplore the evil results. I refer to the matter of communism. All the world knows that communism can take root only in the soil of injustice and oppression. It can hardly thrive in any other.

Monsignor Ryan denounced communism and its earlier counterpart, socialism, more vigorously and certainly more intelligently than any other writer in the English language. (See, for example, his The Church and Socialism, University Press, Washington, 1919, and his A Better Economic Order, Harpers, 1935.) But he did not content himself with condemnation. His was a positive crusade. He sought to remove the causes out of which socialism and communism grow. If any proof is needed for this assertion, the clear answer is the Bishop's Reconstruction Program of 1919, which he not only conceived but also wrote.

Indeed, he does not fall under the censure of Pope Pius XI, but rather merits the praise of that great Pontiff who, after lamenting the attitude of those who look with indifference on the spread of communism, asserts: "All the more gravely to be condemned is the folly of those who neglect to remove or change the conditions that inflame the minds of peoples, and pave the way for the overthrow and destruction of society." (Quadragesimo Anno, par. 112.)

But, mark well, Monsignor Ryan did not demand justice for workers merely because injustice would drive them to communism. Fear of driving workers to communism is anything but a generous motive. It is the view of those who are concerned almost entirely about what might happen to themselves. When all is said and done it is a view that is born of selfishness. It was not John Ryan's view. His was far more Christian. He condemned oppression, and proposed measures for social justice in behalf of the oppressed because justice is their right as children of God and brothers of Jesus Christ.

III

Now, let us look at the man himself. Persons who met Monsignor Ryan for the first time were frequently heard to remark, "How strong and yet how simple he is!" This was the judgment not merely of strangers, but of those who were privileged to be close to him. Massive strength with childlike simplicity—nothing portrays him quite so well.

If we may draw aside the curtain of his young manhood, we may say, I am sure, that he did not build his character to this formula by chance, and, least of all, by self-promoting design. Christian and Catholic that he was from birth, he saw and loved and made his own the transcendent wisdom of Him who being God "emptied himself, taking the nature of a slave and being made like unto men" (Philippians 2: 7); Who laid it down as a first condition of man's blessedness "unless you turn and become like little children, you will not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 18: 13); Who remains with us, true God, under the frail appearance of bread upon our altars; Whose own Mother became all powerful because she was all lowly; and Whose Apostle could proclaim with triumph, "Strength is made perfect in weakness" (2 Corinthians 12: 9).

To this great mystery of Christian faith—strength is made perfect in weakness—John Ryan yielded allegiance. It captivated him and shaped his character. Here is the explanation of his childlike simplicity and of his manly strength.

Child he was to his last breath. Even at the risk of seeming to trifle, I would say that it was only a boy, who at the age of 70 could look back to the time when he was 29, and write of himself as he did in his autobiography, "Until I left home for the Catholic University, the latter part of September 1898, I had never seen as large a city as Chicago. The 2 or 3 days that I spent in that metropolis on my way to Washington were extremely interesting. I still recall the powerful impression made upon me by the elevated railroads, the tall buildings, the lake front, the crowds and the noise, hurry, and bustle." (Social Doctrine in Action, Harper, 1941, p. 62.) This same attitude of utter truthfulness runs through all his writings, as it dominated the man himself. "The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips" (Malachi 2: 5).

But God's paradox had worked itself out. The Seat of Wisdom had declared: "He has put down the mighty from their thrones, and has exalted the lowly" (Luke 1: 52). Indeed, the artless simplicity of John Ryan had made of him a man of judgment, of courage, and of breadth of view.

Judgment, he had, to separate fact from make-believe, and when he rendered judgment, there was none that did not know its meaning. Courage, he had, but it was the courage that the God of hosts vouchsafes only to those who fight for the right.

Breadth of view he had, both of God's world and of God's church, as witness his desire for a study to discover whether the status of the church in Catholic countries is not in direct proportion to the degree to which the peoples of these countries have sought to carry out the Catholic program for social justice and to live it in their daily lives.

This morning I venture the prophecy: He will stand in our country almost alone, to offset the sentence of condemnation that future generations will justly pass upon our own, that whereas we have made revolutionary advances in scientific research in behalf of things, we have made little if any progress in the high science of social thinking in behalf of human beings.

Such is the man and such is the priest whose mortal remains we consign to the earth today. His soul can be happy, and his bereaved brothers and sisters can even rejoice, in the assurance of St. Paulinus of the fourth century: "It is one thing to pray for yourself. It is quite another for a multitude to clamor to God for you." With the faith that is ours, we can confidently hope that the uncounted thousands whose cause he espoused have already prevailed for him at the seat of divine mercy.

O angels of God, if eternal justice, before whom no man stands without fault, still holds him in the prison-house of suffering, lift up the bars and admit this valiant champion of justice and charity into the mansions of peace and of rest.

ADDRESS BY GENERAL EISENHOWER AT GUILDHALL, LONDON, ENGLAND

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, some weeks ago the Congress of the United States held a joint session to honor the commander in chief of the Allied armies in Europe, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower. We were all deeply impressed with the speech General Eisenhower made on that occasion. Our allies also sought to show their appreciation of this great American commander in chief, and one of the first to do so was Great Britain. At a banquet at the Guildhall, London, General Eisenhower made a speech which every American should be given the opportunity to read. I have here a copy of that speech. It is a speech to be remembered, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The high sense of distinction I feel in receiving this great honor from the city of London is inescapably mingled with feelings of profound sadness. All of us must always regret that your country and mine were ever faced with the tragic situation that compelled the appointment of an Allied commander in chief, the capacity in which I have just been so extravagantly commended.

Humility must always be the portion of any man who receives acclaim earned in the blood of his followers and the sacrifices of his friends. Conceivably a commander may have been professionally superior. He may have given everything of his heart and mind to meet the spiritual and physical needs of his comrades. He may have written a chapter that will glow forever in the pages of military history. Still, even such a man, if he existed, would sadly face the facts that his honors cannot hide in his memories the crosses marking the resting places of the dead. They cannot soothe the anguish of the widow or the orphan whose husband or father will not return.

The only attitude in which a commander may with satisfaction receive the tributes of his friends is in humble acknowledgment that, no matter how unworthy he may be, his position is a symbol of great human forces that have labored arduously and successfully for a righteous cause. Unless he feels this symbolism and this rightness in what he has tried to do, then he is disregardful of the courage, the fortitude, and devotion of the vast multitudes he has been honored to command. If all the Allied men and women that have served with me in this war can only know that it is they this august body is really honoring today, then, indeed, will I be content.

This feeling of humility cannot erase, of course, my great pride in being tendered the freedom of London. I am not a native of this land. I come from the very heart of America. In the superficial aspects by which we ordinarily recognize family relationships, the town where I was born and the one where I was reared are far separated from this great city. Abilene, Kans., and Denison, Tex., would together add in size to possibly one five-hundredth part of greater London. By your standards those towns are young, without your aged traditions that carry the roots of London back into the uncertainties of unrecorded history. To those people I am proud to belong, but I find myself today 5,000 miles from that countryside, the honored guest of a city whose name stands for grandeur and size throughout the world. Hardly would it seem possible for the London Council to have gone farther afield to find a man to honor with its priceless gift of token citizenship.

Yet kinship among nations is not determined in such measurements as proximity, size, and age. Rather we should turn to those inner things, call them what you will—I mean those intangibles that are the real treasures freemen possess. To preserve his freedom of worship, his equality before the law, his liberty to speak and act as he sees fit—subject only to the provision that he trespass not upon similar rights of others—the Londoner will fight. So will the citizen of Abilene. When we consider these things, then the valley of the Thames draws closer to the farms of Kansas and the plains of Texas. To my mind, it is clear that when two peoples will face the tragedies of war to defend the same spiritual values, the same treasured rights, then, in deepest sense, those two are truly related. So, even as I proclaim my undying Americanism, I am bold enough and exceedingly proud to claim basic kinship to you of London.

And what man who has followed the history of this war could fail to experience inspiration from the example of this city? When the British Empire stood—alone, but unconquered; almost naked, but unafraid—to defy the Hitler hordes, it was on this devoted city that the first terroristic blows were launched.

Five years and 8 months of war, much of it on the actual battle-line! Blitzes, big and little, fly-bombs, V-bombs; all of them you took in your stride. You worked—from your needed efforts you would not be deterred. You carried on, and from your midst arose no cry for mercy, no wail of defeat. The Battle of Britain will take its place as another of your deathless traditions. And your faith and endurance have finally been rewarded.

You had been more than 2 years in war when Americans, in numbers, began swarming into your country. Most were mentally unprepared for the realities of war—especially as waged by the Nazis. Others believed that tales of British sacrifice had been exaggerated. Still others failed to recognize the difficulties of the task ahead.

All such doubts, questions, and complacencies could not endure a single casual tour through your scarred streets and avenues. With awe our men gazed upon empty spaces where once had stood buildings erected by the toil and sweat of peaceful folk. Our eyes rounded as we saw your women serving quietly and efficiently in almost every kind of war effort, even flak batteries. We became accustomed to the warning sirens, which seemed to compel, from the native Londoner, not a single hurried step. Gradually we drew closer together until we became true partners in the war.

In London my associates and I planned two great expeditions: that to invade the Mediterranean and later that to cross the Channel. London's hospitality to Americans, her good-humored acceptance of the added inconveniences we brought, her example of fortitude and quiet confidence in the final outcome—all these helped to make the supreme headquarters of two Allied expeditions the smooth-working organizations they became? They were composed of chosen representatives of two proud and independent peoples, each noted for its initiative and for its satisfaction with its own customs, manners, and methods. Many feared that those representatives could never combine together in efficient fashion to solve the complex problems presented by modern war.

I hope you believe we proved the doubters wrong. Moreover, I hold that we proved this point not only for war, we proved that it can always be done by our two peoples, provided only both show the same good will, the same forbearance, the same objective attitude that British and Americans so amply demonstrated in nearly 3 years of bitter campaigning.

No one man could, alone, have brought about this result. Had I possessed the military skill of a Marlborough, the wisdom of Solomon, the understanding of Lincoln, I still would have been helpless without the loyalty, the vision, the generosity of thousands upon thousands of British and Americans. Some of them were my companions in the high command, many were enlisted men and junior officers carrying the fierce brunt of the battle, and many others were back in the United States and here in Great Britain, in London. Moreover, back of us were always our great national war leaders and their civil and military staffs that supported and encouraged us through every trial, every test. The whole was one great team. I know that on this special occasion, the 3,000,000 American men and women serving in the Allied Expeditionary Force would want me to pay the tribute of admiration, respect and affection to their British comrades of this war.

My most cherished hope is that, after Japan joins the Nazi in utter defeat, neither my country nor yours need ever again summon its sons and daughters from their peaceful pursuits to face the tragedies of battle. But—a fact important for both of us to remember—neither London nor Abilene, sisters under the skin, will sell her birthright for physical safety, her liberty for mere existence.

No petty differences in the world of trade, traditions, or national pride should ever blind us to identities in priceless values. If we keep our eyes on this guidepost, then no difficulties along our path of mutual cooperation can ever be insurmountable. Moreover, when this truth has permeated to the remotest hamlet and heart of all peoples, then indeed may we beat our swords into ploughshares and all nations can enjoy the fruitfulness of the earth.

My Lord Mayor, I thank you once again for an honor to me and to the American forces that will remain one of the proudest in my memories.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 136. An act for the relief of the Oregon Caves Resort;

S. 451. An act for the relief of Carl Baumann;

S. 573. An act for the relief of Lee D. Hoseley;

S. 711. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Fuhrmann;

S. 729. An act for the relief of William Andrew Evans;

S. 732. An act for the relief of Ensign Elmer H. Beckmann, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 762. An act for the relief of Everett McLendon, Sr.; Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr.; Mr. and Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr., for the benefit of their minor daughter, Nadine McLendon; and Everett McLendon, Jr.;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Oliver Jensen;

S. 857. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Ford;

S. 888. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands in the vicinity of the War Department Pentagon Building in Arlington, Va.;

S. 902. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in a Quonset hut at Harrowbeer Airport, Yelverton, South Devon, England, on December 26, 1944;

S. 909. An act for the relief of Hugh Egan;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Henry H. Huffman and Mrs. Marie J. Huffman;

S. 985. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires occurring at various naval shore activities;

S. 986. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in administration building at the naval air station, Bunker Hill, Ind., on December 28, 1944;

S. 996. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg) William Augustus White, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 1007. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward P. Standley; and

S. 1265. An act for the relief of John R. Jennings.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 90. An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara;

S. 620. An act for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin;

S. 694. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers; and

S. 1062. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 239. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark;

H. R. 240. An act for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks;

H. R. 801. An act for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children;

H. R. 874. An act for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges;

H. R. 875. An act for the relief of Nannie Bass;

H. R. 935. An act for the relief of Andreas Andersen;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of John August Johnson;

H. R. 1236. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in two hundred and eleven and thirty-six one-hundredths acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 1457. An act for the relief of Josephine Benham;

H. R. 1636. An act for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Candler Cobb;

H. R. 1956. An act for the relief of Annie M. Lannon;

H. R. 1961. An act for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler, Harold S. Keeler, and Genevieve M. Keeler;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.;

H. R. 2027. An act for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, deceased;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of John J. Gall;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of the estate of Franz Tillman, deceased;

H. R. 2172. An act for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Florence Zimmerman;

H. R. 2310. An act for the relief of James A. Brady;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.;

H. R. 2335. An act for the relief of Albert E. Severns;

H. R. 2362. An act for the relief of Edward Woolf;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Arlethia Rosser;

H. R. 2452. An act for the relief of Sam Kalak;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Capt. Werner Holtz;

H. R. 2481. An act for the relief of the estate of Ed Edmondson, deceased;

H. R. 2512. An act for the relief of Helen Alton and Edwin Alton;

H. R. 2579. An act for the relief of John G. Johnson;

H. R. 2595. An act for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly;

H. R. 2620. An act for the relief of Leslie O. Allen;

H. R. 2642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson;

H. R. 2677. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to accept and dispose of real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson, of Polk County, Ark., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2686. An act for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood;

H. R. 2723. An act for the relief of I. H. Beasley;

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of Donald George;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stuart B. Riley;

H. R. 2835. An act for the relief of James Lynch;

H. R. 2836. An act for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti;

H. R. 3008. An act for the relief of Don Hicks;

H. R. 3011. An act for the relief of John Hames;

H. R. 3087. An act to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3198. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton, a minor;

H. R. 3249. An act for the relief of Stanley J. Lilly;

H. R. 3302. An act for the relief of Christian H. Kreusler;

H. R. 3424. An act to permit renewal of certain trade-mark registrations after expiry thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3603. An act to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3790. An act for the relief of Genevieve Lund;

H. R. 3870. An act to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, the "Harry L. Englebright Dam";

H. R. 3871. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas;

H. R. 4018. An act for the relief of Robert A. Hudson;

H. R. 4048. An act to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decisions of the Court of Claims in two suits instituted by H. B. Nelson (doing business as the H. B. Nelson Construction Co.); and

H. R. 4100. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 239. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark;

H. R. 240. An act for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks; and

H. R. 1236. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to quit claim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in two hundred and eleven and thirty-six one-hundredths acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 801. An act for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children;

H. R. 874. An act for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges;

H. R. 875. An act for the relief of Nannie Bass;

H. R. 935. An act for the relief of Andreas Andersen;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of John August Johnson;

H. R. 1457. An act for the relief of Josephine Benham;

H. R. 1636. An act for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Candler Cobb;

H. R. 1956. An act for the relief of Annie M. Lannon;

H. R. 1961. An act for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler, Harold S. Keeler, and Genevieve M. Keeler;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.;

H. R. 2027. An act for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, deceased;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of John J. Gall;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of the estate of Franz Tillman, deceased;

H. R. 2172. An act for the relief of J. Clyde Maquis;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Florence Zimmerman;

H. R. 2310. An act for the relief of James A. Brady;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.;

H. R. 2335. An act for the relief of Albert E. Severns;

H. R. 2362. An act for the relief of Edward Woolf;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Arlethia Rosser;

H. R. 2452. An act for the relief of Sam Kalak;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Captain Werner Holtz;

H. R. 2481. An act for the relief of the estate of Ed Edmondson, deceased;

H. R. 2512. An act for the relief of Helen Alton and Edwin Alton;

H. R. 2579. An act for the relief of John G. Johnson;

H. R. 2595. An act for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly;

H. R. 2620. An act for the relief of Leslie O. Allen;

H. R. 2642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson;

H. R. 2686. An act for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood;

H. R. 2723. An act for the relief of I. H. Beasley;

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of Donald George;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stuart B. Riley;

H. R. 2835. An act for the relief of James Lynch;

H. R. 2836. An act for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti;

H. R. 3008. An act for the relief of Don Hicks;

H. R. 3011. An act for the relief of John Hames;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3198. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton, a minor;

H. R. 3249. An act for the relief of Stanley J. Lilly;

H. R. 3302. An act for the relief of Christian H. Kreusler;

H. R. 3790. An act for the relief of Genevieve Lund;

H. R. 4018. An act for the relief of Robert A. Hudson; and

H. R. 4048. An act to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decisions of the Court of Claims in two suits instituted by H. B. Nelson (doing business as the H. B. Nelson Construction Co.); to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2677. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to accept and dispose of real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson, of Polk County, Ark., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 3087. An act to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 3424. An act to permit renewal of certain trade-mark registrations after expiry thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 3603. An act to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3870. An act to name the dam at the Upper Narrows site on the Yuba River, in the State of California, the "Harry L. Englebright Dam"; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 3871. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 4100. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to strike out the following:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this act.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect 90 days after the date of the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, whichever is the earlier: *Provided, however*, That any travel or transportation contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to House bill 694, the bill now under consideration. The amendment proposes, on page 3, line 5, before the period, to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, however, That the provisions of this act shall not take effect until all sections of the United States are allowed the same freight rates on both class and commodity freight.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have seldom seen an important measure come to the floor of the Senate about which there has been so much misunderstanding as there is with respect to the so-called land-grant bill. There is no particular mystery attached to it. It is true that the railroads will profit to some extent—not an unreasonable extent—if this bill passes. But, Mr. President, the pressure upon me and upon every other Senator for the passage of the bill comes from shippers. I hold in my hand my file of correspondence, entirely from shippers. Several hundred—perhaps a thousand—letters have come to me since the agitation for the repeal of the remaining land-grant rates has begun.

I wish to read a letter which I would not call typical, but a model letter from a shipper. It tells why the shippers want the bill passed. It is as clear and concise a statement of the shippers' side of this case as can be made. This letter is from the Monsanto Chemical Co., of St. Louis. It is written by the traffic manager, a Mr. Vahle. It reads in part as follows:

Land-grant rates are discriminatory, and we, therefore, feel that the law which authorizes land-grant privileges should be repealed. The Interstate Commerce Act governing transportation requires railroads to file tariffs naming rates that shippers must pay for the transportation of freight. These are the only rates that may be charged and they cannot, without specific approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, be deviated from in any manner or form. In this way all shippers are informed of the rates applicable to their shipment as well as those applicable to those of competitors. This, however, does not apply with respect to land-grant rates because there is no law requiring their publication.

I charge Senators to take notice of that. I telephoned the Tariff Bureau of the Interstate Commerce Commission this morning to ascertain if they had on file in the Bureau rates charged by railroads obliged to give the land-grant deductions. They said they had no such rates on file. They do not know what the railroads charge where the land-grant deduction is involved. The man in the Tariff Bureau of the Interstate Commerce Commission with whom I talked ended by saying, "About all we know about land-grant rates is what we read in the newspapers." I submit, Mr. President, that that is a most unhealthy situation.

I continue with the letter:

This results in uncertainties not only by the shippers located on non-land-grant roads in competition with shippers on land-grant roads, but also between shippers located on different land-grant roads, and in some cases, even when competing shippers are located on the same land-grant roads.

To participate in Government business at present a shipper to whom a land-grant reduction is not available must absorb the difference between his standard commercial rate and the lower land-grant rate of his competitor, and there are times when natural advantages are eliminated because a competitor with a more unfavorable location happens to be in a position to use a route where land-grant rates apply.

The ordinary commercial shipper does not always know and cannot find out how much land-grant mileage may be applicable in the movement of his own product and has still less chance to know how land-grant deductions may be applied where his competitors are located. Not even the regulatory authorities know where they stand in prescribing a rate structure, in view of the uncertainties as to the nature of the Government property and its uses to which the lower land-grant charges apply.

Shippers on non-land-grant routes, therefore, are at a distinct disadvantage against their competitors served by land-grant roads, and we, therefore, feel that these uncertainties should be eliminated in order to remove discriminations which the present act causes.

Land-grant rates are also responsible for circuitous routing of Government traffic, this resulting in the wasteful use of equipment at a time when every possible effort is being made in the interest of conservation and the efficient use of equipment.

Freight rates should be made on a fair and nondiscriminatory basis, and we, therefore, earnestly request you to support the new bill, urging its passage at an early date.

Mr. President, I subscribe to every word in that letter. It is as straightforward, concise, and coherent a statement of the case for the repeal of the remaining land-grant rates as can be made by anyone. I have in my files, and I held up some of them this morning, approximately 1,000 letters along this same line. I chose to read this because it fairly reflects the position of shippers the country over.

Mr. President, I have been active in transportation and traffic matters all my life. I am familiar with shipper organizations the country over. So far as I know, there is not one shipper organization of any standing anywhere that is not urging the repeal of this remaining segment of the land-grant rates.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the

chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I correctly understand that the shippers on land-grant railroads and shippers on non-land-grant railroads have a difference in rates when they ship only Government supplies or supplies other than Government supplies?

Mr. REED. Only Government supplies.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If we pass this bill, would it lower the rates on the non-land-grant railroads or would it merely raise the rates on the land-grant railroads?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will indulge me for approximately 15 minutes, I shall hope to explain all those things.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the question arises as to how the land-grant system began. Back in 1820 the Government granted tracts of land for the building of highways. Later, in the 40's and 50's, the Government made grants of land in order to encourage the building of canals. In both cases—both for the highways and for the canals—the grants specified that Government property should move over such roads and canals without the payment of tolls. I do not mean to say that I have quoted the precise language, but that was the substance of it.

Then came the railroads. Railroad land grants were first made about 1850. I think the Illinois Central received the first one. Approximately 131,000,000 acres of land were given to railroads to induce construction and extension of mileage, principally in the Middle West, but partly in the South. The old provision that Government property should move without payment of toll was carried into the railroad land grants. Of course, that is an impossible thing, because a railroad moves the traffic; it does not merely furnish the right-of-way. So there was a controversy as to how much of a deduction should be made. The question went to the courts. The Court of Claims, first, I think, and then the Supreme Court decided that there should be an adjustment between the Government, as a shipper, and the railroads.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it was the other way around; it went to the Supreme Court first, and later to the Court of Claims.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has suggested that it went first to the Supreme Court. At any rate, it went to both courts. The courts virtually told the railroads and the shippers to get together, and finally they agreed upon a 50-percent reduction from commercial rates.

I have struggled to find statutory authority for the 50-percent reduction. Some persons who are very well informed on this subject had suggested there was none. At any rate, this morning I located the statutory authority for the 50-percent reduction. In the appropriation bill of July 16, 1892, chapter 195, 27 Statutes at Large 174, 180, there is a provision which reads thus:

> For the payment of Army transportation lawfully due such land-grant railroads as have not received aid in Government bonds (to be adjusted in accordance with the decisions of the Supreme Court in cases decided under such land-grant acts) but in no case shall more than 50 percent of the full amount of service be paid.

That was the first one—in 1892.

In a later law, again an appropriation bill, in chapter 291, 43 Statutes at Large 486, an act of June 4, 1924, a rider was written in. In those days riders were written into appropriation bills, just as is occasionally done now. That rider reads as follows:

> Payments shall be made at such rates as the Secretary of War shall deem just and reasonable and shall not exceed 50 percent of the full amount of compensation, computed on the basis of the tariff or lower special rate for like transportation performed for the public at large, for the transportation of property or troops of the United States over any railroad which, under land-grant acts, was aided in its construction by a grant of land on condition that said railroad shall be and remain a public highway for the use of the United States, and for which adjustment of compensation is required.

Mr. President, that provision applied to all property of the United States. For the first 70 years of railroad land-grant-rate operations the total deduction, including the deduction for carrying the mails, which since 1924 have been carried at 80 percent of a normal rate, was $56,000,000. The amount of business handled by the Government in those early years, outside of business of the Army, was not considerable. The mails were carried at 80 percent of normal rates. Other property was carried at 50 percent.

These figures are the result of studies made by the late Mr. Eastman, when he was Coordinator of Transportation, by the Board of Investigation and Research, and perhaps by others.

Then came the recent era when the Government went into business on a large scale, and its business no longer was confined to the movement of troops or property for the military services. The land-grant deductions became enormous, and the confusion introduced into competitive business by virtue of the uncertainty attaching to shipments on land-grant railroads as compared to non-land-grant roads produced an almost impossible condition which was well described in the letter I read a moment ago.

When Congress enacted the Transportation Act of 1940 the present President, then Senator Truman, was active in the move to limit land-grant deductions to property owned by the Government and used for military purposes. To exclude from such deductions the movement of Government property designed for civil use would have greatly reduced the amount of deductions on land-grant railroads traffic, except for the fact that the war broke out. The war brought an enormous increase of Government military traffic. Great difficulty has arisen in trying to define what is military traffic as opposed to what is civil-property traffic. The Senator from Montana discussed that matter at some length yesterday. I shall refer to it only very briefly. What of lend-lease goods? When the Government is shipping lumber or cement or other building materials for the purpose of the construction of houses for war workers, is that a military purpose? So many questions of that kind have arisen, according to my information, that today there is an argument between the railroads and the Government over the payment of bills aggregating approximately $175,000,000. The practice is for the railroad to submit its bill on a basis which it thinks proper. Then the Government department affected pays it. Then it goes to the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office says it will take probably 5 years before it can determine all related questions as to whether the land-grant rates apply. A great deal of misinformation has been given by previous persons as to the effect of the deductions. As I have said, for the first 70 years the deductions amounted to $56,000,000. The Post Office Department, which had had the mails carried at 80 percent of what the rates otherwise would have been, benefited over a period of years to the extent of approximately between $2,000,000 and $2,500,000 a year. But that was repealed by the Transportation Act of 1940. At the present time the Post Office Department pays rates regardless of whether a railroad is a land-grant railroad.

When shipping conditions return to normal, it is my considered judgment, based on the best information I can obtain—and I have made an earnest effort to obtain information from every available source—that the amount of the so-called land-grant deductions on property shipped under the present law for military purposes only, will be somewhere between $3,000,000 and $7,000,000 a year. I doubt if anyone can come any closer to the exact amount than that.

Mr. President, there is no mystery about this matter, but it is a subject which has not been fully understood. Such absence of understanding has given an opportunity to persons who are inclined to be alarmists or careless about the truth to make claims of enormous waste, graft, tremendous expense to shippers, and great profits to the railroads. As I have said, it is my considered judgment that when shipping conditions return to normal, so far as property moving for military purposes is concerned, under the present law the deductions would amount to somewhere between $3,000,000 and $7,000,000 a year. That is the best figure I could obtain. I am reinforcing the statement by what happened before the depression period and before the war.

From January 1, 1928, to December 31, 1933, a period of 6 years, the total deductions were $14,442,000. That related to what was approximately a normal movement before the period of activity which took place due to the depression, when the Government undertook all kinds of PWA, WPA, and other Government activities. The yearly deduction average was about $2,400,000.

I am appealing today for the repeal of this act principally for the benefit of the shipper. There is not a shipper of any consequence anywhere in the United

States about whom I know anything, or a shipping organization of any importance which can speak with knowledge on this subject, that does not favor the proposed repeal. It is almost impossible for a manufacturer or producer on a non-land-grant railroad to do business if he has a competitor on a land-grant railroad. That situation is not a fair one. There is no place where the manufacturer, the wholesaler, or the distributor located on a nongrant railroad can ascertain what his competitor pays if his competitor has the advantage of rates because of being served by a land-grant railroad. That situation is discriminatory. It is a situation which some of us have tried for many years to remove from the field of transportation. We have tried to put all competitors on such a basis that there would be neither favoritism nor discrimination. We have succeeded fairly well, but we do not yet have a perfect rate structure. I have had a great deal to do with these matters over a period of many years. We never will have a perfect rate structure, but we have improved it tremendously, and the enactment of this bill would aid greatly in that direction.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina in the Chamber. I ask for his attention for a moment.

Yesterday in the course of the debate between the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] a question was asked relative to the extent to which the railroads of the South might have received aid from land-grants. I have before me a land-grant map. I shall be very happy to let any of my colleagues examine it. I was told by the Department from which I received the map that it is the last one in existence so far as is known. I promised that I would return it.

I also have before me a list of railroads which I shall be glad to show to any Senator. I believe there is an ample supply of pamphlets which give information about the railroads, including the amount of land which has been granted to them.

For the information of the Senator from North Carolina, allow me to say that the following railroads operating in the South received land grants: The Illinois Central Railroad Co.; the Mobile & Ohio, Mississippi; Mobile & Ohio, Alabama; the Florida, Atlantic & Gulf Central Railroad; the Florida Central & Peninsula Railroad; the Florida & Alabama Railroad; the Alabama & Florida Railroad—those are apparently two separate railroads—the Tennessee & Coosa Railroad; the Alabama & Chattanooga Railroad; the Mobile & Girard Railroad; the South & North Alabama Railroad; and the Selma, Rome & Dalton Railroad.

If the Senator from North Carolina is interested, I shall be very glad to pass one of these pamphlets to him.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, from the information which I have just heard, there were land-grants to railroads in the South in such States as Florida, Mississippi, and Alabama.

Mr. REED. I believe there were some in Alabama, in Tennessee, Florida, and some other States.

Mr. President, a repeal of the present law will not mean that the Government may not obtain a reduction in freight rates, or have its freight carried at a lower cost than the public can have its freight carried. Section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act specifically provides, and has so provided for a long time, that the railroads may, without violation of law, make a contract with the Federal Government, State or municipal governments to handle traffic at less than normal rates. I read from the opening language of section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

> That nothing in this part shall prevent the carriage, storage, or handling of property free or at reduced rates, for the United States, State, or municipal governments, or for charitable purposes, or to or from fairs and expositions for exhibition thereat or the free carriage of destitute and homeless persons transported by charitable societies.

Mr. President, I shall be happy to answer any question which I am capable of answering. I have tried to outline the question as tersely and as clearly as I could. From long experience I have come to the very firm belief that for the benefit of honest, fair, and open competition between shippers, this land-grant provision should be repealed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In examining the map to which the Senator from Kansas has referred as showing the names of land-grant railroads, I note that west of the Missouri River line the portion of the Northern Pacific which runs through North Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and Washington, and the portion of the Southern Pacific which runs from about halfway between Los Angeles and San Francisco, and extends down to about Albuquerque, N. Mex., as well as a stretch of the Union Pacific running through Kansas and ending at the Colorado line, are the only roads shown which are presently land-grant railroads. I have been of the firm opinion that the Union Pacific clear through was a land-grant railroad; that the Great Northern was a land-grant railroad, and that great portions of the Milwaukee had land grants.

Mr. REED. There was no land grant to some of the roads named by the Senator from Iowa. The Great Northern never had a land grant. The Milwaukee extensions to the coast never had a land grant. The Union Pacific Railroad was the first transcontinental road constructed. That was back in the days of the Civil War and President Lincoln had in mind always as a national policy the necessity of building a railroad to keep the Pacific coast within the United States.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I beg the Senator's pardon. I believe I misstated myself a moment ago. It was not the Union Pacific; it was a portion of the Santa Fe through Kansas. The Union Pacific is not shown to be a land-grant railroad at all.

Mr. REED. The Union Pacific never was a land-grant railroad. It was aided heavily by bonds. About 1905, after considerable investigation and controversy, there was a final settlement between the Union Pacific Railroad and the National Government in which the matter of these bonds, what was due and when it was due, was adjusted. So today the Union Pacific Railroad——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. REED. Allow me to complete my reply. The Union Pacific is not a land-grant railroad in the sense that I have used that term as applying to Government shipments.

Mr. HATCH. Unless my recollection is at fault, vast areas of public land were conveyed to another corporation which was indirectly owned by the Union Pacific. Is not that true?

Mr. REED. I think that is quite possible, but that does not change the statement I made. I have never examined the old law, but the provision which was standard in the case of most land grants, that a rate reduction should be made on Government traffic, was never put into the Union Pacific grant. The Union Pacific was granted lands; yes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. I think the Senator will find the history of the Union Pacific and its affiliated corporations a most interesting one in the development of the railroads of the West.

Mr. REED. Of course, that may be. I am talking about a matter that is immediately before the Senate. The Union Pacific land grant is not involved in this question in any way.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Perhaps the Senator has covered the point I am about to mention. If so, I did not hear him and I should be glad to have him discuss it for my information. What is meant by bond-aided roads? What is the distinction? Was it a direct loan, an underwriting? What was the method of bond-aiding the railroads in the early days?

Mr. REED. I can only speak from general knowledge.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I see very few; in fact, I see no bond-aided railroads indicated west of the Missouri River.

Mr. REED. The Union Pacific, I think without question, was aided by bonds as well as by grants of land, which the railroad sold; but my understanding, without an examination of the old law, always has been that there was no provision in the grant of land to the Union Pacific that required a reduction in the rate for which Government traffic was carried. There was quite a controversy between the National Government and the Union Pacific Railroad sometime along about the turn of the century—I think about 1905, as nearly as I can remember—and the Union Pacific and the Government reached a settlement. What that settlement was I do not undertake to say, but we have never considered—and I speak with knowledge on this subject—the Union Pacific as being a railroad of which

a reduction of the rate at which Government property was carried could be required.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am greatly interested in this question, if the Senator will yield again——

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It seems from this map—and this morning is the first time I have ever seen it; I understand there is only one in existence, as the Senator said.

Mr. REED. I had to cross my heart and hope to die, when I borrowed that one. I promised to return it to the department from which I obtained it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A quick examination of this map seems to indicate that the State of Iowa and the State of Minnesota have by far the bulk of the land-grant railroad mileage in the United States.

Mr. REED. I think that may be correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It seems that all five of the major roads—east and west railroads which cross my State—are land-grant, with the exception of one or two small ones.

Mr. REED. The answer to that would be that when the Civil War ended—with due regard for my southern colleagues, I will say the War Between the States——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas will permit a correction from North Carolina, let me say that we had a vote in North Carolina in 1915 on that subject and the State voted to call it the War of the Rebellion. I am bound by that at any rate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, at the close of the War of the Rebellion—I accept the nomenclature of the very distinguished Senator from North Carolina—it was the desire of the National Government to open up for settlement and to induce settlement of the States west of Chicago, or, really those west of the Mississippi River. I think that is a fair statement. There had been no way to travel except by road into that area until these railroads were built. Through the State of Missouri one could travel and did travel by the Missouri River. There was much more travel on the Missouri River in those days than there has been in recent years. So to induce railroad building to encourage it in the territory from Chicago to the Rocky Mountains, and more especially between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains, aid grants of land were made to railroads.

Mr. President, at this time I ask to have incorporated in my remarks pages 5 and 6 only of a pamphlet issued by the Department of the Interior, entitled "Information Concerning Land Grants for Roads, Canals, River Improvements, and Railroads." This table shows the names of the railroads and the amount of land granted. Perhaps it may be useful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The table is as follows:

Statement showing area of the grant and the amount of land certified and patented under grants made by acts of Congress to aid in the construction of railroads

GRANTS ADJUSTED AND CLOSED

Name of railroad	Date of grant	Area of grants in acres	Acres patented	Deficiency
Illinois Central R. R. Co.	Sept. 20, 1850 (9 Stat. 466)	2,595,133.00	2,595,133.00	
Mobile & Ohio (Mississippi)	do	737,130.29	737,130.29	
Mobile & Ohio (Alabama)	do	419,528.44	419,528.44	
Hannibal & St. Joseph R. R. Co.	June 10, 1852 (10 Stat. 8)	778,550.04	611,323.35	167,226.69
Pacific R. R. Co. now St. Louis & San Francisco Ry. Co.	do	1,159,080.33	1,161,284.51	
Little Rock & Fort Smith Ry. Co.	Feb. 9, 1853 (10 Stat. 155)	1,057,024.00	1,052,082.51	4,941.49
St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern R. R. Co. (Missouri)	do	574,400.00	41,652.47	532,747.53
St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern R. R. Co. (Arkansas)	do	1,946,112.00	1,356,298.00	589,814.00
Memphis & Little Rock R. R. Co.	do	838,400.00	188,380.49	650,019.51
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co.	May 15, 1856 (11 Stat. 9)	1,046,062.73	389,990.11	656,072.62
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Ry. Co.	do	1,228,526.96	644,747.17	583,779.79
Cedar Rapids & Missouri River R. R. Co.	do	1,024,895.66	1,023,755.08	1,140.58
Dubuque & Sioux City R. R. Co.	do	1,207,145.51	1,239,464.08	
Iowa Falls & Sioux City R. R. Co.				
Florida, Atlantic & Gulf Central R. R. Co.	May 17, 1856 (11 Stat. 15)	1,315,496.22	1,308,620.88	6,875.34
Pensacola & Georgia R. R. Co.				
Florida Centra & Peninsula R. R. Co.	do	1,049,744.69	750,958.84	298,785.85
Florida & Alabama R. R. Co.	do	147,942.81	166,691.08	
Alabama & Florida R. R. Co.	do	439,972.58	399,022.84	40,949.74
Tennessee & Coosa R. R. Co.	June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 17)	88,935.81	84,545.01	4,390.80
Alabama & Chattanooga R. R. Co.	do	662,349.00	463,253.35	199,095.65
Wills Valley R. R. Co.	do	168,572.03	240,106.45	
Mobile & Girard R. R. Co.	do	302,181.16	302,181.16	
South & North Alabama R. R. Co.	do	595,874.38	522,218.75	73,655.63
Selma, Rome & Dalton R. R. Co.	do	507,313.07	419,699.19	87,613.88
Bay de Noquet & Marquette R. R. Co.	June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 21)	128,000.00	128,301.05	
Marquette, Houghton & Ontonagon R. R. Co.	Mar. 3, 1865 (13 Stat. 520)	304,367.64	310,023.67	
Ontonagon & Brule R. R. Co.	June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 21)	35,679.79	34,227.08	1,452.71
Chicago & Northwestern Ry. Co.	Mar. 3, 1865 (13 Stat. 520)	702,608.75	518,014.51	184,594.24
Jackson, Lansing & Saginaw R. R. Co.	June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 21)	746,378.35	740,299.41	6,078.94
Northern Central Michigan R. R. Co.	do	220,924.37	1,132.30	219,792.07
Grand Rapids & Indiana R. R. Co.	do	947,699.92	846,679.45	101,020.47
Port Huron & Lake Michigan R. R. Co.	do	37,467.44	37,467.44	
Flint & Pere Marquette R. R. Co.	do	590,811.79	513,152.37	77,659.42
Madison & Portage R. R. Co.	June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 20)	120,765.88	915.38	119,850.50
Wisconsin Railroad Farm Mortgage Co.	do	240,649.03	243,288.77	
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha R. R. Co., successor to West Wisconsin Ry. Co.	May 5, 1864 (13 Stat. 66)	922,834.10	773,874.00	148,960.10
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha R. R. Co., successor to St. Croix & Lake Superior R. R. Co.	do	1,288,208.90	1,288,208.90	
Chicago & Northwestern R. R., successor to Chicago, St. Paul & Fond du Lac R. R. Co.	June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 20)	561,937.93	555,140.15	6,797.78
Vicksburg, Shreveport & Pacific R. R. Co.	June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 18)	702,137.68	373,175.95	328,961.73
Vicksburg & Meridian R. R. Co.	Aug. 11, 1856 (11 Stat. 30)	409,499.81	199,101.51	201,398.30
Gulf & Ship Island R. R. Co.	do	146,222.67	139,113.22	7,109.45
St. Paul & Sioux City R. R. Co.	Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 195); May 12, 1864 (13 Stat. 72)	1,126,578.55	1,126,618.55	
Minnesota Central R. R. Co.	Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 195); Mar. 3, 1865 (13 Stat. 526)	599,065.72	176,289.78	422,775.94
Winona & St. Peter R. R. Co.	Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 195)	1,680,143.09	1,749,209.16	
Southern Minnesota R. R. Co.	Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 195); Mar. 3, 1865 (13 Stat. 526)	91,241.32	56,843.92	34,397.40
Leavenworth, Pawnee & Western R. R. Co., now Union Pacific R. R. Co.	July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. 489); July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. 356)	7,069,242.87	7,091,674.37	
Union Pacific R. R. Co.	do	11,401,296.15	11,401,175.51	120.64
Union Pacific R. R. Co. (central branch)	July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. 489); July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. 356)	222,639.57	223,034.53	
Sioux City & Pacific R. R. Co.	July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. 489)	45,413.50	41,313.83	4,099.67
Leavenworth, Lawrence & Galveston R. R. Co.	Mar. 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 772)	658,857.76	73,893.93	614,963.83
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe R. R. Co.	do	2,878,020.39	2,929,348.08	
Missouri, Kansas & Texas R. R. Co.	Mar. 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 772); July 1, 1864 (13 Stat. 339); July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 289).	889,757.94	609,057.63	280,700.31
Wisconsin Central R. R. Co.	May 5, 1864 (13 Stat. 66)	1,277,188.56	835,635.34	441,550.22
St. Paul & Duluth R. R. Co.	May 5, 1864 (13 Stat. 64)	870,376.71	822,657.41	47,719.30
Sioux City & St. Paul R. R. Co.	May 12, 1864 (13 Stat. 72)	279,437.16	322,412.81	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul R. R. Co., successor to McGregor & Missouri River R. R. Co.	do	1,284,492.15	396,392.70	888,099.45
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co., successor to Burlington & Missouri River R. R. Co.	July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. 356)	2,361,984.00	2,374,090.77	

Statement showing area of the grant and the amount of land certified and patented under grants made by acts of Congress to aid in the construction of railroads—Continued

GRANTS ADJUSTED AND CLOSED—continued

Name of railroad	Date of grant	Area of grants in acres	Acres patented	Deficiency
Southern Minnesota Railway Extension Co	July 4, 1866 (14 Stat. 87)	1,602,931.34	451,626.21	1,151,305.13
Hastings & Dakota R. R. Co	do	1,229,064.41	374,522.55	854,541.86
St. Joseph & Denver City R. R. Co	July 23, 1866 (14 Stat. 210)	1,238,087.80	486,808.87	751,278.93
Atlantic & Pacific R. R. Co. (Missouri Division)	July 27, 1866 (14 Stat. 292)	630,793.91	508,529.97	122,263.94
New Orleans Pacific R. R. Co	Mar. 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573)	2,750,053.52	954,957.89	1,795,095.63
Total		68,213,231.18	55,826,276.02	12,709,697.06
Grants revested by act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218):				
Oregon & California R. R. Co	July 25, 1866 (14 Stat. 229)	3,821,991.80	2,777,631.96	1,044,269.84
Do	May 4, 1870 (16 Stat. 94)	397,692.16	128,618.13	268,984.03
Total		4,219,503.96	2,906,250.09	1,313,253.87
Grand total		72,432,735.14	58,732,526.11	14,022,950.93

Statement showing area of the grant and the amount of land certified and patented under grants made by acts of Congress to aid in the construction of railroads as of June 30, 1938

GRANTS PRACTICALLY ADJUSTED, BUT NOT CLOSED

Name of railroad	Date of grant	Area of grants in acres	Acres patented	Amount due
St. Paul & Pacific R. R. Co	Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 195); Mar. 3, 1865 (13 Stat. 526)	3,851,691.25	3,256,846.21	594,845.04
Central Pacific R. R. Co	July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. 489); July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. 356)	8,056,581.46	7,920,255.69	136,325.77
Northern Pacific Ry. Co	July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. 365); May 31, 1870 (16 Stat. 378)	43,150,330.39	38,591,614.78	4,558,715.61
California & Oregon R. R. Co	July 25, 1866 (14 Stat. 239)	3,268,564.63	3,240,608.85	27,955.78
Atlantic & Pacific R. R. Co. (Western Division)	July 27, 1866 (14 Stat. 292)	13,423,237.62	11,917,309.83	1,505,927.19
Southern Pacific R. R. Co. (main line)	do	4,714,055.71	4,664,355.65	49,700.06
Southern Pacific R. R. Co. (branch line)	Mar. 3, 1871 (15 Stat. 573)	4,064,373.25	2,140,474.81	1,923,898.44
Total		80,528,833.71	71,731,465.82	8,797,367.89

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have tried to elucidate this situation. I shall be happy to reply to any further questions, but if there are no further questions, I yield the floor.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have heard the argument derived from the land-grant theory, and I do not think the argument is well founded. If some one will argue to me that we are not paying the railroads a sufficient sum, I will listen to that, but I do not believe the land-grant proposition is convincing. There is another side to it. Nobody knows what the lands were worth. Historians speak of the land grants as the sources and product of a great deal of corruption. I recall Mr. Beard's chapters on that point. However that may be, if the railroads are making a profit we should not pay them more than we are now paying them, and if they are not making a profit, I think the Government, having the sovereign power, should see to it that they are rewarded for their great service.

In that connection, Mr. President, I would pay a tribute to the railroads, their management, operators, and workers, for the very remarkable service they have rendered this country during the war. I denounced those who undertook to strike, and I went beyond the parliamentary limitations and said that the movement to strike was a "damned outrage." I still think so. I have no apologies for that. They should not have threatened to strike.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Carolina will yield, I do not think a strike should be permitted any group of men employed by an institution which is wholly devoted to the public service, such as the railroads and telephone lines, the electric utilities, and wherever the public interest is paramount, as it is in the use of those instrumentalities.

Mr. BAILEY. I believe the Senator will go further and say that those who strike have no right whatever to prevent men willing to work from working.

Mr. REED. I agree with that. The Senator from North Carolina has raised a point, and if he will permit me, I wish to say that it was estimated, as it developed yesterday in the discussion between the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Montana, that there were 131,000,000 acres of land, valued by Mr. Eastman's coordinating staff at about 97 cents an acre. The railroads sold it for more than that—there can be no doubt about that—but the Government which retained ownership of half the land, also sold its land at an increased price, due to the fact that transportation was furnished by the building of the railroads. From the beginning of land-grant deductions down to June 30, 1942, there had been a total of $340,783,000 in benefits received by the Government because of the reduced rates.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator means benefits as compared with what the civilian was paying.

Mr. REED. The Senator is correct; that was the difference between the rates the Government paid and what the private shipper was paying. As against that, the value of the lands given the railroads was put at $125,000,000.

Mr. BAILEY. That would all depend on when it was sold and how it was valued. I agree that in those days the land in the western portion of this country was practically worthless.

Mr. REED. Let me pursue that for a moment, with the permission of the Senator from North Carolina. For the last 2 years, during the period of heavy shipments of munitions and very heavy movement of troops, the deductions made because of Government shipping as against private shipping have run as high as $20,000,000 a month, so that from June 30, 1942, down to June 30, 1945, we will say, a period of 3 years, I would think, without being able to state it precisely, that not less than $500,000,000 benefits have accrued to the Government, and possibly exceeding that.

Mr. BAILEY. That may all be conceded; it is a matter of statistics; but I would not base an argument here on the ground that the war period developed a great volume of business. What I should like to know—and I have not heard anyone give the information—is what it would cost the Government in normal times, which we hope are just ahead of us. My judgment is that there is not a great deal involved. The railroads will not be hauling naval and military materials.

Mr. REED. I gave that figure at some time; perhaps the Senator was not listening. I said that in my opinion, based upon the best information I could obtain—and all we can get is an approximation—it would be somewhere between three and seven million dollars a year.

Mr. BAILEY. I apologize to the Senator. I was in the Chamber and intended to listen to him, but I became engaged with another distinguished Senator in a private conversation on the subject of things happening all around the world. I am glad to have the information. He says now it would be about how much?

Mr. REED. Somewhere between $3,000,000 and $7,000,000 a year, if the law we are discussing shall be repealed.

Mr. BAILEY. That is no great amount of money.

Mr. REED. It is not sufficient to permit to continue the discrimination which exists. I again say, as I stated in the beginning, that the reason why I have been vigorously urging this repeal is that it would be in the interest of removing discrimination between shippers. Every shipper of this country, so far as I know, wants this discrimination removed. A manufacturer, a distributor, who happens to be located where he can use a land-grant railroad, has a definite advantage over his competitor if the competitor is located on a non-land-grant railroad. In the days when the Government came into business as heavily as it did during the depression and again throughout the war, it was made almost impossible to maintain competitive businesses, because of the uncertainty of the land-grant deductions.

Mr. BAILEY. That was only, however, on account of the shipment of military matériel and the movement of troops.

Mr. REED. In connection with building camps and bases and erecting factories and munition plants, I would think, without being able to apply more than a very general judgment, that the Government was not only the largest shipper in the country but almost as large as all the other shippers put together.

Mr. BAILEY. I am asking the Senator for information. I was informed this morning, by an authority which I shall not quote, that all the railroads had come down to the land-grant level by reason of the competitive situation. If that be the case, why should there be any confusion among the shippers?

Mr. REED. I hope the Senator from North Carolina recalls what I suggested yesterday. Let me use the western transcontinental railroads as an illustration. It is not competition alone that has forced the rates down. The non-land-grant railroads have equalized—that is the expression—against the land-grant rates. But it goes further than that. There are seven transcontinental railroads. The Great Northern is the northernmost; the Northern Pacific is the next; the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul is the next; then we come to the Union Pacific; then to that route which is made up of the Missouri Pacific, the Denver & Rio Grande, and the Western Pacific; then we come to the Santa Fe and the Southern Pacific.

Mr. BAILEY. They are the land-grant roads.

Mr. REED. Three of them. The Southern Pacific, the Santa Fe, and the Northern Pacific are land-grant roads. The Great Northern, the Milwaukee, the Denver & Rio Grande, the Western Pacific, and the Union Pacific are not land-grant roads.

It would have been impossible—physically impossible, I mean—during the war period, for the three land-grant roads to handle all the traffic. It taxed the capacity and the facilities of all seven transcontinental lines. We needed our whole railroad plant. There was no possibility of diverting the traffic to the most direct route or to the land-grant route. To move the traffic as expeditiously as it was moving—and I agree with the Senator from North Carolina that the railroads did a magnificent job—it was necessary to use the whole railroad plant. What happened was that the traffic was moved at land-grant rates, and the non-land-grant roads equalized their rates down to meet land-grant rates, even though the national necessity compelled the routing of traffic over their roads.

Mr. BAILEY. Had the railroads not done that prior to the war also?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. It has been the rule?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. And that rule has derived, not from obligation on account of land grants, but from the necessities arising from competition.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. Yet we are arguing here as if the whole thing was derived from the land grants.

Mr. REED. It has its roots in the land grants.

Mr. BAILEY. The act does not refer to that. I should rather discuss the question and consider the question for myself of whether the $3,000,000 or $5,000,000 a year involved—I think that was the amount mentioned by the Senator from Kansas——

Mr. REED. From $3,000,000 to $7,000,000. I take $7,000,000 as a maximum.

Mr. BAILEY. Whether that ought to be increased by 100 percent.

Mr. REED. Even if it were a maximum of $7,000,000 a year, that would only be a fraction of 1 percent of the total revenues of the railroads. I have not calculated it.

Mr. BAILEY. It is a relatively small matter if we get out of the war picture.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. If we get back into the war picture, in the view that if the Government is in distress it can get the money back by taxation, I would be willing to consider that as a reasonable thing. But what is troubling me is the argument that this thing has been derived from the land grants, when so many railroads did not have that benefit. The Senator mentioned the land-grant roads. I do not think the Senator from Kansas mentioned any railroads which operated in Alabama or Florida or Mississippi.

Mr. REED. I was speaking of the transcontinental railroads which were so important.

Mr. BAILEY. The land grants in the States I have mentioned were very small. It would be impossible to convince me that there were land grants in any of the original 13 States. The States owned their own property. The Federal Government did not own a foot of it. We were not territories.

Mr. REED. The Senator is correct. The railroads were on State grants, though, in the original 13 States.

Mr. BAILEY. How could the United States make grants in North Carolina? It did not own any property there. It owns some now, but it did not own any then. Am I not correct in that statement? Will not the Senator agree with me about that?

Mr. President, while the Senator is looking through his papers I believe I will make a remark. There is an effort on foot now to claim for the Federal Government certain lands in the sea off the coast of North Carolina. I will concede that if we go far enough we get into territory to which North Carolina may not have rights, to which it would certainly not have superior rights. But North Carolina was here before the Union was, and it may be here after the Union is gone. There may be a republic in North Carolina when we have something else here in Washington. But, at any rate, North Carolina was there before the Union. And North Carolina owns all the tidewaters in the State, and North Carolina owns, and has title to, the ocean waters to a certain point or a certain line, usually called the 3-mile limit. I am not sure that that is the right way to draw the line, especially since the 3-mile limit does not mean as much as it once did. I go back to the prohibition law respecting that. We tried to enforce the prohibition law on the basis of the 3-mile limit and found that it could not be done, and we said that we could arrest a bootlegging ship any place within 1 hours' travel. We measured it by travel instead of by miles. Probably Congress passed an act dealing with that subject. I am not sure about that.

My point is that the title to the land in the original 13 States was in the States, and is in the States now, and will be in the States so long as they are States. That is a fundamental fact. We say we have our tenure in North Carolina. Under whom do I hold my land? Under whom does any farmer hold his land? He holds it under the State, and he pays taxes on that basis, and he does jury service. Our Supreme Court says that we hold in North Carolina in free and common socage. That is the old English tenure of dignity. They can require certain things of us but certain things they cannot require. So we do not hold a foot of land in North Carolina in any sort of tenure from the United States. I think that is important to be remembered.

THE PALESTINE PROBLEM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire fully to associate myself with everything that has been said on the floor of the Senate with reference to the Palestine question, which, as Senators will recall, was discussed at great length on yesterday. There is in my judgment immediate need, Mr. President, for the British Government to correct a grievous wrong, and there is need for this Government to perform its duty in living up to the pledges which it has made in the past.

Mr. President, in law the Jewish case is unanswerable; in equity, it is even stronger. The Jews have suffered from our common enemy more than any other people, and we owe them a chance to live their national life in a free land of their own. But I desire to emphasize another consideration, Mr. President, namely, the direct American interest involved in this matter. When dealing with foreign

policy, we are naturally anxious to further any program which in the long run will serve the interest of our country.

America has a twofold interest in enabling the Jews to establish a Jewish state in Palestine. One interest springs from our profound anxiety that the traditional atmosphere of conflict in Europe, which has proven so dangerous to internal stability and world peace, shall be assuaged. We may not all realize how profound a part anti-Semitism has played in the development of the aggressive and nationalistic movements throughout Europe which have first fed upon the Jew as their immediate victim. These unfortunate movements carried their numerous followers into internecine hatred and finally into international aggression. This process continues, despite the fall of Hitler. Again anti-Semitism is being used through Europe to organize the dark forces of hatred which may easily upset our hope of organizing a peaceful Europe; and again, as before, the entire world, our country included, may find itself involved in the vortex of those forces.

There is a second interest involved; the interest of America in the Middle East. There is much nonsense spoken about the danger of large-scale violence or war which the Arabs could unleash against the Jews or against the United Nations. To anyone who has given careful study to the military realities of the situation such talk appears to be ridiculous.

The truth is that the Arab peoples are engaged now in the difficult task of beginning their national life in conditions of backwardness almost unrivaled in the modern world. Our best wishes go out to those peoples for the success of their endeavors; and not only do our wishes go out to them, Mr. President, but we are ready to help them to advance from their present state of abject poverty, of almost universal illiteracy, of the absence of any modern provisions for public welfare, to a degree of progress compatible with modern civilization. The Arab peoples know that no country is more anxious to give such assistance and is less interested in obtaining obvious or hidden advantages from them than are we. There have been expansionists among all peoples in the past, and there may be some expansionist tendencies among extreme nationalists. In this, I am not interested. I hope the rulers of the Arab countries will give less thought to future expansion or Pan-Arab movements and more thought to the social and economic advancement of their own peoples. If they do this, they will find the Government and the people of the United States true friends.

In our endeavors to raise the living standards of the Middle East, no single step would be so helpful as the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish state. The Jews have already done wonders in modernizing those portions of Palestine which they were grudgingly permitted to settle. Mr. President, I saw the development there. It is the outstanding example of its kind in that part of the world. They are constantly reaching out and reclaiming desert land, cultivating, and developing it in the most modern style. Their example has already stimulated the Arabs of Palestine, who, as regards living conditions, economic standards, public health, and literacy, are already far advanced in comparison with Arabs of other countries. Both peoples have increased their population and improved their living standards in this particular corner of the Mediterranean, due primarily, if not altogether, to the development in Palestine by the Jews.

Palestine is already, socially and economically, the most modern corner of the Middle East. It is per capita the largest consumer of American goods in that quarter of the world. With the further growth of the Jewish settlement in Palestine, we may be certain that this process of economic development will continue.

Mr. President, there is a whole world of dessert land over there, a great deal of which could be reclaimed and put under cultivation if the leadership and the desire to do so were present. Palestine, and, stimulated by its example, the entire Middle East, would become to a still larger extent an important cog in the complicated machinery of world trade. The consuming standards of the population of those countries would rise if that result should ensue and America would be one of the main centers from which they would be likely to look for goods in ever-increasing measure. America would be aided by this development.

Furthermore, a predominantly Jewish Palestine would assure this country of a friend in that section of the world. It is true that we have friends there now, but the Jewish people are bound to our country by the links of gratitude for the help which the Jews of Palestine have received from the Jewish community in the United States. They are linked to this country by the innumerable personal and family bonds existing between the Jewish population in Palestine and the millions of our Jewish citizens. A Jewish Palestine would provide us in that important part of the world a strategic corner of the first order, as well as a true friend on whom we could rely at all times.

Our Government has a particular obligation to act in the present case. A great deal of lend-lease material and assistance in other forms has been provided very recently by our Government to the governments of the various Middle East countries. It is not quite clear to what extent the lend-lease material was used in that case to combat our common enemy, which was, after all, the main purpose of our lend-lease operations. But certainly it would be very odd, to say the least, if we found those same governments threatening to use the lend-lease material which they obtained from us in order to make war or engage in violence against the Jews. I doubt very much whether they would do it. The amount of help which we have given to the Middle East countries, and the further help which those countries must receive from us, should very naturally contribute to peace in that region and not to lawlessness. By setting up a national homeland in Palestine for the Jews and by giving their neighbors in the countries of the Middle East an opportunity to enjoy a higher standard of living, I believe that the peace for which we are all looking will be reinforced.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, after line 20.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, unless one were a daily reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he would not have known anything about the facts in connection with the bill under consideration, because from the beginning the press and radio of the country have been almost absolutely silent in the treatment of publicity with respect to the proposed legislation. In other words, the people of the country do not know the facts and the meaning of the proposed legislation. Even Members of the Senate and Members of the House, unless they are members of the committees which dealt with the proposals know very little about it.

I asked one of the outstanding Members of the House, after the bill had passed, "What do you mean by letting a bill of this character get by the House without your opposition?" He said, "I never heard of it. I know nothing about it."

In order that the people of the country may know what is behind the bill, what is in the bill, and what it is all about, it is necessary that the history of the whole subject be reviewed on the floor of the Senate. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has a daily issue of about 46,000 copies; and possibly, by going into detail through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and persuading the Press to give widest publicity to it, we can get the facts before the public.

There has been a very large lobby in Washington in connection with this proposal. Of course, the public knew nothing about the lobby. There was no way to tell anything about it, because a lobbyist who is worth his salt does not announce his goings and comings, but quietly does his work.

I remember that last December, when the bill was reached on the call of the calendar and an effort was made to pass it, I interposed objection and announced that I was willing to filibuster for 30 days rather than see it passed. That evening after I reached my office a railroad lawyer, representing one of the largest railroad systems in the country, came to my office about 6 o'clock in the evening and said he wanted to talk with me confidentially. I said, "Very well." He said, "I understand that you have threatened to filibuster against the bill for 30 days rather than see it pass." I said "Yes; I made that statement." He said "I want to know if you meant it." I said "Yes; I meant it." He said, "You would not reconsider?" I said "No." He said "If you are going to take that position, I am going home tomorrow. I have been here for several months trying to have this legislation passed, but if you are going to

filibuster until the close of the Seventy-eighth Congress, it is not necessary for me to stay any longer."

I said, "Very well. I am afraid the people of the country and many Members of Congress have not appreciated the magnitude of this piece of legislation; they have not stopped to analyze it and see what it involves."

Of course, Mr. President, I do not expect the Senate to listen to my extended remarks, which will last many hours, but I hope the Members of the Senate will read at least my introductory remarks in the RECORD, because I propose and desire to show, first, how big this question is.

There are, in the 48 States of the Union 1,934,051,921 acres of land, including water acreage. The railroad promoters between 1850 and 1871 obtained tremendously large grants of land. Let me say that in many cases the men who then came to Congress and to the State legislatures and secured the large donations of land were not the builders of the railroads. They were the smooth, manipulating operators who secured the grants and then passed them on, for their share in the deal, to someone who would build the railroads. They were merely slick operators, if you please. They were able to persuade the Congress of the United States and some of the States of the Union to grant, donate, give, and patent for them, for the purpose of building railroads, a total amount of 179,284,978 acres of Government land—enough land to make 14 States of the American Union. The grant was just that large. As proof of that fact I shall read the names of 14 States of the Union which could have been created within the area of gifts of land made by the Government to the railroads which are involved in the pending bill. Sufficient land was donated to the railroad promoters in this country in the 20-year period between 1850 and 1870 to make up the States of Rhode Island, Delaware, Connecticut, New Jersey, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maryland, West Virginia, South Carolina, Maine, Kentucky, Virginia, and New York. The transfer was just that big. Congress and the State legislatures gave to the railroad promoters, I repeat, all that Government land. Whose land was it, Mr. President? It was the people's land, the taxpayers' land. The railroads thus received land equal in extent to the area of 14 States of the American Union, as composed today. To be exact, the 14 States I have mentioned have a total acreage of 174,770,000 acres, and the railroads received 4,507,978 additional acres. In other words, the railroads received an amount of land equivalent to the area of 14 of our States and several million acres in addition. That gives some idea of how large the grant was.

What was the consideration? For what reason did the railroads plead with the Congress and the State legislatures to grant them all that public land, land which belonged to the Government and the States, land which had been or would have been used for homesteaders as the Nation grew in population? Of course, the excuse was that the land was given to the promoters to project and construct railroads in undeveloped sections of our great Republic. Very well; I am not denying the fact that the building of the railroads did add and contribute to the development of our Republic in the palmy days of the seventies and eighties; that is true; but there was so much land involved and the lands were so valuable that, as a face-saving proposition, there had to be some other consideration. What was the other consideration? A solemn contract was entered into between the United States Government and the railroad promoters to the effect that when the railroads had been built, because of this gracious and valuable gift or grant the Government of the United States could use their rights-of-way and could use their roads and the railroads would haul the freight of the Government free of charge—in consideration for the grant of sufficient land to make 14 States of the Union.

Previous to that period there had been a policy of granting rights-of-way to build toll roads and canals, in which case the Government was given the right to use the roads or the canals free of charge. That was the consideration in that case. In those days the grants were largely for rights-of-way for the highways, the toll roads, and the canals. But in the case of the grants to the railroads, every other section of land on each side of the proposed railroad right-of-way was given to the railroads, and in some cases many additional sections of land were given to them. It soon developed that the railroads expected the Government to have its own engines and its own rolling stock—freight cars, gondolas, passenger cars—and railroad crews to operate on the railroads. Of course, that was not feasible or practical or economical. Then arose the question whether, as the railroads contended, the Government should bear a certain part of the expense if the railroads were going to haul material for it. The question was whether the Government should pay some of the expense for the crews, the coal, and the operation of the trains. Finally the matter was carried to the courts of our country, and the courts sent it to the Court of Claims. It was finally decided, and there was general agreement that thereafter the railroads should give the Government of the United States a 50-percent rebate or deduction from the standard passenger fares and standard freight traffic rates. For many years that rule obtained. But in those days the Government itself had very little hauling to do, and the returns to the Government on the basis of the 50-percent rebate of the standard rates fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission or by the railroads themselves did not amount to very much. No one knows definitely, because that figure has not been investigated. It is generally conceded, and I believe we are all agreed, that up until 1930 it amounted to more than $1,000,000 a year. In other words, the Government received more than $1,000,000 a year as a part of its compensation for its grant of more than 130,000,000 acres of land. However, when the panic started, the Government went into the relief business and paid for the hauling of a great quantity of supplies for the unfortunate people of this country. During the years 1930 to 1940 the figure increased from $1,000,000 to $7,000,000 a year, and the Government commenced to receive some return for the grant of the 130,000,000 acres of land to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I am not an enemy of the railroads. I am willing to give credit where credit is due. I am not an anti-railroad man. It has never been my pleasure to enjoy the political support of the railroad owners in my section of the country. However, I can say that I have always enjoyed the support of the men who worked on the railroads and composed the brotherhoods, as well as all other railroad employees. So long as I could have their support I did not care much about the upper tens who owned the railroads. My support from the laboring people was brought about by the fact that I had always been a friend of the laboring man. As Governor of my State for 8 years, I had an opportunity on repeated occasions to prove that I was the railroad man's friend. For that reason, the higher-ups and the owners of the railroads may be opposed to me, but the great rank and file of the railroad brotherhoods and other railroad employees are and have always been my friends. I do not dislike the railroads. I think they have rendered a great service to the country. However, I may say that the railroads have made a record which is known from the beginning to the end as placing them among the greatest welshers and the greatest beggars. Every time they get sick or panicky, or have a little trouble of one kind or another, they come and camp on the steps of the American Capitol and ask for relief. They cry: "Relief! Relief! Give us help. We are in trouble." They try to dodge their responsibilities just as they tried to dodge them at the beginning of their operations under the Land Grant Act. They went to the courts. I do not mean that the railroads should not go to the courts. The courts were established for the purpose of settling differences of opinion. The Court of Claims settled the controversy on the basis of 50 percent of the rebate.

So, Mr. President, from 1930 to 1940 the Government received in the form of rebates approximately $7,000,000 a year. In 1939 the railroads came again and knocked on the doors of the American Congress and said in effect, "We are in trouble. We are having pains. Our business is shaking and we need help. We want you to pass an amendment to the Transportation Act."

Mr. President, do you know why the railroads get sick? As long as they had to pay back to the Government in the form of rebates on the land grants only $1,000,000 a year, they got along very well. From the standpoint of the railroad owners, $1,000,000 did not mean very much. However, when they saw the $1,000,000 jump to $7,000,000 they became interested. So in 1940 they came to the Congress and asked it to amend the law and relieve them from a part of their obligations with respect to the great acreage of land which had been granted to them.

Mr. President, in order that we may understand what happened in 1940, I wish to read the law which the Congress enacted. I was a party to the passage of this law. I did not object to it, because the railroads convinced me that they were in trouble, that they needed help, and I was willing to go along. But I wish to read the law to show what we actually did for the railroads 5 years ago. And here they are knocking on our door again. They are never satisfied so long as there is any money in sight. I read from the law:

PART II—RATES ON GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC

GOVERNMENT TO PAY FULL RATES

SEC. 321. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, but subject to the provisions of sections 1 (7) and 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, the full applicable commercial rates, fares, or charges shall be paid for transportation by any common carrier subject to such act of any persons or property for the United States, or on its behalf, except that the foregoing provision shall not apply to the transportation of military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use or to the transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States (or of property of such members) when such members are traveling on official duty.

The pending bill proposes to eliminate that exception from the 1940 act. In other words, the 1940 act said, "Railroads, go on. We will make you a concession. We will let you have full fare on everything you haul for civilian purposes for the Government; on all supplies you want to haul in connection with the relief program, on all the concrete, cement, sand, lumber, and so forth, you haul for Government activities we will let you charge the full fare in violation of the contract you made for this 130,000,000 acres of land. But we are going to make a little exception when it comes to hauling military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use or for the transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States or of property of such members when such members are traveling on official duty. We are going to hold you to your contract, and when you are hauling stuff for military or naval purposes you are to pay the 50-percent rebate. That is what you will have to do from now on." That applies only to land-grant railroads, the roads which got all this land, sufficient to make 14 States of the American Union.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the original agreement provided that they should get nothing for doing it.

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. The Supreme Court came along and said they were to get 50 percent.

Mr. BILBO. I praise the railroads for the great work they have done. They have performed valuable service. They have had to do it in developing civilization. But the railroads in their operations are the greatest "welchers" I have ever known.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield fulther?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The testimony of Mr. Eastman is that the land is worth only 97 cents an acre. Is it not true that after some of the railroads got this land they organized corporations, taking in a few of the directors and insiders, and sold the land for almost nothing to fellows on the inside, who resold it for large sums after homesteaders had come and improved the land?

I have in mind especially a railroad company in the Northwest. After they got this land from the Government they organized a company. Some of the officials of the railroad were also officers of this new company. They sold the land for large sums, and, of course, the money would not be reflected in the assets of the railroad company. So when Mr. Eastman said the land was worth 97 cents an acre, I call attention to the fact, if the Senator will permit me, that some of the very land they got originally for 97 cents was sold to farmers who came out there for many, many times the 97 cents an acre.

Mr. BILBO. Exactly; and that is not half the devilment they did. When they projected their lines they spotted the towns and cities to be located on the railroads, and they always established the depots—some people call it "daypo"—on their land, the land they had gotten from Uncle Sam. Then they organized their real-estate agents on the outside, erected restaurants and hotels and elevators, and went into the real-estate business on a large scale. In that way they made hundreds of millions out of that land.

I believe they said these lands cost Uncle Sam 6.1 cents an acre. Then it was said they cost 26 cents an acre. Now some of them say 97 cents an acre. But they have made their millions and their hundreds of millions in the disposition of these lands. They have utilized the timber on the timberlands of the West, and they are still doing that. They found coal mines on the lands which Uncle Sam gave them, and they have discovered oil fields on these lands. They have made their hundreds of millions of dollars.

Next the railroads, and their management, paid half a dozen men perhaps fifty or seventy-five or one hundred or one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, and if they wanted to spend their money in riotous living and get into trouble and come to Congress, very well. They came in 1940, Congress listened to their appeal, and passed the act of 1940. We made the concession which has been discussed, and it was a big concession, because the civilian hauling from 1930 to 1940 amounted to more than $7,000,000 a year, and we made them a present of it in the bill we passed in 1940.

When the war came on, and Uncle Sam had to raise an Army of 12,000,000 men, with all our machines, our war machinery, and ammunition, tanks, air planes, and other things which had to be hauled on the railroads, the railroads saw this $7,000,000 jump day by day until it went as high as twenty-four, twenty-five, and perhaps thirty million dollars a month. When they saw the rebate which they had to pay to the Government rapidly increasing, they went wild. I shall take up some of the things they have been doing in an effort to recapture that twenty-five or thirty million dollars a month, a quarter of a billion dollars a year.

I stated the other day on the floor of the Senate that this piece of legislation involved as much as a billion dollars. My good friend the Senator from Montana—I am sorry he is not in the Chamber at the moment—said that statement was preposterous. In his effort to try to prove that the railroads had already paid enough for the land, he admitted that they had already paid the Government a billion dollars in money in the form of this rebate. Right now, while I am speaking on this floor, Uncle Sam, for the relief of the taxpayers, is receiving from this source probably between seven and eight hundred thousand dollars every day.

If Senators care anything about their poor tax-ridden constituents, if they want to do something for them, they can chip in on their tax bill by speaking a day on the pending bill, and relieve them to the extent of $800,000. I am afraid that if some do not do it the railroad organizations and chambers of commerce will not be able to send them back to the Senate.

The Senator from Montana, aided and abetted by the Senator from Maine, aided and abetted by the Senator from Kansas, had much to say about the number of organizations that were for the bill. I am not surprised. Certainly they are for it. If we take the testimony before the committee of the House during two sessions and the testimony before the Senate committee, we do not find any taxpayers protesting, we do not find anyone at the hearings except railroad officials and members of chambers of commerce, and organizations under the domination of the railroad influence. Everyone who has sense enough to get in out of the rain knows that to be so. The multiplied millions of taxpayers are going to have to pay the tax bills of this war, which will amount to more than $300,000,000,000 before it is over with. They were not invited to come before the committee, and they were not there, and no one was there to speak for them; but today Senators have an opportunity to chip in $800,000 a day for the taxpayers of this country if they will just get on the floor and stay with me. I thought I would chip in a few millions before I quit.

I want to finish reading this law which we passed when the railroads knocked on our door in 1940. I read as follows:

Provided further, That section 3709, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 41, sec. 5), shall not hereafter be construed as requiring advertising for bids in connection with the procurement of transportation services when the services required can be procured from any common carrier lawfully operating in the territory where such services are to be performed.

In other words the railroads were looking after their business. They were doing away with any competing rates on

any transportation service to be rendered.

Now I come to subsection (b), to which no one has paid any attention:

(b) If any carrier by railroad furnishing such transportation, or any predecessor in interest, shall have received a grant of lands from the United States to aid in the construction of any part of the railroad operated by it, the provisions of law with respect to compensation for such transportation shall continue to apply to such transportation as though subsection (a) of this section had not been enacted until such carrier shall file with the Secretary of the Interior, in the form and manner prescribed by him, a release of any claim it may have against the United States to lands, interests in lands, compensation, or reimbursement on account of lands or interests in lands which have been granted, claimed to have been granted, or which it is claimed should have been granted to such carrier or any such predecessor in interest under any grant to such carrier or such predecessor in interest as aforesaid.

That simply means that Mr. Ickes showed up on the scene and was trying to stop all these claims, and that the railroads were trying to get more and more of these lands. I continue to read:

Such release must be filed within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act. Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring any such carrier to reconvey to the United States lands which have been heretofore patented or certified to it, or to prevent the issuance of patents confirming the title to such lands as the Secretary of the Interior shall find have been heretofore sold by any such carrier to an innocent purchaser for value or as preventing the issuance of patents to lands listed or selected by such carrier, which listing or selection has heretofore been fully and finally approved by the Secretary of the Interior to the extent that the issuance of such patents may be authorized by law.

I think that is a wise provision of the law. The railroads were building cities and selling the lands at a handsome profit, and of course the innocent purchasers of the lands on which the railroads held out to them that they had the patent should be protected; they should not be sacrificed. There have been some very wonderful cities built on the land-grant railroads. I understand the Twin Cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis were built on lands granted to the railroads. I wonder if they did not get a little more than 97 cents an acre for the land when laying out and constructing these cities.

There is one other section of the Transportation Act of 1940 to which I wish to call the Senate's attention. It is section 322, which read as follows:

SEC. 322. Payment for transportation of the United States mail and of persons or property for or on behalf of the United States by any common carrier subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, or the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, shall be made upon presentation of bills therefor, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, but the right is hereby reserved to the United States Government to deduct the amount of any overpayment to any such carrier from any amount subsequently found to be due such carrier.

In the old days the way these accounts were handled, as I understand and am informed, was for the Government to make payment to the railroads when they presented their bills and they had been audited. After that the railroads received their money. But the railroads were so anxious to get the money that finally there was enacted section 322, which provided that all a railroad had to do was to make out the bill of lading and the expense account and present it to the auditing officer and to the treasurer, and the money would be paid in whatever amount the railroad charged, and the auditing would be attended to after awhile. That was a fine way of doing business. Mark you, Mr. President—and I hope everyone in this country knows this fact—that as the result of the act which Congress passed in 1940 requiring Uncle Sam to pay whatever bill the railroad made out for the hauling of any piece of freight, or the hauling of a carload of freight, before the bill was audited, there is now in the General Accounting Office accounts amounting to between $400,000,000 and $500,000,000, representing money which belongs to the taxpayers of this country, on which the railroads are riding easy, since they have obtained the money. I understand Mr. Lindsay Warren is having a difficult time securing adequate auditors. He is about 3 years behind in his work.

Mr. President, I am going to make a charge here and now, and Senators can run it down if they so desire. I understand an order has been issued in the General Accounting Office that in the auditing of these bills of lading upon which the railroads have gotten the money, and on which they have been paid the overcharges, the auditors are not to monkey with any account where it is evident that the overcharge is under $50. That means about $200,000,000 more given to the railroads because the Office does not audit their accounts. That is a pretty serious charge. It ought to be looked into. Whether it is true or not I cannot say, but in view of the source from which I obtained it I believe it to be true. The charge was not made in writing, but it was charged that such a thing was being done. The original order was not to audit any of the bills of lading involving an overcharge of $5 or less. Now that has been raised to $50 or less. If a railroad presents a voucher containing 20 bills, and if the voucher amounts in all to $2,000 for payment of 20 freight bills, that is, if there are 20 bills of lading covered by one voucher and it is all to come under one payment, if there should be an overcharge of $50 in each bill of lading Senators can see that it would amount to 20 times $50 or $1,000.

That, Mr. President, is a serious charge. I have received that information from two sources. But I repeat that between $400,000,000 and $500,000,000 of the taxpayers' money is in the auditor's office because these accounts have not been audited for the last 3 years. It is not drawing any interest. It is there because of the congestion of work in the auditor's office.

Mr. President, I have given the Senate a picture of what we did in 1940, 5 years ago, to help the railroads when they said they were in trouble, and they came asking for relief from us, we gave them relief to the extent of $7,000,000 a year; and then, as we began to prepare for the World War the amount began to climb from $7,000,000 to $12,000,000, $15,000,000, $18,000,000, $20,000,000, $24,000,000, $25,000,000, $30,000,000, until they simply could not stand it. They came back in 1942 and selected a distinguished gentleman of the House by the name of LYLE H. BOREN, a Representative from Oklahoma, a State which does not have a foot of land-grant railroads in it. He introduced a bill and a hearing was held on it. The bill was H. R. 6156, which was considered on April 29, 1942. A motion was made to recommit the bill and the House did recommit it, and very properly so.

The revenue continued to grow, and the mouths of the railroad owners continued to water. The railroads were anxious to get hold of that money, notwithstanding the fact that since 1940 they have been making more money than ever before in the history of this Nation. Yet they come clamoring for this $24,000,000 a month which is helping to relieve the tax-burdened people of the Republic—a quarter of a billion dollars a year.

House bill 4184 was introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress. A hearing was had on it, and it was reported from the House committee and went to the floor of the House. It passed the House without a roll call. I checked the RECORD, and the roll of the House was not called that whole day. On May 23, 1944, there was no record made of who was present in the House. The bill was passed on a viva voce vote. It came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and was reported by that committee.

When I came back from an operation at the Mayo Institute I found that bill on the calendar waiting to be passed. I had made some study of the question and knew something about it. I prepared to speak for 30 days, until the close of the Seventy-eighth Congress, rather than see it become a law. As Senators may remember, I announced my intention to do so, and the bill was never called up again, so it did not pass.

Since that good day the law has not been disturbed, and since that good day we have been saving for the taxpayers an average of $24,000,000 or $25,000,000 a month. I know that I have been instrumental in saving between $250,000,000 and $300,000,000. That is why I said we could build a new Capitol with the $250,000,000 and let the railroads pay for it.

That idea is not new with me. In Mississippi we had a dilapidated old capitol building, such as we have here in Washington. We proceeded to build a new capitol. It is a beautiful building, handsomely furnished in marble. It did not cost the taxpayers of Mississippi one red cent, because we found that the Illinois Central Railroad had been dodging taxes. We filed a suit for back taxes, and made them pay every cent of them. We now have an opportunity to make the railroads of the country pay for a new Capitol Building becoming to the dignity of the greatest, most powerful, and most influential nation in all the world.

That money has been saved. The point I make is that we can save some more. It is good money. It is honest money. It is money paid on an honest contract, solemnly entered into between the Congress of the United States and the slick manipulating railroad promoters who came here between 1850 and 1860. Why not do it?

That bill died on the calendar at the close of the Seventy-eighth Congress. During the first days of the Seventy-ninth Congress the same Representative from Oklahoma introduced an identical bill, and on May 4 it passed the House, again without a roll call. There is no way to tell how any Member of the House voted on that bill. I do not blame Members of the House. I think I would try to cover up such a record. There was a demand from three or four Members of the House to have a roll call on the passage of the bill, but the House said, "No; we do not want a roll call. We do not want any record made."

Very little has been said concerning the bill. It has hardly been discussed. The newspapers of Washington and of the Nation have said nothing about it. As I told the Senate the other day, we enacted a dog tax law in the District of Columbia, and the newspapers of Washington devoted several columns to it. That was a bill providing a $3 dog tax to stop rabies in the District of Columbia. But we now have before us a bill involving a billion dollars, and affecting the welfare of the taxpayers of the country, and there is nary a line about it in the newspapers. The only way I could get any mention of it was to talk about building a $250,000,000 new Capitol Building.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Since the Senator is insisting upon a new Capitol Building, I wish to give him a further theme for his speech, which from what I have heard, I understand will be quite prolonged. If we are to build a new Capitol Building, what does the Senator say about building it in the central portion of the country?

Mr. BILBO. I do not know whether the Senator is deliberately trying to put me "on the spot" or not. I will make this proposal to him: If he will select the site, I will obtain the money to build a new Capitol Building, and we will move the Capital. There has been a great demand on the part of many persons to move the Capital of the United States. Of course, it is somewhere near the center of the Thirteen Colonies, the original Republic; but as we have grown and expanded there has been a demand that the Capital be located somewhere near the geographic center or the center of population of the Nation. As I understand, the center of population and the geographic center are both in the same general territory—somewhere in Kansas or Iowa, or on the Mississippi River.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to recommend Indianapolis, which happens to be the center of population of the United States.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator mean that Indianapolis has been the center of population, or is now the center of population?

Mr. CAPEHART. Indianapolis is within 40 miles of the center of population of the United States.

Mr. BILBO. The present center of population?

Mr. CAPEHART. The present center of population is near the town of Linton.

Mr. BILBO. I see no objection to locating the Capital in Indianapolis. However, the same objection applies to Indianapolis that applies to Washington. Washington is too near New York, and Indianapolis is too near Chicago.

From the military standpoint, it would be a wise thing to move the Capital to the geographical center of the United States and get it away from the seacoast and the hazard of attack from the ocean. The progressive, industrious, hustling new ruler of Turkey, when he took control of affairs in Turkey, did not hesitate a minute to move the capital from Constantinople to the center of the landed area of his country, to make it safe. I understand that it is rather difficult to approach the new capital of Turkey. Perhaps that would be a good idea for us to follow.

However, this is all speculation, because in these days of the atomic bomb, instead of going backward, east, west, north, or south, we had better go down, to get away from the atomic bomb. It is now a question of underground protection, rather than interior location. But we are all praying that the atomic-bomb secret will remain the possession of the American people, and that we will use it for peace, happiness, and progress, and not for human destruction.

Mr. President, House bill 694 passed the House without a roll-call vote. No record was made of how the Members of the House stood on the proposal, although I understand that in the Committee of the Whole, 40 Members held up their hands. I do not know who they were. The bill came to the Senate, and we all anticipated a full hearing before the Senate committee. In fact, the chairman of the committee assured me before he went to Europe that his plan was to have a full hearing before the full committee; but evidently his committee got out of control, and no hearing was held. I was very anxious to have a full hearing on the bill, because there are many facts which I should like to see developed, and which I think the Congress ought to know before finally passing judgment on this measure.

Mr. President, I should like to read the bill, and state just what we are proposing to do. The title of the bill is:

An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

I have just read into the RECORD the sections of the law referred to in the title of the bill. The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 321 of title III, part II, of the Transportation Act of 1940, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the following—

I called attention to the exception a while ago—

Except that the foregoing provision shall not apply to the transportation of military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use or to the transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States (or property of such members) when such members are traveling on official duty.

That is the part we would strike out—

so that said subsection, as so amended, shall read as follows—

When the bill is passed, if it is passed—

SEC. 321. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, but subject to the provisions of sections 1 (7) and 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, the full applicable commercial rates, fares, or charges shall be paid for transportation by any common carrier subject to such act of any persons or property for the United States, or on its behalf, and the rate determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission as reasonable therefor shall be paid for the transportation by railroad of the United States mail: *Provided, however,* That any carrier by railroad and the United States may enter into contracts for the transportation of the United States mail for less than such rate.

Right here I wish to make an observation about the "reasonable rates" to be "determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission." I take it that all Members of the Senate know that the Interstate Commerce Commission does not fix any rates. That is not its business. It never fixes a rate. I understand that today approximately 250,000 tariff schedules are on file with the Interstate Commerce Commission. The railroads fix the rates and file them with the Interstate Commerce Commission. Unless you or I or some other citizen objects to a rate or schedule which is set up and filed by a railroad with the Commission, that is the rate, and we pay it. The Interstate Commerce Commission does not pretend to fix rates unless it is directed by law so to do or unless complaint is made by some board, some chamber of commerce, some company, or some individual citizen. Otherwise the rate stands. Approximately 250,000 rate schedules are now filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I notice that one of my friends will submit to the bill an amendment which would be a fine piece of legislation and would give the Interstate Commerce Commission something to do. It provides that there shall be uniformity of rates throughout the United States on all classes of property and commodities hauled by the railroads. That would not be bad business.

The bill reads further, as follows:

Provided further, That section 3709, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 41, sec. 5), shall not hereafter be construed as requiring advertising for bids in connection with the procurement of transportation services when the services required can be procured from any common carrier lawfully operating in the territory where such services are to be performed.

I should like to have some of the sponsors of the bill tell me just what they are driving at in that proviso. What do they mean? What do they seek to accomplish by it? Do they wish to do away with competition? Do they seek

to give a monopoly to someone? I trust that someone will give me a full explanation of it before this discussion is ended.

Then the bill as passed by the House of Representatives contained the following provision:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The Senate committee struck out that provision and inserted the following:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect 90 days after the date of the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, whichever is the earlier: *Provided, however,* That any travel or transportation contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract.

Mr. President, from my standpoint, inasmuch as I am opposed to the proposed legislation, section 2 as passed by the House of Representatives is much better, I think, because it fixes a definite date when the bill shall go into effect. The other provision opens a way to a great deal of speculation and possibly litigation. The railroads would fight for 6 months or a year over a difference of 1 day, because it would mean $800,000 to them. This measure involves tremendous sums of money, not chicken feed. So the date should be fixed definitely. That is why I wish to continue this discussion until Christmas, because for every day that we continue it, we shall make for our taxpayers approximately $780,000 or $800,000. I do not know how we could better aid the taxpayers of the country. Goodness knows they need aid from someone. They have not yet been heard on this proposition. When we return home, I hope the constituents of some of my colleagues will not ask them why they did not make them $800,000 by speaking for 1 day. If a Member of the Senate cannot do that by speaking that long, his constituents might substitute someone else for him.

Section 3 of the bill as reported to the Senate reads as follows:

SEC. 3. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable rates, fares, and charges, shall give due consideration to the increased revenues which carriers will receive as a result of the enactment of this act, so that such increased revenues will be reflected in appropriate readjustments in rates, fares, and charges to shippers.

That is the biggest piece of baloney I have ever seen stuck into a bill. It is a well-known fact that when the railroads take up with the Interstate Commerce Commission matters in which they are interested, the Commission is their friend. Where is the taxpayer who thinks he is going to get anything as a result of the passage of the pending bill, if it is passed, when it provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall direct the additional revenues into the coffers of the railroads in the fixing of the rates, fares, and charges to the shippers.

Mr. President, I should like to relate an experience I had. Yesterday my friend the Senator from Montana laid great emphasis on the fact that the railroad brotherhoods throughout the country are behind this measure. I admit that a few of the higher officials of the railroad unions may have been led by their contacts and associations with the railroad owners and operators to say they were in favor of this proposed legislation, but I am telling you, Mr. President, that the rank and file of the railroad laboring people are not for this bill and they will not be for it when they find out what is in it.

Now I wish to tell a story. We had here in Washington a man who represented the railroad brotherhoods. He was a good friend of mine. He said to me, "I want you to do me a personal favor."

I said, "Very well; I shall be happy to do it."

He said, "I want you to vote for this railroad land-grant bill."

I said, "Oh, no; oh, no. You do not want me to do that."

He said, "Oh, yes; I do. That will help us."

I said, "Why, you crazy galoot, you have been led to believe that if the railroads could recapture $24,000,000 or $25,000,000 a month and put it in their coffers, you would get an increase in your wage-scale. But the law itself provides that you shall not get it."

Here it is, Mr. President; section 3 provides that the increased revenue which the carriers shall receive as the result of the enactment of this bill "will be reflected in appropriate readjustments in rates, fares, and charges to shippers."

So I said to my friend, "This bill which you are trying to have passed and which you want me to support provides definitely, specifically, eternally, and everlastingly that you railroad boys will not get one cent of the increased revenue."

He leaned over and said to me, "Say, Senator, you do as you darned please and we will be satisfied."

Mr. President, that is going to be the echo of all the laboring men who work for the railroads, when they find out that they are not going to get any of the gravy when we pass this sop, this Christmas present, for the railroads. Of course, some of the leaders may have been misled; we all understand that. But I am talking about the rank and file.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to have the Senator comment further with reference to section 3. According to what the Senator said, $24,000,000 a month will be poured into the coffers of the railroads.

Mr. BILBO. Yes; and that will be done at a time when the railroads do not need it.

Mr. OVERTON. Under section 3 there is a provision that the Interstate Commerce Commission will so readjust the rates that none of the money will be retained by the railroad companies. Apparently that is the construction to be placed on it, namely, that the rates will be lowered so as to cover the sum of $24,000,000 a month, or whatever may be. Does the Senator think the railroads believe that provision will be carried into effect as it is written.

Mr. BILBO. The railroads know it will not be carried into effect. They know that from their past experience in dealing with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. OVERTON. Apparently that is what is intended, namely, that the railroads shall never benefit by this Act, because the sums of money which will be saved to the railroads will be taken from them by means of a downward adjustment of rates.

Mr. BILBO. The railroads know that the reduction will never be made. The taxpayers of this country would never receive it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. First, I wish to say that I appreciate that the Senator from Mississippi knows more about what the rank and file of the railroad men are thinking with regard to this matter than do the brotherhoods who represented them before the committee.

The wages of the railroad men themselves have always depended to a certain extent upon whether or not the railroads were in a prosperous financial condition.

Secondly, section 3 of the bill reads:

The Interstate Commerce Commission, in the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable rates, fares, and charges, shall give due consideration to the increased revenues which carriers will receive as the result of the enactment of this act, so that such increased revenues will be reflected in appropriate adjustments in rates, fares, and charges to shippers.

Therefore, it is obvious that such factors must be taken into consideration in fixing railroad rates, and the wages of employees. All those factors depend on the financial condition of the railroads. As the Senator has said, if the railroads are to benefit to the extent of $20,000,000 a month—which, of course, is a ridiculous figure——

Mr. BILBO. That is the record at the present time.

Mr. WHEELER. I am talking about peacetime.

Mr. BILBO. We have not yet reached peacetime.

Mr. WHEELER. However, if the railroads should receive $20,000,000 a month, anyone who is at all familiar with railroad operations and railroad rates, knows that it would be reflected in reduced rates to the general public, and that it would likewise be reflected to some extent in the wages paid to employees.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator from Montana is wise in the ways of the world and with respect to the Interstate Commerce Commission. He knows, if he knows anything, that if the $20,000,000, or $15,000,000, or whatever it will be in the days to come, is passed on to the railroads it will never be reflected in the fixing of freight and passenger rates throughout the United States. The Senator knows that when the railroads are with the Interstate Commerce Commission they are in the house of their friends. That has been proven by many things which have taken place.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is charging, then, that the Interstate Commerce Commission is owned by the railroads, and that the railroads control it.

Mr. BILBO. Oh, no; I did not say that.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes; the Senator is saying that the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission are controlled by the railroads. When he makes such a statement he reflects upon every President who has appointed members to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and upon the Senate which confirmed the appointments. While I have not always agreed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, it has been recognized from one end of the country to the other as doing one of the best jobs that have ever been done by any commission in the United States of America.

If the Senator would kindly take the time to study the rates of the railroads he would know, as a matter of fact, that when rates have been changed or established the financial conditions of the railroads have always been taken into consideration. That statement is borne out by the fact that at certain times in the past increases in railroad rates have been granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission because of the bad financial condition of the railroads. Likewise, in prosperous years the rates have been reduced. A general reduction in freight rates of railroads cannot be obtained if the railroads are in a bad financial condition. Railroads cannot be operated during a period of bankruptcy and give a high degree of service to shippers or to anyone else having occasion to avail themselves of the services of railroads.

Mr. BILBO. No; I am not going as far as the Senator from Montana went yesterday when on this floor he charged the Department of Justice with a knowledge of violations of the laws of this country and at the same time with doing nothing about it. The Senator went so far as to say that if the information were taken to it on a silver platter the Department of Justice would do nothing about it. I am not going that far. However, I assert that the finest fellowship and comradeship that ever existed in this country exists between the railroad officials and the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission. They are very close friends. The smartest men in the country are employed by the railroads. It would be very easy to persuade the Interstate Commerce Commission that a reduction in rates and fares should not be granted.

To prove to the Senator from Montana the truth of my statement, I may say that since 1941 the railroads have received the largest revenues in their experience, and have made not only hundreds of millions but billions of dollars. Has there been any reduction in rates? No.

Mr. WHEELER. Allow me to say to the Senator that before the war many of the railroads were in financial straits. Does the Senator know how many railroads were in the hands of receivers, and how many of them are in the hands of receivers today?

Mr. BILBO. Do I know? I know that they do a lot of manipulating to get control of this and that.

Mr. WHEELER. During the depression years a great many of the railroads were either in the hands of receivers, or were on the ragged edge of receiverships. That condition obtained from one end of the country to the other. There were only a few railroads which did not come within that category.

Mr. BILBO. The Congress enacted the relief act of 1940. That is what it may be called. The railroads said they were sick, puny, and in precarious financial condition. While Congress was enacting that legislation the railroad representatives were on the front steps of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation borrowing money by the millions of dollars. Since the beginning of the war they increased the rates by changing the classification of goods hauled by them, and making the Government pay more than it should have paid.

Allow me to tell the Senator about some monkey business which has been taking place. For example, if a machine was shipped on a flatcar, the railroads would weigh the machine. They would take large heavy timbers and stack them all around the machine in order to hold it on the car. They weighed that lumber and applied to it the same rate which was accorded to the machine, although the lumber took a much lower rate. In other words, they applied to the lumber the same rate they applied to the machine, and charged the Government for hauling it. If they were hauling bombs they charged the highest rates, which was all right according to the freight rate in effect. However, they would literally cover the whole platform of the car with lumber which took a lower rate, but the Government was charged the same rate for hauling the lumber that it was charged for hauling the bomb.

Mr. WHEELER. Did the Senator do anything about that situation, or attempt to do anything about it?

Mr. BILBO. Could I?

Mr. WHEELER. I ask the Senator if he did anything about it.

Mr. BILBO. I am doing something about it now. I am giving it publicity. The Senator from Montana, as chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, should have done something about it.

Mr. WHEELER. Allow me to say to the Senator from Mississippi that similar information was brought to me, and I wrote a letter to the Bureau of the Budget and told them that I thought it should investigate the charges which had been made.

I not only received the information, but I passed it on to the Bureau of the Budget and wrote it suggesting that it should not only investigate the matter but investigate all of the charges surrounding it. I also suggested that it should have someone in the Government service appointed to examine the rates on all materials and make a complete check of them. Up to the present time the Bureau of the Budget has apparently done nothing about it, but that has nothing to do with the pending bill. If there has been anything wrong with reference to the charges to which the Senator has referred, it has been due entirely to persons in the War Department and in the Navy Department who have been handling such matters and who should have ascertained whether the charges were correct. As I have said I wrote to the Bureau of the Budget and said that the matter should be investigated. However, Mr. President, that has nothing whatever to do with the pending bill. It is a matter which comes entirely within the jurisdiction of the War Department and the Navy Department. I understand that the charges are being investigated at the present time.

Mr. BILBO. I have the Senator's letter here, and I have the reply of Mr. Smith. But the Senator went to the wrong place to get relief.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no; I did not go to the wrong place to get relief. I went exactly to the right place. I went to the place where some of the Senator's informers said that it should be done. When we go to the Bureau of the Budget we go to the adviser of the Chief Executive of the United States, and we go to the agency that has direct contact with these matters, and whose duty it is to check up on them.

Mr. BILBO. I think the Congress of the United States has some responsibility in a matter of this kind, and that has been delegated to the Senator's committee, dealing with interstate commerce and the railroads, and he is very jealous of his jurisdiction.

Now, let the Senator attend to it.

Mr. WHEELER. I thought I was attending to it.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator merely wrote a letter.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Mississippi should attend to it. I will delegate that to him, and let him attend to it.

Mr. BILBO. I beg the Senator's pardon; I am not on his committee.

Mr. WHEELER. He knows so much more about this proposed legislation than anyone else in this body, and more about it than the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the committee, and everyone else.

Mr. BILBO. I think I come nearer representing the taxpayers of the country than does the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I happen to be on the committee which approved the bill. The Senator has made the statement, I do not know how many times, that there would be a saving of some twenty million to twenty-four million dollars a day to the Government and the taxpayers.

Mr. BILBO. A month.

Mr. CAPEHART. A saving of twenty to twenty-four million dollars a month. That is based upon the war business, is it not?

Mr. BILBO. What is the question?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is based upon war business, is it not?

Mr. BILBO. It is based upon the statement of the Association of Railroads, who make that statement.

Mr. CAPEHART. I mean it is based on traffic during the war period, when

the railroads are hauling enormous quantities of war material and troops.

Mr. BILBO. It is mixed; yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. What would be the saving then during peacetime?

Mr. BILBO. I have just finished saying that from 1930 to 1940 it was $7,000,000 a year.

Mr. CAPEHART. Seven million dollars a year?

Mr. BILBO. Yes; and before 1930 it averaged, from 1870 on, a million dollars a year.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why does the Senator stand here, then, and try to make the taxpayers and the people believe that they are going to save $24,000,000 a month, which is the amount they are possibly saving today, during the war, when he knows—he can read, I am certain—that the pending bill will not take effect until 90 days after the war is over, and then the saving to the taxpayers, if there is a saving, will be $7,000,000 a year.

Mr. BILBO. No.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why does the Senator try to fool the American people into believing that they are going to save $24,000,000 a month when he knows that there is no truth in the statement?

Mr. BILBO. I am glad the Senator asked the question. I am not trying to fool the American people. I am trying to tell the American people what is involved in the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BILBO. I want to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Very well.

Mr. BILBO. I have here a statement by the Association of American Railroads, in which they say:

> The increase in Government traffic for military purposes has been so immense that in 1942 the deductions in railroad transportaiton charges were estimated by the Government Board of Investigation and Research at $20,000,000 a month, or $240,000,000 a year.

That was in 1942; and this is the railroads speaking. This is their story, not mine. Doubtless the amount is even greater now. Of course, it grows greater. It is still great, and it is going to be great until we get through with the war. We have just finished the shooting. We have had an army of 12,000,000 men, and every one of those men has to be hauled from some seaport and landed in one place or another, transferred from a hospital to the place of discharge. They all have to be hauled.

Besides that, there are millions of tons of freight which have to be handled and brought back from all the battle fronts of the world and put in places of storage. That freight has to be hauled by the railroads to different points in the country. This matter of the railroads doing business for the Government under the land grant proposition will go on until the middle of next summer. That is why I have offered an amendment to the bill, if the bill is to be passed, making it effective about 18 months from now, so that we can have all this war material business cleaned up.

The Government's activities in the reconversion period, with all the things we are to do in the way of river and harbor improvements, building highways, and other projects, in order to produce 60,000,000 jobs, the hauling for the Government and in behalf of the Government, will amount to more than $7,000,000,000 for the next 3 or 4 years.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me call attention to the fact that those matters will be taken care of under the law as it is now; they would not come under the pending bill. So the Senator is entirely wrong. The traffic connected with the building of the projects to which the Senator has referred and with other war purposes which would be hauled by the railroads would not come under the pending bill.

Mr. BILBO. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator was just saying that when we did these things they would come under the bill. That is not true. The Senator overlooks the provision of section 22 of the law, which provides that the Government of the United States can at any time make a contract for special rates for the hauling of Government material.

Mr. BILBO. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Government does not get a fair rate for hauling its traffic, then it is the fault of the executive departments of the Government in not asking the railroads for proper rates.

Mr. BILBO. Yes; but the Government has not been getting fair rates.

Mr. WHEELER. I am saying that in the future, even though this bill shall be enacted, in wartime or in peacetime under the present law, the executive branch of the Government can say to the railroads, "We feel that, because of the amount of traffic we are shipping over the railroads, we should have a reduced rate." They should negotiate with the railroads, if the bill is passed, for a proper rate, if they are not getting one. That is the responsibility of the Government departments. If they do not do what they should, it is the fault of the executive departments of the Government.

Mr. BILBO. Should they do it if this bill is enacted?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, they should. This bill does not change in the slightest degree section 22 of the act. The Senator is entirely wrong in his theory of the proposed legislation.

Mr. BILBO. Oh, no.

Mr. WHEELER. One reason why the Interstate Commerce Commission has recommended repeal is that the provision now on the statute books creates discrimination in rates between different sections of the country. The Interstate Commerce Commission is not in a position to correct that situation. The interstate Commerce Act in the first instance was passed in order to prevent discrimination between different sections of the country and different manufacturers. But the Interstate Commerce Commission cannot correct the condition under the present law. If the Government feels it is entitled to a lower rate because of the great volume of goods it is shipping over the roads, it has a perfect right—in fact, it is its duty—to go to the railroads and say, "Because we are shipping this tremendous amount of goods over your roads we are entitled to and should have a reduced rate."

Mr. BILBO. We already have a good rate, and we should let it remain as it is until we get through hauling all the war materials, and all the soldiers. I know the land-grant bill does not apply to the business the Government does outside of the war effort, because that was fixed in 1940. Before that, of course, the Government got a reduction on everything of a civil nature which the railroads hauled. In 1940 the Government was cut down to just two items, namely, war materials for naval and military purposes, and the property of the civilians who were engaged in war activities.

I say that it will take 12 to 18 months before that business is cleaned up, and that is why there should not be a hurry to pass the bill. The railroads are making more money than they ever made before. They are in fine condition. Yet they are not giving us any reduced rates, as the Senator says we will get if we pass the bill. Oh, no. We are chasing after the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow if we believe the railroads are going to give us anything, because they made hundreds of millions during the war, and they have not given us any consideration. Instead, they have increased the rates Uncle Sam had to pay on the materials he has had to haul.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator approve the bill if it stated it was to take effect, let us say, 18 months after the cessation of hostilities?

Mr. BILBO. I will compromise with the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. If that is true, then all the argument and the things the Senator is saying against the bill go for naught, do they not?

Mr. BILBO. I can tell the Senator, whenever we get to that point, why I have made my statement. At the beginning of my speech this afternoon I said I am not a railroad hater. I ask the Senator from Indiana to believe that statement. I give the railroads credit for the great work they have done in the development of this country; they have done a wonderful work; but I repeat, they are the greatest bunch of welshers I have ever known in my life. We have coddled them, we have fed them, we have taken care of them and helped them. And now, after we helped them in 1940 and gave them the extra $7,000,000 a year, I suggest that we should finish this war before we undertake to give them more money. After the war I think they will possibly get even more than $7,000,000. That was the point I was developing when my friend the Senator from Montana got off his base. That is what I was trying to develop a while ago, that after we settle the war and get everything in place, and every soldier is back home, the money that would be made out of this land-grant bill will amount to more than $7,000,000 a year, because during the reconversion period we are going to engage in numerous activities.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then the Senator's thought is that 90 days after cessation of hostilities is not sufficient time.

Mr. BILBO. That amounts to nothing. It is simply monkey business.

Mr. CAPEHART. But if the time were, let us say, 12 months or 18 months, it would meet with the Senator's approval?

Mr. BILBO. We could clean up by that time; yes. If it were 12 months or 18 months we could clean up. But I think the bill should be amended again by providing that in case of another war the Land-Grant Act should automatically go into effect.

Mr. CAPEHART. We can be certain then that the record shows that the $24,000,000 a month is the additional revenue during the war period, and is not the revenue the railroad would make additional during peacetime, and that it has been estimated that in peacetimes the additional revenue will be about $7,000,000?

Mr. BILBO. I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not want him to get by with that statement. I do not think it has gone down below that amount yet. I think the railroads are still enjoying the return of $24,000,000 through the Land Grant Act because they are doing just as much hauling of freight today as they did during the war.

Mr. CAPEHART. How can we state the situation, then, so the public will understand that even if the bill were passed we would not be losing, as the Senator has said so many times, $24,000,000 a month?

Mr. BILBO. After 18 months I think it would then dwindle down to about $7,000,000 or $8,000,000.

Mr. CAPEHART. A year?

Mr. BILBO. Yes. I am willing to have it continue for reasons I am not going to set forth right now, because I do not want to hurt the railroads of the country by making a certain statement.

Mr. President, I wish to read into my speech the reports on this bill from the various departments of Government which will indeed be a revelation to some people. There is a rule or custom in Congress that when a bill is introduced and referred to a committee the secretary of the committee shall immediately send the bill to any department of Government which would be interested in its subject matter. The strangest thing I have seen since I have been in the Senate for 12 years is what happened in connection with this particular bill. The bill was sent to five or six departments of the Government and they condemned it. Notwithstanding that fact the bill was favorably reported by the committee. It had previously been passed by the House, and is now ready to be passed on the floor of the Senate.

I have introduced quite a number of bills and had them sent to the departments, and in some cases the departments have condemned the bills, in which case the committee would say "That is the end of that bill, because a department or departments do not agree to it." The situation became so bad that I made the statement that no longer did we have a government by Congress but a government by bureaus and commissions who were passing on all domestic legislation and often killing it.

I wish to read to the Senate the report which Mr. Ickes made on this bill when it was submitted to him:

MY DEAR MR. LEA: Further reference is made to your letter dated February 18, requesting a report on H. R. 4184—

Senators will see we have no new reports on the bill because neither of the committees would hold hearings on the bill this year. They predicated their case upon the hearings held last year—

a bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic. The bill would relieve the land-grant railroads of their present obligations to transport at one-half the regular tariff rates the military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval use and the members of the military or naval forces of the United States, or the property of such members, when such members are traveling on official duties.

I recommend that the bill be not enacted—

That is Mr. Ickes' first statement—

It is merely a gift—

Listen to Mr. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior—

It is merely a gift of large sums of money from the Federal Treasury to the benefiting railroads for which there is no compensation or return to the United States. This Department, under date of December 2, 1942, made a statement to your committee in connection with a similar bill, H. R. 6156, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

If the Congress, however, should see fit to enact such legislation, I believe that the bill should be amended so that the relief provisions will not apply to any land-grant railroad unless or until such railroad or land-holding subsidiary has reconveyed to the United States all patented lands except those sold to third persons for value and those directly used in the operation of the railroad—

I propose to take up that phase of the bill a little later and discuss it in its entirety—that is, the return of the 16,000,000 acres which the railroads still have—

If the United States surrenders a valuable right to the railroads, it should receive a proper consideration. It is in the public interest to return these lands to the public domain or the reservations within which they are situated, particularly for the purpose of facilitating their administration from a conservation point of view in the interest of the Nation.

My friend the Senator from Montana discussed this proposition at length. He said that when this bill came up last year he was opposed to it and he then insisted that the railroads return the 16,000,000 acres of land they still have in their possession. But he now says he is in favor of the bill and he wants the railroads to keep the land. He has had a complete conversion. His conversion was greater than that of the Apostle Paul on the way to Damascus. The Senator from Montana says that the reason why the communities in the West where the 16,000,000 acres of land are located are opposed to giving these lands back to the Government is that they would thereby lose the taxes on them. I appreciate that position because the Government has gone into my State and in some cases has bought as much as 75 percent of the landed area of a county. The Government has almost bankrupted some counties. I think there will be some effort, indeed there have been some such attempts, to give these counties relief. I think I can assure my friend the Senator from Montana that if the railroads should be required to return the 16,000,000 acres of land to the Government upon the passage of this bill, I would be glad to join him in any movement looking to the enactment of legislation which would give relief to any county or any governmental entity that may have suffered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to say that neither the State of Montana nor any county of the State is begging for relief from the Federal Government. We do not want any relief either from the Senator from Mississippi or from the Government of the United States. We do not wish to have land taken off the tax roll and tied up in Federal Government ownership so that no one can ever use it. It would simply be tied up in a forest reserve, and no one would get any benefit from it. At the present time people can buy this land at a cheap price, or they can buy the timber and cut it. But if the land is turned back to the Government it will be turned into forest land, and no one will get any benefit from it, at least for a long time, until the Government changes its whole policy with regard to allowing people to prospect on the land, develop the resources of the land, or buy the land.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator is too well informed to make that contention. He knows that under the general policy of the Government, when lands are taken over and placed in reforestation projects and the timber matures—and I understand that some of the timber on the land in the Senator's State has already matured—the county government or the school district gets a pro rata share of the proceeds from the sale of the timber grown on the land which has been converted into a reforestation project.

Mr. WHEELER. I am talking about going on the land and taking up homesteads or buying it or opening up prospects for miners, and so forth. I think I know something about the policy which has been adopted in my own State—perhaps more than the Senator knows about that particular subject. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Mississippi has a general knowledge of every subject, and knows more about the West and about the lands there than do those of us who have lived there for a long time. I do not claim to know all about Mississippi. I admit that the Senator has complete knowledge, but I do not like to have him tell me what is good for the people of Montana.

Mr. BILBO. I do not know everything.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes.

Mr. BILBO. But I will say that there was a time when I knew more than did the Senator from Montana, because I knew that we were going to have a war, and he thought we would not.

Mr. WHEELER. I thought we would not, and I still think we should not have had one. I have no apologies for anything that I said before we got into the war. I did everything that I possibly could to keep the country out of war. I predicted that Europe would go Communist, and that there would be many of the things which now exist. Those predictions are coming true. There are in Europe the same selfishness and greed that there were after the last war.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator is still predicting; and his predictions will be fulfilled as the others were.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the Senator from Mississippi and Walter Winchell take the same view; and I am glad to see them on the same side.

Mr. BILBO. I do not believe that Walter Winchell thinks any more of me than he does of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, he does. He agrees entirely with the Senator in his war stand.

Mr. BILBO. There is one thing about it—Walter and I agree with respect to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad that the Senator and Walter agree in their views with reference to me, because I feel highly honored.

Mr. BILBO. I am sorry that "Ephraim is joined to idols." "He that hardeneth his heart shall fall into mischief." "He that being often reproved hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed."

I read further from the letter of the Secretary of the Interior:

> If the lands reconveyed to the United States are placed under the jurisdiction of the reservations in which they may be situated, they would be subject to such provisions for payments to the States as now obtain. Thus, lands added to a national forest or a grazing district would share their revenues with the States to the extent that other lands federally owned in these specialized areas do.

That shows that there is nothing in the Senator's contention that if the lands were turned back by the railroads to the Government, which should be done, they would fare the same as do any other lands which are incorporated into Government projects.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator knows perfectly well that the share which any State gets from the sale of a little land by the Government from a forest reserve is a comparatively small amount, whereas at the present time all that land is taxed, and the county and the schools obtain a direct tax from the owners of the land. The Senator knows that. I appreciate the fact that he is making these speeches for home consumption, and I am glad if he thinks they will help him at home.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator is correct when he says that I am making them for home consumption, because my people vote.

Mr. WHEELER. What percentage of the Senator's people vote?

Mr. BILBO. All those who are qualified.

Mr. WHEELER. What percentage of the Senator's people vote?

Mr. BILBO. One hundred percent of those who are qualified.

Mr. WHEELER. What does the Senator mean by "qualified"?

Mr. BILBO. All those who meet the educational qualifications.

Mr. WHEELER. What percentage of the people of the Senator's State voted in the last election?

Mr. BILBO. All those who were qualified under our Constitution; all those who met the educational qualifications.

Mr. WHEELER. What percentage of the Senator's people voted?

Mr. BILBO. I am telling the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. No; the Senator is not.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator does not understand English.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is dodging the question, because of the fact that he does not wish to tell the percentage of the people who vote in his State.

Mr. BILBO. I am telling the Senator that all those who are qualified under the educational qualifications as set up by our Constitution, approved by the Supreme Court of the United States, vote in my State. That is as much as the Senator can say about his State.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no. Everyone in my State above the age of 21 years may vote, regardless of his race, color, or anything else. That is far more than the Senator from Mississippi can say with reference to his State.

Mr. BILBO. Anyone can vote in Montana—is that it?

Mr. WHEELER. Anyone who is 21 years of age can vote in my State, whether it be a woman, a man, or a colored person, regardless of race or religion. I am very proud of the fact that there is no religious or racial intolerance among the people of my State.

Mr. BILBO. Voters are not qualified in the Senator's State—is that true?

Mr. WHEELER. We qualify them by age.

Mr. BILBO. They are not qualified mentally, or by education. That accounts for a great deal. In my State we qualify the voters.

Mr. WHEELER. That is why the State of Mississippi has such able representatives.

Mr. BILBO. We get the cream of the crop in the Congress.

Mr. WHEELER. That is the reason why the Senator was elected.

Mr. BILBO. Certainly. The Senator has given me the reason why Montana has such a Senator.

The Senator from Montana has been beating down the value of the lands which the railroads obtained from the Government. He says that they are practically worthless. If they are such sorry lands, I think he ought to be ashamed of himself for making the railroads pay taxes on them.

I read further from the letter of the Secretary of the Interior:

> In view of the fact, however, that the lands to be returned to the Government by the railroads may have been on the tax rolls of local communities and have formed a part of the tax base upon which the communities have predicated their fiscal arrangements, and that in some cases the payments referred to may not be the equivalent of the taxes which have been paid, I suggest that some provision might be made for alleviating the situation.

That is exactly the proposal which I made to the Senator a while ago. I do not believe in imposing hardships on any community in this Nation.

> I believe that an appropriate solution would be to authorize the head of the executive agency which will assume jurisdiction over the reconveyed lands to enter into agreements with the State or local taxing units involved providing for payments by the United States to such units to compensate them for tax losses for which they are not otherwise recompensed. I offer this, however, only as a temporary solution, since the Congress is now working on the general problem of the effect of the Federal ownership of real estate upon local revenue structures.

That has been a problem with which we have all been greatly concerned—to bring about equity in situations in which the Government has gone into counties and States and taken over large tracts of land, removing them from the local tax rolls.

> The lands under consideration should, of course, be subject to any permanent comprehensive payment plan which may be evolved for Government lands generally. Accordingly, I recommend that any authority granted in this bill for making payments should be limited to a period of 5 years.
>
> For the convenience of your committee, I enclose a draft of a proposed section to be added to H. R. 4184 in order to effectuate the reconveyance of the patented lands and the payment provisions suggested in this report.
>
> The Bureau of the Budget has not advised me of the relationship of this report or of the proposed draft of amendment to the program of the President.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> HAROLD L. ICKES,
> *Secretary of the Interior.*

Let us see what the Secretary of the Treasury says about it:

> MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of February 22, 1944, enclosing copies of H. R. 4184, a bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, and requesting a statement of this Department's views on this proposed legislation.
>
> The proposed legislation, if enacted, would strike out those clauses of section 321 (a) of the Transportation Act of 1940 which keep in effect land-grant rates with respect to "the transportation of military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use * * * [and] the transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States (or property of such members) when such members are traveling on official duty." Under section 321 (a) of the Transportation Act of 1940, as so amended, the Government in other words would be required to pay the full applicable commercial rates, fares, and charges for all transportation performed for it by any common carrier subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, including any land-grant carrier, except to the extent that any of such carriers might voluntarily agree to perform such transportation free or at reduced rates under sections 1 (7) and 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (U. S. C. title 49, secs. 1 (7) and 22).
>
> This Department can see no justification for such legislation.

This is the Treasury Department of the United States speaking—

The reason for the Department's opposition toward H. R. 4184—

Which is the same as House bill 694—

are the same now as expressed in letter to you dated February 19, 1942, in connection with H. R. 6156, Seventy-seventh Congress, a House bill endeavoring to accomplish identical results. The comments contained in that letter are deemed sufficient without additions to fully cover the present bill.

For your information a copy of afore-mentioned letter of February 19, 1942, is attached.

For these reasons the Department is opposed to the enactment of this bill.

The Department has been advised by the Eureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report, as the enactment of the proposed legislation would not be in accord, at least at this time, with the program of the President.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. President, in all the 11 years since I have been in the Congress, whenever one of the departments and most certainly when two of the departments unquestionably condemn a piece of legislation, it is rejected with a vengeance. But that is not the case with the pending land-grant railroad bill.

Now I shall read the letter referred to in the one I just read. The letter I shall now read was written by Mr. D. W. Bell, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, and it contains additional reasons on the basis of which the Treasury objects to this vicious piece of legislation:

FEBRUARY 19, 1942.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of December 3, 1941, enclosing copies of H. R. 6156, a bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, and requesting a statement of this Department's views on this proposed legislation.

The proposed legislation, if enacted, would strike out those clauses of section 321 (a) of the Transportation Act of 1940 which kept in effect land-grant rates with respect to "the transportation of military or naval property of the United States moving for military or naval and not for civil use * * * [and] the transportation of members of the military or naval forces of the United States (or property of such members) when such members are traveling on official duty." Under section 321 (a) of the Transportation Act of 1940, as so amended, the Government in other words would be required to pay the full applicable commercial rates, fares, and charges for all transportation performed for it by any common carrier subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, including any land-grant carrier, except to the extent that any of such carriers might voluntarily agree to perform such transportation free or at reduced rates under sections 1 (7) and 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 49, secs. 1 (7) and 22).

This Department can see no justification for such legislation. The land-grant rate benefits that the Government now enjoys, already substantially reduced by the provisions of section 321 (a) of the Transportation Act of 1940, were intended to compensate for the large grants of public lands made to the land-grant carriers, and the transportation savings thus far realized by the Government fall far short of full compensation for the value of those lands.

The Senate will remember that just a moment ago I cited the 179,000,000 acres of land which were given to the railroads—sufficient land to embrace the combined area of 14 States of the Union. The Treasury Department says that although the Government received a million dollars a year up until 1928, I believe—it amounted altogether to $340,000,000, and from then to 1940 it amounted to approximately $85,000,000, and during the war it ran up to $250,000,000 a year, or a total already received of approximately $1,000,000,000—yet the railroads have not adequately paid for the value of the 179,000,000 acres of land they received under the land grants. As I have said, the railroads received more than enough land to comprise 14 of the States of this country. Of all the outrageous legislation which has ever been reported, I think the pending bill is the worst, and so did the Treasury think so.

I read further from the letter:

Certainly there can be no just claim that the land-grant carriers should be relieved of their obligation to the Government on any ground of fairness to them. To release the carriers under present conditions would result only in their gratuitous enrichment by many millions of dollars within the next few years and in the addition of the same amount to the already heavy cost that the Government must pay for transportation required in connection with the prosecution of the war. Especially at this time, when the carriers generally are realizing increased revenues from greatly enlarged traffic incident to the war effort, and when the financial burden of the Government is greater than ever before, legislation of the type here proposed would be most inopportune.

For these reasons the Department is opposed to the enactment of this bill.

This Department transmitted its report to Budget for clearance, in accordance with established procedure, on January 12, 1942. The report has not yet received Budget clearance, but in view of your request for expedition, and in order that the report may be available at the hearing on Thursday, February 19, which your committee has scheduled on H. R. 6156, the Department is submitting its report without the customary Budget clearance.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

That letter was followed by the letter I read just preceding it, and that proves the position of the Treasury of the United States.

But, Mr. President, notwithstanding the position of the Department of the Interior, and notwithstanding the position of the Treasury, which in its letter condemns the bill and points out its viciousness and what an injustice it would be for the Government merely to enrich the coffers of the railroad systems which already have been enriched because of the extra business brought to them by the war—notwithstanding all that, the House committee and the Senate committee ran roughshod over those objections, and the bill was passed by the House of Representatives without a yea-and-nay vote, and it is now before the Senate, awaiting action by the Senate.

Here is a very interesting report from the former Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, who recently resigned:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1944.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEA: This is in reply to your letter of February 18, 1944, requesting report and comment on H. R. 4184, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, entitled "A bill to amend section 321, title III, paragraph II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic."

The purpose and effect of the bill is to abolish entirely the so-called land-grant railroad rates now applicable to military and naval shipments. Since the Transportation Act of 1940, such shipments alone have been entitled to the benefits of these reduced rates. The amendment now proposed would accomplish the complete elimination of the land-grant rate structure.

No basic military considerations appear to be involved, at least at the present time. At another time and under other conditions, the increased revenues which would accrue to the carriers under this bill might be necessary to secure improved service in the transportation of military property and personnel, but that does not appear to be the case under existing conditions. It is not believed that the financial condition of the carriers can be said to necessitate the proposed step at a time when they are realizing substantially increased revenues from traffic incident to the Nation's war effort.

The immediate impact of the bill on the War Department is, of course, financial. The Government is already bearing enormous costs for military transportation required in connection with the prosecution of the war. According to present figures, disbursements for Army transportation, passenger and freight, for the calendar year 1943 have amounted to nearly one and a half billion dollars.

I wonder if the Senate catches the significance of that sentence. I shall repeat it:

According to present figures, disbursements for Army transportation, passenger and freight, for the calendar year 1943 have amounted to nearly one and a half billion dollars.

In other words, Mr. President, the Government of the United States was paying $1,500,000,000 of the tax money of this country just for freight and passenger transportation for the War Department for the year 1943, and the same amount was spent for that purpose in 1944, and practically the same amount was spent for that purpose in 1945.

I read further from the letter:

Approximately 90 percent of this traffic was carried by the railroads. No exact figures are available as to the savings resulting from the application of land-grant rates, and it is virtually impossible to hazard even an estimate in view of the wide variation in applicable deductions, and the necessity of including amounts saved under equalization agreements which roads and also motor carriers competing with land-grant carriers have made in order to participate in the business. It has been wholly impracticable to attempt a segregation of these items during the press of wartime. It is unquestionable, however, that such savings are substantial and important and that enactment of the present bill would add many millions of dollars to the heavy transportation costs already being borne by the War Department.

Mr. President, in that connection I hold in my hand a statement by the railroads themselves. In it they say that at

the time when the statement I just read was made the amount already had reached $24,000,000 a month and it was on the increase.

I read further from the letter from the Secretary of War:

It is realized that the calculation of land-grant rates between myriad destinations for large numbers of commodities is a highly technical and time-consuming process and that, from this standpoint, such rates may be regarded as burdensome to traffic and finance personnel of the War Department and to the General Accounting Office. Considerations of this kind, however, are wholly outweighed by the large savings to the Government resulting from the reduced rates. It is realized also that, from the standpoint of the total national economy, substantial grounds may be urged in support of the bill, but it seems highly doubtful that such grounds can be regarded as compelling during the present period of increased revenues accruing to the carriers.

In view of the increased costs which the bill would entail, the War Department does not feel that it can recommend its passage. If, however, the Congress should feel that some legislation along the lines proposed is desirable at this time, it is suggested that consideration be given to the addition of a proviso which would preserve land-grant rates for the duration of the present state of war and which would expressly reserve to the Congress the right during any subsequent period of war to reinstate, either in whole or in part, the existing land-grant deductions.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report, as the enactment of the proposed legislation should not be considered, at least at this time, as being in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. President, I have already submitted an amendment to the pending bill providing that, if enacted, the law shall not take effect until 18 months thereafter. That would afford plenty of time to complete all the hauling of freight incident to the war, and the return of all the boys to their homes.

I propose to submit another amendment providing that if we cancel the contracts with the railroads under which they received one-tenth of all the lands of the United States—179,000,000 acres, or enough to equal the total area of 14 States of the Union—and we become involved in another war, when it will be the duty of everyone to perform his part of the necessary tasks personally, individually, and corporately, the proposed legislation shall no longer be effective. I am sure the railroads will not object to it. I do not know whether we will have another war. I hope and I pray we will not. But, as a matter of precaution, we should incorporate in the bill a provision that upon the declaration of another war, automatically, the present law shall again become effective during the years of the war so that the railroads will have to help carry the tax burden and largely expedite the handling of passengers, freight, and so forth. I do not believe that any Senator would object to that. I do not believe the railroads, if they have much patriotism, would object to it.

Mr. President, this war in which we have been recently engaged, the greatest and most costly in all history, is about to come to a close. I could not say, and I would not say, that it is at an end because the peace treaty has not yet been signed. No terms have been agreed upon. Our forces are occupying certain territories, and there is still trouble throughout the world. The present is no time for the pending bill to be enacted. When we have completed the occupation of Japan and Germany, the costs which will have mounted up by then will be so great as to burden our children and our children's children for a long time to come. The costs will be in excess of $300,000,000,000. Yet right in the midst of such a colossal debt we are confronted with the pending bill. The bill would add another twenty or twenty-five million dollars a month, or a quarter of a billion dollars a year, to the cost which has already accumulated, by giving a windfall to the railroads of this country whose earnings now are unequaled in the history of railroads. If we reduce that amount—and we have no hope that it will be reduced by more than $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 a year—we permit the railroads to violate their contract which was made in good faith, and make them a present of this great amount of money year after year for the next hundred or 200 years to come.

The pending bill proposes to give this huge amount of money in order to benefit a comparatively few number of persons at the expense of many taxpayers, and furthermore, add an additional cost to the already unthinkable cost of the war which will have to be paid for by the men who have been fighting for the liberties which we now enjoy, and hope to continue to enjoy in the future. In other words, the boys who fought the war are the only ones who will have to make good the gift of a Christmas present to the railroads as proposed by the terms of this bill.

Mr. President, the gift to which I have referred is a strange part of this bill. I have read carefully the hearings in the House as well as the hearings in the Senate. I have analyzed the testimony of all the witnesses who testified at the hearings, as well as memorandums which are sometimes filed at committee hearings. At no place have I been able to find that a taxpayer's organization, or that any group of disinterested citizens of this Republic asked that the Congress cancel the contract which is the subject of this debate, and make a Christmas present to the railroads of the country. The only argument which has been made in favor of the bill was made by the railroads, and their friends and representatives with whom they collaborate in all their activities. Those are the sources from which the pressure is coming. For months Washington hotels have been flooded with railroad lobbyists striving to bring about the passage of this bill. Why can the railroads afford to spend great sums of money to have this bill enacted into law? It is because the return would be very great. If the bill were enacted into law the railroads would receive an additional $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 a month until the hauling of soldiers and freight comes to an end. The assurance has also been given that the railroads would receive at least $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 a year from then on.

Of course, I do not blame the railroads. They are fighting for their progress, and for the opportunity to pay dividends to their stockholders, as well as to enhance the value of their holdings. I do not blame them. The subject is not personal with me. I am merely trying to represent the taxpayers of the United States, and the men who will have to pay the bill during the years to come. They will have to pay for the Christmas present which it proposed to give to the railroads. Therefore, I dare fight on.

There could be only one reason, Mr. President, for increasing the already huge profits of the railroads which are now trying by forces hitherto unknown in magnitude to avoid carrying out the terms of a contract which they willingly and eagerly entered into with the United States early in the 1800's, at a time when they saw an opportunity to benefit immensely from the bargain which they so gladly made.

Let us look into the contract for a moment and see what was intended. The land-grant law conveyed to private corporations certain lands for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads. In return for the land the corporations, their assignees, and successors agreed by contract to transport over the railroads constructed on the granted lands the property and troops of the United States—little enough—free from toll or other charge, to wit:

The said railroad and branches shall be and remain a public highway for the use of the United States free from toll or other charge, for the transportation of any property or troops of the United States.

Those were the words of the original act which passed when these lands were given to the railroads. It was following up the old line of thought that was used in the days of tolls and highways, when rights of way were granted by the Government. They merely used the same expression in the contract, which meant the use of the rights of way of the railroads.

The total amount of land which passed into these corporations was 132,425,554 acres. That is not a small amount. As a matter of fact, the States, in the same campaign of the railroad building era, when these promoters were plying their trade in the Halls of Congress and in the halls of the legislatures, donated 48,000,000 acres, in round numbers, which makes the 179,000,000 acres about which I have been speaking.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Do the States get any rebate in freight rates or railroad rates because of the contribution they made?

Mr. BILBO. I am not advised.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator knows they do not, does he not?

Mr. BILBO. That is a question into which the Senator's committee should have looked.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to inform the Senator, so that he can answer anyone else who may inquire, that the States do not. The States were glad to have the railroads built because of the improvement and development they brought to the States. They did not consider themselves as needing any reimbursing along any other line.

Mr. BILBO. The States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BILBO. But the entire East, and the greater part of the South, which had an interest in the Federal Government, figured that when the railroad promoters took lands which belonged to all the people of this Republic, the promoters should at least grant some consideration to all the people of the country, because it was not a local matter, as the Senator refers to it, in the States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The people were paid back, because the people kept nine-tenths of the land themselves, and since they kept nine-tenths of the land themselves, when the railroads were built, their own lands, nine-tenths of the lands, were public lands, which these railroads served, which paid all the people for the investment that was made by the railroads in providing railroad service through their land. That is how all the people were repaid.

Mr. BILBO. No doubt, when the people of Texas gave 10,000,000 acres to the railroads—I think that was the amount; perhaps it was more; I shall get the figures and let the Senator have them some time within the week while I am speaking—the people of Texas realized that they were helping conditions locally by opening up the country, but at the same time it was not doing the people of Connecticut much good.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator believe that it is possible to do anything for any State in this Union in the way of progressive construction and building without helping all the United States?

Mr. BILBO. It has been a mighty hard job, and I have been working at it day and night, to keep some things from happening which will affect my people very materially that seem to fit all right in States like New York.

The actual railroads constructed upon these lands amounted actually to 17,627 miles, which could have been built on an area of 214,000 acres. In other words, the railroads received 179,000,000 acres of land, and upon those lands have been built 17,627 miles of railroads, and they needed only 214,000 acres for rights-of-way to build the 17,627 miles of railroad. In other words, if we take 214,000 acres away from 179,000,000 acres we see how much gravy, velvet, Christmas gift, the railroad promoters got in this great scheme of the fifties, sixties, and seventies.

In other words, the acreage actually received by those corporations was 620 times as large as the acreage actually required for the railroads which they actually built.

Why did we give them 620 times more than they actually needed? That was because of their aggressiveness and ingenuity as they manipulated the State legislatures and the Congress of those days. But they agreed to do a little hauling for the Government in return for getting 620 times more than they needed to build 17,500 miles of railroad.

Now, the Senator from Colorado does not want them to pay at all. He wants to cancel the debt. He wants to give them a clean sheet. He wants to cancel the note and tell them to go their way and steal no more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course the Senator from Mississippi is misrepresenting my attitude. However, the note has been paid, the debt has been canceled, the debt has been paid many times over.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator think the contract has been fulfilled?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it has been more than fulfilled. I think the Federal Government has been paid handsomely for the gift it made in having the railroads built in the first place. I think the Federal Government has realized a billion dollars in cash for an investment which was probably worth approximately $130,000,000. But that is in addition to the contribution the railroads made in improving the land which is owned by the Federal Government, by all the people.

Mr. BILBO. I know the Senator is sincere in his contention. He feels that the Government has been adequately paid for these lands. Let me make him a proposition. I have just gotten through telling the Senator that the railroads got 620 times more land than they needed for rights-of-way for the railroads. In other words, there were 620 times more acres of land than they needed to build the railroads upon. That was gravy, that was velvet, that was a Christmas present by the Congress in those days.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That was an inducement.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator says he believes—and I think he is pretty nearly right—that up to this time the Government has received as its part of the rebate, in carrying out the contract, more than a billion dollars. I think it will go to about a billion dollars. It was a million dollars every year from 1870 to, let us say, 1928, then it jumped to seven million; then it jumped to twelve, to fifteen, to eighteen, and then up to twenty-five or thirty million. I think that by this time it amounts to more than a billion dollars.

The Senator says that that was enough to pay for these lands. My contention is that these railroads on the 179,000,000 acres of land have realized $2,000,000,000 or more. The Senator's committee is a very active one, with a very charming, keen, and active chairman, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. Why does not the committee make an investigation? It could do it very easily, because there is a record, a written record, of every acre of land the Government gave to the railroads. There has to be. A patent is issued in every case. Then there is a record of every acre of land which the railroads have sold, and the deeds will show the consideration, and show the money they have made. Take the figures and make the subtraction, and it will be found that the railroads have made in excess of a billion dollars in the deal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What is the Senator's proposition?

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. BILBO. I yield to both Senators.

Mr. ELLENDER. In that connection, has the Senator ever investigated to ascertain the number of acres of valuable oil lands and other mineral-bearing lands which have been sold to corporations which we may call subsidiary corporations of the railroads?

Mr. BILBO. No; I have had a hard time getting the committee to investigate merely ordinary affairs. All they have had before them in the committee were some letters, testimony, statements, and evidence of a few railroad companies and a few chambers of commerce. They have not heard from the folks. They have not gotten the facts yet.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am informed that several of the large railroads have sold to subsidiary corporations large holdings which were impregnated with oil, and with a large amount of other minerals, but they are still flourishing.

Mr. BILBO. I have heard the same reports, and I believe every word of them. I believe that evidence to be true. I understand some of the railroads are still operating the oil fields which they discovered and developed in the land grants given them by the Government. They found coal fields, and they are still operating them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not as properties of the railroads.

Mr. BILBO. Oh, no. The railroads have plenty of money, and they hire the very best talent in the country as their lawyers. They do things according to Hoyle. They have an unlimited expense account. I have records here to show that the railroads have advertised in newspapers for competitive business in counties were there was but one railroad, where there was no competition, where a newspaper advertisement would do them no good at all. Why were they advertising in a newspaper of that kind? There was an editor whom they wanted to reach, with whom they wanted to communicate, whom they wanted to use. So they gave him a nice fat full-page advertisement to carry in his newspaper day after day.

There was one railroad newspaper in my State. I became crossed up with the railroads in 1908 and that railroad newspaper has been cussing me every day since. I have been a marked man because of my attitude at that time. It involved a case somewhat similar to this,

and I shall develop it sometime this week.

I continue to read:

What became of the remainder? A large amount of it was sold by these corporations to others at a handsome profit in dollars in addition to the oils, coal, and minerals which they extracted from some of these lands and also at a very nice profit, to say nothing of the vast amount of forest products they received and used in their construction, and later also sold at more profits.

It is said that the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis are built on land granted to railroads. In the growth of cities of this character, on land owned by the railroads under land grants, on which they laid out the cities, the subsidiary companies in the real estate business have made multiplied profits. I know one railroad, the Illinois Central, which has some very valuable holdings as the result of the land grants made to it.

I continue to read:

All these and many more benefits did they derive from this contract solemnly entered into. This land was the people's land. It belonged to the people into whose laps they now seek to dump a burden of $250,000,000 a year because they are now sick of their contract.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 301)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Almost 2 months have passed since the atomic bomb was used against Japan. That bomb did not win the war, but it certainly shortened the war. We know that it saved the lives of untold thousands of American and Allied soldiers who would otherwise have been killed in battle.

The discovery of the means of releasing atomic energy began a new era in the history of civilization. The scientific and industrial knowledge on which this discovery rests does not relate merely to another weapon. It may some day prove to be more revolutionary in the development of human society than the invention of the wheel, the use of metals, or the steam or internal combustion engine.

Never in history has society been confronted with a power so full of potential danger and at the same time so full of promise for the future of man and for the peace of the world. I think I express the faith of the American people when I say that we can use the knowledge we have won, not for the devastation of war, but for the future welfare of humanity.

To accomplish that objective we must proceed along two fronts—the domestic and the international.

The first and most urgent step is the determination of our domestic policy for the control, use, and development of atomic energy within the United States.

We cannot postpone decisions in this field. The enormous investment which we made to produce the bomb has given us the two vast industrial plants in Washington and Tennessee, and the many associated works throughout the country. It has brought together a vast organization of scientists, executives, industrial engineers, and skilled workers—a national asset of inestimable value.

The powers which the Congress wisely gave to the Government to wage war were adequate to permit the creation and development of this enterprise as a war project. Now that our enemies have surrendered, we should take immediate action to provide for the future use of this huge investment in brains and plant. I am informed that many of the people on whom depend the continued successful operation of the plants and the further development of atomic knowledge, are getting ready to return to their normal pursuits. In many cases these people are considering leaving the project largely because of uncertainty concerning future national policy in this field. Prompt action to establish national policy will go a long way toward keeping a strong organization intact.

It is equally necessary to direct future research and to establish control of the basic raw materials essential to the development of this power whether it is to be used for purposes of peace or war. Atomic force in ignorant or evil hands could inflict untold disaster upon the Nation and the world. Society cannot hope even to protect itself—much less to realize the benefits of the discovery—unless prompt action is taken to guard against the hazards of misuse.

I therefore urge, as a first measure in a program of utilizing our knowledge for the benefit of society, that the Congress enact legislation to fix a policy with respect to our existing plants, and to control all sources of atomic energy and all activities connected with its development and use in the United States.

The legislation should give jurisdiction for these purposes to an Atomic Energy Commission with members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Congress should lay down the basic principles for all the activities of the Commission, the objectives of which should be the promotion of the national welfare, securing the national defense, safeguarding world peace and the acquisition of further knowledge concerning atomic energy.

The people of the United States know that the overwhelming power we have developed in this war is due in large measure to American science and American industry, consisting of management and labor. We believe that our science and industry owe their strength to the spirit of free inquiry and the spirit of free enterprise that characterize our country. The Commission, therefore, in carrying out its functions should interfere as little as possible with private research and private enterprise, and should use, as much as possible, existing institutions and agencies. The observance of this policy is our best guaranty of maintaining the pre-eminence in science and industry upon which our national well-being depends.

All land and mineral deposits owned by the United States which constitute sources of atomic energy, and all stock piles of materials from which such energy may be derived, and all plants or other property of the United States connected with its development and use should be transferred to the supervision and control of the Commission.

The Commission should be authorized to acquire at a fair price, by purchase or by condemnation, any minerals or other materials from which the sources of atomic energy can be derived, and also any land containing such minerals or materials, which are not already owned by the United States.

The power to purchase should include real and personal property outside the limits of the United States.

The Commission should also be authorized to conduct all necessary research, experimentation, and operations for the further development and use of atomic energy for military, industrial, scientific, or medical purposes. In these activities it should, of course, use existing private and public institutions and agencies to the fullest practicable extent.

Under appropriate safeguards, the Commission should also be permitted to license any property available to the Commission for research, development, and exploitation in the field of atomic energy. Among other things such licensing should be conditioned of course upon a policy of widespread distribution of peacetime products on equitable terms which will prevent monopoly.

In order to establish effective control and security, it should be declared unlawful to produce or use the substances comprising the sources of atomic energy or to import or export them except under conditions prescribed by the Commission.

Finally, the Commission should be authorized to establish security regulations governing the handling of all information, material, and equipment under its jurisdiction. Suitable penalties should be prescribed for violating the security regulations of the Commission or any of the other terms of the act.

The measures which I have suggested may seem drastic and far-reaching. But the discovery with which we are dealing involves forces of nature too dangerous to fit into any of our usual concepts.

The other phase of the problem is the question of the international control and development of this newly discovered energy.

In international relations as in domestic affairs, the release of atomic energy constitutes a new force too revolutionary to consider in the framework of old ideas. We can no longer rely on the slow progress of time to develop a program of control among nations. Civilization demands that we shall reach at the earliest possible date a satisfactory arrangement for the control of this discovery in order that it may become a powerful and forceful influence toward the maintenance of world peace instead of an instrument of destruction.

Scientific opinion appears to be practically unanimous that the essential theoretical knowledge upon which the discovery is based is already widely known. There is also substantial agreement that foreign research can come abreast of our present theoretical knowledge in time.

The hope of civilization lies in international arrangements looking, if possible, to the renunciation of the use and development of the atomic bomb, and directing and encouraging the use of atomic energy and all future scientific information toward peaceful and humanitarian ends. The difficulties in working out such arrangements are great. The alternative to overcoming these difficulties, however, may be a desperate armament race which might well end in disaster. Discussion of the international problem cannot be safely delayed until the United Nations organization is functioning and in a position adequately to deal with it.

I therefore propose to initiate discussions, first with our associates in this discovery, Great Britain and Canada, and then with other nations, in an effort to effect agreement on the conditions under which cooperation might replace rivalry in the field of atomic power.

I desire to emphasize that these discussions will not be concerned with disclosures relating to the manufacturing processes leading to the production of the atomic bomb itself. They will constitute an effort to work out arrangements covering the terms under which international collaboration and exchange of scientific information might safely proceed.

The outcome of the discussions will be reported to the Congress as soon as possible, and any resulting agreements requiring congressional action will be submitted to the Congress.

But regardless of the course of discussions in the international field, I believe it is essential that legislation along the lines I have indicated be adopted as promptly as possible to insure the necessary research in, and development and control of, the production and use of atomic energy.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 3, 1945.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and be printed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to comment very briefly on the message. Of course, the President is totally right in emphasizing the utter importance of prompt action in this field, because there is nothing pending in human relations which casts a greater shadow over the future on the one hand, or perhaps offers a greater hope for the future on the other.

It is perfectly obvious that congressional action is necessary preceding any conclusive determination of the American position respecting either the development, use, or control of atomic energy. It is necessary before any such Atomic Energy Commission as the President has outlined should be appointed. It is necessary before any of the powers which the President suggests are given to the Commission. Furthermore I respectfully suggest that it is advisable that some voice of congressional authority shall be available for Presidential consultation while the President is discussing with other nations what the international situation shall be in respect to control of the atomic bomb. I respectfully suggest that it would be infinitely more advisable if even the international conversations could proceed with some degree of congressional cooperation.

What I am saying is that it seems to me that everything the President has said points toward the importance of the action taken by the Senate last week in adopting a concurrent resolution proposing to create, at the highest level, a joint congressional committee of 12 members, composed of six Senators and six Representatives, to deal, on behalf of Congress, in respect to the entire subject of atomic energy—not only its development and use but also its control in all its phases and factors.

I call attention at this very moment to a demonstration of the reason why a special committee of this nature ought to be created to deal with this subject. It is so big that it transcends the jurisdiction of any committee in this body. For example, the Presiding Officer—no doubt on the advice of the Parliamentarian—has sent the message on this subject to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, whereas the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has had jurisdiction over at least two of the proposals which have heretofore been submitted in the Senate, and it is from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that a recommendation for action has come. Yet we have here a divided responsibility between committees. In the House there is an even greater division of responsibility, because a large number of measures have been introduced in the House, and they are scattered among various committees.

I am simply again urging, on the basis of the President's message, the high importance of early action in the creation of an adequate congressional authority to cooperate in full good faith with the President in dealing with this cataclysmic subject. I very respectfully express the hope that the House of Representatives may find it possible to agree with the action of the Senate without further delay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, pursuant to the President's message with respect to the development and control of atomic energy, I desire to introduce a bill to carry out the recommendations which the President has made, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before that bill is referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, I wish to know on what theory this subject comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs. The only consideration that has been given to it, beyond cursory attention in the Military Affairs Committee to the Thomas bill, has been in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not believe that the record of the Committee on Military Affairs with respect to the Thomas bill creates any precedent. In the first place, the net result of the committee's consideration was to report a bill which was totally impracticable, inasmuch as it proposed to make the Chief Justice of the United States chairman of a commission of this nature, and the Chief Justice promptly announced that he could not serve in such a function.

I do not know why the Committee on Military Affairs should have control of a subject of this all-embracing nature. This is not merely a military question. This is infinitely more than a military question. It is a question touching every phase of civilian life. Certainly fundamentally it is a question touching our international relations; and so far as the immediate problem is concerned, the international phase is even more important than the domestic phase. The Committee on Foreign Relations has had jurisdiction over the subject to as great an extent as has the Committee on Military Affairs. I know of no reason why this proposal should go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. I think what the Senator has just said about the proper committee jurisdiction of this matter is fortified by the President's message itself, which devotes itself in substantial part to a recognition and consideration of what may be done in foreign fields with respect to this new instrumentality.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine for his observation, and I wish to make a comment. I think it is perfectly silly for us to be in an argument over the jurisdiction of a matter of this nature. I am simply demonstrating through this quarrel over committee jurisdiction how impossible it is to have an appropriate forum for a discussion of a subject of this nature if we rely upon any of our present standing committees. I freely concede that the Committee on Foreign Relations has too narrow a jurisdiction. However, I assert that the Committee on Military Affairs also has a very narrow jurisdiction—even narrower, so far as this particular problem is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. BILBO. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, but I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. So if I were actuated by personal preferences, I should say that a bill dealing with such a subject might go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I do not think the fact that the President mentions the international situation which he proposes to take up and discuss with other nations would give that committee jurisdiction of the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt for a moment, I wish to suggest that a subject of so important a nature should be dealt with when we have at least a quorum present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know that there is to be a vote on this matter now.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think a quorum should be present even if there is debate on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. At any rate, I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, let us not take time to have a quorum call at this time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to have all Senators present to hear this discussion.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may we not have the bill laid on the table until we can confer about the matter and see what shall be done?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I myself think that would be a very happy solution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will permit me to say a further word while I am on my feet, I should like to observe that, although I have not read the bill, from the President's message and from what I have learned elsewhere I judge that it deals purely with the handling of atomic energy. That development was made by the War Department, for use by the military branch of our Government for very good reasons which we all understand. Of course, the line of demarcation between the jurisdiction of committees in the Senate is like a rail fence which goes first one way and then another, so that one cannot say there is ever a straight line which delineates exclusively the jurisdiction of any committee. But the atomic bomb and the use of atomic energy are matters which were developed under the jurisdiction of the War Department, for military purposes, and I imagine that the bill which has been introduced would have a military phase as well as other phases. When the President negotiates or reports to Congress any agreement or any approach to the subject with other nations from an international viewpoint, of course, that would go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it should go; but I doubt very much whether the Committee on Foreign Relations, under the rules and practice of the Senate, has any greater claim to the measure which is to be considered than does the Committee on Military Affairs or some other committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say a word, I wish to state that I am insisting that none of the standing committees of the Senate has jurisdiction which is sufficiently broad, and that the Senate itself has declared by its own action that this subject in all its aspects should be concentrated in a joint congressional committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; but the resolution does not yet have the force of law, and no one can prophesy when or whether it will meet with the approval of the other branch of Congress. I think the President feels and I think most of us would naturally feel that in an atmosphere of that uncertainty we should not be expected to wait until the other branch of Congress acts on the resolution, if it does act, before we start to do something about at least our domestic consideration and handling of this form of energy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to do so, let me say that I read in a newspaper that the House Rules Committee had cleared a resolution of precisely this same type.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the measure now under consideration might well lie on the table at least until we can explore the subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to having it lie on the table; but in view of the question of jurisdiction which has arisen, I would not care to see arise between committees a quarrel as to which one of them—or possibly two or three committees, any one of which might well have jurisdiction—should have this measure referred to it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am not raising a quarrel. I am simply using the prospect of a quarrel to demonstrate the best way to avoid one.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I think there is great merit in the suggestion made by the Senator from Alabama, and reinforced by the suggestion made by the Senator from Michigan. This subject matter is one in which I expect the entire Senate is profoundly interested. Whether there is to be a controversy over the subject of committee jurisdiction, I do not know; but if the matter is to be discussed and if a question of jurisdiction is to be threshed out on the floor of the Senate, it seems to me it would be unwise in the extreme at this hour to start the discussion and to undertake at this time of the day to reach an ultimate decision regarding the matter. I hope the Majority Leader will accede to the suggestions which have come from both his own side of the aisle and from the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, and that he will let this matter rest until tomorrow morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, the Chair has already consigned the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs; as I understand.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, no; I objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message of the President was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The question of the reference of the bill to a committee had not been acted upon at the time when the question was raised by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, Mr. President, I do not care whether the bill lies at the desk or on the table until tomorrow, but probably the only way it can get from the Senate to a committee is by an appeal from the ruling of the Chair as to which committee should receive it. I think it would be most unfortunate if tomorrow the Chair ruled as to the committee which should receive it and if there were then a controversy over the Chair's ruling on that point.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator on that matter. I should like to say that I fully realize that whatever action the House of Representatives takes will be taken in response to the policy which the President and the administration believe is appropriate under the circumstances, and I am quite ready to yield to that decision. I suggest to the Senator that if the bill can lie upon the table until tomorrow, the able majority leader can speedily determine between now and then whether it is the intention of the leadership of the House of Representatives to create a joint committee such as the Senate has requested. If that is not the purpose, I shall subside. If it is the purpose, I respectfully submit that all these proposals should go to that join' committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not certain that I can ascertain that information by tomorrow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will bet three to one on it, and I will "put up" right now.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator sometimes loses, of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

I do not think anyone will deny that this measure has very important military aspects.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I would not deny that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This is not the first bill coming to Congress that has concerned more than one committee. While the bill, as drawn, probably should not and would not appropriately be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I think we all understand that the Foreign Relations Committee has an important interest in such legislation, as do other committees. I presume that if the bill does eventually go to the Committee on Military Affairs—and I fully anticipate that is where it will go—hearings will be held. If it is the wish of the Senate to have the bill referred to other committees as well, certainly it can be referred to other committees for hearings or for whatever purpose is desired. Certainly the fact that a bill is referred to the Committee on Military Affairs does not mean that it is forever out of the possession of the Senate, because it is always in the possession of the Senate, and if the Senate wishes to have it referred elsewhere, that can be done immediately or after hearings have been held on it or at any other time the Senate desires to have such action taken.

So the dispute we are having here as to the committee jurisdiction of the measure is not as important as one might think. This is not a final action by any means.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say so, I think the Senator from Colorado misses the point I have made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I do not miss the point the Senator has made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The point I make is that this bill is too important in its over-all aspects to be dealt with by piecemeal reference of various pieces of it to various standing committees of the

Senate. I think the subject must be dealt with on an over-all basis, because it is an over-all subject and the only way to deal with it on that basis is through a special joint committee. If we start parceling out various pieces of the problem—the piece the Senator from Colorado proposes to have sent to the Committee on Military Affairs, the piece we have in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the piece the House of Representatives' Committee on the Judiciary has, the piece the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives has—if we are going to deal with the subject, in our initial approach to it, in that scatter-splash fashion, I submit it is a most unfortunate approach to the supreme problem confronting civilization today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I cannot attach such importance to the pieces the Senator has referred to, provided the pieces dovetail into some pattern which really covers the situation. Whether there is a special joint committee to consider the whole plan is, it seems to me, beside the point. Perhaps eventually that sort of disposition will be the wish of the Senate. If it is, that readily can be done.

Simply because we ask that the measure be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs does not mean that committee will have any final disposal of it or that hearings will start on it tomorrow morning. Certainly, we do not expect action that quickly. However, I am glad to have it lie on the table and let the matter of reference be determined tomorrow, or at some future time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to add only a word to what has already been said. I wish to say that I wholeheartedly associate myself with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in the thought that this matter should be referred to one committee. I do not know of anything which would be more confusing, or less helpful in reaching a result, than a reference of the subject to several different committees.

Mr. President, there is pending at the present time a matter involving the Missouri Valley Authority. Months and months have been consumed in consideration of the measure by various committees, and the end is not yet in sight.

I invite attention to the fact that I am glad this matter lies on the table and has not been sent to the Military Affairs Committee. I have no disrespect for that great committee, but the message of the President of the United States points out that this problem is not a military problem at all. We hope and pray that the use of the atomic bomb will never again be a military problem. But the President has pointed out the international and domestic aspects involved, neither of which are military in character. The only purpose in the world in sending this bill to the Military Affairs Committee is that of recognizing by the Senate of the United States that this vast force is to be used for war and for no other purpose.

I hope, Mr. President, that we may all read the bill before it is acted upon, and determine for ourselves whether or not it carries out the terms of the message of the President of the United States. I hope the House of Representatives will speedily act on the concurrent resolution to which reference has been made, and that a special committee may be appointed, and that it will start working immediately, and entertain full jurisdiction of all matters connected not with the bomb, but with atomic energy.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President could have sent his message to the Congress dealing altogether with the domestic phases of the atomic situation without any reference to the international phase of it. The bill which has been introduced does not, as I understand, deal in any way with the international situation, but only with the internal situation in the United States. The fact that in his message the President added to what he might well have said concerning the internal domestic situation and then stopped, has no relationship to the terms of the bill itself in the form in which it has been introduced. So the mere fact that the President speaks about the international situation and states that he will enter into discussions with other nations, and later report to the Congress whatever agreements have been entered into, or whatever the facts may be, does not, in my judgment, alter the terms of the bill which has been introduced, and which deals wholly with the internal situation.

I myself do not think there is necessarily any conflict between the establishment of the joint committee provided for in the concurrent resolution which was agreed to by the Senate the other day, and the commission which the President has recommended, and which is provided for in the bill which has been introduced. I can see perhaps some confusion resulting from the appointment of a congressional committee and the appointment of an executive committee by the President; but there would not necessarily be any conflict between the two. I may say, however, that the concurrent resolution which we adopted the other day does not give the joint committee entire jurisdiction. If the matter eventually comes back it will then have to go to a standing committee. We have enough standing committees, and while jurisdiction is somewhat nebulous none of us have encouraged the idea that joint committees or special investigating committees should be given legislative jurisdiction in the sense that standing committees have legislative jurisdiction.

I hope that the Senator will read the terms of the bill. I think he will find that it contains nothing which would relate to international affairs, thereby giving jurisdiction to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Even though the Military Affairs Committee may not have any greater jurisdiction than any other committee, I doubt that the measure should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD so that we may all know exactly what it contains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico that the bill be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I presume that, although the bill lies on the table, it will be printed in the usual manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If it lies on the table, it will be printed in regular bill form.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the advantage of having the bill printed in the RECORD would be in the opportunity afforded to Members of the Senate and Members of the House to read it earlier than they perhaps would otherwise read it. Some of the Members of both Houses of Congress read the RECORD before they arrive at their respective Chambers, and therefore it might be of some advantage to them to have the bill printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order concerning the printing of the bill in the RECORD will be independent from the order concerning the printing of it in regular bill form. It will be printed both ways.

Without objection, the bill will lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1463) for the development and control of atomic energy, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. Research and experimentation in the field or nuclear fission has attained the stage at which the release of atomic energy on a large scale is practical. The proper development and utilization of such energy will advance the national welfare, secure the national defense, insure the national safety, and promote world peace, to an extent and by means which cannot now be measured. The misuse of such energy, by design or through ignorance, may inflict incalculable disaster upon the Nation, destroy the general welfare, imperil the national safety, and endanger world peace. In the highest national interest, and to protect the national existence, it is essential that all further development and exploitation of this newly tapped source of energy be centrally directed and controlled for the benefit of the entire Nation. Accordingly, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that control of all sources of this energy be vested in the Commission established by this act and that all activities connected with research on the transmutation of atomic species, the production of nuclear fission, and the release of atomic energy shall be conducted in the interest of the Nation and world peace, under the supervision and direction of the Commission. The primary objectives of all action taken under or pursuant to this act shall be the promotion of the national defense, the protection of the safety of the inhabitants of the United States, the safeguarding of world peace, and the furtherance of the acquisition of knowledge concerning atomic energy.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established the Atomic Energy Commission (hereinafter called the Commission) which shall be composed of nine members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the

advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall initially appoint three members to serve for 3 years, three for 6 years, and three for 9 years; and thereafter each member appointed shall service for a term of 9 years, except that a member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission as Chairman. Six of the members shall constitute a quorum of the Commission. Members of the Commission may be removed by the President only for inability to act, neglect of duty, malfeasance in office, conflict of interests, or because continuance of the member in office would be inimical to the national defense. The members of the Commission, except officers of the armed forces on active duty and civilian members holding other offices or positions under the United States, shall receive a per diem allowance of $50 for each day spent in meetings or conferences of the Commission and all members shall receive compensation for necessary traveling or other expenses incurred while engaged in the work of the Commission. The provisions of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) shall not be deemed to apply to any person because of membership on the Commission, and members may engage in other occupations or businesses, private or governmental, to an extent not inconsistent with the performance of their duties, and may hold other offices or positions under the United States and receive compensation therefor.

(b) The Commission shall meet at least four times in every calendar year.

(c) The Commission shall, without regard to the civil-service laws, appoint an Administrator and a Deputy Administrator who shall not be members of the Commission and shall serve at its pleasure. The Administrator and the Deputy Administrator shall engage in no other occupation or business, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 and $12,000 per year, respectively, in addition to which each shall be reimbursed for necessary traveling expenses.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of United States Code, title 10, section 576, or United States Code, title 5, sections 59 (a) and 62, or any other statute, any active or retired officer of the armed forces, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service, may serve as a member of the Commission, as Administrator, or as Deputy Administrator, without prejudice to his commissioned status as such officer; no retired officer shall be deemed to have been placed on active status by reason of such service; any officer serving as Administrator or as Deputy Administrator shall receive, in addition to his pay from the United States as such officer, an amount equal to the difference between such pay and the compensation prescribed in subsection (c).

(e) The Commission and the Administrator, within the limits of funds which may be made available, may each employ and fix the compensation of necessary personnel without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws, the Classification Act of 1923, or any other statute, and may each make such expenditures for supplies, property, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out their respective functions.

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSION AND THE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall have plenary supervision and control, so far as the jurisdiction of the United States extends, over all sources of atomic energy and over all matters connected with research on the transmutation of atomic species, the production of nuclear fission, and the release of atomic energy. In the conduct of its activities, the Commission shall adopt the policy of minimum interference with private research and of employing other Government agencies, educational and research institutions, and private enterprise to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the objectives of this act. The activities of the Commission shall be carried on in accordance with the basic principles established by the President in the promotion of international peace, the development of foreign policy, and the safeguarding of the national defense.

(b) Subject to the direction and supervision of the Commission, the Administrator shall be charged with and responsible for the administration of this act. The Deputy Administrator shall have such authority and exercise such powers as may be delegated to him by the Administrator and, in the absence of the Administrator, or in the event of his inability to act, shall act as Administrator. With this in view, the Deputy Administrator shall at all times be kept fully informed by the Administrator.

(c) All Government agencies are directed to render full cooperation, aid, and assistance to the Commission and the Administrator, to effectuate any applicable regulations, orders, and directives of the Commission and the Administrator. With the consent of such agencies, or with the approval of the President, the Commission and the Administrator may themselves utilize and direct the services of officers or employees of other Government agencies.

ADVISORY BOARDS

SEC. 4. (a) The President may from time to time establish such advisory boards as he deems appropriate to assist in the effectuation of the purposes of this act, and shall prescribe the composition, functions, duties, and duration of such advisory boards. One member of each board shall be designated by the President as chairman thereof.

(b) Members of the boards, except officers of the armed forces on active duty and civilian members holding other offices or positions under the United States, shall receive a per diem allowance of $25 for each day spent in actual meetings or conferences, and all members shall receive necessary traveling and other expenses while so engaged. The provisions of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) shall not be deemed to apply to any person because of membership on said boards, and members may engage in other occupations or businesses, private or governmental, to an extent not inconsistent with the performance of their duties, and may hold other offices or positions under the United States, and receive compensation therefor. Any active or retired officer of the armed forces, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service may serve as a member of an advisory board without prejudice to his commissioned status as such officer, notwithstanding the provisions of United States Code, title 10, section 576, or United States Code, title 5, sections 59 (a) or 62, or any other statute; no retired officer shall be deemed to have been placed on active status by reason of service on an advisory board.

(c) The Commission and the Administrator shall advise and consult with such advisory boards as may have been established, on matters within their respective spheres of interest, and the boards may made such recommendations to the Commisison or the Administrator relating to legislation, policies, procedures, administration, and research as they may deem desirable in the performance of their functions.

GENERAL POWERS OF THE COMMISSION AND OF THE ADMINISTRATOR; DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 5. (a) In the performance of its functions, the Commission is authorized—

(1) to make and modify agreements, arrangements, and contracts (including where deemed advisable cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts but not cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts), upon such terms and conditions and in such manner as may be deemed necessary to facilitate the purposes of this act, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts;

(2) to make advance, partial, and other payments in connection with contracts, loans, and grants of funds to any person on such terms and conditions as are deemed appropriate in the national interest;

(3) from time to time to adopt and amend such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, which shall be published in the Federal Register where deemed by the Commission to be of general application and where not inconsistent with considerations of security;

(4) To bring suit in its own name, or in the name of the United States, in any court, State or Federal, of competent jurisdiction.

(5) To acquire, purchase, lease, and hold real and personal property as agent of and on behalf of the United States, and to sell, lease, grant, and dispose of such real and personal property as provided herein.

(6) To exercise, in the name and on behalf of the United States, the rights of eminent domain and requisition as provided herein.

(7) To create or organize corporations, the stock of which shall be wholly owned by the United States and controlled by the Commission, to carry out the provisions of this act.

(8) To exercise the duties and authorities of the head of a department of the Government respecting the making of a certificate in the manner and for the purpose provided in section 4894 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 37).

(9) To take all such other action and exercise all such other powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers and performance of the functions provided in this act.

(b) In the performance of his functions, and subject to the supervision and direction of the Commission, the administrator shall also have the powers and authority provided in subsections (a) (1), (2), (4), (5), (6), (8), and (9) hereof.

(c) The Administrator may delegate any power and authority conferred upon him, except that provided in subsections (a) (4), (6), and (8) hereof, to any qualified officer, or employee of the Commission, the Administrator, or any other Government agency, and may authorize successive redelegations of such power and authority to such personnel: *Provided*, That any delegation by the Administrator of power and authority to purchase, acquire, or sell real property shall be specific in terms. Nothing in this subsection (c) shall restrict the Administrator's powers of delegation to the Deputy Administrator as provided in section 3 (b).

TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY TO THE COMMISSION; DECLARATION OF PRIVATE INTERESTS AND ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY

SEC. 6. (a) There are hereby transferred into the custody and control of the Commission the following property owned by the United States or any of its agencies, or any interest in such property held in trust for or on behalf of the United States;

(i) All stocks of the ores or other materials from which the substances known as thorium, uranium (including uranium enriched as to one of its isotopes), and elements higher than uranium in the periodic table, can be refined or produced;

(ii) All plants, facilities, equipment, and materials for the refining, or production, or for the utilization, in any form of the substances described in subsection (a) (i);

(iii) All stocks, on hand or in process, of the substances described in subsection (a) (i);

(iv) All processes and technical information of any kind, and the sources thereof (including data, drawings, specifications, patents, patent applications, and other sources), relating to the refining, production, or utilization of the substances described in subsection (a) (i);

(v) All contracts, agreements, leases, patents, applications for patents, inventions and discoveries (whether patented or unpatented), and other rights of any kind concerning any items of the types of property described in subsections (a) (i) to (a) (iv);

(vi) All property in the custody and control of the Manhattan Engineer District, Army Service Forces, Army of the United States.

(b) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other statute, including the mining and leasing laws, no right, title, or interest in or to deposits from which there can be refined or produced the substances described in subsection (a) (i), owned by the United States, and no right to prospect, or explore for, mine, or remove such substances, may be acquired except in accordance with the provisions of this act. The Commission is authorized to extend the provisions of this subsection (b) to any deposits from which there can be refined or produced other metals or substances determined by the Commission to be readily capable of or directly connected with the transmutation of atomic species, the production of nuclear fission, or the release of atomic energy. Notice of such extensions shall be published in the Federal Register.

(2) The Secretary of the Interior, or the head of any other appropriate Government agency, shall transfer into the custody and control of the Commission such deposits covered by subsection (b) (1), or public or acquired lands containing such deposits, as the Commission from time to time requests. Until the Commission so requests, all public and acquired lands shall continue to be administered under the laws otherwise applicable, and disposition of such lands may be made as provided in the public land laws, or otherwise. However, all patents, conveyances, and other grants of any right, title, or interest in or to all public and acquired lands shall hereafter contain a reservation to the United States, acting through the Commission or the Administrator, of all right, title, and interest in and to all deposits covered by subsection (b) (1), and of the right of the United States, acting through the Commission or the Administrator, to prospect or explore for, mine, or remove such substances; moreover, no location based on a discovery of such deposits may be made nor may any rights to them be acquired under the mining laws. Damages shall be paid by the Commission for injury to any property, or interests therein, occasioned by action of the United States in prospecting or exploring for, or removing such substances.

(c) The President of the United States is authorized to provide, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, for the transfer to the control, possession, and use of the Commission of such other property of the United States as he may from time to time deem necessary and proper for the purposes of the Commission.

(d) At such time or times subsequent to the enactment of this act as the Commission or the Administrator may determine, all persons knowing or having reason to believe that they have any right, title, interest, or claim in and to any and all items of property of the type described in subsections (a) (i) to (a) (v), inclusive, and any deposits of ores from which substances described in subsection (a) (i) can be refined or produced, which are not owned by the United States or any Government agency, shall declare the same to the Commission in such manner and form and to such extent as the Commission or the Administrator may prescribe. The Commission or the Administrator is authorized to acquire, purchase, take, requisition, or condemn, on behalf of and as agent of the United States, any of the property so declared, or any interest in such property as the Commission or the Administrator finds to be within the scope of this act.

POWER TO ACQUIRE, REQUISITION, CONDEMN, AND REQUIRE DECLARATIONS OF OTHER ITEMS OF PROPERTY

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission or the Administrator is authorized to require any person to declare, at the time, in the manner, form, and to the extent prescribed by the Commission or the Administrator, and to acquire or purchase, within the United States or elsewhere, and to take, requisition, or condemn, within the United States, as the case may be, any of the following, on behalf of and as agent of the United States, whenever such action shall be deemed to be essential to the performance of their functions under this act:

(i) ores, metals, minerals, and other substances or materials;

(ii) real property, plants, mines, facilities, and equipment;

(iii) technical information of all kinds;

(iv) patents, applications for patents, inventions and discoveries (whether patented or unpatented) and rights thereunder; and

(v) contracts, agreements, leases, and rights;

which, in the judgment of the Commission, are peculiarly related to the transmutation of atomic species, the production of nuclear fission, or the release of atomic energy.

(b) The Commission or the Administrator is authorized to conduct exploratory operations or investigations to determine the locations, extent, and mode of occurrence of deposits of any ores, minerals, or substances, with or without the consent of any person holding any interest in the property so affected. Just compensation shall be made for any property or right so acquired or taken, as provided in section 8 (b), and damages shall be paid for any injury done to the property affected.

COMPENSATION FOR PRIVATE PROPERTY ACQUIRED

SEC. 8. (a) The United States shall make just compensation for the personal property acquired, taken, or requisitioned pursuant to section 6 (d) or section 7. The Commission shall determine such compensation. If the compensation so determined be unsatisfactory to the person entitled thereto, such person shall be paid 50 percent of the amount so determined, and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such further sum as added to said 50 percent will make up such amount as will be just compensation.

(b) In the exercise of the rights of eminent domain and condemnation, the Commission or the Administrator shall cause proceedings to be instituted under the Act of August 1, 1888 (U. S. C. title 40, sec. 257), or any other applicable Federal statute. Upon or after the filing of the condemnation petition, immediate possession may be taken and the property may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this act, notwithstanding any other law. Real property acquired by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer may also be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this act, prior to approval of title by the Attorney General.

INVENTORIES OF PROPERTY

SEC. 9. Within 3 months after the enactment of this act, the Administrator shall compile a preliminary inventory of the property of the United States subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, and shall prepare a complete inventory as soon thereafter as possible. Every year thereafter the Administrator shall compile supplementary inventories, indicating all changes in such property. A copy of each inventory shall be submitted to the President of the United States and the original shall be filed with the records of the Commission. From time to time the Commission shall submit to the Congress and shall make public such portions of said inventories as may be so disseminated without prejudice to the national interest.

AUTHORITY OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 10. (a) The Administrator is authorized to conduct research and experimentation in the field of nuclear fission, the transmutation of atomic species, and closely related phenomena, and to proceed with the development of any and all processes or methods for the release of atomic energy, and for the exploitation and use thereof for military, industrial, scientific, or medical purposes: *Provided, however,* That it shall be the policy of the Commission and of the Administrator, in accord with the objectives of this act, to utilize, encourage, and aid colleges, universities, scientific laboratories, hospitals, and other governmental, nonprofit, or private institutions equipped and staffed to conduct research and experimentation in this field. The Administrator may also engage in all such related activities as he deems necessary for the proper performance of these functions. In performing any of his functions, the Administrator may construct, establish, and operate all necessary plants and facilities, may modify and use any or all of the property available to the Commission, and may employ such personnel as may be necessary. Without regard to the civil-service laws or any other statute, the Administrator, with the approval of the Commission may also arrange by contract or otherwise, with other persons to engage in any of the foregoing activities on behalf of the Commission, and subject to its supervision.

(b) No other Government agency, except the armed forces for military purposes in time of war or national emergency and at the direction of the President, shall undertake or engage in such activities without the consent of the Administrator and upon such conditions as he, with the approval of the Commission, may prescribe.

(c) The Administrator is expressly authorized to acquire such property, to establish or construct such buildings and facilities, to provide or arrange for such services, and to engage in such activities, as he deems necessary and proper for the housing, health, safety, welfare, recreation, and security of personnel employed by the Commission, the Administrator, or any agent of either of them. Any person whose property is taken pursuant to this subsection (c) shall be entitled to just compensation in accordance with the provisions of section 8.

(d) In the administration of this act, the Commission, the Administrator, and their agents and licensees shall, so far as feasible, protect and conserve all natural resources.

LICENSING OF THE COMMISSION'S PROPERTY

SEC. 11. (a) The Administrator is authorized to license any or all of the property available to the Commission, without regard to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 or of any other statute, to any person or Government agency for (1) research and experimentation in nuclear fission or the transmutation of atomic species; (2) the development, exploitation, and use of processes or methods for the release of atomic energy; (3) any use of such property where it is deemed advisable for the purposes of this act to retain control or supervision in the Commission over the property, its utilization, or disposition; or (4) any other purpose incidental or related to the purposes of this act. No such license for purposes (1), (2), or (3) shall be given by the Administrator to a foreign government or any person who is not under and within the jurisdiction of the United States, without the approval of the President of the United States.

(b) It shall be a condition of all licenses given pursuant to this section that the holder

or grantee thereof shall file with the Commission such reports concerning the use of the licensed property, and related matters, as the Administrator or the Commission may require. The Administrator or the Commission may impose such other terms and conditions upon the licensee as may be deemed advisable and appropriate in the national interest.

(c) In the performance of their functions under this section and section 13, the Commission and the Administrator shall adopt the policy of (1) widespread distribution, so far as feasible, of such licenses and consents on equally equitable terms to all qualified persons, and (2) discouraging the growth of monopoly, restraint of trade, and unlawful competition in the trades and industries affected by such licenses and consents. The Commission and the Administrator shall promptly report to the Attorney General any evidence which they may have (i) of the use of property licensed under this section or (ii) of action under any consent granted under section 13, which fosters monopoly, restraint of trade, or unlawful competition.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

SEC. 12. Whenever the Commission or the Administrator determines that control over any property of the United States of which the Commission has jurisdiction, or that the disposition of such property under sections 10 or 11, is no longer necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act, they shall report such property to the appropriate Government agency concerned with the utilization and disposition of such property, and shall turn over or dispose of such property pursuant to the orders of such agency: *Provided*, That the Commission shall itself be authorized (without regard to the Surplus Property Act of 1944 or any other statute) to sell or return any real or personal property, on such terms and conditions as it deems proper, to the person from whom such property was acquired, and his heirs or assigns, or to the present occupants or holders of such property: *And provided further*, That the Commission and the Administration shall return any such property to the Government agency from which it was acquired.

CONTROL OF ACTIVITIES

SEC. 13. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person without the consent of the Administrator and upon such conditions as he, with the approval of the Commission, may prescribe—

(1) To define, produce, or process the substances described in section 6 (a) (i) or any ores or materials known to be capable of producing such substances;

(2) to use, process, manufacture, or utilize, in any manner, the substances described in section 6 (a) (i).

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to export from or import into the United States ores or other materials containing any appreciable quantity, as defined by regulation of the Commission, of the substances described in section 6 (a) (i), or such substances, for any purpose, until after application has been made to the Administrator and the Administrator's consent has been obtained, including in such application a sworn statement as to the quantity, designation, consignee, and intended use of the material being exported or imported, together with such other information as the Commission may require. The Commission or the Administrator may prohibit or condition the exportation or importation of the materials described above in such manner as they find to be required by the policies and purposes of the act.

(c) The Commission is authorized to extend the provisions of subsections (a) or (b) to any other metal or substance determined by the Commission to be readily capable of or directly connected with the transmutation of atomic species, the production of nuclear fission, or the release of atomic energy. Notice of such extensions shall be published in the Federal Register.

(d) It shall be unlawful for any person to conduct research or experimentation involving the release of atomic energy in amounts deemed and to be prescribed by the Commission as constituting a national hazard or being of military or industrial value, without the consent of the Administrator and upon such conditions as the Administrator, with the approval of the Commission, may prescribe. In administering this provision, the Commission and the Administrator shall interfere to the least possible extent with small-scale experimentation in research laboratories of nonprofit institutions.

(e) The Administrator and the Commission shall have plenary authority to direct, supervise, regulate, and inspect the activities with respect to which consent has been granted, to the extent necessary to enforce compliance with the conditions which have been prescribed in connection with the granting of consent to such activities.

REPORTS

SEC. 14. As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, the Commission shall separately submit to the President of the United States and to the Congress (a) reports concerning the matters within its jurisdiction and the exercise of its authority under this act, and (b) financial statements of the Government operations and activities subject to its jurisdiction.

AUDITS

SEC. 15. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office in the settlement of the accounts of the Administrator or other accountable officer or employee of the Commission, the Administrator, or their agents, shall not disallow credit for nor withhold funds because of any expenditure which the Commission shall determine and certify to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

VOLUNTARY PAYMENTS TO STATES AND LOCALITIES

SEC. 16. In order to render financial assistance to those States and local governments in which the activities of the Commission are carried on and in which the Commission, or its agents, have acquired properties previously subject to State and local taxation, the Commission is authorized to make payments to States and local governments in lieu of such taxes. Such payments may be in the amounts, at the times and upon the terms the Commission deems appropriate, but the Commission shall be guided by the policy of not exceeding the taxes which would have been payable for such property in the condition in which it was acquired, except where special burdens have been cast upon the State or local government by activities of the Commission, the Administrator, the Manhattan Engineer District, or their agents, and in such cases, any benefits accruing to the States and local governments by reason of these activities shall be considered in the determination of such payments. The Commission and any corporation created by it, and the property and income of the Commission or of such corporations, are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by any State, county, municipality, or any subdivision thereof.

SECURITY REGULATIONS

SEC. 17. The Commission is authorized and directed to establish, and to provide for the administration of security regulations governing the collection, classification, dissemination, publication, transmission, handling, and communication by any person of information, data, documents, equipment, and material of any kind relating to or connected with research on the transmutation of atomic species, with the production of nuclear fission, or with the release of atomic energy, in all cases where such information, data, documents, equipment, or material have at any time, before or after the passage of this act, been entrusted to, or come into the knowledge or possession of, any such person (1) by reason of his official duties, or (2) pursuant to a contract with or license from, or in the course of employment by the Commission, the Administrator, any other Government agency, their agents, contractors, or licensees, or (3) in connection with activities governed by section 13.

GENERAL PENALTIES

SEC. 18. (a) Any willful violation or any willful attempt to violate, or any conspiracy to violate, any of the provisions of this act, or of any rule, regulation, or consent authorized hereunder, except as provided in section 19, shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $100,000 or by imprisonment for a term of not exceeding 10 years, or both.

(b) On application by the Commission or the Administrator, any court of competent jurisdiction is authorized to, and shall grant injunctive or other appropriate affirmative relief against any violation of any of the provisions of this act, or of any rule, regulation, license, or consent authorized hereunder.

PENALTIES FOR SECURITY VIOLATIONS

SEC. 19. (a) Any violation of any regulation promulgated by the Commission pursuant to section 17 shall, in addition to any other penalties, be ground for dismissal from employment by the Commission or the Administrator, or for dismissal, at the direction of the Administrator, from employment by other Government agencies, or the agents, holders of consents, or licensees of the Commission, the Administrator, or other Government agencies, without regard to criminal prosecution or conviction thereunder.

(b) Any violation of regulations promulgated by the Commission pursuant to section 17 of this act shall, regardless of intent, be punishable by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment of not more than 30 days, or both, or, if willful or through gross negligence, shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $100,000 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 10 years, or both. An attempt to violate or a conspiracy to violate regulations promulgated by the Commission pursuant to section 17 of this act shall be punishable in the same manner.

(c) Whoever, lawfully or unlawfully, having possession of, access to, control over, or being intrusted with any information, data, documents, equipment, or material of any kind relating to or connected with research on the transmutation of atomic species, with the production of nuclear fission, or with the release of atomic energy, with the intent to jeopardize the interests of the United States, or with reason to believe that his act will have such consequences, communicates or transmits, or attempts or conspires to communicate or transmit the same to any person not entitled to receive it, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500,000 or by imprisonment for a term of not exceeding 30 years, or both.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 20. As used in this act—

(a) The term "Government agency" means any executive department of the Government, or any administrative unit or subdivision thereof, any independent agency of, or any corporation owned or controlled by, the United States.

(b) The term "person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, political entity, public or private institution, group, or other entity.

(c) The term "material" includes any article, commodity, substance, machinery, accessory, equipment, part, component, assem-

bly, work in process, maintenance, repair and operating supplies, and any product of any kind.

(d) The term "United States" includes all Territories and possessions of the United States.

(e) The term "license" (verb) includes license, lease, loan, sell, furnish, make available, dispose, grant, any right or interest.

(f) The term "property" includes real property (including all interests in or pertaining thereto), personal property, intangible property, plants, equipment, materials, and for the purposes of section 11 includes funds available to the Commission.

(g) The term "agent" of the Commission or of the Administrator includes corporations created by the Commission, contractors with the Commission or the Administrator, and other agents.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 21. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act. So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for the use of the Manhattan Engineer District, Army Service Forces, and all records and all outstanding obligations thereof, shall be transferred to the Commission for use in connection with the exercise of any of the functions authorized by this act.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 22. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstance other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 23. This act may be cited as the "Atomic Energy Act of 1945."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely rise to point out to the majority leader and to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] how complicated is the matter which we are now discussing. Several bills have been introduced in both the Senate and in the other House providing for scientific research, the development of atomic energy, and all similar matters. Many of those bills have already been referred to various committees.

The custom which has been followed in the past of indicating on a bill to what committee it should be referred has been sometimes, perhaps, a bad practice. So complicated became the problem of scientific research in connection with the atomic bomb, atomic energy, and all the integrated matters, that finally it was determined to hold joint hearings in regard to the matter. Some bills had been introduced and referred to the Commerce Committee, and others had been referred to the Military Affairs Committee. Why reference was made in any instance to the Military Affairs Committee, I do not know, unless, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has pointed out, atomic energy may be converted into a weapon of war. If that be not true, then I believe that the Military Affairs Committee would have no jurisdiction whatever over the subject. Beginning next Monday, we are holding joint hearings. Every scientist who had anything to do with manufacturing the bomb, including military men, has been invited to appear before the joint committee of the Military Affairs Committee and the Commerce Committee. The testimony, of course, will deal greatly with the problems associated with atomic energy. I do not know why we should refer this bill in any event to the Military Affairs Committee unless we resign ourselves to the claim that atomic energy is purely a military instrument.

I suggest that inasmuch as this is a very vitally important problem, perhaps the leaders on both sides of the Chamber should arrange to have a special Senate committee handle the matter. Until that has been done every committee in the Senate may claim jurisdiction of the bill. The Committee on Interstate Commerce will want jurisdiction because some may say that atomic energy will some day provide power for operating the railroads. The Committee on Manufactures may claim jurisdiction because some may say that atomic energy will be vitally associated with manufacturing.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What about the matter of appropriations?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; there is also involved the matter of appropriations.

I think we shall experience constant difficulties in having hearings held in connection with scientific research, a subject about which the President has spoken.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator know that the Senate only a few days ago adopted a concurrent resolution calling for an over-all congressional committee of 12, dealing with the full development, control and use of atomic energy?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not familiar with it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that is the answer to the Senator's statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It may be. I am discussing the problem of referring bills which provide for hearings in connection with this subject. The country is avid to hear more about the subject of atomic energy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree completely with the Senator that there should be a clearing house. I am simply suggesting that we have already proposed a means of establishing a clearing house.

Mr. BARKLEY. But that clearing house, however, would have no jurisdiction over the bill which has just been introduced.

In view of the statements which have been made here with reference to referring bills to various committees, I suggest that it might be well to refer the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from Colorado to the Committee on the Library, where it will be subjected to a real research for the purpose of finding out what the matter is all about. [Laughter.]

The fact that this bill might be referred to the Military Affairs Committee in no sense makes it subject to the conclusion or suspicion that atomic energy is to be used only as a war instrument.

The development of atomic energy and the production of the bomb, as I stated awhile ago, came under the jurisdiction and through the activities of the War Department. The War Department has all the facts in regard to the development of atomic energy and the production of the bomb. They are not interested in atomic energy purely from the standpoint that it may some day be used for war purposes, and the fact that it might go to the Committee on Military Affairs would not, in my judgment, in any sense indicate that we look upon it only as a possible instrument of war.

It is true that many committees of the Senate, under our practice, might claim jurisdiction of this matter, and I have deplored the practice which was inaugurated here a few years ago, under the obiter dictum, we might say, of one of our Vice Presidents, that any Senator could get a bill of any kind sent to any committee he desired to have it sent to if he would just write the name of the committee on the bill. That is a ridiculous absence of any orderly procedure in the Senate of the United States, and I have been trying as best I could to get away from that announcement ever since it was made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How long ago was that? I am trying to identify the Vice President.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was not within the last 5 years, and it was not as long ago as 14 years. [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We have had an announcement very recently that the old rule to which the Senator referred, that a Senator could indicate the committee to which he wanted a bill to go, was abandoned by the Presiding Officer, that a bill should be referred to the committee which had jurisdiction of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that should be the rule, and I think that the Presiding Officer, guided by the Parliamentarian, should take the responsibility of sending a bill to the committee to which he thinks it should go.

I have no objection to allowing the bill now being discussed to lie on the table until tomorrow. In the meantime, if I can get any information from any source that would shed any light on the future possibility of atomic or legislative energy, I shall be glad to impart the information to the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me further?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to say that the message of the President strikes me very forcefully, and I approve it, but there is one sentence I just happened to notice which, in a way, shows the condition in which the Senate is in dealing with this problem. The President says:

> But the discovery with which we are dealing involves forces of nature too dangerous to fit into our usual concepts.

I submit, Mr. President, that the forces are too new, too strong, too transcendent to fit into the usual, ordinary concepts and rules of the Senate.

Mr. BILBO. As a matter of fact, the bill should be sent to the Committee on the District of Columbia, for the whole world wants to localize this development.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is where most of our explosions occur. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Mississippi guarantee that if it is sent to his committee and he reports it, he will not filibuster against it?

Mr. BILBO. I shall not unless the interests of the taxpayers are involved.

Mr. BARKLEY. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, and the Senator from Mississippi being completely exhausted——

Mr. BILBO. I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that I have just finished some preliminary remarks, and have started in on a mighty good speech. I wish to ask unanimous consent that I may retain the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. When I said "exhausted" I meant physically, and not mentally.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator is mistaken about the physical part also.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Since the Senator from Mississippi has such a long speech, I suggest to the able majority leader that we begin our session tomorrow at 11 o'clock, prepared to continue a little later in the evening.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think we had better not do that tomorrow on such short notice. Besides, some of us have to be at an important conference tomorrow which might not be concluded by 11 o'clock. But the idea the Senator offers is worth considering, and we might well consider whether day after tomorrow, if the Senator from Mississippi is not both physically and mentally exhausted, we may meet at 11 o'clock instead of 12.

Mr. BILBO. I may say that I shall be glad to yield at any time, without losing a right to the floor, for any matter which any Senator wishes to have taken up, because it will take me some time to conclude, and I should not care to delay any matter in which any Senator may be interested.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, we all understand that technically the Senator could not keep the floor by just saying he wanted it. It is always the province of the Presiding Officer to recognize a Senator. But in honor of the custom to which we have always adhered, that if a Senator has not finished his remarks, we are not thereby compelled to remain here during the night, and that we may take a well-deserved rest, I suggest that we suspend now, and I personally shall have no objection to the Senator's having the floor tomorrow. Further than that deponent sayeth not.

Mr. BILBO. I shall appreciate the courtesy.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION—NOMINATION ADVERSELY REPORTED

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond S. McKeough to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this nomination will lead to some discussion, I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator from Kentucky have in mind some day on which the nomination will be considered?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Louisiana that I do not now have a date in mind.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harrington Wimberly to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard Sachse to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. O'Connell, of Pennsylvania, to be judge for the third circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Everett M. Evans to be marshal for the District of Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Grant to be marshal for the southern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hubert J. Harrington to be marshal for the district of New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the same request with respect to the nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 4, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 3 (legislative day of October 2), 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Harold D. Finley, of New York, now a foreign-service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Parker T. Hart, of Massachusetts, now a foreign-service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Robert J. Cavanaugh, of Illinois, now a foreign-service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

William H. Christensen, of South Dakota, now a foreign-service officer, unclassified, and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons now foreign-service officers of class 6 and secretaries in the diplomatic service to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Perry Ellis, of California.
Charles S. Millet, of New Hampshire.
Walter Smith, of Illinois.
Philip P. Williams, of California.

The following-named persons now foreign-service officers of class 6 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Roswell C. Beverstock, of California.
Easton T. Kelsey, of Michigan.
John Ordway, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as foreign-service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Herbert D. Brewster, of Minnesota.
Maurice J. Broderick, of New York.
James M. Byrne, of New York.
Francis H. Columbat, of California.
Robert F. Corrigan, of Ohio.
Russell H. Fifield, of Maine.

John F. Fitzgerald, of Pennsylvania.
John C. Hawley, of Texas.
Thomas E. Hoffman, of Ohio.
Weldon Litsey, of Wyoming.
LeRoy Makepeace, of Connecticut.
Miss Betty Ann Middleton, of California.
Cabot Sedgwick, of Arizona.
Herbert D. Spivak, of New York.
Norman C. Stines, Jr., of California.
Edward L. Waggoner, of Ohio.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

John F. Sonnett, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Francis M. Shea, resigned.

THE JUDICIARY

JUDGE, UNITED STATES' CUSTOMS COURT

Irvin C. Mollison, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. Thomas J. Walker, deceased.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Lowell B. Mason, of Illinois, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1942.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Harvey Jones Gunderson, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the unexpired term of 2 years from January 22, 1944, vice Howard J. Klossner.

FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Watson B. Miller, of Maryland, to be Federal Security Administrator.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be first lieutenants with rank from October 5, 1945

Second Lt. George Edwin Pinard, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Jack Holt Alston, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Harold Elmer Gould, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Earl Wilson Worley, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Byron Eugene Hall, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. John Scrimgeour Evans, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. William Archibald Lanford, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Ray Edgar Soper, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Frederick Thomas Anutta, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. John Lloyd Folts, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Rudolph King Ort, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Louis David VanMullem, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Roland Leo Kolb, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Cleveland Charles MacLane, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Henry Dale Weston, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Herbert Frederick Crecelius, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).
Second Lt. Donn Royce Pepke, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Second Lt. Dohald Calvin Foster, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Yates McCachern, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Patrick Williams Riddleberger, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edwin Allison Nichols, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. George Benedict Cullison, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Kenneth Paul Burns, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Richard Casper Wittmann, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Edward Herbes, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. John Herbert Lackey, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Second Lt. Charles Dean Chitty, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Clyde Asa Ray, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Malcolm Arnot Moore, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Winton Ralph Close, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Athel Bangert, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Stanley Eldred Matthews, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Alexander Hume Lucas, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Hollis Clinton Lewis, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lewis William Leeney, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Wheeler Martin, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Harry Lee Waesche, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. William Allen Williams, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. James Hobson Williford, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Henry Samuel Tyler, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Paul Edward Doherty, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Donald McLarty Wright, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Second Lt. Gordon Ames Moon 2d, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Walton Orville Threadgill, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Lloyd Joseph Ptak, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Ralph Lorimer Oliver, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Paul Clendenen Davis, Signal Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Maurice Kurt Langberg, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Condy, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Hubert Arthur Brandon, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles William Carr, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. David Leonard Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles William Johnstone, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Lawson Clifton Horner, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Frank Purvis Thornquest, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Thomas Fleet Osborne, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. James Thomas McKee, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Charles Frank Jenkins, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Ernest Nils Ljunggren, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Robert Edmondston Coffin, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Howard Stanley Ellmore, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Fred Howard Bounds, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Melvin Almon McKenzie, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Earl Raymond Tash, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. William Wolfe Ottinger, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. John Daniel Lavelle, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Jack Franklin Marr, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Harl Pease, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Donald William Graham, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Second Lt. Edward Longfellow Burge, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Gerald Michael Dailey, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles Allen Carroll, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Vernon Cline Irby, Signal Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Lowell Edgar Thompson, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Simeon Moore, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Boyd Lee Branson, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Clarence Edwin Jeffress, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George William McCaffrey, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Charles Goodwin Whitmire, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Allison Cochran Brooks, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Thrashley Moncrief Hardy, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Henry Sidney Taylor, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Clayton Charles Craig, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Melvin Armand Goers, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Jack Bansley Falks, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Howell Garnhart, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Samuel Beatty, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Robert Clinton Taber, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. George Brent Vivian, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Ray Spurrier, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Paul Arthur Nilsson, Ordnance Department (temporary major).
Second Lt. Richard Wyman Healy, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Frank Leo O'Brien, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Joseph William Albert Whitehorne 3d, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Simon Howard Johnson, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Joseph Francis Mooney, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Clarence Arthur Powers, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Samuel Adams Steere, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Jack William Blair, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Potvin Barry, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Thomas Berry, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Paul Collins Broun, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Jack Edward Cunningham, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Kay Briggs, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Benjamin Anthony Karsokas, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. John Hancock Hay, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. John Scott Pollard, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Andy Walter Pribnow, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Grant William Allison, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Marshall Wolcott Stark, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Fred Hilton Cantrell, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. James Harry Cook, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Willard Webster Morris, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Earl Jay Holliman, Signal Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Lawrence Sullivan, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Donald Wright MacFeeters, Ordnance Department (temporary major).

Second Lt. Adellon Franck Hanson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Richard Anthony Wetzel, Signal Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert H. Schulz, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Otto John Glasser, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Allen Wightman Sanders, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Slater Cowart, Junior, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Clarence Spottswood Towles, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. William Astor Hoy, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Barton Lamond, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Peter Saville Walker, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Donn Hayes, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Stanley George Huey, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. George Max Manning, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Alexander Caldwell, Cavalry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Frederick Perry Jenks, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Robert Stephens Puckett, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Donald Millard Gordon, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Ernest Thornton George, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Eugene Pierce Gillespie, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Bernard Sullivan, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Sam Jones Rich, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. William FitzGerald Brand, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Paul Hamill, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Frank Jenkins Ryder, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Frank Foster Boyle, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Jerome Bailey York, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Russell Allen Berg, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Second Lt. Robert William Dalrymple, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. Floyd Bayless Mitman, Jr., Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).

Second Lt. Charles Douglas Yelverton Ostrom, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary major).

Second Lt. Martin Fannon Sullivan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Stanley Michael Smolensky, Ordnance Department (temporary major).

Second Lt. Duane Seaman Cason, Cavalry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Charles Richard Petticrew, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Floyd Lester Johnson, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Ralph Emerson Vandervort, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Harold Bernard Ellis, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. Adrian L. Roberson, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. Haakon Lindjord, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Roland George Daudelin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. A. H. Hamner, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Edwin Freeland Harlan, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Harold Harley Haaland, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Hale Mason, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Lewellyn Clifford Daigle, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Henry Benjamin Holmes 3d, Signal Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Don Winton Ryker, Ordnance Department (temporary major).

Second Lt. Carlyle Philip Woelfer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Tom Crampton Smith, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Ralph M. Johnson, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Edmund Dwan 2d, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. James Joseph Gibbons, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Thomas Jeffries Riggs, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Sherman Chambers, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Lafayette King, Cavalry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Edward Sterling Abdo, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Robert William Foster, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Frederick Lorimer Graham, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Herbert Alfred Waterman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Dawson Hope Mullen, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Herbert Henry Heumann, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Gordon Omar Fraser, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Leo J. Nielsen, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Edward Norton Hathaway, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Henry Ritter, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Paul Alexander Simpson, Ordnance Department (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Harold Jack St. Clair, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

To be first lieutenants with rank from October 7, 1945

Second Lt. Edward Lee Waddell, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Marshall Cake, Jr., field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Donald Leroy Harrison, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Albert Sidney Williams, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Charles John Anderson, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Anthony Joseph Touart, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Horward Ellsworth Sommer, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Max Adams Morris, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Lionel Raymond Fuller, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Hughes Seewald, Cavalry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Gerald William Homann, Corps of Engineers (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Thomas Walter Anderson, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Joseph Hamilton Grant, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. William Bennison Fulton, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Lloyd Lorenzo Leech, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Victor Owen Wilson, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Richard Theodore Lunger, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Kenneth Theodore Kofmehl, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. James Griffith Hays, Jr.. Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Edward Clark Rose, Jr., field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Molloy Clark Vaughn, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. James Wilbur Gilman, Cavalry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William John Regner, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Lloyd Edmonstone Jones, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Hal LeRoy Schroeder, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. Alpha Alsbury Fowler, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Ardery Campbell, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. John David Hill, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Lawrence Glenn Mathews, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Edward Cooper Bruce, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert John Giesen, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Harry William Hale, Field Artillery (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Walter MacIndoe, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Alphonso Axel Topp, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Frank Dixon McElwee, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. William Treloar Russell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Charles Benjamin Thomas, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. David Simuel Henderson, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Samuel Cochran Phillips, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert James Lynch, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. George Reece Sedberry, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Benjamin Hancock, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. James Wilson Kerr 3d, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Turney White Leonard, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. George Marion Seignious, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. George Arthur Austin, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Louis Scott Torgeson, Infantry (temporary captain).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Walter Clifton Royals, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1945.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Walter Steen Jensen, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 24, 1945.

To be major

Capt. Howard William Doan, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 1, 1945.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Gynther Storaasli, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from October 11, 1945.

To be lieutenant colonel

Chaplain (Maj.) Edward Robert Martin, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from October 5, 1945.

To be major

Chaplain (Capt.) John Edward Duffy, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from October 25, 1945, subject to examination required by law.

IN THE NAVY

Commodore Frederick W. McMahon, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of November 1943.

Capt. Augustus J. Wellings, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as deputy commander, service forces, United States Pacific Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

The following-named officers of the line of the Navy to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign.

Howard W. Burnett, Jr.
Kenneth R. Klofkorn
Joseph C. Snyder

Civil Engineer Robert C. Johnson to be a civil engineer in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service, to continue while serving as a senior officer in charge of naval construction regiments, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Civil Engineer Archibald D. Hunter to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service, to continue while serving as officer in charge of a naval construction brigade, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALASKA

Alfred G. Francis, Kotzebue, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

ARKANSAS

George W. Powell, Houston, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lonnie A. Parchman, Tie Plant, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CALIFORNIA

Rosabelle A. Hill, Samoa, Calif., in place of G. E. Patterson, retired.

COLORADO

Ruth H. Murphy, La Jara, Colo., in place of R. E. McCunniff, deceased.

Lyla Munson, Sedgwick, Colo., in place of W. C. Lowery, transferred.

Ida L. Springer, Segundo, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONNECTICUT

Austin M. Ackerman, Durham Center, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

FLORIDA

Orbie L. Little, Bluffsprings, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Beulah B. Wiles, Captiva, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John T. Carpenter, Myrtle Grove, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

GEORGIA

Frank R. Rountree, Egypt, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Nina E. Story, Eliabell, Ga. Office become Presidential July 1, 1945.

J. Elton Braddy, Tarrytown, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

ILLINOIS

Marion Dennis, Chambersburg, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles A. Ray, Cottage Hills, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Helene H. Sauerwein, Piatt, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fred W. Nash, Gilson, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John P. Early, Penfield, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

J. Ross Prather, Rossville, Ill., in place of E. J. Hathaway, resigned.

INDIANA

Foster D. Sutton, Otisco, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hilda Fern Calvert, Switz City, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

IOWA

Pearl G. Hill, Badger, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Katherine W Baxter, Burlington, Iowa, in place of R. W. Baxter, resigned.

Mark J. Torrence, Kamrar, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dorothy E. Peterson, Pilot Mound, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harry G. Liddle, Wever, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

KANSAS

Homer I. Sharp, Bloom, Kansas. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

LOUISIANA

Anthony Aucoin, Chataignier, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William S. Lewis, De Ridder, La., in place of V. E. Green. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Belva C. Dyess, Folsom, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Grace A. Rownd, Springfield, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vivian B. Allgood, Summerfield, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MARYLAND

Walter H. Davis, Still Pond, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Bessie M. Cubalo, Lincoln, Mich, in place of E. V. Adair, resigned.

Cecil Fay Neal, Smiths Creek, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MINNESOTA

Walter Freudenberg, Saginaw, Minn., in place of Mabel Johnson, resigned.

Eldora J. Pilotte, Sedan, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSISSIPPI

Andrew J. Hensley, Mantee, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Reid K. Thomas, Michigan City, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSOURI

Dora Weber, Bronaugh, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Juanita A. Drewel, Labadie, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Estle C. Butcher, Mount Moriah, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MONTANA

Helen M. Cyr, Milltown, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEBRASKA

Mayme L. Beaird, Brock, Nebr., in place of C. E. Saal, retired.

Earl J. Hughes, Concord, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Henry L. Balser, Dixon, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Benjamin F. Schiefelbein, Ithaca, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Josephine L. Jenny, Malmo, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEVADA

James E. Hughes, Mesquite, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Evelyn Campbell, Mountain City, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Geraldine S. Sayre, Smith, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW YORK

James J. Cunningham, Caledonia, N. Y., in place of J. F. McGovern, removed.

Mary H. Stanton, Glen Spey, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Margaret M. Kuney, Verplanck, N. Y., in place of N. A. King, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Sallie O. Tarkington, Camden, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Laura Church, Purlear, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH DAKOTA

Warren W. Taylor, Dazey, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Viola Hazle Blocker, Elbowoods, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OKLAHOMA

Velma B. McKinzie, Elmer, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William T. Dunsworth, Thackerville, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OREGON

John W. Knott, Coburg, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alice W. Porter, Long Creek, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Walter E. Hickok, Terrebonne, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Florence N. Pearson, Timber, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Laura Thompson, Tualatin, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Bertha A. Snyder, Beachlake, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Martha S. Darlington, Darling, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lloyd E. Latshaw, Dornsife, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frank W. Nangle, Force, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Iolabell McElhoes, Home, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Beatrice A. Curley, Ithan, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Josephine R. Gift, Lemasters, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Henry L. Whitaker, Narvon, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Beatrice I. Duerr, New Britain, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Eva Morris, New Derry, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Adam Hoover, Newry, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elmer J. Kirk, Rockton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

A. Irene Close, Sproul, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Zella M. Larimer, Stahlstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harold E. Brocious, Timblin, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harold H. Peiffer, Union Deposit, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William M. Betz, Venus, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elsie R. West, Wawa, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Abel S. Landes, Wycombe, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Hattie M. Stadden, Wilmer, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

UTAH

Harold A. Wood, Holden, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

VERMONT

Lou B. Maginn, East Fairfield, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harold F. Mason, Lyndon Center, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

VIRGINIA

Doris B. Reames, Ford, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WASHINGTON

Harold A. Althof, Seabeck, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Agnes M. Pritzl, Cato, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John J. Flanagan, Lannon, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lizzie J. Mulvaney, Wilson, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WYOMING

Mabel E. Harrison, Arvada, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 3 (legislative day of October 2), 1945:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Harrington Wimberly to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1948.

Richard Sachse to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1947.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

J. Howard McGrath to be Solicitor General of the United States.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

John J. O'Connell to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (new position).

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Everett M. Evans to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho.

Robert Grant to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois.

Hubert J. Harrington to be United States marshal for the district of New Jersey.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Lt. Gen. Raymond Albert Wheeler to be Chief of Engineers, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance.

Col. Boyd Wheeler Bartlett to be professor of chemistry and electricity at the United States Military Academy, with rank from August 3, 1945.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels

Howard J. Houghland, Air Corps.
John Lawrence Dunn, Infantry.
James Gregory Monihan, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.

To be captains

Opal Ellis Henderson, Air Corps.
Daniel Ira Moler, Air Corps.
Lawrance Owen Brown, Air Corps.
Henry Bishop Fisher, Air Corps.
Clayton Baxter Claassen, Air Corps.
William Thomas Hudnell, Jr., Air Corps.
Harold Lawrence Kreider, Air Corps.
John Oman Neal, Air Corps.
Henry Agnew Sebastian, Air Corps.
Harrison Schermerhorn Markham, Chemical Warfare Service.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

Heinz Kuraner
Emmett Leroy Kehoe
Knox Dunlap
Stephen Dominic Berardinelli
William Joseph Power
Jacob Rell Till, Jr.
Lawrence Carter Ball
Richard Leland Bohannon
John Knox Cullen

To be captains

John Hawes Amesse
Harold Victor Ellingson
Joseph Negley Schaeffer
Alfred Sjouke Blauw

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Albert Fields

To be lieutenant colonel

Harold George Ott

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Verne Clifford Hill
Elmer William Young

CHAPLAINS

To be colonels

William Roy Bradley
James Lloyd McBride
Mylon Dickinson Merchant
Maurice William Reynolds

To be major

Stanley Joseph Reilly, subject to examination required by law.

To be colonels

Rexford Edwin Willoughby
William Glenn Livesay
James Washington Barnett
John Charles Mullenix
John Andrew Weeks
Robert Lincoln Christian
William Hampton Crom
Delphin Etienne Thebaud
George Sheppard Clarke
Charles Andrew Willoughby
Walter Eyster Buchly
Harold Chittenden Mandell

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Lt. Col. Joseph Magoffin Glasgow, to Adjutant General's Department.

Maj. Paul Leroy Carroll, to Quartermaster Corps.

First Lt. Amos George Johnson, to Quartermaster Corps.

Capt. James Francis Stroker, to Finance Department.

Lt. Col. Shirley Wiggins McIlwain, to Ordnance Department.

Capt. Bernard Sanders Waterman, to Field Artillery.

Second Lt. Alan Lyon Partridge, to Field Artillery.

2d Lt. Paul James Reinhalter, to Field Artillery.

1st Lt. James Moore Boyd, to Infantry.

1st Lt. Robert Jerome Delaney, to Infantry.

1st Lt. Philip Martin Royce, to Infantry.

1st Lt. Joel Terry Walker, to Infantry.

Lt. Col. Tom Christopher Rives, to Air Corps.

Capt. William Fulton McKee, to Air Corps.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Lois G. McClain, Acmar.
Laura Herring, Alberta.
Allen C. Coleman, Allen.
Lilian Mary Thomas, Battles Wharf.
John D. Reid, Blount Springs.
Madie Ellis, Brownville.
Rosa L. Spence, Buffalo.
Edwyn E. Cook, Calhoun.
Maory A. Hudson, Choccolocco.
Vera B. Rabby, Coden.
Horace E. Davidson, Coker.
Gaddis W. Killian, Collbran.
Guy D. Ward, Cottonwood.
Amby Campbell, Crossville.
Sarah E. Waites, Cusseta.
Louise T. Willingham, Emelle.
Helen P. Welch, Epes.
Burnie J. Wall, Equality.
John R. Griffin, Excel.
Reuel M. Lankford, Fackler.
Walter D. Browder, Gaylesville.
Russell P. Gilbert, Geiger.
Nonie Virginia Singleton, Gorgas.
Clara M. Adair, Graysville.
Chester M. Ross, Groveoak.
Clarice Davis, Hacoda.
Bob Lee Dixon, Hatchechubbee.
John T. Cope, Inverness.
Roxie Lois Clark, Jack.
Hassie H. Nickerson, Jacksons Gap.
James V. Herron, Keener.
Georgia Lyon Dunn, Laceys Spring.
Jacob B. Patterson, Lacon.
Jim W. Cleveland, Lawley.
Robert Brooks, Meridianville.
Ola Hale, Murrycross.
Carl Brown, Muscadine.
James T. Finley, Jr., Owassa.
Mary R. Huguley, Pigeon Creek.
Thadeus E. Bolling, Pike Road.
Marie G. Lucy, Portersville.
Ollie W. Phillips, Ralph.
Pearl R. Pierce, Saraland.
Frances Graham Henderson, Satsuma.
J. Bryan May, Sawyerville.
Martil B. Roberts, Semmes.
Paul H. Savage, Jr., Spring Garden.
Mildred S. Burnett, Stanton.
Jesse M. Fleming, Tennille.
Emma P. Mitchell, Ward.
Robert C. Newton, Webb.
Robert T. Yarbrough, Woodland.

ALASKA

Velovous Allen Poor, Douglas.
Arleen Kranich, Homer.
Orrin S. Felmley, McGrath (to correct name).

GEORGIA

James H. Smith, Ashland.
Alma Gillis, Axson.
Royce G. Braselton, Braselton.
Wilson T. Tuten, Bristol.
Blanche A. Tarvin, Cataula.
Robert L. Vining, Chatsworth.
Mary M. Lassetter, Clem.
Curtis Rice, Du Pont.
Winnie S. Giles, Elko.
Minnie O. Rozar, Empire.
Dymple Warmack, Fair Mount.
Clarence Finleyson, Finleyson.
Luther G. Fortson, Fortson.
Louis A. Mauldin, Habersham.
Garland B. Turner, Hillsboro.
Howard R. Park, Ideal.
Isabel R. Bulloch, Juniper.
Silas White, Kirkland.
Thomas L. Harbin, Lithia Springs.
Margaret Mable, Mableton.
Mary B. Herrin, Manor.
Riley O. Crosby, Mershon.
Olin S. Horne, Metcalf.
Kathleen Hammond Langston, Middleton.
Julia W. Miller, Midland.
Robert Homer Smith, Midville.
Stella A. Teel, Morris Station.
Adahbelle Elrod, Murrayville.
Matthew D. Freeman, Nicholson.
Claude A. Bennett, Plainville.
Pauline S. Middleton, Ramhurst.
Joseph B. Mahan, Rydal.
Fannie M. W. Brim, Sasser.
Joe M. Athon, Shady Dale.
Nan L. Johnson, Stockton.
Marie Warren Harris, The Rock.
Nettie R. Miles, Varnell.
Paul A. Cline, Waleska.
Myra L. Lang, Waverly.
Luther F. Richards, White.
Joseph M. Drury, White Oak.
Edgar S. Hicks, Yatesville.

IOWA

John S. Benbow, Archer.
Robert R. Kriete, Baldwin.
Edward J. Hoffbauer, Blue Grass.
Hilda A. McGovern, Brayton.
Nelle B. Davis, Conway.
Lucille Sexton, Cromwell.
Nellie M. Easton, Curlew.

Walter W. Delahoyde, Dawson.
Elizabeth Grimme, Durango.
Ervin F. Spratt, Elkhart.
Frank W. Elias, Ely.
Martha E. McClaskey, Exline.
Andrew L. Dickinson, Gilbert.
Henry J. Eischeid, Halbur.
Esther E. Olson, Jolley.
Tjebbe D. Beintema, Leighton.
Elizabeth K. Buren, Leland.
Selmer E. Skare, Lincoln.
Leonard S. Lawless, Macksburg.
Leonard C. Gordon, Martelle.
Guy E. Waldron, Meriden.
Jacob Ruedy, Middle.
Rose Mae Hatter, Millersburg.
Edith Page, Nemaha.
Albert N. Kloser, North Buena Vista.
Leo J. Mehaffey, North Liberty.
James M. Van Vliet, Otley.
Mollie Daley, Parnell.
Timothy P. Sheehy, Searsboro.
Essie B. Whisler, Unionville.
Francis M. Bucher, Wapello.
Esther N. Booth, West Chester.

KENTUCKY

Amy Levan, Burna.
Robert Chesnut, Burning Springs.
Golda West, Cromwell.
Winnie K. Veatch, Crutchfield.
Daniel M. Mann, De Mossville.
Thelma L. Vest, Elliston.
Emma Luckett, Fairfield.
Luther S. Safriet, Gatliff.
William Cantrill, Garrison.
John R. Murray, Guston.
Golden R. Back, Harveyton.
Charles W. Keatts, Herndon.
Grace Hamilton, Melvin.
Thomas J. Turner, Minnie.
Elmer Schadler, Morning View.
William F. Marrs, Mount Hermon.
Irwin G. Cochran, Oak Grove.
Loma B. Gaines, Oakland.
Claude Hurt, Olaton.
Bessie M. Watkins, Pine Mountain.
Fannie Elder, Pryorsburg.
Homer Boyd, Rockport.
Estelle Little, Sandgap.
Lettie Smith, Sassafras.
Kelly H. Allen, Shelbiana.
Robert A. McDowell, Simpsonville.
Gladys Morgan, Smithfield.
Ella B. Burdick, Tollesboro.
Wilford D. Cunningham, Webbs Cross Roads.

LOUISIANA

Alma A. Maloof, Braithwaite.
Vivian Ballay, Empire.
Grace S. Ellzey, Venice.
Thelma J. Leon, Violet.

MISSISSIPPI

Mabel H. Domengeaux, Belzoni.
Ethie McNair, Neshoba.

NEBRASKA

Pauline Rosenow, Alvo.
Viola Calhoon, Benedict.
Edward L. Spatz, Bruno.
George R. Hanson, Champion.
Evelyn A. Endres, Crab Orchard.
Daisy G. Hendricks, Douglas.
Angus K. Halcomb, Filley.
Albert O. Kruger, Gurley.
Vratislav J. Kovarik, Hallam.
Laura F. Besley, Halsey.
Vera Fisher, Hubbell.
Maude M. Dunn, Inavale.
Ruth C. Olson, Johnstown.
Irene Jansen, Kennard.
Otis T. Carlson, Marquette.
Bernice L. Irland, Otoe.
Vera J. King, Primrose.
Robert G. Lynch, Roseland.
Francis H. Holtorf, Saint Libory.
William J. Johannes, Seward.
Joseph Kounovsky, Snyder.
Fannie H. Manning, Steele City.
Harry V. Smith, Waco.
Amy E. Conant, Wellfleet.
Floyd A. Garrett, Whitman.

NEW MEXICO

James E. Matchin, Crownpoint.
Vincent C. Steele, Greenville.
Louise Miller, Loco Hills.
Bertha R. Yessler, Nara Visa.
Anastacia V. Lopez, Penasco.

OKLAHOMA

Evan E. Wiley, Arapaho.
Samuel A. Irwin, Atwood.
Charles A. Warren, Brinkman.
Thomas H. Atkins, Bromide.
James O. Deer, Carney.
Nellie I. Malone, Cashion.
Maureta G. Pappan, Chilocco.
Henry C. Black, Cloud Chief.
Gussie C. Morton, Cromwell.
Cornelia M. Jenkins, Drummond.
Obera Goodwin, Durham.
Dora L. Parks, Fay.
Harold Chaffin, Francis.
Helena M. Hood, Hoffman.
Lula T. Stiles, Hollister.
Joseph E. Carnes, Kansas.
Fern D. Arnold, Kiowa.
Lillie E. Williams, Leflore.
Haskell C. Donnelly, Lehigh.
Mamie I. Pope, Loyal.
Jerome H. Hodgens, Moffett.
Rephord H. Stevens, Mustang.
John W. Clarke, Nardin.
Sally Clayton, Oakhurst.
Ruby E. Harper, Quinlan.
Roberta J. Price, Rosston.
Beuna M. Gass, Selman.
Mary A. Ferren, Shamrock.
Carrie Zahn, Sharon.
Clarence O. Lester, Smithville.
Mary Marie Yaeger, Springer.
Ethel Watkins, Talala.
Artie B. Clement, Texola.
John R. Chitwood, Vinson.

RHODE ISLAND

Harriet A. H. Nichols, Foster Center.
Thomas J. Conroy, Hamilton.

VIRGINIA

Joseph H. Hurst, Allisonia.
Sallie B. Willson, Ballsville.
Bettie F. Gayle, Baskerville.
John C. Kehoe, Bealeton.
Harry R. Bell, Birdsnest.
Harry B. Marshall, Blue Grass.
Mary Webb, Branchville.
Bertha B. Alvis, Brook Hill.
Lawrenceson C. Costen, Buell.
Edna O. Watkins, Buffalo Junction.
John Duke, jr., Carrsville.
Annie L. Davis, Cascade.
Jerry Morgan, Catawba.
Virginia M. Cline, Clear Brook.
Edwina Boisseau, Dewitt.
Idamae Turner, Dorchester.
French S. Brawner, Dumfries.
Rosalie R. Baker, Dunbar.
Fleda H. Goodwyn, Dundas.
Edna Kilgore, East Stone Gap.
Mary E. McChesney, Fishersville.
Etta C. Turner, Fort Blackmore.
John R. Sweeney, Jr., Gainesville.
Nathan H. Tillage, Gloucester Point.
James M. Jones, Goodview.
Cynthia L. Kerr, Goodwins Ferry.
Regina E. Selby, Greenbackville.
Maude Gilmer, Hansonville.
Gorman A. Hilton, Hiltons.
Edna Y. Harper, Holdcroft.
Gordon P. Murray, Hollins.
Fred L. Marshall, Keeling.
Rosa L. Thrift, Kinsale.
Genevieve P. Gresham, Lancaster.
Ella S. Hockaday, Lanexa.
Claude L. Bradshaw, Laurel.
Eva G. Davenport, Leona Mines.
Marie H. Clark, Lively.
Gladys M. McLaughlin, Lowmoor.
Theron P. Bell, Jr., Machipongo.
Adelbert D. Sydnor, Mannboro.
Nannie B. Chase, Mappsville.
John E. Dodson, Mattoax.
Norman O. Armstrong, Midland.
Stephen M. Nelson, Nelson.
Ellie I. Amburgey, Nora.
Julia Maloney, North Garden.
Lucille H. Gilbert, North Holston.
Edward L. Deane, Nottoway.
Nancy C. Leontal, Oakton.
Lauza Richie, Oakwood.
Walter H. Burgess, Paces.
Charlie A. Pannell, Parrott.
C. Meredith Richardson, Pendletons.
Anne G. Pearl, Port Republic.
Joseph Thomas Tokarz, Port Richmond.
William R. Bailey, Quinton.
Ollie May Brooks, Red Ash.
Anne H. Giles, Rock Castle.
Lottie Herndon, Ruckersville.
Margaret M. Powell, Seaford.
Linda T. Meissner, Skipwith.
Thomas H. Elmore, Snowville.
Wiley H. Robertson, Spout Spring.
James H. L. Parker, State Farm.
John E. Winstead, Village.
Lola G. Fowler, White Post.
Adam R. Springston, Wilsons.
Buren Skinnell, Wirtz.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Frank B. Burress, pastor of the Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Holy Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. We thank Thee for the opportunities of another day. May we have strength and wisdom to take advantage of the possibilities ahead of us in living this day that are within the realm of Thy will.

We pray Thy divine blessing upon each of these men and women that are here assembled to deliberate on weighty matters that involve our Nation's welfare. May they be led aright as they serve their countrymen and Thee. May the laws that are here made be of Thine approval.

Bless, we pray, the President and those who serve with him. May we be ever conscious that lasting enduring peace only comes through the Prince of Peace as He is related individually in the hearts of men. For we ask it all in His name with the forgiveness of our sins. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution providing that the war emergency has been relieved to an extent which will justify proceeding with the highway-construction program under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1281. An act to provide for covering into the treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3951) entitled "An act to

stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REVERCOMB to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 1, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAYBURN: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on the Revision of the Laws. Due to the pressure of other business, I am unable to give the business of this committee the attention which it deserves.

With all good wishes,
Cordially yours,

JOE W. ERVIN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

STRIKE WAVE MISSES CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article from the Minneapolis Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GALLAGHER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUNKER asked and was given permision to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a telegram from Los Angeles.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his marks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a resolution adopted by the City Council of Lawrence, Mass., and in the other a letter from a constituent.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he received from the American Legion, Department of Maryland, enclosing four resolutions adopted by that body.

Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of enrolled House Concurrent Resolution No. 28, passed by the Twentieth Legislature of Oklahoma.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Lorain Journal in connection with the homecoming of Admiral King.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast.

Mr. EATON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article on the result of socialistic experiments in Australia.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the country is not suffering from unemployment. It is suffering from enforced and deliberate idleness. In the city of Detroit, Mich., conditions exist that must soon be corrected or mob rule will take the place of law and order. I have a letter this morning from a prominent surgeon of one of the largest hospitals in Detroit. He says:

> We have no oil for the building we doctors are in, and I have no gas today.

From other parts of my district people are saying they cannot take their sick children to a doctor because they do not have gas.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. That is not a veterans' hospital?

Mr. DONDERO. No; a civilian hospital.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. Governor Dewey has managed to settle the elevator strike as well as other strikes in the State of New York. What is good for New York is good for America. Maybe we could enlist his cooperation.

Mr. DONDERO. People in my district claim they can get gas only at the will of the CIO. Do we have a supergovernment under an administration impotent or unwilling to protect the people from lawlessness? Demands are made for larger sums for unemployment while employers advertise for people to work. In New York, 175,000 draw unemployment insurance while 100,000 jobs go begging. In Pontiac, Mich., 5,600 are unemployed while 5,000 jobs are available, according to the press. Oakland County, Mich., farmers are unable to secure help. Out of 100 farm jobs only 17 were filled in September. Such conditions are indefensible. It presents a threat to the maintenance of law and order. The structure of government is endangered. I do not believe a majority of those involved in strikes approve them. Other governments have been destroyed from within and ours may be.

LEO CROWLEY

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an editorial appearing in the Sheboygan Press of Sheboygan, Wis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, there has been submitted to the Speaker and by him appropriately referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds a public-buildings bill. Accordingly I have introduced that bill today.

The normal Federal construction has been held in abeyance during the war, and that statement applies also even to maintenance and repairs. This bill is an authorization measure for urgent cases and would extend well beyond 1 year, probably for 3 years, if enacted into law. I wish to give notice that very shortly hearings will be announced by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for the consideration of this measure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief history of the battleship *Texas*.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain comment and correspondence in reference to the operation of the Wages and Hours Act.

TENDERING THE THANKS OF CONGRESS TO GENERAL OF THE ARMY GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND THE MEMBERS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 243.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 243

Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George C. Marshall, and the members of the Army of the United States who have fought under his direction during the wars; and providing that the President of the United States shall cause a medal to be struck to be presented to General Marshall in the name of the people of the United States of America

Resolved, etc., That the thanks of the American people and of the Congress be, and they hereby are, presented to General of the Army George C. Marshall, for his statesmanship as a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff in cementing the moral and physical forces of the United Nations in the common cause against aggression and his leadership in formulating and executing the global strategy

of the wars; his initiative, wisdom, and foresight as Chief of Staff of the Army in conducting the expansion, equipping, training, and deployment of the great Army of the United States to the high degree which enabled it to go directly from its training camps and maneuver grounds to overcome the strongest forces which our determined enemies could amass; and his selfless integrity, inflexible patriotism, and surpassing military genius which guided our armies directly to the heart of the homelands of our enemies; and to the members of the Army of the United States under his direction for their heroic valor and unwavering loyalty and service throughout the wars.

SEC. 2. The President of the United States is requested to cause a gold medal to be struck, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be presented to General Marshall. When the said medal shall have been struck, the President shall cause a copy of this joint resolution to be engrossed on parchment, and shall transmit the same, together with the said medal, to General Marshall to be presented to him in the name of the people of the United States of America.

SEC. 3. A sufficient sum of money to carry this joint resolution into effect is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs if there is any precedent for what is now suggested?

Mr. MAY. This is a special medal, not a Congressional Medal. I do not know of any precedent except such a medal was awarded to General Grant and other generals of his day and the importance of doing this at the end of this tragic war as an expression to our fighting forces and to our Chief of Staff as the leader of our fighting forces during the period of the war.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. MAY. Yes; it is.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it proposed to continue this practice with respect to other generals or other military men?

Mr. MAY. No; this applies only to General Marshall and to the troops that were mobilized during the recent conflict.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the reports on Pearl Harbor cast some reflections upon General Marshall. This report was made by an official Army board.

Mr. MAY. I am sure the gentleman does not concur in those reflections.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am not saying that I do, but they were made.

Mr. MAY. That was a newspaper story, that I happen to know is not true in any sense and is wholly without foundation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am wondering if this is not premature until we have a thorough investigation of Pearl Harbor. The report was not rumor. It is a matter of official record.

Mr. MAY. No; I do not think so.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would object to the consideration of this resolution at this time, until there is a further investigation of the Pearl Harbor report.

Mr. MAY. I hope the gentleman will not insist on objecting.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I shall insist on objecting because of the implications that were made in the press and in an official report as to General Marshall's responsibility in the Pearl Harbor disaster. There is also the job of demobilizing the Army. We should wait until that job is done efficiently.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

CHILD-CARE CENTERS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram I have received from Mr. Whittle, of the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Los Angeles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the pending question before the Appropriations Committee for the much-needed continuation of Lanham Act funds to provide for child-care centers, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that California and southern California in particular, is not asking for much in view of their contribution to Federal taxes for the fiscal year, 1944–45, which amounted to nearly $2,000,000,000.

The whole State of California with 6½ percent of the national population collected 8½ percent of the internal-revenue taxes from all sources. I hope when the Appropriations Committee considers the question of continuing child-care centers, that it will recognize California's contribution to the national-tax revenue which far exceeds the amount of Federal aid California receives for all other purposes.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *October 2, 1945.*
Hon. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Washington, D. C.:

Emergency child-care committee in meeting held October 1 approved report made by research department of Welfare Council of Metropolitan Los Angeles on present status of mothers using child-care centers. Ninety-eight percent of mothers using nursery centers returned cards and about 85 percent of mothers using extended day-care centers. Twenty percent of mothers are sole support of families; 78 percent provide partial support. Over 50 percent of the group have husbands still in service. Copy preliminary report on study on survey and copy of statement of principles adopted by committee being sent you. Urge Appropriations Committee authorize continued use of Lanham Act funds already appropriated for child-care centers, at least for period long enough for State Legislature in special session to take necessary action.

H. F. WHITTLE, *Chairman.*

THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to plead guilty to a charge made in the public press today. It is not very often that I confess to the House anything said about me in certain publications but I am charged in the Communist Daily Worker today with being in sympathy with the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I plead guilty to that charge, because in my opinion the DAR is just about the most American organization on earth. This organization is composed of the descendants of the men who fought for the creation of this great Republic. While I am at it, I want to say the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] on yesterday attacked the Daughters of the American Revolution on the race question. If one of them had attacked him or said anything about a member of his race, then you would have heard a howl to high heaven.

It is about time Americans stood up for American principles, and for the defense of American organizations, such as the DAR.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to include during general debate on the reorganization bill, H. R. 4129, a brief as to the constitutionality of the reorganization.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from soldiers on the subject of demobilization of the Army.

STRIKES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the morning press tells us that the folks down in Texas have a rough way of handling the strikers who turned off the electric current which supplies the cities and hospitals with light, water, and power. Someone down there in authority just fired them and put some veterans in their places. Now is that being fair to the union? Those men down there who fired the strikers who would not work, who were preventing others from working, will be called labor baiters if they do not watch out. A little while ago the OPA in one of the few acts which were of benefit to the people, discontinued the rationing of gasoline. But the CIO in Michigan picked up rationing and they are telling the people, hospitals, stores, and industries in Detroit which individual which corporation gets gasoline. A CIO gentleman named August Scholle, in his ignorance and conceit, presumes to ration gasoline. How does he get that

way? Now the CIO and the PAC, its newest maid, are the political allies of the administration. I hope that the majority leader and his colleagues here in Congress will get the administration back on the right track, the main line, so that the veterans returning home can get jobs here in America, so that as they reach home they will find an America equal at least to the one they left.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

HON. LEO T. CROWLEY, FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. I was indeed delighted to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] eulogize Mr. Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, for the splendid services he has rendered to the country. The tribute was in such glowing terms as only the gentleman from Wisconsin could express, yet I wonder whether it would not be more fitting if some Republicans paid like praise to Democrats who are serving the country with ability, efficiency, and devotion in important offices in the Government. To the contrary, unfortunately, no matter who the Democrat may be while serving in office, he is invariably assailed and criticized and charged with being a bureaucrat. Unfortunately, such unfair criticism has been heaped also upon Republicans who have been holding important positions under the late President Roosevelt's administration. I hope that other Republicans and even some Democrats instead of criticising and finding fault will occasionally eulogize efficient, honest, and conscientious officials instead of waiting until they have severed their connections, whether voluntarily or involuntarily. I feel that a good word of praise of men while serving in public office would encourage them in their activities, believing that there are some people who evaluate their services to the country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to know when the gentleman paid tribute to any Republican.

Mr. SABATH. May I say to my friend, the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, that I can call attention to the fact that I have paid tribute to Republicans but, frankly, there are few whom I could honestly praise. Has not the gentleman frequently heard me pay tribute to the former Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson; to the former Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox; to the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes; to Mr. Donald Nelson, former Chairman of the War Production Board, and to former Attorney General Mitchell, all of whom are Republicans. Not only that but I have supported some Republicans for office, among them the late James R. Mann, former minority leader of the House. And lest I forget, I have eulogized the gentleman himself, especially as to his ability to control the Republican Members and, as he must recall, I have urged that he be continued in his important position of minority leader.

As to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that some labor organizations are supporting the Democratic Party, I ask him why should not all labor organizations do so. Why should not the farmers; yes, and the businessmen of the country, if they have their own and the interest of the country at heart, who have enjoyed higher prices for their labor and higher profits than under any other administration in the history of the country, likewise support the Democratic Party?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATORS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] that I surely, as one Republican, have done just what he has criticized us Republicans for not doing. It is a matter of record in the Antigo paper of some 3 years ago that at a meeting there in a community which is largely Democratic I was asked why they did not get better administrators in the administration to handle these various departments. I said at that time I did not know why Henry Wallace went around and hired the leaping jackasses that he had working for him as economists when there were men like Leo Crowley who everybody in the State of Wisconsin knew was a good administrator, and who regardless of politics, agreed was a good public servant. I do not think my statement had anything to do with the selection of Leo Crowley, though he was selected a few days afterward to head the FEA. In the State of Wisconsin they were for Leo Crowley as an administrator because we have had confidence in him. During many years he has demonstrated that he is above partisan politics. He is a public servant. He is an American. The only sin that he has or will ever commit is that he is for the American people. That evidently is quite a sin in some places.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has expired.

REORGANIZING AGENCIES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 360, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the rule for the consideration of the so-called reorganization bill. It is an open rule which will require the bill to be considered under the general rules of the House. It provides for 4 hours' general debate.

I have no requests for time on this side. I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] desires to use any time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 360 makes in order the bill H. R. 4129, provides for 4 hours of general debate thereon, and waives all points of order against the bill.

H. R. 4129 provides for the reorganizing of agencies of the Government, and for other purposes. There are many of us in Congress who believe the reorganization of the various agencies, divisions, and departments of the Executive Branch of the Government is urgently needed. In fact, when this measure was before the Rules Committee, I suggested that what we need most just now is a simple, plain piece of legislation to authorize the President to abolish any agency or division of the Government within the executive branch, and to discharge any employee of any of such executive agencies. It seems to me that what the country wants today, what it is prayerfully asking for, is the complete abolishment of numerous governmental agencies and the discharge of many of the millions of Government employees now on the public pay roll, rather than just a transfer of those Federal agencies, and the employees thereunder, to some other department of the Government. Instead of reshuffling the agencies of the Government we need to trim them down—a cutting, a reduction, not only in the various agencies, but in the number of employees also.

Today the Federal Government has on its pay roll something more than 3,000,000 employees. We have an untold number of agencies of the Government. Assuredly we want reorganization, if it is to be the proper kind of reorganization, but certainly, too, we need a great shrinking of the Federal Government. This, I am sure, is the real desire of a great majority of the people of America. It know it is the position of my party. I hope it is the position of the majority party. Let us also hope that from this

legislation will stem, not only a reorganization, but also a great reduction in the size of the Federal Government and in the number of employees on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman inform us at this time as to whether or not any amendments will be offered by the committee to this bill?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand amendments will be offered by members of the Committee and by other Members of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I mean as committee amendments.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not certain what the committee may do as a committee. I cannot speak for the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it supposed that this reorganization bill will effect a substantial reduction in the number of Federal employees?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That, of course, is the reason given by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments for reporting the bill. It is to be hoped of course that such will be the result, but I do know the complete abolishment of many of these agencies and offices of the Government would, without question, result in a decrease in public employment. That is what America seeks.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Unless it brings about a substantial reduction in the number of Federal employees its passage will be futile, as was the other so-called reorganization measure which was enacted several years ago.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I may answer the gentleman from Ohio by saying that when we have passed similar reorganization bills in the past the final result after the reorganization has always been more employees on the Federal pay roll than we had before. I hope such will not be the result of the passage of this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is exactly what I am afraid will result.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 159]

Andresen, August H.	Boykin	Chelf
Barrett, Pa.	Buckley	Clark
Bell	Camp	Colmer
Bender	Campbell	Cooley
Bolton	Cannon, Fla.	Courtney
	Celler	Cravens
Curley	Kearney	Rees, Kans.
Dawson	Kee	Rivers
De Lacy	Kerr	Rodgers, Pa.
Dickstein	King	Roe, N. Y.
Douglas, Calif.	Landis	Sharp
Douglas, Ill.	Lea	Sheridan
Drewry	Lesinski	Short
Elliott	Lewis	Simpson, Ill.
Elsaesser	Luce	Slaughter
Fenton	McGehee	Somers, N. Y.
Gathings	McGlinchey	Taber
Granger	Madden	Talle
Hagen	Mansfield, Tex.	Thomas, N. J.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Marcantonio	Weiss
	Mundt	White
Hall, Leonard W.	Murray, Tenn.	Wickersham
	Norton	Winter
Hancock	O'Toole	Wolcott
Hedrick	Patman	Wolverton, N. J.
Hendricks	Patterson	Wood
Holmes, Mass.	Pfeifer	Zimmerman
Hope	Powell	
Jenkins	Rabaut	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 339 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Miami Herald.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the act, H. R. 1975, an act for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson and Young, having been presented to the President of the United States on September 18, 1945, for his approval, and not having been returned by him to the House of Congress in which it originated within the time prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, has become a law without his approval.

REORGANIZING AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some general observations about this proposal and the things that it generally covers, and then I wish in particular to discuss an amendment I propose to offer. At the outset may I say that I certainly am not approaching this proposition from any partisan viewpoint or persuasion, and I believe none of us should approach it in other than that manner. As far as I am concerned I believe I can say that the Members who sit on my side of the aisle—on the Republican side—are just as anxious to effect economy and reduce Government jobs, and abolish useless boards, bureaus, and commissions as are any of the Members.

However, I do hold some very definite convictions about this matter, and speaking further of partisanship, I know from past actions in this body and from many statements that have come from many of my good friends on the other side of the aisle that they hold exactly the same convictions I hold. I would assume, in respect to the exemption of certain independent agencies from this provision, that the author of the bill and the chairman of the committee himself at one time certainly held the convictions I now hold. He may still hold them because in the bill he originally introduced he provided for a greater list of exemptions than I would provide for.

We all want necessary and proper reorganization. The question is how to obtain that reorganization.

First of all, I should like to point out that there are many places where there is a crying need for reorganization that are completely under the control of the Executive, and could be accomplished without any legislation. Of course, where agencies have been created by statute it might also be said that the President can suggest certain reorganizations or changes in the basic law upon which the Congress could act. Some say that that is not an effective way to approach this problem, but I should like to say for the record that in my years in Congress I have not been conscious of any failure on the part of the Congress of the United States to respond to any reorganization proposals submitted by the Executive.

There are others who say there is such a lethargy on the part of the legislative branch of the Government that we need some such bill as this. Let me say to you that if we adopt this bill we plead guilty to that charge of lethargy. In this connection I wish to point out that in this bill we are doing another thing. It is a little strange to contemplate it and possibly for the purposes of reorganization it is not necessary, but if we adopt this legislation we have in truth and in fact transferred legislative functions to the Executive and undertaken to recepture or to capture for ourselves a certain measure of veto power that normally exists in the executive branch.

However, it seems to be the prevalent opinion that an arrangement for Executive initiative is necessary. If it is, certainly no one can contend against it.

Having regard to whether or not this might be helpful, I point out that we have had this kind of legislation on the books for a long time. How much has been accomplished under it? Why, back in President Hoover's time there was submitted under a similar arrangement quite a list of reorganizations that was defeated in 1933 by the then Democratic majority in the House of Representatives. Incidentally, under that plan the disapproval of one House defeated the program. Since that time we have had a similar law. I have seen very little if any real accomplishment. I have seen some damage done. I have seen the Civil Aeronautics Authority destroyed as an independent agency of the Government, and turned over to the control of the Department of Commerce. I saw the REA transferred to the Department of Agriculture where its political control became so obnoxious that a Senate committee declared out against it and the

Senate of the United States enacted legislation to undo the damage that had been done. Incidentally, I express the hope that this body will follow the lead of the other body and reconstitute the REA as an independent agency of the Government.

There is a great demand today for reorganization. Great newspapers have editorialized upon it. They say something ought to be done, and something should be done. Little has been done under these plans, but we can try again.

If we get that point let us do the best job we can. I say now I am ready to go along with reorganization. I will go along with President Truman in reducing boards, bureaus, and commissions, and in economy in government, together with cutting down personnel as deeply as he dare propose at any time. But what safeguards should we throw around this rather extraordinary procedure?

Back in 1937 or 1938 there came in a very similar proposal. It aroused a storm in the country second only to the storm aroused by the message to pack the Supreme Court of the United States. What was that about? Why, it was because many feared that it was an effort to destroy the independence of the Comptroller General and the great quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial independent agencies of the Government.

What happened? The Congress exempted practically all of those agencies. Yes, with one exception, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, largely upon the persuasive argument of the gentleman from Missouri who lulled us or sought to lull us into a feeling of false security by saying to us in so many words that it was unthinkable that the President would seek to destroy the independence of that great agency, a thing which subsequently came to pass.

Now, this bill is before us. What about these great independent agencies of the Government? The committee exempts three, the ICC, the SEC, the FTC, and gives a left-hand exemption to four or five more by saying a separate plan must be submitted for them. If that is the best we could have, I would be for the separate plan. It is better than nothing. I do not like the idea of putting in a lot of bait and destroying an agency that none of us want to see destroyed. However, this provision really means nothing except that it is conclusive evidence that the committee must have been disturbed about the implications of this bill. Can anyone point out to me any reason why the ICC, SEC, and FTC should be exempted and the Maritime Commission should not, the Tariff Commission should not, the Federal Power Commission and other similar agencies should not be so exempted?

My firm conviction is that we should and must protect the integrity of these great independent agencies. Hence, my amendment which is simply this: That the list of exempted agencies should be extended to include eight agencies that are not so exempted, in addition to the three that are exempt. These are as follows: Civil Service Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Power Commission, the Maritime Commission, the National Mediation Board and National Railroad Adjustment Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Tariff Commission. That amendment will not in any way interfere with a needed reorganization of the Government in any quarter. On the contrary, the inclusion of that amendment will make for good government and efficient government.

How many employees do you suppose those agencies have? The sum total is 23,053. Why, we have something over 3,000,000 Federal employees. Upward of 10,000 of that 23,000 are in the Maritime Commission. The National Mediation Board and the National Railroad Adjustment Board only have 98. Who will contend that to exempt those agencies will in any way interfere with a needed reorganization of the Government? The number compared to the over-all number is infinitesimally small.

This amendment poses this question: Shall we permit the destruction of the great independent quasi legislative and quasi judicial agencies that deal with the very lifeblood of trade and commerce? Shall we stand by and see them transferred to executive control in some executive department, probably under some Cabinet officer of the Government?

We might as well be frank about it. There are two schools of thought in this country. One schools of thought holds that we need these independent agencies. That has been the congressional viewpoint. We have thought that they should be answerable to the Congress. Their members are appointed for a term. They should make their decisions without regard to politics. They ought to make them independently and without regard to political domination or control.

Then there is another school of thought that has chafed at that situation ever since the Humphreys case when he was sought to be taken from the Federal Trade Commission because it was felt that his views were not in harmony with the views of the administration. Those people want to get their hands on all these great independent agencies. They want to subject them to executive control. They want to destroy the situation under which those agencies are answerable to the Congress that created them. They want them to follow executive direction instead of congressional intent as expressed by us.

When it comes to issuing a license for a broadcasting station, do you want this independent board answerable to us to say who shall get it or do you want some Cabinet officer to say who shall get it? If you want to get a certificate of convenience and necessity for a bus line or truck line or railroad or an air line, do you want to go to the ICC as a great independent agency that decides the fact or do you want to go to a Cabinet officer?

This is not seeing ghosts under the bed. These reorganization proposals have proceeded on the theories outlined in the old Brownlow report which came out baldly and said that these independent agencies should be taken in under 1 of the 12 executive departments of Government.

As far as I am concerned, I know that the continuing existence of these independent agencies makes for the best government. Parenthetically may I also say that the then Senator Truman felt the same way about it, and later I want to quote a few of the things that he said along that line, although he seems to feel differently now.

Why are these agencies indispensable? They are the creatures of Congress. They are answerable to us. I think practically all, if not all of them, are bipartisan commissions, the requirement being that the minority shall be represented on the commission. Why is that? That is a logical extension of the two-party system. It provides for expression of the minority viewpoint on that commission or agency. Why, the decisions of these agencies, when they go on to the circuit court of appeals, are final on the facts on review even as are the decisions coming from a district court of the United States. You transfer one of these bipartisan agencies to a Cabinet position, to an executive department, and the independent, bipartisan status of the agency is out the window. It just becomes a joke.

The whole thing has been summed up by the Brookings Institution in words better than I could use. Let me read you what they say in a report on this bill:

> The regulatory agencies * * * have the power to make rules and regulations having the force of law and, consequently, in a real sense are legislative agencies. They also perform adjudicatory functions that should be carried out in an impartial manner free from political influence. Moreover, in order to preserve the necessary degree of continuity in public policy their freedom from the potentiality of partisan political action is also desirable. It is argued by some that administrative expenses could be cut by placing these agencies in the regular departments. But such savings would be very small since, as will be shown, administrative costs are but a small part of total expenditures. Consequently, the President should not have the power to place them in executive departments headed by political appointees.

Let no one say that this is not a real threat. I have referred to the CAA transfer to the Department of Commerce. I have referred to the reorganization order that destroyed the independence of the REA, and has put us now to the necessity of undoing the wrong that was done. We also have a duty and a responsibility to recreate the Civil Aeronautics Authority as an independent agency of the Government. We have an airport bill before our committee. It may cost upwards of a billion dollars. It refers to what the Administrator is to do. But when the Under Secretary of Commerce appeared, he said, "Why, the decision and determination of the Department of Commerce would be superimposed upon that of the Administrator."

Some say that President Truman does not covet control of these independent agencies of the Government. As I pointed out a moment ago, we were told

that by one speaking of his predecessor and presumably for him, only to see the thing against which we sought to guard come to pass. The CAA was transferred. They had been doing a great job. When that matter came to the House of Representatives for action we overwhelmingly defeated the reorganization proposal, but when it went to the other body they refused to go along. Now we have the very bad situation of having that great agency in the Department of Commerce. That convinces me that this one-house procedure is a highly dangerous thing.

There were voices raised over there in the Senate against that reorganization proposal affecting the CAA. One of those voices was the voice of Senator Truman. The then President, his predecessor, finally became so angered that he said those opposing his reorganization plan were guilty of ignorance, gullibility, or politics. The then Senator Truman said in substance that he would not undertake to contest the matter of his ignorance but he certainly would contest the matter of his gullibility. He went on to say certain things about that transfer that I think every one of us ought to listen to today in trying to figure out what is happening. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing the debate. This is Senator Truman speaking:

Aviation is again to be placed under the control of a Department which made such a mess of it that it was removed by Congress only 2 years ago with the express consent and active support of the President. He asks that a plan which failed be substituted for one which has worked successfully.

But what about the plan itself? A close study reveals that it is not so clear cut as it might seem to be on first reading of the order. It does not distinguish between duties directly under the control of the Secretary of Commerce and those which allegedly remain as independent functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The order requires that the Board report through the Secretary of Commerce, whose degree of indirect control is obviously unlimited. In fact, the Secretary is the Board. The whole set-up becomes political. Air regulation by a bipartisan board is out of the window.

A little further on, speaking after certain questions that he had propounded, he said these words:

These and many other queries come to mind; but I need not here enumerate them further in order to illustrate the clever indirection with which the independent regulation of American aviation is being sacrificed on the altar of concentrated Executive control of governmental functions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time, 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to complete my statement and wonder if I might possibly be allowed some time by the majority side?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. How much time would the gentleman need?

Mr. HALLECK. Five additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Further on in that debate in the Senate, Mr. Truman also said this:

There was not a single witness in the hearings who conscientiously felt that the Civil Aeronautics Authority should be transferred to the Department of Commerce. We are going straight back to where we started and the efforts of the Senate and all of the efforts of the House to create a bipartisan board to regulate air commerce are simply made nugatory by this order. This bipartisan board is a continuing body to regulate transportation by air just as the Interstate Commerce Commission has regulated transportation on the railroads and by busses and trucks. It is, I repeat, a continuing organization. We have been trying to set up a transportation policy. The effort, so far as the House is concerned, is completely wiped out if this order goes into effect. I sincerely hope that so far as air commerce regulation is concerned, a political set-up will not again be resorted to. Before the Civil Aeronautics Authority was established the main difficulty with the regulation of air commerce was the fact that the Department of Commerce is innately a political organization.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. May I be permitted to conclude?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman quoting former Senator Truman?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I am quoting the words of former Senator Truman.

The Secretary of Commerce is appointed by the President because he is friendly and favorably inclined to him, and that is the way it should be; he is a part of the executive department of the Government. What we tried to set up was a quasi-legislative and judicial body, which, if transferred to a political organization, will put things exactly where they were when we started.

Further on, Senator Truman said to Senator PEPPER, who was supporting the reorganization:

Would the Senator transfer the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Trade Commission under the same conditions to the Department of Commerce?

Senator PEPPER answered:

It would not make a bit of difference in the world to their effectiveness.

You see there is a school of thought which is running back of this whole thing.

The RECORD shows further:

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator would transfer them to the Department of Commerce?

Mr. PEPPER. They would serve just as well and just as effectively if they were oriented there as if they were in their present capacity.

Mr. TRUMAN. I cannot agree to that at all. They are quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative bodies and they are responsible to the Congress and to no one else. I think that if the Civil Aeronautics Authority does go to the Department of Commerce, we will have ample proof of what would happen.

Now, then, you may say, "Well, does President Truman still hold those views?" Well, I wonder. I told you about this airport bill. Since they are going to spend a lot of money I decided I would like to see the administrative situation cleared up. I recall when our committee reported the omnibus air bill last year it provided for the re-creation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority as an independent agency of Government. So quite some time ago I introduced a bill to provide for the re-creation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority as an independent agency of the Government. Our committee addressed a communication to the Budget Bureau inquiring inquiring whether or not they favored that bill and whether it is in line with the President's program. In view of what Senator Truman said in the Senate, I supposed of course that he would favor re-creating the CAA as an independent agency. But, no. Something has happened. It would appear that he has changed his mind.

After waiting around all summer, on September 21 the Budget Bureau wrote this to the committee:

In reply, I wish to state that I recently had occasion to discuss this subject with the President and he authorized me to advise the Secretary of Commerce, which I did in my letter of August 23, 1945, copy attached, that the enactment of the proposed legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President.

Now, what has happened to the views and viewpoints of the President? You heard his arguments in the Senate. Now, as President, it seems to me it is fair to say that by this request he seeks the same power he condemned in his predecessor; the power to acquire concentrated Executive control of Government functions. In the Senate he expressed views directly against that. He sends this request here for power which, if granted, and the pattern of the CAA and the REA is to be followed, can result in the destruction of these great agencies and untold harm to the people of America. That is why we must exempt these agencies.

Now, I wonder, has the President of the United States forsaken the high principles that he announced in the Senate? True, the matter of the CAA was the particular thing under consideration, but the quotations I have read to you go to the very foundation work of this whole question. Has he forgotten them or did he not know the implications of the reorganization message sent up here? Did he not know the reply that was addressed to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce against my bill to recreate the CAA as an independent agency of Government? Or is it possible that those who promoted these reorganization schemes in the past are still in the saddle and driving on with the same vigor and same determination to strip the legislative branch of the Government of its prerogatives, its powers, and its responsibilities, and concentrate them in the executive branch of the Government?

This matter is now before us. There is only one safe course for us to pursue and that is to see to it, while there is yet time, that these things are safeguarded. We can adopt this amendment to exempt these agencies, and other agencies if it is deemed advisable to include them. We will not jeopardize reorganization where it is needed. We can provide, assuming that we transfer the legislative initiative to the Executive, which seems advisable, that disapproval by one body of the Congress shall defeat

the program. But if we pass this legislation without these exemptions, without requiring the approval of both Houses before they go into effect, then we have made possible the destruction of these great independent agencies. What can happen was demonstrated in respect to the CAA, even as against the word of Senator Truman. We have seen that great independent agency which regulates in the air, just like the Interstate Commerce Commission regulates on the surface, could have its independence destroyed, could be transferred to the Department of Commerce where there is now divided responsibility, where no one can tell who does have the responsibility and who does make decisions.

Now is the time to do something about it, and we must do it in connection with this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rather hesitate to take the time of the House under the rule because I plan to discuss the bill under general debate.

Mr. Speaker, our friend from Indiana has demonstrated that it is easy to be critical but difficult to be constructive. He has given lip service to reorganization. He is silent, however, as to his plan or proposal. If the fundamental plan the bill has set forth is unsound, I say to my friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] bring forth a plan that is sound.

The gentleman from Indiana states that a mistake was made with respect to the transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Board and with respect to the REA, and he quotes as his principal witness the present President of the United States. This bill proposes to give to that President, his principal witness, the power to submit to this Congress a plan that will provide for the transfer of this very Board from the Department of Commerce to make it an independent agency. Mr. Speaker, I am not going into the matter of the REA except to say that in my judgment the position of the REA today is better than when it was under Mr. Slattery or than it would have been under Aubrey Williams, whom it was proposed to place in charge of that agency. If the President of the United States favors taking that Administration out of the Department of Agriculture and establishing it as an independent agency, we give to that principal witness, the witness upon whom the gentleman from Indiana has relied and whose testimony he has quoted, the power to submit that plan to the Congress of the United States. The gentleman criticizes only two transfers of the many that have been made. The average is good, if there are only two subject to criticism.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman at length, if he will pardon me, during the general debate.

Something was said about a proposal submitted by President Hoover for reorganization in December 1932. Congress gave him the power to submit a plan. He proposed to consolidate 58 agencies. We had extended hearings. Col. J. C. Root was the Director of the Budget. The testimony showed that Colonel Root admitted that at least some of those reorganizations, all in open plan, were utterly unsound, and he convinced the committee that the President was not familiar with the reorganization plan. They were submitted just a short time before he retired. The facts are and the record shows that our friends on the Republican side opposed the plan as a whole. They said they were in favor of a few of the transfers. The record is that the Republicans offered a motion to recommit with instructions to divide the plan. That motion was defeated. The fact is that the entire plan was defeated without a record vote and without a division vote because there were few, if any, on either side who were in favor of the plan as the bill for submitting the plan had been pronounced probably to be unconstitutional, as I shall show later in the day, by William D. Mitchell, the then Attorney General of the United States.

Let me say in conclusion that the problem of reorganization is one of the most important in the Government. We have in my judgment the best reorganization bill that has been submitted to the House.

With respect to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the gentleman from Indiana is a member, could submit at any time a bill to transfer the Board from the Department of Commerce and making it an independent agency. It is a matter within the jurisdiction of his committee, and I repeat that committee could submit a bill at any time. If there be legislation affecting the Board pending before the committee, the transfer might be included in such legislation. It is fair to say that the plan, as he says, was rejected by the House; it was favored by the Senate by a vote of 46 to 34, and subsequently the plan was approved by both Houses passing a resolution putting it into effect before the expiration of the 60 days. It is further fair to say that in transferring the Board to the Department of Commerce the President abolished another Board, the Board of Safety; and the President of the United States let the bipartisan character of that board remain, and it is now bipartisan. I shall be pleased to discuss the matter more extensively in general debate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if Congress is unwilling to undertake this reorganization problem, unwilling because of the feeling that it is not properly equipped to do so, then it ought not to tie the hands of the President, upon whom responsibility is being placed, and it ought not to try to do it in part by limiting the powers of the President. A very serious error will be committed if a host of agencies are exempt from reorganization. The committee reporting the bill however, has justified the position taken by my devoted and distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], because the committee does propose that certain agencies shall be exempt. Very frankly, I am deeply concerned with what may be done with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. I would like to see it taken care of, but I am convinced that the President will be in a very much better position to do a good and satisfactory job if the agencies exempted under the bill are eliminated and none other be put in.

We have made attempts heretofore to get reorganization but at no time has reorganization been needed so badly as now. To effectuate the purposes of the bill, we must give the President a free hand. You are not going to get the kind of reorganization that you feel ought to be had if you cripple, hamstring, tie the hands, or limit the power of the agency you are appointing to do this important work.

I hope upon reflection that Members will take a trustful attitude. Certainly the gentleman from Indiana is in good position to favor delegating this whole power of reorganization to the President because he finds himself in accord with views expressed by him on this subject while a Member of the United States Senate. He is not in position to entertain doubt as to the kind of a job that the President would do.

I am not sure that I shall offer any amendments when the bill is considered under the 5 minute rule, but certainly I would favor the striking out of all these exempted agencies if keeping them in this exempt class a host of others must also be admitted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Reference was made a bit ago to my comment on the REA and the statement was made that the REA under the Department of Agriculture had done a good job. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry made an extensive study of that whole thing and wound up by putting this paragraph in their report, along with a lot of other things I will not take time to read at this juncture:

> The disintegration and demoralization of personnel in the REA since its integration into the Department of Agriculture is an outstanding contrast to the harmony and excellency of morale that appears to have existed prior thereto, and is an indictment of the administration under the Agricultural Department.

They cited the testimony of Mr. John Carmody, who certainly was an able man and they state the following of him:

> He made his reasons known in the testimony before the committee. He feared that the success of the REA would be impaired and the REA would be handicapped when it became subordinate to the Department of Agriculture. He anticipated the menace of layers of authority over REA. His anticipations and fears were fully justified.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in 1930 we had about 450,000 Government employees and a national debt of about $20,500,000,000. Today we have over 3,500,000 Government employees and a national debt on September 27 of over $262,500,000,000. There is not a man in Congress or a man any place in the United States who will deny that we need reorganization. H. R. 4129 probably is not the best solution to that problem. If this bill had come up 6 months ago I would not have voted for it, but I will vote for the bill today because I have reason to believe that we are going to do something on account of absolute necessity, and if we do not do it, this Government of ours is going to go by the ways. I think that every Member of Congress as well as the Chief Executive realizes that fact. Let me give you some reasons why we should reorganize the Government as given by the Comptroller General, Lindsay Warren, before our committee. He says ther are 29 agencies of Government engaged in lending money; three Government agencies engaged in insurance deposits and loans; 34 agencies dealing with the acquisition of land; 16 agencies dealing with wildlife preservation; 10 agencies dealing with Government construction; 9 agencies dealing with credit and finance; 12 agencies dealing with home and community planning; 10 agencies dealing with materials and construction; 28 agencies dealing with welfare matters; 14 agencies dealing with forestry; 4 agencies dealing with the examination of banks; 65 agencies engaged in gathering statistics; 75 bureaus and agencies of Government and divisions in the transportation field; 8 bureaus and departments of Government dealing with labor. That was before the Executive order just a week or so ago putting everything back in the Labor Department. There are three agencies dealing with collections of customs. If we do not need a reorganization of Government, then I do not know anything. The question is, How are you going to go about it? If the gentleman from Indiana could carry out the things that he wants to do and in the manner which he suggests ought to be done by the Congress, that would be one thing, but I am convinced that the Congress will not do it, and the reason is because Congress has not got the backbone to do the job. There is only one other thing left for us to do, and that is to take a chance once more on the Chief Executive. I would not have talked that way 6 months ago, but I am convinced that there is only one thing to do, and the best thing to do is the salvation of America, the salvation of this country of ours, and if we do not do that I think we will be sunk.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman heard me read the colloquy that took place between the then Senator Truman and Senator PEPPER of Florida at the time the CAA was under consideration. The then Senator Truman asked Senator PEPPER if he would put the ICC under a Cabinet Executive post. Senator PEPPER indicated that he would. The then Senator Truman said that he would not be for that at all. May I ask the gentleman whether he stands with Senator PEPPER or the views expressed at that time by the then Senator Truman?

Mr. RICH. I am only taking another chance, because I have reasons to believe, on account of statements made to me by the Comptroller General, that we will certainly get something better. We cannot get anything worse. If we cannot get anything worse, we ought to get something better.

Mr. HALLECK. May I ask the gentleman one final question? The gentleman heard me enumerate the eight additional independent agencies that I thought should be exempted. Did Lindsay Warren at any time say anything to the gentleman to indicate that their shift to the executive departments would in any way accomplish the result that the gentleman is talking about, with 23,000 employees?

Mr. RICH. We can eliminate those agencies if the Congress sees fit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As a part of our program of international cooperation, expanding foreign trade, and domestic progress in commerce and industry, I recommend the speedy approval by the Congress of the agreement of March 19, 1941, between the United States and Canada for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. When approved, the two countries will be able to harness for the public benefit one of the greatest natural resources of North America, opening the Great Lakes to ocean navigation and creating 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectric capacity to be divided equally between the people of the United States and Canada.

The development, utilization, and conservation of our natural resources are among those fields of endeavor where the Government's responsibility has been well recognized for many generations.

During the war we were forced to suspend many of the projects designed to harness the waters of our great rivers for the promotion of commerce and industry and for the production of cheap electric power. We must now resume these projects and embark upon others.

The Congress and the people of our country can take just pride and satisfaction in the foresight they showed by developing the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers and the rivers in the Central Valley of California. Without the power from these rivers the goal of 50,000 airplanes a year—considered fantastic only 5 short years ago, but actually surpassed twice over—would have been impossible. Nor could we have developed the atomic bomb as early as we did without the large blocks of power we used from the Tennessee and Columbia River.

The timely development of these rivers shortened the war by many years, and saved countless American lives. We must ever be grateful for the vision of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the wisdom of the Congress in urging and approving the harnessing of these priceless natural resources.

One of the great constructive projects of the North American continent, in fact, one of the great projects of the world, which was delayed by the exigencies of war, is the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

For 50 years the United States and Canada, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, under Liberal and Conservative governments, have envisoned the development of the project together, as a joint enterprise.

Upon the expectation that we would join with them in completing this great engineering project, Canada has already built more than half its share of the undertaking.

We, however, still have our major contribution to make.

Every engineering investigation during the past 50 years, every economic study in the past 25 years has found the project feasible and economically desirable. The case has been proved; the plans are ready.

The St. Lawrence seaway will make it possible to utilize our war expanded factories and shipping facilities in the development of international economic cooperation and enlarging world commerce. New and increasing opportunities for production and employment by private enterprise can be expected from this cheap water transportation.

It is the kind of useful construction which will furnish lucrative employment to many thousands of our people.

The completion of the seaway will bring many benefits to our great neighbor and ally on the north. The experience of two wars and of many years of peace has shown beyond question that the prosperity and defense of Canada and of the United States are closely linked together.

By development of our natural waterpower resources, we can look forward with certainty to greater use of electricity in the home, in the factory, and on the farm. The national average annual consumption of electricity by domestic consumers has almost doubled in the past 10 years. Even with that increase, the national average is only 65

percent as high as in the Tennessee Valley where electric rates are lower. Increase in the consumption of electricity will mean more comforts on the farms and in city homes. It will mean more jobs, more income, and a higher standard of living. We are only on the threshold of an era of electrified homes and mechanical aids to better living. We can encourage this trend by using the bounty of nature in the water power of our rivers.

If we develop the water power of the St. Lawrence River, the United States' share of that power will be available for distribution within a radius of 300 miles. This will include most of New York State and its neighbor States to the east. Public and private agencies will be able to pass on to the consumers in that area all the advantages of this cheap power.

Under the leadership of Governor and later President Roosevelt, the State of New York created the framework of a State power program. I have always been, and still am, in favor of that program.

Under it, the power facilities are to be constructed by the Federal Government and turned over by it to the State of New York. The terms of allocation of costs to the State of New York have been agreed upon in a memorandum of agreement dated February 7, 1933, recommended for execution by the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the power authority of the State of New York. This basis of allocation is fair and acceptable.

It has always been understood by the responsible proponents of this development that the water-power projects should become the property of the State of New York, and that the electric power should be developed and handled by the State. That should continue to be the policy, and I recommend that it be so declared by the Congress.

Any agreement with the State of New York to this end must protect the interests of the United States as well as the interests of neighboring States; and will, of course, have to be submitted for approval by the Congress before it can become effective.

I urge upon the Congress speedy enactment of legislation to accomplish these objectives so that work may start on this great undertaking at the earliest possible time.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 3, 1945.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen who speak on the bill, H. R. 4129, the reorganization bill, in Committee today may include in their remarks, tables, newspaper items, and other matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO REORGANIZATION BILL

Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to print the Committee amendments to H. R. 4129 with a brief explanation following his remarks in the Committee of the Whole.

REORGANIZATIONS IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4129, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to analyze this bill, as it would only be a repetition of what others have agreed to do. I want to make a few remarks in reply to some of the statements which were made during the consideration of the rule. I have been a Member of the House of Representatives for nearly 20 years. There has not been a select reorganization committee set up by the House during that time that I have not been a member of. I have been chairman of House committees, and after the death of Senator Robinson, of Arkansas, I became chairman of the Joint Committee on Reorganization. During that period there were some very outstanding men who I have been associated with. One of them is now Secretary of State. Another is now Secretary of the Treasury. Another is now Comptroller General of the United States. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], and others, members of committees.

Had this bill been brought to the floor immediately after it was reported by the committee nearly 2 weeks ago, this opposition that you hear now would not have sprung up. But the delay gave an opportunity to job holders to buttonhole Members of Congress to exempt their agencies so that they could retain their positions. The Speaker of the House of Representatives even made a public expression in reference to their interference. Are we going to listen to job holders, or do we intend to think of the interest of the taxpayers of this country? The President disapproved of what was going on. Subordinates of his in the executive branch of the Government coming to Members of Congress to try to override his recommendations.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], I concede, has a right to talk about the Civil Aeronautics Administration, because he has been a member of the committee which considers legislation affecting the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Naturally he is interested. But if the President of the United States in the event this bill becomes a law, just as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] said, retains the same position that he had while in the Senate to which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] referred, he can make the Civil Aeronautics Administration an independent agency. He can also return the REA to its former status.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. No. I asked the gentleman to yield to me and he refused.

Now, aviation has moved along very fast. It is going to move along faster. We read in the papers today where an airplane load of fish comes to Washington from the Great Lakes. The airplane is going to carry not only mail but it is going to carry express and freight. The War Department today has gliders large enough to place two tanks within them. They used them in Europe. They were made in my city. That corporation is still making gliders, even though the war be over, to sell to airplane lines. What for? To carry express and freight.

I am just as much interested in the Civil Aeronautics Administration as any Member. We, the Congress, delegated power to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Under the provisions of this bill you cannot take one function away from it. You can add to it but you cannot take anything from it. We delegated the power to the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate rates for the railroads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Later on we placed the supervision of trucks under the Interstate Commerce Commission. It regulates their rates. If aviation is going to advance so that it will be a real competitor of the railroads and the trucks, would it be a mistake to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to regulate rates for the aviation companies? Would it not be better to have them all under one head? All are engaged in interstate transportation.

You all know how for years I have been endeavoring to have the executive branch of the Government reorganized. Years ago I knew there was a great need for reorganization if we were going to stop the control of our Government by bureaus. It was for that reason that I supported the legislation that gave President Hoover the right to reorganize and it is for that reason I participated in securing the passage of legislation on several occasions since that time.

I cannot conceive of a better argument that could be made for this legislation as the committee reported it than that advanced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

I want to compliment him on the speech he made, which in my opinion was an endorsement of this legislation. I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] likewise endorsed this legislation, but unfortunately he added some "ifs" and "buts". What does he propose? He proposes to offer an amendment to exempt certain agencies. Is he willing to offer those amendments individually? No. He is going to offer them collectively. Why? He wants to

get Members of this House who would like to see the Federal Deposit Insurance Corportion, for example, exempted, to go along with him on the other seven or eight exemptions which he proposes; and so on down the line. An opportunity for some logrolling, you vote to exempt my favorite agency, I will vote for yours.

It seems to me if you want to approach this question honestly and fearlessly and you really want to offer amendments, offer them separately and let every agency stand on its own bottom. The more agencies you exempt the less reorganization you will have.

I am going to be honest with you and say that if I had my way there would be no exemptions in this bill. The question has been asked why we exempted the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. The answer is that there was an argument among the Members and a majority agreed that these three organizations were outstanding arms of Congress. In other words, Congress has delegated power to them to do certain work for the Congress such as the regulation of rates, the control of securities, the control of business from unfair practices and false advertising, and so forth. Then, again, Members asked why we provided in paragraph C of section 5 that the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the United States Tariff Commission, and the Veterans' Administration could not be reorganized unless the plan was submitted to the Congress individually and not contained in a plan where other recommendations might be made.

A great part of the original bill introduced by the chairman was contained in the 1939 act and he included in the exemptions practically all the agencies that were contained in that act. I can tell you as a member of the committee that handled that bill that those exemptions would not have been in that act if the views of the House of Representatives had prevailed. While we passed the bill by a fair majority the bill only passed the Senate by one vote and it was necessary to make concessions to the Senate in order to get a law. The fact that those agencies were exempted in the 1939 act is the answer to any criticism that might be advanced as to why President Roosevelt did not more thoroughly reorganize the executive branch of the Government. We tied his hands and told him, "You can go so far but no further." It is true that we also gave the President the power in 1933 to reorganize the executive branch of the Government but you know and I know the situation that confronted the President when he took office in 1933. We were faced with disaster. The banks were closed, thousands of business houses were going into bankruptcy, and he was trying to save our Government from ruin. Before he had time to do a real job the act expired.

It is reasonable to assume that when President Truman twice asked the Congress to reorganize the executive branch of the Government he is willing and ready to do it. The Congress will not do it, so why should we not delegate the power to the President to do it but at the same time provide in the law that the Congress will have the power by concurrent resolution to either approve or disapprove of his recommendations? As you all know a concurrent resolution is final when acted upon by both Houses. It only requires a majority of both Houses to pass a concurrent resolution under the terms of this act to approve or disapprove his plans. We do not provide for a joint resolution which would give the President the veto power. The President could veto a joint resolution and you and I know it would require a two-thirds vote of the Congress to pass it over his veto.

It is true we gave President Hoover unlimited power to reorganize this Government; but what Mr. Hoover do? Mr. Hoover sent down his reorganization plan after he was defeated, and the Congress very wisely, after his Budget Director assailed his plan—and I was the one who asked him the question, and it was in answer to my question that he disapproved of the President's plan and suggested the incoming President be given the power—the Congress refused to approve it.

In 1939 when we were receiving those telegrams and letters about which the gentleman spoke—and he knows who was the leader of the opposition—they did not come to me in wastebaskets, they came to me in mail sacks. I was chairman of that committee; but I today can make the statement that there is not one businessman, there is not one banker—and I say banker because the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation wants to be exempted and has sent a letter to me—not one who opposes this reorganization plan. Why? Businessmen have had more to do with the Government in the last 10 years than they ever did, especially during the war. They found it took them about 2 days to find the man they wanted to talk to to discuss a matter; so they are all for reorganization.

They encountered a bureaucracy the likes of which they never had any idea existed. They knew that no private business could operate 30 days as did their Government, and they urged reorganization. The press, the columnists, the commentators, and organizations of every type urged a reorganization not only of the executive but of the legislative branch of the Government. Therefore, we should certainly give President Truman an opportunity to set his house in order and place few limitations upon him. If he does not, then the responsibility is his, not that of the Congress.

If and when amendments are offered, I propose to express myself on the amendments.

This is a good bill, and I hope it will be passed as reported by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I think too much of the gentleman from Missouri to engage in running controversy with him, but there are a couple of things I cannot let pass without correcting.

No. 1: The gentleman certainly knows I stated my opposition in the Rules Committee when this matter was before that committee and I have stated it publicly on many other occasions. But I certainly brought it out very definitely at the time the Rules Committee was considering the request for a rule, as the gentleman from Mississippi and the chairman of the committee know.

No. 2: I approve of the statements made by Senator Truman which I have quoted. I am disturbed by the change in his position indicated by the letter of the Bureau of the Budget stating that he is not for the re-creation of the CAA as an independent agency. I am disturbed at his apparent objection to the exclusion of these independent agencies. I am disturbed at President Truman's reversing Senator Truman.

That other reorganization did not provide for the transfer of the CAA to the ICC to effect a consolidation. It short-circuited the ICC and transferred it to the Department of Commerce, where it certainly should not be.

No Government employee has spoken to me about my opposition to this matter, not a single one has said a word to me. I am seeking to exempt these eight because they are in the same category as the three that are exempted and they should be exempted. I am motivated by principle and by conviction, not by a matter of getting votes. If there is any inconsistency it is on the part of the committee that exempts three rate-making regulatory independent agencies and does not exempt the FCC and the Federal Power Commission and others.

It is true, as the gentleman from Missouri indicated, that President Hoover submitted his plan after he was defeated. Maybe it was still a good plan, I do not know, but as I get it, the opposition was: "We are going to wait for the incoming President to do the job." All I have got to say about that is that the incoming President came in, served as President for a long, long time, and if a real effective reorganization were needed then, certainly, in that long period of time the reorganization might have been effected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on May 24 of this year the President of the United States transmitted to the Congress a message recommending legislation which would authorize reorganization of the executive departments. In that message the President asked for no exemption. He asked for permanent legislation.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held hearings on this bill and it took us about 3 weeks to write the bill that was finally reported.

On May 26 of this year I introduced a bill following the language of a bill passed by the House and Senate in 1939 authorizing the Chief Executive to reorganize the executive departments. I had

21 exemptions in my bill. After hearing our former colleague, now the very able Comptroller General of the United States, Hon. Lindsay Warren, it is fair to say that our committee was convinced that if we exempted 21 agencies from the provisions of a reorganization act there would be no reorganization.

Mr. Chairman, of course the reorganization of these executive agencies can be done by the Congress under the Constitution of the United States. For years, years, and years Members of Congress, the public, and the press have criticized growing bureaucracy, but, as far as I know, the Congress of the United States itself has never reorganized a single agency in the executive department. There is a reason for that. In the first place, we do not have the time to make a study. In the second place, we do not have the facilities, we do not have the experts to make the reviews for us. There is one thing, in my opinion, the Congress could do for itself; that is, provide a sufficient staff to make the surveys necessary for the intelligent consideration of legislation and reorganization plans.

This is not the first time that what I have just said has been stated to the Congress. In 1841, 104 years ago, the Congress was wrestling with the problem of reorganization. I want to read to the committee what a House committee reported in 1841:

> The committee soon found out that, without a total abandonment of their other representative duties, it would be impossible during the present session to examine all the departments in a satisfactory manner. The public interest demands a rigid and more general investigation. Economy does not consist in withholding supplies which the public safety demands but in limiting the appropriation of public money to proper objects, and in insuring that it is disbursed with fidelity.

Of course, if we want this huge number of executive agencies reduced, we must of necessity rely upon the Chief Executive to do that. I think Congress is certainly protected in this bill. We have limited to some extent the authority of the President to reorganize. We have exempted from reorganization the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Under this bill, we will permit the reorganization of the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the United States Tariff Commission, and the Veterans' Administration, but the President cannot reorganize those and transmit reorganization plans for those agencies if they are tied in with any other agency. Each individual agency reorganization mentioned here must be sent up in a separate plan, and Congress within 60 days can knock that plan out if it does not like it. I might add, by authority of the committee, that we are going to offer an amendment to section 5, subsection 3, on page 8. We will add the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. That will be in what is known as plan 2. In other words, if the FDIC is to be reorganized, it must be sent up as a separate plan. It cannot be tied in with the plan of reorganization of the Federal Land Bank or the Federal Reserve Board or any other agency. It comes up and must stand or fall on its own merits.

In this bill we also limited the time for submitting reorganization plans to July 1, 1948. We felt that there was a crying need and a crying demand for reorganization of the Government agencies. We felt if we made the statute permanent that it might tend to delay needed reorganization. For that reason we placed the time limit July 1, 1948. There were other reasons for that. One of them is that we did not want to be charged with having a reorganization plan sent up during a Presidential campaign for purely political reasons. We think that with a time limitation the executive department will get busy soon and try to solve this problem.

I might say that under the War Powers Act of 1941 the President of the United States is authorized to combine departments. He can abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission. He can abolish its functions. All of us voted for that act. I asked for a copy of all the Executive orders that were issued under the first War Powers Act. I am frank to say that I do not agree with some of them, but they lapse 6 months after the expiration of this act. There must be some 75 Executive orders which were issued under authority of that act. The Interstate Commerce Commission has not been bothered. The Securities and Exchange Commission has not been bothered. The FDIC has not been bothered. All of these agencies that we have fears about today have not been bothered. I think it is fair to say that if some of the agencies that have been enumerated in the so-called plan 2 of our reorganization bill were set up here in an effort to change the bipartisan membership of a board, say the Civil Service Commission, that both Houses of Congress would by an overwhelming majority repudiate those plans.

It might be said that we are delegating too much authority to the President. Of course, we are delegating a good deal of authority. But within 60 days after that plan has been transmitted to the Congress, under the cloture rule which has been written in here, a very unusual rule, it makes it impossible for those who favor the reorganization plan to filibuster, delay, or by dilatory tactics make it impossible to get a vote on the plan.

I think that should allay the fears of most of us who do not want to give too much authority to the Chief Executive. That is our protection. Without that protection, I would not support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

I would take more time, but I think our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], will devote most of his time to an explanation of the bill. He will not speak in general terms as I have. I believe that after he gets through all of you will say that he has covered every phase of this bill. He has given it more study than any other member of our committee because he has been a member of the committee for a number of years and has had experience since 1929, I believe, in the reorganization of the Government.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO BE OFFERED

It is proposed to offer certain committee amendments to H. R. 4129, and I am setting them forth for the information of the House.

The following amendment proposes a substitute for paragraph (1) of section 4. It is merely a clarifying amendment, and makes no substantive change in the meaning of the paragraph:

> Page 4, strike out lines 16, 17, and 18, and insert the following quoted paragraph:
> "(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head."

The following amendment is for the purpose of making it clear that the President's power, under paragraph (2) of section 4, to provide in certain cases for the appointment and compensation of the head of an agency, includes the power to appoint a board or commission and to fix the compensation of the members thereof:

> Page 5, line 1, after the period, insert a new sentence as follows:
> "The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members."

The following amendments to paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 4 are merely clerical amendments.

> Page 5, in line 14, strike out "such" and insert "any"; and in line 18, strike out "the" and insert "any."

The following amendment to section 5 (c) would provide, in effect, that any plan affecting the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—except for transfers to such agency—could not also relate to other matters:

> Page 7, line 24, after "Federal Communications Commission", insert "Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation."

REORGANIZATION THE AMERICAN WAY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the views expressed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and those expressed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] as to the necessity or the demand for this legislation can be accepted, I think, by all of us. There is no question but that the country as a whole wants a reorganization in the executive department. We all know from experience that for at least 17 years the Congress and the Executive have been endeavoring to get a worth-while reorganization and that so far we have not accomplished very much. That being true, I can see no reason for opposing a reorganization bill, provided it follows constitutional lines and keeps our constitutional procedure and principles.

What the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] said about the advisability of exempting certain organizations may or may not be true. I am not here expressing any opinion on that. Four are exempted in the bill. As the gentleman from Indiana said, the chairman of the

committee in his original bill exempted 21 organizations from any reorganization plan. But this is my point, and this is my argument. Everything the gentleman from Indiana wants can be obtained and brought about if the House will adopt two very short amendments as to how and when the bill can become effective.

Reorganization of the executive agencies is long overdue. The people are impatient, they are disgusted, because of the failure of the President and the Congress to reduce and make more efficient executive agencies.

President Hoover, President Roosevelt, and the Congresses which served during their time had a try at the job, but never completed it.

President Roosevelt in his first campaign promised drastic reductions in Government agencies and in Government expenditures. Though he had the full support of a willing Congress, but little has been accomplished under the general reorganization law, which after 2 years of hard work and long study was enacted in 1939.

Because the advisability, yes, the necessity, of a reorganization in the executive departments is admitted, time will not be taken to prove that fact.

The case for this bill is made by the testimony of the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, a former Member of this House, in whose ability and integrity we all have the utmost confidence. That testimony is available to every Member and is found beginning on page 65 of the published hearings on H. R. 3325.

In the course of his testimony, Mr. Warren said this:

> The late President told us in 1937 that the Government had become a higgledy-piggledy patchwork, and you need not leaf through the current appropriation acts to see that, sadly enough, it still is true.

While a majority concedes that there should be a reorganization, there is an honest difference of opinion, not only as to the agencies which should be consolidated, but as to the method by which it should be accomplished.

Experience demonstrates that, if we are to wait for the Congress to, in the first instance, report out a worthwhile reorganization bill, we may never have reorganization. This, because the various agencies which have been established, each has in Congress its friends and advocates who immediately, when it is proposed to abolish that particular agency, join with the friends of other agencies who desire that another-named agency be excluded from any reorganization, and the result is either the failure to pass any bill or a bill which, because of its exemptions, means little or nothing toward either economy or efficiency.

Hence the committee arrived at the conclusion that the first step in any reorganization plan should be taken by the Executive. The Executive, with his numerous aides, should have a more comprehensive, a more accurate, view of the over-all situation in the executive department than can the individual Members of Congress. Hence, this bill provides that the President shall submit to the Congress a plan for a reorganization. With that feature of the bill, a majority of the Members are in hearty accord.

Because the committee was of the opinion that certain agencies exercised quasi-judicial functions, the bill provided—section 5 (5) (c), page 7—that no reorganization plan should affect the Civil Service Commission, Federal Communications Commission, United States Tariff Commission, and Veterans' Administration, if it also provided for a reorganization which did not affect such agency.

True it is that there are other agencies in the executive department with quasi-judicial functions which might be affected by a reorganization plan, and friends of those organizations have asked why they, too, were not made exempt.

Evidently the committee thought that the named organizations had demonstrated beycnd question their lack of need of a reorganization, and that those not named exercised functions more administrative than judicial in character.

No doubt when this bill is read for amendment friends of other agencies desiring that they be exempt from its provisions will make a vigorous fight to include them in the exempted class.

There is merit in many of the proposed amendments, but if, in consideration of the bill, the House starts making exceptions creating further exemptions, in the end we will have a bill which will defeat the purpose for which it was proposed.

THE METHOD

The method as set forth in the bill by which a reorganization is to be accomplished is this: The reorganization plan is to be submitted by the President to the Congress and unless within 60 days both Houses of Congress, by a majority vote, disapproves of the plan, it becomes law. That method is, in my mind, unconstitutional because it is in direct conflict with the provisions of the Constitution, relating to the enactment of legislation.

As we all know a bill submitted to Congress cannot become a law, cannot be effective, until it has received the approval of a majority of the Members of the House and the Senate and the approval either expressed or implied, of the President or until after a disapproval by the President, it has received the affirmative vot of two-thirds of the Members of each House.

The enactment of this bill, containing as it does, the provisions that any plan submitted by the President shall become the law of the land, unless it is within 60 days disapproved by a majority of both the House and the Senate, is an attempt to amend the Constitution, or to disregard its provisions, by making it possible for the President, with the aid of a majority of the Members of one House, to amend legislation.

There has been a great deal of talk about the American way of life, about the Constitution, and the principles underlying it, which have so recently demonstrated their superiority to any other method of government, but all too often when a specific proposition comes before the Congress, it has failed to adhere to the principles which have demonstrated their soundness.

All the good proposed by this bill can be accomplished if we adhere to constitutional methods. There is no excuse for any short cuts. There is no excuse for either House of Congress shirking its responsibility, delegating its authority to the President and the other House.

When the bill is read for amendment, I shall offer two amendments, the effect of which, will be to require for the approval of any reorganization plan, a majority vote of both the House and the Senate. That is the method provided by the Constitution for the enactment of legislation.

This and preceding Congresses have issued too many blank checks, not only for unlimited sums but checks giving unlimited power.

The Nation is looking to the Congress to reassume not only responsibility, but initiative.

The amendments referred to, if adopted, will enable those who wish to exempt certain agencies from reorganization to, if they have the support of a majority of their colleagues, accomplish their purpose.

Not a little pressure was brought to bear upon me when this bill was before the committee to exempt from its provisions a certain farm agency.

Those appealing to me were in favor, so they said, of an over-all, worth-while reorganization which would bring about efficiency and economy in every nook and corner of the executive agencies, but they insisted that the particular agency in which they were interested should not be touched.

No doubt many Members of Congress have been subjected to a like pressure, but if each and all of us were to yield to his own desire to exempt a particular agency, we would, as has been stated, in the end get no worth-while bill.

Reorganization in the executive departments is in reality, in the first instance, the job of the President. It was a job which Governor Roosevelt, in his early campaigns for the Presidency, promised to perform. It is a job which other Presidents have indicated they would like to do.

But every time we get up to the door and start to clean house, we are met with individual objections to this, that, or the other agency, its personnel or its functions being curtailed or reduced.

It may be that some of the agencies which it is proposed to exempt should be exempted. Conceding that point, the same thing can be accomplished if the House will adopt the proposed amendments as to the methods of procedure and if the plan sent down by the President is required to receive the affirmative vote of a majority of both Houses before it becomes effective.

There is no reason why any agency should be exempt from an effort on the part of the Executive to improve its functions, to lessen the cost of operating it.

Let the President, whoever he may be, with his aides and his assistants, with the mass of material available, suggest the proposed reduction in personnel and expense; then let the House say whether that particular plan shall or shall not become a law.

If we put through blanket exemptions, let us not hereafter criticize the executive department because of its failure to bring about efficiency and economy.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under this bill, it provides for the transfer, abolition, or consolidation of any agency of the Government. In another provision of the bill on page 9, the definition of agency is "any executive department." Has the President under this bill the power to reorganize, consolidate, or transfer any of the powers of the War and Navy Departments?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman will read subdivision A of section 5, he will find his answer.

I appeal to my Republican colleagues; I appeal to all the Members of the House, to again approve the authority of the Executive to submit a plan which will bring about the economy advocated by Hoover, promised by Roosevelt, but still a desirable reform to all appearances a long way ahead of us.

If the Executive attempts to reorganize an agency or a commission which the House thinks should not be touched, all we need to do is to fail or to refuse to adopt it.

If the plan is good, if it has merit, then we can go on record as being in favor of it.

That is all I have to say at this time on this proposition. I am not making any argument as to the desirability of transfer or consolidation of any particular agency. All I am asking of the Members of this House is that when this bill comes up for amendment you insist that any action which may hereafter be proposed by the President shall follow the constitutional procedure and receive the approval of both branches of Congress; that there shall be no delegation of authority either to the President or to the President and one House of the Congress to enact legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments I desire to present some of the reasons why I cast my vote recommending passage of H. R. 4129, which provides for reorganization by the President of agencies of the Government.

One hundred and four years ago a special committee of the House of Congress was appointed to investigate the feasibility of reducing the ever-increasing number of payrollers on the Government civil list.

That was 20 years before the War Between the States, yet even at that time the necessity of reorganizing the several governmental departments was recognized as an acute problem. Something had to be done—and quickly—because the number of employees in the Capital's departments had grown to 600 persons.

The congressional committee went to its task with a will. For 11 long months it held hearings, questioned department heads, delved into the intricate and overlapping operations of the National Government's tax-supported agencies. And, the net result of that ambitious investigation was a grand total of nothing accomplished. Actually, the House committee asked for more than just a year's time to examine the departments and their 600 employees in a satisfactory manner.

There have been numerous efforts at reorganization made since a few departments and 600 Federal payrollers stumped that congressional investigating committee in the year of 1841. None has been successful. As a matter of fact, the inability of Congress to effectually cope with the problem seemingly encourages department executives to a more reckless and profligate waste of the taxpayers' money. The record of congressional failures is to them a mental balm, if ever they would experience pangs of conscience, for extravagantly adding useless employees to the public payroll and fertilizing the mushroom growth of more and more agencies whose functions overlap and whose duplications serve only as an addition to the general confusion.

And what I mean by general confusion is the state of mind in which the taxpayers find themselves when compelled by laws or emergencies to seek information or aid from governmental departments which, purportedly, have been created for service to the public.

For instance, there are 34 different Federal agencies which deal in the acquisition of land. I am not being facetious when I say that by the time a taxpayer ferreted out from that conglomeration the individual division with which he had to do business, then there would probably have been several new departments created to handle his particular problem. There are 65 departments that gather statistics, several of them apparently having as their sole duties the compilation of facts and figures about the other statisticians.

Twenty-nine are vested with authority to lend Government funds. In this connection I submit that by the time an individual seeking a loan has defrayed the costs of legal help or private investigators in discovering which of the 29 departments are entitled to make his particular loan, he would have expended the greater part of such loan for special services and would be in the market for another loan. And by that time he would have been apprised of the fact that he could have obtained quicker service at more attractive terms from private lending agencies.

There are 75 Federal Government agencies—count them—engaged in the field of transportation. This, in itself, raises a moving question. Certainly, with so many transportation experts in the so-called field services daily and nightly utilizing all means of travel, the ensuing congestion on the railroads, planes, and busses constitutes a situation which may in time require the creation of still another department to untie the transportation knot in just the transportation department itself. I cite the Comptroller General's office for the information that last year the Federal Government's transportation costs alone were nearly as much as it cost to run the whole Government in 1914.

Sixteen Federal agencies have to do with the preservation of wildlife. In this respect the term "preservation" is in many ways a misnomer. Because much of the work of these agencies is connected with the welfare of woods and waters creatures only from birth, hatching, and spawning to the boom of the hunter's gun or the spin of the fisherman's reel.

As a member of the Select Committee on Wildlife Resources, and as a hunter and fisherman, I am personally very much interested in conservation. Nevertheless, after reviewing the efforts made by so many overlapping and conflicting Government agencies in the name of "wildlife preservation," my heart goes out to the taxpayers for the vast sums that are being expended on behalf of lo, this one dead duck.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman is making a most interesting speech and has given us some figures that I have not been able to find in any of the reports. Is the gentleman able to tell us or is the committee able to tell us how many of all these conflicting and duplicating agencies were created by Congress and how many by the Executive? If we had those statistics we could then determine whether the chances would be better for the Executive to eliminate duplication or for the Congress to do it. Are such figures available?

Mr. HENRY. Those figures are available and I am sure the gentleman will find when he analyzes them that most of them were created by the Executive.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. About 58 were created by Congress.

Mr. HENRY. Twenty-eight different Federal departments deal with public welfare matters. Again I refer to a statement by the Comptroller General to the effect that there is a rather obvious conflict between the functions of many of these welfare agencies. I contend that the old adage of "too many cooks spoil the broth" can be pertinently applied to a situation where at least a half dozen overlapping agencies are engaged in nutrition programs.

Time does not permit a detailed review of all of the surfeited activities, but here are a few more illustrative of the complete picture as it was back in 1939:

Home and community planning gains the attention of 12 separate Federal departments; Government construction is handled by 10, while materials of construction engage 10 others. Fourteen are actually concerned with forestry matters, and 9 with credit and finance—besides the 29 that lend Government funds, 3 that insure deposits and loans, and 4 that examine banks.

At least 15 departments meddle in one way or another with housing projects financed in whole or in part by Federal funds. A cursory investigation reveals

that 8 departments and agencies have representatives browsing in the field of labor relations. The Comptroller General recently was astounded to discover that at least two Government corporations—Commodity Credit and the former Defense Supplies—were actually doing a thriving business in several administrative and financial activities which have heretofore been regarded as solely the functions of the United States Bureau of Customs.

What I have been able to portray of overlapping and duplications is, however, only a minor part of the complete picture of how such mismanagement, inefficiency, and confusion affects the taxpayer. It naturally follows that a superabundance of useless payrollers is required to maintain so much duplication.

Government records reveal that in 1932 there were, in round numbers, 590,000 civilian employees on the Federal pay rolls. You will remember that the situation so amazed Candidate Franklin D. Roosevelt that he campaigned for the Presidency—and successfully too—with the promise that, if elected, he would cut all boards, bureaus, and commissions 25 percent.

But what happened? Instead of the promised curtailment we have been compelled to endure an increase in the number of civilian employees of the Federal Government that is in no way commensurate with the increase in population, and certainly does not represent sound value for the services rendered.

The over-all picture of today as compared to 1932 is: 1932, civilian employees, 583,196; 1945, civilian employees, 3,667,861.

That is an increase of more than 500 percent over a period of 12 years—an increase of more than 3,000,000 employees to administer affairs of government for 130,000,000 persons. It means that each group of 37 men, women, and children in this Nation is supporting an adult employee on the Federal pay roll.

Giving the babes in arms, as well as other nontaxpayers, a break, we find that an estimated 50,000,000 persons, contributing 2 cents and up to the Federal Treasury in the form of income taxes, paid the salaries and expenses of 3,667,861 Federal employees. That adds up to 13½ taxpayers supporting 1 Federal employee.

What follows such inflation in bureaucracy is inescapable. The Federal Treasury is being drained to maintain these useless boards, bureaus, and commissions at a time when every conscientious legislator, with the welfare of his constituents at heart, is studying ways and means of easing the tax load.

The latest reorganization law, passed in 1939, was short-lived. The war thrust upon our peacetime mushroom growth of bureaus a pentagon-like superstructure of new agencies and commissions. In the mad scramble to organize emergency wartime bureaus, even those with only peacetime pursuits took advantage of the general confusion to add to their personnel, under the subterfuge of functioning for the war effort. Duplication of effort—both in war and nonwar activities—was avoidable. Nevertheless, for more than 12½ years no one has been successful in an attempt to stay the indiscriminate hiring of millions of new employees.

As I have pointed out, the Congress itself has failed to effect remedial measures in more than a century of trying. Obviously, we have reached a turn in the road.

We can blunder along with ineffectual attempts by the legislative department to bring about deflation of bureaucracy and its superfluity of personnel. Or, we can take the most direct and effective route to gaining results, namely, by leaving complete authority with the Chief Executive, by demanding that, clothed with such authority, he undertake the project at once, and by holding his office strictly accountable.

A study of H. R. 4129, the enabling act for such reorganization, reveals that Congress does not relinquish its control. Rather, the bill states that the President shall investigate the organization of all Government agencies to reduce expenditures and promote economy, and that he shall submit his recommendations to Congress not later than July 1, 1948. The reorganization plans, which may be submitted piecemeal, agency by agency, will take effect within 60 days of submission to Congress, providing that the two Houses do not pass a concurrent resolution disapproving the proposed reorganization.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman related in his very able, informative speech, that we have increased the Federal payrollers from 583,000 plus in 1932 to 3,600,000 plus in 1945.

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wonder what there is in the record of President Truman or anybody connected with him that would inspire the gentleman to believe that they will cut down instead of go up?

Mr. HENRY. Nothing except the President's own good judgment, honesty, and integrity. There is no other recourse that we can adopt except take that chance.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Has not the President been a part of the administration making these increases and voting for them and sustaining them for more than 10 years?

Mr. HENRY. I cannot answer that.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the gentleman believe that the head of the executive department now lacks authority to make the necessary retrenchment and curtailment which the gentleman says are so essential at this time?

Mr. HENRY. I do not think he lacks authority, no, but this places the duty on the President and makes him act.

Mr. DWORSHAK. He is head of the executive branch of the Government and has full responsibility and authority now. There is little to justify any hope that the budget requests which come up here will offer any recommendations or proposals that we cut down on our Federal pay roll which has increased over five hundred-fold, as the gentleman has pointed out. The President already has the authority. What is preventing his acting now?

Mr. HENRY. I do not think there is anything that prevents it, but this forces the duty upon him.

Mr. DWORSHAK. He has had that duty for a long time.

Mr. HENRY. Thus, the Congress, having heretofore vested in the President the authority to create new agencies, now demands that the President abolish such agencies that have become useless, reorganize and consolidate those whose functions overlap.

It is expressly stated in the bill that wherever it has been determined that the functions of any agency have been automatically terminated by passage of time or fulfillment of its original purposes, then no reorganization plan shall transfer such nebulous functions to any other agency. This safeguard will be appreciated by those who are apprehensive lest reorganization resolve itself into mere shifting of personnel without achieving results in the form of reduced numbers of employees and curtailment of expenditures.

Certain departments have had to be exempted from reorganization. The reasons for this were intelligently explained to the committee. Briefly, the exemptions arise from the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission are quasi-judicial agencies, and any plan affecting the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Tariff Commission, and the Veterans' Administration must be submitted to the Congress separately and not embodied in a general reorganization.

The bill prevents abolition of any executive department while at the same time carring safeguards against creation of a new one. Withal, the greatest safeguard contained in the measure is the reservation that the entire plan is subject to congressional review and veto.

We will soon undertake the Victory Loan drive for the sale of $11,000,000,000 of United States securities. And we are all reminded how generously the American public has responded to all of the previous War Loan drives as evidenced by the fact that each was heavily oversubscribed.

But the shooting is now over, and in view of all of the present wastefulness on the part of Washington officialdom, I am wondering if our appeal to bond purchasers will have a rather hollow ring unless prompt reorganization of the agencies of our Government, with resulting economies and elimination of overlapping effort and functions, is not made possible by the enactment of H. R. 4129. In the absence of such legislation, will the people meet a quota of $11,000,000,000 willingly when they know that waste as usual is to be the continuing policy in Washington?

Upon a government simple but strong in its construction has been engrafted a system of bureaucracy which appalls

with the amazing speed of its development. It has become a gargantuan monster so powerful that it is almost capable of mastering its own creator, the Congress.

I urge passage of H. R. 4129 and I am willing to support any sound amendment which will strengthen its objectives and at the same time protect the interests and the powers of the Congress. It is the instrument by which we are instructing the President to forthwith set the executive house in order. The American people are demanding economy and efficiency and he will be held to account if he fails to submit all of the necessary plans.

By passing legislation at this time we shall demonstrate to the people of America that we are sincere in our effort to economize and to inject some semblance of sound business practice into the operation of government.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, as to the imperative need for a thorough reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, there is hardly any question. We have today over 3,000,000 Federal employees, and a national debt in the neighborhood of $265,000,000,000. We are faced with the largest, most costly and most dangerous bureaucracy in history. Unless we meet this problem with courage and determination, we cannot long remain a free people, where the Government is the people's servant and not their master.

When the Comptroller General of the United States testified before our Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, relative to reorganization legislation, he presented some startling examples of the overlappings and duplications of the agencies and bureaus. His testimony also bears out that, contrary to what some would have the people believe, the war did not create this problem of bureaucracy. The war merely accentuated it. The situation which confronts us arose out of the administration's policy of having the Congress make broad delegations of power to the Executive. There were repeated warnings and protests against that procedure, but they went unheeded.

In his testimony the Comptroller General called attention to the fact that in 1939, over 6 years ago and 2 years before Pearl Harbor, there were at least 29 agencies lending Government funds, at least 3 agencies insuring deposits and loans, at least 34 agencies dealing with the acquisition of land, at least 16 agencies dealing with wildlife preservation, at least 10 agencies dealing with Government construction, at least 9 agencies dealing with credit and finance, at least 12 agencies dealing with home and community planning, at least 10 agencies dealing with materials of construction, and so on. That is a sample of the situation 6 years ago. One can readily imagine what the situation must be today, with the creation of many new agencies, commissions, and boards, and the unprecedented increase in the number of Federal employees in connection with the prosecution of the war.

The question at issue is not whether there is any need for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. The need has existed for many years. It is imperative that we act. The question at issue is with respect to the method to be employed for accomplishing a reorganization.

It should be borne in mind that a great many of the existing agencies and boards were not created by statute or specifically authorized by law. They were simply created by Executive orders, or by a letter or informal memorandum, out of the innumerable delegations of power made to the Office of the President during the last 12 years. Without this bill or any other legislation, the President has ample authority to abolish, transfer, or consolidate any number of agencies and boards which were entirely the creation of the White House, but very little, indeed, by way of reorganization has been done by the President under this authority he already possesses. However that may be, I recognize that a complete and proper reorganization will require additional legislation, and I am prepared to give the President my fullest cooperation for the enactment of appropriate legislation.

As a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I voted to report this bill with reservations. I did so to bring this issue before Congress and with the conviction that the inadequacies and defects of the committee's bill will be corrected before we reach a final vote.

There are several methods that might be employed for accomplishing a reorganization. In the first place, it is not necessary to make any delegation of power to the President. Under his constitutional prerogative he could recommend to the Congress changes in the existing laws that may be necessary to effect a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. The Congress could then explore and enact his recommendations into law. This is the orthodox method procedure strictly in keeping with the principles of our system of government. It is the customary legislative procedure. It is the procedure I personally prefer and have long advocated.

In the second place, there is the method whereby the Congress delegates certain powers to the President to issue reorganization orders or plans, but his plans or orders do not become effective until formally approved by both the House and Senate by joint resolution. Under this procedure Congress would be required to act on the particular plan within a specified number of days after the plan has been submitted. Some have argued that this procedure is no different than the customary procedure of Congress acting on the President's legislative recommendations. But this joint resolution method has the advantage of precluding changes being made in the detailed plans of the President, of requiring the Congress having to accept or reject a plan in its entirety, and the further advantage of bringing the question promptly to a vote.

This method of procedure has the all important element of protection against possible arbitrary exercise of power by the Executive. It gives the President freedom to act; but, at the same time, preserves the principle of "checks and balances" fundamental in our system of government. It is quite possible that Congress would never have occasion to disapprove any plan the Executive might propose, but I cannot too strongly stress the importance of Congress having such a check, whoever may be the President, and however wise, however honest, and however conscientious he may be. The pending bill does not follow this procedure. I urged its adoption in committee, and I am now urging the House to adopt it in the place of the committee's proposal.

And there is the third possible method, whereby power can be delegated to the President to issue reorganization orders to become effective within a specified number of days unless either the House or the Senate pass a resolution to negative or set aside the particular order in question. This method gives the Executive order full force and effect of law, unless one or the other House of Congress acts to set it aside.

And there is the fourth possible method of procedure for carrying out a program for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. The legislation could provide that the Executive orders of the President will become effective unless within a certain specified number of days both the House and the Senate pass a concurrent resolution to set them aside. Obviously, this method makes the check of Congress on the Executive less effective, because both Houses of Congress must act. As a practical matter, the administration's political control over one of the Houses of Congress makes such a check one of form without substance.

This is the method, requiring action by both the House and the Senate to prevent a plan from going into effect, that is embodied in the committee bill, and is one of the features of the measure to which I have objected. I sincerely hope that when the bill is read for amendment, the House will see fit to reject this particular feature of the bill and substitute in its place a provision requiring affirmative action by both Houses of Congress before any Executive order becomes effective.

As I have already indicated, I am prepared to cooperate with the President to the fullest extent possible for accomplishing the highly desirable reorganization objective. The fact that I so strongly believe that the Congress should retain an effective check over the delegation of power to the Executive does not, in any way, indicate a lack of confidence in the President. Under the terms of this bill we are delegating legislative powers to the Executive. They are extremely important powers, and it is incumbent upon us to reserve for the Congress, which speaks for the people, an effective check on the exercise of powers delegated. To be sure, the bill as reported provides for a check; but, as I have pointed out, it is not as real and as effective as it could and should be. It must be said, however, that even to the extent that Congress retains some right to pass upon the exercise of powers delegated, the pending bill is cer-

tainly an improvement over the type of legislation that has been enacted during the last several years under New Deal sponsorship.

There is another feature of the pending bill which I believe can be strengthened. Section 5 (a) sets forth the limitations with respect to reorganization plans, and exempts from the bill three agencies—the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, and Securities and Exchange Commission. These agencies are quite properly exempted because they are independent agencies which perform quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions. It is, indeed, important that such agencies retain their independence, and to the fullest extent possible be free from political control and dictation. But there are several other such agencies which, in my view, should also be included in this exemption. I have in mind such agencies as the Maritime Commission, Tariff Commission, Civil Service Commission, and Federal Communications Commission.

The complete exemption of the independent agencies, which are regulatory bodies performing quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions, would not materially affect the purpose of this bill in that the number of persons employed by these agencies are relatively small. The possible transfer of these agencies to a department of the Government, placing them under a Cabinet officer, will materially affect their independence.

As a member of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments which reported this bill, I urge that we courageously put into effect some kind of a reorganization program. I likewise urge that the House endeavor to strengthen the bill in the two particulars I have mentioned. In any case let us not fail to do something without further delay for eliminating the costly and dangerous bureaucracy which has grown up in the Federal Government.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the committee has stated, immediately following the message from the President requesting powers of reorganization, the chairman introduced substantially the Reorganization Act of 1939 as the basis for hearings on reorganization. The original bill was completely rewritten. It has been reported as H. R. 4129, after hearings. The rule which has been granted waives points of order, but the bill is being considered under the general rules of the House. Amendments are in order. That rule affects the bill in only one regard. Referring to the authority for consolidations or transfers, it provides, by waiving points of orders, that the appropriations may be transferred.

Mr. Chairman, there is widespread criticism of overlapping, duplication, and inefficiency in the executive departments. Congress has been vocal and loud in its criticism. We have used the word "bureaucracy" as a sweet morsel. The country has criticized wasteful and useless bureaucracy. The President agrees. He has requested power to reorganize. With the prosecution of the greatest war in history, under powers conferred upon him in the First War Powers Act, there has been an unparalleled expansion of executive agencies. These agencies will expire 6 months after the war.

The need now for reorganization is greater than heretofore. There are today, for example, some 17 agencies dealing with public housing. I shall not detain you to enumerate the list. These have been more or less consolidated in the National Housing Agency under the War Powers Act, but those consolidations will expire automatically 6 months after the war. The Federal Government owns one-fifth of all the lands in the country. There are some 11 bureaus dealing with Federal lands. In the field of public welfare there are about eight agencies dealing with vocational rehabilitation and education. There are same six agencies dealing with nutrition programs and research. There are three agencies dealing with the care of dependent children. In the field of labor relations there are some 12 agencies. While some of these labor agencies have been recently consolidated by the President of the United States, those consolidations will expire 6 months after the war. There are many agencies dealing with transportation, including regulation, operation, promotion, research, and shipping agencies. As the Comptroller General pointed out, there are some 75 bureaus, divisions, and agencies of the Government that have important connections with transportation. Now it is time for us to put our house in order. The Comptroller General well said—and I quote his language:

> The present set-up is a hodgepodge and a crazy quilt of duplications, overlapping, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies, with their attendant extravagance. It is probably an ideal system for the taxeaters and those who wish to keep themselves perpetually attached to the public teat, but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill.

Congress and the country demand reorganization. The people are sold on reorganization. The President, I repeat, agrees. He says, "Give me the power. You have given my predecessors the power, give it to me."

What is the method? It has been said that Congress by a simple statute can abolish duplicating agencies with duplicating functions. It is not so simple as that. Congress has never reorganized the Government. I challenge anyone to point to a single statute passed by the Congress of which you are now a Member or by our predecessors. Congress does not reorganize. If we judge the future by the past, Congress will not reorganize. What is the practical solution of this difficult problem? It has been suggested that we could authorize the President of the United States to reorganize. The solution I repeat is not as simple as that. The power to reorganize is a legislative power. That power must be and can only be exercised by Congress as provided by the Constitution. We can either exercise the power directly by passing statutes approved by both Houses of Congress or, within certain well defined limitations and after setting up standards and policies and defining the subject matter, Congress can authorize the Executive to provide and submit plans for reorganization. In order to do that, according to the decisions of our Supreme Court, it is necessary for the Congress to set forth the subject matter in clear and unequivocal language. It is necessary for Congress to prescribe the method, the standard, and the yardstick. I undertake to say that the pending bill meets that test. Executive orders have been issued under the Reorganization Act of 1932 as amended and reorganizations have been before the Supreme Court in two cases and have been approved. The pending bill contains an adequate policy and definite standards and defines the subject matter. It is constitutional. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point, under permission previously granted me, in the House a brief with respect to the constitutionality of the proposed legislation.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TITLE I OF THE REORGANIZATION BILL

Title I of the reorganization bill vests in the President the power to reorganize the several agencies of the Government. Such a reorganization will necessarily entail the transfer, the establishment, and abolition of certain agencies. Since this, under ordinary circumstances, would have to be accomplished by an act of Congress, the question immediately arises as to whether, by conferring this power upon the President, Congress has authorized him to exercise legislative power in violation of the Constitution.

The issue of delegation of legislative power has been raised in the Supreme Court a number of times in the past and although it has been raised successfully but three times (*Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (1935), 293 U. S. 388; *Schechter Poultry Corporation* v. *United States* (1935), 295 U. S. 495; *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.* (1936), 298 U. S. 238. The Carter case will not be discussed herein since it involves only the validity of a delegation to an unofficial body), the Court has announced the principles upon which to judge such cases. Thus, it appears that Congress cannot delegate to an agent its power to make law. However, it may authorize an agent to regulate a subject matter which Congress itself might regulate by statute, if in so doing sufficient restriction is imposed upon the power of the agent to prevent him from substituting his will for that of Congress as to what the law shall be. Hence, if Congress in a statute clearly states the subject with which its agent is authorized to deal, and prescribes the policy of Congress with respect to such subject, so as to furnish an adequate standard to guide its agent in carrying out the delegated power, the statute will not be considered as delegating legislative power. If the agent, however, has been authorized to regulate any subject he may choose, or if Congress has properly restricted him to a particular subject matter but has failed to state adequately its policy with reference thereto, in either case the agent has been authorized to exercise legislative power.

An excellent statement of these principles appears in *Sears, Roebuck & Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (C. C. A. 7th, 1919; 258 Fed. 307), in which the Court upheld the Federal Trade Commission Act (38 Stat. 717, U. S. C., title 15, secs. 41–51). In the course of its opinion, the court stated (at p. 312):

"With the increasing complexity of human activities many situations arise where governmental control can be secured only by the board or commission form of legislation. In such instances Congress declares the public policy, fixes the general principles

that are to control, and charges an administrative body with the duty of ascertaining within particular fields from time to time the facts which bring into play the principles established by Congress. Though the action of the Commission in finding the facts and declaring them to be specific offenses of the character embraced within the general definition by Congress (unfair methods of competition) may be deemed to be quasilegislative, it is so only in the sense that it converts the actual legislation from a static to a dynamic condition. But the converter is not the electricity."

Since the validity of a statute when attacked on the ground that it constitutes an invalid delegation of legislative power depends upon the definiteness of the instructions given by Congress to its agent, the authorities must be examined to determine what statements of policy or standards have been considered in the past to be sufficiently precise.

In *Field* v. *Clark* ((1892), 143 U. S. 649), the Court dealt with the third section of the act of October 1, 1890 (26 Stat. 567), which enacted a schedule of duties on certain merchandise and empowered the President to cause these duties to go into effect against the products of any country producing such merchandise, which imposed upon American products duties or other exactions deemed by the President to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable. The phrase "reciprocally unequal and unreasonable" was held to constitute a sufficient standard to guide the President in so regulating the duties.

The case of *Buttfield* v. *Stranahan* ((1903), 192 U. S. 470), involved the act of March 2, 1897 (29 Stat. 604), which made it unlawful to import into the United States any tea "which is inferior in purity, quality, and fitness for consumption to the standards provided in section 3." Section 3 empowered the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the recommendation of a board of tea experts, to fix uniform standards of purity, quality, and fitness for consumption of all tea imported into the United States. The Court held that Congress had stated a policy to forbid the importation of "the lowest grades of tea, whether demonstrably of inferior purity, or unfit for consumption, or presumably so because of their inferior quality," and concluded that this statement of policy was sufficiently definite to guide the executive officers.

In *United States* v. *Grimaud* ((1911), 220 U. S. 506), the Court considered a statute (the act of February 1, 1905, 33 Stat. 628) providing for the establishment of certain forest reservations and giving to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to "make such rules and regulations and establish such service as will insure the objects of such reservation, namely, to regulate their occupancy and use and preserve the forests thereon from destruction." Thus, the executive officer was instructed to regulate the use and occupancy of the national forests so as to "preserve the forests thereon from destruction." This standard was held by the Court to be adequate.

Section 135 of the Tariff Act of 1922 (42 Stat. 858) has also been upheld. By that section the President was empowered to adjust the duties on imported merchandise so that they would equal the difference between the cost of production in the country of origin and the cost of production of like merchandise in the United States. In *Hampton & Co.* v. *United States* ((1923), 276 U. S. 394), the Court held that Congress' statement of its legislative plan was sufficient to permit the delegation to an agent of the duty to fill in the details. See also *Hampton & Co.* v. *United States* ((1927), 14 C. C. P. A. 350).

The Radio Act of 1927 (44 Stat. 1162) permits the Federal Radio Commission to grant licenses when "public convenience, interest, and necessity requires." In *Radio Commission* v. *Nelson Bros. Co.* ((1933), 289 U. S. 266), it was held in effect that the standard furnished by the quoted phrase was sufficiently definite to prevent the Commission from substituting its will for that of Congress as to what the law should be.

The Trading with the Enemy Act (40 Stat. 411), which authorized the President to sell property seized under that act in any manner "consistent with the public interest," was upheld in *United States* v. *Chemical Foundation* ((1926), 272 U. S. 1).

The phrase "unfair methods of competition" has been held to constitute a sufficient standard not only when used in the Federal Trade Commission Act, heretofore mentioned (*Sears, Roebuck & Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission, supra*), but also when used in section 316 of the Tariff Act of 1922 (42 Stat. 943); *Frischer & Co.* v. *Elting* (C. C. A. 2d, 1932, 60 F. (2d) 71).

The Antidumping Act (42 Stat. 11) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to impose additional duties upon merchandise to the extent that the foreign market value exceeds the exporters' sales price. This formula was held to be sufficiently definite in *Kleburg & Co., Inc.*, v. *United States* ((C. C. P. A., 1933) 71 F. (2d) 332).

In contrast with the above decisions, the statement of policy in the National Industrial Recovery Act (48 Stat. 195) was held inadequate in *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* ((1935) 293 U. S. 388) and *Schechter Poultry Corporation* v. *United States* ((1935), 295 U. S. 495). Consequently certain sections of the act which conferred regulatory powers upon the President were held invalid as delegations of legislative power. In those cases it was contended that the policy or standard to guide the agent was contained in section 1. In that section it was declared to be the policy of Congress to remove obstructions to the free flow of interstate and foreign commerce; to promote the organization of industry; to induce and maintain united action of labor and management; to eliminate unfair competitive practices; to promote the fullest possible utilization of productive capacities of industries; to increase consumption; to reduce unemployment; to improve the standards of labor; and otherwise to rehabilitate industry; and to conserve national resources.

In the Panama Refining Co. case the Court considered section 9 (c) which conferred power upon the President to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of oil produced in excess of quotas permitted by State law. The Court held that the subject of the President's regulation was completely stated, for section 9 (c) specifically provided that the transportation of "hot" oil in interstate commerce was to be prohibited. It concluded, however, that Congress had not fully stated its policy in this regard, for it had not indicated at what time or under what circumstances it intended this prohibition to go into effect. The statements of policy in section 1 were regarded (p. 418) as "simply an introduction of the act, leaving the legislative policy as to particular subjects to be declared and defined, if at all, by the subsequent sections."

In the Schechter case the validity of section 3 (c) of this act was involved. This section authorized the President to approve codes of fair competition, upon a finding that the codes would tend to effectuate the policy of the act. The question there presented was regarded as more fundamental than that presented in the Panama case, for the statute did not include a precise statement of the subject to which the President's regulatory power under section 3 (c) was addressed. The Court, after having turned to the statements of policy in section 1, stated that it was unable to determine what constituted, or what regulation might be included in, a code of fair competition and it therefore held that the statute had failed to specify with sufficient particularity the subject with which the President was authorized to deal. Accordingly, it concluded that, the President's discretion in prescribing rules for the Government of trade and industry being virtually unfettered, the code-making authority conferred by the act was an invalid delegation of legislative power.

It may be concluded from the authorities set out above that in delegating regulatory power to an agent, Congress, in the statute making the delegation, must specify: (1) The subject matter over which the power is to be exercised; and (2) a policy or standard to guide the agent in the exercise of the delegated power. An illustration of the nature of these necessary elements is found in the case of *United States* v. *Grimaud*, heretofore referred to. There the subject to which the delegated power was addressed was stated by Congress to be the occupancy and use of the national forests. The policy or standard prescribed by Congress to guide its agent in regulating such occupancy and use was the preservation of the forests from destruction.

It is now necessary to apply these principles to the provisions of the reorganization bill. Under section 1 of that bill, the President is required to investigate the organization of the agencies of the Government to determine what changes are necessary to accomplish the purposes specified in the seven subsections of that section, namely:

"(a) To improve the effectiveness of administrative management of the Government;

"(b) To reduce expenditures to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

"(c) To increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

"(d) To group, coordinate, consolidate, reorganize, and segregate agencies and functions of the Government, or any part thereof, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

"(e) To reduce the number of such agencies by regrouping or consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and by abolishing such agencies or such functions, or any part thereof, as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government;

"(f) To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and

"(g) To segregate in any agency of the Government regulatory functions which are exercised in essentially the same manner as the functions of a court are exercised, from any policy-determining, prosecution, enforcement, or other administrative or executive functions, and to transfer any of the abovementioned functions from one agency to another and so segregate such functions in the receiving agency."

Under section 2, whenever the President finds and declares that any transfer, regrouping, consolidation, reorganization, segregation, or abolition of any agency or part thereof is necessary to accomplish any of the purposes set forth in section 1, he is required to make such change by Executive order.

Unquestionably, the subject to which the delegated power is addressed, namely, the reorganization of the agencies of the Government, is set forth with sufficient definiteness, for the President is told in section 2 precisely with what he may deal and what he may do with respect thereto; that is, he may deal with the agencies of the Government by transferring, regrouping, coordinating, consolidating, reorganizing, segregating, or abolishing such agencies. The meaning of all these terms is well recognized and the President is not empowered by this section to take any action which does not fall within them. Thus, section 2 of this act differs from section 3 (c) of the National Industrial Re-

covery Act, for the court, in the Schechter case, held that the terms of the latter which described the subject of the President's regulatory power—codes of fair competition—had no well-defined meaning and would have permitted the President to make any type of regulation he considered necessary or advisable for the rehabilitation or expansion of industry.

Having determined that section 2 of the reorganization bill contains a sufficiently definite statement of the subject matter to which the President's power is addressed, the only remaining question is whether the policies or standards declared in section 1 are adequate to guide the President in exercising the delegated power. When several standards are set forth to guide the agent in the exercise of the granted power, it is necessary, in order to determine whether legislative power has been delegated, to examine the most indefinite of the several standards and if that be sufficient to govern his action, the statute can be said to be valid.

Of the standards set forth in section 1, subsection (c) of that section contains the most indefinite. It provides that the President may exercise his power so as to "increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues." Thus Congress has stated its policy, namely, to reorganize the agencies of the Government so as to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues. A comparison of this policy or standard with those which have received judicial approval in the decisions heretofore cited clearly shows that it would be considered a sufficient guide to the Executive. Obviously the standard here set forth is more definite than was that approved by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Chemical Foundation*, supra, in which the President was empowered to sell certain property of the Government when it was in the "public interest," or that prescribed in the Radio Act of 1927, which permits the Federal Radio Commission to grant a license when "public convenience, interest, and necessity require" (*Federal Radio Commission* v. *Nelson Bros. Co.*, supra). Moreover, the standard under discussion is much more precise than that approved in *Buttfield* v. *Stranahan*, supra, in which the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to forbid the importation of tea which was "inferior in quality" or "unfit for consumption." It is unnecessary to set forth further precedents, for those already stated clearly indicate that the President's power to effect a reorganization under this bill is controlled by limitations which are more precise than those which have been heretofore approved by the Supreme Court.

Nor can the standards prescribed in section 1 of the reorganization bill be compared with the statement of policy in section 1 of the National Industrial Recovery Act for the Supreme Court, in considering that act, did not regard section 1 as setting out standards but merely as serving as an introduction to the act. (See p. 6 of this memorandum.) Section 1 of the reorganization bill cannot be dealt with in this fashion, for the bill clearly indicates the intention that the provisions of section 1 shall serve as a guide to the President in making reorganizations under section 2. In this connection, it will be observed that he is required to investigate and to find and declare that the policy set forth in section 1 will be furthered before he can exercise any of the powers conferred upon him by section 2.

Moreover, even if the statements of policy in section 1 of the National Industrial Recovery Act had been considered as a declaration of standards but had been rejected by the Court as too indefinite to serve as a guide to the Executive, the scope of the power delegated by the reorganization bill is so much narrower than that delegated by the National Industrial Recovery Act that the standards set forth in the two are not proper subjects for comparison. Where the delegated power is narrow in scope the standards to guide the agent in the exercise of that power may be less definite for the agent's discretion is limited by the very nature of the subject matter. This is illustrated by an excerpt from the opinion of the Court in the Schechter case (at p. 540) concerning the licensing authority of the Federal Radio Commission:

"The authority of the Commission to grant licenses 'as public convenience, interest, or necessity requires' was limited by the nature of radio communications, and by the scope, character, and quality of the services to be rendered and the relative advantages to be derived through distribution of facilities."

Direct support for the constitutionality of the reorganization bill is found in the judicial decisions and the opinions of the Attorneys General regarding the Reorganization Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 413), as amended by the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517), since title I of the present bill is patterned closely after the provisions of the 1932 act which confer upon the President the power to reorganize the agencies of the Government.

The delegation of authority therein contained was upheld in an unpublished opinion of Attorney General Cummings on June 8, 1933. Moreover, Attorney General Mitchell, in stating that the validity of section 407 of the Reorganization Act of 1932 was extremely doubtful (37 Ops. Attys. Gen. 56), apparently considered the delegation of authority in that act to be valid. Section 407 provided that any Executive order issued under the act should be transmitted to Congress and should not become effective until after the expiration of 60 days from such transmission; and that if, during the 60-day period, either branch of Congress passed a resolution disapproving the Executive order, it should become null and void. Mr. Mitchell questioned the constitutionality of this section, because, Congress having made a valid delegation to the President of the power to issue such Executive orders, they became law upon their effective date, and Congress could not alter, amend, or repeal them, except by the enactment of legislation.

In addition, numerous Executive orders have been issued under the authority of the Reorganization Act of 1932, as amended, and their validity has been attacked on only two occasions. In both cases the validity of this legislation was upheld (*Isbrandtsen-Moller Co.* v. *United States* (D. C. S. D. N. Y. 1936), 14 F. Supp. 407 [recently affirmed by the Supreme Court on other grounds, 4 U. S. L. Week 639]; and *Swayne & Hoyt, Ltd.*, v. *United States* (S. Ct. D. C. 1936), 10 Am. Mar. Cases 1790).

Furthermore, in prior statutes providing for governmental reorganization the Executive has been given broad powers. A good example of this is the Customs Reorganization Act of 1912 (37 Stat. 434), which authorized the President to reorganize the Customs Service with a view to reducing expenses. In making such reorganization and reduction in expenses, he was authorized to abolish or consolidate collection districts, ports, and subports of entry and delivery, to discontinue needless offices and employments, to reduce excessive rates of compensation below amounts fixed by law or Executive order and do all things that in his judgment might be necessary to make such reorganization effective. In that act his discretion was limited by the requirement that he reduce expenditures. Another example is the Overman Act (40 Stat. 556), by which the President was authorized to reorganize the agencies of the Government. His discretion in effecting such reorganization was limited only by an extremely general statement of policy to the effect that he was to act in the interest of national defense. Although these statutes were never tested in the courts, they indicate a legislative practice of giving the President broad discretion in the field of administrative reorganization.

Other examples of delegations of authority to make administrative reorganizations follow: Act of February 14, 1903 (32 Stat. 830), President authorized to transfer from designated departments to the Department of Commerce and Labor any bureau performing "statistical or scientific" work. Act of June 24, 1910 (36 Stat. 613), Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, authorized to distribute the functions of the Bureau of Equipment of the Navy Department among other bureaus of that Department "in such manner as the Secretary of the Navy shall consider expedient and proper." Act of March 3, 1917 (39 Stat. 1122), President authorized to abolish bureaus or agencies in order to eliminate duplication of service.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the reorganization bill contains no delegation of legislative power for the subject matter with which the President is authorized to deal is definitely stated and an adequate policy or standard is prescribed to guide him in the exercise of his power.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mention has been made about preserving the constitutional powers of the Congress to abolish, consolidate, or eliminate duplications and duplicating functions. In wartime we have given that power to the President of the United States. We gave him that power without any restrictions and without reserving any right to disapprove in the Overman Act of May 20, 1918. In this connection, may I say for those who are apprehensive as to what the Chief Executive will do under those powers, that under the 1918 act he had broad power without limitation and without submitting to Congress for its disapproval a plan to combine or to abolish. The Overman Act was in force for more than 4 years and the President never at any time during or after the war undertook to abolish a bipartisan board.

The Congress of the United States in the present war, in 1941, in the First War Powers Act, reenacted word for word the provisions of the Overman Act of 1918 with respect to consolidations and eliminations. I ask the privilege at this time of reading, for the information of the Members who are interested in this great and perplexing question, the provisions of the First War Powers Act. I quote:

The President is hereby authorized to make such redistribution of functions among executive agencies as he may deem necessary, including any functions, duties, and powers hitherto by law conferred upon any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer, in such manner as in his judgment shall seem best fitted to carry out the purposes of this title and to this end is authorized to make such regulations and to issue such orders as he may deem necessary, which regulations and orders shall be in writing and shall be published in accordance with the Federal Register Act of 1935: *Provided*, That the termination of this title shall not affect any act done or any right or obligation accruing or accrued pursuant to this title and during the time that this title is in force: *Provided further*, That the authority by this title granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war: *Provided further*, That no redistribution of functions shall provide for the transfer, consolidation, or abolition of the whole or any part of the General Accounting Office or of all or any part of its functions.

I call attention that under section 7 of the pending bill the Comptroller General is not included in the term "agency," as under the Budget and Accounting Act. He is, and I quote, "independent of the executive department." His office is declared in the pending bill to be a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

The First War Powers Act is the law at present. That will continue to be the law for 6 months after the present war has been declared to have ended. Under that power the President of the United States, the present occupant of the White House, has never undertaken to abolish a bipartisan agency. The only case where there has been a board transferred to a Cabinet head of a Department is the Board of Civil Aeronautics. I shall not go into that. I believe in the rule of the majority. It takes both Houses to pass a law. Whatever may be said about the Civil Aeronautics Administration Act, that act could not have been passed in the first instance unless the Senate and House had agreed. The reorganization was rejected by the House in the first instance, but it was not rejected by the Senate by a substantial vote. It required the vote of both to disapprove. But the point is that the apprehension that the President of the United States will abolish these bipartisan agencies is utterly disproved by the record. It was transferred and is still bipartisan.

I should like to say this further. In the Reorganization Act of June 30, 1932, amended March 3, 1933, and amended finally on March 20, 1933, the President of the United States was given carte blanche to submit reorganizations without exemptions. There was not a single exception embodied in that act, which remained in force for 2 years.

We are fortunate in having as a member of our committee my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], who is as honest as the day is long. He was a Member of Congress at the time of the reorganization in 1932. There was never any attempt at any time to eliminate any bipartisan agency. The argument that the purpose of this legislation is to eliminate bipartisan agencies to a thoughtful mind falls of its own weight when we reflect that the Republican Party, when in power, could at any time have abolished a bipartisan agency. Most of these bipartisan agencies have been established during the Democratic administration. That administration, without a reorganization bill, could have abolished them at any time. Is there a better and more effective method of reorganization than that proposed in the pending bill? Let him who has such a plan come forth with it or forever hereafter continue only to advocate reorganization by lip service.

The delegation of power must be in terms that are clear. I think it well for us to keep in mind that we are delegating power in this bill to the Chief Executive to make the consolidations. We delegated that power to President Hoover in 1932. He submitted a plan just before he went out of office. We think that is unwise. We are preventing the present Chief Executive from repeating that. We limit this act to the July 1st before his term of office expires. President Hoover, under the act as originally passed in 1932, submitted a reorganization plan. Either House under that act could defeat his reorganization. One of the ablest attorneys in the United States, recently selected by the Committee to Investigate Pearl Harbor, the then Attorney General W. D. Mitchell, held, and the lawyers within the sound of my voice will appreciate the reasoning, that Congress can delegate on any well-defined subject matter and well-defined standards, the power to legislate, but he held that rejection by one House rendered the act of 1932 of doubtful constitutionality, and Congress agreed with him by rejecting the plan.

Having delegated that power, only the Congress can disapprove or reject it. The provision in the original act that one House could defeat it was eliminated and we promptly amended that act on March 3, 1933. The Hoover Reorganization Act was rejected on both sides of the House primarily because it was unconstitutional, and in the next place it was rejected because the Director of the Budget himself said that it was unworkable. President Hoover, in effect, said: "I merely combine; my successor will do the coordinating;" and Congress decided that if his successor were to do the coordinating he should also do the combining.

I wish there had been further economies in previous reorganizations. There have been a number of them. There are men within the sound of my voice who recall the valuable reorganizations following the act of 1932. You will recall that the Farm Credit Administration was established as a separate agency. I could enumerate others. There were five plans submitted under the act of 1939, and I remind you that there was only a contest in one instance, and that was with respect to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Plan No. IV, and that plan, first rejected by the House, but approved by the Senate, later was approved by both Houses. The programs of the then Executive under powers conferred upon him were finally approved by the Congress. That is the record of the Executive, that is the record of the trial of the method here proposed. Under the other plan, to wit, through direct congressional action—and I am a Member of the House jealous of its prerogatives—under the other plan there can be, and there has been, no reorganization whatsoever.

As has been said, the question before us is nonpartisan. He who opposes must propose a better plan. We hear a lot of whispering. However, my friend from Indiana was absolutely clear. He came out into the open. He pointed out that under all of the reorganization acts, under the Overman Act of 1918, the act of 1932 and the act of 1939, and under the present First War Powers Act, there were two cases where he was dissatisfied or rather which he criticized, and either of those cases now could be remedied by a proposal initiated by the chief witness introduced in behalf of his dissatisfaction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] stated, I favor in principle the provisions of the act of 1932 making no exemption, and, pardon me for saying it, I am as interested from the standpoint of the agencies with which my committee or the committees of which I am a member deal as any other Member of the House; but my obligation to my Government and to my country is greater than my obligation to any committee or to any department of the Government. From my study of this proposal of reorganization through the years I am convinced that the more the exemptions the less the reorganization. In the first instance, I would oppose any exemption. We remember what happened in 1939; we are practical legislators or statesmen. The Reorganization Act of 1939 came up at a time when there was a widespread opposition to the proposals of the then President of the United States with respect to the Supreme Court. While the Congress had given him the power of reorganization without a single exception 5 or 7 years before, after extended argument and compromise there were exceptions adopted. Unable to prevent any exemptions, I agreed to the fewest number that fell in well-defined groups or categories, being regarded as arms of Congress or quasi judicial bodies. I believe in majority rule. The exceptions are one reason, in my judgment, why there was not more and better reorganization under the act of 1939.

You will find on page 26 of the hearings a statement from the Director of the Budget that there are about 26 principal executive agencies of the Government established by act of Congress, and he names them there. There are about 58 in all. All of these independent agencies are either established directly by an act of Congress or they are established by the Chief Executive under power we have conferred upon him. There are some 58 of these agencies, as I have said, and it was absurd to exempt 21 of them, as was done in 1939.

We ask now for reorganization. We demanded the elimination of waste, duplication, and extravagance and by one blow we excepted substantially one-third of all the agencies in 1939. We got five plans but not as much reorganization as we should have had.

The need is more imperative than ever. There are many reorganizations under the First War Powers Act. I will give you an illustration that has impressed me, the Department of Labor. There was one reorganization Executive order after the other and while I have not conferred with him, I give it to you as my judgment from my study and general observation that the present Secretary of Labor was really shorn of any substantial power to solve the great labor problems in the country. It was said to me reliably that shortly after he accepted the position of Secretary of Labor, the Assistant Secretary and the Department itself did not know that the

Government of the United States had taken over the Illinois Central Railroad, one of the great railway systems in the country because of strikes until he saw it in the public press. The need for reorganization of the Department of Labor into a comprehensive organization has never been greater than it is at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I should like at this time to undertake an analysis of the pending bill, then I will be glad to answer any questions that I can. As to the yardstick, as to the program, there is section 2:

> To reduce expenditures and promote economy, * * * to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies, and functions—

Not just as the President wants to or might want to, but according to their major purposes—

> to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government, and to prevent overlapping and duplication of effort.

Now, I want to call attention to this significant language:

> The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding immediately under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

Then we provide the plan in section 3. The President must, after investigation, find that, first, the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency, or second, the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency, or third, the consolidation of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof, or fourth, the consolidation of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof, or fifth, the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the reorganization plan will not have, any functions, will accomplish the objectives of this act.

There must be submitted to both Houses on the same date a plan, and we provide that he shall designate the agency which he consolidates and transfers and that he can provide a head for it. There will be a committee amendment offered to save any question of transfer of boards, and there is provision for the transfer of records and property.

Then we have the safeguards provided in section 5: First, the President of the United States cannot abolish any Cabinet position. He cannot combine any Cabinet positions. Those matters are of such major importance that we believe that all such positions, having been established directly by Congress, should only be abolished or combined by an act of Congress. Second, we say under this act that no reorganization shall have the effect of changing the name of any executive department. If he wants to change the name of the War Department, that is for the Congress to do. Third, he cannot continue any agency for a longer period than that provided by law. Fourth, he cannot continue any function for any period longer than we have provided by law. Fifth, he cannot provide for any function that is not expressly authorized by law.

There are exceptions in this bill, and I think with reason, although in principle I oppose or I have stated exceptions. The bill provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission, a fact-finding agency, a semijudicial agency, the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission cannot be abolished, and they are exempt from the provisions of this bill, except that powers may be transferred to them, and those agencies thus may be used as the basis for transfer of powers and authorities to them. There are other agencies not in the same category. The Interstate Commerce Commission was established some 60 years ago. It is the right arm of the Congress with respect to rates. But there are other agencies that Executives in times past have undertaken to disturb, and among those is the Civil Service Commission. We say if the Chief Executive wishes to reorganize the Civil Service Commission, he must offer a plan affecting that agency alone so that Congress may vote it up or down.

We believe that the Federal Communications Commission, having control over radio, must never be under any Executive and without responsibility to Congress. So we say that if there is t be any improvement in the Federal Communications Commission, in the United States Tariff Commission, or in the Veterans' Administration, that the President shall be required to submit a separate plan with respect to each of those agencies and its functions so that the Congress can either vote it up or down. Those agencies are not like the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has been imbedded in our history for almost 60 years. Then we have a similar provision which obtains with respect to the civil functions of the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, established not by special law but in the War Department since 1802, which has functioned as the agency and spokesman of Congress in determining and recommending to Congress with respect to public improvements and in advising Congress when flood control and river and harbor work proposals are such that the benefits to be obtained will exceed the costs. It was the view of this committee that the Corps of Engineers should be in that category. Then we provide in this bill that no reorganization shall become effective if it is not submitted before July 1, 1948, in order that we not have a similar case to that which occurred in 1932. The reason for this limitation of 2 years is to urge the Chief Executive promptly to survey and to make reorganizations and submit them for our consideration.

Section 6 contains the provision for carrying into effect the reorganization plans. Then we have a definition of "agency" in section 7. We are dealing with executive agencies and executive departments. The Comptroller General is excluded because we have provided in the Budget and Accounting Act that he shall be independent of the executive departments, that he can be removed only by congressional action, and that his powers shall be exercised without direction from any other officer.

In section 8 we have the matters that are deemed to be reorganizations. We have the saving provisions in section 9 and in section 10 about the payment of funds into the Federal Treasury.

Now we come to title II in this bill, which is probably the most important provision of the bill. In the original act we passed in 1932 either House of Congress could disapprove a reorganization plan. We provided in the amendment to that act that the reorganization would become effective at the expiration of 60 days unless Congress by law provided otherwise, which meant by a resolution passed by both Houses and approved by the President—the only way I know of to enact a law. Every one of those reorganizations under the act of 1933 became law.

In 1939, after considering all methods of reorganization, it was provided that the proposals of the President, to whom we had delegated this power, should become effective unless the two Houses within 60 days should disapprove a reorganization plan. The Congress did something further in the act of 1939 that it never did before. It did something that was not done in 1932 in the Reorganization Act. It absolutely guaranteed a consideration and a vote with respect to the disapproval of the reorganization. It is said that cloture has never been adopted in the Senate of the United States. Let the statement go, but in the Reorganization Act of 1939 we adopted a cloture provision binding upon both the Senate and the House that absolutely guaranteed a report by the committee on any resolution of disapproval and a consideration by both Houses of Congress within that 60 days, so that if any reorganization plan submitted by the Chief Executive did not meet with the approval of the Congress of the United States, that disapproval would be manifested in the way provided by the law, to wit, by a concurrent resolution adopted by both Houses of Congress. We bring that forward in this bill, and it is important.

My good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] would undertake to reverse that policy that has been tried and tested. His proposal is that having delegated this power under the Constitution to the President, having set up the standard, having adopted the program—and the language of this bill is not original, it has a well-defined meaning—having stipulated the subject matter, his proposal now is that it shall never become the law, that reorganization shall be of no effect, unless the Congress by a concurrent resolution affirmatively approves the legislation we have authorized the Chief Executive to submit within 60 days.

Come, reason with me. What change does that make in the existing law? By

passing a law by both Houses of Congress, taking action now, this week, next week, we can provide for reorganization. We have never done it. We are human. My complaint is that the Chief Executive himself, not on one committee or on several congressional committees, with the interest of the entire Nation at heart, has been slow to reorganize. If we were to adopt, with all seriousness and in all fairness to my distinguished friend, who is for reorganization, his provision of conferring legislative prerogatives on the President of the United States, under the restrictions supposed to make them constitutional, that would not accomplish reorganization. In other words, if the Congress of the United States is to act in the first instance, why a reorganization act at all?

Mr. Chairman, we have safeguarded this bill. We have conferred vast powers upon the Chief Executive. We provide in this bill "Thou shalt not," when we say he cannot establish a new executive or Cabinet department. We say to him, "No matter how many may be in favor, thou shalt not combine two Cabinet offices." But we have said more than that. We have provided for cloture in both the Senate and the House. We have said, "After you have thoroughly investigated reorganization and after you have conferred with the interested agencies and with the Congress of the United States and submitted a plan, in the event that reorganization is not satisfactory to the Congress, not one man, not one body, but the Congress that conferred the power upon you, may, by concurrent resolution, disapprove the plan."

I conclude as I began: We are either for reorganization or we are against it. We must provide for it constructively. This bill, in my judgment, has profited by the previous reorganization bills. It has profited by its mistakes. It is the best reorganization bill ever submitted to the House of Representatives. The act of 1939, in speaking of the objectives, eliminated the word "economy." This bill includes it. The act of 1939 eliminated the words "the abolition of functions." Why abolish an agency because of duplication without abolishing its functions? This act provides for the abolition of functions. It is a better bill. We have undertaken to safeguard the rights of the Congress in disapproving the reorganization under the 60-day provision. Under the act of 1939, if the Congress of the United States had taken a recess as we did in the latter part of July of this year, that time would have run in the 60 days. We have safeguarded that by providing for such a contingency so as to require a continuous session of both Houses of Congress, thereby guaranteeing to the representatives of the people in the Senate and in the House the power to disapprove without any sort of question by cloture, and by providing that the question must be voted up or down. We have delegated power to reorganize to the Executive. I would not be in favor of delegating those powers except by definite language. It has been before the Supreme Court. We ought not to take any chances. There lies the danger with reference to those who would like to amend this language by amendments on the floor. My contention is that having delegated the power to the President with safeguards to prevent what happened to the National Industrial Recovery Act and to the Agricultural Adjustment Act which were declared unconstitutional, by definitely stipulating the yardstick, the subject matter, and the policy, it would be unwise now for us to go up the hill again and say that after we had delegated that power to the President and after we had reserved the power to disapprove it, we now do as proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] what we could do without this legislation at all; to wit, pass a bill by both Houses of Congress, approving reorganization.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. There are two questions on which I would like to have the gentleman's viewpoint because I recognize that he and the gentleman from Missouri are probably better informed on this subject than any other Member of the House. The first question is, Does this bill enlarge in any way the present war powers of the President?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does not. That is a very pertinent question and I will answer the gentleman by saying, when this bill was introduced by our distinguished chairman, when a similar bill was introduced in the Senate, there was a provision to repeal in whole or in part in one or both of those bills the First War Powers Act. This committee took the position that that is a big question. It was being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary if not by other committees of the House. The Committee on the Judiciary reported the first war powers bill. We studied the question. We went into it. The war powers conferred upon the President expire 6 months after the war automatically. We ran into the difficulty that before we know it if we undertake in this present bill dealing with reorganization to also provide for modification, repeal, or amendment of the War Powers Act, we might authorize the continuance of some agencies that Congress had not heretofore provided for. The bill does not amend or repeal the First War Powers Act.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does this bill permit the President to do anything by way of organization that he cannot do under the present authority of the War Powers Act?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. It is very much broader. I have gone into it. I have read both of them. This covers a great deal more than the First War Powers Act. The War Powers Act says, for instance, that he is authorized to make groupings and coordinations to prosecute the war. We say for economy. We say to prevent overlapping. We say to provide for efficiency. We say to abolish useless functions. This bill is for peace. The War Powers Act was primarily for war.

Mr. COLE of New York. If there is some distinction between the authority contained in the present law and this bill, then there is some reason for the July 1 time limitation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely.

Mr. COLE of New York. One other question. Is there any serious controversy in this bill other than the exemption of commissions, contained in section 5 (b), and the method of congressional ratification?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am unable to read the minds of Members. The bill was unanimously reported. It does provide for limited exceptions.

Mr. COLE of New York. From the gentleman's attendance at his committee hearings and his study of the matter, I thought perhaps he could answer that question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There are two ways to kill a bill. You and I have been in the House a long time. One way is to amend it. Another way is to offer exceptions. However, I think the gentleman's statement that those not satisfied with the bill will offer additional exceptions and will undertake to amend by substituting approval for disapproval is substantially correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say that the matter of offering additional exemptions has been presented. I do not know what other matters will be presented. I have covered the amendments proposed by the gentleman from Michigan, for approval rather than disapproval. I would say that these are the two principal matters that are indicated to be in controversy.

Mr. COLE of New York. Exemptions under section 5 might be enlarged to include those suggested by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and with which some people agree, and permit the President to make recommendations effecting reorganizations unless the Congress by a concurrent resolution vetoes. Then also permit the President, as to those commissions which are exempt under section 5, to submit to Congress reorganization proposals, but provide that they will not become operative until the Congress, by affirmative action through concurrent resolution, declares in favor of it. I wonder what the gentleman's attitude would be on such a proposal.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The veto question of the three which the gentleman asked I agree with. I think it should be made effective in 60 days unless we take action of disapproval. The exemptions should continue to be limited. I oppose the affirmative action, but I advocate the right to disapproval.

I do not know of any more constructive way to provide for reorganization.

With respect to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, I do not know of anybody who wants to deprive those agencies of their functions. I do not conceive of any President who would have done it. But I said, if we are to make exemptions, those agencies are in a class by themselves. The past adminis-

tration, the late President Roosevelt, had the power to provide that the Federal Power Commission should fix rates. He conferred that power upon the Secretary of the Interior by Executive order, and under existing law the Secretary of the Interior has a right to dispose of power and fix rates, and it is in a different category than the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In my judgment, the constructive approach to the solution that you have in mind will be accomplished by retaining three agencies in a class by themselves and not by multiplying agencies that would be exempted in addition to those that are named in the bill, because if you do multiply them, the more you except, the less you reorganize.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the gentleman prepared to say that the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, or the Securities and Exchange Commission might not be properly reorganized?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am prepared to say that, while personally I would leave it all to the President, if they are to be reorganized it shall be by transfer to them of additional functions without abolishment of the present functions.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Of course I agree that the only way on earth to have a proper reorganization bill is to except nothing, and leave it entirely to the President to reorganize, dissolve, and do away with whatever unnecessary agencies we have. I want to ask the gentleman a question with respect to one particular bureau that seems to be running at large, and of course I know that when I name it somebody will laugh about it. What do you do with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority, that is admittedly a competitive organization, competing with taxpaying private industries?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think that is a fair question, and I expected it from the gentleman from Kentucky, knowing his interest in the Tennessee Valley Authority. We leave it just where we found it. There is nothing provided about the Tennessee Valley Authority in this bill. It is not excepted from the provisions of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Running at large.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I can only repeat it is not excepted from the provisions of the bill.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. To enact this legislation into law the measure must receive a majority vote of both Houses; must it not? We agree on that; do we not?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We do; that is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly. Then the gentleman said a moment ago we should give this power to the President and then recover it. Is it not true that if the President sends down a plan and gets the assent of either House, it would become effective?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated this—we delegate, but both Houses reserve the right to disapprove.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not that true? I know the gentleman wants to get into other things.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I answered by saying the reorganization would be effective after 60 days if neither House assented. Previous reorganization bills provided that the reorganization would become effective after the expiration of 60 days unless we acted. For the first time the gentleman's amendment proposes that we have the right in the first instance, that both Houses of Congress must really adopt the legislation. If that method is sound, there would be no occasion for reorganization. We might as well pass legislation to reorganize, without delegating powers to the President in the first instance.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. If it were not for the constitutional question which the gentleman from Mississippi says is involved in allowing a reorganization plan sent down by the President to be rejected by the disapproval of one House, would he object to having such an amendment? He says it is unconstitutional, but men like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] have taken another view.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will permit, I will state that I favor provision for disapproval within 60 days. I think that the two Houses having delegated the power to the President ought to have the right to pass on the reorganization, and the right to disapprove. I am glad to answer the question.

Mr. JUDD. But the gentleman does not believe we ought to provide so that a resolution of disapproval by one House would make invalid any reorganization plan, that is, prevent it from going into effect?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Once again I state that if both Houses have to act to grant the power to the President the only constructive way to handle it is to have both Houses disapprove the reorganization.

Mr. JUDD. Then you approve abdicating our responsibilities and granting to the President and one House power to adopt a plan even though the other House disapproves it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; both Houses must act to give the power in the first instance and both Houses reserve the right to pass on what the President does. I now yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Assume that this House disapproves by a practically unanimous vote a plan submitted by the President, and further assume that the other body is persuaded by the President to refuse to disapprove the plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman fom Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one-half minute in which to answer the question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That question is answered by the opinion of Attorney General Mitchell, to which I have previously referred.

The President has asked that the job of reorganization be done. He asked that he be given the powers of reorganization which were conferred upon his predecessors. I urge that we give him the powers. I believe that he will exercise them courageously, fearlessly, promptly, and impartially. He has the confidence of the country. President Truman knows that the country expects the reorganization of the permanent executive departments. Such reorganization has been too long delayed. If Congress gives him the power, the President will do the job.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If my time has not expired, I gladly yield——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional half minute to answer the gentleman.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman did not answer my question. I asked the gentleman to assume that this House, by a practically unanimous vote disapproves a plan submitted by the President, and to further assume that the President would be able to convince the other body that it should refuse to disapprove the plan. Would the gentleman then favor this bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I favor the bill; both Houses must act to confer the power upon the President. The House might pass any bill unanimously, but unless it passes the other body, the Senate, it does not become the law. It takes both Houses to pass the reorganization bill. Both Houses thus delegate the legislative powers of reorganization, prescribing the subject matter and the standards to the President. Congress might provide for reorganization by both Houses adopting reorganization in the first place. But Congress admits that it is impracticable for Congress to reorganize. Congress complies with the law by delegating the authority. Having delegated the power to the President, unless Congress has good reason, there should be no disapproval.

To safeguard the legislative prerogative always heretofore Congress has provided for the reorganizations to become effective unless resolutions are passed within 60 days. An affirmative resolution by both Houses of Congress is nothing more nor less than passing legislation that Congress can now pass. We run smack into the fact, however, that Congress has passed no such legislation. If we delegate the power to the President we should not disapprove without good reason. No resolution means approval. The delegation of powers to the President is thus completed. The conditions have been complied with. Having delegated the power, Congress should not do

more than reserve the right to disapprove.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I find it possible generally to support this sort of legislation. I shall want to support an amendment which will be offered by my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. At this time I want to speak directly on two amendments affecting the bill.

The first of these I shall pass over briefly because it has been accepted by the committee as a proper clarifying amendment, but for the benefit of the Members who read the RECORD I would like under previous authority granted to insert it at this point. It is an amendment changing subsection 1, section 4, page 4, by striking out lines 16, 17, and 18 and inserting in lieu thereof new language, as follows:

(1) Shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head.

Mr. Chairman, I also propose to offer an amendment when we reach that stage which will include the following language to be inserted after the period, line 3, page 4:

And a statement of the facts and reasons upon which each such finding is based.

My reason for offering this language is that it is consistent with my concept of the way in which our Federal Government should operate. I have no objection to delegating authority to the Executive, but I am very jealous of the Congress of the United States being at all times able to judge adequately and fully the manner in which powers and authorizations have been carried out.

A reading of the bill discloses that in section 2 the Congress fixes five standards to which the Executive shall conform in making any reorganization under the authority granted to him.

Section 3 provides five methods by which he shall attain those standards, but it also says that as to these methods by which he attains the standards which we fix, he shall prepare a reorganization plan for making the transfers, consolidations, and abolitions as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan.

The word "findings" as used in this bill means what we mean in the law by the term "conclusion of fact." I want to be sure that there is available for the Congress, when we act upon any plan, the facts and the reasoning from those primary facts by which the findings or conclusions are reached and that they are presented in any reorganization plan. It is essential to the granting of authority that we should demand the facts from which the President concludes that the five standards which we set out in section 2 are reached, shall be presented to us so that we may determine whether or not his findings are logical or his findings are consistent with common standards of reasoning, which is the term used by the Supreme Court of Indiana in determining the sufficiency of findings reached by fact-finding bodies.

It has been said by way of objection in the discussion of this amendment that if we insert this language a court might be able to determine that perhaps the facts upon which the President reached his findings or conclusions were not sufficient to conform to the standards which we laid down in section 2, and for that reason one might successfully defeat certain aspects of the plan, if the facts from which the President reached his findings, that he had complied with the standards, are made available. I then say to you that as far as I am concerned I have consistently in this body opposed any attempt by direct legislative action to interfere with the functions of the courts. That was my principal ground of objection to the insurance legislation which was in here in the last session. By the same token I must object to an indirect method of depriving a court of jurisdiction by failing to set out the facts from which it may conclude that the findings are or are not consistent with accepted common modes of reasoning.

So I cannot go along with those who say that we should not insert the requirement that I insert, because perhaps from the facts set out in the plan of reorganization a court might find that the findings of a particular reorganization plan, which the President made, were not based upon sufficient facts. To do so would be to deprive by indirection the courts of the country of the functions which our Constitution gives to them, so that as to the position implicit in that argument, I do not wish to be a party.

Definitely I am making an appeal without regard to party to those who in this body from time to time have denounced bureaucratic arrogation of authority, to those within this body who have denounced the usurpation of authority, by proposing a method by which they can establish, in this instance, at least, an effective method of implementing the principles in which they say they believe. It is in a sense a challenge to those I have heard make this denunciation, with which in many cases I am in accord. But I am not satisfied, if you please, to step into the well of this House and denounce a weakness without, if possible, offering an effective means of combating it. And that is what I am asking this House to do or will ask it to do when we reach the amendment stage.

I make no criticism of the Executive. It is no criticism of the intent of the Executive. But we owe an obligation to ourselves and we owe an obligation to the principles upon which this Government is founded to require that the Executive shall state the facts from which he reaches his conclusions so that we might have some standard by which to judge the effectiveness of his reasoning and the logic of his proposal. If we do not do that, we have no method by which we can adequately judge this plan when it comes back.

The proposal, therefore, which I am making, is made in the very best of good faith, and it cannot involve the good faith or the lack of good faith in the Executive because we are in the same position as saying, "Yes, we believe you will do all right, but it is our job to see that you do all right." We are in about the same position as we are when a man comes to us and says, "Will you loan me some money?" and you say, "Yes, surely, sign this note." Then if he is offended and says, "Oh, no, I do not want to sign a note, I will pay you back," does not your common experience tell you as men that that is a man whom you have reason to distrust? Therefore, how can any man argue by analogy that we do not have the right to say to the Executive, "We ask you to set out the facts by which you reach your conclusions," because he is in substance saying, "Well, but we know the Executive will do that." Assume that the Executive will. It would be good business in the case of a loan, and it is sound political philosophy to do it in this body. It is one of the most definite ways I know by which the purpose of the Congress, in our scheme of government, can be carried out and by which the Congress may effectively judge, when the plan is resubmitted to us, the action which has been taken under the powers which we hereby grant.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the bill (H. R. 4129) is considered by this body at a period in the history of our country when we are face to face with the death-like grip of the tentacles of what I believe we can properly call the octopus of government.

It shall be my purpose as a newer member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to part company with more able and experienced members of the committee, on which I am fortunate to serve. This is done not as to the objectives or the reasons motivating the necessity for prompt action of the Congress for passage of this legislation. I shall explain, however, in vigorous manner I hope, my feeling that the proposal now before us fails to reach into the real heart of the trouble and will in the last analysis fall short of achieving those reforms and those efficiencies which are vital to the better functioning of government.

I will support the measure, and I do it enthusiastically, as was the case in 1939, yet during the hearings, as my colleagues will concur, I have said again and again that we are giving, if this bill becomes law, the power to the President of the United States to abolish agencies and bureaus and their functions, yet we fail to give to our Chief Executive of the United States the authority to consolidate or to abolish any of the 10 departments of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, from where do the expenditures in peacetime flow in our Federal structure? Why, 80 percent goes to departments of all the money that is spent which comes from taxes collected from the American people. That 80 percent is spent not by the bureaus and agencies, but by the departments of Government. I urge the membership of this Congress and the citizens of our common

country to effect economies, and to do that task we must act with courage and not approach timidly the problem by any half-way gesture.

I say in a very humble fashion, but I believe in a straightforward manner, that although the 10 departments of our Government are important, they have no standing in the Constitution. They are all creatures of the Congress of the United States. They are in no sense sacred, just as there are no bureaus or agencies that are sacred. Under this legislation, we give to the President of the United States, Mr. Truman, who, during his tenure of office must carry out the challenge that it is a growing belief, as expressed again and again by speakers in the well of the House, that the Congress cannot apparently do this job and will not do it. Yet, my colleagues, we chain the hands of our Chief Executive and say, "Yes, abolish an agency or a bureau but never touch a department of the United States."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I would want to be corrected.

Mr. CHURCH. The President is not now prohibited by law from making recommendations to Congress that departments be abolished.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I well understand that, sir. I have not indicated otherwise. But now we propose to delegate to him new powers not embraced in mere recommendations for change in our Federal structure.

Under this legislation no single department of government could be abolished. None could be consolidated. No additional department could be created.

Mr. CHURCH. Under a plan submitted——

Mr. RANDOLPH. We will call it a plan.

Mr. CHURCH. As submitted by the President.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No two or more departments could be merged; yet a bureau within a department could be transferred. A bureau within a department could be abolished. Several bureaus may be transferred or abolished within a department. A number of these bureaus may be taken out of one department or several departments and regrouped outside of the 10 departments to which I have referred. The character of one or several of these bureaus or agencies could be changed. This is where I believe we stop short.

Where, Mr. Chairman, falls the light and where come the shadows? We fail to realize that we are giving to the President of the United States under this legislation 99 percent of the vested power and then we are withholding the 1 percent which is the important percentage. If we are to do the thorough job of reorganization of the Federal agencies, then cannot we include within the workable scope the departments of the executive branch of our Government. In other words, the President can leave simply a shell of a department, could he not? He could make all of these changes within its structure and there would be nothing of substance remaining. Even the very name of the department might be a misnomer. But he would have the power to do all this, and yet he could not strike at the innermost part of this problem.

I would like you to go a little further with me in my thinking. Let us reason together. I never heard a better witness before a committee of this Congress in which I have been privileged to serve, for almost 14 years, than the able Comptroller General, Lindsay Warren, when he appeared before our group. To me the philosophy which he expressed was a doctrine that was not only helpful in the consideration of the pending legislation but a stimulant which we should absorb in considering all the legislation which comes before this body. A thoughtful reading of his testimony, as contained in the printed hearings, is worth while.

I remember well, however, that Lindsay Warren in his statement indicated that Congress would not do this reorganization job and it had to be delegated to the President of the United States to undertake this tremendous responsibility. We present this bill because the Congress, apparently, from the statement of Mr. Warren and the statements by members of our committee, will not do it affirmatively. We are afraid. They say we are loath to proceed. If, as Mr. Warren said so convincingly, the Congress will not do this duty, then why is it not as important to give to the President of the United States the power to operate on a department as a whole as to operate upon 99 percent of the body politic of that department?

Mr. Chairman, I desire to read a letter which I have addressed to the President of the United States, under date of October 1, 1945. It is a very short communication, and for that reason I direct your attention to its content:

OCTOBER 1, 1945.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White, House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your message to the Congress of the United States May 24, 1945, you asked that legislation to revise the Government executive agencies "be sufficiently broad and flexible to permit of any form of organizational adjustment, large or small, for which necessity may arise."

In your message to the Congress September 6, 1945, you requested that legislation should "be sufficiently flexible to permit any kind of adjustment for which necessity may arise."

Beginning Wednesday, of this week, the House will consider H. R. 4129, a bill to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes. This measure, and also a bill dealing with this same subject matter in the Senate, does not give the Chief Executive the power to consolidate or create new departments.

During hearings before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I focused attention on the need now for the creation of a Department of Defense by consolidating the War and Navy Departments. It was my feeling that since the President, under our Constitution, shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, he would be in a better position than any other official or group in our Federal structure to determine the desirability of a plan for the reorganization of our armed services.

I am persuaded, in view of the history of legislation to consolidate the Army and Navy, that Congress will be reluctant to act affirmatively. It would be genuinely appreciated by myself, and other Members of Congress, if you would clarify your position in reference to congressional authority being provided to the President to reorganize and consolidate departments, as well as agencies and bureaus, as H. R. 4129 contemplates.

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

I have referred, as you noted, to the President of the United States in his capacity as Commander in Chief. That, my colleagues, comes about through section 2 of article II of the Constitution, which provides:

The President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States.

This provision was penned by John Rutledge, of South Carolina, and seconded by Edmund Randolph, of Virginia.

Certainly the official who is charged with the command of the armed forces of this Republic is in my opinion in a better position than any officer in the forces, than any official in the Federal Government or in the States—yes, even than the Congress of the United States—to determine in the first instance how these forces should be organized and how they would be used in time of war.

It is decidedly no diminution of the constitutional or statutory authority of any officer in these armed services or any civilian officer of the Nation, including the Secretaries of War and Navy or of the Congress, to provide by statute which will be approved by the President, that he shall propose a plan for the reorganization of these armed services. Congress may then, by concurrent resolution, stay its operation if it is not agreeable to what has been proposed. If the statute should provide that the stay should be by resolution of either House the statute would violate the Constitution for the reasons stated by the former Attorney General, Mr. Mitchell, to President Hoover, in his opinion, 37 Op. A. G. 56, to which reference has been made at least in part today by the very able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who made a spendid analysis of this bill.

Many futile attempts have been made over a long and disappointing history in the Congress of the United States to consolidate the War and Navy Departments into a single Department of Defense or a single Department of Armed Services or of whatever name you desire to call it. The history of that legislation is one of the sad experiences for the men who have sincerely believed in the proposal during many years.

Prior to our entrance into World War II again and again proposals came to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, but no hearings were held on the subject matter. I remember—and I speak now not in criticism but only to give you the factual background—that back in 1940, one and a half years before our country was engaged in this war, I made vigorous attempts to have consideration before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Then it was appropriate to go thoroughly into the subject matter of a consolidation of the

War and Navy Departments into a unified command with a Secretary of Defense sitting in the Cabinet and under secretaries for land, for sea, and for air, and with the establishment of the air forces into a hard-hitting air arm which could be used to win this global struggle which has now been brought to victory.

At this point a copy of the measure I sponsor is set forth:

H. R. 550

A bill to establish a Department of Defense, to consolidate therein the Department of War and the Department of the Navy and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the National Defense Reorganization Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Defense, which shall be administered by a Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive the same compensation as other heads of executive departments.

(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes is amended to include the Department of Defense, and the provisions of title IV of the Revised Statutes, as now or hereafter amended, shall be applicable to the Department.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

(d) There shall be in the Department of Defense three Under Secretaries of Defense and three Assistant Secretaries, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall perform such duties as may be required by law or prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. Each Under Secretary shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum, and each Assistant Secretary shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum. The Under Secretaries shall be known, respectively, as the Under Secretary for the Army, the Under Secretary for the Navy, and the Under Secretary for the Air Force, and, so far as practicable, each such Under Secretary shall, under the general direction of the Secretary of Defense, have charge of that branch of the national defense indicated by this title. The Assistant Secretaries shall be known, respectively, as the Assistant Secretary for the Army, the Assistant Secretary for the Navy, and the Assistant Secretary for the Air Force, and each such Assistant Secretary shall, under the direction of the appropriate Under Secretary, assist in the administration of that branch of the national defense indicated by his title. There shall also be in the Department such other officers and employees as shall be transferred to the Department of Defense under this act, and such other officers and employees as may from time to time be provided for by Congress.

TRANSFER OF WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) The Department of War and the Department of the Navy and all that pertains thereto are transferred to the Department of Defense, and the Department of War and the Department of the Navy shall cease to exist as separate executive departments.

(b) The offices of Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, Under Secretary of War, Under Secretary of the Navy, Assistant Secretary of War, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Assistant Secretary of War for Air, and Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air are abolished, and the functions, powers, and duties vested in and imposed upon such officers are hereby vested in and imposed upon the Secretary of Defense.

(c) The transfer to the Department of Defense, under this act, of officers and employees of the Department of War and the Department of the Navy shall be without changes in classification or compensation, but the Secretary of Defense is authorized to make such changes in the titles and designations and prescribe such changes in the duties of such officers and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(d) All unexpended appropriations in respect of the Department of War or the Department of the Navy shall be available for expenditure by the Department of Defense and shall be treated as if the Department had been originally named in the laws making the appropriations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN AIR FORCE AS A SEPARATE BRANCH OF DEFENSE

SEC. 4. There is hereby established under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense a separate branch of the armed forces, to be known as the Air Force. The Air Corps of the Army and all that pertains thereto are transferred to the Air Force. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Air Force.

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby created in the Air Force commissioned offices of such number as the President may determine to be necessary. The President is authorized to establish appropriate grades for such commissioned offices and to prescribe titles for such grades.

(b) The President is authorized—

(1) to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to the commissioned offices in the Air Force, officers of the Air Corps of the Army, and such other individuals as the President may determine to be fitted to perform the duties thereof:

(2) to prescribe the pay and allowances for the offices created by subsection (a) until otherwise provided by Congress, but no officer appointed under authority of this subsection shall receive lower pay or allowances than he was receiving as an officer of the Army when so appointed.

(c) Upon the taking office of any officer of the Air Corps of the Army, appointed under authority of subsection (b), the office held by him in the Army is abolished and the authorized strength of such branch of the national defense is reduced accordingly.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3, any officer of the Air Corps of the Army who is not appointed and confirmed as authorized in this section shall continue as an officer of the Army, as the case may be, without loss of grade or rank.

SEC. 6. The President is authorized—

(1) To establish appropriate grades and ratings in the Air Force, to assign thereto warrant officers and enlisted men of the Air Corps of the Army transferred to the Air Force under this act, and to prescribe their pay and allowances, until otherwise provided by Congress, but no such warrant officer or enlisted man shall receive lower pay and allowances in the Air Force than he was receiving in the Army or the Navy.

(2) To make such changes in the titles of and prescribe such new duties for civilian personnel of the Air Corps of the Army transferred to the Air Force under this act as he may deem necessary. The transfer of such civilian personnel shall be without change in classification or compensation.

SEC. 7. All unexpended appropriations in respect of the Air Corps shall become available for expenditure by the Air Force and shall be treated as if the Air Force had been originally named in the laws making the appropriations.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 8. (a) Until otherwise provided by Congress, the President is authorized, for the purpose of perfecting the organization and coordinating the activities of the Department of Defense and of the Air Force created by this act, (1) to consolidate, eliminate, or redistribute the functions of offices, bureaus, agencies, branches, and organizations, to create new ones and fix the powers, duties, and functions of their executive heads; and (2) to take such other action, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, as he may deem necessary.

(b) Insofar as is practicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, and until otherwise provided by Congress, (1) the administration of the Department of Defense shall be governed by the laws in force with respect to the Department of War and the Department of the Navy at the time of their transfer under this act, and (2) the Air Force shall be governed by the laws in force (including laws relating to relative rank, promotion, retirement, enlistment, and appointment of new personnel, reserves, and articles for the government of the Army and the Navy) with respect to the Air Corps of the Army at the time of their transfer under this act.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall investigate and report to Congress a plan for further perfecting the organization and coordinating the activities of the Department of Defense and of the Air Force, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary for carrying out such plan.

SEC. 9. All orders, rules, regulations, and permits or other privileges made, issued, or granted by or in respect of the Department of War or the Department of the Navy or by or in respect of the Air Corps of the Army and in effect at the time of the transfer of such departments and corps under this act, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of Defense shall make annually at the close of each fiscal year a report in writing to Congress giving an account of all moneys received and disbursed by him and the Department, describing the work done by the Department, and making such recommendations as he shall deem necessary for the effective performance of the duties and purposes of the Department.

TIME OF TAKING EFFECT

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect upon its enactment, except that sections 2 and 9, inclusive, shall take effect when the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretaries of Defense, and the Assistant Secretaries of Defense have taken office.

Nothing was done, and I remember that effort was not the first attempt made by Members of this Congress to get a fact-finding hearing. I recall the testimony of Comptroller General Warren before our committee a few days ago in which he stated that in 1932 he was the member on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments who broke the tie so that the legislation to consolidate these Departments might be brought to the House floor. He said, "We could never get a rule." What happened then has happened on occasions since, and this is no disparagement of the Rules Committee, but it failed to allow the measure to be brought to the floor of this House. I ask the distinguished minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], who has had an intense interest in this subject, and other Members who are listening, to weigh in their own minds the tremendous savings in billions of dollars which would have been brought about if that consolidation could

have been accomplished in the years before our entrance into World War II.

To use the language of Mr. Warren himself on September 5, when he testified, "I am convinced vast economies could be accomplished, not even mentioning the national defense." Yes; the economies would have been tremendous. We would have done away with the overlapping, with the duplication of duty, and with the fiasco of functioning which has taken place during the strategy and then the actual prosecution of this war. But it was not done. Then came this terrible conflict. Naturally, any man who was in favor of the proposal would drop it under the circumstances of the impact of war. But we determined that when the war was over we would again force the fight. That is what we are doing today. The issue is being drawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman six additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I say in all fairness, and I am happy to announce, that the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] has promised me in writing that hearings on this subject will start in the near future. I know that he means to keep that promise. I say to you this afternoon, however, that on each and every occasion when we have proposed hearings, in peacetime, not in time of war, there has come word from the Navy Department, from the War Department, from one or both of these agencies, that this is not the proper time for the Congress of the United States to undertake such a study and determination.

Will the subject continue to be stymied? Let us hope it will not. I may offer an amendment to grant to the President power to consolidate the War and Navy Departments. What I am about to say is only a disagreement with the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and of the equally distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, but they have seen fit within the last few days to use the language, "There will be no merger."

I include the following news story:

ARMY-NAVY MERGER HIT

WASHINGTON, September 27.—Plans for consolidation of the Army and Navy struck a snag today. The chairmen of both the House Naval and Military Affairs Committees took a stand against it.

The view of Representatives MAY (Democrat, of Kentucky), of the Military Affairs Committee, and CARL VINSON (Democrat, of Georgia), of the Naval Affairs Committee, means that Congress, or at least the House, won't even consider the subject for some time.

MAY and VINSON made their positions known as reports spread on Capitol Hill that President Truman might soon send a special message to Congress recommending a merger.

"There won't be any merger," VINSON said.

"I am against merging the Army and Navy," MAY said.

In other words, by public statement they are shutting the door apparently to consideration by the Congress. We talk about saving money. Here we can actually, within a few years, save billions and billions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country. It will do away with waste and duplication which exists in the services today and will be one of the steps, I say, Mr. Chairman, that will test the courage and the vision of the membership of this body.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we will do it. I believe that now, although we are faced with tremendous opposition which is publicly and in secret expressed.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAVENNER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Perhaps he or somebody else can answer it. It is a question that has been asked me several times today, and it is a subject of considerable interest on the part of a number of Members. The Congress has delegated its legislative authority to fix rates and to regulate the service of public utility corporations engaged in interstate commerce to four major agencies, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Two of those agencies which are acting as the agents of Congress have been exempted in this bill. May I ask why all four have not been treated alike?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I will say to the gentleman from California that if I had my way about it, and I have expressed this in the committee, there would not be a single exemption written for any executive agency in the legislation which is brought before the House at this time.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman made an interesting speech and I share his views about consolidation of the War and Navy Departments under the head of a Secretary of the Armed Forces, or whatever you may want to call it; but when the gentleman spoke of hearings, may I remind him that only 3 or 4 months ago the Special Committee on Postwar Military Policy, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], together with the ranking members of the Military and Naval Affairs Committee and the Maritime Committee, had exhaustive hearings on this very important subject. The hearings have been printed, and I think I may safely say that the Committee on Military Affairs will very shortly conduct hearings of their own looking to some solution of this very important problem. It seems to me, too, that a matter of that importance and dealing exclusively with military activities is well within the jurisdiction of the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs. When I say that I favor the consolidation, I believe that I voice the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs. Since that committee will shortly conduct hearings, I feel that it ought to be left within their jurisdiction.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Of course, I cannot speak for the Parliamentarian of the House. The legislation on this subject matter has been referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The measure which I repeatedly introduced, and is now H. R. 550, is pending before our committee. It certainly is within the province of the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs to consider this subject matter. It is also appropriate that the Select Committee, Postwar Military Policy, headed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], a very fine Member of this House, should go into this matter exhaustively. That committee did go into the matter at length. I have read the hearings, and at this point include my statement before that group on May 19, 1944:

STATEMENT OF HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who is deeply interested in the subject before us, has a statement to make. We will be glad to hear you, Mr. RANDOLPH, at this point.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege to present this statement of views on the subject of a unified command for our armed forces. In several Congresses I have introduced legislation to establish a Department of Defense. This proposal is embodied in H. R. 708, again put in the hopper January 6, 1943.

My testimony comes, of course, not from the standpoint of a trained or skilled tactician in the art of war. The following thoughts and observations are expressed wholly in my capacity as a citizen and also as a Member of the Congress of the United States, who has definite responsibility for assisting in the well-being of our Nation in times of conflict and in periods of peace.

Your committee, as I understand it, is not concerned at this time with the actual writing of legislation to create one command. I shall, therefore, not occupy time in explaining the provisions of the measure, H. R. 708, which would consolidate the Department of War and the Department of Navy, and would also establish the Air Force as a separate branch of the armed services under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense. There would be created a Secretary of Defense and Under Secretaries for Army, Navy, and Air Force. I trust members of your important group will find the opportunity to study the provisions of this bill.

Gen. H. H. Arnold, in command of our Army Air Forces and doing a remarkably good job, gave testimony in 1935 before the House Military Affairs Committee. He was asked by Chairman John J. McSwain the following question:

"I want to ask you to speak out of your own heart and mind your personal conviction with regard to the necessity for independent and increased air power for the defense of America."

In his reply General Arnold said:

"I can see now where you can hitch a 1,000-mile plane on the operation of the Army or Navy today. I cannot see how, if you are going to use a 3,000-mile bombing plane, you can hitch that onto either the Army or the Navy for all its purposes; and if you get a 5,000-mile plane, then I cannot see how you can hitch its activities on either the Army or Navy.

"And beyond that dreaming a little further, you can have an 8,000-mile plane; then I know well you can't hitch it onto either the Army or Navy activities. It is something beyond the scope of either one.

"In order to get a properly trained and effective Department of National Defense, you have got to have three arms—land, sea, and air—equally self-supporting.

"I am of the opinion that sometime in the future this thing called a Department of National Defense is bound to come."

In 1941, Mr. Chairman, the National Aeronautic Association, with no ax to grind, made a noteworthy contribution to the subject matter of a single Department of Defense, in the following resolution:

"The present war has revolutionized methods of warfare and shown the vital necessity for the closest cooperation and unity of command between all fighting forces, with emphasis upon air power.

"The War Department has recently reorganized the Air Corps, creating a semiautonomous air force within the Department. While this reorganization is a step forward, the National Aeronautic Association believes it does not offer a solution to the national-defense problem. It does not guarantee the fullest cooperation, coordination, and development which we believe necessary in the land, sea, and air forces.

"The National Aeronautic Association therefore recommends that the President of the United States promptly call upon the proper executive officers and Members of Congress to make a study looking to reorganization of the War and Navy Departments with a view to consolidation into one Department of National Defense, headed by a Cabinet officer, and subdivided into three divisions of land, sea, and air, each headed by an Under Secretary. Such a single Department of National Defense, we believe, will best serve the country by insuring the development of an Army and Navy of highest efficiency, together with an invincible air force, all properly coordinated."

We should, Mr. Chairman, have a streamlined and unified Department of National Defense instead of the now separate War and Navy Departments. Under legislation which I sponsor these departments would become important segments of a single defense command and our Air Force would become a separate part of the unified whole. Our three important fighting forces, Army, Navy, and Air Force, should be welded into one efficient defense machine under leadership of one coordinating head who would sit at the Cabinet table and speak for all branches of our fighting forces. There may have been a time when we could afford the luxury of separate War and Navy Departments. Such a time has become history with the swift-moving conflicts of the last few years.

Our air power cannot be developed under the framework of land power and sea power. It should be given a home of its own. It must be controlled and directed by men whose entire life has been devoted to the art of preparing and waging war from the air. The soldier and the sailor is no more qualified to direct the building of America's air strength and to control its employment in war than either is qualified to guide the destinies of the other. Until we realize that vital fact, our Air Force can never become a highly potent factor in the defense of this country.

We must liberate our air fighting power from under the bushel that is now hiding its true light. The Army and Navy have not placed sufficient emphasis on air power prior to this World War, but it is encouraging to read the testimony of the War Department officials as to the need now for a single organization for defense.

It is wholesome, gentlemen of the committee, that you consider, under the impact of war, the arguments pro and con on this subject.

In conclusion I firmly believe that the War and Navy Departments must settle their differences by cooperation. This is frequently impossible since the personnel of each Department sincerely believe their own point of view is correct. Too often do conferences result in an impasse with nothing accomplished for the simple reason that there is no "boss." I have been told of the lack of unity of command in our Military Establishment. It is said that questions involving the drawing of proper war plans, the priority of one service over another, what service is to have command in a certain area and under certain conditions, constitute endless subjects of argument and disagreement. Too frequently, it is believed, conclusions arrived at do not constitute the best solution but are only agreements by compromise. Frequently no agreement at all is reached, but each department goes on its way doing what it thinks best for the national defense.

War, in its global aspects, is being waged by a triumvirate of powers consisting of land power, sea power, and air power.

There is no question of whether air power has supplanted, or will supplant, sea power. Each is essential for our national defense. Neither takes the place of the other—each is complementary to the other. It is necessary to take the Army, Navy, and Air, and weld them into a homogeneous military force by creating a unified control.

It will also be possible to procure all war-making supplies and material by one agency functioning under one official who is directly responsible to the Secretary of Defense. Unnecessary duplication of effort would be eliminated. Singleness of purpose would be the paramount concern of the controlling staff of such a department and that singleness of purpose would be the defense of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. RANDOLPH. So far as I know, this concludes the hearings of the committee on this particular phase of our agenda. As soon as the hearings are revised by the several witnesses and printed, which may be very shortly, the committee will go into executive session and determine what is to be done at that time.

The committee is adjourned until further call.

(Whereupon, at 11 a. m., the committee adjourned sine die.)

But I say to you that months have passed since those hearings were held and that nothing of an affirmative nature was made in the way of a recommendation to the House.

I will place in the RECORD a letter received by our committee from the Secretary of War.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Has the gentleman received a reply to his letter to the President?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; I have received no reply. The former Secretary of War January 23 wrote to our chairman about the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the conferences which were being held in the field, and that work went forward and that report has been received, but nothing has come since January. I quote from his letter, as follows:

On June 17, 1944, a special committee of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was established consisting of Army and Navy officers to make a detailed study and to make recommendations as to the most efficient, practicable organization of those parts of the executive branch of Government primarily concerned with the national defense, and the subject matter dealt within this bill is one of the matters which is being considered by this Joint Chiefs of Staff committee.

Only recently the committee has returned from a trip to the major theaters of war, where they have conferred with Army and Navy commanders in order to obtain their views upon the various matters which are under study by the committee, including the consolidation of the executive departments of the Army and Navy as provided for in this bill.

As yet the committee has not rendered its report, and until that report is made available the War Department does not feel that it would be in a position to comment fully upon the provisions of this bill. The War Department, therefore, desires to delay a full report on the proposed legislation until the Joint Chiefs of Staff committee has rendered its report and ample time has been given to the War Department to give it thorough study.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Perhaps I can supplement what the gentleman from Texas said about the work of the so-called Woodrum committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; and the gentleman from New York has done splendid work on that committee. I know that, sir.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is true that we have held exhaustive hearings, and the issue became so acute, not only among the services but before the public, that finally the Joint Chiefs of Staff reached the conclusion that they had better send committees of military personnel to the European theater and to the Pacific theater to inquire of the officers of the high command, like General Eisenhower and Admiral Stark and others in the European theater and Admirals Nimitz and Halsey and General MacArthur in the Pacific theater, as to what they thought of the proposal of the unification of the Departments. It took a considerable period of time for those committees to make the journeys and get those reports. I believe that those reports have been received, and I am hoping that the appropriate committee of the House will send for them.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. They should be made public. I believe that the gentleman from New York is in favor of doing something on this important subject and not allowing it to go on for years and years as it has.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I place in the RECORD the following endorsement of approval for a single defense department by our Secretary of State:

A UNIFIED NATIONAL DEFENSE

In my capacity as Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, I have had an unusual opportunity to become familiar with the operations of our War and Navy Departments.

I believe their achievements in the design and procurement of weapons of war to be outstanding. The supply of our armies in the field and our Navy afloat has permitted a continuing offensive which has reached a magnitude previously unknown to history.

Nevertheless, there have been and remain many duplications of effort which have resulted in substantial expenditures for war which might have been avoided. Procurement and supply programs under a unified system could have saved not only dollars, but—what is far more important in war—manpower and materials.

The combined combat operations of our Army and Navy have been executed under single leadership with remarkable success. Differences at home have been reconciled. In this way, many duplications have been avoided.

However, we have obtained this degree of unity only because the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Admiral Leahy, General Marshall, Admiral King, and General Arnold—have been willing and able to compromise and reach agreements in the common interest.

I do not believe that any changes should be made now, as such changes and the reorganizations involved might interfere with the prosecution of the war. However, I am convinced that America should not face the future without a fully unified national defense. I urge that the Congress at an early date give consideration to legislation which would establish a single Department of National Defense, in which the Army, Navy, and Air Forces would function under one head, who would be directly responsible to the President, as Commander in Chief.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there can be only two reasons for granting to the President the power to reorganize the agencies of Government: Economy and greater efficiency.

The people are alarmed at the growth of bureaucracy; they are disturbed as they see it steadily grow in numbers and in arrogance.

With its growth has come more and more inefficiency and the American people now know that if bureaucracy continues at its present level, there can be no reduction in taxes. They know, too, that the greater the bureaucracy, the greater is the tendency to control all the activities of the people from Washington, and continuance of administrative costs at their present size means continuance of the drift toward concentration of power in the Federal Government.

We must reconvert the Government from war to peace. This reconversion must be viewed against a backdrop of debt, taxes, human welfare, and effort.

Right now, every family in this Nation is saddled with a debt of more than $8,000. That is the average family share of the national debt. This is no bookkeeper's nightmare. It is an obligation—every bit as binding as an obligation to a friend, or a finance company, or a bank. It must be paid up or defaulted in dishonor. It bears interest, which in total amounts to five billions per year, and which to the average family means a payment of $170 annually.

In 1932, the whole cost of the Federal Government was approximately $4,000,000,000. Today, the interest on our national debt alone is $5,000,000,000, or 20 percent more than the cost of the entire Government in 1932.

Yet the President steps forward with demands for at least $66,000,000,000 in public spending during the next year. Compare these demands with the fact that the top year of all tax receipts yielded less than $45,000,000,000. This means more deficit financing or taxes even greater than those we have at present.

Either choice will threaten the solvency of the Nation and put in jeopardy the bonds and savings of the thrifty people of America. It is time some consideration was given to the thrifty, hard-working middle class which is the backbone of the Nation's strength and greatness.

Protect these savings by making a start toward getting governmental administrative expenses down to a sane basis.

We know that a great part of our immense debt went for war expenditures. Nevertheless, of the 263 billions which the people now owe, approximately 49 billions or more had already been squandered before the war began in a reckless political spree.

Regardless of the reasons, however, we still have the debt.

How long do you think it will take to pay it off? How much human sweat and toil will it take the average American family to pay off $8,000? How many days must a farmer and his sons trudge along the dusty corn rows? How many days must the mill hand punch his time?

The prospect stretches ahead for lifetimes and for generations—years and years. In all these years, the earnings of all the people will be sliced by taxes, taking money they could have spent on better homes, better living, and greater advantages for their children.

The taxes will be felt by all the people. There are not enough rich to pay the bill. Even if we took everything away from the people with incomes over $5,000, not leaving them a cent for a crust of bread, there still would not be enough to pay it off, even if we continued for 10 years.

Every farmer, every mill hand, every stenographer, every grocery clerk—all must work to carry this burden of debt and all must pay it off. If we don't pay it off, then there is only repudiation by outright default or its only other form, inflation through the issuance of greenbacks. In either case, the bonds in the hands of 85,000,000 citizens would become worthless, all the mortgages and insurance policies void, all the corporations insolvent, every job an illusion, and every man a beggar.

So the burden is on everyone.

Now if we are to carry the burden, we should have the right to set the pace. We want assurance that while bent down under the load, nobody makes it any heavier by tossing his burden upon our backs, too, when we are not looking. There is not a man in this Congress who does not know full well that the quickest way to break the spirit and enterprise of a people is to load them with debt and drain off their resources in taxation.

Plain, old-fashioned decency and respect for human rights demand that we do everything possible to ease up on the American taxpayer and give him a chance to retain some of his wages. He has work to do and a future to build. Do not ruin the hopes of the Nation and the promise of the world by breaking his traditional ambition and spirit.

The war has imposed upon America some deep obligations. There will be heavy interest charges on debt, and our gratitude to the fighting men and women who made victory possible must be expressed in something more than words. No real American will begrudge a single penny for the care of our disabled and the dependents of those who made the supreme sacrifice. We must provide for pension charges, hospital care, educational and other benefits for our veterans which we willingly assume as a continuing cost of war. These are responsibilities which we should not and must not shirk.

But it is another potent reason for retrenchment in places where we can retrench. We must cut down where we can cut down without injury to efficiency or necessity. We must get rid of every form of waste and extravagance.

One of the ways to reduce expense is to cut down on the Government pay rolls. They are swollen beyond all reason. They were swollen before the war and are now much more so.

Some bureaucrats, in their anxiety to live at public expense and increase their own personal power, have used their ingenuity to devise unnecessary controls and hatch new schemes which require ever more employees and only result in harassment of the citizen.

The time for all that is gone. We cannot afford the luxury of padded pay rolls any longer. We cannot make beautiful speeches about economy and then turn around and vote for measures costing untold billions and authorize pay rolls that are forever mounting. This is a New Deal practice which the people are beginning to see through.

Let me give you an illustration of the padded pay rolls and the way bureaucracy has expanded under the New Deal. The Office of Indian Affairs has grown to 7,619 persons, or 1 bureaucrat for every 43 Indians. Next year the department wants $32,000,000 and 306 new jobs. The Indians have been here long enough; let us set an example for other nations. Emancipate the Indian and let him be a freeman. Surely an Indian who is required by his Government to fight, sacrifice, and perhaps die for his country should be capable of taking care of his finances. Free the Indian from the burden of carrying these hordes of white bureaucrats.

Comptroller General Lindsay Warren reports public housing is financed by 15 different bureaus; a dozen handle Government lands; eight deal with labor relations and countless numbers supervise transportation. These statistics show the need of a regrouping that will net real economy. They eloquently testify that the amendment I propose is a conservative request.

Facing this country are new prospects and strange choices. The opportunity for Americans to prosper, to advance, to travel, and generally to raise their high standard of living is greater today than it has ever been.

Yet that opportunity can easily vanish in the loose, incompetent or political mishandling of our fiscal policies. We are

in critical times. We need plain horsesense.

Let us reduce the Federal pay rolls now.

Let us, in giving the power to President Truman to regroup and reshuffle agencies, declare it is the policy of Congress that this regrouping and reshuffling shall net at least a 25 percent saving in the costs of administration.

Lower costs of Government, not more political power to any individual or any political party, should be the high purpose back of this power which Congress has been asked to yield to the President.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the main purposes of this bill to reorganize the executive branch of the Government are set forth in article 2. In brief they are, first, to reduce expenditures; second, to increase efficiency in the Government; third, to reduce the number of agencies; fourth, to abolish such agencies or functions as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and, fifth, to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

Surely, of those five the most urgent and most important is to abolish agencies and functions. That is one respect in which this bill, it seems to me, is a very great improvement over any of the previous reorganization bills.

As has been said previously today, we will not get much abolition of agencies unless we abolish functions. There was a need for a given agency and its functions at a particular time; now the need no longer exists but the agency still goes on. Or if the agency is abolished, too frequently the functions are merely transferred to some other agency in order to keep people on the pay roll.

I hope we will keep our eye on the ball—the real objective of this bill, which is to abolish functions and thereby abolish agencies. We have specifically said to the President that he "shall" investigate the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes are necessary to accomplish the above purposes; and we further declare that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a), those I have just enumerated.

I do not think there is any question but what everybody, in Congress and throughout the country, wants to abolish and consolidate and economize and eliminate duplication and overlapping. We want to cut our Government down to comprehensible and manageable size so it will function more, not less, efficiently. Surely there will be no disagreement in the Congress on the purposes of the bill. The question is how best to achieve them and under what proper safeguards. It is one thing to direct the President to accomplish certain objectives according to the specific guideposts or criteria which we set up in the bill; but it is another thing to allow his plan to become law without our having the chance to decide whether it follows the guideposts. It is an inescapable part of our legislative responsibility to make sure before a plan goes into effect that it actually fulfills the purposes and meets the criteria we have laid down.

It is proper and wise for us to delegate to the President powers to prepare the plan, but it is not proper for us to allow the plan to go into effect until the same two Houses which delegated that power have passed upon whether or not it has been wisely used. We want him to use it vigorously, but a proper caution and a decent sense of our own responsibility requires that we have the final decision as to whether the President has acted in accord with the objectives we have laid down.

It has been said repeatedly that if we require approval by both Houses of Congress before a reorganization plan goes into effect, we will never get reorganization. That is the bugaboo which is used against the amendment of which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has spoken. It would provide that a reorganization plan goes into effect only if within a 60-day period after transmittal to the Congress there has been passed by both Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress favors the reorganization plan. Let us look at the various possibilities to see whether that procedure would inevitably block reorganization or whether that claim is inaccurate. Suppose the President's plan comes down and it is one for which there is overwhelming approval. Under the proposed amendment there would be no difficulty in getting sufficient votes in both Houses to approve it. The concurrent resolution approving it would pass overwhelmingly. On the other hand, suppose the plan evokes very marked disapproval both here and throughout the country. Under the bill as it is and without the amendment, it would be easy to get enough votes in both Houses to reject the plan. Therefore the question is what will happen if a plan comes down about which there is a marked difference of opinion. Perhaps 55 percent of the Members of the House approve it and 55 percent in the Senate disapprove it, or vice versa.

In that case the plan will certainly come to a vote because under the cloture provisions in title II, after it is referred to a committee and 10 days elapse without action by the committee, any Member can move to discharge the committee and bring the plan out for immediate consideration with the result that there is no possible way whereby a vote on the matter can be blocked, whether by a legislative committee or the Rules Committee in this body or by a filibuster in the other body. Under the bill as written every member in at least one House is going to have to vote aye or no if there is a difference of opinion as to the plan's merits. On the other hand if the suggested amendment is adopted every Member in both Houses will have the chance to vote aye or no, and have his vote count. It is said to us that if we make Members go on record that they approve it, we never will get a plan adopted; but the fact is that under the bill as it is written we are going to have to go on record one way or the other. Why should it be harder to go on record for a plan than to go on record against it. The only difference will be that with the amendment the Members have to go on record in both Houses and in the other case they have to go on record in only one House. Under the present bill if the President and one House approve they do not even need to take up the resolution to the other House, except for formality purposes, and it would not make any difference if the second House did take it up.

The real question, then, is whether we want to enact a bill which permits a reorganization plan to go into effect if only one House approves, no matter how bitterly opposed to it the other House may be. Personally I cannot consent to such a blanket grant of power. Why should we depart from the long-standing and tested procedures under which the House of Representative and the Senate have operated for these 150 and more years? People are crying out all over the country against centralization of power. I do not object to centralization of power in such an instance as authorizing preparation of a reorganization plan, if we have a chance to pass upon how the authority has been used, that is, if it is under our final control. I do not see how the House of Representatives can vote such a blanket grant of power without reserving to itself the right to decide whether that power has been wisely used or not. That is the gist of the argument. How can we vote to delegate power to prepare a plan and then abdicate and allow the plan to go into effect with the approval of only the President and one House of Congress.

So when the amendment comes up tomorrow I hope the Members of the House will consider it very carefully. Congress and the country want reorganization. We are directing the President to prepare a plan because he is in a better position to study the whole situation. All we ask is a chance for both Houses to decide whether the plan fills the conditions that we have laid down before it finally goes into effect.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman conceive of the Congress, both Houses, refusing to accept a plan of reorganization which promises real economy?

Mr. JUDD. No; I certainly cannot.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I recall that under the previous bill the action of the President became law with the consent of only one House.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; a reorganization plan that was rejected overwhelmingly by this House. Then it went to the other body, where it was approved by a narrow margin and thus went into effect; and it was that very plan that took the CAA and put it under the Department of Commerce, against which action Senator Truman was protesting so strenuously when the plan was under debate in the other body.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JUDD. Certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the President should send down a plan placing the RFC

under the Secretary of Commerce the House could not prevent its going into effect as the bill now stands.

Mr. JUDD. No; nor could the Senate either, if the House were to approve. If the President and one House approve, that is all that is necessary. Every year there are a dozen bills that pass one body but are not passed by the other body or even taken up. Do they become laws? No; of course not. Why should we depart from that proper procedure?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Under the gentleman's proposal would the Congress have the right to modify the plan?

Mr. JUDD. No; in either case it has to reject the plan or accept it in toto. But under our amendment it would have to be accepted by both Houses. Acceptance by one House would not be enough to put it into effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. After the President has spent 2 years preparing a plan, then we would have to take it in toto?

Mr. JUDD. That is right; or reject it in toto and let him submit another. The reason for that, I think, is obvious. If we got into a debate here on each one of the provisions of a plan, it would be like writing a tariff bill on the floor of the House. We could not do it here and ever get the job accomplished.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I agree with the gentleman, we should not chop it all to pieces. There is merit to the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, in 1939 the Congress at the behest of the President passed an act granting him authority to reorganize and consolidate the several governmental bureaus, boards, and so forth, in the executive branch of the Government. That measure was in principle the same as the one now pending. The proponents of the 1939 reorganization bill held out glowing promises of reductions in personnel and consequent savings in costs that would be brought about by its passage, but no such reductions or savings were made. On the contrary, the number of Federal employees increased enormously and the costs, of course, accordingly.

Now comes this second reorganization proposal in precisely the same garb as that of 1939. The other measure failed but this one will succeed. It will, so we are being assured, effect what the other failed to accomplish. One must be indeed something of a superoptimist to believe the proposal before us will accomplish one iota more than has the other. With the love of power and proneness to abuse it now existent throughout the entire executive department of the Government, it is in my judgment an illusion to believe that anything else but a further extension of this power would eventuate should this measure pass. In taking this position I am not questioning anyone's motives. I am merely trying to be realistic. Piddling savings sufficient to placate the public might come out of it but, as I see the matter, the end result would be further entrenchment in power of the whole Federal bureaucracy.

The fact is that this measure sanctions the very evils which its proponents claim it would abolish. The real disease that afflicts the Federal Government is not necessarily excessive personnel in its employ but rather the many abnormal functions undertaken by it. Excessive personnel is an integral part of any social function undertaken by the Government.

Many Members protest largely that the agencies of the Government must be reorganized and consolidated—that is, some of them must be so treated. They tell us that Congress will not do this and thereby imply that it is helpless in the matter. The President alone, we are told, can and will successfully undertake this task. He alone possesses the resourcefulness necessary to reshape the bureaucracy so as to bring about a substantial reduction in cost. This is a fallacy of the first water. How anyone after reading the President's 18,000-word message to Congress can hold this view is difficult for me to understand. The most prominent feature of that message is the plea made in it for extending the program of deficit financing. In that message, among other things, he urged the adoption of the euphemistically designated full-employment bill, bureaucratized medicine, and the forcing of fifteen to twenty million more people into the so-called social security program. To expect anything in the way of reduced governmental expenses through the passage of these measures after that message is in my opinion the most illusive sort of wishful thinking.

But even leaving out of consideration the President's message, the idea that he could be expected to effectuate a substantial reduction in Government costs through the reorganization of the several departments is inherently fallacious. No bureaucracy has ever been known to destroy itself. If my perspective of the situation is correct, the bureaucracy is the dominating power in the Government, not the President. It can be depended upon that the bureaucracy will use this power to maintain its position.

This Congress should not be wasting time on a measure of this sort. The problem before us is not one of reorganizing agencies and departments but abolishing them. When the credit of the Government and the value of the dollar are at stake, as is now the case, it is impossible for us to be too drastic in abolishing the whole mushroom bureaucracy. It is the duty and responsibility of this Congress to protect the credit of the Nation which we can do only by exercising courage and forthrightness.

I think we owe a special obligation to our returning soldiers. Think of it—as the 12,000,000 of them return to their homes they find themselves saddled with a debt of $120,000,000,000. That is no small burden for them to assume after having carried the awful load incident to the prosecution of the war.

I could not under any circumstance vote for this measure unless section 6 (a) is stricken out. Here it is provided that the President may set up any sort of organization plan he pleases and that unless Congress by concurrent resolution disapproves such plan it becomes law. This is an anomalous way of legislating. Possession is nine-tenths of the law and once the President were given this power it is unlikely the Congress would veto any reorganization program he might set up.

The committee should by all means adopt the amendment, which I understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] intends to offer, which provides that the Congress must specifically approve any reorganization plan the President might propose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill at this time, but I would like to make a few remarks based on observations I have made since I have been here in Congress. We would all like to see efficiency and economy practiced and increased in government here in Washington. A condition must be brought about where efficiency and economy will be practiced or this country will be destroyed, and in my judgment it is on the threshold of financial destruction at this very moment. We would all gladly vote great power to the President if we thought that he would use it wisely. He probably will, but like us Members of Congress, he is not infallible.

The people of this country have been chastising the Congress, and rightly so, for abrogating its powers to the Chief Executive. The people will wonder if the Congress, in making the greatest abrogation of power it has made in a long time, fails to insist that the plan of reorganization by the President must have the approval of a majority of both Houses of the Congress. I shall not vote for the bill if the amendment providing for that is defeated. It is putting the Members of Congress in a false light and in an unfair position when you place them in a position where those who believe in real economy and want to see real economy effected will have to vote against reorganization ,and particularly when you force a lot of us to vote against it because we want to maintain the prerogatives and the constitutional powers of the Congress. We want to be helpful and cooperative with the Chief Executive. Frankly, I have not seen any actions by the President toward economy that would lead me to believe that we should give him such blanket authority. Let us reserve our congressional right to reject his plan if we should so decide. If he will bring in a real reorganization plan for economy that will help to deflate bureaucracy he need have no fear but that it will be approved overwhelmingly. We want to retain our constitutional right to vote down and reject a bad plan if he submits one.

Some of us wanted to set up an efficiency committee and give it the power of law. Such a bill was introduced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. In answer to the statement that Congress cannot deflate bureaucracy, I undertake to say that they might not be

able to agree on the consolidation of certain bureaus, but they certainly could agree on an economy and efficiency committee and give it the power of law that would really go in and do its job and deflate bureaucracy, but I understand that very worthy bill has not had serious consideration by the proper committee.

President Truman has indicated that he wants to keep the USES offices under Federal control until at least 1947, I believe. The War Manpower Commission never wants to turn them back to the States. The States unanimously have asked, through their governors, that those services loaned to the States for the duration be returned to them. Congress very recently overruled the President by passing a bill to do so. I doubt if you give him all the power of Congress if much economy will be accomplished. If his assistants who remake the Federal set-up know it must have the approval of both Houses, they may move with more care and caution in setting up the reorganization program. It is folly and reckless to pass a bill which provides that the President's reorganization program can be adopted by a mere majority of the votes of only one body. Why have two bodies of the Congress if that is your wish? If the Congress keeps giving up its power to the Executive we will not need either body very long. I am opposed to such a course.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly there ought to be a lot of reorganization in the Federal agencies of our Government. I do not think there is any question about that. But what we need more is reduction of agencies and personnel. We need to eliminate a lot of them. I am not objecting to the President's having the authority to reorganize, but I do not want any legislation to be an excuse to make the attempt to simply put them under one head, as it were, and let it go at that. The big question is that of getting rid of a number of bureaus, agencies, and commissions that have come into the Federal Government during the past few years, a good many under the excuse of being needed because of emergencies, and a whole lot more than have come into being as war bureaus and agencies. My suggestion would be instead of reorganizing these war agencies we proceed to dispose of them and get rid of them because we were given to understand that they were here as war agencies only and were to go out when the war was over. But I have noticed recently that some of these agencies have now decided to change their names and propose new activities and call themselves peace agencies. So before you know it we are going to have a lot of former war agencies carried into the postwar period as either postwar or peacetime agencies. I think that thing ought to be watched. Furthermore, some of the war agencies have already been covered into old-line agencies, including some that have already gone into the State Department.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Anticipating that very thing, in all fairness, does not this bill provide that the President cannot establish any plan or any function except functions now authorized by law; and any functions that he has undertaken to establish under the War Powers Act could not be established under this act which deals with the peacetime agencies?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am just calling the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to the fact that some of these agencies have already come before committees saying, "We ought to stay. We ought to continue our activities because although we were wartime agencies and know we were supposed to have gone out as such, nevertheless it is our feeling that our services are of such great importance that they ought to be continued."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I agree with the gentleman. Bureaucracy never dies and to forestall the activities of these bureaucrats, this bill provides positively that the President cannot under this reorganization establish any of these functions that he may have undertaken to establish under the War Powers Act. We have to do it by act of Congress.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not only that, but I hope and trust that this bill will not be used, for the purpose of covering in a lot of unnecessary activities with other agencies so that their services may be continued under an old line agency. I trust that in this reorganization that thing will be carefully scrutinized.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I say that the committee devoted much time to that, and we do not know of any better language than to prohibit any additional functions or the embracing of any additional functions, such as the gentleman has been talking about, which Congress has not authorized.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman, but that is one of the things that concerns me a great deal, because, as the gentleman from Mississippi has so well stated, bureaucracy just does not die. It just continues to grow by feeding on itself, as it were. There is a very big problem involved here. We have discussed it today, and we have done so before. But we do not take it too seriously. We do so little about it. It is a question which we are going to have to determine very soon, as to whether or not we are going to have government by bureaucracy or government by law. I say to you the situation is so much graver than the people of this country realize. That is the thing that has concerned me through the years. That is one of the reasons why I introduced a bill which provided for a bureau or agency of efficiency whereby Congress itself would keep its hand in the situation with respect to the growth of agencies, bureaus, and commissions, and try, if possible, to bring about a little more efficiency in the agencies of our Government and try to see to it that all unnecessary agencies are abolished.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We favor the economy to which the gentleman refers, and we have included the word "economy" in this bill. But we want to be realistic. It is often said that Congress should reduce expenses 20 percent or 25 percent. We already have had reductions. But let me remind the gentleman that with a peacetime Budget of around $9,000,000,000 there is only about 10 percent involved in the executive department of the Government.

I favor the retention of that, but 90 percent of our normal expenditures goes to the Army and Navy ordinarily, to pensions, to retirement benefits, fixed charged by law. So that you and I, as Members of Congress, in dealing with the executive departments, anxious to promote economy, are really limited in the amounts we can promote because of the great public debt, the interest on it, pensions, and similar fixed charges.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But I will say to my distinguished friend who has given this problem serious consideration as he does every problem that the thing not only involves expenditure of funds but goes still deeper. So many of these bureaus, commissions, and agencies have taken so much power to themselves that it is not only the cost in dollars and cents, but in addition to that, those agencies have taken on powers which the Congress never intended or imagined. That is what disturbs me. It also disturbs me that we have some three million employees on the pay roll at an annual cost of approximately $7,000,000,000 and we will have a most difficult time in reducing that number to anywhere near what the gentleman from Mississippi and I know it should be. The gentleman well knows that we ought to get it down to the figure we had before even the peak in 1940, when it was less than one million.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And for that reason this bill provides for the abolishment of bureaus, just as the gentleman advocates.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I trust the bill will do as much as the committee hopes it will, and I hope at the same time Congress will take back the powers that have been assumed and which was not intended by the Members of this Congress, and which the thinking people do not like a bit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I assume that under this bill the Smaller War Plants Corporation would not be one of the bureaus that would be reorganized, because it is a war agency. I feel they have done a very fine piece of work in securing business for smaller plants, thereby securing employment for the citizens of the country. I am correct, am I not, Mr. Chairman, in

the belief that the Smaller War Plants Corporation would not be in any way included?

Mr. MANASCO. The Smaller War Plants Corporation was created under authority of the First War Powers Act. Of course, unless the Congress, by affirmative action, passes a law continuing the Smaller War Plants Corporation, it would expire within 6 months after the expiration of the date of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is my understanding. I would like to have it continued, because I think it is doing a very fine piece of work for the veterans.

As the Members know, the Smaller War Plants Corporation is handling the securing of trucks for the veterans. I am very much distressed to find it is almost impossible for a veteran to secure a truck, because, while the Smaller War Plants Corporation gives the veteran authority to secure it, he goes to a disposal center and finds that the Office of Surplus Property in the Department of Commerce has not cleared the trucks to them, and the veterans find there are no trucks there.

Yesterday 2,000 of our veterans stood around in the rain at Fort Devens waiting for a promised sale of used trucks. Finally the sale was postponed until today because the Commerce Department had not forwarded the list. Some reports state the trucks offered are not as good as the ones sold previously to the dealers. The inefficient handling of the disposal of used cars and trucks is causing great bitterness among veterans who were promised by Congress to receive the first chance in the purchase of surplus materials.

It is certainly a very bad system at the present time, which, as an official of the Government told me, requires 45 days to secure a truck. The red tape ought to be eliminated. In my opinion the procedure should be simplified to allow the Smaller War Plants Corporation to certify a veteran, so that he can buy a truck more quickly. Under present conditions, the veterans are not receiving the surplus trucks for which the Members of Congress by law have given them priorities. The veterans certainly are entitled to priorities. I have received the following telegram:

BOSTON, MASS., *October 3, 1945.*

Hon. EDITH NOUASE ROGERS:

Department of Massachusetts Veterans of Foreign Wars strongly protest method used in sale of surplus trucks to discharged veterans at Fort Devens, Mass. Sale announced October 2 returned veterans traveled long distance waited all day. No sale took place. Believe this direct injustice to returned servicemen and demand immediate remedial action.

JAMES F. REYNOLDS,
Senior Vice Commander.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman used all his time?

Mr. HOFFMAN. We have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, a great many Members who have addressed the committee this afternoon have paid their respects to this menace of bureaucracy. In this connection I am reminded of a statement that Mark Twain once made that everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it. We are all concerned, gravely concerned, with this thing we call bureaucracy. We have witnessed its growth from year to year until today it reaches menacing proportions.

The one thing at which this bill is aimed is bureaucracy, it is an anti-bureaucracy bill. The bill has been carefully drawn after long and exhaustive study. I believe we are most fortunate in having as primary authors of this bill the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], both of whom went through the previous reorganization fight of 1939 in which they were ably assisted at that time by the now Comptroller General of the United States, the Hon. Lindsay Warren, who then was a distinguished Member of this body.

I believe all who have given serious study to this legislation will readily agree that it is the very best reorganization bill that has been presented to this Congress. This bill differs drastically from the 1939 act in that in the 1939 act we specifically provided that the Chief Executive could not abolish functions; we gave him authority to shift agencies and to eliminate agencies but he could not eliminate functions. I submit that no effective reorganization can occur, no substantial reduction can be made unless functions are abolished. I wish to call to the attention of members of the committee and particularly those who have spoken at length about bureaucracy that the President under this bill cannot create a single thing, he can only destroy. The President under this bill cannot increase expenses, he can only decrease expenses.

The President in May of this year sent to this Congress a message in which he asked for power to reduce Government expenses, governmental activities, governmental agencies and bureaus. He has said he would make reductions and effect economy and efficiency if given the power. No harm can come from the passage of this act and much good may result from it. Instead, therefore, of just paying lip service to our concern about bureaucracy let us do something about it.

I have here a few figures on the growth in size and cost of the activities of the Federal Government. These are approximate figures, beginning in 1900, for various years. The figures are as follows:

In 1900 we employed in the Federal Government 250,000 persons. Expenditures annually amounted to $598,000,000—less than a billion. In 1910 the employees numbered 390,000 and the expenditures amounted to $1,044,000,000. In 1915 the employees numbered 425,000 and the expenditures amounted to $1,122,000,000. In 1922 we have 515,000 employees and the expenditures amounted to $3,909,000,000. In 1930 we had 565,000 employees and the expenditures amounted to $4,665,000,000. In 1935 the employees numbered 800,000 and the expenditures amounted to $7,527,000,000. In 1939, our last peacetime year, we had 920,000 employees and the expenditures — that means appropriations—amounted to $10,338,000,000. This growth of bureaucracy I believe has not resulted from any deep-laid conspiracy, it is a natural tendency. Governments tend to get bigger and bigger, and bureaucracy blossoms by geometric proportions. We now know that we have, largely due to the war, and also to this natural growth, approximately 3,000,000 civilian employees on the Government pay roll. No one estimates the amount of expenditures incident to normal peacetime activities. I submit to you that no one could be more concerned with this growing cost, size, and activity of the Federal Government than am I, and I take it all of you are likewise concerned. I submit to you that if and when government becomes so large that a substantial number of the citizenship are employees of the Government, then we are forced into some form of totalitarian regime and we all become slaves rather than freemen, government becomes the master rather than the servant of the people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think the gentleman is correct about our being concerned about it, but day by day as we meet here, we appropriate more and more money. All the time we are adding to the public debt and, as the gentleman said in the beginning, quoting from Mark Twain, we do not do anything about it.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is what I am talking about. We have a chance now to do something about it in this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We talk about it, but we do not do anything about it.

Mr. GOSSETT. We are now trying to do something about it, and I am getting around to some of the amendments which I fear some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will offer to this bill, amendments which will defeat the purposes of this legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not think you will get any harm from this side of the House. They have been burned often enough with this delegation of arbitrary power and blank checks for billions of dollars.

Mr. GOSSETT. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this bill, contrary to what many have said, does not delegate authority to create anything or to increase anything. It is quite the reverse. This not only delegates authority but it is a mandatory direction to the Chief Executive that he shall under this delegation of authority proceed immediately to use the ax. It is authority to destroy, not to create.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is right about that. This is an order to the President to get busy and send down to us a plan; but it is also a delegation of authority, not to the President but to

the President and to one branch of Congress. That is what I am afraid of. Two years ago we passed a very, very necessary piece of legislation and sent it over to the other side. It is buried over there to this day.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think it is the most specious, illogical argument which the gentleman and one of his colleagues have made for an amendment which is going to be offered to require an affirmative vote of both branches of this Congress before any reorganization plan can become effective, such amendment in effect will nullify and prohibit any effective reorganization.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then does the gentleman believe that the Congress should delegate to the President and to one branch of the Congress the authority to put laws on the books?

Mr. GOSSETT. This does not do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes. This delegates to the President the authority, it directs him, as the gentleman said, to send down a plan.

Mr. GOSSETT. Is the gentleman alarmed about any authority on the part of the President and one branch of the Congress to eliminate bureaus?

Mr. HOFFMAN. To consolidate, not eliminate; to consolidate and transfer I am.

Mr. GOSSETT. What harm is going to come from a consolidation and transfer, which might at the same time get rid of some agencies and activities.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let us take the RFC. Suppose the Senate and the President gives that to Henry Wallace. Is the gentleman not afraid of that?

Mr. GOSSETT. I would not want that to happen and I am not afraid of that happening. I will take a chance on mistakes in reducing bureaus. If it is left up to the Congress nothing will be done.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman try to answer the question I asked the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman always puts in a "but."

Mr. CHURCH. Assume that the House by a practically unanimous vote disapproves of a plan sent up by the President. Does the gentleman want to delegate to the other body the right, and is he willing to grant the other body the power to approve the plan, if it could be convinced by the President that it should?

Mr. GOSSETT. I am not afraid of the other body.

Mr. CHURCH. Even though this body by unanimous vote or practically unanimous vote disapproved it?

Mr. GOSSETT. Suppose that situation would arise, then some bureau or some agency would die and something, at least, would be done. I say that some wrong action in the destruction of bureaus is better than no action in the reduction of bureaus.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, a reorganization plan which the President sends down would not necessarily abolish any agency or function. We direct him to abolish them if he finds it necessary to achieve certain stipulated ends, and I think it would be necessary to abolish a good many in order to achieve those ends, but there is no assurance that the plan that would come down would do other than transfer or consolidate.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. Then you are not necessarily achieving what you desire, inasmuch as you are not sure that the organization plan will abolish agencies or functions.

Mr. GOSSETT. Oh, the gentleman knows that no bureaus are going to be abolished and no economy is going to be effected unless this act is passed and unless somebody is given authority to so reduce and eliminate agencies and activities.

Mr. JUDD. But I do not see how that is changed by requiring the approval of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman knows that the most effective lobbyists in this Nation are sincere and able gentlemen who are the heads of departments and agencies of the Government. The Comptroller General in his testimony before our committee said that if we set up a bureau for the edification of the three blind mice or for the restoration of humpty-dumpty, within 1 year the gentleman charged with that responsibility would come before the Congress with glowing reports of the fine work they had done and perhaps be able to sell some committee on the idea of giving them more money and more authority.

Mr. JUDD. And under this bill as it is the same men would be here lobbying against any plan to change their agencies. If there is anything controversial in the plan there would have to be a vote in which you and I would have to go on record for or against, that is true whether just one House or both Houses have to approve or disapprove.

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman answers his own argument. They will lobby against the destruction of their own bureaus, and we will not get a reorganization plan, and therefore nothing will be done if an affirmative vote is required of both branches of the Congress.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman think it will be so much harder to get it approved by both Houses than in one?

Mr. GOSSETT. Oh, yes.

Mr. JUDD. Let me read one sentence from the debate on this subject in 1939 by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]. He said:

> For a reorganization to be forced through which is against the judgment of one of the two Houses gives rise to an element of friction and discord between the Executive and that House that is not worth the price paid for it.

Does the gentleman concur in that judgment?

Mr. GOSSETT. I do not agree with that. I would rather take the chance of a little friction and discord than to sit idly by and allow all those bureaus to continue to grow and grow while we do nothing about it.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman think it would be wise from a policy standpoint to have a reorganization forced through to which one House was strongly opposed?

Mr. GOSSETT. This is not forcing any reorganization plan through. This simply provides that the reorganization plan shall become effective unless disapproved by the Congress. I submit that that is the only effective and practical and workable way in which we are going to get any reorganization. I will say that the gentleman's amendment sets up an unworkable obstacle and makes it even more improbable that reorganization will occur by this handicap which he places on it.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman object to an amendment providing that the plan will go into effect unless within 60 days it has been disapproved by one House of the Congress?

Mr. GOSSETT. That would be much better than the amendment suggested, but I still would not agree to that, because that sets up the handicap of permitting one House to veto a reorganization plan. But such an arrangement would be far better than your present proposal.

Mr. JUDD. If you are going to have a roll-call vote, what handicap is there in requiring a positive as against a negative vote?

Mr. GOSSETT. Under the gentleman's amendment the reorganization plan dies even if no roll call is had, since it requires an affirmative vote of both Houses.

Mr. JUDD. If the plan is worth anything at all, there will be many people who are in favor of it and they can force a vote to keep it from dying through inaction. Under the cloture provision they can bring it to a vote, and you are going to have to go on record, and so will I.

Mr. GOSSETT. The most generous thing that can be said about the gentleman's amendment, considering it in the best light, is that it sets up an additional handicap to a reorganization plan and makes more hazardous and difficult a reduction in the number of bureaus and a reduction in the expenses of the Government.

Mr. JUDD. I grant that it is an additional handicap, although I could use the word "safeguard" rather than "handicap." It makes it more difficult to put the plan into effect. It has to go through both Houses. But I am convinced that any plan that is disapproved by either House ought not to go into effect.

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman's amendment is a safeguard for the continued existence of the bureaus which we want to destroy. That is the safeguard in the gentleman's plan.

Mr. JUDD. No; it is a safeguard for legislative procedures which have been tested and proven sound, that a proposal has to have the approval of both Houses of Congress before it goes into effect.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I realize we are just talking here waiting for this message. Will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. GOSSETT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman. I listen to him often, and am sometimes enlightened by his remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. When the gentleman and I became Members of Congress we pledged our support to the Constitution. I know that is outmoded and we ought to throw it in the ash can, some say, but having done that, and the Constitution providing that you can get legislation only by and through the action of both Houses, does the gentleman believe now we ought to just scrap that provision?

Mr. GOSSETT. I do not think we are scrapping that provision.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What are we doing?

Mr. GOSSETT. We are trying to provide for economy and efficiency in government. We must do it by action not by inaction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Reorganization Act of 1945."

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 360, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ATOMIC ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Almost 2 months have passed since the atomic bomb was used against Japan. That bomb did not win the war, but it certainly shortened the war. We know that it saved the lives of untold thousands of American and Allied soldiers who would otherwise have been killed in battle.

The discovery of the means of releasing atomic energy began a new era in the history of civilization. The scientific and industrial knowledge on which this discovery rests does not relate merely to another weapon. It may some day prove to be more revolutionary in the development of human society than the invention of the wheel, the use of metals, or the steam or internal combustion engine.

Never in history has society been confronted with a power so full of potential danger and at the same time so full of promise for the future of man and for the peace of the world. I think I express the faith of the American people when I say that we can use the knowledge we have won, not for the devastation of war, but for the future welfare of humanity.

To accomplish that objective we must proceed along two fronts—the domestic and the international.

The first and most urgent step is the determination of our domestic policy for the control, use, and development of atomic energy within the United States.

We cannot postpone decisions in this field. The enormous investment which we made to produce the bomb has given us the two vast industrial plants in Washington and Tennessee, and the many associated works throughout the country. It has brought together a vast organization of scientists, executives, industrial engineers, and skilled workers—a national asset of inestimable value.

The powers which the Congress wisely gave to the Government to wage war were adequate to permit the creation and development of this enterprise as a war project. Now that our enemies have surrendered, we should take immediate action to provide for the future use of this huge investment in brains and plant. I am informed that many of the people on whom depend the continued successful operation of the plants and the further development of atomic knowledge, are getting ready to return to their normal pursuits. In many cases these people are considering leaving the project largely because of uncertainty concerning future national policy in this field. Prompt action to establish national policy will go a long way toward keeping a strong organization intact.

It is equally necessary to direct future research and to establish control of the basic raw materials essential to the development of this power whether it is to be used for purposes of peace or war. Atomic force in ignorant or evil hands could inflict untold disaster upon the Nation and the world. Society cannot hope even to protect itself—much less to realize the benefits of the discovery—unless prompt action is taken to guard against the hazards of misuse.

I therefore urge, as a first measure in a program of utilizing our knowledge for the benefit of society, that the Congress enact legislation to fix a policy with respect to our existing plants, and to control all sources of atomic energy and all activities connected with its development and use in the United States.

The legislation should give jurisdiction for these purposes to an Atomic Energy Commission, with members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Congress should lay down the basic principles for all the activities of the Commission, the objectives of which should be the promotion of the national welfare, securing the national defense, safeguarding world peace, and the acquisition of further knowledge concerning atomic energy.

The people of the United States know that the overwhelming power we have developed in this war is due in large measure to American science and American industry, consisting of management and labor. We believe that our science and industry owe their strength to the spirit of free inquiry and the spirit of free enterprise that characterize our country. The Commission, therefore, in carrying out its functions, should interfere as little as possible with private research and private enterprise, and should use as much as possible existing institutions and agencies. The observance of this policy is our best guaranty of maintaining the preeminence in science and industry upon which our national well-being depends.

All land and mineral deposits owned by the United States which constitute sources of atomic energy, and all stock piles of materials from which such energy may be derived, and all plants or other property of the United States connected with its development and use should be transferred to the supervision and control of the Commission.

The Commission should be authorized to acquire at a fair price, by purchase or by condemnation, any minerals or other materials from which the sources of atomic energy can be derived, and also any land containing such minerals or materials, which are not already owned by the United States.

The power to purchase should include real and personal property outside the limits of the United States.

The Commission should also be authorized to conduct all necessary research, experimentation, and operations for the further development and use of atomic energy for military, industrial, scientific, or medical purposes. In these activities it should, of course, use existing private and public institutions and agencies to the fullest practicable extent.

Under appropriate safeguards, the Commission should also be permitted to license any property available to the Commission for research, development, and exploitation in the field of atomic energy. Among other things such licensing should be conditioned, of course, upon a policy of widespread distribution of peacetime products on equitable terms which will prevent monopoly.

In order to establish effective control and security, it should be declared unlawful to produce or use the substances comprising the sources of atomic energy or to import or export them except under conditions prescribed by the Commission.

Finally, the Commission should be authorized to establish security regulations governing the handling of all information, material, and equipment under its jurisdiction. Suitable penalties should be prescribed for violating the security regulations of the Commission or any of the other terms of the act.

The measures which I have suggested may seem drastic and far-reaching. But the discovery with which we are dealing involves forces of nature too dangerous to fit into any of our usual concepts.

The other phase of the problem is the question of the international control and development of this newly discovered energy.

In international relations as in domestic affairs, the release of atomic energy constitutes a new force too revolutionary to consider in the framework of old ideas. We can no longer rely on the slow progress of time to develop a program of control among nations. Civilization demands that we shall reach at the earliest possible date a satisfactory arrangement for the control of this discovery in order that it may become a powerful and forceful influence toward the maintenance of world peace instead of an instrument of destruction.

Scientific opinion appears to be practically unanimous that the essential theoretical knowledge upon which the discovery is based is already widely known. There is also substantial agreement that foreign research can come abreast of our present theoretical knowledge in time.

The hope of civilization lies in international arrangements looking, if possible, to the renunciation of the use and development of the atomic bomb, and directing and encouraging the use of atomic energy and all future scientific information toward peaceful and humanitarian ends. The difficulties in working out such arrangements are great. The alternative to overcoming these difficulties, however, may be a desperate armament race which might well end in disaster. Discussion of the international problem cannot be safely delayed until the United Nations Organization is functioning and in a position adequately to deal with it.

I therefore propose to initiate discussions, first with our associates in this discovery, Great Britain and Canada, and then with other nations, in an effort to effect agreement on the conditions under which cooperation might replace rivalry in the field of atomic power.

I desire to emphasize that these discussions will not be concerned with disclosures relating to the manufacturing processes leading to the production of the atomic bomb itself. They will constitute an effort to work out arrangements covering the terms under which international collaboration and exchange of scientific information might safely proceed.

The outcome of the discussions will be reported to the Congress as soon as possible, and any resulting agreements requiring congressional action will be submitted to the Congress.

But regardless of the course of discussions in the international field, I believe it is essential that legislation along the lines I have indicated be adopted as promptly as possible to insure the necessary research in, and development and control of, the production and use of atomic energy.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 3, 1945.*

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN THE MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. MAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate voluntary enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, for printing in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Zionists of Winthrop, Mass.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Westbrook Pegler with reference to the heroism of Betty Barton.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

TWO UNKNOWN AMERICAN SOLDIERS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have placed in the hopper today a House joint resolution which provides for bringing to the United States the bodies of two unknown Americans who were members of the American armed forces who served, one in the European theater of war and the other in the Pacific theater of war, and who lost their lives during World War II, for burial of the remains, with proper ceremonies, in the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is most fitting to bring the bodies of these two unknown veterans of our American expeditionary forces of the two theaters of war to Washington for appropriate burial and memorial services at Arlington. I remember very well the services that were held for the Unknown Soldier of the First World War. Certainly we wish to pay all honor and tribute, appreciation, and respect to the dead of this war. I believe it will mean a great deal to the families of these men who gave their lives for their country, and to their comrades. These unknown heroes may belong to the Army, to the Navy, or to the Marine Corps.

The resolution is as follows:

House joint resolution providing for the bringing to the United States of the bodies of two unknown Americans, who were members of the American forces, who served, one in the European theater of war, and the other in the Pacific theater of war, and lost their lives during World War II, and for the burial of the remains with appropriate ceremonies

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, under regulations to be prescribed by him, to cause to be brought to the United States the bodies of two Americans, one who was a member of the American forces in the European theater of war and lost his life there, and the other who was a member of the American forces in the Pacific theater of war and lost his life there, whose identities have not been established, for burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va.

Such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of War.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] may address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow at the close of the business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred, as follows:

S. 1281. An act to provide for covering into the Treasury of the Philippines certain Philippine funds in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m., tomorrow, Thursday, October 4, 1945.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will continue public hearings on October 4 and 5, 1945, at 10 a. m. in the Rivers and Harbors hearing room, 1304 New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 2111 and H. R. 4079.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in open session, on Thursday, October 4, 1945, at 10 a. m., in the committee room 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, October 4, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3367) to amend Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, October 4, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., to consider the following bills: H. R. 608, H. R. 2418, H. R. 3028, H. R. 3444, and S. 504.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, will meet at 10 a. m. Tuesday, October 9, to begin hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

Various groups who have representation in Washington will be heard during the first week, such as Members of Congress first, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Association of American Railroads, railroad traffic organizations, railroad labor, and truck and bus associations.

The second week will be devoted to various State commissions, agricultural associations, National Industrial Traffic League, and various citizens' traffic associations, and traffic boards and chambers of commerce.

It is going to be necessary to limit the time for this hearing as much as possible. It is also desired to avoid any repetition in statements before the committee.

The committee would be pleased to have those who are intending to appear to advise the clerk promptly the least amount of time they will need in which to present their testimony.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

713. A letter from the Federal Works Administrator, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

714. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

715. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the law relating to the service of process in cancellation of naturalization proceedings; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

716. A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting the first quarterly reports of personnel ceilings for the quarter ending September 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

717. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the development and control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

718. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE. Committee on Claims. S. 1076. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on the naval station, Tutuila, American Samoa, on October 20, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 1066). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1102. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval convalescent hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 1067). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1103. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 1068). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1119. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 146 at the naval operating base, Bermuda, on April 26, 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 1069). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1134. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in buildings 102 and 102-A in Utulei, Tutuila, American Samoa, on August 17, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 1070). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1215. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the steamship *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 1071). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. J. Res. 243. Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George C. Marshall, and the members of the Army of the United States who have fought under his direction during the wars; and providing that the President of the United States shall cause a medal to be struck to be presented to General Marshall in the name of the people of the United States of America; with amendment (Rept. No. 1072). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 714. A bill to facilitate the admission to the United States of husbands, wives, and children of United States citizen men and women who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during the present World War; without amendment (Rept. No. 1073). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROE of Maryland: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 3709. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928, and section 3 of the act of March 29, 1944, affecting the compensation of postmasters; without amendment (Rept. No. 1074). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMASON: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2965. A bill to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1076). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 201. An act for the relief of the estates of William F. Bacon, Myrtle Jackson, Catherine Smith, and Tibbie Spencer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1038). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie A. Beltz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1039). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 562. An act for the relief of Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap Associates, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 788. An act for the relief of the estate of George J. Ross; without amendment (Rept. No. 1041). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 883. An act for the relief of Charlie Tyson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 979. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Lillian Epstein; without amendment (Rept. No. 1043). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 980. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edmond J. Saint Amant, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 994. An act for the relief of the Central Leaf Tobacco Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1023. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest L. Barlow; without amendment (Rept. No. 1046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1027. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hibernia I. Conners; without amendment (Rept. No. 1047). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1118. An act for the relief of First Lt. Jack Sanders, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of an explosion at Camp Lejeune, N. C., on January 22, 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 1048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1183. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising from activities of the War Department or of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 1049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1199. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of the death of L. W. Freeman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 843. A bill for the relief of Francis A. Hanley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1051). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 850. A bill for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend; without amendment (Rept. No. 1052). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1234. A bill for the relief of Percy Allen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1053). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1841. A bill for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 1055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Jay H. McCleary; with amendment (Rept. No. 1056) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Mary Galipeau; with amendment (Rept. No. 1057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2401. A bill for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde; with amendment (Rept. No. 1058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2431. A bill for the relief of Monite Waterproof Glue Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2544. A bill for the relief of Willie Hines; with amendment (Rept. No. 1060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2748. A bill for the relief of the Dubuque & Wisconsin Bridge Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2826. A bill for the relief of Esther L. Berg; with amendment (Rept. No. 1062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2962. A bill for the relief of Justin P. Hopkins; with amendment (Rept. No. 1063). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3094. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claims of the Zephyr Aircraft Corp. against the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1064). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims: H R. 3135. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1065). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 4271. A bill to establish an import quota on butter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUNKER:

H. R. 4272. A bill to provide for court review of certain judgments of general courts martial of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4273. A bill to provide for court review of certain judgments of general courts martial of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 4274. A bill to provide for the discharge of fathers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4275. A bill to provide for the immediate discharge from the armed forces of members thereof who have been awarded the Purple Heart or are entitled to that award; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4276, A bill to provide for the construction of public buildings and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 4277. A bill providing for discharge of remaining sons in a family where one son has lost his life in the armed services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4278. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to compensation of postal employees, so as to provide for giving appropriate credit for periods of past service in the making of assignments to salary grades; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4279. A bill authorizing an appropriation of $50,000 for research with respect to the cause and cure of hay fever; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4280. A bill for the development and control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to provide the Congress with information concerning financial commitments to foreign nations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution providing for the bringing to the United States of the bodies of two unknown Americans, who were members of the American forces who served one in the European theater of war and the other in the Pacific theater of war and lost their lives during Warld War II, and for the burial of the remains with appropriate ceremonies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the investigation through the Department of State and with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the investigation through the Department of State and with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 4281. A bill for the relief of Nevada County, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 4282. A bill for the relief of Vera Frances Elicker; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1225. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of citizens of Pontiac, Oakland County, Mich., urging the passage of the so-called Pace bill and the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages in the vicinity of camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1226. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition urging influence be used to see that justice is meted out to our subdued enemies, as well as extended to us, in bringing war criminals to trial and meting out the punishment necessary to blot out forever the chances of another devastating war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1227. By the SPEAKER: Petition of State Department of Polish-American Congress, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement for constitutional relief for Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1945

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 2, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, who art the fountain of all grace, the source of all wisdom and goodness, we would lift our eyes to the infinite blue of Thy love which arches each new day and rest our souls on the assurance that transfiguring even the darkest cloud there is the radiant bow of Thy promise. Near the forum, with its din and clash of human interests, may we keep an altar where a constant sense of the eternal may save us from spiritual decay, from moral cowardice, and from any betrayal of the highest public good. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, October 3, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the Senate commencing this noon until Tuesday morning. I may say that the reason for this request is that I have an important engagement in North Dakota with the Surplus War Property Administrator dealing with surplus property.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from North Dakota is granted.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the present week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the consent of the Senate is granted.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF IRVIN C. MOLLISON TO BE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, October 11, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Irvin C. Mollison, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. Thomas J. Walter, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO COASTAL FISHERIES AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE SUBSOIL AND SEA BED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States transmitting two proclamations and an Executive order, which, with the accompanying proclamations and order, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 28, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: I have today signed two proclamations and two Executive orders affecting areas under or on the high seas and beyond our territorial coastal waters.

One of the proclamations announces that our Government regards the natural resources of the subsoil and sea bed of the continental shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States as appertaining to the United States, subject to its jurisdiction and control. The Executive order on the same subject reserves and sets aside these resources and places them under the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of the Interior for administrative purposes.

The other proclamation declares that our Government regards it as proper to establish conservation zones in those areas of the high seas contiguous to our coasts in which all fishing activities will be subject to the regulation and control of the United States and any other nations interested therein. The Executive order on this subject provides for the establishment of such zones by the President upon the joint recommendation of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 772 aliens whose disposition the Attorney General suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PROTEST AGAINST USE OF SUGAR IN INTOXICATING BEVERAGES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, without the signatures attached, a petition signed by 106 citizens of Gypsum, Kans., remonstrating against the Government permitting sugar to be used in the manufacture of intoxicating beverages.

There being no objection, the petition was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

GYPSUM, KANS., *July 1945.*

To A. J. Krug, Chairman of the War Production Board, and Members of the Kansas Delegation in Congress:

We, the undersigned citizens of Gypsum, Kans., and vicinity, wish to protest against the Government permitting sugar to be used for the manufacture of intoxicating beverages, when there is so little of it obtainable for canning and preserving purposes and for cooking and table use. We do not need liquor, but we do need suger.

INDEPENDENCE OF REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA AND OTHER BALTIC REPUBLICS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Knights of Lithuania, a national fraternal organization of American youth, Massachusetts, relating to the independence of the Republic of Lithuania and other Baltic Republics.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Knights of Lithuania is a national fraternal organization of American youth which seeks to promote close relationships with those of Lithuanian origin in all parts of the United States. Their common heritage creates a feeling of good fellowship, which unites them into a common purpose, "For God and country." Over 1,000 of its members served in the armed forces of the United States. At the semiannual convention of the New England district of this organization, held on September 30, 1945, in Lithuanian Hall, Athol, Mass., the delegates from the New England councils unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

"Whereas the Atlantic Charter respects the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and wishes to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them; and

"Whereas the Allied Nations have fought for the principles of democracy during World War II and these principles of democracy call for the right of peoples to choose their own form of government; and

"Whereas the Allied Nations have assured our defeated enemies, Germany and Japan, the right to vote and choose for themselves the government they wish to be under; and

"Whereas the democratic policy of the United States Government has always been based on the principle that a true peace can be assured for the entire world only when peoples are allowed to govern themselves without interference from any outside source; and

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania has always been a liberty-loving nation and has ever struggled to assure for herself the free exercise of the God-given right to self-government; and

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a neutral nation, is now undergoing a process of complete extermination at the hands of Soviet Russia, supposedly pledged to the same principles of democracy as the other Allied Nations; and

"Whereas the present policy of Soviet Russia of the merciless deportation of the people of Lithuania into Siberia; of the ruthless destruction of her Government, industry, agriculture, and educational system; and the wholesale plunder of the entire population by killing and imprisonment, is a procedure not in accordance with any principle of humanity; and

"Whereas the recent Potsdam Conference failed to make mention of the Republic of Lithuania and the other Baltic Republics: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the United States Government continue to stand firmly by the principles of the Atlantic Charter and use its influence for the ultimate application of these principles to all nations, both large and small; be it further

"Resolved, That the United States Government continue to follow the policy of nonrecognition of Russian absorption of Lithuania and the Baltic States; be it further

"Resolved, That the United States Government take a definite stand toward the restoration of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania and the other Baltic republics; be it further

"Resolved, That we do hereby petition and request His Excellency Harry S. Truman to bring about positive action toward the cessation of such inhumane atrocities committed by Russia against Lithuania's institutions and population; be it further

"Resolved, That the people of the Republic of Lithuania, a neutral nation, be given the right to choose their own form of government; and thereby to hold their rightful place among independent nations in the postwar world; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Harry S. Truman; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable James F. Byrnes; to the Senators from Massachusetts, the Honorable DAVID I. WALSH and the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL; and to the Representative from the First Congressional District in Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON."

LONGINAS L. SVELNIS,
President.

TILLIE AUKSTIKALNIS,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF GREEN BAY (WIS.) NAVY CLUB

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Navy Club of the United States, Ship No. 18, Green Bay, Wis., requesting the Navy Department to return to Green Bay, Wis., the U. S. C. *432* or some similar ship, and that a naval reserve district be reestablished in Green Bay, Wis., the former home of the Thirty-fourth Division, United States Naval Reserve Corps, a unit which is now in active naval service of the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution received was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, by the Navy Club of the United States, Ship No. 18, Green Bay, Wis., in regular meeting assembled, That the United States Navy Department be requested to return to Green Bay, Wis., the U. S. C. *432* or some similar ship, and that a naval reserve district be reestablished in Green Bay, Wis., the former home of the Thirty-fourth Division, United States Naval Reserve Corps, which unit is now in active naval service of the United States.

Let a copy of this resolution be served on the Secretary of the Navy, United States Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and ROBERT LA FOLLETTE and Congressman JOHN BYRNES, and the Common Council of the City of Green Bay, with the request that each of them lend their respective efforts to effect the purpose of this resolution.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 1591. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy,

OCTOBER 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Alma B. Kidwell	113 Park Blvd. SE	Federal Communications Commission	$1,800

B. K. WHEELER, *Chairman.*

from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; with amendments (Rept. No. 623).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 1868. A bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 624).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING OF COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION ON MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) submitted by Mr. OVERTON on October 2, 1945, was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 9,000 additional copies of the hearing held before said committee on S. 555, entitled "A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, did the minority members of the committee give assent to the report?

Mr. HAYDEN. They not only gave assent but they were most anxious to get the additional copies.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. WHITE. That, added to the Senator's insistence, is sufficient.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

ELIZABETH C. BYRNE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 174, for which I ask present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 174), submitted by Mr. GERRY on September 18, 1945, was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Elizabeth C. Byrne, widow of James A. Byrne, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of September 1945, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relating to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 1464. A bill making the 14th day of August in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 1465. A bill extending certain recognition and rights to temporary members of the United States Coast Guard Reserve, including the Voluntary Port Security Force, and members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1466. A bill authorizing rehabilitation on the island of Guam; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. MEAD introduced Senate Joint Resolution 106, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

CERTIFICATES OF MERIT FOR VOLUNTARY WORKERS ON LOCAL PRICE AND RATIONING BOARDS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from New York will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 106) to authorize the award of certificates in recognition of the patriotic services of uncompensated personnel in the administration of the price control, rent control, and rationing programs, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in explanation of the joint resolution, I desire to say a few words.

The people of this country owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to the thousands of men and women who have served so long and so faithfully on our local war price and rationing boards. For nearly 4 years, more than a quarter of a million of them have worked without compensation, without regard for personal time and sacrifice, and at times without thanks, for one of the most difficult jobs of our entire home front effort.

With the Pearl Harbor attack, we were faced with the terrific task of winning a

total, global war. Our first concern was all-out production of war materials to aid our fighting allies and to successfully feed, clothe, and equip our own fighting forces. Yet we had to accomplish this without upsetting the economic structure of this Nation which had to be preserved in order to produce for war.

Within a few hours after Pearl Harbor, the wheels were set in motion for tire rationing, paving the way for the many other rationing programs that were to follow in the long, hard years ahead. And in a matter of hours, thousands of men and women in every community in the country responded to the urgent appeal to form what we now know as a local war price and rationing board. Since that time, approximately 50,000,000 man-hours have been contributed by these volunteers. Since then, about 1,000,000 Americans have volunteered at one time or another for work at local boards. During a peak period, 400,000 board members and their assistants contributed 10,000,000 man-hours on the job of rationing food, gasoline, tires, shoes, and other commodities to the people in their communities. Along with the rationing job, these uncompensated workers have had the difficult task of attempting to keep prices stable in their own communities. All of this was accomplished in true democratic fashion, within the framework of our Constitution, the very framework which Hitler said was too cumbersome and unwieldy to successfully combat his regimented dictatorship. The people, through Congress, enacted the necessary laws to wage an all-out war. These same people, your neighbors and mine, are the ones to whom we owe this debt of gratitude for the splendid job that they did, many times at great personal sacrifice and without any financial gain, in performing all of the detail work necessary to insure the success of the local war price and rationing boards.

With the end of rationing now in sight, many of these volunteers are able to accept an "honorable discharge." Certainly it is our duty and obligation to acknowledge the fight they have so successfully waged on our home front just as we are acknowledging the courageous fight of the men and women who won the war on the fighting fronts.

For, without a doubt, the people who served on our more than 5,500 local boards are responsible in substantial measure for this Nation's glorious victory. It is they who helped tune our vital transportation system to wartime tempo and kept it in continual motion. It is they who so unselfishly volunteered to see that the American people were able to get a fair share of food and other war-scarce supplies at fair prices. I do not believe that any one of us can ever fully appreciate the tremendous job they have done nor can we ever fully repay them in words or citations.

Nevertheless, we can in a small measure give outward manifestation of our appreciation for the arduous labors which these citizens so willingly gave in the fight for victory. Accordingly, I am offering a resolution in the Senate, acknowledging the patriotic contribution made by these uncompensated and volunteer workers and authorizing the President to award them certificates of merit as a token of our appreciation. As our sons and daughters undertook and successfully carried through to victory the greatest military task in history, so our patriotic citizens on the home front protected our Nation's economy. This vast army of workers at home was recruited from all walks of life—professional men and women, businessmen, men and women recruited from the ranks of labor, school teachers, students, and housewives. I am sure that all of my colleagues in the Senate join with me in this effort, as representatives of the people in Congress, to recognize their services in a formal manner.

Likewise, I am sure that I speak for all of our citizens who endured the wartime restrictions so that we could supply our men on the fighting fronts and divide what was left at home. With the successful conclusion of the war, many of the restrictions are no longer necessary—gasoline is no longer rationed; fuel oil is more plentiful; meat, butter, and other staple foods are in greater supply, and all of us anticipate a return to the full joy of all of God's bounty in this, the greatest land on earth.

We can remember in years to come that these Americans are living proof of the true meaning of America—democracy. We can remember that their efforts for the past 4 years are a glowing example of what Americans can accomplish by working together and for each other. They have truly shown us democracy in action.

More than this, we can try to repay our debt to them by continuing to cooperate with those who will remain to complete and write "finis" to the final chapter of wartime rationing.

I hope the joint resolution will receive favorable committee consideration and that before the story of the war is fully written these unselfish patriotic people who devoted so many hours to this very necessary work will be recognized by the Congress and that they will be given the citation of merit for which the joint resolution calls.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, an article from the Atlanta Constitution of September 6, 1945, entitled "A Cheer for the OPA Workers," which is in keeping with the purposes of the resolution, and an article from the Washington Sunday Star of September 9, 1945, entitled "OPA Carries on Despite Abuse," which gives a historical record of the wartime activities of the Office of Price Administration and rationing.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution of September 6, 1945]

A CHEER FOR THE OPA WORKERS

As the pressure of war eases, it is quite likely that personal tensions will ease. When that happens the public will be more generous with its estimate of OPA, which, despite admitted errors and bungles, has done a magnificent service, and will continue to do so in the declining emergency.

Because of OPA and other controls, the dollar continued to buy more than twice what it bought in the First World War, when there were no controls. OPA will continue to disappear. Regional Director Alexander Harris has announced the paid force will be cut in half within the next few weeks. But some controls, on the necessities, will be retained to prevent inflation and black-market abuses.

The Atlanta Constitution would like, in congratulating the OPA on its over-all record, to pay special tribute to the thousands of volunteer workers who served without pay throughout the war. Their work was not pleasant. The American public, even when it admits necessity of regulations, still does not like them. Few of those who complained at the counters of ration boards realized much of the work was being done as volunteer war services. It was real service to the Nation and the war effort.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of September 9, 1945]

OPA CARRIES ON DESPITE ABUSE—WHIPPING BOY OF WAR AGENCIES STILL SEEKS TO PREVENT INFLATION AND BRING FAIRER DISTRIBUTION OF SCARCE GOODS

(By Alexander P. George)

OPA, whipping boy of the Government's war agencies, set three records that probably will stand for a long, long time:

1. It did more to regulate the everyday living of millions of Americans than any other agency in history.

2. It was on the receiving end of more verbal brickbats than any organization ever set up to help the country in an emergency.

3. It was blamed for doing more things that it didn't do than any agency, including even the unpopular prohibition enforcement authority.

OPA—Office of Price Administration—was designated as a wartime agency, but is authorized to work against postwar inflation and collapse such as followed World War I. So it is concentrating on trying to keep prices controlled until supply and demand are fairly well balanced. It also continues to ration scarce essential goods.

Says OPA Administrator Chester Bowles: "I'll be more glad to get rid of regulations than anyone in the United States. But it's our duty to keep them until their removal can be safely accomplished without unfair distribution of scarce goods or the danger that prices will shoot upward as they did after World War I."

EIGHT MILLION ITEMS RATIONED

Funds are available to continue OPA until June 30, 1946. Its rationing power ends December 31 unless extended by law. Some Members of Congress urge that OPA be abolished now.

President Truman could close it out any time. However, he recently issued an order to "hold the cost-of-living line." Moreover, sugar is likely to be rationed for another year, and there will be pressure to keep rent controls in some areas for several months.

OPA price regulations have covered almost everything the typical American family buys, eats, wears and uses. They applied to some 8,000,000 different commodities and services, from eggs and onions to shoe shines, piano tuning, and funerals.

It regulated at all levels the prices of goods bought and sold by some 3,000,000 establishments. It controlled rentals for some 15,000,000 dwelling units—houses, apartments, and rooms in hotels and boarding houses—in 382 defense rental areas where some 92,000,000 persons lived.

CONSTANT TARGET OF CRITICISM

When the war ended, OPA was administering 10 rationing programs. It handled 13 major rationing programs in all. This involved the printing and distribution of one hundred and twenty-eight to one hundred

and thirty-one million copies of each of four war ration books; of millions of gasoline and fuel-oil rationing books; and hundreds of thousands of purchase certificates for autos, tires, and other rationed goods.

OPA was an almost constant target of criticism by Members of Congress, businessmen, farmers, and the general public. Its officials were denounced as "bungling bureaucrats," "long-haired professors," the "slide-rule boys," "Roosevelt's gestapo," "czars," and "Communists."

OPA was blamed by some people for the shortage of nylon stockings, for rancid butter, chilly houses, the lack of banana splits.

It was accused of depriving babies of diapers and of taking Christmas trees away from little children. It was bawled out for the scarcity of alarm clocks and girdles, for Jimmy Byrnes' midnight curfew, and for closing the race tracks.

When the draft of 18-year-old boys went into effect, OPA offices in various sections of the country received letters and phone calls berating the agency for "making our boys go to war."

During the cigarette famine, a man complained to a district OPA office. Informed that cigarettes were not rationed and OPA has no control over the supply, he said, "If that's true, then what the hell do all your employees do with their time?"

CREATED IN APRIL 1941

OPA was created in April 1941 by Executive order of President Roosevelt. It was first designated the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply. In August 1941 the name was changed to Office of Price Administration, and control of civilian supplies was transferred to the War Production Board.

In January 1942 WPB delegated the responsibility for rationing to OPA.

Three men have occupied the Nation's No. 1 hot seat:

Burly, brusque Leon Henderson, New Deal economist.

Prentiss M. Brown, lawyer and former United States Senator from Michigan.

Chester Bowles, retired New York advertising executive, still sweating it out on the reconversion front.

Henderson resigned in December 1942 on grounds of ill health. He was under heavy fire from Congress for his handling of price and rationing problems. He was also in bad with farm groups, and his belligerent defense of OPA policies antagonized members of congressional committees.

Brown, more soft-spoken than Henderson, took over in January 1943. He said he hoped "to make it plain to the people why we must do the things we do." He ran into trouble when he opposed congressional moves for increased prices for farm products and when OPA rolled back prices.

SAYS CONTROLS MUST CONTINUE

In October 1943, Bowles, who had been general manager of the agency, became Administrator. Bowles admitted mistakes had been made by OPA and brought more businessmen into some of the agency's top jobs.

When butter and meat became very scarce and ration points suddenly were canceled early this year, consumer complaints were the loudest in OPA history. Black-market operations reached a gigantic scale.

Bowles said "American housewives are paying $1,200,000,000 tribute yearly to operators of food black markets—a very great national disgrace." He estimated that overcharges for clothing, tires, gasoline, and other items would account for several million dollars more.

He maintained, however, that the vast majority of businessmen were honest, and that in fairness to these businessmen it was necessary to clean up the black markets.

Bowles asserts that price controls during the war saved the Government and the buying public billions of dollars. He says there still is "a dangerous gap between sudden victory and sound prosperity," and has asked for "cool heads and continued cooperation of business, workers, farmers, and consumers to see the stabilization job through."

Rationing chronology of the OPA

	Rationing began	Rationing ended
Tires	Jan. 5, 1942	
Autos	Feb. 26, 1942	(1)
Typewriters	Mar. 13, 1942	Apr. 27, 1944
Sugar	May 5, 1942	
Gasoline:		
In East	May 15, 1942	
Nation-wide	Dec. 1, 1942	Aug. 15, 1945
Bicycles	July 9, 1942	Sept. 23, 1944
Men's rubber boots and work shoes	Oct. 5, 1942	
Fuel oil:		
In East	Oct. 1, 1942	
Nation-wide	Mar. 14, 1943	Aug. 15, 1945
Coffee	Nov. 29, 1942	July 29, 1943
Stoves:		
In 30 States	Dec. 19, 1942	
Nation-wide	Aug. 24, 1943	
Coal and wood		Oct. 15, 1944
Oil		Aug. 15, 1945
Shoes	Feb. 9, 1943	
Processed foods	Mar. 1, 1943	Aug. 15, 1945
Meats and fats	Mar. 29, 1943	

[1] WPB undecided yet whether new autos will be rationed.

MERITORIOUS CLAIMS OF CERTAIN RESIDENTS OF GUAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to submit, for appropriate reference, amendments intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 1139) for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims, and request that they be printed in the usual form and also in the RECORD. I also ask that a short statement of explanation of the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts for himself and Mr. TAFT will be received, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and printed, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments submitted by Mr. WALSH for himself and Mr. TAFT to Senate bill 1139, are as follows:

On page 2, line 4, after the comma and before the word "of", insert "including waiver of any claims against the War Damage Corporation." Delete the words "or injury."

On page 2, line 9, delete the comma and the words "or personal injury or death."

On page 2, line 14, insert the word "or" before the word "destruction." Delete the comma and the words "or injury."

On page 3, line 11, after "$5,000", insert a comma and the words "or any claims for death or personal injury to residents of Guam arising under the conditions herein set forth as a basis for property damage claims."

The statement presented by Mr. WALSH is as follows:

These amendments have been prepared and are offered after consultation with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] who objected to passage of the bill S. 1139 the last time it was called on the calendar. The amendments are designed to meet Senator TAFT's objections.

The amendments will eliminate any possibility of a double recovery on a claim. A claimant could not recover from both the Navy and from the War Damage Corporation for the same damage. The amendments would also require the certification of death and personal injury claims to the Congress in the same manner as is now provided in the bill for claims of more than $5,000.

PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS ON SURRENDER OF GERMANY AND JAPAN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in this hour of military triumph, the United Nations stand forth as the greatest alliance of comrades-in-arms—the strongest force for waging war in all recorded history. Invincible in war, this mighty brotherhood of nations will become an equally powerful association for the restoration of order to the world and the preservation of the peace so bitterly won.

The beginning of the peace is signalized by the unconditional surrender of the enemy. It is proper, therefore, that a compilation of the surrender documents be printed with accompanying addresses and statements of the President of the United States, the supreme commanders and of the defeated leaders. I, therefore, ask that such compilation prepared under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate, by the Senate Library, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FULL EMPLOYMENT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio statement on full employment made by him on August 4, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

INSURANCE JOURNAL—COMMENTS ON SOUTHEASTERN UNDERWRITERS DECISION

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Regulation Let's Face It Now," published in the Insurance Field of September 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY COL. ROBERT R. McCORMICK

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick October 2, 1945, before the Washington Advertising Club, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PROGRAM BY AMERICAN PLANT FOOD COUNCIL

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a declaration of policy and program by the American Plant Food Council, Inc., under date of September 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATOMIC BOMB LESSON—ARTICLE BY COLLIERS

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Atomic Bomb Lesson," from Colliers magazine for September 29, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact——

THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BILBO. Before proceeding further, Mr. President, conscious of the rules of the Senate governing debate, I realize that, strictly speaking, when a Senator yields the floor to another to make a speech or statement, or for anything else, the Senator so yielding loses the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that in this case the Senator will not lose the floor by yielding to other Senators.

Mr. BILBO. I wanted to have an understanding about that. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I thank my distinguished colleague from Mississippi, and the President pro tempore.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the strike situation in this country, as we all know, is very serious. What do my colleagues think would be the reaction of the American people, including the striking unions of our country, if they were to read in the newspapers that the President, his Cabinet, the Supreme Court, and the Members of Congress had gone out on strike, and had thrown picket lines around Government buildings in order to prevent Federal employees from working? No doubt the reaction of all Americans, including the unions, would probably be, "In this critical period, this is close to rebellion." They would be correct, because a strike against the Government is only one step removed from rebellion against it. President Coolidge said that on one occasion.

There are occasions when strikes are a necessity, to protect the inherent rights of labor. What is now happening does not present such a situation. The condition is just the reverse.

A strike against the people which deprives them of such essential services as food, fuel, transportation, communication, and other crucial goods and services is well nigh an act of treason. We know what the break-down of transportation has meant in France, and in the other countries of Europe. We know the problem there now is not so much the production of food, as it is transportation. The whole continent is disrupted, and people will die this winter, not because food is not available somewhere, but because transportation is not available. Moreover, people will freeze to death on the continent of Europe because transportation is not available to move the available fuel.

Mr. President, the situation is pretty serious in this country. I say it can no more be tolerated in a government of law and order than can any crime against law-abiding citizens. But at the present moment, in this critical period, every strike, no matter what the field in which it is occurring, is an act of sabotage against American reconversion. We might well dwell upon that.

We have poured billions of dollars into production plants for war purposes. We have been planning and dreaming and thinking of the day when we could reconvert, when we could embark upon production for peace. But right now, when the pent-up demands of 140,000,000 people should be met, they cannot be met because of strikes. These are strikes against American prosperity and against American safety, as I shall show in a few moments.

The strike situation will probably grow worse before it becomes better. The great rank and file of honest American labor is being guided by judas-goat leaders down a trail which will lead to eventual elimination of many rights which the unions and American labor have worked hard to obtain, and which they are entitled to keep.

A HISTORY OF FALSE EDUCATION OF LABOR

America is now suffering from the New Deal's false education of the past decade, which taught labor that it could do no wrong. The air is black with New Deal chickens coming home to roost, chickens of a false philosophy, of fundamentally wrong thinking. But the American public, not the New Deal, is the real sufferer now, and because of that, it is going to remember this strike disease in the years ahead, in 1946 and 1948, and it is going to act to eradicate it forever from the American scene.

Mr. President, the crisis is with us; we are nearer to the brink than we think, and the crisis must be met now. A mere watch-and-see attitude is unthinkable. We watched and saw all through the war. Fourteen thousand strikes occurred, costing 24,000,000 man days, when men in uniform needed the materials and the arms which could have been produced.

The no-strike pledge was respected by the overwhelming majority of American workers, and for that we humbly bow and say thank you. But there were those who did not play the game. The no-strike pledge was violated while our boys were dying on foreign battlefields. It was violated by the same irresponsible racketeering minority which is creating industrial havoc today.

Mr. President, we have been told, in the fundamental philosophy of the American way, that each man is to a great extent his brother's keeper. In this economic and political set-up in America let us see how that thought works out if it is not put into action.

In Detroit a short time ago, in a concern which we will call X, 11 men were accused of attacking a foreman. He was terribly abused. The 11 men were dismissed by the management. On appeal to the appropriate Government authority, 7 of the 11 were reinstated, but the other 4, the Government authorities said, should have been discharged. One of them had left the State. Three men, then, who had violated the labor code, we might say, were justifiably discharged.

As a result, men who lacked vision took a group of some 2,000 workmen out of that plant. They were producing certain materials which Ford needed. The consequence was that Ford had to shut down. Fifty thousand men went out of the Ford plant.

Was that all that was affected? No. The wives and the children of Ford's workmen were affected. Who else? The businessmen in the community, the grocer, the butcher, the candlestick maker, every one who received the benefit of the economic currents of the wages Ford would have paid during the weeks, was detrimentally affected.

Was that all? No. Every Ford dealer in the United States was affected, and every workingman working for Ford dealers was affected. Every businessman in the community where the Ford dealer traded was affected, because there was a lack of vision originally in the leadership of the 2,000 men in the plant where 3 men were justifiably discharged because they assaulted a foreman.

Mr. President, we can see how the ramifications extend. The situation calls for something to be done by government. It calls for us in this legislative body to have a little more iron in us. We, as individuals, are our brothers' keepers, and we in Congress have the same obligation generally.

Mr. President, why did not the administration act to control the racketeering minority before it precipitated the present strike epidemic? That is the question. It is a vital question which you and I have a right to have answered.

THE GREAT STRIKE DANGER AHEAD

If this epidemic becomes worse and worse, and it affects transportation, as there is intimation that it will, and Washington cannot have shipped into it the food and the coal it needs, our people will know what Europe is experiencing. War caused the condition over there. Are we going to have a repetition of it in peacetime over here in every city in the Nation? This thing has to be met head on. It is not a challenge to 99 percent of labor except in this respect: Labor has had years and years to clean its own house, to conduct or administer its affairs in the democratic way, but in many instances it has let the racketeer mind dominate, and now the thing has come into the open so that every citizen in America is beginning to think about it. I receive letters from all over my State, from laboring men, from the wives of laboring men, as well as from management, saying it is time that Congress take some action.

The fuel situation is particularly alarming. Are our home owners and other citizens to freeze because irresponsible labor leaders decree strikes? Think it through. Are the schools to be closed and the children to be sent home because fuel is unavailable, made so because of strikes? Are the stores and the factories and the hospitals to close because they cannot get heat? Is it mere coincidence that the administration fostered its plan to ship 6,000,000 tons of coal to Europe just before the domestic strike? Did it innocently miss the fact

that coal stocks had been running continuing deficits, and that the more depleted they became the stronger would be the hands of the mine unions?

Mr. President, we do not want Europeans to freeze any more than we want Americans to freeze, but we realize that if the European peoples invested one-half as much energy and ingenuity in digging the coal that is in Europe and in utilizing whatever transportation is available to move it, as they expend energy and ingenuity in bickering with one another, then there would be sufficient coal to heat every hearth in that ravaged continent.

We have said time and time again that in dealing with war-ravaged Europe it is the function of this blessed country to be the Good Samaritan. The Good Samaritan was one who helped another so he could help himself. The Good Samaritan was not a Santa Claus. He was one who rebuilt his fellow man who was in need. And that should be our function in the days ahead. If we in this country do not have the brains and the vision to coordinate the resources that are here—manpower, demand, factories, material—into a great machine of production, then we also will freeze.

It seems apparent, Mr. President, that while we are participating in debate, other men are laying the groundwork for economic civil war. While we are dealing in soft words, other men are dealing in ugly actions. While we profess to want to do everything for veterans, at this moment their jobs are being destroyed by strikes. In fact, the veterans are being forced to go to the very highest court in the land in defense of their elementary rights of reemployment in their old jobs or jobs of like seniority, status, and pay! The veterans are being made the goat just as the public is being made the goat. And neither the veterans nor the public are going to stand for that very much longer!

We should not countenance one day longer these economic skirmishes leading to economic war. How can we expect to maintain world peace when we cannot even maintain industrial peace within our own Nation?

Mr. President, I know that false accusations of labor-baiting and union-busting will be hurled at me because I state these truths. I have been a laboring man. I have worked in sawmills of northern Wisconsin for 15 cents an hour 10 hours a day. I know labor. I work longer now at my present job. That is not the issue. I have no more time for racketeers in management than I have in labor. And what is a racketeer? A racketeer is one who wants to run the show according to his own rule, not according to the law of the land; who forgets that he is his brother's keeper. I recognize that such conditions obtain in every segment of society. We find them even in the clergy, we find them among men wealthy in this world's goods, and among men who are poor. But recognizing the fact—and that is the big thing—that the racketeer mind is there, it is our job to see to it that it does not damage the general welfare. That is our challenge.

Labor has an atomic bomb in its hands. It is playing with it recklessly and wildly. That atomic bomb must be controlled by the Government before it blows up labor and America. End strikes or strikes will end America.

Let me propose the following actions in the form of a Public Charter of Freedom from Labor Abuses. I propose that we enter into these actions without rancor, without prejudice, but with an iron determination to secure justice and industrial tranquillity.

A PUBLIC CHARTER OF FREEDOM FROM LABOR ABUSES

First. Reevaluate the entire Wagner Act. That act obviously filled a certain need in bygone years, but it is hopelessly obsolete and even harmful today to the best interests of the American people, including labor. It is a segmental act, designed for only one segment of our population. It must be revised in the interest of the public welfare. We have legislated segment-wild. We have made legislation for this segment and that segment, but one great over-all segment has not been regarded, and that is the public. And now if we have any vision we are going to see to it that the public is not disregarded.

Second. Immediately enact legislation to have compulsory arbitration protect the public interest.

Third. Establish the policy of having representatives of the public participate in every labor-management conference.

Fourth. Enact any necessary clarifications of the draft law to insure full protection of the reemployment rights of veterans.

Fifth. Insure full protection by law enforcement officers to all veterans and others who want to take up jobs vacated by strikers.

Sixth. Establish the legal responsibility of unions for all violations of contract in the form of wildcat strikes, and so forth.

Seventh. Require the full and accurate reporting of union finances and officers in the same manner as we require such reports from corporations.

Eighth. Establish the labor-management-public conferences in Washington on a continuing basis rather than on a one-time basis.

Ninth. Request of labor leaders that they themselves come forth with suggestions for legislation that will end the menace of strikes.

Mr. President, I say now, as I said before we went into this war, that if I were in the councils of labor I would say to labor, "This is your opportunity. Come forth with suggestions for constructive legislation in your field which will protect the public interest." I repeat that idea. This country does not belong to any one group. It does not belong to the Democrats or the Republicans, to management or labor, or to the farmer. It belongs to all of us, and in this great world crisis if we are going to meet this situation head-on, it must be by a unity of spirit within us which will bring about constructive action.

Tenth. Amend the Sherman Anti-trust Act to make labor organizations whose members are engaged in Interstate Commerce subject to that act. Prohibit them from engaging in unreasonable restraints of trade, for example, those restraints designed to compel the hiring of useless labor, to prevent the use of cheaper material, improved equipment, or more efficient methods.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion it is time for this great body to speak. It is time for us to sense that the voice of the people speaks through us. It is time for us to act, not with rancor, not with love of one and hate of the other, but with the hope in our breasts that we can go forward to solve this problem. It is only by measures such as these that we can protect the paramount rights of the public.

AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD JAPAN

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EILBO] has the floor, and he can yield only for the purpose of placing matters in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to make a statement.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHEELER. I object to the Senator from Mississippi yielding for anything but a question.

Mr. BILBO. I had a definite understanding with the Chair that by unanimous consent I could be permitted to yield to my colleagues for matters of importance which they wished to place in the RECORD, without losing the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. I object to the Senator yielding for anything except a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Montana withhold his objection? The Senator from Nebraska wishes to propound a unanimous-consent request. Having gone as far as we have gone, in the opinion of the Chair, the Senator from Mississippi should be allowed to yield. However, from now on the rule will be strictly adhered to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not hear the last remark of the Chair. I understood when I came into the Chamber that in response to a parliamentary inquiry propounded by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi the President pro tempore stated that the Senator from Mississippi would be permitted to yield to a Senator for a statement. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. That was merely stated as the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to make a statement and insert some exhibits in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I shall have to object. I dislike to object, but apparently the Senator from Mississippi has definitely stated that he intends to filibuster against the bill. For that reason I shall have to object.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the distinguished Senator from Montana would withhold his objection. I am for the bill, and I know that the distinguished Senator knows that I am for it. I do not rise in an attempt to filibuster

against the bill. However, I feel that in justice to the position which I recently took relative to our policy towards Japan, I should be accorded the privilege not only of placing some exhibits in the RECORD, but of making a supplemental statement relative to my challenge of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Acheson, and with respect to the clarification which I asked relative to our policy toward Japan.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I dislike to object. However, as I have previously stated, I feel that I must object. If I do not object to the Senator from Nebraska making a statement, then any other Senator can ask unanimous consent to make a statement. It would simply mean that the Senator from Mississippi could continue indefinitely to filibuster against the bill, and one Senator could hold up the business of the United States Senate. I feel compelled to object.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me for a question?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, is the Chair going to hold me to the strict construction of the rule?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to do so if there is objection. The Chair has no option in the matter.

Mr. BILBO. The Chair will remember that earlier in the day I propounded a parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair stated that it would be proper for me to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair stated that in his opinion it would be proper for the Senator to yield to other Senators for the purpose of placing matters in the RECORD.

Mr. BILBO. I do not know what the Senator from Nebraska wishes to do.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. Under the ruling of the Chair I cannot yield without losing the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can yield for a question at any time.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the decision of the Chair, and because of the fact that I feel this statement should be made now, without further delay, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to incorporate it in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the statement will be embodied in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

The statement submitted by Mr. WHERRY is as follows:

Mr. President, a lot of muddy water has gone over the dam since I warned the American people of the confusion in our Japanese policy. Our immediate and long-range policies and objectives in the Far East have become the most crucial issue, confronting the American people, and I want to call to the attention of my colleagues that the whole question of our foreign policy toward Japan is hourly, becoming more and more confused.

It will serve no useful purpose to continue a discussion of our policies toward Japan by inferring they are based upon personal opinions, likes, or dislikes, or on a basis of a hard or a soft peace. These arguments are all irrelevant, and only add to the present confusion.

The real issue is the failure of our Government to clarify its policy in clear, consistent, and understandable language. Until this is done we shall find ourselves becoming even more confused as to where we are going in the Far East, and what our intentions are toward the Japanese people.

May I review a series of plain contradictions that have occurred over the past several days, contradictions which have arisen in our highest Government circles:

1. On September 17, General MacArthur announced that within a very brief time, in his opinion, he would be able to discharge his obligations as Supreme Allied Commander in Japan, with 200,000 troops.

On September 18, the following day, the Baltimore Sun carried the following story:

"President Truman today backed up Gen. Douglas MacArthur's plans to slash the occupation army in Japan. Mr. Truman, thereby, gave little comfort to the State Department which had questioned the general's estimate."

Also the President is quoted as saying:

"If Japan can be occupied with fewer troops, so, too, probably can Germany."

But, Mr. President, according to the Baltimore Sun of the same day, Mr. Acheson let it be known that he was moving to investigate General MacArthur's statement and expressed amazement that anyone could predict the future needs of Japan at this time.

2. On September 19, Mr. Acheson took occasion to contradict the President's support of General MacArthur by deliberately attacking the general with the statement:

"The occupation forces are the instruments of policy and not the determinants of policy."

It was this statement that drew the following comment from Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times of September 23, and I quote Mr. Krock:

"It was an open rebuke of the supreme commander by the principal department of the United States Government under the President."

Mr. Krock went on to say:

"Mr. Acheson had had no professional diplomatic experience and is not one to wear his authority lightly, not even as a deputy. * * * so, whether or not he took superior counsel or got superior instructions before making either or both of his public statements reproving General MacArthur, it was very typical of him to make those statements."

III. Mr. President, realizing the seriousness of the situation which this confusion had caused, and in view of the fact that Mr. Acheson had not yet been confirmed by the Senate. I felt it my duty to do what I could to help clarify the confusion which this conflict in high Government circles had created. I took the liberty of forwarding a series of nine questions to Mr. Acheson and requested his answers, advising him that I felt I needed these answers in order to enable me to vote intelligently on his confirmation.

On September 22, however, the New York Herald Tribune, released a story by John C. Metcalfe, its Washington correspondent, that the clarification of our policy toward Japan, which I was attempting to ascertain, through my letter to Mr. Acheson, was contained in a directive, which the administration had drawn up but seemed unwilling to release.

According to Mr. Metcalfe: "The directive which bears a striking similarity to the Allied control plan for Germany, is described by officials as 'a hot potato' because of its political implications. What these officials mean is that the release of the control plan at this time would have the effect of reaffirming and emphasizing the stinging implication of Mr. Acheson's words that Washington and not General MacArthur is the policy-maker in this matter."

Mr. President, what policy—Mr. Acheson's, General MacArthur's, Secretary of State Byrnes' or the President's?

Why, Mr. President, the very purpose of the White House directive states, and I quote:

"This document is a statement of general initial policy relating to Japan after surrender. * * * It does not deal with all matters relating to the occupation of Japan requiring policy determination."

But, Mr. President, the policies with which it does deal are stated in such general and ambiguous terms that the following three major questions, which the American people need to have answered in order to intelligently support any policy, in the Far East have only been further confused.

1. Just what are our commitments to the Japanese under the Potsdam terms of surrender?

2. Just what are the functions General MacArthur is serving in his capacity as Supreme Commander of the Allied forces in the Far East?

3. What this Government means by, and intends to do, with the statement from this White House directive:

"Changes in the form of government initiated by the Japanese people or Government in the direction of modifying its futile and authoritarian tendencies are to be permitted and favored in the event that the effectuation of such changes involve the use of force by the Japanese people or Government against persons opposed thereto, the Supreme Commander should intervene only where necessary to insure the security of his forces and the attainment of all other objective of the occupation."

Mr. President, since the White House directive did not answer these questions, I felt that certainly Mr. Acheson would attempt to do so in his reply.

But, on the 24th of September, I received from him an acknowledgment of my letter and for his answer he substituted this White House directive.

IV. On Monday afternoon, September 24, I challenged the confirmation of Mr. Acheson, as Under Secretary of State, because I feared the policy that he announced, and felt that it was too crucial to be unclarified either in high Government circles, or in the minds of the American people. My position was further clarified by a statement I made over the radio that night, and I ask unanimous consent to here insert exhibit 1, a copy of my remarks.

EXHIBIT 1

"Question 1. Senator WHERRY, what do you believe to be the basic issue in the controversy between the State Department and General MacArthur?

"Answer 1. Mr. Leitch, the issue is crucial, as I see it. It is not in any sense personal, such as between Mr. Acheson and General MacArthur, or between Mr. Acheson and myself. It does not concern the question of civil versus military authority. It has nothing to do with a hard or soft peace. The issue is whether this Government intends to carry out provisions of the Potsdam Declaration or whether this Government intends behind the scenes to go beyond those provisions.

"Question 2. Senator WHERRY, where does your opposition to Mr. Acheson's confirmation figure in this picture?

"Answer 2. Mr. Leitch, on last Thursday, Mr. Acheson inferred that this Government intended to go beyond the Potsdam agreement to destroy the will of the Japanese people to wage war by going so far as to foster a social and economic revolution in

Japan, no matter what the cost in American lives and property.

"Question 3. Well, Senator WHERRY, what do you figure this cost might be?

"Answer 3. In the first place, it would mean the destruction of all the Japanese authority which General MacArthur has thus far so ably used to save American lives and property, and to end all further resistance by Japan. If we violate the Potsdam agreement by inciting a social, economic revolution in Japan, it could not help but result in a bitter civil, religious, and racial war which well might end in eventual communization.

"Question 4. What evidence is there, Senator WHERRY, that a smear campaign is actually under way against General MacArthur to force him out as Allied commander?

"Answer 4. The newspaper PM has taken the lead in smearing General MacArthur along with the Daily Worker by charging that he is a reactionary, a collaborator with Fascist groups, a political office seeker, and an advocate of a soft peace. This program which has been going on for weeks is summed up in the report of the Communist rally in New York that appears in an AP dispatch today, which tells of the boos and hisses that greeted General MacArthur's name when 12,000 Communist Party workers heard it mentioned. I might say that from the thousands of letters I have received from all over the country and from reading the press which I believe represents the real American people, my fears are widely shared.

"Question 5. Well, Senator WHERRY, what do you believe will be the end result of our present policy toward Japan?

"Answer 5. If this policy of confusion continues, it means anything might happen in Japan. General MacArthur said that Japan is demoralized and prostrate—that Japan will be totally disarmed by October 15—that her Navy is totally destroyed—that no food or clothing is to be given to the Japanese people this winter, that they are on their own socially and economically—and that as a power she is completely done and cannot hope to rebuild herself because of her present demoralized state. If, in addition to this, an economic and social revolution is deliberately created in Japan, the result might be that General MacArthur will fail to establish a democratic government, which is intended by the Potsdam agreement, and a government of collectivism might emerge victoriously over a contemplated democracy in Japan."

The second conflict in high Government circles over our confused Japanese policy came on the reaction of President Truman and Secretary of State Byrnes to Russia's attack on General MacArthur and her demand for participation in Allied control of Japan.

I. According to the Washington Post of September 27:

"The Russian demand made in London for four-power control of Japan came as a complete surprise to President Truman. * * * And from his answers to a series of questions, most listeners drew the inference that he didn't look with favor upon the Russian proposal."

II. The New York Times of the same day said:

"President Truman said today that 'the Soviet Union had never expressed any dissatisfaction with the United States independent control of Japan.'"

"But the President added: 'In the event of any differences in opinion of the Allies about the control of Japan the policy of the United States would govern.'"

Yet, Mr. President, on September 30, the New York Times carried the story that the Big Five had accepted a new occupation policy for Japan. Quite obviously this was a move that completely contradicted President Truman's own interpretation of the White House press release of September 22.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert exhibit 2, an article appearing in the New York Times, September 30, entitled "Big Five Accept New Japan Plan":

EXHIBIT 2

"BIG FIVE ACCEPT NEW JAPAN PLAN—MEETING IN WASHINGTON CALLED TO MAP OCCUPATION POLICY—CONTROL GROUP PREDICTED

"(By Herbert L. Matthews)

"LONDON, September 29.—A new plan for the occupation of Japan has been accepted by representatives of the major Allied Powers meeting here in London for the Council of Foreign Ministers. There will be a preliminary commission meeting in Washington, to be followed almost certainly by the establishment of some variation of a control commission that will sit in Tokyo.

"This was divulged late this evening by the office of the United States Secretary of State James F. Byrnes in a carefully worded communique basing American consent upon Britain rather than the Soviet Union, and making it seem as if Washington's desires were being fulfilled. However, as these dispatches demonstrated in the last few days, there has been a keen struggle going on behind the scenes of the Council of Foreign Ministers and the original American plan, which was merely for an advisory commission to sit in Washington, has now been greatly broadened and strengthened, and in time the seat of the commission will be in Tokyo, as other powers desired.

"UNITED STATES RETAINS MAJOR CONTROL

"At the same time, major control is going to be kept in American hands and it can be stated confidently that there is not going to be any such control commission as now sits in Berlin. Gen. Douglas MacArthur and his advisers will remain primary factors.

"The announcement was made in the following terms tonight:

" 'Secretary of State James F. Byrnes announced that he has received from British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin consent of the Government to a proposal made by the United States Government August 22 for the establishment of a Far Eastern Commission to formulate a policy for carrying out the Japanese terms.

" 'The Commission will also be asked to consider whether a control council should be established and, if so, the power which should be vested in it.

" 'The Soviet Union and China had already given consent to the establishment of a commission. France, the Philippine Islands, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the Netherlands will be invited to become members of the Commission. The first meeting will be convened in Washington in the near future.

" 'In agreeing to the establishment of a commission Mr. Bevin stated that was his understanding that the Commission could determine whether it should meet in Washington or Tokyo. Mr. Byrnes confirmed Mr. Bevin's understanding and said that the United States representatives would be instructed to vote that the Commission hold its meetings in Tokyo.

" 'Mr. Bevin also requested that India be invited to become a member of the Commission. Mr. Byrnes said that the United States would agree to the request and that he would submit the request to the Governments of the Soviet Union and China for their approval.' "

I also ask at this point in the RECORD to insert an editorial from the Washington Post of September 27, exhibit 3:

EXHIBIT 3

"MOLOTOV'S BOMB

"What happens when there is no preliminary agreement on an agenda was illustrated by Molotov's request at the Council of Foreign Ministers in London for the establishment of an Allied Council on Japan. Nothing about Japan was intended to arise in London. One can only surmise why the Russians brought it up. Certainly not because they are in quest, as the other countries are, of innocuous subjects, on or off the agenda, upon which agreement might be obtained. That is not their technique. Their technique at present seems to be to apply the logic of an international approach to problems which we have held are immune from it. Perhaps they knew beforehand that they would get support from other nations who fought side by side with the United States in the war against Japan, particularly Australia and New Zealand. If they didn't know, they made a shrewd calculation, for the Australasians rushed to their support. And Mr. Bevin, who had immediately sided with Mr. Byrnes in rejecting the entry of Japan into the London discussions, found himself caught in an intra-empire disputation from which he is now extricating himself.

"In point of fact, the Allied Powers for a month or so have been more or less restive about the way the United States is exercising leadership in the matter of Japan. The requisite authority is not complete on the public record. On August 14 President Truman announced that 'the surrender will be made to MacArthur in his capacity as supreme Allied commander in chief.' This was a new appointment. It also seemed to have been specifically accepted by the Russians. At any rate, the Russians underwrote both the Potsdam terms and the clarification which was subsequently sent to Japan by Secretary Byrnes. And their representative appeared at the surrender ceremony and signed his name in due form and order under the signature of General MacArthur as the supreme commander for the Allied Powers."

"For some time there has been a wisecrack circulating in the Capital over the preposition in the MacArthur title. Some wag, probably in the Navy, started the story that MacArthur felt he was acting as supreme commander of the Allied Powers, not for them. If there is any wonder on this score among Americans, think of the questioning among foreigners, particularly after the statement of intentions that General MacArthur laid down on September 17. Since then, to be sure, General MacArthur has got back on the beam and has admitted that he is only the executant of a policy which is determinable, in the new jargon, at the highest diplomatic level. But what is that level? The Russians in London asked the question, and we do, too. It was certainly a surprise to read the White House statement on Japan occupation policy on September 23 saying, 'Although every effort will be made, by consultation and by constitution of appropriate advisory bodies, to establish policies for the conduct of the occupation and the control of Japan which will satisfy the principal Allied Powers, in the event of any differences among them, the policies of the United States will govern.'

"Perhaps the State Department may shed some light on this question now that the Russians have raised the issue. The Russians certainly have a point. It is a pity that it was not anticipated by the setting up in Washington of an Allied commission which can deal with the high policy that the supreme commander is charged with administering. The Allied world has reposed a great deal of trust in the United States. We must not abuse it. Not that we can allow any interference with the details of administration such as were mentioned by Molotov when he dragged Japan into the London parley. That would simply botch up the occupation. The United Nations in general seem to be fully prepared to intrust MacArthur with substantive authority as their agent, because they know the weight we have been carrying in the operations against Japan. As to Russia, we feel sure that the Molotov point is in great part a maneuver, and that Moscow is no exception to this rule.

The Russians ought to be grateful to the United States for giving them the tip at Potsdam which enabled them to put forward their war declaration and so square an account or two before the Japanese gave in."

The third, and even greater contradiction, which has caused confusion and the highest concern, in high Government circles is: What does this Government mean by the directive to General MacArthur—not to interfere with any social, economic, or political upheaval in Japan. It is at this point that the basic contradiction of our whole policy towards Japan becomes more and more obvious.

No informed person of my acquaintance believes that a democracy can be established in Japan unless the United States is determined to start from the ground and rebuild a Japanese society. This is admitted to be a policy that will take many many years; and I am convinced that it is this policy that was advocated, and is now being advocated by the policymakers both in and out of the State Department, who are still our best informed experts on Japan; and that such a policy was rejected because it was too costly and because we did not have the technical advisors to make such a policy work.

Furthermore, this policy would have necessitated complete unconditional surrender which would have removed every single Japanese authority, including the Emperor himself.

This talk of our new dealers, our leftwingers, and our professional internationalists that they want to establish a democracy, through revolution, in the midst of a medieval society, should be squared by the American people that our Bill of Rights democracy has taken over 150 years to build and this canot be transplanted to the Japanese people or any other people overnight.

At this point in my remarks I would like to insert an article entitled "Lack of Realism in Tackling of Japanese Problems," by Lowell Mellett, which appeared in the Evening Star of September 25, 1945:

EXHIBIT 4

"LACK OF REALISM SEEN BY WRITER IN TACKLING OF JAPANESE PROBLEMS

"(By Lowell Mellett)

"Both in Washington and in Tokyo we seem to be tackling the problem of Japan in a confusion of high purpose and hard realism.

"General MacArthur indicates to Higashi-Kuni's government a desire that woman suffrage be instituted in Japan. That comes under the head of high purpose. But the general forgets how such things come to pass in a democracy. He forgets women achieved the ballot in this country through a long, patient process of educating the men, plus a remarkable capacity for making themselves a national nuisance.

"He forgets how they picketed the White House in their efforts to win over the weary Wilson, who believed either that they weren't ready for suffrage or that the country wasn't ready for them to have it. He forgets how they got themselves arrested and thrown in jail—although the cavalry wasn't called from Fort Myer to ride them down—all as part of their desperate determination to make the country conscious of their rights as citizens.

"Myself, won over early by the women's point of view and by their tactics, I don't see why the women of Japan should have the ballot handed to them on a silver platter made in the United States. If they don't get it the hard way, it probably won't mean much to them.

"As for realism, the general seems to be carrying out with energy and dispatch his instructions to demobilize and demilitarize the once flowery kingdom.

"PUBLISHED INSTRUCTIONS

"On the realistic side, too, are the published instructions from Washington that the general is not to interfere if the Japanese people decide to toss the Emperor into the limbo of forgotten men. Our policy, says the instructions, 'does not commit the supreme commander to support the Emperor or any other governmental authority in opposition to evolutionary changes looking toward the attainment of the United States objectives.' Washington doubtless means revolutionary, not evolutionary, unless it anticipates our occupation of Japan for a very long time.

"Much more of the Government's instructions is in the realm of realism. Those paragraphs dealing with disarmament and the destruction of Japan's war industries, for example, and with international trade and financial relationships. All these are practical matters coincerning which we can lay down the law and have every right to do so. But, when the Government gets into the domestic life of our defeated enemies, the most that can be said for its program is that it is filled with high purpose.

"'Laws, decrees, and regulations which establish discriminations on the grounds of race, nationality, creed, or political opinion shall be abrogated,' says the instructions. Shades of Martin Dies and his still functioning committee. Doesn't the Government know what goes on in these United States?

"GOVERNMENTAL REFORMS

"'The judicial, legal, and police systems shall be reformed as soon as practicable * * * and thereafter shall be progressively influenced to protect individual liberties and civil rights.' Well, the Government does say 'as soon as practicable,' and it may understand this reform is a slow evolutionary process, in which we ourselves still have a long way to go.

"'Encouragement shall be given and favor shown to the development of organizations in labor, industry, and agriculture, organized on a democratic basis. Policies shall be favored which permit a wide distribution of income and of the ownership of the means of production and trade.' The CIO Political Action Committee takes a daily lambasting in Congress and elsewhere for proposing something like this in the United States.

"'To favor a program for the dissolution of the large industrial and banking combinations which have exercised control of a great part of Japan's trade and industry.' This refers to Mitsui, Mitsubishi, and other great family corporations of Japan, not to the Morgan, Rockefeller, du Pont, Mellon, and other great family corporations of America.'

"Perhaps we shouldn't object. Perhaps the Government and the general will work out ways of accomplishing these high purposes in Japan and then we'll know how to go about achieving the same here at home."

In the light of this historical fact which is shared almost 100 percent by men in our Government service who have spent their lives studying the Japanese people, the attack of the leftwingers, the Communists, and fellow travelers on General MacArthur, who is doing such a magnificent job in carrying out the terms of the Potsdam surrender in Japan, takes on a wholly new significance. I am sure that the President intends to abide by the conditional terms of surrender which are written into the Potsdam Declaration, and he does not intend under any circumstances to let the American people be robbed of a lasting peace in the Pacific because of a violation of these agreements.

However, Mr. President, is it not significant that at the present moment there is not a single member of the policy making staff of our State Department who has ever been in Japan?

Is it not significant that these men who opposed the Potsdam agreement are receiving their strongest support from the radicals, the leftwingers, the Communists, their fellow travelers, and now from Russia?

Is it not significant that all this talk about redistribution of the land, the socialization of banks and industry, shows more clearly every day the basic structure of what Russia considers to be "democracy" which she is imposing on central and eastern Europe with a vengeance.

At this point in my remarks I would like to insert an article by Mr. Frank R. Kent, appearing in the Washington Star, September 28, entitled "Attacks on MacArthur Fail To Set Well With Average American":

EXHIBIT 5

"'ATTACKS ON MACARTHUR FAIL TO SET WELL WITH AVERAGE AMERICAN,' SAYS OBSERVER

"(By Frank R. Kent)

"It should be noted that the attack on General MacArthur has not ceased with the Senate confirmation of Acting Secretary Dean Acheson. On the contrary, it is more virulent than before. Ridiculous accusations have been widely spread and, despite President Truman's denial, unfounded forecasts that he will be recalled and replaced are being made.

"Up to the time of the Acheson 'rebuke'—and since—the criticism of the general has been exclusively confined to the radical press and the extreme left-wing politicians, journalists, and radio commentators.

"In this connection, it is interesting that the latest MacArthur attack comes from Russian representatives at the London conference, where Russia, reported dissatisfied with 'MacArthur's policy' and the Washington attitude that the United States should be supreme in the matter of Japanese occupancy, now insists upon an Allied control commission 'to lay down policy for MacArthur.'

"The President said this had not come to him officially. Nevertheless, the London dispatches undoubtedly had a factual base.

"LITTLE UNDERSTOOD

"None of this is going down well with the American people. The great bulk of them do not like it, nor do they understand it. The vast majority are under the impression that General MacArthur has been doing a fine job in Japan. He, of course, has his faults and frailties, but under him the Japanese occupation has proceeded ahead of schedule and with remarkable smoothness.

"The bleating of the radicals about a 'soft peace' seemed adequately answered by the news dispatches, by General MacArthur himself, and by General Wainwright (the last man to want a soft peace), who emphatically asserted that MacArthur could be trusted to guard against that.

"In fact, the average citizen has great difficulty in understanding the basis for the MacArthur attack. Mr. Acheson obviously thought that the general was trying to make a policy different from that laid down for him by the White House and felt called upon publicly to 'rebuke' him at his press conference in order to uphold the sound principle (from which no one dissents) that the Army is the 'instrument' and not the 'determinant' of policy.

"There are two things to be said about this. One is that it is anything but clear the general was trying to do anything of the kind. A reading of his full statements certainly does not indicate any such idea.

"The second is that, conceding Mr. Acheson's sincerity in believing the general had not thoroughly understood either the policy or the principle and needed his attention called to both, the way in which this was done was unhappy.

"For example, there seems no reason why it should have been done at a press conference; that there were better ways for the Acting Secretary to communicate with the supreme commander, who could be almost instantly reached by telephone, radio, or cable, without the world-wide publicity that followed the press conference.

"STATEMENT CALLED INEPT

"Also, the phrasing of the Acheson statement was not particularly felicitous. It is absurd to say that he 'insulted' General

MacArthur, but the somewhat tart and sarcastic tone seemed unnecessary—especially inept in a diplomat.

"It hardly can be contended that the incident put the United States in a favorable light before the rest of the world. The impression conveyed to many was that ours is a disunited government addicted to quarreling with our representatives in the field instead of supporting them. Distinctly, the Nation's prestige abroad has not been enhanced.

"General MacArthur still remains a great and shining military figure, but the fear is that his authority as an administrator may have been weakened in Japan—and the difficulties of his job increased.

"Mr. Acheson is a very able lawyer whose character is above dispute. His overwhelming confirmation, over the protest, was entirely justified and expected. But his efforts to chastise the general publicly was not well received."

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article by William F. Tyree appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of September 29, 1945, entitled "Halsey Applies for Retirement and Tells Critics To Lay Off Mac":

EXHIBIT 6

"'LET MACARTHUR ALONE'—HALSEY APPLIES FOR RETIREMENT AND TELLS CRITICS TO LAY OFF MAC—ADMIRAL TO QUIT IN FAVOR OF YOUNGER MEN—GENERAL DOING FINE JOB 'BULL' SAYS

"(By William F. Tyree)

"PEARL HARBOR, September 28.—Admiral Halsey announced today that he had applied for retirement from the Navy and he strongly defended General MacArthur's occupation of Japan, saying he was doing a 'fine job of reducing Japan to a fourth-rate power.'

"Halsey, who will be 63 years old on October 30, said, 'Let MacArthur alone * * * Those of us who know what's going on are entirely undeceived by criticism of MacArthur's policy.'

"TAKES WIFE'S ADVICE

"Recently returned from Japan en route to the United States with units of his conquering United States Third Fleet, Halsey made his remarks at a press conference. Only a few times did he make fiery statements because, he said, his wife told him he 'ought to keep my dignity' when talking about the Japanese.

"Halsey said the atom bomb was a 'very potent weapon' but that he expected to see a counter-weapon developed.

"NAVY HERE TO STAY

"'I don't believe you'll ever get rid of the Navy any more than you would the doughboy,' he said when asked whether the atom bomb would make other weapons obsolete. 'We couldn't have won this war without either of them. And when I say the doughboy I mean ground and air forces and all branches of the services. Everybody contributed to winning this war. If they didn't I have been fooled for 4 years—and I've been around the war a bit.'

"The 'bull of the Pacific,' his job of driving the enemy from the sea done, shook his head sadly and said:

"'I'm an old man and I'm tired. I've applied for retirement but they haven't told me yet what they plan to do about it.'

"Halsey's only plan now is to leave Pearl Harbor on October 9, leading his fleet back to the west coast for Navy Day on October 27.

"TALKS CAUTIOUSLY

"With none of the old-time fire in his eyes, Halsey spoke cautiously, explaining 'You don't know how much trouble I get into when I talk. My wife tells me I ought to keep my dignity.'

"Halsey said his retirement decision was made simply to make way for younger officers. He said he had only one vivid recollection of the war—'My knees shaking in great dread every time we started in for a fight.'

"Halsey said he was glad the way the war turned out because he did not think that '10,000,000 dead Japs are worth 1 dead American.'

"He said he knew the Japanese were licked August 10 when the Third Fleet hit Tokyo after cruising along the empire's coast for 6 weeks, but when surrender time came he said he felt 'just a little ashamed we didn't lick them a long time ago.'

"FELT ASHAMED

"When one of those 'dirty little Japanese destroyers came out to meet our 287 ships to guide us into Sagami Bay it made me ashamed,' he said, speaking of the victorious entrance of the Third Fleet into Tokyo Bay preparatory to the formal surrender on September 2.

"The admiral said 'let MacArthur alone.'

"'He's doing a fine job reducing Japan to a fourth-rate power,' Halsey said.

"'Those of us who know what's going on are entirely undeceived by criticism of MacArthur's policy.'

"Halsey said there was no use in pushing the Japanese during the occupation period because 'they'd just fall down.'

"'I think you'll discover MacArthur's policy is one of increasing restrictions.' Halsey said. 'I wandered over Japan for 3 weeks and saw nothing to lead me to believe the Japs are being treated kindly. They are not being mistreated, either.'

"Halsey turned from serious matters at that moment and pointed to a white rocking horse in the corner of his office. It had just arrived from an unknown donor. He said he planned to give it to 4-year-old Michael Carney of Honolulu, nephew of Halsey's chief of staff, Rear Adm. Robert B. Carney.

"'I couldn't ride a horse across this room anyway,' he said."

This contradiction between a real American policy and the revolutionary policies of our left-wing appeasers, becomes more apparent every day, when we read in such papers as the New York Herald Tribune, concerning this whole question of Communist participation in the occupation and control of Japan, as follows:

"How much hope is there of bringing about such a meeting of minds in the Orient if the political names in Europe are to be played under the old brass knuckles rules of power politics. Can there be a policy of sweetness and light in one area of the world and dog eating dog in the other?"

Or, is it not significant, Mr. President, that even the New York Times of October 1, carries in its leading editorial the statement:

"The overwhelming role which the United States played in the Japanese defeat exceeding by far the role of any single power of the war in Europe, entitled it to a primary role in all far eastern settlements and most particularly in all matters affecting American security from new Japanese aggression. The primary role need not and will not be surrendered."

Can it be that the editors of the New York Times are confused on this whole question of social evolution of Japanese society? They see the implications of an appeasement program with Russia.

I should like at this point to call to the attention of my colleagues a story carried in PM on October 2, and I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

EXHIBIT 8

"COMMUNIST PARTY EMERGES IN JAPAN—TINY MOVEMENT STILL AFRAID TO TALK BECAUSE OF GAG LAW

(By David Boguslav)

"TOKYO, October 2.—A Japanese Communist movement which had been driven completely underground during the war years is now being resurrected in the hope that working strictly within the proposed Japanese democratic framework, it will grow eventually powerful enough to force essential reforms.

"This appears to be as far as the avowed leaders of the movement, now cautiously emerging from their hiding places, are prepared to go at present.

"Every effort to obtain something approaching a commitment regarding their future plans—whether the local Communists are prepared to undertake a direct action program, what their feelings are regarding the throne—meets with evasiveness. Further investigation reveals that such Communists as are qualified to assume leadership are simply afraid. There's a social order and preservation law still on the books. Under this statute, the Government can—and apparently still does—carry out 'preventive' arrests, throw people in jail without investigation and act generally in a manner calculated to inspire terror.

"PEAK OF 10,000

"The Communist movement in Japan was never numerically strong. In the late 1920's it reached a peak of about 10,000 members. The mass arrests of 1928, followed by unremitting vigilance of the secret police thereafter, drove the movement underground, where it maintained a feeble existence.

"It was then composed mainly of individuals described as 'thinkers,' who apparently delighted in academic discussions but were incapable, whether through their own deficiencies or through the grip maintained by the secret police, of any semblance of organized action.

"This correspondent recently talked with eight Japanese Communist workers meeting in a small house a few blocks east of the Daiichi building where the occupation forces have their general headquarters.

"We gathered in an upper-story room, whose sole article of furniture was a highly varnished hollowed-out tree stump which served as an ashtray.

"LURID CAREER

"The spokesman was an elderly professor, Saido Takatsu, formerly of the University of Waseda faculty. He had had a lurid career which included a flight to Russia and later 2 years of Japanese imprisonment. He was one of the few released since the occupation. Seconding him was a younger man, Morio Emori.

"Both men apparently were only spokesmen preparing the way for the real leaders. Of these, some are abroad, notably Kenzo Yamamoto, who is now in Yenan, China, and Isco Abe and Ikuo Oyama, both in Chicago.

"Saido reviewed briefly the leftist movement in Japan to the pre-Meiji period when rumors of a libertarian movement penetrated the wall of isolation. Soon after the Russo-Japanese war, a group of Japanese contacted Russian underground revolutionaries and were active in the Second Internationale. At one time the police discovered a plot to assassinate Emperor Meiji, whereupon these among others were rounded up and 12 were executed.

"The leftist movement continued subversively, but carried an anarchist tinge until the Russian Revolution. Following Japan's rice riots in 1919, the first Communist Party cells were formed. Their history during the ensuing decade was one of periodic raids, round-ups, and arrests of their leaders culminating in the mass round-up of March 10, 1928.

"The Government thereafter kept the 'Red menace' conspicuously before the public, stepping this up with the outbreak of the Manchurian incident. The Japanese at the time used 'communism' as the pretext for their invasion.

"Therefore, according to Saido, the movement was aided by Moscow. Beginning in 1942, the movement operated through cells

and worked in two 'departments': The department of financial aid which was charged with raising funds and the department of direct action which conducted propaganda.

"All of these operations were sporadic. Politically, the last real party was Oyama's Rodo Nominto—the Workers and Peasants Party. The group split about 1937 into the extremist Nippon Musanto and the moderate Shakai Taishito. The former dissolved in December 1937, and the latter accepted Premier Konoye's "new structure" whereby the Government began measures which culminated in Japan's single party, the Imperial Rule Assistance Association of 1940.

"GO UNDERGROUND

"The true Communists were driven underground with most of the major leaders clapped in prison. Since then the military approached many of the jailed Communists, offering them the choice of release if they recanted or an indefinite stay in prison.

"According to Saido, many of these members may be dead and thousands of others are still jailed on suspicion of Communist activities. Hideki Tojo himself jailed some 10,000 of these so-called suspects when the war broke out.

"Saido pointed out that at best the Communist Party never succeeded in getting a secure hold on labor. At the utmost its followers never exceeded 6 percent of the workers. With regard to the merchant marine, Saido said that the seamen at the outbreak of the war had an effective union and many known Communists were among its leaders. This union was dissolved immediately after Pearl Harbor.

"Regarding the future of communism, the revealing view is that the party cannot meet openly at present because of the gag laws.

"Meanwhile the Communists are taking some action. The party leaders are working with the authorized liberal groups, notably the Nippon Shakaito—the Japanese Socialist Party."

There is confusion on these three issues. This is evidenced by articles in papers in every corner of our land.

At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD an article from the Progressive, dated October 1, 1945, and entitled "The Issue in Japan":

EXHIBIT 9

"THE ISSUE IN JAPAN

"The uproar in the jingoist press and among the striped-pants crowd in the State Department and the brass hats of the War Department over Gen. Douglas MacArthur's policies in occupying Japan is one of the most depressing developments in many months.

"The simple fact that the MacArthur policy has proved itself thus far—by permitting a bloodless occupation, by making possible a sharp reduction in future occupation forces, by enlisting the cooperation of the rank and file of Japan, by providing for the arrest of those designated as war criminals, and by achieving the demobilization of the Japanese Army in phenomenally brief time—all this seems only to infuriate the critics.

"The jingoist press is shrieking because it believes that the only way we can prove that we are superior to the Fascists and militarists is to act like them—on a greater scale.

"The brass hats are furious because MacArthur's forecast of early reduction of occupation forces imperils their cozy little game of keeping an Army big enough to provide enough soft jobs for the officers.

"The State Department boys are in a tizzy over the MacArthur policy because they prefer to be vague and vacillating and to carry water on both shoulders, as in the case of Spain, rather than to pursue a direct, clear-cut, forthright course of action. Despite all the belated assurances that the State Department does have a policy—on paper—the lack of integrated planning and over-all policy is forcibly emphasized by the fantastic exhibition last week when President Truman endorsed MacArthur's policies while his Acting Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, let loose with a petulant blast against those same policies.

"MacArthur has made it clear that his actions in Japan are purely military and for occupation purposes only, and that the basic policy of dealing with Japan politically is one that must be decided 'upon the highest diplomatic level of the United Nations.'

"The fact that the United Nations organization, established at San Francisco last spring, still exists only on paper, and the fact that the Big Five's Council of Foreign Ministers, meeting behind locked doors in London, hasn't yet been able to decide on a policy for Italy, let alone Japan, is hardly the fault of the American forces in Japan who are doing magnificently the job they were assigned.

"We hope that MacArthur will not be swayed by the jingoists and imperialists at home, that he will stick resolutely to his original course of occupying Japan with a policy based on justice, tolerance, and freedom, and not one founded on the revenge, hatred, and dismemberment advocated by the hate cult."

And I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Evening Star, Tuesday, October 2, 1945, entitled "Japanese Control":

EXHIBIT 10

"JAPANESE CONTROL

"If the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in London has done nothing else, it has served effectively to confuse the picture with respect to the shaping of Allied policy in Japan.

"A week ago this seemed to be one point concerning which there was no room for misunderstanding. The White House had announced that we would welcome Allied participation in the control of Japan, but that in event of differences over policy the policy of the United States would prevail. As late as last Wednesday, at a press conference, President Truman repeated that, if differences of opinion should arise, the differences would be resolved by this Government in line with our policy.

"But now, apparently, no one knows what the policy for control of Japan will be, nor how it will be determined, nor who will determine it. Secretary of State Byrnes, without any reference to the earlier statements from the White House, has announced in London that a plan for the control of Japan has been agreed upon by the major powers. This disclosure, made after Soviet Foreign Commissar Molotov had criticized American policy in Japan and had called for establishment of an Allied-control commission in Tokyo, is set forth in guarded language, so much so, in fact, that it is difficult to say what it means. It seems evident, however, that we have abandoned our earlier proposal for a purely advisory commission on Japan, which was to have met in Washington, and have agreed to the creation of a Far Eastern Commission, which, after its first meeting, apparently will assemble in Tokyo, and which will be 'asked to consider whether a control council (for Japan) should be established and, if so, the power which should be vested in it.'

"This announcement was accompanied by informal interpretations to the effect that General MacArthur must have 'primary control' and that the United States is not yielding on the point that, through General MacArthur, it will effectively dominate the new set-up in Tokyo. There is not a word in Mr. Byrnes' statement to support these interpretations, however, and, while he may have had such reservations in mind, the failure to incorporate them in the formal statement, assuming that that document has real meaning, can easily stir up a hornets' nest of trouble when the other members of the Far Eastern Commission, all of whom want an authoriative voice in Japan, meet to consider the desirability of a control commission and the powers it should have. At the least, Mr. Byrnes has opened the door to a development which seemingly points the way to abandonment or drastic modification of our original position with respect to the control of Japan. Perhaps this should be done, but it will be interesting to see what, if anything, has been obtained in the nature of a quid pro quo."

And, now, Mr. President, it has become only too obvious that the confusion that exists in our highest Government circles over our policies toward Japan is only part of the larger confusion that marks American foreign policy as a whole.

This morning we learn from an AP dispatch in the Washington Post that, and I quote:

"A Russian demand that General MacArthur's rule in Japan be replaced by a four-power control government was presented to the United States during the last hours of the Conference of Foreign Ministers, the Moscow radio declared today.

"The demand, it said, was made in a letter handed to United States Secretary of State James F. Byrnes yesterday as the foreign ministers of the five leading Allied Powers, deadlocked over procedure, ended unsuccessfully their first atempt to write a European peace."

As I see this Russian request, it is nothing more nor less than a deliberate attempt to transplant the chaos and suffering and confusion that exists in Europe into the very heart of Asia. I believe that appeasement of Russia on this request will bring about that very condition. And, now, as though this were not confusion enough, our acting Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, has taken the liberty of aggravating the serious breach that has already occurred between the United States and Argentina, by slapping what seems to me to be a gratuitous insult in her face. Today's Washington Post says and I quote:

"That the United States believed Argentina had not only failed to fulfill its hemisphere commitments but had completely repudiated them. * * * He reminded newsmen that those acts included provisions for seizing enemy property, acting against enemy nationals, futhering democratic principles, and restoring such rights as freedom."

Mr. President, the continuance of this kind of policy which the United States has been following throughout recent past in which on the one hand we abjectly appease the tyranny of the Communist collective state, while on the other hand we dictate to every other nation caused even my distinguished colleagues, Senator VANDENBERG and Senator CONNALLY to take the State Department severely to task yesterday for pursuing this unilateral course toward the Argentine.

In conclusion, Mr. President, if the present state of anarchy in international relations is not soon straightened out, and placed once again upon moral principles and a respect for international law at least on the part of America, the present confusion would only become worse confounded, and we shall find ourselves not only losing the peace in Europe and in Asia but also of having built up a far more tragic conflict in the future.

For myself, I do not intend to let these matters rest.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator be good enough to call for a quorum in the event that the question of the reference of any resolutions or bills respecting the control of atomic energy should arise this afternoon?

Mr. BILBO. If a quorum call can be made by unanimous consent without my losing the floor, I shall be delighted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Any Senator has the right to suggest the absence of a quorum at any time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I merely wished to make it a matter of public record that I hope there will be a quorum call in the event the able Senator from Mississippi yields for the consideration of the atomic energy question.

Mr. BILBO. If I should yield for a quorum call, would I lose the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that under the precedents the Senator would lose the floor.

Mr. BILBO. That is my understanding. That is the reason why I suggest to the Senator that he obtain unanimous consent for a quorum call without my losing the floor. If that can be done, I shall be delighted to yield at any time.

Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Montana a question. He makes the statement that I am filibustering. I am wondering when a speech becomes a filibuster. I have not spoken as long on this bill as the Senator did the other day, but he raises the question of a filibuster before I have even completed my speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator addressing his remarks to the Chair?

Mr. BILBO. No. I stated that I wished to ask the Senator from Montana the question, but I cannot afford to let him have the floor to answer it. That is what I had in mind to ask him.

Mr. President, yesterday evening I was shocked by a statement made in a radio broadcast by a man by the name of Fulton Lewis, Jr. I have listened to Mr. Lewis for a number of years, and I enjoy his broadcasts, because he seems to be a very diligent student, investigator, and traveler, and he sometimes gives me information which is worth while. Of course, I appreciate the fact that he is or tries to be the mouthpiece of the Republican Party, because from his standpoint nothing good could come out of the Democratic Party. But here is what he said about the present discussion on the floor of the Senate and my discussion of the bill:

> The bill under discussion is so trivial that most of the Members of the Senate did not know what BILBO was talking about, and they cared less.

Mr. President, not only is that a jab at me personally but it is an indictment against the personnel of the Senate. Is it possible that a bill could pass the House of Representatives, be reported to the Senate from the Interstate Commerce Committee, be placed on the calendar of the United States Senate, and the Senator from Montana could discuss it for 3 or 4 hours, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] for 2 or 3 hours, and I could talk about it a little while, as I have been doing, and still the Members of this body do not know what the bill is all about? That is a very sad commentary for a broadcaster to send out over the radio to the American people who are in the habit of listening to him—that Members of the United States Senate do not know what is in a bill which has been under discussion on the floor of the Senate for more than 2 days. He says it is trivial. Is it possible that Mr. Fulton Lewis is so possessed of worldly goods and golden shekels that he looks upon $20,000,000 a month, or $240,000,000 a year—a quarter of a billion dollars, which is the amount of money involved in this bill—as a trivial sum? Is it possible that he regards as trivial the fact that under the pending bill the proposal is to take away from the taxpayers of the country millions of dollars which belong to them under a solemn contract made by the Government with the railroads who received 179,000,000 acres of the taxpayers' land? Does Mr. Fulton Lewis consider that trivial? I am surprised; I am shocked. No, Mr. President; he knew what was involved in this bill. Mr. Lewis was playing his part. He thought he was complying with and meeting the wishes of some of his close friends—for instance, the president of the Union Pacific Railroad Co. That is what he was doing.

In the course of my discussion I have already remarked that the magnitude of this bill—involving, as it does, large sums of money, a matter of great importance to the taxpayers of this country—is such that there seems to have been a conspiracy or a united effort on the part of those who are sponsoring this measure—I do not mean my colleagues at all; I mean folks on the outside—to have this bill passed through both Houses of Congress without any fuss, without any noise, without any notice, without any discussion, even without any understanding. I said the other day to one of the most prominent Members of the House of Representatives, one who is about as important as any Member of the House, "Why did you sit still and let the House of Representatives pass this bill which robs the taxpayers of the United States of $24,000,000 a month which they are entitled to receive under a solemn contract made between the Government of the United States and the railroads?" He said he had not heard about it and did not know anything about it. Mr. President, it is a well-known fact that the bill was passed by the House of Representatives on two occasions without even a yea-and-nay vote. Two or three Members of the House of Representatives requested a yea-and-nay vote the second time the bill was passed by the House, but the House refused to give it to them. In other words, no record has been made in the House of Representatives as to which of its Members favored passage of the bill and which were opposed. So if one of the Members of the House should announce his candidacy against me when I am up for reelection I would have no way on earth to fix on him a part of the responsibility for the passage of the bill in the House, except to point out that he kept his mouth shut, and so made no affirmative record.

Mr. President, that has been the sneaking way that the railroad manipulators who have been here on the ground have pursued to have this bill passed by the Congress without any publicity. Up until Sunday morning not a newspaper in Washington had said a word about the bill for the last 3 years, so far as I have been able to ascertain. Yet the bill involves vast sums of money which, if it is passed, will be taken away from the taxpayers of this country and placed in the coffers of the railroad companies of the United States that are today, and have been since the beginning of the war, making more money than they have ever before made in the history of the Nation.

Mr. President, is the debt under discussion a just one? Someone remarked the other day—and his statement intrigued me—that it is a strange thing that every time the Government makes a good deal or a good contract, some peckerwood wants to cancel the contract. I believe that to be true, because it seems to me that in the present case the Government made a fairly good trade when it gave the railroads 179,284,978 acres of land, equivalent to the area of 14 States of the Union. Notwithstanding the magnitude of the great domain which was given to the railroad promoters, during the recent war it has seemed that the Government made a fairly good deal, because it was getting some consideration for the grants of land it made.

I heard a Senator say on this floor that the Government has been adequately paid and compensated for those lands. Mr. President, do you think that 14 States of the United States are not worth more than a billion dollars? That is his argument. Fourteen States of the American Union could have been made out of the land which was given to the railroads, and still there would have remained 4,507,978 acres—an area sufficient to make another State larger than Rhode Island.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I seek information. Does the Senator have an estimate of the income from the land which was granted to the railroads?

Mr. BILBO. Oh, yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Is that land now productive real estate?

Mr. BILBO. Some of it is wonderfully productive; some of the most productive land of the Nation; some of the finest bodies of timber in the Nation, for instance.

Mr. McMAHON. What is the income which the railroads receive from it?

Mr. BILBO. The Senator wishes to have the figures; does he?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; that is what I should like to have.

Mr. BILBO. Very well. I have the information and I shall present it. I am sorry to say that all I have in that connection comes from the railroads. How-

ever, I shall give it to the Senator for what it is worth; I have it here. No investigation has ever been made by the Government to ascertain the value of the 179,000,000 acres of land.

At this point I wish to refer to a list of the railroads of the Nation which received the land grants. I think it will be interesting.

I will say for the benefit of my good friend from Connecticut that he has only a passing interest, that is, the interest which any good citizen might have in this controversy, because there are no land-grant railroads in the Northeast. There are very few in the South. I have before me a list of railroads which received grants of land. The promoters of the railroads not only persuaded Congress to give them large areas of land, but they went to the legislatures of the various States in which the railroads were to be constructed, and persuaded the legislatures to grant land to them for the purpose of building the railroads. So I will give facts with reference to the land which was granted by Congress, and the land that was granted by the State legislatures.

The Atlantic Coast Line received from Congress 1,843,922 acres of land. The State of Florida granted to the Atlantic Coast Line 7,428,299 acres, making a total of 9,272,221 acres. Many Senators are familiar with the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad. It alone received sufficient land from the State of Florida and from Congress to equal the total area of the States of Connecticut and New Jersey.

The Congress gave to the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad 14,886,795 acres. The State of Texas gave to the same railroad 3,856,640 acres of land, making a grand total of 18,743,435 acres.

The Congress gave to the Canadian Pacific 1,273,960 acres of the people's land. Michigan was persuaded to give to the Canadian Pacific 1,409,464 acres of land, making a grand total of 2,683,424 acres.

Here are the facts with regard to the Chicago & North Western Railroad. The Federal Congress was very gracious to the group of promoters who were active in the development of the Chicago & North Western Railroad. The Congress gave the road 7,302,338 acres of the people's land. Michigan and Nebraska together gave the road 498,125 acres, making a grand total of 7,800,463 acres.

The Congress gave to the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad 3,292,749 acres. The State of Nebraska gave to the road 286,663 acres of land, making a grand total of 3,579,412 acres of the people's land to the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad.

Congress gave to the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad 1,453,565 acres of land. Minnesota gave it 499,115 acres, making a grand total of 1,952,680 acres of land to the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad.

Congress gave to the Great Northern road 2,823,145 acres of the people's land. Minnesota became generous again and gave 425,578 acres to the road, making a grand total of 3,248,723 acres.

Here are the figures with reference to the Illinois Central Railroad. That road runs through my State. The Federal Government gave it 4,630,453 acres. That was all the land which it received, because neither the State of Mississippi nor any other State gave the Illinois Central any land. The road received all its land from the Federal Government.

The Missouri, Kansas & Texas received from the Federal Government only 576,683 acres. However, from the State of Texas it received 2,785,920 acres, making a grand total of 3,362,603 acres.

The United States Congress granted to the Missouri Pacific Railroad 3,749,157 acres of land. The State of Texas and the State of Arkansas granted 12,989,256 acres, making a total of 16,738,413 acres of land to the Missouri Pacific Railroad.

Here is the Northern Pacific. That road, Mr. President, must have had a smooth bunch of manipulators in Washington. Congress gave to the Northern Pacific 39,843,053 acres of land. That is sufficient land to equal the total area of the State of Georgia, the State of Michigan, the State of Illinois, or the State of Wisconsin. Minnesota gave to the road 1,052,085 acres. The grand total was 40,895,138 acres of land to only one group of railroad promoters.

To the Seaboard Air Line railroad the Government gave 1,318,983 acres of land. Florida gave 969,299 acres, making a grand total of 2,288,212 acres of land.

I now come to the Southern Pacific. Its case was well presented to the Congress because the Congress gave to that road 21,648,681 acres. Texas and Oregon supplemented the congressional Christmas present by giving to the Southern Pacific 10,865,930 acres of land, making a grand total of 32,514,611 acres of land to the Southern Pacific as a Christmas present. At least the sponsors of the pending bill want to make it a Christmas present. They want to make it possible for the Southern Pacific Railroad to stop paying on its contract.

Mr. President, the Union Pacific Railroad received 18,977,659 acres of land. To all other railroads, that is the short-line railroads considered together, the Congress has donated 6,680,595 acres and the States have given 5,816,998 acres. In other words, in addition to what I have already enumerated, 12,497,593 acres have been given to the small short-line railroads throughout the United States. One of those lines was in my State. This makes a total of 130,401,606 acres, which the Congress gave to the railroad promoters from the year 1850 to 1871; and the States at the same time yielded to the seductive arguments of the railroad promoters and donated 48,883,372 acres, making a grand total of 179,284,978 acres, an acreage sufficient to embrace the area of 14 States of the American Union.

That is what Congress and the States gave to the railroads, and the only compensation, the only return, the only payment the promoters agreed to make and contracted to make was to haul free what little freight the Government, the people, had to haul. But in 1940, after the railroads had "welshed" on the proposition, a law suit which reached the Supreme Court was sent to the Court of Claims, and the Court of Claims finally adjudicated that in adjusting the equities involved, whatever they were, the Government should pay 50 percent of the standard prevailing rates, whatever they were.

In 1941 the railroads came here with tears in their eyes. They said, "We are facing bankruptcy; we are famishing; we are going into the hands of receivers; we are not getting sufficient returns to carry on our business, and we want the Congress to help us or we will go out of business." So Congress very graciously in 1940 gave the railroads a concession by providing that the Government after 1940 would pay 100 cents on the dollar, according to the prevailing rates for passengers and freight, on all the stuff hauled for the Government, except—here is the exception—except in time of war the railroads would be required to haul the soldiers and sailors in the armed forces of the Government, their personal belongings, and war materials needed to carry on the war for the salvation of the Government, at rates 50 percent less.

When we passed the law in 1940 we were not in war, and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] said we were not going to get in war. The railroads were satisfied because at that time the railroads were paying into the Federal Treasury $7,000,000 a year under the 50-percent rebate in hauling supplies, food, clothing, and other stuff during the panic of 1930 up to 1940. Then the railroads said, "Give us the $7,000,000 we are paying back into the Treasury for 179,000,000 acres of land, and we will be doing fine, we will be happy." The Congress did that, and I helped to do it.

When the war came on and we began to build up an army of 12,000,000 men and to produce instruments of death to be shipped to the battle fronts of the world, because of the hauling of war material and the hauling of 12,000,000 men, the amount involved went from $15,000,000 to eighteen and a half million a month, and as the war continued the amount went up to $20,000,000, $22,000,000, $24,000,000, and $25,000,000 a month. When the railroads saw that much money going into Uncle Sam's strong box to help carry on the war, notwithstanding they were doing more business and were in better financial shape than they had ever been in the history of this country, in 1940 they came on their knees to Congress and said, "Wipe out the rest of the consideration for this contract, and make it a complete present to us," although they had received, as I have said, sufficient land to comprise 14 States of the American Union. It was just that raw. The proposal struck the House of Representatives with great astonishment. They had not been properly propagandized; they had not been properly educated when they first considered that bill, and they killed it. But in the year 1942 the railroads began to advertise and to propagandize to make contacts, and to get the House in order. So when Congress met in 1944, when the Government was receiving from the railroads at the rate of $24,000,000 a month—a quarter of a billion dollars a year—that bill went through the Committee of the House and through the

House like greased lightning. The House would not pass it in 1942 when the amount involved was about $18,000,000 a month, but when it got up to $24,000,000 or $25,000,000 a month in 1944, 2 years afterward, the Congress passed it. When that bill came up here my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce was against it, but he says the committee ran over him, and reported the bill. When I came back to Washington in the last days of November 1944 and found that bill on the calendar ready to be called up I prepared my thunder, and am just now delivering it. I said, "The bill shall not pass; I will filibuster the bill 30 days until the close of the Seventy-eighth Congress rather than to see Congress pass this bill which will take out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country $24,000,000 a month." That stopped it; and since November or December 1944 to this good hour the bill has been inactive; it has been dead so far.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, how much does the Senator say the taxpayers have been saved?

Mr. BILBO. I have saved the taxpayers by a threatened filibuster. Other people talk about filibusters being bad for the country. I am ready to prove that even the threat of a filibuster has saved the taxpayers of this country in the neighborhood of $300,000,000, which is in the Treasury of the United States today because the bill was held up by a threatened filibuster. There is nothing personal in this matter with me.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not ride on the railroads?

Mr. BILBO. Yes; in fact, I am an old railroad man. I used to run on the railroads.

Mr. LUCAS. What did the Senator do?

Mr. BILBO. I was a "news butch," and I made $250 a month, because I was a good salesman.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator explain the term "news butch"?

Mr. BILBO. I cannot respond to the Senator's question unless he asks it in the form of a question. Otherwise, I shall lose the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator explain to me what he means by "news butch"? That is a question.

Mr. BILBO. Since the Senator from Illinois is from the country, and is not in the habit of riding on trains, and never has seen a "news butch," I shall take pains to explain to him what a "news butch" is.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BILBO. Railroads have what they call "concessions," which they sell to news organizations, giving to such organizations the right to put on the train an agent, a salesman, who sells to the traveling public newspapers, magazines, candy, books, and other things which people traveling on trains like to have. The man who has charge of executing that contract, that concession, on each train, is called a "news butch." That is a localism, or slang, or whatever one may want to call it, but that is his appellation.

Mr. LUCAS. On what railroad did the Senator work?

Mr. BILBO. I had a run on the N., C. & St. L., from Nashville, Tenn., to Atlanta, Ga., and then I had a run on the L. & N. from Nashville to St. Louis.

Mr. LUCAS. It was on the L. & N. I saw the Senator first. I just now remembered where I first saw him.

Mr. BILBO. I am betting dollars to doughnuts that I sold the Senator a detective story out of my stock. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. I should not care to gamble with the Senator from Mississippi. I do not want him to lose the floor.

Mr. BILBO. I cannot be held responsible for the Senator's observations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Who has the floor?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi still has the floor.

Mr. BILBO. Yes; I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rules of the Senate the Senator must continue to address the Senate while he holds the floor.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I have the reporters close by. They are hearing what I am saying.

Yesterday, after I had gotten through with a few preliminary remarks, I had started to deliver my real speech on the question before us. I shall continue where I left off yesterday. I had enumerated the many benefits the railroads derived from the land-grant contract solemnly entered into. This land was the people's land.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MURDOCK. With respect to the Senator's claim of saving so much money daily, or monthly, or annually——

Mr. BILBO. I predicate that upon the statement of the railroads themselves.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it the Senator's contention that the railroads could operate at the rates the Government pays?

Mr. BILBO. Could they operate?

Mr. MURDOCK. Having in mind that other people pay much higher rates than those, the Senator is making the claim that he is saving the people of the United States so much money. What I have in mind is this: If in order to operate successfully and in order to maintain the contractual rates of the Government, the railroads are thereby forced to charge all other shippers and all other patrons of the railroads a sufficiently high rate to enable them to operate at a profit, I am wondering if the Senator's claim that he is saving money for the people is a myth, or whether there is some substance to it.

Mr. BILBO. No; it is not a myth; it is a fact, because the premise upon which the Senator predicates his question is not sound, since the Interstate Commerce Commission, which regulates the rates which the railroads can charge for hauling passengers, and freight, and everything else, has fixed the rates without any consideration whatsoever of the land-grant contracts.

Mr. MURDOCK. But the rates made by the Interstate Commerce Commission are supposed to be fair and reasonable.

Mr. BILBO. They are supposed to be fair and just and equitable, but they make them without any reference to the rebate which the land-grant railroads are supposed to pay the Government. That is fundamental, that is sound, that is the truth, and what the Senator is talking about has not anything to do with it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Perhaps I can weave it into the Senator's pattern so that it will mean something. Does the Senator take the position that the rates fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission are not fair and reasonable?

Mr. BILBO. In many cases they are not, I am sorry to say.

Mr. MURDOCK. On the average?

Mr. BILBO. In many cases they are excessive, in many cases they are not equitable when compared with the rates enjoyed by other sections of the country. That is what the lawsuit recently decided by the Supreme Court was about. The South and the West both have complained about the rates fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission on commerce in the South and the commerce in the so-called special districts of the North and the East, which have operated against both the Senator's section of the country and my section.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will yield further——

Mr. BILBO. That was done by the Interstate Commerce Commission. They could have adjusted it, but it required a judicial operation in order to persuade them to do what was right.

Mr. MURDOCK. If we could assume, if the Senator will yield to me further——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. BILBO. I am yielding to the Senator from Utah for a question, and I shall yield to the Senator from South Carolina as soon as the Senator from Utah has satisfied himself.

Mr. MURDOCK. Assuming, as a basis for my question, that the rates fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission are fair and reasonable, then we must assume, must we not, that if they are reasonable, the rates charged by railroads to the Government would not be fair and reasonable? Am I correct in that premise? I first begin with the assumption.

Mr. BILBO. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. MURDOCK. For the sake of the argument, let us assume that the rates fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission are fair and reasonable.

Mr. BILBO. With all the railroads, all over the United States?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; we make that assumption.

Mr. BILBO. Very well. That is a very violent assumption, but we will make it.

Mr. MURDOCK. We will assume that to be so.

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, would it not follow that the rates charged the Government over the land-grant roads are not fair and reasonable?

Mr. BILBO. The Senator means as a result of the land-grant contract?

Mr. MURDOCK. No. I want to exclude the contractual relationship.

Mr. BILBO. The land-grant railroads get the same compensation for hauling freight for the Government and for civilians and for everybody else that any other railroad gets, except as to the items which Congress exempted under the act of 1940. On those items the Government is supposed to get a rebate of 50 percent.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator knows railroad rates are too high. Anyway, the other railroads, the nonland-grant railroads were anxious and willing to make, and of their own volition did make, equalizing contracts with the land-grant railroads in order to get an opportunity to haul the materials at 50 percent of the standard contract.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand that, but I should like to have the Senator go along with me if the questions I am asking are sound. If I may re-state the question, if we may assume that the rate fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission is fair and reasonable, then certainly it follows, does it not, that 50 percent of that rate would not be fair and reasonable, and that the railroads could not exist on it?

Mr. BILBO. The railroads made a solemn, binding contract——

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand that. I am so convinced of it that there is no doubt in my mind.

Mr. BILBO. Let me make my statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. Very well.

Mr. BILBO. These railroads made a solemn, binding contract that they would haul all the freight for the Government for nothing, and then they "welshed" on that contract, carried it to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court sent the case to the Court of Claims, and because of the controversy involved, the Court of Claims adjusted the differences, the contentions of the railroads, and fixed the rate at 50 percent. By paying 50 percent of the rate into the Treasury of the United States, the railroads, I contend, have not yet paid into the Treasury a sufficient amount to equal the value of 179,000,000 acres of land, sufficient land, I repeat, to comprise 14 States of the American Union. What the bill would do is to wipe out the debt and give the railroads a receipt in full. It would in effect say to them, "Go your way and sin no more or rob the taxpayers."

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will yield further——

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. All I was trying to develop was that if the millions of people of the United States who are using the railroads or transportation are paying the bills to make up for the loss arising out of the rates made to the Government, then the Senator's position that he is saving anything is a myth, is it not?

Mr. BILBO. Yes; but the Senator is wrong. The Senator is a thousand percent wrong.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what I want to know; I want to know if I am wrong.

Mr. BILBO. The Interstate Commerce Commission in fixing the rates does not take into consideration the land-grant deductions at all. If the Commission does not take them into consideration it makes the rates fair and just and reasonable regardless of the private deals the railroads made to pay the Government the 50-percent rebate.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator for the answer.

Mr. BILBO. And that is the truth.

Mr. MURDOCK. I hope I have not incurred the Senator's ill will by merely asking him a question.

Mr. BILBO. I love the Senator more than ever.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Would the Senator from Mississippi be willing to agree that the effective date be made October 1, 1946, if the author of the bill agrees to it?

Mr. BILBO. October the 1st of what year?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. October 1, 1946?

Mr. BILBO. Yesterday I submitted an amendment to make the effective date 18 months from now. But this morning I had a conference with a Senator on the Senate floor—I will give his name—the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], who has made a personal investigation along this line, and he informed me that the War Department had assured him that by October 1, 1946, the War and Navy Departments would have all the boys in the Army and the Navy back home, and the hauling of soldiers and sailors and other personnel together with the war materials that must be hauled by the railroads will be finished by that time. In that situation, if the authors of the bill will stand pat and be in good faith about it and help me hold the date to October 1, 1946, no matter what the House says about it, I will agree to it, and will not say another word on this floor. I will tell the Senate why I do that. Under the act of 1940, when we lost our gravy—pardon my colloquialism—because we said to the railroads, "From now on you will not have to make a 50-percent rebate deduction on stuff you haul for Uncle Sam for civil purposes," someone put a little exception in the law, which was, "except war material and sailors and soldiers." In times of peace we do not get anything. When we are through with the war and the boys are brought home, we cannot get any more out of the railroads Then why should I not agree to the proposal?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Would the Senator from Mississippi be willing to confer with the author of the bill and see if agreement cannot be reached? I take the same position the Senator from Mississippi does in regard to the bill, but I am trying to expedite matters, get the bill passed, and obtain as much out of it as I can for the Government at the same time.

Mr. BILBO. I think by that time the Army and the Navy will have all the boys back home. They will be through hauling the freight. Then we can call it a day and quit, because the railroads received the lion's share in 1940, when we released them from hauling anything except sailors and soldiers and war materials at the 50-percent rate. At that time the civilian material carried amounted to about $7,000,000 a year, and during the reconversion period, if the Government carries out its plan and provides 60,000,000 jobs, the railroads are going to profit handsomely by the act of 1940.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a 15-minute recess without taking the Senator from Mississippi off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Carolina for that purpose?

Mr. BILBO. I cannot yield for that purpose, because if I do I am afraid I will lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi refuses to yield. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Why does not the Senator from Mississippi offer an amendment to the pending measure fixing October 1, 1946, as the effective date?

Mr. BILBO. I have an amendment providing that the effective date shall be 18 months from the time of the enactment of this measure. I will accept a change of 6 months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi may modify his own amendment.

Mr. BILBO. I will modify my own amendment and make the date October 1, 1946.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question. It is a question, is it?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is a question.

Mr. BILBO. Very well.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have at the desk an amendment offered on behalf of myself and also on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE] in which July 1,

1946, is set as the effective date. If I modify that amendment to make the date October 1, 1946, will the Senator from Mississippi accept it?

Mr. BILBO. I have not read the Senator's amendment, I am sorry to say. I do not know whether I would or not. Does the amendment affect the bill in any way?

Mr. McFARLAND. It would not, except to fix the date on which the bill would become effective.

Mr. BILBO. Would conditions remain as they now are until October 1, 1946? If the Senator assures me of that, I will accept it.

Mr. McFARLAND. With the exception that provision is made for a fund to be accumulated for the purchase of homes for veterans amounting to $68,000,000, provided that the funds will accumulate before that date.

Mr. BILBO. If it is the will of the Senate to accumulate a fund for just a few veterans very well, but I am afraid there will not be a sufficient amount provided by the fund to help many veterans. We have several million veterans to take care of. I think that by the GI bill of rights and other measures they have been pretty well taken care of. If the Senate wants to carry out the plan the Senator has suggested I certainly shall not stand in the way of any veteran of this war receiving the benefits that may come from it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, then I ask——

Mr. BILBO. However, I was hoping that I could kind of set this fund aside to build a new Capitol Building in place of the one we are now in. The one we are now in is a very disagreeable building.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by me on behalf of myself and other Senators be read and acted upon. The amendment would change the effective date to October 1, 1946.

Mr. BILBO. Very well, the Senator can ask to have action taken on it whenever I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question only.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. BILBO. The Senator cannot do that. The Senator must ask me a question or I will lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi refuses to yield. The Chair would advise the Senator from Mississippi that if the amendment in question were offered the Senator from Mississippi still would have full opportunity to speak on the amendment.

Mr. BILBO. Yes; but I want to finish my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi still has the floor.

Mr. BILBO. I began to say in answer to the suggestion made by the Senator from Arizona with respect to diverting a part of the fund to provide homes for veterans on these Government lands, that I was hoping we could accumulate a fund to build for ourselves a new Capitol Building. The newspapers made a wrong interpretation of my statement in this morning's issues. I did not say that I did not want to build the Capitol Building in Washington. I have already designated the place beyond the Supreme Court Building, if this city shall continue to be the Capital City of the Nation. I am not saying what I would do if someone were to introduce a bill to move the Capital. I am not advocating such action. But this Nation needs a new Capitol Building. Look at the Senate Galleries. Look at the ceiling—it is dangerous and unsightly. Here is a nation of 140,000,000 people, the richest nation on earth, and there is no reason why we should not have a Capitol whose rooms, whose appointments, whose furnishings are in keeping with the dignity and the might and the power and the wealth and influence of this great Nation.

The railroads derived the benefits I have described and many more from this contract, solemnly entered into. The land was the people's land. We ought to keep that in mind when we legislate. We are legislating with reference to the people's land. It belonged to the people, into whose laps the railroads now seek to dump a burden of $250,000,000 a year because they are now sick of their contract.

At that time the railroads were driving a shrewd bargain. No one need think that they need a nurse-maid to take care of their business. They usually take care of their own interests, and they always drive a shrewd bargain. They knew that the Government was not going to have any material volume of freight within the expectancy of the lives of the managements of the railroads at that time. As a matter of fact, things happened that way. The receipts of the Government from the rebate were less than $1,000,000 through all the years from 1870 until recent times. There was practically no freight to haul. The railroads had no obligation to return any appreciable amount. Therefore, of course, they could take the 132,000,000 acres of land which the Government had in trust with the assurance that it was "velvet." It was almost a gift.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understood a moment ago that the Senator was willing to perfect his amendment, making the effective date October 1, 1946.

Mr. BILBO. I should be willing to do so if it were agreeable; and if I could have the assurance that it would be adopted, I would stop speaking.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The best assurance we can give the Senator is the action the Senate takes on his amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I did not catch the statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Mississippi said that he was willing to perfect his amendment if he had assurances that the amendment would be adopted. I stated that the best assurance we could give the Senator was the action which the Senate would take on his amendment.

Mr. BILBO. If it is acceptable to the author of the bill, and to the Senators who speak for the Committee on Interstate Commerce, I will take their word for it, because I believe they have enough power to pass it.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator——

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I can yield only for a question. I ask the Senator to put his statement in the form of a question.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me see if I correctly understand the statement of the Senator. As I understood, his statement was that he would——

Mr. BILBO. Is the Senator asking me a question?

Mr. WHEELER. I am asking the Senator a question. If I correctly understood his statement, it was that if we would agree to October 1, 1946, as the effective date, the Senator would modify his amendment, offer it, have it agreed to, and quit filibustering.

Mr. BILBO. I will even quit making this speech. I think it is good for the people. I offer the amendment as modified.

I ask unanimous consent that further remarks which I had intended to make on the pending bill be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PERTINENT FACTS REGARDING LAND GRANT APPLICATION AND OTHER INFORMATION REGARDING OPERATIONS OF THE RAILROADS IN RELATION WITH GOVERNMENT FREIGHT

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, we were engaged recently in the greatest and costliest war in all history. A war whose cost will still continue to be paid for by our children's children. A cost never before dreamed of, yet here right in the midst of that colossal expense we are confronted with a bill that would add another twenty to twenty-five million dollars monthly, or a quarter of a billion dollars per year, to that cost by the mere expedient of giving it as a windfall to the railroads of this country whose earnings are even now unequaled in the history of railroading. This bill proposes to give this amount of money to benefit a comparatively few people at the expense of the many, and furthermore add that additional cost to the already unthinkable cost of the war, to be paid for by the men who were fighting for the liberties which we now enjoy and hope to continue in the future, and by their children. And why? For only one reason, Mr. President, to increase the already huge profits of the railroads, who now are trying by forces hitherto unknown in magnitude to void a contract which they willfully and eagerly entered into with the United States early in the eighteen hundreds when they saw an opportunity to benefit immensely by the bargain they so willingly drew.

Let us look into this contract for a moment and see what it intended. This land grant law conveyed to private corporations certain lands for the purpose of aiding the construction of railroads. In return for this land these corporations, their assigns and successors agreed by contract to transport over the railroads constructed on the granted lands the property and troops of the United States, free from toll or other charge, to wit: "The said railroad and branches shall be and remain, a public highway for the use of the United States free from toll or other charge, for the transportation of any property or troops of the United States."

Now, Mr. President, the total amount of lands which passed into the hands of these corporations was 132,425,574 acres. Not a small amount. As a matter of fact, an amount of land roughly the combined area of the States of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, which I believe all will agree is quite a handsome lot of land. Now, the actual amount of railroads constructed upon these lands was actually 17,627 miles, which could have been built on an area of 214,000 acres. In other words, the amount of lands actually received by these corporations was 620 times as large as the number actually required for the roads actually built. What became of the remainder? A large amount of it was sold by these corporations to others at a handsome profit in dollars in addition to the oils, coal, and minerals which they extracted from some of these lands and also a very nice profit, to say nothing of the vast amount of forest products they received and used in their construction and later also sold at more profits.

All these and many more benefits did they derive from this contract solemnly entered into. This land was the people's land. It belonged to the people into whose laps they now seek to dump a burden of $250,000,000 a year because they are now sick of their contract. At that time the railroads were driving a shrewd bargain. You need not think that they need a nursemaid to take care of them. They know their stuff, and they drove a shrewd bargain, because they knew the Government was not going to have any material volume of freight within the expectancy of the lives of the management of the railroads. That proved to be the case, and they had practically no freight to haul. They had no obligations to return any foreseeable quid pro quo and therefore, of course, they could take the 132,000,000 acres of land which the Government had of ours in trust with the assurance that it was "velvet" or nearly clear profit or almost a free gift.

They made that contract to haul all Government freight and troops free of charge. Then when the Government began to have some freight business, they welshed. It was beginning to cost them a little something. So they got it cut down to where Government freight was no longer to be hauled free but for half price.

And just as a matter of record, Mr. President, the way they did this is most interesting. They claimed that the original contract specified Government freight and troops were to be hauled on those roads free from toll, that the contract did not specify that they—the railroads—were obliged to furnish the engines, cars, and manpower with which to do it. This, Mr. President, in face of the fact that the original contracts did specify, as previously stated, that the "said railroad shall be and remain a public highway for the use of the Government of the United States, free from toll or other charge upon the transportation of any property or troops of the United States, and the same shall at all times be transported at the cost, charge, and expense in all respects of the company or corporation, or their assigns, having or receiving the benefits of the grants herein made."

When the land grant roads had gotten by with this they liked it, and saw how easy it was to put over. They lived up to the modified contract until they decided to welch again. Then, instead of their obligation to haul all Government freight, they limited it so as to cover only Army and Navy freight. And so systematically, whenever they felt the need, they have welched on their contract. Now the land grant railroads come for their grand finale. They insist that all that remains of their contract is a mere scrap of paper and should be destroyed. These successive welches have usually come at a time of stringency, when the railroads were not doing so well. But this time they come at a time when they thought the attention of everyone concerned was centered on the war and other matters vitally important. This, Mr. President, is not a matter of need on part of these railroads. As a matter of fact, they asked for an increase in rates, which was granted as of March 18, 1942. A 6 percent increase in all rates.

However, after protest by a number of shippers and resultant investigation by the Interstate Commission, this increase was withdrawn and lifted effective as of May 15, 1943, for the reason that this increase was already giving these roads a far greater financial return than was deemed proper by the Commission. As a matter of fact in one case it is said that one railroad in reorganization is making $100 a share on its common stock which had been declared worthless by the Commission. So it is quite clear, Mr. President, that this bill is not based on financial need of the proponents of this bill. Therefore I submit, Mr. President, that this windfall should by no means be given these corporations. It belongs to the people and they should have the benefits of this contract at least until the close of this war and for 1 year thereafter when the condition might possibly be changed and at which time further consideration could be given to this matter based on the condition at that time.

Now, Mr. President, there are some interesting figures and statements to which I should like the attention of my colleagues to be directed in connection with matters directly conected with this bill.

First, they have conducted an enormously expensive campaign for many months through newspapers, pamphlets, and radio, preparing this onslaugh against the public purse. They have enlisted the help of shippers, far and wide, to campaign for the repeal of the Land-Grant Act. Even labor unions have lent their support to this measure, and in the large percentage of instances those who were roped into supporting the passage of this bill were totally ignorant of the facts or of the operation and benefits they themselves were and are receiving therefrom. Statements have been made in the hearings before the House committee and the Senate committee as well which in themselves show beyond question that the persons making the statements knew absolutely nothing about it, or were deliberately making misleading statements to influence Members of Congress into the passage of this bill.

For instance, on page 54 of the Senate hearings on this bill appears a statement of a railroad president which begins, "On account of being unable to obtain Pullman reservations to and from Washington I am denied my desire to appear before your honorable committee in connection with the hearings on the land-grant bill H. R. 4184." After making numerous other statements, too numerous and lengthy to quote he ends his statement by this assertion, "Much circuity of routing, expense, and unnecessary hauls, is indulged in by Government agencies to secure the land-grant deduction." Mr. President, I submit to you that anyone capable of making a statement of that kind displays a complete and total ignorance of the subject of land-grant application or a willful misstatement of the facts.

In the House hearings a statement was made that "in order to make a two or three dollar savings in rates they are actually shipping these circuitous routes and a greater burden is then placed on the ordinary citizen as a shipper, if we assume that the shipping public must pay at least the operating costs of the railroads, it is ridiculous, it is a burden that has to be borne by the ordinary shipper."

Many other misleading and misinformative statements could be pointed out in both the hearings of the House and the Senate did time and space permit. Let these suffice as samples, however.

Mr. President, by their own statement through their counsel as shown on page 38 of the Senate hearings, there is a total railroad mileage of 240,000 miles now in existence in the United States against a total of 17,440 miles of land-grant railroads, or a percentage of less than 15 percent land-grant roads. But when the other 85 percent of the roads saw a little Government business going to competitors via the land-grant routes they couldn't stand it and immediately sought a method by which they too could profit on Government business and as a result the so-called equalization agreements were entered into by these non-land-grant roads, nearly all of them, which by their own and voluntary act committed them to provide the same rates and charges on shipments moving via their lines as would have applied had the shipment moved over the possible land-grant lines. But this is a point on which a great deal of misunderstanding has been permitted to get into the public mind and neither the railroads nor the press have gone to any trouble to disillusion the public of that opinion. The fact that these roads entered into these equalization agreements does by no means mean that because of them the Government gets land-grant rates on all shipments regardless of where they move. Not by a long jugful. It meant and still means only that, if there is a land-grant route available over which a shipment could move for any part of the haul, within the routes and provisions embodied in the tariffs which the railroads themselves made and issued, then, and then only, would the Government be entitled to the same percentage of reduction in rates over the non-land-grant roads involved as would have applied, had the shipment moved over a route permitting movement over partial land-grant routes.

Let me make this point clear, Mr. President, in this way. In the entire territory beginning at the Illinois-Indiana State line, on up to the Indiana-Michigan and Ohio-Michigan State lines and from there on to the east coast clear to the Canadian border and south to Tennessee approximately the southern boundary, and thence east to the coast of the Atlantic there is not a foot of land-grant railroad, and on all traffic practically, that moves from point to point within that area only, the Government gets no reduction of any kind on anything that moves, either military or otherwise. Then farther out in the West; Nebraska, South Dakota, Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, all of which have not a foot of land-grant line within their borders. Also on shipments moving from those States to west coast and southwest coast points there is little and in the majority of cases no land-grant deductible. So that the picture is not as "rosy," if you please, for the Government as attempted portrayal has made it. It is true of course that the figures reportedly representing land-grant reductions seem enormous, but these are days of enormous figures, and when the reductions are compared with the amount of traffic that moves it shows up in a different light. The traffic moving is enormous likewise. Now, by their own statement, from 65 to 70 percent of the traffic handled by railroads presently and for some time past is Government movements, and then when one looks at the earnings statements for the railroads for the past several years, Mr. President, comprehend what their earnings statements will show if this windfall of a quarter of a billion is now added to those already huge statements.

Speaking of percentages, Mr. President, I think the records will reveal that these railroads have permitted, I may even say helped create, the universal impression throughout the length and breadth of this land that the Government gets a 50-percent reduction on all freight shipped by it. That is far from

the facts. As a matter of fact it was brought out in the House hearings and the Senate as well by men in the Government service in the War Department and others that the average land-grant deduction over all taking into consideration all movements amounted to only from 10 to 17 percent rather than the 50 percent generally believed by the public. This, of course, the proponents of this bill have not given the great publicity which they so willingly gave some other figures. For instance, in a pamphlet broadcast by them far and wide, the opening statement reads as follows:

"Present Federal law requires the transportation of a vast Government traffic at half the rates paid by ordinary shippers." Now there may be some modification of that statement somewhere between the covers of this pamphlet, but the point is that a large majority of people picking up such a pamphlet would read perhaps a page or so and then drop it as not interesting to them, but—they did read that opening statement and at some future time some mention is made in a newspaper or otherwise, and memory brings back that statement about the 50-percent reduction on Government transportation. A very clever device, I concede. And so on throughout this entire well-laid campaign of propaganda there have been evasive and misleading statements as a result of which not only the public but many Members of Congress have gained impressions that are entirely erroneous on this matter, and the proponents of this bill have been and still are willing to let it be even so.

Before proceeding further I would point out also, that in the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia there is not a foot of land-grant road, and in addition the State of New Mexico contains a total of approximately 35 miles of land-grant road. That as you see considerably reduces the area covered by land-grant lines. The proponents of this bill will of course state that the roads in these States are covered by equalization agreements, which is true, but, the fact remains that on traffic moving within the confines of the areas outlined here, it is impossible to apply land-grant deductions except in cases where is a movement to a point of sufficient distance in another area where it is possible to theoretically move over a land-grant route according to tariff prescribed routes, and this, Mr. President, I find on investigation, is in a very small minority of cases. So much for that particular angle.

I might mention, in passing, that this bill is fathered by a Member of Congress in whose State there is not a trace of land-grant railroad.

To retrogress for a moment, let me call attention to page 59 of Senate hearings, where, in the statement of A. H. Schwietert, Traffic Director, Chicago Association of Commerce, it reads as follows: "Recently the Commission (that is the Interstate Commerce Commission) postponed for another 6 months the increases in ex parte 148 which permitted a 3 percent increase on some traffic and a 6 percent increase on other traffic. That has been postponed until December 31, 1944." Upon being asked by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, "Why was that rate increase postponed by the ICC?" the reply was, "Because of the increased revenues of the railroads at the present time and the increased volume of traffic."

Question by the Senator: "Then it is reasonable to expect, as soon as traffic falls off and the revenues decrease, that the increased rates will be made effective?"

Answer: "I don't think there is any doubt about that. The 6 percent will go back on just as soon as there is a falling off in traffic."

So, Mr. President, from the action of the ICC there can be no doubt on their part that the railroads are making sufficient profits without adding this huge amount to their revenues.

Let me point out further statements by proponents of this bill which are based on ignorance of facts, as well as pure assumption, by reason of their predicting the future: On page 14 of the Senate hearings on this bill a statement is made that "the present situation is a burden on a great many shippers; the way things stand now the land grants are a burden on those sections of the country because they keep the railroads in those sections poor, and the shipping public in those regions has to make up the difference." I think the absurdity of both statements is obvious, in view of facts I have already given. Let me again emphasize that the shipper is in no way concerned in the charges since they are in all cases passed on to the consumer, either with or without the knowledge of the consumer. As to that part of the statement referring to keeping the railroads poor, Mr. President, I don't think that even deserves comment. Their own earnings statements refute that beyond a question of doubt.

In reading the hearings on this bill, I note that many of the statements made by the proponents of this bill are contradictory. In fact a close check of them will indicate that nearly all statements made by them are, somewhere in the hearings, contradicted either by the same individual making the original statement or by someone else in their desperate effort to put this measure over, which is further evidence that most of the proponents of this bill are not familiar to any degree with the actual facts in the case. In some cases they roar disapproval of one concern being located on a land-grant line because he has an advantage over someone who is not so located. In the next breath they disprove their own statement. On page 33 of the hearings, if you please, is a statement by their chief counsel wherein he says: "Now, here is a movement of iron and steel articles from Chicago to Portland, Oreg., and another from Minnequa, Colo., to Portland. Now the commercial rate from Chicago to Portland is $1.10. If it were not for land grant the shipper at Chicago would have to pay $1.10. Now the shipper from Minnequa, which is a distance much less than the distance from Chicago, has a commercial rate of 85 cents. You see he is nearer [the statement continues]; he is entitled to the advantage of his location." I submit to you, Mr. President, that by the same token the man who happens to be located on a land-grant line is equally entitled to the advantage of his location. By their own argument, they condemn themselves. The entire testimony on behalf of the passage of this bill is biased, unfounded, and has no standing, and if this were a case in court they wouldn't have a leg to stand on. They resort to foul methods and seek by confusion of the issues to get this legislation passed in their favor.

Just another instance to show how they confound themselves in their ardent desire to get this bill passed. On page 171 of the House hearings a statement by the president of the National Industrial Traffic League: "The shippers' interest arises in two ways. First, because of the uncertainty as to what the land-grant rates are, and the discrimination which arises by reason of the land-grant rates between different shippers; and, secondly, because to the extent that the Government fails to pay its fair share of the transportation burden for the traffic which it has transported, the burden of making up the deficit falls upon the general public. Now, Mr. President, as previously pointed out, by their own admission 65 to 70 percent of present-day traffic is Government property and the burden, according to their logic, would therefore fall upon the balance, or 30 to 35 percent of the shippers. Now the burden in this case is such that the Interstate Commerce Commission has already lifted a previously granted 6 percent increase because of the already excessive earnings of the railroads. What a farcical argument. Do they think that Members of this body are going to be stampeded into passage of this bill by that kind of argument and procedure? I am sure my colleagues are more intelligent than to overlook such crafty moves and unfounded statements.

Further on in the House hearings on page 182 we read a statement by the chairman of the legislative committee of this same organization as follows: "In connection with this discrimination feature, let us not be confused or misled by the talk we so often hear about equalization of the land-grant rates; that is, that the non-land-grant road will equalize its rate to a parity with the rate of the land-grant road to meet competition. This equalization will only apply where the land-grant road and the non-land-grant road both operate between the same origin and destination points, let us say origin A and destination B. And even then it is a voluntary proposition on the part of the non-land-grant road, which is under no compulsion to make such equalization in its rates."

A direct contradiction to statements made earlier in the House hearings, Mr. President, when the statement was made that the non-land-grant roads were "compelled to put in the equalization agreements." Now further on page 184 the same witness states: "We feel that existence of land-grant rates has in the past, and is now to some extent at least, causing circuitous routing of Government traffic in order that the traffic may move over land-grant routes. This wasteful use of equipment in a time when every possible effort is being made in the interest of the conservation and efficient use of equipment is manifestly unfair and discriminatory." Mr. President, this is a statement made in complete ignorance of the facts or a deliberate distortion thereof; as previously shown herein, other witnesses have stated that because rates, while figured theoretically over land-grant routes for the purpose of establishing the land-grant deductions to be made under the routes and provisions of the tariffs made by the railroads themselves, does not indicate that shipments actually moved over those routes. As a matter of fact in the majority of cases they do not, but actually move over non-land-grant routes, but the charges are settled on a land-grant route basis if and when such routes are available and in accordance with the provisions of the tariff under which they move. That is what the equalization agreements, made voluntarily by the non-land-grant roads, provide. Need I go further in citing the distortions and misleading statements of the proponents of this bill?

And while the subject of wasteful use of equipment has just been mentioned I should like to go into that subject for a moment. Now, Mr. President, this is an order by and of the Interstate Commerce Commission, namely, service order No. 68, which went into effect February 15, 1942, according to testimony shown on page 216 of the Senate hearings. This order deals with the loading of cars and the rates charged for additional cars used in the shipment. Before this order went into effect, a shipper or the Government, if you please, might have a shipment that would constitute more than it was possible to load in one car which might be available to carry it.

Before the effective date of this order, a car could be ordered of sufficient size or capacity to carry the shipment and if such a car was not handily available the carrier would be permitted to place in lieu thereof either a larger car than that ordered by the shipper or else take the alternative and place instead for loading two smaller ones and the shipper was permitted the privilege of paying the carload rate on the entire shipment even though part of it may have been loaded in another car. Or he, in case it was one large car, larger than ordered

for the shipment, could use the larger car and pay for the minimum weight required in carloads on his shipment or the actual weight if that was greater than the minimum carload weight. Now however, if a shipper, or the Government, has a shipment of say 40,000 pounds and orders a car to carry that load but the carrier sees fit to set in a car of much greater size than needed for this shipment, the Government is no longer entitled to pay for the sized car order of sufficient size to carry the load, but is obliged to pay for the sized car actually used for the shipment and in which the Government had no control or voice in accepting. This results many times in the Government paying for a lot of empty space at severely high rates. The purpose of course was to conserve equipment but in the case of the Government, because of the nature of shipments, it has not only failed in its purpose, because in many cases, shipments originated at places where no other freight was available to use the remaining space, but in many cases the freight was of such a nature that the loading of other freight therewith was not permissible for reasons of security as well as of secrecy, and the Government has been obliged to pay for, at high rates, a lot of unused space. Now this order by the Commission has left open to much abuse the furnishing of improper equipment for loading and has led to the payment for a lot of services not performed. I submit, Mr. President, that the ICC has herein inflicted against the Government and the public, a severe penalty without accomplishing to any degree of efficiency, the purposes for which intended.

Let us see, Mr. President, what is transpiring presently that these people should deserve such a windfall, aside from their contractual obligations, which they are so ardently seeking to nullify.

The Transportation Act of 1940 made some interesting changes in the procedures under which these railroads now operate. Up until that time all bills from the carriers were preaudited, that is when a bill was presented by the carrier for freight or other items carried by them for the Government, the War or Navy Department audited these bills before the carrier was paid for the service. Here again the railroads "squawked," saying they had to wait too long for their money, which they so badly needed, and I might add that perhaps there was some ground at that time for such appeal. However, at that time the procedure was changed by Congress so that from that time on the carriers sent their bills to the Department involved and that office paid the bill forthwith unless there was an obvious error. A check is sent in full payment of the bill presented and the audit takes place later at which time if error is found the carrier is presented with a statement showing the error and amount and is requested to make refund of the amount involved.

Since 1942 traffic has become steadily heavier, and after our entrance into the war the traffic has, of course, reached unprecedented heights. As a result, the work of the carriers in preparing these bills, as well as the work of auditing by the Government, has grown to such an extent that it is impossible to keep pace with the movement of freight and troops, and as a result, with the shortage of trained help and the large volume of the work, the Government is far behind in the work of auditing these bills and the railroads have many millions of dollars in their hands of which they have the use for a period of anywhere from 6 months to 2½ years without one cent of interest, and the Government has been without the use of these funds for that period, and accordingly budgets have had to be increased accordingly by the various departments involved. I am told by reliable authority that overcharges by the carriers, caused by presenting bills erroneously or otherwise, amount to from twenty to twenty-five million dollars per year at present rate of traffic. It is obvious, Mr. President, that under the circumstances bills can be presented on any kind of a basis, the higher the better; the money collected from the Government and used until such time as the bills are audited, without interest or penalty of any kind, except that the carriers have to pay income tax on the entire amount. This they are also protesting. Yet it is their own fault. If bills were presented on the proper basis, they would not suffer the penalty of income taxes on the amount of the overcharges. Also this kind of handling results in endless work in accounting, both for the roads and the Government, and presents an ever-increasing load of work in both, and naturally follows the increased cost of operation. I am advised that if a carrier questions the proper rate or the propriety of deductions account of land grant the proper thing to do would be to present his bill on the lower basis, attach thereto a rider protesting the application of the rate or land-grant deduction, and simultaneously send in a supplemental bill for the basis the carrier claims to be correct. By this method the bill is paid on the lower basis and the carrier is not penalized by income tax on the higher amount unless and until it is found that the higher basis claimed is correct and the carrier paid on that basis. This method would avoid a lot of income-tax penalties, subsequent refunds by the carriers, and income-tax adjustments, including all the involved accounting as between carriers' settlements involved in the haul. It would seem that this would be the right and equitable way to do it.

Let me, Mr. President, give a few examples of how these overcharges accumulate large sums of money for carriers' use until final settlement is made.

I have on record a bill for some steel items from a midwestern city to a north Pacific coast point on which the carrier presented the Government with a bill and was paid by the War Department on a basis of $2.92 per hundred on August 27, 1943, a total of $19,492.70. This bill, when finally audited, was cut down to $7,684.61, or a net difference or overcharge by the carrier of $10,042.31, which has as yet up to this date not been refunded by the carrier.

In this particular case the carrier has had the use of over $10,000 since August 1943 without interest. Here is another even better example, found in the record, or rather the hearings on this bill in the Senate, page 205: On August 14, 1942, 17 cars of ammunition from the east coast to a Pacific coast port. The carrier billed the Government and was paid in November 1942 for this service $77,164.85 on a rate basis of $6.48 per hundredweight, and in this case the carrier deducted no land grant. On August 12, 1942, 16 cars of the same commodity over the same move the carrier billed and was paid by the Government $115,482.44 on the same basis, or a total for the two shipments of $192,667.29. A pretty handsome figure, I should observe, Mr. President, for two shipments. Now, these two shipments should actually have been billed on a basis of $3.22454 per hundredweight, or a total of $95,738.97 for both shipments, making a total overcharge on these two alone of $96,028.32, which the carrier has had the use of without interest since 1942 and as of August 1944 still had in his possession and unrefunded.

I am advised that instances such as this can be multiplied by the thousands and tens of thousands. Mr. President, such circumstances are preposterous and inexcusable. The carrier under such circumstances as these should be compelled to pay interest on the moneys so held. Another that I discovered in the past few days was one where the carrier billed a shipment at the rate of $13.94 per hundredweight, which when audited was finally brought down to a basis of $2.90 per hundredweight, or an overcharge of $11.04 per hundredweight. Mr. President, I submit to you that before any action is taken on this bill this entire matter of transportation for the Government should be thoroughly investigated by this body and through competent people employed in the transportation services of the Government and Accounting Office, I am advised that the entire rate set-up and classification is entirely discriminatory against the Government, and this entire matter ought to be thoroughly gone into immediately before any further action is taken on this bill.

Another interesting situation I should like to point out is a situation as shown beginning at the bottom of page 205 and continuing on page 206 of the Senate hearings. This is the matter of dunnage, which, according to the testimony given, is the material used in making secure for the protection of both the carrier and the Government in cars such articles as trucks, tanks, and in fact vehicles of all kinds, as well as bombs and other articles that may require such security in movement. These materials in most cases are just ordinary lumber or timbers, which, if transported alone, would take very low rates, yet when used for the purpose of security in the transportation of other materials, is paid for at the same rates as paid on the articles which it is used in making secure, which is oftentimes a very high rate. In the case of vehicles on transcontinental moves, from $3 to $5 per hundredweight, and oftentimes much more. Now, on many shipments the amount of this material used is not a small item. As shown on the above-mentioned page, for instance, on bombs, which by the way are, and have no doubt for some time past been moving in tremendous quantities. The record here shows that on a shipment of cars loaded with from 230 to 240 bombs the dunnage alone amounts to 7,950 pounds; from 270 to 279 bombs, the dunnage alone amounts to 10,700 pounds; from 280 to 300 bombs the dunnage alone amounts to 10,000 pounds.

Now, all this is paid for at the same high rates as is applied on the bombs themselves. I should recommend to my colleagues that have not already done so, that they take time to read the testimony in the Senate hearings which begins on page 193. I am sure they will find much of interest therein as well as many reasons why this bill should not be passed at this time, but should rather be withheld and a thorough investigation made through this body by men who fully understand this transportation subject at large as well as the land-grant proposition, which so many whose statements appear in these hearings did not apparently, as evidenced by the statements made.

Let us consider some other matters in this connection, some more of the practices these patriotic devotees of good business methods are and have been resorted to.

I refer again to the Senate hearings, page 200. Mr. President, this is not hearsay but backed up by facts and figures that can be verified. Prior to Pearl Harbor, or December 7, 1941, and as a matter of fact, up until about January 1, 1942, the railroads published export rates to west coast ports; that is, rail rates on materials to be shipped to foreign countries from Pacific coast ports. These rates were lower by a good margin than the domestic rates, or rates on the same shipments that went to the same points by rail, but which were not to be exported to foreign countries. There were a number of reasons for this; i. e., west-bound railroads competing with east-bound carriers for business out of the production centers, particularly of steel and steel products; the desire of Pacific Ocean carriers to participate in the ocean hauls that might otherwise go to eastern ports, and other reasons. However, suffice it to say that up to that time the Government of the United States was using those export

rates on a large amount of material being exported, and these rates were subject to land-grant deductions the same as any other shipments in many cases. There was, however, a provision in the export tariff which stated that to be entitled to the export rates published within the tariff, the shipment involved "must not leave the possession of the rail carrier until delivered to the common carrier by ocean at the port of embarkation, and the responsibility of the rail carrier shall cease upon such delivery." Of course, the Government was obliged to take over all ships of the American lines for war purposes, and on this technicality, that there were no longer any common carriers by ocean, these railroads immediately saw an opportunity to profit thereby and began to assess the domestic rates on all shipments, whether for export or not. In other words, Mr. President, they were so patriotic that they were willing to charge their own Government much higher rates than they willingly theretofore accepted for the same service from, in many cases, our present enemies. And now they come to this body and ask for that patriotic service a present of from two hundred and fifty to three hundred million dollars per year. Oh, they say, but section 22 quotations made retroactive to January 1, 1942, gave the Government the advantage of the export rates even back to that time. But what they do not tell us is that in each section 22 quotation they are very careful to mention the fact that the rates quoted here are not subject to land-grant deduction." Then the men who handle these details for the Government are obliged to make the best of the situation as they see fit, and I am advised that the alternative is to use the domestic rates to the ports of embarkation, minus the land-grant deductions, which invariably gives a better result than these section 22 quotations.

Another interesting item, as shown on page 201 of the hearings: Prior to June 1, 1942, TCFB freight tariff No. 29, west-bound, export, carried rates on various iron and steel articles, including steel of all kinds. However, on June 1, 1942, the carriers inserted in that tariff by supplement 22, item 1348, an item reading: "Rates authorized under head of 'Iron and steel, articles of' do not apply on the following articles of armament: Armor plate, deck plates, conning towers, conning tower tubes, turret tubes, signal towers, or siding hoods." The rates previously carried in this tariff were quite low but entirely in line with the class of commodity covered. The insertion of the above clause in the tariff had the effect of forcing the Government to ship all the articles mentioned above at class rates, which are very much higher, in many cases as much as 100 to 200 percent higher and in some cases even more. For instance, the rate prior to June 1, 1942, from eastern seaboard points to the Pacific coast for export was 63 cents per hundredweight. The above-mentioned clause inserted in the tariff had the effect of bringing the rate on some of these items up to $3.63 per hundredweight.

The same prohibitive clause is included in the tariff covering domestic rates to those points. In other words, Mr. President, they are not willing to give to their own Government, even in a time of crisis, the same rates which they are willing to accord any other shipper or consumer. The evidence is plain, Mr. President—the very articles which the Government, and the Government only at the present, would use in huge quantities they specifically make higher rates on. Nothing more nor less, I must observe, than a plain case of discrimination against the Government of the United States. These are facts, Mr. President, not hearsay. The evidence is on the records. Call in, if you please, men from the Accounting Office and verify these statements. I repeat again that this whole matter of Government transportation should be thoroughly investigated by all means, now, before further consideration is given to this bill. I have a very good idea that many more interesting facts than are shown in these hearings would be brought to light. Time and space did not permit extended research. Apparently the statements so made by men who know this problem were made extemporaneously and more from memory and excellent knowledge than from prepared transcript. Not being a member of that committee, I could not say. But I am told that this is a fact. I say a very extended research should be made into this entire situation, and by men who are working on the auditing of railroad bills, and who are familiar with the goings-on of the entire situation. It would seem to me that they would be the ones who would know the most about it.

Here is another circumstance to consider, as indicated on page 203 of the hearings: When war broke out the Army had in its possession many thousands of vehicles of all kinds—trucks, passenger cars, tanks, etc. All of these had to be moved from one place to another—in many cases across the continent. Now, I don't think anyone could deny that these were used or second-hand vehicles, yet, when shipped, the railroads charged for and were paid on the basis of new vehicles right off the line.

That practice, I understand, still prevails today. Mr. President, I submit to you that is entirely inexcusable. In the first place, if these vehicles were absolutely new and from the factory, they should, by their sturdier construction, their lack of fine finishes, and their all-around insusceptibility to damage as easily as ordinary vehicles, be entitled to a much lower rate. I am told that even on a huge number of these vehicles that have been damaged, wrecked, or in some the wheels and motors taken out and the vehicles shipped in to some central point for repairs, they still pay the new-vehicle rate thereon. These things are positively preposterous. I submit, Mr. President, that if the Office of Defense Transportation were not saturated with men who are in entire sympathy with everything the railroads do such conditions could not possibly exist.

Now, there can be no doubt that the rates on many of the items shipped by the Government were made during peacetimes, when there was little or no movement of that kind of materials, and as a result of which the rates were naturally made high, which would be the case on any commodity of small movement, but there is no excuse whatever to continue these high rates on present tonnage, and in some cases the rates have been even increased. These are all matters that should be thoroughly gone into before any action such as contemplated by this bill is taken. There is no rush—no need for this legislation to be rushed through without further consideration. The railroads are making more money than ever in history and are in no financial need whatever.

I might observe in passing that even the truck lines are willing to have this bill passed, so the rates of the railroads on Government materials will be higher. They (the truck lines) can then, of course, cut under the rail rates and get some business for themselves which they are not now perhaps getting in some cases. It's a cutthroat business, Mr. President.

One of the main reasons, in fact the one on which these proponents have laid the most stress for the passage of this bill, is the fact, as they claim, that not they themselves who make and compile the tariffs, nor the shippers who ship the goods are capable of determining what rates and what land-grant deductions to apply to shipments involved. That is quite an admission, Mr. President. Do they mean to say that they who themselves make these rates and publish the tariffs, make them so complicated that after they are published they cannot themselves determine the proper application thereof? If that be true, then by all means, I submit, some governmental action should be taken to have these tariffs published in such a manner that not only they, but the general public as well, could determine the proper rates in reasonable time and with reasonable effort. As a matter of fact, I believe that the Transportation Act, even now, provides for such clearness and simplicity in publication of tariffs. That matter might also be looked into. However, the point I was going to make was that if there is such difficulty in determining the proper land-grant deductions, and such involved procedures and lengthy accounting and adjustments as they portray, then the simplest and most satisfactory solution would be to substitute for these land-grant deductions a flat reduction of say 15 percent on all traffic which is now entitled to land-grant deductions. Surely anyone could figure 15 percent on any amount without a great deal of trouble. Then not only the railroads, but the shippers, consumers, and everybody would have a full and complete knowledge of the proper rates to apply insofar as the deductions are concerned. Also it would eliminate a tremendous amount of work not only for the railroads, but the Government and everybody concerned. It would eliminate endless accounting for all parties and save many, many man-hours of time and, it would seem to me to be more satisfactory to all parties. I can see no reasonable objection to this proposal by anyone, Mr. President, either in Government or outside.

Retrogressing again, if I may for a moment, I want to bring up a statement made since the preparation of these remarks was begun; a statement purportedly made according to the newspaper caption, by James Donohue, L. & N. general counsel, before a civic club in a midwestern city on November 30, just past. The big headlines over this statement read, "Present Laws Harm Railroads—Urges Three Changes." Hailing the tremendous wartime job being done by the railroads, despite the handicap of less equipment than was available during the First World War, James J. Donohue, general attorney for the L. & N. Railroad, told the Kiwanis Club yesterday that with the volume of traffic reduced after victory, present legislation burdening the railroads' financial structure must be relaxed. Chief among these he declared, are:

1. The present social security law, into which fund the railroads have paid more than one-half billion dollars, an amount sufficient to pay benefits at the normal rate for 50 years.

2. The so-called land-grant laws on Federal statute books for more than 75 years.

3. The majority of State laws which require railroads to pay high percentage of costs for separation of grades.

Calling the railroad social-security law, which requires the railroads to pay 3 percent of the pay roll into the fund a travesty, Mr. Donohue urged an amendment that would end all payments until the reserve is depleted to $150,000,000. The land-grant law he declared requires the railroads to transport United States property, and mail, and members of the armed forces at one-half normal rates, for some 130,000,000 acres of lands, largest of which are in the West and South. "This land was a drug on the market," he continues, "prior to the coming of the rails. Prior to that time the Government was willing to sell it at $2.60 per acre." This is I might point out, at quite a variance with the statement of one of their witnesses in fact the vice president of the American Association of Railroads, as shown on page 23 of the House hearings on this bill stated in speaking of the value of the lands granted "97 cents was fixed at the time of the grant." That is Mr. President, 97 cents per acre. Now here is a statement by another railroad representative that the lands were for sale at $2.60 per acre. I might suggest that the two witnesses get together and compare figures;

establish a common value so there will be no such great variance of opinion in the statements. That is just an observation in passing. Now the article quoting Mr. Donohue continues: "Mr. Donohue also said that a rate increase which would bring the railroads $426,000,000 was suspended by the ICC, and that at the time that was not protested by the railroads. Now," he said, "the rail companies are asking that suspension be lifted." May I point out here Mr. President that they not only want that 6-percent increase in rates but also want in addition this two hundred and fifty to three hundred million dollars per year. Surely, there is nothing small about their desires and requests, I think you will agree. Further, this article continues, (quoting him) "Railroad managers have no illusions about the railroads of tomorrow. They will be faced after the war is won, with a volume of traffic, both freight and passenger, greatly reduced, and by competition, subsidized to an unbelievable extent, on land, water, and in the air, more intense than at any time in the past."

May I call attention, Mr. President, to testimony shown on page 196 of the Senate hearings near the top of the page, second paragraph, wherein the witness stated: "The railroads are in a very peculiar position, so far as the postwar period is concerned. I believe it is quite evident to anybody who locks at the situation that after the war the railroads are going to have to move a lot of this stuff back from the battle fronts and from various parts of the country. Thus there is going to be a lot of shipping, and the railroads are going to be in a much better position than any other industry, because they are going to have a continuing flow of business immediately following the downfall of the Axis, whereas a lot of other industries are going to have to await rebuilding. There is going to be, I think, a period when they are going to be dormant while factories are rehabilitated. That is something the railroads are not going to have to do. There is going to be a lot of business for the railroads in that period. So I do not see why the railroads are very much concerned at this time about the immediate postwar period, because their business is going to be very good as I see it."

Now Mr. President, immediately in line with that very statement, I call your attention to a large headline in a local paper, here in Washington just a few days ago, on December 3 to be exact, which said, "Boom business for rail predicted after war ends." That is the headline. Now the article reads as follows: "United States railroads expect for 3 or 4 years after reconversion, business approximating volume in the 1929 boom year and during the poorest 12 months in a reconversion period lasting from 18 to 24 months—a revenue volume at least 25-percent higher than that of 1939. These estimates were obtained from J. H. Parmelee, director of economics for the Association of American Railroads. The estimates are considered particularly significant because volume of freight and passenger traffic, dependent as they are upon general business conditions, are popularly accepted as a gage of general business conditions. Thus in the opinion of the bureau of economics of the country's railroads, there will be no reconversion slump with widespread unemployment of the character apprehended by a minority of businessmen. Parmelee's estimates do not go beyond his reconversion period of 18 to 24 months plus 3 or 4 years of postwar era thereafter. The industry's chief economist, mainly on the basis of surveys of principal shippers, placed operating revenue during the lowest 12 months of reconversion at five to five and one-half billion dollars. For the postwar period, he placed annual operating revenue at six to six and one-half billion. These figures compare with the $6,280,000,000 revenue of 1929, the largest peacetime year in rail history, and with the $3,995,000,000 revenue of 1939, the last year before the United States started heavy production for the European war. Based on these revenue figures, the railroads will employ 1,000,000 to 1,100,000 during reconversion and 1,140,000 to 1,225,000 in the postwar years. They are now employing 1,400,000."

Now Mr. President, this statement by one of the railroads' experts on such matters, employed by the Association of American Railroads, for that purpose. Somebody has been and is still wrong. There can be no doubt by this time, Mr. President, in the minds of every man in reach of my voice, that the witnesses in the hearings both before the House and Senate committees, have made wild statements, misleading and misinformative statements for no other purpose than to confuse the issues and get the Congress to pass this bill. Can there still linger in the minds of anyone here, any reason whatsoever why this bill should be passed and take two hundred and fifty to three hundred millions of dollars out of the pockets of the taxpayers and dump them into the laps of these concerns? In the face of the facts just cited, Mr. President, I can't conceive of any Member of this body voting in favor of this bill. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, in the face of these facts, I don't believe that even the representatives of the railroads themselves would have the unadulterated audacity to even ask further consideration of their bill. I don't see how they legitimately could.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will either the Senator from Mississippi or the Senator from Montana state the amendment?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The modified amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 23, in the committee amendment, after "Sec. 2", it is proposed to strike out "The amendment made by this act shall take effect 90 days after the date of the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, whichever is the earlier:" and insert "The amendment made by this act shall take effect October 1, 1946."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in order to have the record straight, certain language in section 2, beginning in line 23 on page 2, is proposed to be stricken out, and the language of the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi would be substituted.

Mr. BILBO. Yes. I modify my amendment by striking out "18 months after said act becomes a law" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1946."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, now that the modified amendment of the Senator from Mississippi has been accepted, let me call attention to the fact that I believe that the bill as it originally came from the committee would have saved the Government more money, if that is what the Senator is seeking to do. It would save the Government more money than would the amendment which we have accepted. Section 2 of the amendment reported by the committee reads as follows:

The amendment made by this act shall take effect 90 days after the date of the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, whichever is the earlier.

I do not anticipate for one moment, and I have not anticipated, that the President would by proclamation declare the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan for at least 9 months.

Mr. BILBO. I am not disturbed about such technicalities, if the effective date is made October 1, 1946.

Mr. WHEELER. I merely wished to call the attention of the Senate to the fact which I have stated.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Under parliamentary procedure could the amendment which the Senator from Arizona submitted in behalf of himself and other Senators be submitted for the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi after it is adopted? The effective date is the same, October 1, 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Any other part of the bill may be amended.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I have submitted on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], which amendment I now offer, be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona is not in order. The first part of his amendment is identical with the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], which is pending. The second part of the amendment does not relate to the pending committee amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not wish to consent to the amendment without knowing something about it. What does the amendment propose?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is the same amendment which was reported in the last session of Congress, covering $68,000,000 into a fund for the purchase of homes for veterans in reclamation States. It fixes the effective date as October 1, 1946, the same date as is provided by the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITE. Why is it limited to the reclamation States?

Mr. McFARLAND. Those are the States in which land-grant rates are now effective. It is to take the place of the lands which the railroads have obtained in those States. It represents the value of the lands in those States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] as modified.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated by the clerk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 23, in the committee amendment, after "Sec. 2", it is proposed to strike out "The amendment made by this act shall take effect 90 days after the date of the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, whichever is the earlier", and insert "The amendment made by this act shall take effect October 1, 1946."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, after line 20, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Montana to section 3. I understand that section 3 provides, in effect, that whatever earnings the railroads make by reasor of the removal of the reduction in rates shall be taken away from them by the requirement the Interstate Commerce Commission shall readjust their rates. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. WHEELER. The earnings will not be taken away from them.

Mr. OVERTON. I mean that is what the effect will be. They will profit nothing by it, will they?

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly. What it means is that, as always, the Interstate Commerce Commission in fixing the rates of any railroad will take into consideration its earnings. If this money goes back into the treasuries of the railroads, then in fixing the rates it will be the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to take into consideration the amounts which are received by the railroads. That will be done in fixing the rates all over the country.

Mr. OVERTON. Then, under that explanation, it seems to me that the railroads will not benefit in any way by the measure.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly; the railroads will not benefit by it.

Mr. OVERTON. The other day the Senator stated that the general public will benefit by it.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course the general public will benefit by it.

Mr. OVERTON. Then, do not we arrive at the same result if the existing law remains as it is and if the Government retains that money? When it retains it, of course it will be in the interest of the general public.

Mr. WHEELER. No; the result would not be the same, and I shall tell the Senator why that is so. The purpose in creating the Interstate Commerce Commission was to avoid discriminations or rebates in regard to freight rates as between various sections of the country and various cities. Under the act as now written, there is discrimination as between people who sell to the Government. As I said the other day, if John Smith, a manufacturer, living in New Orleans, which, we will say, has no outlet to a land-grant railroad, is selling his products to someone in Philadelphia, where no land-grant railroad operates, and if a manufacturer living at a distance from New Orleans has access to a land-grant railroad and receives the benefit of the land-grant railroad rates, the latter has an advantage, because he can sell his goods for a lesser price than the price at which the goods could be sold by the man living in New Orleans. In that way discrimination is caused in the case of a manufacturer who sells his goods to the Government of the United States and who does not live on a land-grant railroad, as opposed to a manufacturer who sells his goods to the Government and who does live on a land-grant railroad.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understood the Senators question to be directed to section 3 of the bill as it is now written.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I take it that that section would not do any more, either in fact or in law, than what the Interstate Commerce Commission would be required to do under its general obligations under existing law. I take it that section 3 is merely a restatement of a present legal obligation.

Mr. OVERTON. I think the Senator from Maine probably is correct about that; I think his interpretation of the law is sound in that regard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. It seems that there was a misunderstanding a moment ago regarding the adoption of my amendment. Will the Senator yield for a moment, in order to permit the situation to be straightened out?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have my amendment restated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be restated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the duty of all carriers now operating under land-grant rates, including carriers which have entered into land-grant equalization contracts, when billing the various agencies of the Government for travel or transportation subject to land-grant rates begun after the date of enactment of this act, and prior to October 1, 1946, to forward to the Comptroller General a copy of the bill showing the difference between the full commercial rates, fares, or charges for the travel or transportation in question and the amounts which would be payable at the land-grant or equalization rates, fares, or charges. No report filed by any carrier pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be considered or construed as an admission by such carrier with respect to the lawful rate applicable to any travel or transportation performed prior to the date of date of enactment of this act.

(b) A sum equal to the amounts reported under subsection (a) shall be set aside in the Treasury, and covered into a special fund to be designated as the "Veterans' farms fund," which shall be available for appropriation by Congress from time to time to carry out the purposes of this act.

(c) Seventy-five percent of any appropriation from said veterans' farms fund shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior and 25 percent thereof shall be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture, and shall be utilized by them for the following purposes:

(1) Funds appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior shall be utilized by him for the construction and settlement of irrigation projects in the reclamation States, including the purchase for disposition to veterans in family-type farms of such privately owned lands situated within Federal reclamation projects as are necessary to the proper and integrated development of said project.

(2) The funds appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be utilized by him for the purpose of assisting qualified veterans to establish themselves upon and improve family-type farms on lands within Federal reclamation projects and on lands within the States in which railroad land grants are located but which are not reclamation States. Funds so appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be administered in the same manner as funds appropriated for title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended: *Provided*, That funds may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in the reclamation States and in the other States named in subsection (d) without regard to the prevalence of farm tenancy in said States: *And provided further*, That veterans found qualified for occupancy of a family-type unit on Federal reclamation projects pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act must also be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior. Funds appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act may be used for the purposes of subsections (c) (2) and (c) (3).

(3) In order to provide for cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, pursuant to cooperative agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, to consider the money or any part of the money made available to settlers upon land within Federal reclamation projects, as all or a portion of the capital required of such settler under subsection (C) of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 702), and where any lands have been or may be improved by means of funds made available to a veteran by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall require the entryman or settler of such lands to enter into a mortgage contract or other security instrument acceptable to the Secretary of Agriculture covering his interest in the land and improvements to secure the repayment of the value of such improvements before a subsequent entry is allowed.

(4) The Secretary of the Interior shall expend at least $3,750,000 of the funds appropriated to him and the Secretary of Agriculture shall expend at least $1,250,000 of the funds appropriated to him in each of the States mentioned in subsection (d) as having railroad land-grants valued at $5,000,000 or more: *Provided*, That if the total of the amounts reported under subsection (a) is less than $68,272,770, then the said Secretaries shall expend in each of such States 75 percent and 25 percent, respectively, of an amount which bears the same ratio to $5,000,000 as the total of the amounts so reported bears to $68,272,770.

(5) An eligible veteran for the purposes of this act is one who has been or may be declared eligible for any benefits provided for in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of

1944 as the same now exists or may be hereafter amended.

(6) No amount shall be deducted or withheld from any payment due to any veteran under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of protecting the United States against loss in connection with any sale of land under this act.

(d) For the purpose of this act the value of lands to which carriers have legal or equitable title or possession in the several States is hereby fixed as follows:

Arizona, $7,000,000; California, $14,331,090; Idaho, $1,149,190; Minnesota, $87,228; Montana, $19,209,090; Nevada, $11,112,454; New Mexico, $5,000,000; North Dakota, $1,000,500; Oregon, $171,292; Utah, $349,120; Washington, $8,789,406; Wisconsin, $3,300; Wyoming, $70,100; total, $68,272,770.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment was agreed to a moment ago, but I wish to have the situation made clear.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the amendment was not agreed to. Another amendment was pending, and it was agreed to. But the amendment of the Senator from Arizona was not agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to explain to the Senator that in the land-grant States the railroads still have a certain amount of land. It was advocated by some that the railroads should turn those lands back to the Government.

Rather than to do that, we propose to create a fund, using the difference between the full commercial rates, fares, or charges for travel or transportation and the amounts which would be payable at the land-grant rates, fares, or charges which accumulates up to $68,772,770 before October 1946, to be used for the purchase or improvement of farm homes for veterans in the reclamation States. The Senator's State is one of the reclamation States. In substance, that is the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I dislike, in an atmosphere of harmony, to say anything which might possibly disturb the harmonious feeling. However, I do not think what I shall say will do that.

Mr. President, this is a cock-eyed amendment which has no proper place in this bill. What it proposes to do is to take money derived from the payment of freight rates on Government traffic moving over land-grant railroads and use it to create a fund, 75 percent of which would be administered by the Secretary of the Interior and 25 percent of which would be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, for the purchase of lands for returning veterans. What connection there is between land-grant railroad freight rates and lands for returning veterans, I am wholly unable to see. We have treated the returning veterans with generosity. If we have not treated them with sufficient generosity, I stand ready to move in the proper direction to give them whatever may be justified.

But to mix things which are not alike, by writing into this bill an amendment of this kind—which has no relation to the bill and has nothing in common with the bill—is, to me, bad legislative practice, which should not be followed.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I took the same position last year on this amendment; and when the committee accepted it at that time I filed a special concurring report expressing my views. I was in favor of the objective of the bill, namely, to terminate the land-grant rates. I was not in favor of the inclusion of this amendment. The bill never came to a vote, so nothing was done.

This year the committee did not accept this amendment. Now the Senator from Arizona has offered it from the floor.

I am anxious, as is everyone else concerned, about helping the shippers of the country get rid of land-grant rates. As has been stated here, they are a source of discrimination as between shippers, and they should be terminated. I am in sympathy with the veterans. If we have not given the veterans all we should have given them, I stand ready to vote to give them what can be justified. But this is not the kind of legislation we should pass in order to accomplish the purpose sought.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Kansas objected to the amendment on a prior occasion, but he was the only one who objected. The amendment represents a compromise which we are trying to agree upon. I think the amendment should be agreed to so that we may dispose of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizont [Mr. McFARLAND] for himself and other Senators. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. REED. I ask for a division.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Myers
Andrews	Gurney	O'Daniel
Austin	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Briggs	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Butler	Knowland	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Carville	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Walsh
Cordon	McMahon	Wheeler
Donnell	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Maybank	White
Ferguson	Mead	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Willis
George	Mitchell	Wilson
Gerry	Moore	Young
Green	Murdock	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The bill (H. R. 694) was passed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that if there had been a roll call I would have voted in the negative.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, if a record vote had been had, as I requested, I would have voted in the negative.

Mr. RUSSELL subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senate passed without a roll-call vote a bill to repeal the so-called land-grant rates. I was temporarily absent from the floor, and when I returned the Senate was engaged in discussion of the question of the reference of the atomic energy bill. I had assumed that there would be a record vote on the land-grant rate bill, and I was out in the reception room, and was therefore denied the opportunity to ask for a record vote. I do not like to have this bill become a law without the RECORD showing I was opposed to it. I desired to make the statement that I was opposed to it, and I ask to have the statement appear in the RECORD following action of the Senate in passing the land-grant rate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I beg to state for the sake of the RECORD that I was opposed to the land-grant rate bill, and had there been a roll-call vote, I certainly should have voted against the passage of the bill. I ask that my statement appear following that of the Senator from Georgia immediately following the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1463

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday the President sent a message to the Congress dealing with atomic energy. In the message he commented upon his purpose to discuss with other nations the question of the control of the atomic bomb, and kindred subjects, with which we are familiar.

The message of the President was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and when the Senator from Colorado introduced a bill carrying out the recommendations of the President, and asked that it be referred also to the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] raised the question of the jurisdiction of that committee as compared with the Committee on Foreign Relations, and possibly other committees. By agreement the bill was permitted to lie on the table without reference, with the understanding that the question of the committee to which it should be referred would be taken up and disposed of today.

I had a feeling that that meant simply that the reference of the bill would be held in abeyance until today, at which time the Chair would refer the bill as the Chair refers bills usually. But from a technical parliamentary standpoint, the bill being on the table, the Chair cannot refer it as he would a bill ordinarily introduced, and, therefore, in order to get it before the Senate, it is necessary that the Chair lay the bill before the Senate, after which a motion will be in order to refer it to a particular committee.

Mr. President, in order that that question may be determined as promptly as possible, I ask that the Chair lay the bill before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate—

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I may be heard for just a moment—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I submit a parliamentary inquiry. What will happen if the Chair shall lay the bill before the Senate and the Senator from Kentucky shall move to refer it to the Committee on Military Affairs, and that motion shall be rejected? What then will be the status of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go to the calendar.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That would be an unsatisfactory status for any of us.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The issue I want decided, and the only issue I want decided, is whether or not the Senate thinks that the question of congressional control of this matter should be subdivided among various standing committees, or whether it should go to an over-all joint committee, which the Senate has already approved by way of resolution, which resolution is pending for action in the House.

I am perfectly willing to consent to any parliamentary maneuver which will permit the Senate to decide that fundamental question, but I do not think either the Senator from Kentucky or I would wish to create such a situation that we would have to vote either to refer the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs or vote it to the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it would be most unfortunate and most unsatisfactory that the bill go to the calendar without the consideration of a committee, and I think that the most direct way to reach the situation is to agree that the Chair may pass upon the question of reference, from which decision any Senator may appeal. We would in that way get the verdict of the Senate. Otherwise the bill will go to the calendar without consideration by any committee at all.

If I may make myself a little more definite, if I should ask unanimous consent, regardless of the parliamentary, technical situation, that as of yesterday, when the bill was introduced, the Chair decide the question of reference, from which decision any Senator could take an appeal, the Senate could then pass upon it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would not that leave us in precisely the same situation? Suppose we pursued the course suggested by the able Senator, suppose the Chair referred the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs, and I took an appeal, and the appeal were sustained; where would that leave the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would still leave the bill, according to my judgment, before the Senate, and a motion could be made then to refer it to another committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The committee to which some of us think it should be referred is not yet in existence, and is awaiting the action of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a situation which probably creates a parliamentary vacuum. Even if the House should agree to the resolution which the Senate has already passed, I do not believe this bill could be referred to it. I do not wish to enter into that argument now.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I disagree with the Senator in that. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Could we not present the issue frankly to the Senate, without any parliamentary difficulties, by a unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote upon a motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs with the understanding that if the motion were defeated, the bill would return to the table?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is unfortunate that we get into a parliamentary vacuum over the reference of a bill. Ordinarily, as we all understand, the Chair has the right to refer a bill, and I imagine that if the general parliamentary process had been carried out yesterday, the bill would have gone to the committee to which the President's message was referred by the occupant of the Chair at that time. But on account of the discussion which ensued, we all agreed that the bill should lie on the table. Many of the Senators did not realize that from a technical standpoint that meant that neither the Chair nor the Senate could pass upon the reference of the bill to a committee unless it were laid before the Senate and a motion made to refer it to a particular committee.

Mr. President, in the absence of the power of the Chair to decide, without unanimous consent, the question of reference—the Senator would not agree to that, would he?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Not without a supplemental agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, any Senator would have the right to appeal from the ruling of the Chair with respect to reference of the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes, but that might bring us to something that neither the Senator from Kentucky nor I would care to contemplate, namely, that it go to the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the appeal of any Senator from the ruling of the Chair was not sustained, then the bill would go to the committee to which it was referred. It would not put the bill back on the calendar. In other words, if the Chair should hold that the bill should go either to the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Foreign Relations, any Senator could appeal from that decision and we would have a vote upon it. That would not send the bill back to the calendar. If the appeal were sustained, it would be in order then, I understand, to move that the bill go to some other committee. I should like to inquire of the Chair whether I am correct about that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, if the Chair should refer the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Any Senator would have a right to appeal.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; any Senator could appeal. And if on appeal the Senate sustained the appeal, then it would be in order to move that the bill go either to that committee or some other committee, so the Senate would have a vote on the question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To some other committee. Not to that committee, because that question would have been decided.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Kentucky appreciates that that would not permit me to raise the fundamental question I wish to raise inasmuch as the joint congressional committee has not yet been created.

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Therefore I cannot move that the bill be referred to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Frankly, I do not think the Senator could move to refer the bill to it, even if the joint committee were in existence.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is another question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; that is another question. But, regardless of the status of the so-called joint commission which was provided for in the resolution which the Senate adopted the other day, here is a bill which was introduced yesterday and must be referred to some committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But it can lie upon the table until the appropriate committee is created.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; which might be indefinitely.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am perfectly willing, as I told the Senator yesterday, to avoid any indefinite postponement just as soon as the temper of the House of Representatives is registered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not so much concerned about the temper of the House of Representatives as I am about its possible action.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well. What does the Senator say about that?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not quibbling upon that proposition. Here is a bill which is introduced as a result of a Presidential message, and the message of the President was predicated upon the importance of prompt action upon this proposed legislation. The bill which has been introduced has no international connotations or relationships. It is purely a domestic bill dealing with a domestic situation growing out of the atomic bomb and atomic energy which has been developed by the War Department through military processes and through research. I do not wish to take advantage of any technical situation to deny the Senate the right to pass upon the question. If the Senator from Michigan is not willing that the Chair should make a ruling referring this bill to some committee, and by reason of an appeal from that decision to get a vote of the Senate, of course I am helpless, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is not helpless in settling the issue this afternoon if he will join me in permitting the issue to be presented in its naked reality to the Senate. I am perfectly willing to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky be permitted now to move to refer the bill to the Senate Military Affairs Committee with the understanding that if his motion fails the bill remains upon the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is not necessary to obtain unanimous consent that I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. All the Chair has to do is to lay the bill before the Senate, and then it is in order to move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I do not feel at this time justified in agreeing that if that motion should be defeated the bill would still be on the table, because it would then be in order to move that it be referred to some other committee.

I should like to see this issue settled because I want to say frankly that a similar bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs in the House yesterday. That committee is preparing to hold immediate hearings upon it. I think it would be most unfortunate for us to get into a quarrel over jurisdiction by committees in the Senate while the House proceeds with hearings on the bill referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Military Affairs, a bill identical with the one introduced in the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator that nothing could be more unfortunate than that we should get into parliamentary difficulties over a subject of this utterly fundamental import not only to America but to the world. The very thing I am striving for is to create one over-all forum which can be responsible for congressional action in connection with the consideration of this problem. My contention is that if it is not put in this one over-all place we will find one segment of the bill in the Senate Military Affairs Committee, precisely as is now proposed should be done, and we will find another sector in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee where the bill submitted by the able Senator from Connecticut has already been taken up. In the other House we find one sector of the problem referred to the House Military Affairs Committee, and another sector referred to the House Judiciary Committee. When we get through with subdividing all the interests that are involved in the answer to this fundamental problem we have created, in my judgment, a total hodgepodge which invites no possibility of the sort of prompt and effective action which the desperate problem requires.

Furthermore, the able Senator from Kentucky has emphasized the fact that the President's message has come to the Senate and has been referred to the Military Affairs Committee. I think that is no precedent whatever. I remind the Senator that when the Senate acted—and the Senate has acted—the Senate's recorded judgment is that this problem is too big for any of its standing committees. The Senate's recorded judgment is that there should be a small joint congressional committee created for the purpose of dealing with the total subject of the control, development and use of atomic energy. And I remind the Senator from Kentucky that that action was not taken until the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had sent a subcommittee consisting of the Senator Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and myself to consult the President of the United States himself in respect to it, and we called upon the President and we had from him the statement that he thought this was the proper way in which we should proceed.

Under those circumstances Mr. President, I do not think I am unfair when, while agreeing with the Senator that we ought to settle it at the earliest possible moment, I ask that the parliamentary situation be such that we can get a straight-out vote on the question whether any part of this problem shall go to any of our standing committees, or whether or not it is the judgment of the Senate that it should sustain its previous action in asserting that the problem is too great for any one standing committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if he is in accord with the President's message received yesterday?

Mr. VANDENBERG. What does the Senator mean?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Whether the Senator is in accord with the presentation of this whole matter to the Senate. This is what I mean. Beginning on page——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me interrupt the Senator to answer his question first. I am not in accord with that portion of the message which indicates that the President is going to proceed to determine what shall be the international fate of atomic energy and then report a conclusion to the Congress for its confirmation. I think that the determination of what shall be the international fate of atomic energy goes to the utter fundamentals of the whole thing, and that the Congress of the United States should have the right of consultation from the very first moment that the subject is taken up, and that again it is necessary to create a joint congressional voice for that purpose so that the Congressional representation can cooperate with the President every moment of the time that the subject is being explored. I do not agree with that portion of the Presidential message.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The President's message begins on page 1 and continues all through page 2 exactly to describe the bill which has been introduced in the Senate, known as Senate bill 1463.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can answer the Senator in a word. I am greatly sympathetic with the President's message. It is not conclusive, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not care to argue that point with the Senator, but I do wish to state, and to make it clear, that the President's message is divided into two parts. Beginning with the last paragraph on page 1, and on all of page 2, the President's message deals with the bill which has been introduced, and describes it in detail, and there is nothing in the bill which has been introduced which is not covered in the President's message on pages 1 and 2.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; there are in the President's message a great many things which are not covered by the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Beginning with paragraph 1 and ending on page 2, there is nothing in the President's message which is not in the bill. The bill is an amplification of that part of the message. Then the President, on page 3, goes on to say:

> The other phase of the problem is the question of the international control and development of this newly discovered energy.

Of course, that is a question with which the Military Affairs Committee certainly does not have jurisdiction to deal; but it does have jurisdiction to deal with all the parts of the bill which has been introduced, Senate bill 1463, the bill described by the President in his message, on pages 1 and 2.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's statement completely confirms everything I have said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator says that the Committee on Military Affairs would not have jurisdiction over certain parts of the problem submitted in the Presidential message.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I did not say parts of the bill. I said parts of the problem.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am talking about the message and about the problem. The Senator states that the problem is infinitely larger than the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The President concedes that, too.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; and I want the Senate again to concede it, as it has already done by voting in the first instance that the problem as a whole should go to a joint committee which can encompass the entire subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill does not encompass the entire subject, because the legislation which is presented to the Senate automatically divides the problem into two parts.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I seem to be unable to make the Senator understand that that is precisely what I object to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I seem to have a similar difficulty, Mr. President. Perhaps it is my fault in both instances.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator that a portion of this message belongs in the Committee on Military Affairs; I agree that a portion of it belongs in the Committee on Foreign Relations; I agree that a portion of it belongs in the Committee on Interstate Commerce; I agree that a portion of it belongs in the Committee on Appropriations. As I stated yesterday, since the Committee on the District of Columbia is the committee in which most of our explosions occur, perhaps some of it belongs even there.

That is the very point. With a subject so broad as this, I do not see how we can divide it up into airtight compartments and have half a dozen different committees at both ends of the Capitol simultaneously dealing with this utterly treacherous subject. It not only involves complete duplication of testimony and consideration, but it involves the very serious hazard that too many cooks may spoil the broth.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was I correct a few moments ago in stating that the present parliamentary status of the measure is such that the Chair himself cannot refer it to a committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no authority after it is laid on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to submit a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Chair lays the bill before the Senate, will it then be in order to move that it be referred to the appropriate committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask the Chair to lay the bill before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does that request require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. With the bill on the table, would it not require unanimous consent to lay the bill before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Technically it would require a motion by a Member of the Senate to lay the bill before the Senate, if there is objection.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that is the way to raise the issue.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Chair lay before the Senate Senate bill 1463.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If that motion were defeated, what would the status of the bill be?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would remain on the table.

Mr. VANDENBERG. A further parliamentary inquiry: Is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is debatable.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator wish to debate it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I will let the Senator have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky that Senate bill 1463 be laid before the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not wish to repeat myself. The issue is very simple. The Senate, upon the unanimous recommendation of its Committee on Foreign Relations, has adopted a concurrent resolution which undertakes to concentrate in one congressional authority the entire control of the original consideration of the problems involved in the development, control, and use of atomic energy. Why was that action taken by the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If that resolution should be adopted by the other House, would such a committee as is described in the resolution be a legislative committee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It would not. The resolution authorizes the committee to present its recommendations to the Congress.

Why did the Senate take that action, Mr. President, and why did the committee take the action which it took? It took the action because it confronted the proposition that the problem involved in the use, development, and control of atomic energy is so broad in its impact and its considerations that no single legislative committee in either the House or the Senate could possibly have jurisdiction over anything except a small portion of the problem.

The able Senator from Colorado himself, who introduced the bill, says that his bill deals only with the military aspects of atomic energy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator. I do not wish to misquote him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I made no such statement as that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well. The Senator may make his own statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill which I introduced carries out the recommendation of the President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the military field.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The recommendation which he made in his message of yesterday, beginning with the last paragraph on page 1, and including all the paragraphs on page 2. That is as much of the President's message as the pending bill, Senate bill 1463, envisages. The President's message then passes to another subject. The bill which is before the Senate does not pass to that second subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me see if I can make my statement sufficiently consecutive to be in some degree logical.

If the Senator's bill covers not only the question of military use, but also the question of the creation of an atomic energy commission to deal with the domestic development of atomic energy, then the bill does not belong in the Committee on Military Affairs, even as it is now written. There, we have another perfect example of the fact that this subject is so broad, and so all-inclusive in its impact upon every phase of American life—yea, upon every phase of world civilization—that there is no standing committee of the Senate which can appropriately take jurisdiction over anything except a very small part of it.

I repeat that if one takes the President's message and applies parliamentary dissection to it, a part of the message must be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; another part of it to the Committee on Military Affairs; another part to the Committee on Interstate Commerce; another part to the Committee on Commerce; and still another part to the Committee on Appropriations. That is a perfect example of the all-inclusive character of this problem.

Mr. President, it was because of that fact that the Committee on Foreign Relations, after consultation with the President of the United States, and with his approval—I repeat, after consultation with the President of the United States, and with his approval—unanimously reported to this body a resolution proposing the creation of a small joint over-all

congressional committee to take total jurisdiction over the entire subject.

That resolution was adopted by the Senate. The resolution has gone to the House. In the House it was referred to the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules substituted for that action of the Senate a practically identical resolution introduced by a distinguished Democratic Member of the House. I hasten to say that I have no pride of authorship in this matter. I am interested solely in the fundamental principle involved, and I shall be very happy to accept the Democratic sponsorship in the House which the resolution now has.

The House Rules Committee unanimously reported the resolution to the House. Whether it will come up in the House for action, I suppose, is largely dependent upon the attitude of the Speaker. I am not prepared to speak for the Speaker, but I assert that on the face of the record, so far as anyone can consult it, the judgment of the House of Representatives itself thus far is precisely the same as the judgment returned by the Senate when it adopted the resolution.

The motion now pending permits us to make a clear-cut decision upon this fundamental question. That is the only thing in which I am interested. It permits the Senate to decide whether it thinks the problem of atomic energy, its control, development, and use, can better be handled by being split into half a dozen different sectors and peddled out to a number of different standing committees of the House and Senate, or whether it believes that this problem is so big, so intense, and yet so delicate that there ought to be one congressional spokesmanship dealing with every phase of its development. A vote of "yea" on the pending motion is a vote to subdivide the question and spread it around among various committees. A vote of "nay" is a vote in favor of over-all consideration.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the resolution to which the Senator refers, which is now in the House, merely provide for the creation of a committee to which the legislation may be referred?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It provides for the creation of a joint congressional committee, consisting of six Members of the House and six Members of the Senate, to take over-all control of the consideration of this problem in the Congress, and to make recommendations to the House and Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Would this bill, as well as the President's message, be referred to that committee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That would be my theory and my view.

Mr. AIKEN. And no legislation is actually involved, other than the setting up of the committee; is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. How is the committee to be designated?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House—if that answers the Senator's question.

Mr. AIKEN. It does. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the motion I have made, which is that the Chair lay before the Senate the bill introduced yesterday by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. Ordinarily, when a Senator introduces a bill the Chair exercises the right, which he enjoys under the rule, to refer the bill to a standing legislative committee which may have jurisdiction of it. I recognize fully that frequently bills which are introduced in the Senate might go to one of two or three committees; but in the exercise of the power and discretion lodged in the Chair to make reference appropriately, the Chair is expected to refer a bill not to two or three committees, but to one of the standing committees of the Senate. That is the practice in the Senate. If the President's message of yesterday—a message which dealt with two phases of this problem, one domestic and the other international—had been limited to the domestic phase, there is no question that this bill would have gone to the Committee on Military Affairs. But the President said, after delivering his message upon the domestic phase of the problem, that he was going to initiate discussions with other nations with respect to the international phase of the problem. Theupon, the Senator from Colorado introduced a bill, not dealing with the international problems, not dealing with the international phase of the subject, but dealing entirely and exclusively with the domestic problem relative to atomic energy as developed by the investigations and researches of the War Department which resulted in the production of the atomic bomb.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The question outside of military use is infinitely larger from a domestic sense than the question inside of military use. Does the Senator think that the problem with respect to domestic use other than military use belongs in the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. BARKLEY. That all depends. We cannot introduce a specific bill and have it referred to more than one committee. Now and then the Senate has referred a bill to a particular committee, with an agreement that after that committee reports the bill it should then go to some other committee—a practice which, in my judgment, is a bad one, because it dissipates jurisdiction and authority. Frequently, bills which are introduced as a whole might, if introduced in separate parts, go to separate committees of the Senate. But the Chair and the Senate must decide the matter of the reference of a bill to a particular committee. Ordinarily I think the Parliamentarian advises the Chair, when he is requested to give advice on parliamentary matters, and especially in connection with the reference of bills, that the committee which would have jurisdiction of the major part of the subject dealt with by the bill would be entitled to have jurisdiction of it, notwithstanding that if some other phase of the subject were introduced separately in the form of a bill, it might go to another committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understood it to be said yesterday by both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Colorado that if other phases of the bill develop, the bill need not stay in the Committee on Military Affairs. Of course, there will be other domestic phases. That being true, of course I should be inclined to vote to have the bill laid before the Senate.

I also think that the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan, namely, that the bill be referred to a committee which is not a legislative committee, probably would put us in worse shape. I understood, however, both Senators to say yesterday that if there were other domestic phases of importance the bill should be sent to a committee other than the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I undertake to say in advance that if a bill is entitled because of its major provisions to be referred to a definite committee, if that committee reports it, it then will be possible to refer it to some other committee. The Senate always has jurisdiction of a bill; and if a committee to which a bill is originally assigned reports it and if there is a phase of the matter which should be considered by another committee, the Senate has the power to refer it to another committee. But I doubt the wisdom of doing that in advance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask the Senator to yield merely for a question. Is it not very difficult to treat the matter of the use of atomic energy in two separate sections—one, its internal effect, and the other its international effect? Do not they have to be considered together?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not think they automatically or necessarily have to be considered together, and the bill now before the Senate does not deal in any respect with any international phase of this problem.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the international phase is the dangerous phase.

Mr. BARKLEY. As the President said in his message, he will initiate discussions as to the international phase and will report to Congress either on what he has been able to ascertain or as to an agreement—which, of course, would go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

But this bill deals with the domestic phase, and it must be referred to a committee. It cannot be referred to more than one committee, as I see it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The really urgent problem is the international use of atomic energy, is it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is urgent, but I do not think it excludes the domestic feature.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It overshadows it, however.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps so, in the ultimate consummation. But, for the time being, it seems to me we must consider this matter from the point of view of the emergency which now presents itself to our country, and that consideration is to be supplemented by the belief and determination that we must consider its use from the international point of view. But the bill now presented does not deal with the international point of view.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Approximately a month ago, on the same day the Senator from Michigan introduced his resolution calling for the appointment of a joint congressional committee, and preceding that event, I made a speech in the Senate and I introduced a bill on this subject. The bill covers both the international and the foreign aspects of the use of atomic energy. I am happy to say that the bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado seems in practically all respects to agree with the provisions of the bill I introduced, so far as the domestic treatment of the question is concerned.

My bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I presume it was referred to that committee because, although it deals with the domestic side, it also deals with the international side of the question. I ask the Senator if any precedent to which attention should be paid now was created by that reference.

Mr. BARKLEY. My judgment is that no precedent was set or created either by referring the Senator's bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations or by referring the resolution of the Senator from Michigan to the Committee on Foreign Relations, because the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] introduced a bill on the subject and it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and there is now on the calendar a bill dealing with that subject, reported from the Committee on Military Affairs. I do not know whether the Senate will take up that bill.

Furthermore, I may say that hearings have been instituted, I believe, by the Committee on Commerce relative to another bill, one in which the Senator from Washington is interested. That bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce. That shows the chaos which exists in the Senate relative to the reference of bills, and it convinces me that the obiter dictum, to which I referred yesterday, by a former Vice President—namely, that any bill which bears the name of the committee to which the author of the bill desired to have it referred, would be referred to it without regard to the rules of the Senate—is bad practice. I do not think any of these bills or any reference which has been given to them to any committee establishes a precedent by which the Senate is bound.

Mr. McMAHON. I am seeking information. Could the Committee on Foreign Relations proceed to hold hearings on the bill I introduced?

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume it could do so. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. So there would be split jurisdiction, anyway, at this stage of the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, physically and mentally, the committee could go ahead. Of course, the bill having been referred to the committee, it could proceed to hold hearings, if it saw fit to do so.

But here we have had a message from the President of the United States, who has some responsibility in this situation, and a bill carrying out his recommendations, so far as the domestic phases are concerned, has been introduced in the Senate. The mere fact that the President mentioned his prospective discussions with other nations, upon which he will report later, in my judgment—unless the bill contemplated that and integrates it and deals with it—would give the Committee on Foreign Relations no jurisdiction.

Mr. McMAHON. As I said, my bill anticipated the President's message by a month and preceded it by a month.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I congratulate the Senator from Connecticut on his ability in foreseeing the situation and on his alertness with regard to the problem, which is one in which we are all interested. I say to the Senate that I have no personal preference in the matter of the committee to which the bill now under discussion is referred. I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I m not a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that I am not a member of either committee, so I am in a worse position.

Mr. BARKLEY. But I will say that the Committee on Foreign Relations had no more jurisdiction of the resolution of the Senator from Michigan, when it was introduced a few days ago, than did the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Committee on Commerce, or any other committee which might deal with some phase of the question of the future use of atomic energy. The fact that the committee reported such a resolution, and the Senate adopted it, in my judgment offers no precedent by which the Senate should be bound in determining to what committee the bill should be referred.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Let us return to the inquiry propounded by the Senator from Arkansas. It seems to me that we should remember that we will not have an international question involved until we acquire domestic control of the problem. What I am trying to say is that we are getting the cart before the horse. An old colored friend of mine used to say, "You cannot have a stew until you catch a rabbit."

The first thing for the Government to do is to acquire control of atomic energy. That is precisely what Senate bill 1463 would do, and that is all it would do. At the present time the whole matter is in a state of suspense. The Manhattan project, so-called, developed the atomic bomb. It has plants scattered around the country. Who owns them? What control do we have of them? What about any secrets which might be divulged as to the atomic bomb or atomic energy? Senate bill 1463 attempts to place a control over the entire problem so that we can deal with it in its international aspects, as well as other aspects which may come before the Congress. The first thing we should do is to perfect an organization which will control atomic energy. Then we can deal with the other aspects which may be involved.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Colorado has said that we have put the cart before the horse. What the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Kentucky are trying to do is to separate the cart from the horse. I do not know what good the cart is without the horse, or what good the horse is without the cart. I deny that we can divide this problem into airtight compartments. The entire problem is involved in every aspect of the question.

The Senator from Kentucky has said that the bill has nothing to do with the international phase. I invite his attention to the fact that the textual language of the bill says that "the primary objective of all action taken under or pursuant to this act shall be the safeguarding of world peace." If that language does not evidence international implications, I do not know what it does do.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a sentence which has been grabbed out of the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It has been grabbed out of the portion of the bill which describes its purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has been taken out of a bill of approximately 29 pages. Because of one sentence in the bill the Senator from Michigan thinks that the bill should be referred to a certain committee, notwithstanding the fact that all the remainder of the bill refers to the domestic situation. I appreciate the sincerity of the Senator from Michigan and I entertain no jealousy so far as the jurisdiction of committees may be concerned. As I said yesterday, I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I am not a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I have no personal feeling as between the two committees. If I did have any feeling of that nature it would probably be in favor of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Kentucky should understand that I am not seeking jurisdiction for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I certainly have concern about the international aspects of this problem. I understood the Senator from Colorado to have said a while ago that under this bill, when the domestic situation had been gotten in hand the

international situation would then be taken up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; the Senator misunderstood me. I was referring to the Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator did not say that.

Mr. BARKLEY. In his message the President said that he proposed to initiate discussions.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand; and I talked to the President about the matter some time ago. I do not wish to engage in debate. I think we have done too much talking about this matter already. Now we are getting into a row as to what committee should consider the bill. I do not believe that we will have another war within the next 20 months. I think we will have plenty of time to talk about and consider the international situation. I was hoping that the committee which has been authorized by the Congress—I think the Senator was not present——

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I was not.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, it would not make any difference——

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree that it would not make any difference whether I was there or not. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator, in an attempt to be funny, made an implication. I meant that it would not make any difference whether the Senator was in favor of it or not so far as the argument is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will not press the matter too strongly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am only emphasizing the Senator's side of the situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would not want to press it too strongly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, it seems to me that the discussion has been proceeding on the basis that the entire subject is divisible as between foreign relations and domestic relations. I gather from what has been said that the bill is intended to deal solely with the domestic side of the situation. I assume that the domestic aspect involves the use of atomic energy domestically, industrially, and commercially. Otherwise I cannot conceive of a domestic use of it, as distinguished from an international use, so far as the circumstances under which the matter is handled are concerned. How can it be dealt with domestically without disclosing the secrets in connection with it? How can we provide for the production, distribution, and use of it as an element of power if we do not hold open to the public the very elements which we all regard as being important and which should be preserved for the benefit of our own people and our own Nation?

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that, in a proper and orderly way, we must first deal with both aspects of the problem. We should first deal with the international aspect, and decide whether the secrets associated with atomic energy and its processes shall be held exclusively by our Government for the benefit of our country, or whether they shall be disclosed to the other nations of the world. If it is decided to make public our formulas and processes and throw them open to the world then, of course, Congress may go into the subject of providing for the domestic use of atomic energy, how it may be used and distributed, and what effect it will have on competition with other sources of power. I do not see how we can accomplish anything by domestic legislation. I do not see how we can develop anything which does not at the same time, if we make it of benefit and practical use, disclose the very thing about which we are so greatly concerned, namely, the rights and privileges of other nations.

It has been said that we should acquire control of atomic energy domestically. Why do we not have control of it already? We furnished $2,000,000,000 for its development. I understand that every dollar which was used in the development of this great and terrible instrument was provided by the Congress of the United States. I have seen statements to the effect that England and Canada had some rights in the atomic bomb. I have no authority for that statement, because it is my information that they did not contribute a single dime. At any rate, the developments were all made by employees and agencies of the United States Government.

The Manhattan agency was created by the Army of the United States. Whatever it knows belongs to our Government. So far as ownership carries control, we are in total control of this entire program and of the secrets which may be involved. So, What is the use of being in a hurry about changing the status? We have control of it, it is ours, it will remain ours until we make some disposition of it. I object to taking action which may make our ownership useless and of no value by simply disclosing secrets which we should keep to ourselves.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me, as has been stated, that the bill is putting the cart before the horse, that we should deal with the subject from an international standpoint. We should settle what use we are going to reserve to our people, in our country, and then adjust our domestic affairs, our commercial and industrial relations, to meet the program which we adopt internationally. I hope we may keep this matter on the table until we work out some definite program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield to the Senator from Colorado, and then I shall ask that I be permitted to make my statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Secretary Patterson gave us the answer to the point which has been raised by the Senator from Alabama, and I think the point raised by the Senator from Texas. I should like to read the paragraph containing his answer. He said:

I urge the immediate enactment of such a statute—

As Senate bill 1463—

I urge the immediate enactment of such a statute as a prime necessity now that the war period is drawing to its close. Such legislation will both permit the uninterrupted continuance of the activities which are now being carried on in the field of atomic power and will also provide for the necessary domestic central supervision of the use and development of this newly tapped source of energy. As section 1 of the proposed bill states, "The misuse of such energy, by design or through ignorance, may inflict incalculable disaster upon the Nation, destroy the general welfare, imperil the national safety, and endanger world peace." On the other hand, "the proper development and utilization of such energy will advance the national welfare, secure the national defense, insure the national safety, and promote world peace, to an extent and by means which cannot now be measured." The agency entrusted with the internal control of power of such unlimited potentialities must have broad and sweeping authority to promote the constant development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and, at the same time, to control every phase of its use so that enemies and incompetents, foreign and domestic, do not bring disaster upon the Nation.

That statement is signed by Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Kentucky to yield to me now, because the Senator from Colorado referred to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the letter from Judge Patterson, for whom I have the highest respect, he makes several references to the preservation of world peace, and how important that objective is. It is the business of the War Department, not to preserve peace, but to secure peace through armed intervention, and I do not quite agree that that department is now to take over jurisdiction over world peace. The Committee on Foreign Relations has been working on that question for several years, and up to now it has received the approval of the Senate in what it has done.

I wish to call attention to page 2 of the bill, line 14:

The primary objective—

"The primary," not the secondary, not the third, not the fourth, but—

The primary objective of all action—

"Of all action"—

taken under or pursuant to this act shall be the promotion of the national defense, the protection of the safety of the inhabitants of the United States, the safeguarding of world peace.

Yet, it is said the bill does not in any way trench on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations. If the desire is to take over the Committee on Foreign Relations and put it in the Committee on Military Affairs, do it by a formal resolution, but do not do it by chipping and chiseling off matters of this kind.

It seems to me that the Committee on Military Affairs has plenty of work to do. I am not criticizing the committee. I am hoping it will attend to its work. I think the Committee on Military Affairs would do well to see that the Army puts on a little more speed in getting our boys out of the Army. I think the Committee on Military Affairs could do rather well

in demobilizing the tremendous Army of generals we have, along with some of the boys. Instead of promoting every few days another list of generals, major generals, and others, it seems to me some of the lieutenant generals and others should be made to go back to their peacetime ranks. We have something to do with the draft, a subject to which the Committee on Military Affairs might well address itself. There is a vast field of jurisdiction which the Committee on Military Affairs has.

There is no great rush and urgency about the matter we are discussing. Everyone seems to be alarmed. I think we will survive the atomic bomb. We have survived the floods and the storms of the past, the plague, the black death, barbarian invasions, conquests, and revolutions. So I think we should use a little judgment. To rush this thing before the Senate, demand that every committee get out of the way and give the green light to the Committee on Military Affairs, is not consistent with the proper solution of the problem before us.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan, then I shall not yield to any other Senator until I make at least one consecutive statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Texas to some additional language in the bill which is to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I suggest that he start at the beginning at the bottom of page 5, where the bill proposes to create a commission, the activities of which "shall be carried on in accordance with the basic principles established by the President." What principles? Principles "in the promotion of international peace, the development of foreign policy, and the safeguarding of the national defense."

If one tried to identify the functions of the Committee on Foreign Relations any more closely than that, I do not know how he would do it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may comment upon that, and upon the reference of the Senator from Texas to the language on page 2, and assign to the various categories the importance they are given in the bill, I might say that, quoting the language on page 2, "The primary objective of all action taken under or pursuant to this act shall be the promotion of the national defense." That is the first objective, according to the language. Then "the protection of the safety of the inhabitants of the United States." That is another matter of defense. Next, "the safeguarding of world peace."

So that on page 2, the question of world peace is No. 3 in the category, and on page 5 it seems to be No. 1. The activities are to be "carried on in accordance with the basic principles established by the President in the promotion of international peace, the development of foreign policy, and the safeguarding of the national defense." So that in both those sentences the question of national defense arises.

Mr. President, we are confronted here with a concrete situation. If we are not to hurry about it, and there should not be any haste about it, and it is not an emergent matter, as the Senator from Texas contends, the President should not have sent his message here yesterday. The President of the United States thought it was of sufficient importance to justify a message yesterday, which deals with a domestic problem, and he might well have stopped there and not mentioned the international phases, but in order that the Congress and the country and the world might know that he had in mind the international situation, he went on further to say that he was going to initiate discussions, first with Canada and England, which have had some share in this matter, although we contributed the major part of the money.

I do not suppose we are going to contend that brains did not have something to do with this activity, as well as money. Brains and money and research ability of the United States and Canada and Great Britain contributed to the atomic bomb. Are we saying that because we put up the money, because we had the money to put up—which would have been futile without some brains—we are not going to consult with our two friendly allies who helped work this thing out? In that spirit the President said first he would consult with Canada and Great Britain, and then with the other nations, as to the international phases of the problem.

We have a bill before us, Mr. President, and I suppose the Senate, under the parliamentary situation must decide where the bill shall go. I contend that even if the concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate a few days ago had been adopted by the House of Representatives and were now a completed act, the bill could not go to the committee created by the resolution. We are trying to streamline Congress, we are trying to reduce the number of committees. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and other Senators have been working diligently for months in an attempt to find some procedure by which the committee system of the two Houses, and especially the Senate, may be based upon a more scientific, modern, and intelligent foundation. I do not know what they will finally report on that.

We have had a similar situation before us heretofore. We created a Committee on Postwar Activities, of which the Senator from Texas and I were both members, and of which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was the chairman. We held hearings for months on reconversion and surplus property and all kinds of postwar problems which face this Nation. We made reports to the Senate. That committee had no jurisdiction to consider bills. No bill introduced here could be referred to that committee. The committee recommended some things to the Senate, and bills were drawn, and the surplus-property bill recommended by that committee was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The unemployment compensation measure was referred to the Committee on Finance. The full employment legislation was referred, not to the Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning but to another committee. That committee had no jurisdiction to have bills referred to it.

Mr. President, I contend that even if the House should agree to the concurrent resolution, the joint committee could not have bills referred to it for consideration. Let me read the terms of the concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate on the 27th day of September.

Section 1 sets up the joint committee of the two Houses; six Members of each House.

Section 2 provides the jurisdiction of the committee, what it may do. I shall read that to the Senate:

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the development, control, and use of atomic energy, with a view to assisting Congress in dealing with the problems presented by its development, control, and use. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

That is all the jurisdiction it has.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator a moment ago was discussing the committee which was established to deal with postwar problems. Legislation dealing with postwar problems was introduced and referred by agreement not only to the proper committee having jurisdiction, but also to the postwar committee. I ask the Senator this question: Does he not believe that the question of atomic energy is far more important than any postwar planning which was considered by the George committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course I do. I think that atomic energy may determine the fate of civilization.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. But I am reading from the concurrent resolution giving jurisdiction to this joint committee, and nowhere in the resolution is there any provision giving jurisdiction to the joint committee to have bills referred to it. It may bring in any recommendation it wants to. It may write a bill and recommend it. But after it has done that, the bill must be referred to a standing committee of the Senate just as was done in the case of the Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee. So I do not see how the Senator from Michigan can contend that the concurrent resolution adopted a few days ago by the Senate authorizes reference of a bill to the joint committee with jurisdiction to act upon it. It is not a standing committee. It is a joint committee, and we have all realized the futility of creating jurisdiction in joint committees or special investigating committees. Such a committee may have proposed legislation referred to it. Only in the case of the Committee on Reorganization, as I recall, since I have been a Member of the Senate, was any jurisdiction given to a

special committee to report a bill to the Senate of the United States and have it placed upon the calendar as if it were a report from a standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. With the greatest respect in the world for the Senator's opinion and for his argument, I am bound to say that I think it is totally technical in nature.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator allow me——

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I will permit the Senator to enlarge upon his technicality.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me that if the joint Houses of Congress by their solemn action assert their belief that this problem is so big that it ought to be integrated into one consideration in the first instance by a joint committee, that by the very nature of that action the Congress would be indicating its desire that every phase of the matter which may be involved in legislation which may have been introduced here shall be surveyed. Of course, there is absolutely nothing in the language of the concurrent resolution which would confine the jurisdiction of the joint committee in respect to every possible aspect of the affair. It can read every bill that has been introduced. It can consider every problem that is contained in every bill. It can have the testimony of the author of every bill. It can take complete cognizance of every phase of the matter. It does not require any technical reference of bills to it. And when it has concluded it can make a recommendation in the form of a bill, in the form of a general recommendation, in any other form, and the Congress then can proceed, through its regular legislative channels, to act upon this concentrated judgment of the agents of the joint House and Senate.

I do not think, if the Senator will permit me, that it makes much difference whether or not there can be any technical legislative jurisdiction assumed by this joint committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it seems to me that we have a situation here which we cannot lose sight of. Here is a bill. This is not a concurrent resolution setting up a committee. It is not a concurrent resolution authorizing an investigation. Here is a bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado, and it is entitled to reference under the rules of the Senate to a standing committee, and it cannot be referred to anything except a standing committee.

The Senator from Michigan is asking us to hold up the reference of this bill until the other House acts on a concurrent resolution which has not yet been adopted, setting up a joint committee which has not yet been created, and upon which no jurisdiction is conferred to have a bill referred to it, and in the meantime this bill is to lie on the table, although any bill which the joint committee might recommend, if the concurrent resolution should be adopted by the other House and the joint committee should be appointed, would have to be referred to a standing committee, because nowhere in the resolution is jurisdiction given the joint committee to report a bill and have it placed on the calendar of the United States Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will allow me, he has accurately described the status of the concurrent resolution; but in spite of all his vehemence, I submit to him that he makes it sound like a far more interminable process than it is calculated to be. The leadership of the House, if it wants to act on what the President of the United States told us was his view of the way it should be handled, can adopt the concurrent resolution tomorrow. If the House is unwilling to do that, if it is the considered viewpoint of those in charge of this legislation that this process should not be followed, I quite agree that we should not postpone a decision interminably, but I suggest to the Senator, in view of the fact that the Senate has acted, in view of the fact that the House Rules Committee has approved a resolution similar to that adopted by the Senate, that at least in the name of a fair consideration of the Senate's viewpoint we ought to be willing to wait a few days to see whether the House will not concur with its own Rules Committee and agree with the judgment of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was not present at the conference to which the Senator refers, and I do not know what the President said in that conference, but evidently the President's message delievered to us yesterday is his last word on the subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That has no bearing on the question here.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it has not only a bearing on it, but it has a fundamental bearing, because the President evidently not only was not willing to wait to see what the House might do with respect to the concurrent resolution, but was unwilling to wait until the committee proposed to be created by the concurrent resolution might go into an interminable investigation and report back to the two Houses. Otherwise I cannot conceive why the President would have sent his message to Congress yesterday and ask for urgent action upon legislation dealing with a domestic problem.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator think that the investigation of the joint committee would be any more interminable than the investigation of the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, I do, because I know something about the history of joint committees. I have been a member of one or two such committees. But regardless of the joint committee's action, regardless of the action of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, or its promptness or speed upon the subject, I know that an identical bill introduced yesterday by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House has already been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs of that body and they are proceeding at once to hold hearings on the subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator permit me one further observation, and then I shall desist?

Mr. BARKLEY. One more, yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I respectfully suggest to the Senator that if speed is what is insisted on in answer to this question, we are far more calculated to get speedy decision if we concentrate the whole problem in one place than if we split it into half a dozen segments and send it all over the Capitol for simultaneous consideration by half a dozen different committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that it cannot be split up into segments and sent all over the place.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is exactly what the Senator is proposing.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill must go to one committee or another.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Blessed is the role of the peacemaker.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not so certain about that.

Mr. McMAHON. Is there not something to this suggestion: With full appreciation of the fact that we have been criticized for having too many standing committees of the Senate, and realizing that a special or joint committee cannot report legislation, would not the proper solution of it be the exception proving the rule? Is not this the time for the formation by this body of a standing committee on atomic energy to handle the problem? Of course the Senator will appreciate, as we all do, I am sure—because he has named them—that various committees would have some claim to jurisdiction of this question. Could we not obviate the difficulty and do the job more speedily and better if we had a standing committee of the Senate to deal with the problem, which is going to shape the future of this world? If that is not sufficiently important to justify a new standing committee of the Senate, then the existence of any one of them is not justified.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator wishes me to answer his question categorically, my answer is "No."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment.

For many months we have had agitation for the creation in the Senate of a committee on aviation. Resolutions have been introduced looking to the creation of a committee on aviation, on the ground that aviation created a special situation which was more important than the jurisdiction of any committee. We have not seen fit to do that, because the Committee on Interstate Commerce and the Committee on Commerce have jurisdiction of the subjects which are referred to them. The Committee on Interstate Commerce has jurisdiction of railroads, bus lines, and radio, and for awhile had jurisdiction of aviation legislation. Then by some sleight-of-hand performance, jurisdiction was taken away from that committee and given to the Committee on Commerce. I am not arguing the merits of that action.

I do not believe that the Senate needs any more committees. I rather think that we might get along with fewer committees. But that is a matter for the consideration of the committee which is going to streamline the Congress. I do not believe that the situation justifies the creation of a new committee, because if a new committee were created, it would have to be composed of members of other committees which are now standing committees of the Senate, and I do not believe we would be justified in adding to the number of standing committees of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has been very kind about yielding. He has been interrupted a great deal.

Replying to what the Senator from Connecticut has said, I wish to point out that there is merit in the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut, except in this respect: he suggested a standing committee. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky that there would be no necessity for the creation of a permanent standing committee. The desired result could be accomplished by the creation of a select committee. It could be given full authority to receive and recommend legislation. I know of no rule of the Senate which requires the reference of bills to a standing committee. In fact, the rules of the Senate recognize that both select committees and standing committees have power to receive legislation. Probably it would depend upon the language of the resolution creating the special or select committee.

I suggest that thought to the Senator from Connecticut if he is thinking along that line. We would not necessarily have to have a standing committee.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to occupy the time of the Senate further. We have before us a concrete situation. We have a bill on the desk.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one further question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In the preliminary part of the debate the Senator stated that the bill would go to the Committee on Military Affairs for the sole purpose of controlling the domestic atomic energy of this country. As I understand, after the President confers with Canada, England, and other countries he will have something further to suggest with respect to the international control of atomic energy. I take it that that question will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, if it comes before us in the form of a bill or treaty.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not necessarily a bill, but any agreement entered into between the President and foreign countries.

Mr. LUCAS. If that situation develops we shall have the Committee on Military Affairs considering one part of the problem and the Committee on Foreign Relations considering another phase of it. That forcibly brings to my attention the conviction that this is an over-all problem, with which the Congress, in conjunction with the executive branch of the Government must deal. I may be mistaken but that is my considered judgment.

I do not quite understand why there is such insistence upon this bill coming before us at this particular time. It seems to me that it might lie over for a day or two, or even longer, until further advice and counsel might be had on the question of what to do. We all wish to do what will be in the best interests of America, her security and defense. That is the big problem. When we read the bill and talk about the primary purposes thereof obviously international security overshadows all the rest. We are all striving for world security. Without that, the question of the protection of the United States and its inhabitants and the national defense of this country, means nothing, as a result of what we have developed in the past few months with atomic energy.

I am utterly sincere in what I am saying. I appreciate the position which the Senator from Kentucky has taken. I know that ordinarily bills are referred in the manner which the Senator has described. But this is something extraordinary. This question is so important that the rules of the Senate should be scrapped in a second, if necessary, in order to arrive at the proper solution.

In other words, we are considering rules which have been in existence almost since the inception of the Nation. We are fooling around with "horse and buggy" rules when the world is threatened with destruction by atomic energy.

So far as I am concerned, I would supersede any Senate rule in order to find the correct solution. It seems to me that we should not be quibbling over technicalities in connection with this great problem. We should not be discussing technicalities involving the reference of the bill to this committee or that committee. I believe that we ought to postpone consideration of the question until we can find the right kind of a solution. There should be unanimity of purpose and activity between the House and the Senate. It is far too important to be considered in peacemeal fashion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not like to have any Senator think that I have been quibbling about technicalities. I contend—and I do not believe that the contention can be denied—that the resolution which we adopted the other day gives no jurisdiction to the joint committee to report a bill, or to have a bill referred to it.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator. There is no doubt in my mind that that statement is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have before us a bill which is entitled to go somewhere. In my judgment it could not go to the proposed joint committee even if that committee were now in existence.

In order to create a special committee, it would be necessary to amend the rules. In the meantime the bill would lie on the table, or float around in midair, while the companion bill has gone to the Committee on Military Affairs in the House, which committee is to hold hearings on it and report the bill. The bill will be passed in the House and sent over here, and we shall then be in the same position in which we now are. We shall not know where to send it.

I am not concerned over whether the bill goes to the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Committee on the Library, or the Committee on the District of Columbia. It ought to go to some committee. The President of the United States thought it was important enough to send a message about it. A bill has been introduced dealing with atomic energy so far as our internal situation is concerned. My motion is that the bill be laid before the Senate so that the Senate may pass upon the question of where it should go. If the Senate does not wish to have the bill laid before it, it can keep it in cold storage until the House acts, and then we shall be confronted with a House bill, and faced with the same problem which now faces us.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know who prepared the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the bill originate in the War Department?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know. I think I can say to the Senator that it is an administration bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I wonder if any Senator can tell me whether or not it was prepared in the War Department. If the Senator from Colorado can tell me, I should like to know.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Colorado may be able to answer that question. I am satisfied that it was prepared in collaboration with the War Department. The War Department has all the facts in regard to atomic energy.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. They developed the atomic bomb, which brought the war to a conclusion. They have more information on the subject than has any other agency of the Government. I do not know whether the Senator has in mind a possible criticism of the War Department if it collaborated in undertaking to write a bill to carry out the President's recommendation.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no criticism whatever.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not believe that anyone could have intelligently drafted a bill without cooperating and consulting with the War Department about it, because that Department has more information on the subject than has any other agency of the Government.

Mr. LUCAS. I heartily agree with the Senator from Kentucky, and I would be the last Member of the Senate to criticize the War Department for the magnificent job which it did in the development of atomic energy in this war. However, as one United States Senator, I am not willing to leave the control of the future of atomic energy in the hands of the War Department. That is the point I am making. That is why I asked the question with respect to who was responsible for drafting the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words. The Senator from Kentucky has just stated that under no circumstances could the bill be referred to the joint committee contemplated by the Senate resolution which was recently adopted, and that unless the bill was sent to one of the present standing committees it would probably float around and go nowhere.

Mr. President, I am not particular whether the bill goes to the joint committee authorized by the Senate concurrent resolution, unless that committee is to have some authority to accomplish the purposes of the bill. If what has been said here today is correct, we did an idle and futile thing the other day when we adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 28. I was present on the day when the resolution was adopted in the committee, and I was present the day before it was adopted, when the committee refused to act until after the President of the United States had been consulted. It was the view of the Committee on Foreign Relations that all matters relating to the control and use of atomic energy—and that includes bills and resolutions, if it means anything—should have consideration by the special joint committee. Otherwise why was the resolution adopted? What is the purpose in conducting studies to advise Congress if the Congress is to proceed to enact laws to control the use of atomic energy without any reference to the work of the joint committee? I do not like to do foolish things. I do not like to see the Congress do foolish things. Unless the joint committee has some purpose, unless it has the power to recommend and even to influence and direct legislation on this subject, the committee should not be created.

Mr. President, I am particularly concerned about having the present bill go to the Committee on Military Affairs. I said yesterday that I have the highest respect for that great committee. But that committee is a war committee. That is its purpose; that is what it was created for; that is what concerns it always—measures of war, measures of destruction, not measures of peace. This bill does not relate to the military activities of this country. Read it word by word and line by line and you will find nothing relating to the military activities of the Nation. I am glad it does not; I am glad the bill recognizes the fact that atomic energy means something more than war and the destruction of human lives. This bill is not predicated upon that theory. Mr. President, incidentally, atomic energy will be a military force if war ever comes again—of course it will be. But so is wheat and so is corn and so is every other product of the farm. A war cannot be conducted without agriculture, and so we might far better send this bill to the Committee on Agriculture rather than to the Committee on Military Affairs, if that is the reason back of it. The Committee on Public Lands—and perhaps most of the deposits of the ores will be taken from the public lands—might have jurisdiction over this bill. The Committee on Mines and Mining might have jurisdiction over it. Both of those matters are mentioned. But military affairs are not mentioned.

But for some reason it is insisted and urged that the first consideration of this great new discovery, which perhaps means either life or death for all civilization, must be undertaken by the Committee on Military Affairs and by no other committee. Mr. President, I am opposed to that.

If the bill is not to go to the special joint committee, I would rather have it go to any other committee of the Senate than the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Naval Affairs. Far better would it be to send it to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the committee which is primarily concerned with foreign affairs and with maintaining the peace of the world, for if this discovery is to have any beneficial use to mankind it will be as an instrument of peace, to prevent war, not as an instrument to promote war. Certainly the bill belongs to the Committee on Foreign Relations far more than it does to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. President, it was setting the cart before the horse to say that we must consider its use domestically before we consider its use internationally. I say it was used internationally since the day the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. It was then a tremendous force in international affairs and it has continued to be such a force up to this time. Who knows what effect it had on the conference of foreign ministers which has just ended in London, or what good or bad effects it may have had? The cart is not ahead of the horse. The horse is far out ahead of the cart and perhaps the country and the Congress. Today the world is far more vitally concerned with this discovery than are potential domestic users in the United States. We can get along without atomic energy domestically. The world is not going to get along without it internationally. We may think we have the secret; but, Mr. President, mark this: As Winston Churchill said in the House of Commons, we are ahead of the rest of the world 2, 3, or perhaps 4 short years which are going to pass, and pass very quickly. But whether it is 1 or 2 or 4 years, the world is going to catch up with us even in the production and the manufacture and use of atomic energy.

Internationally it comes first. The bill should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It should not go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, after consulting with the Parliamentarian, I am informed that I would have to obtain unanimous consent to offer a resolution to create a committee of nine members, to be appointed by the President pro tempore, to deal with atomic energy. I desire to ask unanimous consent for that purpose, and I should like to obtain it, for the reason that the creation of such a committee would give the Senators who believe that this problem should be taken care of immediately a sensible way of disposing of this bill, instead of letting it float around, as the Senator from Kentucky so graphically stated a few moments ago.

In view of the words we have heard from the Senator from New Mexico and in view of the thinking all of us have done on this problem, certainly we must come to the conclusion that upon its wise and statesmanlike solution will depend not only the peace of our people but the peace of the world. When we think about it we realize, as the Senator from New Mexico so graphically stated, that the Committee on Agriculture would have a claim to consideration of this bill. The Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the Committee on Military Affairs—all of them—would have a claim to its consideration. So it would seem to me the sensible thing to do, as long as there is not going to be a joint committee, is to create a select committee of nine members to deal with the matter. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I object.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I would have to object, under the circumstances. However, I should like to say that I agree that if there is not to be joint congressional consideration of it, it might far better go to a special Senate committee, rather than to be parceled out to divers and sundry other Senate committees.

But if the able senior Senator from Connecticut will permit me to say a word, now that the issue has been drawn, I wish to state that I think we should settle it. The question is simply whether the problem of atomic energy, in its initial consideration, shall be given to the highest possible authority which Congress can create for that purpose and whether it shall concentrate that authority in one place, or whether we shall send the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs, whether we shall send another bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and thus parcel out the subject piecemeal.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for more than a moment. I shall vote "nay" on the motion. One of the reasons which seems to me adequate justification for my position is that we are now dealing with the public policy of the United States regarding the most vital new idea that has come into our possession in all our history. It is the duty of Congress to declare that public policy. It is the duty of Congress to lead in thought upon the subject in order that the policy may be sound and good for the security and peace of all mankind and that there may be beneficent results from this tremendous gift to mankind of an unrevealed power.

Therefore, we should not hastily take the construction which some Member of Congress has handed to us in the form of a bill, such as the one about which we have been discussing, and use it as the only basis upon which to make our studies. When the Senate adopted the concurrent resolution providing for a special joint committee our theory was that the committee would do the necessary preliminary work in order to formulate a

policy and submit it perhaps in the form of a bill. Certainly we thought that a bill which would be the product of a special study by a joint committee especially appointed for that purpose, would be more wisely conceived than would a bill which would be handed to us from some other source.

Mr. President, I am apprehensive that delay in this matter will be harmful. I therefore hope to see as prompt consideration given to the policy by the joint committee as can reasonably be given. I certainly hope that no standing committee of the Senate will report to the Senate any bill before it has had the benefit of advice of the special joint committee. If we ever needed in advance the benefit of special study in the preparation of legislation in connection with a matter of this nature, that need is now. For that reason, and as the only course for me to take, I oppose the motion, and when the opportunity is afforded to vote upon it I expect to vote "No."

I do not wish to express opposition to the policy which has been explained here, but I assert now that this bill does not take care of the fundamental policy with respect to secrecy, or with respect to whether the control which has been suggested shall be exclusive. This bill would delegate the policy-making power of Congress to an appointive commission. Listen to these words:

> The Commission shall have plenary supervision and control, so far as the jurisdiction of the United States extends, over all sources of atomic energy and over all matters connected with research on the transmutation of atomic species, the production of nuclear fission, and the release of atomic energy.

Congress does not, therefore, exercise its highest function of establishing and promulgating public policy of the United States with reference to this new energy. Congress "passes the buck." Congress turns over a very important duty to a commission which is to be established under the proposed legislation. Perhaps the time may come when Congress will do that. I am not undertaking to discuss the merits of this proposal. I am merely showing sufficient reason why I shall vote "no" on the motion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to propound a question to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

What is the status of the concurrent resolution which the Senator submitted to the Senate some time ago and which has been discussed today in the course of this debate?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The concurrent resolution was unanimously reported to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee, and unanimously adopted by the Senate. It was sent to the House of Representatives and there referred to the House Rules Committee. In that committee a substitute resolution which had been offered by a distinguished Member of the other House, covering precisely the same grounds, was substituted for the Senate concurrent resolution and unanimously reported to the House. It now awaits the action of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator prepared his concurrent resolution, did he give any thought to the proposition of creating a standing committee of the Senate for the purpose of dealing with problems of scientific discoveries and research?

Mr. VANDENBERG. We certainly did give consideration to whether or not the subject could be referred to one standing committee, and that is precisely a question about which we came to a conclusion, namely, that there is no standing committee which can assume jurisdiction.

Mr. ELLENDER. My inquiry is with reference to the creation of a standing committee of the Senate for the purpose of studying not only atomic energy but all scientific discoveries and research which may need the attention of the Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that the field of scientific evolution is of such vital concern to the future of America that it might well have that sort of consideration in both House of Congress. But I respectfully submit to the Senator from Louisiana that we could proceed without any conflict in respect to this fundamental action with which we meet the specific question which is now confronting us.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am against the motion made by of our distinguished majority leader. I am in entire agreement that the bill which has been introduced by the able senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] should lie on the table until such time as a standing committee of the Senate for scientific discoveries and research or a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives has been created by the Congress.

All of us know that during the war many new discoveries were made. We have spent millions of the taxpayers' dollars in research during the war. The Congress should assume the responsibility of determining the extent to which recent discoveries made at Government expense may be used for the betterment of our people. Unless we take a hand some of these discoveries may find their way in the hands of manufacturers who will take hold of them as their own and charge the American public unconscionable prices for their use. I know that it would be to the advantage of our Nation to have studies made not alone by a joint committee, but by standing committees of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, I am informed that our able majority leader is about to withdraw his motion so I will defer any further discussion on the subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no desire to precipitate a hasty decision in regard to this subject. I have no desire that a decision shall be hastily made with reference to where the bill should go, or whether it should be referred to any committee. The parliamentary situation is such that the Chair cannot refer the bill in the way he ordinarily does, and the Senate itself cannot do so unless the bill is laid down. That is why I made the motion that the Chair lay the bill before the Senate so that the Senate may determine to what committee it shall be referred.

I am convinced that if the House adopts the concurrent resolution, this bill should not be referred to the committee provided for under the resolution because it has no jurisdiction to have a bill referred to it any more than heretofore has any other joint or special committee had jurisdiction to have bills referred to it.

I wish to say to the Senate that when it concludes its business today I contemplate moving an adjournment until Monday next in order that in the meantime Members may think the matter over and not take action now. I am perfectly willing to withdraw my motion to have the Chair lay the bill before the Senate so that the Senate may act upon the matter one way or the other. Therefore, Mr. President, I now withdraw my motion that the Chair lay the bill before the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I missed hearing a portion of the Senator's statement. What is his further purpose after the motion has been determined?

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely stated that I did not wish to compel the Senate to act hastily or precipitantly on my motion; that in my judgment, even if the other House adopts the concurrent resolution which the Senate adopted the other day, this bill cannot be referred to the committee to be appointed under the resolution. However, in order that we may have a day or two in which to think the matter over, and contemplating an adjournment until next Monday when we conclude our business today, I am withdrawing my motion and leaving the bill on the table where it is now, and where it would be if my motion were rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has withdrawn his motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had suggested that the Senate would adjourn until Monday, but I am reminded that tomorrow there will be a joint meeting in the Hall of the other House for the purpose of receiving and doing honor to Admiral Nimitz. Therefore it will be necessary for the Senate to meet at noon tomorrow, and join the Members of the other House for the purpose of receiving and honoring Admiral Nimitz. However, it is not contemplated that any legislation will be taken up tomorrow.

DAN C. RODGERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 694) for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$4,113" and insert "$3,113."

Mr. CORDON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House. The bill is a relief bill, which was introduced by me, and I am familiar with the facts.

The motion was agreed to.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I am sure that every Senator has read the message of the President regarding the subject of atomic energy with the same intense interest that I did. I should not presume on the time of other Senators were it not

for the overwhelming importance of atomic energy in the world today.

As we all know, the fact that this energy has been harnessed has had a great effect on our foreign policy and on the foreign policies of all other major powers. It is undoubtedly going to be the biggest subject in the field of international relations for some time to come.

Therefore, I repeat, I read the President's message with deep thoughtfulness. I agree with many of his points, although I would place more emphasis on keeping secret the important scientific and industrial techniques by means of which atomic energy is used to make atomic bombs than did the President in his message.

As we all know, the Congress already has indicated its desires in this direction. We in this body have placed ourselves on record as favoring congressional participation in all plants for developing atomic energy, and there is little doubt that the concurrent resolution introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] will be passed by the House. Certainly the problem is of broad potentialities, and should be explored by an over-all committee.

Whether or not the President should have the power to appoint members of a commission, with the advice and consent of this body, as he suggests, is a question which, too, must be settled soon. Personally, I believe that Members of both Houses of Congress, with representatives of both large political parties, should be on the commission, if his plan shall finally be adopted.

I certainly agree with the President that use of the atomic bomb as a weapon of war should be outlawed by all nations. Designating the atomic bomb as an "outlaw" as far as war is concerned would in nowise jeopardize the safety of our country—considering our economic and military power otherwise—and it would ease the misgivings of many millions of Americans who have felt that the United States should not have used the two atomic bombs in Japan. I personally feel that the use of these bombs can be defended from the standpoint of saving the lives of thousands of American boys, as well as of Japanese, by quickly ending the bloody conflict. But I must admit that, with many other Americans, I had misgivings about the use of this potent weapon.

Above all, Mr. President, I urge Senators and the people of this country not to heed the advice of Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace and others who have asked that we make the atomic secrets available to all nations. The distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] voiced my views about the wisdom of such a course at the meeting of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Chicago, when he pointed out that America did not divulge radar and other secret weapons to other nations. I believe that if we were to let other nations have this secret, we might as well let them have ready access to every patent granted by the Government. I wonder if Secretary Wallace advocates any such course as this for the Patent Office, which is under his jurisdiction?

We know that we shall use atomic energy as an instrument of peace. We do not know what is in the minds of leaders of other nations. As far as that goes, we have trouble figuring out already how far certain leaders want to extend their physical influence under the guise of liberating people from nazism and fascism.

To my mind, it is utterly nonsensical to talk of giving away secrets of such vast import and power to other nations at this time. Perhaps the day will come—certainly we all hope it will come—when freedom and truth and justice will reign throughout the earth and the mind of man will contemplate war only as a historical subject. But that day certainly has not come yet, and when we look at the moves on the checkerboard of power politics, we know that it will not come by next Tuesday at 3 o'clock.

The majority of Congress, the overwhelming majority of the people—in fact, all except a few naive, trusting, generous souls in Washington, New York, and Chicago—want us of this body and our colleagues in the House of Representatives to watch carefully every development in the field of atomic energy, and to guide those developments with the greatest of skill. The majority of the people want us to keep our national secrets, just as other nations are keeping their secrets. As we all know, there are portions of some nations pretending to be our allies which Americans are not even allowed to visit.

If we fail in our trust on this paramount question of atomic energy, not only our constituents but history itself will condemn us.

ESTATE OF GEORGE O'HARA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 90) for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara, which was, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "$7,882.97" and insert "$5,382.97."

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WHERRY conferees on the part of the Senate.

STIMULATION OF VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, and 6, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment and, on page 3 of the House bill, after the period in line 15, insert the following: "No person who is serving under an enlistment contracted on or after June 1, 1945, shall be entitled, before the expiration of the period of such enlistment, to enlist for an enlistment period which will expire before the expiration of the enlistment period for which he is so serving"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

(1) Before the words "in the Regular Military or Naval Establishment" insert "prior to February 1, 1946,";

(2) On page 4, line 21, of the House bill, after the word "annual", insert "enlisted";

(3) On page 5, lines 16 and 17, of the House bill, strike out "forthwith"; and

(4) On page 5, line 20, of the House bill, after the words "in advance", insert "at his option."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "July 1, 1947" in such amendment and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1946"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 14. The Secretary of War, with the approval of the Philippine Government, is hereby authorized to enlist in the Philippine Scouts, with pay and allowances authorized under existing law, fifty thousand men for service in the Philippine Islands, in the occupation of Japan and of lands now or formerly subject to Japan, and elsewhere in the Far East. Such enlistments shall be for three years unless sooner terminated and citizens of the Philippine Islands shall be eligible to volunteer for such service."

And the Senate agree to the same.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
CHAN GURNEY,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the report?

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator state what the proposed legislation is?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is the so-called volunteer bill.

Mr. WHITE. There is a complete conference agreement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A unanimous agreement. I move the adoption of the report.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in connection with this matter, I should like to have permission to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr.

Acheson, and a statement by the Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 1, 1945.

The Honorable ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: The Secretary of War has submitted to me a memorandum, a copy of which is attached, requesting that the Department of State express to you its views on the Hayden amendment of H. R. 3951 and in particular with respect to certain questions concerning such amendment which the War Department believes are not within its province.

First, the Department of State concurs with the War Department in supporting the Hayden amendment as modified by the three clarifying changes favored by the War Department as listed in the attached memorandum.

Second, with respect to the three specific questions raised by the War Department, this Department has the following comments:

1. In the light of the special relationship between the Philippine Commonwealth and the United States, and in view of the requirement of the Hayden amendment that the Philippine authorities express their approval of the proposal, there would not appear to be any policy considerations against the inclusion of units composed wholly of Philippine nationals in the armed forces of the United States after July 4, 1946.

2. With respect to the question raised by the War Department as to whether members of the Philippine Scouts serving in the armed forces of the United States after the granting of independence to the Philippines would continue to owe allegiance to the United States, the Department of State believes that any possible difficulties in this connection can be avoided through special arrangements in agreement with appropriate Philippine authorities, including, if necessary, appropriate provision in the terms of enlistment.

3. As to the effect upon relations between the United States and the Philippine Commonwealth of including in the Regular Army of the United States a force of 50,000 Philippine citizens who may be better trained and paid than comparable elements of the Philippine Army, the enlistment of Philippine Scouts for the purpose contemplated in the Hayden amendment is to be carried out only with the approval of the Philippine authorities and, if they do approve of the proposal, questions of the nature raised by the War Department would appear to be academic.

A similar letter is being sent to Chairman MAY of the House Military Affairs Committee.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary.

[Enclosure: Copy of memorandum from the Secretary of War, September 27, 1945.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, September 27, 1945.

Memorandum for the Secretary of State.

On September 26, 1945, the Senate adopted the following amendment to H. R. 3951, the "Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945", which had previously passed the House of Representatives:

"The Secretary of War, with the approval of the Philippine Legislature, is hereby authorized to enlist in the Philippine Scouts, with pay and allowances authorized under existing law, 50,000 men for service in the occupation of Japan. Such enlistments shall be for 3 years and citizens of the Philippine Islands shall be eligible to volunteer for such service."

It is believed that, as a result of the foregoing and other amendments to H. R. 3951, the measure will go to a conference between the two Houses of Congress. Senator HAYDEN, who offered the foregoing amendment, anticipated that such a conference would take place and that opportunity would be thus afforded to perfect and clarify the language of his amendment.

The War Department has indicated its concurrence in the principle of the use of Philippine citizens in our occupation force insofar as the military aspects of such use are concerned. It proposes, however, to suggest the following clarifications in text:

1. To substitute, for the words "Philippine Legislature", the words "Philippine Government"; in order to obviate any possible future complications between the Philippine legislative and executive branches.

2. To substitute, for the words "for service in the occupation of Japan", the words "for service in the Philippine Islands, in the occupation of lands now or formerly subject to Japan, and elsewhere in the Far East"; in order to avoid undue restriction in the use of the troops in question.

3. To insert, after the words "such enlistments shall be for 3 years", the words "unless sooner terminated"; in order to avoid any implication that enlistees are entitled to serve out the full 3-year enlistment despite changing conditions.

There are other considerations which may warrant recommendations for future changes in the text. Some of these considerations are of a purely military nature and some involve national policy.

In examining these considerations, certain facts should be borne in mind:

(a) The Philippine Scouts are a component of the Regular Army.

(b) Philippine Scout officers must by law be appointed from among Philippine citizens, although United States Army officers may be detailed to command scout units.

(c) While under existing regulations the base pay of Philippine Scouts is less than that of other components of the Regular Army, the conditions of their service are likely to be more favorable than those of the Philippine Army. The base pay of the Philippine Scouts may be increased by War Department regulation to the same level as other components of the Regular Army.

(d) The President is authorized by law to reduce or disband the Philippine Scouts at any time.

(e) After July 4, 1946, the members of the Philippine Scouts, though serving in a component of our Regular Army, will be citizens of another sovereign nation, the Philippine Commonwealth.

As far as the military aspects are concerned, the War Department, while foreseeing difficulties in operating under the Hayden amendment, believe that none is insurmountable.

Apart from the military matters referred to above, the amendment appears to raise questions of national policy which are not within the province of the War Department:

1. Should units composed wholly of nationals of another sovereign nation (which will presumably become the status of the Philippine Commonwealth after July 4, 1946) be included in the armed forces of the United States which are occupying Japanese territory? The answer to this question appears to involve our relations and engagements with our allies.

2. After the Philippine Commonwealth becomes a sovereign nation next July, will the members of the Philippine Scouts owe allegiance to that Commonwealth or to the United States, in whose Army they and the units which they constitute will be serving? To illustrate the principle in question, a delicate international situation would arise if it were necessary, after next July, to court martial and execute a Philippine Scout.

3. What will be the effect upon the relations between the United States and the Philippine Commonwealth, as a sovereign nation, of including in the Regular Army of the United States a force of 50,000 Philippine citizens who are likely to be better trained and better equipped, and possibly better paid, than comparable elements of the Philippine Army?

It is believed that an expression of your views on these matters would assist the House and Senate conferees in their deliberations and would aid in perfecting and clarifying the language of the amendment. The War Department would appreciate receiving a copy of such a communication from you.

The necessity for immediate action is obvious.

The chairmen of the Committees on Military Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been advised of this reference to you.

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

RETURN OF NATURALIZED AMERICAN CITIZENS FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate Committee on Immigration unanimously reported House bill 3466. It is very important that this bill be considered at the earliest possible time.

Under the Nationality Act of 1940 any naturalized citizen of this country loses his nationality by residing for at least 2 years in a foreign state of which he was formerly a national. Since the outbreak of the war, due to the fact that many naturalized American citizens were caught in their native countries and could not return to the United States, we have on two occasions extended the time in order to permit them an opportunity to return and thereby save their citizenship.

The bill to which I have referred confers no right or beneficial privilege of any character on any person who is not already a citizen of the United States. It merely extends until the 14th of October 1946, the time within which such persons may re urn and save their American citizenship. It is strongly recommended by the State Department, and I ask that the Senate consider the bill now because of the fact that unless it be enacted into law by the 14th of October, those who would come under it, many of whom have been in concentration camps, and who have been behind the lines of battle and unable to return to their homes, would, I think, unjustly and unfairly be deprived of their American citizenship.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If I understood what the Senator said, the bill merely extends the time within which persons may be permitted to return to the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Maine is correct.

Mr. WHITE. We are asked to do in substance what we have done heretofore on two or three occasions.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have done it on at least two occasions.

Mr. WHITE. The occasion for enactment of the bill arises from war conditions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Only from war conditions. The evidence before the committee demonstrated clearly that there was no transportation available for these people, and it was through no fault of their own that they did not return.

The bill was reported unanimously by a full attendance of the Committee on Immigration. I can see no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3465) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE ATOMIC BOMB—ADDRESS BY PALMER HOYT

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on the 7th day of August last, the day after the explosion of the atomic bomb over Hiroshima, Mr. Palmer Hoyt, publisher of the Portland Oregonian, formerly the distinguished Director of the Office of War Information of the United States, delivered before the Portland Rotary Club an address on the subject of atomic energy, in the course of which he made two interesting and instructive suggestions. The first was that the importance of this new power and its vast potentialities deserve consideration by world powers, and, secondly, that one of the surest guaranties against misuse of this power would be general dissemination of knowledge with reference to it, and of knowledge of current events throughout the world.

Because of the importance of the subject and the useful suggestions made by Mr. Hoyt, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the address by Palmer Hoyt, a resolution adopted by the Portland Rotary Club on the subject, and an editorial appearing in the Oregonian of the next day, August 18, concerning the same subject.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAST CHANCE

(Address by Palmer Hoyt, publisher, the Oregonian)

Monday, August 6, 1945, is a day that will live forever in the history of civilization. For it was the day that we officially entered the atomic age. This age holds at once the greatest hope and the greatest menace for civilization.

When President Harry S. Truman told the world that the atomic bomb had been dropped on the city of Hiroshima, he officially recorded the most important development in the history of mankind since man's hoarse gutturals found meaning and became language and since man learned to use fire.

The simple announcement of the controlled splitting of the atom dwarfed the greatest war in the history of the world into relative insignificance. The use of the atomic bomb brought sharply to mankind the necessity of making a choice. Man could choose from the alternatives—life or death. For the first time in man's long and varied history he had in his hands the potential power to destroy the civilization which he has so patiently built through the long centuries.

Thus it is in this new age that the United Nations in general, the United States in particular, and more specifically Harry S. Truman, have a tremendous responsibility. With this in mind I, therefore, respectfully suggest that the President of the United States call the leaders of the United Nations together and that they undertake to write a peace charter based on the peoples' right to know. Such a magna carta would have as its foundation the fact that in this new era of man the world cannot continue to exist half informed and half uninformed. This magna carta would be in itself assurance of the elimination of political censorships and the international distribution of objective news and information. It would also cover the free exchange of magazines, books, and motion pictures to all the peoples of the earth.

In this new world—the atomic age—an adequate rule book is necessary—as streamlined as the age itself—and unless it is provided quickly, this new world is not likely to long endure. I cannot believe that the leaders of the generations now alive will choose the risk of self-immolation rather than the best guarantee of peace obtainable. Old World diplomacy, with all of its out-of-date ramifications, won at Potsdam; new world ideas in keeping with the atomic age must now motivate international relations.

It is most difficult for us to realize that we here were present at the birth of an age. It is most difficult for us to realize that under our very nose an age died and an age was born. I suppose that when some pre-Neanderthal man saw the first blade of grass spring up as the glaciers started to recede to end the ice age, he did not say "The ice age has come to an end." Perhaps he said only, "Glub, slub, dub" (meaning "the grass is green and the chlorophyl will be good for my gingivitis").

It is hard for us to understand that this world today is a different world than we have known before. It is a world, for example, in which the discussion of a third war is equivalent to discussion of race suicide. We can certainly all agree that another war could result only in one of two things—a world dictatorship or the destruction of civilization. The destructive force represented in the control of the smashed atom is beyond our immediate power to grasp. The best illustration of its complete potential that I have seen is in a report made by Dr. Irving Langmuir of the board of directors of the General Electric Co., several years ago:

"We can also count the electrons in atoms. Each atom of the various chemical elements contains from 1 to 92 electrons. About one-third of the particles of which all atoms are constructed are electrons. If we should take the other two particles, the protons and the neutrons, from the atoms of oxygen and hydrogen in a quart of water, leaving only the electrons, the tremendously powerful electrical repulsive forces they exert on one another would produce an explosion equal to that which would be produced by a gigantically vast cube of TNT, the powerful war explosive, 600 miles on each edge. The edge of such a cube would reach almost from London to Berlin and would be 300 times as high as the Alps."

If we think in terms of the cube of TNT described by Dr. Langmuir, it is obvious that such an explosion would blow the world to bits. Undoubtedly this was what Dr. Joseph Goebbels referred to a year ago when he said that Germany would destroy the world in fact before it would accept the peace.

The Allied high command, according to William H. Stoneman, writing for the Chicago Daily News a month before we used the atomic bomb, was fearful that the Germans would use the smashed atom before they could control it with the possible destruction of civilization from such usage.

As we enter the atomic age it becomes not only important but vital that the peoples of the earth be given the immediate opportunity to understand each other through the medium of the world-wide flow of free information. There is only one thing that can save civilization and that is unhampered release of objective news—American style—between the nations.

It no longer will be possible for part of the world to be informed and part of the world to be kept in ignorance. The atomic bomb is a fact. Its destructive force is as yet not fully reported. But its potential is obviously beyond our present powers to conceive. There is talk currently of a jet plane capable of 4,000 miles an hour. After the startling developments of recent days, this seems entirely reasonable. Such a combination would link all the nations of the earth in the most awful network of destruction ever conceived. Even with the planes now available the chain of death is little less than immediate in its implications.

Nor can we hope forever to keep the secret of the atomic bomb from the other nations of the earth. Sir James Chadwick, chief British scientist in the atomic bomb project, declared the other day that the atomic bomb is not strictly a British-American secret, declaring that any nation can learn the answers in about 5 years of experimentation, provided it has access to the necessary raw materials. "I think," said Sir James, "that this is a very serious point."

I agree entirely with the British scientist. It is a very serious point and brings clearly to mind a statement made last September by Lord Van Sittart speaking over an international hook-up when he said, "The next world war may well start with the destruction of civilization overnight."

There can, therefore, be but one adequate prophylactic. The mutual exchange of all types of information unhampered by political censorships and unrestricted by artificial boundaries of tariffs or customs. For example, it is now essential that we know what the Russians are doing and what they are thinking about and that the Russians be informed what we are doing and what we are thinking about. Otherwise, the peace will not be kept and if the peace is not kept, the peoples of the earth face dangers as yet barely imagined.

In this new age many of the arguments of yesterday seem substantially less important. It matters less now whether or not England used enough men in Europe or whether or not the Russians are still entitled to lend-lease. It is no longer of great moment that some of our left-wing liberals fear Yankee imperialism so greatly that they would have us surrender all of our Pacific bases to the control of the United Nations. Nor is it particularly consequential that some right-wing conservatives might still like to revert to a status of narrow nationalism. It is much more to the point to ponder the fact that three-fourths of the world and three-fourths of the peoples of the earth are still "blacked out."

It is increasingly vital that we consider, for example, the Fascist heirarchy now being built up in the Argentine and the freedom of expression and of the press have again gone out of existence in that great land. It is more than important for us to realize that Russia, civilization's latest giant, is "blacked out" as far as ordinary news and information are concerned, in the sense that we understand them.

It is obvious that our whole thinking has to be reworked. How important now is peacetime conscription? It was true that even through the terrific blitzes of Europe, bringing Germany to her knees, that the infantry was still the Queen of Battles. No matter how terrific the bombing from the air, lands to be conquered had to be seized and occupied. However, with atomic destruction a reality, it is doubtful that the infantry will be the Queen of Battles again save on the parade ground. By the use of atomic energy, entire divisions obviously can be destroyed and returned to the atomic state from which they

originally came. Which is another way of saying that war has gone into the laboratories and shut the door behind it.

Providence has placed in the hands of the President of the United States the most powerful weapon to enforce the peace yet conceived. But it is quite apparent that the rule book written at Quebec, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam is outmoded. New agreements must be reached, new concepts achieved, if we are going to keep the peace that promises our only salvation.

The moral leadership that America must exert on the world was shaken at Teheran, slipped badly at Yalta, and apparently vanished at Potsdam. America, free from ambitions of world domination, has the opportunity today to reassert it.

It is significant to note that not at Quebec or Teheran or Yalta or Potsdam was there more than the barest discussion of the only thing that can guarantee peace—world-wide freedom of news and information. In fact it now appears probable that new and drastic restrictions against such procedures were at least tactily there agreed upon.

In the atomic age national boundaries as we have known them no longer exist. It is very interesting to remember in this connection that Dr. A. H. Compton, one of America's greatest scientists, writing in 1931 about the possibility of smashing the atom, said when it is finally accomplished national boundaries will cease to have their present importance.

The best adjustment we can hope for of this certain change would seem to be the voluntary union of neighboring nations. I would suggest that this job be done by the United Nations before it is done by a single power. This job can best be done by creating a community of common interest based on common knowledge and appreciation of common vital problems that concern existence itself.

Great strides already have been made in selling the idea of international freedom of information under the leadership of Kent Cooper of the Associated Press, Hugh Baillie of the United Press, and the American Society of Editors.

Recently three very able men, Wilbur Forrest, of the New York Herald Tribune; Cal Ackerman, of Columbia University; and Ralph McGill, of the Atlanta Constitution, made a world-wide tour in the interest of free-flowing news.

Their main objective was to have included in forthcoming peace treaties the pledges of governments "not to censor news at the source, not to use the press as an instrument of national policy, and to permit a free flow of news in and out of signatory countries."

One of the revealing incidents of their trip came in their visit to Moscow, where they found "an expression of willingness to seek a common ground in the matter of freer exchange of news and more fair and adequate mutual writing and reporting."

But, our American representatives also discovered that Russian editors feel that their government-directed newspapers represent the real free press rather than the private publications of America. As the late Constantine Oumanski once said in effect, "our press is absolutely free—we print only what the government wants."

In many ways the world girdling trip was discouraging. But at least a start was made that should have far reaching benefits. One of them is the proposed international conference in Australia on press freedom. For it should ever be borne in mind what the St. Louis Post-Dispatch said recently in this connection—"It is the first act of dictators to seize press and radio and thus control men's minds. By the same token, it should be the first act of a free world to liberate press and radio that men be informed. As Thomas Jefferson said, "When the press is free and every man able to read, all is safe."

As I said before, great strides have already been made in selling the idea of unshackling news. But these strides are not enough. History has made the accomplishment of the objective essential. Generally speaking the press, radio, and motion-picture leaders of America and of the British Commonwealth of Nations have not accepted the leadership in this vital program. It is imperative that they do not shirk their vital responsibility.

It is also imperative that our leaders and those of the other United Nations come to the clear realization that an uninformed world has neither the right nor the opportunity for a continued existence.

I believe entirely that this world cannot stand another war. But I believe as completely that this world is headed for such a war and destruction unless immediate steps are taken to insure the beginning at least of freedom of news—American style—between the peoples of the earth. A civilization that is not informed cannot be free and a world that is not free cannot endure.

PORTLAND ROTARY DEMANDS BARRIERS ON ATOMIC BOMB

Whereas the unleashing of the atomic bomb against the Japanese launches the world into the atomic age and places in the hands of mankind the most destructive weapon ever imagined, which threatens the very existence of civilization itself; and

Whereas God in His infinite wisdom has placed temporary control of this instrument in the hands of the President of the United States; and

Whereas the atomic bomb can be the most powerful weapon for peace ever given to mortal man; and

Whereas a third world war could result only in a world dictatorship or race suicide; and

Whereas the only hope for permanent peace is in mutual understanding among the nations of the earth, based on the free flow of common information without arbitrary restraints; and

Whereas it is now obvious that the world as we know it cannot continue unless there be a complete understanding among all nations; and

Whereas the only way this mutual understanding can be brought about is by the insurance of the free flow of news and information throughout the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Rotary Club of Portland, Oreg., in meeting duly assembled, respectfully petition the President of the United States to call immediately a conference of the United Nations to outline a new and streamlined peace in keeping with this new age of man and looking forward to the elimination of political censorships and the elimination of all other arbitrary or artificial barriers which prevent mutual understanding by the nations of the earth. It is further suggested that the atomic age has made former diplomatic agreements obsolete and the new peace must guarantee equable use of world-wide communication by all nations as well as world-wide freedom of press and expression; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution not only be spread upon the record, but also be given to the public prints and forwarded to the president of the Rotary International for reference to the appropriate committee.

[From the Portland Oregonian of August 18, 1945]

REMEMBER THE ATOM

In its unprecedented resolution passed at Tuesday's meeting, asking President Truman to reconvene the United Nations to consider problems growing out of the atomic bomb, Portland Rotary Club was ahead of the Nation and it seems to have started something. The press services and the broadcasters have carried the story throughout the country and the immediate reaction is one of general endorsement.

The action grew out of an address by Palmer Hoyt, publisher of the Oregonian, made before the club the previous week, just after announcement of the first bomb—that on Hiroshima.

He expressed the view that the breaking of the atom, releasing upon the earth a force which was fearful to contemplate even in its present primitive stage of development, ruled out the type of international organization which had been agreed upon at San Francisco. This was a force which if used by evil men would lead either to world dictatorship or to world destruction. And how could it be withheld from evil men unless all of mankind appreciated its dangers and became united upon its control? In particular, how could atomic power be appreciated and managed so long as much of mankind was blacked out by censorship and by rigidly supervised communications?

He demanded that the United Nations reconvene in order to guarantee to the little peoples of all the earth the right of the free flow of information—the right of knowing the incalculable power which science, for good or ill, holds over them.

The suggestion was so well received that it was put in the form of a resolution and passed at the next meeting—an action without parallel on the part of Portland Rotary—and one which this page sincerely hopes will make history.

Certainly there is most desperate need at this particular moment that the country and the world not be allowed to forget the problem of atomics. In the excitement of the peace negotiations there has been a tendency to do just that. If we had gone ahead and blasted more cities into dust—if we were still doing it—the words "atomic bombs" would be on all lips, and all lips would be whiter and whiter. Atomics would be the subject of all conversations, and yet so facile is the human mind that peace has to a considerable degree relegated the whole matter.

It is most important that we bear in mind the truth contained in the opening sentence of the Time magazine which appeared Friday:

"The greatest and most terrible of wars ended this week in the echoes of an enormous event—an event so enormous that relative to it the war itself shrank to minor significance."

That is the size of the situation. We may pour paper into the streets in celebration of peace; we may break windows, tip over automobiles, kiss the girls, drink the liquor stores dry, turn handsprings, and call up all the family and friends by long distance. But the world has before it the gray morning of awakening to a realization that the war ended because of a new power, which, as Time says, has made the war itself shrink into insignificance—a power which must work for the angels if it is not to fall into the hands of Lucifer and work for the destruction of all of us.

And here is a case where we are all brothers, from end to end and side to side of the earth. Mankind can have release from its burdens through atomic power or it can have death. But mankind cannot act intelligently if it has no knowledge except as it is fed information by calculating masters. The splitting of the atom has made the free flow of information and the unity of all men an absolute must if we are to get through the crisis. Mr. Truman should read seriously the Rotary Club's resolution.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE ADMIRAL CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish again to announce that the Senate is

invited to go to the Hall of the House tomorrow, and is expected to be there at 12:15. Therefore it is necessary that we assemble promptly at 12 o'clock without delay so that we may proceed to the Hall of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, has the Senator any legislative program for tomorrow or for the remainder of the week?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no legislation to be acted on tomorrow or the remainder of this week.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN HOUSE BILL 3951 DURING RECESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand there is a possibility that the conference report on House bill 3951, the voluntary enlistment bill, which the Senate has just agreed to, may reach the House in time for the House also to agree to the report. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be signed during the recess of the Senate, if the House agrees to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance.:

F. Shirley Wilcox, of New Albany, Ind., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana, in place of Will H. Smith; and

Paul A. Hankins, of Illinois, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION—NOMINATION REPORTED ADVERSELY AND PREVIOUSLY PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond S. McKeough, of Illinois, to be a member for a term of 6 years from September 26, 1945.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is necessary that the nomination go over again. I ask that it may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—JOHN R. MURDOCK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, before unanimous consent is granted, I wish to say that I notice the name of John R. Murdock on the list of promotions in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service. I think the Senate would like to know that he is a very able physician in the Public Health Service, and is the brother of the distinguished and able Senator from Utah, who is now presiding over the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to express his thanks to the Senator from Wisconsin for that statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say that if the distinguished medical officer is as good a doctor and physician in the Public Health Service as his brother is a Member of the United States Senate, he has amply deserved this promotion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is very grateful to the distinguished majority leader.

Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service will be confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

PERSONAL STATEMENT—PALESTINE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I desire to make a very brief statement. Yesterday a representative of the United Press, Mr. Allan Drury, propounded this question to me, and told me that the United Press at New York had asked him to do so. He asked:

Would you favor armed intervention to put down a revolt in Palestine?

I would not take an oath that that is the exact question he asked me, but I would take an oath as to my answer to him. This was my answer:

Our plans—

Meaning the plans of the United States—

Our plans for a peaceful world include Palestine.

That is as much as I told him. That is all I told him. Yet, the United Press carries a story today that I favor sending our boys to Palestine to put down a revolt in Palestine. I do not think a revolt has occurred yet, but I wanted to make that statement. It does not happen very often that I am misquoted by the United Press. This is the first time in a long, long time. I do not remember ever before being misquoted. But this is such an important question that I could not pass up the opportunity for correcting the statement officially.

I feel certain that Mr. Drury reported my answer as I gave it to him, and that the error occurred in the New York office.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received October 4 (legislative day of October 2), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Houston L. Maples, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as senior naval member, United States military mission to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and as naval attaché and naval attaché for air, Moscow, Russia.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Gertrude A. Holloway, Falco, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William L. Stephens, Kinston, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CALIFORNIA

Elnora R. Martin, Alcatraz, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harry O. Comstock, Brockway, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Myrtle A. Garaventa, Davenport, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Enoch B. Quinn, Dutch Flat, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Laleah M. Hinson, Keyes, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONNECTICUT

G. Franklin Cowles, Canton, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

FLORIDA

Hazel V. Webb, Yukon, Fla., in place of R. G. Crosby, resigned.

IDAHO

Parley B. Rees, Inkom, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Lena Butt, Teton, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Andrew C. Miner, Tetonia, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Allen D. Marler, Thornton, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary Ritchie, Ucon, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

ILLINOIS

Everett Dees, Coello, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ross L. Drennan, Dewey, Ill., in place of J. M. Jones, resigned.

INDIANA

Frank C. Kaper, Brownsville, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Calita Job, Quincy, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Agnes E. Hall, Stockwell, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clarence L. Hambright, Tangier, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Louie Monroe, Underwood, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Arthur E. Shirley, Walkerton, Ind., in place of A. L. Rogers, resigned.

IOWA

Henry J. Johnson, Kanawha, Iowa, in place of T. H. Thompson, retired.
Emma A. Cullin, Percival, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

KANSAS

Minnie E. Steed, Bogue, Kans., in place of F. R. Bergin, resigned.
William E. Dinkler, Brookville, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Esther E. Weiss, Fort Dodge, Kans., in place of G. R. Cleveland, resigned.
Joseph L. Brown, Great Bend, Kans., in place of N. G. Walker, resigned.
James R. Daily, Logan, Kans., in place of V. T. Hill, transferred.
John E. Kennedy, Piedmont, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Melvin Rupke, Prairie View, Kans., in place of D. A. DeYoung, transferred.
Emil C. Jarus, Wilson, Kans., in place of P. L. Turgeon, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Leslie V. Beckham, Sr., Boaz, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Robert D. Murphy, Clementsville, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Thomas Harold Hall, Coxs Creek, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Louise F. Kelly, Lejunior, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James W. Atkins, Liggett, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Essie M. McColpin, Melber, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Paul W. Moss, Rockfield, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Dora Lankford, Sunshine, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charles S. Guthrie, Yancey, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

LOUISIANA

Lucy Van der Linden, New Sarpy, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MARYLAND

Rodger W. Curfman, Libertytown, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Lucile M. Nichols, Jerome, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lester L. Laser, Prattville, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Albert H. Anfang, St. Peter, Minn., in place of C. D. Dempsey, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Jessie A. Parham, Rome, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSOURI

Belva Maxwell, Belgrade, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
William B. Jenkins, Couch, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nina E. Straughan, Leadington, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Hattie B. McKibbin, Lesterville, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Percy C. Walton, Mineral Point, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Glen F. Watson, Osgood, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Myrtle M. Matthews, Plato, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Margaret M. Rulo, Richwoods, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MONTANA

Ella Gray, Ashland, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEBRASKA

Arthur Albert Coufal, Miller, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Catherine A. Conradt, Steinauer, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Willard N. McClintock, Verdel, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John C. Traber, Waterloo, Nebr., in place of W. S. Campbell, removed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Elsie M. Coughlan, Greenfield, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW MEXICO

Ray U. Johnston, Dulce, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW YORK

Herbert S. Redner, Arden, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Harriet Space, Huguenot, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nina H. Davis, Meridian, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Nelson A. Fisher, Poestenkill, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Leona M. Gifford, Sacandaga, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Daisy H. Evans, Slate Hill, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Florence McElroy Simon, Taberg, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Lula M. Oliver, Treadwell, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

Mae Barber, Maury, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OHIO

Orrin Echelberry, Blue Rock, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Clarence E. Dingledine, Buckland, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Rachel A. Martin, Burghill, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Walter R. Samsen, Clay Center, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Don C. Stockham, Friendship, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Lawrence L. Seyler, Higginsport, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Alice Wilson, Jerusalem, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Anna A. Schoendorff, Kansas, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Arthur C. Witt, Martin, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
John F. DeBord, Maud, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Louis L. Ford, Mesopotamia, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
James W. Waddell, Middleport, Ohio, in place of J. H. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
Edna F. Kintner, Paris, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Willard I. Hamilton, Peoria, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Paul McKinley, Barden, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Eileen Martin, Saint Johns, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OKLAHOMA

Alfred Connelly, Achille, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Oda L. Benn, Dougherty, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Frances Ausmus, Garvin, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
William A. Sweeney, Hendrix, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Kennie W. Gassaway, Monroe, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ella George, Cassandra, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Marion H. Thrasher, Cranesville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Joseph F. Shaffer, Harmony, Pa., in place of R. B. McQuistion, resigned.
Ella M. Robinson, Large, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Harvey E. Felkel, Santee, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TENNESSEE

Mary E. Leedy, Bean Station, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Joseph B. Campbell, Blaine, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WEST VIRGINIA

Minnie F. Diem, Fort Spring, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Charles H. Gillilan, Frankford, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Earl Edward Bailey, Notomine, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Claude J. Anderson, Six, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ballard B. Mitcham, Stephenson, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Peter J. Miller, Sherwood, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 4 (legislative day of October 2), 1945:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be temporary medical directors, effective date indicated

John R. Murdock, August 1, 1945.
George G. Holdt, August 1, 1945.
Homer L. Skinner, September 1, 1945.
Leo W. Tucker, September 1, 1945.
Roy E. Bodet, September 1, 1945.

To be temporary senior surgeons, effective date indicated

Sidney P. Cooper, July 1, 1945.
George H. Hunt, August 1, 1945.
H. Van Zile Hyde, July 14, 1945.
Roger E. Heering, August 1, 1945.

To be temporary surgeons, effective date indicated

Sol R. Baker, July 5, 1945.
Burnet M. Davis, July 5, 1945.
Theodore E. Hynson, July 6, 1945.
Raymond Hofstra, August 1, 1945.
Leo W. Koster, August 1, 1945.
William F. Powell, August 1, 1945.
Fred W. Thyng, August 1, 1945.
William B. Wiley, September 1, 1945.
James K. Shafer, August 1, 1945.
Benno K. Milmore, June 1, 1945.
Evert A. Swensson, June 1, 1945.
Mayo L. Emory, June 1, 1945.
Phillip H. Best, September 1, 1945.
Edward W. Kunckel, August 1, 1945.
Joseph C. Sturgell, July 1, 1945.

To be temporary senior assistant surgeons, effective date indicated.

Emory S. Moore, Jr., July 5, 1945.
Manrico A. Troncelliti, July 5, 1945.
Junius A. Evans, July 6, 1945.
Leo P. Krall, July 6, 1945.
Louis C. Floyd, July 7, 1945.
Richard E. Markley, July 7, 1945.
Arthur L. Koven, July 11, 1945.
Charles D. Muller, Jr., July 11, 1945.
Robert L. Cannon, July 19, 1945.
Robert J. Bryan, August 1, 1945.
Wade E. Etheridge, August 1, 1945.
Vincent G. Peiffer, October 1, 1945.
George F. Kamen, September 1, 1945.
Richard H. Linn, September 1, 1945.
John H. Pritchett, Jr., September 1, 1945.
Griffith E. Quinby, July 1, 1945.
William C. Redmon, September 1, 1945.
Raymond F. Corpe, September 1, 1945.

To be temporary dental surgeons, effective date indicated

Herbert A. Spencer, Jr., August 2, 1945.
Charles H. Wright, Jr., August 8, 1945.

To be temporary dental surgeon, effective August 3, 1945

Donald L. Truscott

To be temporary senior assistant dental surgeons, effective date indicated

Frederick S. Loe, Jr., August 2, 1945.
John C. Heckel, August 3, 1945.
Eugene H. Hess, August 3, 1945.
Robert J. Herder, August 4, 1945.
Carl E. Johnson, September 1, 1945.
Arthur J. Lepine, September 1, 1945.

To be temporary senior sanitary engineer, effective August 1, 1945

James H. LeVan

To be temporary sanitary engineers, effective August 2, 1945

Edmund C. Garthe
Harry G. Hanson
Richard F. Poston

To be temporary senior assistant sanitary engineers, effective date indicated

Ernest C. Anderson, July 31, 1945.
Roscoe H. Goeke, August 2, 1945.
Donald L. Snow, July 31, 1945.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Frederick W. Neal, Alexander.
John W. Martens, Anchor.
Kathryn F. Vogel, Andalusia.
Elmer E. Young, Bardolph.
Lillian E. Kraut, Batchtown.
Frank C. Goddard, Belknap.
Pearl I. O'Brien, Belvidere.
Byron A. Knief, Burlington.
Harry R. Terpening, Cameron.
Otto H. Vogt, Campbell Hill.
Dora Turchi, Cedar Point.
George L. Weith, Centerville Station.
Mabelle Dailey, Chana.
Mildred E. Halsne, Davis Junction.
Thomas H. Peddle, Dawson.
Hattie A. Robinson, Dix.
John F. Gruneisen, Dundas.
Maude M. Palmer, East Lynn.
Elizabeth K. Ware, Ellisville.
Harry E. Millay, Ellsworth.
Muriel C. Macauley, Golden Eagle.
Margaret E. Hicks, Goldengate.
Gwen B. Mundschenk, Graymont.
Cloyd M. Ostrander, Harmon.
Ralph E. Ferrell, Herod.
Otie L. Keen, Keenes.
Lewis W Langham, Keysport.
Grayce A. Harmon, Lakewood.
Louise M. Gibbs, La Rose.
Mary E. Kennedy, Lee.
Richard L. Peterson, Lynn Center.
Ethelyn C. Bushue, Mason.
Grace Dilley, Norris.
Viola T. Swanson, North Henderson.
Dorothy O. Rock, Oakley.
Florence Hendricks, Oconee.
George W. Scott, Osco.
Frank J. Mulholland, Ottawa.
Marguerite W. Talley, Parkersburg.
George B. Garrison, Pearl.
Howard J. Gorman, Peoria.
LaVern M. Mailfald, Prairie View.
Eva L. Glascock, Raleigh.
Charles E. Hancock, Rapids City.
Zola E. Skibinski, Richview.
Mary Z. Schnell, Roxana.
Dorothy J. Bycroft, Sciota.
Gertrude C. Carr, Sherman.
Delano L. Wetherell, Shumway.
Chester O. Burgess, Sigel.
Orilla M. Anderson, Smithshire.
Garnet K. Martin, South Elgin.
Beulah Nickerson, Speer.
Cora I. Kemnetz, Strawn.
Stephen Durochin, Taylor Springs.
Russell L. Akright, Timewell.
Ola M. Beal, Walnut Hill.
John A. Leturno, Wheeler.

LOUISIANA

Cornelius H. Ferguson, Atlanta.
Loney N. Davis, Ball.
Virgie M. Judson, Denham Springs.
Florence C. Clarke, Fairbanks.
Lucille Smith, Fields.
Margaret M. Watson, Fluker.
Minnie S. Teer, Fordoche.
Alonzo B. Catron, Forest.
Elton J. Champagne, Franklin.
Berta Cobb, Longville.
Wilfred August Guidry, Mermentau.
Rex B. Hawthorne, Mira.
Evlyn F. Griffith, South Mansfield.
Robert L. Brooks, Swartz.
Mattie B. Gryder, Vienna.
Eolden L. Kinchen, Watson.

NORTH CAROLINA

Calvin F. Perry, Sr., Archdale.
DeWitt T. Freeman, Bat Cave.
Talmage R. Preston, Belew Creek.
Maude Miller White, Buxton.
Sadie B. Roundtree, Corapeake.
Carre N. Boykin, Fairview.
Eugene R. Duvall, Grassy Creek.
Anne R. Ewell, Hamilton.
Eugenia M. Corbett, Ivanhoe.
Perry T. Roane, Kelford.
Katie C. Wayne, Lake Waccamaw.
Harold M. McGrath, Linville.
Ina M. Wilson, Marston.
Robert C. Pearce, Micro.
Wade W. Bridges, Mooresboro.
John A. Beshel, Nazareth.
Samuel B. Wilson, Newell.
Jodie B. Ragan, Newhill.
Roger W. Davis, Pendleton.
Will G. Pitman, Penland.
Mamie Pfaff, Pfafftown.
Thomas D. Preston, Pine Hall.
Beatrice C. Richardson, Pleasant Garden.
Grace E. Stahl, Pores Knob.
Alice G. Shavender, Ransomville.
Eubert P. Rutherford, Rutherford College.
Laura E. Andrew, Sedalia.
Howard G. Barnes, Severn.
Alma O. Nelms, Stem.
Ida J. Thorp, Stovall.
Philip Y. Snow, Toast.
Edmond F. Sherwood, Vilas.
Clyde H. McClure, Walnut.
Carlotta W. Flynn, Wananish.
Charles D. Ball, Jr., Westfield.
Thelma T. Wheeler, Whitsett.
Janie J. Henry, Winnabow.
Stella Phelps, Woodville.
Florence R. Hanby, Wrightsville Sound.

TEXAS

Neil W. Sheridan, Augusta.
Lovey L. Bailey, Bradshaw.
Oma Wall, Broaddus.
Cecil D. Foster, Cedar Bayou.
Ervin Sherman, China.
Vernie A. Payne, Combes.
Matthew G. Crosby, Douglas.
Daniel A. Juren, Ellinger.
Turner F. Gassaway, Elm Mott.
John D. Furrh, Elysian Fields.
Jesse R. Chambers, Everman.
Richard A. Watson, Forreston.
Charles F. Broyles, Fruitvale.
Carl B. Cheaney, Gouldbusk.
John H. Pope, Harleton.
Carl T. Wilkinson, Harwood.
Edwin A. Raeke, Industry.
J. Morgan Pickett, Kempner.
Werner E. Knippa, Knippa.
Robbie M. Phipps, Lake Creek.
Georgie F. Morgan, Leary.
Loy W. Bynum, Lelia Lake.
Antone J. Lichnovsky, Nada.
Newt Wollard, Oklaunion.
Wince D. Jones, Petty.
Robert R. Sanders, Pollok.
Robert S. Lee, Poynor.
Tommie L. Timmons, Prairie Hill.
John R. Dunahoo, Ridgeway.
Byron C. Lusk, Sidney.
Willis C. White, Springlake.
B. Maurice Cummins, Taft.
Carl P. Koch, Jr., Von Ormy.
Frank J. Meares, Welch.
Dannye E. Gilley, Whitehouse.
Bertie A. Hart, Winchester.

WASHINGTON

Walter M. Hagenstein, Medina.
Ruby T. Gaston, Orondo.
Howard W. McLaughlin, Usk.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast lighted life and death, earth and heaven, and art the lamp of all life, we breathe again Thy holy name in prayer. We thank Thee that Thy arms are as encircling walls amid the problems and exactions of life. We would trust Thy fatherhood, in whom there is all the freshness and richness of wisdom and mercy. O bathe the very depths of our souls and make radiant any dark passageways of experience. This day help us to fulfill the duties of our station, to bear any annoyances or trivial irritations, to give of our best for the least, and to love all men. These things we would do, not for the praise of man but for the extension of Thy kingdom in human hearts and homes, and for the sake of our Saviour whom we love. All praise and glory be unto Him forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

The SPEAKER. The Chair prefers not to recognize Members to address the House for 1 minute this morning, as the House is anxious to proceed with the consideration of the bill that it had up yesterday.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1077) a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 90), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the National Defense Program in Its Relation to Small Business in the United States, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 500 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings on financial problems of small business held before said committee during the current session.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If this additional 500 is printed, how do we know that the committee will not want 500 more in the near future? It has been customary in the past for committees to make these requests, then to renew the request, and I think we ought to come to a conclusion pretty soon that when a committee asks for a certain number that should finish it.

Mr. JARMAN. I may say to the gentleman that the chairman of that committee introduced this resolution, and since he introduced it asking for 500 I judge that is all he wants.

Mr. RICH. I hope he does not come in for any more.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GRANAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Veterans' Journal.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. GRANT of Alabama) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a telegram sent to Mr. James Byrnes.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post concerning the atomic bomb.

Mr. MURPHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the House and Senate of the State of Pennsylvania in opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANDIS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief summary of the part small newspapers played in the war.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD outlining the wonderful performance of Edward Bennett, holder of the Congressional Medal from his district.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Justin Miller, president of the National Association of Broadcasters.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the subject of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the mistreatment of Gen. George S. Patton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the Army should be congratulated upon its speeding up of the demobilization program during the past 45 days. However, I am convinced that much more progress can be made. Studying just the Army's own official statements, and nothing else, it seems obvious that the addition of more separation centers and more personnel at existing separation centers and separation points would enable more men and women to return to their homes, their families, and their civilian pursuits more quickly. There are plenty of Army camps and posts available for this purpose. I can see no reason why civilian personnel cannot be trained and used to do many of the required tasks, particularly the book work.

It would take time, perhaps 30 to 60 days, to organize new centers and points. Their usefulness would not be too long. But the real point is that millions of men and women could get home at least 1 or 2 months sooner, if this were done. Even 1 or 2 months is of inestimable value to these servicemen and women who have served so faithfully—and to their families—not to mention the Nation's program for returning to peacetime pursuits. I urge the Army to take this step at once.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 160]

Andrews, N. Y.	Gibson	O'Hara
Baldwin, Md.	Granger	Patman
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hagen	Powell
Beall	Harless, Ariz.	Rabaut
Bolton	Hart	Reed, N. Y.
Boykin	Hébert	Rivers
Bradley, Mich.	Hendricks	Roe, N. Y.
Campbell	Heselton	Sabath
Case, N. J.	Hinshaw	Sadowski
Celler	Holifield	Sharp
Clark	Holmes, Mass.	Sheridan
Colmer	Hope	Simpson, Ill.
Cooley	Jennings	Somers, N. Y.
Cravens	Kearney	Starkey
Curley	Kerr	Talbot
Daughton, Va.	King	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson	Latham	Towe
Dickstein	Lea	Vinson
Douglas, Ill.	Luce	Wadsworth
Drewry	McGehee	White
Elliott	Mansfield, Mont.	Winter
Fenton	Morrison	Wolcott
Fogarty	Mundt	Wolverton, N. J.
Fuller	Murray, Tenn.	Wood
Gathings	Norton	Zimmerman
Geelan		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 343 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REORGANIZING AGENCIES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4129, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the first sec-

tion of the bill had been read. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEED FOR REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall investigate the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

(1) To reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(2) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

(3) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(4) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

(5) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding immediately under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: On page 2, after line 22, insert the following subsection:

"(c) It is the policy and expectation of the Congress that the transfers, consolidations, and abolitions contained in any reorganization plan under this act shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 percent in the administrative costs of the agency or agencies affected by such plan.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is quite clear and does not require extended debate. It is so plain and so obviously essential that it deserves the unanimous support of all. This is not a mandatory amendment. It is a declaration of policy. It states the purpose of the Congress in yielding this power to the President. We have had many regrouping, reshufflings, and consolidations in the past, but they have not brought any real reduction in the personnel of this Government. Bureaucracy continues to grow and grow until it has reached a size where the American people are demanding that something be done about it. The people want some of the unnecessary bureaus abolished. So this amendment is offered as a declaration of the policy of the Congress that in any regrouping, any reshuffling, or any consolidation there shall be a saving of at least 25 percent in the administrative costs of the bureaus affected.

The reason I did not make the policy mandatory is that I realize it might be possible that in some particular instance the saving would be below 25 percent, and of course we who are interested in economy would like to see the saving if we could not get a larger saving. I say frankly I would be very greatly disappointed if these regroupings did not bring more than a 25 percent saving. If the job is done properly the saving can run at least 50 percent. But I want to lean on the side of conservatism and stipulate the smaller requirement.

Over 12 years ago Mr. Roosevelt, then a candidate for President of the United States, said he could effect a saving of 25 percent in the administrative costs of Government. He made a campaign based on this very fine issue. At that time the administrative costs of the Government were 100 percent lower than they are today. So I have picked the Roosevelt figure of 12 years ago as a very moderate one which I believe the Congress would do well to establish as its policy of expectation. It is a mark we set for the President to strive for and if he does better we will applaud him.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come when we are obliged through necessity to cut down on our cost of Government. Unless we do, we will find those people who hold Government bonds, deposits in savings banks, and insurance policies, will wake up some day and find that their savings have vanished. The security they believed would tide them through their old age will have disappeared. We cannot continue with unbalanced budgets; the piling up of debt upon debt. The time has come to put our finances in order if we are going to be able to go forward and bring better times for the people of America.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. With pleasure.

Mr. COCHRAN. As I said, what you are doing here is hoping, is not that right?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is all we can do at the moment; that is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. There is nothing mandatory in this amendment?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is a declaration of the policy of the Congress that we want all this reshuffling or regrouping to bring about at least a saving of 25 percent.

Mr. COCHRAN. In subsection (a) we say:

The President shall investigate the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

(1) To reduce expenditures and promote economy.

It seems to me that language covers the gentleman's amendment. Now the gentleman offers an amendment which only expresses the hope that whenever agencies are consolidated or activities coordinated there shall be at least a 25-percent reduction in expenditures.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman like to have me make it mandatory?

Mr. COCHRAN. No, because I think you would tie the hands of the President if it was made mandatory.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I was going to say that I would be willing to accommodate the gentleman, although I have offered the amendment in the form in which I believed fair and would state partially the aspirations of Congress.

Mr. COCHRAN. You would not have a reorganization bill if it is made mandatory.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would be willing to accommodate the gentleman if he thinks it should be mandatory.

Mr. COCHRAN. Again I say no, because you would not have a reorganization bill if it is made mandatory.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why, then, is the gentleman criticizing the amendment on the ground that it does not make the reduction mandatory?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not criticize on that ground. I hope the reductions will be to the extent of 50 percent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I hope it will be 75 percent.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the rules of the game permitted me to raise the hopes of the gentleman, I would do so.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering the amendment is to serve notice right now what is the purpose and intent of Congress. I do not see why there should be any opposition to the amendment on either side of the House. The purpose of the amendment is to serve notice that we must curb this terrific bureaucracy and reduce the heavy costs which the people are obliged to bear through taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would like to say that section 2 contains a declaration of policy, and the bill provides: First, to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government. I think we should keep the word "efficient" in mind at all times. Second, to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues as provided in subsection 2 of section 2 (a).

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I would like to ask my good friend the gentleman from Alabama if regrouping or efficiency is not generally the alibi when we want to accomplish something, either to promote a man or to get rid of somebody?

Mr. MANASCO. Of course, that is in the past. We are looking to the future. There is one thing that disturbs me about the gentleman's amendment. Our committee hopes that we may reduce these expenditures 85 percent, 90 percent, and even 100 percent in a lot of instances, because we want to abolish a lot of agencies. But there are some transfers and regroupings that will be worked out under this reorganization plan which might impose many more duties on the new agencies set up. And if that happens, it will be necessary to increase the administrative expenses of the agency. But, in the over-all picture, I hope that expenses will be decreased.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is just what I am afraid is going to happen. I am afraid you are going to increase the administrative expenses in some agencies. That should not be done. The people of America demand that there be a reduction in these costs of administration.

Mr. MANASCO. Of course, I hope that administrative costs as well as a lot of other costs will be reduced more than 25 percent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If that is true, then let us test the gentleman's sincerity. Let us start now.

Mr. MANASCO. My sincerity and the sincerity of the committee is expressed on page 2 of the bill in the first five lines.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Will not the gentleman who is the chairman of the committee accept this amendment in all sincerity?

Mr. MANASCO. Of course, I realize that the amendment does not really amount to anything.

Mr. CHURCH. Therefore, will not the gentleman accept it?

Mr. MANASCO. It does not hurt the bill much.

Mr. CHURCH. Then I think you ought to accept it.

Mr. MANASCO. The committee does not think it hurts it much. But if you are going in to cut expenses, then I think you ought to add about 25 percent more.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will join me to insert that figure, I am willing to do so.

Mr. MANASCO. I do not think it will affect the reorganization plan at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman amend that so as to strike out 25 percent and make it 50 percent?

Mr. MANASCO. I would like to make it 100 percent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We will accept that. I will accept it.

Mr. MANASCO. The point I am making is that we may be providing in the declaration of policy contained in the bill that when they send a reorganization plan down, if the President cannot prove the reorganization plan provides for a 25-percent reduction of administrative expenses, a court of law might attack the plan and say, "You did not carry out the intent of Congress and, therefore, the entire reorganization plan is null and void." That is one of the dangers. I sincerely trust that the gentleman who offered the amendment realizes that. Our committee is a little more for reduction of expenditures than many Members of the House.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. If the gentleman and his committee admit that the amendment will not hurt the bill, then if the gentleman would go one step further he will have to admit that it will strengthen the bill. There is no question about it. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will strengthen our policy.

Mr. MANASCO. It might hurt the bill in this way. That is, if the transmittal of the plan shows that the President has not cut the administrative expenses 25 percent, then a court might decide that the entire plan is in violation of the law and, therefore, defeat the whole thing.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of economy. I am in favor of balancing the Federal Budget as quickly as possible. The pending bill contemplates that. I have favored the economy advocated not only by the minority leader but emphasized by this committee in reporting this bill.

Reference has been made to the statement of President Roosevelt, when a candidate in 1932, and, by inference, to the Democratic platform of that year. There is a difference between the President's statement, a marked difference between the statement of the President, and the statement of the gentleman as proposed in his amendment. There is a difference between the language of the Democratic platform and the gentleman's amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] says:

> It is the policy of the Congress that the transfers, consolidations, and abolitions contained in any one reorganization plan under this act shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 percent in the administrative costs of the agency or agencies affected.

There might not be a 25-percent reduction in any one plan, but there might at the same time be an over-all reduction in all of the plans submitted of more than 25 percent. If we can save 10 percent or 15 percent or 20 percent under one plan, and 30 percent or 40 percent under another plan, we ought to do it.

I happen to have the Democratic platform of 1932. Let us get the language of the President. He did not advocate a reduction of 25 percent in any one agency. It might be desirable to transfer one of the agencies or boards from a department and make it an independent agency for the purpose of making it more efficient, and there would be no reduction.

The Democratic platform said—and I quote:

> We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government—

It was not in case of any one agency, but—

> in the cost of all agencies.

This 25 percent includes not one, but all agencies. It is an overall reduction which I favored. Now let us be realistic. If we mean to accomplish the provisions of this act, if we mean to promote economy, if we mean to bring the expenditures of the Government within its revenues, if we mean, as we have provided in this bill, economy, let us not hamstring the Executive. Let us not prevent him from making a transfer if that particular transfer does not result in a reduction of 25 percent and let us encourage the President to make other reductions of more than 25 percent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I desire to say——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wanted to preface it by paying a slight compliment to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Thanks. Let us have the question.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi for his stand on economy, for he has stood for economy in this Congress at all times.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Thanks again. I do not want to hamstring this reorganization by saying there must be an automatic reduction of 25 percent in every agency, because there might not be a reduction of 25 percent in one agency and there might be and I trust there will be, an over-all reduction of that much and more in all the reorganizations under this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield further for a question gladly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This does not hamstring the President one bit. This is a directive as to the policy of Congress. He can save 20 percent in any one if he wants to. This does not hamstring the President.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If he can save a hundred percent we will be more than delighted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. So will I. The gentleman wanted to ask me a question and then he is repeating the statement he has already made. I have high regard for him, as he well knows.

To promote efficiency and economy is the purpose of this bill. The vice of the gentleman's amendment is that in every case there must be a reduction of 25 percent in every agency reorganized. I would much prefer an over-all reduction, not confining the reduction to one agency, which might hinder rather than promote economy.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No, no.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But the amendment so states. There might be a transfer or consolidation where you would save 10 percent or 15 percent, but when you make all of the consolidations you might save over 25 percent. You deal with agencies. We are dealing with the entire structure and all executive agencies. The amendment should include all agencies, if included in the bill. We have provided for over-all economy in definite language. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, this situation is one of the funniest things I ever witnessed. Governor Roosevelt, as a candidate for the Presidency, said he was going to do something about reducing the expenses of Government. I think he used the figure 25 percent, and promised that if elected he would make a 25-percent reduction in Government expenditures and would reduce the number of Federal employees. After all these years, during which Mr. Roosevelt had the opportunity to reduce expenses, he did not do so—he increased them. Along comes the ranking Member on the Republican side and what does he do? Here is what he does; he offers an amendment by which he says that it is the policy and the expectation of the Congress that any reorganization plan will save 25 percent; and the Members of the majority party do not want to join with us in our hope that we may have economy just because it comes from the Republican side of the Chamber. The amendment expresses hope—and that is all it is—that we may have worthwhile economy. It does not direct anyone to do anything. It does not cramp anybody. Cannot you on the majority side let us hope that this reorganization plan will save 25 percent? We know you never have given us economy, but please, oh please, let us at least hope for it.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WORLEY to the Martin amendment: "Amend the Martin amendment by striking out the words '25 percent' and substitute in lieu thereof '50 percent'."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment it is my hope that in the proposed reorganization the expenditures of this Government can be reduced as much as possible without impairing the efficiency of the necessary departments, but we should cut out all unnecessary expenditures and governmental activities.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Does it not get down to this: We all want economy in government; we want departments, bureaus, and commissions that are not necessary eliminated. Likewise, is it not true that we have seen too many alleged reorganizations and alleged economies that really did not effect any economy at all, but was just a reshuffling, placing the same people somewhere else and putting a few more on top, with the end result that we were spending more money after we got through than before we started.

This amendment simply means that the Congress wants this reorganization program carried out in line with our previous promises in respect to economy and the elimination of unnecessary and useless bureaucracy.

Mr. WORLEY. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana. This is not a partisan matter at all because each administration, whether Republican or Democrat, always has a platform favoring reduced governmental expenditures. I feel those promises should be kept, regardless of which party is in power.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I came to Congress in 1930. I have seen the cost of Government grow from 450,000 employees to 3,500,000. I have been hollering economy all these years. I was never happier in my life than I am at this moment to see people on the other side of the aisle asking for a 25-percent cut.

Mr. WORLEY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We must continue the most important job of balancing the Federal Budget, because we now owe the biggest debt in our entire history, nearly three hundred billion dollars. We must employ sound judgment and good business practices in reducing these tremendous war-swollen Budgets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief, but I do wish to make comment, having served nearly a year on a previous reorganization bill and having been somewhat watchful as to how the majority party proceeded under that bill. Sometimes we seem to advocate and talk one way but act in another way or fail to act. It is not an unfamiliar result of legislation when party issues are involved. I seem to see something back of this. It could be used and probably will be used, and I think you would use it, to protect jobs for the faithful of the party. Many wartime organizations are to be abolished rather soon. Under this power of reorganization, as the gentleman from Indiana pointed out, you can now take over many of those organizations before they are abandoned, transfer them with all their functions into other permanent organizations, keeping many employees who seem to be deserving of party recognition. We have in mind the way reorganizations can and are usually used to get rid of certain personalities and take care of the favored ones.

Do I trust the doctor assigned to this particular job? Perhaps I trust him more than I did other previous ones, but I am really losing my confidence in doctors whose duties are to protect political jobs.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I will yield to the gentleman if he can help me.

Mr. MAY. I happen to know that due to some activities of the House Military Affairs Committee a certain group in the War Department was moved out of that Department and discharged, but they are turning up in the State Department.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman well knows this reorganization could be used as a tool for taking care of a great many that are supposed to be, and would naturally be, dismissed by the cessation of the activities of the organization to be done away with. I have been watching that side of the House for several years, since the word "Farleyism" was used as synonymous with jobs—Political jobs! The present majority party has proven most effective in creating jobs but has shown no effectiveness or even willingness to do away with them.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, let us be frank about this matter. We are playing with a bill that is conceded to be a bill of importance and of vast seriousness. The very first object set forth in the bill is to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government. We know what that means. When this bill goes to the President of the United States he will understand what that means and to say that we propose to require that he shall save 25 or 50 percent is an idle gesture which really in all conscience does not reveal much good faith in offering such amendments. Of course, it is more applicable or sufficiently applicable to the 50 percent. If you are going to play with the situation, why not say 75 percent? This bill says, "To reduce expenditures to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government" and that means something and is in good faith.

Mr. Chairman, I trust we will not play with this bill by offering such amendments as these.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is recognized.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] answered the question I was about to ask. I was going to ask whether or not the amendment providing 25 or 50 percent reduction would be effective without this language "to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government." I do not think the amendment contains those words.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, I expect the President in regrouping these departments will have that in mind. After all, he is going to do the job.

Mr. HOOK. Oh, well, then, I do not see any need for the amendment at all, because the bill provides for that very thing where it sets forth the purpose of the bill that is "to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of government." Therefore, in view of the answer of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do not see any need for his amendment at all. It is just surplusage, a sort of window dressing.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment and the amendment to the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 107, noes 111.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 112, noes 108.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MANASCO and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 147, noes 142.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

(3) the consolidation of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

(4) the consolidation of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

(5) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the reorganization plan will not have, any functions.

is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the transfers, consolidations, and abolitions, as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each transfer, consolidation, or abolition referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of this section and specified in the plan, he has found that such transfer, consolidation, or abolition is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall (i) state, to such extent as he deems practicable, approximately the reduction of expenditures, if any, which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the plan, and (ii) specify with respect to each abolition of functions specified in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAFOLLETTE: On page 4, line 3, before the period insert a comma and "a statement of the facts and reasons upon which each such finding is based."

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I discussed this amendment before the members of the committee who were present yesterday. In order that the membership may more readily understand it, let me say that in section 2 of the bill the Congress establishes standards to which the Executive shall conform in preparing a plan. In section 3 of the bill the Congress establishes or designates the methods by which the standards are reached.

When you get near the bottom of page 3 you will find this language, beginning in line 18:

Is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the transfers, consolidations, and abolitions, as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each transfer, consolidation, or abolition referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of this section and specified in the plan, he has found that such transfer, consolidation, or abolition is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a).

You will note the use of the word "findings," that is, the five standards which we establish. My position is simply this, that what we call for in the bill as it is today is a statement of "findings." This use of the word "findings" calls for what we say in law are "conclusions of fact," or it amounts to conclusions of law. There is no provision in the bill, as we have written it, whereby the Executive shall declare the facts and then the reason from the facts by which he concludes that the five standards which we have set up have been met. In other words, without the information, which I think the Congress has a right to ask of any Executive, when the plan comes back you do not have information by which you could deduce whether or not in any particular part of the plan the findings which the Executive has given are based upon sound, factual considerations. In other words, you have standards with which he is to comply, but he can merely say, "I find," and use any of the language of section 2 (a) and thereby comply with the act now as written without any amendment.

The President might say, for instance: "In making this particular plan I am doing so to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government."

But if you have no facts from which you conclude that it is a sufficient and adequate statement, you have no method by which you can measure the sufficiency of the plan which is submitted to you or the merit of the work which the Executive has done.

This Congress is conferring a job upon the Executive. I believe it is consistent with my theory of what the American Government should be that this Congress should lay down the policy, and check on the actions of the Executive, that it should have the facts by which it can make an accurate check. I believe my record in this body to date indicates that I am not afraid of delegating authority; but by the same token in order that we may intelligently act when we do delegate authority I think it is not only our obligation but our privilege and part of our function to require that all the facts shall be given us by which we can determine whether or not the authority, which I am willing to delegate, has been adequately and accurately carried out consistent with the standards which we fix. Our failure to adopt this amendment constitutes delegation run rife and congressional abnegation amounting to gross negligence.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Following the line of the gentleman's argument, in view of the fact that this is a transfer of what generally would be considered a legislative power to the Executive, is it not fair to say that the Executive should have the facts upon which his initiation is based even as a legislative committee has before it the facts in the hearings it conducts before it proposes a bill?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I think that is quite right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 10 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the economy hope of our minority leader, I have written a letter to the Secretary of State which I believe to be very important to the mem-

bership of the House and which I will now read:

OCTOBER 2, 1945.

The Honorable JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Realizing the multitude of duties presently absorbing your every attention, I have hesitated to address myself to the subject matter of this communication inasmuch as it will add further to the burdens already being carried by your own good self.

I feel it imperative however, that I have specific answers to certain interrogations that I might make proper response to a large number of questions currently being addressed not alone to me by the constituency, which I represent, but to many other Representatives to this Congress.

Be assured that these are but a few of the many questions being asked and justifiably so, by the taxpayers who in the last analysis will be called upon to make good every financial commitment made by this administration, whether the commitment be made by the Congress or by the executive department under authority delegated the latter during the last 13 years.

May I therefore, look forward to receipt at the earliest possible moment the following information with respect to the matters of loans, grants or other types of financial assistance to foreign governments, their fiduciary institutions or other bodies set up by the foreign government to act for them or for the United States Government in the implementing financial assistance to them.

1. What steps are being taken to determine the present ability of the people of the United States to extend further lend-lease or other funds to any foreign government whatever. This in the light of the fact that even in the 10 years preceding World War II, the Treasury of the United States was unable to collect from the people in any one fiscal year enough taxes to more than pay about only half the cost of running the Federal Government for that year. How long can we continue to operate at an annual deficit and stay solvent?

2. Is your department sponsoring the loan or grants of any money to any government in the immediate future, and if so (a) would you please furnish a list of the governments, and (b) the approximate amount of money that they request or otherwise indicate they want?

3. Would you please advise the latest figure available as to the present national wealth of the United States as contrasted with the gross public and private debts of its political subdivisions and excluding bank deposits, much of which is invested in Government bonds?

4. Will any or all loans made be passed upon by the United States Bureau of the Budget?

5. Has any foreign government seeking aid of the United States been asked to submit a financial budget of their annual taxes (from all sources) and a break-down of the expenses such as is prepared by the United States Bureau of the Budget?

6. Is it contemplated to offer still another bond issue to the public in order to raise money for the purpose of extending contemplated aid to foreign governments?

The nature of the above will indicate in part the kind of questions being asked of myself and other Members of Congress. They are coupled with queries having to do with weekly compensation for our own unemployed, a demand for the abatement of certain nuisance taxes, war taxes on automobiles, household and electrical goods, watches, jewelry, as well as an insistent demand for a reduction both in corporate tax as well as the pay-roll deductions now being made in collecting the current rates on income taxes in general.

National exigency requires prompt response. Inasmuch as all factual data must now be on hand, may I take this opportunity of thanking you for your every effort to expedite answer of the above query.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

LEO E. ALLEN,
Member of Congress, Thirteenth District of Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I want to take this occasion to say that the ranking members and the members on the minority have sincerely cooperated in the reporting of the bill that we have under consideration. I have high regard for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE]. It is fair to say that he suggested two amendments, that the committee considered both of the amendments carefully, and to the next section the committee proposes to offer as a committee amendment an amendment suggested by the gentleman from Indiana. We have the same objectives in mind.

In just a few words I should like to call the attention of the committee to the amendment now under consideration. It requires that the President shall submit the facts upon which he bases his plan for consolidation. I have before me the plan submitted by President Hoover and the plans submitted under the act of 1932 as amended by President Roosevelt. It is unthinkable that any President would submit a plan without also submitting his reasons in support thereof. As I see it, the difficulty with this particular amendment inserted in this section is whether or not the Congress of the United States in approving or disapproving the plan will permit the President to substitute his findings for the yardstick that we lay down.

I am fundamentally interested in the facts or standards as set forth by the bill. I am glad to have the views and the recommendations of the President, but I insist that the yardstick is not the President's findings, not what facts occur to the President. But he is authorized under this section 2 to submit a plan provided he finds that the plan will reduce expenditures, promote economy, will increase efficiency, will group, coordinate, and consolidate functions of Government according to their major purposes, will reduce the number of Government agencies, and eliminate overlapping and duplication. That is our yardstick. We do not put ourselves in the hands of the Executive to comply with his views and his facts. With all deference and in all kindness I concur with the committee in the thought that the adoption of this particular amendment might limit us in our yardstick by substituting the views of the President for the policies and standards we have laid down.

I would like to say this further with respect to this particular section. We have asked the President for the first time, when he submits a plan, to state affirmatively to such an extent as he deems proper approximately the reduction in expenditures. If it be 10 percent, if it be 25 percent, if it be 50 percent, we ask him to state it. Secondly, we do something else. If the President undertakes to abolish, because he has abolished an agency, a function that the Congress of the United States has established, where there is duplication, we can require him in the second place to specify the statute so that we may put our fingers on it and know exactly the functions that are being abolished. In all deference the language in which we set forth our standards and our yardstick is language which has been approved and amplified in previous acts, and by the acceptance of this amendment, knowing that the President himself would not submit a plan without giving his reasons, we might in advance be approving the President rather than our own yardstick.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, in all deference to my good friend who stands for reorganization, in my judgment, this amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAFOLLETTE) there were—ayes 31, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OTHER CONTENTS OF PLANS

SEC. 4. Any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3—

(1) shall designate, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization and the title of its head;

(2) may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more assistant heads of any agency (including an agency resulting from a consolidation) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of transfers and consolidations made by the plan, the responsibilities and duties of such head are of such nature as to require such action. In the case of any such appointment the term of office shall not be fixed at more than 4 years, the compensation shall not be at a rate in excess of $12,000 per annum, and, if the compensation is at a rate in excess of the highest per annum rate which, without specific authorization or appropriation therefor, can be assigned to any position under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the appointment shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(3) shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property (including office equipment), and personnel affected by such transfer, consolidation, or abolition;

(4) shall make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations available for use in connection with the function or agency transferred or consolidated, as he deems necessary by reason of the transfer or consolidation for use in connection with the transferred or consolidated functions, or for the use of the agency to which the transfer is made, but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made;

(5) shall make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANASCO: On page 4, strike out lines 16, 17, and 18, and insert the following quoted paragraph:

"(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the one I referred to as being proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE]. It involves the meaning intended by the language in the bill, and I think it clarifies it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This is an amendment proposed in the committee by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE]?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It was offered by him and adopted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANASCO: On page 5, line 1, after the period insert a new sentence as follows:

"The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANASCO: Page 5, in line 14, strike out "such" and insert "any"; and in line 18, strike out "the" and insert "any."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 6, after line 2, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) In the first reorganization plan which the President submits to the Congress he shall include an agency wherein shall be consolidated and coordinated in the interest of efficiency, economy, and effective national policy all functions relating to relief and rehabilitation in foreign countries, and which shall provide for the coordination of all commercial and financial relations with foreign countries; and shall transfer to such agency all functions, funds and personnel who are, or since December 7, 1941, may have been, engaged in carrying on the functions of the Export-Import Bank, the Foreign Economic Administration, the Rubber Development Corporation, the U. S. Commercial Company, the United States Tariff Commission, the Lend-Lease Administration, the Office of Inter-American Affairs, the foreign functions of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the functions of UNRRA which are wholly within the jurisdiction and control of the United States, the functions of the Bretton Woods agreement which are in the control and jurisdiction of the United States, the administration of reciprocal trade agreements, and any other functions and activities other than those of the State Department which are directly related to foreign aid, trade, finance, commerce, industry, and agriculture."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois on the ground it is not germane. I will reserve the point of order if the gentleman from Illinois desires me to do so at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I prefer that the gentleman make his point of order at this time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment is not germane to the bill now under consideration and is not germane to the reorganization of the permanent departments of the Government. It is not germane to the section under consideration. It embraces many other items and agencies set up under the First War Powers Act by the President with which this bill does not deal with and does not authorize to be continued. Under that act those functions can only be continued for 6 months after the war has been declared ended. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is not germane either to the section to which it has been offered or to the bill. For the reasons I have stated, Mr. Chairman, I believe the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make two points in connection with the point of order raised by the gentleman from Mississippi. The first point is that the amendment deals with nothing except executive agencies. The second point is that on page 2 of the pending bill there is this language:

To create, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government as nearly as can be according to major purposes.

This is an effort to coordinate activities in consonance with a major purpose. I consider, Mr. Chairman, therefore, that the amendment is germane, not only to the bill, but also to the paragraph, and is properly offered at this point

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, may I submit a further point for the consideration of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the agencies defined in this bill are executive agencies. The bill deals with executive agencies. The committee never heard of this amendment until it was read just now. Executive agencies are defined in the bill. I submit the question as to whether a number of the institutions or organizations embraced in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois are embraced in the term "agencies" as defined in this bill. I submit, therefore, that the amendment is not germane to the subject matter of reorganizing the permanent executive departments of the Government as provided in the pending bill. It would make permanent functions that expire under the War Powers Act. The bill authorizes the President to submit plans; the amendment directs him to establish an agency. It is not in accord with the purposes and is not germane to the bill or the pending section.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, for the enlightenment of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to detain the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman further.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This amendment was never presented to the committee. It is a most far-reaching amendment. It provides in the first instance for establishing an agency. We are not giving the President the power to establish an agency unless it is necessary in combining and abolishing agencies, and it is beyond the scope of this bill.

Moreover, I repeat that this amendment deals with a rubber corporation, with agencies that we are doing our level best to abolish, agencies established by Executive order under the First War Powers Act. The bill under consideration does not provide for the consideration of those agencies. We deal with the permanent executive agencies of the Government, rather than the war agencies of the Government. The Economic Administration, the Rubber Corporation, and these other temporary agencies are foreign to the real purpose of this bill. The purpose is to provide for reorganization of existing executive permanent departments of the Government, rather than to provide a foreign idea of establishing a new agency and bringing into that agency agencies that have been authorized under the First War Powers Act, together with agencies that may be authorized under legislation. Certainly that is outside the scope of this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to section 2 (a) of the bill, which reads as follows:

The President shall investigate the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the word "agency" under section 7 of the bill is defined.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has offered an amendment which has been reported. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that the amendment is not germane to the pending bill.

The Chair has examined the amendment in comparison with language contained in the pending bill and invites at-

tention to the fact that under "Definitions of Agencies", as provided in section 7 on page 9 of the pending bill, it is observed:

When used in this act the term "agency" means any executive department, commission, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, or administration, in the executive branch of the Government.

The Chair is of the opinion that the agencies enumerated in the amendment would come within the scope of the definition stated in the bill to which the Chair has invited attention. The Chair feels that the amendment is germane, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a prelude to what I have to say about this amendment let me dispose once more of the contention made by my friend from Mississippi that this was not brought to his committee. I believe it was not. The fact of the matter is that since the 5th day of September, including Saturdays and Saturday afternoons, members of the Deficiency Appropriations Committee have been conducting hearings for 6 days a week. This has been my first opportunity on the floor, let alone appearing before the committee. I regret that fact, but I do not believe that it ought to foreclose anyone in his privilege or his prerogative to submit that which he thinks will implement and modify and improve and strengthen existing legislation, even though it was not submitted to the committee that is handling it here on the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I quite agree with the gentleman in what he says. I believe it is the duty of every Member to submit any constructive suggestion he has. If we could have the opportunity to look it over ahead of time so much the better; but anyway he should have the privilege of submitting it and having it considered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman. There is in the country today a great deal of anxiety. In fact, there is a great deal of fear. Perhaps it is a good thing, because, after all, fear is the beginning of wisdom. How many times this question of loans to Britain has already been discussed on this floor. How many times have we speculated on the request of Russia for a loan? How much discussion there has been about our relief activities abroad. On Monday or Tuesday of next week the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration will be within 50 feet of this Chamber asking for another $550,000,000. So we are confronted with this question of loans, we are confronted with the question of relief and rehabilitation in foreign countries, and there is some reason to believe that the President of the United State is going to ask for another $1,950,000,000 for these purposes. There is also the question of the gold balances the countries have on deposit in the United States, the same countries which at the present time are undertaking to procure loans of money, if they can, in order to supplement and support their own economies at home. There is this problem, for instance, of the Bretton Woods agreement as it relates to both the bank and the stabilization fund; to what extent they are coordinated with the activities, particularly at the present time. On other occasions I have raised this same general question on the floor of the House, and particularly in connection with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. In my judgment the duties which may be established on imports is the least of our problems today.

What difference does it make how much a duty is lowered on goods that go into India when there is an import-control system in India that allows the use of only $30,000,000 of American dollar exchange in 1 year for imports from the United States? What difference does it make what the tariffs if the money is not released with which to buy our commodities freely? What about the cartels that exist in the world today that impede and obstruct the free flow of commerce? Look at the situation in Egypt. It is only a few months since we were seeking to sell a number of DC–3 planes to Egypt for air-line use. It was a terribly long time before the deal was ever negotiated for two reasons; the first one was that there was an import-control panel that was determining what could be sent into the country; and the second one was that there was another control panel to say whether dollar exchange should be released from a $20,000,000 of allowable dollar exchange for the purpose of buying goods from this country. The point of all this is simply how are we going to get a broad picture of our commercial, financial, and relief functions to deal intelligently with the demands made upon us and how is the President of the United States going to get a picture and coordinate every one of these activities in that very field without immense duplication, and waste, and extravagance, unless the thing is centered in some one place?

Recently the Foreign Economic Administration has been taken apart. Part of its functions have been given to the State Department. Part of the OWI functions have been given to the State Department. Some of the Foreign Economic functions have been given to the Department of Commerce.

Once more we are confronted with this problem of seeing a ramification of functions for one major purpose that ought to be under one central head so one can look at every aspect of this problem in the interest of economy and the elimination of duplication. How can we properly evaluate our capacity to undertake further obligation in this field until every aspect is brought together in one place for review?

If we want to save some money and carry out the import and content of the amendment offered by the majority leader that was adopted a little while ago, the thing to do is to consolidate in foreign fields because that is where the billions are going to be. You cannot do it by saving a million here and a million there. Real economy depends on how many billions you can save for the taxpayers of the country which will be committed from time to time from here on out in the field of foreign activities.

One other item should be mentioned. There is a disposition to believe that lend-lease activities have come to an end. They have not. New lend-lease commitments have stopped, but we have had testimony very recently that under the act of 1941 the Lend-Lease Administration can fill the requisitions that were filed before the Presidential order suspending lend-lease, and those requisitions will be fulfilled and goods will be shipped for a period well after the 1st of January, 1946. That is the record.

What about this confusing picture? I suggest that we coordinate these activities and give them some central direction. It is in the language of the amendment:

In the first reorganization plan which the President submits to the Congress he shall include an agency wherein shall be consolidated and coordinated in the interest of efficiency, economy, and effective national policy all functions relating to relief and rehabilitation in foreign countries and which shall provide coordination of commercial and financial relations with foreign countries.

We shall never get a uniform, accurate picture of this matter, we shall never be able to strike a balance sheet, and we shall never be able to put together all the diverse parts of this whole picture and this whole problem until that is done. This is the proper place to do it.

We are delegating a legislative function to the President of the United States. Why not exercise just a little bit of our own legislative capacity and legislative responsibility here by saying to the President: Now, when you send us your reorganization plan, you include something that will consolidate all these agencies and these functions that are dealing with countries abroad so that there shall be a true picture and there shall be a maximum of efficiency in the operation of those functions.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. I am wondering if the gentleman's amendment might not prevent any reorganization at all, because, as I understand the amendment, it is a mandatory amendment requiring the President in his first reorganization plan to carry out the provisions of this amendment. He might not agree with the amendment. He might not want to do that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Alabama that there are two answers. In the first place, the President is not mandated to send any reorganization bill. He may not send us any. This

says that if he does send us a reorganization bill, in the very first one he shall inclinclude that kind of a consolidation in the interest of economy, efficiency, and the national domestic policy.

Mr. MANASCO. That is exactly the reason I think the gentleman's amendment is dangerous because if the President does not want to carry out the suggestion contained in the amendment, we will not have a reorganization of some of the executive agencies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is the law-making branch of the Government. It is up to us to tell the President, as we are telling him in this bill, what he can do and what he cannot do. That is a mere exercise of our own legislative function. The bill does so in a general way. This amendment deals with a special major function, namely, in the foreign field.

Mr. MANASCO. I think that the Foreign Affairs Committee is the committee that should deal with this proposition; they should make those studies, not our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he said he wanted the President to send down a plan which would consolidate our foreign and domestic policies. Did I misunderstand him?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. It is to consolidate those foreign activities relating to aid, trade, commerce, and finance so that you get them all in one basket.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the gentleman have brought in here in the first plan the Tariff Commission which is exempted?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very definitely so. The functions of the Tariff Commission that relate to that ought to be placed there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Placed in this consolidation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As I understand it, the gentleman voted for all these agencies that he now wants to consolidate. I do not believe I ever voted for any of them. If you propose to get them all in one, where I can get at them, I might support the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must remind my colleague from Michigan that the United States Tariff Commission was constituted away back in the days of Woodrow Wilson before I got here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is exempt in this other section.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. May I remind the gentleman that the President can submit a first plan, and then the very next day he can submit other plans, and they could be voted on separately.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Did the gentleman's amendment include UNRRA and Bretton Woods; that the President was authorized to put them into this one agency?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The language is: The functions of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which are under the control and jurisdiction of the United States. That might be our share of the accounting, our share of direction, insofar as it is under our control, and likewise so far as those functions relating to the stabilization fund and the International Bank as are also under our control and our jurisdiction.

To summarize then, Mr. Chairman, until we can assess every other need and demand that other nations may present to us, how shall we properly determine in the interest of our own country just what should be done? Until we appraise the controls, the blocked exchange, the cartels and other instruments which serve to block the flow of commercial goods from the United States, how shall we determine what we should do when requests are made by foreign lands for money in the form of loans and for other types of credit? Until all the facts and circumstances which are a part of our relationship with foreign lands are brought into perspective under one head, how can we maintain records and data that are completely reliable and which must become the basis for our trade relations in the future? I am thinking about the protection of our own national economy because there will be millions of young men who will be returning to find jobs and who have a claim on the gratitude of this country. Our capacity must, therefore, remain intact and if we should extend ourselves or promise far beyond what we can perform for other countries, is it not a certainty that by broken promises we shall earn their ill will and contempt? This tragedy can be avoided and we can make provision for our own only in proportion as these foreign activities are closely and carefully coordinated and that is the objective of the amendment now before you.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to find myself in disagreement with my able friend from Illinois. In the first place, as I see it, this amendment makes it mandatory for the President to set up another agency. We are trying to reduce the number of agencies. In support of my statement I ask you to listen to this language:

and shall transfer to such agency all functions, funds, and personnel who are or since December 7, 1941, may have been engaged in carrying on the functions of the Export-Import Bank, the Foreign Economic Administration, the Rubber Development Corporation, the U. S. Commercial Company, the United States Tariff Commission, the Lend-Lease Administration, the Office of Inter-American Affairs, the foreign functions of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the functions of UNRRA which are wholly within the jurisdiction and control of the United States.

There it makes it mandatory upon the President to create a new agency and to keep on the pay rolls everyone who has been employed in those activities since 1941. It is in direct contrast to the efforts of the committee to create efficiency and reduce expenditures under the terms of this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If this amendment is adopted we are making a permanent agency of the Government directly connected with foreign relief. That is really a war measure and comes under the First War Powers Act. We are establishing an agency here and directing it to be established to put the United States permanently into foreign relief if the amendment is adopted.

Mr. COCHRAN. Absolutely, without a question of a doubt.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman has pointed out personnel. The reason for putting that provision in there was to make sure that no agency would be crippled in its functions until it had been transferred, and thereafter a reduction can be made. The OWI, for instance, has been transferred in its entirely, including all of its unexpended balance, to the State Department. Yet there will be a progressive liquidation of that function, so that by the first of the year the personnel will be progressively diminished. That item was placed in the amendment for the very purpose of safeguarding the functions of those agencies until the transer can be made. There is nothing to prevent the President at any time from reducing personnel, and secondly, there is nothing to prevent the Congress of the United States at any time from reducing appropriations, and personnel must then be in proportion.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The amendment is complicated and I am not sure I understand it. Is it the idea to have this one agency with all these different functions, and then also have the State Department, which has all the negotiating with foreign countries? That sounds absolutely bizarre to me, if that is what it means, but I may not have understood it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I so understand the amendment. May I say further in reference to the personnel part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, as long as the gentleman from Illinois touches on it, that he says that the President shall transfer the per-

sonnel "who are, or since December 7, 1941, may have been, engaged in." That is putting people back to work who have already been separated from the service.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The illustration given by the gentleman from Illinois of the OWI's being transferred to another agency is a reduction. This provides for a new agency. In that case the Executive order reduced an agency for liquidating purposes, merging it into another and an establishing agency. This amendment, however, provides for the establishment of an entirely new agency. The observation made by the gentlewoman from Illinois, I think, bears weight, because this provides that some of the activities of the State Department are to be taken from it and put into the new agency provided for in this amendment. Certainly nobody can follow the far-reaching implications and forecast the results that might occur if this amendment were adopted.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. In answer to the gentlewoman from Illinois and the majority leader, the amendment relates to an agency only. There is no reason why the agency could not be under the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, no Member of this House has any higher regard for the ability of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], than have I. As I read this amendment it is not a move toward economy. Just listen to the reading of the amendment. I read:

> In the first reorganization plan which the President submits to the Congress he shall include an agency wherein shall be consolidated and coordinated in the interest of efficiency, economy, and effective national policy all functions relating to relief and rehabilitation in foreign countries, and which shall provide for the coordination of all commercial and financial relations with foreign countries; and shall transfer to such agency all functions, funds, and personnel who are, or since December 7, 1941, may have been, engaged in carrying on the functions of the Export-Import Bank, the Foreign Economic Administration, the Rubber Development Corporation, the United States Commercial Corporation, the United States Tariff Commission, the Lend-Lease Administration, the Office of Inter-American Affairs, the foreign functions of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the functions of UNRRA, which are wholly within the jurisdiction and control of the United States, the functions of the Bretton Woods agreement which are in the control and jurisdiction of the United States, the administration of reciprocal trade agreements, and any other functions and activities other than those of the State Department which are directly related to foreign aid, trade, finance, commerce, industry, and agriculture.

I am not criticizing the gentleman and those who consulted with him and drew this amendment, because they did not submit it to the committee. That is not my idea at all. I think every Member is obligated to speak up every time he thinks he can make a bill better. But listen to this:

> In the first reorganization plan which the President submits to the Congress he shall include an agency—

I do not know what they are going to name that agency and it does not make any difference, although it might properly be called the omnibus agency on the theory that it includes everything—

> wherein shall be consolidated and coordinated in the interest of efficiency, economy, and effective national policy all functions relating to relief and rehabilitation in foreign countries, and which shall provide for the coordination of all commercial and financial relations with foreign countries—

Now, get this—

> and shall transfer to such agency all functions, funds, and personnel—

In all these other agencies.

That amendment if adopted and carried out, brings under one blanket omnibus bill all of these agencies named, with every single function they have today and every man, woman, and child they employ. What is the use of talking about economy? It is no answer, may I say to the gentleman from Illinois, to say that later the President can economize and fire some of the employees or do away with some of the functions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He can do it right away, as a matter of fact.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He can do it now if he wants to in a lot of these agencies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois what good it will do to consolidate all these and put them in one basket? Are they any better when you get them in one basket?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. That is a fair question. Very definitely so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman give me time to answer?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Here you have the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration with thousands of employees proceeding toward a relief objective without any regard for the things that are happening in other branches of the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Here you have the negotiation of loans or at least they are in a tentative stage today with nobody quite advised as to what is going on, with the result that there is no coordination there whatsoever.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is nothing to prevent the abolition of any agency here after the functions have been transferred.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why not abolish them now or as this bill seeks to do?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The agencies definitely would be abolished.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But, you put them all under one blanket and you say to the President, "You are going to have to transfer all of the functions and keep all the personnel there." That is what your amendment says. When you get through, the total is equal to the sum of all of its parts. You just have all the little shows grouped under one tent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. You can transfer the functions and you can abolish the agencies and you can diminish the functions if you like. I believe the gentleman does not make a valid argument.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why do you have to get them all in one agency to do it? The bill proposes to do it one by one as the plans come along. Here is what you do by your amendment. You say, he shall transfer to this new agency, that is, to this over-all agency, the biggest one of all, all the funds and personnel. Why, you have been yelling your head off and so have I to get rid of some of them. For instance, UNRRA. Why keep that in? Your committee brought in a bill here which provided money for a bigger UNRRA. They would be abroad in one of those agencies. You would keep them in, but not me. I agree with your purpose. I agree with your motive. But I say that you are just grouping them together, putting them in under another name.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I served on the first committee on reorganization back in 1937 and 1938. In every plan that was submitted, all the personnel and all the appropriations were transferred together to a new agency and then the reduction began. It becomes an administrative matter and it has to be worked out that way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is no virtue in the gentleman's amendment then except that you have a new name for the whole bunch of them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That must be so because it is going to be impossible for all of those agencies to go out of business. There must be some exceptions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is after the agency has been transferred to the new agency?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; because how can you get rid of them unless they are abolished by Executive order or by legislation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why not abolish them before they are put in this new agency? Liquidate the bad ones, save the good ones.

Mr. DIRKSEN. You must save some of these functions. They cannot be thrown overboard because they are continuing functions.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman has asked, Is there any virtue in this proposition? The only virtue I see in it is this: You are going to save on the billions of dollars that are handed out for relief. Ninety-five percent of all the appropriations on this relief is handed out and 5 percent goes for administration.

Now, the Members on this floor, including the Member now in the well of the

House, are seeing this 5 percent for administrative costs so large that he forgets the 95 percent which is being handed out for these things.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I am not forgetting the 95 percent that goes for administrative costs. The point I make is—what is the use of putting them all into one agency if you are going to keep all the hired help and all the money. You can kill them one by one just as well as you can after you have put them all in one pen. Why do you bring into this over-all agency and hook it up with UNRRA the Tariff Commission, which is expressly exempted in the bill, and all of those agencies which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] wants exempted; that is, those eight agencies. I cannot see where you are getting anywhere in keeping all the hired men and hired girls and putting them all under one agency. I cannot see it.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Would not the enactment of this amendment have the effect of incorporating the dying wartime agencies; in other words, the dying wartime agencies such as the OWI would be revitalized and we would be making them permanent agencies of the Government?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know. The possibilities of this amendment are beyond me.

Mr. HARE. It would put such an agency into the new agency and that new agency is being created and certainly the old dying, wartime agency is being revitalized and made permanent.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, ever since early 1943 I have been waging a fight that was at times a one-man fight to undo just exactly what this amendment attempts to redo. I was delighted recently to hear of the demise of FEA. FEA is the successor of BEW. You remember BEW got into a fight when it was under the then Vice President Wallace. They had a whole bunch of agencies dealing with foreign affairs in BEW in just the way that the Dirksen amendment recommends, and some more in RFC under Jesse Jones. Jones and Wallace got into a fight. What did President Roosevelt do? He did what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] says we should do. He created another new agency. I have been fighting, and the Republicans have been fighting, to cut down agencies. Every time a New Deal agency failed in its purpose, they set up another new agency to do the same thing. We Republicans have fought that for years. Our candidate, Governor Dewey, last fall made a speech in which he mentioned 14 different agencies that had to do with foreign affairs, and urged that they be consolidated or abolished. I presented on this floor in 1943 the fact that we had six Government agencies and departments exporting commodities and eight importing commodities. This amendment would dodge that question of duplication by creating another new blanket agency and taking in a lot of functions that belong under existing old-line departments.

This amendment could not possibly be adopted in view of the provisions on page 6 of this bill which forbid the creation of a new department or the destruction of an existing one, because what is attempted here is to create a new State Department, a new Department of Foreign Affairs, and give it some new label.

We ought to strengthen and improve our State Department, not tear it down and tear it apart. We want to organize all of our political and diplomatic affairs overseas and in this country under the old-line Department of State. Steps have been taken since the war in that direction. We want to scrap the war agencies as soon as possible. We want to have foreign financial matters in which the Treasury is involved working through the Treasury Department and the Department of State. In foreign lands all of our different activities, commerce, agriculture, finance, relief, or whatever they are, should be headed by our American Ambassador or Minister in that country. We want them coordinated in this country. Steps are being taken, slowly but perhaps effectively, to consolidate and to abolish the war agencies and to abolish agencies such as the FEA, which thought it got a lease on life by getting hold of a few postwar functions.

But what we want to do is just exactly the opposite of what this amendment proposes to do. We must realize that in our foreign affairs, for years to come, many of our departments are going to be involved, but make sure that their activities are coordinated; that no new departments are created for that purpose, but that they function under the State Department as the head. Of course, you will always have the War and Navy Departments involved in international questions. You will have the Treasury. Possibly we may recreate commercial attachés as the representatives of the Department of Commerce, such as President Hoover established all over the world, and which were stricken out by the New Deal, and which I understand are going to again be recreated. But, above all, we do not want a mixed-up affair like this thrown on the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The whole argument of the gentleman from Ohio can be demolished in one sentence. There is nothing in the amendment and nothing in the bill, after these activities are coordinated, to prevent putting them in the State Department.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If that demolishes my argument, your proposal would be just as if we urged the President to set up 50 new agencies, because there is nothing in the bill that would prevent him from abolishing them later. If it is no good at the start there is no use starting it. The President has made a step in the right direction in abolishing FEA and going to the old-line department and attempting to coordinate and simplify it. Let us not require that the President make a step in the wrong direction, with the hope that it could be righted later.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I see the purpose of this amendment, it is to coordinate the activities of all the agencies having to do with the rehabilitation of Europe and Asia. The coordination of the activities of those numerous agencies would save the people of this country billions of dollars in the next 5 or 10 years. What might be spent in immediate moneys for the creation of such a coordination of world rehabilitation efforts would be more than made up in the savings we would make.

Every American with a sound head and a sound heart wants the United States to aid in the rehabilitation of Europe and Asia, even though this may mean some continuation of wartime restrictions and a lowering of the present over-all high level of food consumption in America.

It seems to me, however, that the man in the street, out of whose pocket the money for such a program must eventually come, in the form of taxes, would support it far more enthusiastically if he only had some reasonably clear idea of the answers to the following questions:

First. How big is the whole job? How much American food, fuel, clothing, medical supplies, livestock, rolling stock, matériel, and so forth, and money, in terms of loans, gifts, or credits, are needed actually to prevent a widespread European famine in the next year or 2 years? How much of these are needed over and above actual starvation needs to prime the pumps of European and Asiatic economy and restore normal trade relations between the United States of America and Europe and Asia?

Second. What would the whole job cost?

Third. How much of our food, material, and money should we be willing (a) to give away on an out-and-out charitable basis immediately in order to prevent famine and pestilence in Europe; (b) to risk in the hope or on the promise of political or economic quid pro quos; (c) to invest on sound international business and trade principles, in doing this whole job?

Until we know what has to be done to rehabilitate Europe and Asia, no private citizen or public servant can undertake to say how much of it our people should or can do. For example, however great Europe's food needs, we must not let any section or groups in our own country fall below subsistence level to fill them.

When I returned from Europe, shortly before VE-day, I suggested the need for a world rehabilitation czar, or chairman of a world rehabilitation board, whose primary task it would be to make a beginning toward finding the answers to the above questions. We all talk of the

concept of one world. But certainly the concept of one Europe is the only one that makes sense when we think of the rehabilitation problem. The economic and physical rehabilitation of Europe is not a French, or Dutch, or German, or Greek problem—it is a European problem, and must be studied, presented, and treated as a whole. Neither is it a monetary, food, housing, agricultural, transportation, or medical problem. It is a problem of which all these things are crucial components, none of which can be considered entirely separately from the others.

The problem of the rehabilitation of Europe and Asia should be analyzed as a whole by one agency of the administration, which should have as its agents or informants all other branches of the Government working today on the rehabilitation of foreign countries: the FEA, the UNRRA, the Export-Import Bank, and so on.

This analysis should be presented as a whole to the Congress and the people, so that they may know how much of such a program they are willing to underwrite as taxpayers over a limited period of years, either as charity, risk, or investment, and how much of their own comforts they are willing to sacrifice to achieve it.

Our failure to view the European and Asiatic rehabilitation problem as a geographical and economic whole, and to present it as a whole to the American people will have most unhappy results. If we proceed, as we are now doing, to undertake the job in a piecemeal fashion—piecemeal legislation and appropriations, requested piecemeal, enabling piecemeal agencies working in the field to rehabilitate Europe piecemeal, always in conflict with other piecemeal machinery, we shall bitterly regret it. For in our ignorance of the whole picture, we are then bound to be too generous here, too stingy there; we will promise more than we can deliver in one field, deliver more than is needed in another; we will not undertake what we could do in one country, or field, we will undertake more than we can do in others; we will demand repayment from those who cannot pay, and gratitude from those to whom we should be grateful; we will give charity to those who could help themselves, but withhold it from those who cannot. And in the end we will be called Uncle Shylock abroad and Uncle Sap at home, and we shall deserve both names.

Let us agree on the proposition that we must rehabilitate Europe insofar as the American taxpayer can afford it, and our resources will stand it, and then let us ask our Government to give us a clear, coherent picture of the size, cost, and nature of that whole job, and its over-all rehabilitation machinery and policy for attacking it.

I should like to say that personally I would put the whole clothing and medical question for at least 1 year in the category of Government charity, and I should give it priority over every other rehabilitation project. I would also make it a strongly expressed national policy that American food, marked American, and dispensed entirely by American agents or agencies, should go first into the mouths of European babies, adolescents, and pregnant women, regardless of their nationality. Save the children today is the best way to save Europe tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the gentlewoman consolidate the United States Tariff Commission with the Lend-Lease Administration?

Mrs. LUCE. I do not know about the technicalities of this particular amendment, nor am I addressing myself to those technicalities; I am addressing myself to the intent of this amendment which is altogether in the right direction and which would save the United States billions of dollars.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If it is the purpose of this amendment to consolidate these temporary war agencies would it not be better that they be consolidated under the War Powers Act than to make them a permanent institution of the Government?

Mrs. LUCE. I repeat, I am not addressing myself to the technicalities which this amendment raises—because this morning is the first time I heard it read, and I have not studied these technicalities as you gentlemen have—but to its intent which is altogether along the right lines. Until the American people know how much they are going to be asked to give, to risk, or to invest in Europe, they will not know how big that whole job is and what is expected of them.

I believe that passage of this amendment would provide a method and a procedure by which the Congress and the people could be presented with a true picture of Europe's rehabilitation needs, and that such an analysis of what Europe needs and must have from us can only be made by some such coordinating agency as this amendment proposes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. Gladly.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. For the past 12 years we have seen that whenever the administration failed to do a job with existing departments it created new agencies. I will admit that we have no over-all picture now, but does the gentlewoman suggest that because the administration has failed to present this over-all picture it should create a new agency?

Mrs. LUCE. I listened to the gentleman speak some minutes ago and it seemed to me that both he and the gentleman from Illinois desired greatly a coordinating agency but they merely took issue with one another on questions of method.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut has expired.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. The point I am trying to make is that our failure to view this European and Asiatic rehabilitation problem as a geographic and economic whole and to present it through some such coordinating agency as envisaged by this amendment to the American people, will cost this country billions of dollars.

Let us take this question of a British loan, for example. We know that the Russians also want a loan. Such a coordinating agency as this could wait until every nation had put in its demand for a loan. Then the agency could pass on the total bill for those loans.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I agree with the expression of the gentlewoman's viewpoint as to the intent here involved. I think there should be a consolidation not only of these agencies but of many other agencies that I could name. But here is the thing that disturbs me: The underlying philosophy of this bill is that because of a lethargy in Congress to do these things, we are transferring the initiative to the Executive. This amendment, as I read it and understand it, undertakes to assume for us the initiative in respect to these particular agencies. Possibly we should not go to the philosophy of this bill, although we seem committed to it. How can we explain, if we mandate this sort of consolidation, not mandating consolidations in many other fields and among many other agencies?

Mrs. LUCE. I doubt if the people of the United States will demand much explanation from this Congress on the philosophy of any bill providing that the intent of the bill is sound and that it saves the taxpayer millions, as the passage of this amendment can very well do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Congress is the steward of the purse under the Constitution. We can diminish and cut down or can mandate the President, which is exactly what we are doing in general terms now. That is what we propose to do here, in the interest of economy and efficiency, give him a specific mandate with respect to consolidation of these functions that relate to foreign countries and to bring all the eggs into one basket.

Mrs. LUCE. I believe I am right in saying that even if this amendment is defeated, it suggests a procedure concerning the rehabilitation of Europe which is exactly what the President should and must do if we intend to rehabilitate Europe, without busting the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Can the gentlewoman point out specifically where we could save billions of dollars?

Mrs. LUCE. Let us take one example that may perhaps be multiplied by a thousandfold in the rehabilitation of Europe. We know now that Europe is starving. Let us take Italy, where the people are suffering greatly in many of the great cities. We decide under UNRRA to send so many shiploads of food to Italy. But it may very well be that what is needed in Italy is one shipload of food and two shiploads of plows and trucks, in order to provide means by which Italians may grow their own food and send it to market. By coordinating and analyzing the actual needs of Italy, its food needs, its material needs and so on under one agency, instead of having many scattered agencies at home and in the field often working at cross purposes in deciding priorities for fuel, transportation, food, clothing, money, and so on, there would certainly be a great saving to the United States on the total rehabilitation bill for Italy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the Dirksen amendment, among other things, is to coordinate and consolidate the financial institutions of this country operated by the Government which deal with the subject of foreign loans and exchange problems. In order to carry out this purpose it is proposed that institutions created by the Bretton Woods agreement should be consolidated with other relief agencies and bureaus which deal with foreign matters. We have already achieved coordination so far as financial institutions are concerned. Let me read from the enabling act that sets up the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank:

> In order to coordinate the policies and operations of the representatives of the United States on the Fund and the Bank and of all agencies of the Government which make or participate in making foreign loans or which engage in foreign financial, exchange, or monetary transactions, there is hereby established the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems.
>
> This council is to consist of representatives of United States departments interested in financial and foreign problems.

So we now have the machinery by which each agency of the Government knows what other agencies are doing in the matter of extending loans, and we have now on the statute books plain authorization to coordinate these lending policies.

Furthermore, both the Stabilization Fund and the International Bank are operated and managed by governors and directors representing all of the many countries that are contributing to their capital stock. Tell me how you could divorce any of the duties of the Bank or the Stabilization Fund and transfer them to this new bureau which the gentleman from Illinois expects to set up? It seems to me entirely impracticable, because we appoint governors and directors who are the voice of the United States in these two financial institutions, and there is no possible way by which any of the powers could be transferred in any way to a new bureau or department such as the gentleman from Illinois undertakes to establish. I think that is conclusive evidence that we have accomplished one of the main purposes of the Dirksen amendment, and therefore I shall vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the concern with which this amendment has been accepted mentally by the members of the committee as well as other Members of the House is conclusive evidence to me that in the minds of scores of the Members of this body they wonder what we head into with respect to all these foreign relationships.

I am not so much concerned about the 5 percent of administrative expense or about the billions that might be saved by reason of a consolidation. What worries me and what concerns me is the effect of these international relationships on the economy of our people industrially speaking and agriculturally speaking.

If you will let me go on and earn, produce, year in and year out, I will pay you $1,000 a year over a period of 5, 10, 15, 20, or 50 years but if you create a situation wherein I can earn for only 1 year you will not get anything from me the second year, the third year, or the tenth year, or the twentieth year.

Unfortunately, we have so many activities the nature of which has been referred to by this amendment going on that no man in basic industry in this country today has any idea where he is going to be 6, 12, 18, or 24 months from now.

The Dirksen amendment moves in the direction of giving us some kind of an answer to that question, but this question cannot be satisfactorily answered. I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or of any other committees than the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Insular Affairs, which touches on some of this foreign entanglement question, so I am not an expert on this matter, but I say to you in all sincerity that you cannot go out today and make an international agreement between the United States and Britain or between the United States and any other country or between all of the countries together for a period of more than 1, or 2, or 3 years that is worth 5 cents. Your long-term agreements become short-term agreements automatically because you have no foundation upon which to stand on a long-term basis. That applies to trade, it applies to finance, it applies to credit extension, whether to Britain, Russia, China, or whatever the country may be. That is a terrible thing for anyone the nature of whose business is such that he must make long-term commitments.

I know the Dirksen amendment is not going to be adopted, as sympathetic as I am with its objectives. This is too big a question for us to settle on the floor with any 30 or 40 minutes of discussion, coming into a bill of this kind. But I do hope that the members of these various committees, together with the executive branch of the Government, will pay some attention to this debate on the Dirksen amendment here today and look forward to giving the people of this country the best answer that can be given under the complicated conditions under which we live today.

The people in my district are now beginning to wonder how much further they should go in the purchase of Government bonds, because they no longer understand what the Treasury does with the dollars that the Treasury receives from the sale of those bonds. The objective of this amendment, as I comprehend it, is to give those people a better answer to the questions that are in their minds. As the gentlewoman from Connecticut has pointed out to us, they are entitled to know more about the direction in which we are going. So I trust that as we move on into the fog banks ahead of us with respect to these international agreements a great deal of attention will be given to the principle involved here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIMITATIONS ON POWERS WITH RESPECT TO REORGANZATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or establishing any new executive department; or

(2) changing the name of any executive department or the title of its head, or designating any agency as "Department" or its head as "Secretary"; or

(3) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(4) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(5) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law.

(b) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection

are as follows: Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, and Securities and Exchange Commission.

(c) No reorganization plan shall provide for a reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection if it also provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Civil Service Commission, Federal Communications Commission, United States Tariff Commission, and Veterans' Administration.

(d) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization which abolishes any civil function of the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, or of its head, or which vests any such civil function in any agency which is not within the control and jurisdiction of the Department of War, if such reorganization plan also provides for any reorganization not referred to above in this subsection; but this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such corps of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any other agency. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection.

(e) No reorganization specified in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is transmitted to the Congress before July 1, 1948.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANASCO as a committee amendment: On page 7, line 24, after the words "Federal Communications Commission", insert "Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] is recognized.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, is it not the custom to recognize a member of the committee? The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] was seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not see the gentleman from West Virginia until after he had recognized the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to have the gentleman from Ohio precede me.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROSSER: On page 7, after the period in line 13, insert the following:

"No reorganization plan shall affect any provision of the Railroad Retirement Acts, as amended, or of subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, or of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, or of the Railway Labor Act, as amended; nor shall any such plan affect any agency functioning pursuant to or any function being performed pursuant to any of such acts except functions of the Bureau of Internal Revenue not related to subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code."

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is perfectly clear. The Railroad Retirement System, and the Railway Labor Act, which was passed for the settlement of disputes between the railways and their employees, and that part of the Internal Revenue Code that is necessary for the functioning of the Railroad Retirement System were all enacted after long and serious efforts. We regard them as completely separate and distinct institutions. The railroad industry generally has always been regulated by laws applying solely and exclusively to the railroad industry. So it was in the case of the Railroad Retirement System, the National Mediation Board, and the National Railroad Adjustment Board. While it is true that the railroads are owned by many different groups, nevertheless they are operated practically as a unit. Necessarily so. Therefore, to even think of jeopardizing the retirement system and the labor disputes settlement systems which you have established, by making it possible to merge them with other institutions which have not been satisfactory, would be a very great shock to the railroad men of the country and to the railroad industry generally.

Let me call attention to the fact that under the Railroad Retirement Act the men and the railroads pay the total cost of retirements. Therefore, the Government itself has not any liability, as far as the payment of retirement benefits is concerned. The Railroad Mediation Board has been extolled throughout the whole country by the press and civic leaders as the best plan for maintaining industrial peace thus far established. It would be foolhardy, therefore, and dangerous to make these agencies subject to reorganization and consolidation as is provided in the pending bill.

I therefore earnestly urge the House to adopt the amendment which I have offered. We not only refer to the boards but also to the functions. There is no use preserving a board if you abolish its functions, and we protest vigorously against such a proposal.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. I certainly agree with the gentleman in offering his amendment. I think it would be nothing short of a catastrophe if the Railroad Retirement Board and the Railroad Mediation Board should be transferred to any other Department of the Government.

Mr. CROSSER. There is no doubt about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the Crosser amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CROSSER: On page 7, line 13, after the words "Exchange Commission", strike out the period and add "Civil Service Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal Power Commission, Maritime Commission, National Mediation Board and National Railroad Adjustment Board, Railroad Retirement Board, and Tariff Commission."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is germane, and overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment about which I talked at considerable length yesterday. You will note from a reading of my substitute that it includes the three railroad organizations or agencies that are included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. It is obvious, from the inclusion of those agencies in my amendment, that I approve of his view, and stand with him in his view that those agencies should be exempted from the provisions of this act.

My amendment simply does this: Three agencies of the Government, the Securities and Exchange Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Federal Trade Commission have been excluded from the operations of this Act, except as functions may be transferred to them. I take it that the committee found good and sufficient reason for that exemption.

My amendment simply seeks to extend that same exemption to these eight other agencies, eight other independent, quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative agencies of the Government answerable to Congress, created by the Congress, the reasons for the exemption of which I challenge anyone to distinguish from the reasons of the Committee in exempting the three they did exempt. Today with the Committee amendment they have gone part way with the FDIC by including it in that list of agencies for which a separate program must be submitted. But, as I said yesterday, that is not exemption in truth and fact and is not the safeguard that the Congress of the United States should put around this transfer of legislative power to the Executive Branch.

These agencies I seek to include are bipartisan, they are the creatures of Congress, they act for us and in our stead; they issue regulations that have the effect of law; they adjudicate cases affecting the rights of individuals which decisions, once they are made are final on the facts on court review. Those agencies, as I say, are independent. What I am trying to do is to see to it that under the provisions of this act we do not make it possible to destroy their independence and subject them to political control and domination. I believe few will disagree with me as to the desirability of maintaining the independent status of these agencies. As I pointed out yesterday the sum total of the employees of these

agencies is a little over 23,000. We have over 3,000,000 in the service. No one can say that this interferes with any needed reorganization.

The best arguments for this amendment of mine were voiced by the then Senator Truman when he was in the Senate of the United States discussing the reorganization plan which destroyed the independence of the CAA and transferred it to the Department of Commerce. I quoted him at length yesterday and wish I had the time to quote him again today because to me, as I say, his arguments are impressive and persuasive. I just wish I could believe he holds those same views today.

Some say that it is unthinkable that the sort of authority granted in this bill would be used to destroy these independent agencies. When we enacted the reorganization bill of 1938, 21 agencies were exempted. They were thereby protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. One regulatory agency, the agency that regulates air travel even as the ICC regulates surface travel was not exempted from the provisions of that bill. We were told by the proponents of that legislation that it was unthinkable that an agency like that would be interfered with, and yet the very thing that they said would not come to pass did come to pass, and the CAA, with the Air Safety Board destroyed, was transferred to the Department of Commerce where it now is under a situation of divided responsibility, where that great independent agency is subject to the super-imposed judgment, the super-imposed layer of authority of the Department of Commerce. So it did happen here. I do not want to see it happen to these agencies and you should not want to see it happen to these agencies.

It may be urged further that there is no intention to interfere with any of these independent agencies of the Government that I have named. If the committee had felt confident in that assumption it would not have exempted three.

But there is another strange thing that is happening. Senator Truman was for CAA as an independent agency of the Government. Today the Bureau of the Budget, speaking for him, says that he is for the CAA in the Department of Commerce where it is not an independent agency of the Government. That report was made on a bill offered by me to re-create the CAA as an independent branch of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, if we could depend upon the continuing retention of attitude, the viewpoint, the conviction, the deep principle expressed by the Senator from Missouri, then likely it might be said this exemption is not necessary. But we cannot depend upon the retention of those powers in the face of the fact that apparently this broad power is being demanded by the President and those who surround him, yes, and because of the very definite fact that he has reversed his viewpoint on the fundamental proposition involved when he says as of today the CAA should not be an independent agency of the Government.

I would be perfectly happy to rest my case for this amendment on the arguments and persuasions stated by the then Senator Truman as he debated the matter in the Senate. The responsibility is now ours, because now is the time we can do something about it—later on, likely we cannot do anything about it. I say that this amendment ought to be adopted.

Let no one say that I am undertaking to protect any pet agency. I have included eight, because they should be included, not for the purpose of garnering votes. I could think of a lot more I could put in for that latter purpose. I am putting these agencies in here, because every one of them deserves the same treatment. If one of them is to be included, all of them ought to be included. The gentleman from Ohio makes his argument for exemption of the railroad organizations, but I hope he will stand with me in extending this same exemption to these other agencies that are in exactly the same category.

I understand an amendment will be offered specifically as to the Maritime Commission. If the Maritime Commission exemption is to be supported by Members of this body, then I say in all consistency and as a matter of principle they ought to stand for this amendment of mine.

Now, here is what we get down to in a nutshell. We do not want these agencies subjected to political control. The way to do this is to adopt my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the committee might just as well understand that this section is going to determine whether we are going to have a real reorganization of the Executive branch of the Government. I stated yesterday when the gentleman from Indiana made his remarks that he should approach this matter fearlessly and offer amendments, not an amendment. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] offered an amendment. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment to that amendment and he includes in his amendment the very agency that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] included. Why? He seeks the votes of those favoring the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio. The same applies to friends of the Maritime Commission and other agencies he mentions. What he is doing is this: If you read the amendment you will find that he is preventing the President of the United States from touching eight agencies. The gentleman's speeches show he is more interested in the Civil Aeronautic Authority than any other agency.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. COCHRAN. I refuse to yield. I need my time. This is an important amendment.

We have a situation where the President of the United States has asked us to pass a reorganization bill. Your committee has worked hard on this bill, and has brought in an excellent bill. It does not contain all the President asked for but it is a good bill. It was unanimously reported by the committee with a reservation or two by one or two members.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is a member of the committee, and if I made a misstatement I stand corrected.

Mr. CHURCH. Is it not a fact that some members did make reservation?

Mr. COCHRAN. I said with a reservation or two by some members of the committee, so I did not make a misstatement.

The committee, over my objection, offered a committee amendment taking care of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. I objected to that for this reason: Because we have the Federal Reserve Board examining banks, we have the Comptroller of the Currency examining banks, we have the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation examining banks, and we have the Reconstruction Finance Corporation examining banks. Assume that there is a duplication of examination, do you want different sets of examiners from three or four agencies running into banks and bothering them? If it is found that there is duplication, the President can, under the terms of the bill, consolidate the bank-examining activities.

What brought about the opposition of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was this: It so happens that the Federal Reserve Board, in replying to the committee for an expression of views, wrote to the committee and said that it did not want to be exempted in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman permit me to call his attention to the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Board is not included in the gentleman's amendment and is not frozen in the Department of Commerce if the gentleman's amendment is adopted? It does not refer to the Department of Commerce. The boards which it adds to the exemptions proposed by the bill are these: Civil Service Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal Power Commission, Maritime Commission, National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustment Board, Railroad Retirement Board, and the Tariff Commission. Civil Aeronautics is not frozen in the Department of Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. I stand corrected if I made a misstatement. I did not hear the amendment read, tried to get it, but someone else had it. I thank the gentleman, but most of the gentleman's speech yesterday was devoted to the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the greater part of his speech today was devoted to the Civil Aeronautics Authority and what the President had said when he was in the Senate.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. No, I do not yield.

We are confronted with a demand from the people all over the United States, in every walk of life, businessmen, professional men, all the taxpayers, demanding that we set our houses in order. When I say "houses" I mean the executive branch and the legislative branch as well. There never was such a demand for reorganization as there is today in this country.

I receive just as much mail as any man in this House, and I come from a great city, St. Louis. I know when my people are not writing me in opposition to this bill or making any suggestions in regard to it that they want it, because if they were opposed to it they would notify me and would offer such suggestions as they might have in mind. But as I said yesterday, up to this moment not one letter has come from the city of St. Louis to me in opposition to this bill.

The gentleman has offered this amendment in such a way that if it is adopted the President is frozen from touching these agencies except as he transfers to these agencies additional functions. He can take nothing whatsoever away from them.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am sorry, I need my time. The gentleman is a member of the committee and can get recognized as soon as I get through.

That is just what the gentleman from Indiana has done. He tells the President, "You can take nothing from these agencies but you can add to these agencies." He did not offer his amendment to the next paragraph of the bill, where the President is given the power to send down a plan individually, not included in any other plan, a reorganization suggestion concerning one of these agencies, but he freezes the agencies entirely and tells the President, "reorganize your executive branch of the Government, but you let these agencies alone regardless of whether they should be reorganized or not."

The question confronting us is, do we want a reorganization bill or do we not want a reorganization bill. The defeat of this amendment and other amendments exempting agencies will guarantee that the President will have an opportunity to reorganize the executive branch, and if he does not do it the responsibility is his and not ours. He tells us that he is willing to accept this responsibility and appeals to us, not once but twice, for the authority to reorganize. As everyone knows, the Congress should do the job but as everyone also knows the Congress never has, nor never will do the job. It is hard enough to get a reorganization bill passed giving the President the authority but I say it is impossible to get both Houses to agree to a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government and I do not think anyone will contradict that statement. Therefore, in this legislation we delegate to the President the power to clean his own house to make it more efficient, to reduce expenditures, to eliminate unnecessary employees, to stop duplication and overlapping. Who is the man or woman that will say this is not necessary? Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope this House will pass this bill as the committee reported it. By all means we should defeat such amendments as the amendment now pending offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the amendment to the amendment, and if that fails I shall support the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I am in favor of excluding various agencies from the bill, but at this time I want to direct my remarks particularly to the railway labor agencies that are affected.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, unless we amend it, will doubtless work a hardship on a great many railroadmen throughout the country.

I want to see it amended in order to protect the interests of the railroadmen in my district and throughout the Nation and may I say to the Members of the House that 15 of the railway labor organizations, from the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen down to the maintenance-of-way employees want this bill amended in order to protect their present status and rights.

Consequently, I am in favor of the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio, ROBERT CROSSER, to exempt from the provisions of the reorganization bill, H. R. 4129, the National Mediation Board and the National Railroad Adjustment Board, both of which agencies were created by and function under the Railway Labor Act and the Railroad Retirement Board, which was created by the Railroad Retirement Act and is charged with the responsibility of administering that act. These three agencies perform services of great importance to the railroad industry and to the public. Therefore, in my judgment, the railroad employees have a vital interest in their unimpaired functioning under the carefully considered laws which created them.

The collective bargaining and labor relations machinery established by the amended Railway Labor Act adopted in 1934 is very frequently cited by Members of Congress and many others as being a sound and tested method of maintaining industrial peace in the railroad industry, which is one of the country's most important industries. The amended Railway Labor Act created the National Mediation Board and established its duties and functions. It also created the National Railroad Adjustment Board as a necessary means for the peaceful adjustment or adjudication of types of labor disputes not assigned by the law to the jurisdiction of the Mediation Board.

These two agencies were deliberately established as separate and independent bodies to deal with specialized and technical labor problems in the railway industry. There were good reasons for this action when the amended Railway Labor Act was enacted and those reasons are still valid. Therefore, the Congress should not permit the merger or transfer of agencies such as the National Mediation Board and the National Railroad Adjustment Board, which have functioned so effectively since their inception.

The Railroad Retirement Board should without question be exempted from the provisions of H. R. 4129. The Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, both of which are administered by the Railroad Retirement Board, provide for systems of Nation-wide and uniform annuity and unemployment benefits for railway employees. These systems require, if they are to continue to serve the purpose of Congress when the laws were enacted, that the Board be protected in its present status as a separate and independent agency and that none of its duties, functions or responsibilities be discontinued or transferred to any other agency.

The benefits paid to railroad employees by the Board through the operation of the Railroad Retirement Act and the cost of administration are borne from funds paid by the employees and by the carriers as provided in the Carriers' Taxing Act. The Government does not contribute to these costs. The Retirement Board is doing an excellent job. Therefore, it should not be interfered with in any way by any planning or consideration of any possible merger with another agency or any discontinuing of any of its functions. I, therefore, trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Congressman CROSSER] will pass by an overwhelming majority.

I hope that the amendment now before the House, and the Crosser amendment, will both have a majority vote of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has delegated its legislative authority to fix the rates and regulate the services of public utility companies engaged in interstate commerce to four major commissions. These are the Interstate Commerce Commission in the field of surface transportation; the Federal Power Commission in the field of light, heat, and power; the Federal Communications Commission in the whole field of communications with the exception of the Postal Service; and the Securities and Exchange Commission in the field of financing of all companies engaged in interstate commerce. This bill proposes to exempt from reorganization two of those four regulatory agencies. It does extend, as the gentleman from Indiana has said, a left-handed, partial, and wholly unsatisfactory species of exemption to the Federal Communications Commission in a subsequent paragraph.

But the Federal Power Commission is not treated at all in this bill in any exempt capacity. I have asked members of the committee to explain why all four of these important regulatory agencies have not been treated alike. Their powers and duties in their respective fields of jurisdiction are virtually identical. The services which they regulate are indispensable in modern American life and reach into the homes and the daily lives and the pocketbooks of every American citizen. What is the reason for differentiating between them in this bill? To this question I have been unable to obtain any answer except that the committee desires to exempt as few agencies as possible.

This, of course, is not an adequate explanation of the clear discrimination between agencies which the Congress has authorized to regulate public utility service for the people of America.

If this bill is passed in its present form, the plain inference will be that the House of Representatives believes that two regulatory bodies should be entirely exempt, one other should be partially exempt, and that the Federal Power Commission should not be exempt at all. If the committee in charge of the bill does not see fit to correct this discrimination, I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], because I believe that proper regulation of public utility service in the fields of light, heat, power, and communications is of vital importance to all of the American people, should be independently administered and should not be subject to bureaucratic control.

I served as a member of the State railroad commission in California, and for a time was chairman of that board, which has regulatory jurisdiction over all the privately owned public utilities in that State. I speak from an abundant experience when I say that the problem of regulating electric light, power, telephone and telegraph service, and radio for the benefit of all of our people is just as important today and will be just as important in the future as the regulation of surface transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] is offering to H. R. 4129, a bill to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government. This amendment exempts the Railroad Retirement Act, Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, the Railway Labor Act, and all functions related to these acts from the reorganization powers granted the Chief Executive. I firmly believe if an amendment such as proposed now had been adopted in 1939 specifically exempting these railway agencies from the 1939 Reorganization Act, the railway labor wage dispute in 1943, that involved the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations, would have been avoided and instead the wage question would have been peacefully worked out under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. There is no question that the President precipitated the threatened strike which would have paralyzed our industry at the height of our war effort through his arbitrary acts and Executive orders. You all recall this wage dispute was progressing in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act and to the satisfaction of both carrier and employee. After the emergency board, however, had been appointed in accordance with the Railway Labor Act and it had rendered its report, the President stepped in and began issuing Executive orders, creating additional labor panels, advisory boards and enlisting the services of an Economic Stabilizer before the increase resulting from the Emergency Board's decision could be put into effect. This amendment, I am convinced, will prevent a recurrence of that situation insofar as railway wage disputes are concerned and will prevent a President from again ignoring provisions of the Railway Labor Act which have operated so satisfactorily for nearly 20 years and has served as a pattern for the settlement of labor disputes other than those involving railway workers.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has offered an amendment to exempt from the operation of this act the Railroad Mediation Board, the Railroad Adjustment Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board. I desire that these three railroad boards be exempted from the operation of this act.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has offered a substitute amendment which provides that other bipartisan boards and commissions be exempt from the operation of this act. These are as follows: United States Tariff Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, United States Federal Power Commission, United States Federal Communications Commission, United States Civil Service Commission, Railroad Mediation Board, Railroad Adjustment Board, Railroad Retirement Board.

It will be observed that the eight exemptions set out in Mr. HALLECK's substitute includes the three railroad boards set out in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

If the Halleck amendment substitute is agreed to, these three railroad boards will be exempted and if the Halleck amendment is defeated I shall support the Crosser amendment.

NECESSITY AND PURPOSE OF REORGANIZATION

Page 2 of the bill states the purpose of this proposed legislation:

(1) To reduce expenditures and promote economy.

(2) To promote increased efficiency of operation of government.

(3) To reduce the number of agencies.

(4) To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

The purposes set forth in the bill are most desirable indeed and there can be no doubt of the necessity of cutting out hundreds and perhaps a thousand commissions, bureaus, agencies, boards, authorities, committees, and so forth, and take at least 2,000,000 civil employees off the pay roll.

In some cases 30 or more agencies are undertaking to perform the same functions and render the same service. There has been a tremendous mushroom growth of these commissions, bureaus, boards and other Federal agencies with a corresponding growth of the civilian pay roll of the Government. For example: In 1932 the civilian employees of this Government were 583,196. In 1945 this number had jumped to 3,667,861—an increase of 3,084,665 or between 500 and 600 percent from the time President Roosevelt assumed office. This showing is all the more remarkable because it was Mr. Roosevelt and his party who in 1932 denounced Mr. Hoover and his administration for having on the payroll 583,000 civilian employees, and who promised the American people if they were given control of the Government, they would cut down expenditures 25 percent and abolish a lot of the bureaus, commissions, boards, and so forth.

Many leading Democrats of the House and Senate, and the Republican Party as a unit have been denouncing this constant increase of these commissions, boards, bureaus and agencies and the building up of this tremendous bureaucracy of nearly 3,600,000 civilian employees, costing the taxpayers approximately eight billions annually—more than eight times the cost of running the entire Government under the administration of President Taft for each year.

TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT REDUCTION IN GOVERNMENTAL EXPENSES

I was pleased to have the opportunity to vote for the amendment of the Republican leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], declaring that it was the policy of Congress to reduce the cost of Government at least 25 percent. This amendment was opposed by the Democratic leaders and an overwhelming majority of the Democrats. It was supported by all the Republicans and a number of Democrats and was adopted.

The action of our Democratic friends in opposing this 25-percent cut places them in an embarrassing position while they are urging that we must pass this bill to bring about economy and efficiency in Government. Our Democratic friends are telling the country that they favor a tax reduction. The President announced we would have a deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, of 33 billions.

The only way to insure reduction in taxes is to cut out the waste and extravagance, useless offices and officials, and effect other economies in Government. We cannot waste and squander and at the same time have substantial tax reductions.

WHO SHOULD DO THE REORGANIZING?

Under the Constitution, the Congress is invested with this power. This bill proposes that Congress divest itself of this power and transfer the power to the President on the claim that Congress does not have the time or the facilities to accomplish a reorganization and put into effect the necessary economies. This contention I vigorously deny.

Congress created the eight bipartisan, independent boards and commissions set out in the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. These boards and commissions have a little over 23,000 civilian employees. Congress also created the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, which are exempt in this bill, and which are quasi bipartisan, independent agencies.

I think the Maritime Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and the General Accounting Office should be excluded from the operation of this act. This would make, in all, 14.

The commissions and boards I have referred to were created by Congress to perform very special and efficient services for the people of this country.

The number of civil employees of these various boards and commissions which should be exempted is negligible compared with the number employed by the many commissions, bureaus, boards, and other agencies created by the late President Roosevelt and by President Truman.

Congress in creating these bipartisan commissions, boards, and agencies exercised its constitutional powers, which was legislating, not abdicating, and if there were no civilian employees except those created by Congress we would not have these 3,667,861 civilian employees costing the American taxpayers eight billions annually.

I have heard no complaint from anyone in this debate that the 8 commissions, boards, and so forth, set forth in the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the 3 boards set forth in the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] or the other commissions, boards, and so forth, making up the 14 are not efficient or that they are squandering and wasting the tax money of the people. Their efficiency and economical operation have been tested through the years, and I oppose giving to the executive branch of the Government, that has sinned so greatly in piling commission upon commission, bureau upon bureau, and agency upon agency, placing more than 3,000,000 additional civil employees on the Federal pay roll since 1932, the power to undertake a so-called reorganization of these tested, tried, and efficient commissions, bureaus, and agencies of the Government created by Congress. They might make a bigger mess of it than they have of the commissions, bureaus, and agencies created and built up by the executive branch.

BIPARTISAN AND INDEPENDENT

These commissions, bureaus, and agencies that have been referred to, created by acts of Congress, are bipartisan. The appointees cannot come from any one political party. They must be bipartisan. They are in their very nature quasi-judicial; they must not become political or partisan. Their jobs must not be controlled by political considerations. However, if they are placed under 1 or more of the 10 Departments of the Government, they at once become political. The President names as members of his Cabinet persons of his own political party or those who adhere to his political and economic philosophies. These Cabinet heads would dominate the activities of these commissions, boards, and agencies that are quasi-judicial. The late President Roosevelt had a great desire to take over these quasi-judicial agencies of the Government and make them political and control them. He attempted to do this in the case of the Federal Trade Commission when he summarily dismissed one of its members because he was not in harmony with the political and economic policies of the President, but the Supreme Court set aside the order of President Roosevelt.

These quasi-judicial agencies must remain independent and their officials must not be motivated by political considerations or the special economic philosophies of the President and his 10 Cabinet officers.

The Interstate Commerce Commission deals with the matter of commerce on the land. The Maritime Commission deals with interstate and foreign commerce on the seas. We do not want their decisions colored or warped by any Department head. Congress made them independent. And this is true of the General Accounting Office, as well as other commissions, bureaus, and agencies created by Congress. They are responsible to Congress, the representatives of the people.

We have heard today how President Truman in 1939 denounced the effort to put the Civil Aeronautics Authority into the Department of Commerce and the blighting effect it had on this great agency of the Federal Government, but now he seems to have changed his mind and desires the Civil Aeronautics Authority to remain in the Department of Commerce under his good friend, Henry Wallace.

If these 14 agencies created by Congress that are now independent and with quasi-judicial powers are inefficient, or if they are wasting the public money, we can bring them to account.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Much has been made of the fact that I have been talking about the Civil Aeronautics Authority. I am talking about the CAA as the horrible example of what can happen if we do not provide exemptions. What I am getting at is that if the pattern involved in the transfer of the CAA to the Department of Commerce is to be followed in respect to these other independent agencies, the gentleman, I am sure, will agree with me that instead of cutting down personnel and effecting economy we have just compounded confusion one place after another and will have more people doing the same thing.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I fully agree with the gentleman and thank him for his contribution.

CONGRESS SHOULD LEGISLATE, NOT ABDICATE

The Constitution did not vest in the President the power of creating departments, commissions, bureaus, and agencies. These powers were granted especially to the Congress, and the President cannot reorganize the agencies of the Government without Congress delegating that power to him. And the great fundamental question before us today is: Should Congress exercise this power, or should it delegate it to the President?

Throughout the country the criticism aimed at Congress is that it abdicates when it should legislate. Members of Congress as well as the American people generally complain because of the growing power of the Executive and the tremendous bureaucracy that has been built up since March 4, 1933. We have seen hundreds—perhaps a thousand—commissions, bureaus, and agencies created, increasing the civilian pay roll from 583,000 to nearly 3,700,000 in the continental United States and service in foreign countries, placing a tax burden of eight billions annually on this Nation. Yet some of our colleagues who have denounced in unmeasured terms the growing power of the Executive and the waning powers of Congress and the representatives of the people, have from time to time helped put measures through Congress taking away the powers of Congress and conferring them upon the Executive.

I want to see hundreds of these useless and unnecessary commissions, bureaus, and agencies abolished and cut out at least 2,000,000 officeholders. There are so many in the various agencies of the Government that they get in each other's way and contribute to the inefficiency of our Government, and they contribute to the mounting burden of taxes and to the national debt, threatening the economic life of the Nation. We need more than anything else greater efficiency and greater economy in government.

WHO SHALL REORGANIZE?

It is proposed in this bill that Congress delegate its authority to reorganize to the executive branch of the Government in order to make it more efficient and more economical; but who should do this?

We know that President Truman cannot make the investigation and ferret out these useless agencies and the useless and unnecessary 2,000,000 Federal officeholders. He must, as a matter of necessity, delegate this authority, and to whom shall he refer it?

He will, of course, refer it to these same commissions and bureaus and agencies that are now inefficient—that are wasting and squandering the taxpayers' money. They will want to retain their commissions, bureaus, and agencies. These millions will want to keep their jobs, and I predict that the reorganization plan or plans that may be submitted will be most disappointing to the Congress and to the American people.

In 1932 Congress passed a bill giving the President—Hoover—the power to reorganize the executive branches and agencies of the Government. Mr. Hoover did submit a plan, but the Democrats were in control in the House. They opposed the plan submitted by President Hoover and nothing came of it.

In 1939, through the overwhelming majority of Democrats and New Dealers in the House and Senate, Congress passed an act giving President Roosevelt the power to reorganize the Government. They claimed it was necessary to do away with useless commissions, bureaus, and

agencies, making the executive branch more efficient, and to effect a reduction in the cost of government.

It is now a matter of common knowledge that these commissions, bureaus, and other Federal agencies grew by leaps and bounds under the new act, and during President Roosevelt's administration we found ourselves with more commissions, bureaus, and other Federal agencies than we had had at any time in our history—in fact they number hundreds and the Federal employees jumped from 583,000 under Hoover to 3,667,000 under Roosevelt.

My contention is that the House and Senate should appoint a committee of Members of both Houses, men and women who have been in Congress for many years and who have knowledge of our Government and its requirements, and this committee could call many able, experienced but retired persons from the various bureaus or agencies of the executive branch as well as others who could and would give unbiased testimony and provide this committee with all the information necessary; and then this committee could submit plans to the House and Senate for their action.

I am sure this would bring about a more effective reorganization and accomplish more effectively our purposes than the proposals in this bill and bring about real efficiency and economy in our Government.

It is urged that any plan submitted by the President could be blocked by a vote of both Houses rejecting the plan or plans if taken in 60 days. With the tremendous influence of the President and all these agencies, and the billions of dollars being disbursed, it is doubtful if such a resolution could be put through both Houses in 60 days and perhaps not at all as to both Houses.

But there should be two amendments offered that I shall support—one is that this bill be amended so that the President shall submit his plan or plans to Congress and this would be referred to appropriate committees of the House and Senate for investigation and later on for consideration and discussion in the House and Senate, and passed as we would pass any other bill, such as the bills creating the 14 independent agencies.

If that amendment is defeated another amendment will be offered, providing that if the President submits his plan under this bill, if either House passes a joint resolution expressing opposition to the plan his plan shall be rejected and shall not become law.

If the plan or plans were rejected under either of these amendments the President could then submit another plan or plans, and in this way we would maintain our constitutional integrity and in the end I believe we could get a real reorganization that would bring about real efficiency and economy in government.

The Republicans have made a vigorous fight to preserve the constitutional powers of Congress. The Democrats have more than 50 majority in the House. We all agree there must be a real reorganization, cut out useless commissions, bureaus, and agencies, and useless offices. If the amendments offered by the Republicans are defeated, I shall vote to recommit the bill, and if this motion fails, I may vote for the bill with a lot of misgivings; but I do not want it said that I stood in the way of the Democrats in cutting out these useless agencies and unnecessary officeholders and with the hope that the Senate may improve the bill.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Crosser amendment. I regret that the able gentleman from Indiana has seen fit to spread his amendment onto the Crosser amendment. I was deeply impressed by the case he made yesterday and have been studying the implications of his amendment ever since, and have reached a conclusion. If we are going to deal with these authorities and agencies fairly, instead of sacking them together and throwing them all in, labeling one with inefficiency or an unhappy situation that attaches to another, we may do harm. Each should clear the hurdle on its own merits. Each should be presented by separate amendment. I think that is the only way to handle it, unless each presents such a clear case that no attack can be made on the legislation. This is not such a case. One might clear and another might not.

The Railroad Retirement Act as amended stands today as a structure that has grown up through the years. Railroad legislation in this body should relate to this natural structure. There is nothing more American in this country than our railroad legislation and the development it has made. It is an institution unto itself. The great fights that have been had between railroad employees and railroad employers have been greatly resolved until it has reached a point of some security and it should not be bundled pell mell into this proposed act. I do not want to see it now drawn in under this legislation, as could very easily be done, and made a part of our general labor curiosity shop that has to be tackled from so many angles. I think therein lies the danger. The Railroad Retirement Act as amended is one of the most impressive, one of the most healthy legislative growths that our country has seen. Many others do not stand on the same footing. They are not the same age, they have not reached the same security of development, their ramifications have not been investigated and they have not gone through the same course of trial and error through the years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I am afraid that the gentleman could not add anything.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not think I could either, but I wanted to ask the gentleman something for information.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting with all the strength I have the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, and I hope the Crosser amendment is not burdened down like a kite with too heavy a tail by other amendments and by the opposition that could come because of those who hope to get the advantage of its secure position to get through what they wish.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 37 minutes, the last 7 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, the agencies which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] would exempt will be exempted in the event of the adoption of the amendment now under consideration. The agencies of Government that he would exempt are also named in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. So if you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, you will also be approving by your action that which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] is urging upon us.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Will not the gentleman agree with me that the arguments for the exemption of the agencies included in the Crosser amendment apply with equal force to the agencies otherwise included in my amendment?

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman's point is well taken. He is precisely correct. If any agency of the Government should be exempted, each of the eight agencies which are included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana should also be exempted, and for precisely the same reason.

Each one of the agencies that is named in the Halleck amendment could find a defender on this floor. Time forbids my discussing more than one. That one, I, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, am particularly interested in, one which, I am sure you will agree with me, should be protected in its independent character. The independent agency to which I refer is the United States Tariff Commission. The United States Tariff Commission is a nonpolitical, nonpartisan, non-policy-making agency of Government; independent of Executive control and free from all improper influences. It is utterly impartial in its attitudes, beholden to no man, party, or pressure group. It is merely a fact-finding, statistic-gathering agency with no cause to serve, no master to obey, no party policies to promote.

If it is to become subject to reorganization; to being moved around at Presidential will, it will cease to be a nonpolitical organization and become a political agency; it will cease to be a nonpartisan agency and become a partisan agency; it will cease to be a nonpolicy-making agency and become a part of the policy-executing forces of the administration that happens to be at the moment in power.

There is no such thing as Republican statistics, there is no such thing as Democratic statistics, there is no such thing as partisanship in fact-finding. There is only one truth, and that is neither Republican nor Democratic. But truth can be perverted. That is the danger which the Halleck amendment would avoid.

The entire country has tremendous faith and confidence in the Tariff Commission of the United States. People of all political complexions apply to it for information and when that information is supplied it is information upon which everyone can place and do place complete reliance. Failure to exempt this independent agency from this bill will cast a shadow of suspicion over its now admitted disinterestedness. It will mark the beginning of the end of public confidence in its findings and reports.

I know there are people here who believe in the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program, but there is no one in this chamber, whether he be of the majority or of the minority, who will even pretend that it is in its administration a nonpolitical program or a nonpartisan program or a nonpolicy-making program. If the United States Tariff Commission, as a consequence of reorganization, become a part of the Executive branch, attached, for instance, to the State Department it will have become an integral part of the administration at the moment in power, a partisan agency, thereafter executing party policy. That must not be. As long as the Tariff Commission is not a part of an administration, is not tied to the charriot wheel of party politics it will continue to retain the confidence of the people, still remain a source of information to which they can go for impartial statistics, a place to which they may look for impartially collected facts. That implicit confidence in this highly respected fact-finding, statistic-gathering governmental organizing must not be placed in jeopardy.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, will you have the same confidence in the Tariff Commission that you now have and that you have even had in the days gone by if this now independent arm of the Government is reorganized as a subserviency agency of the Executive branch of the Government?

You know and I know that those who favor the reciprocal trade agreements program will be sorely tempted to take the Tariff Commission over to the State Department and reduce it to its mere function, a mere appendage of that agency which negotiates, by delegation of the Chief Executive, our reciprocal trade agreements. Let us keep the Tariff Commission free, let us keep it independent, let us save it from destruction by adopting the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

It deserves a favorable consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, from 8 years' experience in the administration of the affairs of the auditor's office of my home State of West Virginia, and from 4 more years as director of the State budget, I feel that I can lay a modest claim to having some knowledge of the basic principles of governmental finance. I have learned, among many other things, that a trusteeship once accepted on a trust fund is a sacred obligation.

In addressing my remarks to the Crosser amendment, which I am supporting, I want to deal particularly with the Railway Retirement Act. I think that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments erred grievously when they failed to include this particular agency in section 5 of this bill. The fact is that none of the moneys involved in this trust fund are paid by the United States Government; they are paid by the employees of the railroads and by the railroad companies. Not even the salaries of the men who administer the Railway Retirement Act are paid out of the Government funds but out of the particular retirement fund.

Let me make this point, that until we are able to balance the budgets of the individual agencies of this Government and the National Budget as a whole, we have no business toying around with anything as sacred as a trust fund, as this one happens to be. I trust it will be the pleasure of the members of this committee to support the Crosser amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse wholeheartedly the proposal to exempt from the provisions of this bill the Railroad Retirement Board, the Railroad Adjustment Board, and the Railroad Mediation Board, for the very reasons, among others, so well expressed by my friend who just left the well of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. I think it is unthinkable, and that expression has been used here on the floor of the House, even if they were not covered by the exemption of this bill, that the President of the United States would in any reorganization plan attempt to change, or interfere with, the proper functioning of those three agencies. I have heard that statement made time and again, and I see the gentleman from Mississippi, in charge of the bill at present, nodding his head in acquiescence. But the gentleman from Indiana yesterday made an argument on that question which no one present has been able to refute in the 2 days of debate. The same argument was made when the other reorganization bill was up. As has been shown by readings from the reports of Senate debate, the then Senator Truman said in almost the same language that it was unthinkable that the Civil Aeronautics Board would be transferred from its independent status. The same thing was said on the floor of this House, that it was unthinkable that in a reorganization plan the Civil Aeronautics Board would lose its independent status. But that is exactly what is taking place. That is exactly what may take place in the future. In view of the very apparent change in attitude on the part of President Truman, as reflected in the letter that his Bureau of the Budget wrote disapproving the bill introduced by the gentleman from Indiana to maintain the Civil Aeronautics Board as an independent agency of Government.

So far as I am concerned, I would like to believe that there will be no attempt to interfere with the independent status of these agencies. I am going to vote for the Halleck amendment first and if that fails I shall support the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. I happen to know something of these 3 agencies because I have the honor to serve on the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles their annual appropriations. We appropriate money out of their own funds largely and not out of the funds of the Treasury of the United States. But, gentlemen, I call upon any man on the floor to rise and answer the argument that has been so forcibly put by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. You have had fair notice, despite the promises that were given both in the Senate and on the floor of the House that the independent status of these agencies would be maintained, that those promises are not to be thoroughly relied upon. You lost the independent status of the Civil Aeronautics Authority by adopting that sort of complacent attitude. You may lose the independent status of these other agencies that are quasi-judicial in character and never should be placed with an executive department of government which is politically minded at the top.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. If it is contended that the independent agencies will not be interfered with under the Reorganization Act, if it becomes law, then why not exempt them? Why should anyone say that the passing of this amendment and providing for these exemptions would in any way interfere with needed reorganization?

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly. If there were no thought that the independent status of these agencies might not be interfered with, then why in the name of heaven did the committee exempt any of these agencies? Why did they exempt the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and why did they try, in the subsequent paragraph, to throw a measure of protection around these other agencies, if they did not have in mind that they might lose their independent character if this reorganization bill were to pass without these exemptions being provided?

I hope we pass the Halleck amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I knew that an amendment which I shall offer later as to the method of the adoption of any plan proposed by the President would be accepted I would vote against the Halleck substitute and also against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. But, not knowing that, I am forced to

vote for the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] in order to protect the named agencies.

When this bill was before the committee, the situation was similar to the one which now confronts us. The same was true when the committee had the bill to establish some supervision over Government corporations. Every witness from every department who came before the committee said that the purpose was good and it ought to be applied to every agency in the Government, except the one which he represented.

When this bill was considered, the chairman of the committee originally wanted to exempt 21 agencies. Perhaps he was right. It may be the administration should have no power to interfere with any of them. Finally, the committee exempted four agencies.

Now comes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] and he wants to add two or three more, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] wants to add some more. Why? The reason back of it was expressed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] and by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and it is this: There are certain agencies of the Government that we do not want the President to interfere with.

My way of getting at that would be this: When we come to pages 8 and 12 of this bill, I would change the procedure in this way: I would provide that, before any plan sent down by the President should become effective, it should have the support of a majority of the Members of both Houses. To do otherwise, and to refuse to adopt that kind of an amendment, is, to my mind, a shirking of our responsibility.

Under our Constitution and under our practice there has been up to the coming of the New Deal just one way by which a bill could become a law. Always, in every instance, it had to receive a majority vote of both branches of the Congress.

Now, we propose by this bill that the President shall—may I be permitted to say—introduce a bill; send it down here. The House can unanimously reject it. It goes to the Senate. In fact, it will be sent there at the same time it reaches us, and the Senate approves it. Thereupon it becomes law. The proposal of the President, his plan, by and with the consent of the Senate, of which he may have control, becomes a law in spite of the opposition of the House.

You and I, if we support this bill as it stands today—I do not want to say it; I dislike to say it; but I believe I will—you and I, in my judgment, will have betrayed our people, because we will have relinquished, we will have shirked, our responsibility to enact legislation because we will be saying that the President and the Senate can without our consent make the law.

I cannot go along with that sort of procedure. Because I do not know what the membership is going to do, I say these agencies proposed to be exempted by the gentleman from Indiana should be exempted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a rather contradictory situation in reference to this legislation. I feel as most of us do that there are a lot of overlapping agencies, a great many of which should be consolidated and reorganized. I am in favor of effecting economy in their operation. On the other hand, however, most of these agencies were created by act of Congress. Congress had some particular reason for setting them up as they were established, and I frankly do not like the idea of Congress abdicating its power to the Executive to reshuffle and reorganize and merge these agencies any way the Executive may see fit. Insofar as President Truman is concerned, I am sure he would do the very best he could and I do not know of anything he contemplates doing that I would not be in agreement with. The fact is, I am not greatly worried about any of the agencies insofar as the present President is concerned; it is the legislative principle we are establishing by this kind of legislation that frightens me. There will be future Presidents who may not have the same concept about the manner in which these agencies operate as that held by President Truman. For instance, I have in mind one particular agency, the Tennessee Valley Authority, which Congress in its wisdom said should operate as a regional agency. Congress said that the decisions and the carrying out of policy should be done in the region where it operates, that it should have its principal office not in Washington but it should operate among the people it served. On that basis it has been highly successful and its great success is to a considerable extent the result of the fact that it has been able to operate there where the people could get in touch directly with its officials and where policy could be carried out there where the people had an opportunity to be heard.

So I must warn you that if you are interested in the Washington Valley Authority and the other authorities that may be established similar to the TVA—the Missouri Valley Authority, the Central Valley Authority in California, and others—if they are organized, that you would have a division of responsibility if you had a President who wanted to put them under the Interior Department, for instance, or some other department. In a situation like that you would have to come to Washington rather than to the local office to see about getting a transmission line or a power line built. It would completely destroy the purpose and chief value of a regional authority.

What I think the Congress should do is to take the initiative itself in eliminating or merging some of these organizations that ought to be eliminated and exercise our power and vision rather than abdicate our power and our authority to an Executive regardless of whom he may be. Let us chart their course, lay down their policy, eliminate needless ones and let it be a reorganization thought out and put into effect by the Congress. I therefore have a feeling in line with that of the gentleman from Michigan that what would be more desirable would be to let the Executive make recommendations as to his plans and then let the Congress by affirmative action either accept or reject the plan, and not do it in the negative way that is provided in section 6 (a). We all know as a matter of fact that if a reorganization plan is sent up here it is going to take more than 60 days before we can act on it. Legislation does not come to completion that quickly. Throughout recent history it has been our experience that 60 days is not sufficient time where there is determined opposition to get a bill through committees and have it considered by both Houses.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. The bill contains a cloture rule which makes it impossible for anybody to filibuster such a bill or for any committee to sit on it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Judging by experiences we have had we all know that if there is any substantial opposition to legislation, with a crowded calendar and the other things that inevitably come up, that it is very difficult to get legislation through in 60 days. True the bill has a cloture provision but it might get behind a filibuster in the Senate. No priority over other business is provided for in the bill.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. If the gentleman will read title 2 of this bill he will see that it states that if the committee to which the resolution has been referred does not act within 10 days, at the expiration of that time any Member who is opposed to the reorganization plan can call up the resolution and it shall be of the highest privilege; nothing can supplant it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the gentleman that Congress having created these agencies, having said in some cases that they shall operate and have their principal office in a region, I think it ought to be up to the Congress to say affirmatively whether it wants that reorganization. These agencies are for the benefit of the people. Let us keep them under our control.

Mr. MANASCO. The gentleman will admit that the TVA violated the law in not moving Muscle Shoals a long time ago.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I would like to argue that some time with the gentleman. The headquarters of TVA is in Alabama. In the interest of efficiency and economy most of the operational offices are in Tennessee. This is sensible bcause more than 70 percent of the TVA's operation and power sales are in Tennessee. Many corporations have their headquarters in Delaware where their charters were issued but economy and good business management requires them to have their principal offices elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, with no intention of finding fault with the purpose that the gentleman from In-

diana may have in mind, I call attention to the fact that the adoption of his amendment as an amendment of mine would destroy the very purpose I have in mind. He lists the names of a number of agencies, including the Railroad Retirement Board, the Mediation Board, and the National Adjustment Board, and five others, which he desires to exclude from the operation of the Reorganization Act. His amendment refers to boards and to nothing else. Not only so, but much of the legislation that is so essential to the operation of these railway agencies is left entirely subject to the reorganization measure. For example, you who were here 10 years ago will remember the great battle we had to enact constitutional legislation for a railroad retirement system. The first bill passed was declared unconstitutional by a 5-to-4 decision of the Supreme Court. Then we passed a separate law, recommended by the Committee on Interstate Commerce for a retirement system as such and we provided also in a separate bill, referred to the Ways and Means Committee for payment of the amounts provided under the retirement law. We provided for payment into the Treasury by the railroads and railroad workers of equal amounts of money each year. The law providing for the Revenue Act just mentioned is set forth in subchapter (b) of chapter IX of the Internal Revenue Code, which I include in my statement.

There is also a total omission of another establishment in which the railroad workers are very much interested and which required much effort to establish. I refer to the railroad unemployment insurance system. Nothing is said in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] about that.

Mr. HALLECK. Is that not handled by the Railroad Retirement Board?

Mr. CROSSER. The Railroad Retirement Board simply administers it. That is the Board which administers the unemployment insurance law, a law enacted long after the establishment of the Railroad Retirement Board.

I am not quarreling with the gentleman. I am merely showing that what he proposes to do would completely defeat the purpose of the amendment introduced by me. My amendment states:

> No reorganization plan shall affect any provision of the Railroad Retirement Act as amended or of the subchapter of the Internal Revenue Act as amended or of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, or of the Railroad Labor Act, as amended—

And so forth. The measures named in my amendment include not only the names of the agencies but all the provisions of law which are to be enforced. We say, in the amendment, in addition to that:

> Nor shall any plan affect any agency functioning pursuant to or any function being performed pursuant to any of such acts except the functions of the Bureau of Internal Revenue not related to this chapter.

It was necessary, of course, to exclude from the operation of my amendment the functions of the Bureau of Internal Revenue not relative to the chapter specified previously in the amendment but we do use language to make it clear that this so-called Reorganization Act must not interfere with any of the other laws or any of the agencies for which provision is made in the acts named in my amendment. Under the provisions of the bill as it has been reported the Social Security System could be consolidated with the Railroad Retirement Act. That would arouse the indignation of the railroad men of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I say in all seriousness, that to effectuate the purpose of the amendment which I have offered, the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana should be rejected unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. CROSSER] speaking for the second time, has brought a very important matter to the attention of the Committee. Where we are dealing with commissions and boards he has undertaken to deal with laws and acts, and he has referred to the Internal Revenue Code specifically subchapter (B), chapter 9. Frankly, with respect to what effect his amendment is going to have on the Treasury Department and on other departments, I do not know. This amendment affects any agency functioning pursuant to or any function being performed pursuant to said acts, and excepts the Bureau of Internal Revenue, without excepting other agencies affected. It was never submitted to the committee and it has never been examined by members or the attorneys for the Committee and frankly I do not think that we ought to try to change the revenue laws or other laws on the floor of the House in that way. The Crosser amendment is entirely too far reaching and on investigation may defeat reorganizations in several departments. I will say in all fairness to the gentleman from Indiana that the language that he has used in respect to the National Mediation Board, the National Railroad Retirement Board, and with respect to the Railroad Adjustment Board is the language of the Act of 1939, and the language of the gentleman from Ohio has never appeared in any previous reorganization acts, and should not be included.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. May I ask the gentleman to point out the language of exemption contained in the bill as he reported it applicable to the three agencies? To my mind that is a complete exemption.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, it is complete as to the three agencies named. I will try to cover the original amendment as well as the substitute. I say this without any desire to repeat, which has been said over and over again about the Civil Aeronautics Administration, that there is nothing in this bill that will prevent the transferring of that agency and make it an independent agency, and I shall not refer to the Civil Aeronautics Administration again. I would like to say this also, as I said previously in general debate, that if we are for reorganization, there really should be no limitations. I am opposed to any limitations in principle. As a member of the committee I was unable to prevent all limitations or exceptions. We included the outstanding ones. We limited them as far as we could.

Let me say to those who are apprehensive that there was no exemption of any kind in the act of 1932, and there was no attempt made to reorganize any of the commissions or board referred to in the pending amendment.

The President of the United States had the power to do that for 2 years and he never undertook to exercise it. When we say there should be no exception we do not thereby say that the President of the United States will reorganize those agencies but we do say that he shall have the privilege of taking a look at them, and if he can offer any constructive improvements he may be privileged to submit them to the Congress. In the first War Powers Act that we passed unanimously as I recall we did not make a single exception and we did not surround that act with the safeguards of this act. Under the First War Powers Act the President can reorganize. Under this act he has to submit his reorganization so that it may be disapproved if Congress is not satisfied. And there is a guaranteed opportunity of disapproval. There is nothing new about this procedure. It was included in the act of 1939, and it worked. Both Houses voted on a concurrent disapproval resolution concretely, what do we have before us? There are embraced three exceptions in the bill as reported by the committee about which there can be no reorganization. The first is the Interstate Commerce Commission. We feel that that has been a category to itself. It has been in force for 60 years. The adjustment boards were created in 1926 and 1934. There were other agencies such as the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Communications Commission. We put those five agencies in a category by themselves and we said to the President, "If you submit a plan respecting any one of those five agencies you have got to submit it singly so that the Congress can vote it up or down." In my judgment, if the Civil Service Commission cannot stand on its own feet, then that Commission ought to be reviewed by Congress.

The gentleman from Indiana would undertake to put these five and the first three all under the first head and make them absolutely exempt, and he would include the Federal Power Commission and the Maritime Commission with the three agencies the gentleman from Ohio has undertaken to cover.

The Federal Power Commission is not on a par with the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Federal Power Commission is not the agency selected by President Roosevelt or by the Congress to fix rates and sell public power. I support the Federal Power Commission. I do not have any apprehension that the

President is going to undertake to reorganize it or transfer it. Unless he convinces me in any plan that he can submit a better proposal, I stand for the Federal Power Commission. But when we came to dispose of Bonneville power, Grand Coulee power, the power in all the other public power projects where it was developed, we did not put that power in the Power Commission. I think the President ought to have the right to review and he ought to have the right to recommend that it be placed there, but President Roosevelt and Congress have placed it in the Secretary of the Interior, and in authority.

I have just this to say about the Maritime Commission. I am for a merchant marine and I am for a big Navy, but I sat here for 2 days this week considering the works of the Commission and, frankly, if there be one commission in the United States spending forty-five to sixty billion dollars that should be perfected, it strikes me it is the Maritime Commission, inasmuch as the House provided for selling at rather nominal prices the ships that they had built, at a low of multiplied billions of dollars. No harm can be done the Federal Treasury or the American people by taking a look at that Commission.

Let me say this further and finally: We are either for reorganization or we are against it. Our friends are unduly apprehensive. The President has the power to reorganize and has had it under the First War Powers Act without any exceptions whatsoever. If we are going to reorganize, if we mean to reorganize, why not give the President a chance to examine the 58 or 60 executive agencies, including the agencies mentioned in this amendment, and then give Congress, as provided by this bill, an opportunity to review and with guaranty of the right to reject.

I trust that the substitute will be rejected and that the original amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALLECK) there were—ayes 106, noes 129.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MANASCO and Mr. HALLECK.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 127, noes 161.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CROSSER) there were—ayes 79, noes 83.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 170, noes 44.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDOLPH: Page 8, line 15, strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)", and after line 14 insert the following subsection:

"(e) The provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply in the case of a reorganization plan providing for the consolidation of the Department of War and the Department of the Navy into a new executive department under the direction of a Secretary; the provisions of paragraph (2) of section 4 of this act shall not apply so as to prevent the fixing of the rate of compensation of the Secretary of such new department, in such plan, at the same rate as the compensation paid to other heads of executive departments; and the provisions of subsection (d) of this section shall not apply in the case of such reorganization plan: *Provided, however,* That the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall be effective with respect to such reorganization plan only if such plan (i) does not provide for any reorganization affecting any other agencies, and (ii) does not abolish any civil function of the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, or of its head, or vest any such civil function in any agency which is not within the control and jurisdiction of the new department created under the plan."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I would not ordinarily request the indulgence of the Committee to speak longer than the 5 minutes allotted, but the importance of the subject matter causes me to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, can the chairman tell me whether he proposes to finish this bill tonight?

Mr. MANASCO. We hope so if we do not have too many amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I may say that if consideration of the bill is completed tonight, then there will be no legislative business for the remainder of the week. Admiral Nimitz will be up here at a joint meeting tomorrow and if consideration of this bill is completed the Members may govern themselves accordingly. If we do not finish its consideration, after the joint meeting tomorrow we will proceed with this bill. I hope, however, its consideration will be completed this afternoon.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman propose to adjourn over Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you work us until 11 o'clock, we will have to have Saturday to rest up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I never try to hold anybody. Fortunately the Members have always cooperated very well. I simply said that if consideration of the bill is completed tonight, there is no further legislation this week. As a matter of fact, there will be nothing much until Wednesday of next week, but I shall make an announcement later. I hope it will be completed. If not, I will not be disappointed. It is up to the Members.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How long does the gentleman expect to run tonight?

Mr. McCORMACK. We usually work that thing out as we go along; the gentleman from Michigan knows that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It occurred to me, with these strikes on having to do with the delivery of milk, that maybe some of the babies and children in Washington will want some milk, and we might have to be here Saturday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us confine ourselves to whether we can get through with this bill today or not.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do this for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee whether it would be the desire to sit until 6 o'clock this evening, if necessary, to finish this bill.

Mr. MANASCO. I hope to sit here until we finish the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the weakness of this legislation is the exemptions which were written into the measure in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and later have been written and may still be written on the floor of this House. We either believe in reorganization of these executive agencies of our Government with the resulting economies which will come to the Nation, or we believe otherwise.

This afternoon, therefore, it is my desire to test the opinion of this Congress, at least partially, on whether its individual Members really desire to eliminate the overlapping functions, to eliminate the duplications within at least two of our departments, and to say that the task our President has set himself to we will allow him to prosecute to the fullest extent.

What is the position on reorganization policy of the Chief Executive of the United States? It is very plain, because he has stated it on two recent occasions; first, on May 24 of this year and later, on September 6. In his message to the Members of Congress in the first instance he said:

> The legislation should be sufficiently broad and flexible to permit of any form of organizational adjustment, large or small, for which necessity may arise.

In a later message the President of the United States used almost the same language, although modifying it slightly, when he requested:

> The legislation should be sufficiently flexible to permit any kind of adjustment for which necessity may arise.

President Truman, the man to whom the Congress will delegate these powers if this legislation becomes law, has declared many times that he believes in the consolidation of the War and Navy Departments into a single department. We can call it Department of Defense, Department of the Armed Services, or whatever might seem most appropriate. The President of the United States, when

he was a Member of the Senate, wrote an article in August 1944, which was published in a leading magazine, and in that presentation he vigorously espoused the cause of a single Department of Defense.

This article is referred to in the following editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Post of October 1, 1945, as follows:

UNIFICATION

By common consent unification of the armed services seems to have been put in a back seat. The Navy, of course, has always been against it. Accordingly it was no surprise to hear Chairman VINSON, of the House Naval Affairs Committee, saying last Thursday, "There is no chance of taking up the Army and Navy merger now. I hope it is off forever. The two services should remain separate and distinct." By a curious coincidence Chairman MAY of the House Military Affairs Committee expressed himself of similar sentiments on the same day. "I am against merging the Army and the Navy," he said. "I don't think you can merge them." No comment is available in the Navy Department, but the War Department, we understand, has been circularizing its officials that unification is off, at least for the time being. That means that silence will be Army doctrine till the higherups again release the prounification agitation which till last week resounded through the halls of the Pentagon Building.

The reason for the sudden abandonment of this reform can only be guessed at. May it not be that in return for silence the Navy has assured the Army of support in its postwar program? That is not impossible. One reason that the Army was so enthusiastic for unification had to do with the sense of insecurity that always comes over the War Department when peace returns. When the guns begin to go off, the American people grudge the War Department nothing; but as soon as they are silenced, the Department has great difficulty over appropriations. The Navy finds the going on the Hill much less difficult. It looks as if the future will conform with the past, for the Navy will find its traditional claims fortified by the fact that it is actual custodian of the interests and responsibilities we have acquired or undertaken as a result of the war. Besides, the Navy's chairmen in Congress are valiant pro-Navy men, and Secretary Forrestal, whose pro-Navy success on the Hill is well known, may be counted upon to keep their support intimate and enthusiastic. Thus out of the largeness of its heart the Navy might have agreed to lend the Army a helping hand in the legislative task ahead if the Army will drop its prounification agitation.

This is all the vaguest sort of speculation, but the sudden abandonment of the reform has an ancient and fishlike smell and warrants speculation. Certainly nothing has happened recently to warrant any cooling off. On the contrary, the need for some plan of unification has been pointed up by events. There were, for example, the Pearl Harbor revelations, which showed a shocking lack of liaison to be risked again at our peril. Then there is the evidence of what lack of coordination between Japan's Army and Navy meant to the Japanese war effort. Many things, of course, contributed to the speed with which American power gained predominance in the Pacific, but not least of these factors was the virtually unrelated duality in Japan's military system. That should have been a lesson in itself to the United States. When the war came to an end our command situation in the Pacific was bad enough, but, thank Heaven, the Japanese was worse. It was proof, as President Truman said in a magazine article he wrote as Senator Truman in August 1944 that "a divine Providence watches over the United States."

The President in his message to Congress on September 6 said that he would send a separate message later on the subject of unification. We hope that before he indites his message he will look up his own words in the aforesaid magazine article. Out of his experience at the head of the Truman committee he gave one illustration after another of overlapping and cleavage. He concluded, "What else can be expected of an organizational arrangement that departmentalizes the national security, authorizing and encouraging rivalry?" Coordination would remove the dead hand of tradition which is the bane of improvement, paralyzing innovation, frustrating action, and preventing ideas from getting any hospitality. Coordination of the armed services would commit the moth-eaten traditions of both services into the scrap heap and enable a new establishment to keep abreast of these dynamic times. Representative MAY says he doesn't know how the two could merge. But the way to merge is to merge, and the time to start is now, when the whole question of a postwar military establishment is under review.

His language speaks eloquently and effectively of his intense interest and his deep desire to do more than just advocate, his desire to actually act upon this subject, when he says, "What else can be expected of an organizational arrangement that departmentalizes the national security, authorizing and encouraging rivalry?"

Even my very fine friends, the chairmen of our Committees on Military and Naval Affairs, would not dispute in the well of this House today, although they will vigorously oppose the amendment, that there has existed, there exists, and there will continue to exist under our present set-up those rivalries and organizational departures to which our present Chief Executive has alluded.

We have much confidence in the Comptroller General of the United States, Lindsay Warren, of North Carolina. I would remind especially those of you who are seasoned Members of this body that in 1932 Mr. Warren, then a Member of this body, was the individual within the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments who cast the vote to bring from the committee a bill which would have done exactly that which, now almost 13 years later we are still delaying, instead of acting on affirmatively. The bill was reported and the Committee on Rules never allowed the measure to come to the floor. He told us on September 5 the above fact. You can read his statement on page 99 of the printed hearings. Lindsay Warren believed in it then. He has believed more firmly in it since. I shall refer in a few moments to a further comment Mr. Warren has made on the issue here presented.

Came the period prior to World War II, as we faced gradually and later more quickly the impact of this terrific global struggle. We attempted to conduct hearings on this subject by the committee to which the measure was referred, but no hearings could be held.

I now direct your attention carefully to what Lindsay Warren said on September 5 of this year when our committee was considering reorganization legislation. His comment on a need for a single department was, "I am convinced," he said, "that vast economies could be accomplished, not even mentioning the national defense."

I call your attention also to a past Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, although a man of advanced years, who came before the very able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and his Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy and said that the events leading to and causing Pearl Harbor would not have taken place had there been a unification of command.

When certain individuals say today that there are younger Members of this House who perhaps believe in this proposal because they are wedded to air power, I would remind you that a man like Josephus Daniels could not be charged with such a definiteness of opinion. He was a Navy advocate.

I would remind you also that the present distinguished Secretary of State of the Republic, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, was, as you know, during the prosecution of this war for a time the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

He said, in making his second quarterly report on April 2, 1945:

In my capacity as Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, I have had unusual opportunity to become familiar with the operation of the War and Navy Departments.

I will place in the RECORD his entire statement, which I will not read, but I call your attention to his appeal with this language:

I urge that the Congress at an early date give consideration to the establishment of a single department of defense in which the Army, Navy, and Air Forces would function under one head who would be directly responsible to the President as Commander in Chief.

The entire statement is as follows:

A UNIFIED NATIONAL DEFENSE

In my capacity as Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, I have had an opportunity to become familar with the operations of our War and Navy Departments.

I believe their achievements in the design and procurement of weapons of war to be outstanding. The supply of our armies in the field and our Navy afloat has permitted a continuing offensive which has reached a magnitude previously unknown to history.

Nevertheless, there have been and remain many duplications of effort which have resulted in substantial expenditures for war which might have been avoided. Procurement and supply programs under a unified system could have saved not only dollars, but—what is far more important in war—manpower and materials.

The combined combat operations of our Army and Navy have been executed under single leadership with remarkable success. Differences at home have been reconciled. In this way many duplications have been avoided.

However, we have obtained this degree of unity only because the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Admiral Leahy, General Marshall, Admiral King, and General Arnold—have been willing and able to compromise and reach agreements in the common interest.

I do not believe that any changes should be made now, as such changes and the reorganizations involved might interfere with the prosecution of the war. However, I am convinced that America should not face the future without a fully unified national defense. I urge that the Congress at an early date give consideration to legislation which would establish a single Department of National Defense, in which the Army, Navy, and Air Forces would function under one head, who would be directly responsible to the President as Commander in Chief.

Members of the Congress, reason together for just a moment. Who is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy? Why, it is the President. He is the Chief Executive of this land. Under section 2 of article II of the Constitution of the United States, we have provided that he and he alone is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

Who is better able than our Commander in Chief, President Truman, who in his own language has asked for this power, and who says that he will exercise it, to propose to the Congress a definite plan for the unification of the armed forces of the United States? The reports are in from the Army and Navy. The hearings have been held. The surveys have been made. The opinions of military experts have been gathered. There is a tremendous backlog for a period of almost 15 years bearing directly upon the matter to which we here focus your attention. The President sends a unification plan to the Congress and we have 60 days in which we can say, "We cannot approve of what you have done." Not the Congress, but the President, the leader who is in charge of the Army and Navy, sends that blueprint to the Congress. Let us permit him to do the job which he says will be done and then the Congress of the United States can either stand with him or oppose what he has proposed.

This is a test, gentlemen, and I trust, regardless of party affiliations, we will think clearly and act courageously and do what the country desires that we do: Cut down duplicating departments and eliminate waste. Thus we act in an efficient manner for the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Years ago my Sunday school teacher used as her text the words of Jesus when he said, "Thy lips do Me honor, but I fear thine heart is not with Me." That surely applies here today. Everybody talks about economy and no one does anything about it.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has offered ample testimony in support of his amendment. He has given the best possible authority in support of the amendment. If I had the time I could give you additional authority for the merging of these two departments. Is there any place in the Government where waste and duplication could be cut down to any greater degree than in the Army and the Navy today?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. HENRY. Does not the gentleman from Ohio believe that the magnitude of this whole question is such as to demand separate legislation, rather than mixing it with legislation that is now pending?

Mr. BENDER. I believe separate legislation would be desirable. However, we have the opportunity today, and why wait? This is the time to vote.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I would like to ask the gentleman if the President, under the proposed amendment, which simply authorizes the President to send a plan to Congress, did send a plan here on a proposed consolidation of the Army and the Navy, it would not be a more difficult problem to deal with it than if we brought in separate legislation dealing with it?

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, I disagree with the gentleman. I think it would be easier to deal with it here. I think it would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Postwar Policy and Planning, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], for whom I have the highest regard, would say, if he were now speaking, that his select committee held hearings on this subject more than 1 year ago, in May 1944. I am sure he and other members of that committee, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who desire action, would not feel that casting an affirmative vote on this matter would reflect in any way upon the testimony taken by that select committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. I have been a member of this committee for the past 7 years. This committee used to be the burial ground for most legislation. The committee was so constituted so that it was almost impossible to have a quorum present. Now we are bringing more legislation to the floor of the House than all of the committees of the House combined. You are getting action with a vengeance. Here is your chance to vote for a good amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman understand that he is speaking for a plan to unite the War Department and the Navy Department, and that that plan, among others, can be confirmed by only one House and become law?

Mr. BENDER. You understand the amendment. It was explained to you very clearly. It provides for a merger of the two departments. The House, by voting for this amendment, is going on record for such a merger. That is all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, some of us would like a little time on this amendment if all debate is going to be for it. I will object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thought the House was ready to finish the bill. That was the reason I submitted the request to limit debate.

I, of course, think that the reorganization of the executive departments is one of the most important things confronting the Congress today, but since we would not trust the President with the reorganization of the two railroad boards and a few others I believe we should not at this time give him blanket authority to combine the two agencies to which we entrusted the winning of the recent war. I have no fixed opinion as to whether or not we should have one agency conduct our national defense but I do believe that legislative committees should study this question very very carefully before legislation is recommended combining these departments, or maybe separating them into three or four different departments, that is, of the air, the sea, and the land. I believe that this is a question that might well take 2 or 3 years. It is very easy, of course, to criticize the different agencies of our Government. It is very easy to criticize the War and the Navy Departments for not cooperating in some little petty thing, but in the matter of consideration of legislation in any House committee—I believe I can speak from experience without divulging anything that goes on in an executive session—we have seen a few Members support legislation without amendment, but when it was brought to the floor of the House, support every amendment that was offered. The Army and Navy of course have some petty jealousies but I do believe that when departments, especially those to which our defense has been entrusted are to be reorganized we ought to consider the matter on its own merits and consider it very carefully. For that reason I sincerely trust this amendment will be voted down. I also wish to say that we are going to hold hearings soon—I guess there will be 15 committees holding hearings on this same question within the next few months, but our committee is going to hold them anyway.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In my opinion this is not a proper subject to involve in a merger and reorganization bill. This concerns our whole national defense policy.

Mr. MANASCO. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was sorry to hear my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, say that this is a test of sentiment. I am going to vote against this amendment but it certainly is no test of how I shall vote on the question in the future because I am voting against this amendment for the reason that I believe it has no place in this bill, that the subject should be considered by the regular legislative committees, for there are greater implications and questions involved than mere merger.

Mr. MANASCO. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The very question of the national defense of our country is involved, and that should be passed upon by our legislative committees.

Mr. MANASCO. It involves the policy of our national defense.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I regret that our distinguished leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] says the Congress would not be passing on this subject matter, except that our committees act in bringing in a bill. The Congress would have the power of disapproval, of veto, on any plan consolidation submitted by the President. As a matter of fact our distinguished President twice has suggested to us that, acting as Commander in Chief of both the Army and the Navy, he be given this delegation of power. The President must initiate. We do not seem to act. We have the veto power and this is the time and place to begin that cutting in all departments to end duplication. The public, in my opinion, believes in that principle now more than ever before in our history as a Nation.

Mr. MANASCO. Of course, our committee took the position that the creation of executive departments should be left to the Congress of the United States and not to the Chief Executive. I think the same thing applies to combining these departments.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The majority leader said he is against this amendment. What difference is there between this and the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]?

Mr. MANASCO. I cannot answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, we have just won the greatest war in which this Nation was ever engaged. We won it with the Army functioning as an army and with the Navy fighting as a navy. Now, it is proposed on the spur of the moment, without due deliberation and without due consideration to telescope these two great organizations and to minimize the victory they have won.

Mr. Chairman, this is a question so far reaching and so vitally affecting the defense of this Nation that we ought not to take it in hot haste or impetuously. From the dawn of history, military power, the ability to wage victorious war, has been based upon a separate army and a separate navy. You cannot fly with one wing. Let us not jump off a precipice without a parachute and without knowing what we are going to hit when we get to the bottom. This amendment ought to be defeated.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The argument has been made here that there was a great deal of jealousy between these two arms of the service.

Mr. JENNINGS. If there is rivalry between two organizations like the Army and Navy, it puts each on its toes. Who is it that can truthfully say that the American Navy in this war did not cover itself with glory and that our armies wherever they fought did not measure up to the high standards of valor that have characterized our armed forces in all the wars we ever waged? The truth of the matter is that the training, arming, and maneuvering of armies is one thing and the building, manning, and strategy of a navy is another. Those who have led our armies and those who have commanded our Navy have proved the masters of all our enemies.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Has there been any evidence of lack of unity between the Army and Navy and Air Forces since Pearl Harbor?

Mr. JENNINGS. No. They have cooperated everywhere. All you have to do is to turn to the shores of Africa, the coast of Sicily, the landings in Italy, to the beachhead on the coast of Normandy, to Okinawa, and to Japan. There has been no friction. This war was fought by human beings and men will be human as long as the human race exists. It is good to see rivalry such as exists between the Army and Navy. It means the winning of wars, it means the successful defense of our great country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, we have had a demonstration of the futility of undertaking to combine on the floor of the House in a half hour the two largest departments of Government. This bill proceeds on the theory that when it comes to establishing a cabinet position and executive departments or combining them, those functions shall be left to the Congress of the United States. Legislation has been introduced from time to time providing for combining the War and Navy Departments. For many years there has been such legislation pending.

I recall that about 12 years ago the committee spent weeks, probably months, in such hearings without coming to a conclusion. I recall the committee of which the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is chairman, has been investigating the matter. They probably have their opinion. But in all events this is no place for the consideration of combining the Army and the Navy under the terms of this bill because under the terms of the amendment we might not like the name of it, we might not like the provisions under this reorganization bill. There is no opportunity for amendment. You have to vote it up or down.

Let me say this, too, that now in an amendment to undertake to provide for the combining of the Army and the Navy, with the additional war functions set up under them under the First War Powers Act, would be a mistake. For my part I have an open mind, and I think when this war is over and when we have taken an inventory, we ought to give consideration to combining these two Departments.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. A moment ago the gentleman from West Virginia referred to the Comptroller General's testimony on reorganization. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to page 73 of the hearings where Mr. Warren testified in which he said that this bill would prevent the consolidation of departments, and that he felt that that was a proper restriction. The gentleman from Mississippi asked this question:

> What was that again, Mr. Warren?
>
> Mr. WARREN. He asked me if I thought this legislation should provide for the consolidation of departments——
>
> Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, yes.
>
> Mr. WARREN. Having in mind a Department of National Defense. I told him I thought it would be very unwise to do that in this legislation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly. Every reorganization bill that has ever been presented to the House or to the Congress has provided, as does this bill, that the matter of establishing a new Cabinet position or the matter of combining existing Cabinet positions shall be left to the Congress and not embraced in a reorganization. I trust the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In deference to the gentleman from Texas, the record will show that I did not quote Lindsay Warren as being for or against my amendment. I quoted him as believing that a single department of defense would effect economies in Government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We are glad to have the Comptroller General's opinion, but this Congress should not go about combining departments handling hundreds of millions of dollars and passing on that matter in 30 minutes without adequate provisions for the transfer of the functions and the funds, including the officials of the two departments.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. For the last 5 years, at least ever since Pearl Harbor, the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs have been in session nearly every working day on matters of national defense and national security. Does not the gentleman believe, in all fairness, since they are charged especially with that duty, that they ought to continue hearings and make recommendations on such a tremendous question?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not wish to usurp any of the prerogatives of congressional committees. I will let the gentleman answer his own question. I think it would be utterly unwise to adopt this amendment, and I trust it will be defeated overwhelmingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANDOLPH) there were—ayes 37, noes 112.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: On page 7, line 12, before the word "and", where it first appears in the line, insert "United States Maritime Commission."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would provide that no reorganization plan could affect the Maritime Commission, except that the whole or part of the functions of other agencies could be transferred to the Commission; in other words, it includes it in the provision that applies to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, as well as the other commissions that were included by the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Under the Shipping Act of 1916 and the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933, the United States Maritime Commission has broad regulatory powers over carriers by water engaged in carrying commerce between the United States and its island possessions. These functions are similar to and patterned after the functions which are exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission. For example, the Commission enforces a statutory prohibition against the granting of rebates or using other discriminatory or unfair methods by carriers so that shippers and competing carriers may be protected from unjust treatment. Common carriers by water are required to file for the Commission's approval their agreements and schedules concerning rates, competition, and pooling and are forbidden to indulge in such unfair practices as false billing, false weighing, giving of preferences, allowing persons to obtain transportation at less than regulatory rates and unjust insurers not to give competing carriers favorable rates of insurance. The Commission is also empowered to determine whether rates are unjustly discriminatory between shippers or ports or unjustly prejudicial to exporters. It may enforce just and reasonable regulations relating to handling, storing, and delivering property. It may suspend filed rates and in their place fix just and reasonable maximum or minimum rates. It may prescribe just and reasonable classifications, tariffs, regulations, or practices.

In the field of foreign shipping, the Commission is charged with determining whether or not conference agreements filed with the Commission are just and reasonable.

In awarding both operating and construction subsidies under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, the Commission is charged with determining, within certain prescribed limits, the amounts of such subsidy.

Under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, the Commission is charged with determining just compensation for vessels which are requisitioned by the United States.

Under the Shipping Act, 1916, the Maritime Commission has broad regulatory authority over persons carrying on the business of forwarding or furnishing wharfage, dock, warehouse, or other terminal facilities in connection with common carriers by water.

The duties are very similar to those performed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and are far more important because here we are dealing also with conferences in which foreign shippers participate and we may need to protect American commerce. I respectfully ask the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman fear that if this bill passes without the exception being granted to the Maritime Commission that the President may in a reorganization plan shift, or change, or limit the functions and powers of the Maritime Commission?

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman now speaking does not fear any action on the part of the President of the United States if the facts can be fully presented to him and if the decision is made personally by him. But the gentleman has seen very recently some letters that have gone to the Senate on matters pertaining to shipping and the gentleman fears that those who have written those letters do not understand the shipping situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee voted a few moments ago on the Halleck amendment, which contained the Maritime Commission as an exception to the provisions of this act. I, of course, realize there are judicial and regulatory functions in carrying on the Maritime Commission. Of course, we will admit that. But we have many other executive agencies. I think it is fair to say that any agency in existence today in the Federal Government could come to a congressional committee and prove to the agency's satisfaction that they carry on quasi legislative and quasi judicial functions. I recall about 3 or 4 months before the Pearl Harbor attack—I believe it was the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], or perhaps both of them—who had bills introduced authorizing the transfer from Washington of many of our executive agencies in order to make room for the growing defense program. I was on the subcommittee that held hearings and every agency in the Federal Government asked to be heard on that bill. Every agency came up with a long prepared statement, a very convincing statement, that it would be impossible for them to move away from Washington because they were tied up with the war effort. I recall the then head of the Office of Indian Affairs appeared. You would have thought that if the Office of Indian Affairs was moved out of Washington we would have lost the war at one stroke. The same thing was true concerning the Farm Credit Administration and the Home Loan Board and the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Railroad Retirement Board. After Pearl Harbor was attacked in about 2 weeks, the President issued an Executive order and moved all of them out. They have all been functioning. Of course, we have been hearing directly or indirectly from most of them since that time wanting to be exempted from the provisions of this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the Maritime Commission was embraced in the proposal of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and defeated?

Mr. MANASCO. I stated that.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. Is it not true that in the former bill which was reported by the committee of the gentleman from Alabama the Maritime Commission was excluded?

Mr. MANASCO. Not in this bill.

Mr. BLAND. I am not referring to this bill, but I refer to the former bill.

Mr. MANASCO. Of course, it was in the act of 1939. There were about 21 agencies exempted in that case and as a result we had no reorganization of executive agencies to speak of.

Mr. CHURCH. It was excepted from the bill which the gentleman introduced, was it not?

Mr. MANASCO. Yes. I exempted a great many of them but every member of my committee wanted to report the bill out with very few exemptions. They voted me down on my bill.

Mr. CHURCH. In your bill the Maritime Commission was excepted.

Mr. MANASCO. I excepted the same agencies that were excepted in the 1939 act, but, as I say, the committee on both sides voted against me.

Mr. CHURCH. But you agreed at that time with the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MANASCO. I think if we should have any reorganization at all, probably the Maritime Commission needs reorganizing. I do not know anything about the functions of the Maritime Commission. I am a landlubber, but I do think the President should have an opportunity, if necessary in his judgment, to reorganize an agency that has spent 45 or 50 million dollars of the taxpayers' money. If there is anything that needs to be reviewed there, he should not be precluded.

I sincerely trust that the committee will vote down this amendment and all other amendments to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: On page 7, line 24, at the end of the line insert the words "United States Maritime Commission," and then insert a comma.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I will not take much time. After I make my argument and lose, I try to accept the verdict gracefully. However, this amendment should prevail for the reasons I have assigned for my former amendment. This amendment brings the Maritime Commission in the next class. It is not exempting the Maritime Commission from reorganization, but it does require that there must be a separate and distinct plan for such reorganization. You must remember you are dealing, in many respects, with some very scheming gentlemen. I do not mean Americans entirely, but we have to compete all over the world if we develop a merchant marine. Any proposition with reference to the merchant marine ought to come in a separate plan of reorganization. For many years we have been trying to build up a merchant marine. I have been a member of the committee since 1922. From that time until the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, only two dry-cargo ships were built. We have had to fight for our existence all the time.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It will not be my purpose to occupy the time of the House rearguing the able exposition by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]. I hope, however, in the interest of the American merchant marine that his amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: On page 8, line 8, after the word "war", strike out the balance of line 8 and all of line 9 down to the semicolon.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to clear up a situation which is not clear in the bill. I believe if you will read paragraph (d) on page 8, you will conclude that the committee intended to leave the Corps of Engineers in the War Department. I think if you will read the report of the committee you will conclude the same thing; but there is an uncertainty about that in the clause in line 8 that I wish to strike out. That clause makes it uncertain. I have discussed the matter with some of the members of the committee and I find that the members of the committee themselves are not altogether clear on what it means. I think the committee intended to leave it in the War Department. I do not think anybody in this House wants to take the Corps of Engineers out of the War Department. I understand the President can reorganize the Corps of Engineers, but he cannot take it out of the War Department. What I want to do is to make certain that the Corps of Engineers is left in the War Department. I have discussed this matter with counsel for the committee and he assures me that this amendment would make certain that the Corps of Engineers would stay in the War Department. Unless we adopt this amendment the President could take the Corps of Engineers out if he wanted to. We do not want that done and I ask that you adopt the amendment. I hope the committee will accept it.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. I, of course, cannot speak for the committee, but it is my understanding that the War Department engineers could not be transferred out of the War Department. He could reorganize the civil functions but not transfer the corps from the War Department.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is my understanding, but I want to make it certain. If you adopt this amendment it will make it clear. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana) there were—ayes 14, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the Committee because I believe the statement I am about to make should be of interest to all the membership.

When the so-called Halleck and Crosser substitute and amendment were under consideration I stated that the language of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana with respect to the Railroad Retirement Board, the National Mediation Board, and the National Railroad Adjustment Board, was the language that was included in the act of 1939; and I stated, I think, that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], whether he intended it or not went much further, and to such an extent that I did not at the time attempt to make a final estimate as to the far reaching effect of the amendment. I ask the indulgence of the Committee to make this statement for the information of the membership. The Crosser amendment reads:

No organization plan shall affect any provision of the Railroad Retirement Acts, as amended, or of subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, or of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, or of the Railway Labor Act, as amended; nor shall any such plan affect any agency functioning pursuant to, or any function being performed pursuant to, any of such acts, except functions of the Bureau of Internal Revenue not related to subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. Chairman, may I read the following statement prepared by the legal advisers of the committee:

The Crosser amendment has effects which cannot be ascertained without a careful examination of the existing laws referred to in it, and it goes far beyond the purposes for which it was offered.

For example, the Railroad Retirement Act (U. S. C. title 45, sec. 228c-1 (j)) provides that any department or agency maintaining military records shall, at the request of the Railroad Retirement Board, furnish that with certain information necessary to the administration of the act.

Also that act (U. S C. title 45, sec. 2280 (b)) makes it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to invest funds in the Railroad Retirement Account.

Thus, the War Department and the Navy Department, and the Secretary of the Treasury, are agencies "functioning pursuant to" the Railroad Retirement Act, within the language of the Crosser amendment, and therefore could not be affected by any reorganization plan, even with respect to activities not under the Railroad Retirement Act.

This conclusion is made more certain by that part of the Crosser amendment which expressly excepts from the prohibition functions of the Internal Revenue Bureau not related to subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code. This exception makes it clear that no other exceptions are intended.

An examination of the other provisions of law mentioned would no doubt reveal that the amendment would have the effect of relieving other agencies from the legislation.

So that on the floor of this House in an amendment that was involved, an amendment that was never submitted to the committee, certain language was adopted. I cautioned Members, and I am not saying this critically. I always bow to the majority of the House. I want to help the railroad employees, I have always aided them. I am glad to aid any employee. I do not want to take the railroad employees and put them in a separate category or give them separate treatment. I want the President of the United States to take into consideration all workers and all employees, as well as the public in any power we have given him to reorganize.

I merely submit to the Committee this language carefully considered and furnished me by the attorneys upon whom the House relies.

Mr. BLAND. Is there any method whereby we can return to that?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Of course, by unanimous consent, but there will be another day, and probably a conference

before this bill becomes a law. The Crosser amendment should be clarified and modified.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: On page 8, line 1, after the words "Tariff Commission", insert "the Export-Import Bank of Washington."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, for RECORD purposes I wish to quote a paragraph from Public Law 173 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, an act to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes. This is subsection (f) of section 3 and reads as follows:

(f) The Export-Import Bank of Washington shall constitute an independent agency of the United States, and neither the bank nor any of its functions, powers, or duties shall be transferred to or consolidated with any other department, agency, or corporation of the Government unless the Congress shall otherwise by law provide.

We will have to bear in mind that although the Congress approved the Bretton Woods proposal it has not yet been approved by other countries parties to the Bretton Woods agreement and that in the meantime the Export-Import Bank is primarily the agency through which this country proposes to carry on activities of a nature similar to those which may be carried on by the International Credit Bank provided for in the Bretton Woods agreement. As I understand this proposal before us, unless we amend it something like I am proposing here, the President will have the power to directly go against the language of the Export-Import Bank law which I have read. We should do all this with full knowledge and be prepared to take the consequences and all because so much confidence and faith has been placed in the Bretton Woods proposal, and apparently the other countries of the world will expect so much of that piece of machinery. Certainly there has been a great story sold to our people with respect to the functions of the Bretton Woods proposal creating millions of jobs through the production of goods in this country for export to other countries that perhaps we should be somewhat careful about how we upset or transfer or liquidate the Export-Import Bank, at least until the Bretton Woods machinery gets into operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAWFORD) there were—ayes 31, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TAKING EFFECT OF REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) The reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect in accordance with the plan upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

(b) For the purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

(2) in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in sec. 102) with respect to such reorganization plan has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 8, strike out line 25, and lines 1 and 2 on page 9, and insert "there has been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress favors the reorganization plan."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment on the desk, to page 12, line 22. The purpose of both amendments is the same; they have just one object in mind, and neither one is any good without the other. I ask unanimous consent that the second amendment be now reported, and that both amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 12, line 22, strike out "does not favor" and insert "favors."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the gentleman's request to consider these two amendments en bloc, and I think these are the important amendments which have been brought to our attention, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point, and that it be in order to offer amendments to the bill as the sections are reached consecutively.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, that means that anyone can offer an amendment and it will be in order?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly. The Chair will announce the sections as they are reached consecutively and amendments will then be in order to those sections.

Mr. McCORMACK. That will enable the amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan to be considered better from a legislative angle, the bill having been considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

DEFINITION OF AGENCY

SEC. 7. When used in this act, the term agency means any executive department, commission, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, or administration, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

MATTERS DEEMED TO BE REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this act any transfer, consolidation, abolition, designation, disposition, or winding up of affairs, or provision for the appointment and compensation of the head or assistant heads of an agency, referred to in section 3 or 4, shall be deemed a reorganization.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed, in respect of or by any agency or function transferred to or consolidated with any other agency or function under the provisions of this act, before the effective date of such transfer or consolidation, shall except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, have the same effect as if such transfer or consolidation had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested functions in the agency from which the transfer is made under the plan, such functions shall, insofar as they are to be exercised after the transfer, be considered as vested in the agency to which the transfer is made under the plan.

(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term "regulation or other action" means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of any transfer of authority, power, and duties from one officer or agency of the Government to another under the provisions of this act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, shall allow the same to be maintained by or against the head of the agency or other officer of the United States to whom the authority, powers, and duties are transferred.

UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this act shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

PRINTING OF REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 11. If the reorganizations specified in a reorganization plan take effect, the reorganization plan shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

TITLE II

SEC. 101. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in section 102); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

SEC. 102. As used in this title, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. — transmitted to Congress by the President on ———, 19—.", the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

SEC. 103. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

SEC. 104. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, 10 calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committe from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagrced to.

(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

SEC. 105. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

SEC. 106. (a) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(b) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

SEC. 107. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of section 104 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, these two amendments have but one purpose, and that is to require the usual, regular procedure on the part of the Congress before the proposed plan become law. Every Member of the House has received at least one copy of the proposed amendments and a statement giving my reasons for offering them.

There is a right way and a wrong way to do things. This House some time back adopted a wrong way, the way of granting blank checks—blank checks for money, blank checks for power. You all remember how we gave the late President a blank check for something like $2,000,000,000. You all recall that later on the House tried to get rid of several Federal employees it did not want by putting in an appropriation bill a proviso that none of the money made available by that bill should be used either for the compensation or the disbursements of those named individuals. I recall one, and I cite it just as an example, David Saposs. He was over in the Labor Department when a bill came in before this House from the Committee on Appropriations. Acting upon the advice of that committee, the House overwhelmingly provided that no money appropriated by that bill should be paid to David Saposs. What happened? The President had authority to use a part of the blank check. Saposs was transferred, and he was kept on the public pay roll contrary to the will of the House and the Senate and paid by the President out of the blank-check fund.

Later on, another bill came in, and again the Congress by legislative action said that Saposs should not have any of the funds appropriated by that bill. But David got it. The President transferred him to another place and he drew Federal money from the blank-check fund. I understand today he is abroad in the employ of the Federal Government although this Congress has twice said he should not have Federal money. I mention this incident, not as a criticism of Saposs, but as an illustration of what happens when we follow the wrong way or when we grant blank checks.

Back in 1935 we passed certain labor legislation, the National Labor Relations Act, labor's magna carta, they called it. It was something of a blank check to the National Labor Relations Board authorized by it. That bill never was a fair, equitable bill. After its passage and when it was put into operation, the heads of all three great unions, John Lewis for the United Mine Workers, Philip Murray for the CIO, and William Green for the A. F. of L., all condemned the operation of it, the legislation itself, and the agency which administered it, and they said many a mean thing about it that was far worse than anything any employer or I ever said.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I prefer not to, if the gentleman will permit me to go on.

That is another illustration of how a blank check to an organization works out. We gave them authority to do certain things and they went ahead and discriminated at all times against the employers. And later on, when it came to jurisdictional disputes, they discriminated first against one union, the CIO, and again against the A. F. of L.

Finally both agencies condemned the act, organizations administering it, and the result of the NLRB's decisions as being unfair, biased, and prejudiced. We have learned by bitter experience that the power granted has been misused, our trust betrayed, our confidence abused.

So why should we now continue that policy of granting a blank check for either money or power? And that is what this bill does.

Now, in addition to the blank checks given to the President, we require that in order to legislate, he have the endorsement of but one branch of the Congress, for example, the Senate. I want to say to my brethren on the Democratic side there is nothing partisan about these amendments or the argument. There is not a man on the minority side who has gone along with you gentlemen as have I. I never voted to ram down your throats the poll-tax amendment—never. Every time it came up, I voted against it. What did I get from the minority side? I got laughs and I got sneers. They said, "Those fellows over there are making a sucker out of you," and I guess you were—I guess you were. I voted against it not because I liked you but because I believed from the bottom of my heart that it was none of our business and that it was the business of the States, under our Constitution, to prescribe the qualifications of electors.

Again, when the FEPC came up, I voted with you gentlemen from the South. So what did they tell me over on the Republican side? "Oh," they said, "you are making heroes of those southern Democrats down in their communities and you are getting us kicked around in the northern cities." Again they were right.

But once more I voted the way I did, not to get your favor, not because I loved their criticism—I voted that way because I believe that the question of preventing discrimination because of race, creed, or color, state of origin or ancestry, can never be solved, any more than the prohibition question can be solved, by legislation. It is a matter of education. It is a matter of Christianity. You cannot legislate something into the mind and heart of a man that is not there and that he does not believe in.

You talk about the good neighbor policy. You sent Nelson Rockefeller and a host of others, with billions of dollars, down to South America to buy their good will. When are you going to practice what you preach? When, after your fine speeches about adherence to the Constitution and its principles, are you going to vote as you talk? When are you going to make your acts match your words?

My argument to you now is this: When are you gentlemen going to forget politics? When are you going to come along and under the Constitution perform your duty here of retaining in the House and in the Senate the power to pass and the responsibility of passing legislation? I am putting it up to you.

I do not mean to say that I am not going along with you, when, if ever, you are right, but for once I would like to find you voting with me instead of always following along behind the tailboard of your cart. I am getting sick and tired of it.

I would like to see a little reciprocal trading on your part—an instance where you forgot your party and your party label and exchanged it for a vote to protect what you are pleased to term the American way of life; what I call the good old-fashioned principles of a Government consisting of checks and balances.

Yes, I will go along with you when I think you are right, no matter how you vote, but in all decency and all fairness, why should you not come across on this proposition?

You know very well that these two amendments are offered for the sole purpose of protecting the legislative functions of the House as prescribed in the Constitution. If word had come down from the administration to support them, you would have swallowed them with a smile and lauded them to high heaven and, had a Republican ventured to raise his voice against their adoption, he would have been the victim of your bitter criticism.

You know very well the Constitution provides that we here in the House, acting with those in the Senate, should pass legislation. Now what do you propose to do? What you want us to do now is just this: You want us to give the President authority to submit a plan. That is fine. No one has any objection to that. But you go further, and you say, when he sends that plan down here, it shall become the law if he can get the Senate to go along with him. I know what you are getting at. You think that, by some chance, the Republicans may carry the House at the next congressional election; but you know that you can hang on to control of the Senate. So, for another 2 years, if this bill becomes law, the President and the Senate will become the law-making body, and the House, even if it have a Republican majority of a hundred, can twiddle its thumbs or sit on its hands.

Do you remember 2 years ago when we tried in the House to stop this custom of holding up food-laden trucks until the driver paid the union's price to use the public highways? Mr. Justice Roberts said that practice was no better than highway robbery. The unions charged the farmers for every truckload of food that went into the city. That bill went over to the other body and there it was killed.

What do we do today? If these strikes go on today—encouraged by the Wagner Act, the PAC, the Communists—if they should go on tomorrow and the day after, there may be a shortage of food in the city of Washington. We all hope not, but once again I point to that only as an illustration of what happens when you give someone a blank check, either of money or authority.

I ask, Why should we not here today reaffirm our allegiance to the Constitution? Why should we not go back to the old way, the proven way, the sound, safe way? Why should we not go back and say to the people who sent us here: "Yes; we will follow the constitutional method. We will let whoever wishes introduce a bill or propose a plan, but before it becomes law we will require approval by a majority vote of both the House and the Senate."

That is all I am asking. There is nothing unfair about it. It is the patriotic way. It is the legal way. It is the proper way.

Will not you gentlemen today let your reverence for the Constitution, your feeling of loyalty to it, sweep you out of and above your adherence to party politics?

I ask each one of you individually how you can justify a vote which in effect ignores your responsibility for the enactment of legislation; which proclaims to the country that you will not longer support the constitutional way of enacting laws?

How ever again can you stand on the floor of this House and talk about adherence to constitutional processes if you today, by rejecting these amendments, shirk your responsibility, vote to destroy the constitutional provision that requires the affirmative action of a majority of both Houses before a proposal can become a law?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the consideration of this amendment to the bill comes so late in the day, when everybody is tired, because I am convinced that in some respect this is the most important part of the bill. The people of this country are crying out against overgrowth, overlapping, duplication, and waste in Government. They are crying out against centralization of power. Yet in this very bill, in which we provide for reorganization with the idea of achieving economy and more efficiency and eliminating duplication, and so forth, we are making a vast grant of power to the President, without reserving for ourselves the right to pass on whether or not he uses that power wisely.

I am not afraid of granting him that power if we have a chance to review it. I want him to have the power. I know he is in a better position to provide a good reorganization plan than any of us here is, but I cannot believe that it is a wise or sound legislative policy for us to make a delegation of power to the President to prepare a reorganization plan and then allow the plan to go into effect if only one House agrees, even though the other House disapproves it. That is the essential question, whether we want to have a plan go into effect with the approval of only one House, no matter how bitterly it may be opposed by the other House.

Every month each House passes legislation which then goes to the other body, where it either is not taken up, or is considered and rejected. Does it become law just because one House approved it? Of course not. Yet, here we are commissioning the President to prepare a plan and submit it to the Congress, and if one House disapproves it 10 to 1, but it squeaks by in the other House by only 1 vote, it goes into effect and becomes the law of the land.

To do that is to abdicate our responsibility for making sure that the power which we have properly delegated is wisely used, in accordance with the objectives we have laid down in section 2 of the bill. I am not suggesting any lack of confidence in the present President of the United States, because I personally have great confidence in his integrity and the soundness of his judgment; but no President or his advisers can be all-wise. That is why we have division of responsibilities under our Constitution. We in Congress have certain responsibilities we cannot escape. One of them is for the form, character, and functions of executive agencies.

Besides, this bill grants power that will exist until July 1, 1948. Is there anybody here who can be sure that the power will never be used by anybody other than the present occupant of the White House? Surely it is not improper to recognize frankly that every man's life is unpredictable. Nobody can be sure there will be no change in personnel or circumstances in the next 2½ years. It seems to me indefensible for us to make such a delegation of the responsibility and power which are ours without reserving the right to make final decision as to whether or not they are properly used.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In previous reorganization acts has there not always been some provision that there must be the affirmative approval of at least one of the

Houses of Congress before the reorganization could go into effect?

Mr. JUDD. It is my understanding that in some of the legislation there has been a requirement of positive approval by Congress, or a provision that it would go into effect only if within a certain period there had been no disapproving resolution passed by either body.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But here we are going still another step.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If my colleague will permit me to, I have here——

Mr. JUDD. I know what the gentleman is going to say, that the language in the bill is in accordance with the act of 1939.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With the gentleman's permission I am going to say this, that in both the act of 1939 and the act of 1932 it was provided that if within 60 days no action were taken these orders automatically became the law. I am answering the question of the gentleman directly and by the record.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; and it was under that 1939 act that a thing happened which many people here believe was unwise—the transfer of the CAA into the Department of Commerce. That reorganization plan was disapproved, as I recall, by a vote of 4 to 1 in this House, but it was approved in the other body by a narrow margin and became the law, despite our objection. It was under that law which the House had disapproved that the CAA was placed under the Department of Commerce, so that it ceased to be a wholly independent quasijudicial agency and became subject to the control of the Secretary of Commerce, who is a political appointee. I hope we will cling to the principle of not allowing so important a plan as authorized in this bill to become effective unless both Houses have expressed their approval. If approval is given by both Houses, the reorganization will go into effect. If one House does not approve, then surely it ought not to go into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, each person must, of course, approach this question as he sees it. I must support this amendment, but I reserve the right to present my own reasons for wanting to support the amendment, so that I will not be adopting those of anyone else. Again this is a question which is as fundamental as was that one which was present in the amendment which I offered heretofore and which was defeated.

I anticipate, because of the complexities of the economy in which we live, a time in the future when we are going to have to delegate more authority than we have heretofore delegated to the executive branch of the Government, if we are going to make our economy work. If we do that, I will not be one of the Members to quarrel, because I am not afraid of delegating authority to executives; but I want to preserve the purpose of the Congress of the United States, which I think was well designed when we created this Constitution, and that is that the Congress shall be jealous of the powers which it delegates and that it shall reserve to itself a clear and unquestioned right as a Congress to check constantly upon the action of the Executive.

I wish to appeal to those Members in this body who call themselves "liberal" and say to them that it is high time that being a "liberal" did not mean simply following a party line all the time; that it is high time that being a "liberal" on the question of material things, on the question of economic things, is not the sole test.

There is not a person in this body who will go further than I in seeking a solution to the numerous problems that I think confront this country to give people greater comfort than they have heretofore enjoyed, but along with that the job of being a "liberal," as far as I am concerned, means paying attention to the means by which you attain the ends.

I issue the warning that those of you who grin at what I am saying today some day in the future either your children or your children's children are going to regret any action that you take that weakens the power of the Congress of the United States because it is the only check they will have upon abuse of authority which of necessity the Congress will have to give to the executive branch of the Government in the future, no matter what political party operates and controls this Government.

So I am asking you to preserve certain fundamental checks and balances without which you cannot operate or control a regulated economy in a democracy, as we understand that word. The greatest government ever conceived, as far as I know, is our American system, containing the powers and the checks and the balances inherent in the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, ordinarily I feel that I should not intrude myself upon the deliberations of the Committee of the Whole; but we have started out here to try to pass a workable reorganization bill, and I repeat, a workable bill, one under which the executive department of the Government may reorganize the various departments of government. I may say in passing that the people of the United States, in my opinion, are very much interested in reorganization of the departments of Government, because they think it means two things, and I agree with them and hope that they will be brought about. First, it will mean more efficiency in government, and, second, it will mean economy in government.

If we are going to pass a bill to allow reorganization, then we should not throw stumbling blocks in the way that will prevent reorganization. The pending amendment provides:

That there has been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress favors the reorganization plan.

If this amendment is agreed to, if I can read and interpret legislation correctly, we will be back exactly where we are now, for the simple reason that the Congress by a joint resolution or by a bill, going through the same labor that it would in passing a concurrent resolution, could reorganize these departments itself, and, in my opinion, may I repeat, if the pending amendment is adopted you might just as well strike the enacting clause out of the bill, because delays might defeat a reorganization, delay can defeat a reorganization, and it is easy to delay in the House, and it is easy to delay in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the fact again that if this amendment is adopted we are back exactly where we started, because the Congress would, in effect, have to legislate just exactly like it does now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is no change made in the procedure provided in the bill except the change that the House must express its approval. The language that the gentleman is talking about, with the exception of two or three words, is in there now and there can be no delay under the bill either as written or as amended.

Mr. RAYBURN. The Congress might adjourn, it might filibuster.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am afraid the gentleman does not understand the amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. I understand the amendment all right. I saw the amendment day before yesterday. I repeat, if this amendment is adopted, we are in the same position practically from a legislative standpoint and from a reorganization standpoint that we are in now.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Texas came down from the rostrum and spoke from the floor, he showed that he was subject to the same frailties that any of the rest of us are. He made a statement about the effect of this amendment which he had to amend and which I want to further amend. The 60-day limitation or speed-up or streamlining of legislative action, title II, remains in the bill under the Hoffman amendment. All that happens under the Hoffman amendment is that you must have two Houses favoring it instead of having a situation that we faced here in this Chamber when we voted down decisively the reorganization plan with Democratic votes, and the plan went into effect in spite of our action. This bill is really misnamed. It is called a bill for the reorganization of the executive departments. It does not provide any mandatory reorganization of any department at all. This bill should properly be called a bill for the reorganization of Congress. I am for the streamlining of Congress and bringing about more rapid action. If we adopt this amendment and preserve the all-important and elaborately worked-out rules for the House and for the Senate in title II, these rules will prevent filibusters and delaying tactics

in either body, and the gentleman from Texas is wrong. There are no provisions for delay in this amendment, if adopted, title II is preserved. With the provision for the speed-up in the reorganization plan we have taken a great step forward. Furthermore, we have done it in a constitutional way.

Let me read the words of former Attorney General Mitchell, the opinion which has been kicked around as if it in some way upheld this one-chamber proposition that is in this bill now. The Attorney General's opinion, which is obiter on this whole subject, had to do with whether the Committee on Ways and Means could reserve power in legislation to review tax refunds. Here is what the Attorney General said on page 63 with reference to whether legislation permitting a review of an administrative act would be valid:

> No one would question the power of Congress to provide for delay in the execution of such an administrative order, or its power to withdraw the authority to make the order, provided the withdrawal takes the form of legislation.

What we have done here is to put the withdrawal of approval of an Executive order, if a mere Executive suggestion for reorganization may be called an order, in the form of legislation by action of both Houses. What we are doing by title II is to speed up by vote of both Houses, if this bill passes both Houses, the method by which these reorganization plans can be considered so that there can be no delay and there can be no filibuster. What we do when we pass the Hoffman amendment is simply to provide that our review shall be legislative. If you will read the words of the Mitchell opinion, which have been quoted so much, you will find that anything less than legislation to review an administrative order is unconstitutional. So, therefore, I urge, at a time when representative government is on trial all over the earth, that we take this step to streamline our Government, yes, but to preserve our integrity and our independence as a body under our Constitution.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend who has just taken his seat has favored the proposed amendment because he suggests that because it is a concurrent resolution by both Houses it does not violate the judgment of the former Attorney General because the fact that both Houses concur in passing the resolution of disapproval makes it a legislative process. With all due respect to my friend, I beg to call attention to the fact that a concurrent resolution is not a legislative process. Legislative process requires the approval of the House and the Senate and the President to make a law. There are the exceptions with which you are all familiar, of course, holding a bill too long or having the objection overridden.

It seems to me that we might compromise and do anything that ought to be done. This is no contest between the Houses of Congress and the President. As a practical matter the Houses of Congress cannot reorganize these executive agencies. Members of Congress do not have time to do it. That job has to be delegated to the President or rather to the executive branch of the Government. Both Houses must concur in the delegation of that power. Each House could refuse to delegate the power as completely as if it were the entire Congress. It is in entire harmony with that distribution of governmental power and responsibility for each House to retain in itself that same power, when it comes to examine and pass. The executive branch of the Government has discharged the commission from the Congress to prepare and submit plans of reorganization. In order to effectuate that arrangement we would provide that either House could pass a resolution of disapproval and then the reorganization would not go into effect. It ought not to go into effect if either of the delegating Houses disapproved the result of the action of their agent. It must be borne in mind that that is a legislative duty which has been delegated to the President. It would not be any evidence of disrespect or lack of confidence to provide for approval by the Houses of Congress before the plan of reorganization goes into effect. I feel sufficient opportunity would be afforded if affirmative approval be not required, but there be retained in this law to each House the power effectively to disapprove. That arrangement ought to give assurance to those who are concerned that the bill not go into effect if it does not meet congressional approval, and would remove any apprehension that there might be a filibuster somewhere which would prevent an expression of legislative judgment. I understand there is some effort in this bill to establish rules of procedure which would govern each House in the consideration of the concurrent resolution provided for in this bill. I do not know what may have been held on that point but I do know that each House of Congress is as sovereign and independent of the Congress with reference to its rules as is the House of Commons independent of the Congress.

Some doubt is expressed as to the constitutionality of the provisions which attempt to make laws terminable upon the passing of these resolutions. I have no doubt as to the constitutionality. There would be no attempt anywhere to repeal legislation by these resolutions or by anything that might be done later on. This provision for such termination is incorporated into the law, it is a part of the law. It is a provision that upon the happening of a certain contingency, agreed to by the House, agreed to by the Senate, and approved by the President, the law would terminate; it becomes a part of the law. If you provide in this law that on the happening of a certain contingency, namely, the adoption of a resolution by the House or the Senate that it does not favor a reorganization that contingency becomes a part of the law, and on the happening of that contingency the plan does not go into effect.

It is a good thing in connection with all these extraordinary powers that are conferred upon the Executive that the legislative branch holds a strong grip on these powers. It is a good arrangement all around. First if such control is retained there will not be withholding of such power which the public interest requires they exercise, because they would remain under the control of the Houses of Congress to which they belong. That power ought to remain here. It ought to remain in the House and in the Senate. We ought not to be afraid to delegate to the President powers which the Houses of Congress cannot well exercise and the President can be assisted in the discharge of these delegated powers by the retention by the Houses of Congress of responsibility, helpful responsibility, under our system of government.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I suspect that I have talked more than my share of the time on this measure. If I have done that, it is because I have some very deep convictions about this whole proposition.

As you know, I contended as vigorously as I could for the exemption of some of the great independent agencies of the Government. It seemed to me, and I still believe, we owed it to ourselves and to the country to protect the independence of those agencies and to see to it they are not hereafter subjected to political control and domination. However, the majority of the membership did not see that as I saw it.

Now, we come to this further question. Having refused to exempt these agencies, what further responsibility do we have to see to it that the proper safeguards are reserved to the Congress of the United States in connection with this great grant of authority? The accomplishment of worth-while reorganization is a fine objective for which we strive, and I likewise strive with you. But what are we doing? As the gentleman from Texas pointed out, normally it takes an affirmative vote of the House and of the Senate and affirmative action by the President, or lack of negative action, in order that a measure become law. Many of these agencies that will be affected by this legislation if it becomes law are creations of the Congress of the United States.

How far shall we go in our effort to accomplish this worthy objective? First of all, we transfer the legislative power, or at least the legislative initiative in the first instance, to the executive branch of the Government. The executive initiates action, the executive plans it, the executive outlines the plan and sends it to the Congress. What do we get for that in return? We get for that the veto power, the power which under the Constitution normally lies within the executive branch of the Government.

Some might contend that to get reorganization we should go so far as to say to the Executive, "Here is a complete blank check. Do what you will with any

agency created by the Congress. But whatever it is, we say beforehand that it is all right." How many of you would contend for that sort of thing? I daresay very few.

Now, what is the next step we can take? We can say, "Mr. President, we give you power to initiate this program. We admit our lethargy, but we are not going to let it become effective if either House objects or rather if a concurrent resolution of the Congress is not enacted within a fixed time approving the subjected plan."

Or we could provide, as the committee says we should, that unless both Houses affirmatively reject the plan, then it shall become effective.

Now the only thing I want is that when we trade the legislative power for the veto power we do not get shortchanged. Under the committee proposal, we are going to be short-changed. We are going to put ourselves in a position where the Executive by obtaining the assent of one body of the Congress can tear up and destroy and subject to political domination the agencies we ourselves have created and for which we should be responsible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that either the Hoffman amendment or the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] will be adopted. We created these agencies for good purposes and to perform some particular service. If we just retain only a negative veto power over what the President may do, we have no real assurance that our legislative intent as to whether the agencies are to be continued or what is to be done with them will be able to find expression. I think we might as well admit the facts of the case, that we are delegating power to reorganize because the Congress does not have a staff sufficient to give us the facts which would enable us to intelligently reorganize the departments. We do not have the staff to find out all the things these agencies are doing and what kind of reorganization we should have. Therefore, we delegate to the Executive the power to recommend reorganizations.

The La Follette-Monroney committee is going to make its recommendations on the strengthening of Congress. We hope that they will recommend that the committees of this Congress have adequate, well-equipped staffs to study the makeup of these departments and agencies, to see whether they are actually functioning properly; to see whether there are overlapping functions, and to see whether consolidations and mergers should be put into effect.

So it seems to me that since Congress will probably soon be in a position to do this work itself, we should not at this time turn the whole thing over to the President. As I said before, I do not have any fear about any particular agency under President Truman. This is an unhealthy and undemocratic precedent we are about to establish. The people expected us to create these agencies and they expect us to see that they continue to operate for the purpose for which they were created. We should have our committees strengthened. Let us get better staffs, so that we can study the work of these agencies and have a larger share of determining what reorganizations should be accepted. I think we will be able to pass on the matter effectively. I am not in favor of retaining only a negative vote. I think both Houses should say whether these reorganization plans should go into effect, or at least one House should speak affirmatively.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I just want this House to understand that Congress still holds the purse strings and still has power.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; but we should have control over their organizational make-up.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, possibly it would be the right and proper thing for Congress to approve any changes that are made. If the Congress must approve them before they are made, you will see more lobbying by Government departments in this House of Representatives than you have ever seen in all your lives. Every department of Government will be here on your neck as soon as the President makes a proposal to do something to try to cut down, consolidate, or eliminate some of the departments and functions of Government. You will not get any place by adopting these amendments. I am not for them, because I am for consolidation of departments and bureaus, and elimination of functions so as to get economy in Government operation which is imperative if we are to keep from going into bankruptcy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We have listened to you for 8 or 9 years yelling against blank checks on the Treasury and on the taxpayers, and now you come along and advocate giving a blank check to the President for arbitrary power.

Mr. RICH. I told you yesterday that if this was 6 months ago I would not do it. I know if you are going to save this Nation, if you are going to get any economy in Government, if you are going to reorganize, the only way to get results is to do it this way, even if it is the wrong way, because I do not have the faith in Congress that they will do it. They are afraid to do the job. That is the reason I am going to take a chance on President Truman. If he does not do it, God save America. Its top-heavy Government will swamp us and the New Deal is responsible for that.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I would like to say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned I am not willing to abandon the principle on the admission that the people of this Congress are not capable of doing their duty.

Mr. RICH. I am admitting it. That is the difference between you and me.

When I have seen lobbying as I have seen it here in the last 10 years I am forced to stop and think, for all too often when Members are approached by these people in the departments they yield, and we do not get any place; in other words, we have a wishbone instead of a backbone. They do not do the best for the Government; they think too much of themselves.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has said, has he not, that this is the last time he will give away that power? Did not the gentleman on yesterday say this is the last time he would give away that power?

Mr. RICH. I have never given it away before; since I have been in Congress I have always been against giving it away. The reason I am trying it now is in an effort to save America from the results of a Congress that tried to spend the Government into prosperity and who dreadfully failed.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman said this was the last chance.

Mr. RICH. This is the last chance; yes; this is the last chance for America to save herself. If she does not save herself now, God will have to save her, because Congress never will, so far as a reorganization is concerned of the Government. The right way will not get results, so I am trying this one. It cannot make conditions worse.

Mr. JUDD. Did the gentleman ever hear what the Reichstag did when it lost faith in itself?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, let us review a little of the history of reorganization in this very Chamber. We hear allegations about abandoning the republican form of government unless this amendment is adopted. To a person in the gallery or to a person reading the newspapers it would appear that this provision of the bill was a new proposition in this body. I was a Member of this body in 1932 when former President Hoover recommended a reorganization bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. As I remember it, the 1932 act under which Mr. Hoover sought to reorganize the Government provided that the reorganization proposal could be defeated by a negative vote in one body of the Congress. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am coming to that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That act provided that unless we took some action, the reorganization went into effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot resist the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The suggestion made by the gentleman from Mississippi would, of course, indicate the pattern that has been suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, let us look a little at the history of this legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the majority leader yield for just one question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman remember that not so long ago, the distinguished Speaker of the House and the gentleman from Massachusetts himself took the floor and told us that unless we passed the work-or-fight bill we were just gone? It went over to the Senate and they buried it. How about that?

Mr. McCORMACK. What has that to do with this?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It just indicates that the gentleman is not a good prophet; that is all.

Mr. McCORMACK. That does not necessarily follow; I will place my record on prophecy over the years against that of the gentleman from Michigan; but let us look a little at the history of reorganization.

In 1932 former President Hoover, who was elected as a Republican, but who was my President nonetheless, recommended a reorganization bill. We delegated the power to him. In that case it became the law after 60 days unless one House rejected it, but the principle of delegation of power to the President was involved; that is the basic question. In 1939 we passed another reorganization bill, and the very provisions contained in this bill were contained in that bill; so we find that on at least two previous occasions, this very body has passed reorganization bills with the principles of delegation of power to the President of the United States involved in both; in one case to a President elected as a Republican, and in the other case to a President elected as a Democrat.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman does not contend that those are identical provisions, does he?

Mr. McCORMACK. The question of delegation of power, the basic proposition is that there was a delegation of power.

Mr. PLOESER. Would the gentleman accept the 1932 provisions in this bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. This is an improvement over the 1932 provisions.

Mr. PLOESER. That is the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. McCORMACK. This provision follows out the very recommendations made by Attorney General Mitchell when he criticized, as I remember it, a provision confining it only to action of one House. He said in substance it should be taken up in both Chambers.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. PLOESER. I just want to make it clear that the gentleman's contention that this is following the pattern of 1932 is not actually true.

Mr. McCORMACK. The important fact remains that in 1932 there was a delegation of power to the then President of the United States.

Mr. PLOESER. The House gave up its power?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no.

Mr. PLOESER. Not under the 1932 bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is trying to quibble over details. The basic question involved was delegation of power and on several occasions in the past the Congress of the United States has passed reorganization bills delegating powers, in my time in this body on one occasion to a President who was elected as a Republican and on another occasion to a President elected as a Democrat. As a matter of fact, we passed another reorganization bill, as I remember it, either in 1933 or 1934, and there was a complete delegation of power on that occasion, which delegation of power was not abused.

Let us look frankly at the situation. If we were doing the right job the Congress would reorganize, but we know from a practical angle that it is difficult for the Congress to do it. I can remember within the past 4 or 5 years in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Legislature passed a reorganization bill giving to the Governor complete delegation of power. I supported it on that occasion. The Governor is the chief executive of the State and is the head of the executive branch of the State. The President is the Chief Executive of our country and the head of the executive branch of the United States Government. What better place to delegate power in connection with reorganization of the executive branch of the Government than to the head of that branch, in the case of the State the Governor and in the case of the United States the President?

We have to do it from a practical angle. We realize there are practical difficulties that prevent any legislative body from bringing about an effective reorganization. You and I are practical legislators and we have to view this question from a practical angle. I will agree that theoretically the legislative body, the Congress of the United States or the legislature of a State, should do it, but then there are the practical difficulties that we all know exist. We are placing it in the hands of a man elected in the case of a governor of a State by the people of that State and in the case of the President of the United States, elected by the people of the United States through our electoral systems.

This bill is carefully couched with protective language. The provision is the same as contained in the 1939 act. The basic question of delegation of power is the same as the 1932 act. I hope the provisions of the bill will be supported by the Committee of the Whole and that the Hoffman and Judd amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I am gratified at the stand taken in this debate by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and by my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in opposition to this effort to have the House of Representatives surrender its lawmaking duty and power to the Chief Executive and to give to the President a blank check to exercise the legislative function that this House should hold in its own hands.

You may surrender to the executive branch the power to legislate placed in the hands of Congress by the Constitution. By so doing you will strike another blow at the power and prestige of the lawmaking branch of this Government.

Eager hands are stretched forth to seize and exercise this power. By voting in favor of the amendments to require the President to submit to Congress his plan of reorganization for an affirmative vote of approval before it becomes effective, we hold in our hands the power and the duty that is ours to protect the people. Only by so doing can we free them from being bedeviled by incomprehensible rules, regulations, and interpretations promulgated and enforced by New Deal bureaucrats. The extent to which the citizen has been shoved out of court into New Deal bureaus, and has been put constantly in need of a lawyer to help him keep out of jail is the result of Congress surrendering its lawmaking powers to appointed officers responsible to nobody except the boss who put them in office.

A Washington bureaucrat, who believes in bypassing Congress, recently said in a public speech:

> Speaking of opportunity, are the lawyers of this country, men and women, going to take full advantage of their opportunities in administrative law? It is the most rapidly expanding area of law practice today. There are some 217 special courts, bureaus, and commissions which today decide upon and administer various Federal laws directly affecting citizens and business firms in this country. This does not take into account similar State quasi-judicial bodies.
>
> Administrative law, through the Federal Communications Commission, regulates the programs you hear on your radio and determines the use of the telephone and telegraph in our country today. Administrative law, through the Federal Trade Commission, determines various trade practices within the industries of this Nation. Administrative law, through the OPA and other departments, regulates what food you may buy and what you may pay for it.

With all due deference to my lovable friend from Massachusetts, the majority leader, I was surprised when he advanced the idea that theoretically speaking the Congress ought to be the legislative body but that practically we ought to delegate our power to the Chief Executive. We all know that the Chief Executive will not himself work out this reorganization plan. If we put this vast power in his hands he will delegate it to God knows who and they will hand him a plan of reorganization and he will hand to the Congress a reorganization plan prepared by bureaucrats, none of

whom were elected by the people and who are not responsible to the people.

What representative of a firm or what representative of a corporation would give the power of attorney to someone he does not know to map out the future of that concern's business without the members of the firm or the board of directors of the corporation having the right to say whether or not they approved the plan that the man holding the power of attorney proposed? Let us not forget that the people of this country are tired of being ruled from Washington by bureaucrats. All over this country, in the minds of Democrats, in the minds of Republicans, and in the minds of all the people there is a conviction, a deep-seated conviction, that the Congress must recapture the vast power that it has yielded to the Chief Executive, and that the Chief Executive has exercised without congressional sanction. I am amazed that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is willing to surrender his power and responsibility as a Member of this House and turn over the rights and interests of his constituents to an unknown bunch of executive employees. He has long been the most vocal and persistent critic of Executive usurpation of power. And I am not prepared to admit that this House will filibuster and thus defeat a reorganization plan. It cannot filibuster. We are fighting over this bill—but we are not filibustering. I have been here 6 years, and I have never seen any lobbyists. And if any wicked and seductive lobbyists menace any Member of this House, I feel certain the membership of this House will go to the rescue of the Member thus put in peril. Let us retain and hold in our hands the right to say whether or not we approve of the reorganization plan that may be worked for or by the President. As I said, it will not be his plan; it will be somebody else's plan. I want it to be my plan and your plan. The people that I represent and the people that you represent expect us to stand four square as their representatives here and to retain the constitutional prerogatives of this House and restore legislative government to this Republic. I hope that this amendment is adopted.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I think there is a great deal of confusion in the minds of some Members that has not been cleared up. I would like to have the gentleman, who is a very able lawyer, tell us if there is not a vast fundamental difference between the 1932 reorganization and the pending legislation. In the 1932 act one of the Houses of Congress, either the House or the Senate, could absolutely exercise the veto power by refusing to accept any reorganization scheme or recommendation or plan by the President of the United States, whereas under the pending bill the President, by getting the support of one of the bodies of Congress, can enact a law as though it had been passed by the Congress?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is true.

Mr. Chairman, every dictator the world has ever known strode to power over the wreckage of legislative government. Totalitarian states are builded on the ruins of the surrendered and usurped powers of the lawmaking branch of the government. And hence it was that the founding fathers in article I of the Constitution, in the first section, provided:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

And after the vast and exclusive legislative powers of Congress were enumerated in the Constitution, paragraph 18 of section 8 provides:

> Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or any department or office thereof.

And by article VI of the Constitution, paragraph 2, it is declared:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, shall be the supreme law of the land.

I took an oath "to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic"; to "bear true faith and allegiance to the same"; I took "this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion."

I shall vote in favor of these amendments to retain and exercise the exclusive lawmaking power of Congress on the reorganization, abolition, and consolidation of the sprawling executive agencies of the Government. My vote will be determined by what I conceive to be the plain letter and spirit of the Constitution and my oath of office. If either the Hoffman or the Judd amendment is adopted, I shall vote for the bill. If they are both defeated, I shall vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to verify something that I hope is true. A short time ago Colonel Taylor of the American Legion called me and asked if I thought that the Veterans' Administration would come under the provisions of this bill. He said the American Legion was very much opposed, and I could quote him as saying that it was opposed to having the Veterans' Administration come under the provisions of this reorganization bill. I told him I thought the Veterans' Administration was exempted. Is that correct? I want to get the facts into the RECORD.

Mr. MANASCO. The Veterans' Administration is not excepted from reorganization, but if a reorganization plan is put into effect and transmitted to the Congress then that plan must come up separately. We have the right to vote it up or down on its own merits. I am sure the gentlewoman will recall that the Veterans' Administration was recently reorganized under the provisions of the War Powers Act. If this bill is not passed, the recent reorganization will die 6 months after the expiration of the first War Powers Act.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the Veterans' Administration be reorganized into another department under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. MANASCO. No, it cannot.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is my understanding. As the gentleman from Tennessee knows I have a reorganization bill before his committee, which would create a veterans' department with a cabinet position. He has promised me a hearing.

The amendment of the gentleman from Michigan would serve as a safeguard against having the Veterans' Administration reorganized without the approval of both the House and the Senate. As it is not exempted I think the Veterans' Administration would be exempted from the provisions of this bill and I hope the Senate will take action to exempt it. The Veterans' Administration should be reorganized under a separate law approved by both the House and the Senate.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the time allotted to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts be given to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the observation that we have delegated time and again power to the President to create bureaus and organizations. This bill seeks to delegate to him power to destroy them. I have been amazed and distressed by the crocodile tears that have been shed here over what some allege to be an abrogation of legislative power. We have abrogated powers time and again for affirmative action in the creation of bureaus and agencies. Now we seek to delegate power to destroy them.

If we are going to hamstring the President and require any affirmative action by this Congress, we are not going to get any reorganization. Let us just be honest and sincere in this matter and give the President a chance. He says he will do the job, and if he does not do it, the responsibility is his. I would not say that any of my friends on the left would want to play any politics, but if you do, then put some responsibility on the Chief Executive and let him act; if he does not act, the responsibility is his. You could then rightfully criticize for inaction.

We know what happens in this Congress when the departments come up here and lobby for exemptions of one kind or another. Let us not impose a handicap or an obstacle in the way of effective reorganization. Let us give the President a chance to reduce some of these bureaus and agencies, to stop, if you please, this disastrous mushroom growth of bureaucracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the argument just made, I do

not believe the gentleman from Texas is so naive as to believe that argument has very much force. When this Congress delegated power to the Executive to do certain things the Executive by Executive order created certain agencies of Government, and the President by the same token of the use of the Executive order has stopped, obliterated, and transferred those agencies at will and is doing so today.

The difference that the gentleman from Texas and many others do not seem to appreciate is this: If we pass this legislation without this amendment we are saying to the President of the United States, "You have the power in the reorganization of Government to destroy or change or separate or transfer the functions and powers of every single department and agency of Government, including those that this Congress has created by legislative enactment that are creatures of the law and not creatures of Executive order. All that is necessary for you to do, Mr. President, is to submit that plan and have the affirmative approval of one branch of the Congress."

I believe in reorganization and I tried in my small way as a member of the Committee on Appropriations to bring about some reorganization through the medium of control of the purse. But I want you gentleman to understand, my good Democratic friends, that you are now asking for reorganization and you want the President to have the right to respond to the overwhelming demand that is sweeping this country today, but you cannot get away from your old policy of turning everything over to the Executive saying, "Now you do it and we will wash our hands of it." You have even converted my good friend, BOB RICH, to that philosophy—BOB RICH, who has stood here now for 9 years or more and argued every day on the floor of the House. He has now been converted to the philosophy that the Congress of the United States does not have the capacity or the ability to handle this proposition and, therefore, it must be turned over to the lawmaking drafters in the executive departments.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman spoke about me.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that the difficulty has been this. Suppose that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, brought a reorganization bill here, a proposal to reorganize the departments of government, and suppose that bill went before a legislative committee and hearings were held and it came on the floor of the House. You could pass it if you wanted to, could you not? You have the votes. You would have no difficulty if you truly meant to reorganize in the public interest. You have had the power for lo, these 12 years to do that very thing. I want to warn you, gentlemen, I cannot go along with this thing because I know that the action we are taking today is a surrender of congressional power and authority and is the very road along which they traveled over in Nazi Germany when the legislative functions were all merged into the authority of one man. I am not going to stand for that so far as my vote is concerned. I think the people of this country are asking that the Congress reassert its power and that the Congress make this reorganization. You and I were elected on that platform. Let the President submit his plan to the entire Congress and let both Houses of the Congress, the people's representatives, say whether they approve or disapprove. To do otherwise is to admit that representative government has failed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is recognized.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, an affirmative concurrent resolution is substantially specific legislation to provide for reorganization. It is substantially, as the distinguished Speaker of the House has said, passing legislation for reorganization by the Congress in the first instance. We have not passed it. No Congress heretofore has passed it. We have been debating this measure for 2 days, and I think we settled that matter when we adopted the policy declared in section 2 of this bill. Congress declares in the second section of this bill that reorganization could be effected by a delegation of powers with a definite standard and a definite subject matter better—and I quote from the second section which we approved—"can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation."

Let me tell the gentlemen who say we give to the President blanket authority, that we passed the First War Powers Act without a dissenting vote as I recall and without a single safeguard provided by this bill. He has the power to reorganize without complying with any of the conditions suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] without reporting to Congress. Now let us be practical. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches are coordinate branches of the Government. We say to the President, "Within these standards and with this subject matter, we confess we have never reorganized; we ask you, a coordinate branch of the Government, to submit a plan." Can we say any more or less for President Truman than we did, with propriety, in dealing with President Hoover and President Roosevelt? We say, "Mr. President, under the Constitution and laws, we have delegated this power to you. But these are peacetime agencies and we reserve two safeguards. You cannot combine Cabinet departments. We have got to have 60 days. Mr. President, with all deference, although you have done something that we ourselves confess we have never done and probably never will do, we reserve the right, with all deference to you as a coordinate branch of the Government, to disapprove." That is what the bill does.

I repeat that under the act of 1932 it was provided that after the expiration of 60 days, if there were no action by either branch of Congress, President Hoover's reorganizations would have become law. The pending provision that we are now asked to amend, to provide that we will go up the hill again, after delegating the power, is in the exact language of the Reorganization Act of 1939. It contains cloture. It has worked. It has been tried and tested. There is no question but that both branches of Congress can express themselves, and if both branches in 60 days disapprove the plan, the plan does not become the law. Let me ask you now, why discriminate? President Hoover asked for the power. He was a coordinate branch of the Government. So is President Truman. You are unable to do something as an individual and you ask a neighbor to do the job, and then you do him the fairness to say, "I reserve the right to disagree or disapprove. That is what we did for President Hoover, and for President Roosevelt. For my part I propose to be as fair to President Truman as I was to his predecessors.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were—ayes 111, noes 145.

So the amendments were rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said regarding President Hoover's position on this legislation.

The present bill contains almost the exact principle of such reorganization and consolidation enumerated in a message by President Hoover to the Congress on February 17, 1932. At that time he proposed that—

> Authority to * * * the President to effect these transfers and consolidations * * * by Executive order, such Executive order to be before Congress for 60 days during sessions thereof before becoming effective, but becoming effective at the end of such periods unless the Congress shall request suspension of action.

In that message, President Hoover advocated the consolidations upon the principle of major functions of the different agencies. Following this message, an authority was passed on June 30, 1932, by a Democratic Congress but provided that such Executive orders should not become effective unless Congress should approve them. This completely reversed President Hoover's proposal and in effect threw the whole business back into Congress. Nevertheless, he laid before Congress Executive orders consolidating 58 functions into 9 divisions. They were not confirmed and he stated publicly at that time that there would never be effective reorganization unless the original proposal was adopted. The Hoover principles are at last adopted in this bill, including the principle of consolidation according to major functions. If you look up the debate prior to the passage of the act of June 30, 1932, you will probably find that Republicans supported Hoover's principles and Democrats opposed them.

I have in my hand a letter written by ex-President Herbert Hoover on October 1, 1945. I read it to you:

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have your request for my views on H. R. 4129, giving authority to President Truman to reorganize the executive departments. There should be further clarifying exceptions of some quasi-judicial agencies but with that reservation I heartily favor the bill.

Incidentally that proposition was provided for in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. Mr. Hoover stated further:

Six successive Presidents over 35 years have recommended such reorganization. The overlap, waste, and conflict of policies between executive agencies have been a scandal for the whole 35 years.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD:

On page 8, line 25, strike out the words "the two Houses a concurrent" and insert in lieu thereof the words "either House a."

On page 9, line 1, strike out the words "the Congress" and insert in lieu thereof the word "it." So that after the semicolon in line 23, page 8, the section will read:

"But only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period, there has not been passed by either house a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the reorganization plan."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, there are two ways of accomplishing what I believe the majority of the Members of the House wants to do—that is, to continue the long-standing and tested legislative procedure whereby no action is taken under the authority of the Congress unless it has the approval of both Houses of the Congress.

The first method was that provided in the Hoffman amendment, requiring approval of a reorganization plan by affirmative vote of both Houses. The committee has rejected that amendment. The second way of accomplishing the same thing is provided in my amendment. Under it the plan submitted by the President will go into effect automatically unless within 60 days one House or the other passes a resolution disapproving the plan. That is the power we gave to Mr. Hoover, and inasmuch as the gentleman from Mississippi and others have just been objecting that the Hoffman amendment would not give the President the same power we gave to Mr. Hoover, I hope they will come along and approve of giving to the present President exactly what we gave to Mr. Hoover.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated that what we did in the case of the Hoover reorganization was to provide that if action was not taken, automatically the reorganization became the law.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, but we also provided in it "that if either branch of Congress within 60 calendar days shall pass a resolution disapproving of such Executive order, or any part thereof, such Executive order shall be null and void to the extent of such disapproval."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I did not discuss the other, but I will be glad to try to discuss it further.

Mr. JUDD. That is essentially the provision I want in this bill, the one that was in the 1932 act authorizing Mr. Hoover to reorganize. He could not do it if either House disapproved. I do not believe any President should be able to. Such a provision was in the original bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO]. We discussed it in committee and I favored it, but some said it had been declared probably unconstitutional by Attorney General Mitchell, so I did not press it at that time. I wish I had, because I have been working on it since and, while I am not a lawyer myself, I have a good deal of expert testimony here from men who are, and they believe it is wholly constitutional.

On March 8, 1939, when the 1939 act was being discussed in the House, the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted an amendment essentially the same as my amendment and he said:

In view of the fact I understand there is some notion of constitutional difficulties about having one House opposed to a proposed plan of reorganization to prevent its consolidation, I venture the opinion, and I have no uncertainty about it, that we may provide just as well for a resolution by one House to prevent a reorganization, from a constitutional standpoint, as we can by a resolution by both Houses.

The committee bill before us provides in section 6 that only a concurrent resolution by both Houses disapproving a reorganization plan can prevent the plan from going into effect. Presumably, the committee thinks that is a constitutional provision. The gentleman from Texas says that it is just as constitutional to provide, in the basic law setting up the whole machinery, that the plan can be prevented from going into effect by a simple resolution by one House as it is to provide that it can be prevented from going into effect by a concurrent resolution by both Houses.

Later in the debate the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] took the floor and discussed this Mitchell opinion, stating:

Some misunderstanding as to the application of the Mitchell opinion to the question before us grows out of the fact that there is a difference between the bill before the Congress in 1932 and the bill that is now before us. In the legislation of 1932 legislative power was being delegated to the President to provide for reorganization by Executive order. We have conferred no legislative power on the President in this bill.

That difference exists in the case of the bill before us today. If you examine every word you will nowhere find that legislative power is given to the President to reorganize by Executive order.

He is directed to investigate the organization of all agencies, to determine what changes are necessary to accomplish certain stipulated purposes. Then he is directed to prepare a reorganization plan; to transmit the plan to Congress; to state how much money he thinks it will save; and to specify under what laws any functions which he thinks should be abolished were authorized. Nowhere is he empowered to issue orders. So under the language of the bill we are not granting any legislative power to the President. He has no power to act to reorganize until and unless 60 days have elapsed after transmittal of the plan to Congress without the passage by both Houses of a concurrent resolution stating that the Congress does not favor the plan. Thus disapproving the plan would not be vetoing an administrative act.

May I continue with the quotation from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]:

Attorney General Mitchell rendered an opinion that an Executive order made under the grant of legislative power could not be vacated or set aside by any congressional action short of legislation. It is perfectly apparent to the membership of the House that this bill was drawn with the view of naming the President as the ministerial agent of the House rather than vesting in him legislative power, and therefore the provision contained in this bill whereby Congress may vacate any action taken by the President by concurrent resolution is perfectly valid, because it is a condition subsequent and is a part of the law itself.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I ask my distinguished colleague if there is any difference between the constitutional status of a concurrent resolution and a resolution by one House.

Mr. Cox. Let me say to my friend that because of the great concern of my colleagues on the Reorganization Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN], I experience great embarrassment in answering the gentleman's question, and yet I must not take the attitude of trying to conceal any honest opinion that I may entertain with respect to the proposition. I say to the gentleman, in answer to his question, that there is no difference whatsoever; that if it is within the competency of Congress to provide for vacating a plan that might be submitted under the bill by the President, by a concurrent resolution, it is of course equally within the right of Congress to provide that the order might be vacated by a simple resolution of either body.

Can anyone refute that argument? If it is constitutional for us to provide, as the bill does, for rejecting a plan by a concurrent resolution by both Houses, then surely it is constitutional for us to provide for rejection of a plan by a single resolution by one House.

So it seems to me that there can be no question about my amendment being unconstitutional. Under the bill as so amended we would merely be directing that the President prepare, according to our yardsticks, a plan and submit it to us, and that the plan would go into effect after 60 days if within that time there

had not been passed by either House a resolution disapproving. If either House disapproves the plan, it is not vetoing any action or order by the President. He will not have issued any orders. The House will merely be adopting or not adopting the plan he submits. Only after 60 days without disapproval by either House would he have power to issue reorganizing orders.

Under the amendment the plan will not go into effect if a majority of one House votes against it. If a majority of either House votes against it, I do not think it ought to go into effect, and it is hard for me to believe the majority of the Members of the House think otherwise. The reasons for disapproval will be brought out in the debate. Reorganization will not be killed, as you have been told this afternoon. The particular plan will merely go back to the President for such modification as will remove or reduce the objections, and the plan can then be resubmitted.

When Mr. Smith, the Director of the Budget, was before our committee, I asked him what would happen if the Congress approved parts of a plan but disapproved other parts.

Would it be possible to reject part, or would we have to disapprove the whole thing? He replied, on page 27 of the hearings:

> I believe, the way it is drafted, you would disapprove all of it, and the Executive would have to come back with a new plan.

Later he said on the same subject:

> The Executive would have to submit another plan, and undoubtedly the debate on the plan submitted and turned down would be a fairly clear indication of the objections of the Congress to the plan submitted.

So it simply is not true that adoption of this amendment means killing all reorganization or making reorganization impossible, as has been claimed. We would merely be saying to the President that we do not agree with certain parts of a particular plan, and we ask him to take it back, revise it, and bring it to us again. He has over two years and a half in which to make any desired changes.

Let him send down the best he and his advisers can devise and we will consider it. It will not be perfect; of course not. How many bills are sent here that we do not have to make some changes in; or how many bills are prepared by committees of this House that are not revised again and again? Why jam through a reorganization bill without each House having a chance to send it back, if it desires, for revision in certain respects? Nothing else becomes law if one House of the Congress disapproves. Why should a reorganization plan take effect if one House disapproves? This amendment would provide that the plan would go into effect unless one House takes action within 60 days to disapprove. Surely that is the minimum power we should reserve for the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have listened to the arguments of the Speaker, the majority leader, and the gentleman from Mississippi, a member of the committee, against the Hoffman amendment. As I got the force of their argument, it principally was that if no action was taken in the Congress by both Houses the plan would be defeated.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman's amendment completely meets that argument, does it not?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; under the Hoffman amendment the plan could not go into effect unless both Houses took action to approve. Under my amendment the plan goes into effect unless one House or the other takes action to disapprove. Surely those who thought requiring positive action to approve would make reorganization too difficult cannot properly object to my amendment on that score. It requires positive action to disapprove. At least one House must within 60 days pass a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the plan; otherwise the plan automatically takes effect. Can anything be more reasonable?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I know the gentleman wants to be accurate in his answer. The question was and the law was that if no action was taken the plan would become automatically effective. That is all the provisions of the previous law.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman contended that under the Hoffman amendment unless affirmative action was taken the plan would lapse.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I contended that under the Hoffman amendment unless no action were taken it would become the law, and that has been in every reorganization we have had.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, reorganization of the Government is a legislative function, and therefore our responsibility. I believe we should delegate power to the President to prepare the plan? I cannot approve granting him power to put it into effect with the approval of only one House. We must always have in the Congress the final decision on what is actually done. We cannot have that final decision unless this amendment is adopted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes, 2 minutes to be allotted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] and 5 minutes to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, when the Hoffman amendment was under observation and debate I suggested the objection to that amendment that it would require affirmative action on the part of the Houses of Congress. We are trusting the President. There is no complaint about the President. We have asked him to do a job. It is not any discourtesy that when the President has performed his service the results of his efforts shall come back to the two Houses of Congress and then, if either House of Congress disapproves what the President has done, or has some amendments to suggest, the thing will go back to the President for him to take into consideration the suggestions of the House.

It seems to me that as we face situations where we have to turn more and more power over to the executive branch of the Government the Houses of Congress ought to hold a little tighter grip on the results of the action of these departments. It ought to be so that when these departments, if we have to turn these powers and responsibilities over to them, have done the work we ask them to do, then the Houses of Congress ought to have an opportunity to disapprove if they take affirmative or negative action, as is provided for in the pending amendment. Congress cannot do these jobs. The President cannot work out these reorganizations. Yet they must be done. It is a bad situation. There is too much government here for the machinery of democratic government. As I see it it is a high duty of the Houses of Congress, which must delegate legislative duty, each to retain its duty to examine, and the power to disapprove and to terminate these extraordinary delegations of legislative power, as is proposed in the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, my good friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has discussed a perplexing legal question. Lawyers often differ. The provision that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] offers as a substitute for the provision in the bill would make that provision read just as it was in the Reorganization Act of 1932. It would enable either branch of Congress to pass a resolution and to defeat a plan of reorganization.

The Hoover Reorganization Act of 1932 was submitted to the then Attorney General. I give you his language, not mine. I inserted in yesterday's RECORD a brief where this matter as we propose it in this bill has been before the Supreme Court in two cases and has been approved. We repealed on March 3, 1933, the very provision that the gentleman would now insert, and we relied on Attorney General Mitchell. Attorney General Mitchell has been followed by Attorney General Cummings, who concurred with him. I read the opinion of Attorney General Mitchell, as I again say that the theory is that both branches of Congress, having conferred this power upon the Executive, both branches of Congress should disapprove it. I quote:

> It must be assumed that the functions of the President under this act were executive in their nature or they could not have been constitutionally conferred upon him. No one would question the power of Congress to provide for delay in the execution of such an administrative order or its power to withdraw the authority to make the order, provided the withdrawal takes the form of legislation. The attempt to give either House of Congress by action which is not legislation

the power to disapprove administrative acts raises a grave question as to the validity of the entire provision.

I repeat that Congress promptly in a few months and in every reorganization act since then has followed Attorney General Mitchell. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were—ayes 123, noes 139.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MANASCO and Mr. JUDD.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 145, noes 159.

So the amendment was rejected.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to inquire of the majority leader what the program will be for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad the gentleman has done so because with such a large attendance the membership will be advised.

There is no legislative program for either Monday or Tuesday.

On Wednesday the bill (H. R. 3517) providing a limited immigration quota for the people of India will be called up for consideration, with 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is to give the people of India an immigration quota like the rest.

Mr. McCORMACK. Like China, a quota of a hundred.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Seventy-five, I believe.

Mr. McCORMACK. Seventy-five or 100.

On Thursday and Friday the tax bill will be considered. So if we finish this bill tonight, there will be no further legislative program until next Wednesday.

REORGANIZATIONS IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, are there further amendments at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. There are no further amendments at the desk.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4129, pursuant to House Resolution 360, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with instructions that the committee report the bill back to the House with the following amendment:

On page 8, line 25, strike out the words "the two Houses a concurrent" and insert in lieu thereof the words "either House a"; and on page 9, line 1, strike out the words "the Congress" and insert in lieu therof the word "it," so that after the semicolon in line 23, page 8, the section will read:

"But only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60 day period, there has not been passed by either House a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the reorganization plan."

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 168, nays 192, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—168

Adams	Gearhart	McCowen
Allen, Ill.	Gerlach	McDonough
Allen, La.	Gifford	McGregor
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillespie	McMillen, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Gillette	Martin, Iowa
Andresen, August H.	Gillie	Martin, Mass.
Andrews, N. Y.	Goodwin	Mason
Angell	Graham	Merrow
Arends	Grant, Ind.	Michener
Arnold	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Auchincloss	Gross	Mott
Barrett, Wyo.	Gwynne, Iowa	Murray, Wis.
Bates, Mass.	Hale	O'Konski
Beall	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Peterson, Ga.
Bender	Hall, Leonard W.	Phillips
Bennet, N. Y.	Halleck	Ploeser
Bennett, Mo.	Hancock	Ramey
Bishop	Hand	Rankin
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Brehm	Henry	Reed, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Herter	Rees, Kans.
Brumbaugh	Heselton	Rizley
Buck	Hess	Robertson, N. Dak.
Buffett	Hill	Robsion, Ky.
Butler	Hoeven	Rockwell
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman	Rodgers, Pa.
Canfield	Holmes, Wash.	Rogers, Mass.
Carlson	Horan	Schwabe, Mo.
Case, N. J.	Howell	Schwabe, Okla.
Case, S. Dak.	Hull	Scrivner
Chenoweth	Jenkins	Shafer
Chiperfield	Jennings	Short
Church	Jensen	Simpson, Pa.
Clason	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Maine
Clevenger	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Wis.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Springer
Corbett	Jones	Starkey
Crawford	Jonkman	Stefan
Cunningham	Judd	Stevenson
Curtis	Kean	Stockman
D'Ewart	Keefe	Sumner, Ill.
Dirksen	Kefauver	Sumners, Tex.
Dolliver	Kilburn	Sundstrom
Dondero	Kinzer	Taber
Dworshak	Knutson	Talbot
Ellis	Kunkel	Talle
Ellsworth	LaFollette	Taylor
Elsaesser	Landis	Tibbott
Elston	Latham	Towe
Engel, Mich.	LeCompte	Vorys, Ohio
Fellows	Lemke	Vursell
Fuller	Lewis	Weichel
Fulton	Luce	Wigglesworth
Gamble	McConnell	Wilson
Gavin		Wolfenden, Pa.
		Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—192

Abernethy	Gordon	O'Neal
Andrews, Ala.	Gore	Outland
Bailey	Gorski	Pace
Baldwin, Md.	Gossett	Patrick
Barden	Granahan	Patterson
Barrett, Pa.	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Fla.
Bates, Ky.	Green	Pfeifer
Biemiller	Gregory	Philbin
Bland	Hare	Pickett
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Pittenger
Bonner	Harris	Poage
Boren	Hart	Price, Fla.
Bradley, Pa.	Havenner	Price, Ill.
Brooks	Hays	Priest
Brown, Ga.	Healy	Quinn, N. Y.
Bryson	Hedrick	Rabin
Buckley	Hefferman	Rains
Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Ramspeck
Bunker	Hoch	Randolph
Burch	Holifield	Rayfiel
Burgin	Hook	Resa
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Rich
Camp	Izac	Richards
Cannon, Mo.	Jackson	Riley
Carnahan	Jarman	Robinson, Utah
Chapman	Johnson, Luther A.	Roe, Md.
Chelf	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Fla.
Clements	Kee	Rogers, N. Y.
Cochran	Kelley, Pa.	Rooney
Coffee	Kelly, Ill.	Rowan
Combs	Kilday	Russell
Cooley	Kirwan	Ryter
Cooper	Kopplemann	Sabath
Courtney	Lane	Sadowski
Cox	Lanham	Sasscer
Crosser	Larcade	Savage
D'Alesandro	Lesinski	Sheppard
Daughton, Va.	Link	Sikes
Davis	Ludlow	Slaughter
De Lacy	Lyle	Smith, Va.
Delaney, James J.	Lynch	Snyder
Delaney, John J.	McCormack	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	McGlinchey	Sparkman
Domengeaux	McMillan, S. C.	Spence
Doughton, N. C.	Madden	Stewart
Douglas, Calif.	Mahon	Sullivan
Durham	Maloney	Tarver
Earthman	Manasco	Thom
Eberharter	Mansfield, Mont.	Thomas, Tex.
Engle, Calif.	Mansfield, Tex.	Thomason
Ervin	Marcantonio	Tolan
Fallon	May	Torrens
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Trimble
Fernandez	Mills	Voorhis, Calif.
Fisher	Monroney	Walter
Flannagan	Morgan	Wasielewski
Flood	Morrison	Weaver
Fogarty	Murdock	Weiss
Folger	Murphy	Whitten
Forand	Murray, Tenn.	Whittington
Gallagher	Neely	Wickersham
Gardner	Norrell	Winstead
Gary	O'Brien, Ill.	Woodhouse
Geelan	O'Brien, Mich.	Worley

NOT VOTING—71

Baldwin, N. Y.	Gibson	Powell
Barry	Granger	Rabaut
Beckworth	Gwinn, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.
Bell	Hagen	Rivers
Bolton	Hartley	Robertson, Va.
Boykin	Hébert	Roe, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Hendricks	Sharp
Campbell	Hinshaw	Sheridan
Cannon, Fla.	Holmes, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
Celler	Hope	Stigler
Clark	Kearney	Thomas, N. J.
Cole, Kans.	Keogh	Traynor
Colmer	Kerr	Vinson
Cravens	King	Wadsworth
Curley	Lea	Welch
Dawson	LeFevre	West
Dickstein	McGehee	White
Douglas, Ill.	McKenzie	Winter
Doyle	Mundt	Wolcott
Drewry	Norton	Wolverton, N. J.
Eaton	O'Hara	Wood
Elliott	O'Toole	Woodrum, Va.
Fenton	Patman	Zimmerman
Gathings	Plumley	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Kerr against.

Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Doyle against.

Mr. Baldwin of New York for, with Mr. Wood against.

Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Curley against.
Mr. Bradley of Michigan for, with Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Hartley for, with Mrs. Norton against.
Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Vinson against.
Mr. Simpson of Illinois for, with Mrs. Douglas of Illinois against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Stigler with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Robertson of Virginia with Mr. Hope.
Mr. West with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Cravens with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. King with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 305, nays 56, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—305

Abernethy	Crawford	Hall,
Adams	Crosser	Leonard W.
Allen, Ill.	Cunningham	Hand
Allen, La.	Curtis	Hare
Anderson, Calif.	D'Alesandro	Harless, Ariz.
Andresen,	Daughton, Va.	Harris
August H.	Davis	Hart
Andrews, Ala.	De Lacy	Hartley
Angell	Delaney,	Havenner
Arends	James J.	Hays
Auchincloss	Delaney,	Healy
Bailey	John J.	Hedrick
Baldwin, Md.	D'Ewart	Heffernan
Barden	Dingell	Henry
Barrett, Pa.	Dirksen	Herter
Barrett, Wyo.	Dolliver	Heselton
Bates, Ky.	Domengeaux	Hess
Bates, Mass.	Dondero	Hobbs
Beall	Doughton, N. C.	Hoch
Bender	Douglas, Calif.	Hoeven
Bennet, N. Y.	Durham	Holifield
Biemiller	Earthman	Holmes, Wash.
Blackney	Eberharter	Hook
Bland	Ellis	Huber
Bloom	Ellsworth	Izac
Bonner	Elsaesser	Jackson
Boren	Elston	Jarman
Bradley, Pa.	Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Calif.
Brooks	Engle, Calif.	Johnson,
Brown, Ga.	Ervin	Luther A.
Brumbaugh	Fallon	Johnson,
Bryson	Feighan	Lyndon B.
Buck	Fellows	Johnson, Okla.
Buckley	Fernandez	Judd
Buffett	Fisher	Kean
Bulwinkle	Flannagan	Kee
Bunker	Flood	Keefe
Burch	Fogarty	Kefauver
Burgin	Folger	Kelley, Pa.
Butler	Forand	Kelly, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Fuller	Kilburn
Camp	Fulton	Kilday
Canfield	Gallagher	Kirwan
Cannon, Mo.	Gamble	Knutson
Carlson	Gardner	Kopplemann
Carnahan	Gary	Kunkel
Case, N. J.	Gavin	LaFollette
Case, S. Dak.	Gearhart	Lane
Chapman	Geelan	Lanham
Chelf	Gerlach	Larcade
Chenoweth	Gifford	Latham
Church	Goodwin	LeCompte
Clason	Gordon	Lemke
Clements	Gore	Lesinski
Cochran	Gorski	Lewis
Coffee	Gossett	Link
Cole, Mo.	Granahan	Luce
Cole, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	Ludlow
Combs	Green	Lyle
Cooley	Gregory	Lynch
Cooper	Gross	McConnell
Corbett	Hale	McCormack
Courtney	Hall,	McDonough
Cox	Edwin Arthur	McGregor
McMillan, S.C.	Ploeser	Smith, Va.
McMillen, Ill.	Poage	Smith, Wis.
Madden	Powell	Snyder
Mahon	Price, Fla.	Somers, N. Y.
Maloney	Price, Ill.	Sparkman
Manasco	Priest	Spence
Mansfield,	Quinn, N. Y.	Starkey
Mont.	Rabin	Stefan
Mansfield, Tex.	Rains	Stevenson
Marcantonio	Ramey	Stewart
Martin, Mass.	Ramspeck	Stockman
May	Randolph	Sullivan
Merrow	Rankin	Sumners, Tex.
Michener	Rayfiel	Sundstrom
Miller, Calif.	Reece, Tenn.	Talbot
Miller, Nebr.	Rees, Kans.	Talle
Mills	Resa	Tarver
Monroney	Rich	Taylor
Morgan	Richards	Thom
Morrison	Riley	Thomas, Tex.
Murdock	Robertson,	Thomason
Murphy	N. Dak.	Tibbott
Murray, Tenn.	Robinson, Utah	Tolan
Murray, Wis.	Robsion, Ky.	Torrens
Neely	Rockwell	Towe
Norrell	Rogers, Fla.	Trimble
O'Brien, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.	Voorhis, Calif.
O'Brien, Mich.	Rogers, N. Y.	Walter
O'Konski	Rooney	Wasielewski
O'Neal	Rowan	Weaver
O'Toole	Russell	Welchel
Outland	Ryter	Weiss
Pace	Sabath	Welch
Patrick	Sadowski	Whitten
Patterson	Sasscer	Whittington
Peterson, Fla.	Savage	Wickersham
Peterson, Ga.	Scrivner	Wilson
Pfeifer	Sheppard	Winstead
Philbin	Sikes	Woodhouse
Pickett	Slaughter	Worley
Pittenger	Smith, Maine	

NAYS—56

Andersen,	Hancock	Mott
H. Carl	Harness, Ind.	Phillips
Arnold	Hill	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mo.	Hoffman	Rizley
Bishop	Horan	Rodgers, Pa.
Brehm	Howell	Schwabe, Mo.
Brown, Ohio	Hull	Schwabe, Okla.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenkins	Shafer
Chiperfield	Jennings	Short
Clevenger	Jensen	Simpson, Pa.
Dworshak	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Gillespie	Johnson, Ind.	Springer
Gillette	Jones	Sumner, Ill.
Gillie	Jonkman	Taber
Graham	Kinzer	Vorys, Ohio
Grant, Ind.	Landis	Vursell
Griffiths	McCowen	Wigglesworth
Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa	Wolfenden, Pa.
Halleck	Mason	Woodruff, Mich.

NOT VOTING—70

Andrews, N. Y.	Gathings	Rabaut
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gibson	Reed, N. Y.
Barry	Granger	Rivers
Beckworth	Gwinn, N. Y.	Robertson, Va.
Bell	Hagen	Roe, Md.
Bolton	Hébert	Roe, N. Y.
Boykin	Hendricks	Sharp
Bradley, Mich.	Hinshaw	Sheridan
Campbell	Holmes, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Hope	Stigler
Celler	Kearney	Thomas, N. J.
Clark	Keogh	Traynor
Cole, Kans.	Kerr	Vinson
Colmer	King	Wadsworth
Cravens	Lea	West
Curley	LeFevre	White
Dawson	McGehee	Winter
Dickstein	McGlinchey	Wolcott
Douglas, Ill.	McKenzie	Wolverton, N. J.
Doyle	Mundt	Wood
Drewry	Norton	Woodrum, Va.
Eaton	O'Hara	Zimmerman
Elliott	Patman	
Fenton	Plumley	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk anounced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mrs. Douglas of Illinois with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.
Mr. Zimmerman with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Mundt.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Kearney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3466. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3951), entitled "An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may be allowed to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for Monday may be transferred to Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and to include excerpts in each.

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. VOORHIS of California) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and to include two resolutions.

Mr. BUCKLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of the May 10

issue of Counter Attack published by the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] have permission to address the House next Wednesday for 45 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and other special orders, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRUMBAUGH (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the California Grange News.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he recently made over Station WIND on UNRRA.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks she made today.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix and include several newspaper editorials.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GERLACH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from a Bristol, Pa., newspaper of October 1.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article she wrote on Palestine, the Homeland of the Jewish People.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

THE LATE SMITH W. PURDUM

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a great postal official passed away this morning when death claimed Smith W. Purdum, Second Assistant Postmaster General, at his home in Hyattsville, Md., bringing to a close a distinguished career of 47 years of continuous service in the postal establishment.

Mr. Purdum, who would have been 69 years old had he lived until December 12, entered the postal service in the humble capacity of substitute railway postal clerk at the age of 22 and, step by step, worked upward through the grades of rural agent, post-office inspector, Deputy Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, and Fourth Assistant Postmaster General to his final assignment as Second Assistant Postmaster General, which gave him over-all jurisdiction of the mammoth operations connected with the transportation of the mails.

But to say that Smith Purdum occupied this or that position gives but a faint idea of his worth to the postal service. More than any other man he had a mastery of all of the problems of the service. The great school for training postal officials is the Inspection Branch and in that branch he laid the fundamentals of a great career. He became the Department's oracle, famed among his colleagues of the service throughout America and the world for his knowledge and wisdom pertaining to postal matters.

His high standing as a postal authority was recognized by his appointment as the legislative representative of the Postmaster General and his frequent designation to represent the Postmaster General at meetings of the President's Cabinet.

He loved the postal service and lived for it. On normal days he arrived at his office at 8 a. m. and left at 8 p. m. When there was a job to be done he recognized no hours of rest or relaxation. Times without number he was the last employee to leave the Post Office Department building at the end of the day.

His frankness, candor, and honesty were very refreshing to those of us who sat on the opposite side of the appropriations committee table. While the mental attitude of department heads altogether too often seems bent on seeing how much they can get out of the Treasury, Mr. Purdum always had in mind the interest of the taxpayers as well as of the Post Office Department. Repeatedly he came before us and voluntarily reduced estimates that had been presented to us by the Bureau of the Budget, these reductions sometimes running into millions of dollars.

In his book Behind the Ballots, Postmaster General James A. Farley told this story apropos of the sterling honesty of Smith Purdum.

> Purdum is a completely honest man, and it is a matter of genuine relief to know that as long as he is in charge of expenditures for new buildings no man will ever be able to raise the finger of slightest suspicion against the financial operations of the Department in that respect. He is fair but unyielding in what he considers to be the proper conduct of his office. For more than 2 years I have been trying to have him approve the erection of a post office at the city of Orangeburg in my home county of Rockland, N. Y. The receipts of Orangeburg justify a new building and its erection would enhance my prestige considerably. But Smith insists doggedly that other villages in the congressional district are more entitled to a new building than Orangeburg and it looks as though I am waging a losing battle.

No higher or more forthright tribute could be paid to the honesty of Smith Purdum than these words of his former chief. Mr. Purdum occupied a pinnacle in the postal service which none other probably ever will attain. We probably shall never see his like again. His name is a household word throughout the postal service and the hearts of millions of postal workers will be touched by the sad news of his death.

FREE PALESTINE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained once more, by present circumstances abroad, to speak in behalf of a free Palestine. Members of Congress and the American people have been led to believe for some time past that this question would be settled, yet obstacle after obstacle has been interposed to prevent an equitable settlement.

Winter is approaching in Europe and with it is bound to come distress and social upheavals. War refugees and political outcasts, driven from pillar to post for no other reason than their race and faith, still remain spread throughout Europe in large numbers, shut out from possible migration to countries where they might find security and safety.

In order to forestall continued suffering by these groups who have been pilloried and persecuted with such brutal fury, the doors of immigration to Palestine should be opened and a free Jewish state should be established in that country which would permit refugees and persecuted people a haven of safety and a place where they may renew ordered, civilized living.

It is said that this is purely a domestic question which is of no concern to the rest of the world. This argument is also used to justify the enslavement and oppression of many other peoples and can carry no great weight with those who have fought and died for freedom and independence of nations and individuals. I believe that the rank and file of our British allies recognize and respect the widespread sentiment among the American people for the establishment of a free democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. It is no answer to say that organized brigands would assail such a settlement and promote political and social disorder in the Near East, because the decent opinion of mankind will never tolerate for long any situation which permits organized minorities, or even powerful tyrannical groups or nations, to block the establishment and peaceful, orderly development of free representative government and democratic institutions.

I raise my voice in protest, therefore, against the further delay in executing previous solemn commitments which have been made to the Jewish people to enable them to carry out their aims for relief, self-government, and a homeland of their own. I wholeheartedly approve of and commend the efforts which our President is exerting to assist in settling this question, and I urge that our Government take additional steps at once

through vigorous diplomatic representations and good offices to open the door of Palestine and prevent the privation and suffering which lie before our unfortunate Jewish brethren this winter unless an early satisfactory settlement of this question is found. In my opinion, the early effectuation of a free Palestine is not only of great moment to very many worthy human beings, but, indeed, to the realization of our war aims. As a people, we cannot remain silent or unmoved in the face of continued persecution and possible destitution of millions of our fellow men, women, and children, whether they are Jews or gentiles.

It is unfortunate to note in this connection that many peoples in many lands of various races and creeds are suffering from persecution, exploitation, unwelcome and detested political domination, and denial of their God-given right to free government. We cannot and will not be immune to their pleas for deliverance. In keeping with the traditions of our own free Nation, we must hold out the hand of succor, declare our sympathy for their plight, our resolution to relieve their hardship, support their just aims, and work as vigorously and straightforwardly as we can to encourage and help them to achieve self-determination.

I sincerely believe that this Congress should go on record at once as favoring the immediate abrogation of the infamous white paper and the establishment of a free Palestine, and we should unhesitatingly go on record as favoring freedom through justice for every nation desiring and seeking it.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate voluntary enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman make a short explanation of what the agreement is?

Mr. MAY. I will be glad to. There were six or seven changes made by the Senate. Four of them were clerical changes which corrected some errors created by the new amendments adopted by the Senate.

The first amendment on which there was any controversy related to the period of enlistment. The House had provided for 1 year, 2 years, and 3 years. The amendment agreed upon by the conferees provides for 1 year, 1½ years, 2 years, and 3 years.

The next controversial feature of the report was where we provided that the benefits for dependents of soldiers under the Allotment and Allowances Act should be extended to July 1, 1946. The Senate receded on that and we provided that those payments should be available to the enlistees up to July 1, 1946, except as to those who enlisted before July 1, 1946, who would be paid up to 1947.

The last amendment on which there was any controversy was what was known as the Hayden amendment, relating to the induction of the Philippine Scouts. The Hayden amendment provided that 50,000 of those scouts might be inducted into the Regular Army to serve in Japan as occupation troops. It also provided that it should be with the approval of the Philippine Legislature. The change which was made in conference was to provide that instead of being approved by the Philippine Legislature it should be approved by the Philippine Government, so as to eliminate any possible chance for controversy between the legislature of the Philippines and the executive department, President Osmeña. The Senate amendment on that subject limited the occupation duties of these troops to Japan proper. The amendment, as agreed upon, provides that they may be deployed or used anywhere in any territory which was occupied by Japan during this war, including the Philippine Islands.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Just widening the opportunity for the use of these Philippine Scouts.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Do I understand this is a unanimous report of the conferees?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, and 6, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment and, on page 3 of the House bill, after the period in line 15, insert the following: "No person who is serving under an enlistment contracted on or after June 1, 1945, shall be entitled, before the expiration of the period of such enlistment, to enlist for an enlistment period which will expire before the expiration of the enlistment period for which he is so serving"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

(1) Before the words "in the Regular Military or Naval Establishment" insert "prior to February 1, 1946,";

(2) On page 4, line 21, of the House bill, after the word "annual", insert "enlisted";

(3) On page 5, lines 16 and 17, of the House bill, strike out "forthwith"; and

(4) On page 5, line 20, of the House bill, after the words "in advance", insert "at his option."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "July 1, 1947" in such amendment and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1946"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 14. The Secretary of War, with the approval of the Philippine Government, is hereby authorized to enlist in the Philippine Scouts, with pay and allowances authorized under existing law, fifty thousand men for service in the Philippine Islands, in the occupation of Japan and of lands now or formerly subject to Japan, and elsewhere in the Far East. Such enlistments shall be for three years unless sooner terminated and citizens of the Philippine Islands shall be eligible to volunteer for such service."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
Managers on the Part of the House.
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
CHAN GURNEY,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

SENATE AMENDMENT NO. 1

Senate amendment No. 1 provided for an enlistment period of 18 months, at the option of the person enlisting. This is in addition to the options provided under the House bill for 3-, 2-, and 1-year enlistments (the period of the 1-year enlistment being 1 year plus the period of any enlistment furlough). The House recedes.

SENATE AMENDMENT NO. 2

Senate amendment No. 2 provided that the 1-year enlistment authorized under the House bill could not be availed of by a person serving under an enlistment (contracted after June 1, 1945) which would not expire within 1 year. The conference agreement extends this provision so as to provide that no person serving under any enlistment contracted on or after June 1, 1945, may enlist under the bill for an enlistment period which will expire before that under which he is serving.

SENATE AMENDMENT NO. 3

Senate amendment No. 3 required that persons holding a grade or rating, either temporary or permanent, be enlisted or reenlisted in a grade or rating at least as high as that so held. Under the House bill, discretion was granted to the services in this respect. The conference agreement adopts the policy of the Senate amendment, but

limits its application to enlistments contracted before February 1, 1946.

SENATE AMENDMENT NO. 4

Senate amendment No. 4 amended the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 so as to provide for continuing eligibility for family allowances during the whole of an enlistment period which is contracted for prior to July 1, 1947, notwithstanding the termination of the war and the 6 months' period thereafter. The conference agreement adopts the Senate amendment, but limits its application to enlistments contracted before July 1, 1946.

SENATE AMENDMENTS NOS. 5 AND 6

Senate amendments Nos. 5 and 6 are clerical amendments made necessary by Senate amendment No. 4. The House recedes.

SENATE AMENDMENT NO. 7

Senate amendment No. 7 authorized the Secretary of War, with the approval of the Philippine government, to enlist 50,000 men in the Philippine Scouts for service in the occupation of Japan. The conference agreement adopts the Senate amendment, but provides, in addition to certain clarifying amendments, that this force can be used also for service in the Philippines, in the occupation of lands formerly or now held by Japan, and elsewhere in the Far East.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
W. G. ANDREWS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREAT BRITAIN, REMEMBER THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an open letter to Prime Minister Churchill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, in 1923 the United States Congress unanimously adopted a resolution supporting the Balfour Declaration and this same course was followed by 53 nations throughout the world. No formal action was ever taken by Great Britain to effectuate the Balfour Declaration. Today 100,000 Jews live in concentration camps throughout Europe with no homes to go to and their only haven of refuge is Palestine who can absorb them without any cost or burden to world society and I appeal to the leaders of Great Britain who seek justice for their people now to apply it to the stricken Jews of the world and permit the immediate immigration of these 100,000 Jews to Palestine. I include an open letter to Prime Minister Attlee:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRIME MINISTER ATTLEE

Seven thousand Jews in liberated Czechoslovakia committed suicide in the last few weeks. They returned from the concentration camps to find their homes gone, their families massacred, and opportunities for employment closed to them. They made repeated attempts to build a new life for themselves in Czechoslovakia or to emigrate overseas, but all doors were closed. They chose the only possible way out—out of unending misery and out of life.

This is only one of many such reports that reach us almost daily from the countries of Europe. Do they reach your ears, too, Mr. Attlee?

Perhaps you were not greatly impressed. What, after all, is the snuffing out of 7,000 lives in a world grown accustomed to the violent death of millions? But we were not only impressed, Mr. Attlee. We were badly shaken. It is not only the number of these latest victims, but the timing of this mass-suicide—after "liberation"—that we find so tragic.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE

It was our very unhappy conviction all along that the responsibility for the extinction of 6,000,000 Jews in Europe was not Hitler's alone. The entire Christian world shares that responsibility. By their failure to take a strong stand the great democratic powers gave Hitler the green light to destroy European Jewry. And when hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of Jews could have been saved from the claws of the Nazi beast, it was Great Britain which refused to admit them to Palestine—their only haven.

When we voiced these accusations, official British spokesmen invariably took cover behind "the exigencies of war." These flimsy excuses for a brutal policy, unprecedented in the history of human misery, were always morally offensive. But now the war is over. Hitler is gone, Europe is free, democracy is triumphant—and thousands of Jews prefer death to the type of liberation which has come to our people in Europe.

THE LABOR PARTY'S PROMISE

This is happening, Mr. Attlee, at a time when your Labor government is in power in Britain. Your party is now in direct control of Palestine's destinies. It is the party which as recently as May 1945 adopted a resolution declaring:

"There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a 'Jewish national home' unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe. * * * The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales."

A magnificent declaration, Mr. Attlee. You will agree, no doubt, that it entitles us to expect a full measure of justice from your regime.

The Lord President of the Council and Labor Party Leader of the House of Commons, the Right Honorable Herbert Morrison, declared while denouncing the Chamberlain Government's white paper in May 1939:

"If we do this thing today we shall have done a thing which is dishonorable to our good name, which is discreditable to our capacity to govern, and which is dangerous to British security, to peace, and to the economic interest of the world in general and of our own country. Moreover, it will not work * * * the Government must understand that this document will not be automatically binding upon their successors in office, whatever the circumstances of the time may be."

THE PROMISE HAS NOT BEEN KEPT

You are the "successor in office," Mr. Attlee. But in place of the fulfillment of these oft-repeated pledges, we have received word that your Government plans to continue with slight modifications the brutal white paper policy. While the remnants of European Jewry are massed in concentration camps, morally and physically exhausted, still under violent anti-Semitic attacks, hungry and penniless, with nothing to return to but the graves of their loved ones, you are planning to keep the doors of Palestine practically closed. Despite the pledges of your party, the anti-Zionist policies of the Colonial Office are being implemented with the same vigor and determination as in the days of the old government.

Britain can no longer hide behind the exigencies of war. So now we are told of the many preoccupations of the new government, which prevent it from taking action to fulfill its promises with regard to Palestine. We venture to say that, despite your many preoccupations, one of the first acts of the new government should have been a sweeping abrogation of all measures restricting Jewish enterprise in Palestine, the opening of that country's gates to free and unrestricted Jewish immigration and an official declaration reestablishing Palestine as a Jewish state. Nothing else and nothing less was rightfully expected of you and your Government. Nothing else and nothing less could restore our faith in the sincerity of Britain's pledges, in the good will of Britain's people, and in the progressive spirit of Britain's new government.

We waited hopefully for a historic pronouncement consistent with your party's program. Instead, you offered us a mean trickle of immigration certificates which fairly mocks the tragic needs apparent to all. What did you expect us to do with this "gift"? Did you, perhaps, mean that we were somehow to divide these certificates among the hundreds of thousands of our people who must migrate to Palestine or be doomed?

THIS IS OUR STAND

We refuse to accept any such miserable gifts based on the white paper of 1939. We demand full recognition of Jewish rights to Palestine. We are at the very end of our patience, Mr. Attlee, and no palliative solutions will be accepted by American Jewry or by what is left of European Jewry. As for the Jews of Palestine, what can they do but resist to the bitter end the policy which you propose to continue in that country.

America is today called upon to deal with your Government in order to help in the solution of your country's financial and economic difficulties, to the end that the British working masses may maintain a fair standard of living. They are entitled to it. But we say to you: The same rule of life should apply to the surviving Jews of Europe. You cannot expect sympathy for the social advancement of Britain's masses when you withhold the right to a life of self-support and self-respect from the first victims of nazism. You cannot talk of social and economic progress and at the same time bolster the reactionary, pro-Fascist, feudal Arab rules in the Middle East, including the pro-Axis Mufti. Justice too, is indivisible.

In this eleventh hour we urge you not to drive Jewish youth in Palestine and elsewhere to regard you and your people as enemies and betrayers of a sacred trust. We call on you to redeem Britain's pledge to the Jewish people now.

Nothing else and nothing less will do.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

I. G. FARBEN CARTEL POLITICAL INFLUENCE WITH RELATION TO WORLD PEACE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on December 10, 1943, I asserted to Members of this House my belief that the menace of the cartels was the greatest cloud which hung on the horizon of the United Nations.

Today, as the war is won in Europe and the Pacific, and on the eve of various international conferences where this same problem will arise, I reiterate that same conviction and I appeal to the Congress to take cognizance of that cloud—of the menace to future world peace of the political influence of the cartel. This influence we have observed so frequently being exerted upon our domestic economy, and, far worse, upon our own national defense and security, and upon those international relations out of which came the planting of the seed of outlawry and the reaping of the harvest of death and destruction in the war just ended.

The atomic bomb does not remove or lessen this menace of the cartel. To the contrary, this dreadful new scientific implement of war makes it even more imperative that these privately and secretly directed international alliances of scientific industry be forever eradicated from the affairs of this troubled world.

It is in this connection that I wish to call to the attention of every Member of this House the authoritative and comprehensive article on Cartels which is appearing in the Encyclopedia Americana, and which, with the permission of the copyright owners, was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix of March 6, 7, and 8. The reproduction in this way was by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who, I am happy to say, hates the cartel and all its works as I do. His purpose, as explained, was because there is voluminous discussion of cartels and exigent need for a clear understanding of just what the word "cartel" means. I am in accord with the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. Obviously, we should be certain of exactly what the cartel is, of everything that it does, and of the reasons why it does these things. Otherwise we dare not hope for a solution of the many problems arising out of this type of collective monopoly.

Among the notable features in this article on the cartel is a heretofore unrecorded illustration of cartel political influence which is very timely. Mention is made of the League of Nations Economic Conference held at Geneva in 1927 where demand had arisen that the delegates should provide a solution for the problem of privately directed international cartel activities. So it would seem that even then the evils of the cartel had caused repercussions in that earlier unsuccessful effort to attain world peace, and that there had developed a demand for action by the League against those evils.

But what happened? The delegates, instead of proclaiming any solution for the problem, proceeded to reject a proposal for the establishment of international control of the cartels, and reported that what they termed "the rationalization" of the cartel "was calculated to secure greater security and a higher standard in the conditions of life to the community; lower prices and better goods to the consumer; and higher and steadier remuneration to the producers."

Fine words, although untrue—but there were more. Again we find from this article that among the delegates to this International Economic Conference was one Dr. Clemens Lammers who in some strange way had become the official advisor of the other delegates on the subject of the cartel. Dr. Lammers presented to the conference a set of guiding principles concerning cartels in which, among other dicta, he proclaimed that the foremost purpose of cartels was in lowering costs and improving products; that the legal control of cartels existed in only a few countries; that the international cartel as an expression of cooperation among nations would be voluntary; and that efforts to interfere with the operations of cartels by means of an international court were unwise. It is likewise revealed that this official advisor of the League of Nations, Dr. Lammers, also advocated the education of public opinion that cartels were indispensable for the general welfare of the masses and urged that America should shape its measures pertaining to international cartels accordingly.

Now, I think that I can leave it to the Members of this House that in the light of revelations since the war began you may readily decide whether these fine words, and impudent instructions to the Americans, in 1927, by the League of Nations adviser on cartels, as they were thus deftly infiltered into public opinion the world over, were not, in substance and effect, swallowed hook, line, and sinker by so many people in this country that it became an easy task to keep us almost unarmed, spiritually and physically, until the recent war began.

I think, too, that you will agree with me that all of the fine words about cartels which flowed out of that League of Nations Conference in 1927, in the guise of unbiased world opinion, may have a rather familiar sound to us, right now in 1945, while other world peace conferences are in progress in a confusion of tongues and purposes; and while insidious influence is reported to be at work among the victors over Germany to soften the peace. For what purpose? So that German industry may revive and German cartel industrialists may survive, to plan another war. Most of us have been deluged in the recent past with insidious propaganda, also allegedly unbiased, which intimates that the cartels may be just those same nice kindly institutions that Farben's Dr. Lammers, in 1927, abjured the League of Nations to tell us that they were then. So that perhaps some of us may be persuaded again that the cartel is a public benefactor; that it may be good—or may be necessary—and accordingly why bother to consider doing anything, or at least anything harsh about them just now. That plea that cartels are necessary is now again stressed. Only recently representatives of the oil industry, which has been so deeply involved in prewar criminal cartel conspiracies that they dare not, as yet, refer to the alleged goodness of the cartel, stood before a Senate committee and pleaded tearfully that cartels were necessary—that we, the people of these United States who are now paying so ghastly a price for our blindness on this problem, must now relax our anti-trust-law restraints to permit these oil companies again to take part in foreign cartel arrangements—so that we can again engage in foreign trade with the international cartels which, these petroleum magnates inform us, will now be revived.

So here we have, in 1945, this slight modification of Dr. Lammers' 1927 plea that cartels were both good and necessary, and that the United States should mind its own business and again let them alone, or join with them in Europe.

Now let us look back and find out who this distinguished Dr. Lammers was. You will find out from the Americana thesis that he had become a member of the Reichstag in the early days of the German Republic. Also that he held another position which, we might assume, made him a very competent authority on this subject of cartels, if he wanted to tell the truth about them. For this Dr. Lammers, when he persuaded the League of Nations to do nothing about cartels because he found them indispensable for the welfare of the masses; and who also instructed the United States to shape its measures accordingly, that is, to keep its big mouth shut, was, at that same time, one of the directors of the giant combine and keystone of the world's greatest supercartel, the German I. G. Farbenindustrie.

So now we may learn, after 18 years have passed, that this apparently disinterested action, or nonaction, of the League of Nations on the cartel problem in 1927 was in reality the direct result of intrigue and pressure, of secret political influence, which was exerted upon the League's delegates by one of the leaders of this vicious privately directed supercartel. Already, at that time, it was the real power in the background which directed the economy and the Government of Germany, and later was to become so strong, as this article points out, that it remains a moot point whether Hitler used the cartels for his purpose, or whether the cartels, the I. G. Farben industrial leaders, merely created Hitler and made use of him for their purpose. Here in this article are the facts of how Farben used the League of Nations for its own despicable purposes, in this instance, in order to prevent any attempt to examine or to control its evil designs on world peace, and at the same time to convince the world that it was a beneficent, kindly, and necessary institution.

Accordingly, I say that here is a striking example of the kind of international political influence, and power, which we must recognize as still in existence, and against which every one of us here, and every representative of this country now in Germany, should be on guard. This Geneva incident well illustrates what the article refers to as the tremendous value of the cartel to the war aims of its leaders, due to its essential features of secret world-wide organization with private and irresponsible control.

We have all, I think, felt the impact of such influence here at Washington, at times like these, when investigation and legislation which may affect any cartel activities is under discussion, or pending. Then it is that some visitor—in plain language some lobbyist—attempts

his persuasions with quaint sophistries, or more subtle argument. Now what essential difference can anyone point out between the lobbyist—or fixer—exerting pressure here at Washington, or in Europe in our reconstruction set-up, in 1945, for cartel survival; and Farben's Dr. Lammers at Geneva in 1927 successfully persuading that international assembly not to act against the cartel.

In the light of events since then, which are known to all of us, it may be admitted that should the Geneva Economic Conference in 1927 have protested at the evils of the cartel, and had it even raised the lid a fraction of an inch to peer within the Pandora's box of I. G. Farben, then those beastly, tragic human ills, which later were loosed from that casket of evil and death, might not have brought us, now, to a war and a victory so dearly won with the blood of American youth. In 1927 I. G. Farben's leaders had to prevent action by the League, so Farben's distinguished Dr. Lammers was on the spot to do so.

Who shall dare to say that some other Dr. Lammers, disguised in sheep's clothing as a learned technical adviser, or in the raiment of an apostle of democracy and peace, has not been around Washington to advise anyone so credulous as to listen to him; or is not among those who at this very time are in Europe to help decide on the spot what to do about saving German industries, or what punishment, if any, shall be meted out to guilty German industrialists.

I am stressing this story of what Dr. Lammers did at Geneva in 1927 as a warning that we must be on guard now in our new world assemblies and in our reconstruction peace set-up, against the secret scheming of the cartel leaders, and especially those in the background of the I. G. Farben cartels, who are right now using political influence in unexpected places in order to be permitted to revive their private international superstate—first to control the peace, and then to prepare for the next war. Perhaps we have here a clue to some of the confusion and grotesque results which have resulted at San Francisco, such as the Argentine incident; or for some of the mysterious and disturbing news items which are now coming out of our occupied territory in Germany.

We must understand that these people seldom show their hands openly. Having become interested in this Dr. Lammers 1927 episode, I made inquiry of the author of the Americana cartel article, Mr. Howard W. Ambruster, of Westfield, N. J., and am informed by him that, although the part played by Dr. Lammers in the Geneva Conference is recorded in detail in the published proceedings of the League of Nations, and in Dr. Lammers' own writings on the subject, yet there appears to be no mention in these publications of Dr. Lammers' high position in the management of I. G. Farbenindustrie. Mr. Ambruster advises me that the proceedings of the League identify Dr. Lammers as a member of the Reichstag and as holding several other imposing titles, but his connection with I. G. Farben appears to have been omitted. That little fact had to be excavated from other documents relating to the supercartel itself. These identified the good doctor as one of its managing directors but, strangely enough, did not mention his other titles or his service to I. G. Farben at Geneva.

This Americana article also reveals what I think few of us have realized, except vaguely, that the I. G. Farbenindustrie, being the largest corporate structure in Germany when it was formed in 1926 as an amalgamation of the dye trust with other industries, was also tied in with Fritz Thyssen's Versinigte Stahlwerke or steel trust, which was the second largest corporate entity in Germany. Farben was the controlling factor in this tie-up and these two industrial giants held sway over the entire fabric of Germany's social economy and war potential, and became also the nucleus of world-wide cartel structures of industrial espionage and sabotage, and of subversive political influence which prepared for war inside Germany by rearming; and inside Germany's prospective victims with false peace propaganda, political corruption, and obstruction of their own defenses. Here was the gigantic industrial and political superstate, privately directed—without which the war would not have been planned; could not have even started; nor carried on to its bloody end.

Yet now we are told by Farben's prewar partners that we must tolerate international cartels again, and must relax our laws so that our own nationals can again take part in them. Let me remind you that we have all heard the accusations made repeatedly that Germany's industrial leaders, knowing that this war was lost, were already planning for World War III; and I submit that in order to do this they must first acquire a hold of some kind upon the new machinery for world peace which the United Nations, and all of civilization, are praying will accomplish its purpose. Consequently, I say that if we of this Congress do not approve of international monopolies we should say so right now in unmistakable language. If we do not approve of cartel political influence in international affairs, or of the cartel's lobby here at home, let us act decisively forthwith to clean our own house of such influence. And if we mean to punish the real war criminals we should demand that some one should put the finger of accusation upon those international cartel leaders, and their stooges; without whose contriving Hitler could never have come to power; and the German general staff could never have set an army in motion. In the cartel, in its industries and scientific research, is the real war potential.

On this same subject of cartel political influence I call the attention of this House to another statement on the cartel by the author of the Americana monograph, as given before the Senate committee which conducted hearings last May on S. 11, the O'Mahoney-Voorhis bill to require registration of restrictive foreign-trade agreements. Mr. Ambruster testified at some length before that committee on May 22. After discussing what a cartel is, and why it is an unqualified evil, whether considered in its social, economic, or political aspects, he said that of all of these characteristics, that of political influence is by far the most menacing to the future peace of the world. He cited several more unknown or little known examples of I. G. Farben's evil influence in international affairs, and in relation to our own none too successful efforts to put a stop to and punish those involved in the activities of this private war-making machine as carried on inside of this country. He also made a rather positive statement to the Senate committee that there could be little authenticity in the exclamations of shocked surprise at what Farben had been planning, as heard since the war began, and after the participation of those involved had been exposed. Mr. Ambruster cited what appear to be ample proofs that he knew and had protested against these things for a decade before the war began; also pointing out that if he, an outsider, knew of the menace of Farben's penetration into our national security, then those actually involved in the tie-ups must have known this also. The question arises, why was no attention paid to his warnings? That potent sub rosa influence was the cause is apparent.

Rather than antitrust suits resulting in postponements, relatively small fines, consent decrees or no punishment, this witness has recommended that some of the agents and allies of I. G. Farben in this country should be prosecuted under the general conspiracy statute for having engaged for many years in a gigantic conspiracy to interfere with the functions of the Government of this country. He cited support for this theory from some surprising sources. Others appear to agree that this matter of cartel political menace to our national security, and to the future peace of the world, can be reached only by the width, depth, and teeth of the criminal conspiracy statute; and that antitrust action is too feeble a weapon. It will be interesting to observe how the new high officials in the Justice Department respond to this suggestion. Favorable action by this House on Resolutions 102 and 103—L. H. SMITH and JERRY VOORHIS—now pending and frozen in the Rules Committee, might assist it.

I think that I might quote here two of the replies to questions with which Howard Ambruster closed his testimony before the Senators. Asked whether he thought that cartels caused the war in Europe, he replied:

> I not only think it, but I know it, and I can prove it.

Asked how we, the United States, can secure our own proper share of foreign trade in the postwar era, unless we permit our nationals to become again involved in foreign cartels, the witness replied:

> I do not care how much foreign trade we lose by it. It won't pay for what we have been through * * * when you balance the cost against the profit, we are too far in the red already.

It is probable that many Members may agree with this conclusion that the cost of the cartel is too great. Many may be astonished at some of the proofs which he laid before the Senate committee in support of this conclusion. Ambruster knows this problem from a great many

years of actual contact, from rubbing his elbows and bruising his knuckles on domestic and international cartels, in their social, economic, and political activities; and also from the outlook of a student who obviously has done a tremendous amount of research on it. I strongly urge the Members to read his testimony before Senator O'MAHONEY'S committee.

Aside from all considerations of the evils of private collectivism in our domestic economy, or in the private regimentation of human effort by the cartel, the one great national and international issue which the cartel presents to us at this time, and which we must face before it is too late, is that of the cartel's political influence, as we see it now revealed in preparation for this war, and as it must be met if its impact upon the next peace is to be immunized. We have won the war in Europe and in Asia, but are we doing those things which must be done if we are to win the peae, while the friends and allies of I. G. Farben also plan and connive in secret to reconstruct their private cartel superstate? Remember, too, that much of the propaganda which clandestinely attempts to foment discord among the Allies in this war and in this peace has its origin and its motivation among the adherents of another era of world cartelization. Of what avail the victory of arms, with its ghastly sacrifice of blood and treasure; of youth destroyed, or warped, or wrecked—if out of it shall come another peace of Farben's cartel pattern, a peace disguised this time as a union of nations to rule by force—by the atomic bomb, if you please—and men of the cartel are in power in that new world assembly?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order or the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE ATOMIC AGE

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, mixed with my feeling of elation on August 14 that we had come finally to the end of the war, the beginnings of which I saw myself in China in 1932, was a feeling of stupefaction. At first I sensed rather than fully realized that we had come to the end of one age and that we were witnessing the birth of another because of the smashing of the atom and the release of atomic energy. Now I know with certainty that it is true. We are in the atomic age. We cannot retrace our steps, whether we like it or not.

This new atomic age demands of us an entirely new concept of our responsibilities one to another. These responsibilities must be based fundamentally upon a fully Christian moral attitude. Now, more than ever before, is the time for all of us to read our Bibles and to live by the principles found within that Good Book.

When I returned to Congress this fall I wondered if we would begin where we left off, as though nothing had happened. Or would we demonstrate to the world that we did understand that a new age had begun? Would we act accordingly? Would we live up to our responsibilities? Would we realize that the first order of business of this Congress and of the peoples of the world is the question of the survival of mankind?

Would we realize that we have to learn to live together or perish? Living together will demand cooperation of everyone. Cooperation is now possible because no longer, if we use our scientific knowledge for the benefit of all, need one nation prosper to the detriment of another. But it is imperative that we realize fully the absolute necessity that this atomic energy, released for the destruction of man during the war, be used now for the fuller and better life which a continued peace will demand.

We realize that we have unleashed a power that can destroy all of us, and we also fear in our heart of hearts that men have not the self control and the discipline that will be needed to use that power in the future for creative instead of destructive purposes. What we are really afraid of is ourselves. What we have done through science is to bring ourselves finally face to face with ourselves. We are the problem—not atomic energy. Everything has changed but man. We must now for the first time fully embrace Christian principles in our relationships to one another at home and to our neighbors across the world or we are lost.

This presents to us the question are we going to keep for a short time the knowledge of atomic energy to ourselves, or shall we release it to the United Nations for the benefit of mankind? The reason I use the words "for a short time" is because clear thinking and a knowledge of the facts will show that no nation could possibly keep the knowledge of atomic energy a secret after it is known that man has successfully smashed the atom and can harness its power.

The question being asked everywhere these days as to whether we should release the secret of the atomic bomb to the world is based upon the fallacious premise that there is a secret which can be kept. In fact, there really is not any secret to keep. It is only a question of what stage of development have the various countries reached in their own research. The real secret was that the atom has been successfully smashed. That today is common knowledge.

We are by no means alone in our attempts to harness the atom. Scientists of many nations worked on the research that led up to the smashing of the atom. Both Germany and Japan knew the principles; and if we had not succeeded in bombing out a plant in Norway, where the Germans were working on an atomic bomb, they might well have produced it first, won the war, and changed the whole course of the world.

The Japanese, too, had their own program of atomic research, similar to the programs in the United States and in Germany. As far back as 1938, in Tokyo, a giant cyclotron was nearing completion which was the duplicate of one under construction at the University of California. It was intended to be the largest and most powerful in the world.

In fact, if it had not been for the courage and vision of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who made the ultimate decision to risk our matchless resources in this race for survival, we would not have been given a second chance to build a free and united world.

We cannot keep this knowledge to ourselves. The only question can be, how soon do we release it? I, myself, think it ought to be given to the United Nations as speedily as possible, for it is not subject to monopoly. What we need now in the world are friends. The air needs to be cleared of suspicion and doubt and fear. The United Nations, through the Security Council, should have the right to find out and know what is going on in every research laboratory in the world.

As Mr. Walter Lippmann stated in a recent column, after demonstrating that the secret cannot be kept and that it was unnecessary to argue whether it ought to be kept:

> The object of our policy cannot be to keep the secret. That cannot be done. Our object must be to prevent the secret use of the knowledge as a military surprise. We can hope to do this only by measures which make the knowledge so much the common property of the scientific world that scientists would quickly be alerted if any of their colleagues anywhere went underground to develop a weapon of surprise.
>
> No form of international control can work if it is not based on the premise that the scientists themselves must be the detectives and inspectors of the control. If we start with that premise, then it follows that the international agreements should aim at the most prompt and detailed exchanges of scientific knowledge in the whole field of atomic energy. It ought to be quite feasible for the scientists who now have the secret to say what reports, correspondence, exchange of visits among laboratories, would make most certain that no development can long be carried on secretly.

Mr. Lippmann further stated:

> If, on the contrary, we ourselves try to keep the secret, we shall not instigate others to act in secret, but we shall also make it much easier for them to act in secret. For instead of alerting the scientific world so that it can alert governments and people, we should be closing the eyes and ears of the very men who can most quickly detect any hidden mischief that is being concocted in the dark.
>
> To those who contend that we should guard this secret, we must, I believe, reply that, on the contrary, the safest course is to guard against its being a secret anywhere.

If we do not act promptly in this matter, can we in the future, with any degree of fairness or consistency, demand that the Security Council know what other nations are doing in research? If we follow an ostrichlike attitude of secrecy, we put in jeopardy all we have fought for, as it will surely sow the seeds of distrust, not only among our allies but in our own hearts before we have decently buried the dead of our combined victory.

As Mr. Lippmann put it in his column:

> If would be dangerous in the highest degree to suppose we were keeping the secret if in fact we were not. For that could only give us, as it has already given many, a false sense of security and a false sense of our own power.

This false sense of power could lead us straight into the old isolationism. What folly to return to the belief that we can remain isolated in this shrunken world after what we have just been through. If we readopt an isolationist attitude of self-sufficiency, the world is

finished for the atomic bomb and the secrets of atomic energy can no more insure our country of security than did the expanse of the Pacific insure us against the disaster of Pearl Harbor.

Our faith in the future cannot be built upon the sands of isolationism, or on the false security of any secret weapon. It must be built upon the rock of international good faith, upon the brotherhood of man. Mankind cannot afford another war. We must erase therefore the causes of war. International good faith will erase one of the causes of war—suspicion. To create international good faith we must have international cooperation. That cooperation cannot be based upon the distrust we are now evidencing by the unthinking talk about the so-called secret of the atomic bomb. On the contrary, we must all strive and bend every effort to the end that science serves man—all of mankind—and make certain that this new and terrifying power is used to wage war against what have always been the common enemies of mankind—famine, pestilence, and fear.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Messrs. KEOGH, STIGLER, and COLE of Kansas, until October 27, on account of official committee assignments.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 136. An act for the relief of the Oregon Caves Resort;

S. 451. An act for the relief of Carl Baumann;

S. 573. An act for the relief of Lee D. Hoseley;

S. 711. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Fuhrmann;

S. 729. An act for the relief of William Andrew Evans;

S. 732. An act for the relief of Ensign Elmer H. Beckmann, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 762. An act for the relief of Everett McLendon, Sr.; Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr.; Mr. and Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr., for the benefit of their minor daughter, Nadine McLendon; and Everett McLendon, Jr.;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Oliver Jensen;

S. 857. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Ford;

S. 888. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands in the vicinity of the War Department Pentagon Building in Arlington, Va.;

S. 902. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in a Quonset hut at Harrowbeer Airport, Yelverton, South Devon, England, on December 26, 1944;

S. 909. An act for the relief of Hugh Egan;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Henry H. Huffman and Mrs. Marie J. Huffman;

S. 985. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires occurring at various naval shore activities;

S. 986. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the administration building at the naval air station, Bunker Hill, Ind., on December 28, 1944;

S. 996. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg) William Augustus White, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 1007. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward P. Standley; and

S. 1265. An act for the relief of John R. Jennings.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will continue public hearings on Friday, October 5, 1945, at 10 a. m. in the Rivers and Harbors hearing room, 1304 New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 2111 and H. R. 4079.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, will meet at 10 a. m. Tuesday, October 9, to begin hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

Various groups who have representation in Washington will be heard during the first week, such as Members of Congress first, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Association of American Railroads, railroad traffic organizations, railroad labor, and truck and bus associations.

The second week will be devoted to various State commissions, agricultural associations, National Industrial Traffic League, and various citizens' traffic associations, and traffic boards and chambers of commerce.

It is going to be necessary to limit the time for this hearing as much as possible. It is also desired to avoid any repetition in statements before the committee.

The committee would be pleased to have those who are intending to appear to advise the clerk promptly the least amount of time they will need in which to present their testimony.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

719. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $25,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1946 (H. Doc. No. 304); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

720. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate for the appropriation of $550,000,000 for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (H. Doc. No. 305); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the National Defense Program in Its Relation to Small Business in the United States, House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings on financial problems of small business held before said committee during the current session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1077). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 4127. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1852, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4283. A bill to require parking facilities for the persons employed in Federal office buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 4284. A bill to provide for issuance of temporary certificates for air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 4285. A bill making the 14th day of August of each year a legal holiday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4286. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Fulton, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 4287. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Iuka, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 4288. A bill to provide uniform authority for the payment of travel expenses of consultants and other expert employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 4289. A bill to provide for the payment by the United States of premiums on bonds given to the United States by persons employed in the field and departmental service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 4290. A bill to direct the discharge of certain members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4291. A bill to terminate the war tax rates on certain goods and services, and to reduce the regular rates thereon to 5 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4292. A bill to amend the act of February 11, 1937 (50 Stat. 19, ch. 10), in relation to disaster loans to States or political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 4293. A bill to incorporate United States Navy Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 4294. A bill to assist in soil-conservation and water-conservation work, forest-fire prevention and suppression, and forest improvement by making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for such work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. J. Res. 254. Joint resolution providing for the reception by the Senate and the House of Representatives of representatives of enlisted men who have served in the armed forces of the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. Res. 364. Resolution requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the report of the Arkansas River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 4295. A bill to correct the naval record of Raymond Stanley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 4296. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. Gregory; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4297. A bill for the relief of Joseph Schell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4298. A bill for the relief of Severo Apoluna Dinson and Candilaria Dinson, and the legal guardian of Lura Dinson, and the legal guardian of Teresita Dinson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4299. A bill for the relief of Juan S. Purisima; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4300. A bill for the relief of the county of Hawaii, T. H.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4301. A bill for the relief of Philip Naope Kaili and Susie Kaili; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4302. A bill for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 4303. A bill to continue in full force and effect patent No. 1,686,983; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 4304. A bill for the relief of the city of Oceanside, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 4305. A bill for the relief of Ralph Cannavo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 4306. A bill for the relief of Fred C. Hindrichsen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1228. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., calling upon the Congress of the United States to support the program recommended by President Harry S. Truman, intended to assure the profitable operation of business and industry and to provide jobs for all employable persons, and to support legislation suggested by the President, such as the full-employment bill, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill relating to social security, and the housing bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1229. By the SPEAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, relative to Federal unemployment compensation and other legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1945

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 2, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Charles Wesley Flint, D. D., LL. D., resident bishop, the Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-living God, Lord of nations, Father of men, we thank Thee for all the personal favors granted unto us in spite of demerit and shortcoming, and for all the national blessings bestowed also so generously. Today we thank Thee especially "for heroes proved in liberating strife" and for all who had a part in the victorious crusade.

Grant that the war-born capacity for ungrudging sacrifice in a common cause may ripen into sacred unselfish sharing in the years of peace, with sentiment disciplined by justice and justice hallowed by mercy.

Endow those entrusted with responsibility for the momentous decisions of these days with clarity of understanding and purity of purpose, so that their efforts may make for the doing of Thy will on earth, even as it is in heaven.

We ask in the Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, October 4, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3951) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) authorizing the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the National Defense Program in Its Relation to Small Business in the United States, House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings on financial problems of small business held before said committee during the current session, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 136. An act for the relief of the Oregon Caves Resort;

S. 451. An act for the relief of Carl Baumann;

S. 573. An act for the relief of Lee D. Hoseley;

S. 694. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers;

S. 711. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Fuhrmann;

S. 729. An act for the relief of William Andrew Evans;

S. 732. An act for the relief of Ensign Elmer H. Beckmann, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 762. An act for the relief of Everett McLendon, Sr.; Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr.; Mr. and Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr., for the benefit of their minor daughter, Nadine McLendon; and Everett McLendon, Jr.;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Oliver Jensen;

S. 857. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Ford;

S. 888. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands in the vicinity of the War Department Pentagon Building in Arlington, Va.;

S. 902. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in a Quonset hut at Harrowbeer Airport, Yelverton, South Devon, England, on December 26, 1944;

S. 909. An act for the relief of Hugh Egan;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Henry H. Huffman and Mrs. Marie J. Huffman;

S. 985. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires occurring at various naval shore activities;

S. 986. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in administration building at the naval air station, Bunker Hill, Ind., on December 28, 1944;

S. 996. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg) William Augustus White, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 1007. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward P. Standley;

S. 1265. An act for the relief of John R. Jennings;

H. R. 3466. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; and

H. R. 3951. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry naval nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry naval nominations, which

were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of today's Senate proceedings.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Murray
Andrews	Hatch	Myers
Austin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Overton
Bankhead	Hill	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Butler	Knowland	Saltonstall
Byrd	La Follette	Shipstead
Capper	Lucas	Smith
Carville	McCarran	Stewart
Chavez	McClellan	Taylor
Connally	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	Wherry
Gerry	Mitchell	White
Green	Moore	Wiley
Guffey	Morse	Willis
Gurney	Murdock	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is therefore necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has asked that we be in the Chamber of the House at 20 minutes after 12, so it will be necessary to leave here at a quarter past. Inasmuch as it is intended a recess shall be taken until next Tuesday, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate departs from its Chamber to go to the House it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next, so that we will not have to reassemble.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE PALESTINE SITUATION—RESOLUTIONS FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have about 400 resolutions from constituents in North Carolina on the subject of the Palestine situation, with respect to the British white paper and related matters, and we have here a classic illustration of pressure politics in this country. I am not in sympathy with these resolutions. I do not think they are well-founded. Whenever the matter comes up, if it ever shall, I intend to set forth my views fully. But because I believe that the right of petition should not be denied in this country, I send the resolutions forward, with the statement that I am opposed to the tenor, the contents, the objective of the resolutions.

I ask unanimous consent to present these petitions and that they be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions presented by the Senator from North Carolina will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as requested.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, and I submit a report (No. 625) thereon. I also submit the views of the minority of the Judiciary Committee together with a memorandum by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], which I ask be printed together.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and the views of the minority together with the memorandum will be printed as part of the report.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of September 1945 from the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relating to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS

OCTOBER 4, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	1434 Saratoga Ave.	District of Columbia government	$3,970

KENNETH D. MCKELLAR, *Acting Chairman.*

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Lowell B. Mason, of Illinois, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1942.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Medical Director George W. Calver to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to continue while serving as medical officer in attendance on the Congress.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution providing for the bringing to the United States of the bodies of two unknown Americans, who were members of the American forces who served, one in the European theater of war and the other in the Pacific theater of war, and lost their lives during World War II, and for the burial of the remains with appropriate ceremonies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes, was read

twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BY SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT A STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 50, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the National Defense Program in Its Relation to Small Business in the United States, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 500 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings on financial problems of small business held before said committee during the current session.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this is the concurrent resolution required by the rules, as a courtesy to the House. The House wants some printing done, and I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the concurrent resolution at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Does the concurrent resolution do anything except authorize certain printing?

Mr. HAYDEN. It merely authorizes the printing of additional copies of hearings before a committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSSES AT NAVAL AIR STATION, PUNGO, NORFOLK, VA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1062) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$1,049.18" and insert "$2,216.78."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

RECESS TO TUESDAY—RECEPTION TO ADMIRAL CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into providing for a recess until Tuesday, I now move that the Senate stand in recess, and I ask the Senators to assemble to go to the House Chamber.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, October 9, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

Thereupon the Members of the Senate, preceded by the President pro tempore, the Sergeant at Arms, and the Secretary, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to receive and hear the address of Admiral Chester W. Nimitz.

(For the proceedings in the House of Representatives, see this day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9465.)

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received October 5 (legislative day October 2), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Roger W. Paine, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of June 1942.

Capt. Claude O. Kell, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of July 1942.

Capt. Grover C. Klein, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of December 1942.

Capt. Thorvald A. Solberg, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 10th day of December 1942.

Capt. Frederick E. Haeberle, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of February 1943.

Capt. Norborne L. Rawlings, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of February 1943.

Rear Adm. Andrew F. Carter, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to rank from the 20th day of June 1945.

Rear Adm. Ellery W. Stone, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of September 1943.

Rear Adm. Oswald S. Colclough, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 2d day of March 1944.

Rear Adm. Thomas G. W. Settle, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 20th day of December 1943.

Commodore Edmond J. Moran, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of August 1945.

Commodore Giles C. Stedman, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of September 1943.

Commodore Paul F. Foster, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of January 1944.

Commodore Thomas B. Inglis, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of September 1943.

Commodore Lewis L. Strauss, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of June 1945.

Capt. George C. Dyer, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 24th day of September 1943.

Capt. Charles B. Momsen, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 6th day of October 1943.

Capt. Felix L. Johnson, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 10th day of October 1943.

Capt. Herbert G. Hopwood, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 30th day of October 1943.

Capt. Maurice E. Curtis, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 20th day of November 1943.

Capt. John E. Gingrich, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of December 1943.

Capt. Sidney W. Souers, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to rank from the 18th day of May 1944.

Capt. Luis de Florez, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of December 1944.

Medical Director Winchell M. Craig to be a medical director in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 20th day of July 1943.

Pay Director Gerald A. Bubank to be a pay director in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 10th day of August 1944.

Pay Director Wilfred J. McNeil to be a pay director in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 10th day of June 1945.

Civil Engineer Kirby Smith to be a civil engineer in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 18th day of May 1943.

Capt. Thomas Blau, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Antoine O. Rabideau, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Alvin O. Lustie, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Joseph B. Lynch, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Isaac J. VanKammen, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. John M. Gill, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Claude O. Bassett, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Webb C. Hayes, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. James E. Arnold, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Gene Markey, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. David S. Ingalls, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. John D. Small, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Howland R. Gary, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Capt. Warner N. Grubb, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

Medical Director Thomas B. Magath to be a medical director in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service.

Medical Director Richard A. Kern to be a medical director in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service.

Medical Director Don S. Knowlton to be a medical director in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service.

Medical Director Thomas M. Rivers to be a medical director in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service.

Medical Director Alphonse McMahon to be a medical director in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service.

Dental Surgeon George C. Paffenbarger to be a dental surgeon in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service.

Pay Director John W. Landregan to be a pay director in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service.

Pay Director William L. Nelson to be a pay director in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service.

Chaplain Robert J. White to be a chaplain in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service.

Civil Engineer Cuthebert P. Conrad to be a civil engineer in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore for temporary service.

Civil Engineer Roy M. Harris to be a civil engineer in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service.

Civil Engineer Francis M. McCarthy to be a civil engineer in the United States Naval Reserve, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be Thou, O Lord; Thou who art the creator of the mountains and master of the winds and tides, breathe upon us anew the blessing of the divine presence. Give our fair land a will to forsake lesser ambitions and to share with others what we are and have. Direct us to put ourselves in the spirit of utter selflessness on the side of right and justice, and to live courageously the great moral and spiritual imperatives upon which our Republic was founded.

O Trinity of love and power, today the minds of our people are arrested by the visions of a better world, foreshadowed by the presence of those valiant leaders who have led captivity captive and broken the chains of pagan rule, restoring faith and hope where darkness and despair prevailed. For all brave and intrepid masters of the sea and of the depths beneath, we give our grateful thanks; through danger and death they fulfilled their perilous missions, with love of freedom as the watchword of their souls. In the spirit with which they led their mighty ships through tempest and wild alarm, O God, unite our country in an eternal purpose to preserve and bear aloft the torch of nations who love Thee and keep Thy commandments. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 694. An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to have printed additional copies of the hearings before said committee on S. 555, a bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 694. An act for the relief of Dan. C. Rodgers.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 90) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WHERRY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. An enclosed space on the East Capitol Plaza has been reserved for Members and gallery visitors who wish to view the parade which will follow the appearance of Admiral Nimitz.

In view of the fact that most of the exits to the building are closed, Members and gallery visitors who desire to view the parade should go to the first floor and leave the building by the door directly opposite the air-line ticket office.

The Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE IN HONOR OF FLEET ADMIRAL CHESTER W. NIMITZ, COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE PACIFIC FLEET AND THE PACIFIC OCEAN AREAS

At 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by its President pro tempore, its Secretary, and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The President pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoin s the following members of the committee to escort our distinguished guest into the Chamber: The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort our distinguished guest into the Chamber the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Secretary of the Navy, Hon. James Forrestal.

At 12 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced fleet commander of the United States Navy, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and the Pacific Ocean area, Chester W. Nimitz.

Admiral Nimitz, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the great privilege and the high pleasure of presenting to you a great American, a great fighting man, one of whom all Americans are proud, commander in chief of the United States Pacific Fleet, Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF ADMIRAL CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Admiral NIMITZ. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress of the United States, distinguished guests, it is with all humility that I appear before you on this occasion. I feel confident that no greater honor will come to me during my lifetime. I am sensible of the fact that I do not come here as an individual and I acknowledge at the outset that I am here only as a representative of the brave men who fought under my command in the Pacific. Some of them are here with me today. [Applause.] Speaking in the name of those brave men, whether they wore the uniform of the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Marine Corps, I wish to give you a brief report on the job we are just bringing to an end.

Five weeks ago I was in a land of hunger, and defeat, and disillusionment. Five weeks ago I was in Japan. Among the ships of the Pacific Fleet anchored in Tokyo Bay was a proud symbol of that humanity and mercy which can exist among a civilized people even in the midst of bloody war. That symbol of humanity and mercy was a ship of the United States Navy, the hospital ship *Benevolence*. She had been sent to Tokyo Bay, as her sister ships had been sent to other enemy ports, to take on board the starved, the sick, the wounded, and the heartsore American prisoners of war in that area. I shall always remember that visit because it was my privilege that day to shake the hand of so many men who had fought and suffered that this Nation might remain free. I was again impressed by the bright courage and unshaken confidence which had sustained them during their captivity. To me those men like others I have seen in many hospitals and those to whom I have been privileged to make awards in the name of the President were a reminder that our victory had been purchased at great price. In the hearts and the hungry eyes of those rescued men you could see a kinship with their thousands of lost comrades, men who will forever

sleep beneath the lonely palms of the distant Pacific isles, men who will stand their eternal watch at sea for as long as time goes on. Those men, the rescued and their lost comrades, are a greater price than any that can be reckoned in billions of dollars. [Applause.]

Let us have a look at what was accomplished in the Pacific war by the costly victory of our fighting men; let us review what Japan had left in the way of military resources when she was forced to admit defeat. It may come as a surprise to many Americans to learn that from the standpoint only of troops and aircraft Japan actually was better off on VJ-day than she was nearly 4 years ago when she initiated national hara-kiri with her treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor.

At the end of the war Japan had a larger army and a far more powerful air force than she possessed on December 7, 1941. Here are the rough figures, according to our best intelligence: In the home islands of Japan at the time of surrender there were more than 2,000,000 professional military personnel. In addition, there was a large force of home guards, prefectural police, and auxiliaries of various kinds. In China, Manchuria, Formosa, and Japan's stolen empire to the south there were more than 3,000,000 men. All told, Japan could muster a trained professional army of more than 5,000,000 men on VJ-day as against a total of only 3,000,000-plus on the day this war began.

From the standpoint of air strength the figures are even more startling. Japan began this war with an approximate total of 5,300 planes, of which roughly 3,200 were combatant types. On the day war ended Japan's air force had increased by approximately 100 percent, to a total of 11,000 planes, of which approximately 6,000 were combatant planes.

Why, then, did the enemy have no alternative but to surrender? And why did he strive for peace before the introduction of the atomic bomb and before the entry of Russia into the war? By early August Japan's fighting fleet had ceased to exist. [Applause.] Of a once great navy Japan had still afloat one battleship, damaged; four aircraft carriers, all damaged; two heavy cruisers, both damaged; and two light cruisers, one damaged. Not one of these ships had a crew aboard. Thirty-nine of Japan's once large force of destroyers remained, but 6 of these were damaged and 10 were without crews. Fifty-one enemy submarines survived, and 96 small patrol crafts. In addition, there were a couple of mine layers, two old training cruisers, and a submarine tender. By the middle of 1945 Japan might just as well have scuttled this remnant of her navy for all the good it could do against our all-powerful sea-air forces.

The picture of Japan's merchant marine was equally grim. Over a year ago our intelligence gave us information on the toll we were then taking of Japanese shipping between Malaya and the home islands. Of each five merchant ships that sailed from Singapore the Japanese counted themselves extremely lucky if three of those five ships stayed afloat to complete their journey.

Our enemy was forced to surrender because Japan, a maritime nation, dependent on food and materials from overseas, was stripped of her sea power. On the other hand, we had sea power which made it possible to capture and hold the bases within Japan's system of inner defenses from which our Army's very long-range bombers and other aircraft operated. We had sea power which made it possible to cut the enemy's lines of overseas communications to points on the Asiatic Continent and in the Southwest Pacific, denying him access to needed resources. His industry was strangled and his people were at the point of starvation. He lacked oil for his ships and gasoline for his aircraft. We had sea power which made it possible to protect our own lines of communication and move vast quantities of men, material, and munitions to our forward bases and also to the Russians. We had sea power to prevent an enemy effort to launch amphibious counterattacks on our flanks or in the rear. We had sea power to cover and support every amphibious landing in the Pacific war. We had powerful carrier forces which had struck strategic and tactical targets in the inner recesses of the empire. We had seized everywhere bases and built the airfields which made possible the wonderfully successful B–29 bombing and mining missions and eventually the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. With our sea power making possible the use of all our other resources, we gave Japan the single choice of surrender or slow but certain death; and for the wise decision to surrender we can all breathe a fervent thanks to God. [Applause.]

In stressing the importance of sea power in our Pacific victory, I do not intend or desire to give the impression that in gaining this victory any one service deserves praise above another. It was my privilege and honor to command officers and men of all the services. Never did I find that a man's uniform affected his willingness to respond when there was a job to be done. [Applause.] They were all brave men. There was no difference in the way they fought; and when they fell, whether they were dressed in army khaki, marine green, or navy blue, they all wore the same red badge of honor that is stained with the blood of freemen who hold that liberty is dearer than life itself. [Applause.]

Our victory was the product of integrated teamwork from the highest echelon of command to the lowest. No mention of the Pacific war could be made or should be made by me without reference to the late Franklin D. Roosevelt whose foresight and keen interest resulted in a rapid upbuilding of the Navy soon after he assumed the responsibility of Commander in Chief. [Applause.]

We, the officers and men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, in the Pacific are deeply grateful to our late Commander in Chief and to our present Commander in Chief and to our seniors in the chain of command for their unwavering support of the forces in the field. We are also grateful to the Congress and to the people whom they represent for providing rapidly and generously the resources which made our victory possible. Never in the history of any war have those forces in the field been more effectively and loyally supported by the folks at home. [Applause.]

I was privileged to command not only Navy personnel including Coast Guard and Marine, but also Army personnel. I would indeed be remiss if I did not include in my appreciation the officials of the War Department and the Army officers and men in the field who were tireless in their efforts to meet our requirements and who fought shoulder to shoulder with us. We in the Pacific Ocean areas are indebted also to our allies of the British Commonwealth. New Zealand and Australian forces fought with us and a powerful detachment of the British Pacific Fleet had an important place on the team and participated in the operation which resulted in the defeat of Japan. [Applause.]

Our operations would not have been possible without the strong support of our merchant marine. These gallant officers and men maintained a bridge of ships across the Pacific and bore their share of the Japanese attacks while unloading on distant islands while the struggle was still intense and the issue not yet decided. All of you know the accounting which has been made in the office of the Secretary of the Navy. Until he had literally given his life in the service of his country, Secretary Frank Knox moved and acted in the high tradition that we revere. At his death another and younger leader was ready in the person of James Forrestal. To both of these men our country owes a debt of gratitude. [Applause.]

From the beginning of the war we had the intelligent direction of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. For the conduct of the offensive in the Pacific Ocean areas which carried across the Pacific from the Gilberts to the Ryukyus there was a joint staff under my supervision. Officers and men of all American forces and representatives of Great Britain served on this staff. I am indebted to them for their loyalty, ability, and unfailing wise counsel.

Your fighting men have done well the job you sent them out to do, the job you helped them to do by your complete mobilization of thought and energy on the home front. Your fighting men have handled well the tools and machines and weapons which you provided for them in such quantity and in such quality as has never before been known in the history of warfare. Your fighting men have kept the faith, and soon they will be coming home. [Applause.]

As a professional sailor and a servant of my country, I should indicate to you what I think should be done to guarantee that the peace which we have bought so dearly be made permanent, to guarantee that our men will not have to go forth to fight another war. I point out to you the sad fact that we have never yet entered a war for which we were prepared. The science of warfare is constantly changing but with the emphasis always

on speed. I pray that no future war may ever again find us unprepared. Most of all I pray that such a war does not begin and end to our disadvantage and before we can even begin to fight. This need not happen to us. It will not happen to us if we exercise our intelligence, our vigilance, and use our good plain, common sense and keep our fighting forces ready. If we fail in this we have betrayed those brave men who died to give us the privilege of living in friendship and decency with other enlightened nations. To each mother, to each father, to each brother, and to each sister, wife, and sweetheart of those valiant men who will never return, I express my personal and heartfelt sympathy. I do not believe, I cannot believe, that your loved ones died in vain. I stand here today as the representative of the soldiers, sailors, and marines who have won the victory in the Pacific. We have carried out the duty imposed upon us on December 7, 1941. I am deeply moved by and profoundly grateful for the evidence that I have seen today that Congress considers that duty to have been well and faithfully discharged. [Applause.]

At 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m. Admiral Nimitz and his committee of escort retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m. the Speaker announced that the joint meeting was dissolved.

Thereupon the President pro tempore and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings had during the recess of the House will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore been granted a special order to address the House for 15 minutes this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that that order be vacated and that in lieu thereof I may be permitted to address the House on Tuesday next for 15 minutes after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the administration insist that the British Empire return here, as a witness to appear before the committee investigating Pearl Harbor, Tyler Kent, the son of a distinguished career man in our foreign service, who, in October of 1939, was appointed coding clerk in the American Embassy in London?

Some recall that it was his duty to decode messages sent and received by the State Department in a secret code. In May of 1940, he was seized by British authorities who accused him of having revealed to a Member of Parliament, Capt. Archibald Ramsay, what Kent said were the contents of certain secret messages which had passed between Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt. Kent confessed that he had copied and photographed these messages.

Churchill then was First Lord of the Admiralty in the British Cabinet and Roosevelt was President of the United States. Joseph P. Kennedy was the American Ambassador in London.

For years, Kent was held confined in a British prison and all attempts to obtain from him information as to the communications which passed between Churchill and Roosevelt have been futile.

Kent claimed that his purpose in disclosing these messages was to prevent war, and it was alleged that, while high officials here were talking peace, they were, as a matter of fact, planning war.

Will the committee on Pearl Harbor call Kent? Will it call Kennedy? Will it call those who in the State Department or in any other department here in Washington put into code and deciphered the some 450 cables which Kent's mother claims were exchanged between Roosevelt and Churchill?

Will the committee call the Government's employees in London and compel them under oath to disclose the contents of these messages?

There is in particular one message which it is claimed was sent by Churchill to Roosevelt in October of 1939, in which, it is charged, Churchill, who was not the Prime Minister, wrote:

> I am half American and a natural person to work with you. It is evident we see eye to eye. Were I to become Prime Minister of Britain we could control the world.

Now it is stated that President Roosevelt deprived young Kent of his citizenship; that he is no longer an American citizen.

It is to be hoped that the committee will insist that the facts in connection with Tyler Kent's arrest and incarceration be made public; that the truth of the many rumors which have been circulated about the secret communications between Churchill and Roosevelt be ascertained.

In justice to the memory of one of these men and in justice to the other, the people of these United States and of the British Empire should learn whether or not these two men were plotting to get the United States into war or whether they were seeking to avoid war—this not solely for the purpose of clearing the record, but in the hope that other like incidents, other like conspiracies, if there was a conspiracy, might in the future be avoided and American lives saved.

American mothers and wives have the right to know whether those in authority are planning or following a course which will bring war.

Reference to this matter was made by me on June 8, 1945—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5801—and more recently I received a latter calling attention to the Kent incident, pertinent parts of which are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 7, 1945.*

Rep. CLARE HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Following my telegram of August 7th, my contacts with the women of the country reveal the great interest which is being manifested in the investigation of Pearl Harbor. Many people know that no Congressional Investigating Committee will expose the entire truth about Pearl Harbor unless it fearlessly traces the intrigues which preceded our shameful disaster. The released report of Army and Navy investigations about Pearl Harbor, as well as John T. Flynn's remarkable investigations, while giving us much invaluable information, do not tell the whole story and omit many important matters which should be disclosed to our people. Such disclosures have nothing to do with party politics; the heartaches of war are the same, regardless of party.

A record is in existence, it is contained in several hundred cablegrams which were exchanged between Winston Churchill and the late President Roosevelt through the medium of the American Embassy in London, using the State Department secret code. In a Congressional message you brought out the case of Tyler Kent. The Pearl Harbor investigation will be incomplete if the cables exchanged between Roosevelt and Churchill are not brought within the orbit of public daylight.

When President Truman blames "the Nation as much as any individuals" for the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor, we need to analyze this statement. If, for instance, someone would blame the American people for the weather, we should demand to be shown just how they were to blame. Certainly in the Pearl Harbor matter the American people had nothing to do with the foreign diplomacy, the intelligence service, or the warnings to be sent to Pearl Harbor. The assertion is made that the people did not support the President in his efforts for preparedness. Does this mean that the isolationists or those who were for America first were to blame? Is it permissible to ask: If the preparedness had been greater, would there not have been more ships tied up at Pearl Harbor to be destroyed and would there not have been more men whose lives would have been lost? That certainly would have been the result with the same kind of diplomacy and warnings. Could it be that the blame should be laid at the door of those in the Roosevelt administration, the State Department, and the British Foreign Office? The first two had complete charge of affairs, and the attitude of the third is indicated by the remarks of their propagandists. For confirmation we quote from the book, Propaganda in the Next War, by the British author, Sidney Rogerson:

"In the next war, as in the last, the result will probably depend upon the way in which the United States acts, and her attitude will reflect the reaction of her people to propaganda properly applied. * * *

"Fortunately, with America, our propaganda is on firm ground. We can be entirely sincere, as our main plank will be the old democratic one. * * *

"The position will naturally be eased if Japan were involved, and this might and probably would bring America in without further ado. At any rate, it would be a natural and obvious object of our propagandists to achieve this, just as during the Great War they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany."

In the New York Journal American of July 16, 1941, it is quoted that "Lord Northcliffe himself said in his book in 1928 that he spent $150,000,000 in the United States in 1917 to get America into the war."

Still further information is furnished by Sir George Paish, who, when in this country in 1940, is quoted in the Journal American of August 30, 1940, as saying, "I am responsible for getting this country into the last war and I intend to get it into this one."

The same newspaper, in the issue of July 16, 1941, quotes from a book written by Winston Churchill in 1925, which states: "The best way to secure American sympathy is to get American blood shed on the field."

With all these expressions of the desire of the British to get America into war, only a complete revelation of the cablegrams exchanged between Roosevelt and Churchill can expose the full truth, and it is that which we hope you will demand at once. Tyler Kent is still alive; his personal safety should be demanded. Capt. A. Ramsay, Scotch member of Parliament, is also alive. Joseph P. Kennedy is until now in this country and should not be allowed to leave it until events leading to Pearl Harbor have been revealed.

The State Department cannot deny having the files or the cablegrams exchanged between Churchill and Roosevelt. Therefore, the elements leading to the discovery of the truth are not lacking. May we, therefore, hope that you and other patriotic Congressmen will not allow any congressional investigation committee to overlook any of the important factors connected with the Tyler Kent case.

Patriotically yours,

NAGENE CAMPBELL BETHUNE.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Tulsa Tribune.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include letters from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a poem by Alexander M. Sullivan, business manager of the Boston school committee.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Reader's Digest of October on the subject of stream pollution.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include two matters, one a report from his Committee on Procedure in the Postwar Era and an article from the Army and Navy Journal.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a quotation from the President of the United States on the subject of child-care centers.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article from the New York Times.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

PAY OF WORKERS IN NAVY YARDS

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of calling attention to a bill which I introduced this morning to pay to the workers in the navy yards, in Government arsenals, and other establishments the same pay for the cut-back week of 40 hours that they formerly received for 48 hours.

I believe this to be a very important measure, and I hope the Members will take suitable notice of it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2466. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; and

H. R. 2951. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 694. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 9, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Wednesday, October 10, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, will meet at 10 a. m. Tuesday, October 9, to begin hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

Various groups who have representation in Washington will be heard during the first week, such as Members of Congress first, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Association of American Railroads, railroad traffic organizations, railroad labor, and truck and bus associations.

The second week will be devoted to various State commissions, agricultural associations, National Industrial Traffic League, and various citizens' traffic associations and traffic boards, and chambers of commerce.

It is going to be necessary to limit the time for this hearing as much as possible. It is also desired to avoid any repetition in statements before the committee.

The committee would be pleased to have those who are intending to appear to advise the clerk promptly the least amount of time they will need in which to present their testimony.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

721. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report (list No. 1) reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 314 individual whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by his immediate predecessor, Attorney General Biddle, and 2 reports (lists Nos. 2 and 3) of the cases of 458 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. R. 4307. A bill to amend sections 81, 82, 83, and 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 4308. A bill to protect employees at all Government navy yards, naval stations, arsenals, and other Government establishments against hardship by reason of reduction in compensation due to reduced hours of work and to continue purchasing power at a high level, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1945

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 2, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose keeping are the destinies of men and nations, endue with Thy wisdom our fallible minds. In the midst of decisions that concern fearful forces of nature which if not harnessed by mutual good will may destroy us utterly, give us greatness of soul that the keys of new power may be used to open doors, not of peril but of plenty, for the whole earth. In disturbing days strengthen us with the assurance that in the supreme tests only the soul is decisive and that only the spirit can save the flesh.

So distill upon us the dews of quietness and calm that in simple trust and deeper reverence we may be found steadfast and abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that in Him and for Him and with Him our labor is not in vain. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, October 5, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1062) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

SENATOR FROM OHIO

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Hon. JAMES W. HUFFMAN, appointed by the Governor of Ohio as Senator from that State to succeed Hon. Harold H. Burton.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF OHIO,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Ohio, I, Frank J. Lausche, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint JAMES W. HUFFMAN a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the resignation of Harold H. Burton, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Frank J. Lausche, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbus this 8th day of October, in the year of our Lord, 1945.

By the Governor:
FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Governor.

[SEAL] EDWARD HUMMEL,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be received and placed on file.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator-designate is in the Chamber and ready to take the oath.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the bar of the Senate, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. HUFFMAN, escorted by Mr. TAFT, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to him by the President pro tempore.

REPORTS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying reports, referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Ninety-third, Ninety-fourth, and Ninety-fifth Annual Reports of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1942, 1943, and 1944.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 9, 1945.*

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 5, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 136. An act for the relief of the Oregon Caves Resort;

S. 451. An act for the relief of Carl Baumann;

S. 573. An act for the relief of Lee D. Hoseley;

S. 694. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers;

S. 711. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Fuhrmann;

S. 729. An act for the relief of William Andrew Evans;

S. 732. An act for the relief of Ensign Elmer H. Beckmann, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 762. An act for the relief of Everett McLendon, Sr.; Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr.; Mr. and Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr., for the benefit of their minor daughter, Nadine McLendon; and Everett McLendon, Jr.;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Oliver Jensen;

S. 857. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Ford;

S. 888. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands in the vicinity of the War Department Pentagon Building in Arlington, Va.;

S. 902. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in a Quonset hut at Harrowbeer Airport, Yelverton, South Devon, England, on December 26, 1944;

S. 909. An act for the relief of Hugh Egan;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Henry H. Huffman and Mrs. Marie J. Huffman;

S. 985. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires occurring at various naval shore activities;

S. 986. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in administration building at the naval air station, Bunker Hill, Ind., on December 28, 1944;

S. 996. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg) William Augustus White, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 1007. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward P. Standley; and

S. 1265. An act for the relief of John R. Jennings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADMINISTRATOR ON RENT CONTROL

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control, for the District of Columbia, covering the period January 1 to June 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LAND ACQUISITIONS BY NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the secretary of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, which were referred as indicated:

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Pvt. Ernest Gann, San Francisco, Calif., praying for the prompt return of members of the armed forces from overseas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter from Samuel F. Gaches, president, American Chamber of Commerce, Manila, P. I., relating to the restitution of American capital in the Philippines; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Marcus M. Gilman, commander of the Major General

Maurice D. Rose Post, No. 318, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, embodying a resolution adopted by that post at South Bend, Ind., on October 1, 1945, relating to the persecution of the Jews.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR GENERAL MAURICE D. ROSE POST, NO. 318, JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES,
South Bend, Ind., October 3, 1945.

Hon. RAYMOND WILLIS,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.

SIR: At a meeting of Major General Maurice D. Rose Post, No. 318, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, held in South Bend, Ind., on October 1, 1945, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas in spite of the end of the war against fascism, many of the European countries are still persecuting the Jews and discriminating against them in so violent a manner that they are deprived of the possibility of decent, human living; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has recently taken steps to ameliorate these injustices in Germany: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we appeal to Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States, and to Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State, and to the Members of Congress, that they take the proper steps to eliminate these outrages, not only in Germany, but throughout the various European countries that are discriminating against a minority people who have sacrificed more than their share in the struggle for freedom and democracy; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to each Member of Congress, and to all veteran organizations dedicated to American and democratic ideals."

Please use your good offices to the end that the sense of the aforesaid resolution be carried out.

Respectfully submitted.

MARCUS M. GILMAN,
Commander.

RELIEF OF THE STRICKEN PEOPLE OF GREECE — RESOLUTION OF OMAHA CHAPTER 147, ORDER OF AHEPA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, Greece is one of the countries which has suffered deeply as a result of this war. In the city of Omaha in my State there is a considerable population of Greek descent, and they are very much interested in seeing to it that conditions in that country are brought to the attention of Congress and the people of this country so that food and clothing may be sent to the people of Greece this year.

I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter and a resolution that comes from the Omaha Chapter 147 of the Order of Ahepa and my letter of reply.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letters and resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The letters and resolution were received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ORDER OF AHEPA, NO. 147,
Omaha, Nebr., September 26, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senator,
State of Nebraska, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: Herewith, enclosed, I am sending you a copy of a resolution adopted by Omaha Chapter, No. 147, Order of Ahepa of the United States of America.

The national headquarters of the Order of Ahepa is located in Washington, D. C., and shortly, the officers of the supreme lodge will be calling on you regarding the facts enumerated in our resolution.

Personally, I feel very deeply on this subject. I have a large number of letters from relatives and friends, living in Greece, and the pleas in these letters are pitiful and the conditions are terrible.

Although Greece has not been in war for a year, nevertheless there is tremendous suffering throughout the land.

Knowing full well your attitude of helpfulness toward the Grecian people, prompts me to urge you to do all in your power to help relieve their present distress.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

FELIX MELONIS,
President.

OCTOBER 9, 1945.

Mr. FELIX MELONIS,
President, Order of Ahepa,
Omaha, Nebr.

DEAR MR. MELONIS: I have received your letter and resolution adopted by Omaha Chapter, No. 147, Order of Ahepa of the United States of America.

Am submitting the resolution on this date for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Your feelings are justified and I concur with them. I trust that some tangible relief will soon be given the Grecian people.

Thanking you for your communications and appreciating the opportunity of corresponding with you, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH S. WHERRY.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by Omaha Chapter, No. 147, of the Order of Ahepa of the United States of America.

"Whereas Omaha Chapter, No. 147, of the Order of Ahepa of the United States of America in meeting duly assembled at the Rome Hotel in Omaha, Nebr., September 23, 1945, unanimously adopted the following resolution; and

"Whereas Omaha Chapter, No. 147, of the Order of Ahepa and nearly all of the members of said chapter are being besieged by their relatives living in the land of Greece to send shoes, clothing, and food. The description of the people and country are appalling. Dreadful conditions exist throughout the country. People live in want without homes, food, and clothing.

"That the Order of Ahepa deeply deplores the wretched condition in which the people of Greece now find themselves, as the terrible results of the war inflicted upon them. These brave and fearless people, resisted with all their might and to their very last drop of blood forceful enemies on all sides until they were overwhelmed by superior strength. The people of Greece upon being conquered were horribly treated and afflicted with unbearable torture and death, and had depraved conditions forced upon them; driven from their homes, and homes destroyed, left them wandering through the streets and hills of their own beloved country, as browbeaten animals. All this and more, the brave people of Greece have stood and fought and endured for the price of freedom; and

"Whereas since hostilities have ceased for more than one year last past in that country, want and hunger tramps in the streets, the naked go unclothed, and the hungry are unfed, and immediate action will be required to save these people from a terrible winter; and

"Whereas this small country of Greece has suffered so terribly from its enemies that unless the victorious Allied Nations of the world pause and hesitate in the march toward a rightful peace, the small country of Greece will not receive its full measure of justice and reparation from its vicious enemies. Thus it may be left a helpless and defeated nation in the hour of victory, for which this small nation struggled and bled alongside of its victorious Allied Powers of the world. The enemy nations fought and killed the flesh and blood of the soldiers of the Allied Powers and are now engaged by intrigue and subtle means in ingratiating themselves into the good graces of the representatives of the victorious Allied Nations for the avowed purpose of depriving this mighty and little nation of Greece of being restored to her just and rightful place among the nations of the world: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That Omaha Chapter, No. 147, of the Order of Ahepa in meeting assembled do beg and implore the representatives of the victorious Allied Nations of the world to immediately bring relief to the war-stricken people of Greece and in their deliberations of the peace to come to see that the country of Greece is restored to her lawful place among the nations of the world. That reparation in full measure be exacted from all enemies and that the nation of Greece and its possessions be restored unto her; and, therefore, be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. KENNETH WHERRY, United States Senator from Nebraska, Washington, D. C.; Hon. HUGH BUTLER, United States Senator from Nebraska, Washington, D. C.; and Hon. HOWARD BUFFETT, Congressman from District No. 2, State of Nebraska, Washington, D. C."

FELIX MELONIS,
President, Chapter, No. 147, Order of Ahepa, Omaha, Nebr.

Attest:

GUST PSERROS, *Secretary.*

STATEHOOD FOR PUERTO RICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution approved by the Puerto Rico Statehood Congress, held at Ponce, P. R., on July 25, 1945, relating to statehood for Puerto Rico.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas after the Spanish-American War President William McKinley, of the United States, officially stated that there should not be the slightest doubt that the United States were resolved to retain the island of Puerto Rico under their flag; and

Whereas the great Puerto Rican patriot, Eugenio María De Hostos advised Puerto Ricans, in a letter written from New York on September 10, 1898, to ask the National Congress to recognize Puerto Rico's capacity to become a State of the Union; and

Whereas, Drs. Herma and Zeno Gandia, acting as did De Hostos in their capacity as official delegates of Puerto Rico, requested President McKinley to extend American citizenship to Puerto Rico; and

Whereas those same delegates pointed out, early in their mission, that we should be treated and considered as befits a people

which gave a cordial reception to those who approached it as its liberators and friends who would extend to it their own institutions of government; and

Whereas the Presidents who succeeded McKinley, two of them, Roosevelt and Taft, from his same party, and the third, Wilson, a Democrat, coincided in recommending with systematical insistence, until the last named obtained it, that American citizenship be extended to us; and

Whereas Puerto Ricans were drafted in the First World War, loyally complied with their duties as citizens, and there was not a single case of desertion; and

Whereas in 1921 President Harding, on an official occasion in New York, referred to Puerto Rico's association with the United States, acknowledging the permanence of this association, and thus underscoring the expressions of other statesmen of the Nation, and stated further that Puerto Rico was the American state which would serve as interpreter for the two Americas; and

Whereas when the new Nationality Act was approved in 1940 Congress acknowledged that Puerto Rico, like the incorporated Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, is an integral part of the American Nation, by providing that the children of this island, like those of the mainland, are citizens of the Nation by reason of their birth on American soil, regardless of the citizenship of their parents; and

Whereas when the Selective Service Act was enacted on the eve of our entry into the Second World War the American citizens of Puerto Rico covered this Territory's quota with volunteers; and

Whereas during this war the fighting men of Puerto Rico have fought on all the battlefields on land, sea, and air, many have been cited for their courage and gallantry, and many have received exceptional distinction by being assigned to posts of great responsibility; and

Whereas the National Government has entrusted more than one Puerto Rican, at inter-American and international conferences, with diplomatic and cultural missions which were officially approved by the Secretary of State of the United States; and

Whereas we have not only complied fully with our military duties during this war but we have also, in no less measure, done our job as American citizens in respect to the effort of our civilian population, which has accepted in the highest spirit of patriotism all the limitations and privations which the war effort entails, and has exceeded its quotas in the purchase of war bonds, having recently surpassed all the States of the Union in this last respect; and

Whereas in 47 years of fruitful association with the United States, we have, while losing nothing fundamental to our spirit, added to our culture the very valuable and capital contributions of the culture of the mainland, so that we are now a people thoroughly steeped in the institutions of the Nation; and

Whereas as far back as June 23, 1823, Thomas Jefferson recommended to President Monroe the desirability of incorporating the island of Cuba as a new State, in order to strengthen the power of the Union, within "our system of States," despite the fact that the Cubans were not citizens of the United States, had no political relationship with them, and spoke no English, and that Cuba was then much farther from the land of Jefferson, in point of time, than is Puerto Rico now; and

Whereas when American citizenship was tendered to us it was rejected by only 278 Puerto Ricans, and accepted by one and one-half million; and

Whereas the acceptance of American citizenship, as was then pointed out among others by the great independence leader, José de Diego, meant our merging with all other American citizens under the sovereignty of the United States; and

Whereas all these acts and facts show that it was the intention of the United States that Puerto Rico be permanently a part of the Nation, and that in due time there would be fulfilled here the thought expressed by McKinley when he appointed the first civil governor for this island and instructed him to prepare Puerto Rico for statehood; and

Whereas no responsible Government official here or in Washington can feel that the rights of American citizenship are to be extended only partially to us, but rather that these rights should be gradually enlarged until they are enjoyed to the fullest extent possible under the American flag, following the traditional pattern of Territories in their progress toward statehood: Now, therefore, this Congress does

Resolve, To petition the President and the Congress of the United States that the main line of political orientation thus far established be not destroyed; that on the contrary it be emphasized progressively and affirmatively, fairly, and without discrimination; that the American citizens of Puerto Rico be afforded the same opportunities for economic well-being and political independence within the constitutional system of the United States as have been afforded to the people of the 48 members of the Union, who enjoy a republican system of government under a powerful association which guarantees its own sovereignty; to the end that there be no colonial peoples under our flag and that the solemn promise of Gen. Nelson A. Miles upon arriving on our shores, in 1898, that he brought us the blessings of liberty, be truly fulfilled; it is further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of our Nation, Hon. Harry S. Truman, to the members of his Cabinet, to the presiding officers and all of the Members of both Houses of Congress, and to the principal newspapers of the mainland.

PROBLEMS OF MERCHANTS UNDER OPA REGULATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, a letter I have received from a group of small businessmen in Visalia, Calif., relative to some of the problems with which they are faced in connection with their present operations.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

VISALIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Visalia, Calif., October 3, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: The Visalia merchants whose signatures are affixed to this letter appeal to you to do whatever is within your power to stop the squeeze OPA has been tightening on the Nation's merchants to cover up higher costs for labor and raw materials without raising prices to consumers.

We wish to call to your attention that in 1945 OPA has allowed 54 general increases in costs of merchandise and all but three of these the merchant has had to pay out of his own pocketbook since he must continue to sell at his wartime ceilings. In addition, during 1945, OPA allowed 3,911 special price advances for individual manufacturers, processors, etc., and merchants have had to pay for these advances too out of their own pocketbooks.

It should further be noted that approximately 85 percent of retailing wartime profits have resulted from savings in services that wartime would not permit retailers to perform for their customers. These services are now expected of retailers and will have to be resumed. In fact, it is these services which will provide jobs for the returning veterans and for others who have lost their wartime jobs.

Also, studies show that corporate retail profits were more than one-fourth less than those of manufacturing corporations, whose wartime earnings increase was markedly above the over-all average.

We feel that if rigid price control continues, while wage increases are permitted, it will slow up reconversion and will block maximum employment.

The undersigned believe that when you have studied this problem, you will be convinced that the OPA's price-control program cannot succeed, and we respectfully request that you do whatever is possible to bring about a condition which will permit retailers to stay in business and to continue with our program to offer additional employment to servicemen and others who are or will be in need of jobs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Finance:

S. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution permitting federally owned alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol; with amendments (Rept. No. 626).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 914. A bill to amend the Tariff Act, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 629).

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 356. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide a limitation on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle; with amendments (Rept. No. 627); and

S. 432. A bill to increase the period of limitation on actions against railroad carriers for recovery of overcharges from 2 to 4 years; with amendments (Rept. No. 628).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 263. A bill for the relief of Margery Anderson Bridges; without amendment (Rept. No. 630); and

H. R. 1104. A bill to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 631).

By Mr. HOEY, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 386. A bill to amend the law relating to the authority of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to make arrests without warrant in certain cases and to search vehicles within certain areas; without amendment (Rept. No. 632).

By Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 390. A bill to amend section 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924; without amendment (Rept. No. 633).

By Mr. DONNELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 391. A bill to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940; with an amendment (Rept. No. 634).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 239. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark; without amendment (Rept. No. 635); and

H. R. 240. A bill for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks; without amendment (Rept. No. 636).

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of September 1945 from the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relating to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

OCTOBER 4, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944 (see attached memorandum).

CARL A. HATCH, *Chairman.*
By W. H. MCMAINS.

OCTOBER 4, 1945.

To: Senator CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

From: Senator PAT MCCARRAN, chairman, Subcommittee to Investigate Administration and Use of Public Lands.

The following persons were detailed from the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, to assist with the work of the above-mentioned subcommittee:

Earl S. Haskell, senior administrative officer, Forest Service, CAF–12; basic salary, $5,000 per annum.

Elizabeth Heckman, clerk, CAF–5; basic salary, $2,000 per annum.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1467. A bill to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations, of unpaid balances in the pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes; and

S. 1468. A bill to authorize temporarily the allowance of leave to officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard retired subsequent to September 8, 1939, and retained on active duty, to the same extent as if such officers had not been retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1469. A bill for the relief of Enok Thue Hansen; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1470. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish the Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1938, so as to grant for an indefinite period the right to locate and patent mining claims within certain areas of the Olympic National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 1471. A bill to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1472. A bill providing for the observance as National Flag Raising Day of the day on which the public schools open each year for the beginning of a new school year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. MCMAHON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 179), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That a special committee on atomic energy, to be composed of nine Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate is authorized and directed to make a full, complete, and continuing study and investigation with respect to problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy. All bills and resolutions introduced in the Senate, and all bills and resolutions from the House of Representatives, proposing legislation relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be referred to the special committee. The special committee is authorized to report to the Senate at any time by bill or otherwise with recommendations upon any matters covered by this resolution.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $2,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMERCIAL AND RECREATIONAL FISHERIES RESOURCES OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 180), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the commercial and recreational fisheries resources of the Columbia River Basin with particular reference to the effects on such fisheries of the construction of dams and other Federal projects. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as to any measures necessary for the protection of such fisheries as it may deem desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY AT MEMORIAL DINNER IN HONOR OF THE LATE ALFRED E. SMITH

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the general committee for the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Hospital, at the memorial dinner to honor the memory of Alfred E. Smith at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, October 4, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S HOMECOMING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, entitled "America's Homecoming," delivered by him before the Odd Fellows Homecoming at Frederick, Md., on October 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LONDON COUNCIL OF FOREIGN MINISTERS—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address, constituting a report on the first session of the Council of Foreign Ministers, delivered by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, on October 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT BY BASIL O'CONNOR

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Nothing Could Conquer Him," delivered by Hon. Basil O'Connor, chairman, executive committee of board of trustees, Georgia Warm Springs Foundation, at Warm Springs, Ga., on August 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEDICAL RESEARCH—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Think, Two Billions for a Bomb—How Much To Conquer Disease?", published originally in the Philadelphia Record and widely reprinted, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to bills on the calendar beginning at the place where the last call was concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capehart	Gerry
Andrews	Capper	Green
Austin	Carville	Guffey
Bailey	Chavez	Gurney
Bankhead	Connally	Hart
Bilbo	Cordon	Hawkes
Brewster	Donnell	Hayden
Briggs	Ellender	Hickenlooper
Buck	Ferguson	Hill
Butler	Fulbright	Hoey
Byrd	George	Huffman

Johnson, Colo.	Moore	Stewart
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Taft
Kilgore	Murdock	Taylor
Knowland	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
La Follette	Myers	Tunnell
Langer	O'Daniel	Tydings
Lucas	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
McCarran	Overton	Wagner
McClellan	Radcliffe	Walsh
McKellar	Reed	Wheeler
McMahon	Revercomb	Wherry
Magnuson	Robertson	White
Maybank	Russell	Wiley
Mead	Saltonstall	Willis
Millikin	Shipstead	Wilson
Mitchell	Smith	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and therefore is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PROPOSED CONGRESSIONAL RECEPTION TO GEN. DOUGLAS A. MACARTHUR

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur, United States commander in chief of the armed forces in the Pacific and supreme commander for the Allied Powers for the purpose of enforcing the surrender of Japan, is invited to address a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress in the Hall of the House of Representatives at such time as shall be designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and as may be convenient to General MacArthur.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry. By this concurrent resolution it is sought, as I understand, to invite the General to a reception which is to take place in the House. I understand the House has not acted, and it seems to me it is not good form for the Senate to initiate a resolution with respect to what should happen in the House of Representatives, nor should the Senate agree to such a resolution until the House has acted in the matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the Senator from Texas that the measure I have introduced is a concurrent resolution, and the House will have to act on it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know it is a concurrent resolution, but it seems to me that in a matter of this kind the House should initiate the proposal, if the reception is to be held in the House Chamber. I make that suggestion because of the comity which exists between the two bodies and the respect which should be shown the House in view of the custom which has long existed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is also the custom, when joint meetings or sessions are held, to hold them in the Hall of the House of Representatives. I would not think the point raised by the Senator from Texas is of sufficient importance to preclude the Senate from initiating action on a concurrent resolution and asking the House to join.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not desire to speak at any length in support of this resolution. Neither its merits nor its appropriateness require any explanation or discussion. We have had the privilege of having General Eisenhower, General Wainright, and Admiral Nimitz address the Congress since the termination of hostilities in Germany and Japan. The Congress and the Nation have paid them the honor and tribute they so richly deserved.

Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur, as commander in chief of our air, land, and sea forces in his theater, had the major responsibility for the successful conduct of the war against Japan, and, Mr. President, General MacArthur in my opinion has done a job unexcelled by any of our military leaders in this war. He is a native of my State, Arkansas, and recently accepted an invitation to attend a celebration there in his honor just as soon as he has an opportunity to return to the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the unanimous adoption of the pending concurrent resolution, and I sincerely hope we may have General MacArthur with us soon.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I do not desire to delay action on the concurrent resolution. I am in favor of it. I had intended at the proper time—and I know of no better time than now—to read to the Senate a cablegram which I have received from Japan in reference to the existing situation there, and especially in reference to the relations between General MacArthur and the people of Japan. I think the telegram is very informative, and that the Senate would be pleased to have its contents in the RECORD.

Mr. President, a few days ago I received a delayed cablegram from Rev. P. J. Byrne, an American missionary whose headquarters are at Kyoto, Japan. It presents the views of some Americans, long in Japan, and a point of view that Americans should consider with their judgment on the MacArthur policy.

The signer of this cablegram has been a missionary in Japan for several years, and is a man of sound judgment and a real American.

I quote certain phrases from the cablegram which I am sure will interest the American people regardless of their present views:

People expected strictness, efficient American action, and are getting it.

* * * * *

As amazing consequence of foregoing, Japanese people despite bombing, bear little or no resentment against Americans.

* * * * *

Emperor has no practical connection with government, but veneration of him is basis of national unity. His deposition would overnight transform 70,000,000 orderly, now cooperating, citizens into riotous anarchistic mob. Occupation forces would have to be more than doubled; must stay 10 times longer than under MacArthur's eminently practical policy.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask that the delayed cablegram be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the cablegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOKYO, *September 20, 1945.*

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

Maryknoll fathers join entire Catholic body Japan in commending General MacArthur's masterly occupation policy.

People expected strictness, efficient American action, and are getting it; also getting consideration of reasonable requests with consequent stimulation of own active cooperation.

But highest esteem of all won and clinched by the superb statesmanship of respecting their veneration of Emperor and shrines, and utilizing it as practical instrument toward executing Potsdam program at minimum cost in forces and in time.

As amazing consequence of foregoing, Japanese people, despite bombing, bear little or no resentment against Americans. Furthermore, new liberal government formally welcoming American religious and cultural workers. Consequently, am wiring Maryknoll send priests and sisters, as many and as soon as possible. Jesuit University, Tokyo, Madames of Sacred Heart, Sisters of Notre Dame, and other religious societies have same optimistic conviction and program.

Unfortunately, disturbing criticisms heard anent MacArthur's policy, particularly from certain newspaper correspondents. Apparently some officials favor Nazi attitude toward Japanese people, and advocate deposing Emperor.

Emperor has no practical connection with government, but veneration of him is basis of national unity. His deposition would overnight transform 70,000,000 orderly, now cooperating, citizens into riotous anarchistic mob. Occupation forces would have to be more than doubled; must stay 10 times longer

than under MacArthur's eminently practical policy. Incidentally all religious effort would be hopelessly ruined.

Earnestly request your good offices toward impressing authorities with vital necessity MacArthur's present policy be freely maintained over here and fully sustained over there.

Gratefully,

Father BYRNE.

MARYKNOLL, KYOTO, JAPAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Arkansas.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) was agreed to.

OPERATION OF BIG INCH AND LITTLE BIG INCH PIPE LINES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the New York Times of September 29, 1945, there appears an advertisement by the Office of Surplus Property, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as the disposal agency, advertising for sale or lease Government-owned Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines. This advertisement is as follows:

GOVERNMENT-OWNED BIG INCH AND LITTLE BIG INCH PIPE LINES FOR SALE OR LEASE

Two large Government-owned transcontinental petroleum pipe lines will soon be declared surplus. They extend from Texas northeasterly to a midway terminal at Norris City, Ill., and from there to terminals in eastern Pennsylvania and the New York-New Jersey area. Both were construed to meet the critical petroleum emergency during the war.

BIG INCH CRUDE OIL STEEL PIPE LINE

Twenty-four-inch main line extends 1,254 miles, from Longview, Tex., to Phoenixville, Pa. Twenty-inch branches reach to Philadelphia area and Linden Terminal in New Jersey. The system includes feeder and distribution lines, but depends partly on privately owned lines.

Twenty-seven pumping stations are placed approximately 50 miles apart. Designed capacity is 300,000 barrels per day.

LITTLE BIG INCH PETROLEUM PRODUCTS STEEL PIPE LINE

Twenty-inch main line extends 1,475 miles, from Beaumont, Tex., to the New York-New Jersey area. System includes feeder and distribution lines, but depends partly on privately owned lines.

Thirty-one pumping stations are placed approximately 50 miles apart. Designed capacity is 235,000 barrels per day when operated on gasoline; lower capacity if operated on mixed products, depending on viscosity.

Persons interested in obtaining full information for these properties and in negotiating for their purchase or lease should communicate at Washington, D. C., with George F. Buskie, executive director, or F. E. Berquist, Acting Deputy Director, Plant Disposal, Office of Surplus Property, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a disposal agency designated by the Surplus Property Board, Washington 25, D. C.

Mr. President, I wish to register an emphatic protest against having the Government sell either of these two lines. I can readily understand why the big interests and others are opposed to having the Government own these two lines, but I know of no reason why the common people of this country, through their Government, should not continue to own them. Right now they can bring in 235,000 barrels of gasoline a day from the South to the East. If they are operated, they will do much to avert suffering because of lack of fuel among the people of the East.

I have prepared a concurrent resolution stating that it is the will of the Congress that these pipe lines not be sold or leased.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to submit the concurrent resolution and that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) was received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government-owned pipe lines known as Big Inch and Little Big Inch, extending from Texas to the New York-New Jersey area, should not be disposed of as surplus property, but should be retained and operated by the United States.

PROGRESS OF DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement which should be of special interest to all Members of the Senate, and I make it as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee and on my own responsibility.

Mr. President, I am certain every Member of the Senate has been deeply impressed with the sentiments recently expressed in the mail they have received from men in the armed services, both Army and Navy, and from the parents and families of those in the service. That there is a great deal of discontent and dissatisfaction at the slowness with which the demobilization program of the Army and Navy is being administered is obvious. That there has been a decline in the morale of officers and enlisted men among the Reserves in the Army and Navy is apparent. This situation is unfortunate, especially in view of the magnificent job and the tremendous sacrifices made by those who entered the service during the war.

These men entered the service to fight the war and to bring victory to the American cause. They have finished the job; the fighting is over; the long and weary and lonesome hours spent far away from loved ones, which they were willing to do during the period of the war but naturally has led them now to turn their thoughts to home and return to peacetime pursuits.

I repeat what I said a short time ago—in my opinion, those who are remaining in the armed service and their families and friends are more concerned about the speedy demobilization of the Army and Navy than any single factor of the postwar program. Reconversion and unemployment problems are of tremendous importance, but in the homes of these men the one thought is that of the return of their loved ones. The question which is heard in every home every hour of the day, day and night, is—"When is my son coming home?" "When is my husband going to return?" These are the uppermost thoughts of millions of our people, and it is in their thoughts from morning until night.

"When am I going to get away from the atmosphere of war and the discipline of Army and Navy life, from the unpleasant surroundings, monotonous daily routine, and the lonesome spots that I have willingly accepted during the war?" "When am I to meet those nearest and dearest to me in life, face to face?" These are the constant thoughts of millions of our men who are still in the armed services.

We must recognize this condition, and we must act. It would be most unfortunate if these men continue long in their present state of mind, which not only is widespread but is reaching proportions that will have serious effect on the enlistment of men in the postwar Army and Navy.

Let me quote from one of thousands of letters I have received, some of which have been signed by nearly every man on naval vessels:

We are proud of having played a small part in winning a glorious victory and will always be proud and cherish the thought that we have been part of such a great victory. We have respect for the Navy and its accomplishments; however, just as we are able to quickly point out the good aspects, we are also able to pick out its shortcomings, too. We honestly believe, Mr. WALSH, that the Navy today has not done its utmost or its best to demobilize the Navy as quickly as possible, and we feel that only if the Members of the Senate and House demand its speeding up will demobilization be speeded up.

When it was necessary for the Navy to get us out into these areas of the Pacific no time was lost getting us out. It now seems strange that it should take so long to get us home now that the war has been won. It is our honest hope that you and other Members of Congress will do everything possible to speed up demobilization of Navy personnel. If we can't be demobilized quickly, then at least send us home as quickly as possible. I am sure that waiting for release from the Navy would be a little easier back in the States rather than on some isolated island in the Pacific.

Similar letters have come to me in reference to the Army.

The above quotation is in a letter sent to me and signed by 20 or more enlisted personnel on one of the naval vessels in the Pacific.

Now I do not intend to speak in criticism of the Navy or the Army. I realize they have a tremendous task and that certain inequities are certain to follow in any system of demobilization and that delays are inevitable. The problem before the Navy is monumental, and we and the men in the service must be patient.

I realize it is going to take time, but I realize also that the absence of any definite promise of a particular time when the Reserves can look forward to coming home is a source of great irritation. I have made several suggestions, particularly to the Navy Department, on this subject, and I know they have given these suggestions most careful and sympathetic consideration. They have repeatedly liberalized their program of demobilization, and I think in the main they appreciate the serious morale situation that is resulting at the present time.

The Army and Navy officials must realize that these men cannot talk to them as they can to their representatives in the Congress, and I am speaking today in the hope that through the Navy officials

here in Washington, every other officer in the Navy should realize that the first and most important concern of the Navy is to return its Reserve officers and enlisted men to America with the least possible delay. I want my words today to stimulate every person concerned with the job of demobilization to speed and speed and speed this job, to undertake this task with the attention, efficiency, and ability that they manifested in bringing the war to such a glorious finish.

What can be done? We must recognize that the job must be done in an orderly manner. We must realize that some, at least, will have to be retained in Pacific waters. One thing I make bold to suggest is that every ship in the Navy and every ship under the control of the Army or the merchant marine be made available to return these men to America. At least we should let these men and their families know that every available transportation facility is to be put at their disposal and that every officer at every station and on every ship is aroused to the necessity of cooperating in every way possible to the end that the war may be over for those who are still in uniform as well as it is over for us who are here at home enjoying peace and tranquillity and following our usual peacetime civilian pursuits.

In behalf of the thousands who have written me I want to assure them that Members of the Congress are using, and intend to continue to use, all their influence to attain the objective upon which their hearts are set.

They must realize, however, that the power of Members of Congress is limited, as we are still technically at war and will be so long as the war emergency exists. In a word, it is up to the Army and Navy to finish this job as satisfactorily as they have finished the fighting job, and to leave nothing undone to answer the plea from these practically voiceless men of the armed services.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think the Senate is very grateful to the Senator for this statement, and for the effect he has made along the lines indicated. However, I should like to ask the Senator if he knows the rate of demobilization of the Navy as of the present time? The rate of demobilization of the Army is approximately 30,000 a day. I understand that the demobilization rate in the Navy is only 1 percent of 30,000 a day.

Mr. WALSH. The Navy has been demobilizing for only 6 weeks. The Army began demobilizing after VE-day. During the month of September approximately 112,649 enlisted men and 15,519 officers were demobilized in the Navy. On the last day of September the daily average was nearly 10,000. It seems to me that the Navy was not fully prepared to undertake as speedily and quickly the needed demobilization program. However, the Navy has a different problem than that of the Army. With an Infantry regiment literally all that it is necessary to do is to say to the men, "Stack your guns and go home." But the Navy consists of many units. If a program were adopted, let us say, calling for the immediate demobilization of all men with 5 years' service, it might take every cook off a ship. A cook may be more valuable than the commanding officer. So I sympathize with the very serious problem which the Navy has; yet I feel that the demobilization should be speeded up, and should be conducted much more rapidly than has been the case heretofore.

I am glad to have the observation of the Senator. I wish to impress upon Senators that the officers and men in the Navy are tied up together. Taking out any group from any one of the links is likely to leave a ship stranded in the Pacific without the full manpower required to bring it back to American shores.

Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WALSH. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I am thankful to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which I am a member, for the statement he has made.

Is it not true that the Navy was not in a position to do much demobilization until after VJ-day? That, of course, caused many delays. It is also true, with regard to both the Army and Navy, that we are demobilizing 10,000,000 men. It required 4 years to get them into the service. Each man must be thoroughly processed before being discharged. He must have a thorough physical examination before being discharged. It requires time for each man to get his last discharge.

Mr. WALSH. That is true of the Army, too.

Mr. ANDREWS. Those men, with their equipment, if possible, must be brought back home over distances from 4,000 to 10,000 miles. It seems to me that the demobilization has been conducted as expeditiously as is practicable under the circumstances.

There is one more thing that is worrying these young men. Let me say, that besides my own son, I have had 14 nephews in this war, some of whom will not come back. Those still in the service are apprehensive lest they come back to find their mothers, sisters, wives, and babies cold this winter. Those men do not know whether they can telephone their loved ones at home when they reach the United States. There are hundreds of strikes, and many threatening. Congress or someone else must get busy and settle the strikes which are in progress. Otherwise, how are we to transform our plants into working units for the manufacture of consumer goods? We cannot do it if all the workers sit down and quit, expecting the Government to take care of them.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, my purpose in making this statement was not to be critical of the Army or Navy. It was in the hope that it would stimulate both the Army and the Navy to concentrate on one thing which must be done, and that is to demobilize quickly the men and return them to their homes. My purpose was also, in view of the letters which I have received, to send a message of hope, cheer, and encouragement to those men, to let them know that they are not forgotten, that Members of Congress keenly appreciate their situation, and are desirous of helping them in every possible way. I hope that my message will reach every commanding officer in the Army and Navy everywhere, and that commanding officers will realize the extent to which the men under them, who are voiceless, are anxious to have the demobilization program continued.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have been told by many naval officers that the wartime strength of the crews on naval vessels is often 100 percent more than is necessary to operate the ships, and that they could demobilize between 33 and 50 percent of all the men in the Navy without a single ship being laid up. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. WALSH. It is true that many of the ships are what would be called overmanned.

Mr. TAFT. Necessarily so, in wartime.

Mr. WALSH. That situation comes about partly for the reason that other men were being trained to become familiar with the activities required of officers and men in the Navy, with the expectation that they would be transferred to new ships when they had been commissioned, or take the place of those to be relieved. That is being done. Ships which have come off the ways during the past 6 months are being sent to the Pacific.

To illustrate the sensitiveness of the men, I have a letter signed by every man on a ship, saying to me, "How would you feel if you were on this ship and had been here for 5 years, and found a ship returning which had been here only 6 months? How would you feel in that situation?"

That is the reason which prompted me to make this statement. I want those men to realize that they are not forgotten, that Members of Congress are speaking in their behalf. We who are here as their representatives are speaking to their superiors, to impress upon them what the men themselves cannot say as to the importance of their being sent back home. I am trying to show their anxiety, how disturbed in mind they are, and how tremendously desirous they are of getting rid of what, after the war is over, appear to be unnecessary red tape and conditions from which they want to get away. They fought nobly and bravely, they have done a magnificent job, and they feel that now that the war is over the next thing is to get home. I hope the Army and Navy authorities appreciate that situation, and that is why I have taken occasion to refer to these matters.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Massachusetts has referred to morale. The most appealing letters I receive are from men in the armed services, stationed in

this country, who are disqualified physically for foreign service and are sitting here, doing nothing. In particular, let me say that recently I talked to two doctors who said there were more doctors in their camp than possibly could be used at any time; that they do not have more than 15 or 20 minutes of work to do a day, and that, although an order has been issued for doctors over 45 years of age to be dismissed, actually only 10 in that camp have been dismissed.

It seems to me that not only must we follow the point system, but, in addition, if the men have nothing to do, they should be returned promptly to civilian life.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, that matter has been called to my attention in several letters which I have received, and I have discussed it with the naval authorities. They state that some of the men who are sitting around, apparently doing nothing, are to take the places of men who will be relieved from duty on ships and returned home. I still think there are many men who have finished their jobs or have finished the required schooling to enable them to perform particular duties in the Navy who should be returned home and could be returned home. But apparently it has taken some time to develop the machinery for returning them.

The Senator from Ohio has spoken about doctors. I can understand the situation as to doctors, much as I sympathize with them, because every man must be physically examined before he leaves the service. Physical examinations are given to officers and men at the time of discharge, for their own protection and for the protection of the Government, so that the men who may have claims for compensation in later years will have their records and will be able to have recorded when they are leaving the service what troubles they have met with during their service in the war. So it is essential that a large number of doctors be kept in the service for that purpose, as well as to take care of the casualties and the diseased.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Ohio mentioned the case of doctors. It so happens that I have paid particular attention to the situation of doctors in the Army. I asked the Secretary of War to tell me the number of doctors on the Army rolls as of the 1st of January 1945, when the war on both fronts was going on at full speed; and then, again, I asked him to tell me the number of doctors on the Army rolls as of September 1, when the war on both fronts had died down. It is an astonishing thing that there were 506 more doctors on the Army rolls on the 1st of September 1945 than there were on the 1st of January 1945. That is shown by official figures from the Secretary of War.

I have been trying to bring about the release from the service of a doctor whose local board in his county has asked the State board in Kansas to help get him out because he is needed at home. That doctor tells me that he was kept at a camp near Washington and that all he had to do was examine the feet of men to see whether they had athlete's foot, that anyone could do that sort of work, that he could teach anyone in 5 minutes how to do it. Yet we have been unable to have him released from the service, even though the procurement and assignment boards both of the county and of the State of Kansas have asked that he be returned home.

The handling by the Army and the Surgeon General's office of the question of doctors is a national scandal, and there is a group of us who do not intend to let it lie still.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have been delighted to hear the statement made this morning by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. Since the reconvening of the Congress after the recess, the greatest question at hand with which we have had to deal is the return of our soldiers, sailors, and marines to their homes. There is no doubt that Army demobilization has been speeded up. However, in my opinion it has not been speeded up sufficiently. We are told that there are not a sufficient number of ships available to bring home the men who are in foreign places. Today I am receiving letters from the South Pacific, from men in the service there, who deny that that is so. They say that ships are leaving there unloaded. I call that matter to the attention of the Senate, because if that be true, certainly some action should be taken at once.

I am glad, indeed, that the able senior Senator from Massachusetts has raised his voice on this subject, because it is one which is very close to many of us. I am receiving letters from men in the Navy who say that the Army is demobilizing but that they are not receiving any attention, that they are being left stranded in various foreign areas. That situation should be corrected, and it must be corrected.

I commend the Army for the steps already taken; but I must say they have not gone far enough, even at this time, in regard to the speed of demobilization. Not only does that criticism apply to demobilization of men in the Army in foreign countries, but it applies to men in our own country. In the camps in this country there are men by the thousands who are doing nothing of service to the country, but they are being held in the camps.

I say that if there is any basis of fact for the argument advanced in defense of slow demobilization, namely, that the physical examinations cannot be given fast enough and the demobilization papers cannot be prepared fast enough, then, first, more facilities should be placed in every camp so as to release the men from the camps as rapidly as possible, instead of moving them into the demobilization centers; and, secondly, those who must wait for their demobilization papers should be sent home on furlough and subsequently returned to the camps.

I make this argument and appeal particularly on behalf of the men in the service who have dependents.

Again I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his service in this effort.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his generous remarks. I must say that the Navy has been very considerate of so-called hardship cases. The cases which have been and are now receiving special attention are the so-called hardship cases involving a distress condition at home—for instance, a married man with children and a sick wife. There are many of those cases, and such men are being rapidly discharged, as they should be. Perhaps more attention has been given to those cases than to any other class of cases.

I think we all agree—I know the Senator from West Virginia does—that we must expect some inequalities and some injustice. However, my position is that I must do my utmost to have steps taken immediately to improve the handling of this situation, because many of the men who have written to me have said in their letters, "Will the Members of the Congress take some action? Will you let the Army and Navy know how we feel? We cannot talk to them."

That is my purpose. I wish to let the Army and the Navy know that we are sincerely interested and that we ask that the most concentrated efforts be made in the next few months so as to return the men to civilian life rapidly, rather than to keep them in the service so long that when they return they will come home embittered. Today many of them are disheartened. I have said this to high-ranking officers. Instead of permitting that situation to exist, the men should be returned home promptly, so that no resentment will exist. We want to encourage men to volunteer for the services, so that the postwar Army and Navy will be composed of volunteers and the best way to do it is to reduce to a minimum all discontent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further comment?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad the Senator mentioned hardship cases. I would be unfair if I did not commend the War Department and the Navy Department for their action on the whole in the last few weeks regarding hardship cases. I know they have given them their attention.

Mr. CORDON rose.

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Apropos of the discussion with reference to the slowness with which men are being released from the armed forces, particularly from the Navy, and of the statement which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts with reference to the bitterness which is being felt by the servicemen themselves, I may say that that bitterness is being communicated to the people back home as evidenced by a letter which I received this morning, and from which I shall read three short paragraphs:

Several days ago I received a letter from my son stationed at Pearl Harbor. Among other things, he said in this letter was this: That a congressional committee would shortly visit Pearl Harbor and that the orders

from the Navy to the boys were that while the committee was there they were to keep busy even though they had to do the same thing over and over.

In other letters of his he has told me about the almost complete idleness, how the Navy has maintained transports for the purpose of giving them plane trips, and how the boys are allowed to take unofficial leave for 10 days at a time because there is nothing to do. He told us about the carrier *Wasp* which they are going to take through the Panama Canal. The guns have to be dismounted in order to get the ship through the "ditch." The sole purpose of moving this ship is so that it can participate in a parade in New York Harbor, but no boats are available to bring the boys home.

I shall read no further. I cite the letter as an example of the feeling among fathers and mothers, as well as the boys themselves, because of the slowness and inaction on the part of our military officials in returning the boys to their homes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Similar letters have come to me.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for the statement he has made. I have relied upon the judgment and the work of the distinguished Senator during my consideration of many matters pertaining to policies affecting the entire military force.

I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Massachusetts. The hardship and exceptional cases are matters to which we should give very careful consideration. I have in mind a doctor in Oklahoma who has served in the southwest Pacific. He was a skilled surgeon in this country, but is not permitted even to practice surgery where he is now located. I have also in mind a man who is a father of two children. He was drafted and is now in the Pacific. His business and his home have been completely disrupted. In view of these hardship and exceptional cases are we as a Congress to take the responsibility of passing legislation which will demobilize the military forces more speedily and more effectively than they are now being demobilized, or are we to continue to rely upon the orders and directives which we receive from the military? In other words, in accepting responsibility is there anything that the Congress has left undone which it should do? Are we dilatory in our duties. Shall we continue to rely upon the military and not interfere by legislating, and at the same time expect our military forces to expedite the demobilization of the forces?

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me that the only thing which we can do under the present circumstances is to bring pressure—as I am trying to do today—on the Army and Navy authorities to act more quickly, and concentrate with greater effort upon returning the men to their homes.

One of our difficulties in connection with the problem is the fact that, technically at least, we are still at war. If I or the Senator from Nebraska were to submit a resolution today declaring that the war emergency was over, we would be accused of interfering with the orderly ending of the war, as well as with leaving the Army and the Navy up in the air and crippling the necessary work of preserving the property of the Army and the Navy, and getting our ships back safely to America. I think we should begin to look forward as quickly as possible to the time when we can declare the war emergency to be at an end. Perhaps the time, in some particulars, is here now to eliminate powers which were given under the War Emergency Act. But I wish to impress upon Senators that we must recognize the necessity of orderly procedure. We must also recognize the really serious problems which confront the Army and the Navy, and particularly the Navy. As I have already indicated, the Navy's problems are involved and intricate. However, we should make it at least apparent that we, as a Congress, are concerned and troubled, and that we want action.

I may add that about 3 weeks ago I offered a formula for demobilization. Following that offer, I was amazed at the number of letters which I received from distant points in the Pacific to the effect that "Thank God somebody in Washington is thinking about us and is interested in us. We hope Congress will do its utmost to help us and not forget us." I hope that will be the result of our discussion here today. I hope it will be believed that we are thinking deeply and seriously concerning the problem, and that we are anxious for action.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, about 3 weeks ago I stated that I thought it was time for the Naval Affairs Committee to bring forward a resolution to end the draft and terminate the war so that demobilization could be accomplished with greater speed. It is my opinion—and I am appealing to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee—that the quickest way to bring about demobilization will be by a resolution terminating the war emergency and declaring it to be at an end. I respectfully submit that the chairman consider my suggestion. The resolution could be considered and, if agreed to, the demobilization situation could be speedily brought to an end.

Mr. WALSH. I shall be pleased to give consideration to the Senator's suggestion, but I believe that the time for such a resolution has not yet arrived. If we were to offer such a resolution, I believe we would be charged with undertaking to perform war administrative duties or to interfere with them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has discussed one of the most pertinent and pressing questions we have had to face. I appreciate personally his able statement concerning the problem with which we are confronted.

In one respect I believe the experience of all Members of the Senate has been substantially the same as mine. A great portion of our time is spent on hardship cases in connection with the Army and the Navy. I wish to emphasize the statement which was made in the Senate about professional services, especially in connection with the medical and dental corps in the Army and the Navy. I have come very firmly to the conclusion that the policy of the Army—and to some extent the policy of the Navy, according to my somewhat limited knowledge of Navy policy—is one of the most inexcusable, inefficient, and condemnable policies which exist in the entire war organization. I think that the statement of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] was an appealing one, namely, that on the 1st of September this year there were 500 more physicians in the Army than there were on the 1st of January of last year, even with demobilization taking place at the present rate.

I invite the attention of Senators to an example which is only one of countless examples which are very glaring. In Iowa we have a very famous surgeon who is a specialist in his particular line, and the only one of his kind of whom I know in a radius of several hundred miles of his location. He is the only available surgeon in his particular specialty. He has been in the Army now for approximately 3½ years, having volunteered without being drafted. He is a man well past middle age. That surgeon, one of the most highly trained specialists in his line in the United States, according to my information, has for the last year and a half been denied the opportunity to exercise his specialty in the Army; rather he has been an administrative officer, a glorified clerk, with either the leaf of a lieutenant colonel or the eagle of a colonel on his shoulder—I do not recall his exact rank at the moment. However, he has been denied the operating room, and is keeping records, not records of surgical importance necessarily, but records of the personnel of the Medical Department. He is an administrative officer. His services have been denied to the armed forces. I would have little objection if his great surgical ability could be utilized by the armed forces, but it has been denied to the armed forces because of some policy, as I understand, that after a medical officer reaches the rank of lieutenant colonel, if he is a surgeon, he is not permitted to operate on patients any more but becomes an administrative officer. I could give the Senator countless examples from my own State of fine men in their specialties who, when they become lieutenant colonels or higher in rank, are taken away from the practice of their professions and become administrative officers, so that neither the Army gets the benefit of their professional services, nor are they permitted to go back home to administer to the medical and surgical needs of the civilian population.

I may say further to the Senator that it is a matter of common knowledge to every one that the civilian population is almost destitute of professional care, both medical and dental; certainly that is true of many areas. I think that is one of the phases of the situation that can well be looked into.

I should like to add an inquiry to that made by the Senator from Nebraska. I ask a question which has been in my mind. It is, What, if anything, can we do, other than make speeches, or go to the

War Department or the Navy Department, about the men in the armed forces who really should be demobilized at a faster rate? Is there a possibility of legislation being enacted or is it advisable to take action along that line? I ask the question in all seriousness of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I am sorry to have to say so, but I do not think it would be opportune at this time to pass legislation on the subject. As I said a few moments ago, I believe we ought to begin to think about it, and there will probably come a time in the near future when some action along the line suggested should be taken.

I may say, in answer to the Senator, without prolonging the discussion, that it is rather easy to pick out individual cases that seem to be glaring and unfair. Let me illustrate what I mean. Let me refer to the case cited of a lieutenant colonel who is an administrative officer instead of practicing medicine. This man is complimented by being placed over other doctors, having them serve under him, and being able to direct them what to do and supervise their work. He is more fitted for something else, but the mere fact that he is a lieutenant colonel is a compliment to him in one sense.

I desire to emphasize the difficulties involved. Ninety-five percent of the men and the officers in the Navy came from civilian life 5 years ago. That is astounding. These men are not as accustomed to or familiar with the naval service as are trained naval officers who have had 20 or 25 years' service; and we must allow for some mistakes, deficiencies, inequities, and perhaps some injustice by reason of the fact that the Navy has been gotten together quickly. But the magnificent job they have done in response to their country's call is a credit to the manhood of America. I cannot say too much in praise of the civilian sailor and the civilian officer who constitute the Reserve Navy.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, may I clarify this point. I was not using that illustration of itself as an attack on anybody. Indeed, there are literally thousands of cases of highly trained men who have apparently been subject to the policy of the Army and Navy so that when they reach the grade of lieutenant colonel they are stopped in the actual work of their specialty, in which they are highly trained, and forced to go into administrative work, which is merely bookkeeping or signing papers, or something of that sort. I object to that policy.

Mr. WALSH. I have heard of similar cases which have puzzled me, just as they have the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think it is a deplorable policy.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. May I call the Senator's attention to the fact that it is not only a hardship for the young men in the Navy, but a great hardship in my State on the fathers and mothers. We have thousands of acres of sugar beets and thousands of acres of potatoes in danger of freezing, but the farmers there cannot get help. The Department of Agriculture cannot get a sufficient number of Mexicans or sufficient help from Jamaica, and when one writes to the Navy Department they answer back and say "So far as agriculture is concerned we are not the least bit interested in working this phase out," although the sons write back to their fathers and mothers that they are doing absolutely nothing but sitting around awaiting discharge.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I appreciate of course all the attention and emphasis that is given to this great problem here in the Congress, and the effort of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to encourage the boys in the service and their parents at home. What is more I greatly appreciate the judicial attitude the Senator takes with respect to this great problem, and his perfect candor in stating that he holds the opinion that it would be premature for the Congress, in view of the condition of affairs in the world, to interfere by a resolution with demobilization. I agree fully with him in his purpose and in his method.

I rise to interrupt him for the purpose of adding a note of encouragement, which I gather from what occurred in the House Military Affairs Committee as reported by Mary Spargo whose reports are generally accurate. This is published this morning in The Washington Post. I shall ask to have the entire article inserted in the RECORD, but in order to bring some parts of it to the attention of the Senate I ask permission to read just a few paragraphs from this report:

I read as follows:

> Discharges of Army doctors and members of the Army Air Forces have been tremendously speeded up in recent weeks, the House Military Affairs Committee learned yesterday.
>
> Meanwhile the date when Army enlisted men with two or more years' service will become eligible for discharge regardless of points was set yesterday at March 20 by Brig. Gen. Robert W. Berry, Assistant Army Chief of Staff for Personnel.
>
> Brig. Gen. Raymond W. Bliss, Acting Surgeon General, discussing release of doctors, disclosed that last Thursday the War Department had arrived at a firm schedule for their discharge in the Pacific theater.
>
> Bliss said the Army had 45,500 doctors on VE-day, and now has 43,000.

Of course, that is interesting to note in connection with the statement by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] that there were 500 more on September 1 and on January 1.

It is apparent that since VE-day 2,500 have been released.

The Army will have released 12,000 doctors by Christmas and 28,000 by next July, Bliss told the committee.

There is more to this, and I ask to have the entire article inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCHARGE OF DOCTORS SPEEDED; 2-YEAR MEN ELIGIBLE MARCH 20

(By Mary Spargo)

Discharges of Army doctors and members of the Army Air Forces have been tremendously speeded up in recent weeks, the House Military Affairs Committee learned yesterday.

Meanwhile the date when Army enlisted men with 2 or more years' service will become eligible for discharge regardless of points was set yesterday at March 20 by Brig. Gen. Robert W. Berry, Assistant Army Chief of Staff for Personnel.

Brig. Gen. Raymond W. Bliss, Acting Surgeon General, discussing release of doctors, disclosed that last Thursday the War Department had arrived at a firm schedule for their discharge in the Pacific theater.

Bliss said the Army had 45,500 doctors on VE-day, and now has 43,000.

The Army will have released 12,000 doctors by Christmas and 28,000 by next July, Bliss told the committee.

The Army Air Force discharge rate will have reached better than 10,000 a day by October 18, Brig. Gen. W. T. Hall, of Army Air Forces personnel, said.

From a peak of 2,301,000 men the Army Air Forces will be down to 700,000 by July 1, Hall declared.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, this news should be helpful in improving the morale of the men and of their parents.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator has interpreted my purpose admirably, and I am grateful to him for the sentiments he has expressed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs whether he can give some information as to the use being made of naval war vessels in the return of men from overseas. I recognize that there are certain logistical limitations in passenger vessels, transports, and the like, in bringing these men home to port facilities which may be available, but I was wondering to what extent we have augmented the transports and the other vessels we had available to us by the use of naval vessels in the return of the men from the overseas theaters.

Mr. WALSH. I have not any definite information. In letters, I have received complaints that men have asserted that naval vessels have returned with space which could have been allotted to those who could be demobilized.

The Senator recalls what I stated a few minutes ago. I made a special point of urging that every available naval vessel, as well as every vessel under the control of the Army and of the merchant marine, be made available for the important work of bringing the servicemen back to America, so that they could be demobilized here.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to ask one further question to stress the point. Does the Senator from Massachusetts have any information as to the basis on which we are operating with the British in the use of the "Queen" vessels in bringing our troops home? Is there any information that the British may soon want them returned to their own civilian

passenger traffic? If so, that would be quite a considerable blow to the return of our men from overseas, because as the distinguished Senator knows, each of the "Queen" vessels will accommodate about a whole division on a trip, and if they should be taken out of the trade before we could have our men all brought back from the European theater, or the Pacific theater, if they are using any of them in the Pacific, it would put quite a dent in our whole program of bringing our troops back. Has the Senator any information no that point?

Mr. WALSH. I have not. That is a very timely inquiry, and the very fact that the Senator propounds the inquiry, and makes it a part of the RECORD, will call the attention of the Army and Navy authorities to the point so that they may give consideraion to that aspect of the problem.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it would be very advisable for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs to make some inquiries so that information on this point may be available to the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. In reply to an inquiry made a few minutes ago in reference to doctors, I wish to point out some of the difficulties involved. Let us take the case of the doctor referred to by two of the Senators. Should that man be immediately given a discharge? That matter must be considered by some naval personnel officer. Here is a man who has been in the service 5 years, and here is another who has been in the service 2 years. How can we release the man with 2 years' service when the man who has been in the Navy 5 years is not in a position to be released yet?

Such questions present the ramifications which come into the whole program, and which make the problem a very difficult one. That is why I do not want what I have said, or anything that has been said here today, considered as being mere criticism of naval or Army authorities, but as an evidence of our deep and abiding interest in this question, and the importance we place upon speedy action.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator made any inquiry as to whether or not any ships have been taken from the ship pool which was used during the war, so that they are no longer used to bring soldiers and sailors back?

Mr. WALSH. I do not think there is a naval ship not in use; I do not know about the merchant ships.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am talking about the over-all pool.

Mr. WALSH. I do not know about that, but I do not know of a naval ship which is not in use. Suggestions have been made that more ample accommodations could be made on vessels than have been made, but I do not think there is any doubt that all the naval vessels available are in operation, in one capacity or another by the Navy.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs receives much more mail in regard to this matter than do other Senators, but I know each Senator receives a great volume of mail on this question.

Mr. WALSH. Mine has been tremendous, and disheartening. After I have sat and read for hours at a time the letters I have received I have been very much disturbed. That was one of the things which motivated me in taking the course I have followed today.

Mr. FERGUSON. We must realize these men write only because they are greatly concerned over the matter. They are not merely writing for the sake of writing.

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. They are greatly concerned; a great number are concerned, and I think it is of great concern to all Americans. I appreciate the action of the Senator in bringing the matter up on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. WALSH. As Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs I feel that I have a certain responsibility on me. Grateful as I am to the Navy yet I want the men who seek discharges, to know that the Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the members of that committee, and the Senate, are proud of the job they have done, and are anxious that the Navy finish it as gloriously as they served us during the war period.

WIDOW OF JOSEPH C. AKIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 620) for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin, which was, on page 1, line 11, to strike "$3,905" and insert "$1,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order heretofore entered, the calendar will be called, beginning with Calendar No. 565, Senate bill 680.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 680) to encourage and protect small oil refineries by extending preference to such refineries in disposing of royalty oil under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 1, line 8, before the word "refineries", to strike out the word "smaller."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is this Calendar No. 565?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask that the bill go over.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PROMOTION OF MINING RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 932) to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the parenthesis, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall disturb any vested rights of any person or persons in or to said real property or any part thereof", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That within the following-described real property situated in Deschutes County, Oreg., namely, sections 13 to 16, inclusive, sections 21 to 28, inclusive, sections 33 to 36, inclusive, township 21 south, range 12 east, Willamette meridian; sections 16 to 21, inclusive, sections 28 to 33, inclusive, township 21 south, range 13 east, Willamette meridian; sections 1 to 4, inclusive, sections 9 to 12, inclusive, township 22 south, range 12 east, Willamette meridian; and sections 4 to 9, inclusive, township 22 south, range 13 east, Willamette meridian; deposits of all minerals are excluded from the operation of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive (relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States): *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall disturb any vested rights of any person or persons in or to said real property or any part thereof.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Oregon tell us just what the bill provides?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to exclude a small area in central Oregon from further disturbance of the surface by mining exploration. The exclusion is desired because of the fact that the area, which covers a pumice formation, surrounds some small lakes and has great scenic value, and is quite a public recreational spot. The only purpose of the bill is to prohibit disturbance of the ground by mineral prospectors. So far as is known, there are no minerals there except pumice, and the area is covered with pumice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIE H. JOHNSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1129) for the relief of Willie H. Johnson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after "$600" and the period, to strike out "The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for loss of earnings and pain and suffering sustained by the said Willie H. Johnson as the result of personal injuries received on February 22, 1944, in Dunnellon, Fla., in an accident involving a United States Army vehicle" and to insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred in Dunnellon, Fla., on February 22, 1944, involving an Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received

by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Willie H. Johnson, Dunnellon, Fla., the sum of $600 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred in Dunnellon, Fla., on February 22, 1944, involving an Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. VIRGINIA M. KISER

The bill (H. R. 2317) for the relief of Mrs. Virginia M. Kiser was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH A. HANNON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 801) for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the name "Hannon", to strike out "of Coquille, Oreg., the sum of $8,843.63, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by him as the result of the loss of his home and its contents, in Coquille, Oreg., such home and its contents having been destroyed when a United States Navy airplane crashed into it on October 15, 1944," and to insert "and Eleanore M. Hannon of Coquille, Oreg., the sum of $6,542.52 in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for the destruction of their house and personal property in Coquille, Oreg., and for personal injuries to Eleanore M. Hannon as the result of the crash of a United States Navy airplane on October 15, 1944", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon, of Coquille, Oreg., the sum of $6,542.52, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for the destruction of their house and personal property in Coquille, Oreg., and for personal injuries to Eleanore M. Hannon as the result of the crash of a United States Navy airplane on October 15, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon."

ALBERT CANTALUPO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1089) for the relief of Albert Cantalupo, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "to", to strike out "Mr. and Mrs."; on line 6, after the name "Cantalupo", to insert "and Emma Cantalupo"; and on line 7 to strike out "$2,208.99" and to insert "$1,508."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Albert Cantalupo and Emma Cantalupo."

AUGUST SVELUND

The bill (H. R. 3081) for the relief of August Svelund was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MICHAEL C. DONATELL

The bill (H. R. 1629) for the relief of Michael C. Donatell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ALAN SELLS AND THE ESTATE OF ALAN SELLS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 779) for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$11,750", and insert "$7,745.35", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Mrs. Alan Sells, of Topeka, Kans., the sum of $7,745.35, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her, as a result of an accident which occurred while she was riding as a passenger in a United States Army vehicle near the Topeka Army Air Base, on February 1, 1944, and (2) to the estate of Alan Sells, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Alan Sells as a result of such accident, and for funeral expenses incurred by it in connection therewith: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. RUTH C. STONE

The bill (H. R. 213) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth C. Stone was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARA BLACK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2737) for the relief of Clara Black, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "to Clara Black, of Alhambra, Calif., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States arising out of the death of her husband, Harry Leon Black, who was killed", and to insert "to the estate of Harry Leon Black, of Alhambra, Calif., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of said Harry Leon Black, as the result of personal injury sustained by him when he was struck."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Harry Leon Black."

PAUL E. TACY

The bill (S. 1231) for the relief of Paul E. Tacy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul E. Tacy, of Monterey, Calif., the sum of $23.50, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by him when his automobile was struck by a United States Army vehicle on Fountain Avenue, in Pacific Grove, Calif., on October 28, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MRS. ORA R. HUTCHINSON

The bill (H. R. 1849) for the relief of Mrs. Ora R. Hutchinson, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

L. A. WILLIAMS

The bill (H. R. 1958) for the relief of L. A. Williams, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORIDA RHONE BURCH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2545) for the relief of Florida

Rhone Burch, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "to", to strike out "Floride Rhone Burch", and insert "the estate of Donald Rhone", and in line 8, after the words "death of", to strike out "her son", and insert "the said."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Donald Rhone."

USE OF SURPLUS EQUIPMENT FOR SOIL EROSION CONTROL—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1414) to assist in soil conservation and water conservation work by making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for such work through the distribution thereof by grant or loan to public bodies organized under State laws, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill was thoroughly considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and received its unanimous approval. It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to requisition from other Government departments and agencies such surplus materials, equipment, and supplies as may be necessary and suitable for carrying on soil conservation practices and our water conservation works, and also forest-fire prevention and suppression and forest improvements.

The first section of the bill gives the Secretary the right, after the property has been declared surplus, to requisition it, and section 2 gives him the authority to pass the surplus property on to such public bodies as are organized and created for the purpose of carrying on soil conservation and reforestation practices and the like.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not rather extraordinary, after this property is declared surplus, to begin letting a department requisition it? If we do this with respect to the Secretary of Agriculture why not with respect to every Federal bureau so that we will simply have departments and agencies grab surplus property when they see it? The Secretary would apparently get the property for nothing. He would not pay for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The soil, water, and forest resources of the Nation are among its basic assets and this surplus property will be utilized through public agencies to preserve them for future generations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I fully agree with the purpose of the bill. I am only suggesting that it seems to me to be an extraordinary method of amending the Surplus Property Act to say that Department A can step in and grab anything that is declared surplus by the Army or Navy or anybody else in the course of the process of distributing surplus property. By doing that we would be destroying the orderly procedure of distributing surplus property.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not see that at all. After the property is declared surplus it is then offered for sale through certain agencies. It should not be a disturbing factor to the Administrator if some of the property is requisitioned by another public agency for public use. This is all Government-owned property and, as I have pointed out awhile ago, it will be used by a Government agency for the purpose of protecting our natural resources. I do not see why agencies which are publicly organized should be forced to go into the market and buy these surplus goods from dealers who are not in business for their health.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the case of the surplus property I and other Senators were in favor of largely giving materials to public bodies that could use them, but we were defeated in that attempt. The Senate refused to do it. The Senate required that public bodies in general pay the appraised value. Certainly it seems to me that this bill upsets the whole procedure. I do not see how the Surplus Property Administrator, whoever he is, could administer the act if any Government department could suddenly step in and grab something that he has perhaps already made contract for, or made arrangements to sell, or had some other general plans to dispose of.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator's committee have any report or any comments from the Surplus Property Board as to this bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. HILL. None at all. I took the same position taken by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I shared his views with reference to the disposition of this property so far as public bodies were concerned. I had the view that we might well turn this propery over to these public bodies. But after long consideration of the surplus-property-disposal measure the Congress decided not to do that. Now what is proposed to be done is to make an exception for one department of the Government. We are making an exception without a consideration, really, of the whole question of what effect the making of this exception will have so far as the disposal of surplus property is concerned.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], in charge of the bill, advises us that the committee did not have the comments or the suggestions of the Surplus Property Board with reference to the bill. If we are going to let each committee which might have jurisdiction over some particular department bring in legislation for that particular department setting aside the general plan and program and policies we adopted for the disposition of surplus property in the Surplus Property Disposal Act, I am afraid we are opening up the door, I am afraid we are setting a precedent which will return to plague us.

I wonder if the Senator would not let the bill go over until some of us can examine it more fully?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that if the bill is going to do any good for the purpose for which it is intended it should be enacted into law immediately. We should either give up the idea conveyed by the bill right away or we should pass the bill.

The question which arose in my mind, and which should arise in everyone's mind is: Why should we dispose of this surplus property for 35 cents, 45 cents, or 50 cents on the dollar and then require the departments to take taxpayers' money, of which we all try to be considerate, and pay full price for equipment which is no better? I have heard from a good many soil-conservation districts and I have heard from the president of the Association of State Forests, telling of their inability to obtain equipment, of their desire to get equipment, and of the need to secure equipment for the forest services which could use it, I suppose, in making trails or roads through the forests as a means of fire prevention. The soil-conservation district would use a certain number of bulldozers, graders, and ditchers and perhaps some other equipment. They have got to have it anyway if the agencies are to do the work for which they are organized. So I do not see how we are protecting the taxpayers' interests by requiring this surplus property to be sold for half price, and then we be obliged to appropriate money so the agencies can buy, perhaps the same identical equipment, back from a dealer for full price.

It seems to me that if this measure is going to do any good we ought not to delay action on it. I think the Secretary is limited in the amount which he can requisition to the amount which is actually needed. He has got to show the need for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. He must not only show the need, but that the equipment he requisitions is suitable to do the job.

Mr. AIKEN. And the reason that we did not take it up with every other department of government was because we felt that in order to be of benefit the measure should be passed quickly. But officials of the Department of Agriculture did appear before the committee, favored the bill, and thought that it would be to our advantage to use this equipment rather than to sell it and maybe buy it back again for twice the amount for which it was sold.

I hope the bill will be passed. It may be that it will take some time to get it through the House. In view of the attitude of the House on this question, the House will undoubtedly take it up with the Surplus Property Board.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I think this is entirely too important a bill to be passed in this way. I shall object, with a

view to having the matter come before the Senate for full discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The bill will be passed over.

RICHARD A. ALLBERRY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 865) for the relief of Richard A. Allberry, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "to", to strike out "Richard A. Allberry, of Lincoln, Nebr.," and insert "the estate of Agnes J. Allberry"; in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims"; in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "his wife" and insert "the said"; and in line 12, after "August", to strike out "8" and insert "9", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Agnes J. Allberry, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Agnes J. Allberry, who died in Hawaii on August 11, 1943, as the result of burns received by her from the explosion of a United States Navy airplane which crashed near the place where she was working on August 9, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Agnes J. Allberry."

GREGORY STELMAK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 998) for the relief of Gregory Stalmak, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,365.58", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gregory Stelmak, of Hartford, Conn., the sum of $4,365.58, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by him, as a result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle while walking along Village Street, in Hartford, Conn., on October 18, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF MANUEL ROSE LIMA

The bill (S. 1101) for the relief of the estate of Manuel Rose Lima was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Manuel Rose Lima, of New Bedford, Mass., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of said Manuel Rose Lima, as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Navy vehicle while walking on Washington Street, in Nantucket, Mass., on September 11, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

The bill (S. 1233) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Kansas was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 618, House bill 3871, is a similar bill. Is there objection to substituting the House bill for the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3871) authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1233 will be indefinitely postponed.

UTILIZATION OF WARTIME PLANTS AND FACILITIES FOR PROCESSING AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, ETC.

The resolution (S. Res. 176) relative to the continued operation of federally owned plants for processing agricultural commodities and forest products or for manufacturing nitrates for fertilizer was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator in charge of the resolution [Mr. BUTLER] whether there should not be an amendment specifying some date on which the Secretary of Agriculture should report to Congress. The resolution requests that no such plants be sold or leased until the Secretary makes his report. Should not a reasonable time be fixed—say, January 1 or February 1, 1946—for a report? Would not that be a proper amendment to the resolution?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in that connection I think the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is proper. This morning the Committee on Finance approved a measure which is of a temporary nature, an emergency measure, in which the date was fixed as July 1, 1946. It is a measure somewhat similar to this resolution. The resolution would not constitute a law. It simply sets forth a desire on the part of the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture shall do certain things. I am perfectly willing that a time be stipulated. I prefer July 1, 1946, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is agreeable to me. I offer such an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 7, after the word "Congress", it is proposed to insert "not later than July 1, 1946."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment be inserted in line 10, after "Congress", so as to read:

Until the report of the Secretary of Agriculture is received and considered by Congress, but not later than July 1, 1946—

And so forth.

Mr. BUTLER. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment should appear again at the end of line 4 on page 2, so as to read: "but not later than July 1, 1946, all Government agencies having jurisdiction over said plants are requested to continue the operation thereof," and so forth. It seems to me that is the most important place to put it.

Mr. BUTLER. That is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested to make an immediate study to determine the advisability of continuing the operation of all federally owned plants and facilities which were used during the war for the exclusive processing of agricultural commodities and forest products or for manufacturing nitrates for fertilizer and to report to the Congress his findings and recommendations based thereon.

Until the report of the Secretary of Agriculture is received and considered by the Congress, but not later than July 1, 1946, all Federal agencies having jurisdiction over the above-mentioned plants are requested to refrain from leasing, selling, or otherwise disposing of, any such plants without the

approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. Until such time as the Congress has had an opportunity to study the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture and formulate a policy with reference to the future operation or disposition of the above-mentioned plants, but not later than July 1, 1946, all Government agencies having jurisdiction over said plants are requested to continue the operation thereof, provided the products from such operation can be effectively used by the Federal Government, or provided the plants can be used to process surplus or perishable crops.

THANKS OF CONGRESS TO GENERAL MARSHALL

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 96) tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George Catlett Marshall was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to raise one question in connection with the joint resolution. I address my remarks particularly to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. It seems to me that General Marshall is on a precise service level with Admiral King, and that we feel equally grateful to both. I am wondering whether the joint resolution should not be temporarily passed over until perhaps the Senator from Massachusetts is prepared to offer an amendment to include Admiral King.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am very happy to have the Senator from Michigan to make this inquiry of me.

Some time ago it was suggested to me that a somewhat similar resolution should be proposed in favor of Admiral Nimitz. I talked casually with the Secretary of the Navy about it. Personally I feel that it is a mistake to adopt such resolutions, because I do not know where we are going to stop. The first thing we know, we shall have a resolution on behalf of a boy in my home State, who came home with both arms missing, and who performed heroic deeds in the service of his country. He is as much entitled to the thanks of Congress and to a medal as is the highest ranking admiral or general.

Mr. VANDENBERG. A little more so.

Mr. WALSH. Therefore I decline to submit such a resolution—not that the admiral was not deserving of it, and not that General Marshall is not deserving of it; but where are we going to stop? The whole business will become a farce. We shall have resolutions coming here from now until doomsday, relating to every single member of the armed forces.

I do not wish to have my remarks considered in any way as a reflection upon this brave and great general, but I feel very strongly that we are opening the door to an endless number of resolutions. There are many men occupying subordinate positions with respect to whom I should feel obliged to submit resolutions. I was hoping that the precedent would not be established.

So far as the Navy is concerned, I take the position that by declining to adopt such a resolution we can say to those who may propose similar resolutions in behalf of others, "We have not adopted such a resolution with respect to Admiral Nimitz. Why should we do so in the case of others?" In other words, such a policy would be helpful in preventing the large number of resolutions which would follow. As the Senator from Michigan has indicated, thousands of enlisted men have performed heroic services and are entitled to a vote of thanks. In my judgment, the Senator's observation is correct. So far as I am concerned, I should prefer not to have any of such resolutions adopted. In fact, while the war was in progress, I thought that we made a mistake in granting promotions to high-ranking officers in the Army and Navy. Now we have nothing to give them. They received their promotions during the war. In my judgment, it would have been better to wait until the end of the war, and then give them the advanced ranks which we gave them during the war, and which they certainly merited. That is perhaps apart from the Senator's inquiry. If we could add Admiral King's and Admiral Nimitz' names to this resolution and let it end there, and say no more, we might be able to stop the flood of resolutions which I fear would follow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's observations completely demonstrate the difficulty which we confront when we enter this field. I was not speaking about Admiral Nimitz, who obviously is entitled to any gratitude that it is possible for us to express. I was speaking of the fact that Admiral King occupies the same relative position in the Navy that General Marshall occupies in the Army. I should not wish to be guilty of any invidious suggestion that Admiral King had not rendered tremendous service to his country by neglecting to include him in a resolution relating to General Marshall.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, that is one of the several reasons which led me to discourage the offering of a resolution in behalf of Admiral Nimitz. Of course, Admiral King ought to be the first to be given a vote of thanks by the Congress. How can we stop with Admiral King? Admiral Nimitz is almost as much entitled to a vote of thanks and a medal? There is a long list of admirals, captains, lieutenants, and commanders who have performed very great services. Let me suggest to the distinguished Senator that it might be that the resolution could be modified so as to include Admiral King and all other officers and men of the Army and Navy, and in that way be of a general, sweeping character.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; that cannot be done, because the resolution, as I read it, requires the striking of a special medal.

Mr. WALSH. How does the distinguished Senator from Alabama feel about the matter? Perhaps our observations have indicated to him some points which he did not previously consider.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it was not the intention to include all the officers and all the men. I think the point raised by the Senator from Michigan is a good one. The Senator from Michigan has referred to Admiral King. Admiral King held the same relative position in the Navy that General Marshall held in the Army. General Marshall is Chief of Staff of the Army and he was a member of the combined Chiefs of Staff of the United Nations. Admiral King had the corresponding position in the Navy. He was Chief of Naval Operations, which amounts to being Chief of Staff of the Navy, and he was a member of the combined Chiefs of Staff of the United Nations. I should like very much to have Admiral King's name included in the resolution. However, inasmuch as the resolution has been considered by the committee and reported by it to the Senate, I should very much regret to see it rejected by the Senate, in view of the magnificent services which General Marshall has rendered to the country.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, how can we reject any resolution, reported to us by a committee, commending a man for brave and heroic deeds?

Mr. HILL. We shall have to deal with that when we reach it. So far as such men are concerned, there are various ways of recognizing them. There are various medals which can be conferred on them, all the way from the Congressional Medal of Honor down to the lesser medals.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator from Michigan feels that the public would consider it a discourteous act on the part of the Senate to have the Senate fail to pass the resolution, would the Senate permit me to move, as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that the name of Admiral King be included? I make that suggestion in view of the observations made by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That was the purpose of my inquiry. I thought the able chairman of the committee would do that.

Mr. WALSH. I have stated the reasons why I did not wish to begin the practice. However, in view of the situation here I will move that the name of Admiral King be inserted at the proper place in the joint resolution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It will require a little more than the insertion of Admiral King's name. Admiral King is Chief of Naval Operations, I believe.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, would it be better to have the resolution temporarily passed over?

Mr. HILL. It could be temporarily passed over, with the understanding that an amendment to the effect just stated would be adopted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes—and with the understanding that it is being passed over without any reflection, but solely with that understanding.

Mr. WALSH. I am agreeable to that course, but I hope there will be a limit to commendatory resolutions or resolutions authorizing the conferral of medals.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I totally agree with the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, a short time ago Senate Joint Resolution 96, Calendar No. 591, was under consideration. Action was suspended

pending the offering of an amendment by me to include the name of Admiral King in connection with the vote of thanks from the Congress to General Marshall. I have prepared certain amendments, and I now wish to present them. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to Calendar No. 591, Senate Joint Resolution 96.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 96) tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George Catlett Marshall, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the thanks of the Congress are hereby tendered to General of the Army George Catlett Marshall for his distinguished leadership, as Chief of Staff of the Army and as a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff of the United Nations, in planning the expansion, equipment, training, and deployment of the great Army of the United States and in formulating and executing the global strategy that led to victory in World War II; and to the members of the Army of the United States who served under his direction with such heroic devotion and personal sacrifice.

SEC. 2. The President of the United States is requested to cause a gold medal to be struck, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, in General Marshall's honor. When the medal has been prepared, the President is requested to present it to General Marshall, together with a copy of this joint resolution engrossed on parchment, in the name of the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. WALSH. The first amendment which I offer is to insert, on page 2, after line 15, the following:

SEC. 2. That the thanks of the Congress are hereby tendered to Fleet Admiral Ernest Joseph King for his distinguished leadership, as Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations and as a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff of the United Nations, in planning the expansion, equipment, training, and operation of the United States Navy and in formulating and executing the global strategy that led to victory in World War II; and to the members of the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, and United States Coast Guard, and to the members of the Reserve forces who served under his direction with such heroic devotion and personal sacrifice.

It is word for word the same as the earlier part of the section which deals with the general subject.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think the amendment is absolutely satisfactory in every way.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, may we have action taken on the amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. The next amendment to the committee amendment is, in line 16, page 2, to strike out the figure "2" and insert "3", so as to have it read "section 3", instead of "section 2."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Next I propose that in line 17, after the words "to cause", there be stricken out the article "a"; and in the same line, after the word "gold", that there be stricken out the word "medal" and the word "medals" inserted, so as to read "to cause gold medals to be struck."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments to the committee amendment are agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. The next amendment is, in line 18, after the words "General Marshall's" and before the word "honor", to insert "and Admiral King's."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. The same amendment should be made in line 20, after the words "General Marshall's."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. The next amendment I propose to the committee amendment is, in line 19, after the words "When the", to strike out "medal has" and insert "medals have".

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Also in line 20, I move to strike out the word "it", before "to", and insert the word "them."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. The next amendment is, on page 3, line 1, to strike out the figure "3", and insert "4", so as to read "sec. 4."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to; and without objection, the committee amendment as amended is agreed to.

The question now is on the passage of the joint resolution as amended.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 96) was passed, as follows:

Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George Catlett Marshall and to Fleet Admiral Ernest Joseph King and to the members of the armed forces of the United States who served under their direction; and providing for the striking and presentation to General Marshall and Fleet Admiral King of appropriate gold medals in the name of the people of the United States

Resolved, etc., That the thanks of the Congress are hereby tendered to General of the Army George Catlett Marshall for his distinguished leadership, as Chief of Staff of the Army and as a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff of the United Nations, in planning the expansion, equipment, training, and deployment of the great Army of the United States and in formulating and executing the global strategy that led to victory in World War II; and to the members of the Army of the United States who served under his direction with such heroic devotion and personal sacrifice.

SEC. 2. That the thanks of the Congress are hereby tendered to Fleet Admiral Ernest Joseph King for his distinguished leadership, as Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations and as a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff of the United Nations, in planning the expansion, equipment, training, and operation of the United States Navy and in formulating and executing the global strategy that led to victory in World War II; and to the members of the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps and the United States Coast Guard and to the members of the Reserve Forces who served under his direction with such heroic devotion and personal sacrifice.

SEC. 3. The President of the United States is requested to cause gold medals to be struck, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, in General Marshall's and Admiral King's honor. When the medals have been prepared, the President is requested to present them to General Marshall and Admiral King, together with a copy of this joint resolution engrossed on parchment, in the name of the people of the United States.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

The title was amended to read: "Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George Catlett Marshall and to Fleet Admiral Ernest Joseph King and to the members of the armed forces of the United States who served under their direction; and providing for the striking and presentation to General Marshall and Fleet Admiral King of appropriate gold medals in the name of the people of the United States."

AGRICULTURAL BYPRODUCTS LABORATORY, IOWA STATE COLLEGE

The bill (H. R. 1765) to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the Agricultural Byproducts Laboratory on the campus of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONTROL AND USE OF ATOMIC ENEREGY—JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 93) to provide for the formulation of policies with respect to the control and use of atomic energy was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the acting majority leader at this time. It seems to me quite obvious that this particular measure should be indefinitely postponed. It involves an original recommendation by the Committee on Military Affairs respecting the control and use of atomic energy. It proposes a commission headed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who has indicated by letter to the Senate that he could not serve in that capacity. Furthermore, it deals with a subject upon which we now have more official information. I am wondering whether the able Senator from Alabama would not think it wise to postpone the joint resolution indefinitely.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in view of the absence of the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the author of the resolution, and in view of

the absence of the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who expressed his views last Friday on the question of atomic energy, I should prefer to have the joint resolution simply go over for the time being. The Senator from Michigan realizes, of course, that if that is done, the chances are that unless some Member of the Senate later moves to bring up the joint resolution, it will not come before the Senate, anyway, because it is the practice here to proceed with the calling of bills on the calendar, beginning where the last call concluded. As the Senator knows, many bills which have been on the calendar for quite some time are in the status of having been reached once and of having been passed over, and subsequently they remain on the calendar without further action as to them.

For the time being, at least, I should prefer just to let the measure be passed over.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have no objection to that course. I simply wish to observe in passing—and I make this observation with the very greatest respect for the personnel of the Committee on Military Affairs—that I hope that if the committee succeeds in obtaining jurisdiction over legislation dealing with the control and use of atomic energy, it will pay a little more attention to the necessity for accumulating accurate information on the subject than it did when it reported this particular joint resolution in 45 minutes, without hearing any witnesses or conducting any hearings whatsoever.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not know that the Committee on Military Affairs acted with much more expedition than did the Foreign Relations Committee when it reported the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That resolution provided merely for the creation of a committee.

Mr. HILL. The joint resolution we are now discussing provides for the creation of a commission.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is quite true.

Mr. HILL. I may say that, in my opinion, both committees acted with about the same speed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Alabama must allow me to disagree with him. The Foreign Relations Committee was careful enough to send a special committee to consult with the President of the United States before it took any action whatever. I am sure that will commend itself to the Senator from Alabama as being a course of great prudence.

Mr. HILL. I was not on the subcommittee which went to confer with the President, but there seems to have been some misunderstanding somewhere regarding what the President wished in the matter. According to my understanding, when the resolution came from the Foreign Relations Committee it was thought that it was the wish of the President that the matter be handled along the lines of that resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; that was the committee's belief.

Mr. HILL. Subsequently there came from the President a message indicating that he preferred another course.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; the message did not refer to another course. The President's message did not bring up the matter of jurisdiction. The difficulty arose when the House of Representatives Rules Committee reported a similar resolution, and then totally collided with some mysterious edict from some totally inexplicable source that that course should not be pursued.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps that message was an inexplicable, as the Senator has said, as the atomic bomb itself. Undoubtedly we have much to learn about the atomic bomb.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been 5 minutes of discussion on the pending measure. Is there objection under the rule?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have objected.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the joint resolution will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1426) to provide for the replanning and rebuilding of slum, blighted, and other areas of the District of Columbia and the assembly by purchase or condemnation, of real property in such areas and the sale or lease thereof for the redevelopment of such area in accordance with said plans; and to provide for the organization of, procedure for, and the financing of such planning, acquisition, and sale or lease; and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BENALI EL OUKILI BOUCHETA

The bill (S. 1360) to compensate Benali El Oukili Boucheta, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for the wrongful death of his son Mohamed Ben Boucheta Ben Ali El Oukili, near Marnia, Algeria, on September 30, 1944, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Benali El Oukili Boucheta, a resident and inhabitant of French Morocco, the sum of $780 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States arising from the wrongful death near Marnia, Algeria, on September 30, 1944, of his son Mohamed Ben Boucheta Ben Ali El Aukili: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CLEMENT EUZIERE

The bill (S. 1361) to compensate Clement Euziere, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for personal injuries caused by a naval vehicle near Oran, Algeria, on September 21, 1943, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clement Euziere, a resident and inhabitant of French Morocco, the sum of $2,000 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States arising from an accident occurring near Oran, Algeria, on September 21, 1943, in which he sustained permanent injuries, to wit: the loss of his left leg at the level of the upper third of the thigh: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL FOR CERTAIN PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSSES

The bill (S. 1363) to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of water damage occurring at certain naval and Marine Corps shore activities was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,581.44, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of water damage occurring in the baggage room, main bachelor officers' quarters, Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., on February 20, 1944; and as the result of the destruction of commanding officer's quarters, amphibious training base, Okracoke, N. C., on September 14, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

LAND FOR RESETTLEMENT IN GUAM

The bill (S. 1362) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer land for resettlement in Guam, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this is one of three bills affecting Guam. One of the bills is on the calendar and another one is now pending before the Naval Affairs Committee.

With the exception of Hawaii, Guam is the only possession which the United

States has in the Pacific the citizens of which are nationals of the United States as distinguished from those of the Philippine Islands. I should include, however, Samoa.

As Senators know, the damage to Guam has been terrific, and the people there have suffered severely. Incidentally, the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, as well as other Senators who have heard the story of the loyalty of the citizens of Guam and their devotion to the interests of America during the time of war, have been thrilled by a recital of the facts. That little island of 22,000 people was almost completely destroyed. An effort is now being made to rehabilitate it. The island happens to be under the jurisdiction of the Navy.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the transfer to the naval government of Guam public lands belonging to the United States which are not required for military or naval use, in order that the naval government may use this land for the resettlement of residents who are displaced as a result of the extensive military and naval construction programs on Guam.

Current naval and military programs in Guam have necessitated the extensive acquisition of private real property on the island. There are now over 160 military and naval reservations on Guam and they occupy over half of the more valuable lands of the island as well as considerable portions of the pasture and forest areas. This increase in military and naval land requirements has created a problem in the rehabilitation of residents who have had to be moved from property acquired for governmental use and who, therefore, have to be resettled elsewhere on the island.

Private owners of lands in Guam will not usually sell their holdings. Even if they would sell, it would not be desirable to open the real-estate market at the present time when money is plentiful as a result of the current construction program, since this would result in unwarranted inflation in real estate. For this reason the military government of Guam has prohibited private transfer of property.

There are available in Guam, however, certain Government-owned lands which are not required for military or naval use and which might, therefore, be used for resettlement purposes.

It is estimated that the Federal Government owns approximately 16,507 hectares—40,788,797 acres—of land in Guam. Of this amount, 14,581 hectares—26,000,665 acres—was Spanish Crown land which became the property of the Federal Government upon the cession of Guam to the United States. It is believed that much of this land will be unsuitable for military or naval installations but may be suitable for resettlement purposes. At present, however, there is no provision of law which makes possible the transfer of this property to former owners to replace lands taken for military and naval use. In order to make this land available for a proposed resettlement project through the naval government of Guam, it is desirable to have Federal-owned land not required for military or naval use transferred to the naval government for retransfer and sale to dispossessed owners. This land would be supplemented by other land acquired from private owners by the naval government of Guam.

Therefore, to provide necessary authority for the successful resettlement of displaced residents of Guam whose land has been acquired by the United States for military and naval purposes, the Navy Department recommends the enactment of the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I hope this bill will not be setting a precedent in any way for the United States to pay for damages to property in other lands whose people were not nationals of the United States but who suffered damages as the result of war operations. If we enter upon a course of that kind we will soon be a bankrupt country.

Is there not at the present time a law which permits the Army and the Navy to pay for damages which have been done to property both of American nationals and citizens of foreign countries? Why should not action under the present law be taken with respect to Guam?

Mr. WALSH. This bill does not deal with that subject. There is, however, another bill to which the Senator's statement should be applied. This bill merely relates to the giving and taking of property.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand the bill, it contains nothing except that the United States Government, in building war and naval establishments, took land from certain persons, and that in the settlement with them it may acquire other land upon which they may build homes.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am somewhat concerned by a sentence appearing in the committee report to the effect that this land, being land taken by the Navy for war purposes, would be supplemented by other land acquired from private owners by the naval government of Guam. Is there existing authority for the naval government of Guam to acquire lands not now owned by the United States for the purpose of transfer to persons residing on the island of Guam?

Mr. WALSH. The United States Government owns a great deal of land on Guam. This bill does not seek to acquire additional land, it merely authorizes the naval government to transfer land owned by it to the natives in payment of land acquired for military and naval installations during the war.

Mr. CORDON. Is there authority now existing for the naval government of Guam to acquire more land than it now owns?

Mr. WALSH. The public lands are under the control of the Secretary of the Interior. It is my judgment that there is no authority now for the naval government of Guam to acquire any land.

Mr. CORDON. The statement to which I refer, which may be found in the report, is that the naval government would acquire additional land from private owners.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me, as a matter of fact, that under the present law the Navy could perhaps acquire the whole island. I think the Senator should remember that the Island of Guam has a special and peculiar status. I do not think that anything done there can be considered as a precedent for doing anything anywhere else.

Mr. CORDON. Is it the Senator's understanding that there is no private ownership on Guam?

Mr. TAFT. Oh, yes; there is; but today almost the entire island is devoted to naval purposes. It is covered with a network of four-lane highways, and has six or seven airports. This bill merely provides that the naval government may transfer lands owned by the United States. If it be true that the government has taken someone's land on which a house had been built, I still believe that it would be better to allow the naval government to acquire another piece of land, and give it to the person whose home had been taken. I believe it would be better to follow that procedure than to settle for cash, having in mind present conditions on Guam.

The capital city of Agaña must be entirely rebuilt. In doing that it seems to me that we must give to the Navy complete authority. The matter will not involve a great deal of money. The bill contains the words "such lands owned by the United States in Guam." No additional authority would be given to acquire such land.

Mr. CORDON. The terminology of the bill is "lands owned." The report indicates that in addition to those lands there may be other lands not now owned but which may presently be owned. I am asking what the legal effect would be.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, does not the second page of the report cover the subject? The Federal Government acquired 36,000 acres from the Spanish Government, and as I listened to the testimony in the Committee on Naval Affairs the question was of transferring some of the Federally owned property which had been acquired from the Spanish Government to citizens whose property had been taken by the naval authorities for naval installations. It does not require the acquisition of any new property. It relates simply to some of the property we acquired from the Spanish Government.

Mr. CORDON. One further question. The bill grants authority for transfer of title, first by the Secretary of the Navy, and second by the naval government of Guam. It deals with title to real property, and I should like to have the distinguished Senator's opinion as to whether that is an appropriate method for the transfer of title. Is there any authority in a naval government to handle title to real property in its capacity as a naval government?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I think it is a new question. I do not know of any general authority in the naval government of Guam or any other departmental government to have the authority pro-

posed here. This is the way and manner, however, in which the Navy Department feels that transfers should be made in Guam, on account of the peculiar and unusual situation which exists there. The government of Guam is a naval government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, to strike out "or such officer as he may designate" and insert "after consultation with the Secretary of War", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of effecting the rehabilitation and resettlement of the residents of Guam, the Secretary of the Navy, or such officer as he may designate for such purpose and under such regulations as he may prescribe, is hereby authorized to transfer to the naval government of Guam, for transfer or sale by the naval government of Guam at its discretion, to such persons and upon such terms and conditions and at such times as it may determine to be suitable, in replacement of lands acquired for military or naval purposes in Guam, such lands owned by the United States in Guam as may be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, after consultation with the Secretary of War, not to be required for military or naval purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOURTH-CLASS POST OFFICES IN ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 656) to provide further for the appointment of postmasters for fourth-class post offices in the Territory of Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3220) to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

INCORPORATION OF PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL

The bill (S. 1383) to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the incorporation of Providence Hospital, of Washington, D. C., under an act of Congress approved April 8, 1864, be, and the same hereby is, approved and continued in force except as herein specifically altered:

The corporate name of the said corporation shall be "Providence Hospital", instead of "The Directors of Providence Hospital."

SEC. 2. The corporation is authorized to conduct not only a hospital, clinic, and all the departments, staffs, and services usually connected therewith, but also a school for the education and training of nurses and interns with full power to examine the said nurses and interns and to issue suitable certificates evidencing the completion of their courses of training.

SEC. 3. The provision contained in the act incorporating Providence Hospital approved April 8, 1864, limiting the value of the real estate which may be held by the corporation is hereby repealed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE TO PROPERTY UNDER JURISDICTION OF NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1364) to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damage to property under jurisdiction of the Navy Department, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment on page 2, line 22, after the word "over", to strike out "$1,000,000", and insert "$500,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, compromise, or settle claims for damage cognizable in admiralty in a district court of the United States and all claims for damage caused by a vessel or floating object, to property of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department or property for which the Navy Department may have assumed, by contract or otherwise, any obligation to respond for damage thereto. The Secretary of the Navy is further authorized to receive in payment of any such claim the amount due the United States pursuant to determination, compromise, or settlement as herein authorized and, upon acceptance of such payment but not until then, such determination, settlement, or compromise of such claim shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, any law to the contrary notwithstanding. All such payments shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of the Navy is further authorized to execute on behalf of the United States and to deliver in exchange for such payment a full release of such claim: *Provided*, That this section, as respects the determination, compromise, settlement, and payment of claims, shall be supplementary to, and not in lieu of, all other provisions of law authorizing the determination, compromise, or settlement of claims for damage to property hereinabove described: *Provided further*, That no settlement or compromise where there is involved a payment in the net amount of over $500,000 shall be authorized by this Act.

SEC. 2. Within twenty days after receipt of a payment in a net amount exceeding $3,000 due the United States pursuant to determination, compromise, or settlement of any claim under section 1 of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall file reports with the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, setting forth the nature of the claim; the vessel or vessels involved; the amount received; the basis of determination, compromise, or settlement; and other pertinent facts: *Provided*, That during any war the reports required under this section may omit any fact or facts, disclosure of which, in the opinion of the Secretary, would be prejudicial to the national security.

SEC. 3. This act shall not apply to any claim for which a suit filed by or against the United States is pending.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSITION OF PRIZES

The bill (S. 1420) to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act of August 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 746), as amended (34 U. S. C. 1159), is hereby further amended to read as follows: "That the district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all prizes captured during war if said capture was made by authority of the United States or was adopted and ratified by the President of the United States and the prize was brought into the territorial waters of a cobelligerent or into a locality in the temporary or permanent possession or occupation of the armed forces of the United States or was taken or appropriated for the use of the United States, including jurisdiction of all proceedings for the condemnation of such property taken as prize."

SEC. 2. Section 4621 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1137), is hereby further amended to read as follows: "Any district court may appoint prize commissioners, not exceeding three in number; of whom one shall be a naval officer, active or retired, approved by the Secretary of the Navy, who shall receive no other compensation than his pay in the Navy, and who shall protect the interests of the Department of the Navy in the prize property; and at least one of the others shall be a member of the bar of the court, of not less than 3 years' standing, and acquainted with the taking of depositions."

SEC. 3. Section 4624 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1140), is hereby further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the seized property is taken or appropriated for the use of the United States whether before or after it comes into the custody of the prize court, the prize court is authorized to proceed to adjudication on the basis of an inventory and survey and an appropriate undertaking by the United States to respond for the value of such property without the necessity for either an appraisement or the deposit of the value of the prize with the Treasurer of the United States or any other public depository."

PUNISHMENT OF MURDER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1308) to amend article 6 of Articles for the Government of the Navy, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 10, after the word "with", to insert "life imprisonment or", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy (Revised Statutes, sec. 1624, art. 6) is amended and reenacted to read as follows:

ART. 6. If any person subject to the Articles for the Government of the Navy commits the crime of murder without the territorial jurisdiction of any particular State, or the District of Columbia, he may be tried by court martial and punished with life imprisonment or death.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the purpose of the bill, and the change it would make in existing law? It is a very far-reaching bill, as I read it, having to do with jurisdiction over the crime of murder.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the present laws permit a court martial to inflict punishment by death for the crime of murder committed on board a naval vessel. There is some question whether

a court martial which tries a murder case can impose the penalty of death if the crime is committed on shore, and the purpose of the bill is to permit that to be done. The committee has offered an amendment leaving it optional as to whether the punishment shall be by death or life imprisonment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The only change, then, is that a sentence of life imprisonment may be imposed?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATUS OF FUNDS AND EMPLOYEES OF MIDSHIPMEN'S STORE AT NAVAL ACADEMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1097) to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, after line 7, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. All employees of such midshipmen's store, whether heretofore paid from appropriated moneys or from receipts of the midshipmen's store, shall hereafter be deemed to be Government employees entitled to all benefits and subject to all restrictions arising under the laws of the United States applicable to employees of their grade and class.

And to insert:

SEC. 2. All employees of such midshipmen's store, whether heretofore paid from appropriated moneys or from receipts of the midshipmen's store, shall hereafter be deemed to be Government employees entitled to all benefits and subject to all restrictions arising under the laws of the United States applicable to civil-service employees of their grade and class. All employees of said midshipmen's store on the effective date of this act shall be entitled to claim credit for prior employment in said store for purposes of any benefits to which they may be entitled under the laws of the United States, and no such employee shall suffer, by virtue of being placed in the status of a civil-service employee by this act, a reduction in total pay below that being received by him on the effective date of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That all funds collected from the operations of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy are appropriated for the purpose of providing and maintaining the necessary service and shall hereafter be accounted for as public moneys.

SEC. 2. All employees of such midshipmen's store, whether heretofore paid from appropriated moneys or from receipts of the midshipmen's store, shall hereafter be deemed to be Government employees entitled to all benefits and subject to all restrictions arising under the laws of the United States applicable to civil-service employees of their grade and class. All employees of said midshipmen's store on the effective date of this act shall be entitled to claim credit for prior employment in said store for purposes of any benefits to which they may be entitled under the laws of the United States, and no such employee shall suffer, by virtue of being placed in the status of a civil-service employee by this act, a reduction in total pay below that being received by him on the effective date of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 15) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF UNITED STATES FISH HATCHERY AT BUTTE FALLS, OREG.

The bill (S. 131) to authorize the conveyance of the United States fish hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to convey to the State of Oregon, at any time within 3 years, title to the property known as the United States fish hatchery property near Butte Falls, Jackson County, Oreg., consisting of 13.227 acres of land, together with improvements thereon.

SEC. 2. Any conveyance executed by the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the purposes of this act shall contain the express condition that the grantee shall use the property exclusively for fish cultural purposes, and the further express condition that the title and right to possession of the lands so conveyed, together with improvements thereon, shall revert to the United States upon a finding by the Secretary, after notice to such grantee and after an opportunity for a hearing, that the grantee had ceased to use the property for such purposes; and such lands and improvements thereon, upon such reversion to the United States, shall be returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE, MONTANA

The bill (S. 927) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont," approved July 28, 1937, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved July 28, 1937, heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved July 18, 1939, granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana and counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, Mont., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont., is hereby revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years after the date of the termination of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

WABASH RIVER BRIDGE, ILLINOIS

The bill (S. 1219) authorizing the city of St. Francisville, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for the military and other purposes, the city of St. Francisville, Ill., be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Wabash River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near St. Francisville, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred on the city of St. Francisville, Ill., all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The city of St. Francisville, Ill., is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including interest at a rate of not to exceed 5 percent per annum and reasonable financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER BRIDGE, NEW YORK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 476) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.," approved June 14, 1933, as amended.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas give an explanation of this bill?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the bill really reenacts a law which provides for the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Has the bridge been constructed?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No, the bridge has not been constructed. The bill merely renews authority for the construction of the bridge, as it is desired. It is just the same as other bridge authorizations passed by Congress.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the bridge to be constructed by the United States Government, or does the bill merely permit the building of it?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The bill merely permits the building of the bridge. The cost of the construction is to be determined by the parties involved.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will there be any cost to our Government under the bill?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Not unless Congress makes an appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ST. LOUIS RIVER BRIDGE, MINNESOTA

The bill (H. R. 3150) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River, between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1939, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAHONING RIVER BRIDGE, OHIO

The bill (H. R. 3373) authorizing the reconstruction of the Spring Common Bridge on Mahoning Avenue, across the Mahoning River in the municipality of Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AGE LIMIT FOR APPOINTEES TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The bill (H. R. 1123) to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who reported the bill from the Committee on Military Affairs, I should like to suggest that the Navy are not willing to accept the provisions of the bill which deal with the Naval Academy. They have no objection to the provisions of the bill which deal with the Military Academy. They have some objections to the Navy provisions and they desire to be heard.

It occurs to me there is one of two courses to be pursued, either to strike out the provisions of the bill which relate to admissions to the Naval Academy, and let the remainder of the bill be passed, applying only to the Military Academy, or to have the bill referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs for consideration of the provisions affecting the Naval Academy and have a report made by that committee. I should like to have the Senator's opinion on that suggestion.

Mr. GURNEY. Would the Senator be willing to have the bill go to conference with the naval provision stricken out, and have the matter adjusted in conference?

Mr. WALSH. That might be agreeable if there were assurance that the House would not insist on its provision, and therefore close the issue without the Navy being heard at all.

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure there is no objection on the part of the Committee on Military Affairs to referring the bill to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and letting that committee consider the provisions affecting the Naval Academy.

Mr. WALSH. And then report the bill back to the Senator's committee?

Mr. GURNEY. No; I would suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that he then report the bill back to the Senate.

Mr. HILL. And let it go to the calendar.

Mr. WALSH. That is satisfactory. The Navy Department is in sympathy with the objective of the bill, but it has a problem somewhat different from that relating to the Army.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator make a motion, then, to have the bill taken from the calendar and referred to his committee?

Mr. WALSH. I move that House bill 1123 be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that the Committee on Naval Affairs will consider only the naval features of the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to make a statement for the Committee on Military Affairs. We had word that the Navy was in complete accord with the provisions of the bill as passed by the House. Otherwise our committee would have referred the bill in the first place to the Senator's committee.

Mr. WALSH. I am sure of that. Apparently it is a matter of second thought or consideration on the part of the Navy Department.

INCLUSION OF STEPPARENTS UNDER PAY READJUSTMENT ACT

The bill (H. R. 2525) to include stepparents among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to include stepparents, parents by adoption, and any person who has stood in loco parentis among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes."

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 92) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to voting qualifications, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

OSCAR R. STEINERT

The bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert, was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the Committee on Claims has been requested to listen to new evidence or testimony on this bill, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Claims for further investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ANNA MATTIL AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1889) for the relief of Anna Mattil and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LAURA MAY RYAN

The bill (H. R. 1393) for the relief of Mrs. Laura May Ryan, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INGLIS CONSTRUCTION CO.

The bill (H. R. 1565) for the relief of Inglis Construction Co., a corporation, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLIE B. ROUSE, LOUETTE ROUSE, AND RACHEL ROUSE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1017) for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse, Louette Rouse, and Rachel Rouse, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$200; to Louette Rouse, his wife, the sum of $2,000; and to Rachel Rouse, his daughter, the sum of $100, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by them when the motor vehicle in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle on Highway No. 41 near Tullahoma, Tenn., on August 12, 1944." and to insert "$81.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained and expenses incurred by him as the result of an accident involving a United States Army reconnaissance car on Highway No. 41 near Tullahoma, Tenn., on August 12, 1944; to pay to Mrs. Louette Rouse, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by her as a result of said accident; and to pay to Mrs. Louette Rouse, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $50 for the benefit of her minor daughter, Rachel Rouse, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Rachel Rouse in said accident", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charlie B. Rouse, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $81.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained and expenses incurred by him as the result of an accident involving a United States Army reconnaissance car on Highway No. 41 near Tullahoma, Tenn., on August 12, 1944; to pay to Mrs. Louette Rouse.

of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by her as a result of said accident; and to pay to Mrs. Louette Rouse, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $50 for the benefit of her minor daughter, Rachel Rouse, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Rachel Rouse in said accident: *Provided*, that no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse."

AFTAB ALI

The bill (S. 1081) for the relief of Aftab Ali was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Aftab Ali, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $500, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for the refund of a bail bond posted for Azir Khan, an alien, such bond having been forfeited on January 17, 1944, when the said Azir Kahn failed to appear for deportation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ALICE A. MURPHY

The bill (S. 1126) for the relief of Alice A. Murphy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alice A. Murphy, of the city of Providence, county of Providence, State of Rhode Island, the sum of $200, in full settlement of her claim for personal injuries sustained by her while a passenger in a privately owned bus that was struck by a bus owned and operated by the Navy Department on December 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN FROM AMONG SONS OF PERSONS AWARDED THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

The bill (H. R. 1591) to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] reported the bill on behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs, and is present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I will say I am familiar with the bill, and I withdraw my request for an explanation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with an amendment at the end of the bill, to add the following proviso:

Provided, That all such appointees are otherwise qualified for admission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor."

APPOINTMENT AS CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN OF SONS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE LAND OR NAVAL FORCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1868) authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment at the end of the bill to add the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That all such appointees are otherwise qualified for admission: *And provided further*, That appointees under this act shall be selected in order of merit as established by competitive examination."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL (and other Senators). Over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wonder if those who are objecting to this bill would mind listening to an explanation of it?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, and I say to the Senator frankly that I shall insist on my request that the bill go over. But if the Senator wishes to consume five minutes in discussing the bill, very well.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to say to my able friend, the Senator from Alabama, that I am very much disappointed and discouraged, because I had hoped the bill might pull through today without any objection. It has been so long before the Senate and before the House, and has been considered at such great length by the Committee on the Judiciary, that I really had hoped that today would see the end of the struggle, and that we would have it on its way toward the President's signature. I find that my friend, the Senator from Alabama, is not inclined to be persuaded otherwise, but I must say that at some time in the future, and the near future, when those Senators who are interested in the bill can accommodate themselves to be present to hear, I shall feel constrained to move to bring the bill before the Senate for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, House bill 7, Calendar No. 628, will be passed over.

This completes the bills on the calendar.

SOUND MONEY: SELF-HELP FOR EUROPE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, while I am on my feet I wish to speak on another subject. There are other subjects in which I am much more interested.

Today the demand for silver as money and as an industrial metal is much greater than it ever has been in the history of the world, so those of us who are especially interested in that subject are alert at all times for expressions coming from those who are authorities on the subject of silver as sound money.

There appears an article in the Washington News Digest by Dr. Ruth Alexander, entitled "Sound Money: Self-Help for Europe." The article is so apropos of the subject in which some of us are interested and so filled with fact, that I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD. It is not a lengthy article, but is full of meat and good argument.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUND MONEY: SELF-HELP FOR EUROPE

(By Dr. Ruth Alexander)

War's net result has been to reduce Europe to a primitive economy. The clock has been turned back thousands of years. So-called civilized man has been forced into prehistoric caves. Primitive man is concerned with the primitive problem of maintaining life. He cannot afford the luxury of a "standard of living."

Today, the problems of all primitive economies are increased by a civilized point of view. Most modern Europeans have experienced those comforts which make up civilization.

Such is the nature of man and such his memory of comforts once enjoyed that he will tax his strength and his know-how to the uttermost to gain them. He will agree to political jack-trading without end.

INTERNATIONAL CHARITY A PHONY

Our statesmen are aware of this characteristic. So they promise prosperity as well as peace. But the American taxpayers are tired of the indefinite continuance of a lavish generosity, at their expense. They know that economic well-being based on international charity is a phony. They would like to see Europe raise itself by its own efforts.

The quickest and most effective step toward economic recovery and political independence would be a general return to sound money. Europe's present status is that of a barter economy—the lowest in the primitive scale. Today, men of all ranks and skills are gratefully exchanging their labor for food, clothing, and shelter. In some instances the exchange is direct. In others, it is made through the medium of paper money—a short half-step above barter, since paper is too plentiful and perishable to have value of itself.

Civilization coincides with the origin and rise of money. The history of mankind above the savage level is the history of money. Money is anything which becomes, by general agreement, the common medium of give-and-take. Whatever performs this function is money.

Its substance and form has varied from cattle and sheep to rice, oil, salt, grain, tin, copper, silver, and gold. Its use has been informally agreed upon by general consent or formally established by law.

Sound money or "hard" money is preferably metal money but not necessarily so. Any commodity, or thing, which is desired by people for itself is valuable. Whatever is valuable is capable of becoming money. When confined to animals or grain, money lacked convenience and uniformity. When confined to paper, money lacks value, since paper money rests solely on the decree of the state and can be changed in value, at will, by the politicians. Metal money, alone, combines those features of convenience, uniformity, and scarcity which make it as near an ideal medium of exchange as possible.

Sound money builds civilization. It makes possible that division of labor which sets apart primitive societies from advanced societies. And it makes possible the piling up of a surplus above those goods used up in the actual nourishment of life. A high standard of living is impossible without having more than you need, which, alone, enables you to buy the comforts of life. A high standard of living is impossible, therefore, without sound money.

Barter is the trade mark of barbarians and paper money is the tool of tyrants. If Europe wishes to reestablish herself in the family of civilized nations she can take no quicker step than by adoption of sound money, preferably metal. By means of it, the value of her labor can be measured and her surplus goods can be accumulated.

THE MEN OF THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some months ago I introduced a bill to give recognition which I think is justly due to a great group of those who served during this war in the merchant marine and who are receiving little, if any, recognition for all the fine services they rendered. Apropos of that bill I have in my hand an article entitled "Heroes Without Privileges" by Dean Jenning. In view of the fact that it deals with the subject of what is properly coming to those who served in our merchant marine during this war, I respectfully suggest that the article might well be inserted in the RECORD. I therefore ask that it be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Coronet magazine of September 1945]

HEROES WITHOUT PRIVILEGES

(By Dean Jennings)

"Without wishing in any way to detract from the richly deserved privileges of our servicemen, Coronet at the same time feels the men of the merchant marine have also earned the Nation's gratitude. This article is presented as a picture of a situation that is somehow incomplete — a situation that should never have arisen and must be changed."—The editors.

His name is Joe, or Bill, or Jack. He has been killed in action; he has been tortured by Japs or thrown into their prisons. He has been wounded and permanently crippled, and his outfit has the highest proportional dead and missing rate of the war. But he has no honorable discharge button; he is ineligible for the American Legion; and he comes home from the battle fronts without parades or banquets. He cannot be honored with the flag in burial at sea; his name seldom gets on the home-town bronze plaques, and for him there is no GI bill of rights.

He is the forgotten veteran of the war—the man of the merchant marine.

In a nation which worships its heroes and heaps honors on the man in uniform, there has been a shocking indifference to the problems of the 250,000 men who risked torpedoes, dive bombers, mines, and other refinements long before the United States was at war. Indeed, more than one seaman returning home after a bath in a sea of flaming gasoline has heard himself and his buddies branded "draft dodgers" and "pay check fighters."

Just a few months ago, on the train to Chicago, I encountered three merchant marine men. Two were deck officers, and the third was a young ordinary seaman whose ship had been bombed at Leyte. None was wearing his uniform, and when I mentioned it the youngster said grimly, "We keep our uniforms out of sight, because nobody gives a damn about 'em."

These three men, each of whom had fired guns at Japanese pilots, who had seen their ships sink and their buddies die, may have been oversensitive. Their attitude may have been the exception instead of the rule. But the situation exists, and at this writing the authorities are finally going to bat for the men whom Admiral Nimitz once praised as "an integral part of our fighting team."

The merchant marine has paid a heavy price for its few favors.

It was not generally known until recently, for example, that this Nation lost 1,554 merchant ships between September 1939 and May 1945. Of the men who manned these and other ships some 5,600 are dead or missing, another 500 are prisoners of war, and an estimated 12,000 have been injured at sea or wounded by enemy action. But their names have not appeared on any official casualty list, none of them has ever been summoned personally to the White House to receive the Nation's highest honor, and there isn't one person in a thousand who can identify a merchant-marine medal ribbon or combat bar.

Indeed, the seaman's glory road has more than once been described as a "kick in the teeth."

There is no swift V-mail service for the seaman who delivers a cargo of guns at a distant port. There are no lifetime benefits for his widow if he get a slug from an enemy plane. He has to buy his own uniforms, and when he mails a letter he digs into his pocket for postage. He is not entitled to furlough ticket rates on the railroads and in some places he is barred from service canteens, whether he's been overseas or not. He gets no extra income tax exemption, and if he needs a doctor 5 years from now for a recurrent war injury, it's too bad. He'll pay the bill himself. Until just a few months ago, in fact, returning merchant seamen were refused the gallon-a-day furlough gasoline ration handed out to soldiers and sailors. It is not surprising then if the men from the Liberty ships find some irony in General Eisenhower's words: "We count on their efficiency and their utter devotion to duty as we do our own. They have never failed us yet, and in the struggles to come we know they will not be deterred by danger, hardship, or privation." There is neither a logical excuse nor a sound explanation for the crumbs tossed to the merchant marine.

There was actually a period between 1941 and 1942 when any man signing on for the North Atlantic run to Murmansk was automatically (a) a hero or (b) a casualty. Convoys starting out from Scotland or Greenland had to creep past Trondheim, where Nazi bombers waited to break them up, and losses sometimes ran as high as 80 percent. For a time the merchant sailor was a national idol, but he went into virtual oblivion after Pearl Harbor, and, on a comparative basis, has remained there ever since.

The men of the merchant marine say frankly that they have had inadequate news coverage on their work. This is a fair complaint and has a foundation of truth. Although the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal for extraordinary heroism has been awarded to 114 men, it is a rare citizen who can name one of them.

In most instances action stories in combat zones are under the control of Army, Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard public relations officers. Merchant-marine men have participated in every invasion in the Pacific; they have been on the beachheads by the hundreds, shelled, bombed, and machine gunned. They have even been ordered off their ships by General MacArthur and hustled into fox holes because their ships were untenable. But it has been charged that there is a tendency to play down the merchant seaman's role or to forget it altogether.

Some months ago a Liberty ship was sunk by a submarine. The U-boat surfaced and sprayed the struggling survivors with machine guns until they were rescued by a Navy vessel. The Maritime Commission was not allowed to release this story, and the entire encounter was subsequently related to the press by the members of the Navy gun crew from the vessel, with small credit for the wounded merchant seamen. The claim has been made that this happens frequently. The disparity has even been carried out on a social level, and reports have been verified that in foreign harbors merchant-marine officers have not been allowed to eat with Army and Navy officers.

The prevailing apathy to the merchant seaman is traceable to two popular but unjust legends. First, that the merchant marine is loaded with draft dodgers; second, that they are paid fabulous wages with little or no risk.

Actually, the bloody record of the war at sea indicates that any man who signed on a merchant ship for peace and quiet ought to have his head examined—if he still had his head intact. The War Shipping Administration has issued 342,336 war zone bars, and some 83,000 men have won combat bars for actual contact with the enemy. There are men who have had their ships shot out from under them four times, and about 60 percent of all the men who went to sea have been torpedoed at least once.

There are other factors overlooked in this picture, too. Men who sign with the merchant marine inexorably go to sea and at best it's a grab-bag proposition. Many a man has discovered with a pardonable shock that his ship is flying the familiar red flag denoting a cargo of ammunition. He may be gone for 6 weeks or 8 months. He may be put on a shuttle run, as from Sydney to Leyte, and not get home for a year or more.

He goes to sea with a 2-B classification and must report to his draft board the day he returns.

Regulations allow him 1 day ashore for every week spent at sea, up to a maximum of 30 days, and if he does not ship out again within the prescribed time limit someone is apt to tap him on the shoulder and make up his mind. Indeed, there was never a man yet who went to sea during this war without facing the risk of enemy attack. In the early days the odds against these men were almost suicidal. Their "protection" usually consisted of two ancient popguns, laughingly called anti-aircraft, and the skipper's pistol. There were no hospital facilities.

What happens when these men come home? They have to scramble for railroad tickets like any civilian. They pay the full admission price at theaters, ball games, and other amusement places where other men in uniform go in at reduced rates, and they have to give a strict accounting of their ration points. They are called slackers in the face of the fact that they are all volunteers, and they are subjected daily to many other indignities. Merchant-marine officers have been refused admittance to officers' clubs and the much publicized Hollywood Canteen only recently agreed to admit men wearing the maritime-service uniform.

The second fiction which has had an insidious effect on public understanding of seamen's problems is based on their reported high wages, bonuses, allowances. It must be admitted at first glance that merchant-seaman earnings look like the golden pot to the GI Joe who sweats it out at $50 a month and up. But when all the figures are put through the wringer the gilt comes off, and in the long run the Army and Navy men have the best deal. The merchant seaman, for instance, is not allowed the extra $1,500 income-tax exemption granted to the others, nor does he receive any mustering-out pay.

He is not paid for the time he spends ashore between trips and thus he draws income only for about 10 months a year. He has to take furloughs on his own time, and he has to pay for his own uniforms, whereas the Navy man draws a substantial clothing allowance. Army and Navy pay increases with the time spent in service, regardless of increase in rank, but merchant-marine pay is static and those seemingly stratospheric bonuses apply only in a war zone. There are countless other cash benefits for the Army and Navy man which are denied to his fellows on the merchant ship—free postage, reduced travel rates, lower amusement prices, subsistence and rental allowances, lower insurance premiums.

The seaman has no dependency allowances, and his insurance applies only while he is aboard ship. If he breaks a leg while off articles, he has to pay for his own treatment, but the Navy and Army man's policy is good anywhere and any time. The most obvious injustices, however, involve medical attention. Wives of Navy men below the rank of petty officer, third class, for instance, pay nothing for their confinement, but the seaman shells out the full price to private doctors for the delivery of his baby.

Injured members of the merchant marine are cared for adequately by the United States Public Health Service, but on a somewhat limited basis. If a man is once discharged from one of these hospitals as cured, he must come back within 2 months if further treatments are needed or pay for it himself. But Army and Navy men are guaranteed perpetual medical care without a cent of cost. Dependents of merchant seamen killed receive a flat sum of $5,000—no more. But the widow of a Navy man killed receives a lifetime pension if she remains unmarried—a sum that averages from three to six times more than the total possible for a seaman's widow. For compensation allowances merchant seamen must be totally and permanently disabled. But the Navy man draws his compensation for any degree of physical injury, and can supplement his pension by working at a civilian job.

Figures compiled by Commodore Telfair Knight, United States Maritime Commission, of the War Shipping Administration, showed the average income of a Navy seaman, first class, and an ordinary seaman were about the same at the end of a year. Citing all the foregoing financial facts in a plea for a fair deal, Commodore Knight remarked in an open letter to the American Legion: "The commonly accepted opinion that merchant seamen are too well paid is thus seen to be a myth."

Myth or not, the evidence available strongly supports the growing feeling that the men who delivered the goods have had a raw deal.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Judge Schuyler Otis Bland, Senator George Radcliffe, Congressman Bailey, Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur, and many other fair-minded men and women have recently been outspoken in their support of the merchant marine. In Hollywood, Clark Gable, back home after long service with the Army Air Corps, is already at work on his new picture—a merchant-marine story tentatively called The Big Shore Leave. Pat O'Brien and Rudy Vallee are west coast representatives in a new organization for merchant seamen, and elsewhere in the Nation there is a hopeful attitude in editorial opinions, vox-pop letters, and the activities of various private and governmental agencies.

The men of the merchant marine are confident the American people will not let them down. They have fought the war, too, in their own way, without squawk. They have delivered the guns and tanks and planes. They took GI Joe to war and they'll bring him home again.

It's about time they got a break.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] may be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate during the remainder of this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the consent of the Senate is granted.

AMENDMENT OF THE BONNEVILLE PROJECT ACT

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 468, House bill 2690, to amend the Bonneville Project Act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I not only have no objection to the bill, but I very much hope it may be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2690) to amend the Bonneville Project Act, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF MIDSHIPMEN FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there are two or three bills on the calendar which were passed over on a previous call of the calendar; on one occasion because of my absence and on another occasion because of an objection made by one Senator.

I now move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 288, Senate bill 130, to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 130) to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment at the end of the bill to add sections 2 and 3, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy," approved December 20, 1917 (40 Stat. 430), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the words "and five for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and fifteen for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. The increase in appointments provided in this act shall be accomplished by the appointment of not more than five during each of the years 1946 and 1947.

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 1517 of the Revised Statutes is amended to read as follows: "Candidates allowed for congressional districts and for Territories must be actual residents of the districts or Territories, respectively, from which they are nominated; and candidates allowed for the District of Columbia must have been actual residents of said District for not less than 5 years immediately prior to their nomination."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, for some time past the District of Columbia has been treated shamefully in the matter of the number of individuals it is entitled to send to the Naval Academy. I think the number is only three. There are several States which have very much less population than the District of Columbia, which are entitled to 15 appointees, 5 for each Senator and 5 for the Representative in Congress. The bill seeks to remedy that grave injustice.

For the RECORD I will enumerate some of the States in which the population is less than that of the District of Columbia: Arizona, 499,000; Delaware, 266,000; Nevada, 110,000; New Mexico, 531,000; Wyoming, 250,000.

I am sure there can be no reasonable objection to the bill, and I ask that it be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first committee amendment was, on page 1, after line 9, to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The increase in appointments provided in this act shall be accomplished by the appointment of not more than five during each of the years 1946 and 1947.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 2 to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 1517 of the Revised Statutes is amended to read as follows: "Candidates allowed for con-

gressional districts and for Territories must be actual residents of the districts or Territories, respectively, from which they are nominated; and candidates allowed for the District of Columbia must have been actual residents of said District for not less than 5 years immediately prior to their nomination."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISCHARGE OF MIDSHIPMEN BECAUSE OF UNSATISFACTORY CONDUCT OR APTITUDE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 506, Senate bill 1064.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The title of the bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief explanation of the bill. My colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who was one of the Board of Visitors at the Naval Academy this spring, is likewise interested in this bill, and particularly interested since the matter was called to his attention and to the attention of other members of the Board of Visitors when we were at the Naval Academy.

The purpose of the bill is to require the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, whenever he determines that the conduct of any midshipman is unsatisfactory or that any midshipman has demonstrated that he possesses insufficient aptitude for becoming a commissioned officer in the naval service, to submit to the Secretary of the Navy a full report of such determination and of the facts upon which it is based. If, after according such midshipman an opportunity to examine such report and to submit a written statement thereon, the Secretary of the Navy shall deem the Superintendent's determination reasonable and well founded, upon the basis of such report and statement, he may, at his discretion, discharge such midshipman from the Naval Academy.

Under existing law, a midshipman can be discharged for academic deficiency but it is impossible to take such action in the case of unsatisfactory conduct without a recommendation for outright dismissal. The majority of midshipmen's conduct cases at the Naval Academy are those in which the demerits assigned exceed the limited number, or offenses in which the individuals involved exhibit disregard of regulations for the routine and discipline of the Academy. Only in rare instances is actual moral turpitude or a serious military offense involved which warrants the extreme recommendation for outright dismissal, carrying the far-reaching stigma that accompanies such termination of service connection. Under existing law, however, the Superintendent has no alternative other than the recommendation of dismissal in accordance with the act of Congress approved April 9, 1906.

If the present bill is enacted, a midshipman would be discharged from the Naval Academy for academic deficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, inaptitude for the naval service. Midshipmen would be dismissed only in rare instances involving actual moral turpitude or a serious military offense.

This year there were three boys who purchased the examination papers in advance of the day of the examination. In some way they were able to contact the stenographer or typist or person who made up the examination papers, and sold them among themselves. Of course the Superintendent took steps to dismiss them. The slow process of getting final action permitted the men to remain around the school and spend their time visiting Senators and Representatives to intercede for them and bring the proper amount of pressure to keep them in the school. It is a very unwholesome situation, and dangerous to the discipline of the school. This bill gives the accused all the rights he now has. He can appeal to the Secretary of the Navy and have a hearing, but it eliminates the necessity of having the President take final action.

I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1064) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy shall, whenever he determines that the conduct of any midshipman is unsatisfactory or that any midshipman has demonstrated that he possesses insufficient aptitude for becoming a commissioned officer in the naval service, submit to the Secretary of the Navy in writing a full report of such determination and of the facts on which it is based. If, after according such midshipman an opportunity to examine such report and to submit a written statement thereon, the Secretary of the Navy shall deem the Superintendent's determination reasonable and well founded upon the basis of such report and statement, he may, in his discretion, discharge such midshipman from the Naval Academy.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF RESIDENTS OF GUAM

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there is on the calendar a bill in which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is very much interested, and which was passed over at his suggestion. I refer to Calendar No. 439, Senate bill 1139. He and I have been in conference with members of the committee, and I believe that the matter has been adjusted satisfactorily to all concerned. The bill relates to claims of residents of Guam.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1139, Calendar No. 439.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1139) for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments, in section 2, on page 4, line 8, after the word "Pay", to insert "and"; and in the same line, after the word "subsistence", to strike out the comma and the words "and transportation", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of granting immediate relief to the residents of Guam by the prompt settlement of meritorious claims arising in Guam, the Secretary of the Navy, and such other officer or officers as the Secretary of the Navy may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, are hereby authorized to appoint a claims commission or commissions, each composed of one or more officers of the Navy or the Marine Corps, to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and make payments of amounts determined as just compensation, where accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and in final settlement, of claims for damage or injury occurring in Guam, including claims of insured but excluding claims of subrogees, on account of damage to or loss or destruction of public property, both real and personal, or on account of damage to or loss or destruction of private property, both real and personal (or personal injury or death), of residents of Guam, including claims for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property bailed to the Government and claims for damages incident to use and occupation of real property, whether under a lease, express or implied, or otherwise, when such damage, loss, destruction, or injury is the result of or incident to hostilities or hostile occupation, or is caused by or incident to noncombat activities of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps forces or individual members thereof, including military and civilian employees thereof, where the amount of such claim does not exceed $5,000: *Provided*, That no claim shall be considered by such commissions unless presented within one year after the occurrence of the accident or the incident or engagement out of which such claim arises, except that claims arising out of accidents, incidents, or engagements, after December 6, 1941, but prior to the first day of the month following enactment of his act, may be presented at any time prior to the expiration of one year after the latter date: *Provided further*, That any such settlements made by such commissions shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe and may, in cases where the amount exceeds $2,500 but does not exceed $5,000, be subject to the approval of such commanding or other officer of the Navy or Marine Corps forces, as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe; and the Secretary of the Navy shall have authority, if he deems any claim in excess of $5,000 to be meritorious, to certify such amount as may be found to be just and reasonable thereon to Congress as a legal claim for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor, together with a brief statement of the character of such claim, the amount claimed, and the amount allowed: *Provided further*, That no claim of any person who has voluntarily aided an enemy of the United States, or of any national of any country at war with the United States, or of an ally of such enemy country, except when the local military commander or his designee shall determine that such national was at the time of the damage or injury and still is friendly to the United States, shall be allowed under this act: *Provided further*, That any such settlements made by such commissions under the authority of this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

SEC. 2. In the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy or his designees, settlements of claims under section 1 of this act shall be made by reimbursement in kind from available Government property stores and services and/or out of the appropriation current at the time of settlement, for "Pay and subsistence of naval personnel."

SEC. 3. Insofar as the claims of residents of Guam arising in Guam are concerned, this act is in lieu of all other provisions of law authorizing settlement of war-damage claims by the agencies of the United States Government, but shall otherwise be supplementary to, and not in lieu of, all other provisions of law authorizing consideration, ascertainment, adjustment, determination, or payment of claims by the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 4. Claims of the type described in section 1 hereof on account of damage to or loss or destruction of property, both real and personal, or personal injury or death of any person, caused by Coast Guard forces, or individual members, including military personnel and civilian employees thereof, or otherwise incident to activities of such forces, arising at any time while the Coast Guard shall be operating as a part of the Navy may be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, and paid in the manner in this act provided for the settlement of Navy and Marine Corps claims: *Provided*, That no claims on account of damage to or loss or destruction of property, or personal injury or death, caused by Coast Guard forces or individual members thereof, or otherwise incident to the activities of such forces, shall be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, or paid under the provisions of this act at any time when the Coast Guard shall be operating under the Treasury Department.

SEC. 5. This act shall not apply to claims of persons not permanent residents of Guam or to claims not arising in Guam.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Ohio to explain the amendments which he and I have proposed to the bill, and also present his view.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall explain the amendments. I previously objected to the bill on several grounds.

In the first place, the bill, as originally drafted, proposed to authorize the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to settle claims for loss of property from Japanese action or from the action of our own Army and Navy; also claims for personal injury or death resulting from such activity. It was not very clear to me whether it intended to create a legal liability for which the United States was assuming responsibility or not.

I discussed the matter with the Judge Advocate General of the Navy and studied the bill. In my opinion all it does is to authorize the Navy to settle certain claims. There is no legal obligation on the Department to do so. We have excluded claims for personal injury and death. So far as I know, we have never recognized the responsibility of the United States Government for claims for personal injury or death resulting from war. We do not even recognize the claims of our own soldiers. I do not believe that we should recognize the claims of people killed in the Philippine Islands. So at my suggestion that feature was eliminated so far as the discretionary power of the Navy is concerned.

Under the terms of the bill the Navy Department can settle claims up to $2,500 on the ground. It can settle claims up to $5,000 on the approval of the Secretary of the Navy. Any claims for property damage in excess of $5,000 must be sent to Congress in the form of a claims bill, to be passed upon by the Congress.

I agreed that that provision might also cover claims for personal injury or death. Such claims cannot be settled, but if they are considered meritorious, they may be recommended to Congress for settlement. I do not believe that we have in any way tied our hands. We may decide not to recognize claims for personal injury or death if we wish to do so.

The effect of the amendments is to take from the bill the settlement of claims for personal injury and death as a discretionary matter, and require such claims to come to Congress. They can be presented to Congress, anyway. Personally, I would prefer a clear statement of what legal liability we are assuming; but I realize that the Guam situation is a special and peculiar situation. Residents of Guam are largely almost wards of the United States. They have no self-government. The Navy governs Guam practically as an arbitrary ruler. I think the method proposed, by which we give the Navy Department discretion to settle claims up to a certain amount, and recommend to Congress the settlement of certain other claims, is perhaps the best method of dealing with that problem. I do not regard the bill as a precedent for settlement of claims in the Philippine Islands, or in any other part of the Territories of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I concur in what the Senator from Ohio has said, and I commend him for the assistance which he has rendered the committee in calling attention to the subject matter which has led to the amendments. He has been very helpful.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after the comma and before the word "of", it is proposed to insert "including waiver of any claims against the War Damage Corporation," and in the same line, after the word "damage", it is proposed to strike out "or injury."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 9, after the word "personal", it is proposed to strike out the comma and the words "or personal injury or death."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 14, before the word "destruction", it is proposed to insert "or", and in the same line, after the word "destruction", it is proposed to strike out "or injury."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 11, after "$5,000", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "or any claims for death or personal injury to residents of Guam arising under the conditions herein set forth as a basis for property-damage claims,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 442) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to appoint claims commissions for the purpose of considering, ascertaining, adjusting, determining, and settling claims of the residents of Guam for damage arising from combat on the island, covering the periods of the Japanese invasion and our reconquest, to settle claims arising from the noncombat activities of our forces on the island and from the noncombat activities of the Japanese forces while they were in occupation. Such settlement may be made either in kind or by payment of a monetary award.

The affairs of Guam have been administered in the interests of the naval station and the native inhabitants have been considered wards of the Navy. Thus, the United States has a definite responsibility to protect the inhabitants of the island. The Japanese invasion and occupation resulted in extensive damage to private property on the island. Further damage resulted from our reconquest. As a result of the two periods of combat and the actions of the Japanese occupying force during the interim, the people of Guam have suffered extensively, and it is believed that immediate steps should be taken to alleviate their suffering. The fairest, most equitable, and most immediate method of achieving this end would be through the early settlement of claims for damages arising in the period since December 6, 1941, and caused by the activities of the Japanese and American military forces.

Since Guam is at present an integral part of combat operations, it is not feasible to have other Government agencies operating within the island. For that reason it is proposed that the Navy be authorized to settle the damage claims referred to.

The good will of the islanders toward the Navy was responsible for no small part of the comparative ease with which reconquest took place and moreover was responsible for many of the difficulties of the Japanese on the island. It is believed that a prompt settlement of damage claims will result in the rebuilding and augmenting of that good will.

The bill is modeled upon Public Law 39 (78th Cong.), under which the Secretary of the Navy was authorized to appoint claims commissions for the settlement of noncombat claims in foreign countries.

The bill provides that—

"(a) Claims must be presented within 1 year after the occurrence of the accident or the incident or the engagement out of which the claim arises, except that claims arising after December 6, 1941, but prior to the first day of the month following enactment of this act, may be presented at any time prior to the expiration of 1 year after the latter date.

"(b) Claims which do not exceed $5,000 may be paid under regulations approved by the Secretary of the Navy. Claims in excess of $5,000 may be certified to Congress as a legal claim for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor.

"(c) Claims of persons who have voluntarily aided an enemy of the United States may not be paid.

"(d) Settlements made under authority of this act shall be final and conclusive.

"(e) Settlements may be made by reimbursement in kind from available Government property stores or services and/or out of naval appropriations current at the time of settlement.

"(f) The act shall not apply to claims of persons not permanent residents of Guam or to claims not arising in Guam."

The committee understands that the town of Agana, the largest on the island, is a complete wreck and that the Army and the Navy have already built a number of villages and schoolhouses for the natives. The committee were informed that the Army and Navy had taken over a large part of the best lands in the island for military purposes; that it will be necessary to retain some of these lands permanently for Army and Navy installations, and that the Navy Department will recommend enactment of additional legislation authorizing the conveyance of some lands now owned by the Government to the natives, in order that they may provide for their own subsistence.

It is not possible at this time to make a worth-while estimate of the cost to the Government if the bill is enacted. It is believed, however, that the cost will be relatively small, as construction is cheap on the island, and Army and Navy personnel located there have already begun the task of reconstruction.

In the future, this island will become one of the most important United States naval and air bases in the Pacific. Its people have been loyal wards of the United States. The committee believe that the enactment of the bill is just and warranted, that it will be helpful in retaining the good will of these people in the future, and that it will be a sound investment in our future security.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, this week, October 7 to 13, inclusive, has been decreed by an act of Congress and proclaimed by President Truman as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. I cannot let the premier observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week pass without offering my tribute to those who successfully introduced and pressed to a conclusion this splendid humanitarian idea.

There can be no question as to the need for establishing such national observance. For many years prior to this war our Nation wastefully expended or ignored its own manpower. We know that to be true when it is considered that, on an average, each year prior to Pearl Harbor some 800,000 of our citizens became permanently disabled, in varying degrees, in industry alone, and—sad to relate—many of them were thrown upon the human scrap pile, or termed "nonfeasible for rehabilitation."

We know, from investigations of various congressional committees, that it has been well established that there are today more than 26,000,000 physically handicapped citizens of this Nation. Only last week Millard W. Rice, National Service Director, Disabled American Veterans, stated that 2,500,000 were permanently disabled.

On the industrial front, we find that approximately 3,500,000 have been disabled through injuries incurred during the great stress of our tremendous war-production effort.

We cannot ignore this condition. A large segment of our population demands special consideration. They cannot be permitted to wither on the vine for lack of opportunity to earn their way in competition with those who are able-bodied.

So I wish for National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week the great success it deserves, and hope that Government, industry, and the public will thus be aroused so as to recognize their obligation to these willing but unfortunately disabled workers. The record made by the physically handicapped during this war entitles them to such recognition and is, in fact, one of the brightest pages of our achievement. Their production, when properly placed in suitable employment, equaled and often excelled that of the nonhandicapped. Their record of absenteeism was infinitely superior to that of the average nonhandicapped worker, and their injury record showed that, being already physically handicapped, they were, as a class, far more cautious and less liable to further injury, than those who have never been disabled.

My distinguished colleague from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is deserving of the thanks of the Senate for having sponsored National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. Paul A. Strachan, president, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, should also be commended because this was his idea, and I can attest to the diligence with which he pursued it. Mr. Strachan, himself 85 percent physically disabled, is to be congratulated upon the fine work of himself and his federation in thus bringing to the attention of the Congress a means whereby our physically handicapped citizens will undoubtedly benefit immeasurably.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Give Paul a Hand," written by Thomas L. Stokes and published in the Washington Daily News of October 8, 1945. Mr. Stokes is a distinguished newspaper writer. This article is very appropriate at this particular time, because it refers very effectively to the subject of the observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVE PAUL A HAND

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

There's a long, tall, gangling fellow about this town, blessed with amazing and persistent energy despite physical handicaps. He won't let people alone because of something he's got in his mind and heart.

He might be called a lobbyist, but of the better and commendable type in the field of human welfare.

This is Paul A. Strachan's big week, and the big week for those he represents.

It is National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, so decreed by an act of Congress and proclaimed by President Truman. Paul Strachan is responsible for this week's being set aside to enlist interest in the millions of physically handicapped in the country. It will be observed annually from now on. He is responsible also for the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, of which he is president and dynamo.

Getting a week set aside nationally and officially was a job that took him 3½ years. It was his idea. He went at it by himself. He enlisted Representative JERRY VOORHIS (Democrat, California) and Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE (Democrat, West Virginia), who introduced resolutions in House and Senate. Then he started button-holing other Members. He's the greatest buttonholer you ever saw, and once he gets hold of your lapel he doesn't let go soon or easy.

The resolution, approved by Congress, was signed by President Truman August 11, this year. Afterward the President issued a proclamation specifying that during this week, October 7–13, "appropriate ceremonies are to be held throughout the Nation, the purpose of which will be to enlist public support for and interest in the employment of otherwise qualified but physically handicapped workers."

There are millions of them in the country normally.

Observance of this week for the first time this year is particularly timely. It serves to call our attention as a nation, to the hundreds of thousands who are handicapped, in one way or another, from service of their country in the war, disabled veterans.

War plants took a toll as well as the war.

Helping all these citizens to readapt themselves to a place in our society—in business, industry, agriculture, the professions—is a national responsibility, a State responsibility, and a community responsibility.

The physically handicapped contributed to the war program, too, by finding jobs in plants to help relieve the manpower shortage.

Many remarkable, and almost miraculous, readjustments have been made. What can be done is no better exemplified than by Paul Strachan himself. Once a successful businessman, he was incapacitated by a long illness from which he emerged with complete loss of his hearing as well as other marks. For a time he was active in the labor movement.

Then he got the idea of trying to help others who were physically handicapped. Three years ago he started the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, which now has lodges all over the country.

He is tireless, indefatigable. Early every morning he is down at his little office. All day he is busy at his numerous chores, getting out mail and tending to the details of his organization. All day he's busy at his job, visiting Members of Congress and officials at Government agencies charged with rehabilitation. He is responsible for a congressional investigation going on now into the problem of the physically handicapped to establish a better coordinated Federal program. A skillful writer, he turns out his own copy, and he is an eloquent speaker.

Give Paul Strachan a big hand this week.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William C. Mathes, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, vice Ralph E. Jenney, deceased; and

Edgar H. Rossbach, of New Jersey, to be United States attorney for the district of New Jersey, vice Charles M. Phillips, resigned.

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Brig. Gen. Thomas Henry Green (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as The Judge Advocate General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from December 1, 1945, vice Maj. Gen. Myron Cady Cramer, The Judge Advocate General, whose term of office expires November 30, 1945.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Joseph A. Bell, for appointment as administrative officer, Philadelphia Branch, Research and Statistics Division, Philadelphia, Pa., under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended;

George Robert Stephens, for appointment as professor of English at the United States Military Academy, in the Regular Army of the United States;

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Watson B. Miller, of Maryland, to be Federal Security Administrator.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the business on the Executive Calendar.

TREATIES

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read Executive D (79th Cong., 1st sess.), a convention between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on April 16, 1945; and Executive E (79th Cong., 1st sess.), a convention between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons, signed at Washington on April 16, 1945.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the treaties be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the treaties will be passed over.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Raymond S. McKeough, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for a term of 6 years.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be passed over, and I wish to advise the Senate that it is the intention to proceed with the consideration of the nomination on Thursday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul A. Hankins, of Illinois, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of F. Shirley Wilcox to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lowell B. Mason, of Illinois, to be Federal Trade Commissioner for an unexpired term of 7 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George W. Calver to be medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry additional nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the additional postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of this day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, October 11, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 9 (legislative day of October 2), 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons to be foreign-service officers of class 1, secretaries in the diplomatic service, and consuls general of the United States of America:

Leland B. Morris, of Pennsylvania.
Willys R. Peck, of California.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Thomas M. Madden, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice John Boyd Avis, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 9 (legislative day of October 2), 1945:

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Paul A. Hankins to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

F. Shirley Wilcox to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Lowell B. Mason to be Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1942.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

George W. Calver to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service to continue while serving as medical officer in attendance on the Congress.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Eula E. Gardner, Bee Branch.
James F. Yates, Canehill.
Della E. Stripling, Center Ridge.
Will W. Clayton, Delaplaine.
Joe H. Webb, Egypt.
Olive Wixson Ford, Fisher.
Joseph A. Schnitzer, Fort Smith.
Doris L. Crank, Garland.
Etta M. Poston, Gilmore.
Hendrix Williams, Grubbs.
Rena M. Stout, Hattieville.
Hattie A. Beasley, Hiwasse.
Myrtle V. Martin, McKamie.
John Louis Robinson, New Blaine.
Charles F. Smith, Oden.
Madie C. Duncan, Ogden.
James O. Carter, Omaha.
Graydon E. Bone, Oxford.
Virgil I. Cragar, Perry.
James G. Royer, Pleasant Plains.
Myrtle Kirk, Poplar Grove.
Anna McCall, Portia.
Robert F. Godfrey, Pyatt.
Irene Morgan, Roland.
Ethel L. Powell, Round Pond.
John Franklin Neal, Rudy.
J. Allan Richardson, Sidney.
Ruth V. Gibson, Summers.
Ralph McDonald, Weldon.
Henry M. Lambert, Winthrop.

FLORIDA

Dora L. Kixmiller, Anastasia.
Francis I. Warttig, Anna Maria.
Truby B. Pinholster, Brooker.
Willis C. Preston, Cypress.
Belle K. Smith, Edgewater.
Ruby McL. Floyd, Elkton.
Lillie Foy, Ellenton.
Ruth C. Owens, Eustis.
Leona M. Mercer, Hosford.
Ethel Cox, Intercession City.
Onnie Lou Carr, Lemturner.
Vivian Prouty, Lockhart.
Mary E. Pryor, Mary Esther.
Edythe E. Parker, McDavid.
William F. LaRoche, Merritt Island.
John R. Moseley, Milligan.
J. Harry Hilldale, Oak Hill.
Harry F. Wells, O'Brien.
John M. Hamlin, Osprey.
Myrtle L. Duggar, Panacea.
Gussie White, Pinetta.
William D. Thomas, Samoset.

Clifford H. Meigs, Shalimar.
Vera G. Bingham, Silver Springs.
Mary Louisa Gormley, South Daytona.
Robert H. Albury, Tavernier.
Elizabeth M. Porter, Valrico.
Archie A. Wadsworth, Wimauma.
Enoch S. Maddock, Windermere.
Clifford A. Flood, Yulee.

MAINE

Lauren F. Kelley, Belgrade.
John H. Watterson, Blaine.
Julia D. Wells, Brownfield.
Edith M. Bradbury, East Brownfield.
Eva F. Sanborn, East Sebago.
Nettie L. Towle, Enfield.
Egline Plourd, Frenchville.
Elsie A. Davis, Greenwood Mountain.
Alfred E. Crabtree, Hancock.
Merle R. Snell, Kents Hill.
Adelaide Walker Lister, Locke Mills.
Pauline E. Higgins, Manset.
Charlotte F. Robbins, McKinley.
Charles F. Huff, Orrs Island.
Frank D. Fournier, St. David.
Cora B. Means, Sedgwick.
Herman L. Sawyer, Steuben.
Fred L. Ludwig, Washington.
Vance A. Lincoln, Wayne.
Daisy M. Littlefield, Webhannet.

MINNESOTA

Arnie N. Sellman, Almelund.
Jack E. Essila, Angora.
Louis I. Westby, Avoca.
Rose C. McFarland, Bena.
Helmer J. Hedberg, Bock.
Arthur Laniel, Brooks.
Anna M. Albertson, Brookston.
Lucille R. Gallagher, Cedar.
Ellsworth T. Swanson, Crystal Bay.
Alfred V. Benson, Danvers.
Dora H. Halbert, Halma.
Garnett W. Hines, Hines.
Lyle M. Smith, Holloway.
John S. Easter, Humboldt.
Berniece Bales, Huntley.
George W. Cameron, Jr., Invergrove.
Viola P. Johnson, Jacobson.
Doris E. Gagnon, Jenkins.
Alfred Sletta, La Salle.
Hilda Hammer, Leoneth.
Alfred H. Roloff, Lynd.
Evelyne L. Wilson, Mahtowa.
Clarence H. Guetzkow, Mayer.
Clarence T. Newhouse, Mandota.
Louise R. Reinarz, Mizpah.
Anna G. Lechner, North Redwood.
Esther J. Finden, Oak Park.
Ida B. Mattson, Ormsby.
Frank W. Hill, Ostrander.
Harry B. Roth, Plato.
Fred C. Meyers, Porter.
Celia G. Hickman, Randolph.
Otto C. Kunkel, Rapidan.
Clarence M. Breneman, Ray.
Clarence Mielke, Richville.
Herman J. Weis, Roscoe.
Frank B. Klein, St. Bonifacius.
Clara E. Bloms, St. Michael.
Christie A. Ahles, St. Vincent.
John P. McGillin, Stillwater.
Vernice C. Heutmaker, Victoria.
August C. Ewert, Waldorf.
Clifford J. Newgard, Waltham.
Otto H. Koetke, Walters.
Ada V. Erlandson, Warba.
Dwight M. Backman, Whalan.

MONTANA

Edana F. Boschert, Ballantine.
Norman M. Spangelo, Box Elder.
Elizabeth McCormick, Clydepark.
Mina B. Madsen, Dagmar.
Joshua E. Patterson, Edgar.
Ruth M. Atkins, Gallatin Gateway.
Charles L. Gorman, Havre.
Emma M. Shults, Inverness.
Esther E. Heigh, Ismay.
Clarence J. Morgan, Judith Gap.
Marion Coates, Martinsdale.
Leslie N. Field, Melstone.
Joyce C. Dickson, Neihart.
Kathryn E. Auclair, Paradise.
F. Reese Puckett, Peerless.
William L. Marsh, Roy.
Eunice N. Skinner, Simms.
Alerta K. Bradbury, Willow Creek.

NORTH DAKOTA

Irwin E. Walton, Bantry.
Hannah M. Fedje, Barton.
Alice Jacobson, Benedict.
Mary Fritz, Bowesmont.
Irene Miller, Burlington.
Joyce E. Murray, Cayuga.
John Fiske, Colfax.
Veva M. Fosnes, Emerado.
Lottie Posey, Glenfield.
William F. Stone, Knox.
Oliver M. Sproule, Manvel.
Elizabeth L. Stahl, McGregor.
William F. Henger, Mooreton.
Harold D. Ward, Palermo.
Grant O. Perry, Plaza.
Robert O. Johnson, Sutton.
Edna W. Dewerff, Wheatland.

OREGON

Anna J. Schatz, Adams.
Eula M. Easley, Bates.
Emma L. Saling, Beaver.
Don C. Meyer, Blue River.
Blanche E. White, Corbett.
Gladys D. Holverson, Crescent Lake.
Hazel V. Graham, Cutler City.
Mae E. St. Helen, Donald.
Elsie E. Campbell, Eagle Creek.
Harriet A. Zumbrun, Fort Klamath.
Edith T. George, Goble.
Richard E. Tozier, Helix.
Emma M. C. Breshears, Lexington.
Harold M. Foster, Lorane.
Charles M. Cox, Lowell.
Anna Tohl, Manzanita.
Connie Hanner, Murphy.

PENNSYLVANIA

Le Roy A. Starr, Adamsdale.
Nancy F. Skinner, Adrian.
Jennie B. Fox, Aitch.
Alma V. Lewis, Alverda.
Paul J. Kline, Arcadia.
Eva M. Weller, Aristes.
Harold F. Herr, Bausman.
Ethna L. Crowe, Bear Lake.
George E. Anderson, Berkshire Heights.
Edna P. Thompson, Bigler.
Leslie May Trimble, Birmingham.
Edmund B. Kling, Blairs Mills.
Emma A. Murray, Boalsburg.
Stuart E. Shearer, Braeburn.
Helen M. McGovern, Branch Dale.
Gail Wood, Brave.
Helen Preksta, Cadogan.
Oliver W. Gehris, Center Valley.
Marshall Troutman, Clearville.
Sarah A. Dermody, Damascus.
James H. Opie, Donaldson.
M. Olive Carberry, Dudley.
George V. Butz, East Texas.
Elizabeth Hresko, Eckley.
Elizabeth McC. Seese, Ehrenfeld.
Lettie C. Reese, Exton.
Faye E. Zahniser, Fleming.
John J. Mohr, Fogelsville.
Mary E. Spangler, Frank.
Francis O. Todd, Georgetown.
Arthur Bagshaw, Glenloch.
Louise E. Rosencrance, Greeley.
Beatrice Boyle, Harwood Mines.
Marie J. Suain, Hazel Hurst.
L. Chester Stevens, Hustontown.
Nellie K. Bistline, Ickesburg.
Mary E. R. Martin, Indiana.
Gladys I. Innerst, Jacobus.
Ruth Dalton, James City.
Maude C. Alexander, Julian.
Adeline G. Kokinda, Junedale.
Edna M. Albright, Kempton.
Annie V. Lefever, Kirkwood.
Erwin A. Deming, Lake Ariel.
Alfred E. Vouaux, Lake Como.
Charles G. Matz, Landingville.
Charles A. Dillman, Lavelle.
William Van Tassel, Lawrence.
Mildred G. Kerchner, Lenhartsville.
Jessie I. Snagusky, Llewellyn.
Joseph Verbish, Locustdale.
Lynnford L. Livengood, Manorville.
Susan Danshaw, Maryd.
Ira N. Foust, Mill Creek.
Lorena E. Haws, Monocacy Station.
Helen R. Peck, Morgantown.
Raymond H. Moser, Neffs.
Nettie R. Akens, New Bedford.
Daniel M. Herr, New Providence.
E. Pearl Witherow, Olanta.
Cormac A. Kennedy, Oneida.
Jessie M. Shaffer, Osterburg.
Julia A. O'Hara, Pleasant Mount.
Frances R. Hoover, Railroad.
Edward F. Workman, Reinerton.
Vincent Smith, Riddlesburg.
Marie E. Byers, Rockhill Furnace.
Fred L. Clagett, Rummerfield.
Helen L. Benney, Rutherford Heights.
Charles K. Flook, Salladasburg.
George McConnell, Sandy Lake.
Grace C. Wonsettler, Scenery Hill.
Verna B. Fissel, Shermans Dale.
Ruth Blackmore, Smiths Ferry.
Grace E. Carpenter, Starrucca.
Howard M. Smith, Stillwater.
George J. Yencho, Jr., Sugarloaf.
Joseph D. Roeder, Summit Station.
Anna C. Hiltebeitel, Sumneytown.
Martha N. Gingrich, Swatara Station.
George H. Bronson, Sweet Valley.
Harry S. Klose, Swineford.
Jacob B. Hendricks, Trexlertown.
Florence V. Wiley, Uwchland.
Alpha I. Williams, Wallaceton.
Edgar A. Henry, Weatherly.
Marjorie A. K. Crippen, Wells Tannery.
Jane W. Hinkle, West Hickory.
Charles A. Barlok, Whitney.
Ernest C. Smith, Windsor.
Wilmer Stover, Yoe.
Wayne T. Schwartz, York New Salem.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mary K. Ricker, Bath.
Andrew F. Blair, Blairs.
Gladys P. Harrison, Bluffton.
Mary Bates Ratchford, Carlisle.
Lottie W. McCaskill, Cassatt.
William B. Simpson, Catawba.
Martha E. Peeples, Cateechee.
Ruth M. Dixon, Cherokee Falls.
Norman B. Williams, Dacusville.
Eunice McKeown, Fort Lawn.
Bessie E. Drawdy, Green Pond.
Rita B. Rentz, Islandton.
Stella H. Grady, Jamestown.
Van C. Oxner, Kinards.
Roy B. Cromer, Lake City.
Delma B. Liddell, Lownesville.
Palmer M. Moore, Lowrys.
Joel T. Massey, Mauldin.
Frank B. Berry, Reevesville.
Benjamin T. Garrett, Six Mile.
May S. Hallman, Ward.
Rosabelle W. Trotti, West Columbia.

TEXAS

Dorothy R. Spande, Adrian.
Jewel D. Eades, Alanreed.
Louise Henicke, Alleyton.
Lillian Meadows Smith, Argyle.
Freeda M. Burkett, Burkett.
Maudie M. Hensley, Chicota.
Ima M. Shannon, Direct.
Ruby E. Page, Doole.
Annie B. Causey, Doucette.
Pearl W. Lee, Driscoll.
Mabel F. Hoover, Friendswood.
Leona B. Dozier, Fulshear.
Edna A. Upton, Gillett.
Lela M. Williams, Girard.
Elizabeth D. Davis, Hardin.
Edna E. Horning, Hartley.
Hattie M. Austin, Ireland.
Vera L. Platzer, League City.

Mary J. Townsend, Leesburg.
Grace B. Shepherd, Leona.
Jannie A. Minton, Lipscomb.
Opal M. Browning, Lohn.
Nettie Stewart, Otey.
Nora E. Yarbrough, Ponder.
Carrie McClure, Port O'Connor.
Katherine Kenner, Powell.
Dillie N. Kimbrell, Rowlett.
Fannie Fuqua, Shiro.
Nannie E. Webb, Simms.
Ida Mae Meador, South Houston.
Lula M. Hassey, Tye.

WEST VIRGINIA

John J. Balassone, Albert.
Edgar D. Combs, Augusta.
Martin D. Welsh, Bakerton.
Nancy R. Browning, Barnabus.
Charles R. Cunningham, Baxter.
Gladys P. Frazier, Beards Fork.
Irma Botkin, Big Chimney.
Mamie P. Maynor, Bluecreek.
James D. Mode, Cinderella.
Mary Leftwich, Coal Fork.
Wilda Y. Shannon, Coalton.
Archie L. Peak, Decota.
Ruby Williams, Drybranch.
John U. Hevener, Dunmore.
Maude S. Walker, Fort Ashby.
Jesse P. James, Frametown.
Stanley A. Patton, Gap Mills.
George O. Morris, Gay.
James F. Lewis, Gerrardstown.
Arthur E. Stacey, Glen Ferris.
Arietta J. Allen, Green Spring.
Orville G. Toney, Hansford.
Alice B. Chapman, Hartford.
Shirley L. Diddle, Henderson.
Lillie B. Sharps, Independence.
Vennie B. Coleman, Itmann.
Foster M. Mays, Kenna.
Maurice H. Smith, Killarney.
Lester H. Harman, Kingmont.
Mollie Davis, Lavalette.
Nellie Robinette, McConnell.
Thomas F. Dick, Maitland.
Ruby E. Garten, Meadow Creek.
Clara M. Hall, Miami.
Kathryne Marlow, Palestine.
William A. Thrash, Petroleum.
William Baxter Harvey, Premier.
Edith Graham Eckle, Sandstone.
Harley Z. Moore, Smithburg.
Aubrey J. Bishop, Summerlee.
Marjorie Hamilton, Switzer.
Nancy Sinclair, West Milford.
Lloyd C. Gwinn, Whipple.
Arthur Downing, Wilkinson.
Edison R. Lynch, Wyco.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate October 9 (legislative day of October 2), 1945:

POSTMASTER

George H. Hope to be postmaster at Pembroke in the State of Georgia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all grace, where'er Thy children meet, keep Thy eternal vigil over them; in their highest hopes and greatest sorrows and in all that is deepest in human experience, there faith will have its Olivet and love its Galilee. In the lessons Thou wouldst have us learn, O give us the wisdom to pursue and the dignity to be calm.

Merciful God, in a world so full of change and confusion, help us to uphold the right and live generously for another's need. Be pleased to hallow our daily work, blessed Lord, and give us the humility and the courage to follow our Master in our daily service as willing instruments from which no touch brings aught but concord and cooperation. In the fulfillment of our obligations we would find the larger freedom and broader understanding that enriches our loyalty to our country. Preserve the lives of our loved ones from harm and their hearts from evil, and at the last take us in perfect peace into the everlasting arms of heavenly love. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 5, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on Saturday, October 6, 1945, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On October 6, 1945:

H. R. 2951. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the National Defense Program in Its Relation to Small Business in the United States, House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings on financial problems of small business held before said committee during the current session.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1062. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945.

TAX BILL

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the tax bill, H. R. 4309, and that the minority or any individual member of the committee may have a similar privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under previous order of the House I was granted permission to address the House for 45 minutes today. I should like to have that order vacated, and ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I was heretofore granted permission to address the House today. I request that that order be vacated and ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on next Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAVAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Malvina Lindsay on women having a greater voice and part in the affairs of this Government.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of an address by Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert at the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Union College.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Harrison S. Robinson on the Central Valley Project, and further to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. PITTENGER (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Coffee Trade Journal.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem by Mrs. Helen Hall Bucher.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GALLUP POLL ON MAJOR ISSUES

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. OUTLAND addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice that beginning tomorrow morning at 10:30 in the committee room of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will give consideration to the public-buildings bill, H. R. 4276. The first witness will be the Commissioner of the Public Buildings Administration, Mr. W. E. Reynolds.

In view of the erroneous inferences which have been drawn from newspaper publicity with reference to this measure, I wish to place in the RECORD for the information of the Members and the country a statement which has been submitted by the administrative authorities in connection with the bill. It is as follows:

To understand the extent and limitations of the proposed legislation entitled "An act to provide for the construction of public buildings and for other purposes," it is necessary to consider the supporting data attached hereto. We wish, however, to emphasize the interpretation of the term "eligible project," which is employed in connection with projects outside the District of Columbia. The act of May 25, 1926, requires the Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster General to submit annually to the Congress a total list of projects outside the District of Columbia eligible for construction. This list includes projects that may not be constructed for many years. It is necessary to emphasize this point, as much misunderstanding has existed in the past. For further emphasis, the fact that a project may be in the report does not mean that we would recommend its construction at this time. It is simply eligible for future construction.

GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to read a letter appearing in the Gettysburg (Pa.) Times written by an ex-soldier, now a private citizen, John Cato:

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

DEAR SIR: During the Second World War I was under General Patton. I served with General Patton through France and Germany, and I am proud to have served under such a fine general as General Patton.

General Patton was, and always will be, a soldier's soldier. When the going was tough, and the fighting was rough and dirty, General Patton was always at the front leading us on to new glory and victory.

Therefore, I feel that a great wrong is being done by removing General Patton and allowing such men as John L. Lewis to remain in office.

Ever since the war John L. Lewis has been leading American industries to follow strike after strike.

Whenever our Senators and Congressmen kick men like General Patton out of his command and allow such men as John L. Lewis and his labor union gangsters in office, it is time for a change.

JOHN E. CATO,
Ex-Soldier and Now Private Citizen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, on October 8, 1944, the world was shocked to learn of the untimely death of one whose place in history is assured, the Honorable Wendell Willkie, a man whose international influence lives after him, and the loss of whose leadership was not only a national but a world tragedy.

We shall not see his like again. Only once in a generation does God endow an individual with such capacity for leadership, and in our shortsightedness all too often we do not recognize the gift—until too late.

Of Wendell Willkie I say—

Nothing can cover his high fame but heaven;
No pyramids set off his memories,
But the eternal substance of his greatness—
To which I leave him.

THE ATOMIC BOMB—THE OBLIGATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion it is just as impossible for the United States selfishly to try to limit or to monopolize the advancement of science in its investigation and development of the atomic bomb, in order to control the principles involved in its use, as it would be to try to regulate the sunrise. The futility of an effort to control it is obvious.

The tremendous forward march which scientists have made along this line necessarily involves the beginning of a new era in the use of an energy, for power production and the good of all, long recognized as a possibility but never heretofore harnessed by man. My scientific friends tell me that what has been done is only the alpha of the alphabet and that no man can dream what the omega may be, for they are experimenting in a new field the boundaries of which are not measured, a field so full of promise for accomplishment for future generations that we should do everything in our power to increase rather than to retard opportunity. We should encourage every effort which man may make, wherever he may be, looking toward the perfection of the use of this heretofore unusable energy now qualifiedly under control. Such experimentation will involve, possibly, a method of control of so terrible and devastating an instrument of destruction as is found today in the atomic bomb. Certainly we should not miss this opportunity to protect ourselves. We have no monopoly on the brains of the world.

It therefore follows that the interest of the people is justifiable, and they may be assured that Members of Congress, their representatives, will have the last word in deciding basic questions of policy and governmental structure involving this atomic bomb, not only for this day but for all generations, and will neither evade nor avoid their responsibility.

In this connection I wish to say that the responsibility as sole keeper of the safety and security of and for civilization is too big a burden for any one man, even the President of the United States, to assume or to attempt to carry. He may very well consult Congress, for he should not start something he cannot finish unaided.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the appendix of the RECORD on the subject of the break-down of the London Conference and to include therein an article by Dorothy Thompson on the same subject.

MURRAY FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we have been favored by visits from delegations, state delegations representing the CIO organizations here, to lobby mainly in favor of the Murray full employment bill. They have a perfect right to do that. I issued my weekly letter this week on the subject. The full employment bill, which I analyzed, and pointed out its alpha, or origin, and its omega, or final end. I did it in response to these lobbying activities.

I am including that letter in my remarks for the edification of my colleagues.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

MURRAY'S FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

S. 380, the Full Employment Act of 1945, is both an illusion and a snare. It is an economic mirage painted to create false hopes. When carefully analyzed the bill promises an economic utopia, but it doesn't even attempt to set up the machinery to create this much-to-be-desired utopia. The preamble to the bill expresses a pious purpose to which everyone, employers and employees alike, gladly subscribes. But how is full employment, this desired utopia, to be established and maintained? That is the rub!

From the dawn of civilization to the present time mankind has been misled time and again by false prophets who promised the millenium. Karl Marx, away back when, offered a plan to bring about full employment. He has had his followers. Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler, all followed in the footsteps of Marx. Stalin says—in the Communist Constitution for Russia—"Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to work, the right to receive guaranteed work with payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality." Hitler told his followers, "We shall banish want; we shall banish fear. National socialism is the revolution of the common man." Mussolini said, "It is only when private enterprise is inadequate that the state intervenes." Do we want to follow in the footsteps of Italy, Germany, or Russia? Do we want to exchange our conditions, imperfect as they may be, for the conditions that are prevalent today in either Italy, Germany, or Russia—conditions brought about as a result of foll win false leaders?

THE FATHER OF THE MURRAY BILL

Sir William Beveridge is the direct father of the Murray full employment bill. He is the man that sold our late President on the idea of 60,000,000 jobs, full employment for all. Henry Wallace, Mordecai Ezekiel, and F. D. R. swallowed the full employment bait held out by Beveridge, but ignored or overlooked the hook embedded in the bait. Now our labor leaders, both William Green and Philip Murray, have swallowed the bait, but they also have overlooked the hook. What did Beveridge mean when he said, "The state cannot undertake the responsibility for full employment without full powers. If trade-unions under full employment press wage claims unreasonably, maintenance of a stable price level will become impossible; and wage determination will become a function of the state."

In plain English Beveridge's statement means that workers will be told where they must work, what hours they must work, and what wages they must work for. That is exactly where the followers of Mussolini, of Hitler, and of Stalin finally landed. It happened in Italy, in Germany, in Russia; and it can happen here—if Congress obeys the order contained in the Communist Party statement filed with the Senate Labor Committee, "Congress must adopt this legislation."

THE NATURAL QUESTION

Considering the statement from the Communist Constitution for Soviet Russia guaranteeing full employment for all, and the brazen order of the Communist Party of America given to our Congress, "Congress must adopt this legislation," can there be any question as to what is the Communist Party line on Murray's full employment bill? Should Congress follow the Communist Party line in this matter?

RECONVERSION POLICY

Mr. AREND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks a letter from a constituent at home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. AREND. Mr. Speaker, it becomes more apparent day by day that the people at home are greatly disturbed over the slow reconversion policy in effect in this country and they are anxiously waiting for something to be done about it. It is high time that those in authority accept the responsibility for straightening out these difficulties which presently confront this Nation. I would like to read this short letter from a constituent:

Well, we are all considerably wrought up over developments of the last few days. Listening to the radio in vain for some strong voice to tell the country that we are not going into a revolution at home; that we are not going to tolerate riots and disorder by self-seeking groups; that we are not going to give the Capitol or the Washington Monument away to any racketeering labor leader; that efforts to choke the Nation into submission will be met with appropriate measures of resistance even to the point of dissolving all organizations urging or even permitting their members to strike against the public interest. But we don't hear such a voice. On the contrary, without exception the men who are supposed to represent the best thought of the Nation keep suggesting with apparent apprehension that unless Congress votes the wage increases demanded we "will have riots and disorder" all over the place. And, to tell the truth, unless somebody goes to bat for law and order and individual rights, I am afraid we will. Are you all mice in Congress? Or must we walk with open eyes straight into inflation and depression and all the calamities that follow?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the question of the use of farm products in commercial alcohol.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution on the question of coal from the city of Fargo, N. Dak.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorandum on the Philippines by Senator Harry B. Hawes.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COUNSEL FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 365), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise provided by law, the sum of $6,500 per annum, payable monthly as compensation to a counsel for the Committee on the Judiciary, to be designated by the chairman of the said committee, and an additional amount not to exceed $1,000 for necessary travel and subsistence shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a response to an appeal from the Committee on the Judiciary. The Congress, following a favorable recommendation by the Judiciary Committee, delegated power to the Supreme Court to write regulations, and so forth, in reference to the Judicial and Penal Codes.

The Court has already acted on the Judicial Code, and the Congress, as provided in the resolution delegating the power, approved the action of the Court. The Court is now ready with its report on the Penal Code.

The committee says that it will take a long time to examine carefully the recommendations of the Court. A complete analysis will have to be made in regard to the suggested changes.

The committee also pointed out that the Committee on Revision of Laws has reported a bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure." The committee says that bill must be carefully analyzed.

They have a number of other most important proposals before the committee that will require the work of an attorney. The chairman of the committee, as well as other members of the committee, both majority and minority, appeared before the Committee on Accounts and explained the situation that confronted them. The committee, therefore, ordered this resolution favorably reported.

The fact of the matter is that the Accounts Committee is probably acting in advance insofar as this committee is concerned on the proposed reorganization of the Congress. However, this is a temporary matter, and provisions to restaff this committee as well as other committees of Congress will be taken up at a later date. There is no opposition to this resolution that I know of.

PUBLIC DEBT, INFLATION, PRIORITIES FOR VETERANS TO BUILD HOMES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in our anxiety to grant as much tax relief as

possible, we should not overlook the fact that our national debt is $261,722,708,115.85 at this time, which carries an annual interest charge of over $5,000,000,000, or approximately $15,000,000 each day. Every dollar paid now on this debt will be equal to the payment of $2 in the future.

I humbly warn Congress of the strong efforts that are now being made to break down the effective controls that have prevented inflation during the war. If they are broken down, our money loss to the people of this Nation will be equal to our money loss if we had lost the war.

Our fighting men saved our country upon the battle fronts of the world. Let us not permit it to be destroyed by inflation here at home. Their part of the job has been done and done well. Now let us do our part here on the home front just as well.

During the war, workers at war plants were given first priority on materials to build homes. Now that the war is over, let us give first priority to the veterans of this war, who desire to build their own homes and, at the same time, protect them against the speculators and profiteers.

More than 1,400,000 veterans have married during this war and are anxiously awaiting the time when they can build their own modest homes and enjoy the blessings of this great country for which they fought upon the battlefields to preserve.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes, and I make the same request for Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SHIP-DISPOSAL BILL

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries had under discussion the tanker sections of the ship-disposal bill, I requested that the committee's records bear mention of the fact that I am a stockholder in a number of companies who operate tankers.

When I subsequently, on the floor of the House, opposed and voted against the Jackson tanker amendment, I did so because I felt that it discriminated against the tanker industry which, in turn, affects the livelihoods of hundreds, possibly thousands, of citizens in the district I represent. At that time I overlooked mentioning my ownership of stock in the industry. My previous mention of the matter in committee indicates that I had nothing to conceal.

If I committed a sin of omission, I regret it. I trust, however, that my sin was no greater than that of a Member who, owning a farm, advocates and votes farm benefits for his farmer constituents without specifically mentioning his own farm ownership.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

IMMEDIATE ACTION IN DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am not at all satisfied with the progress being made by those having charge of releasing men and women from our military units, and I am wondering the reasons behind the statement made by General Hershey, National Director of Selective Service, when he stated at Denver, Colo., on August 21, 1944, and I quote:

> We can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out.

Do those in control really desire that our boys be released or do they wish to keep them in service for personal reasons? Is that why our boys are not being demobilized more rapidly?

The dissatisfaction which has resulted from the handling of the present demobilization program certainly justifies Congress in taking immediate action to bring order out of chaos. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from letters that I have received in my office from both officers and enlisted men that some of our commanding officers do not want men released from their command because they are fearful their rank will be reduced. I vigorously object to the right or authority of any one commanding officer to declare a man essential and irreplaceable, and thereby prevent that man from being discharged within 90 days, regardless of his qualifications for release, including points and other requirements as set forth by the current discharge regulations. It has been proved no man is indispensable.

Mr. Speaker, I have been informed on good authority that our soldiers located in foreign lands are being utilized to reconstruct our allied nations as well as our enemy countries. One specific instance which I do not believe should be sanctioned by any of us tells of our American soldiers being used to construct telephone lines in Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I object to such a program. We must bring these boys and girls home so they can be with their families, finish their education, and again get started in civilian life. It is time for Congress to once again become a truly legislative body governed only by the people as a whole, and not by one group or a few individuals.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared recently in the Christian Advocate.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include two letters.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three separate instances, in one to include an editorial entitled "Tapping the Till" appearing in the New York Herald Tribune recently; in the second to include a brief editorial by John C. Knight appearing in the Detroit Free Press; and in the third to include an article by Drew Pearson.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I was granted leave to extend my remarks and include two addresses, one by Air Marshal Douglas Colyer, and the other by Hon. Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air. I am advised by the Public Printer that this exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing, that it will take three pages of the RECORD and cost $156. I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding the cost that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Nothwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, in his recent message to the Congress and the people of the United States on the matter of the St. Lawrence seaway the President stated:

> Every engineering investigation during the last 25 years, and every economic study in the last 25 years has found the project feasible and economically desirable. The case has been proved, the plans are ready.

That statement to anyone at all informed is at wide variance with the facts. The only conclusion or inference which can be drawn is that the President has not read, nor is he informed of, any of the hearings held by the Senate committee on the St. Lawrence project as a treaty prior to the defeat of that treaty in the Senate in 1934, or the hearings held before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors during the year 1941.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CONTROL OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, this morning the press carried a report of the strong stand taken by President Truman on the question of divulging the knowledge which we have concerning the atomic bomb. At a press conference in Tiptonville, Tenn., yesterday, the Chief Executive emphatically stated that this country would not give the know-how of constructing the atomic bomb to any nation now lacking it. For this firm, definite, straightforward, and forthright position the President is to be most highly complimented. His stand is admirable. It evidences a realistic approach to this all important question and I hope that it will end the nonsensical agitation to give to all the world our discoveries in the field of atomic energy. The country, I am certain, rejoices because of the President's attitude. The United States certainly needs less sentimentalism and a more firm, realistic approach to foreign affairs.

In the construction of the atomic bomb we spent two and one-half billion dollars and great effort on the part of our people. Why anyone should desire to make available the knowledge we have acquired by our genius and our industry is beyond my comprehension. Only last Friday Admiral Nimitz in this Capitol pleaded for a strong United States. One of the ways in which we can remain strong is to keep what we know about the atomic bomb, develop and utilize atomic energy to the utmost. We certainly have had bitter experience in furnishing materials to other countries. Japan sent our scrap iron back in bullets. The President's stand on atomic energy should be hailed as a great step in making certain the security of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain excerpts.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Progressive.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HAYS and Mr. LARCADE were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of other special orders I may be permited to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, the local newspapers have reported the past few days that during the month of August there was a net decrease of 104,408 in the number of civilian employees on the Federal pay roll. These same newspapers neglected to inform the public, however, that the total number of paid employees serving outside the continental limits of the United States was approximately 854,170, which is the revised figure as of June 30, 1945.

If you compare the figures contained in the August report of the United States Civil Service Commission, you will observe that from March 31 to June 30, during 3 months, there was an increase of approximately 200,000 in the number of civilians employed by the United States outside the continental limits of this country. Therefore, while the administration is taking some civilians off the Federal pay roll in this country, many thousands are being added abroad. At the present time the grand total of civilian employees in this country and outside our continental limits is 3,650,000. Bureaucratic government is thus being transplanted to foreign shores under New Deal supervision, with American taxpayers paying the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

DR. MICHAEL M. MILLER

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, some 5 or 6 weeks ago, as will be recalled by Members of Congress, a statement was carried in the Washington papers relative to comment made by Dr. Michael M. Miller regarding the personal habits of Members of Congress and alleging that Dr. Miller had said too many Members of Congress drank excessively.

Immediately following the press release of the story Dr. Miller issued a positive denial to International News Service and all the major news services, including United Press and Associated Press; also denying any knowledge of or statements concerning inebriety in the State Department, since obviously he had no reason to make such absurd statements.

The complete refutation was carried in only one of the District newspapers.

I have personally taken pains to ascertain the true facts relative to this incident and feel that Dr. Miller has been done a gross injustice, as well as the Congress, by his having words put in his mouth which he never uttered.

The facts appear to be that a young reporter of the United Press asked Dr. Miller about drinking in Congress, to which he replied he had no first-hand information; that it might be fitting to obtain information from various Members of Congress regarding the subject.

The reporter then asked Dr. Miller what sort of questions she should ask, to which he stated that in no case did he want to be quoted as having raised these questions since he knew absolutely nothing about drinking among Members of Congress.

The reporter, instead of following the suggestion of Dr. Miller by interviewing Members of Congress on the subject, misquoted Dr. Miller as making sweeping accusations.

Dr. Miller states that it is his opinion that a great majority of the Members of Congress are strongly opposed to excessive drinking and as to whether any of them are indulging in the use of intoxicating liquors he has no personal knowledge and has never thought of making such charges.

My inquiry discloses the fact that Dr. Miller is a highly reputable physician and I feel it my duty to make this statement as a result of the special inquiry I have made regarding Dr. Miller and the incident which has caused so much unjust and unfavorable comment.

CHILD-CARE CENTERS

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, last week the President urged that the Congress appropriate $7,000,000 to continue the child-care centers set up with Lanham Act funds beyond the deadline of October 31, which has been set for their closing.

I have today received petitions from hundreds of citizens in my district urging that this step be taken. These petitions correctly state that a majority of the mothers who have children in these centers are wives of servicemen and are in great need of child-care service so that they can continue their work. I sincerely hope that the Committee on Appropriations will in the very near future report such an appropriation to the floor and that favorable action will be taken by the Congress. As I have stated in the RECORD before we should do everything possible to help the families of married men in the service and relieve them of anxiety regarding the welfare of their loved ones.

RETURNING LAND TO ORIGINAL OWNERS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter addressed to me from the Ripley County

Bankers Association; also, a resolution adopted by that organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the war the Government acquired some 80,000 acres of land in my district for the purpose of making a proving ground. A part of that land was located in Jennings County and a part in Ripley County. That land is no longer needed for the purpose for which it was acquired by the Government. I think it should be turned back to those farmers who originally owned the land and thereby permit them to add to the economic welfare of the counties involved.

As a part of my remarks, I include the following letter and resolution of the Ripley County (Ind.) Bankers Association:

RIPLEY COUNTY BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Milan, Ind., October 5, 1945.

Hon. EARL WILSON,
Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: The Ripley County Bankers Association meeting in regular session at the Hillcrest Country Club, in the city of Batesville, on the 27th day of September 1945, considering the business and economic welfare of Ripley County and its citizens, adopted the enclosed resolution, relative to the disposition of the Jefferson Proving Grounds.

We believe this request to be of vital importance to Ripley County and the surrounding counties, and beg of you and your constituents to give it sincere consideration, and to take the necessary steps to hasten the passage of such a measure.

Sincerely yours,

WM. H. CALL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Whereas there now exists certain land in Ripley County owned by the Federal Government, commonly known as the Jefferson Proving Grounds, which land comprises an area of approximately 42 square miles; and

Whereas the aforesaid land was originally purchased by the Government to promote the war effort, and which land has now served this purpose: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government have this territory occupied and resettled by practical farmers, and to offer said land for settlement at an early date, on such terms and conditions as it deems to be in the best interest of all concerned.

1. The aforesaid land is deteriorating by erosion and is growing up with briars, weeds, and grubs.

2. The predatory animals are becoming so numerous that they are doing much damage to poultry and crops.

3. The removal of the population from said territory has resulted in serious loss to the business people in the towns adjacent to this territory.

4. The loss of taxes from said land is working a hardship on the other taxpayers of our county.

5. The greater part of said territory is good farm land, it would support a large number of people, who would add wealth and culture to our county; be it further

Resolved, That any portion of this land unsuited for agriculture be reforested by the State of Indiana or the Federal Government; be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of this association, and a copy thereof be sent to Hon. EARL WILSON, Congressman; Hon. RAYMOND WILLIS, United States Senator; and Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART, United States Senator.

Adopted in the September 27, 1945, meeting of the Ripley County Bankers Association.

GENERALS PATTON AND MACARTHUR

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the sadistic smear bund, including Walter Winchell and Drew Pearson, are now gloating over the fact that they think they have humiliated Gen. George S. Patton.

They are now trying to destroy General MacArthur. I happen to be probably the only Member of Congress who ever discussed with General Patton personally the small incident that this smear bund magnified in order to try to destroy him in the very midst of the hottest fighting of the war. Thank God they failed in those treasonable attempts.

I wish General Patton would resign, come home and tell the American people the truth about the way he has been treated. I dare say there is not a baseball field in America that would hold his crowds. He is one of the bravest soldiers and one of the greatest military leaders of all time, and I am tired of seeing him attacked by these scavengers.

So far as I am concerned, and I believe I speak the sentiments of 90 percent of the American people, I am not for letting anybody else "barge in" on General MacArthur who is doing such a wonderful job in Japan.

Let us put a stop to these un-American attacks on American heroes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I inquire of the majority leader what the program for the rest of the week will be?

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow the immigration bill, in relation to the people of far-off India, comes up. On Thursday it is the intention to meet at 10 o'clock to take up the tax bill and dispose of it on that day. Friday, October 12, is Columbus Day, when in the districts of many Members on both sides there will be held celebrations by Americans of Italian blood, and others. It is an outstanding day in the history of our country both from a colonial and constitutional standpoint. We hope that the tax bill will be disposed of Thursday so that we can adjourn from Thursday to Monday.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Could the majority leader give us some idea of the program for next Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be the call of the Consent Calendar and, as far as I now know, there will be one suspension, on the bill reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs, conferring a special medal on General Marshall. Whether the Speaker will decide to recognize Members on any other suspensions, I am unable to state, but if so, the leadership on the minority side and the House will be advised as quickly as possible. But as of now that will be the legislative program for next week: the Consent Calendar and one suspension.

Does that answer the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE NEW WORLD CAPITAL

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that the United Nations Executive Committee has overwhelmingly voted to locate the new world capital in the United States. This country, more than any other in the world, has developed the principles of democracy in government.

The logical location for the seat of the United Nations in the United States is San Francisco. San Francisco is young, vigorous, picturesque, and progressive. Its geographical location is ideal to serve the purposes of the United Nations. San Francisco is at the crossroads of the Occident and the Orient.

The city and county of San Francisco long ago recognized this fact by developing its harbor into one of the world's greatest shipping centers, and more recently by the construction of a great international airport upon which nearly $20,000,000 has already been spent. Even before the announcement of the selection of the United States as the location of the seat of the United Nations, the city of San Francisco contemplated spending an additional $20,000,000 on its great airport, which the people of San Francisco will wisely authorize at the polls next month.

That San Francisco is the natural place for this new world capital is recognized internationally by the voluntary support already given by many nations to its selection as the seat of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks an editorial

entitled "The New World Capital," which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, October 7, 1945, dealing with this question:

THE NEW WORLD CAPITAL

The city by the Golden Gate may preen its feathers over the 9-to-3 vote in the United Nations Executive Committee in London to locate the UNO capital in the United States. The vote is not final, for it must be ratified by the Preparatory Commission and by the General Assembly. Nor was San Francisco specified in the recommendation. The world capital might be Philadelphia. It might even be New York. But the chances are that it will be San Francisco. The delegates from Australia, Brazil, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Mexico, Russia, and Yugoslavia seem to have had that city in mind when they supported the American candidacy. So may have the delegates from France, Britain, and the Netherlands, who preferred a European site. It was not an issue between cities. It was an issue between continents.

The new won over the old, a location where the winds of freedom blow over one, like Geneva, which maintained a precarious neutrality in two world wars, or The Hague or Copenhagen, both overrun in the war. Russia significantly preferred a new start. Mr. Gromyko and his chief, Mr. Molotoff, may have pleasant memories of the San Francisco Conference, which did not break up in a disagreement. If so, their attitude is encouraging, a small bright item in a dreary week.

The French and British arguments for a European location had their point. It was not Geneva that failed—it was the members of the League of Nations. Many of the sore spots which the United Nations should try to heal are in Europe. The hoped-for security of small nations might be dramatized by putting the world capital in one of them, long exposed under the old system to the surge of invading armies. But the choice of San Francisco would emphasize the world-wide, and it is to be prayerfully hoped, the disinterested character of the UNO. The Occident and the Orient now meet on our Pacific coast more truly than at Suez, though a vast ocean rolls between.

UNO's birthplace has many happy auguries that take our minds off some dismal present facts. The nations came together there under the urgent demands of war. By the time the new organization is completed the statesmen who have just failed in London may have come to realize that the demands of peace are just as urgent and require just as much sacrifice. They might be able to plan a brighter future in the fogs that roll in through the Golden Gate.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to pay tribute to National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, which our Nation is now celebrating.

The splendid purpose of this observance is apparent to all. We have been derelict in the past in our treatment of our physically handicapped citizens, and it is high time that we rectified that condition.

Surely the discriminations, both socially and economically, which, unfortunately, have been practiced against many of the millions of handicapped people, are unfair and unwise. A nation which has some 25,000,000 who are variously disabled, must make adequate provision for them. It must not put more barriers in their way to progress, but, rather, recognize its obligation to see that these—our afflicted brothers and sisters—have full opportunity to recover, physically, insofar as that may be possible; to be afforded needed educational facilities, and to be placed in suitable employment.

I am proud that I have always supported legislation designed to improve the lot of the disabled, both military and civilian, and I want to seize this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who sponsored National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. Its passage is a merited tribute to his statesmanship and humanitarianism, which we all recognize.

I also congratulate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, which organization, through its president, Paul A. Strachan, and its secretary, Miss Mildred Scott, fought so valiantly, to have the resolution enacted.

PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Ninety-third, Ninety-fourth, and Ninety-fifth Annual Reports of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1942, 1943, and 1944.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 9, 1945.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit this week and next week during general debate, on a bill pending before that subcommittee relating to railroads.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply indebted to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] for the kind remarks he has just made. It is my purpose in the 15 minutes I have this afternoon to discuss National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. I believe this week is an observance on the part of our whole Nation, first, of the accomplishments which handicapped people have made through the years, and particularly during the war period, and, second, of the opportunity and the obligation which the Nation has to open to handicapped people the opportunity for constructive contribution through worth-while jobs to their Nation's welfare. The keynote of this whole program seems to me to be found in one short sentence: "Consider the man, not the disability." We all know of those outstanding examples from history where people suffering from handicaps of one kind or another have not only overcome those handicaps but more than overcome them and made of themselves outstandingly great people. What the handicapped people of this Nation really want—first, the handicapped veteran and, second, the handicapped citizen who is not a veteran—is to live like other people, to have a worthwhile job, and to be able to make a contribution to the welfare of his family and his country.

Now, there are in the way of a realization of that goal certain obstacles. The first of these obstacles consists of certain popular misconceptions which I shall speak about in just a moment. The second of them is a general apathy on the part of vast sections of our population, most important perhaps those who are in a position to offer employment to handicapped people in a wide variety of occupations. It was largely to overcome these popular misconceptions concerning the positions and abilities of our handicapped citizens, and, second, to overcome this general apathy about the problem, that the idea of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week was conceived and the legislation introduced by me. I should like to give at the very outset primary credit for the inspiration that led to the passage of this legislation to two organizations, the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, and the Disabled American Veterans.

In order that we may get a clear idea of what the purposes of this week are, I should like to read the proclamation issued by the President of the United States in this connection. It reads:

Whereas the people of this Nation are determined to foster an environment in which those of their fellow citizens who have become physically handicapped can continue to make their rightful contribution to the work of the world and can continue to enjoy the opportunities and rewards of that work; and

Whereas Public Resolution No. 176, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 11, 1945, provides in part:

"That hereafter the first week in October of each year shall be designated as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. During said week, appropriate ceremonies are to be held throughout the Nation, the purpose of which will be to enlist public support for and interest in the employment of otherwise qualified but physically handicapped workers":

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby call upon the people of the United States to observe the week of October 7–13, 1945, as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. I ask the governors of States, mayors of cities, heads of the various agencies of the Government, and other public officials, as well as leaders in industry, education, religion, and every other aspect

of our common life, during this week and at all other suitable times, to exercise every appropriate effort to enlist public support of a sustained program for the employment and development of the abilities and capacities of those who are physically handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, there is a third problem which arises in this connection, and that is the problem of actual barriers which exist, either in the minds of people or in point of fact, toward the employment of disabled veterans or other handicapped people. One of those barriers arises in connection with the workmen's compensation laws, which I should like to deal with briefly because, before we can get down to the earnest work which we know lies ahead of us—of placing our disabled veterans in worth-while employment—we must be sure there are not any actual obstacles which stand in the way.

One of these things which has actually been a barrier is the fact that under the workmen's compensation laws a handicapped person, if employed, under certain circumstances, on suffering injury which to another person would yield a certain amount of compensation, would be entitled, for good and sufficient reason, to a much larger amount of compensation. It was with this idea in mind that I offered an amendment to the GI bill if rights, when it passed the House, which provided in effect that whenever a disabled veteran was employed by an employer, if that disabled veteran were injured on the job and became entitled to workmen's compensation for his injury, then the Veterans' Administration should compensate the workmen's compensation fund for any amount of losses over and beyond the contribution which that man himself had made out of deductions from his pay in connection with the operation of the act.

Under those circumstances there would be not only no barrier against the employment of disabled veterans, but a positive inducement to their employment, because there could be no losses either to the employer or to the compensation fund as a result thereof.

FINE RECORD OF THE HANDICAPPED WORKER

Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak for a couple of minutes on some of the misconceptions about our handicapped citizens. Incidentally, it has been estimated by the Disabled American Veterans that there are some 400,000 service-connected physically handicapped veterans of World War I in the United States today; that there may be as many as two and one-half million physically handicapped veterans of World War II. To these must be added the large numbers of those disabled in the performance of their jobs in industry, of which there are many times the number of disabled war veterans.

The United States Office of Education recently conducted a survey among a cross section of large employers in this country to see what those employers' opinions were as to the record made by handicapped people who had been employed during the war. We all know that during the war the contribution made by our handicapped citizens has been an outstanding one and that their contribution to the production record of our country was of vital importance in the winning of the war; but few of us probably realize the exact facts that pertain in this connection.

I am reading now from press material prepared by the Disabled American Veterans for use in connection with National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, which is probably the most comprehensive material on this subject that has ever been gathered together.

Going back to the survey conducted by the United States Office of Education, they sent questionnaires to somewhat over a hundred employers and received replies from most of them. These were substantial employers so that it is an important result.

Out of 97 employers reporting on absenteeism, 53 found there was less absenteeism among handicapped people than there was among other people. Thirty-nine said it was the same for both groups, and only five reported that absenteeism was more among the handicapped.

With regard to the accident rate, which is most important, of these employers, 87 reporting on this subject, 49 found the accident rate was lower among the handicapped; 36 said it was the same for both groups; and only 2 reported a higher accident rate for the handicapped than for those who did not have handicaps.

On the question of productivity, 105 employers answered that question. Twenty-five found that the output of the handicapped people was actually greater than that of the others. Sixty-nine reported that there was no difference between the 2 groups, and only 11 reported that it was lower among the handicapped.

In other words, the evidence is convincing that the handicapped people of the United States have produced as much or more than other people have been able to do. We have instances in connection with the war effort of the Nation where, for example on inspection jobs a certain company hired blind people after a little experimentation, to do this inspection job and found that those blind people did this particular inspection job better than sighted people had been able to do it.

In other instances we have whole departments of corporations which have been staffed entirely by people who are entirely deaf, where it was found that those people could do that job better than others were able to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that on last Wednesday afternoon a meeting was held in my office of a number of persons connected with various agencies, public and private, interested in and dealing with this problem of the physically handicapped people; and I am encouraged to note that real effort is being made both by Government agencies among the armed forces and out of the armed forces to attempt to solve this problem. It cannot be solved, however, in my judgment, without the united attention to it of the whole of the American people. It is not enough that we have the devoted work of such men as Mr. Millard Rice, of the Disabled American Veterans, and the long battle that organization has conducted in this field, nor that we find the earnest work being done by the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped under Mr. Paul Strachan. It is not enough that we find employers here and there finding opportunity for handicapped workers, or that at this meeting I refer to we heard the excellent statement of Mr. Hines, representing the American Federation of Labor. Even the fact that the armed forces are giving attention to it and the Civil Service Commission and the United States Employment Service is not enough, nor even the very fine job being done by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in connection with their State-aid program which has been set up by Congress.

No, Mr. Speaker; the only ultimate answer to this problem and the only way in which our handicapped people will have the chance to which they are entitled and which they have so richly earned either through service in the armed forces where their disabilities have been incurred or by the fine production record of many of their number during the war, the only way this is going to be realized is by united national effort, and in my judgment that is going to take a certain profound dedication on the part of many of us to that cause. Those employers who have gone out of their way to hire handicapped people are entitled to the thanks and gratitude of the whole Nation. May their tribe increase, as I believe in time it will. But I hope most earnestly that every one of us will observe this week not only with word of mouth but also in our acts and in our hearts and that there will go out through this Nation, over the radio, in the press, and through the observances carried on in the communities of the country, a message to the disabled veterans and to the other handicapped people which will be a message of hope.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to congratulate the gentleman for his able presentation of this vitally important matter at this time. Never before has there been so large a proportion of our young men handicapped or disabled, most of them as a result of this war. These are they to whom we owe a deep debt of gratitude which must be expressed in more than words. We should make ourselves particularly helpful to them in this hour, and more so as the gentleman has called the attention of the country to the situation through this public presentation. I wish to thank him for it and endorse his act in their behalf.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Arizona, who has done so much already for this great cause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a brief article.

OPA AND LABOR LEADERS DOUBLE-CROSS THE PRESIDENT—OPA AND STRIKES MAKE RECONVERSION IMPOSSIBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for months prior to the end of the war, the administration's propaganda agencies were beseeching industrialists and businessmen to take up and carry the production and employment burden which inevitably would follow the end of the war.

After the fighting was over—yes, and before—American industry was told by the administration's spokesmen—yes, it heard threats from many a left-winger—that unless it did produce needed merchandise, unless it provided full and suitable employment at an adequate wage, the Government itself would take over.

To throw a real scare into businessmen, industrialists, and the taxpayer, the President came out flat-footedly for an unemployment bill which sought to have the Federal Government guarantee $25 a week for 26 weeks to all those thrown out of employment and who were unable to find a suitable—to them—job.

Another step in the program was taken by President Truman when he insisted that Congress pass the so-called full employment bill, which would have put into legislative language the prior threat that, if industry did not meet the demands of the unions to provide full employment, the Government, with the aid of the Federal Treasury and whatever powers it might possess, would use the taxpayer's money to create and maintain full employment.

Whatever may be the merits of the proposed legislation, reconversion and full employment are impossible under the administration's labor and OPA policies.

This administration apparently is, as was the preceding one, in an alliance with the leaders of organized labor. In exchange for its political support, the last administration granted special favors, gave undue advantage to certain labor leaders and unions. Now, many of those leaders and their political supporters are fighting among themselves.

Many of the present strikes are jurisdictional. They are due to disputes between the political leaders of the unions; to disputes between rival factions in some unions. Some of them are due to the Government's support of the union demand for a 30 percent increase in wages.

No opinion is expressed as to whether the workers making the demand for the 30 percent increase should, because of an increase in the cost of living, receive it, but one thing is certain: Just as long as the OPA holds down the price of the finished product, a 30 percent increase in wages cannot be paid by manufacturers without destroying all prospect of continued employment.

One of the reasons for creating OPA was to hold down the price of the things needed by the low-income group. The effect of its operation has been to defeat the very purpose for which it was established.

Low-priced merchandise of all kinds—socks, shirts, underwear, children's garments, women's dresses, and men's work suits—have gone off the market and in their place have come high-priced garments of every description.

The same is true of many other low-priced items, an abundance of which is necessary to the welfare of the average citizen.

From the daily press any citizen who cares to read can learn about the causes and the effects of the strikes. The destructive efforts of OPA have not been given so much publicity.

To illustrate what the OPA is doing, let me give you an example by citing the facts connected with the action of the OPA which makes it impossible for one businessman, who, after arranging for materials and manpower in the fall of 1944 and after entering upon a reconversion program, in reliance upon the OPA, later had his plans knocked into a cocked hat by that same organization.

A brief summary of this particular case is as follows:

Prior to the war, the Burnette Castings Co., of Hartford, Mich., under the name of the Cookware Co. of America, was manufacturing and selling direct to the consumer aluminum cooking utensils.

On October 12, 1944, it asked OPA for prices, but none were given until January 3, 1945.

These prices were supposed to be based upon comparison with the March 1942 prices of competitors, but, owing to the fact that the company's product had certain improved features peculiar to it, no real comparison was made.

After several conferences in Washington between company representatives and representatives of the OPA, the company was told that a certain schedule of revised prices would be effective from and after the 18th day of April 1945, and, at the request of the representatives of the OPA, the company, in writing, accepted that statement as one under which it could work.

Relying upon such representations and a written confirmation and schedules of prices, dated April 28, 1945, signed by Chester Bowles, the company purchased new machinery; added new employees; borrowed $150,000 of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and sold and agreed to deliver upward of a half a million dollars' worth of cooking utensils.

On August 31, 1945, the company received a letter from OPA stating that, after some unnamed date, it must sell its products at a material reduction from the prices named in the order of April 28.

The April 28 price was, in part, based upon the cost of three improvements appearing on the Burnette utensils which do not appear on others. These improvements, which added to the cost, were:

(a) Spiral ridges on the bottom of the pan;

(b) A milled, raised edge on the outer circumference of the pan; and

(c) An adjustable vent.

There will be another feature added as soon as it can be obtained. That is a temperature gauge—100,000 of which have been ordered. For that, when added, OPA has verbally agreed to add 50 cents to the retail price.

The company's president, Mr. Burnette, came to Washington and appeared before the House Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed Their Authority.

Testimony was taken by this committee on October 2, and Mr. Samuel W. Levitties, Director, Consumer Goods Division, OPA, speaking for OPA on the Burnette and other matters, among other things testified—stenographer's minutes, Ward & Paul, October 2, 1945, pages 3184–3188:

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Levitties, you listened to the testimony today. Are you satisfied that the OPA witnesses who claim that there was an error made in this higher price that they granted, are you satisfied that they have proved they knew there was an error and that an error was committed?

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, no; I wouldn't say I am completely satisfied that they knew at the time that an error was committed.

Mr. HARTLEY. Do they know today?

Mr. LEVITTIES. I am perfectly in accord with you, because to me the first question I would like to ask is, What is the value of each of these three extra gadgets in there? What is the actual cost? I don't know. That hasn't been brought out.

Mr. HARTLEY. On that point, the man who fixes the price on each of those gadgets should fix the price on what it cost Mr. Burnette to put those embellishments on the frying pan rather than whether or not the price executive feels it is a practical thing for them to do. Isn't that right?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If he wants to put the gadgets on and people want to buy them, you are willing to give him a fair price?

Mr. LEVITTIES. For the article he makes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Based upon what it costs him?

Mr. LEVITTIES. Definitely.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all he is asking.

Mr. LEVITTIES. That is exactly what I propose to do, and I sincerely apologize for this unfortunate incident coming out at such great length before this committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You see, up to this time no one has been willing to take that into consideration.

Mr. LEVITTIES. I am willing to see Mr. Burnette today, tomorrow, or any other day.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He is sitting there and would be glad to go with you.

Mr. LEVITTIES. I will be glad to go with him.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Levitties, you also heard the testimony that telegrams and letters from him about this subject have been unanswered for a month. It seems to me that is inexcusable.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, let me say something on that point. I just took over this division on the 1st of September—a month ago. We are fully cognizant of the seriousness of the situation. Congressman VOORHIS expressed the fear that here we are in reconversion, and everybody is concerned about what we are going to do with the unemployables, let's get them back to work, and so forth. This thing caught the Office unawares. The end of the war was certainly no one expected momentarily, and I, for one, definitely recognize that we have to proceed with greater speed. We are doing something about it.

We have broken up the Consumer Durable Goods Branch into three branches now for the sole purpose of getting quicker and more rapid action in order to price these reconverted items. We are trying to staff the people in these branches in order to give better service to the people who are entitled to it. We can't get back into reconversion unless we do that very thing.

The CHAIRMAN. You will talk with Mr. Burnette?

Mr. LEVITTIES. I certainly will at any time he wants to spend some time with me.

The CHAIRMAN. He is right here.

Mr. FISCHBACH. Mr. Levitties, as a businessman, don't you think it would stabilize the conditions under which manufacturers have to operate if some provision were adopted whereby a price order, when fixed, could not be withdrawn so that they would have something solid to look forward to instead of a flimsy foundation upon which to proceed?

Mr. LEVITTIES. Mr. Fischbach, I agree 100 percent with that statement. I, as a businessman, certainly would not want to come to OPA or any other agency and be made to believe or think that I can proceed on certain Government desires, action, or regulation, and then have that snatched from under me. They are certainly entitled to that.

The fact of the matter is that this is unfortunate, but it isn't a prevalent situation. It isn't something that exists every day. It just developed in one case—perhaps a dozen cases.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Levitties, Mr. Burnette, as a matter of fact, has been trying to get straightened out and go to work for something like a year.

But Mr. Levitties did not sit down with Mr. Burnette as requested. He arranged for Mr. Burnette to come to his office on a subsequent day, when he promised to adjust these prices. Burnette kept the appointment but was told by Mr. Levitties that he must file under SO–119. Today, October 9, he is still waiting here in Washington.

Briefly, his case is this:

He obtained priority both for materials and labor in November of 1944. He was ready to operate, but waited for a price from OPA. On January 3, he was given a price. He could not produce under it.

On April 18 and 28, after a full and complete investigation, Chester Bowles in writing gave him a price. August 31, he was notified the April 28th price has been withdrawn. Both he, and evidently the Smaller War Plants Corporation, a Government agency, which loaned him $150,000, relied and acted upon Chester Bowles' written order. Subsequently, OPA welshed and left him out on a limb.

If Chester Bowles will not willingly keep his word to a citizen and to another department of the Government, and if he cannot be forced to do so by the Congress, it is a waste of time and money to urge industry to reconvert.

Unless the law-enforcing agencies of State and Nation put an end to the violence and the rioting which encourage strikes; unless the administration quits playing politics with labor racketeers and politicians; unless the OPA mends its ways or is abolished, this country, after a short period of prosperity, will take a nose dive into a depression which will bring suffering and want to many of us.

It is just futile to talk about reconversion and full employment as long as the strikes and the policy of OPA make the accomplishment of either impossible.

EXHIBIT A

THE BURNETTE CASTINGS CO.,
Hartford, Mich., April 18, 1945.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

(Attention Mr. E. W. Heilman.)

GENTLEMEN: After conferences with the Durable Goods Price Branch of the Office of Price Administration on April 17 and 18, we have agreed to proceed with the production and sale of the following utensils at the retail prices listed below:

Article:	*Price*
Grill	$3.95
Round roaster	7.90
Sauce pan, 3½ quarts	6.70
Sauce pan, 2½ quarts	5.70
Sauce pan, 1½ quarts	4.70
Small fry pan	4.70
Chicken fryer	7.25
Old oval roaster	14.25
New oval roaster	14.70

We appreciate the cooperation of your Office in coming to a quick determination of an adjusted price.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM A. BURNETTE,
Chairman of the Board.

EXHIBIT B

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

OPINION ACCOMPANYING REVISED ORDER NO. 3242 UNDER SECTION 1499.158 OF MAXIMUM PRICE REGULATION NO. 188

On January 3, 1945, the Office of Price Administration issued Order No. 3242 under section 1499.158 of Maximum Price Regulation No. 188 establishing maximum prices for sales to retailers and to users of eight articles of kitchen utensils manufactured by Burnette Castings Co. of Hartford, Mich. These articles are described in the manufacturer's application dated October 14, 1944.

Upon review of the previous order, it appears that certain features of these articles were not given due weight in the original determination of prices, and an increase in the existing maximum prices is required to compensate for these features in order to bring the prices into line with the general level of maximum prices in the regulation. In addition, with respect to one of the Burnette articles, a different article has been chosen as being more comparable than the one originally used as a comparable article, and this has brought about a change in price.

The order also establishes a maximum price for an oval roaster on the same basis that was used to determine the maximum prices for the remainder of the articles, all of which constitute a line of articles.

It appears also that the manufacturer cannot determine maximum prices for sales to jobbers and to department stores since, in March 1942, it made no sales of the same type of articles to those classes of purchasers and, therefore, it has no price differential which it can apply to its established maximum prices. Maximum prices for sales to these new classes of purchasers which are in line with properly established maximum prices of competitive manufacturers for such sales are accordingly fixed by the order.

Issued this 28th day of April 1945.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Certified to be true copy of original:

MARY RUSSELL,
Administrative Assistant.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

(MPR 188, Revised Order No. 3242—Burnette Castings Co.)

APPROVAL OF MAXIMUM PRICES

For the reasons set forth in an opinion issued simultaneously herewith and filed with the Division of the Federal Register, and pursuant to section 1499.153 of Maximum Price Regulation No. 188, it is ordered:

(a) This revised order establishes maximum prices for sales and deliveries of certain articles manufactured by Burnette Castings Co., of Hartford, Mich.

1. For all sales and deliveries to the following classes of purchasers by any person, the maximum prices are those set forth below:

Article	Maximum prices per unit for sales to—			
	Jobbers	Department stores	Retailers other than department stores	Ultimate users
Square griddle	$1.88	$2.25	$2.63	$3.95
Sauce pan:				
1½-quart	2.35	2.68	3.13	4.70
2½-quart	2.85	3.25	3.80	5.70
3½-quart	3.35	3.82	4.47	6.70
Fry pan with cover:				
8-inch	2.35	2.68	3.13	4.70
11-inch	3.63	4.13	4.84	7.25
Round roaster	3.95	4.50	5.27	7.90
Oval roaster:				
15 by 10 by 7	7.13	8.12	9.50	14.25
16½ by 11½ by 8¾	7.35	8.38	9.80	14.70

These maximum prices are for the articles described in the manufacturer's applications dated Oct. 14, 1944, and Feb. 28, 1945.

2. For sales by the manufacturer, the maximum prices apply to all sales and deliveries since Maximum Price Regulation No. 188 became applicable to those sales and deliveries. They are f. o. b. factory and they are subject to a cash discount of 2 percent for payment within 10 days net 30 days.

3. For sales by persons other than the manufacturer, the maximum prices apply to all sales and deliveries after the effective date of this revised order. Those prices are subject to each seller's customary terms and conditions of sale on sales of similar articles.

4. If the manufacturer wishes to make sales and deliveries to any other class of purchaser or on other terms and conditions of sale, he must apply to the Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C., under the Fourth Pricing Method, section 1499.153 of Maximum Price Regulation No. 188, for the establishment of maximum prices for those sales, and no sales or deliveries may be made until maximum prices have been authorized by the Office of Price Administration.

(b) The manufacturer shall attach a tag or label to every article for which a maximum price for sales to consumers is established by this revised order. That tag or label contain the following statement with the amount properly filled in:

CPA Retail Ceiling Price $———.

DO NOT DETACH

(c) At the time of, or prior to, the first invoice to each purchaser for resale, the seller shall notify the purchaser in writing of the maximum prices and conditions established by this revised order for sales by the purchaser. This notice may be given in any convenient form.

(d) This revised order may be revoked or amended by the Price Administration at any time.

(e) This revised order shall become effective on the 30th day of April 1945.

Issued this 28th day of April 1945.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Certified to be true copy of original:

MARY RUSSELL,
Administrative Assistant.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of those who have

special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, man has written another chapter in the history of war. The world arises from the rubble, ashes, and devastation of destruction to gaze with hope and faith upon the early rays of the sun of peace. The armed forces of America have made possible life—without the roar of the bomber, the shrieks of the cannon, the cries of the wounded and dying. America resurgent looks to the future—with gratitude to her warriors, appreciative for the successful constructive efforts of her citizens, and sensitive to the problems of reconstruction and reconversion.

All postwar difficulties are not, however, questions of surplus properties and contract renegotiations. Neither are they directly associated with labor troubles nor solely concerned with the returning veterans.

One of the important problems which exists independently of but magnified by the wounds of battle is that of the employment of the physically handicapped of this Nation. This week of October has been set aside by an act of Congress to emphasize the great importance to our country of enabling the physically handicapped to enter upon the road to happiness through the employment of their talents to the full extent of their abilities. Public support for and interest in the employment of otherwise qualified but physically handicapped workers of America should supplement this congressional action.

A conservative estimate indicates that in industry alone during the war years 7,800,000 have been injured, 365,000 permanently disabled, and 62,000 killed. This is in addition to the 1,100,000 military casualties. Prior to Pearl Harbor statistics show that the number of physically handicapped approximated 25,000,000. These figures evidence conclusively that a formidable segment of our population is composed of men and women who suffer disabilities which prevent their full enjoyment of the physical strength with which man is normally endowed. Unfortunately, this number is being daily augmented, not alone by the men and women who return disabled from military service but also by an approximate average of 1,000,000 persons injured yearly in industry. The rehabilitation and placement of these less fortunate residents of every city and town in our country challenges, not only the attention of legislators but the sympathy and necessary understanding of employer-employee labor-management. This importance of the problem is recognized. Thoughtful care must be given to its solution.

Leaders of industry have expressed concern at this constantly expanding national problem. Educational and religious groups, as well as veterans' organizations have initiated and supported programs designed for the aid and assistance of our physically incapacitated in a concerted effort to guarantee for them the American way of life. No words are needed to make apparent the necessity for giving the partially incapitated an opportunity for employment. Obviously useful employment is more desirable than dependence upon Government dole—both from the point of view of the disabled—who seek not charity but placement—and from the selfish aspect of national economy which reaps greater revenue from greater employment.

We must have in America full life for all our citizens whether they be physically fit or partially disabled. Congress has been generous in appropriating funds to the end that conversion shall be rapid and orderly. Congress is now occupied with the problem of full employment, realizing as it does that upon employment depends national security and greatness.

During the war when the nations of the world were the beneficiaries of the miracle of American production and creative power, many millions, old and young, able and disabled, worked on the assembly line of industry to help make victory more secure and more speedy. There are today 11,000,000 veterans returning to this country with one ambition—finding a job. The impact of this searching force of heroes upon our industrial system cannot be underestimated. Veterans, able and disabled, must be placed in a position where they may enjoy the fruits of the battles they have so gloriously fought and won, fruits of life they so rightfully deserve. But they too realize that along with them, a place must be found wherein citizens, whose physical condition makes it harder to bear the burdens of daily life, must earn purchasing power to avoid the pitfalls of a depression which, unless they find employment, may engulf them to our national sorrow.

I know how these men and women, in and out of military service, feel about their physical afflictions. I am familiar with their difficulties. Every day, in the ordinary routine of life, men and women are maimed and blinded and disabled by illness and accidents. Experience teaches that the attention, hitherto given, has failed to completely solve the social and economic problems of the physically handicapped. Few, however, realize the small percentage of persons who are totally free from illness and physical defect. The industrial work of the world is accomplished by human beings who suffer in some degree from physical limitation. Our recent Selective Service System proved that many, in apparent possession of the highest physical attributes, suffered from ailments which exempted them from military service.

The highest ideal of health encompasses more than full and complete enjoyment of perfect physique. Man must also possess strength, endurance, skill, as well as resourcefulness and will power. Compensation laws place much financial responsibility upon industry. But society has been slow to recognize its obligation in the training for new positions and the retraining for old occupations, which disabling accidents or illness makes necessary. Neither employer nor State can do more than supplement what the will to do of the individual seeks to accomplish. The ambition and the will of the individual is the real key to the problem. But industry can give, and should give, handicapped persons a reasonable opportunity to engage in productive employment. Compensation or money payment helps prevent the demoralization of the adult cripple, but it does not make him necessarily a productive member of society.

Let us not forget, in our own anxiety, to do honor to our returning veterans the economic and social consequences of a failure to provide employment or means of employment through education, rehabilitation, and selective placement for the millions of our citizens who are uppermost in our minds during this National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. There exists a peculiar social obligation to those disabled who have not found their natural place in society. Labor unions and relief agencies, churches, settlements, and veterans' organizations all must share responsibility. The absorption of the physically handicapped is not distinct from the general distribution of labor. The handicapped man should first have his disability reduced to a minimum to the end that he may take his place, not as a disabled veteran or a partially disabled individual, but as an ordinary citizen. The people of this Nation are determined that their fellow citizens, who suffer physical limitations, shall have the opportunity to continue to contribute to the general welfare of mankind and to enjoy the satisfaction of the reward which flows from useful employment.

America owes a debt to her disabled citizenery. During the darkest hours of the war, when the flower of America fought on the battlefields of the world, these men and women, heedless of discomfort and forgetful of their infirmities, answered the call of their country and became heroes of industry. They too have served in the hour of dire peril. They are entitled, from the National and State Governments, as well as from industry and labor, their share in victory and in peace—the opportunity to continue as self-supporting members of their communities.

Our Government has not been unmindful of its special obligation. The problem of rehabilitation of servicemen at the close of the last war led to a general program for the civilian handicapped. Federal and State assistance has developed considerably, during recent years. There remains great work to be done. The present war, with its frightful consequence, will give impetus to the initiation and carrying on of more extended programs of rehabilitation. Education, training, and placement will be carried on by experts who are familiar with the problems and who will work for one end—a job and a commensurate living for all those able and willing to work.

A new and, I hope, a brighter and more permanent era of peace is enveloping the world. There is a moral resporisibility upon all to see that those men and women, who gave of their minds and bodies for the preservation of our Nation, shall be given the continued opportunity to give for the miantenance of the peace.

"National Employ the Physically Disabled Week," established by an act of Congress, is being observed during this week in accordance with a proclamation of the President. The people of America are proud of the achievement of the physically incapacitated during the hours of our national emergency. America will not forget their accomplishments but will during this week, and all the weeks of the year, lend succor and assistance to every humanitarian effort to bring to our handicapped, in full measure, the joy and peace and security they so richly deserve.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORRELL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we read in the papers that the point system for discharging Army personnel is to be abandoned and instead men will be discharged on the basis of having had 2 years of service.

Whatever may be the purpose of this change it means, in effect, the establishment of a 2-year term of involuntary induction of men into the armed forces, until at least 6 months after the war has been declared terminated by the President or a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress.

There is no authority in the Selective Service Act to conscript men to serve in the armed forces for any specified period. I am convinced that the administration, the executive bureaucracy and controlling forces in the Army intend to use every means they can conceive to delay as long as possible the official ending of the war in order to hold onto and strengthen their grip on the war powers conferred by the Congress. The point system for discharges must have interfered with their plan and they saw the opportunity to accomplish their end by continuing conscription for 2 years through this devious scheme. These same forces know that the country is overwhelmingly opposed to universal conscription of our youth, especially for policing the world, and it may be expected that they will use such indirect means as they can avail themselves of to force this program upon our people.

It is clear to me that high officials in the administration and Army are determined to keep as many men in the armed services as they possibly can, all their protestations to the contrary notwithstanding. They will fight all efforts to officially end the war and only an aroused and determined public will force Congress to effectively demobilize our armed forces and permit the men who were conscripted to fight the war to return to their homes and loved ones.

From the many letters that I am receiving from practically every district in the United States and from the soldiers in every theater of the world where they are located, I am convinced that the public and the soldiers want Congress to take steps to declare the war officially ended and the Army demobilized at the earliest possible moment. If the President, the bureaucracies and our military heads do not know that the war is over, they should realize that the soldiers and the public do.

I shall continue to press for the passage of my bills, H. R. 4105 and H. R. 4106, which in substance provide for the demobilization of the armed forces, the discontinuance of all inductions and the replacement within 6 months of all men needed for occupational and other military duties by members of the Regular Military Establishment and I ask that all Members of the House help me in accomplishing this task.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FOREIGN COMMITMENTS

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I introduced a resolution (H. J. Res. 250) providing that the Secretary of the Treasury should secure from all agencies and departments of the Government quarterly statements reporting the amount of their commitments outside of the United States.

The war is over. No excuse remains for not making a full and complete disclosure to the American people of all promised and proposed commitments abroad. The people should have a consolidated and understandable picture of the expenditures already contracted and in process before this House acts on any new appropriation abroad.

Between forty and fifty governmental agencies are spending American tax and bond dollars over the globe. It is time to take the American people into full partnership on these ventures. The bill for all these commitments must be paid by the sweat and toil of the taxpayers.

The resolution as introduced is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 250

Joint resolution to provide the Congress with information concerning financial commitments to foreign nations.

Resolved, etc., That in order that the Congress of the United States may be regularly informed concerning the aggregate amounts of commitments by the Government of the United States or by agencies thereof, involving the transfer of American goods, services, or credits to foreign governments or their political subdivisions, instrumentalities, agencies, corporations, or nationals, or to international organizations, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to secure from the appropriate officials of such governmental subdivisions, including, but not limited to—

the Foreign Economic Administration;
the Office of Price Administration;
the Reconstruction Finance Corporation;
the Department of Agriculture;
the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs;
the Federal Works Agency;
the Export-Import Bank of Washington;
the Petroleum Reserves Corporation;
the United States Commercial Company;
the Rubber Development Corporation;
the Rubber Reserve Company;
the United States Maritime Commission;
the Department of the Navy;
the Panama Canal;
the Panama Railroad Company;
the Post Office Department;
the Defense Plant Corporation;
the Defense Supplies Corporation;
the Metals Reserve Company;
the Department of the Treasury;
the War Department;
the War Refugee Board;
the War Shipping Administration;
the Office of Alien Property Custodian;
the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas;
the Bureau of the Budget;
the Department of Commerce;
the Office of Defense Transportation;
the Federal Communications Commission;
the Department of the Interior;
the Department of Justice;
the Department of Labor;
the Petroleum Administration for War;
the Department of State;
the Smithsonian Institution;
the War Manpower Commission;
the War Production Board;
the American Battle Monuments Commission;
the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration;
the International Monetary Fund;
the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development;
the United Nations Food and Agriculture Administration;

such information as may be necessary to enable him to prepare and transmit to the House of Representatives and to the Senate (1) a detailed report, which shall be transmitted within 45 days after the date of approval of this joint resolution, showing, as of October 1, 1945, the estimated dollar value of American goods, services, and credits to be transferred pursuant to commitments made by such agencies; and (2) quarterly reports which shall be transmitted within 15 days after the end of each quarter, showing the amounts of funds disbursed, and the value of goods, services, and credits transferred during such quarter pursuant to such commitments, and the value of goods, services, or credits to be transferred pursuant to any such commitments remaining unfulfilled at the end of such quarter.

I have just now received from an agency known as the clearing office for foreign transactions and reports, Foreign Economic Administration, two informative sets of documents on foreign expenditures. These documents, one marked "Secret" and the other "Confidential," apparently have come to me as a result of this resolution, and I am pleased to have these compilations, which carry, as of April 1, substantial data on uncompleted contracts.

However, I reiterate that the information requested in my resolution should be presented to the people. They should know the purposes of these expenditures, how much is being expended, and where it is being expended.

From a hurried glance at this data it would seem that the requested information can be provided to Congress without too much difficulty. I again urge that a consolidated statement giving this picture be given to Congress before new appropriations are requested.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. LEMKE. I wonder whether such a resolution is necessary. I thought the Congress was the only body that could make such commitments that were legal

and binding upon the people of the United States.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman knows, of course, that Congress makes appropriations. Some of those appropriations have been made in the nature of blank checks. As long as the war was on there was a legitimate reason for secrecy on some of these commitments. The way certain funds were expended was certainly information that we did not want to get into the hands of our enemies. But the war is over.

Mr. LEMKE. I agree that the war is over, and so are our secret agreements and secret commitments. At least, I should hope so.

Mr. BUFFETT. I am afraid the gentleman is an optimist on that score.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE NATIONAL DEBT, THE NATIONAL INCOME, AND INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, much is being said on the floor of the House all the time about expenditures by our Government in foreign countries. It is true that the war is over and that we should economize just as much as possible. We should save every dollar that we can, and we should pay that dollar on the national debt.

SIZE OF NATION'S DEBT

Our national debt today is $261,000,000,000. It is larger than the debt of any other country on earth. It is larger than any debt we have ever had in the United States. This national debt can be paid. It can be paid without any more trouble or inconvenience to the people than when we were paying one-tenth that much in 1932, when our national income was so low. We will have little trouble paying that debt if we keep the national income up; we will have all kinds of difficulty trying to pay the debt if our income goes down low as it was in 1932.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND LIVES SAVED FOR EVERY BILLION DOLLARS SPENT FOR LEND-LEASE

About the expenditures in foreign countries: I think this should be said about what was spent during the war. During the war I believe President Roosevelt once said that for every billion dollars we spent in lend-lease we saved the lives of 100,000 young men. I do not know that that estimate was a correct one, no one has any way of knowing; but we have reason to believe that the money we expended for lend-lease was one of the finest investments this country ever made. Every time we sent money to Russia, supplies or materials, and the Russians used that money, supplies or materials to go out and fight and kill and destroy our common enemy, the Germans, there were fewer German soldiers to take the lives of American soldiers. The same way in China, every time we sent money or supplies to China—they did not need the money as much as they needed the supplies—and a Chinese took a part of the food we sent and went out and killed a Jap there was one less Jap to kill an American soldier. So out of the money that was expended by our Government for lend-lease I think we can safely estimate that from a million to 3,000,000 lives of young men were saved; in other words, from one to three million of our young men are safe, sound and well and are returning to their homes in the United States today by reason of the fact that we were not stingy with the use of funds and supplies to our allies who were using these supplies sent to them to destroy a common foe. That is worth thinking about.

MACHINES USED INSTEAD OF MEN

I believe this Congress is to be commended, and the administration, during the time this war was being fought, for using money and using machines instead of using men. Many countries did not do that, they were not privileged to because they did not have the supplies and materials or the capacity to do the job. It was a policy which was adopted by the administration and this Congress never to send a soldier against the enemy in a hazardous undertaking when a machine could be sent instead; and, regardless of the cost of that machine because we valued a human life much more than all the money on earth—we can work and pay money back, we can restore materials and money but we cannot restore the lives of the men lost in battle. So this Congress is to be congratulated and commended and the administration in turn for at all times using money where possible, where it would do good, to save the lives of American soldiers.

DEBT HIGH—CASUALTY LIST LOW

Our national debt is high, yes; but our casualty list is comparatively low insofar as the losses in other countries are concerned. Let us see about our casualties. One million of our men were casualties. Obviously, a major power engaged in a great world war cannot put forth the best effort and not have casualties. We had 13,000,000 men in service during this war in the armed services of the United States. They were on 55 battle fronts throughout the world. The sun never set on the American soldier during this war, yet notwithstanding the major part we had in this world war we had a million casualties only. I say "only." It is a large number. I regret that we had any, but we did have a million casualties and out of the million casualties there were 250,000 killed. This out of 13,000,000 men in the armed services. Of course, 250,000 is a large number, but small compared to the losses of other countries. The total casualties of all participating countries during World War II, amounted to 55,000,000 and in the major part we played we had a million. Considering the great part we played, the dangers and the hazardous expeditions our men were forced to go upon, that number is comparatively low because we were willing to spend money to save human life.

We hear criticisms all the time about our national debt being very high, but as far as I am concerned, I would rather have this high national debt which we can pay than higher casualties. We can pay this debt and it will be paid. There will be no bankruptcy, there will be no repudiation; it will be paid in good honest dollars, I hope, that are worth approximately 100 cents on the dollar. There is no doubt about that. I would much prefer this high national debt, with a low casualty list, than the reverse, as other countries had it during this war. Our position is much more favorable than the position of any other country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Now that the war is over is it not time that we quit giving away these billions of dollars?

Mr. PATMAN. We certainly do not want to give away money and it is not necessary to give away money to foreign countries now. We have a set-up for permanent peace in this country which I think is ideal. Of course, we do not know that it will work exactly because it is made up by human beings like all other plans and they cannot be perfect, but there is no reason why these countries cannot go into the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and obtain loans for worthy purposes. When a country obtains a loan from the International Bank that country does not owe just America. That country owes all of the Allied countries. It owes all participating countries in the world. Therefore, it is less likely that that particular country would default on payment of that debt because if she did she would be in bad with all the countries on earth, not only the United States. So I do not anticipate we will be called upon to give money away.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do anticipate that there will be applications made to the International Bank for loans and also to the Export-Import Bank in this country. Let me tell you that there are three legs to this peace proposition. One leg is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; the second leg is the United Nations Charter; and the third leg is reciprocal-trade agreements. Those three legs support permanent peace in the world today and without every one of them we would not have a substantial leg to stand on.

Mr. GROSS. Do the records show that these other countries are making their contribution to the bank and are cooperating with it? Does not the record show the opposite, that it is only American dollars that are being handled and swapped around?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. We have, of course, two funds to deposit in, one of which is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. America only pays her part

like the other countries pay. We do not pay any more; we do not pay any less. We put less than $6,000,000,000 into those two funds. We are not going to lose any of it. I do not believe we will lose a dollar. I do not believe there is a reasonable chance of losing any money. But if we should lose it all, it would be less than the cost of running the war for 1 month. So it is a good risk.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman honestly believe any of this money will ever be paid back and can he possibly believe that in face of the previous action of these countries?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman says "paid back." It is not being paid out by the United States. The headquarters for the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development and the Stabilization Fund will be here in the United States. Other countries will pay the money here. It is not being paid out. It is being paid into funds that will be right here in the United States. So I hope that in the consideration of all these questions involving expenditures, we keep in mind the good that we received from Lend-Lease; that we keep in mind these plans for permanent peace that I have mentioned; and, third, but in no way is it the least, we should do everything within our power to prevent inflation here at home. Our servicemen have done their part well. They have won this war. If we permit them to come back to a country that is destroyed by reason of ruinous, runaway inflation, we will have caused them to suffer a great injustice that we could have prevented. We do not want ruinous inflation in this country. But there are greedy forces at work, each one feeling that "there should be no control over my particular industry. Our people can police their own members. We will not raise prices. We will not unduly increase prices." But they are mistaken. You cannot police your own industry. Experience has proven that. It is in the interest of every man, woman, and child in America to get rid, yes, of every control that it is possible to remove, but not to remove one until it is safe to remove it; otherwise we will have runaway inflation. When we have reconversion and production to the extent that supply and demand can operate, take off all controls. May I invite your attention to this fact, that after the other war we had no controls on materials, and supplies for home building. Prices went up high; very, very high. Construction immediately stopped. So instead of encouraging production and the building of homes, we actually stopped the building of homes. Let us not repeat that same performance after this war at a time when dangerous inflation is the most likely.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. KINZER (at the request of Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania) for this week, on account of death in family.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to have printed additional copies of the hearings before said committee on S. 555, a bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority; to the Committee on Printing.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1062. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on October 5, 1945, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3466. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; and

H. R. 3951. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 10, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation in open session on Tuesday, October 9, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m. in the committee room 356, Old House Office Building.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation on Wednesday, October 10, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the committee room 356, Old House Office Building, at which Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley, Acting Surgeon General, Veterans' Administration, will appear.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Wednesday, October 10, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m. in executive hearing to consider the bill (H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

722. A letter from the Secretary, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

723. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting Semiannual Report of the Administrator of Rent Control, covering the period January 1 to June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

724. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

725. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

726. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize temporarily the allowance of leave to officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard retired subsequent to September 8, 1939, and retained on active duty, to the same extent as if such officers had not been retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

727. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations, of unpaid balances in the pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 365. Resolution providing funds for the employment of a counsel to the Committee on the Judiciary, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1105). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4309. A bill for the reduction of taxes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution to announce the sense of Congress as to the composition of the postwar Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 1107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TALBOT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2465. A bill to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointmnt also as a United States commissioner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1108). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TALBOT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3281. A bill to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix a term of the United States District Court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June; with amendment (Rept. No. 1109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Submitting report on the national war effort, pursuant to House Resolution 20, authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to study the progress of the war effort (Rept. No. 1110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 936. A bill for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1266. A bill for the relief of the Transit Investment Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1080). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1316. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mattie Lee Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 1081). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1358. A bill for the relief of O. M. Minatree; with amendment (Rept. No. 1082). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1489. A bill for the relief of Harold B. Alden and Walter E. Strohm; with amendment (Rept. No. 1083). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1613. A bill for the relief of Christopher Dance; without amendment (Rept. No. 1084). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1835. A bill for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers; with amendment (Rept. No. 1085). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1976. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1086). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2029. A bill for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart; with amendment (Rept. No. 1087). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2054. A bill for the relief of Rastus L. Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1088). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2062. A bill for the relief of Dave Topper; with amendment (Rept. No. 1089). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2102. A bill for the relief of Harry Goldstein; with amendment (Rept. No. 1090). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2154. A bill for the relief of John W. Magee; with amendment (Rept. No. 1091). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2187. A bill for the relief of the Bunge Corp., the Corporacion Argentina de Productos de Carnes, Herman M. Gidden, and the Overseas Metal & Ore Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2189. A bill for the relief of Clifford E. Craig; with amendment (Rept. No. 1093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2191. A bill for the relief of Cleo E. Baker; with amendment (Rept. No. 1094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2223. A bill for the relief of Catherine Bode; with amendment (Rept. No. 1095). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2300. A bill for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore and Louise D. Blackmore; with amendment (Rept. No. 1096). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2333. A bill for the relief of Albemarle Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephriam Daniels; with amendment (Rept. No. 1097). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2746. A bill for the relief of Annarae Weiss; with amendment (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2762. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1099). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2886. A bill for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3224. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lionel Comeaux and New Orleans Public Service, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3303. A bill for the relief of A. M. Strauss; without amendment (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3390. A bill for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll; with amendment (Rept. No. 1103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3496. A bill for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger; with amendment (Rept. No. 1104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI. Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3441. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Master Sgt. Gerhard Neumann; without amendment (Rept. No. 1111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3075) granting a pension to Mandelia C. Williams, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 4310. A bill to grant members of the armed forces certain benefits with respect to leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 4311. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from taxation all amounts received by members of the armed forces as compensation for military or naval service performed during World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 4312. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 4313. A bill to direct the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4314. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 4315. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Devils Lake Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 4316. A bill to provide that the education and training provided for by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 shall be made available to veterans on an equal basis without regard to their age; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4317. A bill to establish an Office of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy, to plan, foster, and encourage scientific research in recognition of its paramount importance as related to the maintenance of future naval power, and the preservation of national security; to provide within the Department of the Navy a single office, which by contract and otherwise shall be able to obtain, coordinate, and make available to all bureaus and activities of the Department of the Navy, world-wide scientific information and the necessary services for conducting specialized and imaginative research; to establish a naval research advisory committee consisting of persons preeminent in the fields of science and research, to consult with and advise the Chief of such Office in matters pertaining to research; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 4318. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide for return of amounts deducted from compensation in all cases of separation from positions within the purview of such act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4319. A bill to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 4320. A bill to provide for continuance of the farm-labor supply program up to and including December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4321. A bill to amend article 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended, so as to exempt

annuity payments under such code from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution inviting Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur to appear before a joint session of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 366. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 80, a concurrent resolution to announce the sense of Congress as to the composition of the postwar Navy; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4322. A bill for the relief of James I. Parsons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4323. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to George Morse; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4324. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Fred Frerich; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4325. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Howard Helmer; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4326. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Theodore Goedort; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4327. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Al Frerich; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4328. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Ben F. Clark; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4329. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Larry McGowan; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 4330. A bill for the relief of the Belle Isle Cab Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Esequiel (Frank) Padilla, and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 4332. A bill for the relief of George Lassila; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4333. A bill for the relief of Archie J. Verville; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4334. A bill granting a pension to Taylor M. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4335. A bill for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4336. A bill relating to the naturalization of Domenico Leone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 4337. A bill for the relief of E. A. Shull; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 4338. A bill for the relief of Anna Blanchard and others; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4339. A bill for the relief of Fannie C. Fugate; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4340. A bill for the relief of the estate of Randolph Bolles and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4341. A bill for the relief of James B. McGoldbrick; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1230. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Niagara Frontier Planning Association, Buffalo, N. Y., recommending elimination of the excess-profits tax for corporations, study of corporate-tax situation for the purpose of achieving the elimination of double taxation of dividends, reduction of the fiscal requirements of the Federal Budget, further reduction of other peacetime Government costs, and the determination of the broadest practical basis for individual taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1231. By Mr. HOCH: Resolutions of Berks County Industrial Union Council, Reading, Pa., pertaining to current legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

1232. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of J. Webb Howell, of Bryan, Tex., opposing H. R. 4130; to the Committee on Labor.

1233. Also, petition of Mrs. J. G. Frye, College Station, Tex., favoring the unemployment pay bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1234. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition containing the signatures of 12 citizens of the Thirty-first Congressional District, State of New York, advocating the enactment by the Congress of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1235. Also, petition containing the signatures of 14 citizens of the Thirty-first Congressional District, State of New York, advocating the enactment by the Congress of legislation providing for the closing of taverns in the vicinity of camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1236. By The SPEAKER: Petition of New York State Association of Real Estate Boards, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their disapproval of the LANGER bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1237. Also, petition of the Peace Campaign of Mount Vernon, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a Christian peace in a Christian Europe and a curb on rampant tyranny; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1238. Also, petition of the Labor Canteen Forum committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of President Truman's 21 point score of economic and social progress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1239 Also, petition of Richard Knight, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the redress of a grievance occasioned by the corruption of the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1240. Also, petition of J. Henry DeBoer, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to labor difficulties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, Thou whose goodness faileth never, send Thy blessing upon all men and ground them in the faith of our fathers who gave their measureless devotion that we might be strong and free. Lift us above all littleness and prejudice that our treasured land may never lose the hope of honest toil and its rewards. In the wilderness of problems which confront us, enable us to see the way of the Lord and ever to follow therein.

Instill in us the love of justice and fair play, together with the deep desire to know Thy will and to understand that there is no victory comparable to the subjection of evil tendencies over self. More and more teach us the truths which alone can keep us loyal and true and which open wide the avenues that lead to a more useful life. Thou hast endowed us with the gift of choice and holdest us accountable for our acts; the seeds we sow today will be the harvests of some subsequent tomorrow. Lead us therefore to sow good seed that our harvests may be the fruits of righteousness and brotherhood. O let Thy still small voice be our conscience, Thy law the anchor of our minds, and Thy love our redemption. In the Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth C. Stone;

H. R. 476. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.," approved June 14, 1933, as amended;

H. R. 656. An act to provide further for the appointment of postmasters for fourth-class post offices in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Laura May Ryan;

H. R. 1565. An act for the relief of Inglis Construction Co., a corporation;

H. R. 1629. An act for the relief of Michael C. Donatell;

H. R. 1765. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the Agricultural Byproducts Laboratory on the campus of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts;

H. R. 1849. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ora R. Hutchinson;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Anna Mattil and others;

H. R. 1958. An act for the relief of L. A. Williams;

H. R. 2317. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virginia M. Kiser;

H. R. 2690. An act to amend the Bonneville Project Act;

H. R. 3081. An act for the relief of August Svelund;

H. R. 3150. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River, between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1939;

H. R. 3373. An act authorizing the reconstruction of the Spring Common Bridge on Mahoning Avenue, across the Mahoning River in the municipality of Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio;

H. R. 3871. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas; and

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1089. An act for the relief of Albert Cantalupo;

H. R. 1591. An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor;

H. R. 1868. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2525. An act to include stepparents among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Florida Rhone Burch; and

H. R. 2737. An act for the relief of Clara Black.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 130. An act to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia;

S. 131. An act to authorize the conveyance of the United States Fish Hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells;

S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon;

S. 865. An act for the relief of the estate of Agnes J. Allberry;

S. 927. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Poplar, Mont.," approved July 28, 1937;

S. 932. An act to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States;

S. 998. An act for the relief of Gregory Stelmak;

S. 1017. An act for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse;

S. 1064. An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude;

S. 1081. An act for the relief of Aftab Ali;

S. 1097. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy;

S. 1101. An act for the relief of the estate of Manuel Rose Lima;

S. 1126. An act for the relief of Alice A. Murphy;

S. 1129. An act for the relief of Willie H. Johnson;

S. 1139. An act for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims;

S. 1219. An act authorizing the city of St. Francisville, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.;

S. 1231. An act for the relief of Paul E. Tacy;

S. 1308. An act to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy;

S. 1360. An act to compensate Benali El Oukili Boucheta, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for the wrongful death of his son Mohamed Ben Boucheta Ben Ali El Oukili, near Marnia, Algeria, on September 30, 1944;

S. 1361. An act to compensate Clement Euziere, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for personal injuries caused by a naval vehicle near Oran, Algeria, on September 21, 1943;

S. 1362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer land for resettlement in Guam, and for other purposes;

S. 1363. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of water damage occurring at certain naval and Marine Corps shore activities;

S. 1364. An act to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damage to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes;

S. 1383. An act to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, District of Columbia, approved April 8, 1864;

S. 1420. An act to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George Catlett Marshall and to Fleet Admiral Ernest Joseph King and to the members of the armed forces of the United States who served under their direction; and providing for the striking and presentation to General Marshall and Fleet Admiral King of appropriate gold medals in the name of the people of the United States; and

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution inviting Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur to address the two Houses of Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 620. An act for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of the Navy.
6. Department of the Treasury.
7. Department of War.
8. Foreign Economic Administration.
9. National Housing Agency.
10. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
11. United States District Court.
12. War Relocation Authority.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was granted previously a special order to address the House today. I am unable to address the House today, and ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic—known as the land-grant bill—with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BOREN, PRIEST, HARRIS, HOLMES of Massachusetts, and REECE of Tennessee.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 34.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 9,000 additional copies of the hearing held before said committee on S. 555, entitled "A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the hearing in which the Missouri Valley Authority was rejected?

Mr. JARMAN. I do not know what the conclusion of the committee was. Senator OVERTON, the chairman of the committee, simply called my attention to this resolution and asked me to ask for its consideration as soon as possible. The Committee on Printing approved it, and I request its consideration by unanimous consent, instead of as privileged, merely to save time.

Mr. RANKIN. They want to have 10,000 extra copies printed of a voluminous report literally full of propaganda against the Missouri Valley Authority in which President Truman is so much interested. How many pages are in these hearings?

Mr. JARMAN. I have no idea. Nine thousand extra copies are provided in-

stead of 10,000. But the Committee on Printing takes the position that when the Senate desires some printing of its hearings and passes a resolution to provide it, there is not much we can do about it, under the courtesy rule, just as they do in the Senate with us. One body cannot be familiar with such requirements of the other.

Mr. RANKIN. It has to pass both Houses of Congress.

Mr. JARMAN. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. My recollection is that this hearing was used by certain interests as a sounding board for a barrage of propagandists against public power and against the development of the Missouri Valley Authority, in order to try to cripple the program that has been so successfully carried on in this country, both on the Tennessee River and on the Columbia River. It seems to me that we are going pretty far afield when we get out and, at Government expense, publish 10,000 copies, or 9,000 copies as the gentleman from Alabama says, to be sent all over the country to be used by these organized enemies of the Missouri Valley Authority, without knowing what the cost is going to be or how many pages are to be printed.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. A very peculiar situation existed in the Senate.

Mr. RANKIN. I heard that.

Mr. COCHRAN. There was a discussion as to where that bill should go, that is, to what committee. They finally came to the decision that it should be sent to three committees, first to the Committee on Commerce where the Senator presiding was opposed to the legislation. That committee made an adverse report. It was then referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. It so happened that the same Senator who was chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. When they get through, it is to go to the Committee on Agriculture. The gentleman is right that there is a lot of propaganda against the Missouri Valley Authority in the hearing, but there are also some favorable statements. On top of that, let me say to the gentleman that the Bureau of Reclamation itself has spent a large amount of its printing and binding appropriation to print maps and propaganda against the Missouri Valley Authority and I have asked the Committee on Appropriations to look into those expenditures of public funds to defeat legislation pending before the Congress. A private group bought 18,000 copies of the Bureau's report and they go through the mails at Government expense.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that this Congress is being literally flooded, and the American people are being flooded, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is being flooded with misleading propaganda against the development and distribution of the water power of this country. If they had had their way there would be no TVA, no Columbia River development, and no rural-electrification program.

I expect to answer this propaganda in due time, but I am reluctant to give my consent now to the publishing of 9,000 copies of a hearing containing, nobody knows how many pages, but which we do know is literally full of misleading propaganda put into that record in order to discredit what has been done in the development of the water power in this country and its distribution to the farmers and other people throughout the country.

So, for the time being, Mr. Speaker, I shall object.

Mr. GALLAGHER. And I object.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] if this is not a regular report from a senatorial committee, and a request from the Senate?

Mr. JARMAN. It is a resolution passed by the Senate providing for the printing of certain hearings which the Senate committee says it needs. It comes to the House. They asked us to pass this resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Have we ever before objected to a request of such character by the Senate?

Mr. JARMAN. Not only have we never objected since I have been chairman of this committee, but the Senate has never objected to a similar request of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman thinks this is a report. It is not a report. It is copies of hearings.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. When the Committee on Printing considered this, it was not a question for us to consider whether we liked the propaganda that may be in a circular which we are asked to present to the House, but because of the fact that the Senate sent it here and asked us to have it granted, we are presenting it. I say to you——

Mr. RANKIN. To me?

Mr. RICH. Yes, to you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is out of order when he refers to the gentleman from Mississippi as "you" and points at him and shakes his hand at him.

The SPEAKER. Members on the floor should address each other in the third person. The point of order made by the gentleman from Michigan is good.

The gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. May the House be advised as to who has the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] under reservation of objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. All I have to say about this report is, if some Member is going to object to any report that comes from the other body or that is printed in this body, simply because he does not like something in that report, then we will never have any printing done.

Mr. JARMAN. The minority leader is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if you are going to print a volume largely containing Power Trust propaganda, at Government expense, instead of letting it come out of the contingent fund of the Senate, that is a different proposition.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that the gentleman is indicting the Senate.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Because it is a senatorial report or hearing.

Mr. RANKIN. No; it is not a report. It is a lot of hearings where a lot of Power Trust propagandists came before that committee to fight our public-power and rural-electrification program.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is your opinion.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand; but I will read it to the gentleman if he will give me time. But for the time being, Mr. Speaker, I am going to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Daily News concerning the president of the American Federation for Physically Handicapped.

AID TO THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped has been concerned with learning ways to see that physically handicapped people in this country shall not be handicapped by indifference, by ignorance of their capabilities, and by illogical prejudice. We want to see that they are assurred an even break, that their lives are not further clouded by hopelessness.

When one falls in battle, or is hurt in a factory, or lies ill of a crippling disease, or is the victim of an accident in the home, or on the farm, or on the highway, about the first thing he asks is, "How shall I support myself?" The answer to his important question is easier to find than it once was. During the manpower shortage physically handicapped people have had many opportunities not normally open to them. They have shown by actual experience that they are good employees, that they are loyal, that they are on the job with greater regularity than the able-bodied, that they can produce.

This is National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. I am glad that the Congress and the President authorized such an annual observance. The physically handicapped do not desire more than an opportunity, and they have shown that they can make good use of

opportunity for their own benefit and the benefit of the Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, October 11, after the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday, October 15, after the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include an editorial entitled "General MacArthur and His Critics," and in the other to include an editorial entitled "The Japanese Emperor and Peace," the editorials being from the Arizona Daily Star.

Mr. SAVAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the magazine America.

THIRTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF CHINESE INDEPENDENCE

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, on this, the thirty-fourth anniversary of Chinese National Revolution for Independence under the leadership of that great man and patriot, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, I am sure that I, as chairman of the subcommittee on the Far East of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, speak the sentiments of the United States Congress and the American people in conveying to the people of China and their present dynamic leader our congratulations and felicitations.

For the first time in 14 years China is now able to celebrate this occasion during peacetime. Now, having defeated her aggressor enemies, the hearts and minds of the people of China turn to the day of their liberation from the shackles of tyrannical government as do our own thoughts on each July 4 turn on our Day of Independence and emancipation in the year of 1776.

During these 34 years of Chinese independence she has striven mightily to extinguish the reawakening flames of reaction. She has battled within against counterrevolutionary and radical forces seeking to make orderly democratic processes a mockery. And, though weakened internally by these natural developments in the transition from centuries of monarchy to a republican form of government, when the challenge to her national integrity came from Japan, China, under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, girded her loins and virtually unaided by the rest of the world fought 7 years of heroic war, while all the world wondered. When her cause seemed darkest she always called upon that reserve fountain of strength to be found only in the hearts of a great and determined people. The virtues of courage, tolerance, vision, constancy, and faith, even during these darkest hours, were constantly present among the Chinese people.

China has on a thousand battlefields won the right to sit in the council of great nations. We are proud of her friendship.

DEMOBILIZATION OF COMBAT VETERANS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the discharge machinery is working faster and better. But repeated letters from men working right in the separation centers tell me it could work a whole lot faster than it is.

Overseas combat veterans are entitled to first release. Every bit of available shipping space must be devoted to bringing them home and until that job has been done space on ships ought not to be allotted to others, such as Australian war brides, as letters from men overseas tell me was recently done.

Men who are busy, who have important assignments, can feel their service has a real meaning, even a world significance. But the worst feature of this whole demobilization picture is the number of men being held in service with nothing to do. Men just cooling their heels or running errands for officers, combat veterans being required to take basic training all over again—these men simply cannot understand why they are not discharged at once, or, if their points are low, at least given indefinite furloughs until the discharge schedule catches up with them. Some of these men are potential or even trained scientists, doctors, teachers—people greatly needed in their professions. The only policy that would make real sense would be one of either discharging or granting indefinite furloughs to every man to whom no significant assignment can be given. Thus, these men could make a start getting back to civilian life even if they had to return later for their discharge.

I do not doubt that the high command of the armed forces is trying sincerely to carry out speedy demobilization. But evidence is convincing that in the intermediate officer ranks there is actual resistance to the release even of men who are utterly unneeded. Such a situation cannot be tolerated, either by the top command or by the Congress.

In the end Congress will be held responsible for what is being done, and, personally, I am ready to vote on legislation that would set forth the policies to be followed.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in order to ease the worries of those who feel that Congress should increase the amount of the unemployment benefits, and the time for drawing them, I desire to read a telegram from Minnesota. It is as follows:

Manpower situation in Minnesota most critical in history. Increase in unemployment payments will aggravate matters. Farmers hardest hit. Embargo threatened on livestock shipments because packing plants so undermanned they cannot keep pace with receipts. Processing of $20,000,000 Thanksgiving turkey crop handicapped. Creameries shorthanded. Potato harvest short pickers. Earnestly hope you resist pressure CIO-PAC delegation.

MINNESOTA PEOPLES POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE,
By A. J. OLSON, *Chairman*.

Mr. Olson, the author of the telegram, is a prominent and successful farmer in Minnesota. For years president of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, he probably understands the labor situation in the Northwest as well as any individual. It is fair to assume that an equally critical labor shortage exists in nearly all other sections of the Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Frank E. Gannett. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $117, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include one of the many letters he has received commending him on his bill to eradicate cancer and infantile paralysis.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting article on the atomic bomb recently printed in Collier's Weekly.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bridgeport Telegram.

Mr. PITTENGER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may have permission today to speak for 20 minutes, after any special orders previously entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made at Richmond, Va., on October 5 entitled "Winning the Peace."

Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made by him on Jewish immigration in Palestine.

Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the proceedings of a forum on the subject Immigration participated in by him.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include four speeches he made on the west coast recently.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a printed document from a publication.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have permission to sit today during the general debate on the immigration bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is a bill coming before the House which I want to speak on, the immigration bill; at the same time there is no matter of greater importance before the Committee on Military Affairs than the matter of the atomic bomb and the legislation which we have pending in that committee. I would like to be present at that important meeting, Mr. Speaker, therefore I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRINTING REPORTS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this morning we had a controversy here in reference to publishing a record of proceedings that a Senate committee would like to have printed, and because one of the Members of the House of Representatives, who apparently did not like what was in the record, objected to the printing of it. If we are going to object to the publication of things that we do not like, then I want to say that I am going to have a lot to object to in the Committee on Printing, because I do not like what the propaganda proposes, and I do not like that procedure. A good deal of material has been published that I do not like, but that is no reason why I or the Members of the House should refuse to let that information go out to the country. I think that we ought to be very careful in picking out the things that we want published and those that we do not want published. This is a free country yet; we have free speech, free press, free radio, now let us have freedom in the House of Representatives if we believe in our Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

STEVEDORES' STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are more than a million wives and mothers who want their husbands and sons home from overseas. The Army and the Navy may or may not be unduly slow in getting them home. They both took them over fast enough and not all are alive to come back so the task should be easier. However, I am not talking about that. We are told we do not have the ships. The press tells us that ships like the *Queen Elizabeth*, which docked at New York day before yesterday, bringing home soldiers, were confronted with a strike. The *Queen Elizabeth* was loaded with soldiers and their personal baggage. The men who were supposed to unload her would not unload her; they were on strike. So the Army called upon two battalions of soldiers—soldiers, mind you, to unload those ships. So men who had stayed here at home during the war—who all through the war were safe at home refused to help the returning veterans get their personal belongings off the ship so she could sail back for more soldiers. What are the wives and mothers saying about these strikers who are delaying the return of the servicemen? Now, I for one want to know from the sponsors of the full employment bill before I vote for it what is to be gained by creating jobs when men will pull that kind of a dirty deal on the returning fighting men. Are we to spend tax money to create jobs when there is no assurance that men will accept and work at them?

EX-SERVICEMAN'S RIGHT TO WORK

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] did not tell you so, but those boys, those soldiers, who were unloading that boat in New York, were hissed by the strikers.

I have this letter from a serviceman in New York this morning:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: I heard on the radio the other day that you are sponsoring a bill in Congress to exempt veterans from the necessity of joining a labor union upon return to civilian life. I'd like to congratulate you on this move and hope you are successful in getting it through Congress.

There are many thousands of us who hope to return to our old jobs or get new ones soon. After having to accept the low pay of the Army we don't want to have to kick back part of our civilian pay to some union's private treasury.

I hope you will exert all your effort to give veterans this decent opportunity to make a living without letting someone else cut in on it and without having to obey someone else who wants to go on strike.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MICHENER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CUBAN SUGAR

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the Republic of Cuba is sending a five-man commission to New York and Washington to negotiate with our officials for the purchase of the 1946 and 1947 crops of sugar.

It is a strange situation when Cuban industry, primarily controlled by American interests, calls upon the Government of the United States to guarantee it against loss on the 1947 crop, in peacetime, and in the absence of Government control. If American industry has reached the point where it no longer is willing to rely upon the open market and competition for its existence, that is a sorry day in the history of the capitalistic system of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper clipping on a phonetic alphabet.

Mr. COFFEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two topics and to include excerpts from newspaper articles.

WIVES AND CHILDREN OF SERVICEMEN MARRIED ABROAD

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I think something ought to be done on behalf of the thousands of young ladies who married GI's overseas and are now unable to come to this country. The GI is back but his wife and child are still overseas. There are more than 20,000 in England alone. I cannot see any reason why transportation should not be provided by the War Department or some other department to bring these women and children over here.

REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS IN THE AUSTRIAN AREA

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was informed by the War Department that arrangements have been made so that packages and mail may be sent to the refugees and displaced persons in the Austrian area. The military authorities will permit the use of the Army postal system for this purpose. Packages to weigh not more than 5 pounds will be handled through the International Red Cross.

I also was informed that the German area under United States military control will possibly be opened up in a few days for mail service and the sending of packages to these displaced persons and refugees. I understand that the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. McCloy, is down there now and is working on this problem. I believe this information will be received gratefully by everybody.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT—FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 4, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In my communication of September 5, 1945, I transmitted for the consideration of the Congress proposed rescissions of portions of several war-related appropriations, including appropriations available to the Federal Works Agency under the heading "Office of the Administrator: War public works (community facilities)" to the extent of $19,115,000.

This item included funds that had been appropriated by the Congress for wartime child-care centers on the understanding with the Federal Works Agency that when the need for women in war production and essential supporting services ended, Federal funds would be withdrawn. Therefore, my communication of September 5 was based upon that understanding.

On August 27 I requested the Federal Works Administrator to present to the Congress the problem which had arisen where local communities were not able to continue needed child-care centers for children whose mothers are the wives or widows of servicemen. The Federal Works Administrator now advises me that the appropriate committees of the Congress do not believe it feasible to enact special legislation to take care of this problem for this particular group of mothers.

Although some communities have already arranged with local funds to operate centers for children of working mothers, the majority of them have not yet completed such arrangements. In some communities, State or local laws, or other limitations make it impossible for them to assume this responsibility by October 31, the presently scheduled date for the termination of Federal assistance.

The reconversion of the wartime child-care program to peacetime operations under which the local communities would assume the financial responsibility requires Federal assistance for a few more months. This extension of time would give working mothers more time to make other arrangements for the care of their children and would give local communities additional time to provide the necessary State or local funds.

Included in the amount which I have heretofore recommended for rescission is an item of $7,000,000 for service projects. If this amount is not repealed, the Federal Works Agency would be able to make Federal funds available for he operation of needed child-care centers until March 1, 1946. I therefore now recommend that the amount of the proposed rescission for "War public works (community facilities)" be reduced to $12,115,000.

Yours very truly,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 34. Pending that, I wish to say that the gentleman from Mississippi requested me to say that he withdrew his objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 9,000 additional copies of the hearing held before said committee on S. 555, entitled "A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 367, Rept. No. 1112), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 805) to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 368, Rept. No. 1113), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation and for other purposes,

and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, if any, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto, if any, to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION OF PERSONS INDIGENOUS TO INDIA

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 361 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. This is such a violent assault on our immigration laws that I think the Members should be here, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 163]

Adams	Bates, Mass.	Brumbaugh
Allen, Ill.	Bell	Buckley
Andresen, August H.	Bennet, N. Y.	Burch
	Biemiller	Byrne, N. Y.
Bailey	Bishop	Camp
Baldwin, Md.	Blackney	Campbell
Baldwin, N. Y.	Bland	Carnahan
Barden	Bolton	Case, S. Dak.
Barry	Boren	Chapman
Bates, Ky.	Bradley, Mich.	Chelf
Clements	Heffernan	Philbin
Cole, Kans.	Hess	Phillips
Cole, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Rayfiel
Cooley	Howell	Reece, Tenn.
Curley	Izac	Rees, Kans.
Daughton, Va.	Jackson	Rizley
Dawson	Jennings	Rodgers, Pa.
Dingell	Kefauver	Roe, N. Y.
Domengeaux	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Fla.
Drewry	Keogh	Rowan
Earthman	Kilburn	Sasscer
Eberharter	King	Scrivner
Elliott	Kinzer	Shafer
Ellsworth	Lane	Sharp
Elston	Larcade	Short
Fellows	Latham	Smith, Va.
Fenton	LeFevre	Snyder
Flannagan	Lesinski	Somers, N. Y.
Fulton	Lewis	Sparkman
Gamble	Ludlow	Spence
Gavin	Lyle	Starkey
Gillespie	McGehee	Stigler
Gillie	McGlinchey	Stockman
Gore	McKenzie	Sumners, Tex.
Gorski	Madden	Taylor
Granahan	Mansfield, Mont.	Torrens
Granger		Towe
Grant, Ala.	Merrow	Vinson
Gregory	Mott	Vursell
Griffiths	Mundt	Wadsworth
Gross	Murray, Tenn.	Wasielewski
Gwinn, N. Y.	Priest	Weiss
Hagen	Quinn, N. Y.	West
Hall, Leonard W.	Rains	White
	Norton	Winter
Halleck	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolcott
Hancock	O'Toole	Wood
Hart	Peterson, Fla.	Woodrum, Va.
Hébert	Pfeifer	Worley

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). On this roll call 285 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs of the House has been conducting hearings on the subject of the atomic bomb. We conducted the hearings yesterday and closed the hearings. We went into executive session this morning at 10 o'clock and worked until 12:15 on the bill for amendments. A unanimous consent request for the committee to sit during the session of the House was made today by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] at my request, and was objected to by the gentlewomen from Connecticut who did not attend the session of the committee. I understand the tax bill is to come up and that the House will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. Under the rules of the House, can the Committee on Military Affairs sit during general debate from 10 a. m. to 12 o'clock noon or during the entire general debate tomorrow without the consent of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It cannot, without the consent of the House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may sit during the sessions of the House, and particularly during general debate on tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that for tomorrow only or does that include this afternoon?

Mr. MAY. I said tomorrow.

Mr. CLASON. If the gentleman makes his request for tomorrow only, I have no objection so far as tomorrow is concerned.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to make certain that it relates only to tomorrow.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, that is what I said. I make the request for tomorrow.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If the gentleman wants to make a unanimous-consent request that the committee may sit tomorrow during general debate on this bill, I have no objection.

Mr. MAY. That is exactly what I did.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION OF PERSONS INDIGENOUS TO INDIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SABATH. I assure the gentleman from Michigan I will yield to him the usual 30 minutes for debate on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes. It provides for 2 hours of general debate after which the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The purpose of the bill is to permit approximately 100 of the 390,000,000 of East Indians to enter the United States annually under the immigration quota law, and to allow the naturalization of approximately 4,000 East Indians who have been in the United States for many years, providing they are able to comply with the regulations governing naturalization, who under the existing law have been precluded in obtaining citizenship. The enactment of this legislation will place the East Indians in the same status as the nationals of other Asiatic nations who are permitted to enter the United States in limited numbers and whose subjects residing in the United States are eligible for naturalization if able to meet the requirements for citizenship.

I am informed there is a general demand for the enactment of the proposed legislation. Only 2 years ago the House passed a similar bill to permit the same number of Chinese to come to the United States under the immigration quota law. The Senate also favorably considered the bill and the President signed it. This action had a wholesome effect upon the Chinese Government and its people and served to cement more firmly our ties of friendly relations with that country.

In 1917 the Congress passed a restrictive immigration law. I am pleased to say I was a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at the time that law was enacted. Naturally, we have amended the law from time to time and I am of the opinion that we should further amend it at this time to accord the same privilege of admission to 100 of the 390,000,000 East Indians to our country annually, and the

same right or opportunity of naturalization to those who have resided in our country for a long period as we have accorded to the Chinese people. The legislation was recommended and urged by former President Roosevelt, also by President Truman, by the Attorney General and the Department of State, and all who are familiar with conditions in India and who have the best interests of our Nation at heart.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], who is a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, will later explain more fully the need for the enactment of the proposed legislation. There are many sound and pertinent reasons why the measure should pass. Of course, I realize there are a few gentlemen in the House who will endeavor to create an issue and shout that the enactment of this bill will open the door for the admission of millions of immigrants. Such assertion is not unusual on the part of these gentlemen who fail to realize that our country has not been injured by the admission of immigrants in the past but, to the contrary, has benefited to a great extent by reason of the large immigration prior to the First World War.

Those immigrants have shown a true democratic spirit and love of our country and have proven their patriotism in the last and present war. Some of the gentlemen of the opposition will claim today, as they have in the past, that the admission of the limited number of East Indians will affect the standard of living of our country and that it will compete with American labor. Such statements are unwarranted because today, notwithstanding the tremendous immigration in the past, the standard of living in the United States is far beyond that of any other nation and the wages of American labor higher than in any other country. Despite the higher cost of production we have been able to compete with the world and have been able to outsell any other nation, regardless of the low wages paid in other countries. The opposition is aware and familiar with these facts and their opposition to the pending measure is due to unwarranted and unjustifiable prejudice.

I repeat there are many reasons why this bill should be passed. The present immigration law is discriminatory in that it excludes East Indians from admission to the United States. It has served as a bait for other foreign nations in insinuating to the East Indians that our country does not deem them as worthy of admission to our country. Such insinuations have been useful to other foreign nations in obtaining political advantage and fostering favorable commercial relations, and which have militated to our disadvantage. The enactment of this legislation will put an end to these insinuations and any resentment the East Indians may have held in being excluded from admission to our country will be eliminated. Opportunities for commerce with India, as with China, are tremendous. By establishing good will we can obtain their confidence and the sharing of their commerce. I predict that within a few years Great Britain will not be able to control India and in the not distant future it will attain its long-delayed freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the minority report on the bill is very vague and is so written as to prejudice any uninformed Members as to the effect of the bill. In order to make clear to the membership the impelling reasons calling for the passage of the bill and what it aims to accomplish, I insert a statement which I requested which should enlighten any doubting Thomases. The statement is by Mr. Edward J. Shaughnessy, special assistant to the Commissioner of Immigration, as follows:

Prior to the act of February 5, 1917, there was no restriction against the coming to the United States of East Indians. In the 1917 act (which is frequently referred to as the basic exclusion act) a so-called geographical area was proscribed and a provision included in the act to the effect that persons born in this area, with certain very limited exceptions, could not migrate to the United States. This proscribed area included all of India and other parts of the Orient. China and Japan had been otherwise taken care of by treaty and agreement.

The barred zone provisions, like the Chinese exclusion laws, became practically useless with the advent of the 1924 Quota Act, because that act provides that persons of races ineligible to citizenship, with certain very limited exceptions, shall not be admitted to the United States.

The Chinese exclusion laws were repealed in the Seventy-eighth Congress by the act approved December 17, 1943. All that act did was to grant a quota of 105 per annum to persons of the Chinese race and to make such persons racially eligible for naturalization. You will recall that prior to this time the only persons, generally speaking, racially eligible for naturalization were persons of the white race, African black race, and Western Hemisphere Indians. The act relating to Chinese made persons of that race ineligible to naturalization.

The bill under discussion makes persons of the East Indian race eligible for naturalization. The bill is not quite as broad as the Chinese Act because the latter act created a quota of 105 a year for persons of the Chinese race, in addition to the quota of 100 per annum for China which covers persons other than Chinese, but racially eligible to naturalization, who are born in China. All this bill does is to make a person of the East Indian race eligible to come in under the existing quota of 100 for India—so he takes his chances along with persons racially eligible to naturalization who are born in India. Likewise, the bill is not as broad as the Chinese Act because there are some 45,000 Chinese aliens in the United States, whereas there is an estimated figure of less than 4,000 East Indians in the United States.

Another distinct feature which appears in both the Chinese Act and this bill is that persons coming under them are chargeable to those small quotas regardless of where they may be born, except, of course, the United States; whereas, as to other quota immigrants, they are chargeable to the quotas of the countries in which they are born, or if born in most places in the Western Hemisphere, are nonquota aliens, not chargeable to any quota.

The various combinations of races specified in sections 1 and 3 of the bill are included in the measure so as to safeguard against persons of mixed blood with minor degrees claiming the right of admissibility under the provisions of the bill.

Further argument does not appear to be necessary because the reasons for the bill are contained in the report. It is noted that the Secretary to President Truman expresses the latter's agreement with the purpose of the bill and, also, the late President Roosevelt strongly endorsed the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by many outstanding American citizens, including educators, religious leaders, publishers, writers, and by various organizations throughout the United States. all of whom urge and endorse the enactment of this legislation. I shall not encumber the RECORD with the names of hundreds of signers of the petition, but shall insert several exerpts from the petition which touch on the moral issues involved. They are as follows:

Every country of course, has the right to have such immigration laws and fix such quotas as it may see fit. The people of India have no desire to ask for any special privileges or treatment. They do not seek unrestricted immigration to the United States, but they do wish and ask that the stigma of inferiority may be removed—as it has been rightly done very recently in the case of the Chinese. If there is to be a democratic world order, with better understanding among the different nations, particularly of the East and the West, then an easy interchange of students, teachers, merchants, scientists, and and philosophers is essential.

Democratic and freedom-loving Americans are certainly not shedding their blood for the continuance of radical discrimination, racial intolerance, racial superiority, which are Hitlerian theories and which must result in wars. India is a nation which has had a great and continuous culture of 6,000 years. India has produced some of the world's most eminent scientists, poets, philosophers, and statesmen.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House any longer, except to say that I hope there will be no opposition to the rule and that nothing will be said on this matter that will create a condition that may be used by our enemies among the 390,000,000 people of India.

I reserve the balance of my time and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, any proposal to liberalize or to restrict the immigration law of the land is always fraught with much controversy. Immigration is a matter in which every one of us is vitally interested. Personally, I have always supported strict immigration laws and do not believe that this bill violates that policy. This bill has been thoroughly considered by the committee having jurisdiction. I am not a member of that committee. I am not as well informed as to just what the bill provides as are the members of that committee who have drafted it and who are familiar with its every detail.

This rule, if adopted—and I am sure it will be adopted—will permit 2 hours of general debate. Then the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule, so that all Members will have an opportunity to vote on any amendment or proposal suggested. It is an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], the ranking member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the rule under consideration makes in order H. R. 3517, a bill that authorizes the naturalization of some 4,000 East Indians

now resident in the United States, and gives the East Indians an immigration quota of 100 per year. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the passage of this bill. I favor it for the same reasons I favored a bill 2 years ago that granted the Chinese similar privileges.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that Stalin is seeking a controlling influence in both Europe and Asia. We all know the effort Stalin is making today, through his Communist agents all over the world, to undermine MacArthur and to weaken Uncle Sam's position in Asia. The work of his agents in both China and India is witness to this fact. We must do what we can to offset his efforts in these two countries, each of which has some 400,000,000 people.

Both India and China are on the verge of an industrial awakening. Each will need to buy hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of machinery, especially machine tools, which we can supply. And the best of it is they can pay for them with the raw materials they have that we need. This will mean jobs for 500,000 American workers each year during the next 10 years. These two countries constitute the greatest potential market for American goods for the next 50 years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to repeat some of the arguments that I made when the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act was before this House. In order to be both exact and concise, I propose to quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, June 10, 1943, but I want the Members to think India every time I say China:

What will be the effect of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act upon the postwar period? Will it aid or hinder us in providing jobs for our returning soldiers? Will it help us preserve our American standard of living after the war is over?

The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Dewey, perhaps the best-informed man in the House on international finance, international credits, and international trade, testified before our committee on the possibilities for American commerce in the postwar period. His testimony was complete, convincing, and irrefutable. In substance, he stated that China, with her 450,000,000 people, now on the verge of a great industrial awakening, offers the only real postwar market for American manufactured goods. He also stated that China will need billions of dollars' worth of American products and that she can pay for these goods because she has vast amounts of raw products that we need, and so can establish the international credits that go with a favorable balance of trade. On the other hand, Congressman Dewey pointed out that while Europe after the war will need vast amounts of American products of all kinds, Europe will have nothing to pay for them, neither raw products nor cash, which means, of course, a repetition of what happened in our trade relations with Europe after the last war. Congressman Dewey left no doubt in my mind that the answer to this question, or series of questions, is an emphatic affirmative.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, one of the greatest statesmen we have ever produced in America, stated in a speech made decades ago:

"Our trade henceforth must be with Asia. The Pacific is one ocean, and the Pacific is the ocean of the commerce of the future. Most future wars will be conflicts for commerce. The power that rules the Pacific therefore will be the power that rules the world."

My only comment upon this quotation from Beveridge is that with close friendly cooperative ties between Uncle Sam and the awakening giant of the Orient, China, there will arise no question as to what joint powers will rule the Pacific hereafter.

Mr. Speaker, the machine-tools industry of America, in its effort to support and sustain the Nation's war aims, produced during the past 2 years $2,200,000,000 worth of machine tools, the equivalent of its total output for 20 years preceding Pearl Harbor. Even though we assume that the Nation will be on a sustained level of prosperity higher than ever before, these permanent additions to the Nation's production tools are more than adequate to meet the demands of our economy for 20 years to come.

During World War I we piled up so great a supply of machine tools, compared to normal needs, that one-third of the companies building machine tools for the First World War were forced out of business; some went bankrupt, some sold out their assets, and some merged with other companies in the struggle for survival that was forced upon the industry in the adjustment period of the difficult twenties.

In view of these facts, unless we find some way to dispose of the surplus machine tools left on our hands at the close of this war, at a profit, we will either have to dump them in the ocean or the thousands of former workers in the machine-tools industry now in uniform will find themselves out of jobs when they come back because the plants in which they formerly worked will be closed. What is true of the machine-tools industry is also true of many other manufacturing industries of America. This is a postwar situation that must be faced.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman spoke about the 4,000 who are in the country at the present time. How can they be in here now?

Mr. MASON. I do not know exactly how they have been admitted.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Those Indians who are here came into this country before the Johnson Act, which was passed in 1924. They have sons and daughters and many of those sons fought on our side in this war and were drafted in the Army. They are here because they came before 1924.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Before the Johnson Act was enacted they were then eligible?

Mr. MASON. Yes. Of course, only those legal residents could apply for naturalization.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Before the Johnson Act they came in here, but they were not put under the Johnson Act. Under that act they were made ineligible for citizenship because they came from the Orient.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If we give them this quota today, and I hope we will, we will be simply restoring the status they had previously?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How many countries are there that do not have a quota at this time?

Mr. MASON. Only China in the Orient has been given a quota.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Some one has told me if they give a similar quota, if we want to do it a little later on, to all the countries in the Orient it would involve only about 800?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It would be less than that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What percentage, if the evidence has been submitted to the gentleman's committee, of the 4,000 who are now residents would be eligible for citizenship?

Mr. MASON. A very large percentage.

Mr. Speaker, China is awakening from her long sleep. She is on the verge of an industrial revolution. She will need billions of dollars worth of machine tools after this war is over to help in her industrial development. She will need railroads built; railroad engines and railroad equipment for those railroads; farm machinery for modernizing her agricultural methods; road-building machinery to build the vast system of hard roads that will be required; and mining machinery to develop her vast mineral resources. Best of all, China will have the raw materials and consequent international credits to pay for these things. And so, Mr. Speaker, our potential trade with China after this war is over should furnish jobs to hundreds of thousands of our boys when they return from the war.

Mr. Speaker, every word I said 2 years ago in support of the bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act is just as applicable today in support of the passage of H. R. 3517 which extends to the East Indians, the same privileges that we have granted to the Chinese. Keeping in mind the best interests of our people, the best interests of our returning soldiers who will be looking for jobs, and knowing as we do that the tug-of-war between Uncle Sam and Joe Stalin is just starting in the Orient, the outcome of which will determine just what influence and position we will have in Asia during the coming years, I say we should act favorably upon H. R. 3517. I claim the passage of this bill will help to provide a cash market for American manufactured goods, thereby creating thousands of jobs for American workmen, therefore its passage will be in the interests of America.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is there anything in this bill that would prevent the people who come in here from being Communist revolutionaries?

Mr. MASON. No; there is not. But there is in our present immigration laws. That is one reason why we want to establish this good will in India, because Communist influence is beginning to permeate India.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. As long as you have added immigration barriers they are going to use it against you. Letting in 100 does not mean anything.

Mr. MASON. It means that they are placed on the same quota basis as England or any other nation. It gives them exactly the same ratio.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They would come under the present 1924 immigration law. They cannot be Communists or Fascists. They have to swear under oath, and it is up to the council to check into that.

Mr. MASON. Of course, the same regulations, the same restrictions, and the same requirements are applied to these people as would apply to anyone who comes in under our immigration law.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understood the gentleman to say that this places India on the same quota basis as England.

Mr. MASON. It does.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But there is a wide difference in the percentages.

Mr. MASON. Not at all. The percentage of our quota is based on the number that were here in a certain year. Of course, England had plenty at that time, and they got the largest quota.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That was in 1890.

Mr. MASON. But it is the same ratio. They are treating them all alike.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I do not understand how we are going to get so much business out of this by furnishing them with the tools. Of course, we are going to lend them the money.

Mr. MASON. Oh, no.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But they are going to borrow the money from us. They have already done it. We furnish them with tools, and so forth that the gentleman is talking about, but with their cheap labor, and with free trade that the gentleman voted against, how can we compete with them? How are you going to expect Great Britain to permit us to get anything much out of India?

Mr. MASON. As far as Great Britain permitting us is concerned, Great Britain under the sterling bloc now permits $50,000,000 to be spent in the United States. But Great Britain is applying for a long-term loan on easy payments, and the trade is that she has to loosen up her sterling bloc so that the Americans can get and will get a good share of India's market.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That was the trade on Bretton Woods, and they did not do it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I hope they will also loosen up on the doors to Palestine and let some poor devils in there that now are seeking admission. May I also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in connection with Great Britain the Embassy requested sanctioning the approval of this quota for India.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are a good many reasons why I favor the adoption of the rule and the adoption of this bill.

The first reason is a moral one. In 1943 we lifted the stigma of inferiority on the Chinese, and there is no reason whatsoever why we should not do it now with a country that has a population of 390,000,000 and perhaps 400,000,000 people. It is difficult to develop good will with a country and still proscribe them and say, "Well, obviously, we are only too glad to deal with you, but your people cannot come to this country."

We like to go to India and we send our trades people there. They can come in only if they are students; if they are exchange professors; if they are tourists under the act of 1917. But how we ever expect to develop good will with so large a country unless we lift this proscription is more than I know. So I think the first reason for the bill is a moral reason.

The second reason is economic. There are great trade opportunities with India. If that standard of living is ever lifted for 380,000,000 people, it will develop a tremendous outlet for the agricultural products of this country. Subsistence standards are extremely low. So many of the people live on a handful of rice and a bit of fish. I saw a great many people there whose income for a day was probably 3 or 4 cents. They need some help, and in proportion as their standards of living are developed so the outlet for all kinds of commodities from this country will also be expanded.

It is a frugal country. You may be surprised to know that the balance in the Bank of London in favor of India right now is probably $4,000,000,000. The British owe India that much. It is a testimony to their frugality, but it is an equal testimony to the fact that they have the money with which to buy when some day those restrictions are lifted whereby they can enter freely into the market and express their desire to buy the goods of the United States of America.

They have some of the finest businessmen I know. The jute business done by importers in this country is done largely with the Bitla Bros. in Calcutta. They have a magnificent office building there, and for all the world it is equivalent to a large American corporation. They are enterprising, they are keen, and they have business acumen. The Tata family in Bombay is one of the greatest enterprises that the world has ever seen. The Bitla Bros. told me not so long ago that they were negotiating to take over a very popular make of American car and manufacture it there. Of course, some of the materials will come from the United States of America. So I say the second reason is that there is a great potentiality for business for this country, in addition to the moral reason.

Then, third, India is going to have her freedom some day. There is a ferment there. It was described in two words to me by a man from this country who said, "If I were to describe India, I would say that it was in a state of suspended revolution." Freedom's ferment is at work. For years and years they have been reaching out for freedom, and it will not be denied any more than it will be denied in other sections of the world. So that day will come, and when it comes, the important controls, the blocked exchange, and some of the other restrictions upon trade will finally be lifted, and it will expand enormously the market for the goods that are manufactured and that are the products of the soil of this, our own Republic. So the first reason is that this bill ought to be enacted for moral reasons; secondly, for economic reasons; and then, third, there is a political reason. We have a mission at Delhi. We have a fine consulate at Bombay. We have a fine consular establishment at Calcutta. I have often marveled that we can so freely ask for space and send our own people there and at the same time not be decently reciprocal in our relations with them. They do not have to let us go there if they do not want to, but they have been very decent and they have been very generous about it. So there is a political reason that commends the enactment of this bill. Today we enjoy a friendly diplomatic relationship with India. Why not promote it by the development of further good will? The fourth reason, in my judgment, would be an ethnic reason. I do not know how it comes about. I suppose it is one of those natural things, but after all the Indian is a Caucasian. It is a delight to talk with him. He is a man of culture and a man of refinement. There are millions of them. Of course, you have people in the submerged and depressed classes. Take a man like Dr. Ambedkar, who is the leader of 70,000,000 untouchables in India today. He is a graduate of Columbia University. Long ago, a very rich man in India took an interest in him and enabled him to go to school, including Columbia University. Today he speaks for 70,000,000. It is a pleasure to sit down with him, he speaks our language as well as we do. He is a brilliant lawyer. He is trying to ameliorate the tragic conditions of some 70,000,000 depressed people over there. Therefore, ethnically, since they are Caucasians and since we confuse it, of course, with the fact that we think of them as Hindus, when as a matter of fact that is only an appellation which applies only to their religion and not to their race, there is an ethnic reason why they ought to be admitted.

Next, there is a language reason. It is amazing—the number of people in India who speak the English language. The English language is the accepted language of the provincial legislatures. It is the accepted language of the Indian Parliament. If you attend the parliament in Dehli, the people who stand at their places in the parliamentary chamber, or who go to the well of the house to make a speech just as we do here, speak the very language which is spoken in this Chamber. Therefore, in the interest of good will and because of the confraternity of language, there is still another reason why it seems to me we ought to get on common ground and admit 100 people and to permit the naturalization of those who are here now.

There are other reasons that could be advanced, but those are the principal reasons.

So permit me to summarize. First, on moral grounds we ought to do this and remove this stigma. Secondly, we ought to condition ourselves now in the field of good will so that when the day comes when freedom comes to them, and even before that time, there will be a ready market for the products of this country. There was a man in my office 2 weeks ago who had just come from there. He had $5,000,000 worth of orders in his pocket from American concerns like the Cleveland Twist Drill and the Buffalo Machine Tool Co., and some plants in New Jersey, Ohio, and elsewhere. His difficulty, of course, was blocked exchange and the import control system that obtains at the present time. In proportion now, as we develop this good will and condition ourselves for a future day as well as the immediate present, so there will be an expansion of the outlet for American products of all kinds, and it will mean jobs for our people.

Then, as a matter of good will, since there is an ethnic consideration involved, since they are Caucasians, I see no reason why the limitations of the act of 1917 and the limitations of the act of 1924 should be permitted to continue.

Finally, permit me to say they are people of culture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think some of the finest things that have ever been written upon the parchment of ancient literature come from India. I think that some of the finest things that have been done in the architectural field will be found there. They are entitled to encouragement in that field. I know of no better way than developing this type of good will which is upon the horizon of the world, the fruition of which we hope will finally eventuate in terms of some kind of enduring and lasting peace. They are far away from here. If we expect to protect ourselves against what is freely referred to as the Communist ideology in the world; if we expect not only to safeguard ourselves but to translate democratic ideals in other corners of the earth, how can you best do it than to start building upon a foundation of good will? So, in proportion as we do this, we shall gain a respectful hearing among those people, and instead of becoming willing converts to some ideology with which we do not agree, there will be an opportunity for us to have the language and also the message of America find a place in those far-off corners. I do hope, therefore, that in the interest of international good will, expansion of trade, and the encouragement of their culture in every field, and to carry out this great fraternity of the language that has become common with our own in these far-flung lands, this bill will pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, after the highly informative statement that has been made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as well as by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I feel it is not necessary for me to say anything further.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 3517, with Mr. CLARK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, there are 2 hours of general debate, 1 hour in control of the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and 1 hour in control of the ranking minority member of that committee.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to some pertinent facts regarding this legislation which I think will be very helpful in determining the merits of the bill.

On March 5, 1945, the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, sent a message to the Congress which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. The late President urgently asked for this legislation on the basis that has been so ably presented by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], so it is needless for me to go into that question further.

There were quite extensive hearings on the bill. After the hearings, there were some questions raised by members of the committee that this legislation might embarrass the British Government, and solely upon that the bill was lost in the committee by a very few votes.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I hope the gentleman will not put the defeat of the bill on that basis. The bill was voted down by a vote of 10 to 6, by those who opposed the bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am just giving the membership the history of the bill. I believe if the gentleman will follow my statement he will understand what I am trying to present.

The question then arose of what position the British Government might take on it. On May 3, 1945, the British Government, through Ambassador Halifax, communicated with the State Department from the embassy in Washington, which communication was referred to me as chairman of the committee, urging the Congress to pass this legislation, and I shall ask unanimous consent to incorporate that letter in my address.

As time went along pressure increased from the State Department and our Government agencies urging the immediate enactment of this legislation in the interests of our country and, on May 18, 1945, I received a communication from William D. Hassett, secretary to President Truman, urging the enactment of this legislation.

The principle behind this legislation is the same as that of the Chinese case, as has been pointed out. This bill does not change any of the requirements for immigrants; it does nothing except to give India a quota which would be about 75 numbers a year. In 100 years there would be about 7,500 East Indians, providing they qualify mentally, physically, and morally. The masses of the Indians are not coming here. It is the merchant of India who is seeking to trade with the United States who will come. He cannot now come except under a visitor's visa and he must apply monthly for an extension of time to stay here under such a visa. All they are asking is that the discrimination against 390,000,000 people as a race be removed and that the few Indians in this country be allowed to apply for citizenship. Most of the sons and daughters of the Indians in this country have served in our armed forces.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill is an equitable bill. If you will take the trouble to read the hearings, you will find, as I have pointed out, its importance to this country and how urgent it is that we pass this bill in the interest of future trade; also, it could be one of the finest gestures we could make toward millions of people.

The following is the text of the letter I received from Franklin D. Roosevelt, the late President:

WASHINGTON, *March 5, 1945.*

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that your committee soon will hold hearings on legislation to authorize the admission into this country under a quota of persons of the East Indian race, and to permit persons of this race to become naturalized citizens.

I regard this legislation as important and desirable, and I believe that its enactment will help us to win the war and to establish a secure peace. I am sure that your committee is aware of the great services that India has rendered to the United Nations in their war against the Axis. The Indian army, raised entirely by voluntary enlistment, has fought with great skill and courage in Europe, Africa, and Asia. India has also furnished and will continue to furnish substantial amounts of raw materials and manufactured products of great assistance in the prosecution of the war.

The present statutory provisions that discriminate against persons of East Indian descent provoke ill-feeling, now serve no useful purpose, and are incongruous and inconsistent with the dignity of both of our peoples.

The quota for East Indian persons would be approximately 100 immigrants a year. There can be no real danger that this small number of immigrants will cause unemployment or provide competition in the search for jobs.

It is my hope that the Congress will take steps to remove the present provisions of our immigration and naturalization laws that discriminate against persons of East Indian descent.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The following is a copy of the letter I received from William D. Hassett, secretary to President Truman, and a copy of the letter he enclosed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 18, 1945.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DICKSTEIN: This letter is in respect to several bills introduced in Congress for the repeal of the exclusion and the granting of quotas to Eastern Hemisphere Indians, which measures, I believe, have been the subject of hearings before the House Committee on Immigration, of which you are chairman.

The President has read the text of a letter addressed to you under date of March 5 by his lamented predecessor. He asks me to transmit to you a copy of that letter herewith and to say that he is in agreement with the position set forth in that letter by his predecessor.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM D. HASSETT,
Secretary to the President.

[Enclosure]

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 5, 1945.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that your committee soon will hold hearings on legislation to authorize the admission into this country under a quota of persons of the East Indian race, and to permit persons of this race to become naturalized citizens.

I regard this legislation as important and desirable, and I believe that its enactment will help us to win the war and to establish a secure peace. I am sure that your committee is aware of the great services that India has rendered to the United Nations in their war against the Axis. The Indian Army, raised entirely by voluntary enlistment, has fought with great skill and courage in Europe, Africa, and Asia. India has also furnished and will continue to furnish substantial amounts of raw materials and manufactured products of great assistance in the prosecution of the war.

The present statutory provisions that discriminate against persons of East Indian descent provoke ill-feeling, now serve no useful purpose, and are incongruous and inconsistent with the dignity of both of our peoples.

The quota for East Indian persons would be approximately 100 immigrants a year. There can be no real danger that this small number of immigrants will cause unemployment or provide competition in the search for jobs.

It is my hope that the Congress will take steps to remove the present provisions of our immigration and naturalization laws that discriminate against persons of East Indian descent.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The following is a copy of the letter from the Attorney General, Francis Biddle:

MARCH 3, 1945.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On February 13, 1945, in response to your request for my views I commented on H. R. 173, a bill to authorize the naturalization and the admission into the United States, under a quota, of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India and their descendants.

I have now given this bill further consideration and I should like to endorse its purpose. The present provisions of the immigration and naturalization laws which discriminate against the people of India seem to me to be unwise and unfair. This is particularly true in view of the important contributions both of men and material that India has made in the present war.

Under the proposed legislation persons of the East Indian race will be eligible to migrate to the United States under the existing quota of 100 per annum now allotted to India but available only to persons presently eligible to naturalization who were born in India. I think this quota restriction is a sufficient protection to this country against excessive immigration from India. Similarly, it seems to me that persons of East Indian descent lawfully admitted to the United States should be eligible for naturalization. The Department's alien registration statistics show that the number of these persons now in the country does not exceed 3,896. Consequently, the number of persons who will be eligible for citizenship under this legislation will not be great.

If you wish me to do so, I shall be glad to appear before your committee and testify in favor of this bill.

I have been advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

The following is a copy of the letter from Joseph C. Grew, Acting Secretary of State:

MARCH 6, 1945.

The Honorable SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DICKSTEIN: I refer to my letter to you of February 9, 1945, in which I stated that the enactment of legislation such as H. R. 173 would remove an outstanding inequity in American immigration and naturalization laws and one which causes bitter resentment against the United States by the people of India.

You will be interested in learning in this connection that the Department has now received strong representations in support of this legislation from Sir Girja Bajpai, the Agent General for India in Washington. The Department has also received a telegram dated February 26, 1945, from the American Commissioner to India, New Delhi, advising the Department that sentiment in India may preclude the extension of reciprocal trade treatment to the United States in the absence of such legislation.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary.

The following is a copy of the letter received by the State Department from Ambassador Halifax:

MAY 3, 1945.

The Honorable JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary of State of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ACTING SECRETARY: I see that when the bill to grant a quota to Eastern Hemisphere Indians and to make them racially eligible for naturalization (H. R. 173) was taken in the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, a member of the committee asked a question about the attitude of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom. Mr. Biddle answered that he thought the bill would be welcomed by His Majesty's Government.

The subject matter of the legislation is, of course, one for the Government of the United States to determine. I should, however, like to assure you that His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom would welcome enactment of a law on the lines of the bill as a gesture of friendship to India, which has played, and is playing, so important part in the war.

Yours very sincerely,

HALIFAX.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCOWEN].

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the passage of this bill. The sponsors of this bill claim, in part, that they favor it for the same reasons they favored a bill 2 years ago that granted the Chinese similar privileges. The main reasons that caused the passage of the Chinese bill 2 years ago were to remove a so-called stigma and to keep the Chinese in the war. No stigma exists in the law against the East Indians and the East Indians are not now fighting Japan. It naturally follows then, that this bill cannot be supported on the same ground that caused the passage of the Chinese bill.

The further idea expressed in support of this bill, that the passage of it will offset Stalin's efforts to spread Communism in India is without any foundation in fact and in my opinion ridiculous to the extreme. It is argued further that this bill should be passed to create a market for machinery and machine tools. We tried the same thing with Japan, having opened Japan up for trade about 1854. We sold her everything with which to make war, from gas to scrap, and got it shot back at us at the expense of many thousands of lives of American boys. Shall we start that with India, that is said to have 400,000,000 people? All the goods that America can sell to India in the next thousand years is not worth the life of one American boy—if it is your boy, or any other American boy, is it? Let us stop this dollar propaganda and maybe they will quit calling Uncle Sam "Uncle Shylock."

The United States through a long period of many years has established a very good immigration system based on the fact that a nation's sovereignty gives it a perfect right to set down the rules and regulations under which nationals of other countries may enter and may become citizens. Too often we hear that an injustice exists when the bars are not let down to this country or that, and that discrimination is against such nationals of other countries. This is not true because the right to enter a country or to become a citizen of it is a privilege granted by the adopted country and not a right. If it be a privilege and a right no injustice and no discrimination can be correctly charged. The sponsors of this bill claim the letting in of 100 a year is insignificant. Perhaps it would be if it would stop there until peace were estab-

lished and a general overhauling of the immigration laws should be deemed advisable and should be undertaken. Oh, yes, admit only 100—that doesn't matter, they say! Do you remember the story of the break in the dike? A leak so small that the water was easily held back until the dike was repaired and safety assured. Let us now stop the leak in the immigration dike. This attempted break in the immigration laws should be prevented and thereby stop danger to the immigration system and assure perfect safety to American labor and the American form of government.

This is not the time to change our immigration policy with respect to the Indians or any other people. This bill does not determine any particular issue. Most certainly many problems will arise out of it if it should become a law. It gives a quota and breaks down a vital point in our immigration policy. It is like breaking a link in a strong, taut chain, as a result of which the entire chain falls, requiring much labor to repair and to restore, even if so much damage has not been done as to make any attempt at repair or restoration impossible. Immediately after peace will have been established, a deluge of people will clamor for entrance. What are we going to do about that?

This bill is only a small forerunner of what is to come—pass this bill and you will soon be confronted with other similar bills of great magnitude.

Oh, they say, we should do this to have the good will of the Indians. Why do we always have to be doing something for other countries to keep them sweet at the expense of our own national interest? Is it not time we look after the interest of America which the passage of this bill is against? Is our employment problem not now looming on the horizon? Is it not likely soon to become a large question? The American Federation of Labor is against the bill. On page 114 in the hearings will be found the statement of Mr. Hines representing the American Federation of Labor. He said that he presented the views of 7,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor, stated that this entire problem should be better considered and better handled after the war was over, and that the A. F. of L. is against the enactment of the bill at this time. Shall we let thousands in as will be requested later to take the place of dead Americans killed in battle or the place of others maimed for life? Shall we let millions in to take jobs in America when we likely shall have a great army of unemployed? I know they say this is "only 100." It was only 100 to pass the Chinese bill. It is only a hundred proposed now for the East Indian bill. It may be only a hundred for another, then another, and again another. And after enough links will have been broken there will be no chain. The sentiment for the immigration laws will be so broken down that it will be impossible to prevent the passing of a law that will let the deluge in.

I object to repealing the immigration law now and I object to repealing it and breaking it down little by little. It were far better to pass a law to stop all immigration for a period of years than to do these unwise things.

Let us overwhelmingly defeat H. R. 3517 and stop the camel's getting into the tent before we are all shoved out!

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one-half minute in order to make a correction. The gentleman stated that the A. F. of L. was opposed to this legislation. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the American Federation of Labor did not definitely go on record in opposition to this bill, and that that statement ought to be corrected.

Mr. McCOWEN. As I said a minute ago, on page 114 of the hearings there is the statement made by Mr. Hines, legislative representative, the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., which anyone can refer to and read and in which Mr. Hines states that—

We—

The American Federation of Labor—

are against the enactment of this bill at this time, in view of our policies, as referred to in our resolution.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Why does not the gentleman read it?

Mr. McCOWEN. A little more than one-half way down on page 114 of the hearings will be found my own specific question to Mr. Hines as follows:

Mr. McCOWEN. Then do I understand that your organization (the A. F. of L.) would be against the enactment of this bill at this time?

Mr. HINES. Yes. We were against the enactment of the bill pertaining to the Chinese. We are against the enactment of this bill at this time, in view of our policies, as referred to in our resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can now get down to business and really consider this legislation in the proper light. I have not had the privilege of going all over the world to see the Hindus, the Koreans, and the Moslems and everybody else like the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has who spoke a few minutes ago, and like some other distinguished ladies and gentlemen who may appear with reference to this bill. But I do live in America. I do know something about the American spirit. I think I know something about what would be good for America.

A good long time ago our forefathers in this Chamber saw fit to enact an exclusion law. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] says he was here, and says he was on the committee. He intimates that he thought he was right at that time, and says he has maintained it since. Our forefathers who were in this Chamber at that time laid down a principle.

The present policy was established in 1917 and reaffirmed in 1924, and again in 1940. You gentlemen sat here in this Chamber and reaffirmed it in 1940. You said in 1940 that you wanted to continue the principle of Asiatic exclusion in our law. You reaffirmed your decision in 1940 to keep intact our immigration law to protect the American people.

We had the Chinese bill up 2 years ago. I felt when we had the Chinese bill up that that would be followed by demands in behalf of the Hindus and the Koreans and the Siamese and every other oriental group. That is proving 100 percent correct so far. The Chinese bill was presented in time of war. It was passed, and now they come in here and ask you to include 400,000,000 Hindus or Indians or Moslems. We held a lot of hearings on this bill, and it was very difficult to find out just what their status was.

They try to base this bill on what we have done for the Chinese. China was a nation and China is a nation. China was our ally. India is nothing in the world but a province of Great Britain. It does not even have dominion status. Whatever India does has to be approved by Great Britain. Incidentally, this bill was approved by the British Ambassador. The British will not give the Indians or Hindus what they want, but they tell us to do this.

I hope the people of India are able to secure dominion status, and I hope that is not delayed any longer. If England would give the people of India some liberty, then we might be able to get some trade from them. In that case there would certainly be more argument for the passage of this bill.

When this bill came before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization some months ago we held hearings and we took a vote on it, and we defeated it 10 to 6. It was defeated on its merits, not because of any confusion about what Great Britain would do or not do or like or not like; it was defeated on its merits because the members of the committee did not think it was time to tear down our immigration laws.

It is true that President Roosevelt endorsed the bill. It is also true that President Truman's secretary sent up a letter on it. You can read between the lines. The President's secretary sent up a letter. Then the bill was resurrected. After all the pulling and the pressure and wirepulling and everything else that could be done, the bill was finally voted out of the committee by a vote of 6 to 9. It was voted down at first by a vote of 10 to 6. After all the pressure that could be brought, it was voted out by a vote of 6 to 9. It is here before you. The arguments for this bill before the committee were summed up in about three arguments. In the first place, they said it would help the war effort. The war was still going on then. They said we owed this to India because India was fighting in the war. It is true that India had a few hundred thousand men out of a population of 400,000,000 under arms. But can anyone deny that they were fighting for their own homes? Japan was trying to invade India. Does this fact alone demand that we change our basic law that has been standing all these many years? No; as a matter of fact, the people of India should be under everlasting gratitude to us because India was saved from the Japs largely through

the effort, the toil, sweat and blood of American manhood. Since the end of the war proponents of this bill have dropped the war-effort idea and have sought other arguments to support it.

Now, the next reason they advance for it is the moral reason which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] mentioned. Let me tell you that the way to help a people is not always to invite them into your house, but to send something to them to help them. I believe in helping the Indian people. I am affiliated with a church that believes in sending the Gospel to the Hindus. We are trying to do that now. I have been trying to contribute throughout the years out of my meager means to send the Gospel to them and I expect to keep it up. There is your remedy. That is the thing we ought to do and do more of. If we can carry the Gospel to the people of India, it will do more good to cement friendship between our people and those people than anything else we can do. Very few people in that great country will ever hear of this law if it is passed. And if they hear of it, they will immediately wonder why you limit a nation of 400,000,000 to a quota of 75 or 100 a year. But if one wants to use the moral side of the argument for this bill, let me urge that we go to the greatest force this world has ever seen for right and morality—the Gospel of Christ. That can be carried to all the people of India and it will establish a bond of friendship for our country that will stand the tests of wars.

Now, the third argument proponents of the bill present for its passage is trade. They put it on a business basis. They urge a change in our basic law, affecting our traditional immigration policy, for business reasons. It is expedient for business reasons, they say. They are willing to reverse our entire immigration policy for the hope of gain. They voted for this very principle of immigration as late as 1940, but now they think they see a good business deal and the principle can be laid aside.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the author of the bill, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and my friend from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and others urge that this bill ought to be passed because of the trade we would get out of it. Well, does not everybody know that we will get just so much trade as England wants us to have out of India? Are we so foolish as to think that England is going to let us have any of that trade that she can handle herself? Let us not be misled by such arguments. Oh, certainly, we may get a little trade, but we will get just as much as England wants to let down the bars and let us have. England through the tariff can and will absolutely control every bit of the trade with India. That is why she will not let India have her freedom. England wants that business and she is going to get it, that is, all she can handle. Yes, we will get a little—what England cannot handle. I do not say this in criticism of England. It is good business for her and she is not going to let it go until she has to. Besides, does anyone think that India would give us that great business even if she could in return for our permitting her a small immigration quota? No; nations do not trade that way. Nations, like individuals, trade where they can get the best bargains if they are free to do so, but since India will have no such freedom, the argument that this bill should pass for trade reasons falls.

But they tell you that bill would admit only 75 or 100 Hindus or Moslems a year and that it amounts to nothing. But the number is not the issue. It is the principle. It is not a question of how many will come here, after all, but the real question is whether or not you want to break down our immigration laws. For a long time now we have had in our laws this policy of excluding Asiatics. Our forefathers thought it was good. They thought it would protect American workers from cheap Asiatic labor. They evidently concluded that it was the right position for America to take. That principle has stood for a long time. As I stated a moment ago, many of you here present voted for it again in the Nationality Act of 1940. Now, were you wrong then? Do you want to reverse your position? Do you want to throw that basic law out the window? That is the larger question. So far as the people of India are concerned, God knows I have nothing against them. I want to help them. I have no hatred in my heart against them. I have talked with many of them when they came before our committee. Frankly, from what I have seen of them, I like them. Of course, it is probably true that those who have come here are of a high type. But this bill strikes at the very foundation of our basic law. Our people back in history set up those laws to protect our Nation. After the First World War they were coming here at the rate of over a million a year and something had to be done to stop them. Now they are going to want to come here again from all over the world. I know it and you know it too. Every scheme and every device is going to be resorted to to bring the people from Europe, from Asia, and from everywhere, to the United States, to take the jobs that our veterans ought to have. Oh, you say 75 or 100 a year will not cut any figure. I tell you, my friends, when you break down the principle, you have gone far. Men protecting levees behind floods know that just a little opening might blow out the entire levee. They argue that this number is small, and they would lull you to sleep with that argument, but they know full well that when they once break down the law, their purpose has been accomplished.

When you break down the principle, when you let in 100 Hindus a year, does anybody in this Chamber think that 400,000,000 Hindus will be satisfied with a quota of 100? Of course not. When they get through breaking down this immigration wall, this bar that was put there long before our time here, and all of them become eligible for citizenship, then the next fight that will be brought to this floor is to admit these people on the basis of the populations in the various countries. That is what you will have. When you do that they will be coming here in streams. That will be the next fight. Oh, my friends, this is the beginning. This is not the end of it.

Another thing I want to mention is this: I read in the paper only about a week ago where Hindus and Moslems were killing each other on the streets over there. Does anybody want to transport to America that internal quarrel that has been going on for ages over there? Do you want to create another problem for your children and grandchildren and mine? Do you want to make the situation any worse here than it is? Where will the American people be 75 or 100 years from now unless we in America call a halt to this thing? I am speaking for the returning veterans. I am speaking for the whole American people. I want to do my best to protect and defend our laws that were set up to give to our people security and protection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that the immigration law of 1924 was passed over the protest of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and it was sponsored by the American Legion and every other veterans' organization in America. They are opposed to breaking down our immigration laws in this way.

If the boys who come back from this war could have their way, they would not be for breaking down our immigration laws in this way.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman.

Now, this is a test. I say to you frankly I have been a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization for several years, and during all that time I have been fighting to maintain our laws; fighting to protect the standards. I repeat I have no prejudice against the Hindus. I have great respect for those pepole. But I have been fighting through the years to maintain our laws and not to drag them down. This vote you are going to cast today is a test. This vote will be a mandate to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization as to our future course. If you want to tear this down, drag it down, if you want the wall to crumble down and let them come in, go on and do it, but it is not going to be done with my vote. I am going to protest against it. I am going to do that in behalf of the American people and the American boys who gave their blood and their lives, some of them, to protect this very thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman very much.

In conclusion I want to reiterate that this is a crucial vote. This is a test vote. I want to know what the House desires to have done. You will be establishing a new policy. We are going to have other bills. This will be followed by other bills to let in Koreans, Siamese, and others. If you break down the law as to 400,000,000 Hindus, Moslems, and others in India, what position do you want your committee to take when Koreans and others make the same

request? I ask you to stand with the members of the committee who voted, 10 to 6, to kill this bill, and with the six members who voted not to vote out this bill the last time, five of whom filed a minority report. I ask you to stand by those members of the committee and to protect our immigration laws. Your vote will make policy. It will be a mandate to the committee. I have tried to do my duty as I saw it. I have tried to preserve our immigration laws. It is for the Congress to say whether you want the laws to stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H. R. 3517, a bill to authorize the naturalization and the admission into the United States under a quota of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India. This bill is a perfected version of bills introduced by myself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] in January 1945, and later by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in February of this year. Hearings were held before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on March 7, 8, 13, 14, of 1945. Because of my absence and Mr. DIRKSEN's in Europe at the time, the bill considered by the committee was the Celler bill.

After these hearings, the Celler bill was tabled in committee by a vote of 10 to 6. On June 14, of this year, the committee moved to consider the Luce and Dirksen bills. At this meeting I testified before the committee in behalf of H. R. 1584 and H. R. 2256, and so did Ambassador Phillips, speaking very strongly for the State Department.

As a result of the administration's and the State Department's increased and increasing support of the bill from the time of its introduction, the committee reconsidered its decision, and reported out the bill we now have before us by a vote of 9 to 6.

Under the existing quota system, this bill will permit the immigration into the United States, from anywhere in the world, of not more than 75 Eastern Hemisphere Indians, or their descendants, a year.

Now during the lengthy hearings on this bill, many reasons were given by a number of important and persuasive witnesses, representing large trade, church, labor, and civic welfare groups and organizations, why we should pass the bill. Most of these reasons suggested that it was to our own immediate self-interest to do so. They were, in short, reasons of expediency—military, economic, and political expediency.

At the time the hearings were held, our Nation was at war with Japan, and still sorely pressed everywhere in Asia. And India's contribution to our war effort, both in the Pacific and the Mediterranean was indisputably great in terms of manpower and material. Much, then, in the hearings was made of the strategic importance of India to us in achieving victory. It was frequently advanced by witnesses that this legislation should be passed as a builder of morale among the Indian troops and a reward for their help and valor in the war against Japan. That reason of military expediency was disposed of by VJ-day. We won the war without passing this bill.

Many reasons of economic expediency were also put forth at the hearings. These reasons, unlike the military ones, are still valid. Witness after witness testified to the great trade and business opportunities which would exist in the postwar world between America and India. Although most of the vast sums of moneys owed to the Indian Government by the British are blocked in pounds sterling in London, and thus forcibly earmarked for spending within the British Empire, yet there is certain to be a surplus of Indian buying power abroad. And Indian buying power in world markets is sure to become ever greater. India is potentially the third greatest industrial power on earth. She is bound to develop rapidly industrially, regardless of any political circumstance which either afflicts or stimulates her economy in the next decades.

Yes; we could do lots of business with India, and India could do lots of business with us in the years ahead. And to be sure, any good businessman knows that it is easier to do business in an atmosphere of good will, which the passage of this legislation would certainly help to bring about. But the increased trade agreement is merely another expedient reason for the passage of this bill. And whether we pass it or not, we will try, and India will try, for purely selfish motives, to do as much business with one another as we profitably can.

To now outmoded military and nonconclusive economic reasons of expediency there were often advanced in the hearings reasons of political expediency. These, I believe, were the most cogent of all. Many expert witnesses pointed out that in the years ahead it will matter greatly to us, in terms of our own national security, whether the Asiatic countries veer toward democracy as we know it, or toward the Soviet brand of democracy.

Mr. Owen Lattimore, one of the experts on the Far East, who is currently being widely read and listened to, not only by laymen but by people in the State Department, suggests that after the war there is going to be a great deal of shopping around, so to speak, among the Asiatic peoples, particularly colonial peoples, for political ideologies. And he rightly feels that they will buy that ideology which promises them most in terms of their own economic and spiritual security. The peoples of Asia are awake and on the march. Because of greatly increased press and radio facilities they are in communication with one another and the world as they have never been before. They are beginning to think in political idioms. And Lattimore points out that there are only three nations which have great political attraction for oriental peoples today: America, Russia, China. He suggests, and I believe he is right, that that nation whose system or ideology shows the greatest hope for their own economic and political advancement, is the one which is bound to have the greatest appeal for the oriental peoples. Now it is axiomatic, as every American Negro knows, that where racial discrimination exists against an individual, a group, or a nation, political and economic advancement for them is markedly curtailed.

There are many, many ways in which I believe that Russia must become much more like America: freedom of expression, freedom of the press, and trial by jury lie close to the heart of all truly free men. But there is one way, a very important way, in which Soviet Russia appears to offer an advantage over us, and that is in the vital matter of racial discrimination.

Whatever Soviet Russia does or does not stand for, whatever it does or does not bring in the way of economic or political advancement to its own nationals, or to those it carries into its orbit, political or economic distinctions made on the colors of people's skin, is something it stands firmly against. The fact that this is so, that official Soviet ideology seems to make room for men of all colors and, therefore, nations of all colors, is a most potent political fact in the world. Perhaps it is the most potent one of all. Certainly we will do well to reckon with it. We know that communism in America has a great appeal for some few American Negroes, who otherwise would despise it, robbing them immediately as it would of their religious liberties, and of economic and political advancement, because communism seems to promise a quick end to the spiritual humiliations and economic handicaps they must suffer simply because they were born with a black skin. The appeal of communism to the colored peoples of every colonial empire on earth is bound to be great for the same reasons. Naturally the colored peoples of Asia, those who are still under white masters, will be inclined, all other forces being equal, to do their ideological shopping in Moscow.

I believe that every Member of this House is familiar with my stand on the subject of Indian independence. For a number of years, like many others in America and in England, I have urged upon the British for reasons of principle, no less than expediency, that India be given a near date line for independence. Ir a radio speech not long ago, I said that if India did not get its independence freely from Great Britain she might, in her despair, turn to communism for comfort, and toward the Kremlin for aid. The danger, I suggested, was not that Russia would spread into India, but that India might spread into the united socialist states of Soviet Russia. If this should happen, India and all its teeming millions—India, with its vast potential industrial power; India, with its rich soul and unexplored fund of spiritual power; India, that great strategic and spiritual heart of Eurasia—might be lost for all time foreseeable to the family of free, liberty-loving nations.

There was a quick and a significant reaction to this statement in a few sections of the Indian press.

Listen to the closing words of this editorial in the Indian Patna Times, which were typical of many others:

Mrs. LUCE is a type common in England, but she is one of the few Americans who have not hesitated to speak out their minds. She

certainly represents the predominant but hitherto nonvocal element in American public life. This war has made them realize that India, too, is their problem. Their future trade is linked up with India's economic and industrial dependence on the western countries. America and the British Empire need not fear an independent capitalistic India. But socialism, backed by Soviet communistic idcals, is a menace which no capitalistic country having its vested interests or its eyes on the future purchasing power of India can afford to ignore. * * *

Indians are still in a large measure backward and illiterate, but they possess by now animate power to distinguish between friend and foe, between the benefactor and the deceiver. India and Indians are not going to walk into Stalin's parlor, nor are they prepared necessarily to mistake a Truman for a "True-man." India is determined to build its own destiny, but in so doing it will not hesitate to examine all political, economic, and social principles practiced in the past or the present. India cannot afford to be blind to the great experiment and practical progress registered in the economic sphere by the Soviet Union. * * *

Mrs. LUCE speaks the truth when she says: "The appeal (communism) can make is the appeal of activity as contrasted with inertia." India will not deny that the Soviet system has a great fascination for its people, for it is an appeal to activity instead of the present inertia. * * * India is awakening. India is not ashamed to confess that she is prepared to try, as an independent entity, with such local variations as necessary, the same economic system which prevails today in the U. S. S. R.

That is only one expression of Indian opinion. It is by no means the expression of the opinions of India's most powerful leaders, such as Nehru and Gandhi, whose pattern for an independent India still lies closer to the American and British parliamentarian pattern than to the Soviet dictatorship one. But I believe that the Russian idea is bound to gain ground among India's millions if America has no greater appeal to offer than she has today.

What is most significant about that editorial is how clearly it shows to what extent the picture of America must have become falsified and distorted in the oriental mind. America and its system, in times past, have offered and given more hope of freedom and individual liberty and economic advancement to all peoples of the world than any other nation in the world. And today it still does so. But today America is losing this position of leadership in Asia. Wendell Willkie warned us truly of this when he said 3 years ago that the reservoir of good will for America in Asia was running low. In India and in the colonial world America, once the hope of all enslaved peoples of every color, race, and creed, is slowly coming to be viewed, at worst, as a nation of dollar imperialists, of hypocritical coexploiters with other imperialistic nations, of the black, brown, and yellow man. And at best, as a country which, in spite of its vast power and professed ideals, does not practice what it preaches abroad. Yet, more and more today, colonial peoples are looking for inspiration and economic salvation toward Russia rather than toward us, as did all the world, including Russia, from 1776 until the time of Versailles. The loss of moral leadership implied by such a reorientation of the colonial peoples of Europe and Asia, and, yes, Africa, too, toward Soviet ideals can be, I repeat, a very great tragedy for our Nation and for the cause of our democracy and our freedom everywhere in the world.

At our peril we will ignore it, at our peril we will fail to do everything we can to regain that leadership. We can regain it, if in our dealings with nations and peoples we stick with principles instead of trying to follow expediency.

What are the principles which we should consider in passing this specific legislation before us?

Let us take our immigration laws and address ourselves, not to the reasons why it would be expedient to pass this particular immigration bill, but the fundamental American principle which demands that we pass it and which we shall betray in the eyes of our own people, as well as India's, if we do not pass it.

As I understand it, the original principle behind our immigration laws was the principle that any man, providing he fulfilled certain specific qualifications equally applicable to all men, was eligible for entry and citizenship, regardless of race, color, or creed. The quota system was a device applied to our laws which controlled the numbers of such men who could enter the United States of America. The quota system was devised to guard against nationals of other countries from coming here in numbers so great as to lower our existing living standards or dilute our growing American culture and deepening tradition.

The Congress controlled that eager flood of immigration by the quota system. Today, it is no longer a flood, but a trickle, the management of which is entirely in our hands upon this floor, for we can increase or decrease this Indian quota—or any of our quotas at will. Where the trouble came in, and where it still lies, is that some years ago we arbitrarily decided, by passing the exclusion acts, that no Asiatic—that is to say, a man with a brown or yellow skin, regardless of how healthy, intelligent, skilled, or otherwise fit—was fit for American citizenship. The principle we abandoned when we decided this, was a great American principle, perhaps the greatest of all: namely, that all men, regardless of color, race, or creed, are judged alike, not only in the eyes of God, but in the eyes of Uncle Sam. And the principle—the dangerous principle, yes the Hitlerian principle, that we put in its place, was the principle of racial discrimination. It is this principle of racial discrimination existing within the framework of our quota system which must be removed.

Two years ago for reasons of military expediency, we struck that Fascist principle from our books in the case of the Chinese. Let us, not for reasons of expediency, which often change or wither and die under the impact of events, but simply because it is right to do, strike it from our books in the case of the Indians now.

Mr. Chairman, the decision we take today about the admission of 75 Eastern Hemisphere Indians a year is certain to have a profound effect upon the minds of all Asiatics for many years to come. For this bill is a significant test in the eyes of millions of Indians and other Asiatics, of our much vaunted devotion to the enactment of our laws, without regard to race, creed, or color. But to come nearer home than India, there are few bills which the Negro press of this country, representing 13,000,000 of our own citizens, feels more deeply about than this. If we fail to pass it, if we fail to admit 75 Eastern Hemisphere Indians to our shores, under the existing quota system, our American Negroes, and their press will feel, and I believe justifiably, that we have denied to a mere handful of immigrants those economic and spiritual opportunities which under American law we have extended to hundreds of thousands of other immigrants, simply because of their color. To the extent they feel this, a vote on this bill, is a vote on the racial question here at home.

If we fail to pass this bill, we shall further damage our claim to moral leadership not only throughout the Asiatic world but here at home among our own colored people.

It is to this principle of racial descrimination that such diverse minds as follow, expressed themselves last March in the hearings before the Immigration Committee which led that committee to report this bill favorably. Here is what was said by Mr. V. A. Dodge, a businessman of New York City:

I have developed a very intimate knowledge of the Indian businessman. * * * I know he is a man of as fine honor as anyone I have ever done business with, and I have done business with people all over the world.

I respect him, and I dislike to feel that he is discriminated against.

You raise this question: "Does a hundred mean anything?" * * * Yes, it means a lot to those people. It is that gesture, that feeling, "Now we are out of that class discrimination." They do not ask you to do other than what we have already done for many countries and nations.

William Henry Chamberlain, foreign correspondent and author:

The maintenance by this Government of any form of official race discrimination places a stamp of hypocrisy upon our war aims and is a great handicap to our fighting men in Asia.

The Reverend Father John LaFarge, editor, America:

An important token and recognition of a kinship with the people of Asia which, in the coming epoch, our country cannot afford to overlook.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, president, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America:

I have long been on record as favoring the revision of our immigration laws to place all people upon the quota basis and to eliminate all restrictions based upon color or other discriminatory factors.

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver:

An act of simple justice in consonance with the basic traditions of America.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think the gentlewoman is giving the Russians too

much credit when she believes their talk about having no racial discrimination. They persecuted the Jews in Poland. They are now persecuting the Jews in Arabia. They are back of the Arab movement to prevent the immigration of Jews into Palestine.

Mrs. LUCE. Whatever their secret practice is, their official propaganda and policy is against racial discrimination. I take it that the lady from Illinois is also against the principle of discrimination as she indicts Stalin for practicing it, in which case she must unavoidably vote for this bill.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That does not follow at all; I am sorry. The gentlewoman has used language several times where she was not quite logical in her sequences. How does the gentlewoman think that 100 people coming in here is going to increase trade with India?

Mrs. LUCE. I have already said that I do not think these reasons of economic expediency are conclusive. I am in accord with the gentlewoman in believing that letting 75 Indians in will not make much difference in our trade. I am speaking of the principle of discrimination as the decisive one in this debate, and I gather from the gentlewoman's words that she is against racial discrimination in our laws, too, and is therefore for this bill.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. This bill is not going to help racial discrimination. I would like to ask this further question, if the gentlewoman will yield. The gentlewoman knows, of course, that during the past few years a large percentage of the people who have come in here from foreign countries have been Communist revolutionaries. Does the gentlewoman not know that this bill will certainly be used for that purpose?

Mrs. LUCE. It would be exceedingly difficult for the gentlewoman to prove, that if 75 Indians come into this country, they are all bound to be Communists.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The statement that a large percentage of those who immigrated to this country in the last few years were Communists is one that cannot be substantiated. In fact, our immigration laws forbid anyone who declares he is opposed to the Government and wants to overthrow the Government, and sl.uts out communism. So the only way any Communist can get into this country under our present laws is to lie about his belief.

Mrs. LUCE. I thank the gentleman for the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 additional minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I should be greatly interested to know, if the gentlewoman has the information, what the law and the policy of Russia are with respect to the immigration of Indians.

Mrs. LUCE. I am sorry, I cannot answer that, but I would hazard a guess that whatever Russia's immigration laws are, this is still a more desirable country; more people want to come here than go to Russia. That ought to prove something about the respective merits of our two systems.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentlewoman agree with the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana that we are departing from our immigration laws and destroying the basic principle, or is it not rather the case that we are merely extending the principle and for the second time bringing in some of these peoples around the world under the formula? We are not leaving the formula; we are here fortifying the basic formula under which our immigration laws have been established. I believe the gentlewoman will agree with me that we are not tearing down any barriers; we are merely carrying on with other peoples the same principles and policies we have followed hitherto all through our history.

Mrs. LUCE. I am in complete accord with the gentleman. I thank him for bringing up that point. I want to say again, that at our peril we are going to ignore the fact of our loss of moral leadership throughout the world, which will continue until we abandon arguments of expediency for those of principle.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentlewoman just used a phrase which I think could well be brought in here. It is at our peril that we, representing white folks, will continue to practice discrimination against various kinds of colored folks in a world where they outnumber us tremendously. I thoroughly agree with the high moral principle that the gentlewoman bases her plea on. I also want to urge that we continue to live in a world in ferment and turmoil. We of the minority race and minority color on this planet will at our peril continue to practice discrimination against the majority. Before the final test comes we had better—indeed, in order to prevent a test, we must—abolish principles of discrimination based upon color.

Mrs. LUCE. I thank the gentleman for that very fine speech. I, too, thought while the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] was asking the categorical question, What would become of our children and our children's children if we let 75 Indians a year into America? What would become of them, if we did not? Well, I can tell him what may become of our children and our children's children, if we go on with policies of racial discrimination in America, and our laws and attitudes applying to colored peoples of the world. What will happen is that we will turn over a billion of the world's population solidly against us, because they will come to know that we do not mean what we say, when we say we believe in democracy.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I gladly yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. In Louisiana we have levees, and we know what happens to the people behind the levees when you blow up the levees. That answers the question that was asked here just a moment ago.

Mrs. LUCE. Now, it is constitutionally within our power on the floor of this House to control the numbers admitted under the quota system. We set both the numbers and the quotas here. Anybody who does not like the numbers of people who come to this country can say so, and if enough of them do not like the numbers of people coming from other nations to this country, we can, with legislation on the floor of this House, decrease those numbers. At any time we choose, we can say people from other countries are coming here in such numbers as to threaten our standards of living and dilute our American traditions and our American culture, and we can, if we wish, cut down the numbers. I am addressing myself not to numbers who come under the quota system which it is entirely within the power of the gentleman from Louisiana, and like-minded people if there are enough of them, to control. What is important is that there should not be legislation discriminating on color lines on the statute books of a country which claims to believe in no discrimination against people because of the shape of their noses or the slant of their eyes or the color of their skin. Such legislation must be taken off our books, because the greatest American principle, the very greatest principle of all, or so I believe, is that every man stands equal in the eyes of God and of Uncle Sam.

If the able gentleman from California rises in disagreement I will yield to him gladly.

Mr. GEARHART. I did not rise to dispute that or any other point which the very able gentlewoman has raised. On the contrary, I rose to tell the lady from Connecticut that I sympathize very much with her in her argument against discrimination. The question I have in mind, which I would like to have the lady discuss, is, How can it be said we are eliminating discrimination when we admit only 75 native Chinese and only 75 Hindus, and at the same time welcome into our country 25,957 Germans, 65,721 Englishmen, and 5,802 Italians, and so on down the line? How can anyone say, with that discrepancy in figures before us, that discrimination will be eliminated from our considerations by the enactment of this measure?

Mrs. LUCE. I hope I made it clear that I would be the first to protest against people from any nation, of any color, coming here in such numbers as to lower our living standards and weaken our culture. This is a principle on which we are all agreed. And it does so happen that the peoples of the Orient can underlive us. They can live cheaper than our

people will, or than the people from Germany or France or Italy will live. It does so happen that their philosophy of life and their religions are more alien to us than those of Europeans. We are utterly justified in controlling and keeping low oriental immigration in terms of numbers, because of the fact that they in too great numbers may undermine our way of life, our living standards, our form of religion. But we are not justified in discriminating against orientals in toto, simply because they have skins of a different color. The proper reason for keeping orientals out in great numbers is because of those economic facts, but it is certainly improper to keep them out altogether, simply because they are orientals.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. There is no actual discrimination against them in letting in 100 Indians, 65,000 English, and 26,000 Germans, because the same formula applied to the English allows them 65,000, and applied to the Irish allows 17,000, and applied to the Germans 26,000 or 27,000, and applied to the Chinese 105, and applied to the Indians 100 per year. The gentleman from California is a member of the Ways and Means Committee. They have a tax of 3 percent on income. Three percent on $100 is $3. Three percent on $1,000,000 is a larger sum, but the principal is equal. Equity, and no discrimination.

Mrs. LUCE. I am so glad that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] does not at all dispute the principle of discrimination, and that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has clarified the fact that all we seek to do by taking this antiexclusion legislation from the books is to revert to the principle that the existing quota system shall be applied to all men everywhere alike, regardless of race, color, or creed.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. The argument, in my opinion, that the enactment of the legislation will convince the people of China or of India that they are no longer discriminated against will fall unless you allow them to come in in proportion to their numbers. If you want to eliminate absolutely the thought of discrimination from the minds of the Hindus, you have to let as many Hindus come to this country in relation to the total population of India as 65,000, the British quota, is related to the 44,000,000 people who live in England.

Mrs. LUCE. Perhaps if the able gentleman were more familiar with Philippine legislation he might change his views. For instance, there is no feeling of racial discrimination between the Chinese or the Filipino people. But there is a great deal of feeling in the Philippines about the number of Chinese who try to come into the Philippines, whose living standards are a great deal higher than those of any other oriental people. Wherefore, there is legislation in the Philippines cutting down the number of Chinese who may come in, and allowing the people of other higher-living-standard nations to come in more freely. But the Chinese do not call this racial discrimination, and, in effect, it is not racial discrimination.

Mr. GEARHART. May I ask the gentlewoman if we should extend this right to enter the United States to the Chinese and to the Hindus and at the same time withhold it from the Filipinos, who have lived under our flag for 47 years and who have been loyal to our country throughout the war which has just been brought to a victorious conclusion?

Mr. JUDD. They have a quota of 50 a year right now.

Mr. GEARHART. Am I in error in my understanding that the Philippine Independence Act contains an exclusion provision?

Mr. JUDD. When the Filipinos become independent, there certainly will be a similar bill to give them also a permanent quota.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman may be correct in respect to what a future Congress may do. I do not know. But when the Philippines become independent, which will be July 4 next year, every Filipino will be thereafter excluded from the United States by virtue of the Independence Act now on the statute books. By the enactment of this legislation are we not in fact emphasizing an ancient discrimination?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. May I, Mr. Chairman, sum up this whole matter by quoting from the testimony of Dr. Walter Van Kirk, secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, a council which represents 25 percent of the largest and most influential denominations of the country. Though he did not, the numbers and power of the denominations which he represents might well have allowed him to say that he spoke with the Protestant voice of America on this bill. He said:

> As I understand the bill before the committee, it is not proposed that East Indians shall be accorded any special favors but only that the stigma of racial discrimination, insofar as those people are concerned, shall be removed from our immigration and naturalization laws. This is an action dictated by the ethical precepts of the Christian religion, and by the concern of the American people that the principles of democracy and fair play shall become operative throughout the world. * * * It is the belief of the Federal Council of Churches that such racial discrimination * * * does violence to the Christian view of one humanity under God, and is contrary to the democratic principles upon which this country was founded.

Thus speaks eternal principle, which is a far firmer foundation for lawmaking than either military, economic, or political expediency; and I do not have any doubt that it is upon this firm and eternal principle that we will legislate today.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, we are living in a world in which it is altogether possible for any nation large or small within the course of a reasonable period of time to equip itself with weapons of war against which there is no known defense, weapons of war capable of almost wiping out the civilization of a whole nation by a surprise attack. Against that situation only one known defense exists, a moral, spiritual, and religious advance among mankind in the next few years that is in some degree comparable to the scientific advance of the atomic bomb. We say, and we believe, and it is true that America is the greatest Nation in the world. By that same token it is more incumbent upon us to treat with reasonably decent respect the peoples of this earth, particularly the underprivileged people than would be the case with any other nation. It is furthermore of greater importance to us to try to engender good will toward our country among every people in this world. We must deal with vision and understanding, not only for the sake of other peoples, but of our own children.

The instant bill does not change by one single syllable the number of people who can enter this country under the immigration laws. It merely says that of the quota of 100 persons for India a portion of that number may be filled by native Indians, and that all of it does not have to be filled by European people.

It seems to me that the heart and soul of this move on the part of the Congress, therefore, is simply to accord a decent share of respect to some 350,000,000 human beings. Whatever you or I may like to do, whatever may be the easy attitude for us to take toward this, that or the other person or group of persons, let me tell the membership of this House that in this hour we shall either attain a reasonable approximation to human brotherhood on this earth or face the imminent possibility of the virtual destruction of human civilization, if not a large part of the human race itself. We live in a new age. It is almost impossible for us to realize how completely the bomb that blasted Hiroshima erased, likewise, the old familiar world in which men once lived. The whole world is now united in one fate, for good or ill, to an extent never before dreamed possible. May God help us to understand and to act upon our understanding.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I am definitely interested in what the gentleman has said. He and I are in agreement that the law now exists whereby 100 Indians per annum can come into this country. Assuming that is true and assuming that there exists a discrimination on the part of England in that she lets Englishmen come in but not Indians, why is it not England's move first and not ours?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. England cannot do anything about it. Our immigration laws specifically provide, unless this bill is passed, that people who are native to India cannot come in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, as has been properly stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], this bill does not change the Indian quota. The quota has always been there under the act of 1924. We do not ask for one person to be added to that quota. In the years 1925 to 1944 about 1,020 persons came in under the Indian quota, but they were English, Dutch, or French, or other nationals who had been born in India; but Indians, as such, could not use their quota because they were racially ineligible for citizenship. Under the Nationality Act, they were in the so-called barred zone. Because they were not able to be naturalized they were unadmissible despite the quota.

Under the instant bill, the 100 quota will cover all born in India as well as Indians born outside of India; but of those born in India, probably only a few of them would be Indians coming in under the bill. Others would include primarily French, English, Dutch, and so forth, all of whom have been born in India. Three thousand eight hundred and ninety-six Indians are now in the United States. They have registered under the Alien Registration Act of 1941. Most of them came in before 1924, the date of the present Immigration Act. They are already assimilated here; they are a part and parcel of our life.

Last Sunday I met a delegation of Indians who came up from the Imperial Valley to Los Angeles, where I met them. They were businessmen, they were farmers, they were professional men; they were all upstanding gentlemen, cultured, refined, educated, soft-spoken, thoroughly Americanized. Those men would be permitted to become naturalized under my bill. Over 200—in fact, 215—of their sons served in our armed forces. Many were born here, and they are, therefore, citizens because they were born here, and thus could vote. All of the others will, under my bill, become eligible for citizenship. All who come in under the quota of 100 will be entitled, under proper regulations, to become citizens.

Mr. Chairman, only a small number of Indians, less than 100, will come in yearly, probably only 50 or 60; and when I say "Indians" I mean Indians as such of Indian blood, born in India. What will this mean? Six hundred in 10 years. In 100 years 6,000. Surely there will be no disruption to our economy with so little a trickle of Indians coming into this country under this bill.

Indians do not usually migrate or emigrate out of their own land. They have an intense love for their country, and you rarely find Indians in large or goodly groups outside of India. But—and this I want to underscore and emphasize—the passage of this bill will create great psychological and, indeed, great economic benefits to us. Failure of passage, after we have considered the bill, would involve a terrible and terrific let-down in India. The Indians are a proud people with thousands of years of culture and history behind them. They would resent the continued aspersions that we cast upon them. Passage would mean that we would remove a sinister bar that has existed against them for a good many years. If we do not remove that bar, they will say, "You helped in the case of the Chinese; why not us? We are just as important as the Chinese. We are just as proud a nation. We have just as much historic culture as the Chinese have." They will say—and I agree—that the passage of the bill would establish a bridgehead of mutual esteem and respect. The Indians resent the present situation wherein we deny entrance and citizenship to them. We thus call them directly an inferior breed. This bill does simple justice, long overdue. The Indians reason thusly: We were brothers in war. We were allies in battle. Why should we not be brothers and allies in peace? They say, "We helped you open the Burma Road. Our aviators went through blood, sweat, and tears with your aviators. Why should America continue to look upon us as inferior during peace? If we were good enough in war, we should be good enough for you in peace."

May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana who did not speak too feelingly of the Indian effort in the war that he might well read what Gen. Mark Clark said concerning the Indian troops under his command. On February 27 of this year he said:

> No obstacle has succeeded in delaying these troops or lowering their high morale in fighting spirit. I salute the brave soldiers of these three great Indian divisions.

Gen. Lucian Truscott had this to say about the Indian troops under his command:

> The Indian troops in this theater won the respect and admiration of all Allied soldiers with whom they have been associated. It is an honor for any commander to have such troops under him.

May I point out to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] that the Indians had the largest volunteer army of all the Allies. They were two and one-half million volunteers. There could have been ten or fifteen million Indian volunteers in the British Army if the Empire of Great Britain would have permitted it. India supplied 60,000 merchantmen who were attached to the British merchant marine. India had an air force comprising 300,000 men. They rendered yeoman service on all fronts and rendered immeasurable aid to our Generals Wingate, Chennault, and Stillwell.

The late lamented President Roosevelt wholeheartedly approved this bill. His letter appears in the proceedings and hearings on this bill and in the report of the committee. I have a letter before me from President Truman, which was addressed to me under date of September 26. In part it reads as follows:

> I have indicated on several occasions my interest in H. R. 3517. I think it ought to pass.

May I say to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] that I am informed by Mr. J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America, a very distinguished gentleman, that the high Government officials of the Government of India are holding up the proposed treaty of commerce and navigation between the United States and India pending the outcome of this legislation. Negotiations for that treaty started about 4½ years ago. It is being held up. The high Government officials are watching this legislation.

They are anxious to go forward with this treaty with the United States so that there may be increased international trade between the two countries. I do not know whether they will refuse to go on with the treaty if this bill is defeated. Certainly we would not place them in a very favorable frame of mind if we defeated this bill. Surely the passage of this bill will create a sort of entente cordiale. It would facilitate increased trade because it would create a better atmosphere of friendship.

I still think we must pass this bill with enlightened self-interest. India is a great reservoir for trade upon which we can draw for orders not only for consumer but for capital goods. There is a great scarcity of goods in India. India needs goods badly. The dearth of goods is creating tremendous inflation. We can supply those goods. India covets our goods. She wants our goods.

I might tell you that we owe India at this very moment about $1,500,000,000. How? India supplied us during the war with jute, manganese, bauxite, tin, and other strategic materials. We supplied India with little during the war. As a result, there is an international balance due India from us in the sum of about $1,500,000,000. That money is locked up in the sterling area bloc pool in Threadneedle Street, England, but England cannot keep its hands on those dollars much longer. She must let go her grasp. When she lets go that grasp and the dollars are restored to India, India will want to buy our goods. She wants to buy our capital goods, she wants to buy our consumer goods.

There is in this country an Indian Supply Mission that is buying American goods, not to the extent that India wishes, because, unfortunately, England cannot supply presently to India the dollars with which to buy those goods. But I repeat, England cannot withhold those dollars too long. They must be forthcoming with which to buy American goods.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman says that England will have to take her hands off these dollars in the bank that are supposed to belong to the business people of India. That would suggest that she would first have to take her hands off the people of India, would it not?

Mr. CELLER. That may be. One has naught to do with the other, as far as the bill is concerned.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If she can keep her hands on the people, can she not keep her hands on the dollars?

Mr. CELLER. That is quite beside the argument on the instant bill.

Leading commercial and industrial organizations such as the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, have openly expressed their

opinion that unless this discrimination against people of India is removed they will not encourage increase in trade between the two countries.

Defeat of this bill will defeat efforts to better relations with India.

When the Rules Committee gave its favorable report on my bill, same was received with enthusiasm in the Indian press. Contrariwise when word went forth that the bill might be defeated in the Immigration Committee, there was deep disappointment bordering upon resentment, and items appeared saying the United States still considered India and Indians inferior. The effect was very bad. Commentators began to question our good faith as to the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms."

Particularly, businessmen and industrialists expressed keen regret and doubted placing postwar orders with us.

There has been proposed for India and its wise and sagacious industralists and manufacturers and public officers the so-called Bombay plan.

That plan seeks, over a period of a decade and a half, to increase the productivity of India—industrial and agricultural—to increase living standards and the per capita income.

This plan calls for a great upsurge of American purchases.

In a recent issue of Foreign Affairs, P. S. Lokanathan, eminent Indian, wrote concerning the Bombay plan:

> Her (India's) internal resources are vast and untapped, her foreign balances substantial * * *. It is here that the need for close cooperation between India and the west, particularly the United States, is most essential. India must send out at least a few hundred men every year for training in all spheres of economic activity, and she must arrange to bring American engineers, technicians, chemists, businessmen, and administrators to India. * * * The immediate effect of her economic reconstruction will be a great impetus to imports from abroad, particularly from America, perhaps the only country that can meet the demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to enactment of H. R. 3517, now before us, and which seeks to permit immigration of citizens of India now barred from this country by the immigration laws. I oppose this measure just as I opposed the measure in 1943 which reversed our position and let the Chinese come to this country and become naturalized. My reasons for opposition to the pending measure are the same as those I have heretofore expressed.

Prior to December 17, 1943, the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States was limited to white persons, persons of African nativity or descent, and descendants of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere. Following the First World War millions of people from other lands demanded the right to move to the United States. It was necessary to strengthen our immigration laws at that time to prevent this flood of immigration we could not absorb. We are face to face with that situation again but are not meeting it with much success. The measure which let down the bars for the Chinese is now being used as a precedent for the Indians. If we pass this measure we will have two precedents which can be used to further weaken the immigration laws and let in other people. The camel's nose is under the tent.

Advocates of the policy that we should let down our immigration barriers to those people who cannot be assimilated into our population are traveling with the same crowd of no-good do-gooders and downfallen uplifters who think this country should be run as a free-lunch counter for the whole world. They advocate that this country should be one state in a world state. We may come to that, but now is no time for it. I am interested in preserving the American standard of living, which is the highest in the world. We cannot do it if we let down the immigration bars. I am interested in preserving the American concept of government. We cannot do it if we continue to let floods of people come into America with alien ideologies and with the avowed intention of overthrowing this Government. I am interested in seeing to it that our returning war veterans have jobs. They will not have jobs, there will not be enough to go around, if we force them to compete with hordes of immigrants used to a lower standard of living. Why should our war heroes have to compete with these foreigners for American jobs? Our men have earned the right to return to their jobs without having to compete with them with foreign people whose necks they have saved.

My heart goes out to the oppressed peoples of other lands. I have seen at first hand their sad situations. But, charity begins at home. We must not so weaken ourselves that in the future we will be unable to help oppressed peoples abroad. My position in this matter is not a decision made on the question of race. It is simple economics. Set a small quota for these new immigrants you say? Yes, and then the quota will be raised a little each year. I say, let us stop all immigration for a few years until we have made sure that we have taken care of the people now in this country and who have not yet found it the land of milk and honey the average immigrant thinks it is. Let us not have to add to our relief rolls at Government expense the hordes from the teeming shores of foreign lands. Most of these people no longer come here and go out in the country and start earning their way at hard work on the farm or in the frontier country, such as Alaska. No. They settle in our big cities where they continue to speak their native tongues, practice their native customs, preach their native ideologies, and aggravate our national ills. We have enough trouble on our hands as it is. Those groups of foreign peoples, excluded heretofore, were excluded for good reasons. Those reasons, in my opinion, are stronger now than ever.

Let me make it clear, I do not wish to minimize the contribution which has been made to America by immigrants. America is a Nation created by immigrants. But, the situation has changed in the last few years. America has grown up. She needs time to adjust herself to her new responsibilities and to take care of the children she now has. Until she sets her house in order she should make haste slowly in adopting the neighbors' kids:

> But if any provide not for his own and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel. (1 Timothy 5: 8.)

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDFRO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the subject of immigration is always highly controversial. Two years ago when the bill was before the House to admit 105 Chinese to this country, I voted for it. I look upon this bill with favor and expect to vote for it.

Perhaps one of the most compelling speeches made on this floor today was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. There are economic and political reasons why this country ought to take this step.

Only yesterday I discussed the question of Asia and India with one very high in the service of this Nation who had just returned from India.

I was amazed to learn from his lips of the deep penetration of an ideology of government which is the very opposite in principle to the Government which you and I represent in this Chamber. He is gloomy. He looks to the future with great concern; he is very much disturbed. He sees no brightness nor encouragement concerning conditions in the Orient. For that reason and from the information which I have thus far gained on this floor, I am going to support this bill. I am interested in the 4,000 who are residents in this Nation, many of them students. In my home city of Royal Oak, Mich., there once lived one of those students from India. For nearly 10 years I have introduced a bill in every session of this Congress to make this individual a citizen of the United States. Of course, the Department opposed that proposal upon the ground that you cannot change the basic law of the country for one person. The law must apply to an entire class or race. That individual who lived in my home city came here as a student with a degree from a university of his country. After he arrived here, he obtained degrees from two of the universities in the Middle West, one of them the University of Minnesota. He is a genius in his particular field or specialty, which is the subject of pigments or paints. He is such a genius that he is now employed by one of the great corporations of the country. He did considerable work in the laboratories of the Ford Motor Co. I was informed when the war broke out he created or discovered a paint which could not be photographed. Willingly and voluntarily, he turned that secret over to the Government of the United States to assist us in the recent conflict. That is the type of individual, I think, which makes up a large portion of the 4,000 Indians or natives of India now resident in this Nation. This man is married to an American girl. They have an American family. I can say to the Members of this House that his services are considered of such value in the in-

dustrial world that he receives about twice the amount received by Members of Congress. That is the best evidence of the skill and genius this man possesses. He would make a good American citizen.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. What is the status of this individual now? Is he or is he not an American citizen.

Mr. DONDERO. He is not an American citizen. He is here as a student.

Mr. PATRICK. He is married to an American girl and has raised an American family?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. PATRICK. And yet he cannot be an American citizen?

Mr. DONDERO. He cannot. I shall support H. R. 3517 in the hope that what we do here today may be in the best interest of our Nation and country.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have looked through the bill and I cannot find any specific item in the bill that authorizes the naturalization of 4,000 Indians who are now here.

Mr. DONDERO. As I understand this bill, it covers those who are now resident in this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not find it in the bill. It is not mentioned in the bill. It is not mentioned in the report either

Mr. DONDERO. Then I must refer the gentleman to the members of the committee because that is the information I received from them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield in order for me to answer the question asked by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Section 3 provides that those who are in this country are eligible for citizenship. Section 3 reads:

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of section 2 of this act, the term "persons of races indigenous to India" shall mean any person who is as much one-half of the blood of a race indigenous to India and who is eligible to naturalization under section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended by section 1 of this act.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I have heard the proponents of this bill try to make it seem that the reason some of us were opposing the bill was on account of the color discrimination. At least on the Republican side nobody has thought of color in connection with this bill. I would like to say that I think the people who demagog and try to make it seem that Members are against things on account of wanting to be against the colored people do more harm to the colored people and racial groups in this country than any other group.

Mr. GEARHART. I thank the lady for that contribution. The Republican Party has ever been the champion of tolerance, of good will between the races. To even intimate it is to deny a consistent record to the contrary of over 100 years.

I have listened to the arguments in favor of this bill with great interest, and I am very much impressed with the aspiration which the proponents are seeking to achieve. If I thought for a moment that the passage of this bill would eliminate a feeling among the Hindus that we were discriminating against them, if I thought we would implant in their hearts a belief that we were regarding them as equals, of course, I would be for this bill. But the enactment of this legislation will have just the contrary effect on the psychology of the Hindu people. They are not so dumb as some people may think. How can you disabuse the minds of this ancient people of the suspicion that we are discriminating against them when you grant them a quota limitation of 75 out of their 400,000,000 people, and grant a quota limitation of 65,721 to the people of the United Kingdom out of their 45,000,000? Instead of his being a bill to promote friendship with the Hindus, it will operate, I verily believe, just to the contrary. As soon as they thoroughly understand the undeniable implications of this measure they are going to see the very thinly veiled insult which it carries.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; I yield to the very able gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I wanted to ask the gentleman what he recommends as a quota. How many would he say this bill should admit?

Mr. GEARHART. Unless the American people are willing to go the full way and give them a quota in fair relation to their population, this bill should not be passed. In its present form it is a Pandora's box.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield gladly to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska for I know that any contribution that the gentleman might care to make will be well worthy of our consideration.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does not the gentleman think that a quota of this kind would be recognized as a cheap political expedient, without any validity, as far as recognizing those people is concerned, and would simply be, as you have already said, an insult to their intelligence?

Mr. GEARHART. I do not think it rises to the dignity of even an expedient. It is just a plain sop to a people that are well worthy of our respect and solicitous concern.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think we should be very careful in our immigration laws in the future, fearing that all the people of all nations of the world will want to come to America?

Mr. GEARHART. There is no doubt in the world about it. All of the downtrodden people of the world want to come to the United States, not the successful, the affluent. There will be no Indian princes or Hindu maharajahs, such as sit in the gallery today, who will be seeking visas under this bill if it becomes a law. Those who want to come here are the most unfortunate, the worst off in the other parts of the world, the peons and coolies, people who have been deprived of their inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for generations untold. The Hindus who would come have no appreciation of what liberty means. What can they contribute to the up-building of our country? Why should we multiply our already many problems by augmenting our underprivileged groups?

We have some people in the United States who have been deprived through no fault of their own of many of the good things of life, of an education and all of the blessings that means, but none of these, unfortunate through their condition, wants to migrate to any of the countries we are thinking about. If they did, what a squawk we would hear from abroad!

Everybody wants to come here. Everybody wants to stay here. Is our first obligation the uplifting of our own unfortunates? Personally, I think that is our first responsibility.

Do you want to crowd this country as India and China are crowded? We know that numbers do not contribute to the greatness of a people. The poverty-stricken, disease-ridden, backward areas of the world are in those countries where the population is most congested. Certainly no man who loves this country wants to make of the United States another China or another India. Should we open wide our immigration doors as many of the proponents of this bill would have us do? Bills like this one point that way. Let us not take the first false step. Future generations may curse us for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it cannot be contended that we are discriminating against the inhabitants of India if we should grant them a quota of 100 persons a year, if that is in keeping with the act of 20 years ago fixing the quota formula which has been applied to other peoples. Even if the quota for India were fixed at 50 individuals annually, I believe it could be no more properly considered as discriminatory when written into law, than the quota of 100 individuals provided for in this bill. As I view it, it is not the number in the quota which determines the degree or nature of discrimination, but it is the fact that a great body of humanity is excluded entirely from the high privilege of American citizenship. If by law we cease to say to these four hundred millions in India, none of you are worthy of American citizenship, then I think the former discrimination will be removed.

I have a high regard for the character and culture of the people of India. Theirs is an old civilization. While there is very much that we can contribute to their benefit, there is also very much that we may learn of them. As chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I have had occasion to study their management of certain rivers and water supplies in that land of great physical diversity. They have done some things in that line worth studying, although, of course, they have built no such dams and power plants as Boulder or Grand Coulee. A few weeks ago some eminent men from Asia came to this country to study our great works of irrigation. I said to one of them, from one of the oldest of irrigated valleys, "There is much that we could learn from you."

In 1929 I was an instructor in the University of California at Berkeley. In some of my classes I had men from eastern and southern Asia, and among them several turbaned Hindus. They were very earnest men, and I always had the feeling that I should learn from them. On one occasion I made mention of a little book entitled "Leonard and Gertrude," by Pestalozzi, though not intending to make it a rigid requirement for student reading. Imagine my surprise one night as I entered the library to find one of these turbaned East Indians with a copy of the book in his hand. I said to him, "Do you find that little book interesting?" He replied, "I hope to translate this book into the language of my people." Those Indians seemed to take life very seriously in contrast with the blasé attitude of many students.

Although in general I will be found voting against any measure that weakens or lowers our immigration barriers, I do think that it will be possible to benefit this country by careful selection of the right kind of individuals from this land, as from other lands. If I could, by this effort, gain for America the good will of 400,000,000 human beings, I should want to do it, even though, by giving them a quota, less than the quota indicated in this measure. I want to keep the quota principle governing immigration, but lower the quota amount proportionately for all nations, as our welfare may require.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for me to see how any Member can get terribly excited or emotional over this bill, a bill which removes a legislative insult to a people and allows at the maximum only 100 persons out of nearly 400,000,000 to enter the United States each year. I wonder how we would feel if some country by law said that no American could become an immigrant to that country. Although we might not want any American to go to that country it still would be an insult to the people of America if any country passed a law of that kind. Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill is consistent with the national interests of the United States. Let us think of ourselves. The first question uppermost in my mind on legislation which concerns other nations, either directly or indirectly, is, What action on my part is for the national interest of my own country?

As we look at the facts, having entered into the Great War, we know there are about 390,000,000 or 400,000,000 people in the area that this bill will affect to the very limited extent that it does, or will if it becomes law. There is no area of the world that is more important to the United States at the present time than the Far East. I am speaking now from the standpoint of our own national interest. Never mind letting our minds roam over there. Let our minds stay right here in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the future of this part of the world is highly uncertain. The attitude of 400,000,000 people of India toward the United States is of direct and important concern to my country, the United States. While the United States enjoys considerable prestige in India because of our lack of imperialistic influences and because of our policy of justice for weak nations, the principle of racial discrimination in our immigration laws is most bitterly resented and makes us highly vulnerable to anti-American propaganda. I hope we will not depart from this attitude of justice for the weak nations and that the power we have we will always retain for good and not for evil.

Mr. Chairman, during the war the Japs used this argument against us in India and in China. We removed it 2 years ago in the case of China when we allowed a maximum of 105 Chinese to come into the United States each year. By that simple act we removed a legislative insult by allowing 105 Chinese to come in here at the most. We thereby brushed aside the complete effectiveness of the Japanese propaganda among the 450,000,000 to 475,000,000 people of China. The very same thing is going on now except that instead of Japan using this propaganda as it did during the war in India against us, some other country or countries for their own interest are using it against our best interests at the present time.

I can assure my colleagues I make this statement not only as my own personal opinion but on the authority of the officials of our Government whose duty it is to enter into negotiations and conferences with the governments and the representatives of the people in the area that this bill will affect, if it is enacted into law.

The people of China and the people of East India constitute about 800,000,000 human beings. The population of the world is approximately 2,000,000,000. Forty percent of the people of the world live in China and East India. By allowing a mere quota of 205, 105 for China and 100 for India, we are placing ourselves in a position where the resentment of 40 percent of the people of the world will be removed. It has been removed in the case of China and it will be removed with the passage of this bill in the case of India. No one is making anybody from India a citizen automatically. If this bill passes, anyone who applies for citizenship from India has to go through the same procedure that my forebears had to go through when they came from Ireland. It was only through the gift of God that we were born in America and born of the race that we are.

This bill only involves 100 immigrants. That is all it constitutes. They have to go through the same procedure that anybody else has to go through to become a citizen. They have to be here so many years; they have to comply with the law; they have to be persons of good moral character; they have to be persons who know our laws and history and they have to be persons who can pass the test that all others must pass. The passage of this bill does not automatically make them citizens. It makes them eligible for citizenship, and of those from India who are here today it amounts to approximately 4,000.

Any one of this group of 100 who comes in must meet all of the laws relating to our immigration laws, that is, literacy, health, moral character, and financial ability so that they will not become public charges. All other conditions precedent to any person coming here from any other part of the world must likewise be met by this 100.

I am glad that the Members on both sides are supporting this bill. From our own angle, the national interest of the United States, I submit that the evidence is overwhelming that we pass this bill which will allow a quota of 100 people from this great area that is going to become more and more powerful in the future, as time passes. Their friendship will be valuable to us. We want their friendship, and they want ours. The passage of this bill will remove this legislative insult. It will give to them that privilege which will enable them to feel that the legislative insult directed against them by this great country of ours has been removed from the statute books.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further request for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 57 Stat. 601; 8 U. S. C., Supp. 703), be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. (a) The right to become a naturalized citizen under the provisions of this act shall extend only to—

"(1) white persons, persons of African nativity or descent, and persons who are descendants of races indigenous to the continents of North or South America or adjacent islands;

"(2) persons who possess, either singly or in combination, a preponderance of blood of one or more of the classes specified in clause (1);

"(3) Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent, and persons of races indigenous to India; and

"(4) persons who possess, either singly or in combination, a preponderance of blood of one or more of the classes specified in clause (3) or, either singly or in combination, as much as one-half blood of those classes and some additional blood of one of the classes specified in clause (1).

"(b) Nothing in the preceding subsection shall prevent the naturalization of native-born Filipinos having the honorable service in the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard as specified in section 324, nor of former citizens of the United States who are otherwise eligible to naturalization under the provisions of section 317."

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago some of us stood on the floor of the House when the Chinese Exclusion Act was up for a test and met the same arguments that have been made here today. The argument made then was that we were discriminating against a people, against a nation, an organized nation, China, probably the oldest nation in the world. We were made to believe then, at least we were justified in believing, that that would be the last of this kind of onslaught upon the well-defined principle of the American Government, known as restrictive immigration, but today we notice that the immigration law is changed with abandon and altered very materially. Those who have stood here have argued to us on the basis that this admits only 75 to 100. We do not know whether that is the number that will be admitted. In fact, this small quota may be made up altogether from Indians now in America as students or visitors or those who are here illegally. That is not the only change made in this law. This is the sentence to which I direct your attention:

White persons, persons of African nativity or descent, and persons who are descendants of races indigenous to the continent of North or South America or adjacent islands. Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent.

If you wanted to do the same thing by India as you have done by China, why did you not say "persons of Indian descent"? Why did you not just add to the words "Chinese descent" the words "Indian persons and persons of Indian descent"? But you do not do that, because India is not well defined nationally or racially. India is a sprawling, indefinable province, a great yeast of humanity that is moving and seething, and I hope they work out their own salvation. They have a salvation to work out. But England owes them that salvation, England owes it to them to point to them the way out. We do not owe them that obligation, and besides, we cannot pay them that obligation. We would run counter to our relationship with Great Britain if we go very far with this.

This is the language they use. They say "white persons," and then they go on down and change the immigration law in many respects.

Those of you who were here when we built up the great code of immigration law recall that we spent on them a lot of debate and serious consideration, political and otherwise. If this bill is adopted, the law would be changed very materially. They say not "Indian persons and persons of Indian descent" but "persons indigenous to India."

Where will that take them? Will it take them down to Singapore; will it take them to Borneo or to a hundred nearby islands? Will it take them out into the Pacific Ocean, and include all those people? About 12 or 15 years ago the Polynesians wanted us to grant the right to citizenship to them. We did not do it. Whenever we do what this bill will do, we open the door, and when the door is wide open there is no door.

My distinguished friend the gentleman from Massachusetts makes out that we are raising bars against India. This is not a one-sided matter; many nations in the world have bars raised against us. We cannot go where we please. We who claim to be proud Americans frequently find the doors barred against us. I dare say we cannot locate in India, although I do not know the exact facts with reference to that. We could not go into Japan; we could not locate in Japan before the war. No; they have bars raised up against us. Practically every country in the world has restrictive immigration laws.

Where do the immigration laws of our country come from? What is the principle involved? Not from a lot of tearful sentiments such as we have heard on the floor of the House today. The immigration law comes from the real, cold, hard facts of national protection. What was the principle reason for these laws? We raised these bars to protect the American workingman. Absolutely, that was the reason. It was to protect the American workingman against the cheap labor of the world, not against the dark-skinned man, not against the slant-eyed man, no. That never was the purpose, that never was the reason. The reason was that we had built up in this country a high standard of living and we wanted to maintain it. You cannot do anything that would do more to tear down that high standard of living than to extend this policy upon which you are embarking today.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am a restrictionist. I am in favor of the bars we have thus far raised up to protect this country from a flood of those from the Old World or any part of it who would come here and by their sheer numbers lower our standard of living. But I am inclined to favor this legislation. Is this attitude inconsistent? Permit me to explain what might seem to be an inconsistency.

I listened to the argument made a moment ago about the matter of so-called discrimination because this measure gives India an allotment of only 100. I think the gentleman from California went far afield when he said in effect it would still be discrimination even though we passed this law and let 100 of these natives of India come in because there are about 400,000,000 of them in India now and 100 does not bear a right and proper relationship to 400,000,000. I want to remind my friend from California that our quota system of immigrants from the various nations is not based on a percentage of population in all the other countries. When the quota system was adopted, it was my understanding that it was on the basis of the percentage of those people from those other countries residing in our country in the year 1890. It happens that we did not have many Hindus or Chinese at that time. Therefore, it is not because there are 400,000,000 in India or 600,000,000 Chinese that we set this low figure. We have given them each a quota in lieu of the same percentage that we have given to all other nations.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman then concedes that the adoption of this bill will destroy the principle upon which the act of 1924 is based?

Mr. MURDOCK. Not at all.

Mr. GEARHART. If the gentleman points out in one breath that the quotas were fixed as of 1890, on the basis of the number of immigrants who had come to this country theretofore, then he is giving Hindustan a quota which is not based upon anything like that. He repudiates the principle of the act of 1924.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from California refers to the National Origins Act as contained in the 1924 act. Under the operation of the National Origins Act, as I recall, if a country did not have a 75 or 100 quota, they gave them a quota anyway of either 75 or 100.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman for that suggestion. It helps me and is in keeping with what I was trying to explain. I cannot see that there is any discrimination in establishing a quota—or naming a quota—under a system which Congress in its wisdom set up about 20 years ago, even though the number may be only 100 for a population of 400,000,000. That is not discrimination as I see it.

May I say to my friends on the other side who are opposing this legislation on certain grounds that I too entertain some of those same grounds. While I would be willing to admit 100 from India, the same as I was willing to admit 105 individuals from China, and for pretty much the same reasons, I would at the same time be willing to cut that quota and all other quotas 50 percent for the protection of the America that I love and for the protection of those boys who are coming back who fought to preserve it. They want to have jobs waiting for them when they arrive home. If American jobs are endangered by too liberal quotas for immigration, let us lower all quotas equally. I want to make that clear. I think we have removed a discrimination when we have allotted a quota, no matter whether that qota be 100 from India or 50 from India.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. How can you have a quota from one country that has a greater population than another country and yet permit so many less immigrants to come from that country, and treat them fairly?

Mr. MURDOCK. I will say to the gentleman that if 20 percent of his income is taken for taxes and 20 percent of my income is taken for taxation, he pays a lot more taxes than I pay. Yet I do not feel that he ought to feel he is discriminated against in the matter of taxation.

Mr. RICH. To whom is the gentleman referring?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when I hear the word "expert" used on this floor as it has been this afternoon, I am reminded of a statement that Lloyd George made during World War I. When he was covered with experts he said, "I have 20 experts and I will give them for one good man."

One of the Members this afternoon spent a great deal of time portraying the great tolerance of our friend, Stalin. I would suggest to any of you who are interested in that direction you might consult the Poles, you might consult any of the Balkan states, or any of the little states to the east of the Baltic Sea, and you may learn something of the tolerance of our friend, Stalin.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. I think the gentleman will be interested in the comments of a rather distinguished Chinese philosopher a few years ago when he wrote some words about like this. He said, "What the American people need is not the 'four freedoms' but one freedom—freedom from humbug."

Here we are passing on a bill to provide for people to come in from India at a time when the American people have not yet demonstrated their ability to treat with justice and freedom tens of thousands of Americans of color of Japanese ancestry, millions of Americans of color of African ancestry, hundreds of thousands of Americans of color of American Indian descent.

Until we can treat the people we already have here of color with justice and righteousness, do you think we have any business bringing in others to again discriminate against and further complicate a situation acutely unfair to those already mentioned?

Mr. ELLIS. No. I think the gentleman's deductions are correct.

Now, the question of trade has been brought out this afternoon. I think the story by our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], to be kind, was fantastic. The basis of this enormous trade has no support in history or precedent. It is hopeful thinking. We must consider that our foreign friends are hard businessmen, just as we are. They will buy here what they need and what they can get most of for their dollar, and not one thing more. They do not deal on any other basis. If anyone thinks that by this little sop we will get the trade of the world, you are due for a sad reckoning.

I have served as a member of this committee for 2½ years. There has been a constant effort by a group to break down the barriers we have set up against the free flow of peoples into this country. I have heard it proclaimed this afternoon on this floor and heretofore in our committee that we are indebted to all the peoples of the earth. We are indebted to India because of their participation in this war. We are indebted to China because they saved the lives of American soldiers, and so on, with Russia and all the rest. Will not somebody agree with me that our participation in this war has saved the lives of Russians, of Chinese, of Indians, and the other people of the world? These people we are talking about this afternoon—India, Russia, China, England, the world will not stand long enough for these people to pay their moral and material debts to this country.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. During the consideration of the other bill breaking down our immigration laws to let in 105 Chinese, it was stated that it was necessary in order to keep the Chinese in the war. There was no suggestion that we would let the Hindus in to keep them in the war. They were not very much in the war. It was Mr. Gandhi who sat down in the grass and agreed that they would not fight, even though the Japanese threatened to come in there and take their country. They said they would not fight.

Mr. ELLIS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Now, what can we get out of a country like that?

Mr. ELLIS. These subjects have been brought to this floor because of their emotional appeal at this time and an opportunity to break down inch by inch the barriers we have deemed necessary for the protection of our people.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman agree that we could make room for a lot of good people from every nation in the world who know that this way of life of ours is as near utopia as it is possible to get if we would turn out of this country or invite out of this country—I do not suppose they would go—but invite out of this country the thousands upon thousands who believe in some other form of government and who are trying to undermine our form of government by force and violence? If we got them out we would make room for a lot of good people all over the world to come in.

Mr. ELLIS. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I come from the part of the country that has 95 percent of these Indians. I have thought much about this legislation. When the act of 1924 was passed I thought it was the greatest act ever passed by the Congress of the United States, but since coming to Congress I can see, in my humble way, where there might be discrimination in that law.

I am not going to support this bill because it will bring us any trade, for I do not believe trade follows that sort of route; trade goes where the buyer can get the most for his money.

I am not going to support this bill because it will help the Indians—that is not our duty—or because it will help the Hindus; but it seems to me that occasionally the Congress has a chance to pass a law which may be very minor in its significance at the time but which may have tremendous significance in the future. As I look across the Pacific Ocean from where I live and realize what has happened in the last 3 years and contemplate that there might be another great war brewing in the future, I realize the importance of this measure. We can see what Japan tried to do; she tried to build up a greater Asia. Her program was a racial program to build up the black man and the yellow man and unite him against the white man. The seed that she planted has not yet hurt us, but it is taking root in Java and in Sumatra and Indochina and other places. It is the seed of revolution and war against the white man and against imperialism.

We have adopted a very humane policy with reference to the Philippines; I believe it is the model every country that has an imperial system ought to follow. That policy is that when a racial unit, or a geographical or economic unit, shows that its people can handle their own affairs they ought to be given their political freedom.

I am not worried about the time I am going to live, but it may be that my grandchildren may live in a day when this great racial war will develop. The white race constitutes a very small fraction of the people of the earth. They would have no chance against a billion or two billion black, yellow, and brown men if they were properly armed and industrialized. To avoid this, it seems to me, is the basic reason for this law. General Patton has indicated what the military men think of the probability of another war. It is that another war will come and that it might be a giant race war.

We may plant the seed of friendship among 450,000,000 people in India, among 400,000,000 people in China, among several hundred million people in the islands out in the Pacific; and it seems to me that, if we adopt this kind of policy and show in a small way, by allowing a very small quota to enter our country, that we are not discriminating against people because of their color, that we have no hostility toward them on account of their race, we can plant the seed of friendship now which in the future will be a valuable thing to us. We have spent three hundred billions in a war and lost a quarter of a million men. Frankly you can see, and I can see, that the white race cannot stand many more wars like this. It might be the white man's last stand. A racial war would be deadly, more bitter, more vicious than any war the world has ever seen. As I see it, this is a small and friendly gesture that will not injure us.

I know these people cannot be amalgamated and they will not be amalgamated on the Pacific coast, but it is a small way, I repeat, to indicate to this great seething mass of people out in the Orient that the American white man is not going to discriminate against him because of color or race. It is for this reason, perhaps poorly stated, but with all the earnestness at my command, that

I believe this law will pay big dividends in the long future ahead of us.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to know if the gentleman has any evidence or information that the masses of Indians or the masses of Chinese are interested to any great extent in this subject?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Frankly I do not think they are, but their leaders are, and the leaders are the ones who disseminate the information and mold the opinion of their people.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I had not intended to quote certain important information from the State Department, but I can give my colleague the information. I call attention to the fact that Mr. William Phillips, of the State Department, urged upon the committee that it is very essential for the interest of this country that the pending legislation be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against this bill, not on any racial grounds or for reasons of color, but for other reasons.

I want to call the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States to a certain document relating to a movement that is being undertaken in India to communize that country. I refer to a pamphlet entitled "A Penguin Special—A Plan of Economic Development for India." This was first published in India in January 1944. I should state that it was difficult for me to obtain a copy of this pamphlet, as apparently it is being suppressed in the United States.

The movement does not spring from the bourgeois or the working people. It is the fruit of the industrial leaders of India. Here are the names and connections of those who are credited with writing the plan:

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas is the doyen of the Indian commercial world. He is president of the East India Cotton Association, a director of the Reserve Bank of India, and chairman and director of numerous other concerns.

Then there is Mr. J. R. D. Tata.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Did the gentleman say T-a-t-a?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is correct. J. R. D. Tata.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I direct the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that this is the same family to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] referred when he was trying to reassure us as to the lack of chance of any Communists coming here from India.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is very important because this man is one of the top leaders of this Communist movement at the present time.

Mr. J. R. D. Tata, Sir Ardeshir Dalal, Mr. A. D. Shroff, and Mr. John Matthai are directors of the great Tata firm, which has pioneered most of India's industries and today constitutes one of the major industrial groups in the Empire.

Mr. J. R. D. Tata is head of the firm and of the various Tata companies. He occupies a key position in the industrial life of India.

Sir Ardeshir Dalal is in charge of the Tata Iron & Steel Co., whose works at Jamshedpur are the largest in the Empire. He was a member of the Indian Civil Service, and filled many important positions in Government before he joined Tatas.

Mr. A. D. Shroff is in charge of the Investment Corp. of India, the Tata Oil Mills, and other concerns. He is known throughout India as an economist and a financial expert.

Dr. John Matthai is economic adviser of the firm and in charge of Tata Chemicals. He has a distinguished record in Government service as an economist and administrator, and was for some years chairman of the Indian Tariff Board.

Mr. G. D. Birla heads the well-known financial and commercial organization known as Birla Bros. His interests are widespread and he is one of the acknowledged leaders of trade and industry.

Sir Shri Ram is a leading industrialist of Delhi and a director of the Reserve Bank of India. He occupies an important position in various commercial organizations.

Mr. Kasturbhai Lalbhai is a prominent mill owner of Ahmedabad. He is director of the Reserve Bank of India and controls many commercial and industrial concerns.

What is it that these people plan to do? I can touch only a few high points.

Under Political Assumptions we find this language:

> Underlying our whole scheme is the assumption that on the termination of the war or shortly thereafter, a national government will come into existence at the center which will be vested with full freedom in economic matters. The maintenance of the economic unity of India being, in our view, an essential condition of any effective planning, we have assumed for the purpose of our plan that the future government of India will be constituted on a federal basis and that the jurisdiction of the central government in economic matters will extend over the whole of India.

Under Planning Organization it states:

> We contemplate that under the central government there will be a national planning committee in which the various interests concerned will be represented and to which the responsibility for drawing up plans will be delegated.
>
> The actual execution of the plans will be the function of a supreme economic council working alongside the national planning committee under the authority of the central government.
>
> The principal objective of our plan is to bring about a doubling of the present per capita income within a period of 15 years from the time that the plan comes into operation.
>
> It is an important part of our proposals regarding industrial development that in the initial stages attention should be directed primarily to the creation of industries for the production of power and capital goods.
>
> Apart from its importance as a means of quickening the face of industrial development in India, it will have the effect of ultimately reducing our dependence on foreign countries for the plant and machinery required by us and, consequently, of reducing our requirements of external finance.

If the document to which I am referring means anything this ought to answer the contention of the proponents of this bill that its passage would mean more trading with India. I think that argument has little foundation. The original formula for basing quotas was specifically designed to restrict immigration. This is the principal fact to be kept in mind in considering this bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last eight words.

Mr. Chairman, it is always very unwise to establish a precedent, fearing that the precedent will eventually lead to something that is very detrimental to the welfare of the United States. We, as elected Representatives of the people, are here to try to make this country the best place on the face of the earth, where all the American people may live in peace, harmony, and contentment. You can establish a precedent in a small way that eventually will lead to harm. If, as the gentleman from Ohio just stated, we are passing this bill to let in a few who are desirous of becoming American citizens, but who are Communists now in other nations, then we want to keep them out. The people of all nations are permitted to come here at any time for a certain period of time, but then they must return to their own countries. This applies to all countries.

This bill is not a question of whether we are trying to do something detrimental to or something good for the black race, the yellow race, the red race, or the white race. That question does not enter into it. It is a question now of letting people into this country on our immigration quota system.

I think that after this great World War we are in the most dangerous position the Nation has ever been in, in a dozen different ways, so that our actions now and our actions from now on must be the very essence of good common sense, for the best interests of the greatest number of our American people and, above all, for the perpetuation of our form of government and the saving of the rights, the liberty, and the things that the American people have enjoyed. I am terribly afraid that with conditions as they are in our country today and with the great amount of propaganda that is going on in this country to make this country communistic, we are in the most dangerous spot we have ever been in in our whole history. So be careful in immigration, labor, finances. We are in danger from a dozen different directions.

Let us look at the situation as regards immigration. Our immigration laws were passed originally for the purpose of maintaining jobs in America for the American citizen, so that we would not let into the field of American labor thousands and hundreds of thousands and millions of people who want to replace the American laborer and take his job away from him by cheap peon labor. I think we have done a grand job in these years in building up the American standard of living to the highest it has ever been. Are we going to tear that down? Be careful; watch your step; do not let down the immigration bars for cheap labor; in fact, most all people who can will try to gain entrance to the United States.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. What the gentleman says may still be an issue so far as cheap imported labor is concerned, but the real issue in this bill, as I see it, is permitting those to come into this country who have a different ideology of government.

Mr. RICH. That is one thing I do not want. I do not want men to come into this country and remain here who are Communists, and then make them American citizens. That is what we did with Harry Bridges. He came here from Australia. He did more damage to America, to American institutions, and to the American way of life, and then the Communists and a lot of radicals got behind him and boosted him through every obstacle until the powers that be in Washington that have controlled this country for the last 10 years saw fit recently to do away with the court order. We could not do it by the old court so we had to appoint new ones. Then after we got the new court appointed they wiggled the laws around some way to let Harry in. Now he is a citizen. He is one of your brothers now. Now you will have to listen to him. I think he is a dangerous man to have in our country as a citizen of the United States.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Did Mr. Bridges come under the quota to the Indians or the Chinese? Did he come into this country on that kind of a quota?

Mr. RICH. No. He came in as a visitor.

Mr. JUDD. Then the difficulty is in the whole immigration law, not the thing we are dealing with today.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that I am talking more on generalities than I am on this particular bill, but I want you to be mighty careful of what you do from now on so far as immigration laws are concerned, they can be most detrimental to America, they can do more harm than good, they can destroy our way of life if we are not careful—so be careful what laws we pass.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill be concluded in 30 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those people who is afraid of the future and not one who is always talking of the dangers we face because any time you face the future you face danger. I am one of those who feel there is a great future ahead of us. We want this great Nation of ours to go along with everybody in the whole world. That may be a new note, but it is a sincere note.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. It is a very refreshing note, and I thank the gentleman for it.

Mr. FULTON. When speaking of India, it is a pleasure to talk of a good solid country which is a creditor country among the family of nations. We who have fought in the South Pacific are not forgetting already the people who helped us and fought alongside us not longer than a few months ago. I have been assured by Sirdar J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America, who is an old friend of mine and whom I have visited in his home in Kashmir, India, that the passage of this bill will create a surge of friendly feeling among the people in India for the people of America. Mr. Singh tells me, and I know it from my personal experience, that the people of India have not only friendly but almost affectionate feeling for the people of America. By removing this discrimination from a great and civilized nation, we will be demonstrating that we not only talk democracy but practice it.

We all know that the world is shrinking. Within a few weeks we will have regular commercial airplane service between India and America which will take only 41 hours. That length of time was the length of time necessary to go from Pittsburgh to Cleveland in our colonial era. Think how close they are to us. This advance will give the necessary incentive to American businessmen to visit India and Indian businessmen to visit America. But you cannot have good business relations unless there is trust and friendly feeling. The passage of this bill will create that trust and friendly feeling.

We in the United States need friends. Too many people in this country are looking around for new enemies. They are trying to cultivate new enemies. I can look down the street in my own home town and find some very fine people to be inimical to, but it is better for me and better for my town and better for my country that we try to be friends. We can have great new friends if we help to create a strong, independent, and democratic India and a strong, independent, and democratic China. There are 500,000,000 Chinese and 400,000,000 Indians. These two countries should be strong and should begin to have real faith in the professions of the western democracies. They are ideologically alined with us already. We cannot allow present conditions of discrimination against the Eastern Hemisphere countries to go on for any length of time for they will lose their faith in this western democracy of ours.

The passage of this bill will win us friends in India. It will enlarge and strengthen the reservoir of good will which Wendell Willkie found for us in the east. Let us try to see if we do not have that reservoir of good will. Let us try to make friends.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration H. R. 3517 introduced by Mr. CELLER, of New York, which proposes to grant an immigration quota to the people of India to enter the United States and to give naturalization rights to the several thousands of the people of India already in the United States. It is a simple proposal to further break down our immigration laws.

THE SECOND DECLARATION OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE

I was a Member of the House in 1924 and helped to pass the act of 1924 when a Republican Congress passed our first great restricted immigration law which was signed by a Republican President. I, too, recall distinctly that representatives of many foreign countries gathered here in Washington, to lobby against that bill. They made a determined fight to defeat it—in fact the word was passed around on the floor of the House that if we passed that bill it meant war with one of the five great powers.

In the interest of the people of our country and to prevent millions of aliens coming into this country, we did pass the bill. It was spoken of as the Second Declaration of American Independence. Our colleagues, Mr. SABATH, of Illinois, and Mr. DICKSTEIN and Mr. CELLER, of New York, who are making a hard fight to pass the bill before us, H. R. 3517, were present and made an active fight in opposition to the restricted Immigration Act and they have been active ever since on measures that, in my opinion, seek to break down our immigration laws. Of course as Members of the House they then had the right and still have the right to do this very thing.

I believed then and I still believe it was one of the best laws ever passed by the United States Congress. I have consistently opposed all efforts to break down or nullify that splendid legislation.

I am opposed to H. R. 3517 because it is a major attempt to nullify our immigration restrictions.

Congress heretofore has refused to grant a quota to Asiatics or give the people of India the right to be naturalized and become American citizens. The bill before us amends our immigration laws and grants to the people of India a quota, permitting them to come to the United States, and it also gives naturalization rights to the many thousands of Asiatic Indians located now in the United States to become citizens. It is my firm conviction that this legislation will prove to be against the best interests of our country and the people of the United States.

NOT EXCLUDED ON ACCOUNT OF COLOR

It is urged by those favoring this bill that the acts of Congress excluding the people of India from coming to this coun-

try and staying in this country and becoming citizens is based on the matter of color, and it is intimated that those of us who oppose this bill do so on account of color. I want to categorically deny this assumption or insinuation. I am not opposed to this bill because of the color of the people of India. It is admitted that the people of India cannot be readily assimiliated with the people of the United States. They are orientals, and they are imbued with the ideologies, culture, and economic and political philosophies of the oriental peoples. They differ in their language and their standards of living as well as in other respects from the American people as much as day differs from night. If they had the conception of government, the culture and the ideologies of the colored people of the United States, it would be quite different. Our colored people have been free for 80 years. They have the same language, the same political, economic, and cultural ideologies, speak the same language and have the same religious concepts as the white people of our country, and in all of this, there is a great contrast between the colored people of India. The colored people of this country have but one loyalty and one flag and that is our own country and the Stars and Stripes. I do not mean to reflect on the intelligence or the peculiar culture, and the economics of government and the ideologies of the people of India; that is a matter for their concern. I do assert, even as some of the proponents of this bill assert, that the people of India cannot and do not assimilate with the people of the United States, and I think it is unwise from every point of view to admit people to this country who do not readily assimilate with the characteristics, culture, ideology, and philosophies of government, as well as with the religion, of the people of our country.

The reason why they were excluded from the quota and from citizenship in this country was that they could not and would not assimilate readily with the American people. We know the low standards of the teeming millions of the people of India, also their low wages, their caste system, under Indian ideals. There are about 300,000,000 Hindus and Buddhists and approximately 100,000,000 Mohammedans. The Hindus and the Mohammedans cannot agree among themselves and hence there is constant warfare between these two groups in India. The Hindu and Mohammedan religions are foreign to the religions of the people of the United States. We desire to protect our high standards of living, our high American wages, and the splendid American opportunities and preserve our own ideologies, philosophies of government, and culture. Is there anyone within the sound of my voice who can seriously contend that the passage of this act would be helpful to the American people or American workers, to American homes, churches or schools? Is there anyone who will contend that it would be helpful to the millions of our heroic defenders who will soon be back home after sacrificing and winning a glorious victory for our country, and will it be helpful to the sons and daughters of our defenders?

Yes, our heroic men on land, sea and in the air made victory sure not only for our own country but for the people of India, China, and other Asiatic countries.

I should like to see the people of India, China, and every other country have as good a country as our own, with freedom of opportunity and high standards of living; but are we justified in filling our country up with orientals from India and other countries of the Far East and taking away the opportunities of our defenders and their sons and daughters?

Is there anyone here who seriously contends that the admission of these orientals and the giving to them of the status of citizens, will improve or add strength to our country or benefit our citizens, our homes, our schools, and our churches? I think it will have the opposite effect.

HAVE WE NOT BEEN GENEROUS?

Some of the proponents of this bill say that we ought to do this in order to hold the friendship of the people of India and other orientals of the East, including approximately a billion and a half of the earth's people. In the first place, India is a province of Great Britain. There are approximately 400,000,000 people living in India. If these 400,000,000 living in India had the ideologies of the American people they would not permit 45,000,000 in the British Isles to control them and hold them in subjection when they live 10,000 miles away from the British Isles.

We have had hundreds of thousands of Americans in India during this great war. We have spent billions of dollars or more to help India. Thousands of American boys gave their health and their lives to defend India from Japan. I regret to say that at the same time it was to help protect the British soldiers and to keep India in subjection. But Gandhi, as you know, is the leader of nearly 300,000,000 Hindus. Japan was threatening to and did march into India; but Gandhi headed the movement against India defending herself. But for the American soldiers and American treasure, India would have been overrun and plundered by the Japs. While our boys were fighting and dying in India I have heard of but one person from India in this country who enlisted and went out to fight for this country or his own country. It was estimated that when the bill was up to repeal our Exclusion Act as to China, there would be no request to repeal it as to 800,000,000 other orientals including India. If this gets by then we shall soon have a bill up that we must remove the exclusion as to the millions of orientals of the East Indies, Malaya, Indochina, and orientals in other parts of Asia.

As orientals cannot and will not be assimilated with Americans, I shall consistently oppose all such legislation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I just called the attention of the gentleman to the fact—and it is a fact—that in spite of the pacifism preached by Gandhi in India, India had the highest rate of volunteers in the whole Allied group of our armies.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have heard that some Indians did volunteer but it was a very small number compared with their 400,000,000 population and I know that the gentleman is in error when he makes the statement he has made.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I shall be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. I should like to ask the gentleman whether these Indians were fighting for themselves or for us?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Those who did fight certainly were fighting for their own country. They were fighting for themselves. As a people they were not willing to rise up and fight the Japs. What they did in war was nothing commensurate to their 400,000,000 population. According to the information we have, the British had more soldiers in India to keep the Indians from rebelling and uprising than they had to fight the Japs, and we kept thousands of soldiers in India to help the British keep down the uprising of their own subjects. Some small groups of Asiatic Indians glorified themselves in this great war. It seems to me if you are going to establish any real friendship with India, bring the American boys home from India. We have helped free India. Our boys should not be kept there now to help police India; and so long as the United States joins with the British to police India and keep her in subjection, this gesture of breaking down our immigration laws will not create friendship between the United States and India.

We are told that in order to develop and hold the friendship of the people of India we must set aside our immigration laws and permit the people of India to come into this country and permit the thousands already here to become citizens, and permit other people of India to come in.

We have given to India and other countries in this great war, in lend-lease and in other ways, $50,000,000,000, and have added to our national debt $250,000,000,000 more; and there have been killed or wounded and missing 1,100,000 American boys, not counting those whose health will be ruined because of this war. Every day the proposition is made here that we must do much more in order to hold the friendship of India, China, the Dutch East Indies, Russia, Great Britain, France, and others. Really, I am getting fed up on this whole proposition. If we have not already won the friendship of these countries, we certainly cannot do so by admitting Asiatic Indians as citizens and permitting other Indians to come into this country to become citizens later.

In 1943 the administration forced through an act to repeal our exclusion law as to China. It was urged that we should do that to keep China in the war. There are about 450,000,000 people in China. By that act we made room for a lot more Chinese to become citizens of the United States and for other Chinese to come into this country.

It will be observed that after we helped China win this war, Chinese are fighting amongst themselves and American boys are being kept in China and away from their homes in order to keep the Chinese from killing each other.

So in 1943 it was to keep China friendly when we were actually saving it; and now, after the war is over, we must pass this bill in order to keep the people of India friendly to us.

After what we have done for India through the years, if we have not earned her friendship we cannot do so now by the passage of this act.

I am greatly concerned to preserve the opportunities and jobs for our own defenders and our own people and to limit the people who do come into this country to those who are in harmony with the American way of life and with our culture and our ideologies.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, that was a right refreshing colloquy with which to wind up 10 minutes of talk. It is rather strange when we are just emerging from a war in which our country, with her allies, necessarily took her part, of course, for the protection of our country and our own people but not despising the aid given, the sacrifices made by any of the other nations who fought by the side of our own boys in the trenches overseas. The reasons given by our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the reasons given by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] are not fanciful reasons for supporting this bill; they are realities. If we have peace in this world, we must have as its basic foundation the foundation of good will toward and concerning other peoples, one for another. The pitiable suggestion that the 75 or 100 people from India who will be received under this bill is not sufficient, is begging the question. If you put it upon the basis of population of the various countries and allow a certain percentage, that is a commercial proposition and not one of the extension of faith and good will to the peoples of other countries. This 75 or 100 people to be admitted into this country is based upon principle, and regardless of the numerical strength, it corrects an injustice, or at least a discrimination that was found to exist in a law formerly passed. It does not make any difference to India how many people you allow to come in here, but it does make a difference to their pride and their position in the family of nations, a great country to whom we should like to be a good neighbor and whom we should like to have as a good neighbor, if we refuse outright to admit any.

It does, however, mean a whole lot of difference to these people whether we are arrogant, egotistical, self-possessed, isolation-minded to the extent that we are unwilling to acknowledge that any of those people are qualified or fit to come in even under our walls of restriction to become citizens of this country. That consideration means all to India. It does not make a bit of difference to India whether you take 100 or 150,000. Neither is it important as compared with the population of that country, but it is important for us to say that we recognize you as our fellow human beings.

We need not get so uppish about this matter. We immigrated to this country ourselves and if you want to go back to the beginning and right the things that are insisted upon by the opponents of this bill, we might have to turn the country back to the American Indians and go ourselves somewhere else. No one is asking to open the floodgates of immigration, to take down all the bars, but we are asking that the United States of America do not continue a discrimination against a people whom we want to have as our fellows in arms and to help us establish a peace in this world based on the good neighbor doctrine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a motion?

Mr. PITTENGER. Is it a motion to limit time?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield for that purpose only.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this bill close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

The motion was agreed to.

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein the minority views and the names of the minority attached to the report accompanying the pending bill.)

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PITTENGER. If it is not taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of registering my opposition to H. R. 3517, now under consideration.

As I understand the object of this bill, it would amend our immigration laws so that 100 people from India could come to this country annually for the purpose of permanent residence. I am opposed to that, not because a hundred of those people would affect the situation in the United States one way or the other but because, in my opinion, this bill is a step toward demolishing all of the safeguards that the immigration laws of the United States have thrown around the people of this country. We need now, more than ever at any other time in our history, the safeguards of our immigration laws.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to make up our minds that this war No. 2 is over. General Marshall told us today of our contribution toward winning World War II. Our problem in the future, until this superstate some people talk about or something else is devised, is to make America safe for the American people. We need to make up our minds that the period of idealistic preachings that has been going on for some years is at an end. We need to get back to the fundamentals and the bedrock idea that the highest type of political society that has yet been developed in this world and one which will at the same time work is the type known as a nation. The attribute of a nation is sovereignty. We have had immigration laws to protect our sovereignty and to protect the domestic economy of the Nation.

We heard a lot of talk here this afternoon about the Chinese Exclusion Act. Our action in the last Congress in modifying that act could be, in my opinion, justified only on the basis of a war emergency and on no other ground. There were sound and controlling reasons why the Chinese exclusion law was passed. Every one of those arguments presented back in 1894, or whatever time it was, are controlling and fundamental in connection with our approach to this Indian question.

We have just heard some talk about Harry Bridges, although I do not see what Harry has to do with the people of India. He has covered a lot of territory in his day. But that is all beside the point. Then we had some talk that a vote against this bill is an indication of racial discrimination. I deny that. Such claims are nonsense. I want to say to the Members of this House that those of us who are opposed to this bill do not approach it with any idea of racial hatred in our hearts. No person can live long or get far who has that idea or who practices or preaches that doctrine. But we do approach this bill with the idea that we must protect America, our American form of government, and our system of society, against those ways of life and those systems that may be adapted to some foreign countries, but which most of us think would not work in this country. We do not want their economy. We do not want their system of political government or their system of business enterprise. We have developed a system of government and a system of domestic enterprise in this country that has surpassed any that the world has ever known. Our hearts go out in sympathy to the downtrodden people of other countries, but the way to help them is not to open the gates of immigration here, and have their systems of government and economy drag our system down to their levels.

The great charter of our American way of life, our domestic happiness, and our protection of our people against foreign standards of living, and other matters, was the Immigration Act of 1924. Among other things, that act was intended to protect the American worker against the competition with low-paid foreign labor. You know the story. In some foreign countries the laborers are paid a few cents a day. Without our immigration laws, those foreign workingmen would come to the United States and drive down the rates of pay for our own people. To permit a break-down of our immigration laws would be a tragedy to American labor. It would have to compete with the low-wage scales in vogue in these

other countries. Our high standards of living would be destroyed. This bill before us is just an entering wedge that will lead to these results. It may look harmless, but it is dangerous; for it strikes a blow at our long-established immigration policy to protect the workingmen in this country.

Mr. Chairman, the committee was not unanimous in reporting out this bill. There were members of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization who opposed this bill. Those members were Congressmen A. LEONARD ALLEN, DAN R. MCGEHEE, EDWARD O. MCCOWEN, HUBERT S. ELLIS, and LOWELL STOCKMAN. They set forth their position in their minority views on H. R. 3517, which accompanies Report No. 854, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session. As part of my remarks, I set forth this report which reads:

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 3517

We regard H. R. 3517 as one more step, and a great step, in the continuing effort to break down our immigration laws. Many years ago—before the service of any member of this committee in this House—the Congress saw fit to set up certain safeguards against immigration. After the First World War, because of the great desire of many millions to come to the United States, it became increasingly necessary to strengthen our laws against immigration. One of the safeguards set up many years ago was to exclude Asiatics.

We are now witnessing very strong efforts upon the part of many persons and certain interests in this country to destroy these safeguards and break down the barriers against immigration which our predecessors saw fit to set up.

During the last Congress the Exclusion Act as to the Chinese was lifted, it being urged by the proponents of the legislation that it was necessary in order to keep China in the war. It was said at that time that that act would be used as a pretext for bills to further break down our immigration laws, and let in Hindus, Koreans, and all other groups of the hundreds of millions of Asiatics.

The prediction has now come true, in part, in this bill, H. R. 3517, to admit Hindus to enter our country and become American citizens. But in this case, to say the least, there is certainly no reason that should seem compelling to anybody. The situation is not at all similar to the Chinese situation. After all, China was an independent nation and has fought a long, hard struggle against Japan. In the case of India, we find an entirely different situation. India belongs to England. India is a British possession. Under no stretch of the imagination can it now be said that the war situation requires that we further break down our immigration laws to accommodate the 400,000,000 Hindus who are subjects of Great Britain. It will be urged that Indian soldiers fought in the present war. It is true that an army, small as compared to the population of India, rendered some service in this war. But the Hindus were certainly fighting for their own homes and firesides. Any argument that we should make this great change in our basic law because a small percent of the Hindus fought to protect their own homeland sounds empty indeed.

There is no question but that millions of people will want to come to the United States after this war just as they did after the last war. We take the position that it is a matter of great importance, especially at this time, not to weaken our immigration laws, but to strengthen them. Some members of this committee have fought to prevent the almost constant effort which has been made, and is being made, to weaken our laws and make it possible for additional nationalities to come to this country. We think that the interests of the United States will best be served at this time by calling a halt to this type of legislation. We express the earnest hope that this bill and similar attempts to further destroy our immigration laws will be decisively stopped. We believe that a decisive vote against this bill will be a very wholesome thing and it will certainly lend encouragement to the members of this committe who have been doing their best to maintain and strengthen our immigration laws.

A. LEONARD ALLEN.
DAN R. MCGEHEE.
EDWARD O. MCCOWEN.
HUBERT S. ELLIS.
LOWELL STOCKMAN.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] moved that all debate on this bill close in 15 minutes. Does that limitation passed by the House apply to amendments on this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It does.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, let us look for just a moment at some of the actual results of previous legislation which was based on racial discrimination. Prior to 1924 Japan had been moving steadily in the direction of democratic reforms. American gifts after the 1924 earthquake led to unbelievable good will in Japan toward us. Then in 1924 we passed the law on racial discrimination excluding the Japanese and other orientals on the basis of their color. It was an utterly needless slap in the face. The same result could have been achieved by legislation such as we are considering today. Many Americans who knew Japan warned that it would discredit those Japanese liberals who were strongly pro-American and deliver Japan into the hands of the jingoists. The Japanese Ambassador warned there would be "grave consequences." Congress went ahead, choosing to belittle the Japanese. The Americans at Bataan and Iwo Jima would admit there have been rather "grave consequences." I have stated many times that war between Japan and ourselves was inevitable from that day on, if Japan could become strong enough to attack us. We obligingly supplied her with the necessary strength. As a result thousands and tens of thousands of Americans are dead today.

One day right after Pearl Harbor Mr. Churchill stood here and said, "What kind of people do the Japanese think we Anglo-Saxons are? Do they imagine that we are the sort of men which this treacherous attack will cause to fold up? Don't they know that that is the very sort of thing that will steel our wills to fight on until they are crushed? What kind of people do they think we are?" And he was right in his estimate of us.

But I could not help thinking of some Japanese who were saying, "What kind of people did you think we are? Did you think you could write into your statute books a law permanently branding us and stigmatizing us as inferior human beings because of the color of our skin, without having us hate you and grit our teeth and strive until we could become strong enough to stick a knife between your ribs and twist it as we did at Pearl Harbor?"

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. No, I do not.

I venture the prediction that history will record that what Congress did on that day in 1924 when it made race the basis of exclusion made war between ourselves and Japan inevitable, if we were not willing to change it.

This war in Europe more than anything else has been a war to determine who would control the development of Asia. Hitler knew that, and he poured commercial and diplomatic agents and military men into China during the thirties to try to get Asia to come along his way. England and France and Holland knew it. They are working their heads off right now to get their colonial empires reestablished. Japan knew it. She tried to get control of Asia first in order to attack us later. Russia knew it. She had her propagandists and agents working all over Asia for 20 years. We were the only people, with Asia right at our door, who did not realize that all along the war in Europe was a war to decide which type of idea is to control the development of a billion people—the enormous resources and manpower and potential markets of Asia. Our democratic ideas have a better chance now than ever before to play that dominant role. But they cannot win if the democracies refuse to treat individual Asiatics as equal human beings.

Look at the good results on the other side. We have treated the Filipinos on a basis of racial equality, and they stood by us in one of the finest demonstrations of loyalty the world has ever seen. Then 2 years ago we passed a law like this one putting the Chinese on a basis of equality with the peoples of Europe, the Americas, and Africa under our immigration laws. All who know will testify that the effect on China's morale was extraordinary. The act was worth to us divisions of American soldiers.

Now, what is the future to be in Asia? The orientals are rejecting the old colonial system. They are determined to get free from it and they will succeed. Which new way are they going to go? Are they going to go along with all the colored races to form a bloc twice as large as all the whites in the world? Against it we could win the military battles for a time, but in the long run it would out-endure us and out-suffer us and out-breed us. Or are the Asiatics going to go along with communism into world class war? Or are they going to go along with the democracies? The answer is still in our own hands. Are we going to treat them as we treat the peoples of other countries? Or are we going to treat them as racially inferior?

A Russian said some months ago, "The trouble with you Americans is that you do not understand us. We take all the empty seats. When did we ever push you or anybody else out of a seat you were occupying? But if you leave a seat

empty and we take it, then don't you come along and try to push us out."

That seemed to me an accurate analysis. The western world left eastern Europe a political vacuum, empty seats, and the Russians took them, then we came along and said, "Oh, no, you have to get out of Poland, or Rumania, or Jugoslavia." They would not and will not do it.

Some of us have been concerned for months that we would leave Asia an empty seat, a political vacuum, and if we did, Russia would go in and no one could blame her. It was only when we finally took a definite stand last spring in support of the Chinese Government that the tide began to swing in the direction of our type of political ideas—and, the seat being filled, Russia did not assume control of China, Manchuria, Korea, and so forth, as so many predicted, but instead promised to support the established Chinese Government even more unqualifiedly than we had. Let us learn that lesson and keep the seats occupied in Asia by doing everything possible to develop confidence and good will, or at least remove insults. If we do not provide positive leadership in Asia there are others who will.

India, next to the United States and Soviet Russia, is the richest nation in the world in natural resources. There are a billion people in Asia with the greatest undeveloped resources and markets in the world, in the process of deciding whether to go with the Communists or with all the nonwhite peoples, or with the democracies. Which way they go depends largely on our wisdom and our justice. Let us not be the ones who draw the color line and force them into that bloc. To treat the people of India justly does not mean letting in any appreciable number of immigrants or tearing down our immigration laws. It means putting them on a basis of equality with other nations under those laws. Giving them a quota of 100 as this bill provides starts treating them as equal human beings. Surely that can do no harm to us, and it certainly will do a lot of good to all concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to speak on this bill, but I heard some rather remarkable things. In the first place, I am astounded that anyone would assume that a resident of India ipso facto is a Communist. It ignores the fact that all of the education which India has received to date for all practical purposes has been of English background and character. How in the world then can you assume ipso facto that the people who are coming here are bringing a Communist ideology with them? To me that is the most tragic and silly "red herring" that has been drawn across this legislation.

Number two, I am a little bit surprised, in view of the people who volunteered in India to fight, and did fight, that any Member of this body who, along with many other Americans, who have the right to have that opinion, thought that Japan would never go to war with the United States, should now arise and criticize Gandhi or the people of India who thought they could do things by peaceful means.

Finally, I am surprised that any man who represents a constituency which is composed of people who have come into this country in one of the later waves of immigration should now begin to declare that Caucasian people with whom we desire to do world trade should not be admitted. I am surprised that anyone who is so interested in the St. Lawrence seaway would not understand that unless you have world trade you do not carry any traffic on seaways.

I am surprised and astounded at the arguments that have been made against this legislation. I hope we will get back to understanding the fact that we are removing a stigma which we as a white people and Caucasians have in all cases with a tremendous national arrogance and ignorance inflicted upon other Caucasian peoples too long ago. Now it is almost too late and it is certainly the proper time to rectify that error.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in the District of Columbia a good many years ago we had an engineer officer whom everybody knows affectionately as Dan Sultan. He was then a colonel. He became a lieutenant general in the Army of the United States in charge of the China-Burma-India theater. The last time I saw Dan Sultan in Delhi, India, he told me that he had the most unique army of any general in the history of warfare, in his command. Then he began to recite the nationalities that he had under his charge in Burma. Included in his command were whole regiments of Nepalese. Included in his command were whole regiments of Ghurkas. Included in his command were whole regiments of bearded Sikhs from India, and they fought shoulder to shoulder with the American doughboy and the British Tommy against the common enemy. What happens then to this argument that they were fighting only for themselves? They died in the elephant grass of Burma along with other soldiers in the interest of victory. Our scientists tell us that in this atomic age the only hope of the world is now to fracture the incrustations of the human heart and develop just a little good will. These people in India are reaching out now and turning westward. The people of the Balkans are looking in our direction. The people of France are beginning to look in our direction. Are they going to ask for bread and get a stone? Suppose we say on this day by our solemn vote, "No, we are willing to send a salesman of General Electric or Westinghouse and these other American companies to siphon out as many dollars as we can get, but we will not admit 100 of your people every 365 days." Suppose they say, "Very well, if that is all that brotherhood and good will means to the people of America, perhaps we ought to turn in another direction." It is the future of the world which is involved by the expression of our national attitude after world leaders gathered together at San Francisco and wrote their names upon parchment which gave life to a United Nations Organization. It is the hope of mankind at a time when the instrumentalities of destruction and the atomic bomb make us shudder for the future of mankind. This is going to be an exercise in good will toward 400,000,000 people who are looking westward today. Let us not fail them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make the record reflect the real state of facts. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] read a list of names of very distinguished and eminent Indians and implied they were Communists. He spoke of J. R. D. Tata, Z. D. Birla, Dr. John Matthai, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir Ardeshir Dalal, Mr. A. D. Shroff, Sir Shri Ram, Mr. Kasturbhai Lalbhai. Those men are distinguished bank directors, eminent industrialists, and manufacturers. It would be equivalent to saying that J. Pierpont Morgan or Edward Stettinius were Communists. Birla Brothers is as large and influential as the General Electric Co. Mr. Tata is the head of a steel firm which is the equivalent of the United States Steel Corp. You cannot say those men are Communists or Communist tainted. The gentleman from Ohio perhaps unintentionally made an egregious error that I am constrained to correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CELLER. I wish to state that the passage of this bill will mean greater infiltration of western ideas into Asia, particularly into India.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. CELLER. No. The time is too short.

Do you know that in the vicinity of India almost one-third of the population of the world resides? If they could be made to wear hats, for example, or to wear shoes, there would be no unemployment in this country. We would be quite busy filling orders. Beyond that, there would not be enough machines on this planet to supply the demand. For that reason and many others, I do hope that this bill will pass.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman wants to be fair and he wants to be honest about this matter. I did not refer to those gentlemen as Communists. I merely quoted from a document which, in my judgment, sets up a communistic program in India and I mentioned those names in connection with the authorship of that program.

Mr. CELLER. But the inference was plain, and I think the record should be made clear. I know some of these gentlemen. They are no more communistic than you or I. They firmly believe in private initiative and enterprise. They are renowned and distinguished in India as well as in England.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. If these people from India are granted citizenship, will they have the right to manage and control their own property?

Mr. CELLER. Anybody who is a citizen of this country has a perfect right to manage his own property. You would not want to take that right away from any of the citizens of the United States—even if such citizens are of Indian or any other descent.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Will they have a right to go into a restaurant to buy a meal or a drink?

Mr. CELLER. Have you that right? If they are citizens they have the right to do the same thing.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Does not the gentleman think that native-born American Indians ought to have the same right?

Mr. CELLER. That question is quite irrelevant and needs no answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. With the exception of those covered by subsections (b), (d), (e), and (f) of section 4, Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 155; 44 Stat. 812; 45 Stat. 1009; 46 Stat. 854; 47 Stat. 656; 8 U. S. C. 204), all persons of races indigenous to India entering the United States annually as immigrants shall be allocated to the quota for India computed under the provisions of section 11 of the said act. A preference up to 75 percent of the quota shall be given to Indians and other aliens racially eligible to naturalization, born and resident in India or its dependencies.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of section 2 of this act, the term "persons of races indigenous to India" shall mean any person who is as much one-half of the blood of a race indigenous to India and who is eligible to naturalization under section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended by section 1 of this act.

(b) For the purposes of section 2 of the act of December 17, 1943 (57 Stat. 601; 8 U. S. C., Supp. 703), the term "Chinese person" shall mean any person who is as much as one-half Chinese blood and who is eligible to naturalization under section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended by section 1 of this act.

(c) Notwithstanding the two preceding subsections, any quota immigrant who is of one-half Chinese blood and one-half the blood of a race indigenous to India shall, if born in India, be chargeable to the quota for India; if born in China, to the quota for the Chinese, or if born in neither of those countries, to whichever of the said quotas has the least applications for visas against it at the time the application for visa is made.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: On page 3, after line 25, add a new section:

"SEC. 4. The rights of citizenship of the American Indian shall not be abridged in the following particulars, except in the case of incompetency:

"(a) In the management and control of his own property;

"(b) In any restrictions against his person in the matter of food or drink."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill. It deals with another question. It is not the function of this legislation to go as far as the amendment seeks to go.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming desire to be heard?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. This deals with the American Indian who is as much a citizen as all of us.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I insist on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I wish to call attention to the fact that time was limited on the entire bill and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, and the Chair has so ruled.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, the subject matter of this bill is citizenship. I think it is high time that this Congress give some consideration to the American Indian. Thousands upon thousands of Indian boys have gone from the reservations of this country to every battle front of the world to fight side by side with your boys and my boys. It seems to me that the time has come when we should accord to these citizens the simple rights to which they are justly entitled. It is an understatement to say that the treatment of the American Indian is disgraceful. He has never been permitted to play a part in determining his own destiny. It seems to me that the policy of the Indian Bureau is the perpetuation of the system of Bureau control and domination. An Indian cannot buy or sell his property without the consent and approval of the Bureau. There are over 10,000 employees in the Indian Bureau, which represents 1 employee for about every 25 Indians. It is significant that there are more employees in the Indian Bureau than in some of the great departments of our National Government. It is quite natural that in such a system there is a desire to perpetuate the power of the Bureau. There are interminable laws and regulations that attempt to regiment the poor Indian in every conceivable way. It has robbed these original native-born Americans of free citizenship. The restrictions against the Indian in his personal conduct is an effrontery to the self-respect of a great race and the possibilities of a proud people. The American Indian is entitled to the opportunity to manage his own property and to work out his own destiny, and if he is good enough to fight and die for this country, he is certainly entitled to these simple rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair holds that the amendment is not germane and sustains the point of order.

Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLARK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 361, had directed him to report the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am.

The SPEAKER. Does any Member of the minority desire to offer a motion to recommit? If not the Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana) there were—ayes 47, noes 99.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 83, nays 207, not voting 141, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

YEAS—83

Abernethy	Gwynne, Iowa	Pickett
Allen, La.	Hare	Pittenger
Barrett, Wyo.	Harness, Ind.	Ploeser
Bennett, Mo.	Harris	Plumley
Bonner	Hill	Rankin
Brehm	Hobbs	Reed, N. Y.
Brooks	Hoeven	Rich
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Robsion, Ky.
Bryson	Hull	Rockwell
Buffett	Jenkins	Russell
Butler	Jensen	Schwabe, Mo.
Clevenger	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Cravens	Johnson, Ind.	Shafer
Cunningham	Jones	Simpson, Pa.
Davis	Kerr	Smith, Ohio
Doughton, N. C.	Landis	Springer
Durham	Lanham	Stefan
Dworshak	McCowen	Stewart
Ellis	McGregor	Sumner, Ill.
Fellows	Maloney	Taber
Fuller	Manasco	Tarver
Gallagher	Martin, Iowa	Thomas, N. J.
Gathings	May	Tibbott
Gearhart	Miller, Nebr.	Weichel
Gerlach	Norrell	Whitten
Gibson	O'Hara	Wilson
Gillette	O'Konski	Winstead
Graham	Pace	

NAYS—207

Allen, Ill.	Goodwin	Murphy
Andersen, H. Carl	Gordon	Murray, Wis.
	Gossett	Neely
Anderson, Calif.	Granger	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.	Green	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews, N. Y.	Hale	O'Neal
Angell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Outland
Arends		Patman
Arnold	Hancock	Patrick
Auchincloss	Hand	Patterson
Bailey	Harless, Ariz.	Peterson, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Hart	Poage
Beall	Havenner	Powell
Beckworth	Hays	Price, Fla.
Bender	Healy	Price, Ill.
Bennet, N. Y.	Hedrick	Rabaut
Bloom	Hendricks	Rabin
Bradley, Pa.	Henry	Ramey
Brown, Ga.	Herter	Ramspeck
Buck	Heselton	Rayfiel
Bulwinkle	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Bunker	Hoch	Resa
Byrnes, Wis.	Holifield	Richards
Canfield	Holmes, Mass.	Riley
Cannon, Mo.	Holmes, Wash.	Rivers
Carlson	Hook	Robertson, N. Dak.
Carnahan	Hope	
Case, N. J.	Horan	Robertson, Va.
Celler	Huber	Robinson, Utah
Chenoweth	Jarman	Roe, Md.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Church	Johnson, Luther A.	Rogers, N. Y.
Clark		Rooney
Clason	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rowan
Cole, Mo.		Ryter
Combs	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Cooper	Jonkman	Sadowsky
Corbett	Judd	Savage
Courtney	Kearney	Sheppard
Cox	Kee	Sheridan
Crawford	Keefe	Sikes
Crosser	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Ill.
Curtis	Kelly, Ill.	Slaughter
D'Alesandro	Kilday	Smith, Maine
De Lacy	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Delaney, James J.	Knutson	Smith, Wis.
	Kopplemann	Snyder
D'Ewart	Kunkel	Somers, N. Y.
Dickstein	LaFollette	Stevenson
Dirksen	Lea	Sullivan
Dolliver	LeCompte	Sundstrom
Dondero	Lemke	Talbot
Douglas, Calif.	Link	Talle
Douglas, Ill.	Luce	Thom
Doyle	Ludlow	Thomas, Tex.
Elsaesser	Lynch	Thomason
Engel, Mich.	McConnell	Trimble
Engle, Calif.	McCormack	Voorhis, Calif.
Ervin	McDonough	Vorys, Ohio
Fallon	McMillen, Ill.	Vursell
Feighan	Mahon	Walter
Fernandez	Marcantonio	Wasielewski
Fisher	Martin, Mass.	Weaver
Flood	Mason	West
Fogarty	Michener	Whittington
Folger	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Forand	Mills	Wigglesworth
Fulton	Monroney	Wolcott
Gardner	Morgan	Wolverton, N. J.
Gary	Morrison	Woodhouse
Geelan	Murdock	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—141

Adams	Cochran	Grant, Ala.
Andresen, August H.	Coffee	Grant, Ind.
	Cole, Kans.	Gregory
Baldwin, Md.	Cole, N. Y.	Griffiths
Baldwin, N. Y.	Colmer	Gross
Barden	Cooley	Gwinn, N. Y.
Barry	Curley	Hagen
Bates, Ky.	Daughton, Va.	Hall, Leonard W.
Bates, Mass.	Dawson	
Bell	Delaney, John J.	Halleck
Biemiller		Hartley
Bishop	Dingell	Hébert
Blackney	Domengeaux	Heffernan
Bland	Drewry	Hess
Bolton	Earthman	Howell
Boren	Eaton	Izac
Boykin	Eberharter	Jackson
Bradley, Mich.	Elliott	Jennings
Brumbaugh	Ellsworth	Kean
Buckley	Elston	Kefauver
Burch	Fenton	Keogh
Burgin	Flannagan	Kilburn
Byrne, N. Y.	Gamble	King
Camp	Gavin	Kinzer
Campbell	Gifford	Lane
Cannon, Fla.	Gillespie	Larcade
Case, S. Dak.	Gillie	Latham
Chapman	Gore	LeFevre
Chelf	Gorski	Lesinski
Clements	Granahan	Lewis
Lyle	Priest	Sumners, Tex.
McGehee	Quinn, N. Y.	Taylor
McGlinchey	Rains	Tolan
McKenzie	Randolph	Torrens
McMillan, S. C.	Reece, Tenn.	Towe
Madden	Rees, Kans.	Traynor
Mansfield, Mont.	Rizley	Vinson
	Rodgers, Pa.	Wadsworth
Mansfield, Tex.	Roe, N. Y.	Weiss
Merrow	Rogers, Fla.	Welch
Mott	Sasscer	White
Mundt	Scrivner	Winter
Murray, Tenn.	Sharp	Wolfenden, Pa.
Norton	Short	Wood
O'Toole	Sparkman	Woodruff, Mich.
Peterson, Fla.	Spence	Woodrum, Va.
Pfeifer	Starkey	Worley
Philbin	Stigler	
Phillips	Stockman	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mott for, with Mr. Randolph against.

Mr. McGehee for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Stockman for, with Mr. Tolan against.

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Adams against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Gorski against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Izaac with Mr. Short.

Mr. Wood with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Traynor with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Hess.

Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Brumbaugh.

Mr. Bland with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Kinzer.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Biemiller with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. King with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Priest with Mr. Rees of Kansas.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Burch with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Earthman with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. CURTIS and Mr. ZIMMERMAN changed their votes from aye to no.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, October 16, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] may address the House for 30 minutes after the legislative program for the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3938) to continue veteran benefits previously granted by acts of the Congress to temporary members of the Army of the United States, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including men inducted under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio address delivered by him on the benefit to agriculture from the full employment bill.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram from Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek which was sent to a meeting in Trenton to celebrate Chinese Independence Day.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the 15-minute special order I had for today and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a table from the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain quotations and an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on the thirty-fourth anniversary of its birth the Republic of China stands today as an independent and equal nation among the nations of the earth. Extraterritoriality for foreigners in China is gone. The concessions controlled by various Euro-

pean powers have been returned. The Japanese attempt at conquest has been broken. Russia has signed a 30-year treaty of friendship, including a promise not to interfere in China's internal affairs. The Communists in China are without hope of outside assistance, and the danger of civil war is thereby greatly reduced. China is at last free.

In some quarters it has been popular to criticize China for not making more rapid progress in achieving full democracy. Yet, if looked at with perspective, it is clear she has made substantial progress even in the midst of a cruel war of survival. Next to victory over Japan the most important fact in Asia today is this: That at a time when so much of the rest of the world, including our own country, has been putting more and more power into the hands of centralized government, the Chinese people and their greatest leaders are moving resolutely in the opposite direction. They have rejected the colonial system, which the imperialistic powers of Europe are trying to perpetuate in Asia; they have rejected totalitarianism of the Fascist model; they have rejected totalitarianism of the communistic model; they have rejected totalitarianism of the racial model which Japan tried to develop in Asia; they are deliberately choosing for themselves democracy of the American model with such modifications as their own particular situation and genius dictate.

This is the fact which overshadows all others. It has great significance not only for China but also for all of Asia and for the whole world, including the United States. True democracy with respect for individual human beings and all their rights is under attack in many parts of the world. We are now gaining a new partner in democracy, and China's experience with it will almost certainly determine which way Asia is to go.

Let no one have illusions about the ease of China's task in the years ahead. Chinese know how great are the difficulties—the hunger, the disease, the poverty, the inflation, the lack of transportation and modern industry, the millions of refugees, the illiteracy, the sectionalisms. They know there are some in the government who do not want to follow Generalissimo Chiang in transferring power to the people, and that there are some among the Communists who want to continue as a separate government with a private army, rather than become a loyal opposition. It will take time for each of the groups in China to learn to trust the other, and to trust the democratic way of winning support from the people, not by arms, but by giving them better government.

Yes, it will be slow and hard and there will be discouraging set-backs. Nevertheless, the great moment of opportunity has come. The oldest and largest and potentially the strongest people in the world is finding itself as a nation. China at long last is on the march toward government of the people, and by the people, and therefore for the people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier in the day and include a letter from the President, the State Department, and the Attorney General.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday when I made my speech about National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, I spoke from notes and not from manuscript and I had not time to finish all my remarks.

One of the very important things I did not reach was to point out the excellent work which has been and is being done by the subcommittee of the Labor Committee headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]. I regret very much that I had not the opportunity to get to that in my remarks. I want the RECORD to show how deeply all those concerned and interested in the handicapped people of this country appreciate the fine work that subcommittee has done and will continue to do.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

UNRRA

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning the Appropriations Committee will begin hearings on an appropriation of $550,000,000 for continuation of the work of UNRRA in Europe and the Far East. There is also pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs a recommendation of the President for an additional authorization of approximately $1,300,000,000 to carry the projected UNRRA program through another year.

At the end of July last together with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] I was asked by the State Department, at the suggestion of Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, to attend the third council meeting of UNRRA in London as an adviser. At the conclusion of that conference I was asked to visit various countries in Europe where UNRRA operations are being conducted and to report in full on that matter.

I had intended to make that report in the time allotted to me today, but in view of the lateness of the hour I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein certain exhibits pertaining to this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the report that I am now making is based on personal observation of the operations of UNRRA in the following countries: England, France, Germany, Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia, Austria, and Czechoslovakia, as well as upon a number of first-hand reports I have received with respect to the operation in Poland. I spent over 2 months in these countries and devoted my time exclusively to a study of the food situation, the general economic situation, and the relief and rehabilitation operations of UNRRA. I owe a debt of real gratitude to UNRRA officials, to the United States Army, and to the American officials for their unfailing helpfulness in this study, not only to myself, but likewise to my two able traveling companions, Dr. Albert Vitor, of the War Food Administration, and Mr. Edward Hensen, Director of Agricultural Rehabilitation for UNRRA.

In order to understand the over-all picture, it seems to me that there are a few simple questions that need to be answered at the outset. The first and foremost is the question, Are the liberated nations of Europe in as great distress as some people would have us believe? My answer to that question is emphatically "yes." Europe is now entering upon a winter, the consequences of which in terms of distress and deprivation cannot be overemphasized. Unless one has seen the extent of the devastation to cities, to bridges, to transportation systems, one cannot visualize the conditions under which millions of people must live. In addition, southern Europe and north Africa were cursed with a drought such as they have not known in a century. On top of extraordinarily difficult living conditions and a serious food situation, the shortage of fuel and the difficulties of transport create a sum total of actual and potential distress which cannot help but move any unprejudiced observer very deeply.

I shall not dwell on the question of need any longer because I think that you all have had enough eye witness accounts from sources that you can trust to be convinced that the need is very real and very great.

Assuming that the needs are as stated, the next question that arises, is, Should the United States take its part in helping to alleviate this suffering? It seems to me that this question must be approached from two angles. The first is a purely humanitarian angle, and the answer is, of course, in the affirmative. The second is a very practical angle as to whether or not it is in our national interest to try to maintain even minimum living standards in the distressed areas. To me, the answer to this question is likewise in the affirmative. I think we have a very real national interest in trying to stave off the inevitable political anarchy which follows in the wake of distress and destitution. We have every reason in our own selfish interest to try to restore Europe to a point where its people can, through their own efforts, recover a degree of self-respect and reasonable optimism in regard to the future. The entire postwar world must be the loser if destitution continues in so large a section of the globe.

Any appraisal of the European picture must take account of the fact that the nations of Europe have to be divided into three categories. The first are those nations which are in a position to achieve a certain degree of recovery through their own means, either because they have foreign exchange available to them or because they are in a credit position to

borrow. These countries comprise the majority of those in western Europe, namely, England, France, Belgium, Holland, and Norway. The second group are the ex-enemy countries—Germany, Austria, and Italy. Germany and Austria are, of course, under military armies of occupation, and the primary responsibility for the welfare of the people in those nations devolves upon the military authorities. Italy's case, however, is somewhat different. A small military force still remains in northern Italy, but by and large the country is being governed by an Italian Government recognized by the larger powers, and it can be considered an essentially free country. However, Italy has no foreign exchange whatever with which to make essential purchases abroad, particularly in foodstuffs, and as the military authorities, who up to now have fed the people, are withdrawing, Italy presents a very serious problem. The only foreign exchange available to the Government which might be used for the purchase of foodstuffs is an item of approximately $150,000,000 which represents the Army pay which the Italian Government advanced to our armies of occupation. This sum, however, can last but a short time in view of the tremendous needs before the next harvest.

The third category comprises those countries which have been liberated from the enemy and which have no foreign exchange whatsoever with which to get outside aid. These countries are Greece, Yugoslavia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. It is this latter category of countries in which UNRRA is presently carrying on its principal work of relief and rehabilitation, and so I shall limit my report largely to these countries. At a later date I hope to have something to say with respect to the problem of Germany and Austria.

There is a general misconception that UNRRA is carrying on its activities throughout all of Europe. I wish to repeat that outside of its operations with respect to displaced persons, which I shall describe later, it is confining its work entirely to the third category of countries that I have mentioned, with the exception of a small operation in Italy.

What does the work of UNRRA consist of? Here again I think it is important to list the different types of operations which UNRRA conducts and to describe each in some detail.

The first operation deals with the problem of displaced persons. Before the war on the Continent ended, the Allies knew that within Germany proper there were many hundreds of thousands of persons who were nationals of conquered countries surrounding Germany and who either through forced labor or for other reasons had been brought within the limits of Germany proper. It was realized that to get these people back to their own homes would be a stupendous task. No one, however, realized how great the problem was until Germany had been finally defeated. At the conclusion of this report I am attaching a table showing the nationalities and numbers of displaced persons with whom the armies of occupation had to deal in the so-called American, British, and French zones of occupation. There are no figures available for displaced persons in the Russian zone of occupation. These figures likewise show how many persons had been returned to their countries of origin by the middle of September and how many on that date still remained to be repatriated or relocated. As you can see from examination of this table, the armies of occupation have done an amazing job in having already repatriated some five and one-half million people. Of the eleven hundred thousand remaining, you will notice that some 80 percent are people of Polish origin. The reason that so many Poles remain is twofold. In the first place, when Germany first surrendered, the Polish liaison officers who went into Germany all represented the Polish Government in London, which at that time was recognized by Great Britain and the United States.

These Polish liaison officers did their best to persuade the displaced Poles not to return to Poland, because the country seemed to be completely under Russian domination. In the second place, transportation into Poland and facilities within Poland for taking care of these persons were extremely limited. It is now expected that during the coming winter many hundreds of thousands will return to Poland, provided the liaison officers from the new Polish Government who are now in Germany can persuade them that they will not be persecuted on their return and that there is some shelter for them. It is expected that at least 75 percent can be repatriated within the next few months. However, it will undoubtedly be next summer before provision can be made for the remainder, as well as for the persons of other nationalities who still come under the category of displaced persons.

There are a great number of camps throughout the occupied areas in which these displaced persons are being given shelter and food. UNRRA had arranged with the armies that it would not assist with the various problems raised by these destitute people until called upon to do so by the responsible authorities in the Army. At first, this was left to the discretion of the divisional commanders. Later, it was made an over-all policy. UNRRA teams were asked to come in and help with the internal organization of camps in which the various groups were housed, and during a considerable interim period there was great misunderstanding and great confusion as to the role that UNRRA was to play. UNRRA made some bad mistakes in its recruiting of personnel for this work. Furthermore, UNRRA had no food of its own, no transportation, and no clear mandate as to just what its responsibilities should be. That whole situation, which for a time was an extremely unhappy one, has now been very largely remedied through the drafting of suitable agreements between UNRRA and the control authorities and through the selection of very much better personnel for the UNRRA teams.

The division of authority is roughly as follows: The armies are supplying food, transportation, and the outside guarding of the camps; UNRRA is caring for the entire internal organization of the camps, including health, medical supplies, supplementary needs such as clothing, et cetera. The costs are being charged to reparations.

On the whole, I would certify that the arrangement is working well and that many of the valid and serious criticisms which were directed at the UNRRA organization 6 months ago with respect to this operation are no longer valid.

Without taking too much time on the question of displaced persons, I do want to point out that they present a very tragic and troublesome human problem. Among them are perhaps 10,000 children who are clearly not German, but whose parentage and nationality no one knows. There are persons in every walk of life and of every type of political persuasion. There are perhaps 100,000 Jews who have no homes anywhere. The eventual settlement of these persons in places where they could reconstruct themselves presents a real challenge and one which I am afraid cannot be met immediately. In the meanwhile, those who have been caught and are destitute through no fault of their own are entitled to the most sympathetic treatment and to a higher standard of living than the German people themselves.

The operations of UNRRA with respect to displaced persons are carried on as I have said within the military zones in Germany and likewise in the military zones occupied by the British, French, and Americans in Austria. In addition, UNRRA is helping to a small degree with the resettlement of these people in the nations to which they have been returned, outside of the Russian areas.

While the displaced-persons operation has received a great deal of notoriety and has been the target of a great many criticisms, it represents in financial outlay only a very small percentage of the operations which UNRRA is conducting.

UNRRA's principal function is in connection with relief and rehabilitation in the countries of eastern and southern Europe which are without any means of their own. This latter operation divides itself into four parts. The first consists of importing and transporting within the countries sufficient foodstuffs to prevent starvation and provide a minimum diet. The second part consists of agricultural rehabilitation, the third of industrial rehabilitation, and the fourth of health and sanitation.

With respect to the first; namely, the importation of food, there is but very little explanation required. However, I shall return to it in a few moments in connection with the over-all food needs of the continent of Europe.

The second part of the program; namely, agricultural rehabilitation, is to my mind perhaps the most constructive of UNRRA's operations. In each of the countries where there is an UNRRA mission there are agricultural technicians who have made a careful study of the requirements of that country in order to bring back its own agriculture so that it might become more nearly self-supporting, or as in the case of some of the countries, return to an export position. It is hard to realize that during the war

years the countries have had no fertilizers to speak of and no insecticides. It is also hard to visualize how completely draft animals, tractors, and agricultural implements have either been destroyed or taken away from the peasants.

Already UNRRA has done a remarkable job in getting tractors on the land for plowing, in bringing in draft animals, in providing seeds and in mobilizing phosphate rock and nitrates for the production of fertilizer so that there will be sufficient available to spread on the land in the spring.

In addition, the technical skills of the agricultural experts who are serving with the mission are extremely helpful to the newly created ministries of agriculture in each of these countries. I feel so optimistic with respect to the results which this program is achieving that I feel that by the next harvest year each of the so-called UNRRA countries, with the exception of Greece and Italy, will be able to take care of itself insofar as its essential food needs are concerned.

The third category of operations being conducted by UNRRA consists of industrial rehabilitation. In the main, this embodies the importation of certain raw materials, notably cotton and wool, so as to allow the industries of the country to resume their production of very badly needed materials. The program also includes the importation of machinery necessary to get essential public utilities reestablished, as well as specialized machinery, such as sawmills for producing lumber in areas where sawmills had been destroyed or removed by enemy action.

Another extremely important phase of industrial rehabilitation is in the supplying of transport materials. Without the thousands of trucks, mostly from surplus Army stocks, which were moved into these countries it would have been impossible to move food from the ports of entry to internal points, as well as to begin some revival of industrial life. A minimum of railway equipment is included in this phase of the program. Likewise necessary fuels.

There are some phases of the program which are naturally controversial because it is very difficult to distinguish between what might be termed rehabilitation and reconstruction. Reconstruction per se is not a part of the UNRRA program, and yet, as in the case of railway equipment, the line of demarcation is extremely difficult to draw.

The last phase of the operation deals with health and sanitation. It was to be expected that as a result of wholesale destruction of cities and sanitary facilities epidemics of one kind or another would be prevalent throughout the liberated areas. Hospital supplies of every kind were at the lowest possible point. UNRRA has replenished many of these hospital supplies and has likewise recruited to its missions many very able public health officials who have been doing first class work in preventing epidemics. Likewise, these public health officials have conducted, particularly in southern Europe, antimalarial campaigns with very marked success.

When it is considered that in Greece, for instance, one-third of the population is rendered unfit for work for 30 days in a year because of malaria, one gets some idea of the terrific wastefulness of this disease. Campaigns to eradicate the mosquito by the spraying of DDT through the exhausts of airplanes over mosquito-breeding marshes have been extraordinarily successful, not only in Greece but also in Italy. Tremendous benefits will, I feel certain, come from this type of operation. The expense has been comparatively small, and the work has been very ably carried out.

From the very brief description that I have tried to give of the types of work which UNRRA is doing you can perhaps visualize the scope. However, some questions naturally arise, and these require specific answers.

How well is the job being done? This question is being asked repeatedly, and it is very difficult to answer categorically. Some of the missions are very ably staffed; some not so well. In some countries there is fine governmental cooperation; in others it is difficult to discover just what is happening to UNRRA goods. It is extremely easy to criticize both individuals and organizational methods. I have been very free in my criticism of a number of things that I saw, and I shall continue to be critical in the hope that remedies will be found.

On the other hand, everything must be comparative, and again it is only fair to ask questions. Can any other organization do the job? Can it be done better?

With respect to the first of these questions, I am convinced that no other organization can be substituted for UNRRA at this time. UNRRA's functions are essentially emergency functions. At best, they are likely to continue only through next year, and I feel that it would be impossible and highly impractical to try to substitute any other organization for UNRRA at this time. Its pipe lines for the supplying of food and other necessary materials are in order and are becoming steadily more efficient. It has its agreements with the different countries. It has its staffs in each country and in the principal offices in London and Washington. To create something entirely new is unthinkable. To substitute the American Army, as some have suggested, would be entirely impractical at this date. To ask the Red Cross to undertake the job would be most unfair to that organization both because it is entirely unequipped to handle certain phases of the program, such as agricultural and industrial rehabilitation, and further, because its charter limitations might require it to do something of an entirely different nature.

If, as seems to me obvious, no substitute for UNRRA could now be devised, is it possible that UNRRA can do the job better than it has hitherto? My answer to that is a very simple "Yes."

UNRRA has been improving its personnel steadily. From the time that Governor Lehman asked Commander Jackson, an extremely able Australian naval officer, who had achieved great distinction first in organizing the supplying of Malta during the perilous existence of that island in the early years of the war, then as head of the Middle East Supply Council in Cairo, to become his principal representative in London, many administrative changes have been made—all of them for the better.

Commander Jackson deserves tremendous credit for what he has done. He slept at night on a cot in his office in London for a period of 6 months and has now left London to take a brief and well-earned rest. There has been appointed in his place Gen. Humphrey Gale, who was chief supply officer for General Eisenhower and a man of great recognized ability.

The displaced persons operations are now under the charge of General Morgan, a very able British officer who is well and very favorably known to General Eisenhower in that he was the principal British planning officer for D-day.

These and other changes have made of UNRRA a greatly improved operating organization.

There is one comment with respect to UNRRA personnel which I feel reluctantly compelled to make. During the early days of the organization it was extremely difficult to recruit able personnel, largely because the war was in progress, able manpower was at a premium, and those who were engaged in active war pursuits could not be relieved of their duties in order to join what was essentially a postwar organization. Furthermore, the conclusion of the war came at a much later date than was expected in the summer of 1944, and as a result, many of those UNRRA personnel who had been recruited to assist in UNRRA's work had to wait many months with nothing to do. A number of able individuals drifted away from the organization, and when UNRRA was finally called upon to undertake its task, it had to do the best it could with the personnel at hand.

Over and over again, Governor Lehman and Commander Jackson have asked our State Department and our military authorities to release to UNRRA men of proven capability to take on responsible positions. Almost invariably the individuals asked for have not been forthcoming, and as a result, there have been frequent long delays in filling important key positions. When finally these positions had to be filled, they were filled with persons of nationality other than United States citizens.

The fault in this respect lies squarely on the shoulders of our own Government and not on the UNRRA organization. If anyone wishes to criticize the fact that many key positions in the organization are held by persons other than Americans, the answer lies hidden somewhere within our own Government and not because of an unwillingness to select Americans for the task.

It is no more than fair to note that UNRRA, in addition to its shortcomings because of lack of properly qualified personnel, encountered all sorts of obstacles in the clearance of its requisitions for supplies and its requisitions for cargo space. There was lack of coordination in Europe between UNRRA and the armed services and, likewise, no coordination between UNRRA and the foreign-service officials of the State Department

and other United States agencies, a situation, the blame for which rests entirely on the shoulders of our own Government.

In view of the conclusions that I have reached as just indicated, I feel very strongly that our problem today is not one of trying to find a substitute for UNRRA or of stopping UNRRA's operations, but rather one of trying to assist in making these operations more effective and more efficient.

While it is impossible for me in this brief report to cover the detailed operations of UNRRA in each of the countries visited, I do not wish to leave the impression from what I have said that I feel that this Government should continue appropriating money to the support of UNRRA without certain specific restrictions. In some of the countries which I visited, bitter criticisms were voiced against the UNRRA operation, often by our own officials, because of the feeling that too little was known as to what became of UNRRA goods once they entered the country, and too little was known of the operations of the government with respect to its own economic problems. After very careful consideration, I have drafted some proposed specific restrictions on the future appropriation by the Congress of money for UNRRA, which I feel can help remedy specific situations and be of constructive aid in the whole picture. These suggestions are as follows:

No part of the appropriation herein for carrying out the provisions of the joint resolution of March 24, 1944, entitled "Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization" shall be available for that purpose subsequent to December 31, 1945, unless and until the President has received from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification to the effect that the furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of any country, will be made only under agreements and other suitable provisions providing:

(1) That properly accredited representatives of the press of any of the member nations of the Administration will be granted full liberty to observe and report upon the distribution and utilization of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services furnished for such country.

(2) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of such country with other nations, together with full information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to UNRRA.

(3) That markings on supplies furnished by the Administration which indicate the national source of such supplies will not be changed.

(4) That at regular periods such country will make available to UNRRA statements of its current financial position, which statements shall set forth in detail all receipts of such country from the sale and from the rental of supplies furnished by the Administration.

(5) That the Administration will be permitted, during the period of its operations in such country, to retain title to all motor-transport equipment supplied by the Administration, and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to allocate to individual vehicles the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration.

(6) That the press of such country will be permitted to publish all statements, relating to the operations of the Administration in such country, made by the administrative head of the Administration's mission in such country.

And furthermore that no part of the appropriation shall be available for the purchase of foodstuffs to be shipped subsequent to August 31, 1946, to any country except China and in the case of China subsequent to December 31, 1946, and that no part of the appropriation shall be available for the purchase of rehabilitation materials to be shipped subsequent to October 30, 1946, to any country except China and in the case of China subsequent to February 28, 1947.

You will notice that these restrictions fall into two categories: The first deal with what I might call lifting the veil of secrecy which in some instances lies rather heavily over the internal activities of certain of the countries to which assistance is going. As you know, UNRRA is contemplating enlarging its sphere of activities to the White Russian Socialist Soviet Republic and to the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic. Little if anything is known to the outside world with respect to conditions in these countries, although there is every reason to believe that they were terribly devastated as a result of German military action. It is my own strong conviction that secrecy is the greatest breeder of distrust and misunderstanding. It is for that reason that I am convinced that all relief operations, of whatever nature, should be carried out in the full light of day; that the press should be given an opportunity to observe every phase of the relief operation; that UNRRA itself ought to be given full information with regard to any trade or barter agreements which a particular country may have made; and that the press of each country ought to explain fully to the people of that country just what UNRRA is and what it is trying to accomplish.

While I may be accused of having political motives in the drafting of these restrictions, I nevertheless can assure you that I feel that these restrictions are entirely consistent with an intelligent program. It is inconceivable to me, for instance, that UNRRA should be able to plan a program of food or industrial material imports if it does not have full information as to what foodstuffs and other materials are being imported or exported under secret agreements by the country which it is trying to assist. It is further inconceivable to me that UNRRA can perform its most efficient services in assisting a nation to get on its feet unless it is kept fully advised as to the financial situation of the nation and in particular knows just what revenues the nation is deriving from the sale or rental of goods which it has received from UNRRA.

I ought to explain at this point that the agreements which UNRRA has with each of the receiving countries specifically provide that title to all UNRRA supplies imported into the country shall be vested in the government of that country immediately upon the discharge of the goods at any point of entry or on the crossing of a frontier. From that point on, distribution, processing, and sale of these goods becomes the responsibility of the government and the government alone, but UNRRA is permitted to observe how these procedures are carried out. No control with regard to distribution is permitted to UNRRA, and it can protest only if it finds that the distribution discriminates against any person or group because of race, religion, or political affiliation.

The specific restriction which I have suggested with respect to the retention by UNRRA of title to transport equipment and fuel for that equipment is purely in the nature of a permissive restriction. The only way of being certain that distribution is being made on an equitable basis—should doubt exist that distribution is being made in this way—is through some measure of control over the means of distribution; namely, the motor transport. In Greece, for instance, where in the early stages of its operations UNRRA was suffering considerable losses through pilferage from the trucks which were moving supplies from the ports to inland points, these losses were cut down to the amazingly low figure of 1½ percent after the UNRRA authorities, in full cooperation with the Greek authorities, instituted a system of simple but nevertheless effective controls—the routing of the trucks, the issuance of gasoline, and the collection of proper vouchers and receipts.

The restriction which I suggest with respect to the possible changing of markings on supplies furnished by UNRRA is designed to counteract a criticism often heard, and in some cases justified, that the markings on certain types of vehicles and food supplies which indicated the country from which these supplies originated had been defaced or changed.

I am certain that no country could take offense at these restrictions and that they would go far toward satisfying many persons who have had valid criticisms to make.

The second set of restrictions which I am proposing have to do with the cut-off dates of UNRRA operations. These restrictions are advanced, not with the niggardly idea that by stopping operations as of a given date we should merely be saving money, but because I believe they are in the best interests of the recipient countries themselves. After all, the primary purpose of UNRRA is to assist nations so that they can become self-supporting and thereafter be able to help themselves. There is no denying the fact that some nations are prone to think that help is likely to come to them indefinitely and that there is no urgent need for them to bestir themselves to put their own houses in order. If these nations are put on notice definitely that UNRRA assistance must cease after a day certain, they will then be able to gear their own programs with that date in mind. I hope very much that the House will see fit to adopt these amendments.

I cannot end this report without some comment on the feeding operations of UNRRA in relation to the world food supply and particularly the supply of food in the United States. I have heard the opinion voiced frequently that because of UNRRA operations we are constrained to ration ourselves in the United States and

that by and large we are asking too great a sacrifice from the American people in return for the doubtful benefits involved. The best answer to this type of argument lies, I believe, in a few figures.

The commodities which are in shortest supply in the world today come under four heads: wheat, sugar, fats and oils, and meats. If the full UNRRA requisitions in these four commodities are met, excluding a possible large Italian operation, the amounts allocated to UNRRA would be as follows: in wheat, UNRRA would receive roughly 10 percent of the export surpluses from Canada, the United States, and the Argentine; in sugar, UNRRA would receive roughly 1 percent of the world's supply or 2 percent of the amount which normally goes into world channels; in fats and oils, UNRRA would receive roughly 1 percent of a single year's production in the United States; in meat, UNRRA would probably receive none.

This last statement requires some explanation. UNRRA today is negotiating with the Army to purchase roughly $100,000,000 worth of surplus Army rations. These Army rations contain approximately 400,000,000 pounds of meat. However, these rations represent meat which had already been taken from previous years' production, meat which is in tinned form, is expensive, and would find no ready market in the United States. In other words, the meat requirements of the UNRRA countries can be met without in any way diminishing the current marketable supply in the United States.

In view of these figures, I do not think that any honest person can pretend that the essential humanitarian and social work which UNRRA is doing is a serious drain on the food supply of the United States. I might even add that UNRRA is going to be most helpful in taking from the market a number of agricultural products which this year are going to be in surplus supply in this country.

Let there be no misunderstanding with respect to the figures which I have just given with regard to UNRRA's food requirements. As I tried to explain earlier in this report, UNRRA is operating only in a limited number of countries which have no resources of their own. It is not operating in the many other countries of Europe, whose food needs likewise are very great. I shall not at this time try to summarize the total requirements of all the other European countries and Africa, but they are very considerable, and it is probable that in order to meet all these needs we shall continue to be pinched, until spring at least, insofar as sugar and fats and oils are concerned.

To anyone who is interested in details on the food situation in all the countries of the world and who is particularly interested in seeing how large a quantity of exportable food is likely to be available in the United States during the coming year, I recommend that he study carefully the very full report of the Department of Agriculture, dated October 1, 1945, in which the best available estimates on food and supplies are very clearly set forth.

In this brief report I have made no mention of UNRRA activities or programs for China or other liberated areas in the Far East. I do not feel qualified to discuss this phase of UNRRA's operation other than to say that I feel that we owe China and the other liberated areas in the Far East a great debt of gratitude for their part in the war, and I feel that the same humanitarian considerations and the considerations of self-interest which have to date dictated the assistance we have given to liberated countries in Europe should apply equally in the Far East.

The tabular summary of displaced persons in Europe referred to in the course of my remarks is as follows:

COMBINED DISPLACED PERSONS
EXECUTIVE, CARE OF G–5, DIVISION, USFET,
September 13, 1945.

I. Summary of current situation

Requiring repatriation from US/BR/FR zones (Germany)	1,072,000
Probably nonrepatriable	308,000
Repatriated	5,152,000
Total	6,532,000

II. Current situation by nationality

Nationality	Requiring repatriation from United States, British, and French zones (Germany)	Probably nonrepatriable	Repatriated
French	2,000		1,505,000 (Sept. 5).
Dutch	2,000		271,000 (Aug. 22).
Belgian and Luxemburg	1,000		295,000 (Aug. 26).
Danish			5,000 (estimated).
Norwegian			6,000 (estimated).
Russian		50,000	2,022,000 (Sept. 10).
Estonian		19,000	
Latvian		57,000	1,000 (Sept. 10).
Lithuanian		44,000	
Polish	826,000		84,000 (Sept. 10).
Czechoslovak		3,000	135,000 (estimated).
Yugoslav		30,000	204,000 (estimated).
Greek	3,000		42,000 (Sept. 10).
Italian	24,000		527,000 (Sept. 6).
Hungarian	88,000		10,000 (Sept. 10).
Rumanian	12,000		5,000 (Sept. 10).
Bulgarian	1,000		
Stateless	33,000		
Germans		105,000	51,000.
Others and unclassified	80,000		19,000 (Sept. 10).
Total	1,072,000	308,000	5,152,000.

(*a*) Repatriation figures for French, Dutch, Belgians, Luxemburgers, Czechs, Yugoslavs, and Italians are obtained from official sources of governments concerned. The figures include repatriates from areas other than the British, United States, and French zones of Germany.
(*b*) Included in the French figures of 1,505,000 are 153,100 repatriated by air. A 10-percent allowance for self-repatriation is included.
(*c*) For details of Belgian-Luxemburg repatriation figures, see rept. 44.
(*d*) British zone authorities report 177,637 western Europeans received from the Soviet zone as of Sept. 1. American zone authorities report the reception of 302,166 persons, including 231,305 western Europeans, 61,558 Italians, 1,898 Czechs, 5,428 Yugoslavs, 88 Balts, 1,455 Poles, 145 Rumanians, 3 Greeks, 71 Hungarians, and 215 others from the Soviet zone as of Sept. 10.

III. Displaced persons on hand in United States, British, and French zones in Germany and in Third U. S. Army sector in Czechoslovakia

Military unit and zone	Date of report	In camps	Others estimated	Total
Western district (Seventh U. S. Army)	Sept. 10	174,549		174,549
Eastern district (Third U. S. Army)	do	357,347		357,347
Czechoslovakia (Third U. S. Army)	Aug. 31	111,602		111,602
Total United States zone		643,498		643,498
Total French zone	Sept. 1	93,960		93,960
First Corps		136,380		136,380
Eighth Corps		145,308		145,308
Thirtieth Corps		316,494		316,494
Total British zone	Sept. 7	598,182	45,180	643,362
Grand total		1,335,640	45,180	1,380,820

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FULL EMPLOYMENT AS A NATIONAL GOAL

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has amended and passed the full employment bill. At the same time it has raised an issue as to what is the paramount national objective in this country.

The amended bill includes a proviso that Federal expenditures necessary to achieve full employment shall be undertaken only if they are "consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government and other essential considerations of national policy."

On the face of it, one can hardly take exception to such a requirement. Whether explicitly stated or not, it is obvious that the various items of Federal legislation should be consistent with each other and should all be integrated and oriented toward the over-all objectives of national policy. This indeed is one of the major purposes of the full employment bill—to set up procedures for working out a legislative program that will deliberately take into account

all phases of Federal activity and knit them together into a national economic policy that is internally consistent.

Nevertheless, there is an implication here that must be challenged—the inference that there will be occasions on which the full-employment objective conflicts with other national goals and so will have to be rejected. This implication must be thrust out into the open and debated on its merits.

My own position is that I cannot conceive of a situation in which full employment would be inconsistent with anything else to which we might aspire. On the contrary, I consider the achievement of the full-employment level of activity so fundamental to all other "needs and obligations of the Federal Government" that it becomes the A No. 1 "consideration of national policy."

In short, the insistence on putting such specific language into the bill seems to me like arguing whether or not to support economic prosperity in this country in case the people decide they do not want it.

Nevertheless I am aware that there are some who do not accept as axiomatic that full employment is the paramount problem with which we are confronted today. There are individuals and groups in this country who feel that the existence of job opportunity for all who are able and willing to work would be incompatible with other objectives which to them are more important.

For this reason it is fitting that we should reopen the whole question and ask ourselves again what it is that we are after. Let me put it to you squarely. What do you think the primary goal of Federal policy should be? What do you believe it is that we as a nation cherish most?

OPPORTUNITY TO EARN A LIVING

Let us look at it first in terms of the people who comprise the Nation. What is it that is most important to them as individuals?

Remember that an overwhelming majority of these people are workers or families of workers—workers on farms and workers in shops of their own as well as workers in the shops and factories of others. Remembering that, can you believe that there is anything more basic in our national life than the opportunity to earn a living?

It has been charged that this is a crass materialistic view—that work should not be made a primary aim of life. I ask you, What else can a man be but materialistic when he is faced with the problem of sheer subsistence? If it is materialism to desire bread and milk and clothing and shelter for one's wife and children, so be it.

But what other avenue do most other individuals have to the "finer things of life" than the incomes earned from their jobs? If we want man to turn his thoughts to music and art and literature and gracious living, we must provide him economic security. We must relieve him from the gnawing and persistent fear of destitution. We must give him access to the health and education and pleasant surroundings which are so necessary if leisure is to be an opportunity and not mere idleness.

WORLD PEACE

No doubt some of you are thinking that world peace is by far the paramount issue today—much more crucial than daily livelihood. And certainly you are convincing if you speak of what war means in terms of shattered minds and bodies and homes, of hunger, loneliness, and pain, of physical destruction.

But where is the conflict of goals? Every day we are being told that the greatest single contribution which we in this country can make to world peace is to achieve and sustain full employment. And the greatest single threat to international cooperation is the growing fear in other countries that they must insulate themselves against depression in this, the world's leading industrial Nation.

The world has learned a lot since the last war. It has learned that economic warfare is the chief source and the chief method of political warfare. And it has learned that the level of economic activity in the United States is strategic and can make the difference between world prosperity and world depression.

So if we are sincere about world peace, we must commit ourselves to full employment. This will assure other nations that it is safe to deal with us, export and import barriers will begin to disappear, exchange currencies will stabilize, world trade will expand, living standards will rise everywhere, the monopolistic scramble for markets will lose its point, and nations will once again begin to trust one another. This, gentlemen, is the only safeguard we have against war. The stuff out of which peace is made must be fashioned at home. International conferences can do no more than weave it into the final pattern.

FREE ENTERPRISE

I know there are lots of people who, if asked what they consider most important in Government policy, would think first about profits. This is just as logical and just as materialistic as for workers to think about jobs. For both it is a means of livelihood that is at stake. But it so happens that the profit takers have a more influential voice in shaping legislation. Hence, we are likely to hear, and have already heard, a great deal about the dangers of a full-employment program to the free-enterprise system.

Again I am at a loss to see how the two are incompatible. Again I think that the maintenance of full employment is a fundamental prerequisite for preserving the free-enterprise system.

After all, free enterprise as we know it pivots round two concepts—markets and competition.

The connection between jobs and markets is almost too obvious for comment. Unemployed workers are not good purchasers. Nor will products fetch a fancy price in a depressed market.

But competition is equally basic to free enterprise. "Enterprise" implies competition. An economy that is monopolistic ceases to be either enterprising or free. Monopoly is a disease which eats away at the system and, if it is not destroyed, will eventually destroy that system. To be sure, monopoly makes for profits, big profits, but only for the few at the expense of the many. It forces out would-be small and new competitors and it kills new ideas and methods. The high price and restricted output which are the methods of monopoly destroy markets. Worst of all, monopoly is one of the principal causes of the devastating cycles of prosperity and depression which are the greatest menace to the free-enterprise system.

Now, admittedly, full employment by itself could not cure this monopoly disease, but this much is certain—that disease cannot be cured without full employment. The loss of faith in steady markets impels producers to price for depression—that is, to pile up profit reserves during periods of boom to tide them over periods of bust. Not until producers are assured of the stable and expanding markets generated by continuous full employment will they be willing to embark wholeheartedly upon the traditional American policy of high volume and low price and to give free rein to the new ideas, new methods, and new enterprise which are the essence of our free enterprise system.

DEMOCRACY

There are those, sincere and otherwise, who proclaim that in carrying out a Government promise of full job opportunity we would lose our democratic way of life.

Certainly, this awful war has demonstrated that there is nothing more precious in life than that bundle of economic freedoms which we term "democracy." I am sure there is not one among us willing to tolerate unnecessary Government interference in the market place. We in America are unalterably committed to that process of law making which works through the will of the majority—to government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Indeed, it is precisely because democracy is such a primary goal of our national life that we must face up squarely to this problem of unemployment and must pledge all our resources to the realization of the fundamental right to work. The essence of democracy is response to the will of the people, and the people of this country are demanding jobs. That demand is so loud and so insistent that it will not brook interference. All obstacles to it will be swept away. It is too late now for inertia or delay, for weaselly words or double talk.

I can assure you, gentlemen, that if we in Congress do not make good on the administration's pledge of full employment—I should say on the country's pledge, committed to by leaders of both political parties—we shall be swept from office. And if our successors do not carry through on that promise, they too will go, and with them our democratic way of life.

Unemployment gave rise to Hitler and his nazism—to Mussolini and his fascism—and it can happen here.

Democracy can survive only so long as it meets the acid test of democracy—which means only so long as it satisfies the fundamental needs of the people. And this means those needs which the people themselves conceive to be fundamental—not what a few in Congress tell them they should regard as all-important.

To those who fear that a full-employment commitment by the Government would involve a dangerous increase in bureaucratic controls, I should like merely to point to the record. Do you recall the era of Government regulations that was ushered in by the great depression? The surest way to multiply Government controls is to allow mass unemployment to develop. Then we shall have everyone running to the Government for help—for subsidies, for special protection in the scramble for markets and jobs, for the imposition of restrictive controls upon the other fellow. If, on the other hand, the fiscal and regulatory powers of the Government are directed toward influencing, not isolated segments of the economy, but the overall level of demand in the interest of jobs, adequate markets, and free competition, then there will be full scope for enterprise and democracy.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

These are big concepts with which I have been dealing in discussing the basic considerations that must govern Government employment policy—concepts like human values and world peace and free enterprise and democracy.

Hence, it is an anticlimax—indeed, akin to the ridiculous which follows the sublime—to turn to what seems to be the primary objective which opponents of the bill have in mind when they would subordinate full employment to other essential considerations of national policy.

Above all these other considerations, they insist that we must balance the Budget. More important than the right to earn a living, more important than cooperation with other nations, more important than markets for business, more important than rule by the majority is the necessity of keeping tax revenues equal to Government expenditures.

Now there can be no quarrel as to the desirability of balancing the Budget over a reasonable period of years. The issue is rather one of emphasis, of putting first things first.

The fundamental consideration as far as fiscal policy is concerned is that we cannot hope to balance the Budget unless we get and keep a full employment level of activity. Aside from war, depression has been the principal cause of growth in the public debt. When there is mass unemployment emergency relief expenditures rise rapidly. At the same time the tax base dwindles away as the national income plummets downward.

This is why we must sustain production and employment at a high level if we want to avoid Federal deficits. On the other hand, we must be prepared to spend if necessary to counteract a trend toward deflation, even if this necessitates a temporary rise in the debt. This would be the stitch in time which would prevent not only much greater deficits later on, but also the mass misery and frustration which depression entails.

I very much object to having human considerations ranked lower than fiscal policies in the scale of values. But I object even more strenuously to the vicious and misleading implication that the two are somehow incompatible. I think it is high time for all of us to recognize that in order to balance the Budget we must achieve and maintain full employment.

Let me close with this one thought. Full employment is not an end in itself. It is rather a means to most of those things which we hold dear in this democracy of ours. The full employment bill does not cure our economic ills—no one is foolish enough to make that claim. But it is a basic step in the right direction. It is the foundation upon which other legislation can be built. It should be passed speedily and without substantial change. It is not in conflict with our other great goals, it is closely in harmony with them.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

HOMELESS VETERANS! WILL OUR RETURNING SERVICEMEN BE GIVEN BUILDING PRIORITIES, OR WILL THEY BE LEFT TO THE MERCY OF SPECULATORS IN AN UNCONTROLLED MARKET? ORGANIZED PUBLICITY OF SELFISH INTERESTS CLOUDS THE ISSUE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the increasing confusion over the Nation's housing situation, which now has been placed in the hands of our highest administrative officials for decision, charges and counter-charges of opposing groups are completely obscuring the fundamental facts. In my opinion, it is high time we paused in our unrestrained demands to do away with so-called bureaucratic control of the construction industry and examined the actual housing picture as it exists today, before we take hasty action.

Many builders and building realtors are crying, "Take away these bureaucratic controls and we will build all the housing the Nation needs."

I am in full accord with their fundamental objective of building houses as rapidly and on as full as scale as they can be built. But I deeply fear the by-products of their program, which deliberately disregards the danger of uncontrolled inflation inherent in their proposals.

Any thinking man today, particularly those who went through the building boom and collapse of the early twenties, fears inflation, as a direct threat to our prosperity. Responsible business leaders today are in agreement that all the inflammatory ingredients needed to bring that uncontrollable inflation to our country are smoldering in the present housing situation, ready to burst into flames at the slightest spark.

We have one of the country's biggest industries with a critical scarcity of materials—lumber, brick, pipe, some of them in shorter supply now than during the war years.

We have the tremendous pent-up demand for new homes, which has risen to unprecedented heights through lack of construction during the war.

And, last, we have the pressure of our wartime savings, a purchasing power the like of which this country has never seen before, coupled with no prospect for any control on the selling prices of finished homes.

The law of supply and demand is still a basic economic tenet, but when demand exceeds supply that law often operates as the basic guide to uncontrolled inflation.

We have been conducting a splendid home-front war on the inflation front. Now that the military conflict has been concluded, I see no reason for the assumption that inflation no longer threaten us. For us to yield now to the self-centered and vociferous demands of an organized few who seek selfish gain at the expense of the Nation does not become this administration. We must consider the implications of the program they so loudly seek.

Let me cite some sobering facts on this housing situation:

First. The shortage of seasoned lumber is greater than it was during the war period. A few weeks ago one of our highest housing officials optimistically stated that cancellation of war contracts and cessation of Army purchasing would turn a stream of lumber in private channels. Today we know that most of the canceled Army contracts covered future deliveries of timber—timber which still is in trees in our forests. WPB now plans to put lumber on its critical list of materials.

Second. Manufacturers of ceramics, soil pipe, brick, and other essential building materials, without which no housing program can function, are finding it increasingly difficult to step up production because they cannot recruit the labor, despite price increases for their product.

Third. The maximum production of new houses that we can expect, to take care of all our national requirements between now and July 1, 1946, is between 400,000 and 600,000 homes.

Fourth. It is estimated that 1,500,000 returning servicemen, either newly married or about to be married, will be in the market for homes between now and July 1.

Fifth. Millions of displaced war workers, returning to their own localities or seeking greener pastures, will be competing with those 1,500,000 veterans for those homes.

Sixth. Only the man willing to pay the highest dollar will get those homes unless we work out some formula to keep prices from skyrocketing through the manipulations of the speculators.

A fundamental decision faces this administration on this point. Too few voices have been raised to acquaint the general public with the cold facts—to throw public light on the machinations of these big business building speculators.

The only issue involved is patriotism versus greed.

I am particularly concerned over the plight of the returning veteran who wants to buy a home in such an inflationary market. Some 1,500,000 of them will be seeking homes. The majority will need loans with which to purchase them.

Federal Housing Administration loan security requirements are such that it would be impossible for a returning soldier to obtain an FHA guaranty for a loan if the selling price of his home is too far above normal value.

Even the loan provisions of the GI bill of rights specify that the price of a home must be near its "reasonable and normal value."

These provisions, of course, are for the soldier's own protection against the unscrupulous building speculators. Yet the leaders of the group who are raising the hue and cry against control of building prices are the ones who are lobbying to have the phrase "reasonable and normal value" taken out of the GI bill of rights. They want the returning veteran to be at the mercy of the speculators.

Unless we do protect our servicemen, it is not too fantastic to picture hundreds of thousands of our youngsters, the boys who fought your fight and mine, walking the streets of our cities with their families, unable to find shelter. Rumblings of such a situation already are reaching us. Remember the news stories of the veterans who sought to pitch their tents in Central Park.

As home prices continue to rise, the returning soldier will be unable to obtain a loan for home purchase from responsible bankers. There already is a trend on the part of banking interests to scrutinize values more carefully now. Unable to get his money there, the serviceman will be forced to turn to high-interest speculative money lenders for his home financing, or he will be unable to buy a home. His only hope lies in our ability to hold the line against inflation of home prices.

The cry that says "do away with bureaucratic controls" and "put these Government housing agencies out of business" is sheer bunk, a smoke screen for the speculative interests. Unfortunately, many of our responsible and well-meaning business interests have been innocently drawn into the fight, as allies of a group whose real purpose is to split the housing market wide open, regardless of its effect upon the Nation's economy. Yesterday, one of the members of this group made the public statement that he personally did not think a little inflation "would be so bad." Yet that gentleman's own organization recently made a survey of the real-estate market which showed a rise of 50 percent in housing costs during the war, with smaller houses in some instances doubling in cost.

I am the last man in Congress to think of opposing any sound construction program. We need homes and we need them as rapidly as they can be built. We need them, however, at fair and decent prices and not on the basis of what the traffic will bear in an uncontrolled market.

The largest single investment that the majority of our citizens ever makes is in a home. The most important investment that our returning serviceman and his bride will make for many years to come will be his home. There is no code of justice or fair play to which I subscribe which will permit me to endorse any program that lays these young people open to the mercies of greedy speculators now or at any future time. Our boys did not fight our fight to return home to this.

For anyone to say that homes cannot be built and built at top speed at fair prices under a system of governmental priority control is not in keeping with the factual record.

In my home State of Texas in the city of Lubbock, there is as good an example of what I am talking about as can be found. The man who is doing this constructive job is none other than the president of the National Retail Lumber Dealers, Mr. Lamar Forrest, a local lumber dealer and home builder of substance and outstanding civic spirit.

Mr. Forrest is building homes, principally for veterans, under the present L–41 regulation to which so many peculiarly allied interests object. He is building them under OPA order 251, which limits the contractor's profit, and is building them on a custom basis for individual customers. He is making a profit. Yet the local real-estate interests there have raised objections to his work. Why? Because they say he is selling his new houses more cheaply than they can sell old ones, and he is driving down the inflated real-estate market.

Now comes the strange paradox. Mr. Forrest's own association, the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, privately realizes there is a need for continuation of OPA controls on building materials. They know there is a tremendous scarcity, and the whole industry fears the mad scramble that would result if those controls were removed. Their leaders have been wise enough to know the need for such control of supply prices for a few more months until production is stepped up. Yet the association opposes the continuation of L–41. It opposes any form of price control on the finished house, or any control over the profit of the real-estate dealer. It falls into the role of supporter and ally of the big speculative interests, the mass construction builders who do not contract their sales in advance and are thereby exempt from order 251, which limits the contractor's profit.

Before we fall into this trap, gentlemen, which these well-heeled mass construction interests are trying to set for us, let us give some sober thought to this trouble-loaded situation. Let us recommend that our administrative leaders refrain from precipitate action, such as removing these now workable controls too soon.

I shall have more to say on this subject in a few days. If the formula for solving this problem cannot be found by our agency heads, I shall offer my own program.

Strictly speaking, this problem is not and should not be the problem of Congress. If, however, our agencies fail to solve it from the human and national welfare point of view, Congress has no recourse other than to take a hand in the matter by adopting such legislation as is necessary to do the job.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ATTACKS ON GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, World War II, the great conflict, is concluded. It is fitting and proper that a grateful Nation bestow its gratitude and appreciation upon those who fought so nobly to bring the struggle against tyranny to a victorious conclusion. From the dark days of Guadalcanal to our triumphant march into Tokyo, no figure stands out more gloriously than that of Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to contrast the treatment accorded this heroic commander, this ever-faithful public servant, with that accorded to those who have never ceased their efforts to undermine and destroy our American Republic; to those whose primary loyalty has always been to a foreign dictatorship; to those who betrayed us once and will betray us again.

The ink was hardly dry on the Japanese surrender when a barrage of vilification and slander was launched against General MacArthur, led by the Communist Daily Worker, PM, and Drew Pearson, who is the voice of David Karr, formerly with the Daily Worker. For more complete information on this subject, I refer you to the story in the Washington Daily News of October 8, 1945. Even Dean Acheson, our own Acting Secretary of State, participated in that hue and cry, and it was echoed in London by Soviet Commissar Molotov. It has reached a climax in the Russian proposal to hamstring MacArthur with a four-power control board, the fruition of a well synchronized and thought-out plan to sacrifice American interests to those of the Soviet Union.

There is another side to the picture. On June 7, 1945, the FBI announced the arrest of Philip J. Jaffe, editor of the pro-Communist magazine, Amerasia, Kate L. Mitchell, his coeditor, John Stewart Service, and Emmanuel Sigurd Larson of the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, Navy Lt. Andrew Roth, former research associate on Amerasia, and Mark Gayn, a writer for Collier's magazine, who was planning to leave for Russia. They were charged with espionage and with possession of documents stolen from secret Government files.

These charges were not made by some irresponsible person. They were made by J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a highly respected and responsible Government official of long and highly accredited standing. They were made after months of arduous investigation, and on the basis of carefully accumulated evidence. It is inconceivable that Mr. Hoover could have acted without the full knowledge and approval of the State Department and the White House on so important a matter.

As soon as these charges were announced, the same mud-slinging brigade which is now villifying MacArthur rose as one, in defense of the six individuals; namely, the Daily Worker, PM, and Drew Pearson. The results of their efforts offer Americans food for serious thought as to the power and effectiveness of the pro-Soviet press in our own country and the power and effectiveness of those who are dedicated to Soviet appeasement.

Kate L. Mitchell, John Stewart Service, and Mark Gayn were publicly exonerated. Joseph C. Grew, Acting Secretary of State, who was identified by the press as one of the officials pressing for prosecution in the case, for some

reason issued a public apology to John Stewart Service, who was immediately reinstated and is now part of a group supervising the work of General MacArthur in the Far East. Mr. Grew resigned and his place was taken by Dean Acheson. On September 29, 1945, Philip Jacob Jaffe, who is wealthy, was released by the Washington district court upon payment of a fine of $2,500, with the assurance by the prosecutor that the investigation showed that the confidential records, which had been stolen from secret Government files, had been put to no injurious use. Proceedings are now taking place in the courts to quash the two remaining indictments.

I have no knowledge of what the files of the FBI contain in reference to these cases, other than the charge made in the public press of "conspiring to obtain, possess, or transmit information affecting the national defense." The records discovered in the possession of the defendants included confidential documents from the State Department, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Office of Strategic Services, the OWI, FCC, and other agencies. But I do know that five of these individuals have public records which show convincingly their sympathy and cooperation with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the cause of international communism. I present this record before the bar of the House of Representatives and the American people. I believe this record will establish that this was no simple case of overzealous journalism, as the left-wing press sought to prove, but rather what J. Edgar had charged in the first instance—outright espionage in the interest of a foreign power.

Philip Jacob Jaffe, alias J. W. Phillips: For more than 10 years a leader and heavy financial supporter of Communist propaganda causes. A Communist who teaches at the Jefferson School of Social Science, official school of the Communist Political Association. In 1934, at the request of Earl Browder, he took charge of the American Friends of the Chinese People, a Communist front. Under the alias of J. W. Phillips he became its executive secretary, financial angel, and editor of its publication, China Today. His contribution to the Communist cause is known to exceed $5,000 annually. Jaffe is a member of the board of directors of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., the leading pro-Soviet propaganda organization in this country. An even closer associate of Jaffe over the last 11 years has been Frederick Vanderbilt Field, wealthy backer of the Communists and now columnist on their tabloid, the Daily Worker. In October 1935, Field spoke at a banquet given by China Today, as J. W. Phillips. The featured speaker was Earl Browder. While still editor of China Today, Jaffe in 1937 founded Amerasia, along with Field, as managing editor and chairman of the editorial board. Field directed a continuous picket line at the White House against what Field called America's march toward fascism. Jaffe was busy, too. He saw to it that both Amerasia and China Today hewed to the Communist party line. Jaffe wrote in the November 1940 issue of Amerasia:

"The war in Europe is between Great Britain, the greatest imperial power in the world, and a country which is ambitious to replace Great Britain in that role. * * * Thus the war in Europe is between two powers, each with similar economic ends, each denying its subjects democratic procedure."

About 1933 he became contributing editor of Labor Defender, monthly magazine of the International Labor Defense, the legal arm of the Communist Party. Following a trip to these sections (of Communist China) in 1937, Jaffe wrote a long report for the New Masses, Communist weekly. (Frederick Woltman in the Washington Daily News, June 7, 1945, pp. 1 and 2.)

Writing under the pseudonym of John Phillips in the Labor Defender of March 1934, he said, "Defend the Chinese Soviets in their struggle against their national and imperialist oppressors." Jaffe was also active, together with Frederick V. Field, in the affairs of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, whose policies according to changes by one of its own members, Alfred Kohlberg, importer of Chinese textiles, are "determined and carried out by staff members, who are dominated by Communist sentiments and beliefs." (Proceedings before New York Supreme Court Justice Charles B. McLaughlin in the New York Times, Apr. 13, 1945, p. 3.)

Kate L. Mitchell: Member, editorial board of Amerasia, together with Jaffe; member of the executive committee of the American Round Table on India, together with Jaffe and Robert Norton, secretary, a well-known member of the Communist Party; writer and assistant to Secretary-General Edward C. Carter in the Institute of Pacific Relations (1933, 1936, 1939). Carter is now the head of the Russian War Relief, Inc.

John Stewart Service: Shepherded to Yenan the American military mission which brought back a favorable report about the Chinese Communists—a report which placed an estimate on the Communist military potential which General Wedemeyer later found to be exaggerated. * * * Service spoke before the Institute of Pacific Relations after his return to America. (Christopher Emmet in the New Leader, June 16, 1945, p. 8.)

Andrew Roth: Writer for Amerasia, November 1940 issue in which Jaffe attacked the war as imperialistic; writer for the Institute of Pacific Relations, see his pamphlet Japan Strikes Back; writer of a book entitled "Dilemma in Japan," which is severely critical of the State Department and which was most favorably reviewed in the Daily Worker, September 12, 1945, page 8, and September 21, 1945, page 11.

Mark Gayn, alias for Mark Ginsbourg: Mentioned in the New Leader of May 26, 1945, as a writer who published in Collier's a long diatribe against the Chinese Government and refers to Gayn as pro-Communist.

From these known facts, the case bears all the earmarks of a whitewash. Congress should inquire into this case. Who is responsible for its liquidation? What is behind it? This is the same crowd who opposed our national-defense program in 1940 and 1941. This means that from now on Soviet agents can carry on espionage with impunity. This is an open invitation to subversive elements in our Government to continue, expand, and increase their activities and defy all consideration of national security. This is the same crowd which is now vilifying General MacArthur. This is not the cause for which enormous sacrifices in blood and treasure were made unstintingly by our country. Congress must inquire into this matter. The people look to us for action.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President, it is said, is not disturbed by management and labor strife, which he considers a natural outgrowth of the war and is not worried by the situation.

Well, Mr. President, the people of the country and the boys who are coming home after having been deprived of ammunition and equipment because of strikes in essential war industry plants do not feel as you do concerning the situation.

They resent your attitude which they say is that of your predecessor who did nothing to prevent strikes which killed their buddies, though Congress had given him all the authority he needed. They point to definite shortages of ammunition and equipment due to strikes resulting in the death of thousands of American boys for lack thereof. They say that to strike against the United States during war is treason to those who are deprived of an opportunity to save their own lives while fighting for freedom, and they say you have now declared the war is over. You will hear plenty, Mr. President, and those who talk to me are not complacent nor foolish. And they think the full employment bill as written is a joke on them, and on the public, and that you are playing politics.

"Of course," they say, "everybody is for full employment, and to the extent that the bill under consideration is only a gesture so everybody will have to vote for it as would they were the Ten Commandments an issue."

They think your honeymoon is over. They are hard-boiled guys. They could be for you but up to date are not, for reasons too many to enumerate. You know why. You just cannot fool them.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; it is true the title of the bill belies its content and real intent. The real friends of labor in Congress are disturbed by the situation which obtains, and the returning veterans are very vocal in their opposition to it. All the gains labor organizations have made are being sacrificed on the altar of greed and attempts to gain an end by the use of threats against Members of Congress who will not submit to domination by any minority power groups. Laboring men should pray to be delivered from their bosses who certainly are running wild toward an abyss in which all that has been accomplished will be sacrificed for their own selfish ends—and it will be "ends."

The American people will not submit to regimentation by labor while labor persists in its unjustifiable attempt to dictate to the people, so greatly in the majority, what its group insists upon, or else. There is no "or else" unless we cease to function as a democracy which is not to be contemplated. When Mr. Murray and Mr. So-and-So try to tell Congress that if it does not do thus and so it will be replaced by another Congress which will, then they are advocating a government by force rather than by representation, a government of men and not of laws.

Mr. Speaker, the longer the people consider the so-called full employment bill the more evident it becomes that the measure belies its title as it presents more and greater perils to our system of government than it undertakes to avoid.

It has been demonstrated that, if it could be administered, the act would tend to reduce employment opportunities rather than to increase them. It is possible that it might work; and if so, as has been repeatedly pointed out, by working it would not only commit us to industrial stagnation and business standpatism but destroy our cherished liberties as well. It is the peril of the hour that so many people seem willing to settle for a phrase like "full employment" without regard to the probability that such a promise, if carried out by the means prescribed in the Murray bill, will end in compulsory employment in jobs and at wages fixed by public authority. Leaders from Diocletian to Stalin have "solved the unemployment problem," but how many of them have kept their hands off human liberty? The Murray bill proposes to do it by a pious clause in the preamble.

Of course, everybody is for full employment, but it cannot be accomplished by compulsion or dictatorial legislation under our form of government. The bill at best is a demagogic gesture.

The methods being employed by the pressure groups, suspected of inspiring the alleged wildcat strikes to increase confusion, are not conducive to making friends for labor's cause. Quite the contrary, as is evidenced by the attitude of many Members of Congress who refuse to be threatened.

As Merlo Pusey said in his column when he asked the question, "Are unions above law?" the present situation is critical.

Mr. Pusey said:

Most of us think of the current epidemic of strikes as a crisis in industrial relations. It is that, of course, but it is also something more. The question we ought to be asking, in my opinion, is why natural and unavoidable disputes over wage rates should flare up to a crisis before serious attempts were made to achieve a meeting of minds around the conference table.

Pursue this question thoughtfully and it will soon be apparent that the underlying difficulty is a crisis in Government. Labor is following about the same tactics that it has employed for a decade. Management is reacting in accord with the traditional pattern. The chief failure is that on the part of Government to bring about a climate in which amicable adjustments and faithful adherence to contracts are accepted as normal procedure.

When strikes began to reach dangerous proportions, the first act of the administration was to "beg" labor and management to agree peacefully. This pleading tone implied that the Government is helpless in the face of industrial warfare. Probably it encouraged strikers to go ahead with their plans without regard for the consequences to the national welfare. When they did so, the President was quoted as saying in great disappointment, that organized labor had let him down. There was no alternative to use of the war powers to seize oil refineries and possibly other plants and mines paralyzed by strikes.

Here the crisis in Government is demonstrated in acute form. For more than a decade the White House has encouraged and strengthened organized labor and sponsored laws for its special benefit. Under Presidential sponsorship unionized labor has grown from pygmy stature to that of a giant. But no rules have been laid down to guide or control the use of labor's enormously increased power. The White House has simply relied upon labor's supposed loyalty to the President.

In these circumstances, it was inevitable that President Truman should be "let down" just as President Roosevelt was often "let down." The simple fact is that sound relations in a democratic country cannot be built on a foundation of personal loyalties. Ours is a government of laws, and unless all groups are amenable to laws protecting the national welfare, the result is almost certain to be chaos.

Today all pretense of enforcing the law against coercive tactics on the part of strikers has been dropped. One of the refineries which the Government recently seized, for example, was not idle because of any dispute between the employer and the employees. Instead, it was forced to close because hundreds of CIO men, none of whom were employees of the refinery, threw a picket line around it and issued the inevitable threats of violence if gasoline production should continue.

This is a common practice. Employees as well as employers are coerced with no effective effort on the part of the Government to protect their rights if they fail to obey union edicts. The blunt truth is that lawlessness on the part of unions has come to be an accepted means of enforcing their demands.

In many instances, too, collective bargaining becomes a farce because only one side is required by law to bargain. Labor has been put under no obligation to bargain with management for the higher wages or improved working conditions to which it thinks it is entitled. It may upset existing contracts with impunity and put a whole industry out of operation without once sitting down to a conference table.

These are the truly alarming facts back of the disruptions now crippling the Nation's reconversion efforts. Mighty organizations with millions of members have maneuvered themselves into a position where they are stronger than the Government. Instead of having to abide by sensible rules of fair play laid down by the Government, they are frequently able to dictate to the Government and get away with it. During the war the Government was able to avert disaster by seizing industrial plants as a last resort and operating them itself. In peacetime that expedient will no longer be at hand.

The underlying question is whether private enterprise can continue to exist if it is left to the mercy of powerful labor combinations that are not required to respect the rights of either employers or employees. For that matter, democracy itself is imperiled when equal protection under the law disappears.

It may well be that the severest test of the Truman administration will come in its handling of this issue. The pendulum has swung from extremes of business license in the twenties to extremes of labor license at present. No management-labor conference can be expected to repair this critical weakness in our national policy. It is a task that Government—Congress as well as the executive branch—must tackle directly. If they cannot summon the courage to do so, the outlook for both industrial peace and full employment will remain gloomy.

Those who are pushing the buttons and pulling the switches to control labor's policy in the present crisis will pull a switch or press a button one of these days which will pull down on their heads the temple which labor has constructed over the years for its protection rather than to bury it in the ignominy of a lost cause.

The American people will stand up for labor so long as it stands for American ideas and ideals and methods. They will not tolerate, long, such a bolshevik program as is now being followed by the alleged leaders. Those who sow to the wind will reap the whirlwind. The weather vane of popular opinion indicates that the patience of the people has been stretched already too far.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized for 20 minutes.

UNRRA IN POLAND AND EUROPE

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 years ago the United States Government entered into a solemn agreement with the governments of 43 other nations to form and operate an organization to meet the emergency relief and rehabilitation needs of those Allied Nations blasted in the World War, the nations who manifestly would be unable to meet such needs through their own resources.

This agreement was signed in the White House. A few days later the first meeting of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration convened at Atlantic City.

This was the first meeting of its kind, the first completely concurrent gathering of minds on a problem of world peace outside of the councils which were previously set up to carry on the war.

At Atlantic City the primary policies were formulated. The Council asked all uninvaded nations to contribute the equivalent of 1 percent of their national incomes, calculated as of the year ending June 30, 1943, toward an operating fund. That is, a fund to supply the necessary food, clothing, medical and other supplies for relief and rehabilitation, and to pay the costs of hurrying those commodities to the places where they are so sorely needed to forestall the horrible starvation and misery left in the wake of invasion. This request met with an astonishingly unanimous support.

I feel that no one in this House or no responsible person in our Nation will quarrel with the motives and purposes which led to the formation of UNRRA. The American people are the most generous in the world when they see human suffering. Our record after the First World War in feeding the stricken Europeans and our gifts to relief in the present war are ample evidence of our desire to ameliorate conditions of suffering, wherever they may strike.

In recent weeks, many persons from my own district, as well as elsewhere, have come to me with deep concern about conditions abroad and the operations of UNRRA. I feel that these questions demand an answer. Accordingly, I have made inquiry into the entire problem.

Many of the people in my district are of Polish extraction, as I am, but there are also a substantial number of others whose ancestry reads back to the other shattered and devastated nations of Europe.

In recent days, I have talked with UNRRA authorities and with men who have just returned from the European scene, so I could obtain to best advantage the facts about UNRRA's work as well as about the conditions which UNRRA must meet.

The outstanding result of my inquiry, I believe, is to spotlight a considerable

misunderstanding of the UNRRA set-up, its rights, and its obligations under the agreement between the Allied nations.

In the second place, I find that many persons who came to me have little knowledge of the appalling problems that UNRRA must overcome. I confess that I, myself, did not fully realize them.

It should be understood by all at the outset that UNRRA works only through the governments or established authorities of these devastated nations. It does not handle distribution of supplies itself, being only a mixture of provider, advisor, and supervisor. The governments or established national authorities take over the supplies, once UNRRA purchases and piles them up on the distressed shores. Able and unselfish UNRRA men and women are present to advise and counsel with these governments, seeking to oil the machinery of distribution. But they cannot go into every city and hamlet to hand out food and clothing and medical supplies and seeds and farm equipment. That is so huge a task that it must continue to be the job of the national and local governments.

Before any UNRRA program can be set up for one of these countries, the national authorities, with UNRRA experts, make a survey of the minimum needs for existence of the populace so that purchase of supplies may be undertaken on a basis of some intelligence and not in a helter-skelter fashion. A flighty, guesswork program might supply tropical clothing and seeds to northern Poland for example. Fortunately, there seem to have been no such crack-brain procedure.

Now, as to the problems. As is well known, the Allied Nations early in the war set up combined boards to allocate supplies, both manufactured and raw materials. Had they not, the casualty lists and sorrows would be much larger. UNRRA agreed to clear its needs through those combined boards so that it would not compete for commodities more vital to prosecution of the war than to any other purposes. This, it seems to me, was the only sane and businesslike procedure to take.

Procurement of vessels for shipping was organized in the same way. When shells were needed, the ships carried shells. Up to the last few months, shipping of the United Nations, and of neutral nations where it could be obtained, was first devoted to the all-out task of winning the war. When Allied armies liberated areas by piecemeal, the armies took in supplies for the population as long as such an area was significant in military operations. UNRRA teams went into these regions, close to the battle lines, to assist the military and to make surveys for the future. They did not undertake the ultimate relief job until an Allied army gave them the green light.

So it is apparent that UNRRA, though it had funds and some quantity of materials available elsewhere, could not shower these goods on a devastated Europe in any quantity until after VE-day. There simply were not enough ships available.

In spite of this, I want to point out, and I think this is important, UNRRA today has shipped more than 2,000,000 tons of supplies to the stricken countries of Europe. These goods cost $550,000,000. That is a lot of money, either during a war or afterward.

Vast fleets of merchant ships 5 months ago carried only military supplies. Hundreds of them today are steaming overseas on mercy missions for UNRRA with the food and medical supplies, the clothing, the tractors, the trucks so desperately needed.

There is another and even worse transportation jam up in the individual countries. German and Italian occupation armies, as you know, wrought absolute disruption and destruction on Europe's internal transport system. They stole rolling stock. They tore up tracks and blew up bridges systematically as they retreated. In Italy, they used a huge sort of plow to tear up tracks before the advancing Allied armies. In all of Greece they left only six serviceable locomotives and almost no usable right-of-way. Such vandalism knocked cold the normal exchange of vital food and goods and effectively created blood clots in the heart and brain of the transport bloodstream.

The only answer to this, the only way to supply the desperate needs before winter freezes come, is with trucks. There is no time to repair and rebuild rail lines before UNRRA can bring in the commodities vital to carry the conquered nations through the cold weather.

Let me illustrate that with the story told me by a man just back from Poland:

Warsaw had about one and a half million people before the war and is now reduced to less than one-third of this number. But—95 percent of the buildings in the entire city are destroyed. This destruction was not all from direct battle damage, but was a wanton, calculated destruction by a horde of swaggering, inhuman vandals.

The people of Warsaw are not suffering for food, at least not yet. The reason is that the city's immediate trade territory is agricultural and is still producing, actually beyond the needs of the present Warsaw population. There is no transportation to move that food any place else. So Warsaw eats. But the situation for clothing, shelter, and medical supplies is desperate.

In most of the strictly agricultural centers of Poland the food situation is not too bad. But in most large cities and industrial centers, it will be very tight this winter purely because of the transport situation.

All over Poland it is a common sight to see wagons and carts pulled by men, women, and children, without any animal or mechanical draft power at all. Or, you may see two-horse carts with only one horse, or a cow, or people helping to move them.

There were almost no trucks or tractors left in the country. The few remaining horses, mules, and cows have been the main source of transport, and also of farm draft power. But when you use a dairy cow for draft work, her output of milk is cut at least one-half. Cows aren't much good for draft purposes anyway.

Where bridges are out, it is the custom to bring up goods to one side, unload them and ferry them across on boats or rafts. Then, they are reloaded into whatever vehicles are available on the other side or else they are carried by the people on their backs.

There is still another transport problem in Poland. Before the war, that country took its gasoline and oil supplies from its own wells, east of the Curzon Line. That territory is now a part of Russia. For a long time, no motor fuel came in, and even now there is only a trickle from the former Polish wells. UNRRA has three tankers on the way to Poland with gasoline and oil. Until they are unloaded, transport will be difficult despite the trucks that UNRRA is hurrying into the country.

Unloading the manna of mercy is also difficult. The first supplies had to go by ship to the port of Constanza on the Black Sea. Then they traveled overland to Poland. After the German defeat, it was natural to expect use of the ports of Gdynia and Danzig. What happened?

Well, the Germans left the harbor of Danzig undamaged, but its warehouses were completely destroyed. Gdynia had its warehouses intact but the harbor was so blocked that only shallow-draft ships could enter. So, UNRRA boats go first to Danzig, lighten their loads as far as possible with goods that can be handled immediately without warehousing. Then they proceed to Gdynia to finish unloading.

Gasoline and oil storage tank capacity is lacking at those harbors. When the UNRRA tankers arrive it will be necessary to use oil drums and every other kind of container possible in order to unload the ships and move the gasoline.

So much for this part of the story. Parenthetically, I want to answer here a question which many persons have asked me, at least as far as UNRRA is concerned.

A number of Americans I know have sorrowed over desperate requests in letters from Polish relatives for old clothing. These people ask why UNRRA cannot deliver such packages. There are two answers. One is that UNRRA does not handle the distribution inside Poland. That is entirely up to the Polish Government. The other answer is that UNRRA already has substantial supplies of clothing either already in Poland or on the way there. This clothing, much of it from America, will be distributed as fast as possible. But the Polish Government has the final word on the distribution of supplies. If it does not see fit to handle packages of clothing shipped by individuals in the United States, there is nothing that UNRRA can do about it.

UNRRA officials throw up their hands and say to me: "We have ships. But we haven't a postal system to gather the packages and to sort them by destination, towns, and communities. If our ships took them, there aren't at present the warehouses to receive them. We haven't the distribution system in Poland. That's up to the Polish Government. It must be this way under our present agreement."

So I have written letters to the Honorable Secretary of State Byrnes and to the Honorable Postmaster General Hannegan. I have asked them to unite their organizations and their forces with those of UNRRA to gather and sort the packages in this country, to influence or persuade the Polish Government just as soon as possible to guarantee delivery.

The transport situation is just as shot in Yugoslavia, in Greece, and in large portions of Czechoslovakia as it is in Poland. Italy is not in quite as bad shape. UNRRA procurement men in Europe conferred with Allied army authorities shortly after VE-day to obtain badly needed trucks. As a result, 40,000 are being released, most of them now military surplus equipment.

Trucks are not all the military surplus UNRRA is converting from death-dealing to life-giving jobs. But right now they are the most important.

These trucks are being moved as fast as possible to points of need. Poland will get nearly one-third of the total load capacity, Czechoslovakia about a quarter. Other countries will have vehicles in lesser quantity, according to their need. I am told that trucks are now being delivered to Poland and Czechoslovakia at the rate of 100 to 200 a day.

There is another phase of the Polish situation which I feel I must discuss. Two railroad lines and two main highways across the country are the ones used by the Russian military. They move troops and supplies to Germany, and bring home veteran troops and displaced persons. The Russians also are carrying home, I am told, substantial loads of machinery and equipment from Germany, even down to individual garage outfits and bath tubs. They take these as part of their reparations in kind.

Those particular railroads and highways, as yet, are not open to any volume of supply distribution traffic for the Polish Government. In fact, certain rail lines, I am informed, are now being widened to the Russian gage of tracks.

In connection with the movement of Russian soldiers and displaced persons across Poland, there have been stories that the Russians are bleeding that country dry, particularly of livestock. This may very well have been true when the war was going full blast, because the Russian armies live off the land as far as possible.

Authorities in Poland and UNRRA now believe that this thievery will soon be completely under control. They know that Russian top commanders have issued absolute orders against any looting in Poland. Occasional thefts may take place. However, the Polish farmers know this possibility, I am told. They keep their livestock very well under cover. My best information is that looting is no longer a major menace and that UNRRA officials are not fearful that their supplies will go into Russia instead of going to the Polish people for whom they are furnished.

There is another question, too, which apparently raised some doubt in American minds. Reports that UNRRA goods crop up in black markets have come not only from Poland but also from Greece and other countries.

From the best information I can obtain, this is not true, for one reason. A black market, as we know it, implies in the first place that there are important supplies of currency available to purchase commodities at inflated prices, far above whatever ceilings are set.

Well, among the vast majorities of the peoples of these stricken countries there is no such supply of currency. In fact, there is not any. Most all the marketing is done in a free market, or barter market.

Now UNRRA authorities admit that there is some bartering of goods they provide. But this barter takes place between persons so poor that even if they do trade off a bit of their UNRRA goods ration, they receive only a substitute for these goods. They still have total supplies which are at or below their subsistence needs. No one, so far as UNRRA investigators can discover, is racketeering or making a big profit on these goods.

Another difficulty, this one political, might have stymied UNRRA operations in Poland. Happily, it did not. Most persons are familiar with the shifting complexion of the Polish Government since liberation began. Of course, UNRRA took no part in any of the repeated political changes. But it must be borne in mind that before UNRRA may operate in a country, it must, by the original treaty, sign an operating agreement with that country's government.

UNRRA did not wait. It signed a temporary agreement with the various governments after liberation. The agreement with the present group in power was not completed until August of this year.

Despite the changes UNRRA went ahead. It had, by the end of August of this year, shipped to Poland approximately 109,000 long tons of materials, more than half of it foodstuffs. These shipments cost $70,000,000. As I do not have the break-down on commodities later than the end of August. Up to that time, the figures are interesting as to the materials UNRRA furnishes. Among the foodstuffs were nearly 27,000 long tons of flour, canned fish, lard, dried peas and beans, sugar, and 31,000 tons of other miscellaneous types of food.

There were 11,473 tons of raw cotton for textiles, bedding, and clothing; 1,341 tons of shoes; 3,000 tons of miscellaneous manufactured clothing, cloth, and footwear; and 1,450 tons of contributed clothing.

For agricultural rehabilitation, there were 22,600 long tons of material, including 6,487 tons of tractors; 12,188 tons of fertilizers; 906 tons of seeds, and 3,019 tons of other supplies. There were 8,808 tons of industrial rehabilitation supplies, and 2,050 tons of medical and sanitation supplies.

Generally speaking, the break-down of supplies going to the other UNRRA countries in Europe is similar. I shall not burden this record with the beans and peas for each country. But I think that the over-all totals through September are enlightening. The ships are really sailing. The figures show:

Country of destination	Gross long tons	Dollar value
Albania	25,400	$9,000,000
Czechoslovakia	158,400	73,900,000
Greece	1,168,900	189,800,000
Italy	102,200	21,000,000
Poland	163,300	89,900,000
Yugoslavia	455,400	143,000,000
Other UNRRA operations	5,200	2,700,000
China	200	600,000
Grand total	2,079,600	530,500,000

In connection with these figures I must point out that they show actual shipments. Shipments scheduled for October and November total $270,000,000 worth of goods and supplies. Purchase of thousands of tons of other materials which must be manufactured or processed over longer periods of time have already been committed for delivery as soon as possible.

Up to this point I have stressed mostly the relief aspects of UNRRA's program. There is also the rehabilitation program. By resolutions of its council, UNRRA may not do a reconstruction job anywhere. It is purely a rehabilitation task, that is, helping the people of these suffering countries to help themselves. A major phase of that task right now is agricultural rehabilitation.

Here again I must quote my observer, who just came back from Poland. I may say, incidentally, that he is an expert on agricultural problems:

> Poland is normally a food-exporting nation. But even if all the food raised at home could be distributed fully today, production is still 30 to 40 percent below normal at the best estimates. It would not feed the nation at home. Then added is the fact that Poland will receive approximately 3,000,000 displaced persons, destitute for food, clothing, bedding, and in most cases housing.
>
> In ordinary times Poland plants a big crop of winter wheat and rye. The season for plowing and planting this crop ends in the latter part of October. The crop will have to be in by then, at least as much of it as can be planted. And there have been no fertilizers available during the war. I have mentioned the ravaging of the livestock herd. The Russian Government has ordered release of 100,000 farm animals of all kinds to Poland. Even if they are all delivered, this will not fill one-tenth of the need.
>
> The Poles were cleaned out of agricultural implements along the main roads during the war. The situation is not so bad in the remote areas, but it is bad enough. In addition, we must remember that the sections of East Prussia and Silesia now restored to Poland were stripped of major agricultural implements and livestock by the Germans. Then the Russians took what was left as the spoils of war. Hence, in some manner, the Polish Government and UNRRA must furnish practically all the implements that are to be available in this area.
>
> These are the reasons UNRRA is rushing tractors as fast as they are available, and also fertilizers and seed. It is a job of helping the people to help themselves—to produce as large a crop as possible next year, so that food needs can be supplied more nearly within the country and not by a demand on UNRRA or on the rest of the world.

It would be welcome news indeed if we could learn that everyone in Poland is healthy and well. You know that is not true. Tuberculosis and the diseases of malnutrition and the ailments of shock and exposure are common. Among the 3,000,000 who straggle home with the vague hope that things will be better in their native land, health conditions are far worse.

So UNNRA is dispatching a special group of its staff to Europe. It will be the duty of that staff to canvass the Allied military all over Europe. The job is to round up within the next 4 months enough supplies to build 45 hospitals and 45 convalescent camps, wherever the materials can be found. That is not all. Trucks and fuel for them are to be located. The materials will be loaded up and driven to Poland so that the 90 hospitals and convalescent camps may be built as soon as possible. UNRRA already has launched a health and sanitation program in shattered Poland. But

this hospital undertaking is a new and a bigger and a better quality of mercy.

I have made no mention up to now of the conquered countries of western Europe or of Italy. There are two reasons. The first reason is unanimous for France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, and Luxembourg. The original UNRRA agreement stipulated that UNRRA shall not operate in countries having sufficient foreign exchange or money at home to buy materials for their own emergency needs. A separate finding is made for each country. Those western nations were found to have enough funds either abroad or at home to make their own purchases. UNRRA cooperated with these countries in finding and allocating supplies, through the Allied combined boards. But it has not operated in these areas except to help the displaced persons.

With regard to Italy, I must say that that country was first regarded as an enemy nation. As such, it was not entitled to UNRRA help. In view of the later actions of the Italian Government, a limited program was launched in Italy. This was principally devoted to nutrition for children, expectant and nursing mothers, and the aged. The plan is well underway, I am told. It has produced a unique nation-wide system of reporting and registering cases of malnutrition. At the UNRRA Council meeting in London just last August, the members voted in favor of a more extensive program for Italy. This will be launched as soon as possible.

UNRRA has had a major hand in alleviating the tragic circumstances of the displaced persons in Europe. At the request of Allied military authorities, more than 400 specially trained teams of UNRRA workers were assigned in Europe to aid the armies. They jointly with the armies organized and conducted camps; they screened and started for home the desperate refugees who either through Nazi guile or force were uprooted from their homes and thrust into the despicable German war machine. Though the displaced-persons program is far from finished, it is well enough underway.

From this investigation I made of UNRRA two things become clear as water. One is a concentrated essence of misery and of unhappiness and the other is the plain duty of the United States to keep on in its joint efforts with other nations to furnish remedies.

Poland is the most disturbed nation in the world today, as far as its citizens are concerned. If anyone doubts this, let him go by himself for just a half hour and try to visualize conditions such as I have reviewed here. Since September 1939, Poland has been a battlefield. It has been conquered and reconquered. Its governing authorities have shifted almost as fast as the pages of a desk calendar. One chunk has now become part of Russia and a new section of country, recently German, has been restored. On top of this, the 3,000,000 unfortunate wretches, torn from their roots by the Nazis, must come home.

How could any citizen of such a country be at peace in his mind? It is an impossibility. So it is that the ordinary Pole finds no solace except in the recognition of his needs by this international agency of UNRRA. He has become distrustful of every official power and official person, though actually he still may be freer today than he has ever been before.

In any event, it cannot be a judgment against the common man. All he wants is a security, bolstered by help at first, if necessary, which will promise him a decent life in the future. Now then, shall the United States or any other member nation of UNRRA deny him a chance for this security? If we do, we punish him for things he did not do. We penalize him for the acts of others. We strip him of a chance to become a self-respecting citizen of a nation which boasts a centuries-long history of repudiating and fighting oppression. All of this we would do if we disregard not only our obligation but also our pledges to him. I urge with all the strength I can muster that we keep forever in mind the situation of the ordinary Pole. I urge that we do not shirk even in the smallest measure our obligation which we have vowed time and again to see that he and his fellowmen in Europe, whatever their governments may be, have the immediate relief they need and the opportunity to help themselves, at least to freedom from want.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered yesterday by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Norman Cousins on the subject of atomic energy. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $156, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MOTT, for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. GRIFFITHS (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. RANDOLPH, for October 11, on account of business.

To Mr. IZAC (at the request of Mr. HAVENNER), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. BIEMILLER, for today, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 130. An act to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 131. An act to authorize the conveyance of the United States Fish Hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 865. An act for the relief of the estate of Agnes J. Allbery; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 927. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Poplar, Mont.," approved July 28, 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 932. An act to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 998. An act for the relief of Gregory Stelmak; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1017. An act for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1064. An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1081. An act for the relief of Aftab Ali; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1097. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1101. An act for the relief of the estate of Manuel Rose Lima; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1126. An act for the relief of Alice A. Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1129. An act for the relief of Willie H. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1139. An act for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1219. An act authorizing the city of St. Francisville, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1231. An act for the relief of Paul E. Tacy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1308. An act to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1360. An act to compensate Benali El Oukili Boucheta, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for the wrongful death of his son, Mohamed Ben Boucheta Ben Ali El Oukili, near Marnia, Algeria, on September 30, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1361. An act to compensate Clement Euziere, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for personal injuries caused by a naval vehicle near Oran, Algeria, on September 21, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer land for resettlement in Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1363. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of water damage occurring at certain naval and Marine Corps shore activities; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1364. An act to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damage to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1383. An act to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1420. An act to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution inviting Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur to address the two Houses of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 620. An act for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agree to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.), the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 11, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will meet at 10 a. m., Thursday, October 11, to continue hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian ife of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m. in executive hearing to consider the bill (H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

728. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting one set of the Commission's requests for personnel for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1946, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 367. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 805, a bill to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources; without amendment (Rept. No. 1112). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 368. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4309, a bill to reduce taxation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1113). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4162. A bill to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to prescribe rules of pleading, practice, and procedure with respect to proceedings in criminal cases prior to and including verdict, or finding or plea of guilty; with amendment (Rept. No. 1115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4180. A bill to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce; with amendment (Rept. No. 1116). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2957. A bill for the relief of Alvada Hirst; with amendment (Rept. No. 1114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 4342. A bill to amend the law relating to the service of process in cancellation of naturalization proceedings; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4343. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 4344. A bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce; to diminish unemployment; to establish a national policy for assuring continuing employment in a free competitive economy and to protect the right to work; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 4345. A bill to amend section 420 (a) of title 18, United States Code (48 Stat. 479), and section 420 (d) of title 18, United States Code (48 Stat. 980); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 4346. A bill creating an import quota on eggs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4347. A bill to exempt certain essential watches and clocks from the tax with respect to jewelry, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4348. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of May 18, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 391; 18 U. S. C. 253); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4349. A bill to establish the United States police force for the occupation of Japan and Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 4350. A bill to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 4351. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the compensation of postal employees, to provide for adjusting compensation of substitute railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim November 2, 1945, as Woman's Enfranchisement Day in commemoration of the day when women throughout the United States first voted in a Presidential election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution permitting federally owned alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 257. Joint resolution permitting federally owned alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Res. 369. Resolution to provide for an investigation of the operations of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 370. Resolution to provide for payment of the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 369; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 4352. A bill for the relief of Ola L., Margaret, and Betty Bea Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 4353. A bill for the relief of Amy Mary Richter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HANCOCK:

H. R. 4354. A bill for the relief of Frances Bova; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. R. 4355. A bill granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Shull; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 4356. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Brackins and Eloise Willis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PIÑERO:

H. R. 4357. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Alberto Lopez Ramos; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4358. A bill for the relief of Petra Vazquez Ramos; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4359. A bill for the relief of Gustave A. Lohse; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4360. A bill for the relief of Sibbald Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINTER:

H. R. 4361. A bill for the relief of A. L. Clem and Ida M. Bryant; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1945

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 2, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God high over all, pilgrims of the night, we would reach for Thy hand in the darkness. Even as the busy tribes of flesh and blood with all their cares and fears are carried swiftly onward by the flood of this tempestuous day, lead us who seek Thy face to still waters and green pastures, where, in some quiet shrine of the spirit, we may be reassured of those values which are excellent and permanent and which assert their sovereignty in all life's changing scenes.

Write deep in our hearts the suffering and pain of shepherdless multitudes so wearied by the burden and the stress of life. Grant us such a vision of our needy world in this great day of our opportunity as shall make us instant and eager sharers with Thee in its redemption. Redeem our failures, pardon our transgressions, transform every task into a throne of service, and crown this day of labor with the benediction of Thy peace. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, October 9, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 11, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 451. An act for the relief of Carl Baumann;

S. 694. An act for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers;

S. 711. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Fuhrmann;

S. 729. An act for the relief of William Andrew Evans;

S. 732. An act for the relief of Ensign Elmer H. Beckmann, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 762. An act for the relief of Everett McLendon, Sr., Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr., Mr. and Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr., for the benefit of their minor daughter, Nadine McLendon, and Everett McLendon, Jr.;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Oliver Jensen;

S. 902. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in a Quonset hut at Harrowbeer Airport, Yelverton, South Devon, England, on December 26, 1944;

S. 909. An act for the relief of Hugh Egan;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Henry H. Huffman and Mrs. Marie J. Huffman;

S. 985. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires occurring at various naval shore activities;

S. 986. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in administration building at the naval air station, Bunker Hill, Ind., on December 28, 1944;

S. 996. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg) William Augustus White, United States Naval Reserve; and

S. 1265. An act for the relief of John R. Jennings.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BOREN, Mr. PRIEST, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts, and Mr. REECE of Tennessee were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 620. An act for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin;

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth C. Stone;

H. R. 476. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.," approved June 14, 1933, as amended;

H. R. 656. An act to provide further for the appointment of postmasters for fourth-class post offices in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Laura May Ryan;

H. R. 1565. An act for the relief of Inglis Construction Co., a corporation;

H. R. 1629. An act for the relief of Michael C. Donatell;

H. R. 1765. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the Agricultural Byproducts Laboratory on the campus of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts;

H. R. 1849. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ora R. Hutchinson;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Anna Mattil and others;

H. R. 1958. An act for the relief of L. A. Williams;

H. R. 2317. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virginia M. Kiser;

H. R. 2690. An act to amend the Bonneville Project Act;

H. R. 3081. An act for the relief of August Svelund;

H. R. 3150. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River, between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1939;

H. R. 3373. An act authorizing the reconstruction of the Spring Common Bridge on Mahoning Avenue, across the Mahoning River in the municipality of Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio;

H. R. 3871. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas; and

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brigadier General Casimir Pulaski.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THOMAS M. MADDEN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Thomas M. Madden, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice John Boyd Avis, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

FOURTH QUARTERLY REPORT OF UNRRA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the fourth report to Congress on UNRRA operations for the quarter ending June 30, 1945, in which there has been included a summary statement on the status of the United States contribution to UNRRA as of August 31, 1945.

Unconditional surrender of both Germany and Japan has brought full victory

to the United Nations on the battlefields, but victory can have real meaning only if it is speedily translated into a secure peace. That great task is just beginning. Victory over the enemy has been costly in material things and in blood and suffering. Victory in securing a lasting peace will continue to call for the combined efforts of all peoples to bind up the wounds left by the war so that solid foundations will be laid for the future.

In the period under review in this report UNRRA, increasingly freed from the restraints imposed by military needs, moved into the large-scale operations for which it had been maturing plans, scheduling purchases, and building an organization. In Greece, Yugoslavia, and Albania it took over supply responsibility at the request of the Allied military authorities. Operations were under way in Poland and Czechoslovakia and considerable shipments of supplies had arrived in these countries. On the basis of the prior agreement with SHAEF and at the urgent request of the military authorities, UNRRA teams were assisting armed forces in the care and repatriation of millions of Allied displaced persons in Germany and Austria. In the Far East the military situation was less favorable to UNRRA activities but significant operations were carried on in China, and the program for the Far East was further elaborated in preparation for the day of liberation.

In order to carry through these operations and to insure that the supply pipe line would remain full, UNRRA had to draw heavily upon the $450,000,000 appropriated by the Congress, and arrangements were made to exercise the authority contained in the appropriation act to utilize for UNRRA purposes up to $350,000,000 of supplies, services and funds available under the Lend-Lease Act. In the succeeding months UNRRA's need for United States supplies has continued to increase with the result that it has been necessary to utilize virtually all the funds and authority available under the appropriation act.

Through UNRRA the United States is making and will make its contribution for relief to the liberated peoples. In order that these people may move ahead toward the tremendous task of reconstruction, they must have the basic materials to regain their strength. Where we at home have shortages and inconveniences, millions in other lands lack even the bare necessities of life. Life abroad in the coming winter will depend upon the outside assistance which this country and other countries can render to the liberated peoples.

UNRRA, struggling as it has in the face of world deficits of critical supplies and of shipping, has made a substantial beginning in the immense task of relief and rehabilitation. The more this task can be speeded up through the early delivery of vitally needed supplies, the sooner it will be possible for UNRRA to withdraw, leaving the liberated peoples on a firm footing to carry on their own life. The Government of the United States and the other members of UNRRA are meeting this common problem as the United Nations are attempting to meet other world problems—together and to the best of their respective abilities.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 11, 1945.*

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 9, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1062) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONS COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMY FROM CIVIL LIFE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service for the period August 1, 1945, to September 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

A letter from the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third quarterly progress report of the Surplus Property Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

A letter from the Acting President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED IRON AND STEEL PLANTS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report with respect to Government-owned iron and steel plants and facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, his first quarterly report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed by him for the quarter ended September 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service.

A letter from the Acting President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for the United States Civil Service Commission for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DEEP-WATER CONNECTIONS WITH LAKE CHAMPLAIN — RESOLUTION OF BURLINGTON, VT., CITY COUNCIL

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I desire to have published in the RECORD at this place following my remarks a resolution, a certified copy of which is sent to me by W. T. Abell, city clerk of the city of Burlington, Vt., favoring a ship canal to connect deep water at the south end of Lake Champlain with deep water at its northern end in the Hudson River and a like connection of deep water of Lake Champlain with the deep water of the St. Lawrence River, so that all ocean-going vessels may pass through the lake north and south from the Atlantic Ocean and the Great Lakes.

Mr. President, I have always objected to the expenditure of huge sums of money for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, on the ground that it would take commerce away from the northeastern part of the United States, reduce the usefulness and value of the ports along the Atlantic Ocean and the northeastern section of the United States, and probably permanently put an end to the aspirations of the people of this section of the United States for an inland waterway following natural lines up the Richelieu, up Lake Champlain, Lake George, and the existing canal to the Hudson River and down the Hudson River to the Atlantic. This route would cut off thousands of miles which would otherwise have to be traveled if ships went around the salient of the northeastern United States to the St. Lawrence River into the ocean, and then came down to Boston, New York, Baltimore, and Philadelphia. I claim that the project which is here advocated by the city government of the city of Burlington, Vt., ought to be considered either before or concurrently with consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway, or it will never be considered. That is my judgment, in view of the examinations made of the cost of the development of this inland waterway within our own territory that is here mentioned. I do not believe our people will assume the cost of that development after the major project of the St. Lawrence seaway has been constructed.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be recorded here and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution relating to a ship canal at each of the two ends of Lake Champlain

Resolved by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Burlington, as follows: That—

I. The connection of deep water at the south end of Lake Champlain with deep water at its northern end in the Hudson River and the connection of deep water at the north end of this lake with the St. Lawrence River so that all ocean-going vessels may pass through the lake will be a very great contribution to the future commercial, industrial, and numerical growth and development of Burlington and of a large area around this city and are essential to place this city in the class in numerical and business progress with a large number of other cities of the United States.

II. That we commend the very active effort made by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN over 2 years ago in behalf of these ship canals as shown especially by his advocacy in Congress of a deep waterway at the ends of Lake Champlain, by a lengthy letter in its support to President Roosevelt and by an argument in its behalf in a radio forum; that we regret to have noted an obvious cessation in this work of Senator AIKEN during more than 2 years last past and we trust he will forthwith renew his very creditable former work to obtain the passage of measure to secure these canals.

III. That, therefore, the Vermont delegation in Congress, its two Senators and its lone Member in the House, are individually

and collectively requested and urged to take such action as will result in the prompt introduction into one of the two Houses of Congress of two measures, drawn by Martin S. Vilas of this city, one providing for a ship canal between the southern end of deep water at the head of Lake Champlain and the northern end of deep water in the Hudson River, the other providing for a ship canal between the northern end of deep water in this lake and the St. Lawrence River.

IV. That this delegation is further requested and urged to give to these measures after their introduction their support in a determined effort in cooperation with this council and others interested in their behalf to secure their passage; subject to such amendments as may be reasonably desirable.

V. That the clerk is hereby instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each of the Vermont delegation in Congress.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions and a memorial, which were referred as indicated:

A radiogram in the nature of a petition from the Labor Canteen Forum Committee, Oahu, T. H., praying for the enactment of President Truman's 21-point score economic and social program; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Sixty-fourth Annual Encampment of the Commandery in Chief, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, in session in national convention, at Columbus, Ohio, praying for the enactment of House Joint Resolution 35, designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the New York State Association of Real Estate Boards, Inc., Albany, N. Y., protesting against the ruling by the Office of Price Administration extending from 90 days to 6 months the required time to accomplish possession of property in the event of a sale; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the New York State Association of Real Estate Boards, Inc., Albany, N. Y., favoring immediate lifting of rent ceilings on new construction of dwelling accommodations so as to relieve housing shortage without raising rents of existing units; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROTEST AGAINST USING CORN IN THE MANUFACTURE OF WHISKY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a petition signed by many citizens of Topeka, Kans., condemning the policy of the Government in allowing corn to be used for the manufacture of whisky when corn sugar is so badly needed in making bread. I ask unanimous consent to present the petition for appropriate reference and that it be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petition presented by Mr. CAPPER was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned, wish to express to you our thanks for the stand you took in the Senate recently in condemning our Government's policy in allowing corn to be used in making whisky when corn sugar is so badly needed for making bread.

Furthermore, we want you to have the personal satisfaction of knowing that we will lend you every support in any action which will curtail the manufacture and sale of liquors in the United States.

PROTEST AGAINST GOVERNMENT SEIZURE OF PROPERTY OF OIL COMPANIES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter in the nature of a memorial from the Lawrence Paper Co., of Lawrence, Kans., remonstrating against Government seizure of the property of oil companies when the country is not at war. I ask unanimous consent to present the protest for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAWRENCE PAPER CO.,
Lawrence, Kans., October 5, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to go on record with you as objecting very strongly to the Government seizure of the property of the oil companies when the country is not at war.

Wages cannot go up 30 percent, which the unions are asking, without an increase in prices, which it is my understanding the OPA is refusing.

This puts the Government in the position of seizing private property of the oil companies, because the action of OPA makes it impossible to meet the demands imposed on them by the Secretary of Labor.

Yours very truly,

JUSTIN D. HILL,
Vice President.

RELIEF OF PEOPLE OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the members of the "Jednakost" Lodge 391, C. F. U. of A., at a regular meeting held on September 9, 1945, favoring immediate and substantial relief to the people of Yugoslavia.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LODGE NO. 391,
CROATIAN FRATERNAL UNION OF AMERICA,
West Allis, Wis., September 29, 1945.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator of Wisconsin,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the Yugoslav people have been among the most determined and effective allies of the United States and of the United Nations during the past war; and

Whereas the Yugoslav people have carried on their struggle against the common enemy under the worst possible conditions of adversity, lack of arms, ammunition, food, and medical supplies, and literally had to wrest their arms and equipment from the hands of the enemy; and

Whereas the country is devastated and temporarily unproductive and still lacking even more than ever before the necessities of life for its people; and

Whereas great sums of money are being spent and large quantities of goods, clothing, and food are being supplied to the people of nations which were enemies of the United Nations or which only recently have dubiously repented and reformed into the ways of democracy; and

Whereas certain interests and individuals are seeking to mix relief with politics by withholding relief from the people until their conditions are met; and

Whereas such interference in the domestic affairs of a country is contrary to the principles of freedom espoused by the United Nations; and

Whereas the people of Yugoslavia are as deserving of help as any people that were ever engaged in war against the Nazis and Fascists: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved by the members of the Jednakost, Lodge 391, C. F. U. of A., at a regular meeting held on September 9, 1945, That an appeal be made to the proper authorities for immediate and substantial relief to the people of Yugoslavia, and that a copy of this resolution be furnished such authorities.

MIKE FRAIJEVIC,
President.
JOHN W. BABICH,
Secretary.

SUPPLY OF COAL FOR CHEQUAMEGON BAY, WIS., AREA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Washburn, Wis., favoring the taking of immediate steps to insure the Chequamegon Bay area a sufficient supply of bituminous coal before the close of the 1945 navigation season.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Washburn, Wis., declaring the existence of an emergency with respect to the inadequate supply of coal now on the docks in Chequamegon Bay and requesting the Solid Fuels Administration and the proper agents and officers of the Government of the United States to take immediate steps to rectify the situation

Whereas the supply of coal presently on the docks in Chequamegon Bay on Lake Superior is entirely inadequate to care for consumers' needs and wants during the coming heating season; and

Whereas reliable figures and information show a deficiency on the docks in Chequamegon Bay of approximately 300,000 tons, and all bituminous coal used by industrial plants and domestic consumers moves from these docks; and

Whereas it is imperative that coal should be carried by boats to such docks immediately in order to insure a sufficient supply to last until the opening of the 1946 navigation season, which will probably not open until late in April or early in May of 1946; and

Whereas the close of navigation in 1945 will be approximately on the 17th day of November, but that date cannot be relied upon because of severe weather conditions which may cause lake shipments to cease earlier than November 17; and

Whereas a failure to have on hand a sufficient supply of coal on the docks in the Chequamegon Bay area before the close of the present navigation season will create conditions fraught with imminent danger to the health, welfare, and good order of all of the communities served with coal therefrom; and

Whereas this serious coal shortage was called to the attention of the Solid Fuels Administration officials at a meeting held in the mayor's office in the city of Duluth, Minn., on June 12, 1945, and the situation has not been rectified or in any wise made better since that date: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Washburn, Wis., That an emergency is declared to exist, and that steps must of necessity be immediately taken to rectify that emergency for the preservation of the health, welfare, and good order of the city of Washburn, Wis., and specifically on behalf of the

citizens of the city of Washburn, Wis., and generally on behalf of all neighboring communities, and that this resolution stand as a petition to the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, that the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government of the United States take immediate steps to insure the Chequamegon Bay area a sufficient supply of bituminous coal on the docks before the close of the 1945 navigation season, in order to prevent extreme suffering and hardship in this area during the coming heating season; and be it further

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Washburn, Wis., That the Solid Fuels Administration be immediately requested to give every reasonable opportunity to provide, and that the said Solid Fuels Administration do provide, No. 1A priorities which will immediately facilitate the shipping of coal from lower lake ports to docks in the area served by the Chequamegon Bay area; and be it further

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Washburn, Wis., That the city clerk be forthwith directed to mail a certified copy of this resolution to ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE and ALEXANDER WILEY, the Senators from the State of Wisconsin, to ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Congressman from the Tenth Congressional District, President Harry S. Truman, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, and Under Secretary of the Interior Abe Fortas, all at Washington, D. C.

NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1342, to establish a national housing policy.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas bill S. 1342, amending the existing National Housing Agency laws, has been introduced in the United States Senate, which among other things covers research into building costs and methods with the object of lowering costs, also contains provision for land assembly over long periods of amortization for better ratio of land to building costs and also changes the cost per dwelling units from the present $5,000 per unit to $1,250 per room, which would make it possible if the act were passed to complete the sixth ward housing project without change; and

Whereas the passage of this bill would stimulate and improve all housing developments, public and private, in Milwaukee, from the lowest subsidized projects up to and including economic redevelopment projects; and

Whereas the passage of this bill would materially expedite the completion of the sixth ward housing project now contemplated and other redevelopment projects: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That it hereby favors bill S. 1342, which establishes a national housing policy and provides for its execution and hereby urges its Representatives in the Senate and House to use their best endeavors to have said bill enacted into law;

Resolved further, That duly certified copies be sent to Senators LA FOLLETTE and WILEY and Congressmen WASIELEWSKI and BIEMILLER.

NEW POST OFFICE BUILDING AT CUDAHY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Cudahy, Wis., requesting erection of a new post office building in that city.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 681

Resolution proposing erection of new post office building

Whereas the city of Cudahy, Wis., is a municipality situated on the shores of Lake Michigan, in the county of Milwaukee, and has a population of 10,550; and

Whereas this city is the most progressive city in the State of Wisconsin, having 14 major industries, among them such nationally known firms as Ladish Drop Forge Co., George J. Meyer Manufacturing Co., Cudahy Bros. Co., and others; and

Whereas the city has a history of steady and conservative growth and harbors many types of civic and fraternal organizations as the chamber of commerce, junior chamber of commerce, Kiwanis Club, Moose Club, Eagles Club, Knights of Columbus, Knights of Pythias, Cudahy Women's Club, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Cudahy (Veterans) Service League, and others; and

Whereas this community is in dire need of a United States post office building commensurate with its growth and progress to replace the leased quarters now housing the post office, which are too small and inadequate and uncentrally located on a side street: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved, That the mayor and common council of the city of Cudahy do hereby formally endorse and subscribe to a petition for the erection of a new post office building to be centrally located on the main street in the heart of the city; it is further

Resolved, That a new post office housed in a modern building will be in accord with the progressive development of this city and will be justified not by civic pride alone, but also by the steady, conservative growth of the city and its industries during the past 50 years and the immediate urgent need for adequate modern quarters; it is further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon and made a part of the minutes of this meeting and that the city clerk cause suitable copies thereof to be forwarded to the United States Postmaster General, to the two Senators and Congressman representing this District for early favorable action upon this petition.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 116) to facilitate the execution of subsection (d) of section 13 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 637) thereon.

REPORT ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures relating to civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government by department and agency for the months of July and August 1945, showing increases and decreases in the number of paid employees.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reduction in nonessential Federal expenditures—Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for the months of July and August 1945 showing the increases and decreases in number of paid employees

Departments or agencies	1945		Increase (+) or decrease (−)
	July	August	
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
Bureau of the Budget	591	587	−4
DEPARTMENTS			
Agriculture Department	91,624	95,529	+3,905
Commerce Department	35,243	34,771	−472
Interior Department	44,857	45,055	+198
Justice Department	27,129	26,839	−290
Labor Department	6,804	6,346	−458
Navy Department	758,119	721,342	−36,777
Post Office Department [1]	384,249	387,262	+3,013
State Department	11,380	11,188	−192
Treasury Department	97,132	95,808	−1,324
War Department [2]	1,138,450	1,077,179	−61,271
NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES			
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	124	65	−59
Foreign Economic Administration	6,512	6,371	−141
National War Labor Board	3,711	3,844	+133
Office of Alien Property Custodian	753	729	−24
Office of Censorship	5,807	4,700	−1,107
Office of Defense Transportation	3,191	2,828	−363
Office of Economic Stabilization	19	19	
Office of Inter-American Affairs	1,292	1,249	−43
Office of Price Administration	64,818	61,985	−2,833
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1,362	1,310	−52
Office of Strategic Services	2,350	2,103	−247
Office of War Information	9,127	7,989	−1,138
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion [3]	370	458	+88
Petroleum Administration for War	986	970	−16
Selective Service System	18,598	18,573	−225
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,843	1,874	+31
War Manpower Commission	28,234	27,839	−395
War Production Board	12,002	11,311	−691
War Shipping Administration	5,554	5,556	+2
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	343	349	+6
Civil Service Commission	7,014	6,863	−151
Employees' Compensation Commission	515	517	+2
Export-Import Bank of Washington	62	68	+6
Federal Communications Commission	1,494	1,508	+14
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,222	1,218	−4
Federal Power Commission	651	655	+4
Federal Security Agency	33,418	30,368	−3,050
Federal Trade Commission	455	448	−5
Federal Works Agency	20,459	20,532	+73
General Accounting Office	14,036	14,139	+103

[1] Increase due to part-time temporary substitute clerks and carriers.

[2] Does not include 733,792 employees stationed outside the continental United States.

[3] Includes the Office of Contract Settlement previously reported separately.

Reduction in nonessential Federal expenditures, etc.—Continued

Departments or agencies	1945		Increase (+) or decrease (−)
	July	August	
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Government Printing Office	6,957	6,943	−14
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,030	2,013	−17
Maritime Commission	10,494	10,280	−214
National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics	6,706	6,746	+40
National Archives	348	342	−6
National Capital Housing Authority	221	223	+2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	17	
National Gallery of Art	270	270	
National Housing Agency	15,418	15,366	−52
National Labor Relations Board	807	751	−56
National Mediation Board	98	92	−6
Panama Canal	31,391	31,555	+164
Railroad Retirement Board	1,784	1,803	+19
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	13,191	13,562	+371
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,151	1,150	−1
Smithsonian Institution	406	410	+4
Tariff Commission	296	294	−2
Tax Court of the United States	118	119	+1
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,349	12,686	+337
Veterans' Administration	69,751	73,010	+3,259
Total [4]	3,015,702	2,915,777	−111,700 / +11,775
Net decrease			−99,925
War Department [5]	539,222	733,792	+194,570
Grand total	3,554,929	3,649,569	

[4] Includes employees stationed outside the continental United States, as reported by various departments and agencies excepting the War Department totals; July 120,075 and August 120,046.

[5] Employees stationed outside continental United States, reported quarterly as of June 30, 1945.

NOTE.—Employment figures now reported to the committee include dollar-per-annum and without-compensation employees of the consultant-expert type who are authorized to receive per diem in lieu of subsistence.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. KNOWLAND introduced Senate bill 1473, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1474, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1475. A bill to amend section 15 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1476. A bill to extend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. LUCAS introduced Senate bill 1477, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1478. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Edith Frances De Becker Sebald; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1479. A bill for the relief of Dennis L. Fleak; to the Committee on Claims.

TRAINING OF YOUNG MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the national defense and security by requiring that all qualified young men perform a period of training and service in the armed forces of the United States, unless such men have elected to acquire necessary military training through voluntary service in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the National Guard, or other components of the armed forces.

The bill deals with the continuation of the Selective Service Act and provides that the selective-service machinery shall continue in operation during peacetime; that young men becoming 21 years of age shall be subject to 1 year's military training, but it provides a voluntary alternative program by which they may elect to discharge their obligation by gaining a given number of points. These points may be gained either by training in educational institutions, in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, in the National Guard, or in one of the organized reserves, so as not to interfere with the education of young men as they are going through high schools and colleges.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1473) to provide for the national defense and security by requiring that all qualified young men perform a period of training and service in the armed forces of the United States, unless such men have elected to acquire necessary military training through voluntary service in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the National Guard, or other components of the armed forces, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROTECTION AGAINST UNLAWFUL RESTRAINTS AND MONOPOLIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the daily press of yesterday the people of the country were informed that an antitrust suit had been filed against large electric companies plus two of their subsidiaries, and also against an association said to be jointly controlled by them. The news dispatch said that Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge called the instigation of this suit, "a drive against American participation in foreign cartels."

Most of us are familiar with how these international cartels have robbed the people of this country and the common people of other countries.

All of us are familiar with the history of tungsten and how Thurman Arnold, when he was Assistant Attorney General, showed that it cost $24 a pound to manufacture tungsten and it was sold for $48 a pound before the cartel was formed, and that after the formation of the international cartel the price of tungsten was raised to as high as $408 a pound.

The curious part is, however, that these crooks still have the loot of which they robbed the people, and none of them were sent to jail. On the contrary, one of them was advanced to a very high Government position.

We have only too many instances of men who have been arrested for stealing loaves of bread to support their starving families. We have seen the spectacle of our men in the armed forces being given life sentences for stealing cigarettes; and I, for one, want to go on record as asking the Attorney General, who I believe is one of the best law enforcers this Government of ours has had in recent years, not only to bring civil suits in cases where these crooks could steal millions and then pay a fine of a few thousand dollars but to take steps to put these millionaire gangsters into the penitentiaries where they belong.

Not a single violator of the Sherman Antitrust Act was sent to the penitentiary under the administrations of Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, or Herbert Hoover, which is as far as I have the record. But by telephoning the Department of Justice, I also find that none were sent to the penitentiary under the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The only exception was Eugene Debs, who was imprisoned for contempt of court for violating an injuction issued under this act.

I suggest that the way to stop the formation and carrying on of these cartels on the part of this large influential bunch of parasites is to put them behind the bars, and in order to aid the Attorney General, I am today introducing a bill materially lengthening the term of imprisonment for this bunch of thieves, for whom I, at least, have no respect. A highwayman who takes a gun and holds you up in an alley at least runs some little risk and, if he is caught, may, in some States, receive a long, long sentence.

But these thieving scoundrels who meet together to fleece the rest of their fellow men, under the Sherman Antitrust Act can only get a maximum imprisonment of 1 year and a $5,000 fine. The violation of the act is a misdemeanor, and I propose to make it a felony.

I propose to aid the Attorney General by giving him the opportunity of at least advocating that Federal judges send these money-mad chaps up and give them long sentences—terms of imprisonment of not to exceed 50 years and fines not to exceed $100,000,000, or both.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, approved July 2, 1890, as amended, so as to increase the penalties for violation thereof.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1474) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, as amended, so as to increase the penalties for violation thereof, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF CLAIMS UNDER CERTAIN WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize

relief in certain cases where supplies and services have been furnished for the Government during the war.

The bill is exceedingly important. It seeks to amend the First War Powers Act of 1941. The object is to shift the basis upon which claims may be considered, from the present interpretation by the department of the original act. I hold in my hand a letter in which the War Department has allowed a contractor $173,000. An additional $75,000 is in dispute. According to the law as it now stands, under which contracts were made on the theory that they would aid the war effort, the War Department takes the position that amendatory legislation is necessary before it can pay any part of this claim. I have before me a half a dozen similar examples. I hope the committee to which the bill is referred will give this subject its early consideration.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1477) to authorize relief in certain cases where supplies or services have been furnished for the Government during the war, introduced by Mr. LUCAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

OPENING OF PALESTINE TO FREE ENTRY OF HEBREWS

Mr. MYERS (for himself and Mr. TOBEY) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 37), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States, on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved "That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christians and other non-Jewish communities in Palestine and that the holy places and religious buildings and cities in Palestine shall be adequately protected";

Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Hebrew people during the war period in Europe and the resultant homeless status of thousands of former Axis citizens of the Jewish faith has forced these victims into a situation of need which has aroused the indignation of Americans of every race and creed;

Whereas final surveys made at the President's request have confirmed the desire of the vast majority of these distressed people to go into Palestine and emphasized the factors preventing their return to the tragic scenes of their persecution; and

Whereas, by the terms of the treaty of peace signed with Turkey by the Allied and Associated Powers, including the United States, at Lausanne, July 24, 1923, the responsibility for the control and administration of the Palestinian area rests with such Allied and Associated Powers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States shall use its good offices and take immediate appropriate measures to the ends that Palestine shall be reopened at the earliest possible moment for free entry of Hebrews into that area, that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and settlement on the land by the Jewish people, and that Palestine ultimately be established as a free and independent democratic state with full citizenship rights for its inhabitants without discrimination based on racial or religious factors.

SEC. 2. Pendng the setting up of the governmental machinery to effectuate the establishment of Palestine as an independent democracy and to aid the people of Palestine in so doing, the President is urged to initiate steps in conjunction with other interested United Nations to set up a supervisory international commission to effectuate the immediate transfer of the Hebrew people of Europe to Palestine and to insure peaceful and orderly processes in securing these ends.

THE ALUMINUM INDUSTRY—PRINTING OF FIFTH REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL UNDER WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION ACT (S. DOC. NO. 94)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, in section 205, requires the Attorney General from time to time to submit to the Congress reports with respect to the factors which may tend to eliminate competition in our economy. The fifth report under this section was received by the Senate on September 19, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and by that committee referred to the subcommittee on surplus property.

On Monday next the subcommittee on surplus property, together with the industrial reorganization committee of the George Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, and the Small Business Committee, will begin hearings on the report which has been submitted by the Surplus Property Administration on Government-owned surplus aluminum plants.

Mr. President, I may add in connection with this hearing that I should like the Senate to know that it will be held in the Caucus Room in the Senate Office Building. The Surplus Property Administrator, Mr. Symington, will be present and will testify. The Department of Justice has also been invited to have representatives present. The chairman of the committee has received telegrams from leading business executives interested in the aluminum industry, like Mr. Wilson, of Alcoa, indicating their desire to be present and testify. It occurred to me that the Senate would be glad to know that this hearing will be in progress.

The report of the Attorney General, to which I referred, Mr. President, deals with the aluminum industry. It is a matter of great importance. It should be in the hands of all the members of the two committees and of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Attorney General submitted in accordance with law may be printed with an illustration as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT DEDICATION OF KENTUCKY DAM

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the prepared address delivered by the President of the United States at the dedication of Kentucky Dam, Gilbertsville, Ky., October 10, 1945, and his extemporaneous remarks on the same occasion, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S STAND ON CURRENT ISSUES—ARTICLES FROM THE DES MOINES REGISTER AND THE PROVIDENCE JOURNAL

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Shies at Questions on Key Issues," from the Des Moines Register of October 4, 1945, and an article entitled "Don't Shoot the Pianist; He's Doing the Best He Can," from the Providence Journal of October 9, 1945, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR OF TENNESSEE AT PRESENTATION OF PORTRAIT OF PRESIDENT POLK

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Jim McCord, Governor of Tennessee, on the occasion of the presentation of a portrait of President James K. Polk to the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., on October 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

GIFT OF AIRPLANE TO GENERAL DE GAULLE—ARTICLE BY JOHN M. CUMMINGS

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Following Precedents Makes Things Simpler," by John M. Cummings, published in the September 26, 1945, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEARL HARBOR—ARTICLE BY JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Pearl Harbor," by John Chamberlain, published in Life magazine for September 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TREND OF THE CIO PROGRAM—STATEMENT BY DR. WILFORD I. KING

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Where Does the CIO Program Lead?" written by Dr. Willford I. King, professor of economics, New York University, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY OF SOLDIERS—EDITORIAL FROM TULSA (OKLA.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pay the Soldier War-Worker Wages," to be published in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of October 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STRIKE SITUATION—EDITORIAL FROM COURIER-POST, CAMDEN, N. J.

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How To Lose Friends and Not Influence People," dealing with the present strike situation, published in the Courier-Post, of Camden, N. J., of October 6, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ENDORSEMENT BY PHYSICIANS FORUM OF HEALTH PROGRAM IN SENATE BILL 1050

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Physicians Forum, endorsing the health program incorporated in Senate bill 1050, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT OF MURIEL E. REYNOLDS AND MARGERY M. PORTER AS CORPORATE OFFICERS OF STANDARD OIL CO. (N. J.)

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the Standard Oil Co. with reference to the appointment of Miss Muriel E. Reynolds and

Mrs. Margery M. Porter as corporate officers of the company, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPHECY BY GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON CONCERNING INEVITABILITY OF ANOTHER WAR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR McMAHON

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him regarding statement by Gen. George S. Patton regarding the inevitability of another war, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ADJUSTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES—ARTICLES BY B. L. MASSE AND C. W. ANROD

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles entitled "The Adjustment of Industrial Disputes," by B. L. Masse and C. W. Anrod, from the magazine America, for August 25, 1945, and September 1, 1945, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE ACHESON-MacARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Supplementing the remarks I made on the floor of the Senate a few days ago against the confirmation of Mr. Acheson to be Under Secretary of State, and also in view of the fact that at that time I voiced some statements relative to my apprehension that in its foreign policy in Japan, the administration might go further than the Potsdam agreement, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to a news release of this morning by Reuters, an English news agency, forcibly calling attention to alleged facts which corroborate my fears. The news release reads:

General MacArthur will resign supreme command in Japan should a four-power commission be appointed to control Nippon, a high staff officer stated here tonight, adding MacArthur would "drop a few sticks of dynamite when he goes."

At the same time the officer asserted MacArthur's command had not received "one iota of assistance or cooperation" from the Russian delegation here since occupation.

I do not know on what facts this news release is based. I am neither condemning it nor condoning it; but often in the past, foreign news agencies have been relied upon to give us information, which when brought out in the open had to be admitted as true by the administration.

I should also like to bring to the attention of the Senate a statement by Robert Young, printed in the Washington Times-Herald this morning under the headline "Byrnes again backs Mac against Reds." I ask that this article regarding the statement by the Secretary be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BYRNES AGAIN BACKS MAC AGAINST REDS—REJECTS BIG FOUR COUNCIL RULE OF JAPANESE—SAYS PLAN VIOLATES TERMS OF SURRENDER

(TOKYO, October 10.—General MacArthur will resign supreme command in Japan should a four-power commission be appointed to control Nippon, a high staff officer stated here tonight, adding MacArthur would "drop a few sticks of dynamite when he goes." At the same time the officer asserted MacArthur's command had not received "one iota of assistance or cooperation" from the Russian delegation here since occupation.)

(By Robert Young)

Secretary of State Byrnes yesterday reiterated his support of General MacArthur as supreme Allied occupation commander by expressing opposition to a Russian proposal that an Allied control council be set up to administer Japan. He said there was no intention of changing MacArthur's status.

Byrnes said at a news conference that the United States would be opposed to the policy of a control council and would continue to pursue the present occupation policy at least for the time being. He said he did not believe the Russian control council proposal was a wise one, and that before considering it he would have to consult with the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military situation in Japan.

CITES SURRENDER TERMS

The Secretary of State cited his August 11 letter to the Japanese Government prior to the surrender, which declared that the Japanese Emperor would have to take orders from the supreme military commander. He said that was the understanding under which the Japanese surrendered. Referring to this understanding as a contract, he added that he did not believe this contract could be changed at this time.

None of the Allies has complained in any way about MacArthur's conduct of his Japan occupation assignment, Byrnes asserted. A control council would not fit in with the understanding on which the Japanese agreed to unconditional surrender—that is, that the Emperor take orders from the supreme Allied commander, he said.

COMMISSION MEETS OCTOBER 23

Byrnes announced that the United States has called the first meeting of the projected Far Eastern Advisory Commission for October 23 in Washington. Establishment of the commission, which would recommend long-range policies for the control of Japan, would not necessarily sacrifice American dominance in formulation of Japanese occupation policy, he explained.

The Secretary of State said he sent telegrams Tuesday to Great Britain, Russia, China, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, France, the Netherlands, and the Philippines telling them of the scheduled meeting and urging them to appoint their representatives on the commission. The United States representative will be Frank McCoy, president of the Foreign Policy Association and a retired Army general and expert on far eastern affairs.

The United States and Great Britain have agreed that India should participate in the commission, but so far Russia and China have not concurred in the invitation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also have two editorials, one from the Des Moines Register——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator desire that I yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have a right to reserve an objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas reserves the right to object.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not expect to object, but I wish to know what the Senator is asking. Is he asking permission to print a statement by Secretary Byrnes?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator said something about Robert Young having written an article.

Mr. WHERRY. A statement regarding Secretary Byrnes, a release printed in the Times-Herald, entitled "Byrnes Again Backs Mac Against Reds." In the article Mr. Young is quoting, from Mr. Byrnes, who makes his position clear that he is backing General MacArthur, and that he expects to carry out the Potsdam agreement.

I wish to take this opportunity to say that I appreciate that statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Referring to the article which the Senator from Nebraska quoted, and the statement from London, I do not see why London sources should be the ones to give out what is transpiring here or under our command in Japan. If the Senator from Nebraska wishes to credit those sources, of course he is at liberty to do so. But Secretary Byrnes has made it entirely clear that he does not favor the establishment of a joint commission for the control of Japan. He did, however, agree to an advisory commission, which he proposed long before the meeting in London. As I understand, he proposed, directly after the surrender of Japan, that there be a joint advisory commission, which would have no authority except to suggest and advise and afford the opportunity to various governments who are our allies to propose and suggest their ideas as to policy with regard to Japan. I understand it was agreed to at the moment by all the participating powers.

The other reference the Senator made was to the Russian proposal that there be established a joint commission with authority to control the conduct of affairs in Japan. The proposal was not agreed to by this Government, and Secretary Byrnes made it very clear that he had not agreed to it, and had no intention of doing so.

I think this statement is due the Secretary and those who represent the Government of the United States in connection with these supposedly inspired articles coming out of London. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. Of course, I am yielding for unanimous consent requests for the insertion of matters in the RECORD, in accordance with the usual practice. I do not care to yield for the discussion of controversial matters.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are the only ones that are worth discussing.

Mr. REED. That may well be, but in the present situation I shall be glad to yield for unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. WHERRY. I withdraw the request. I thank the Senator for the time he has given me.

BOTTLENECKS IN RECONVERSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield a few moments to me?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was not so long ago that we heard talk about bottlenecks in the production of materials for war. The situation has now changed.

We are no longer producing for war, but we face bottlenecks in reconversion which will interfere with our economic prosperity unless we "bust" them wide open.

It is in relation to one of these bottlenecks that I have written to Mr. John Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The letter reads:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
October 10, 1945.

Hon. JOHN R. SNYDER,
Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: There has recently been called to my attention a very serious situation in the gray iron foundry industry.

As you know, we have a number of gray iron foundries in Wisconsin.

I am informed that if this situation is cleared up; if 63,000 to 70,000 men can be secured for this industry, it will mean that as a result of what they produce, jobs for three or more million men in industries which use the gray iron castings will be created.

I will be specific in this matter. The automobile industry, as you know, is in dire need of gray iron castings for motor blocks and heads. The refrigeration and air-conditioning industries require castings for motor compressors and heads, motor end frames, cylinders, and rings; the washing machine industry for frames, arms, motor end frames; the textile industry for repair parts for looms, weaving machines, and all types of textile machinery; the rubber industry for tire molds and repair parts for the rubber-making machinery; the mining industry for coal-mining machinery; the railroads for brake shoes and car wheels. Other industries need these vital items for farm machinery; for food-processing machinery; for office equipment, etc.

I have recently listened to talks over the radio and seen press releases in relation to shortages, but all of these seem to have missed the vital point that none of these shortages can be met without the prior production of gray iron castings.

As you know, much of the machinery that we are relying upon for reconversion has been worn out, and the need for new parts (castings) in all the lines suggested above is so critical that I feel that I am doing the proper thing in calling your attention to this fact, which you undoubtedly know, but because of pressure of business and other matters, may have overlooked.

Now, anyone who makes a suggestion should have a remedy.

If the Government is really interested (as I think it is) in getting reconversion under full steam, then the Government must look after first things first. That means getting 70,000 workers into the gray iron foundry industry—70,000 jobs there are looking for men. What is the Government doing about filling those jobs? I am sure it is not disputed that these jobs will produce 3 million other jobs. Is there anything more important in America than the matter of creation of jobs—the very thing about which I am writing you? If there is, I don't know it. On other occasions the Government has taken steps to get men to fill critical situations. I think that is what must be done now.

Will you kindly let me hear from you in the immediate future in relation to what is intended to be done and what is done on this matter?

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

A copy of this letter has gone to the following:

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD, chairman, Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

Hon. John D. Small, War Production Board.

Hon. J. A. Krug, Chairman, War Production Board.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises.

I especially stress the importance of this matter to the chairmen of the two committees I have mentioned. Without any reflection upon any individual or committee, I wish to say that failure to take action in this matter will not only clog the channels of employment, but will demonstrate an utter lack of perspective.

There is another phase to this matter. There are some ugly rumors going around. They are to the effect that there are those in government, and those in labor, who don't want reconversion to run along smoothly and get under way at a maximum pace. I pass no judgment on such rumors, but I do say that there is a lot of dumbness in high places.

I said the other day that the public interest was paramount to any individual interest, that is, the right of the Nation should not be interfered with by individuals or groups. At that time I spoke on the subject of strikes. Strikes, of course, constitute a bottleneck, especially when they occur in industries the closing of which results in shutdowns in other industries, in dissipation of jobs.

But the bottleneck I am speaking of today is outlined in the letter I have just read. It is one that government can iron out, if it will get underway, if government will assist in siphoning men into this industry instead of interfering with the industry, as was done a few years ago. The general average of pay in this industry throughout the Nation is $1.02 an hour. But the big thing about it is that it is calling for help, not so much for itself, as for the general welfare of the Nation. It will produce wealth and 3,000,000 additional jobs.

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in times such as these when one serious problem after another arises to challenge us, we too often tend to forget the lessons of history.

On this day, however, the anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, it is my hope that all thoughtful Americans will pause to reflect upon the record of his achievements.

Born almost 200 years ago, Pulaski came to America at a time when the beacon of freedom was already beginning to glow. In 1777 he joined the army of General Washington. He formed the Pulaski Legion. He distinguished himself on many occasions. He fought through the battles of the bitter winter of 1777. He defended Charleston. And, finally, in Savannah, in 1779, he gave his life in the cause of freedom.

Let us remember also the historic achievements, not only of the thousands of Polish-American men who have fought in our Army and Navy in all of America's wars, but also the heroic struggles of the Polish people against the invaders of Poland.

Let us go back only 6 years ago to 1939 when Hitler was looking forward on the wave of the future. At that time no country had the courage to resist the Fascist armies. In the Rhineland, in Spain, in Austria, and at Munich, Hitler was met with retreat. But when the German armies invaded Poland, Hitler was met—for the first time—with resistance, stubborn, unyielding resistance that kindled the flame of courage and freedom in the hearts of all liberty-loving peoples throughout the world.

If we here in America go forward in the spirit of Pulaski, in the spirit of those brave men and women who were the first to stand up against Hitler, it is my conviction that we can build a world where intolerance and aggression are only bitter memories of the past and where the ideals of liberty and justice are adhered to by all the nations of the world.

GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI—POLAND

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to have placed in the RECORD, along with my remarks, a statement with reference to the service and sacrifice of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, to whom we pay tribute today. I send the statement to the desk, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASIMIR PULASKI: A POLISH PATRIOT WHO DIED FOR AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE

History records that Casimir Pulaski arrived at General Washington's headquarters in July 1777, bringing with him a letter of introduction from Benjamin Franklin, who then was representing the United States of America in Paris. Our Nation was but 1 year old.

This young Polish nobleman was genuinely democratic—a patriot who loved liberty and freedom. Washington and Franklin said many fine things about Pulaski. Franklin said he was "an officer famous throughout Europe for his defense of the liberties of his country," and this is something which the people of Poland are again fighting for, at this very moment, to avoid a fourth partition of their country.

Rising to the rank of brigadier general during the two most crucial years in the American Revolution, Pulaski fought with valor and distinction in the battles of Brandywine, Warren Tavern, Germantown, Trenton, and Haddonfield near Camden, N. J.

He organized his own "Pulaski Legion," which fought at Little Egg Harbor and Charleston, as well as in a number of other engagements. At the Battle of Savannah, on October 9, 1779, General Pulaski was mortally wounded; he died 3 days later, on October 11, 1779.

In his last message to the Continental Congress, Pulaski wrote:

"I could not submit to stoop before the sovereigns of Europe, so I came to hazard all for the freedom of America."

The memory of this great champion of American freedom will ever be revered, and tales of his gallantry repeated throughout the length and breadth of our land.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, today we recall the life and accomplishments of Count Casimir Pulaski. His story is that of a man who made one of the greatest personal sacrifices of the War of the Revolution. He demonstrated great ability and leadership, supreme loyalty, and painstaking devotion to the cause of the Revolution. This great man came to this country from his own distant land. He offered his services to the struggling American colonies and followed the leadership of General Washington until he met his death at the siege of Savannah. Mr. President, this heroic officer, who fell under heroic and valorous circumstances, made as I have said, one of the great and outstanding sacrifices of the Revolutionary War.

In behalf of the 6,000,000 American citizens of Polish ancestry who have made a remarkable contribution to the Nation's war effort, it may be said that their ambitions and their desires for the land of their fathers should naturally enter into any discussion of this kind.

Mr. President, not only for them, but for the 7,000,000 Polish people who died in the recent war, I believe that the circumstances which caused their deaths may properly enter into a discussion of this character on a day such as this.

The late President Roosevelt's observation in October 1944, to the effect that world opinion will back up our objective of reconstituting Poland as a great nation was heartening to the friends of Poland in the United States and everywhere. His stand was in keeping with the guaranties embodied in the Atlantic Charter.

The pledges of the Atlantic Charter were held out to all freedom-loving people of the world who joined with us in the common effort undertaken as members of the United Nations. As members of the United Nations the United States and the Republic of Poland pledged mutual assistance to the end that the "four freedoms" shall become the heritage of the peoples of the earth.

Mr. President, another observation which is fitting and appropriate on this occasion is the observation of the late Cardinal Hinsley of England who paid tribute to the courage of Poland in a broadcast to the Polish people on Easter Sunday of 1940, in the following moving words:

You, through all history, will have the glory of a brave resistance against overwhelming odds, and of heroic suffering heroically borne. The like brutality and the like cruelty of exterminating hate, the world has never seen before. * * * Poland will rise again. "Fear not those who are not able to kill the soul."

At the outbreak of hostilities in Europe in 1939 brave Poland, after concluding an alliance with Great Britain, offered the first resistance to the then overwhelming strength of Hitler and his Nazi war machine. The story of the epic struggle of Poland, shut off as she was from any real assistance by other powers, will live forever. The heroism of Poland inspired the freedom-loving nations of the world, and brought home to them the Axis threat to civilization. By thus engaging Hitler in the early days of the war, Poland prevented a surprise attack by Hitler on France and England, who were unprepared. Had Poland compromised instead of resisting aggression, the whole course of history might have been changed.

Mr. President, justice in the treatment of Poland and of all other nations, great or small, will enhance the prestige of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, and will insure the ultimate success of our present objective, a just and lasting peace in a world no longer subject to the threat of the aggressor.

So on this day, the day on which we observe the anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, it is our hope that Poland will take her place again among the strong nations of the world, and that she, along with all the smaller nations of the world, will be admitted to membership in the United Nations and there receive the encouragement and support of the larger nations of the world.

RELEASE OF DOCTORS FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, when I came back to this session of the Senate it was from a territory where I had heard more discussion about getting boys out of the Army than on any other subject. One of the most important phases of this question which I heard freely discussed was the question of the release of doctors now held by the armed forces at the expense of adequate service to the civilian population, after the Army need for many of them had ceased.

Mr. President, at the beginning of this week the House Committee on Military Affairs commenced hearings on this subject. A representative of the Surgeon General's Office of the Army stated either in the record or to newspaper representatives that some figures appearing in the Washington Post regarding the number of doctors in the Army were not accurate.

It happens that I furnished the Washington Post with those figures. Yesterday I sent to Representative MAY, of Kentucky, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, a copy of a letter which I wrote the Secretary of War on September 15, in which I specifically asked the Secretary, "Will you be good enough to give me the number of doctors and surgeons on the rolls of the Surgeon General's force as of January 1, 1945?" I also asked him to give me the same information as of September 1.

I received an answer from the Secretary of War dated September 24. The Secretary of War advised me that on January 21 the number of doctors and surgeons in the Army was 45,511. On September 1 the figure was 46,017, an increase of 506 doctors. I do not know where the representative of the Surgeon General's office who testified before the House committee this week got his information, but I got mine from the Secretary of War. If there is any better source for information of that kind, I do not know what it is.

I ask unanimous consent that copies of these letters be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1945.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF WAR.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Will you be good enough to advise me the number of doctors and surgeons on the rolls of the Surgeon General's force as of January 1, 1945?

Will you be good enough to give me the same information as of September 1, 1945?

I would also like to have the same information regarding dentists.

I assume that this information is readily available and I shall appreciate a prompt reply.

With my best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

CLYDE M. REED.

WAR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, D. C., September 24, 1945.

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,

United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REED: In response to your request of September 15, Mr. Stimson has asked me to provide you with the following information concerning the number of doctors and dentists on the rolls of the Surgeon General's office as of January 1, 1945, and September 1, 1945:

	Doctors	*Dentists*
Jan. 1, 1945	45,511	15,103
Sept. 1, 1945 (estimated)	46,017	14,583

Because of your interest in this subject, I am enclosing a copy of the recently announced plan whereby 13,000 physicians, 25,000 nurses, 3,500 dentists, and a large number of other Medical Department officers will be returned to civilian life by July 1, 1946.

I trust that this information will be adequate for your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,

Administrative Assistant.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was absent from the city part of the summer vacation, and was not in complete touch with what was happening in the committee on this subject. I had in mind submitting a resolution directing the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate to make an investigation of the question of the release of doctors by the armed forces. It is the most scandalous thing in the personnel situation during this war.

I found on inquiry that on June 12 the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] had submitted a resolution such as I contemplated submitting. I refer to Senate Resolution 134. Hearings were held on that resolution on July 11. I will wish to quote from the hearings, because the experience of the Senator from California is pretty much in line with my own experience.

Hearings were held also on Senate bill 1355, introduced by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], dealing with the personnel question in the Army. In the hearings on Senate bill 1355 on September 18 the Senator from California told why he submitted the resolution which he had submitted. The Senator from California said:

As chairman of the subcommittee, I sought some explanation of this apparent great waste of medical power, but must admit I was engulfed in an impenetrable fog in an attempt to elicit facts or any conclusion from the military authorities.

Mr. President, that is my own experience. The Senator from California told of his experience with this subject. To that subcommittee was assigned a medical officer, a colonel. In discussing that assignment, the Senator from California made this comment:

My preliminary investigation led me to believe that during the war the work load of the average military medical officer was only about 10 percent of the work load of our average civilian physician.

Colonel Holbrook, assigned to the subcommittee of the Senator from California, is now engaged in making an investigation for that subcommittee, and will later make a report. He has made some very illuminating comments upon the organization of the Surgeon General's office.

On page 259 of the hearings on September 18, Colonel Holbrook made this comment—and I am quoting a medical officer of the rank of colonel, not stating any conclusion or impression of my own:

Let us look at the record. Unfortunately, our Medical Department entered this war with almost exactly the same plans that were utilized during the war of 1917-19.

About the only question I would raise there is whether he could not have fairly made the same comparison with the medical plans of the War of 1812, instead of bringing it down to 1918.

He also said:

These plans were accepted without revision in light of the military experience and medical advancements of the succeeding 20 years.

Colonel Holbrook further said:

The present requirement of 6½ doctors per thousand, or 1 per 150 soldiers, in the Army is antiquated, and results in unnecessary waste of large numbers of doctors. The civilian population has at present 1 doctor to an average of more than 1,500 population, and some of the States average between 3,000 and 6,000 individuals per doctor.

Colonel Holbrook further said, in speaking of the set-up whereby it can be hoped to get doctors out of the Army:

Appeals by the communities to Procurement and Assignment, and by Members of Congress, for release of doctors whom they believed to be essential to the life and welfare of their communities, were largely fruitless.

Mr. President, that has been my own experience, to which I shall refer presently.

On page 254, Colonel Holbrook further said:

We had reached the point—

He was speaking about last spring—

where our urgency and our military necessity had come very close to bankrupting the medical care of the Nation.

Before I leave this point of the indifference, incapacity, and apparent incompetency of the policy of the Surgeon General's office, I wish to refer to the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I wish to say that I think the Senator from Colorado has been the most useful Member of this body in bringing the question of military personnel and the policies of demobilization out for airing, agitation, and discussion. The Senator from Colorado, in the hearing before the subcommittee on July 11, commented upon a statement made by General Berry, appearing for the Army. The Senator from Colorado then said:

The leisurely attitude of the Army toward their release—

Discussing the release of doctors—

is a thing that this committee ought not to accept lying down.

General Berry then said:

I take exception Senator, to your use of the word "leisurely."

Mr. President, here I wish to express my 100 percent concurrence in the reply of the Senator from Colorado, which was as follows:

I hope I am wrong, but from your testimony and from the replies you have to the radiograms that you sent out, I think "leisurely" is the descriptive word.

Mr. President, I have made some inquiries about the operations of the Surgeon General's office. About all I can get from people familiar with it—some who have worked there, some who have been officers there—is that they have done things that way for 40 years and probably will be doing them that way for the next 40 years, no one there becomes excited or acts in a hurry, and generally if an effort is made to get a doctor out of the Army it is fruitless. So I wish to pay my compliments to the senior Senator from Colorado and to express at the same time my complete concurrence with him.

Now I wish to come to a case from my own State, a concrete example of the way this thing operates, or, rather the way it does not operate, in the Surgeon General's office. I hold in my hand a letter from the president of the Shawnee County Medical Society. Shawnee County, Kans., is the county in which Topeka, the capital of the State, is located. Dr. C. K. Schaffer, president of the Shawnee County Medical Society, wrote me a letter, of which I shall read a part, and I shall ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed in the RECORD:

Previous to the war, Topeka and Shawnee County had 90 physicians, active in the practice of medicine. * * *

During this war period 29 of our younger, most active physicians have gone into the service and 10 of the remainder have passed away since the start of the war. Our population at this time is more than 100,000 and we have only 51 physicians left, a ratio of 1 to 2,000. * * *

There has been no return of any of our physicians that volunteered for the service, neither is it possible to secure younger physicians for Topeka, as they must enter the service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter, from which I have read several paragraphs, be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with an attached list of the names of the physicians who have been taken into the armed forces from Shawnee County, Kans.

There being no objection, the letter and attached list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAWNEE COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY,
Topeka, Kans., September 21, 1945.

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: As president of the Shawnee County Medical Society, I desire to call your attention to a very serious situation that has developed in our community.

Previous to the war, Topeka and Shawnee County had 90 physicians, active in the practice of medicine. Our population at that time was about 85,000.

During this war period, 29 of our younger, most active physicians have gone into the service, and 10 of the remainder have passed away since the start of the war. Our population at this time is more than 100,000, and we have only 51 physicians left, a ratio of 1 to 2,000. Topeka being considered a fair medical center, our hospitals and medical service extend to another 35,000 or 40,000 people, which makes a situation that is very serious. The physicians that are now left in Topeka, although working from 14 to 18 hours a day, find it impossible to answer all of the professional calls that are demanded.

There has been no return of any of our physicians that volunteered for the service, neither is it possible to secure younger physicians for Topeka, as they must enter the service.

So long as the war was actually in progress we felt no desire to hamper the cause, so we have endured a tremendous load; in many instances people just have not been able to get a physician. Now that the war is over, we feel that a very urgent program should be established to return many of these physicians to their homes, and especially do we feel the urge for our community.

Although the Medical Directory lists 100 physicians in Topeka, 49 of these are either engaged in some institutional work, such as the State hospital, State board of health, S. B. A. hospital, Santa Fe hospital, or are retired because of age or illness; none serve the people directly from the standpoint of serving them during an illness.

I am appealing to you to assist us as much as possible in obtaining the immediate release of at least 10 Topeka physicians. I do not desire to select anyone in preference to the others, so am merely sending you the names of all of our men in the service and request that you aid us as far as possible.

Sincerely,

C. K. SCHAFFER, M. D.,
President,
Shawnee County Medical Society.

TOPEKA DOCTORS IN SERVICE

Commander B. J. Ashley, Navy.
Commander L. R. Pyle, Navy.
Maj. M. E. Pusitz
Maj. Clyde Trees.
Capt. Floyd Taggart.
Capt. Charles Joss.
Capt. Leslie Saylor.
Maj. H. L. Kirkpatrick.
Commander B. I. Krehbiel, Navy.
Capt. James Bowen.
Capt. Harry Bowen.
Capt. Clovis Bowen.
Capt. David Gray.
Maj. O. M. Raines.
Col. Wm. Menninger.
Col. Guy Finney.
Maj. Hal Powers.
Capt. Spencer Boyd.
Lt. G. F. Helwig, Navy.
Lt. Comdr. Henry Blake, Navy.
Maj. O. R. Clark.
Lt. Comdr. Harlan Crank, Navy.
Lt. Comdr. Lucius Eckles, Navy.
Capt. F. L. Ford.
Lt. Col. Don Wakeman
Lt. Col. R. C. Anderson.
Capt. Robert Riedel.
Capt. Jack Graves.
Col. Seth Hammel.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have taken up that matter with the Office of the Surgeon General. I sent a copy of the letter to the Surgeon General on about the 26th of September. Today is the 11th of October. I asked the Surgeon General to make a check and see what could be done. For the benefit of Senators who have not had direct experience with this matter, let me say that the set-up is as follows: When the war broke out the War Manpower Commission organized what is called a Procurement and Assignment Committee. It had a committee for each State, with a chairman. Each State was broken down into county committees, each with a chairman. When a county or a community needed a doctor, the county committee made a request and sent it to the State committee which, if it approved, sent it on to Washington, to be presented to the Washington office of the Procurement and Assignment Committee, which was supposed to handle and be responsible for adequate civilian medical service. I have seen somewhere a statement from the Surgeon General's Office that no request coming from a community and approved by the county and State committees has been disapproved. Mr. President, let me tell you my experience. I have read the letter from the Shawnee County Medical Society showing a critical condition. I sent a copy of that letter to the Surgeon General's Office, and I also sent with the letter the list of 29 doctors who have entered the service from that county. Seven of them are in the Navy. Of course, the Surgeon General of the Army has no control over doctors in the Navy, although I understand that the two doctors who have been in the Navy are on their way out.

Two of the 29 doctors who have been named have been released. One of them was a colonel. He served in the Spanish-American War. He also served in World War I, and the war which has just been terminated. He is about 65 years old.

On October 9 I received a letter with reference to 18 other doctors. Seven of them fell into one classification and the remaining 11 fell into another classification. I shall read from a letter to show how the Surgeon General's office treats the questions which come to it with the approval of the State and county medical authorities. Day before yesterday a representative of the Surgeon General's office wrote me as follows concerning seven doctors:

> The following-named officers are assigned to Army installations in the zone of interior.

That is to say, they are in this country. After giving the names of the doctors, the letter continues:

> Most of these officers have not served overseas, according to the records of this office, and it is doubtful if they have sufficient points to be released at this time.

Mr. President, which is more important, the need of doctors in civilian life, or the number of points which they may have?

Let us go on to the next classification with reference to which the Surgeon General says:

> Further information reveals that the following-named officers are assigned to overseas installations.

After giving the names, the letter continues:

> In this connection, I can also advise you that the War Department on September 21, 1945, directed all overseas commanders to return all Medical Corps officers to the United States within 60 days—

If they had stopped there it would have been all right, but they did not stop there—

> if they had 80 points or more; or if they were 48 years of age; or if they had entered upon active duty prior to January 1, 1941.

Mr. President, I inquire, What can I tell the folks in Shawnee County? Must I tell them that we cannot get the doctors of that county out of military service because they do not have sufficient number of points, or that they have not been overseas? The 11 doctors to whom reference has been made who are overseas may be released if they have a sufficient number of points, regardless of their need.

What becomes of the claim of the Surgeon General's office that it is trying to take care of the needs of communities and have not failed in a single instance? I think I can find, if I search the record, the claim made by a representative of the Surgeon General's office that in not a single instance has that office refused a request for a discharge of a doctor from the Army if there was need for him in his local community.

In southeast Kansas is Crawford County, our principal coal-mining county, the county seat of which is a town named Girard. On April 26, 1945, the local procurement and assignment board, which looks after the subject of doctors, wrote a letter to the State chairman in Topeka, Kans. The board said:

> There is an acute shortage of physicians in this locality. Since Dr. Schulte—

That is the name of the man about whom the letter was written—

> entered service; Dr. Jones, who enjoyed an extensive country practice, has died, and Dr. Millington is incapacitated because of his health. Girard—

Which is a town of approximately 5,000 people, and is surrounded by communities which make up a population of perhaps 15,000—

> now has only three practicing physicians; two of them are past 70 years of age, and the other is past 50.

On April 30, 1945, the State chairman advised the local board that he had approved its request for the release of Dr. Schulte from the Army, and had forwarded it to the authorities in Washington.

On July 5, 1945, the State chairman wrote to the local board as follows:

> On April 30, 1945, I forwarded the National Board of Procurement and Assignment Service for Physicians in Washington, D. C., your request for the deferment of Captain Schulte. This will advise you that up to the present date I have not received any word with reference to the possibility of his release from service.

On October 5, 1945, the local board in Girard wrote me with reference to its efforts, and sent me copies of correspondence, together with the following comment:

> Dr. Schulte will be 45 years of age December 12 of this year, and has been in active service of the Army since August 31, 1942.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the copy of the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL BOARD NO. 1, CRAWFORD COUNTY,
Girard, Kans., Oct. 5, 1945.

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: An effort has been made by this local board to secure the release from military service of Capt. Edward J. Schulte, MC O-280141, because of the shortage of physicians in this city and the surrounding country. Copies of correspondence with the Procurement and Assignment Service for Physicians in Kansas are enclosed for your information.

Dr. Schulte will be 45 years of age December 12 of this year, and has been in active service of the Army since August 31, 1942.

Any assistance you might render toward securing the release of Captain Schulte will be greatly appreciated by the citizens of this community as well as this local board.

By direction of the local board:

WILLIAM E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am asking the Surgeon General's office for the status of this case.

While I am on the subject of doctors I wish to read some extracts from letters which have been written to me by doctors themselves, by their families, or by persons having intimate knowledge of the circumstances. From LaCygne, Kans., a woman writes:

> My brother is a young Navy doctor and has been in for years and he has seen plenty of service, especially in a hospital in San Diego, Calif., and two stretches at sea, and is now stuck in the Philippines where he says they are doing nothing but sitting around. Once he wrote me that he was inspecting latrines.

From Fort Scott I received the following letter from the wife of a physician:

> My husband's unit, a 750-bed evacuation hospital, has been overseas for 26 months and their chances for return to the States is no greater now than it was 26 months ago. At this time they are in Manila taking care of a handful of patients. Next week they will probably be idle.

A father writes from Topeka, Kans.:

> Howard has given 59 months and 7 days of service to his country, has 91 points, thinks he has done enough to be discharged. His superior officer received notice he would be out October 15, and not later than November 1. Now a later order came through saying to hold him until December 15. This boy in all this time has had only about 21

days off. He has a wife and two small children. If not released until December 15 he will have no place to live because he has sold his house.

Mr. President, to the credit of the Surgeon General's Office, I wish to say that I took this matter up with that office and insisted that this man be released in accordance with the promise which had been made to him. A telegram was sent from Washington yesterday or the day before to the commanding officer instructing him to release the man from the Army by November 1. But, Mr. President, those steps should not be necessary. There is not a Member of this body who enjoys the tremendous flood of correspondence to which he is subjected. He does not enjoy being required to listen to troubles and tales of woe, and being confronted with the necessity of calling up the Surgeon General's Office to plead for action with regard to such matters as those about which which I have been speaking. How much better it would be if we had a competent, efficient, intelligent, and sincere administration of these matters with due regard to the interest of the doctors themselves and the civilian population of the country.

I now read from a letter dated Topeka, Kans., November 8, 1944:

The reason I desire such a transfer is that I prefer to be busy and not feel that I am stagnating in my field.

That is from a doctor who has a very high reputation as a specialist. He says that he is stuck at a hospital where, for eye, ear, nose, and throat treatment, there are only 75 patients. Yet the authorities will not transfer this doctor to a hospital which is large enough to afford full employment of his special capacities.

Here is a letter from Toledo, Ohio:

Five years ago—

The writer says—

this October 7 my husband, Dr. R. E. S., was the first in the surrounding community to enter in the Medical Corps of the United States Army. Since Major S. received his orders in April 1944, he has spent 7 months in north Africa, seen much of Italy, and today I am notified he is in Okinawa. In all this period of 17 months his morale has sunk to a new low for the simple reason that he loves his profession (surgery), and all the work he has done in 17 months could easily have been performed in 2 weeks—8 hours a day for working schedule. Such a waste of a specially trained surgeon is indeed a crime. Here at home the civilian doctors cannot begin to handle the patients as they should. I feel that he should be discharged. We have never had a home for our little girls. Dr. S.—

Her husband—

is almost 35 years old.

I have a letter from a captain stationed at Verdun, France, who writes as follows:

VERDUN, FRANCE, *July 30, 1945.*

I am writing you as a request for your help in securing my release from the Army. I am 42 years old and will have been in the Army as a medical officer, 3 years in September. During this entire time I have been with field units, my first year with an Infantry division, and for the last 2 years with an artillery battalion. I was in continuous combat from August 1944 until VE-day in May, serving in the battles for France and Germany.

I have 86 points and am eligible for discharge, including 15 points for battle stars and 5 points for a bronze star given for meritorious service.

He goes on to tell the experience he has had in trying, without any success whatever, to obtain release from the Army. I ask that the remainder of the extract from his letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have gone through Louisiana and desert maneuvers training medical units before my commitment to battle last year. Reference can be made to my unit commander and my records as to performance of duty, as a gentleman, officer, and doctor. My ratings have always been excellent and superior. I have tried to do my duty well, and I am sure my usefulness to my country in the Army, at present, is far much less than that as a father and country doctor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, back in the first hearing before the subcommittee of which the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is chairman, the Surgeon General's office, as I recall, made the statement that they would release 7,000 doctors by May 1, 1946. That was back in June, when May 1, 1946, was about a year away. So 7,000 out of 46,000 doctors would be discharged next year. It is true that recently, on October 1, as I recall, or perhaps a few days prior to that date, the Army made a statement that they would release, as I recall, 13,000 doctors. In his letter to me the Secretary of War said that number would be released by the 1st of July 1946. I think the date meant in the statement was January 1, 1946. Mr. President, I think they ought to have 13,000 doctors out of the Army now. There is no excuse for the waste of time since VE-day in discharging doctors who are so sorely needed for civilian medical purposes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. REED. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from California. Let me say that I referred to the Senator's subcommittee and I am going to refer to it again. I compliment the Senator from California, as well as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], for the active attention they have given to this subject, for I think they have rendered a distinct service to the country.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind statement of the Senator from Kansas, and I am very happy on my part that he is continuing the fight for the demobilization of doctors. I think the statement that was made by the Army at the last hearing 2 or 3 weeks ago was that they would discharge before January 1 between 13,000 and 18,000 doctors. We hoped we had an understanding with the Surgeon General that the number would be 18,000.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Kansas that action in demobilizing doctors was long overdue, but I feel that if the Army meets its obligation to discharge 18,000 by January 1 it probably will be doing a fairly good job. I am, however, somewhat worried now lest the Army will not do what it agreed to do, as stated in the transcript which the Senator holds in his hand. I am very glad he is presenting the data he is in order that the efforts of the officers in charge may be speeded up.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from California can think I can use in parliamentary debate and have printed in the RECORD more vigorous language than I have been using, I shall be very happy to adopt it.

Now may I ask the Senator from California a question? I am happy he is present. I have gone over the hearings first of the subcommittee and then the hearings upon the bill of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] for a readjustment of discharges from the Army. On page 65 of the hearings before the subcommittee of which the Senator from California is chairman, on July 11, the Senator from California made this request:

I would like to ask both the general and admiral if they could submit, as soon as possible, for the record, complete data on this point, as to the number of beds, the number of patients in the different hospitals, and the doctors and the different kinds of attendants.

I think what the Senator had in mind was what I had in mind. I have heard very much of the waste of manpower by assigning to a division complete medical equipment, sufficient for combat service, and keeping it there whether the division went into combat or not. I understand that the Army fully staffed numerous hospitals, and that many of the hospitals in the United States were overstaffed. None of us questions the number of doctors needed for men who have been injured in combat. If one doctor is needed to care properly for an injured soldier, for heaven's sake let him be used for that purpose, but this thing of wasting medical skill by the Surgeon General's office is a crime, and that is what I assume the Senator from California is trying to get at. I may say to the Senator from California that I inquired at his office if the information had ever been received from the Surgeon General, and was told that it had not been received.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; that is correct; but I may say to the Senator from Kansas that I hope to have the detailed information in my hands within 3 or 4 days, and I shall be glad to turn it over to him as soon as possible.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator's subcommittee is doing a good job. I should like very much to have the Senator reconvene his subcommittee for further hearings, and, with the permission of the Senator and the subcommittee, I should like to appear before it, and in the light of what I am trying to develop, ask some questions of the medical officers who are leisurely taking their time about this matter.

Mr. DOWNEY. I think that can be worked out, and I believe within a few days we will have more elaborate data

for the Senator, by which he may support his own views and his interest in this matter.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have a son, two sons-in-law, and two grandsons in the armed forces. No Member of this body has a more direct concern and a deeper interest in the welfare of the Army and the proper care of the men of the Army, both officers and enlisted men, than I have, but it distresses me to see the inefficiency, the incompetency, the bungling, the waste, and the loss of manpower that is attached to the handling by the Surgeon General's office of the doctor question.

Mr. President, when I first started giving as much publicity as I could to these matters, the Washington Post printed an editorial on October 1, reading as follows:

DOCTOR SHORTAGE

We can detect no evidence of thoughtful planning in the War Department's report to Senator REED that the Army had 506 more doctors on September 1 than on January 1, when the war was in full progress in Europe and the Pacific. The shortage of doctors serving the civilian population has been acute for several years. In some communities doctors are working from 14 to 18 hours a day and are still unable to make the rounds to all who are sick. This situation could be endured patiently so long as men were being wounded or contracting diseases at abnormal rates in fox holes and jungles. But, with the fighting at an end, it seems inexcusable to hold such a large number of doctors in the armed forces.

Of course, Army and Navy doctors must still be available to protect the health of men in uniform, and they have a big assignment in examining veterans as they are discharged. But we suspect that the release of both doctors and dentists could be greatly accelerated without depriving the services of any essential medical talent. Certainly it would be difficult to show that the ratio of doctors per thousand men served should be greatly increased when the fighting stops. Yet that is what the present policy, so far as it has been made public, appears to call for. Obviously the need for doctors in the services should be more closely scrutinized in the light of the acute shortage at home.

I shall conclude in another moment, Mr. President. I know the Senator from Kentucky always becomes worried when I make an extensive speech. I never become worried when he makes one; otherwise I should be worried much of the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not worried about the Senator making an extensive speech, and I doubt if any worry I might entertain would avail me anything. But I am not at all worried. As the Senator knows, we have no legislative business to transact, and I am anxious that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination which is controversial.

Mr. REED. I am quite certain I shall be able to conclude in a few minutes.

Mr. President, I think the Secretary of War should appoint a board of inquiry to investigate fully all the policies and practices and the whole operation of the Surgeon General's Office since the beginning of the war. There is no question about the waste of time, of doctors, and of medical service available. Almost every Senator has had these matters brought to his attention. Some of us have discussed the problem. Just a few days ago there was a running debate, participated in by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and other Senators, who told of cases within their personal knowledge relating to this subject very similar to those I have discussed today. I think Secretary Patterson, for whom I have a high regard and warm personal affection, owes it to himself and to his Department to bring this unhappy and unsatisfactory situation to an end and fix responsibility for the wasteful and inefficient policy of past months.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICAN NATIONALS IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. MOORE. Will the Senator yield to me to make a brief statement?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be glad to. I am anxious that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination which will bring about some debate, but I withhold the motion.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to what I deem to be an unreasonable and arbitrary discrimination being imposed against American nationals operating in the United Kingdom.

On August 29 the British petroleum representative in the United States made it known that American oil companies were prohibited from rebuilding facilities destroyed during the war in the British Kingdom, unless material and equipment used in such reconstruction were obtained from sterling sources; in other words, in the British Empire. The order also applies to new construction and development.

On September 14 I addressed the following letter to the Honorable W. L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State:

I am advised the Office of the British Petroleum Representative in the United States of America has recently ruled that an American petroleum company will be required to procure from sterling sources all material required for the reconstruction of its facilities in the British Empire destroyed during the war, even though no United States dollar exchange is requested. The case in question involves three projects for the rehabilitation of bulk terminals and interior distribution plants belonging to the Standard-Vacuum Oil Co. in the Straits Settlements and the Federated Malay States.

Through the Petroleum Administrator for War this company was granted priorities assistance and export licensing of $2,315,000 worth of material for procurement in the United States. Application was made through the Office of the British Petroleum Representative in the United States to the Petroleum Division of the Ministry of Fuel and Power in London for authorization to acquire the materials in accordance with the regulations established by the British Petroleum Representative in the United States. Reply to the application was by letter dated August 29, 1945, in which Standard-Vacuum was informed. "The Petroleum Division are quite willing to approve these three projects, but subject to the condition that all the material required is procured from sterling sources."

The ruling, if unaltered, will work a distinct hardship on American nationals similarly affected and will result in an arbitrary distrimination in favor of British firms, not subject to the restrictions, in competition with our nationals within the Empire. The order is obviously disadvantageous to American manufacturers of materials and equipment. In some cases it will absolutely prevent American nationals from rehabilitating their own war-destroyed facilities in the United Kingdom. In the instant case, Standard-Vacuum points out that pipe and valves necessary for the reconstruction of these particular facilities are unobtainable from sources within the British Empire.

In order to facilitate these reconstruction projects, I am informed, Standard-Vacuum has offered to waive its claim to dollar exchange through normal recovery of depreciation.

Unless American nationals are able to rehabilitate their properties damaged by warfare on an equal footing with competitors of the United Kingdom with reference to the time element, they will be at a competitive disadvantage which may take years to overcome, or may even completely destroy the investment of our nationals.

This unwarranted and discriminatory ruling of the British authorities is wholly incompatible with the appeals now being made by the British for gratuities or noncommercial loans from the United States with which to rehabilitate their own commerce. The ruling is incompatible and inconsistent with the theory of the Bretton Woods agreement and is entirely out of harmony with international cooperation leading to a postwar rehabilitation of commerce and trade.

I earnestly urge that the Department of State take early and appropriate action to rectify the situation outlined.

On September 19 I received the following reply from Mr. Clayton:

I have received your letter of September 14 regarding the British ruling that the Standard-Vacuum Oil Co. will be required to procure from sterling sources all material required to reconstruct its facilities in the British Empire.

This matter has also been brought to my attention by Standard-Vacuum. We are giving it earnest consideration but a little time may be needed to determine what steps may be most appropriate in the circumstances.

I shall write you again more fully just as soon as possible.

On September 27, I again wrote Mr. Clayton:

With further reference to my correspondence with you on September 14, concerning the recent order of the Office of the British Petroleum Representative in the United States of America, denying American nationals engaged in the oil business "authorization of acquisition" for materials and equipment for shipment and use in the United Kingdom unless such materials and equipment were procured from sterling sources, I desire to call to your attention the increasing hardships and discrimination that is being inflicted upon American oil companies by this order.

I am today in receipt of a letter from one of the largest oil well supply companies in the United States, pointing out that it has substantial export orders from American oil companies involving materials and equipment which are not available from sources within the United Kingdom, and that by reason of developments in import control by the United Kingdom, as set forth by the Ministry of Fuel and Power in London and by reason of the order of the Office of the British Petroleum Representative in the United States of America, the material and equipment involved cannot be shipped, despite the fact the purchaser has approved export clearances from the proper United States Government agencies.

The particular orders involved in this case cover materials and equipment necessary for the carrying out of concession contracts held by American nationals and a continuation of the restrictive controls which have been invoked against American nationals may cause an impairment of their contractual obligations.

There is a growing feeling among American oil companies, which have suffered a destruction and loss of their facilities abroad during the war period and which are under contractual obligations in the United Kingdom, that the restrictive controls imposed by the British authorities are not, in fact, measures designed to support the sterling bloc but, on the contrary, are an unfriendly discrimination against American nationals in favor of British competitors which are not being subjected to similar restrictive controls.

In the instant case, as was true in the instance called to your attention on September 14, the materials and equipment involved are not obtainable in the United Kingdom.

In this connection, I call your attention to article II of the Anglo-American Oil Agreement, just concluded between representatives of the respective countries in London last week. Article II of that agreement provides that all valid concession contracts and lawfully acquired rights shall be respected by the signatory nations, and that there shall be no interference, directly or indirectly, with such contracts or rights; that with regard to acquisition of exploration and development rights the principle or equal opportunity shall be respected; and that the exploration for and development of petroleum resources, the construction and operation of refineries and other facilities, and the distribution of petroleum shall not be hampered by restrictions inconsistent with the purposes of the agreement. The restrictive controls being imposed at this critical time on American nationals are clearly inconsistent with these provisions of the oil agreement.

The seriousness of this matter cannot be overemphasized and I urge that every effort be made to correct the situation before it becomes a public issue.

On October 2 Mr. Clayton replied:

Thank you for your letter of September 27 bringing to my attention further difficulties which American oil companies are having in view of the recent British ruling making it necessary for equipment which is to be used in British territory to be purchased from sterling sources. You may be sure that we are continuing to give this question earnest consideration and I shall inform you as soon as possible of the progress we are making.

On October 10 I addressed Mr. Clayton, as follows:

I again refer to the serious situation developing in the oil industry as a result of the attitude of the British with respect to the use of materials and equipment in the United Kingdom acquired outside sterling sources.

I am sure you are giving this matter the serious consideration it deserves with the view to obtaining early relief for the American oil companies affected; however, in view of an official statement, which has been made by the British Ministry of Fuel and Power, replying to complaints registered through Petroleum Administration for War, that the order is a major policy of the British Government and American nationals should not expect it to be rescinded, I take the liberty of calling your attention to the attitude of this British agency, which speaks for its government.

Instances of extensive property loss, as well as serious competitive handicaps being suffered by American nationals, are multiplying so rapidly that it seems appropriate for our Government to take some immediate affirmative action. The British order is, in effect, a virtual confiscation of American interests. For example, terminal and distribution facilities of an American company, partially destroyed by war, remain idle and suffer further deterioration while a British company builds competing facilities with materials and equipment purchased in the American market. Another example brought to my attention is the inability of an American national to export drilling equipment to the United Kingdom to comply with drilling obligations under the oil concession held by this national. Failure to comply with such obligation, of course, endangers the validity of the concession. The necessary drilling equipment is unobtainable from sterling sources. Similar examples of hardships resulting from the discriminatory order of the British could be recited.

In my opinion, it would be entirely appropriate to request the British Government to grant American nationals relief in this connection as a condition to further negotiations for postwar financial aid to Britain. Such action would be only a reasonable protection of American interests.

Previously I have called your attention to the fact that the British attitude is contrary to the policy expressed in the recently concluded Anglo-American oil agreement, which will in the near future be presented to our respective governments for ratification. I suspect that some Members of the Senate would deem it unwise to ratify the agreement so long as the British persist in such discriminatory practices.

As you know, the Special Committee of the Senate Investigating Petroleum Resources, under the chairmanship of Senator O'MAHONEY, has been conducting hearings with a view to formulating a national oil policy. It probably would be helpful to explore the reasons and background of the British order and its effect upon American interests in the United Kingdom.

Assuring you of my great appreciation for your cooperation, I am,

Aside from being an expression of disapproval of our termination of lend-lease, the action of the British appears to be an obvious method of exerting pressure upon the United States to force a more favorable attitude with respect to postwar financial aid for rehabilitation of Britain's world trade and commerce.

At this moment, while the interest of American nationals in the United Kingdom is being destroyed by this arbitrary action, British government officials are suggesting that this and other trade barriers will be removed if and when we see fit to grant postwar financial aid to the British on such terms as they deem satisfactory.

Mr. President, if the United States is to retain a vestige of self-respect in world affairs it is indeed time that we assert ourselves against international banditry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Oklahoma is discussing one of the most important international economic problems confronting this country. I think it goes to the very heart of the whole British preferential system in international trade. I certainly agree with what I think is implied in the Senator's remarks. The time has come when we are going to be obliged to have without further delay a very realistic and tough economic conference with England in order to find out in the King's English free of all ambiguity and equivocation what Great Britain proposes to do to remove unfair and unreasonable British preferentials from the channels of international trade. I say that such a frank understanding free of "ifs" and "buts" and "maybes" should be reached between England and the United States before the Congress agrees to any $5,000,000,000 loan or a large loan of any other amount to be used to build up England's competitive power in world trade. I, for one, pay great respect and acknowledge a great moral debt to England for the heroic and unmatched back-to-the-wall fight she put up in the darkest hours of this war. This country must never forget that Great Britain saved freedom from being overrun in Europe before our country got into the war. However, I think England should be told very frankly that she should not overlook the fact that the United States of America saved Great Britain in this war.

I think the time has come when we must find out whether or not Great Britain is going to be willing to sit down with us at an economic international conference and negotiate removal of those trade preferential barriers which, in my opinion, so long as they last, make it impossible for international economic peace to exist between America and Great Britain.

The policy she is following today is a policy of international war against the United States. I think the Senator from Oklahoma is making an important contribution to a more realistic understanding of the economic relations between America and Great Britain.

At a later date I shall discuss at length the effect of many of the British trade preferentials on the international maritime trade. The program England follows within the sterling area in regard to her maritime industry; her cargo preferentials; the handicaps under which the American merchant marine has to operate today in order to compete with English ships because of the preferential advantages we are permitting Great Britain to enjoy, both within and outside of the sterling area; the advantages which some in this country high in Government service would give to British interests in the purchase of American ships to the disadvantage of the American merchant marine do not promise well for the future of our merchant marine or our chances of competing with England in foreign trade. I recognize that we must help England with her problems of economic rehabilitation, but such cooperation should work two ways. I think the time has come for some very realistic economic horse trading between England and the United States. I am opposed to sacrificing our American trade interests by yielding to present British preferential policies. I am satisfied that fair compromises can be worked out with England once she is told firmly that our future economic help will be dependent upon concessions on both sides of the table.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon very much and I feel greatly assured of the soundness of my position because of his approval of it.

Mr. President, I take this occasion strongly to urge that negotiations with the British, looking to postwar financial aid, be suspended until this discriminatory order against American nationals is revoked. Surely it is not too much to ask the man who knocks at your door for relief to leave his gun at home.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Some time ago I placed in the RECORD a statement of the difficulties which a motor manufacturer in this country had in shipping motors to South America in competition with the British. The purpose of inserting that statement in the RECORD was to show that in many instances our own Government is forbidding our manufacturers to ship machinery and goods to South America. Meanwhile the British are shipping them there and guaranteeing delivery in a third to a quarter of the time required by our people to make delivery.

Supplementing that statement, I have received a number of letters from manufacturers in my own State and other States, indicating that export licenses have been denied American manufacturers to ship goods ordered in Australia, for example. The latest communication which I have received on that subject was about 3 days ago, from a manufacturer in my State who had an order from Australia for some heavy machinery. He was notified, before he had shipped it, that he had been denied an import license into Australia by the British Government because machinery of that type could be obtained in Great Britain. Therefore he was not privileged to sell American machinery in Australia.

The Senator from Oklahoma has raised a most important issue. I agree with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on that point. It is a most potent issue. It goes to the very heart of the question whether the attempts on the part of this country, through legislation and attitude, to be a good neighbor and to take part equitably and fairly in the exchange of goods among nations are to be restricted by the very nations which we are trying to aid, or whether they are attempting to rebuild their economy based upon continued support, aid, and contributions from this country. I believe that that issue will have to be met shortly.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his contribution. I wish to emphasize this further point: Not only is this discrimination unfair but it is working an irreparable hardship on our nations, because of the fact that they cannot get the materials which they must use to perform their contractual obligations. This is the only country which can supply the equipment needed in the areas where oil wells are to be drilled. Great Britain has demanded that such equipment be procured from sterling sources, and yet at the same time admits that such material does not exist at those sources. That presents a situation which is confiscatory as it affects the interests of American nationals. Certainly it should be the function of the Department of State to see that our nationals are not treated in such a way.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gurney	Murray
Austin	Hart	Myers
Bailey	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Overton
Bilbo	Hill	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Briggs	Huffman	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Shipstead
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	La Follette	Stewart
Carville	Langer	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Tunnell
Cordon	McClellan	Tydings
Donnell	McKellar	Vandenberg
Downey	McMahon	Wagner
Eastland	Magnuson	Walsh
Ellender	Maybank	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mead	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Mitchell	Willis
Gerry	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	
Guffey	Murdock	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a Delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Harvey Jones Gunderson, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the unexpired term of 2 years from January 22, 1944, vice Howard J. Klossner.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Sundry persons for promotion or appointment in the foreign service.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to call the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF RAYMOND S. MCKEOUGH

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Raymond S. McKeough of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for a term of 6 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, since the Committee on Commerce requested me to make an adverse report on this nomination, I have asked the recognition of the Chair in order that I may make their report. No written report accompanied the committee's adverse recommendation and I shall today make a verbal one. It will be brief and will be largely factual. At the same time I shall undertake to explain why it is that a majority of the Committee on Commerce have voted to reject the nomination.

At the outset I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned and, I think, so far as all other members of the Commerce Committee are concerned, there is no personal bias whatsoever either for or against Mr. Raymond S. McKeough with respect to the report which the committee makes and with respect to the views which the minority entertains.

The record shows that Mr. McKeough was born in Illinois, in the city of Chicago, and has lived there all his life up to the present moment. He attended school in Chicago, and acquired what was equivalent to a high-school education. When he left school, he worked as a clerk in the stockyards in Chicago. All this information, by the way, I obtained from the lips of Mr. McKeough himself. Incidentally, I shall further remark that he was the only witness who appeared in his behalf.

After working a while in the stockyards, he became engaged in railroad operations, and he made some advancement as a railway employee. Then he gave that up, and went into the bond, mortgage, and investment business in Chicago. While so engaged, he ran for the office of Representative in Congress from the Second District of Illinois. It is the district which constitutes a portion of the southeastern section of the city of Chicago. He was elected to Congress in 1934, and was reelected in 1936, 1938, and 1940. Therefore, he served four terms in the Congress, as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Then he undertook to run for the United States Senate; he became the

nominee of the Democratic Party in Illinois, and ran against the present junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. He was defeated in that contest. He then obtained a job under the OPA and worked for the OPA. He was a regional director of the OPA, covering some seven States in the Midwest.

Then, about 4 years ago he gave up his connection with the OPA, in order to represent the PAC, or Political Action Committee, of the CIO. He was made regional director of the PAC, with jurisdiction over the States of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana. For approximately 4 years he has filled that position. He is a salaried man. I, as chairman of the committee, did not ask Mr. McKeough what his salary is, but he stated he was in the employ of the CIO, as regional director of its Political Action Committee, and is still on its pay roll.

That, briefly, is the life history of Mr. McKeough. There is nothing in this record against his character as a man, against his integrity, against his patriotism, or against his standing; and none of the telegrams which we received in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McKeough in any way reflects upon him as a citizen of this Republic or as a man.

The first objection made to his appointment is that he is lacking in maritime experience. He is lacking in nautical experience of any kind or nature. He was born and reared and has lived his life, so far, thousands of miles away from our coast lines. He has never had any connection whatsoever with maritime work. When he was a Member of Congress he served on several committees, but he did not serve on the Merchant Marine Committee. He frankly admits all this, and, so far as I could observe from Mr. McKeough's manner and demeanor, his appearance before the committee being the first time I ever met him, they lead me to believe that he is a truthful man and that he did not misrepresent any fact in connection with his experiences and his career and his life.

He states, however, that as a Member of Congress he took such an interest in our merchant marine as any Member of the House or Senate should take, and that he had a fairly good general picture of the subject matter. He also points out that there have been on the Maritime Commission men who had had no previous experience with maritime work. I think that is true. There have been two of them, so far as I know, who, prior to their appointment to the Maritime Commission, had had no experience with the merchant marine.

However that may be, it has been suggested, and, I think, with considerable force, that at this particular time we need a very strong Commission, a Commission composed of men who have had experience in maritime work and who understand its many problems, which are constantly growing and are becoming graver and graver as the days go by. At the present time we have a national ambition to see that our merchant marine is maintained at full peak and that we have the ships and the personnel to man the ships in order to compete with the other nations of the world in international trade.

Presently, as a member of the Maritime Commission, is Mr. Carmody, who prior to his appointment, I believe, had had very little experience, if any, with the merchant marine. There are also two other members of the Maritime Commission who, I understand, are ill, hospitalized, and incapable of doing very much work. So at this critical period of the history of our merchant marine the Commission is laboring under the handicap of having only about two really serviceable members.

Therefore, Mr. President, the objection of Mr. McKeough's nomination on the ground of lack of experience comes, I believe, with a great deal of force. I am sure that Admiral Jerry Land, who is head of the Commission, would like to have as a member of the Commission, someone who could be of real help in undertaking to do his share of the work on the Commission.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, there is no testimony before the committee that Admiral Land would like to have appointed the kind of a person to whom the Senator is referring.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not say there was. I beg the Senator's pardon. I said that I felt quite sure Admiral Land would like to have that kind of a person, and I so believe.

Mr. LUCAS. There is no testimony before the committee to that effect.

Mr. OVERTON. Absolutely none whatever. The Senator is correct. I phrased my statement so as not to indicate for a moment that there was any testimony to that effect. Admiral Land did not appear before the subcommittee, and he has made no statement; but I entertain the view that at this time he would like to have as a colleague in the administration of the affairs of the Maritime Commission someone of experience and ability, who would be capable of rendering a distinct service. That is my opinion. Other Senators may entertain different opinions. They may believe that it would be best to have as a member of the Commission a landlubber who does not know anything about the merchant marine. However, I entertain a different view.

To be perfectly frank, I think that the objection on the ground of a lack of experience would be insufficient to overcome the recommendation which has been made by the President of the United States. So far as I am concerned personally, I would not have cast my vote in the committee against the nomination of Mr. McKeough if it had been based solely upon his lack of experience. But another question arises. A very acute problem exists in connection with the merchant marine. It is one which cannot be lightly disregarded. It is one which becomes more and more serious as time goes on. For several years the personnel which has manned our merchant ships has been divided into two groups. One group is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and the other group is affiliated with the CIO. No love exists between those two groups. They are in constant discord. I believe that I may say without exaggeration that they are at daggers' points. Though it does not appear of record, the situation to which I have referred is so well known that the Maritime Commission does not dare to put out to sea a vessel which is manned with representatives of both groups. No vessel which sails the seas under the American flag dares to operate with a mixed personnel of the A. F. of L.'s and the CIO's. The reason is obvious. Not only would there be no harmony of action, but there would probably be something much worse than lack of harmony of action. There would be open warfare on board our merchant ships if seamen of those two groups were to be assigned to the same ship.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is that the testimony?

Mr. OVERTON. It is not the testimony. I say that it is a well-known fact. It is so well known that I do not believe any evidence in support of it is required. There is, however, testimony to the effect that of the 2,500 merchant ships under the American flag, 1,400 are manned solely by the A. F. of L. group, and 1,100 are manned solely by the CIO group. Therefore, the record shows that those two groups are kept separated in the work which they do.

It is also true, as members of the Committee on Commerce know, and especially Senators who have been members of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, that labor problems constantly arise before the Maritime Commission, and that they sometimes come up for consideration before the Committee on Commerce. Some years ago I was chairman for a while of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine. I believe it was during the time of Senator Copeland. I am not quite sure about that, but it was quite a while back. In those days we had repercussions of those labor troubles.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, we are doing what we can in order to sustain our merchant ships in our international trade. We are dependent upon them. There have been times when our international trade suffered greatly because we did not maintain our merchant marine. A few years ago, before World War II, we started to build up our merchant marine by granting subsidies for construction and operation. Each year we authorized appropriations for construction of vessels by and through the Maritime Commission. Before World War II we did what we then thought best to build up our merchant marine. We had not, however, progressed nearly far enough. The World-War needs were tremendous, and there was a woeful lack of shipping with which to conduct the war and carry supplies to our fighting men across the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. But, we went ahead with American skill, ingenuity, and enterprise, and we built up the splendid merchant marine which exists at the present time. That situation is true so far as the number of our ships is concerned, and, I may add, generally speaking, so far as their personnel is concerned.

However, Mr. President, I think that our merchant marine, because of the antagonism which exists between the two great groups of labor which have charge of our ships, is resting on a powder keg. I, for one, do not want to light the fuse which may blow up the powder keg.

We have now some slight evidences of what may come. The longshoremen in New York City today are tying up some 350, or, as I have heard, as many as 400 vessels, preventing them from transporting our freight abroad and bringing our troops home. The *Queen Elizabeth* landed a few days ago in New York City, and the striking longshoremen refused to unload the ship, although it was carrying men returning from the European war. American soldiers, who had fought for our country, or who stood willing to fight for our country, have had to take the places of the idle, loitering strikers, and do the work they are supposed to do. When I use the expression "idle, loitering strikers," I do not make it apply solely to the CIO, but to the A. F. of L. as well.

Mr. President, I think we should do everything in our power to avoid a general strike on the part of the seamen of the United States of America. That is the reason, I think, why a majority of the committee felt very apprehensive about this matter; that is the reason why they were unwilling, even though the nomination came from the President of the United States, to place upon the Maritime Commission, which is to pass upon the problems of labor, upon the problems in which the seamen who man our ships are so vitally interested, a man who is so closely identified with one of the labor groups as is Mr. McKeough. So far as I am individually concerned, I would take the same position if the name of one closely identified with the A. F. of L. group had been sent to the Senate for confirmation.

I do not like to vote against a nomination submitted by the President of the United States. That has been true when a Republican was in power, and it is so when a Democrat has been in power. In this particular instance I should like to do everything I possibly could to uphold the present Democratic administration. But there are some things which I think I should place above any consideration of administration loyalty or friendship for the President. One is a matter which so vitally concerns our foreign trade and the destiny of our merchant marine, as does the taking of a highly paid employee of one of the labor organizations and placing him in a position of power. I fear what the result may be. I for one am not going to cast a ballot which may bring about such an untoward result.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to know whether the Senator's objection is based on the fact that Mr. McKeough is affiliated with the CIO, or on the fact that the A. F. of L. objects to him.

Mr. OVERTON. I thought I made myself clear on that point. Possibly the Senator was not in the Chamber.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; I have been listening.

Mr. OVERTON. I said I would not support anyone as clearly identified as is Mr. McKeough with any labor group connected with the seamen, whether it was the A. F. of L. or the CIO.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, does the Senator say he would not vote for the confirmation of any member of the A. F. of L. or of any member of the CIO, or any person employed by either organization?

Mr. OVERTON. I said anyone so closely associated as the representative of the PAC of the CIO.

Mr. TUNNELL. I was asking whether the Senator's statement went to the contention that he would not support for confirmation any man who was a member of or employed by either of those organizations.

Mr. OVERTON. Generally, yes; because——

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not yield at the moment, if the Senator will pardon me for a moment until I answer the question submitted by the Senator from Delaware.

I say, generally, yes; because it might be that the connection with one of these groups, whether it be the A. F. of L. or the CIO, while existing, might be so remote that the appointment would not be invidious to the other group; but I would not vote for the confirmation of a representative of any one of those two powerful groups if his appointment met with the stern opposition of Mr. McKeough's appointment meets.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Would the Senator vote for the confirmation of one who belonged to the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, or any other organization of that kind?

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly I would; there is no conflict here. But let me say to the Senator, if he does not know it, that the law prohibits any shipowner from being a member of the Maritime Commission. Why was such a provision embodied in the law? I think it was a wise provision. Having placed that provision in the law, I do not think we would be going too far if we should say that no representative of either of these labor groups can be appointed on the Maritime Commission. The impelling, patriotic purpose and worthy objective would be the same in either case.

Mr. President, I have said that Mr. McKeough's nomination was opposed by the A. F. of L. I requested that copies of the printed hearings be sent to all Senators in order that they may be fully advised what the hearings show. Perhaps some Senators have not been able to read the hearings, I have understood some have not had the opportunity as yet, and I should like to present just briefly a few telegrams which indicate the position of the A. F. of L.

First, I wish to say that the head of the A. F. of L., Mr. Green, representing the whole American Federation of Labor, stands in opposition to the nomination, and while he did not appear in person, he sent a representative to appear before the committee and record his opposition.

Here are two or three sample telegrams which the committee received, which came from A. F. of L. groups from the Pacific coast to the Atlantic. I read from page 8 of the hearings. Here is one from Harry Lundeberg, president of the Seafarers International Union of North America:

> The Seafarers International Union of North America, affiliated with the A. F. of L., with 60,000 active seamen, hereby officially protests the appointment of R. S. McKeough as Maritime Commissioner for the following reasons:
>
> 1. The American merchant marine in the postwar era needs the most capable man available to guide its destiny.

In that conclusion I heartily agree.

There is nothing in Mr. McKeough's career which fits him for service on the important Maritime Commission.

This is a statement from one of these organizations, representing 60,000 seamen, who have to do with our merchant marine. He says:

> As you know, there is a sharp division among seamen in the merchant marine between our organization, which is A. F. of L., and the CIO National Maritime Union. In view of the fact that Mr. McKeough is the Midwest director of the PAC, the political arm of the CIO, we feel his appointment is unfair to the A. F. of L. We are asking that an impartial, capable man with experience in shipping be appointed for the post of Maritime Commissioner. We urge that you give this careful consideration and also request that this wire be printed in the record of the hearing.

Here is another telegram, from Norfolk, Va., signed by Ray White, branch agent of the Seafarers' International Union. He states:

> On behalf of the Norfolk branch of the Seafarers' International Union of North America, I wish to protest the nomination by President Truman of R. S. McKeough as Commissioner of the United States Maritime Commission. Mr. McKeough has served as Midwest director of the Political Action Committee of the CIO, and we hold that he cannot, because of his past affiliations, deal impartially with issues that may arise between ourselves, A. F. of L. seamen, and seamen represented by the CIO unions.

In justice to Mr. McKeough I wish to say that as the chairman, conducting the hearings, I read these telegrams, and after I finished reading them, I asked him whether or not he felt he could act impartially as a member of the Maritime Commission, notwithstanding his affiliation with one of the great groups of labor connected with the merchant marine. He said he could. I shall not challenge the correctness of his answer, and I am quite sure Mr. McKeough thinks he could, and if his nomination as a member of the Maritime Commission should be confirmed, I am perfectly willing to concede that he would enter upon the discharge of his duties feeling that he could be fair and impartial.

But, Mr. President, that is not the point which I think is the serious one. The A. F. of L., which is the larger of the labor groups manning our merchant ships, does not believe that Mr. McKeough would be fair and impartial. The

A. F. of L. regards the McKeough nomination as a slap in its face.

Here is a telegram from Chicago, Ill., signed by Victor A. Olander, secretary-treasurer of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, in which it is declared:

The officers and members of the Seafarers' International Union of North America, the organization in which I hold my personal membership, are very much opposed to the appointment of Raymond S. McKeough as a member of the Maritime Commission and I believe they are fully justified in the position they are taking against this appointment. There is nothing in Mr. McKeough's career which fits him for service on the important Maritime Commission. There is a sharp division between two organizations of seamen in the merchant marine. Mr. McKeough has been identified with one of these groups as a political adviser and Midwest director for the PAC, which is the political arm of the CIO. The proposed appointment therefore seems to be purely political regardless of the effects upon the merchant marine.

That is the way they look at it—as a political appointment, regardless of the effects the appointment will have on the merchant marine.

I have been closely connected with the American merchant marine nearly all of my working life and I know a good deal about its ramifications and problems. I have known Mr. McKeough for some years and I believe he is entirely devoid of the experience essential to good service on the Maritime Commission.

Quite a number of other telegrams are contained in the hearings, and since we conducted the hearings a great many additional telegrams have been sent to the Committee on Commerce which I shall not read to the Senate. I have not read them, but I am advised that they are all in opposition to the appointment.

Here is a telegram from New York:

The membership of the New York branch of the Seafarers International Union of North America wish to enter their protest against President Truman's nomination of R. S. McKeough for the post of Commissioner of the United States Maritime Commission. I have been asked to notify you that as seamen belonging to the American Federation of Labor they cannot have confidence that Mr. McKeough, who was former director of the Political Action Committee of the CIO, can act unbiasedly in matters on which A. F. of L. and CIO maritime unions have differences of opinion.

And so on. Telegrams were also received from San Francisco, Calif., Boston, Mass., Jacksonville, Fla., Los Angeles, Portland, Oreg., San Pedro, Calif., and so on, and so forth.

Mr. President, in conclusion I desire to say that this would be a most unfortunate time to have a general strike occur in the merchant marine. We are now engaged in transporting to their homes our soldiers from the European battlefields and from the Pacific battlefields. We need the veterans who are now serving in the merchant marine. We want the ships manned. We want seamen kept in the service. Of course, it may be said it would be wrong for seamen to strike. I thoroughly agree with such a statement. But I am not here to argue whether they ought to strike or not to strike. I do not want to give them any excuse for striking. I do not want to accentuate the conflict between these two groups, which has existed for a number of years and which is growing more perilous day by day. One group tries to obtain control of one local from another. The other group tries the same sort of tactics on the other group. The situation is becoming more and more acute and worse and worse every day and every hour.

So, Mr. President, I think we had better vote with caution on this nomination. I voted in committee against it, and I shall vote on the floor of the Senate against the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is unpleasant to oppose any nomination submitted by the President, and it is with great reluctance that I take the floor to oppose the nomination of Mr. McKeough. I do so because my convictions are very strong. The Maritime Commission is a most important body, and it handles a very vital section of the Nation's business. We all know that without the shipping of the United States this war could not have been won. Peace has returned, but I think we all agree that in the future our shipping will play a most vital part in promoting the interests and furthering the well-being of this Nation. It is not only a matter of carrying the trade, but it is a matter of integration with the trade. A healthy shipping adds to the health of our commerce in all respects.

The Maritime Commission handles a big business, and efficiency in that body is highly essential. There are five Commissioners, and I believe Mr. McKeough's appointment is intended to be for no less than 6 years.

The act of 1936, which set up the present method of handling our merchant marine, in that section concerning the qualifications of the Maritime Commissioners, contains this proviso:

No person shall hold office as a member of the Commission who, within 3 years prior to his appointment, shall have been employed by, or have had any pecuniary interest in, any carrier by water or substantial pecuniary interest in any other person who derives a substantial portion of his revenues from any business associated with ships or shipping.

Mr. President, that provision puts a degree of limitation upon the appointing power, because it rules out many men who by experience or knowledge would be well qualified for a position on the Maritime Commission. It rules out anyone who has been connected with the management or who has had anything to do in an executive capacity with any aspect of our shipping, and, furthermore, in reality, it can be interpreted to preclude the appointment of any person having a subsidiary interest in our shipping. The provision can be very restrictive.

If Mr. McKeough has any particular qualifications for this office, it must be by virtue of his recent experiences bringing him into some relationship with labor. I am not lawyer enough, Mr. President, even to hazard a guess as to whether the act of 1936 could be so interpreted as to disqualify him. As a layman, it strikes me that perhaps it could, but I do not care to labor the point. I wish, however, to point out that in all fairness there is a moral relationship which, by virtue of Mr. McKeough's very recent connection with labor, could be held at least to question his qualifications.

But, Mr. President, it is not necessary to go into that. The very able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] has already set forth the situation and has read some telegrams. I presume all Senators have been receiving similar telegrams. I have received various communications within the last 2 or 3 days, none of them favoring Mr. McKeough. They are all on the other side and are mostly confined to officials of various subsidiaries of the American Federation of Labor. I shall not read at any length. I have one from Mr. Green, president of the A. F. of L., who says he opposes confirmation for two reasons, the first being Mr. McKeough's recent employment by the CIO. Mr. Green says:

It is reasonable to conclude that Mr. McKeough would be influenced by his relationship.

We do not need to agree with that, but Mr. Green and, no doubt, many others think he would be influenced by his relationship.

Mr. Green's second reason:

Those who serve as members of Maritime Commission should be experienced in maritime problems and maritime issues which are presented to Maritime Commission for final decision. There is no evidence at hand that Mr. McKeough is qualified—

And so on. I have another telegram from the president of the metal trades department, A. F. of L., which is somewhat remote from shipping. But here is one from the Seafarers' International Union, the Atlantic and Gulf district:

Representing approximately 30,000 seamen, Seafarers' International Union, A. F. of L., protests strongly against the nomination of R. S. McKeough for the post of Maritime Commissioner. This person has lately been Midwest director for the CIO-PAC and has shown bias and prejudice against American Federation of Labor unionists.

The telegram urges all Senators to fight against the appointment.

Mr. President, I do not subscribe to the statement that Mr. McKeough has shown bias and prejudice. That is undoubtedly something that is arguable. However, this telegram represents the thinking of a part of the most numerous organization of seamen.

The following item comes from the Pacific coast:

PORTLAND, OREG., *October 4, 1945.*

Hon. THOMAS C. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sailors' Union of the Pacific and Seafarers International Union of North America request you to oppose confirmation of R. S. McKeough as member of Maritime Commission. He is supported by groups whose political views do not harmonize with free government by and for a free people, and we vigorously oppose such persons holding any public office paid for out of public funds. We

believe McKeough's confirmation would be detrimental to the welfare of the American merchant marine and Nation.

CHARLES W. ATKIN,
Acting Agent, Sailors' Union of the Pacific.

There are various other telegrams which I do not need to read.

Mr. President, I assume that Mr. McKeough's general aptitude and his ability are very high indeed. The President has made the appointment. So far as any specialized knowledge and experience are concerned, they have been confined to one field. It is true that the personal element in our shipping is most important, and certain of the Maritime Commissioners need to work in that particular field. The better qualified they are for the work, the better the Commission will be.

The Commission has five members. As everyone knows, along with the advantages of having several heads employed on any important task, there are certain disadvantages as compared with heading an important agency by one man. Boards can and do work very usefully and very acceptably. They sometimes do not, because there is internal dissension, lack of teamwork, and failure to pull together.

Without ascribing to Mr. McKeough any tendency whatever to be a dissenter or a poor cooperator, let me say that the fact remains that in assuming this office under the circumstances and conditions which have been set forth, he would be very sadly handicapped from the start. I am quite willing to grant that he would have the highest integrity and would do the best any man could do in taking a judicial attitude in making any decision he had to make in resolving the demands of labor, or of the factions of labor. But, Mr. President, the important question is what the various factions of labor think he is going to do. What they fear is the most important thing in this problem.

Seafaring men are a mercurial lot. They can become turbulent over night. As the able Senator from Louisiana has so ably stated, such an appointment might constitute a very grave danger to the smoothness of our reconversion and our efforts to get this country's affairs moving along the usual lines of peace.

In Mr. McKeough we would not be sending to the Maritime Commission any particular ability, knowledge, or experience which would be useful in that office. There would be nothing except the possibility of his usefulness in labor matters. However, in that field he would be terrifically handicapped. In effect, there would be two strikes on him when he began. In my judgment, his background and his recent employment would introduce into the Maritime Commission so many dangerous and highly explosive elements that, much as I regret having to say it, I am bound to express the hope that the Senate will not confirm this nomination.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I believe that the first consideration which the United States Senate should keep in mind is the fact that Raymond McKeough is an appointee of the President of the United States. Since I have been in the Senate I have heard the argument made on both sides of the aisle that when the President nominates a man with character and qualifications, that is sufficient for consent in the opinion of most Members of the Senate.

The able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] tells us that so far as Mr. McKeough's character and qualifications are concerned, they are satisfactory to him. Then he leads us along another path, which I shall discuss later, and tells us why he is opposed to the confirmation of the nomination of Raymond McKeough for this important position.

Mr. President, who is Raymond McKeough? What has he done in his past life that qualifies him or disqualifies him for this position? I turn to the testimony which was given before the Committee on Commerce, and read the colloquy which took place between the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and Mr. McKeough:

Senator BILBO. I am sorry, but I don't know anything at all about your background. I think I am a good juror on this case because I have no preconceived ideas about you or the job or the CIO, or the A. F. of L., either, for that matter; we don't have enough of them in my State to bother with. What is your educational background?

Mr. MCKEOUGH. I was educated in the public parochial schools of Chicago, graduated from De La Salle Institute.

Senator BILBO. What institute?

Mr. MCKEOUGH. De La Salle Institute in Chicago.

Senator BILBO. Yes?

Mr. MCKEOUGH. I went to work, after graduating from what was the equivalent of a high school education, in the livestock commission business in the stockyards, as a clerk; and from there I engaged in the railroad business.

Senator BILBO. In what capacity?

Mr. MCKEOUGH. As a secretary to the operating officers of three railroads, ending up as the assistant operating vice president of the Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railroad.

Mr. President, here is an individual who started at the bottom and worked his way up until he became assistant operating vice president of a railroad. Does that demonstrate any qualifications or character from the standpoint of fidelity and ability to handle business problems? The gentleman understands the railroad business. He understands rates. He understands transportation.

From there where did he go?

From there I engaged in the investment banking business on LaSalle Street, Chicago.

If he had remained there and never engaged in any business other than the investment banking business on LaSalle Street, there would not be the objection to him there is in the United States Senate today. If he had come from Wall Street in New York or from LaSalle Street in the city of Chicago, the people who are now opposing his nomination would not be objecting to him.

He had political ambition, as many of us have, and he decided to run for the House of Representatives from the Second District, in the city of Chicago. He had opposition. He was successful, not only once or twice, but four times. After his fourth term in the House of Representatives he was still ambitious, as are many Members of the House, to come to the United States Senate, and he ran for the high office of United States Senator in 1942, against our colleague the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

What is his record as a Member of the House of Representatives? Was he one of those individuals to whom no one paid any attention over there? Was he an active Member? Was he an honest Member? Was he an efficient Member of the House of Representatives, or was he a laggard, a dullard, someone who could not command attention and respect?

Let me read statements from Members of the House of Representatives who know Ray McKeough better than does any Member of the Senate—Members who worked with him in the House in connection with his service in that important public office. It will be recalled that when Mr. McKeough appeared before the Committee on Commerce, I said that if the committee wished to have witnesses to vouch for him, I could bring them by the score. In view of the uncompleted record I thought it advisable to converse with men who know him best.

So, Mr. President, I talked with some Members of the House of Representatives about this man. Here is a letter from JOHN MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House of Representatives at this time, one of the most distinguished and outstanding Members of the Congress, one of the most patriotic and high-minded men who serves in either branch of the Congress:

DEAR SCOTT: I am very pleased to receive your inquiry of me in relation to former Congressman Raymond E. McKeough. It is a pleasure for me to convey to you the very high regard I have for him, not only personally, but in his capacity as an elective official, a former Member of the House of Representatives.

I considered Mr. McKeough one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives during the years he was a Member of that body. Honorable and trustworthy, he devoted his fine talents to the service of the public as his conscience and judgment dictated.

Mr. President, give me that kind of a man on the Maritime Commission, in the House of Representatives, or in the Senate of the United States, and I will show you a man who will serve his Government with fidelity and devotion. I do not care much what his background is, if he has the ability to attain the high position which Raymond McKeough has attained in the affairs of Government and in the affairs of business in this Nation.

I read further from Mr. MCCORMACK'S letter:

I have no hesitancy in expressing the opinion that, if confirmed as a member of the United States Maritime Commission, he would serve as a member of the Commission with distinction, with fairness to all and with favoritism to none.

During the years that Mr. McKeough was a Member of the House of Representatives it was my pleasure to know him very closely—not only as a Member of the House but as a member of the Ways and Means Committee. Prior to my election 5 years ago as majority leader of the House of Representatives, I was a member of the Ways and Means Committee for 10 years, and Mr. McKeough during the latter part of my service on this committee was also a member thereof. Even when a member or members disagreed with him, they

entertained for him deep respect for his views. Above all, they knew he was intellectually honest.

I repeat, Mr. President, he is intellectually honest. I say to my colleagues here is something vital and far-reaching: A man who is intellectually honest. A man who is not intellectually honest, whether he be a Member of Congress or a member of the Maritime Commission, or holding any important business position, is a dangerous person, Mr. President.

I read further from the letter:

I also want to call to your attention what I consider to be a very important fact, evidencing the regard that the membership of the House, particularly on the Democratic side, had for Mr. McKeough while he was a Member of the House. As you and the other Members of the Senate know—

Here is a very important fact—

a Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee is elected by a Democratic caucus through a secret ballot. The primary reason for this is not only the importance of the Committee on Ways and Means as a legislative committee but also the fact that the Democratic members of this committee constitute the committee on committees of the Democratic Party in the House.

In other words, Mr. President, Ray McKeough was chosen to be a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the most important committee in the House of Representatives. A Member of the House of Representatives who serves on the Ways and Means Committee is selected by a caucus of the Democratic Members of the House. One who becomes a member of the Ways and Means Committee becomes a member of the committee on committees, which selects the membership of the rest of the committees in the House of Representatives. Ray McKeough was elected because of his ability, his integrity, and his honesty as a member of the Ways and Means Committee in the third year of his service in the House of Representatives.

I read further from the letter:

Membership on the Democratic side of the Ways and Means Committee is the only Membership in the House on the Democratic side that a Democratic Member must be elected to in a Democratic caucus called for that purpose. Any man who is elected to the Ways and Means Committee must enjoy the confidence and respect of the great majority if not all of the Democratic Members of the House. During his period of service in the House, Mr. McKeough was overwhelmingly elected as a Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee. This clearly evidences the high regard in which he was held by his colleagues.

I realize the confirmation of Mr. McKeough is a matter which rests with the Members of the United States Senate. However, I am sure that the expression of opinion from those qualified to render one in relation to Mr. McKeough will not be misunderstood or misinterpreted by any Member of the Senate.

I have no hesitancy in expressing the strong opinion that Mr. McKeough is well qualified to perform the duties that devolve upon a member of the United States Maritime Commission and that he will perform them without fear or favor. He has always impressed me as a man who in the performance of any duty will follow the convictions of his conscience.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

That is not all, Mr. President. Here is a letter from another member of the Ways and Means Committee, one of the most able, trusted, and respected Members of the House of Representatives, who has served over a period of years. I served with him and Mr. MCCORMACK when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. This letter comes from JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, another member of the Ways and Means Committee who sat shoulder to shoulder, side by side, day after day, with Ray McKeough, discussing, debating, and analyzing the vital problems of this Nation dealing with revenue and other matters. Here is what he says:

MY DEAR SCOTT: Referring to our conversation today, I am very glad to give an expression in the interest of our mutual friend and former colleague, Hon. Raymond McKeough, of Illinois.

It was my privilege to be rather closely associated with Mr. McKeough during his period of service in the House of Representatives and to serve with him on the Committee on Ways and Means during most of that time.

Although our views were not always in full agreement I always found him to be a man of the highest character and integrity and worthy and deserving in every respect. I regard him as a man of outstanding ability and demonstrated devotion to the public service.

I repeat, Mr. President, "demonstrated devotion to the public service."

The letter concludes as follows:

I feel confident that he will make a splendid record as a member of the Maritime Commission.

With kindest personal regards and sincere best wishes, I am,

JERE COOPER.

Last, but not least, I read to the Senate a letter from a man who has a long, distinguished, outstanding career in the House of Representatives, a man who is known throughout this Nation for his sense of fairness, for his integrity, for his devotion to duty, a man who would not under any circumstances or considerations whatever write a letter endorsing a man if the man did not deserve it. I refer to the beloved gentleman from North Carolina, BOB DOUGHTON, who is now chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. I shall read what BOB DOUGHTON says about Ray McKeough. I am reading to the Senate the words of men who know Ray McKeough best. I am not quoting the words of some strangers out on the Atlantic coast or Pacific coast who have sent telegrams to Senators because of the urgings of a few prejudiced leaders. They do not know any more about Ray McKeough than I know about Emperor Hirohito—and perhaps not as much. Yet they send here one telegram after another upbraiding the Senate and asking the Senate not to confirm the nomination of McKeough, when they do not know a single thing about him other than the fact that he worked for the PAC in behalf of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1944. That is the only excuse they have, and that is the real, basic reason why some Members of the Senate may vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Ray McKeough.

Here is what BOB DOUGHTON says:

DEAR SCOTT: This letter is written with reference to our telephone conversation relative to the confirmation of Hon. Ray McKeough as a member of the Maritime Commission.

While not presuming to advise or suggest to you or any Member of the Senate as to how to vote on this matter, I am pleased to state that, in my opinion, neither the outstanding ability nor integrity of Mr. McKeough can be questioned. Not only did my service with him in the House of Representatives warrant this conclusion, but it is also confirmed by my first-hand opportunity to judge of the worth and work of Mr. McKeough while he served as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. President, will the Members of the Senate take the word of BOB DOUGHTON and JERE COOPER and JOHN MCCORMACK, who sat side by side with Ray McKeough in a committee of the House of Representatives which was considering vital problems day after day and year after year, or will the Senate consider a group of telegrams which were inspired and sent to the committee, with no opportunity to cross-examine any of the persons who sent the telegrams?

I read further from the letter:

While Mr. McKeough and I did not always agree 100 percent on all legislative matters, I never had the slightest occasion to question his high purpose; and, while it is none of my concern, I believe that the public interest would be promoted by his confirmation.

With my kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

R. L. DOUGHTON.

Mr. President, on the Maritime Commission we need men with intellectual honesty, we need men with high purpose, we need men such as BOB DOUGHTON says Ray McKeough is.

Some speak about the question of experience; they say Ray McKeough has no qualifications, that he does not have the qualifications which some others do have for this job. Well, Mr. President, Joe Kennedy was the first chairman of the Maritime Commission. I do not know that he ever sailed a ship, unless it was his own private yacht. He represented Big Business, and there was no question about him. But if one of the so-called little fellows, who has worked from the ground up, is nominated for such a position, if some person feels that he represents a minority group of some kind which does not quite square with the big interests of the country, then we readily find a certain group who seek to oppose him.

Mr. President, who else is for Ray McKeough? Reference has been made to the American Federation of Labor. One would believe from the arguments made that all members of the American Federation of Labor are opposed to Ray McKeough. Mr. President, I was a little grieved when I heard the able senior Senator from Louisiana read a telegram from my very dear friend Victor Olander, secretary of the American Federation of Labor in Illinois. Mr. Olander is a very fine gentleman and a very smart person; yet he is opposed to the confirmation of the nomination of Ray Mc-

Keough to be a Member of the Maritime Commission. But back in 1942, when Ray McKeough was a candidate for the Senate, running against our colleague, Mr. BROOKS, the American Federation of Labor in Illinois, of which Victor Olander is the secretary, endorsed Ray McKeough for the position of Senator of the United States. Yet today, Mr. President, although Ray McKeough is qualified, under the theory of Mr. Olander, to be a Senator of the United States, he is not qualified to serve on the Maritime Commission.

Mr. President, with the knowledge that Senators have of the Maritime Commission, the experience acquired during our service in the Senate and with political affairs in our own State, is there any member of this body who feels that he could not act as a member of the Maritime Commission and perform his duties efficiently and satisfactorily? I pause for an answer. Is there any Senator here who believes that he could not serve as a member of the Maritime Commission? For lack of qualification?—I further pause. No Senator answers. So, Mr. President, we all believe that we could serve. In Illinois the members of labor unions and thousands upon thousands of voters believed in 1942 that Mr. McKeough was qualified to serve in the Senate of the United States, but some persons including certain Senators believe that he is not qualified to serve on the Maritime Commission.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not answer the Senator's question because I had already made a statement, and gave reasons why I, as well as the majority of the members of the Commerce Committee, considered Mr. McKeough as not qualified to be confirmed at this time as a member of the Maritime Commission. I can well understand how I could vote for a man to be a Member of the United States Senate or of the United States House of Representatives, or to be President of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. But at the same time I would not vote for him to be a member of the Maritime Commission under all the circumstances surrounding the pending appointment.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator believe that if he, the Senator from Louisiana, were an appointee to membership on the Maritime Commission there would be any question about his confirmation by the Senate?

Mr. OVERTON. That would be utterly impossible because the Senator from Louisiana knows of his lack of ability to serve as a member of the Maritime Commission, and he would not accept such an appointment.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows that if the President should today appoint any Member of the Senate to be a member of the Maritime Commission, the appointment would be confirmed without any question. Last week a Member of the Senate was confirmed to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. I am glad that Harold Burton was appointed, and that his appointment was confirmed. But no question was raised with regard to the appointment. President Truman has made many appointments, all of which were good. But the moment he starts just a little to the left of center, so to speak, he runs into trouble. I know whereof I speak. No one will fool me with regard to the question of voting for or against Ray McKeough. I know the reason for any opposition to Ray McKeough, and every other Member of this body also knows the reason.

Mr. President, I have received the following telegram with reference to the appointment of Mr. McKeough to be a member of the Maritime Commission:

OCTOBER 8, 1945.

Forty-six delegates representing local unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor comprising general teamsters, milk-wagon drivers, bakery drivers, beverage drivers, commission drivers, dairy workers, warehousemen, garment workers, painters, plumbers, and many others representing thousands of workers are on record at the Chicago Federation of Labor meeting held in Chicago, Sunday, October 7, supporting the nomination of Raymond McKeough.

PETER J. HOBAN,
Vice President, Local 753, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chicago.

These laboring men elected delegates who met for the purpose of voting whether or not they would support Ray McKeough's nomination, and sent the telegram which I have read. They did not send one telegram after another with one name signed as representing 30,000 or 60,000 seamen, as has been done in some of the telegrams which have been presented here.

It is just a case of pure "bunk" when one man sends a wire telling a Senator that he represents a certain number of men in behalf of any proposition.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am compelled to leave the Chamber for a while. I must attend a conference on potatoes. There is a great surplus of them. There is also a surplus of labor unions, or at least it would so seem. I wish merely to make a brief statement. I must attend the meeting, and I should like to make the statement before I leave.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope the Senator will not take too much time.

Mr. TAYLOR. I shall take only a minute.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not have much to say except that I, too, have received telegrams from the A. F. of L. I received a 2-page telegram from Bill Green.

Mr. LUCAS. I will have something to say about that later on.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am a member of the A. F. of L. However, I do not want to dodge any issue. I may not be present when the vote is taken on the pending nomination, and I want it to be known how I stand with regard to the matter. If I am present in the Chamber when the vote is taken I shall vote for the confirmation of Mr. McKeough. I shall not vote against a man merely because he is or is not a member of any particular union. I hope I will have the opportunity in the future of voting also for members of the A. F. of L. to fill important positions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] may absent himself from the Senate for the purpose of attending a potato meeting. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to another very important labor leader who has taken issue with Mr. Green and the particular segment of the American Federation of Labor which is interested in this matter. Let it be understood that there is only a very small segment of the American Federation of Labor which opposes the nomination of Ray McKeough. That is the Seafarers International Union of North America.

I have before me a copy of the International Teamster dated October 1945, of Which Mr. Daniel J. Tobin is editor. On page 5 of that magazine, which is published each month, is an article entitled "McKeough Is Unjustly Attacked. Always for Labor, but A. F. of L. Opposes Appointment." The article is in part as follows:

M'KEOUGH IS UNJUSTLY ATTACKED—ALWAYS FOR LABOR, BUT A. F. OF L. OPPOSES APPOINTMENT

For the purpose of calling it to the attention of the great multitude of our members, let us endeavor to show how labor has been treated in Washington. First let us say that there isn't one outstanding national labor official whose influence and standing amongst the masses amounts to a great deal who holds any particularly important position in the Government. Why? Because of labor itself. If an A. F. of L. man is suggested for some important post, the CIO goes in and opposes him. And vice versa.

Recently we had a friend of labor who was nominated for a post on the Shipping Board, the Honorable Raymond McKeough. This gentleman was a Congressman for several years from Chicago, and he never failed to be present and vote in labor's interests.

Not only did he vote in favor of labor, but he was in there battling on the floor of Congress for labor. He ran for United States Senator on the Democratic ticket in the last general election against Senator BROOKS, the incumbent and Republican candidate.

All of labor supported him, both divisions. Then he took a job as director of the PAC, which was, as our members know, financed mainly by CIO unions. He did a good job and helped to carry out the policy of the PAC, endeavoring to elect the friends of labor to office.

The writer of this article worked in cooperation with him throughout the several districts, and all labor unions, including our own joint council in Chicago, worked with him to bring about the desired results.

You know the answer: As soon as he was suggested for the Shipping Board the Seafarers' Union, chartered by the American Federation of Labor, immediately opposed him on the grounds that he would favor, if appointed, Johnny Green's organization of seamen, which is chartered by the CIO.

They made a protest to the A. F. of L., and President Green opposed the nomination of McKeough. We know this man, and we do not think he would be prejudiced in favor of the CIO union over the other AFL union, but it would be only natural if he were somewhat prejudiced.

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters does not bring this case to your attention for any reason except to show you that

there are important bureaus and commissions in Washington that have to do with the affairs of labor and they are honeycombed with the enemies of labor.

The Manufacturers' Association and the United States Chamber of Commerce have no trouble in reaching an agreement on their appointees, but labor unions continually disagree, and labor, with its great strength and power—the institution that was responsible for electing the Roosevelt administration four times—is just sidetracked because of the fact that a few men in labor, standing on their old prejudices, do not have what it takes to lead the way, to make certain sacrifices, to subdue their past opinions and prejudices, so that we may get somewhere for the protection of our members who have elected us and forget ourselves and do the job that should be done for them, whose lives and the lives and interests of whose families are somewhat in our charge and keeping.

Daniel Tobin is one of the leading labor men of this country and he is one of the most influential leaders in the A. F. of L. I would not be surprised if he could tell William Green once in a while what to do in connection with labor affairs in the American Federation of Labor. Dan Tobin is for Ray McKeough in this matter, and he states in the article which I have just read that McKeough has been unjustly dealt with at the hands of labor itself.

Mr. President, is the Senate of the United States going to turn down Ray McKeough merely because one segment of organized labor in this country is opposed to him? That is practically the sum and substance of the argument of the able Senator from Louisiana. I want my position to be distinctly understood that insofar as I am concerned, no labor organization, whether it be the CIO or the A. F. of L., may tell me what I can or cannot do with respect to any nomination which comes before the Senate of the United States. So long as the appointee is supported with credentials such as those which Ray McKeough has, I shall not permit the A. F. of L. to control me and neither shall I permit the CIO to control my vote.

William Green is the President of the American Federation of Labor. He sent a long telegram to every Member, I assume, of the Senate. At least I received one this morning. He did not appear before the Committee on Commerce. He sent a man by the name of Hines to testify in his behalf. In view of the telegram which William Green sent to Senators today it is tremendously interesting to note what Hines said in his testimony. His statement is very interesting, and indicates a very noteworthy and noble reason why he is opposed to Ray McKeough's confirmation.

After Mr. Hines had testified for some time, I asked him this question:

Senator LUCAS. If Mr. McKeough belonged to your organization, there wouldn't be any question about his qualifications and ability to serve? You wouldn't be here, would you?

Mr. HINES. What do you think about that?

Senator LUCAS. I am asking you, Mr. Hines.

Mr. HINES. I presume that if Mr. McKeough came direct from our organization Joe Curran and some more of them would be down here opposing him.

Think of that.

Senator OVERTON. On account of his lack of experience?

Mr. HINES. Well, because be was affiliated with the federation?

Not because of his lack of experience, but because he was with the CIO. Is not that a high and noble reason for one laboring man to oppose another. I read further:

Senator OVERTON. Oh, you mean the other side would be?

Mr. HINES. Yes.

Senator OVERTON. Well, I mean——

Mr. HINES. It is purely, Senator, just purely a question of whether or not——

I am sorry I interrupted him at that point.

Senator LUCAS. It is a fight between the two organizations; that's all it is.

Senator ROBERTSON. You believe that it would be much better to have a man who is acceptable to both organizations in that position?

Mr. HINES. I think so; yes.

Senator ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. HINES. I think it would be quite a happy situation. It is very unfortunate from Mr. McKeough's standpoint that he finds himself in that position.

Senator OVERTON. Let us put it this way: As far as you can speak for the American Federation of Labor and answer this question—possibly you can't speak for them, but you can give your individual opinion—suppose you were called upon by the President to recommend someone for this appointment. Would you select someone who had had no experience in maritime work, whether he is connected with the AFL or not?

Mr. HINES. Well, I wouldn't care to answer that, Senator, without going into it a little more thoroughly. I think it is quite probable that someone who has had no experience could do a pretty good job.

There is Hines saying that McKeough, even though he has not had maritime experience, could do a pretty good job, but he is against him solely and wholly because he represents the CIO.

Let me state right here, Mr. President, that Raymond McKeough never belonged to a labor organization in his life, he never belonged to the A. F. of L. at any time, he never belonged to the CIO at any time. He went out in 1944 to do a job for Franklin D. Roosevelt, and for Democratic candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives. Ray McKeough's crime stems from his effort as director of the PAC in three States in helping elect Franklin D. Roosevelt and other Democrats.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. McKeough is still serving as a paid representative of the CIO, although Mr. Roosevelt's election has long since been over.

Mr. LUCAS. He testified that he is still on the pay roll. I read further from the record:

Senator OVERTON. Well, that is a fair answer.

What does Mr. Green say in his telegram this morning about this very matter? He said:

I am personally and officially opposed to his appointment for the following reasons: First, he has long been employed and is now employed by CIO in promotion of its Political Action Committee headed by Sidney Hillman.

Of course, the American Federation of Labor never takes any part in politics. The telegram reads further:

It is reasonable to conclude that Mr. McKeough would be influenced by his relationship to and association with CIO if his appointment to Martime Commission is confirmed. Seafarers' International Union, Masters, Mates, and Pilots, and other organizations affiliated with American Federation of Labor affected by rulings made by Maritime Commission of which Mr. McKeough would be a member, would be handicapped when Maritime Commission would be called upon to render decisions favored by American Federation of Labor seamen's unions and opposed by CIO seamen's unions, and vice versa. Second, those who serve as members of Maritime Commission should be experienced in maritime problems and maritime issues which are presented to Maritime Commission for final decision. There is no evidence at hand that Mr. McKeough is qualified by reason of experience.

Does anyone believe that if Ray McKeough had been working for Bill Green in the last election, or had been a member of his organization, he would say Mr. McKeough was devoid of experience?

How much control does the Maritime Commission have over the men in the merchant marine? One would think they controlled them from the time they left the ports and sailed the high seas of the world until they got back. From the type of telegrams received here, one would think they went with them every moment.

Mr. President, I have examined this record pretty carefully, I have read the Maritime Act, and I assert that there is only one section of the act which deals with the individuals who are lodging these complaints against McKeough. In title III, section 301 provides:

SEC. 301. (a) The Commission is authorized and directed to investigate the employment and wage conditions in oceangoing shipping and, after making such investigation and after appropriate hearings, to incorporate in the contracts authorized under titles VI and VII of this act minimum-manning scales and minimum-wage scales and reasonable working conditions for all officers and crews employed on all types of vessels receiving an operating-differential subsidy. After such minimum manning and wage scales and working conditions shall have been adopted by the Commission, no change shall be made therein by the Commission except upon formal complaint, public notice of the hearing to be held on such complaint, and a hearing by the Commission of all interested parties, under such rules as the Commission shall prescribe.

I challenge anyone to find any other section in this particular Maritime Act which deals with the seamen. In other words, the Commission fixes the minimum wage and the minimum manning scale, and when they do that, that is the end, so far as wages are concerned, until another application for a review is placed before them. If that happened, McKeough could not make a decision for a CIO group which he did not make for an A. F. of L. group. These individuals, so far as wages are concerned, are treated on the same basis, and it is fallacious and specious to argue, through these telegrams, that Ray McKeough could favor one union over another as a result of this section of the act.

So far as the difference between these labor unions are concerned, the Senator from Louisiana says he does not want to fire the torch that is going to cause a great explosion between these two unions. Well! well! Mr. McKeough is going to start the revolution, Mr. President. He would have nothing to do with a single seaman, except to fix minimum wages, not for members of the CIO, but for those of the A. F. of L. and all others alike. His duties with seamen are extremely limited.

Mr. President, I cannot go along with the argument made by my distinguished friend from Louisiana. The warfare between these two unions has been going on ever since a group in the A. F. of L. broke off and formed the CIO, and I presume it will continue. The fact that we confirm McKeough will not alter it one way or the other.

One would think all the troubles of the two opposing labor organizations would be ended if we did not confirm McKeough. He is the key to peace between the CIO and A. F. of L., according to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, just as surely as we do not confirm Ray McKeough, certain segments of the A. F. of L. are going to claim the credit for his defeat. They will contend that they made the Senate of the United States bow to their wishes, notwithstanding there were only two witnesses who appeared before the committee and subjected themselves to cross-examination by the members of the committee.

Imagine railroading a man out of an important position of this kind with a lot of ex parte telegrams. Why did the committee not call Admiral Land and ask him what he thought about this situation? Why did they not examine him thoroughly about the Maritime Commission, with all its duties and ramifications. Just imagine repudiating an appointee of the President on a lot of telegrams, which were inspired in the first instance, none of the signers of which could from personal knowledge give justifiable reason for his rejection.

Mr. President, there are three admirals on the Maritime Commission now. Admiral Land is responsible for our foreign shipping. A great responsibility rests on him. He is a fine gentleman, a Navy man, who graduated at the Naval Academy in the class of 1902.

There is another admiral on the Commission by the name of Howard LeRoy Vickery, a Naval Academy graduate in the class of 1915. He has been connected with superintending construction in navy yards, as well as acting as adviser in the shipping problems. He went on the Commission in 1937.

There is another admiral on the Commission, 70 years of age, Edward MacCauley, a Naval Academy graduate in 1896. He was in the Spanish-American War, World War I, and has had considerable experience in naval and shipping affairs.

Then there is John M. Carmody, a graduate from the Elmira Free Academy in 1899. He was a bookkeeper for a number of years with various business concerns. He later was in charge of the industrial relations division of the Davis Coal & Coke Co. He then became editor of the Iron Age, and finally landed in Washington in 1933, as head of the Federal Works Administration. He was a good administrator, but what I am speaking of is that he has had absolutely no maritime experience.

Another commissioner who held that office for a while suddenly passed away. I am advised that he had no maritime experience. Some new blood from the Great Lakes region will do no harm to the make-up of this Commission.

Mr. President, that is about all I have to say in connection with this important appointment. I want to conclude by reminding the Senate once more that this is a Presidential appointment, and I do not believe the Senate of the United States, regardless of the political affiliations of its Members, ought to repudiate President Truman on the shallow and specious record which has been made against an honorable and upright man.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, whose members were appointed to conduct hearings on the appointment of Raymond S. McKeough to be a member of the Maritime Commission, I wish to say a few words in opposition to the confirmation of his nomination. I endorse what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], has already said. I feel that if we are to have a merchant marine able to carry the seaborne commerce of our Nation it is essential that the governing body be not only impartial but that it have the respect and support of the personnel of the ships operated under the Maritime Commission.

The Senator from Louisiana advised the Senate that of the 2,500 ships operating in the merchant marine 1,400 were manned by members of the A. F. of L. union and approximately 1,100 by members of the CIO union. There is bitter dissention between these unisns, and the appointment to the Maritime Commission of a prominent member of one union or a body affiliated with it can do nothing but increase the bad condition which exists today between the two unions.

Like most other Senators I have received a number of telegrams in reference to this nomination. I would like to read some of them to the Senate. Copies of others have been read or fully referred to, and I shall ask that they be printed in the RECORD. I will first read a telegram from John P. Frey, president, metal trades department, A. F. of L., under date of October 3, from Washington, D. C., as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 3, 1945.*
Hon. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor has a deep interest in the neutrality and impartiality of the United States Maritime Commission in all matters in which the Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America (CIO) and the metal trades department (A. F. of L.) is concerned. To confirm the appointment of Mr. Raymond S. McKeough as a member of the United States Maritime Commission would place in that body a man who could not be unbiased as between these labor groups for Mr. McKeough at present is employed by the CIO-PAC. I feel assured of your desire to maintain the United States Maritime Commission as an unprejudiced nonpartisan body so far as the A. F. of L. and the CIO are concerned. In view of the above I feel fully justified in requesting you to vote against Mr. McKeough's confirmation.

JOHN P. FREY,
President, Metal Trades Department,
American Federation of Labor.

I read another telegram under date of San Francisco, October 3, from C. J. Haggerty, secretary, California State Federation of Labor, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *October 3, 1945.*
Hon. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Nomination of R. S. McKeough as maritime commissioner has been rejected by Senate committee on grounds that his CIO-PAC affiliation disqualifies him for the new job which involves A. F. of L. and CIO unions. We strongly urge that committee's action be upheld as his appointment to position would create serious disturbance in maritime industry.

C. J. HAGGERTY,
Secretary, California State Federation of Labor.

I read a telegram dated San Pedro, Calif., October 4, from Charles Brenner, agent, as follows:

SAN PEDRO, CALIF., *October 4, 1945.*
Senator EDWARD V. ROBERTSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Wilmington branch of the Sailors Union Pacific AFL vigorously protest the appointment of R. S. McKeough, key figure of the Communist-controlled PAC to the Maritime Commission and that you use your good offices to defeat the appointment.

CHARLES BRENNER, *Agent.*

The next telegram I have in my hand is from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. It is a copy of a telegram which was dealt with fully by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], and I shall not read it, but ask that it may be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 10, 1945.*
Hon. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Senate Commerce Committee declared against confirmation of appointment of Raymond McKeough as a member of Maritime Commission. In my opinion this committee was fully justified in action taken. I earnestly hope you will sustain committe by voting against confirmation of appointment of Raymond McKeough to serve as member of Maritime Commission. I am personally and officially opposed to his appointment for following reasons. First, he has long been employed and is now employed by CIO in promotion of its political action committee headed by Sidney Hillman. It is reasonable to conclude that Mr. McKeough would be influenced by his relationship to and association with CIO if his appointment to Maritime Commission is confirmed. Seafarers International Union, Masters, Mates, and Pilots and other organizations affiliated with American Federation of Labor affected by rulings made by Maritime Commission of which Mr. McKeough would be a member would be handicapped when Maritime Commission would be called upon to render decisions favored by American Federation of Labor

seamen's unions and opposed by CIO seamen's unions and vice versa. Second, those who serve as members of Maritime Commission should be experienced in maritime problems and maritime issues which are presented to Maritime Commission for final decision. There is no evidence at hand that Mr. McKeough is qualified by reason of experience in maritime field or by his knowledge of maritime problems, procedure, and questions. I officially and personally request that you vote against confirmation of appointment of Raymond McKeough to serve as a member of Martime Commission.

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have a telegram from Charles W. Atkin, acting agent, Sailors Union of the Pacific, dated Portland, Oreg., October 4. That telegram also has been previously referred to, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

PORTLAND OREG., *October 4, 1945.*
Hon. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sailors Union of the Pacific and Seafarers International Union of North America request you to oppose confirmation of R. S. McKeough as member of Maritime Commission. He is supported by groups whose political views do not harmonize with free government by and for a free people and we vigorously oppose such persons holding any public office paid for out of the public funds. We believe McKeough's confirmation would be detrimental to the welfare of the American merchant marine and Nation.

CHARLES W. ATKIN,
Acting Agent, Sailors Union of the Pacific.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have a telegram from John Hawk, secretary-treasurer, Atlantic & Gulf District, Seafarers' International Union, dated New York, October 4, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *October 4, 1945.*
Senator EDWARD V. ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Representing approximately 30,000 seamen, Seafarers International Union, A. F. of L. protests strongly against the nomination of R. S. McKeough for the post of Maritime Commissioner. This person has lately been midwest director for the CIO Political Action Committee and has shown bias and prejudice against American Federation of Labor Unionists. We urge all Senators to fight for the appointment of an unbiased figure to this important post which carries a great deal of authority over the merchant marine.

JOHN HAWK,
Secretary-Treasurer, Atlantic and Gulf District Seafarers International Union of North America.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has referred to telegrams, and suggested that few, if any opponents of the appointment of Mr. McKeough appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee holding hearings on this nomination. Capt. C. F. May, President of the Masters, Mates, and Pilots West Coast Local No. 90 of San Francisco, appeared before the committee, and I should like to read the colloquy which I had with Captain May, which appears on page 20 of the hearings, as follows:

Senator ROBERTSON. Captain, as I see it you feel that the appointment of Mr. McKeough would be a disturbing factor in the labor situation in the Maritime Commission?

Captain MAY. Well, we know—that is what we are fearful of. We know the trouble is brewing. It is the undermining continuously going on, and then steps have to be taken in the Maritime Commission.

Senator LUCAS. From what you said here, it couldn't be much worse than what it is at the present time, regardless of who was appointed.

Captain MAY. I didn't get that.

Senator LUCAS. I just make that observation. I say, from the testimony I have heard here, as far as disturbing the morale of the seamen is concerned, I undertake to say that whoever is appointed down here is not going to disturb the morale very much. It is the fight that is going on between the two organizations at the present time that is going to disturb the morale.

Captain MAY. And when we come here and a decision has to be made, we want to have a fair decision and not a one-sided decision.

Senator LUCAS. Well, that is all right.

Senator ROBERTSON. You believe that it would be very much to the advantage of the maritime industry to have an impartial man appointed to the Commission?

Captain MAY. Yes, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. A man that is not connected with the CIO, PAC, or the A. F. of L.?

Captain MAY. Yes, sir; personally I would.

Senator ROBERTSON. And Mr. McKeough being connected and an officer of the PAC, you feel that he does not fit that position?

Captain MAY. Definitely.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize one thing particularly which was mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and that is that there is no opposition from a personal viewpoint to Mr. McKeough. The opposition which the Senator from Louisiana voiced and which I voice is that his appointment would increase the animosity, the bad feeling, which today exists between the two unions in connection with the Maritime Commission. I feel that the appointment of Mr. McKeough to the Maritime Commission would, if I may use the expression, have the effect of pouring gasoline on a fire already kindled.

I hope the Senate will vote against the confirmation of this nomination.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I am opposed to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McKeough. I shall vote against it.

This man has been nominated by the President to be a member of the important Maritime Commission. Convincing evidence that the United States maritime business is controlled by the Communist-dominated maritime union has been adduced before numerous special committees of the Congress, particularly the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This union is affiliated with the CIO. It is, therefore, an important consideration that the appointee whose nomination is now submitted for confirmation has been for some time and is now the district representative of the CIO Political Action Committee for the State of Illinois.

It would be highly improper to refuse confirmation of this appointee because of his affiliation with any legitimate, law-abiding organization, if such membership did not disqualify him for or interfere with the governmental services to be performed; but by the same token it would be an evasion of the constitutional obligations of the Senate to confirm any appointee who is affiliated with an organization engaged in illegal activities and whose objectives are un-American in their concept.

I am convinced that the Political Action Committee of the CIO is both illegal and un-American. The Political Action Committee of the CIO is admittedly a political organization engaged directly and exclusively in political activities and as such is squarely within the purview of the Corrupt Practices Act and the provisions of the Hatch Act. During the last national election the CIO unions contributed in excess of $800,000 to the Political Action Committee for political purposes, exclusive of the huge amounts coerced from the union's membership. Both the contributions and the receipts were clearly in violation of law. The Attorney General of the United States by a weird process of thin and sleazy reasoning whitewashed this open and flagrant violation of the law.

The CIO has deliberately and intentionally violated the Federal election laws with impunity, because the Federal officials were either bribed into submission as political beneficiaries or browbeaten into submission by the sheer ruthless force of its leaders. Mr. McKeough is a part of this organization. He was and is on the pay roll and is engaged in and is a part of its activities.

At the beginning of these remarks I said that in my opinion the CIO was un-American in its concept. Under the guise of progressive social legislation, fostered by a subservient Congress and affirmed by dominated courts, it has been possible for the CIO to become a monster that is destroying the very foundations of our society. The wholesale strikes and walk-outs currently thrust upon the American people by the arbitrary order of the labor bosses is CIO-ism in action.

The CIO has usurped the power of government in determining who shall have gasoline and fuel oil rendered scarce to the American public by their strikes. It has usurped the power of government to blockade public streets and highways in America, and no one can pass or repass these blockaded highways unless the favored recipient holds a pass or permit from the CIO. Many of the strikes by CIO workers now going on, to the immense damage of our effort to reconvert from war to peace, are strikes in violation of unexpired labor agreements.

CIO leaders such as Sidney Hillman have recently spent weeks in London and Paris conferring with leaders of so-called labor organizations in Russia and other European countries dominated by Russia for the purpose of forming an international labor party to control and dominate public policies They are in close association with revolutionary movements in Mexico, Cuba, and other Latin-American countries. The CIO had its representatives at the San Francisco Peace Conference, and even demanded representation in that conference.

All this leads many to wonder whether the rash of strikes from which the public is now suffering is not being directed by some unseen hand, perhaps at some distant capital of the world, for the purpose of putting pressure upon the Government of the United States and the President of the United States in conducting current diplomatic negotiations of the utmost importance to the peace of the world. It seems significant that strikes in key industries were called in this country simultaneously with the stalemate which terminated the conference of foreign ministers in London.

The forces that now dominate the CIO are the same that brought into being the so-called social legislation of the early days of the New Deal Party. It was accepted by the Congress and the people on the plea that labor must be afforded an equal opportunity to bargain collectively with management on such fundamental questions as hours and wages and working conditions. Instead, the labor racketeer and gangster were turned loose to prey upon society at will. We have brought into being a corrupt political oligarchy which, by reason of the power given it by these so-called labor laws, is now able to hold the knife to the jugular vein of the Nation's economy.

When the National Labor Relations Act was passed in 1935, the Congress prohibited certain unfair labor practices of the employers—and certainly there were plenty which should have been condemned—but the act failed to name or prohibit a single unfair employee or union practice. Thus, by its implications, employees, individually and collectively, through the pseudonym of union organizations, were set free to attack management with any device at their command, including the boycott, violence, and the seizure of property through the medium of sit-down strikes and the levy of special taxes. Collective bargaining is one thing—collective coercion is quite another thing.

Ten years have passed since the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act. The record discloses that every year since then there have been more strikes than in 1935, or in any one of the 10 years preceding the passage of the act. In 1935 there were 2,014 strikes, involving 1,117,000 men. In 1944, at the height of our war production, there were 4,956 reported strikes, involving 2,116,000 men, exclusive of the hundreds of sit-downs, slow-downs, work stoppages, and walkouts which were not cataloged as strikes by sympathetic Government agencies. In 1929, at the peak of our peacetime employment, there were only 921 strikes, involving 289,000 men.

The stoppage of war production, so badly needed on the battle fronts by the men who were giving their lives in the protection of the strikers, was at the least unpatriotic and un-American. Mr. McKeough was a part of the organization that fostered and maintained many of these strikes.

I know that it may be said that Mr. McKeough was an employee of the Political Action Committee and not of the CIO. But such argument is wholly invalid because the Political Action Committee and the CIO are one and the same. They are financed from the same source, directed by the same individuals through interlocking directors, and strive for the same objectives.

As a result of the soft attitude of Government toward the CIO, no fair opportunity for a settlement of the oil refinery strikes was afforded the operators. The arbitrary edict of the Secretary of Labor that the refinery operators put into immediate effect a 15 percent wage increase and agree to accept an arbitration award on the 30 percent demanded by the labor bosses so beclouded the issues that negotiations were ended in confusion.

The industry was told that it could accept the Secretary's edict or the Government would take over the plants. This has now been done by the Navy, which gives the whole matter a military atmosphere. But, in my opinion, the action of the President in this connection is as illegal as the Montgomery Ward seizure.

The war is ended. The power of the President under the Smith-Connally Act rests solely upon the fact that this country was at war. The facts cannot be changed by the legal fiction that the war still exists. It may be suggested that the formality of the seizure is protection for the refinery operators and the public. But if a legal fiction may be resorted to in this case, it can be as conveniently used in all other cases, whatever the merits of the situation may be.

As a matter of fact, there was never any agreement between the refinery operators and the unions for a 15-percent increase. Some of the operators had offered a 15-percent raise, but it had been refused by the unions. Many of the operators who were affected by the Secretary's edict had not even been invited to the conference.

The entire situation is thoroughly confused and there seems to be no hope of establishing industrial peace in this country until the administration withdraws from its partnership with the CIO and Congress has the courage to enact legislation which will bridle the unlimited power of the unions, make them responsible for their actions, and force them to assume the same responsibility to comply with their contractual obligations as any other corporation or citizen.

There is now pending in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor proposed legislation introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and former Senator Burton, directed at many of the inequities of our present labor laws. No hearings have been had on the bill, and administration representatives request they be delayed indefinitely.

No longer is it the privilege of the individual employee to refuse to be organized. No longer may he work without paying tribute to union corruptists over whom he has no control. The closed shop and the check-off, enforced by governmental edict, are the essence of the union racketeer's power. No longer is the employee free to resist the regimentation of the labor boss, who presumes to bargain for him concerning purely local matters affected by local circumstances and of which the labor boss has little if any knowledge. Let us not misunderstand. Collective bargaining, except in connection with very minor details, is not carried on by representatives of the employee's own choosing within the particular plant where the grievances arise. The CIO policy of industry-wide bargaining has transferred all power from the workers to the few bosses at the top. Such policy makes possible strikes and stoppage of work in plants where no labor disputes exist.

In the last few days we have witnessed refineries being closed by strong-armed CIO pickets, armed with clubs, gas pipes, brass knuckles, and other instruments of thuggery, although no labor disputes existed in the closed refineries. This is the concept of collective bargaining of the CIO. It is undemocratic and, consequently, un-American. Such is the concept of Mr. McKeough's organization.

No longer are wages or hours of work or working conditions at any particular plant or shop the cause for strikes. Instead, the people are confronted with such vague, indefinite, and uncertain reasons as jurisdictional disputes, industry-wide wage scales, portal-to-portal pay, and similar intangible alibis.

The entire labor policy which has been developed by the New Deal is one of gross discrimination in favor of union bosses and against the employer and business and industry in general. My complaint is not on behalf of industry but on behalf of the people who suffer by reason of a disrupted economy that leads to more and tighter regimentation. Those who have the responsibility of industrial management are not the ones who suffer the most punishment under this one-sided policy. It is the public generally and in particular the enslaved workers, because when economic chaos exists, with its subsequent unemployment, low production, and substandard living, it is usually the man who toils for a living and his family who suffer most.

A great many people presently enslaved by the unions realize these truths and would gladly have labor assume equal responsibility with management in the field of labor relations.

There is no sound reason why the antitrust laws should not apply to the conspiracies of unions and their officers the same as to corporations and other individuals. Management may not restrict production to increase prices, yet union members are free to engage in agreed slow-downs in order to get more for doing less. Unions are free to coerce men to join their organizations, but management is prohibited from even expressing its views with respect to union organization. If union strikes stop production, the Government has adopted a policy of seizing the property of the owners. But never has there been a seizure of union treasury funds. Management has been required to pay wages to men who were never hired and never worked. Yet no man can be forced to work without pay.

The union may breach its contract, and management has no redress at law, although the union is free to resort to all legal processes, as well as illegal pressures, to enforce the same contract. It

is unlawful for any individual to interfere with interstate transportation, yet union members are free to engage in extortion and violence on the public highway, making "common law robbery an innocent pastime," and at the same time be protected by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on the grounds that when acting as union members they are not amenable to the law as individuals. Unions may force men to pay a license fee for the right to work, and the Government not only stands by but it approves by requiring management to deduct the license fee from the earnings of labor.

An Italian labor boss of an American musicians' union levies an income tax upon the amusement industry, and the Government smiles in approval. Petrillo assumes the power to dictate what radio programs may or may not be broadcast, and the Government is helpless.

A recent statement of just a few of the unions showed treasury funds as follows:

International Ladies Garment Workers	$7,707,000
UAW, CIO	2,669,000
Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO	5,000,000
United Steel Workers, CIO	4,000,000
Railroad Trainmen	41,000,000
Railroad Firemen and Engineers	32,000,000
United Mine Workers, Lewis	12,000,000
Teamsters, A. F. of L	19,000,000
Hotel, Restaurants	16,000,000
Electrical Workers, A. F. of L	7,606,000
Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers	8,239,000
International Typographical	5,541,000

They make a total reserve of $160,762,000 for the activities of these few unions unhampered by any restraint of law applicable to other citizens.

Mr. President, I say again that there is no hope for prosperity and industrial peace for America until equality of rights for all citizens, corporations, and organizations is written into the law.

I have examined the transcript of the hearings before the Commerce Subcommittee considering the nomination of Mr. McKeough, and I fail to find anything in the record that would indicate that he is by experience or training qualified to sit on the Maritime Commission. His entire mature life has been confined to politics, clerical work, and the brokerage business, and for a brief time he was vice president of a short-line railroad in the Chicago area. But one thing made clear by the hearings is that Mr. McKeough is thoroughly imbued with the philosophies and theories of the CIO labor and political movement.

The Commerce Committee has recommended against the confirmation of his nomination, on the grounds that it would lead to labor strife in the maritime industry.

Mr. President, I believe it would be a serious mistake for the Senate to override the recommendations of the Commerce Committee.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for a moment or two only. As a member of the Committee on Commerce, I attempted to consider carefully the nomination of Mr. McKeough. The information we had—and I think it has not been questioned—was that in the various capacities in which Mr. McKeough had served in the past, and especially as a Member of Congress, he had demonstrated that he is a hard-working, conscientious, high-class, and efficient man. There is no evidence whatever to the contrary on that subject, so far as I know, and I have endeavored to inform myself. In the House of Representatives he became a member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, and in that capacity and many other ways he demonstrated that he was an efficient, thoroughly-to-be-trusted public servant.

The statement has been made that since leaving Congress he has become engaged in certain other occupations and, in fact, has worked for one of the labor unions. Mr. President, suppose he has? Suppose he worked for two or even more labor groups. No one has suggested that by so working he has done anything which was not honorable, and in accordance with the high standards which he had previously set.

The suggestion has been offered that he has had no technical experience with maritime matters. Of course, it is desirable that a man have some technical experience regarding the duties of the industry which he is to function, but that has not been regarded as an indispensable requisite. We do not select members for the President's Cabinet, for instance, those to be the heads of the War Department and Navy Department, on the ground that they have had specific training and technical experience in army and naval matters. That has not been a criterion which we always have adopted in the selection of men to be appointed to hold administrative positions. On the contrary, some persons believe it is very desirable at times to bring in new blood and at times to put on an important commission a person who is not familiar with the underlying industry concerned, a man who has a new, fresh viewpoint, who is not imbued with certain ideas and viewpoints which might have come to him because of his experience.

At any rate, we recognize both methods of selection as having merit. I have not heard anything which in my own mind could justify the Senate in refusing to confirm the nomination which has been submitted by President Truman. Mr. McKeough has demonstrated again and again, throughout his life, that he is a man to be trusted, that he meets his obligations fairly and squarely. I am satisfied that if he is made a member of the Maritime Commission he will prove himself to be a most conscientious and most efficient one, at all times thoroughly impartial in his decisions and actions.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, for a number of years it was my pleasure to serve in the other branch of Congress with the nominee whose name is now before the Senate for confirmation. I always found him to be fair and just, diligent, painstaking, and able in the performance of his public duties. I think he comes to this office with qualifications which will be very helpful to him and to the Commission upon which he will serve. Furthermore, Mr. President, he comes from the great city of Chicago, a large inland port on the Great Lakes. In my judgment, the Great Lakes merit representation on the Maritime Commission. I am sure the President's recommendation, which received his meticulous consideration, presents a very excellent choice, and one which should be confirmed by the Senate. I feel that Mr. McKeough will be fair, just, and able in all his decisions. I cannot anticipate that any difficulties will arise as a result of his membership on the Maritime Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Raymond S. McKeough to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a few minutes. I believe that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not say something in behalf of the man whose nomination to be a member of the Maritime Commission is now before the Senate. As a former Member of the House of Representatives I believe I have known Raymond McKeough longer than I have known any Member of this body. I knew Ray McKeough in the House of Representatives for 8½ years. I can say to the Members of this Senate that no Member of the House of Representatives who served with Ray McKeough from Illinois would testify other than to his fine character, his outstanding ability, and his integrity of purpose.

Ray McKeough was an able Member of the House of Representatives and, as it has been pointed out by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], he was elected by secret ballot to be a Member of one of the most important committees in the House of Representatives. One must have integrity of purpose and respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle in that body, or he is never elected to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

Members of the Senate who are opposed to Ray McKeough have read many telegrams. I have received similar telegrams. They must be inspired, because I have listened very carefully to the telegrams read by the Senators in opposition to Mr. McKeough, and I have the same telegrams word for word.

Mr. President, my State is probably as much interested in the maritime policies of this Nation as any other State in the Union, and my State has both CIO and A. F. of L. Of all telegrams which have come to my office not one has come from my State in opposition to Mr. McKeough. As a matter of fact, the only telegram I have received from the State of Washington comes from an AFL union endorsing Mr. McKeough. I think that in fairness to the man himself, who has the respect of all Members of the House of Representatives and who was selected by the President of the United States to represent the Middle West, which also has some maritime interests, he is entitled to fair consideration by the Senate.

Ray McKeough did not seek this job; he was not an open candidate for member of the Maritime Commission. There happened to be a vacancy on the Commission, and the President, seeking a man of our own liking, a Democrat, a man who knows government—and he served

in the House of Representatives many years—trying to find a man from the Middle West to represent the Great Lakes maritime interests, asked Ray McKeough if he would accept the position. Mr. McKeough came to me, when all this opposition started and said, "Why, I do not know; perhaps I am not qualified. I do not particularly want this job, but if I can serve and there is not too much opposition, I will take it."

No one would feel worse than Ray McKeough personally if he thought his friends in the Senate turned him down for what I think is some reason entirely out of order, when the President sends his nomination to the Senate.

It has been said that he has had no experience. The trouble with too many of our commissions is that in order to get a man of experience we have to find a man who is connected in some way with the industry affected.

Mr. McKeough will give the Maritime Commission a fresh vision. The very law itself passed by Congress, in order to protect the Maritime Commission, because that is important, provides that a man appointed a member must have for 3 years divested himself of any maritime interest, and that was to make it possible to get just such a type of man as is Ray McKeough.

I hope the Senate will not vote on this question today solely from the consideration that some labor union leaders—and I say that advisedly, some labor union leaders—have seen fit, not because he is a member of the opposite union, but because he helped in an election unit, to send a bunch of block telegrams to the Members of the Senate.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I do not know Mr. McKeough, I do not recall that I ever met him, but he certainly comes with a good deal of recommendation to this body.

In the first place, he was a successful man of business. In the second place, he was four times elected to Congress by his constituents in the Second District of Chicago, Ill. In the third place, he has been recommended by the President of the United States.

It appears that one of his characteristics is loyalty. It appears that he represented the PAC, that is, that he was employed, and as such employee worked for the election of President Roosevelt. In that he was not entirely alone. He had a good deal of company in the United States, and I do not think that should be held against him.

I have listened to the debate very intently, and I have not heard the first word against Mr. McKeough. I have never classed the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] as being particularly radical in his ideas, but he has come to the conclusion that the opposition of a labor union is a serious matter, and I suppose it is; but it is not the argument which we usually hear from the conservative element of our country. We hear the statement made that labor unions should not be permitted to dominate, and now here our friend from Louisiana falls at the first shot.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not falling at the first shot. I wish to remove the impression that one labor union is undertaking to dominate the Maritime Commission. I would take the same position if an A. F. of L. man were nominated for the office.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator is not willing that the CIO man be named, but, to be fair, he says he would not vote for the confirmation of anyone from either organization.

I protest against that position. I do not belong to any labor union, and I never did, but I do not know that there is any particular reason why the bland statement should go forth from the United States Senate that no man who belongs to either of these great organizations can be confirmed for any important position in the Government, especially when he has been so strongly and closely identified with the Government as has the present nominee. Since I have been in the Senate I have seen the names of very few persons come with the same strength of recommendation this man has.

I cannot think that either partisanship or any affiliation with other organizations or any love of other organizations should influence us. I think that when it comes to the point that the opposition of one of these organizations keeps out all the others, and the opposition of the others keeps out the first, both would be in the same position as is suggested by the Senator from Louisiana. If we should condemn this man, refuse to confirm him, we would never get a man with better qualifications for a position in the Government service. If we are to say that his only offense is that he is a Democrat, or that he has participated in a campaign for the election of the Democratic ticket, or that he is employed by one of these great organizations, then we condemn all those who belong to those organizations, and I think there are a good many million of them.

I, for one, would not be willing to vote against a member or an employee of the American Federation of Labor because the CIO opposed him. Nor am I going to vote against an employee of the CIO because the American Federation of Labor is opposed to him, unless it can be shown that he lacks the qualifications which are necessary to the office.

This nominee comes before us as a former Member of Congress, highly recommended by those who know him. Consider the Members of Congress who have endorsed Mr. McKeough. First there is the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], then the Members of the House of Representatives who for years served with him. I have heard nothing against this man from either the State of Illinois or from the House of Representatives, in which he served.

Why should he be refused confirmation? What is his offense? What crime has he ever committed? What offense has he committed against the people of the United States? What lack of appreciation of our Government, or of his duties, if confirmed, has been shown? I have heard of nothing, and until some reason is advanced other than the fact that there is opposition from some labor union, I shall be inclined to think that such a reason is just as dangerous to the objector as it is to the person against whom objection is made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the majority leader that if we are to vote I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, because there are those in committee meetings who would like to be present.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has the right to make the point of no quorum. I wonder if we could agree now to vote at not later than 4:30 o'clock.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly on this matter. I shall speak for not more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Hart	Murray
Austin	Hawkes	Myers
Bailey	Hayden	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Bilbo	Hoey	Radcliffe
Brewster	Huffman	Reed
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Shipstead
Capehart	La Follette	Smith
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Carville	Lucas	Taft
Chavez	McCarran	Taylor
Connally	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Mead	Wheeler
Fulbright	Millikin	Wherry
George	Mitchell	Wiley
Gerry	Moore	Willis
Guffey	Morse	
Gurney	Murdock	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is: Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Raymond S. McKeough, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly, and with no intention of seeking to persuade, but simply to make clear the position of some of us who feel this nomination is unfortunate. I shall say not one word against the character or capacity of the nominee with whom, like the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I served in the House of Representatives. Nor shall I say anything to disqualify him because of his association with the CIO-PAC as such. If there be any suggestion that I personally am prejudiced by this association, I will simply point out to those concerned that I was one of those who supported the nomination by the President of Mr. Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, who, I think, could certainly be attacked upon the score of association with the CIO-PAC, but it

seemed to me that that was not relevant in that case.

So in addressing myself to this nomination it is with considerations entirely other than the character or capacity of Mr. McKeough, or Mr. McKeough's public service, or his association with the CIO-PAC, as such, but rather to the particular issue which is presented by his nomination to the Maritime Commission, which is certainly of a quasi-judicial character, with great responsibilities in the administration of our merchant marine with its intense labor problems. To those in the interior of the country who have not come in contact with it on the coast, I may say that the most virulent controversies exist between the two great labor organizations. I have seen the results on both coasts. I was in the harbor of San Pedro 4 years ago when 400 boats were tied up there, and in San Francisco the same situation existed. During much of this time the controversy has arisen by reason of jurisdictional disputes between these two great labor organizations. With the merits of the controversies we are not here concerned. We simply must recognize the fact of their existence.

The quasi-judicial character of this Commission is recognized in the very point made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who pointed out that the law itself provides that no shipowner can be a member of the Commission, but must have divested himself of his interests at least 3 years before he is appointed. Yet the controversy existing between the shipowners—among themselves or with the Government—is infinitely less pregnant of difficulty than the difficulty existing between these two powerful labor organizations, who are not at all scrupulous at times in the methods which they use.

The quality of loyalty which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] pointed out in Mr. McKeough is the very quality which is going to create the most difficult problem. As the highest advocate of one group in this controversy, as the Midwest director of the PAC, affiliated with the CIO, the qualities of character and loyalty which some so much laud are the very ones which are going to make it impossible for Mr. McKeough to function with satisfaction to himself or to the great responsibilities he must carry. There constantly must arise in his mind the question: "Am I loyal to my former employers or am I loyal to the interests of this great cause?" and the more conscience he has the more troubled he necessarily must be.

Mr. President, it is my sober judgment—I speak as a friend of Mr. McKeough who served with him in the House, and I say it in no spirit of cynicism, that we will relieve the President of an inevitable regret and Mr. McKeough of an inevitable embarrassment if we decline to consent to this nomination.

There are a great many other positions in which I think he might serve without difficulty. The President recognized this problem when, for the first time in our history, so far as I know, he appointed to be Secretary of Labor one who was not a member of a labor organization. I think even Madam Perkins was affiliated with, although perhaps not a working member of, the craft. But the President chose to be Secretary of Labor one who was not identified with labor, in order that that great source of controversy might be avoided.

When this nomination came before the committee, the subcommittee which heard the matter originally reported unanimously against the nomination, and the full committee was almost overwhelmingly against it and laid it aside with the hope that it might be withdrawn. That did not occur. So it is necessary for the Senate now to pass upon it.

I am sure that no Senator will regret his action if the Senate shall advise the President that, in its judgment, it is not well to consent to this appointment to be a member of the Maritime Commission of one who necessarily must be under a very great suspicion of partisan prejudice in any action which he may take.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is: Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Raymond S. McKeough, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. WHERRY, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris, and therefore is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]; and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "yea," and that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is paired on this question with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. If present, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. If present, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is paired on this question with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of illness. If present, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay." He is paired on this question with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay." He is paired on this question with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are unavoidably detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—42

Bailey	Huffman	Morse
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Murdock
Bilbo	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Briggs	Kilgore	Myers
Chavez	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Connally	Langer	Radcliffe
Downey	Lucas	Russell
Eastland	McClellan	Stewart
Ellender	McKellar	Taylor
Fulbright	McMahon	Tunnell
Guffey	Magnuson	Tydings
Hayden	Maybank	Wagner
Hill	Mead	Walsh
Hoey	Mitchell	Wheeler

NAYS—34

Andrews	George	Reed
Austin	Gerry	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gurney	Robertson
Brewster	Hart	Shipstead
Buck	Hawkes	Smith
Butler	Hickenlooper	Taft
Byrd	Knowland	Vandenberg
Capehart	McCarran	Wherry
Capper	Millikin	Wiley
Carville	Moore	Willis
Donnell	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	Overton	

NOT VOTING—20

Aiken	Glass	Thomas, Okla.
Ball	Green	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Hatch	Tobey
Brooks	McFarland	White
Bushfield	Pepper	Wilson
Chandler	Saltonstall	Young
Cordon	Thomas, Idaho	

So the nomination of Raymond S. McKeough to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission was confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

The clerk will state the remaining nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Watson B. Miller to be Federal Security Administrator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William C. Mathes to be United States district judge for the southern district of California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edgar H. Rossbach to be United States attorney for the district of New Jersey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph A. Bell to be administrative officer, Philadelphia branch, Research and Statistics Division, in the Selective Service System.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notied forthwith of all nominations confirmed this day.

That completes the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, as we all know, a very important conference—officially known as the Labor-Management Conference—has been scheduled for November 5 at the White House. Although it is rumored that the conference is likely to be postponed for a while, it undoubtedly will be held eventually with the purpose in mind of formulating a labor program for the reconversion period.

If I am not mistaken—and I think I am not—this conference was born in the fertile and brilliant mind of our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who has won merited public praise on many occasions in recent years because of his timely ideas and his uncommon good sense.

It is good to know that it is possible for this administration to rise above partisanship, and to adopt a sensible idea put forward by a Republican. I am always happy to hear and read of men working together for the good of our Nation despite race, creed, or political belief.

Having said this, I hope I will not be misunderstood when I point out that, in my judgment, it would be a fine thing for the President and his advisers to think seriously of inviting participation in the forthcoming conference of representatives of other groups in our Nation.

Specifically, I believe that it would be worth while to ask the "big three" farm groups—the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the Farmers Union—to send representatives to the conference. Furthermore, I believe that two, possibly more, men of outstanding caliber and unquestioned impartiality should be asked to attend the conference on the part of the public.

It is apparent today to every thinking American that what happens between this labor union and that industry is not merely a private matter. Today so closely intertwined are all the segments of our society that it is impossible for men to have labor troubles in Detroit without making citizens of all classes in every State in the Nation feel the results.

Let me explain: The men who strike in Detroit, or the management representatives who cause a lock-out there, may or may not realize that literally tens of thousands of farmers and other consumers, after having waited patiently for automobiles through the entire war period, are being more and more inconvenienced because of the delay in production.

In some cases—the oil strike, for example—consumers felt directly the results of the strike within a very short time. As we know, gasoline had to be rationed in many cities by unauthorized agencies.

Today, considering the shortage of materials, every strike affects thousands—perhaps millions—of the fellow men of the strikers or the owners who lock-out a plant. The repercussions of a strike or a lock-out under such conditions are not felt merely by one small group of strikers and one small group of owners, but by every American who has waited patiently for one scarce commodity or another. It is possible to say that the very economic livelihood of millions of Americans is affected by isolated strikes or lock-outs in this or that basic industry today.

Therefore, I urge with all sincerity that the President "count the public in" on the labor-management conference. I urge that he count agriculture in because, if the conference is a success, the representatives of agriculture can help to convince the millions of farmers of the usefulness and importance of decisions at which the conference arrives. Since farmers are in a sense both laboring men and management men, it is essential that they be remembered at conferences the implications of which promise to be as widespread as the forthcoming one.

Certainly the tens of millions of consumers—white collar nonunion workers, school teachers, pensioned persons, the self-employed, and professional men generally—all deserve to be represented at this most momentous meeting.

In my humble opinion, this conference needs representation of a broader viewpoint than simply that of labor and that of management. We have now reached a time in American history when, to quote Ben Franklin, "We all need to hang together, or we may all hang separately." Labor and management are to be commended for wanting to take the joint responsibility of formulating a new labor policy, but they must not be allowed to do so. Too many millions of other Americans who do not fall strictly in the category either of union members or management men have a stake in this conference.

INDUSTRIAL DECENTRALIZATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, yesterday I had occasion to appear before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce in furtherance of a resolution to continue the special committee of the Senate having to do with decentralization of industry. At that time I made a statement before the subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that my statement on that occasion be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The question of proper utilization and development of our natural resources is extremely important, particularly at this time, when we must bend every effort toward establishment of a sound and permanent peacetime economy, which will insure the greatest possible growth of our national prosperity.

Continuation of the Senate Special Committee Investigating Industrial Centralization can contribute substantially toward the achievement of this objective, through research and fact finding, and by holding hearings.

One of the purposes of the committee was to provide a forum for the expression of the opinions of the people, from all sections of the country, on the vital problem of full development of our natural resources. An extensive series of hearings was planned. Only one hearing of this series was held. That was in San Francisco in November of 1944. At the time the committee ceased to exist, hearings had been tentatively scheduled in the Southwest, the Midwest, the South, and the East, as well as in New England. The people of those various sections of the country are just as much entitled to express their opinions on this question as are the people of the far West. It has been a source of deep regret to me that the committee was not permitted to go forward with its proposed hearings. If Senate Resolution 15 is approved by the Senate, and the committee is reconstituted thereby, it shall be my purpose to go forward with the hearings as planned.

The work of the special committee necessarily involved a great deal of research. Research was the basis for the report of October 7, 1944, which was intended to be the focal point for discussions, at the series of hearings which, as I have mentioned, was planned. Considerable research also was undertaken in connection with other matters. At the time authorization for the special committee expired, a report on selective imports was in process of preparation. This report was intended to point out where and how this country can increase the volume of goods imported from other nations, without competing with our own industries, and thereby provide foreign nations with some of the money they will need to pay for the goods which we must ship abroad if we are to maintain our exports at a level consonant with national prosperity. Other matters of research ranged all the way from freight rates to attempting to devise a means for opening the production of synthetic gasoline to private enterprise development, as a possible new industry suitable for several sections of this country which are now industrially underdeveloped.

I shall not go into detail concerning these numerous research projects at this time. Some of them would be out of date today. Some of them would be even more important now than they were a year ago, and would be promptly carried forward if the committee should be reconstituted.

The committee had a subcommittee, headed by former Senator Gillette, which had as its duty the investigation of individual cases presenting examples or instances of the way in which officials of Government agencies, who were also employees of former employes of big corporations, used their influence to prevent or inhibit the proper development of natural or economic resources, and to keep the little fellow down and push the big fellow further up.

Another subcommittee was appointed to establish and maintain cooperation with State planning boards and other similar State and local agencies, both official and unofficial.

Much of the vocal opposition to the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Industrial Centralization has come from New England. Newspapers in that section of the country damned the committee black on the strength of a press release, and have continued their opposition with Emersonian consistency.

It is natural for New England to fear decentralization of industry. She has unhappy memories. She remembers the transfer of textile plants from Chicopee and New Bedford and Springfield and Taunton and Providence. That was decentralization by removal. It is hard to put across the idea that there is another kind of decentralization—decentralization by increasing the industrialization and the prosperity of other regions without moving anything.

It is certainly my hope to encourage industrial expansion in the South and West. But I have made no suggestion at any time for limiting industrial growth in the Northeastern States.

Influences operating to inhibit industrial development have been by no means confined to the West or to the South. The mica mines of New England, from Connecticut to Maine, which could be one of the most important industries in that region, have been held back from adequate development in order to preserve and protect the mica-importing industry. I will not take up the time of the committee to go further into that matter. I mention it only in passing. If the committee desires further information on the subject, a good general summary can be found in an article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1944, by Representative THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts.

Now, let's go back a bit and get the record straight.

Nearly 2 years ago—in December 1943—I made a public statement concerning the aims and objectives of the Special Committee Investigating Industrial Centralization. In that statement I said:

"It is no purpose of this committee to attempt the forced incubation of any industry, steel or otherwise, in any place where such an industry is not economically justified. We know that many States have iron ores, electric power, coal, limestone, and other natural resources, in such combination with relation to each other, to transportation, and to markets, that steel industries in those States, perhaps small but nevertheless sound and prosperous, are amply justified.

"The centralization of industry in this country may have had much justification in the economics of the period in which such centralization became established. What we must realize is that many economic factors, such as transportation and markets, are constantly changing. In examining the effect of the centralization of industry on our national structure the Senate special committee must consider not only the economic factors which prevail today but also those which will prevail in the future.

"It is not only such centralization as existed prior to the present war which we must examine but also the increased centralization in some industries which has grown and been fostered since the war began. If this trend toward overcentralization is not checked, if all parts of the country are not given equal opportunity to make the best possible use of all their natural resources, the ultimate effect upon the prosperity of this Nation may be paralyzing."

As the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee so ably stated in its report on Senate Resolution 190, which created the Senate Special Committee to Investigate the Decentralization of Industry, "to the extent that such centralization is self-perpetuating, it is inimical to the national interest."

More than 2 years ago, in addressing a joint meeting of Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, I said:

"No one here has any desire to move a blast furnace from Pittsburgh, or a rolling mill from Gary, to any other part of the country. We need today all the steel production facilities we have and more; and we shall need far more tomorrow. The decentralization, or recentralization, which we hope to achieve is not through moving anything, but through the creation of new production facilities, or the substantial expansion of facilities which are now far less than those amply justified by available resources."

In that same speech, I concluded by saying that the major objective toward which we should direct ourselves should be that, in the final analysis, there should be no great section of this country which shall not have emerged into economic self-sufficiency.

I am not advocating sectionalism. What I am advocating, and have been advocating, is that we put an end to sectional discrimination.

It has never been the function nor policy of the Senate Special Committee Investigating Industrial Centralization—and it never will be, so long as I am connected with that committee—to work for a Government-planned economy. Our purpose is to attempt to avoid an economy planned in shortsightedness, for the benefit of special interest, and perpetuated by restrictions and artificial barriers in the creation and continuance of which the Government has too often been a skillfully used tool.

If overcentralization of industry is encouraged by Government overplanning, or by a policy of dumping and closing war plants, we shall be farther than ever from enduring prosperity when the process is finished. The Government should adopt a policy which will give industry the free hand it needs. Free enterprise has made this country the greatest industrial Nation in the world. But remember, free enterprise does not mean the rule of the jungle, where the lion and the tiger are free to meet the competition of smaller animals by having them for breakfast. Enterprise which is truly free—and I mean enterprise which is free alike from Government control and direction, from artificial economic obstacles, and from the hampering influence of monopoly—is our best bet to solve the problems which lie ahead of us.

The basic economy of this country today is regional rather than national. That is partially because we are a big country, and still growing. The history of our growth has always comprehended new frontiers. The problems of a frontier seldom have been dealt with on the national level, but have been dealt with locally, by the frontiersmen closest to them. The problems of our frontiers have always had an impact upon the economies of other regions of the country, and the development of those frontiers has, of course, played a tremendous part in the growth and prosperity of other regions. But these impacts and these effects have always been incidental, and we have accepted them without giving them too much thought. Today we are without a frontier in the sense of an area of land unexplored and unsettled. Our frontier today consists of the areas of this country which are inadequately developed and insufficiently industrialized. This can be our greatest frontier if we recognize its importance to our national prosperity.

If the industrial East is to be prosperous, it must have markets for all it can produce. There are just two places to look for those markets. One is overseas, beyond our own borders; the other is within those borders.

Without any attempt to minimize the importance of foreign markets, I think we all realize that exporting will not solve all our economic problems. Merely sending our goods abroad will not give us prosperity. As every economist knows, the measure of our national standard of living is what we produce, plus what we import, minus what we export. What we need to insure the prosperity of eastern industry is large-scale development of domestic markets which have not yet been exploited. But it is a fallacy to believe those markets can be developed on a one-sided basis. In order to buy from the East, the people of other sections of the country must have something to trade; that is, they must, themselves, produce.

Raising the standard of living in our Southern States to the same level as the national average would open a huge field for consumer goods. But this cannot be done without effectuating some changes in the present economic system in the South.

Retaining present wartime populations in the West, and fostering an additional increase in the population of that area, which it can well support, will result in a market for consumer goods far beyond anything we could hope to develop overseas, but that cannot be done by telling the people of the West that their job is to till the soil and work the mines, and nothing else.

The great midwestern area of this country has recorded tremendous industrial progress, and at the same time has grown into a very important market for the products of eastern factories. Industry in the midwestern area has been greatly stimulated by the war and the establishment of war-production facilities. It is just plain common sense that the problem of eastern manufacturers, in finding a market for their goods, will not be helped by saying to the Midwest, "Tear down or board up your factories, and go back to growing crops and raising cattle."

Utilization of existing war plants in the South, Midwest, and West, and continued industrialization of those areas, will not detract from any normal industrial activity in the East, but will rather create more markets and consequently augment the Nation's income.

It is just plain common sense that half this country, or a third of this country, can-

not be soundly prosperous if the rest of the country is existing on a marginal economy.

Advocating the fabrication of raw materials near their source should not be regarded as an effort to take something important away from the East. The East does not get the bulk of its raw materials from the other regions of this country. The East does not ship a large percentage of its finished products to the South and West. Excluding from consideration exports and imports to and from foreign countries, the East consumes more than 90 percent of its own manufactured goods, and ships less than 10 percent to the other sections of the country. It is true that the South and West ship more than one-third of their raw-material tonnage to the East for processing, and receive from the East nearly one-third of the finished manufactured products they consume. But the actual tonnages involved are small, compared with what the East produces and consumes within its own boundaries.

The problem is not one of overdevelopment in the East, but of underdevelopment in other areas. The remedy is not for the West or the South to stop buying eastern products, but for those areas to increase their own production. The South and West produce too little, both of raw materials and finished products. Their income is low because their production is low; and because their income is low, their consumption of finished goods is low. Increase manufacturing production in the South and West, so as to utilize more fully and profitably the raw material resources of those areas, and you will create more employment, better economic opportunities, greater purchasing power, and higher living standards. The result will be that the West and South will buy a smaller percentage of their finished goods from the East; but that reduced percentage will represent a huge increase in tonnage. Increasing the productivity of the rest of the country, in both raw materials and finished products, will not harm the East. To the contrary, a growth of southern and midwestern and western productivity and prosperity cannot fail to augment the total national income, with a consequent increase in the economic activity and prosperity of the whole Nation.

Many metropolitan areas of the United States are today facing a tremendous problem as shifts in the worker force are made necessary by reconversion. This problem is being felt in the East as well as in the West, in the North as well as in the South.

There are two ways of dealing with the type of problem these metropolitan areas face. One way is to try to provide postwar employment for the present populations of these areas, where they now live. The other way is to permit economic pressure to force a remigration of these workers to the traditional centers of industry, in the hope that there they may find jobs. I seriously question whether this is an answer at all. Aside from the chaos which will be produced if four or five million people pack up their belongings and start trekking across the country hunting for jobs, that kind of an exodus from our newer war-created industrial centers will necessarily mean a comparable influx of floating populations into our longer-established industrial cities. Those cities have severe reconversion problems of their own. They will not be helped in solving those problems by increasing the number of job hunters.

Governor Baldwin of Connecticut has written an article for the November issue of American Magazine which impressed me very much. In it he calls attention to the importance of the job maker—the fellow who risks his capital and exerts his effort in order to provide jobs for others. He may not provide many jobs, at least at first; but it is the collective contribution of our job makers which will insure the permanent peacetime prosperity of this county, if we attain such prosperity at all.

If we confine future industrial growth and development to one small section or a few small sections of this country, our potential job makers will not have a fair chance. And you might bear in mind, in that connection, that a survey conducted by the War Departmet, something over a year ago, at the request of the Senate Special Committee Investigating Industrial Centralization, showed that about one in every four of the men in our fighting forces had it in his mind to come back home and start in business for himself. Those boys want to become job makers. It is up to us to see that they have the opportunity, no matter what State they call home.

The question before you in considering Senate Resolution 15 is broader than just the question of whether the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Industrial Centralization shall be continued. Work of the special committee—the very existence of the special committee—has been bitterly fought, from the start, by certain interests which desire to perpetuate and increase the centralization of industry in this country. In my opinion those forces are and have been working against their own long-range interests, so far as those interests may be sectional; that is probably not true insofar as those interests have been private and personal. We know that this opposition will continue. It is powerful opposition.

It represents forces which have been successful, for several generations, in keeping industrial growth and development in this country pretty well in the same channels to which it was originally directed by economic factors long since changed or outmoded. The question you must face in passing upon this resolution now becomes, therefore, exactly this: Shall the West and the South and the Midwest have a voice in the charting of this country's economic future? Shall every section of this country be deemed entitled, as a matter of right, to develop its natural resources and reap the benefits of its natural advantages, to the extent necessary for economic self-sufficiency? That question is far bigger than personalities or prejudices; and I submit to you it is far bigger than any mere sectionalism.

I have not chosen this issue. I did not make it. It has been made and chosen by others. The Senate special committee, while it was in existence, attracted public attention. Publicity was focused on it. It became a symbol for the efforts of the underdeveloped sections of this country to rise to economic independence. Therefore it has been attacked, and is being attacked, on the theory that if the special committee can be killed, and can be made to stay dead, the issue will not arise again; or, if it does arise, will be espoused separately by spokesmen from different localities, each of whom can be shouted down by the cry of "sectionalism."

If you do not like the word "decentralization," change the name of the committee to the "Senate Special Committee on Industrialization." Perhaps that would be a better name anyway. But do not vote to consign the committee and its purposes to oblivion, unless it is your intention to vote against giving every section of this country full freedom of opportunity to grow and develop and contribute its full share to national prosperity.

PROTEST BY CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES AGAINST BUILDING OF DAM NEAR GARRISON, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on Tuesday there appeared before the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which I am a member, four distinguished Indians of my State, namely, Hon. Martin T. Cross, chairman of the tribal business council, Affiliated Tribes; Hon. Martin Fox, of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation; Hon. Earl Bateman, a member of the tribal business council; and Hon. Jeff Smith, member of the three affiliated tribes, all from Elbowoods, N. Dak. These gentlemen appeared to protest the building of the dam located by the War Department and the Bureau of Reclamation at Garrison, N. Dak.

Garrison Dam was included in what was known as the Pick plan developed by the Army engineers. The Pick plan was coordinated with the Sloan plan devised by the Bureau of Reclamation a year ago, and in the Flood Control Act of December 1944 Congress authorized the development of the Missouri Valley for purposes of navigation, irrigation, and power and flood control. There was appropriated for the preliminary examination and survey two and one-half million dollars, and for the advance plan, preparation of detailed plans and specifications, the appropriation was $7,635,000. Of this sum $500,000 was appropriated for the advance planning of the Garrison Dam.

Mr. President, as one of the Senators from North Dakota, I feel it my duty to protect the rights of all the people, among them the Indians, and under my oath of office I will protect the Indians' rights regardless of how it may affect anyone else. The treatment that the Indians of this country have received is known to all Senators, and is one of the most disgraceful episodes in our national history.

As Senators all know, there has been a general disregard of Indians' rights which has characterized our dealings with them. I propose to see to it that the three affiliated tribes are given every opportunity to be legally protected. It was a source of great regret to me that Mr. Floyd Montclair, who was supposed to have come down with this delegation, was not present at the hearing. This delegation came to the Indian Affairs Committee of the Senate, where they received a most courteous reception by the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], to support the resolutions of the tribal business council, which is opposed to the Garrison Dam, which it is claimed the Bureau of Reclamation and the War Department is trying to put over on the Indians without the consent of the land owners and the Indians owning tribal lands.

The three affiliated tribes are the Arickaras, the Gros Ventres, and the Mandans. By the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851 their rights in these lands are again reiterated. These Indians and their ancestors have lived upon this land for centuries, and were there at the time of the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

Mr. President, as far back as July 5, 1825, in a treaty with one of the three affiliated tribes, the Arickaras, the United States recognized the Indian country, although it did not specify the exact boundaries. Recognition of the Indian country is found in article 5 of that treaty. It is the opinion of the Acting Solicitor of the Department of the Interior that the Indian Reorganization Act does not affect the status of allotments. Allotments are substantially apart from

restrictions and alienations, in the same position as lands owned by white persons and subject to condemnation for public purposes. The tribal lands are in a different status. The lands which have been promised to the Fort Berthold Indians by a solemn obligation of the United States cannot be taken even by condemnation proceedings until that obligation is modified by Congress.

Mr. President, I am bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, and I have written letters to the War Department and the Department of the Interior calling this matter to their attention also, because I am going to fight for these Indians' rights; and I am serving notice now on both the Department of the Interior, including the Indian Office, and the War Department, that if an act of Congress is intended to be passed it must provide full protection for the Indians by the appropriation of the millions of dollars necessary to reimburse them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the RECORD ought to show that the Committee on Indian Affairs of the United States Senate has provided the opportunity to the Indians to make their protest. A week ago the delegation representing the three affiliated tribes of which the Senator speaks came to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, which position I happen to occupy, and made a statement to me of the disinclination of the Indians, if not, indeed, their absolute opposition, to abandon their homes upon the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation. A chairman of the committee, knowing that it would be the desire of every member of the committee, I immediately assured Mr. Martin Cross, the chairman of the delegation, that I would call a meeting of the Indian Affairs Committee to hear his protest, and that the meeting would be called as soon as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], a member of the committee, was available. He happened not to be available at that time because of his absence on official business. But I think it should be made perfectly clear that the Committee on Indian Affairs has not denied to these Indians a full opportunity to be heard.

Mr. President, I may say in amplification of what the Senator from North Dakota has said that the Fort Berthold Indian Reservatotn consists of more than 600,000 acres of land, of which less than half is good or fairly good arable land. On approximately one-half of the reservation, or about 300,000 acres, most of the Indians now make their homes. If the Garrison Dam is built as proposed in the plans of the Army engineers, it will flood approximately 221,000 acres of the best farm land upon the reservation. It will inundate lands upon which, as I recall, there are more than 400 Indian homes, out of a total of 600, so that the Indians will be deprived, not only of their homes, but of their best agricultural land.

The suggestion has been made, as I understand, by the Army engineers that there might be an exchange of lands. But the land which is offered in exchange is known in North Dakota as the Bad Lands. That area is land upon which the Indians could not make their homes and could not raise agricultural crops.

Mr. President, I was very much impressed during the course of the hearings by the development of the fact that back in 1874, or thereabouts, when the Indians of the tribes in question were being requested on behalf of the Federal Government to leave that area and go to South Dakota, their response was that they would prefer to work harder and live under more difficult circumstances in the Dakotas, which had been their ancestral home, than to go to any other area of the United States. That struck me as being a rather eloquent declaration of love of home, made by the Indians. It does seem, from the expressions which were made during the hearing before the Indian Affairs Committee, that the Government of the United States should be very loath to dispossess these Indians.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, lest there be any misunderstanding, I wish to make it very plain that the distinguished chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee went far out of his way to give the Indians who came to Washington from North Dakota every opportunity to be heard. In their behalf, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee. Not only did he do that, but we had an opportunity to bring forward any witnesses we chose.

Mr. President, what I am objecting to is the action of the War Department in proceeding to use funds out of the appropriation previously made, to go ahead with the building of the dam. I serve notice now that I shall fight any attempt to change the location of the homes of these Indians in flooding the fine, fertile, beautiful lands which they now occupy and which have been so eloquently described by the distinguished chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, and sending them on what are known as the Bad Lands of North Dakota—an area covered by buttes, stones, and ravines.

So far as I am concerned, I feel that a man, regardless of the color of his skin—and I am sure the distinguished chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee agrees with me—is entitled to receive from his Government treatment equal to that received by other citizens. The Indians on this reservation have made a magnificent contribution in this war. Seven of the boys from the three affiliated tribes alone paid the supreme sacrifice. Although the Indians are in a hopeless minority in North Dakota, I want them and I want all the people in the State to know, and particularly I want the Department of the Interior and the War Department to know, that as long as I am upon the Senate floor they will not be lacking in a fighting champion to protect their rights.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, having been designated as one of two Members of the Senate to attend a food and agricultural meeting to be held at Quebec beginning on the 16th of October, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to be permitted to be absent from the Senate for 2 weeks beginning on October 16, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave of absence is granted.

SENATOR McKELLAR AND THE TVA

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I shall take only a few moments to refer to an article by Marquis Childs, published under the heading Washington Calling, appearing in the Washingon Post for October 9. On that day, Mr. Childs' column is devoted to a discussion of President Truman's trip to Gilbertsville, which was made this week. Yesterday, I believe, the President dedicated the Gilbertsville, or Kentucky Dam, which is the final or last of the TVA system of dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries. I wish to call particular attention to the latter part of Mr. Childs' article, which discusses the TVA and the attitude of my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], toward TVA. After speaking of the President's trip to that area, this columnist, whose articles I always read and generally enjoy, sounds a rather disconcerting note. He accuses the senior Senator from Tennessee of being the enemy of TVA. I wish to correct that statement, in the few minutes of time during which I shall ask the Senate to hear me. Toward the end of his article, Mr. Childs said:

> Obviously, a far-flung operation like TVA could not be kept at the end of a congressional leash. Congress does have the opportunity, of course, to go over all TVA transactions and questions even the smallest voucher.
>
> This, however, was not enough for some Congressmen. The most notorious enemy of TVA, Senator KENNETH McKELLAR, of Tennessee, has never abandoned his efforts to get the Authority under the thumb of Congress. It happens that Senator McKELLAR is also one of the most diligent patronage grabbers in the Senate, which may have something to do with his attitude on TVA.

Mr. President, in the interest of time, I shall not read all the article; but subsequently Mr. Childs quotes a comment in the Chattanooga Times regarding the growth in the Valley since the advent of the TVA. My purpose in calling attention to this article, Mr. President, is to correct the statement made by a columnist for whom I have a great deal of respect, and whose column I daily read and generally enjoy. I never have thought of him as a man who would purposely or intentionally make an untruthful statement, and I do not think he intended to do so in this instance. Possibly the statement was made by reason of the fact that his information was incorrect or because he unthinkingly expressed himself in such a manner. I wish to pay tribute to my colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee as being possibly the outstanding friend, rather than the enemy, of the TVA. I believe he is the outstanding friend the TVA has had throughout the years of its development.

Back in the early part of this year—to be exact, in March, 1945—Mr. Earl W. Cooper, one of the staff of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, prepared Senate Document No. 35, which subse-

quently has been printed, of course. It is entitled "History of Appropriations Made by the Congress of the United States for the Tennessee Valley Authority; Also History of Funds for the Development of the Tennessee River."

I shall not at this time, of course, undertake to read the document in full. But I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY OF APPROPRIATIONS MADE BY CONGRESS FOR THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

FOREWORD

In order to better understand the history of the appropriations made by Congress for the Tennessee Valley Authority, it is helpful to follow the events over the years which led to the formation of the Authority by the Federal Government. The interest in the development of the Tennessee River evidenced by Senator MCKELLAR during the course of these events is particularly noteworthy, since on February 1, 1926, he introduced in the Senate the prototype of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and then, after the formation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, he became the leading proponent of the appropriations necessary to carry out the Government's program of development on the Tennessee River.

ORIGIN AND BACKGROUND OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The report of the Joint Committee Investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, made April 1, 1939, pursuant to Public Resolution No. 83, Seventy-fifth Congress (S. Doc. No. 56, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), contains on page 11 a chapter on origin and background of the Tennessee Valley Authority, from which the following excerpts are quoted:

"The Tennessee Valley Authority statute enacts no radical or even novel program. Tennessee Valley Authority is, rather, the latest stage of a long evolutionary process in the development of the policies of the Federal Government in navigable rivers. To understand the Authority it is necessary to trace this development, culminating in the synthesis of what were once thought of as divergent uses—navigation, flood control, power—into a single unified river control.

"The interest of the Federal Government in rivers, and particularly in the Tennessee, goes back more than a century. Federal control over navigation was established in the case of Gibbons v. Ogden in 1824. Shortly thereafter President Monroe sent to the Congress a report by Secretary of War Calhoun recommending a national plan for roads, canals, and river improvements, including a survey of Muscle Shoals, as one of the most important projects for improvement of navigation.

"Several attempts were made to build a canal around Muscle Shoals. Between 1852 and 1918, 17 surveys and projects were authorized on the Tennessee and 10 on its tributaries. As early as 1909 Congress authorized a survey for a 6-foot channel from Knoxville to Chattanooga and a 9-foot channel from Chattanooga to Paducah.

"The idea of a dual project appeared in 1899 when the Congress granted an application to construct a canal and power stations, which was not, however, undertaken. President Theodore Roosevelt, 4 years later, in vetoing a similar project, expressed the principle of combining different utilities in the same project: * * *

"The principle of allocation, that the receipts from power should be made to cover the costs of the improvement so far as practicable, is here stated in clear terms. * * *

"In 1906 the Muscle Shoals Hydro Electric Power Co. proposed a joint investment with the Government in a navigation and power project, but this and other similar plans were rejected by the Congress. * * *

"In 1912 the National Waterways Commission recognized that the Federal Government would be required to combine the conflicting interests of navigation, flood control, water power, and irrigation on the great rivers: * * *

"This principle of combining multiple uses in single structures is to be taken in conjunction with the previously stated principle of using power to help pay for the project. * * *

"A report from the Corps of Engineers in 1916 showed that nearly $10,000,000 had been spent on the river, with some improvement to navigation but without completing the work. An exhaustive study over a 5-year period led to a plan adopted in the River and Harbor Act of 1930, looking to a 9-foot channel to be obtained by building 32 low dams or 7 high dams.

"The leasing of surplus water power by the Secretary of the Interior at dams operated by the Reclamation Service was authorized in 1906 in an amendment to the Reclamation Act of 1902. Flood control was recognized as a proper feature of multiple-use dams, in the report of the Inland Waterways Commission appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1907. Reforestation of headwater areas was mentioned as an element in stream regulation in the comprehensive statute of 1911 and in a report of the Geological Survey in the same year. Fertilizer as a means of soil conservation was noted by the Bureau of Soils under President Taft, with the observation that—"Fertilizers * * * involve problems * * * which obviously call for governmental assistance." Thus, the various elements that were to be combined in the Authority were appearing as public responsibilities even before the World War.

"The problems of national defense presented by the World War changed the picture and brought definite action. In 1916 the Chief of Engineers suggested that the plans of Muscle Shoals Hydro Electric Power Co. for developing Muscle Shoals be held up for consideration of the possibility of nitrate production, in view of our dependence on imported nitrates."

At this stage of events, in 1916, Senator MCKELLAR was then a Member of the House of Representatives and ranked third on the Military Affairs Committee of the House, of which James Hay, of Virginia, was chairman. He had served in the House from 1911, when he was elected to fill the unexpired term created by the death of General Gordon, until 1916, when he was elected to the United States Senate.

FORMATION OF SECTION 124 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT OF 1916

The House Committee on Military Affairs began hearings in January 1916, and on March 6, 1916, reported out a bill prepared in the committee. The minutes of the committee do not show the responsibility of any individual members for any particular section of the bill. The bill as prepared by Chairman Hay was considered section by section for several days in the committee and was unanimously reported from the committee.

Mr. MCKELLAR, though not taking part on the bill, was present in the committee at all times when action was taken and voted consistently on the floor in favor of the bill.

The members of the House committee at that time were Hay (chairman), Dent, McKellar, Quin, Gordon, Littlepage, Shallenberger, Dill, Caldwell, Wise, Olney, Nicholl, Kahn, Anthony, McKenzie, Greene, Morin, Tilson, Crago, and Hull.

The nitrate provision in the bill as reported stated:

"SEC. 82. That to provide for the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen by the development of water power, or any other means, necessary to establish an adequate supply of nitrogen, the appropriation of such sum or sums of money to construct the necessary plant for such purpose is hereby authorized."

This section was stricken from the bill as it passed the House on March 23, 1916, by a vote of 224 to 180. In the Senate the bill from the Senate Military Affairs Committee was substituted in its entirety for the House bill, with no provision being made for nitrates.

Senator Smith, of South Carolina, on April 7, 1916, introduced an amendment to the national defense bill based on his bill (S. 4971) as reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry "to authorize the designation and withdrawal of water-power sites and the construction of water-power and other plants by the United States for the manufacture of nitrates."

He based the interest of the Agriculture Committee on the startling fact that no other bill had taken cognizance of the need for nitric acid and its use for explosives in time of war and for fertilizers in time of peace.

The nitrate provision was attacked in the House by many of the Members, including Mr. Lenroot and Mr. Longworth, but it finally became section 124 of the bill which passed on the adoption of the second conference report in the House on May 20, 1916.

Thus was formed section 124 of the National Defense Act of 1916, which was the legislative basis for the Muscle Shoals development and was the antecedent of provisions now contained in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

In view of its importance in the history of events, section 124 is quoted here in full.

Section 124 of the National Defense Act of 1916 as passed reads as follows:

"SEC. 124. Nitrate supply: The President of the United States is hereby authorized and empowered to make, or cause to be made, such investigation as, in his judgment, is necessary to determine the best, cheapest, and most available means for the production of nitrates and other products for munitions of war and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers and other useful products by water power or any other power as, in his judgment, is the best and cheapest to use; and is also hereby authorized and empowered to designate for the exclusive use of the United States, if, in his judgment, such means is best and cheapest, such site or sites, upon any navigable or nonnavigable river or rivers or upon the public lands, as, in his opinion, will be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act; and is further authorized to construct, maintain, and operate, at or on any site or sites so designated, dams, locks, improvements to navigation, power-houses, and other plants and equipment or other means than water power as, in his judgment is the best and cheapest, necessary, or convenient for the generation of electrical or other power and for the production of nitrates or other products needed for munitions of war and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers and other useful products.

"The President is authorized to lease, purchase, or acquire, by condemnation, gift, grant, or devise, such lands and rights-of-way as may be necessary for the construction and operation of such plants, and to take from any lands of the United States, or to purchase or acquire by condemnation materials, minerals, and processes, patented or otherwise, necessary for the construction and operation of such plants and for the manufacture of such products.

"The products of such plants shall be used by the President for military and naval purposes to the extent that he may deem necessary, and any surplus which he shall determine is not required shall be sold and disposed of by him under such regulations as he may prescribe.

"The President is hereby authorized and empowered to employ such officers, agents, or agencies as may in his discretion be necessary to enable him to carry out the purposes herein specified, and to authorize and require such officers, agents, or agencies to perform any and all of the duties imposed upon him by the provisions hereof.

"The sum of $20,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, available until expended, to enable the President of the United States to carry out the purposes herein provided for.

"The plant or plants provided for under this act shall be constructed and operated solely by the Government and not in conjunction with any other industry or enterprise carried on by private capital.

"In order to raise the money appropriated by this act and necessary to carry its provisions into effect, the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the President of the United States, may issue and sell, or use for such purpose of construction hereinabove authorized, any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to a total amount not to exceed $20,000,000: *Provided*, That any Panama Canal bonds issued and sold or used under the provisions of this section may be made payable at such time after issue as the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may deem advisable, and fix, instead of 50 years after date of issue, as in said act of August 5, 1909, not exceeding 50 years."

'SECTION 124 SAVED ON POINT OF ORDER AND DEBATE BY M'KELLAR

February 21, 1917, during the debate in the House on the Army appropriation bill Mr. Longworth of Ohio submitted the following amendment:

"On page 48, line 2, strike out '$150,000' and insert in lieu thereof the following: '$140,000, and that section 124 of an act entitled An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes, approved June 3, 1916, is hereby repealed.' "

Mr. Longworth stated at the time:

"Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment, if adopted, will be to repeal section 124 of the National Defense Act, the act which authorizes the expenditure of $20,000,000 for the acquisition of a nitrate plant.

"Gentlemen will observe that up to now none of that money has been expended, and that no site has been chosen, and no recommendation made. Therefore the effect of my amendment, if adopted, will be to save to the Government of the United States $20,000,000 that I regard as a useless expenditure of the public money."

He went on at considerable length to scathingly denounce the expenditure.

Mr. McKELLAR argued the nitrate proposition with Mr. Longworth and finally made a point of order against the amendment, as follows (p. 3824, vol. 54, pt. 4):

"The mere fact that incidentally if this nitrate plant is established on the Tennessee River it will open up that entire river to navigation is no objection to it. It is absolutely apparent that the Government needs nitrate and needs to manufacture it in our own country. It needs to be done in the cheapest manner possible. It is believed from expert testimony that it can be done by water power cheaper than by any other method, provided we can get water power in sufficient quantity. It is understood that on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals you can get more water power than anywhere else in the country, unless it be at some place in Oregon very near the coast and outside of the safety zone. There is no doubt whatever about the Muscle Shoals being the ideal place in all the United States for the location of this plant. That is why these gentlemen down there on the Tennessee River have believed that this was the proper place for it. Now, I say this because I do not believe that the plan to establish this nitrate plant upon the Tennessee River is subject to the criticism that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Longworth] has seen fit to visit upon it, and if the point of order has not been made. I make the point of order against the amendment, because it is not a germane amendment."

The point of order was then argued, but was sustained in a lengthy ruling by Mr. Saunders as the chairman.

NAMING OF MUSCLE SHOALS

Under the provisions of section 124 of the National Defense Act of 1916, President Wilson had two committees organized to report upon processes for nitrogen fixation. The first committee, from the National Academy of Sciences, and the American Chemical Society, submitted a final report on January 20, 1917. The second committee, from the Bureau of Mines and the Ordnance Department, submitted a final report on April 30, 1917, after making studies abroad. These reports were reviewed and coordinated by a third committee.

At this same time President Wilson had organized a committee on the location of the nitrate plant, consisting of Secretaries of War, Agriculture, and Interior, which held hearings at places in the East and South, but made no formal report, since the urgent need of the Ordnance Department for ammonia (as a result of the declaration of war on April 6, 1917) compelled earlier action by the President.

The studies of the War Department, meanwhile had indicated four places as particularly favorable for the location of the experimental nitrate plant, including Sheffield, Ala., at the foot of Muscle Shoals. President Wilson finally made the decision by placing on the edge of the memorandum before him "Advise Chief of Staff I have selected Sheffield." On September 28, 1917, accordingly, the Secretary of War notified the Chief of Ordnance that the President had decided upon Sheffield as the location for nitrate plant No. 1.

Muscle Shoals was selected as the site immediately after the visit of Senator McKELLAR and Senator Underwood to President Wilson.

Continuing with the excerpts from the report of the Joint Committee Investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority (S. Doc. No. 56, 76th Cong., 1st sess.):

"Section 124 of the National Defense Act authorized the President to determine the best means of producing nitrates and to build dams and power equipment for this purpose. Two nitrate plants were built but not fully equipped at Muscle Shoals; and Wilson Dam, the most important of three planned by the Corps of Engineers, was completed in 1925.

"After the war, various attempts were made to find a use for the Muscle Shoals plants. A bill to set up a Government corporation to sell fertilizer and power failed of passage in the House. * * *

"Meanwhile, there were various attempts to interest private industry in the Muscle Shoals plants. In 1921 Henry Ford offered to complete the dams and lease them for 100 years and to purchase the nitrate and steam plants for $5,000,000 and produce fertilizers to be sold at an 8-percent profit. This offer passed the House but was rejected in the Senate."

Senator McKELLAR was favorable to the Ford offer, took active part in the debate in the Senate, and offered several amendments, some of which were accepted and others rejected, to the bill that finally failed of passage in 1925, Mr. Ford having withdrawn his offer October 18, 1924.

"There were many other proposals. A commission, appointed by President Coolidge in 1925, recommended that the properties should be used to make nitrogen compounds but not to sell power. A joint committee was directed to negotiate with private interests to lease the property, but was unsuccessful. In March 1928 the Senate adopted a resolution of Senator Norris providing for construction of a transmission line to sell power. The Alabama Power Co. had at that time the only line to the plant. The House substituted a bill for a corporation to produce and sell both fertilizer and power, which passed both Houses on May 25, 1928. This bill provided among other things for a dam on Cove Creek, now Norris Dam. The bill was pocket-vetoed by President Coolidge.

"A similar bill was vetoed by President Hoover on March 3, 1931, on the ground, among others, that the Government should not compete with its citizens. At President Hoover's suggestion, the Muscle Shoals Commission was appointed. The Commission recommended a 50-year lease of Muscle Shoals and the construction of Cove Creek (Norris) Dam for 'navigation, flood control, and incidental power development.' "

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS BY SENATOR M'KELLAR TO GET THE MUSCLE SHOALS PROPERTIES OPERATED

During this time referred to in the joint committee's report when Congress was seeking some way to get the Muscle Shoals properties operated, Senator McKELLAR was constantly active and proposed the following:

December 6, 1923, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 12 on the Ford offer, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with no action taken; Senate Joint Resolution 14, to investigate the legal right of the Secretary of War to dispose of the Gorgas plant at Muscle Shoals, which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with no action taken; and Senate Joint Resolution 18, authorizing an investigation of charges regarding lobbying against the resolution accepting the Ford offer, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with no action taken.

December 3, 1924, offered an amendment to the McKenzie bill on the Ford offer to limit leasing to American citizens, which was agreed to; also offered an amendment that power in interstate commerce shall be regulated by the Secretary of War, which was rejected. Senator McKELLAR participated at great length in the day-after-day debate. The McKenzie bill failed of final passage after getting to conference.

In March 1925, during the special session, Senator McKELLAR offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That a select committee of four Senators be appointed by the Vice President, two Republicans and two Democrats, two of whom voted for what is known as the Underwood proposal for the disposition of Muscle Shoals and two of whom voted against that proposal, which committee shall investigate, during the coming recess of Congress, the question of what is the best disposition to make of the Shoals property and report its findings and recommendations to the Senate at the next session of the Congress to be held in December 1925."

The resolution also provided for holding hearings and for visiting Ontario for a power study but failed on the objection of Senators Bruce and Jones.

February 1, 1926, introduced S. 3081, to create a commission for Muscle Shoals, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and no action was taken on it. (This bill is printed in full in later pages.)

January 17, 1927, Senator McKELLAR introduced an amendment to the Federal Power Act, to limit jurisdiction to navigable streams.

March 1, 1927, he presented the following notices to suspend the rule and offer amendments to the second deficiency appropriation bill:

"To enable the Secretary of War to be on a fair basis in securing current generated at Muscle Shoals, Ala., the sum of $2,000,000 is hereby appropriated to be used by the Secretary at his discretion for building transmission lines from Muscle Shoals to such point, or points, as he may select."

Also:

"*Provided further*, The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to use any funds at his disposal for river and harbor work not exceeding $200,000 for the purpose of making investigations and borings to ascertain and report to the Congress the feasibility of building a dam on Clinch River at Cove Creek, Tenn. (afterward named Norris Dam) and in the event the Federal Power Commission shall issue either a permit or a license to any private company under the Federal Power Act, such company shall repay to the United States the money so expended by the Secretary of War."

No action was taken on these proposed floor amendments.

December 9, 1927, introduced S. 839, to create a commission for Muscle Shoals, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with no action taken.

March 12, 1928, and on the following day, Senator McKELLAR materially aided in the formation of Senate Joint Resolution 46 as presented by Senator Norris, which was later pocket-vetoed by President Coolidge. He offered the following amendment, which became section 3 in the final passage:

"The Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out the purposes of this act shall locate a fertilizer plant in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, in Alabama, and there shall be turned over to him the nitrate plant, together with the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 1, and such other buildings, houses, and shops there located as shall be necessary for the Secretary and his employees in the construction and maintenance and operation of such plants; and when such fertilizer plant is thus located and established in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals all the power necessary for the requirements of said plant shall be supplied from said steam plant located at nitrate plant No. 2 or from dam No. 2."

And section 2, as finally passed, contained amendments submitted by Senator McKELLAR and other Senators to Senator Norris, as follows:

"(e) Whenever the Secretary determines that it is commercially feasible to produce any such fertilizer, it shall be produced in the largest quantities practicable, and shall be disposed of at the lowest prices practicable, to meet the agricultural demands therefor, and to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to make alterations, modifications, or improvements in existing plants and facilities and to construct and operate new plants and facilities in order to effectuate properly the provisions of this section."

January 5, 1929, introduced S. 5218, which he explained as being the provisions that were not objectionable in the vetoed bill, authorizing the Secretary of War to build the transmission lines and dispose of the power, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with no action taken.

April 29, 1929, Senator McKELLAR introduced S. 813, to create a commission for Muscle Shoals, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with no action taken. Also reintroduced as S. 815, the bill authorizing the Secretary of War to build the transmission lines and dispose of the power.

March 3, 1931, Senator McKELLAR argued at length on the overriding of the veto of President Hoover on Senate Joint Resolution 49, during which Senator Norris stated President Hoover had proposed a new solution, "Turn Muscle Shoals over to Alabama and Tennessee." The bill failed to pass over the veto for lack of two-thirds on a roll-call vote of 49 yeas to 34 nays.

THE PROTOTYPE OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT

Among these legislative proposals submitted by Senator McKELLAR is one that stands out as a likely forerunner and prototype of the eventual Tennessee Valley Authority Act, but since it was submitted during the Coolidge administration it received no favorable action. While not at all phrased in the same language, it does contain many of the principles which were later enacted into the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and might well have superseded it under a friendly administration.

The bill was S. 3081, introduced by Senator McKELLAR on February 1, 1926—7 years before Tennessee Valley Authority—and is in full as follows:

"A bill to create a commission for Muscle Shoals, and for other purposes

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Muscle Shoals Commission (hereinafter in this act referred to as the 'commission') to be composed of three members, one of whom shall be the Director of Fixed Nitrogen Research Laboratory in the Department of Agriculture, and his successors in office, and who shall be a member of this commission, ex officio, and the other two commissioners shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall hold their offices for a term of 4 years and until their successors are appointed and qualified. The salaries of all three of said commissioners shall be $7,500 a year, payable monthly, but the salary herein authorized to be paid to the Director of Fixed Nitrogen shall be in lieu of any salary now paid him as director.

"TRANSFER OF PLANTS AND FACILITIES

"SEC. 2. The United States nitrate plants Nos. 1 and 2, located, respectively, at Sheffield, Ala., and Muscle Shoals, Ala., together with all real estate and buildings used in connection therewith, all tools, machinery, equipment, accessories, and material thereunto belonging, and all laboratories and steam and other plants used as auxiliaries thereto; the Fixed Nitrogen Research Laboratory; the Waco limestone quarry in Alabama; and dam No. 2, located in the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, its powerhouse, and all of its hydro-electric and operating appurtenances (except the locks), and all machinery, lands, and buildings in connection therewith, are hereby transferred to the Commission for use by it in executing the functions vested in it by this act.

"FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION

"SEC. 3. In carrying out the provisions of this act all functions vested in the President by the first two paragraphs of section 124 of the act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916 (including such of those functions as are now being exercised by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture, respectively) shall be exercised by the Commission.

"DEVELOPMENT OF POWER

"SEC. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized and directed to utilize to the fullest extent the plants and facilities made available to it under sections 2 and 3, and to construct, maintain, and operate such additional plants and facilities as it considers necessary, for the development of power by steam or water, at Muscle Shoals, for the purposes specified in section 5. Any excess power developed may be disposed of, under such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe, as hereinafter provided.

"(b) In the disposition of such excess power the commission may give preference to the power requirements of States and political subdivisions of States, including municipalities, and thereafter dispose of the remainder to farmers, manufacturers, and all other users or distributors of current, whether individuals, partnerships, associations, or corporations, in territory within economical transmission distance from Muscle Shoals, equitably and without discrimination, and without reference to State lines, and at rates fair and reasonable and as low as practicable. The commission is authorized and directed to make classifications and shall serve all customers in the same class at like rates and under same conditions of service, and no locality or section shall be favored over any other locality or section. Should the commission sell a portion of such power to a public-utility company for distribution, it shall have the power and it is hereby directed to regulate by provisions in the contract the prices to be charged by such utility company in the resale of such power to consumers. In fixing a basis of rates the commission shall consider (1) the cost of operation; (2) the cost of repairs and replacements; (3) the actual value of the steam plant; and (4) the cost of the plant at dam No. 2 expended after the World War, less the reasonable cost of the navigation facilities of the enterprise, and the current used in the manufacture of fertilizers. After fixing the aggregate of these costs and expenditures the commission shall fix rates so as to bring in income not in excess of 4 percent per annum.

"(c) In order to dispose of such power in the manner which the commission considers most advantageous to the United States and to the public interest, the commission may enter into leases for terms of years not exceeding 10, may make contracts, may construct and/or operate either singly or with any State or political subdivision thereof, or any individual partnership, association, or corporation, transmission lines, or other power projects, and do all other acts which it considers necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act. Any of such power shall be subject to recall when and as needed for the production of fertilizer or ingredients to be used for fertilizer; but such recall of such power shall be made in a fair and just manner, looking to just rights of all users.

"PRODUCTION OF FERTILIZER

"SEC. 5. (a) In order to further develop the art of nitrogen fixation, experiments shall be undertaken to produce mixed fertilizers on a commercial scale, so that the actual cost of such fertilizers may be determined. Fertilizers produced as a result of such experiments shall be offered to farmers, farm organizations, and to dealers at such prices as will cover the cost of production; or, in the event that the cost of production of such fertilizers is excessive, they shall be offered at prices which the commission finds fair in order to meet commercial competition. In order that definite results may be obtained in such experiments, the facilities and equipment for each such experiment shall be utilized until it is satisfactorily shown that it is or is not commercially feasible to produce fertilizers by the method or process used in such experiment. The result of each such experiment and a statement of cost and sale prices of the fertilizer so produced shall be reported to Congress in the annual report provided for in section 9.

"(b) Whenever the commission determines that it is commercially feasible to produce

any such fertilizers, it shall be produced in the largest quantities practicable, and shall be disposed of at the lowest prices practicable, to meet the agricultural demands therefor, and to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"(c) The commission is authorized to make alterations, modifications, or improvements in existing plants and facilities, to dispose of any part of such facilities, and to construct and operate new plants and facilities in order to properly effectuate the provisions of this section.

"(d) Should processes for the economical production of nitrogen be developed by the commission, the use of such processes may be transferred to other manufacturers of fertilizer or fertilizer ingredients on condition that the transferee shall agree to resell fertilizers at rates to be regulated by the commission so that no more than a reasonable profit shall be exacted: *Provided*, That the commission shall not have power by the transfer of such processes to regulate rates so as to form a monopoly, but such regulation shall at all times keep in view commercial competition.

"MUSCLE SHOALS FUND

"SEC. 6. There is hereby established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the 'Muscle Shoals fund,' and all amounts received by the Commission in executing the functions vested in it by this act, together with all amounts appropriated or made available by section 7, shall be covered into such fund, and are reserved, set aside, and appropriated to be available for use by the Congress in building dam No. 3 as provided in this act and by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 7. All unexpended balances of the amount appropriated under section 124 of the act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, and all unexpended balances of appropriations made for Muscle Shoals under any act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department are hereby transferred to the Muscle Shoals fund and made available for expenditure as are other amounts in such fund.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000,000, to be available until expended for the purposes of this act.

"CORPORATION

"SEC. 8. That said Commission is hereby incorporated under and by the name, style, and title of the 'Muscle Shoals Commission' (herein referred to as the Commission). Said corporation shall exist until the Congress shall repeal this provision of the act. Said corporation shall have power—

"(1) To adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

"(2) To sue and be sued and to complain and to defend in any court of law and equity within the United States;

"(3) To make and enforce such contracts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

"(4) To appoint and fix the salaries of such advisers and experts and, in accordance with the civil-service laws, appoint and, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, fix the compensation of such other officers and employees and make such expenditures, including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, for lawbooks, periodicals, and books of reference, and for printing and binding, as may be necessary, for the execution of the functions vested in the commission and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time.

"(5) To prescribe, amend, and repeal by-laws not inconsistent with this act for the conduct of its business;

"(6) In the name of the United States Government to exercise the right of eminent domain, and in the purchase of any real estate or in the acquisition of real estate by condemnation proceedings the title to such real estate shall be taken in the name of the United States Government;

"(7) To exercise all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred upon it by this act, and such additional powers as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

"(8) To purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire United States or foreign patents and processes or the right to use such patents or processes, and to obtain from the United States or foreign countries patents for discoveries or inventions of its officers or employees; and

"(9) The Commission shall, to the extent deemed advisable by it, exercise its functions by and through the Department of War and the Department of Agriculture, and the engineering, technical, clerical, and other personnel of such departments. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture shall detail for service with the Commission such of the personnel of their respective departments as the Commission deems necessary in carrying out the provisions of this act.

"(10) All of the stock in said Corporation shall be in the name of the United States and shall be voted by the Commissioners in equal amounts.

"(11) The Board of Directors shall be the members of the Commission above named.

"ANNUAL REPORT AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) The Commission shall submit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session a detailed report of its operations for the preceding fiscal year.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to effectuate the functions vested in it by this act.

"PROVISION FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

"SEC. 10. The Commission shall utilize the plants and facilities under its jurisdiction and shall dispose of the power developed under authority of section 5 in such manner and subject to the limitation that in the event of a national emergency such plants and facilities and such power shall be immediately available for use by the United States for national defense.

"DAM NO. 3

"SEC. 11. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to complete the construction of dam No. 3 in the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Ala., in accordance with report submitted in House Document 1262, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may in his discretion make such modifications in the plants presented in such report as he may deem advisable in the interest of power or navigation and such sums as may be necessary for the construction of dam No. 3 are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the funds, when available, arising under sections 6 and 7 of this act."

Continuing with excerpts from the joint committee's report:

"When President Franklin D. Roosevelt came into office, the idea of unified management of the river was well developed but was opposed by the idea that power ought not to be sold in competition with private interests. Numerous unsuccessful efforts had been made on the one hand to find a way of turning the plants over to private operation and on the other to operate them as part of a general river program. President Roosevelt took the side of public operation * * *.

"On April 10, 1933, in a brief message to Congress, President Roosevelt said:

"'It is clear that the Muscle Shoals development is but a small part of the potential public usefulness of the entire Tennessee River. Such use, if envisioned in its entirety, transcends mere power development: It enters the wide fields of flood control, soil erosion, afforestation, elimination from agricultural use of marginal lands, and distribution and diversification of industry. In short, this power development of war days leads logically to national planning for a complete river watershed involving many States and the future lives and welfare of millions. It touches and gives life to all forms of human concerns.

"'I, therefore, suggest to the Congress legislation to create a Tennessee Valley Authority—a corporation clothed with the power of Government but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of a private enterprise. It should be charged with the broadest duty of planning for the proper use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River drainage basin and its adjoining territory for the general social and economic welfare of the Nation. This authority should also be clothed with the necessary power to carry these plans into effect. Its duty should be the rehabilitation of the Muscle Shoals development and the coordination of it with the wider plan.'

"The Tennessee Valley Authority Act therefore, was an outgrowth of many previous attempts to deal with Muscle Shoals, as well as a development of long-standing public policies in regard to navigation and flood control. The main feature of the act was the combination of all the governmental interests connected with the river, and the creation of a regional agency based on local, State, and Federal cooperation, to drive all these interests in a single team for the general benefit of the region and of the Nation."

FORMATION OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT

April 11, 1933, the day following the President's message, bills were introduced to accomplish the purpose therein stated.

Senator Norris introduced S. 1272, which was reported immediately, with minor amendments, from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

In the House, identical bills were introduced by Mr. McSwain, Mr. Almon, and Mr. Hill, which were all referred to the House Committee on Military Affairs. The bill of Mr. Hill, H. R. 5081, with certain amendments, was reported out.

The difference between the reported bills was stated by Mr. HILL on the floor of the House on April 22, 1933, as follows:

"As the Norris bill now stands, it has none of these business elements that I have been talking about. There is nothing in the Norris bill today that would cause the Authority to amortize out the cost of any dam. There is nothing in that bill that would cause the Authority to pay any interest to the Government for any money that might be used in the construction of a dam. This bill is on a much better business basis."

Mr. McSwain, chairman of the House committee, also stated on April 24, 1933:

"Why, I have introduced at this session of Congress two bills on Muscle Shoals. On the 9th of March I introduced the first bill that proposed to call the corporation that should be created the Tennessee Valley Authority. I set up in that bill my individual views about how this project should be developed.

"Then, after we had conferred with the President, I introduced another bill, which was H. R. 4559, identical with the bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Almon) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILL). These bills represented in principle, along with Senator Norris' bill, not identical as to words, the views of the President of the United States.

"It is not improper for me to say that when my friend Mr. Norris and I conferred with the President, he said to us, 'You gentlemen draw the bills that you think represent our collective views that we have been expressing here'; and it was never understood or contemplated that the bill that would be introduced by myself or Mr. HILL and Mr. Almon on this end of the Capitol would be identical in every particular respect with the bill to be introduced by Senator Norris."

There were various substitutions of sections and parts of sections between the Senate and the House, and finally the bill that passed bore the number of H. R. 5081, introduced by Mr. HILL; S. 1272, introduced by Senator NORRIS, having been indefinitely postponed.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was thus created by the approval of H. R. 5081 on May 18, 1933 (Public, No. 17, 73d Cong.). All that was needed to start the operation and begin the construction of the contemplated dams in the development of the Tennessee River were the appropriations.

MEMBERSHIP OF SENATOR M'KELLAR ON SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

The record shows that Senator MCKELLAR took a leading part in securing the necessary appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority in order to construct the many dams and install the needed facilities.

Senator MCKELLAR was first appointed to the Senate Appropriations Committee on December 10, 1923, at the beginning of the Sixty-eighth Congress and just 3 months after Calvin Coolidge became President on the death of Warren G. Harding. The members of the committeee at that time were Francis E. Warren, Wyoming; Reed Smoot, Utah; Wesley L. Jones, Washington; Charles Curtis, Kansas; Frederick Hale, Maine; Selden P. Spencer, Missouri; Lawrence C. Phipps, Colorado; William B. McKinley, Illinois; Irvine L. Lenroot, Wisconsin; Henry W. Keyes, New Hampshire; Lee S. Overman, North Carolina; William J. Harris, Georgia; Carter Glass, Virginia; Andrieus A. Jones, New Mexico; Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; Edwin S. Broussard, Louisiana; Thomas F. Bayard, Delaware; M. M. Neely, West Virginia.

By the Seventy-second Congress, under the Hoover administration, Senator MCKELLAR had advanced to second on the minority side of the committee.

In the Seventy-third Congress, under the Roosevelt administration, Senator MCKELLAR was second only to Chairman CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, on the committee.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress, during the absence of Chairman GLASS, Senator MCKELLAR had taken a leading part as acting chairman of the committee.

HISTORY OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority (Public, No. 17, 73d Cong.), approved May 18, 1933, provided in section 27:

"All appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of this act are hereby authorized."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1934

Fifty million dollars was allocated to the Tennessee Valley Authority from the appropriation for National Industrial Recovery Administration of $3,300,000,000 carried in the Fourth Deficiency Appropriation Act approved June 16, 1933 (Public, No. 77, 73d Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1935

Twenty-five million dollars was allocated to the Tennessee Valley Authority from the appropriation to carry out a number of acts, including the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, of $899,675,000 carried in the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved June 19, 1934 (Public, No. 412, 73d Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1936

Thirty-six million dollars was the amount of the first direct appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority, carried in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved August 12, 1935 (Public, No. 260, 74th Cong.).

DETAILS AS TO SECURING FIRST DIRECT APPROPRIATION

The Budget estimates for the independent offices appropriation bill, 1936, considered in conection with the Second Deficiency Act, 1935, contained an item of $300,000,000 for public works, of which $50,000,000 was proposed to be allocated to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The bill as it passed the House made no reference to any dams to be constructed by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Hearings began before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies of the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 24, 1935; those present being Senators Adams (chairman), McKellar, Hayden, Tydings, Hale, Keyes, and Dickinson. Two sessions of these hearings were devoted to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Senator MCKELLAR proposed to the subcommittee the following amendment: *"Provided,* That for the purposes of securing uninterrupted navigation on the Tennessee River from, at, or near Knoxville to the Ohio River and maximum flood control in the Tennessee, Ohio, and Mississippi River Basins and of otherwise carrying out the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, the Tennessee Valley Authority is authorized and directed, out of the funds herein and heretofore appropriated, to continue the construction of Norris Dam, Wheeler Dam, and Pickwick Dam, to begin a dam at or near Guntersville, Ala., a dam at Chickamauga Creek on the Tennessee River and the Fowlers Bend Dam on the Hiwassee River, a dam at or near Aurora Landing, and at Whites Creek on the Tennessee River."

Senator MCKELLAR also stated:

"The purpose of this amendment is that, last year, when a similar appropriation was made, we were told by the head of the Tennessee Valley Authority, that these dams would be built. Senator BAILEY, let me pass this down to you, if you will. We were told that these four dams were to be built. Only one has been started, and we think that the Congress ought to direct that the money be used for the purpose of building dams."

Statements were also made in these hearings by Senators BAILEY and Reynolds, of North Carolina, and Congressman WEAVER, of North Carolina.

Three days later, June 27, 1935, Senator BARKLEY also appeared as a witness in favor of the appropriation, particularly as to Aurora Landing.

Senator Adams, chairman of the subcommittee, read from a lengthy letter he had received from Arthur E. Morgan, chairman of the board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, stating that Aurora should be investigated first to determine whether the building of another dam might make Aurora unnecessary, and similar reasons on the other dams, and requesting a moderate appropriation to build approach roads to the Hiwassee Dam so the equipment at Norris Dam could be transferred to there instead of being dismantled. (The complete letter is in the hearings at pp. 88 to 90.)

Senator MCKELLAR replied:

"That just illustrates our friend, Dr. Morgan. Last Saturday he agreed with me on every word in this resolution except—wait a minute, let me show you what he afterward put in—except this—

" 'And maximum flood control in the Tennessee, Ohio, and Mississippi River Basins, and of otherwise carrying out the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933.'

"Those were sent to me, Monday, and inserted in this resolution.

"The remainder of the resolution, as to the five dams, were absolutely agreed upon by Dr. Morgan and me, on last Saturday, and at his earnest request; and I say that his change of mind is just indicative of what has happened before; and the only way we will get these dams built is for the Congress to direct them to be built."

The amendment, as included in the bill by the Senate subcommittee, approved by the full committee and the Senate, and finally enacted into law, was as follows: "the continued construction of Norris Dam, Wheeler Dam, Pickwick Landing Dam, and the beginning of construction on a dam at or near Guntersville, Ala., and a dam at or near Chickamauga Creek, both on the Tennessee River, and a dam on the Hiwassee River, a tributary of the Tennessee River, at or near Fowlers Bend, and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the location and desirability of a dam at or near Aurora Landing, a dam at or near Whites Creek."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1937

The Budget estimates for the independent offices appropriation bill, 1937, considered in connection with the first deficiency bill, 1936, contained an item of $43,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the following as to the dams: "including the continued construction of Norris Dam, Wheeler Dam, Pickwick Landing Dam, and the beginning and continuation of construction on a dam at or near Guntersville, Ala., and a dam at or near Chickamauga Creek, and a dam at or near Whites Creek, all on the Tennessee River, and a dam on the Hiwassee River, a tributary of the Tennessee River, at or near Fowlers Bend, and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the location and desirability of a dam at or near Aurora Landing and a dam at or near Coulter Shoals."

The deficiencies subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee added the following amendment, which was approved by the full committee and the Senate but was lost in conference: "the construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky., and a dam at or near Watts Bar."

The amendment was the result of two identical amendments offered by Senator MCKELLAR and Senator BARKLEY requesting $1,000,000 additional for each of these dams, necessary to complete navigation.

Thirty-nine million nine hundred thousand dollars was the amount finally approved in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936, approved June 22, 1936 (Public, No. 739, 74th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1938

The Budget estimates for the independent offices appropriation bill, 1938, considered in connection with the Second Deficiency Act, 1937, continued an item of $43,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the following as to the dams: "Including the continued construction of Pickwick Landing Dam, Guntersville Dam, Chickamauga Dam, and Hiwassee Dam, and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the appropriate location and type of dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries."

During the hearings before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies of the Senate Appropriations Committee, on May 3, 1937, Senator MCKELLAR stated as follows during the testimony of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, of the Tennessee Valley Authority:

"Senator MCKELLAR. It is my purpose to offer this amendment, and I want to get your views about it. On page 8, strike out the words in lines 8, 9, and 10: 'and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the appropriate location and type of a dam on the lower Tennessee River,' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'and for construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky., and a dam at or near Watts Bar,

Tenn., and for a preliminary investigation of a dam at or near Coulter's site on the Tennessee River, Tenn.'

"What have you to say in reference to that amendment?

"Dr. MORGAN. I would like to make an additional change by adding the words: 'and such other investigations on the upper Tennessee River and its tributaries as are essential to the development of a unified river-control system.'

"There is certain planning necessary, and it is very essential that before we finish these dams that we know how they fit into others—what is the relationship that is going to be. If we could get cheaper storage at some other site, we will cut down the total cost by adequate planning."

Dr. Morgan described Gilbertsville as the largest proposed unified river-control project, and stated in answer to questions that 4 years and five or six million dollars had been spent on planning investigations.

"Senator HALE. But what I want to know is whether you have definitely decided that you are going ahead at Gilbertsville, because this amendment of Senator MCKELLAR'S provides for starting construction, and also at Watts Bar.

"Dr. MORGAN. We are satisfied that the Gilbertsville Dam is an essential, profitable, and proper element of our construction. It is for Congress to tell us whether we are going ahead with it.

"Senator HALE. This amendment of Senator MCKELLAR'S does tell you to go ahead. So it is a very important amendment to be put in."

Dr. Morgan stated the Budget had cut the amount asked for from $2,750,000 to $750,000.

Senator BARKLEY also appeared as a witness and testified extensively on the amendment.

The subcommittee inserted the following amendment, which was approved by the full committee, passed by the Senate, and enacted into law: "and for the construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky., and for preliminary investigations of sites for dams at or near Watts Bar and at or near Coulter's Site on the Tennessee River, Tenn."

The vote in the full committee on May 10, 1937, relative to the amendment on Gilbertsville Dam was 9 to 8, as follows:

Ayes—9: McKellar, Hayden, Russell, McCarran, Overton, O'Mahoney, Duffy, Hitchcock, Nye.

Nays—8: Glass, Copeland, Byrnes, Adams, Green, Hale, Steiwer, Townsend.

Forty million one hundred and sixty-six thousand two hundred and seventy dollars was the amount carried for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937, approved May 28, 1937 (Public, No. 121, 75th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1939

The Budget estimates for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1939 were in the amount of $40,000,000, and contained the following as to the dams: "including the continued construction of Pickwick Landing Dam, Guntersville Dam, Chickamauga Dam, and Hiwassee Dam, and for construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky., and for preliminary investigations of sites for dams at or near Watts Bar and at or near (Coulter's Site) Coulter Shoals."

The House committee reduced the amount of the appropriation to $37,237,000, stating in its report as follows:

"Gilbertsville Dam: The committee has applied $2,613,000 of the cut to the Gilbertsville Dam, for which there was allotted $2,898,000, of which $185,000 was set up for 'project investigations,' the remainder being for construction on the dam and various other items incident to such construction. The committee has eliminated all items incident to construction."

On the floor of the House Mr. WIGGLESWORTH was successful in striking from the bill "and for the construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky."

The subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations restored this language, which was approved by the full committee and by the Senate and was finally enacted into law.

During the debate on the floor of the Senate on February 25, 1938, Senator MCKELLAR stated:

"Mr. President, I have only a few words to say regarding the pending amendment, which has to do with the Gilbertsville Dam. This same question was thoroughly discussed last year. In fact, this is the same fight that we had last year. Substantially the same arguments were then made; and the Senate, by a large majority, held that the Gilbertsville Dam should be built. Much money has already been spent, and to postpone the beginning of construction until next year would simply cost the Government more. While postponement is argued for, that is not the ultimate purpose. The purpose is to kill the project. The project ought to go on. * * *

"The effect of building the dams has already been to reduce power rates in that entire region. In north Alabama, Tennessee, and even in Arkansas, power rates have been reduced by the use of Tennessee Valley Authority power. The Tennessee Valley Authority has recommended building this dam. It has fixed the site, and $2,600,000 will be required to begin the dam; and that is all that is provided for by the amendment to the pending bill."

Forty million dollars was the amount carried for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1939, approved May 23, 1938 (Public, No. 534, 75th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1940

The Budget estimates for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1940 were in the amount of $40,000,000 and contained the following as to the dams: "including the continued construction of Pickwick Landing Dam, Guntersville Dam, Chickamauga Dam, Hiwassee Dam, Gilbertsville Dam, and for the construction of a dam at or near Watts Bar on the Tennessee River and for preliminary investigations of sites for dams at or near Coulter Shoals on the Tennessee River, and on tributaries of said river."

DETAILS AS TO THE CLOSE FIGHT ON GILBERTSVILLE, WATTS BAR, AND COULTER SHOALS DAMS

The bill as reported to the House provided for the continued construction of "Gilbertsville Dam, and for construction of a dam at or near Watts Bar on the Tennessee River, Tenn., and for preliminary investigations of a site for a dam at or near Coulter Shoals on the Tennessee River, Tenn."

Mr. Faddis, of Pennsylvania, on the floor of the House, was successful in having this language stricken from the bill, so that as it came to the Senate the bill made no reference to the Gilbertsville or Watts Bar Dams.

Senator MCKELLAR offered an amendment in the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to restore this language, which was approved after a close fight by the full committee, approved by the Senate, and enacted into law.

In the meeting of the full committee on Thursday, February 16, 1939, of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Deficiencies Subcommittee, Senator Adams, moved to strike out the Watts Bar Dam item, which was at first carried by a vote of 11 to 10, as follows:

Yeas—11: Byrnes, Tydings, Adams, Maloney, Hale, Townsend, Bridges, Lodge, Holman, Taft, and the chairman.

Nays—10: McKellar, Hayden, Thomas, Russell, McCarran, Overton, Bankhead, O'Mahoney, Truman, Green.

Senator MCKELLAR, after talking with Senator Nye, voted him against the motion of Senator Adams, creating a tie vote, and the committee adjourned to meet the next day.

When the committee met on Friday, February 17, 1939, Senator Adams asked that the amendment be divided into three parts: Gilbertsville, Watts Bar, and preliminary investigations of site at or near Coulter Shoals.

Gilbertsville was approved by a vote of 18 to 6, as follows:

Yeas—18: Glass, McKellar, Hayden, Thomas, Byrnes, Russell, Adams, McCarran, Overton, Bankhead, O'Mahoney, Truman, Burke, Green, Maloney, Chavez, Nye, Holman.

Nays—6: Tydings, Hale, Townsend, Bridges, Lodge, Taft.

Watts Bar, was adopted by a vote of 13 to 11, as follows:

Yeas—13: McKellar, Hayden, Thomas, Russell, McCarran, Overton, Bankhead, O'Mahoney, Truman, Green, Chavez, Nye, Holman.

Nays—11: Glass, Byrnes, Tydings, Adams, Burke, Maloney, Hale, Townsend, Bridges, Lodge, Taft.

Coulter Shoals was thereupon approved by a voice vote.

On the floor of the Senate, during the debate on the committee amendment and increasing the amount of the total appropriation for Tennessee Valley Authority from $21,797,000 to $39,003,000, Senator Adams again sought to defeat the amendment, as follows:

"Senator ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment to the amendment, to strike out the words beginning on line 5, after the word 'Gilbertsville', down to and including the words 'Watts Bar', on line 6, the language being 'and for the construction of a dam at or near Watts Bar.'

"Mr. President, this represents a point of issue which was discussed at length in the Committee on Appropriations. It represents a very definite issue which I wish to have submitted to the Senate.

"When the relief bill was before the Senate those of us who were arguing for a reduction in the amount to be appropriated were told that we should not begin economies with relief; that there were other places. There is now presented what some of us think a very good place, which is not subject to the objections which were made in reference to the relief bill.

"The Tennessee Valley Authority now has in the process of construction the dams on the list which appears in the pending bill, on lines 3 and 4, page 48, which includes the Pickwick Landing Dam, the Guntersville Dam, the Chickamauga Dam, the Hiwassee Dam, and the Gilbertsville Dam. The item which I have asked to have stricken out is the authorization for the construction of a new dam.

"In considering the item the committee divided, 13 to 11, and then only after most persuasive and effective efforts by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who is sometimes down but is never out. Twice during the committee's deliberations the Senator from Tennessee lost, but he always came back with another vote. The result was that our efforts to strike out this authorization for a new dam were defeated by a vote of 13 to 11, representing the vote of every Senator on the committee.

"The votes of the 11 members of the committee whose views I am seeking to express were in accord with the vote in the House of Representatives. The House eliminated both the Gilbertsville Dam and the Watts Bar Dam. The motion which I have made is merely to eliminate the authorization for the construction of a new dam upon which

work is not now being done, and it does seem that if we authorize the construction of the Gilbertsville Dam in addition to four other dams now being constructed, we are being extremely liberal.

"Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority has already spent over $220,000,000. The completion of the plans of the engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority will involve the expenditure of $560,000,000, and it does seem that at least we might be a little less impatient, that we might wait a little, and not crowd construction of a new dam while we have under construction four great dams involving expenditure of $200,000,000.

"The Gilbertsville Dam will involve a cost of $95,000,000 without the installation of power facilities. With the installation of power facilities the cost will run substantially over $100,000,000. Those Senators who have been here during the past few sessions know that the construction of the Gilbertsville Dam was authorized after vigorous battles, and I think I am not exaggerating when I say that it was only the persuasiveness of two great Senators from two great States, and the personal affections of many Senators, that secured the authorization of the Gilbertsville Dam."

After lengthy debate, during which Senator McKELLAR defended the Tennessee Valley Authority as having come through the recent investigation by a joint committee with a clean bill of health, the amendment offered by Senator Adams was rejected, 49 to 31.

Thirty-nine million three thousand dollars was the amount carried for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1940, approved March 16, 1939 (Public, No. 8, 76th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1941

The Budget estimates for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1941 were in the amount of $40,000,000, and contained the following as to the dams: "including the continued construction of Chickamauga Dam, Hiwassee Dam, Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, Ky., Watts Bar Dam, and for construction of a dam near Lenoir City, Tenn."

This language remained in the bill as it passed the House, and continued on through passage in the Senate and enactment into law. In the meeting of the full committee of Senate Appropriations Committee on January 31, 1940, Senator TAFT sought to strike out "and for construction of a dam near Lenoir City, Tenn.," but the motion was lost on a voice vote.

Forty million dollars was the amount carried for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1941, approved April 18, 1940 (Public, No. 459, 76th Cong.).

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE; PUBLIC RESOLUTION 95

Based on the supplemental estimates in Senate Document 241 (76th Cong., 3d sess.), identical resolutions were introduced by Senator McKELLAR (S. J. Res. 285) and Congressman TAYLOR (H. J. Res. 583) providing for $25,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority and stating: "including the funds necessary to begin construction of a dam on the Holston River near Jefferson City, Tenn.; to begin installation of two additional electric generating units at Wilson Dam, Ala., and one additional electric generating unit at Pickwick Landing Dam, Tenn.; and to begin construction of steam electric generating facilities with a rated capacity of approximately 120,000 kilowatts in the area served by the Authority."

The resolution was not changed as it came from the House.

At the meeting of the full committee of Senate Appropriations Committee on July 11, 1940, Senator Adams moved to strike out the references to construction of additional dam and hydroelectric facilities but to provide steam electric generating facilities to produce 220,000 kilowatts in lieu of approximately 120,000 referred to in the resolution. The motion was lost by a vote of 7 to 6, as follows:

Yeas—6: Hale, Lodge, Adams, Taft, Bridges, Townsend.

Nays—7: McKellar, Hayden, Thomas, Overton, O'Mahoney, Chavez, Holman.

Senator McKELLAR spoke at length on the resolution on the floor of the Senate.

Twenty-five million dollars was the amount provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority by the resolution approved July 31, 1940 (Public Res. 95, 76th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1942

The Budget estimates for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1942 were in the amount of $69,800,000, and contained the following as to the dams: "including continued construction of Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, Ky.; Watts Bar Dam and steam plant; Fort Loudoun Dam; and Cherokee Dam."

A supplemental estimate contained in Senate Document 11 was for $10,000,000 to expedite the work on the Fort Loudoun Dam.

On the Watts Bar and steam plant item, Senator McKELLAR, at the meeting of the full committee of Senate Appropriations Committee on February 24, 1941, moved to add: "including additional steam-electric generating facilities with a rated capacity of approximately 60,000 kilowatts," which was adopted by a show of hands, 9 to 4.

On the Fort Loudoun item the amendment adding $10,000,000 for expediting work on the dam was agreed to by a show of hands, 11 to 3.

Seventy-nine million eight hundred thousand dollars was the amount provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, approved April 5, 1941 (Public, No. 28, 77th Cong.).

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION IN PUBLIC, NO. 179

Supplemental estimates were made for Tennessee Valley Authority in House Document 230 (77th Cong., 1st sess.) in the amount of $40,000,000, and stated as to the dams: "Beginning construction of two additional hydroelectric projects and two additional storage projects on the Hiwassee River and its tributaries, (2) installing additional electric generating units in existing hydroelectric projects owned by the Authority, and (3) building the transmission facilities needed to connect these projects and units to the existing transmission system of the Authority and to deliver the power produced by these projects and units to the market."

No change was made in this provision for additional appropriation by the Senate.

Forty million dollars was the amount provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority by House Joint Resolution 194 as introduced by Mr. TAYLOR in the House, approved July 16, 1941 (Public, No. 179, 77th Cong.).

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION

Supplemental estimates were made in House Document 376 (77th Cong., 1st sess.) for the Tennessee Valley Authority and were included in the third supplemental national defense bill, 1942, in the amount of $40,000,000, and stated as to the dams:

"(1) beginning construction of hydroelectric projects on the Little Tennessee River near Fontana, N. C., and on the French Broad River near Dandridge, Tenn.;

"(2) installing additional electric generating units with a total rated capacity of approximately 324,000 kilowatts in existing hydroelectric projects owned by the Authority; (3) installing an additional steam electric generating unit with a rated capacity of approximately 60,000 kilowatts in the Watts Bar steam plant."

As the bill came from the House, the Douglas Dam was eliminated and the amount reduced to $25,000,000. The Senate did not change this item, and the final language read:

"(1) beginning construction of a hydroelectric project on the Little Tennessee River near Fontana, N. C."

A new section was added by Senator McKELLAR in the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, first calling for $24,000,000 and later being reduced in conference to $22,000,000; stating as finally enacted:

"(1) for a site on the south fork of the Holston River near Bristol, Tenn., as recommended by the Tennessee Valley Authority July 7, 1941, with an installed capacity of 75,000 kilowatts, $10,000,000; (2) for building a dam on the Watauga River east of Elizabethton, Tenn., as recommended by the Tennessee Valley Authority July 7, 1941, with an installed capacity of 60,000 kilowatts, $10,000,000; (3) for the completion of the uncompleted unit of the steam plant at or near Sheffield, Ala., $2,000,000; in all, $22,000,000."

During the hearings before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on December 9, 1941, Congressman B. CARROLL REECE, Republican from Tennessee, made a statement as to the need for the Watauga Dam, and also stated as to the interest of Senator McKELLAR in the Tennessee Valley Authority (p. 186 of the hearings):

"Mr. REECE. I have been familiar with the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority since its inception and I am familiar with the circumstances that resulted in its inception and I do not see how anyone who is familiar with the facts can for one moment question Senator McKELLAR'S profound interest in the development of the Tennessee Valley area and the Tennessee Valley Authority, and because of the eight or nine dams now that are embraced in the Tennessee Valley Authority, as I recall the facts, all except three were authorized in the Senate upon Senator McKELLAR'S initiative, in the committee or on the floor of the Senate, and those of us in Tennessee and in the South who are interested in the Tennessee Valley Authority, and its continued development, have looked upon Senator McKELLAR as the greatest friend that the Tennessee Valley Authority has had, and now because of a difference of view on the part of Senator McKELLAR and some particular official in the Tennessee Valley Authority, I do not see how his interest in the Tennessee Valley Authority could possibly be questioned, because he has demonstrated his interest and friendship and usefulness in the development of this great project.

"Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. REECE, I will ask you if you recall whether or not it is a fact that after the Norris and Wheeler Dams were built, that the Tennessee Valley Authority made—and the Wilson Dam being already built, and those are the three that I suppose that you referred to, that after that the Tennessee Valley Authority did not ask the Budget Director for the building of any further dams; the Budget Director did not report to the House the building of any further dams; the President did not recommend the building of any further dams, and the dams that you speak of as having been initiated here in the Senate, were they not the Pickwick Dam, the Guntersville, Ala., Dam, the Chickamauga, Tenn., Dam, the Hiwassee Dam, the Watts Bar Dam, the Fort Loudoun Dam, and the Gilbertsville Dam in Kentucky? Is it not true that all of those seven dams were initiated here in the Senate?

"Mr. REECE. That is right.

"Senator McKELLAR. The House agreed to them in conference.

"Mr. REECE. And the people in Tennessee were looking to the Senator from Tennessee to save these projects for them when they were being agitated, and he performed.

"Senator McKELLAR. Of those seven dams, is it not true that the Pickwick Dam, the Guntersville, Ala., Dam, the Chickamauga Dam, and the Hiwassee Dam, four out of the seven, are now furnishing in very large quantities the power for the making of aluminum in Tennessee?

"Mr. REECE. And except for them the Tennessee Valley Authority would have been in pretty bad shape."

Forty-seven million dollars was the amount provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, approved December 17, 1941 (Public, No. 353, 77th Cong.).

FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION

Supplemental estimates were made in House Document 566 (77th Cong., 2d sess.) for the Tennessee Valley Authority and were included in the fourth supplemental national defense bill, 1942, in the amount of $30,000,000, and stated as to the dams:

"(1) the construction of a hydroelectric project on the French Broad River near Dandridge, Tenn.; (2) the purchase or building of transmission facilities needed to connect this project to the existing transmission system of the Authority; and (3) the acquisition of land necessary for and the relocation of highways in connection with the accomplishment of the above project."

No change was made in this item in the Senate.

Thirty million dollars was the amount provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Fourth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, approved January 30, 1942 (Public, No. 422, 77th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1943

The Budget estimates for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1943 were in the amount of $136,100,000, and stated as to the dams: "Including the continued construction of Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, Ky.; Watts Bar Dam and steam plant; Fort Loudoun Dam (including an extension to bring the waters of the Little Tennessee River within the pool of this project); Cherokee Dam; Apalachia Dam; Ocoee Dam No. 3; Fontana Dam; a dam on the south fork of the Holston River; a dam on the Watauga River; and an additional unit at the Sheffield steam plant; and the beginning of construction immediately of a fertilizer and elemental phosphorus manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Ala."

No change was made in this language in the Senate.

Senator McKELLAR did propose a committee amendment, however, to add $36,120,112 to the bill, being an amount equal to the estimated receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and to strike from the bill the language putting such receipts into the fund known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1943. The bill passed the Senate with those changes, but in conference the Senate receded from the amendments.

One hundred thirty-six million one hundred thousand dollars was the amount provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, approved June 27, 1942 (Public Law 630, 77th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1944 AND 1945

The unexpended balances were the only appropriations made to the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, and in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1945.

Summary of amounts appropriated for Tennessee Valley Authority

Law	Name of act	Congress	Amount
Public No. 77	Fourth Deficiency.	73d	$50,000,000
Public No. 412	Emergency	do	25,000,000
Public No. 260	Second Deficiency.	74th	36,000,000
Public No. 739	First Deficiency	do	39,900,000
Public No. 121	Second Deficiency.	75th	40,166,270
Public No. 534	Independent Offices.	do	40,000,000
Public No. 8	do	76th	39,003,000
Public No. 459	do	do	40,000,000
Public Res. 95	Resolutions (S. J. 285–H. J. 583).	do	25,000,000
Public No. 28	Independent Offices.	77th	79,800,000
Public No. 179	Resolution (H. J. Res. 194).	do	40,000,000
Public No. 353	Third Supplemental.	do	47,000,000
Public No. 422	Fourth Supplemental.	do	30,000,000
Public No. 630	Independent Offices.	do	136,100,000
Public No. 90	do	78th	(1)
Public No. 358	do	do	(1)
Total			677,969,270

[1] Unexpended balance.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES MADE BY TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL UNITS

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act as approved May 18, 1933, contained section 13 relating to payments in lieu of taxes, as follows:

"SEC. 13. Five percent of the gross proceeds received by the board for the sale of power generated at dam No. 2, or from any other hydropower plant hereafter constructed in the State of Alabama, shall be paid to the State of Alabama; and 5 percent of the gross proceeds from the sale of power generated at Cove Creek Dam, hereinafter provided for, or any other dam located in the State of Tennessee, shall be paid to the State of Tennessee. Upon the completion of said Cove Creek Dam the board shall ascertain how much additional power is thereby generated at dam No. 2 and at any other dam hereafter constructed by the Government of the United States on the Tennessee River, in the State of Alabama, or in the State of Tennessee, and from the gross proceeds of the sale of such additional power 2½ percent shall be paid to the State of Alabama and 2½ percent to the State of Tennessee. These percentages shall apply to any other dam that may hereafter be constructed and controlled and operated by the board on the Tennessee River or any of its tributaries, the main purpose of which is to control flood waters and where the development of electric power is incidental to the operation of such flood-control dam. In ascertaining the gross proceeds from the sale of such power upon which a percentage is paid to the States of Alabama and Tennessee, the board shall not take into consideration the proceeds of any power sold or delivered to the Government of the United States, or any department or agency of the Government of the United States, used in the operation of any locks on the Tennessee River or for any experimental purpose, or for the manufacture of fertilizer or any of the ingredients thereof, or for any other governmental purpose: *Provided*, That the percentages to be paid to the States of Alabama and Tennessee, as provided in this section, shall be subject to revision and change by the board, and any new percentages established by the board, when approved by the President, shall remain in effect until and unless again changed by the board with the approval of the President. No change of said percentage shall be made more often than once in 5 years, and no change shall be made without giving to the States of Alabama and Tennessee an opportunity to be heard.

In the Seventy-sixth Congress several bills were introduced in the House and Senate for the purpose of amending this section of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. The House Committee on Military Affairs held a hearing on these bills beginning on January 23, 1940, at which the purposes of the proposed amendments were stated by William C. Fitts, Jr., general counsel and secretary of the Tennessee Valley Authority, as follows:

"Now the first question that might arise is, Why do we need any legislation, if we can change the percentages under that section? The reason is threefold. In the first place, while we could change the percentages, we could not change the States to which payments are to be made, because they are stated in the section and there is no power in the Authority to change them. The only power to change them is by Congress, and this section provides only for payments to Alabama and Tennessee, leaving out Kentucky, North Carolina, Mississippi, and Georgia, in which States there is the same problem, although not to as large a degree as in Tennessee."

Chairman MAY of the committee also stated the reason, in brief, as follows:

"At the time the original act containing section 13, which you just read there, was enacted, it was not contemplated that the Authority would handle it otherwise than in the two States of Tennessee and Alabama. * * * Since then, of course, it has extended its operations into other States and it is necessary to repeal this section and write some other provision in, if we are to cover the whole field."

Mr. Fitts also explained the changes that had taken place in the generation of power through acquisition of steam plants and construction of dams, and cited acts making similar payments from other agencies of the Government.

One of these bills, S. 2925, passed the Senate on April 30, 1940, and was referred to the House Committee on Military Affairs, where no action was taken on it.

Senator McKELLAR thereupon offered the proposal as an amendment to the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1941, in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The statements on the subject made during the hearings on May 30, 1940, are as follows:

Senator McKELLAR stated:

"When the Tennessee Valley Authority took over or bought the power companies' interest in a very large area of Tennessee last year, in some of the counties the properties of the power companies constituted a very large proportion of the taxable property of the county. * * * Of course, under our system, the property, after the Tennessee Valley Authority bought it, is not taxable by the counties or by the State. In that situation, the Tennessee Valley Authority felt that they should pay to the counties their proportion of the taxes lost, and Senator Norris introduced a bill providing therefor, and I have introduced the Norris amendment as an amendment to this bill. Take, for instance, the county of Polk, as I remember, in Tennessee, 41 percent of all the taxable property in that county belonged to one of the power companies that sold out to Tennessee Valley Authority. That county will lose, after the 1st day of July, 41 percent * * * of its taxable values, and that will result in the closing of schools and very great injury to the county if those taxes are lost. * * * The Government does not pay a cent. These payments, in lieu of taxes, come from the revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

They agreed on the bill that passed the Senate, and the State and county authori-

ties agreed on it, and Senator Norris introduced it and it was passed, and it went to the House Military Affairs Committee, under a long-established rule that that committee has jurisdiction over navigable waters, streams, and the result was that the Military Affairs Committee, presided over by Mr. MAY, who seems to be a very great antagonist of the Tennessee Valley Authority—he comes from a coal district, but I have no doubt is sincere and honest in his antagonism to the Tennessee Valley Authority—but at all events his committee has had that bill ever since it passed the Senate, I think since last January, and their first vote on it was 12 to 12, and, of course, the bill was not reported out. The other day the bill was brought up in the committee again and by a vote of 12 to 10 they declined to report it favorably. I am advised 2 members favoring the bill were absent.

Now I have offered it as an amendment to this bill, because it not only affects my State but very seriously affects the State of Georgia—I think in Fannin County, Ga., the amount of taxable property taken out is more than 50 percent of the entire taxable property in the county, and that will close some of the schools, so the testimony in the House record shows.

Under those circumstances, I have offered this bill introduced by Senator Norris, as it passed the Senate, as an amendment to this bill. I do not believe there can be any real objection to it in either the House or the Senate, but of course the House will have to pass on it if it is put on as an amendment to this bill.

On being questioned as to why it was put on as an amendment to the emergency relief bill, Senator MCKELLAR stated further:

"If ever relief was furnished to certain counties or certain people in certain counties, this is in that sense a relief bill, because it has been testified by the officials of these several counties in the House hearings * * * that their schools will close, and many other activities that they now have will be obliged to close unless this money is furnished. If the Senate puts it on, as I hope it will—I hope this committee will recommend it—it has to go to conference, of course, and may have to go to a separate vote in the House, but, under the circumstances, it seemed best to those of us who are so vitally interested in it. * * * I am advised by the parliamentary clerk of the Senate that this amendment is in order on this bill but that it would not be in order on the deficiency bill."

Statements were also made at the Senate hearings by Senator Stewart, of Tennessee; Senator George, of Georgia; Senator Hill, of Alabama; Congressman Sparkman, of Alabama; and Congressmen Byrnes and Kefauver, of Tennessee.

The attitude of the House committee is particularly stated by Senator HILL, as follows:

"I served on the Military Affairs Committee. I had the honor of being chairman of that committee. They are all my personal friends, all splendid gentlemen, but the majority of them do not look with favor on very many matters that affect the Tennessee Valley Authority, and you have an impossible situation unless we can get in this bill the relief so much needed. The relief ought to be granted as a matter of fairness and justice and right. I ask that the committee put the bill on as an amendment to this relief bill."

The conference committee reported in disagreement to the House on the amendment, which was extensively debated on the floor of the House, and on the motion of Mr. CANNON to recede and concur a division showed 154 ayes to 155 noes, whereupon a roll-call vote was ordered, resulting in 205 yeas to 179 nays.

So that once more Senator MCKELLAR took a leading part in securing needed legislation for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The amended Section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, passed as section 39 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public Res. 88, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), is in full as follows:

"SEC. 13. In order to render financial assistance to those States and local governments in which the power operations of the Corporation are carried on and in which the Corporation has acquired properties previously subject to State and local taxation, the board is authorized and directed to pay to said States, and the counties therein, for each fiscal year, begining July 1, 1940, the following percentages of the gross proceeds derived from the sale of power by the Corporation for the preceding fiscal year as hereinafter provided, together with such additional amounts as may be payable pursuant to the provisions hereinafter set forth, said payments to constitute a charge against the power operations of the Corporation: For the fiscal year (beginning July 1), 1940, 10 percent; 1941, 9 percent; 1942, 8 percent; 1943, 7½ percent; 1944, 7 percent; 1945, 6½ percent; 1946, 6 percent; 1947, 5½ percent; 1948 and each fiscal year thereafter, 5 percent. "Gross proceeds," as used in this section, is defined as the total gross proceeds derived by the Corporation from the sale of power for the preceding fiscal year, excluding power used by the Corporation or sold or delivered to any other department or agency of the Government of the United States for any purpose other than the resale thereof. The payments herein authorized are in lieu of taxation, and the Corporation, its property, franchises and income, are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by any State, county, municipality, or any subdivision or district thereof.

"The payment for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among said States in the following manner: One-half of said payment shall be apportioned by paying to each State the percentage thereof which the gross proceeds of the power sales by the Corporation within said State during the preceding fiscal year bears to the total gross proceeds from all power sales by the Corporation during the preceding fiscal year; the remaining one-half of said payment shall be apportioned by paying to each State the percentage thereof which the book value of the power property held by the Corporation within said State at the end of the preceding fiscal year bears to the total book value of all such property held by the Corporation on the same date. The book value of power property shall include that portion of the investment allocated or estimated to be allocable to power: *Provided*, That the minimum annual payment to each State (including payments to counties therein) shall not be less than an amount equal to the 2-year average of the State and local ad valorem property taxes levied against power property purchased and operated by the Corporation in said State and against that portion of reservoir lands related to dams constructed by or on behalf of the United States Government and held or operated by the Corporation and allocated or estimated to be allocable to power. The said 2-year average shall be calculated for the last two tax years during which said property was privately owned and operated or said land was privately owned: *Provided further*, That the minimum annual payment to each State in which the Corporation owns and operates power property (including payments to counties therein) shall not be less than $10,000 in any case: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall pay directly to the respective counties the 2-year average of county ad valorem property taxes (including taxes levied by taxing districts within the respective counties) upon power property and reservoir lands allocable to power, determined as above provided, and all payments to any such county within a State shall be deducted from the payment otherwise due to such State under the provisions of this section. The determination of the board of the amounts due hereunder to the respective States and counties shall be final.

The payments above provided shall in each case be made to the State or county in equal monthly installments beginning not later than July 31, 1940.

Nothing herein shall be construed to limit the authority of the Corporation in its contracts for the sale of power to municipalities, to permit or provide for the resale of power at rates which may include an amount to cover tax-equivalent payments to the municipality in lieu of State, county, and municipal taxes upon any distribution system or property owned by the municipality, or any agency thereof, conditioned upon a proper distribution by the municipality of any amounts collected by it in lieu of State or county taxes upon any such distribution system or property; it being the intention of Congress that either the municipality or State in which the municipality is situated shall provide for the proper distribution to the State and county of any portion of tax equivalent so collected by the municipality in lieu of State or county taxes upon any such distribution system or property.

The Corporation shall, not later than January 1, 1945, submit to the Congress a report on the operation of the provisions of this section, including a statement of the distribution to the various States and counties hereunder; the effect of the operation of the provisions of this section on State and local finances; an appraisal of the benefits of the program of the Corporation to the States and counties receiving payments hereunder, and the effect of such benefits in increasing taxable values within such States and counties; and such other data, information, and recommendations as may be pertinent to future legislation.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to refer to certain portions of the document for the purpose of emphasizing the statement which I made that my colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee has been one of the outstanding friends, if not the outstanding friend, of the Tennessee Valley Authority throughout the years of its history.

In 1938, when the Second Deficiency Act of 1937 was under consideration, an appropriation was made for a survey, preliminary investigation, and so forth, of the Gilbertsville Dam. The item was in the bill which was before the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which my colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee was a member and had been for many years. As a matter of fact, he is now and has been for some time the acting chairman of the committee.

On pages 16 and 17 the document entitled "History of Appropriations Made by the Congress of the United States for the Tennessee Valley Authority" contains a statement of the money appropriated for the preliminary investigation of the dam which was dedicated by the President of the United States yesterday. That appropriation was being considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee in 1938. The appropriation was approved by a vote of 9 to 8. My colleague

voted "yea." The majority leader had appeared before the committee and had testified in favor of the appropriation. But Dr. Morgan, the head of the Tennessee Valley Authority, according to the information printed in this pamphlet, which was taken from the minutes of the Appropriations Committee, had asked that the budget for that year be reduced from $2,750,000 to $750,000. The reduction would not have permitted the preliminary investigation and survey to have been made for the construction of the dam which was yesterday dedicated by the President.

Let us hurry on. In February 1939, we find that an appropriation of money to build Watt's Bar Dam, which is a part of the Tennessee Valley system, was voted by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The vote was 13 to 11. The appropriation carried by a majority of two votes.

Mr. President, we also find in this pamphlet further instances of funds for the purpose of building various dams being voted for in the Appropriations Committee by a narrow majority, usually a majority of only one.

I recall one particular occasion—I do not remember the exact date when the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who was a member of the Appropriations Committee, was absent. In fact at the time the committee was in session and about to vote on the appropriation of funds to build one of these dams he was en route from his home in New Mexico to Washington. My colleague ascertained that night at about 11 o'clock that the next morning the appropriation would be voted down if he could not obtain an additional vote. He knew that the Senator from New Mexico had stated that he would support the appropriation. I recall that my colleague called on me at about 11 or 12 o'clock that night, and asked me to help locate a certain member of the Appropriations Committee. We located him, and found him to be unfavorable. To make a long story short, I may say that we remained up until about 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, and with the aid of friends and the Chavez family, we finally located the Senator from New Mexico at a hotel near Little Rock, Ark., and procured from him by telephone a promise that he would send by Western Union to the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee his proxy to be voted in favor of the appropriation. The telegram came in due time. That is one of the appropriations which carried by a margin of only one vote.

Mr. President, I refer to these facts for the purpose of emphasizing that the senior Senator from Tennessee has fought the battles of the Tennessee Valley Authority ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, as well as for a long time previous to my service here. Many times the subject matter of those appropriations was highly controversial. I remember that it was said of one of the finest men who ever served in this body, the late Honorable Alva Adams, of Colorado, that he had a banker's mind.

He did not want to spend much money, and he would quarrel with my friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee, over appropriating money for the purpose of building dams on the Tennessee. The subject of appropriating money for the construction of those dams was for a great many years very controversial, and the appropriations usually carried by a majority of only one or two votes. The appropriations were achieved only by the untiring, continuous, industrious, intelligent, and everlasting effort of the senior Senator from Tennessee.

The RECORD shows that I have not voted with my colleague on all these various matters. I suppose that when Mr. Childs says that the senior Senator from Tennessee is trying to keep the thumb of Congress on the TVA, he has reference to the fact that legislation has been considered here for the purpose of requiring the Tennessee Valley Authority to cover its funds into the Treasury. That is a matter about which I have not always agreed with my colleague, and probably I shall disagree with him again with reference to that subject. However, that makes no difference. That should not be taken as an indication that any Senator who supports a measure requiring that the money received from operations of the TVA shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States is necessarily opposed to the TVA. It is a misstatement of fact to say that the senior Senator from Tennessee has ever done anything except, figuratively speaking, to shed his last drop of blood in support of building up the greatest public benefit that has ever happened in Tennessee. To say anything to the contrary would be like saying that a man would turn his back on his own son.

Mr. President, I am tired of irresponsible newspaper writers and others making statements of the type and character to which I have referred. I do not think Mr. Childs is irresponsible. I think the statement which he made was based on misinformation. It is very unfair to a faithful public servant, who has worked untiringly in the promotion of a project such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, to make statements of the nature of those which are contained in Mr. Childs' article. The Senator from Tennessee has given not only of his time, but of his own money. I venture the assertion that he spent more than $50 in long-distance telephone calls on the night to which I have referred in an effort to locate the Senator from New Mexico. With the aid of one of his sons, who very kindly left his home and helped us, the Senator from New Mexico was finally located.

The article to which I have referred is unfair, and it seems to me that the men who publish such statements should be just as anxious and as interested about correcting them as they are in making the statements in the beginning.

I reaffirm what I have said, that the Tennessee Valley Authority has never had and never will have a friend any more loyal, any more capable, any more determined to render it a worth-while service than the senior Senator from Tennessee.

Many of these dams were recommended against by the Authority, because in the beginning, as I understand, some of the members of the Authority did not want a large number of dams, but only two or three or four. Now there are a dozen or more. I shall not stop to count them; but we would not have had them except for the determined efforts of my colleague, absolutely overriding the recommendations of the Authority, and if we had not had them during the war, it would certainly have been a severe handicap, because everyone, not only in Tennessee but throughout the United States, has sung the praises of TVA and of the power and the energy generated by the Tennessee Valley Authority and the work it has accomplished in the war effort.

It has not only been the reason for the location of many war plants in Tennessee, but it was due to Senator MCKELLAR'S farsightedness, to his long vision, to his determination, that this Authority was developed.

Those who cried aloud in the days when the war was going on for more and more power in order that we might make munitions of war, would have heard only echo respond to their cries had it not been for the efforts of the senior Senator from Tennessee in the days prior to the war in helping to bring about the building of this great system of dams which has done so much for Tennessee and for the entire South.

The senior Senator from Tennessee is not the enemy of TVA, he never has been the enemy of TVA, and I know personally that he considers the work he has done for the TVA, along with his colleagues in the Senate, is the greatest work he has ever accomplished in his entire life. I knows he looks back upon it as an achievement of which he is perhaps prouder than of any other accomplishment of his entire career.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have not seen the article in the Washington Post written by Mr. Childs, and therefore I am not in a position to comment on it.

Yesterday the President dedicated the one dam in the Tennessee Valley that is located in Kentucky, built at Gilbertsville, known officially as the Kentucky Dam. I assume from what the Senator read of Mr. Childs' article that Mr. Childs was talking about the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to require the TVA to turn into the Treasury all moneys received, and that thereafter they should not be disbursed except upon action by Congress.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I think that is what he meant. He referred to it as Congress keeping its thumb on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I assumed that was what he was talking about, and I wish to say frankly that I have heretofore opposed such a proposal, and I hope it will not be enacted and that the senior Senator from Tennessee will not urge it. But that has nothing to do with the record of the senior Senator from Tennessee in regard to the construction and development of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, I am in a position to know that there was no Senator on either side of the Chamber, although there were many Senators interested, including the Senator from Nebraska [Mr.

Norris] and myself, who worked harder for the TVA than did the senior Senator from Tennessee. The Senator from Tennessee and I worked hand in hand and shoulder to shoulder together to get the Tennessee Valley Authority created and started, and we had to make a very determined fight frequently to obtain the authorizations for special dams in the Tennessee Valley system because at the time when Dr. Arthur E. Morgan was Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority we did not always have what we thought we should have in the way of cooperation from TVA itself.

I realize that there were difficulties, particularly with respect to the dam dedicated yesterday, which is the largest and finest dam on the Tennessee River. There was a long, hard fight to have that dam authorized and started, and frequently we had to make a fight even on the floor of the Senate to obtain a small appropriation in order that a dam might be started. The senior Senator from Tennessee was always active and insistent and energetic in securing the authorizations and the appropriations necessary to construct those dams.

I might say that yesterday, in presenting the President to the vast audience at the Kentucky dam, which he dedicated, I took occasion to say that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] was one of those who was not only most cooperative, but most insistent and helpful, and creative, I may add, in the development of this project which had been hanging over the Tennessee Valley since World War I, when the Muscle Shoals construction was undertaken as a means of developing nitrate for powder in time of war and fertilizer in time of peace. From the time the Wilson Dam was left uncompleted at the end of World War I until President Roosevelt came into office in 1933, there had been a consistent effort to establish the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority. No one knew then how many dams would be required, and no one knew when Congress passed the Tennessee Valley bill how many would be required. I daresay more dams were required and built than were thought of by many of us who favored the original act.

I have always recognized, and am happy now to recognize, that there was no more loyal and insistent advocate of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the development of that power than the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the President pro tempore of the Senate.

PRODUCTION OF SUGARS AND SIRUPS IN INDUSTRIAL-ALCOHOL PLANTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 100, order of business 629.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not intend to object to calling up this measure, if I understand the joint resolution correctly, but I shall ask, for the record, at least, that an explanation be given so that we may understand the purpose of it. If it is the joint resolution I think it is, I am wholeheartedly for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the joint resolution provides, in effect, for the temporary suspension of the provision of the Internal Revenue Act which permits industrial alcohol plants to make simultaneously or alternately sirups and sugars. It was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Finance. The colleague of the Senator, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], is a cosponsor of the joint resolution. One of the principal plants, as a matter of fact, is in the Senator's own city of Omaha.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to say, very briefly, that the joint resolution as originally introduced was drawn in order to permit the Department of Agriculture to process fifty or sixty million bushels of surplus potatoes. Every State in the Union which produces potatoes had a surplus crop this year. The dehydrating plants which had been used by the Army, and would still be in use by the Army if the war were yet in progress, were closed down. Therefore there is nothing to do with the surplus potatoes except to pile them up and let them rot, unless we can make use of them in the manner proposed. At the same time there is a greatly increased capacity for making industrial alcohol, of which there is a large surplus. In order to put those plants to work and at the same time to consume the surplus potatoes it is necessary that a measure of this kind be passed. I introduced the first proposal in the committee to authorize the Department of Agriculture to process the potatoes. We did not know that it would be necessary to amend a chapter in the Internal Revenue Code until the first hearing was held. At that time the Finance Committee instructed representatives of the Department of Agriculture and representatives of the Treasury and Internal Revenue Bureau, with the assistance of the legislative counsel, to prepare the substitute measure which is now before the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The principal reason for the proposed legislation was the surplus of potatoes and the anticipated quantity of "wet" corn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 100) permitting federally owned alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert the following:

That part II of subchapter C of chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 3126. Emergency production of sugars and sirups in industrial alcohol plants.

"(a) In general: Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 2819 and 3122, and of any other law, until July 1, 1946, sugars and sirups from potatoes and from high moisture or damaged grain may be produced in industrial alcohol plants simultaneously with, or alternately with, the production of alcohol.

"(b) Regulations: The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, is authorized to prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The amendment reported by the committee to strike out the preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution permitting alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol until July 1, 1946."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that completes the legislative business of the day; and inasmuch as there is nothing on the calendar which will occupy our time the remainder of this week, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 11 (legislative day of October 2), 1945:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Raymond S. McKeough to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for a term of 6 years from September 26, 1945.

FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Watson B. Miller to be Federal Security Administrator.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William C. Mathes to be United States district judge for the southern district of California.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edgar H. Rossbach to be United States attorney for the district of New Jersey.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Joseph A. Bell to be administrative officer, Philadelphia branch, Research and Statistics Division, Philadelphia, Pa., with compensation at the rate of $5,180 per annum.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. Thomas Henry Green, to be The Judge Advocate General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from December 1, 1945.

George Robert Stephens, to be professor of English at the United States Military Academy, with rank from date of appointment.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To Quartermaster Corps

Lt. Col. Lee Malcolm Hester
Lt. Col. Howard Louis Peckham

To Corps of Engineers

First Lt. Charles Dorsey Maynard

To Ordnance Department

Capt. Floyd Garfield Pratt
First Lt. Milton Harvey Clark
First Lt. Napoleon Robertson Duell
First Lt. Richard Cutler Miles

To Field Artillery

First Lt. Henry Harley Arnold, Jr.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of George Edwin Pinard et al., for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which appear in full at the end of the Senate proceedings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Wednesday, October 3, 1945, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on p. 9331 with the name of George Edwin Pinard and ending on p. 9332 with the name of John Edward Duffy.

POSTMASTERS

ALASKA

Alfred G. Francis, Kotzebue.

ARKANSAS

George W. Powell, Houston.
Lonnie A. Parchman, Tie Plant.

IDAHO

Lola Rossi, Idaho City.
Maybelle E. McEachern, King Hill.
Walter J. Morbeck, Kingston.
Lynn S. Anderson, Lorenzo.
John Henry Thompson, Malta.
George E. West, Middleton.
Nettie A. Sheffler, Sagle.

KANSAS

William F. Folkerts, Albert.
Melba M. Bates, Allen.
Anna B. Jennings, Arnold.
Aldmar Demars, Aurora.
Frank L. Weeks, Belvue.
Homer I. Sharp, Bloom.
Minnie E. Steed, Bogue.
John J. Sedlacek, Bremen.
William E. Dinkler, Brookville.
Frances Z. Wolf, Bucyrus.
Jack VanSickle, Cedar Point.
Marie Mize, Cleburne.
Byron O. Shupe, Denton.
Edith Maxine McKie, Edmond.
Catherine M. Moylan, Emmett.
Elsie Jane Reed, Ensign.
Esther E. Weiss, Fort Dodge.
Joseph L. Brown, Great Bend.
Harry J. Hunter, Hanston.
Marie Oehm, Home.
Beulah M. Dillon, Iuka.
Floyd B. Martin, Lane.
Otto F. Grothe, Lehigh.
Jessie L. Dennis, Leona.
James R. Daily, Logan.
William G. Arnold, Mahaska.
Nicholas G. Blick, Maize.
Jesse C. Swigart, Manchester.
Jesse E. Snedegar, Matfield Green.
John I. Goodrum, Mayfield.
Clifford C. Lemmon, Mission.
John E. Sparling, Oneida.
Howard E. Monroe, Oswego.
Florence M. Martin, Palmer.
Hazel W. Harrell, Paradise.
Grace Schweitzer, Penokee.
John E. Kennedy, Piedmont.
Melvin Rupke, Prairie View.
Anna Marie Todd, Redfield.
John C. Scribner, Saffordville.
Minnie K. Cardwell, Scandia.
Laura A. Fields, Talmage.
Emil C. Jarus, Wilson.
Fred E. Feyerabend, Woodbine.

MISSISSIPPI

Geneva S. Moore, Belden.
Naomi Leach, Center.
Hazel J. Varnado, Chatawa.
Ivy L. Parker, Derma.
Dollie B. Blackwell, Duffee.
Sam O. Buckley, Enterprise.
Eula Ligon, Glen.
Maud Atkinson Davis, Horn Lake.
John L. McElroy, Kewanee.
Celeste M. Balfour, Lamar.
Hilary Hazelip, Mashulaville.
Jodie G. Dexter, McNeill.
Susie V. Mauldin, Moss.
William W. Finch, New Site.
Lula E. Gipson, Puckett.
Samuel H. Childress, Satartia.
Frank E. Hollowell, Sharon.
J. Lester L. Beasley, Sherman.
Nellie T. Hobgood, Silver City.
Mamie L. Odom, Slate Spring.
Jimmie A. Bevill, Thaxton.
Amanda Burchfield, Tomnolen.
John B. Parker, Tula.
Annie Saxon, Union Church.
Mattie Sue Gibson, Verona.
Aileen Rawlings, Washington.

NEBRASKA

Mayme L. Beaird, Brock.
Earl J. Hughes, Concord.
Henry L. Balser, Dixon.
Benjamin F. Schiefelbein, Ithaca.
Josephine L. Jenny, Malmo.
Arthur Albert Coufal, Miller.
Catherine A. Conradt, Steinauer.
Willard N. McClintock, Verdel.
John C. Traber, Waterloo.

OHIO

Martin L. Neff, Adelphi.
Perley J. Shadel, Alvordton.
Clarence C. Daw, Ava.
Earl L. Davis, Barberton.
Oral V. Waugh, Bladen.
James Blair, Buffalo.
Joseph A. Schira, Carey.
Zelda M. Stoneking, Chandlersville.
Ruey A. Donohoe, Dunglen.
Hulda C. Schumacher, Glandorf.
Mary E. Cummons, Hanover.
Mary L. Smith, Harrisburg.
Helen F. Grady, Hayesville.
Luella F. Hayes, Hooven.
Raymond E. Beardsley, Huntsburg.
Helen B. Gorton, Irwin.
Nelle O. Ayliffe, Kipton.
Harry Clark, Kirkersville.
Tressie L. Kissling, McGuffey.
William E. Walker, Midland.
Guy H. Latham, Monroeville.
Frank R. Brewer, New Marshfield.
Fenton L. Brown, North Kenova.
Mary A. Hankinson, Norwich.
E. Dana Wickline, Rio Grande.
Carl B. Dager, Robertsville.
John F. Rider, Rockbridge.
Helen M. McGuire, Rudolph.
Nona E. Aleshire, Tremont City.
Gail Calvin, Union Furnace.
Mae Litten, Vaughnsville.
Pauline B. Davies, Venedocia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1945

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, we rejoice that we are in a world where Thou dost reign; awake, asleep, by day or night, Thou art our guardian angel ministering unto us. Thou who art the fountain of mercy dost bring light out of darkness and peace out of pain and doest all things well. Give us the spirit to accept it gratefully, dear Lord, for larger service and for diviner joys in which our enfranchised souls share with those who walk with Thee. In all which we do today, may we hear Thy "Well done" and receive the blessing of the heart that is undisturbed. Crown us with minds that plan and ponder, with hearts that yearn and aspire; grant that these may be used for Thy glory and for our country's good, and Thine shall be the praise, through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit today during general debate on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by James Marlow regarding the increase in the cost of living.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana and Mr. HOFFMAN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CARLSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN, at Warren, Ohio, on October 6.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier of October 1 entitled "Golden Opportunity."

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a resolution.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include a statement by the Oak Ridge scientists.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program of today and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

Mr. FOLGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and to include some excerpts from letters and a report on Pearl Harbor.

REVENUE BILL OF 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 368 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, if any, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto, if any, to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 165]

Adams	Engel, Mich.	Norton
Andresen,	Ervin	O'Toole
August H.	Fellows	Patterson
Andrews, N. Y.	Gavin	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Geelan	Pfeifer
Barden	Gillie	Phillips
Barry	Gore	Ploeser
Bishop	Granahan	Powell
Bolton	Grant, Ala.	Quinn, N. Y.
Boren	Gregory	Rains
Bradley, Mich.	Griffiths	Randolph
Brooks	Gwinn, N. Y.	Rees, Kans.
Brumbaugh	Hagen	Rizley
Buckley	Hall,	Rodgers, Pa.
Bulwinkle	Leonard W.	Roe, N. Y.
Burch	Halleck	Rooney
Burgin	Harless, Ariz.	Scrivner
Byrne, N. Y.	Harness, Ind.	Shafer
Campbell	Heffernan	Sharp
Cannon, Fla.	Hess	Short
Case, N. J.	Hinshaw	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Holifield	Snyder
Clements	Howell	Somers, N. Y.
Coffee	Jennings	Stigler
Cole, Kans.	Kefauver	Stockman
Cole, N. Y.	Keogh	Sumner, Ill.
Cox	Kilburn	Sumners, Tex.
Curley	King	Talbot
Daughton, Va.	Kinzer	Taylor
Dawson	Latham	Thomas, Tex.
Dickstein	LeFevre	Tolan
Dingell	Lesinski	Torrens
Dondero	Lyle	Vinson
Douglas, Calif.	McGehee	White
Douglas, Ill.	McGlinchey	Winter
Drewry	McKenzie	Wolcott
Earthman	Merrow	Wood
Elliott	Monroney	Woodhouse
Ellsworth	Mott	Woodrum, Va.
Elsaesser	Mundt	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 310 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REVENUE BILL OF 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of H. R. 4309, tax-reduction bill, reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means. Moreover, both sides of that committee requested the kind of rule we are now considering.

The rule is a closed one, commonly designated a "gag" rule, waiving points of order, allowing committee amendments only, which are not subject to amendment, and one motion to recommit. This is an important bill, and it is imperative that it be considered under a closed rule, as has been the case in the past with all revenue bills, in order to keep the Revenue Code in balance. In short, long experience has demonstrated that it is impossible to consider a revenue bill on this floor under an open rule. Simply to comply with the Ramseyer rule would entail burdensome and unnecessary expense.

The bill has been designed, the committee says, to aid both individuals and businesses in the difficult period of transition from war to peace. To accomplish this it is thought necessary to reduce the wartime tax rates to provide incentive for business to expand and to increase consumer purchasing power. Certain expenditures necessary after the end of a war, however, will keep Federal revenue requirements at a high level during 1946.

The total reduction in this bill is $5,350,000,000, of which $2,627,000,000 is attributable to reduction in individual income taxes; $1,888,000,000 to reduction in corporate taxes; $535,000,000 to the return of certain excise taxes to the 1942 rates; $140,000,000 to repeal of tax on motor vehicles and boats; and $160,000,000 to tax refunds to be made of the war excise taxes on floor stocks of alcoholic beverages and light bulbs. Naturally, everybody likes to effect reduction in taxes. I have always been for as low a tax as possible and against unnecessary expenditures. However, in this instance I think the committee has gone far afield in reducing excess-profits taxes and other corporation taxes. Though I am in favor of the passage of the rule, I feel that the reduction from 85 to 60 percent of the excess-profit tax on corporations is manifestly unjustifiable and unwarranted because these very corporations have accumulated in the last few years between twenty-six and twenty-eight billion dollars, which they have in their safes or in their banks as surplus and reserves. Mind you, these are profits which were accumulated after paying all of the taxes they have complained about so much.

Mr. KNUTSON Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I do not yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, the gentleman from Illinois is revealing a very shocking condition that has been permitted under the New Deal.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield to the gentleman for a speech, because he never says anything that is solidly based on facts. He just likes to criticize something, and even then he is not in a position to do it in a fair manner. So I refuse to yield to the gentleman. Furthermore, he is ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and he ought to know all about this bill. I think he does, and because it relieves the corporations in four different ways he has been for it. He said before our committee: "I want a closed 'gag' rule; we must have it." Well, I presume he knows what he is talking about, because his friends, the representatives of these big interests, are always able to point out to him satisfactorily the reason they need additional reduction in taxes and still greater profits, and they have succeeded. From past experience I hesitate to give my full approval to a bill which has the unanimous report of the 10 Republican members of the Committee on Ways and means.

Mr. Speaker, before I forget, may I remind the gentlemen present that I am not responsible for the call of the House. My genial colleague and friend from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] did not want to deprive you of the pleasure of listening to my remarks, and that is the reason he made the point of order of no quorum. That is the reason many of you are here and you should be grateful to him for the opportunity of listening to these few remarks that I have to make.

We all fully appreciate that we never can obtain everything we want and favor in any one piece of legislation or any one bill. Legislation, after all, is a compromise. After we have passed this bill as it is written, line by line and word by word, when it goes to the other body, although as a rule I do not have so much confidence that it can improve any House bill, it will eliminate the provision whereby this bill freezes the employment tax, having to do with Social Security, at 1 percent for employer and employees. Without this provision, this employment tax would on January 1, 1946, go to 2.5 percent against both employee and employer. If there has ever been a time this is the time when employers as well as employees can easily add a little more to the fund for their future welfare.

Because some of these gentlemen say a survey of the employment tax is being made, the committee unfortunately has seen fit to again freeze this tax—for the third time. I regret it exceedingly and I very much hope this freeze will not prevail in the conference report when it comes back.

This reduction and other provisions of the bill will be explained thoroughly and intelligently by the able chairman of the great Ways and Means Committee, my long-time personal friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], as well as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], they having devoted a great deal of time and study to this proposed legislation. Although a reduction is being made for the deserving low-income groups and they will be aided to some extent, I do not think this bill goes far enough when we take into consideration the relief that is in this bill being given to corporations in four different ways. What I specially object to, as I have stated, is the reduction of the excess-profits tax from 85 to 60 percent.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES

Mr. Speaker, here is a brief résumé of the principal provisions of the bill. The

present surtax exemptions are made applicable to the normal tax. Accordingly the normal tax exemption of $500 for each income recipient is eliminated, and there are allowed in its place exemptions of $500 each for the taxpayer, his spouse, and each of his dependents. This change will be effective on and after January 1, 1946.

The rate applicable to each surtax bracket is reduced by four percentage points effective on and after January 1, 1946. The combined normal tax and surtax starting rate thus becomes 19 percent instead of the present 23 percent.

The surtax rates are further revised, effective January 1, 1946, so that generally the reduction of normal tax and surtax combined for any taxpayer will not be less than 10 percent.

CORPORATE TAXES

The excess-profits tax rate is set at 60 percent for the calendar year 1946. The present excess-profits tax net rate is 85.5 percent.

The entire excess-profits tax is repealed, effective December 31, 1946.

The corporate surtax rate is reduced 4 percentage points as of January 1, 1946. This results in a minimum corporate normal and surtax rate of 21 percent in place of the present 25 percent and a maximum combined rate of 36 percent in place of the present 40 percent.

The capital stock tax is repealed beginning with the capital stock tax payable on July 31, 1946. The declared-value excess-profits tax beginning with the related year is also repealed.

EXCISE TAXES

The excise war tax rates are reduced to the 1942 rates, effective July 1, 1946. These are the war tax rates imposed by the act of 1943 to be effective until 6 months after the termination of hostilities.

Tax refunds, to the extent of the excise tax rate reductions, are to be made on all floor stocks of distilled spirits, wines, and fermented malt liquors, held for sale or use in production on July 1, 1946, on which the wartime excise tax rates had been paid.

I know that Members will be especially happy to know that the tax on the use of motor vehicles and boats is repealed, effective July 1, 1946.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take any more time because nearly all are going to vote for the bill. Sometimes, however, it relieves a man if he gives expression to his innermost feelings concerning an important matter. That is what I am doing now. Of course, the Republicans are pleased, they are delighted, because it helps these "poor" corporations that are so close, so near, and so dear to them at all times, and from whom they expect, if I am not mistaken, assistance and contributions for the next election. However, it matters not how much aid they get from those corporations, it will not do the Republican Party any good, because the people will recognize that the Democratic Party is really, truly, and honestly the party of the people, having the interest of the people at heart, and at the same time doing everything it can for the cause of labor, small business, and for the country in general.

I know everybody is in favor of reducing taxes and effect conditions wherein no taxes will have to be imposed, which, however, is simply not in the cards. We must be mindful of the fact that the great war called for tremendous expenditures which increased many fold our national debt.

I feel that every effort possible should be made to decrease the national debt; and, looking to that end, every opportunity to reduce public expenditures must be embraced. That is just what this enlightened administration is seeking to do at all times.

Some gentlemen of the House imply that I am against business, but that is an erroneous allegation, as my record shows. I am in favor of helping business and I have done everything within my power to aid legitimate business, especially that of small proportion; but I am not in favor of relieving unduly by reducing taxes the richest, most powerful corporations who have accumulated huge war profits who were given tax relief just last year under the Republican Ruml plan in the amount of five and one-half billions of dollars. Surely they do not need any relief at our hands. The small businessmen do need relief at our hands; and especially does the wage earner, the common man, merit relief in view of the high cost of living.

One of my colleagues from Illinois, in questioning the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], asked whether I was not influenced in my actions by the CIO reception which was generously accorded me a few days ago in the Senate caucus room. Although the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] answered that he was sure that such reception did not affect my viewpoint or in any way influence me, I would say to him that all my life I have endeavored to follow my mature convictions and supported in this House legislation that was, as I believed, in the interest not only of the CIO but all labor organizations and the unorganized workers, especially including the deserving white-collar group, which is much underpaid. These latter merit my support in preference to greedy war profiteers.

Reverting to the statement that the Democratic leaders, such as Secretary of State Byrnes and Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, are advocating the proposed legislation I am criticizing. I am aware they made such recommendations and suggestions some months ago. But as you all know, I am and have ever been a supporter of the Democratic administration, yet I have consistently and persistently reserved to myself the right of fair criticism when I did not think the head of a department or independent agency was not sponsoring legislation looking to the best interests of the whole country, especially the masses.

With that I conclude by remarks and reserve the remainder of my time.

I now yield 30 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for 4 hours' debate. All points of order are waived. The only amendments that can be offered are by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. In the event they offer amendments, those amendments are not subject to any other amendments. The bill will not be read, of course.

In my opinion, this bill is a move in the right direction. To my knowledge, there is no objection to the rule on this side of the aisle.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this rule has been explained by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. I have also listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the genial chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. I realize he is not at all desirous of having "gag" rules. I do not like gag rules, either; but I think perhaps some word should be spoken in defense of the great Ways and Means Committee, and its position, as far as this particular measure is concerned.

I believe the charge made by my chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], that the committee has gone too far in reducing taxes on business is entirely unjustified.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In just a minute; when I believe the gentleman will have more to say.

I should like to remind the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who has been here some 40 years, and certainly is an able Member of Congress, that the Committee on Ways and Means, in drafting this bill and reporting it, did not go nearly so far as the administration and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Vinson, asked the committee to go. I wish to remind the gentleman from Illinois that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Vinson, whom I have heard him praised on this floor many times, appeared befor the Ways and Means Committee and asked for the complete repeal of the excess-profits tax. Such repeal, the Ways and Means Committee decided, would not permit of any relief for many of the corporations of the country, some 300,000 or 400,000 of them, which do not have excess profits or pay excess-profits taxes, but instead would have given relief to only about 19,000 corporations who do have excess profits and are taxed thereon.

I do not agree completely with the position of the Ways and Means Committee; I think they could have repealed the entire excess-profits tax levy and still have given the reduction of four percentage points, in each bracket, on the surtaxes levied against corporations, and I wish to predict here and now that when this legislation finally is enacted into law—when it comes back from the Senate and we adopt the conference report—this bill will then provide for the complete repeal of the excess-profits tax, and will give the 4-point reduction on surtaxes as provided in the bill now before us.

I wish to also remind the gentleman from Illinois, my genial chairman, that

another of his idols who is now Secretary of State, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, in report after report to the Congress and to the country when he was Director of War Mobilization, recommended that excess profits taxes should be repealed completely and entirely once the war ended. So I believe the gentleman from Illinois finds himself in the position of differing with all of the leaders of his own party; and I am amazed and much surprised that, at his age and after his great and distinguished service, he now takes the floor of the House and criticizes his own administration so severely. It is the first time I have heard him do so. He must feel very deeply on the question or he would not have broken with his own party leadership on this important question.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Illinois made the statement during the hearings that the corporations of this country made $26,000,000,000 profits which are now held in their treasuries. Of course, that is a most shocking situation. May I ask the gentleman who is responsible for this outrageous condition?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I heard the gentleman from Minnesota, of course, reply, on behalf of the Ways and Means Committee, to the effect that he presumed the chairman of the Committee on Rules believed no one should be permitted to make a profit.

I do however wish to call attention to the fact that we have had a Renegotiation Act in operation during this war and that all war contracts were presumed to be renegotiated so as to take the profit out of war. The administration of the Renegotiation Act has been under the complete control of the party of the gentleman from Illinois, and certainly not under Republican administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Therefore, if there is any criticism of the way the Renegotiation Act has been administered, it should be directed against the gentleman's own party, most certainly, and not against those of us who are in the minority.

I should also like to remind him that the excess-profits-tax law, and the collection of all of the taxes due thereunder, comes under officials of his party's administration. If they have been lax in the collection of these taxes or in the performance of any of their other official duties, certainly those of us in the minority are not responsible therefor.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I should like to suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that possibly the gentleman from Illinois might have been influenced by this CIO meeting a couple of days ago.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not wish to go into that. I do not believe the gentleman was influenced by anything but that which was in his own mind, and I am sure he is never, never influenced by politics. I am also sure, now that the gentleman from Illinois has listened to this discussion, that he realizes the weakness of his position, and will take the floor, apologize to those of us in the minority, and agree, very frankly and very fully, that we, the minority, are in no way responsible for the unsatisfactory conditions which now exist—for which I am very thankful.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HAVENNER. I presume the members of the Committee on Ways and Means are aware of the fact that in the public-utility field the excess-profits tax was passed on 100 percent to the consumers. The corporations, therefore, did not pay the tax; the people paid it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I presume that is correct. I presume the gentleman means that when you levy a tax on a public utility the public utility of necessity must pass that tax along to the consuming public in the way of increased rates which are granted by another public agency, as required under the law of the land, and that as taxes are reduced on public utilities the resultant savings must, in turn, be passed on to the consumers in the way of lower utility rates.

Mr. Speaker, as a whole this measure, for a "quickie" tax bill, is about as good as we can expect. We realize why the committee was unable to hold public hearings. I appreciate the circumstances in which they found themselves, but, as I said a moment ago, as a whole they have done a good job.

However, there is one point to which I would like to call the attention of the committee. I have discussed it with some of the members of the committee and hope they can give further attention to it in the consideration of legislation for a permanent tax program. I call attention to the fact that the tax now levied on corporations having earnings of between $25,000 and $50,000 a year is at a higher rate than is levied on any other $25,000 bracket of earnings. I have been advised by the committee this is done to adjust rates, but still it is unfair to those particular corporations which find themselves in the bracket of earnings between $21,000 and $50,000. I would suggest to the gentlemen of the committee that this matter is worthy of more careful attention and consideration when the Revenue Act is up for further examination and consideration in January or February of next year.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. May I ask the gentleman whether he would be kind enough to insert the table he has pointed out and of which he speaks?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is table 6, on page 11, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert this table 6 in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 6.—*A comparison of the present corporate tax structure with changes which would be made by the committee bill*

A. INCOME TAX

	Present law	Committee bill
I. Normal tax:		
(a) Corporations with normal tax net incomes of not more than $50,000:	*Pct.*	
First $5,000	15	No change.
$5,000 to $20,000	17	Do.
$20,000 to $25,000	19	Do.
$25,000 to $50,000	31	Do.
(b) Corporations with normal tax net incomes over $50,000.	24	Do.
II. Surtax:		
(a) Corporations with surtax net incomes of not more than $50,000:		
First $25,000	10	6 percent.
$25,000 to $50,000	22	18 percent.
(b) Corporations with surtax net incomes over $50,000.	16	12 percent.
(c) Consolidated returns: Consolidated surtax tax net incomes, additional	2	No change.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], is unavoidably absent today; I therefore ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD on the measure now before us.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, our people are in universal agreement that thriving private industry is essential to the fullest employment and national prosperity in our postwar period. We must bring vital venture capital again into production. The incentive to use such funds comes first, I believe, with the assurance that the Federal Government will see to it that taxes are assessed sanely and proportionately. A workable plan must also be provided to induce industry to expand its present plants or build for the production of new and improved products. It is only by such means that fairly steady employment will be made available to returning veterans and displaced war workers.

Taxes have been so high as to be practically confiscatory but, this has been unavoidable during the prosecution of the war. Our Government has needed the revenue from these taxes to pay the emergency costs of the prosecution of this terrible conflict.

Excessive taxes, however, always tend to stifle private initiative, and I believe we have reached the saturation point from the standpoint of the levying and the collection of taxes. Who will risk capital when they know in advance that, if the venture is successful, taxes will absorb all the gain? It is a case of "Heads,

the tax collector wins; tails, the investor loses."

Our Government has needed and will continue to need much money with which to carry forward the reconversion struggle. However, it is apparent that, with the war's end, taxes should and can be reduced. That is the reason for the necessity of the passage of the tax measure which is before the House today. The Government will not require as much money, except as it sets in motion necessary programs, including desirable public works, and so forth, which will require it. Assurance must be given to industry and given now; it does not have to come later. Tax relief can provide the needed stimulus to business. And tax relief, also, through legislation enacted now, will remove doubt and uncertainty which today continue to prevail.

Those who have participated, and the Members of the Congress who are writing tax legislation, readily agree that we cannot draft a completely new tax bill without the most careful consideration. Horizontal reductions in the existing tax structure could, in my opinion, be enacted new.

I think it is noteworthy that we recall the significant statement made by our late President in his message to the Seventy-ninth Congress, delivered on January 6, 1945, Mr. Roosevelt said:

> We must overhaul the wartime tax structure to stimulate consumers' demand to promote business investment.

The President, correctly, gave thought to what will be necessary in the postwar period. If you read carefully the President's message, you will see it was divided into two general themes; the first part, the story of our Nation at wars end; in the second place, the necessary story of what we must do when peace would come and our Nation once again would go into the channels of peacetime economy.

Not only was the expression of our late President significant, but also the statement made some months ago, by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], should be taken into consideration.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], made the assertion that we must convert our tax structure today into a tomorrow where we will go from a punitive to an incentive system. He is correct. President Truman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and all others who are thinking logically have a definite responsibility now, not later, to set such programs in motion.

I have made a study of this subject of venture capital. I realized that it was only a partial approach, but I introduced H. R. 280. Its provisions, now enacted into law, attempt to encourage venture capital by amending the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, so as to give an exemption for security issues from the present ceiling of $100,000 to $300,000, offering, as it were, an opportunity for the business interests to form themselves into active industry and commercial enterprise.

The impact of the global war forced our Government to the realization that it was necessary to utilize small manufacturing plants in the production program, in order to meet the full battle requirements. But now we are forced to consider the new set of economic problems which confront us as we approach a more normal peacetime economy.

It is necessary that we provide a program to meet the problems which are certain to face the American people in the coming months.

It is well to consider the place occupied by private industry during the prosecution of the war. I know of no man who has recently stated the case better for private industry than Dr. Harold Glenn Moulton, the president of Brookings Institution. He says:

> Instead of sealing the fate of private enterprise, the war period has brought to the American people as a whole and, I believe, to our Government a new realization of its vital importance.

He continued:

> This profound change in Government attitude is due to two principal factors; the remarkable achievement of private enterprise during the war, and a growing recognition that employment and wages depend upon business expansion under a private-enterprise system unless risk assumption is encouraged by the chance of reasonable profits.

He concluded by saying:

> Repeated emphasis on the many freedoms that we are fighting for has inevitably, if unconsciously, carried over into the field of our business enterprises. I do not mean to imply that all Government regulations of business will henceforth be abandoned or that it would be desirable to scrap all forms of proper regulation. I do mean that the excesses of recent years are likely to be modified and a new spirit prevail.

I believe that Dr. Moulton thus stated the case, and our hopes, in a manner on which we can all place our stamp of approval.

The stake of business in this complex and many-sided reconversion picture has been of vital concern to the Members of Congress, and our citizens generally. It is a concern, which I have had, growing out of a deep conviction that sound and healthy business spirit is an indispensable bulwark against monopoly and any threat to our democratic way of living. Sound industry is the keystone in the arch of our free enterprise.

I believe it is in the national interest to maintain and strengthen the competitive position of industry and to assure it always the fullest opportunity for development.

In this development, I have always rejected the proposition that small business constituted a special interest that requires some type of favored treatment at the expense of other groups. Small business seeks only to be recognized as a vitally important part of our national economy and to be protected against practices which interfere with its rightful course of free competition. Nothing else will do justice to these manufacturing and commercial concerns which constitute the backbone of American economy.

To quote a saying which has become famous for its truth: "Little business incorporated is the biggest business in America."

That statement is to express the viewpoint, I am sure, of the vast majority of the American people.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am a member, is now holding daily hearings on the so-called full-employment proposal. The assertion is often made that we face a problem of permanent unemployment in the United States of America. According to this view, it is popular with many, there would be hundreds of thousands of American citizens who are physically and mentally capable of earning a substantial income, but they must, through no fault of their own, live in a state of near pauperism or actually pauperism itself. I do not subscribe to that concept of the future of our Republic. To me, it is unthinkable that any American who is able and willing to provide himself with the necessities and some of the luxuries and conveniences of life by honest work, should not be given the opportunity to do so.

The chief obstacles to such opportunities are frequently of a national character. We cannot forget that. If such, they are beyond individual control.

As a Member of the Congress—and other Members are joining in the program—I have tried to use every resource at our command to see that we overcome in those national, economic difficulties which are too great for an individual to solve himself or surmount alone. But I am convinced that men and women everywhere should depend upon their own physical and mental resources to rise above those obstacles when they are within the source of individual achievement.

This distinction is necessary if we are to maintain a strong, healthy, and self-reliant people as the citizenry of this country.

I do not believe that in 1945 or 1950 or 1960 we are going to get too much of the true American spirit in this country. I pay a tribute to the men and women of the long ago, because they had those qualities of character which wove the fabric of our great country. I do not want us to lose sight, for a moment, of the essentials which went into their manner of thinking and their way of doing.

I introduced a scientific research bill, first in 1935, which I believed would help to increase the number of jobs available in private industry after the war. I have ever believed that the dollar you spent in research comes back ten- or a hundredfold. It is the expenditure that gives a real dividend for the payment of whatever sum you put in it as a government or other political subdivision.

It is gratifying to know that joint hearings are now being held in the Senate for a national science program. One of the measures before the group is sponsored by Senator MAGNUSON, of the State of Washington. I have introduced a similar bill in the House—H. R. 3860.

If industry is to provide a continually increasing number of jobs, one of the first requisites is the stabilization of business conditions. This is based upon adequate regulation of the supply and demand for capital, either by limiting the supply or

by increasing the demand, or by the use of both.

In this proposal I believe we formulate the foundation for a sound research program from which new industrial and commercial developments can spring. As these developments appear, new and profitable outlets of capital will be provided, as well as new and better jobs for hundreds of thousands of workers.

Consequently, private investment may ultimately be substituted for Government expenditures and borrowing as the chief element in the demand for capital. Business will then be able to carry on under its own power as it receives constant stimulation from the flow of new opportunities and private investment. Federal funds spent for roads and airports, both vital to our transportation demands, constitute Government leadership in the field of public works which generally finds ready support from our people. We must, by carefully selected projects, cushion the period from total war to the step-down to peace. I believe that a government with a tax policy must be as eager to promote a constructive peace as it is to prosecute a destructive war.

The soundest sense that I know is the one that gives to the Americans a low rate of tax, insofar as possible, on a high volume of income or business. That is the only way to avoid the subterfuges of inflation, due to the debt to be repudiated, and I think it is the American way to bring a high volume of business with, as I said before, a low tax rate.

Suppose for just a moment, as I finish, we consider the opposite conception of taxation. Suppose we say, "Let us have high tax rates and put it on a low volume of output. What will happen?" You will agree with me that the American family Ford would become the tenant farmer's mule. I believe that our wives would go back to the spinning wheel of our grandmother's day, and the man who would hold the mortgage this time would be Uncle Sam and the tax collectors of the Federal Government. That condition might be almost tragic.

High rates on low volume is nothing more, to quote a colleague, than "government of the government, by the government, and for that government," and that certainly is not the American way of doing business.

We must consider carefully our present and our future structure. We cannot expect a too rapid reduction in our present income-tax structure.

The bill now before us is certainly needed. I support its provisions and believe that it is a definite step in the right direction. It will be welcomed by the great majority of our citizens, as well as the business concerns of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

REPUBLICANS STAND FOR LOW TAXES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to make crystal clear the position of the Republican Members of this House on the matter of taxation, which we are now to consider.

We stand for low taxes.

We intend to continue to fight until this Government eventually realizes that siphoning off the earnings of our people is not just a matter of percentage and schedules, but a matter of human welfare or human misery.

The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee compromised on this bill. They originally demanded a 20-percent reduction for all taxpayers. They compromised because it was the best they could get.

Therefore, as we stand for lower taxes, so do we intend to fight for reducing the costs of this Government.

In other days it was possible to lower the tax rate and produce as much or more revenue by allowing the free play of initiative to swell the incomes and the wages of the farmer, the businessman, and the worker. Now, we have so swollen the administrative costs and so multiplied the restrictions on enterprise and ambition that only the most drastic measures will recreate in the American people the hope of improving their condition and setting aside for themselves a nest egg for a rainy day. We have so swollen the national debt that each family carries a load of more than $8,000 and the sheer weight of it affects the whole financial structure of the Nation and has a profound influence on the purchasing power of the very money we work so hard to earn.

So confused and so complicated have the many purposes of this Government become that the whole jerry-built system of taxation and the wild and senseless spending of the people's money is now wrapped up in fancy theory and discussed as though the welfare and livelihood of a whole nation is just a matter of bookkeeping and financial jugglery.

Let me say right here and now that when this House authorizes a dollar of expense, it takes a dollar out of some citizen's pocket. If we do not raise it in taxation today and only pile it up on the national debt, then we either put the load on some future worker or we take it out of everybody in the form of inflation, plus the interest we must always pay.

If anyone thinks this present bill, which relieves some 12,000,000 families in the lower income groups, is all that is required, let me disabuse him of the notion. These families need jobs—good American jobs—at good American wages. The jobs these families want will not be created by government. Government cannot create anything unless it first takes away. No, these jobs must be created by the ambition and the enterprise of private citizens who see an opportunity to advance themselves and, in so advancing, create opportunities for others. Such private individuals do create opportunities and high wages for others; there is always competition. That is the American way. That is the way this country has grown strong. It is the only way we can carve out a future of continued greatness.

This tax measure has some merit. It reduces tax rates. It is a step in the right direction.

But we must remember, we must serve notice that it is only a step. It still contains policies which destroy, instead of encourage, private initiative. It still contains the foolish idea that you can get more eggs by killing the goose. Above all it still takes too much money out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

There will come a time—and it is not too far off—when the people of this Nation will realize that we cannot go on spending the Government's money. There is no Government money. It is the people's money—and not just some of the people, but all of the people, because we are now spending so much, the total incomes of all the rich added together could not begin to foot the bill.

There will come a time when the people will realize that continued spending and spending and spending creates not the prosperous new world we hear about, but the miserable old world of debt, starvation, taxes, and slavery. There will come a time when the people will realize we cannot go on borrowing to continue spending. Borrowing from a bright future will create only dark poverty for tomorrow and raise storm clouds of fear and discontent in years to come because interest must be paid by the fathers and principal paid by the sons.

If we, the citizens of this generation, have any regard for the next, we will assume as our highest responsibility the relief of this Nation's burdens. We will examine the costs of this Government and ask "Why?" We will search into the projects of this administration and ask "Why?" We will look over the 3,700,000 persons on the Federal pay roll and ask "Why?" We will take notice of the $50,000,000,000 schemes for artificial prosperity advanced to this House and ask "Why?"

If we have any regard for the welfare of the common man, we will know and we will act upon the knowledge that the luxuries of government come from the bread of the people; that the dollar spent for some bureaucratic official's water bottle is a dollar's worth of toil and sweat for the farmer; that the dollars which bought the car in which the bureaucrat rides so comfortably are the dollars the wives of America's wage earners could spend to set their tables; that the money he borrows and spends so freely bears interest we all must pay.

Therefore, I serve notice that although the Republican Members of this House will give their support to this measure, we shall continue to fight with unflagging determination to reduce the costs of this Government and, by so doing, eventually reduce the burden of taxes.

We are determined that opportunity for youth and security for age shall once more return to this land. We are determined that the livelihood of the citizens of this Nation shall not be wasted by Government and that the earnings of the common man shall grace his table and clothe his family, and not be squandered by an extravagant bureaucracy.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER].

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, my remarks are directed primarily at this rule, which brings about a condition which is certainly unsatisfactory to a great many of us here today.

As a general proposition we know that a revenue bill must be brought in under a closed rule, otherwise only chaos would result. On the other hand, it leaves you in a strange position when you realize that under this very rule, this gag rule, this closed rule, this special rule, whatever you want to call it, you have no alternative when the talking and the debate ends, except to vote "yes" or "no" on a bill that may be 60 percent good or 70 percent good, but which is likewise 40 percent or 30 percent extremely bad, at least in the judgment of many Members.

The primary problem that is engaging our minds today is that of reconversion, which is another way of saying that we are trying to find some plan or some system that will afford jobs not only for the people who have them today but for the returning servicemen and servicewomen as well. Jobs can only come from one place and that is from a healthy and expanding economy, and business cannot provide these jobs unless it is given the help and encouragement that makes for expansion. Taxation is the key to our postwar economic condition and the bill under consideration is the first postwar action taken by this Congress in that behalf.

The outstanding defect in the present bill is that part that deals with excess-profits taxes. The bill provides for a continuation of 60 percent of this tax, while many of us think that all excess profits should be removed now that the war is over. Our feelings in this regard are not dictated by any solicitude for those companies which are subject to excess-profits taxes, but rather by the feeling that this extraordinary wartime method of taxation must be abandoned in order that business may proceed with reconversion to the end that the greatest number of men and women may have productive jobs in private business.

Ordinarily, it is not a matter of overwhelming concern to the House what kind of a bill a committee reports, because if it does not suit the House and if it does not suit any individual Member, that Member has the right to offer an amendment to the bill and the House has the right to either adopt or reject it. However, here we are today faced with a bill which, as I say, is perhaps 60 or 70 percent good, yet it retains one feature which the present administration and the preceding administration have repeatedly declared to be unsound in time of peace.

On January 3, 1945, the present Secretary of State, Mr. James F. Byrnes, when he was Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, filed a report with the Congress, the report being labeled House Document No. 9, Seventy-ninth Congress. On page 58, Mr. Byrnes said:

> While an excess-profits tax is justified in time of war, it is recognized that such a tax discourages small and new enterprises.

On April 1, 1945, Mr. Byrnes filed his second report, in which he stated, on page 36:

> The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury are studying the revision of our Federal tax structure for the postwar period. It is important that their reports be presented to and receive the consideration of Congress at the earliest possible date, as knowledge of this tax program is of major importance to the reconversion period.

On July 1, 1945, Mr. Vinson, now Secretary of the Treasury, was Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, having succeeded the Honorable James F. Byrnes. In his third report, filed with the Congress on that day, Mr. Vinson made the unequivocal recommendation, on page 60 of his report:

> The excess-profits tax should be repealed after VJ-day. Taxes on business earnings should be modified, bearing in mind, on the one hand, the revenue needs of the Government and, on the other hand, the incentive for risk taking and expansion to be gained by the modification.

During the hearings held by the Ways and Means Committee, when that committee was considering the present bill, Secretary Vinson appeared and strongly urged the committee to recommend a tax program which would repeal the excess-profits tax in its entirety. He took the position that this tax was intended as a wartime expedient to prevent profiteering. On other occasions Mr. Vinson has stated that in his opinion the excess-profits tax is too erratic an engine to be turned loose for one full year in time of peace.

I submit that there is no member of the present administration save the President himself who is more of a key man in the shaping of the policy of this administration than is Mr. Byrnes. Mr. Vinson, who succeeded Mr. Byrnes as War Mobilization Director, adopted the views of his predecessor with respect to the excess profits tax, and like Mr. Byrnes, urged its abolition after VJ-day. Yet in spite of the admonitions of these two outstanding leaders in the Truman administration, their advice has been disregarded, and a half-baked, hodgepodge bill is reported, which carries on the wartime theory of taxation, at least to the extent of 60 percent, in the peace years ahead.

Confiscatory peacetime taxes can never produce healthy business, and if there be any doubt as to the accuracy of this statement, we have Great Britain as a shining example. Britain at the present time is virtually bankrupt and unless she receives substantial aid from this country in the form of loans and credits, is in a most precarious position. Mr. Phelps Adams of the North American Newspaper Alliance well summed up this situation in an article appearing in the Kansas City Times of October 2, 1945:

(By Phelps Adams)

WASHINGTON, October 1.—Negotiations for the British multi-billion-dollar loan were spreading consternation and despair among New Dealers here today as the study of Britain's present economic plight offered new and persuasive proof of the faults of the anti-big business and social reform program which the Roosevelt administration imported from England a decade ago and has been seeking to transplant in America ever since.

Current negotiations between the British and Americans show clearly that this identical program—adopted in England years ago—is largely responsible for the economic difficulties which have led the British exchequer to the brink of bankruptcy.

SPONSORED DEFICIT SPENDING

Long before the depression affected the United States, England had adopted a policy of deficit spending. Through a national dole, instituted after the last war, idleness was financed at public expense and a broad program of relief and subsidy, costing tremendous sums, was set up.

To finance this program, Britain levied staggering taxes, designed specifically to break up concentrations of wealth and to dry up the major reservoirs of capital. Britain made it virtually impossible for poor men to become wealthy, and to this end imposed confiscatory taxes upon all incomes above a middle-bracket level.

The New Dealers in the last decade have copied all these policies. Whenever they raised taxes—and they raised them tenfold in a single decade—they argued that American taxes were not as high as the British levies. When they inaugurated their "soak-the-rich" and their "soak-business" programs, they argued that we were not as advanced in our economic development as was Britain, and when they embarked on their billions-for-boondoggling, deficit-spending plans, they held up the British experiments in this field as shining examples of liberalism in social reform.

BRITISH EXPORTS TOO LOW

Today, as negotiations for the British loan proceed and are discussed widely in the corridors and lobbies at the Capitol, it is beginning to be understood that Britain faces bankruptcy because she is not able to export enough goods to pay for the imports which she must buy to live.

Her coal mines are one example. England once exported large quantities of coal, and so obtained foreign credits with which to finance her imports. Today, she must import coal. Her mines, it is true, are old and deep and hard to work, and her miners are paid wages which would be regarded as hideously low by miners in this country, but a British miner produces only about a fourth as much coal daily as an American miner, who uses expensive modern machinery.

The British mine owners do not have enough capital to buy and install this machinery. So the British Government must take over the mines and try to find funds with which to modernize them—if it can.

So it is with textiles, which long have been one of the most important products of the British. Because 95 percent of American looms are automatic, while only 5 percent of the British looms are, an American worker can produce up to 10 times as much in an hour as can a British worker. Again, the British mill owners do not have the capital to modernize their plants.

UNITED STATES HAS BIG BUSINESS

It is extremely disconcerting to New Deal economists, therefore, to be told now that the one thing that the United States has which Britain has not—and which makes it possible for the United States to lend the billions that England needs—is big business. It is even more disconcerting for them to have all these facts spread on the record at a time when Lord Keynes is acting as the special emissary from Britain in seeking financial aid from America, for though Lord Keynes is a delightful and persuasive pleader, it was he who sponsored the deficit-spending theories embraced so heartily by the New Dealers and who—with Harold Laski, the British Labor Party's mentor—has been held up by them as the fountainhead of all economic wisdom.

The Washington Post this morning carries an editorial which forcibly points out the weakness and the shortcomings of the tax bill for which we will be asked to vote with no chance to correct its ill-considered provisions.

TAX FOOLISHNESS

The Ways and Means Committee has responded with almost feverish haste to administration suggestions for reductions in taxes. The bill just introduced into the House does not, it is true, follow in detail the recommendations of Secretary Vinson. However, by liberalizing normal tax exemptions it would drop from the tax rolls in a few months some 12,000,000 persons—the number that would be eliminated by Mr. Vinson's proposal to abolish the 3-percent so-called normal income tax. Proposed reductions in surtax rates would provide slightly more tax relief for the higher-income brackets than under the Vinson plan. On the other hand, instead of prompt repeal of the excess-profits tax, as recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury, the bill provides for a reduction of the tax to 60 percent in 1946, with repeal deferred to 1947. Corporate surtax rates are also reduced somewhat, while the capital-stock tax and the related declared value excess-profits tax are repealed. Finally, the committee voted for reduction of the excise war tax rates to the 1942 level, effective July 1, 1946.

In our opinion, the Ways and Means Committee has shown poor judgment. And this on two counts: First, by its refusal to eliminate the excess-profits tax in its entirety, and secondly, by its decision to narrow the income-tax base at this time and reduce rates generally.

There are cogent reasons for speedy abandonment of the excess-profits tax. That tax by its very nature discourages risk-taking and hence acts as a serious deterrent to reconversion and industrial expansion. As Secretary Vinson said in testifying before the committee, the excess-profits tax was imposed as a means of preventing war profiteering. Hence it could be justified as a wartime control measure, despite its numerous and glaring defects. Mr. Vinson concluded with good reasons that it is "too erratic a tax engine to turn loose for even one full year of the postwar period." That being the case, prompt repeal of the tax rather than gradual abandonment affords the only satisfactory method of procedure.

The proposal to relieve some 12,000,000 low-income individuals from any obligation to pay income taxes is, we believe, just as unsound as the failure to vote the end of the excess-profits tax. It would result in a shrinkage of the tax base, and this would have most undesirable consequences. Of course, very few voices are being raised in opposition to this step. Indeed, Republican legislators vie with Democratic legislators in competing for the favor of low-income voters by promises of tax relief. Moreover, the administration is at one with Congress in pressing for abolition. All this volume of support leaves us unmoved in our contention that the move is thoroughly retrograde.

Suppose there were good prospects of achieving a balanced Budget within a comparatively short time. Even so, we firmly believe that a well-balanced tax system should require direct tax contributions from a large proportion of citizens, in spite of the fact that impositions in the lower brackets may yield little revenue and involve considerable administrative costs. In our country the chief source of revenue is the income tax. This is as it should be, for the income tax assures an equitable tax system adjusted to differences in paying ability. In addition, provided there is equity, the income tax is the only means for making the people realize that they have to pay for the cost of running the Government. Only that knowledge stimulates public interest in fiscal affairs and builds up support for sound tax policies.

However, a balanced Budget is not in prospect. Secretary Vinson anticipates a deficit in excess of $30,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year even at present tax levels. Furthermore, as he points out, the war and its aftermath will keep expenditures abnormally high for a long time to come. Under these circumstances the case against tax reductions is indisputable. Such a cut should be deferred to a later date, except for the proposed repeal of the excess-profits tax, which, by acting as a brake on enterprise, inhibits rapid peacetime conversion and hence cuts down revenue in unsuspected ways.

When this matter came before the Committee on Rules yesterday and the very distinguished members of the Committee on Ways and Means appeared in support of their request for a rule, we discussed it rather fully. The consensus of opinion seemed to be, based upon the statements of the leaders of that committee, that the committee had originally looked with favor upon repealing the excess-profits tax in full, as recommended by Secretary Vinson and by Mr. Byrnes, but that they felt they could not do it and stay within an arbitrary figure of $5,000,000,000 which the Treasury had asked them not to exceed in reducing taxes. One distinguished minority Member said that he was not disturbed too much by the House bill for he was sure that the Senate would repeal the excess-profits tax in its entirety.

I submit that under the Constitution the primary responsibility for tax measures and for the taxation policies lies with the House of Representatives where those measures must originate. It lies with the Committee on Ways and Means, which brings in those measures, and to me as a Member of the House it is mighty poor solace to hear it said, "We need not worry, the Senate will correct our bad tax bill." Business and the workers who look to healthy business for jobs have a right to expect from the House of Representatives a tax bill that is calculated to accelerate employment, rather than one which Mr. Byrnes says discourages small and new business.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed absolutely to this rule. I do not believe that it is impossible for the House to legislate about taxes. If I did, I would be very worried about the workings of our Government. I have certain very profound convictions about this taxation matter which I would like to incorporate in the form of amendments. Under this rule, it is impossible to do so. For example, there was a way in which small business could have been given an opportunity and protection in getting started and still have the committee do what it did about the excess-profits tax, which particular point I do not criticize. There should be provided a specific exemption of a certain number of thousands of dollars of earnings for every single business in this country, and that would do more for the really little, small business than we could in any other way. It is my further conviction with reference to the relief afforded to the people in the higher income-tax brackets that it is more than is called for under the present circumstances. I should personally have preferred simply an increase in the exemption for individual income taxpayers. And I believe the further freezing of social-security taxes is bad public policy. Because I believe this bill ought to be changed in certain ways, I cannot support a "gag" rule and will vote against the rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this rule is here because every Member of the Committee on Ways and Means asked for it. It is here because the Committee on Rules voted for it unanimously, I believe. This type of rule is the creature of necessity. Experience has taught us that it is just impossible as a practical matter, to write a tax law on the floor of the House as it would be in a public convention. A single amendment to this technical tax bill might throw every other part of the bill out of gear. Yes, there are "gag" rules. There are closed rules. There are special rules. The difference usually is that the party in power which asks for the gag rule, calls it a special rule and the minority party invariably calls it a gag rule. I am therefore surprised and somewhat amazed to hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], one of the leaders of the party in power, condemn this rule. It would not be here unless the majority so determined. Of course, if I did not know how sound, how solid, and how sincere the gentleman is, I might be so unkind as to accuse him of demagoging, but I want to believe that the gentleman from Illinois, ADOLPH SABATH, never would demagog. I am not going to attempt to discuss the bill. That will be done at the proper time. We should all vote for the rule because it is the only way we can pass a tax bill soon.

Mr. Speaker, a tax bill never passed the Congress that was satisfactory to all of its Members. It is safe to predict that such a bill never will pass the Congress. This bill is not perfect. By and large, however, it will furnish tax relief all along the line. Twelve million people in the lower brackets now paying income taxes will not be required to pay this tax beginning with the year 1946. Many reductions are made in excise taxes and substantial relief is given from the excess-profits tax. Oh, yes; the nuisance $5 automobile use tax also goes with the wind. All of these details are pointed out in the committee report, and will be fully explained by the members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Ways and Means Committee has seen fit to bring bill 4309 on the House floor without holding public hearings. While I recognize merit in their argument that speed is vital in framing this tax bill, I believe the bill makes such

fundamental changes in existing tax legislation that full public hearings should have been held.

Since there were no public hearings on the bill I believe the gag rule now before us should be voted down. Certainly this bill can be improved by proper amendments. Proposals that could not be submitted to the committee because there were no hearings should be given consideration in the Committee of the Whole.

For these reasons I shall vote against the rule. However, should the gag rule prevail I will vote for the bill as it does contain many sound provisions, particularly those removing 12,000,000 people in the lower income groups from the income-tax rolls, repealing the Federal auto tax, and lowering certain excise taxes to prewar levels.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank the membership of the Ways and Means Committee for incorporating into the tax bill now before us for consideration, H. R. 4309, legislation I had introduced to terminate the use tax on motor vehicles and boats. On March 21, 1945, I introduced H. R. 2707, which reads as follows:

A bill to terminate the use tax on motor vehicles and boats

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3540 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on the use of motor vehicles and boats) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(k) Termination of tax.—The tax imposed by this section shall not apply with respect to any period after June 30, 1945."

I introduced a similar bill on July 5, 1945 (H. R. 3692) which terminated the tax June 30, 1946.

Mr. Speaker, I desire at this point to incorporate a letter to me from the American Automobile Association, and also to incorporate copy of a telegram sent by this association to Congressman ROBERT L. DOUGHTON and Senator WALTER F. GEORGE:

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., October 6, 1945.

Hon. J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCGREGOR: You have been greatly interested, I know, in the question of repealing the $5 Federal use tax on motor vehicles as attested particularly by the introduction early this year of your bill, H. R. 2707. In view of your very fine efforts to have the levy outlawed once and for all, I am enclosing a copy of the telegram which was sent yesterday by H. J. Brunnier, president of the American Automobile Association, to Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and to Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. This message will doubtless be of interest to you, since it expresses sentiments with which I feel you will be in accord. As Mr. Brunnier indicated, we know likewise that these sentiments are held by the vast majority of America's 24,000,000 passenger-car owners. It is possible that you may wish to call this message to the attention of your colleagues.

Yours very truly,

RUSSELL E. SINGER,
General Manager.

From: Department of Public Relations, American Automobile Association, Washington, D. C., October 5, 1945.

Copy of telegram to:

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Millions of passenger car owners all over the country will applaud the announcement, made today, that the House Ways and Means Committee has recommended repeal of the $5 Federal use tax on motor vehicles in the special relief tax bill now being framed.

As the American Automobile Association has pointed out to you and your associates many times in the past, this tax has been one of the most unpopular levies ever enacted in this country, and the repeal of it has been long overdue. The levy has been a nuisance not only to the already tax-burdened motorists, but also to those who have had the difficult job of administering and enforcing it. These millions of people directly affected by the tax will be watching and hoping that a similar recommendation will be forthcoming soon from the Senate Finance Committee and that the repeal measure will be voted through and the tax permanently outlawed before the start of the next fiscal year.

When the time comes for the real postwar tax bill, we are most hopeful that Congress will give serious consideration to the abolition of all Federal automotive excise taxes, so that this field of taxation will be left to the States.

H. J. BRUNNIER,
President, American Automobile Association.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion the cancellation of this obnoxious auto use tax will be of great benefit to all of the people.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to vote today to repeal the most unpopular tax ever foisted upon the American people. I refer to the $5 use-tax stamp which we will abolish for all time, with the passage of this bill.

When the House originally approved of this stamp, it was buried in a lot of other tax items and little information was given out about it. Comparatively few people realized it was a law until the Bureau of Internal Revenue began to chase those who had not paid their $5. Then they woke up.

The fact that we are repealing this odious tax today indicates that Members of the Ways and Means Committee have given heed to the protests without number which have come to them as the result. If they received as many kicks about the stamp as I did, I feel sorry for them.

Anyway, we are doing a noble thing today by doing away with this tax, because it is unfair to the American people. I doubt if a penny has ever been cleared on the revenue from it. The cost to administer it must have taken all the money it brought in, especially to carry the additional 1,200 clerks that were hired to take care of just the stamps.

Last June, I introduced a bill to eliminate the stamps and have continually agitated against them. I did so in the interest of thousands of automobile drivers who found the tax embarrassing and useless. I felt then and I do now, that people should not be penalized for driving cars. It is to the advantage of the country that the public stays on wheels.

The tax was never a fair one. As many got out of paying it as bought the stamps. For years, lax enforcement caused people to delay buying them. When those who did comply with the law saw the others ignoring it, they called themselves suckers for being good citizens.

So the use stamp has left a bad taste in the public's mouth, and we are being smart today in deciding to see the last of it. Let us not pass any more taxes like this one. We will lose face if we do, for the people do not like such tactics.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 4309, with Mr. JARMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill under consideration, H. R. 4309, unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to afford the taxpayers of the country some relief from oppressive taxes made necessary by the war, particularly for the year 1946. Like most tax bills, it does not represent entirely the views of any one member of the committee, or any single person, but might be called a compromise bill, although no compromise was made in matters of principle.

In the preparation of the bill we were afforded immeasurable assistance by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, a former member of our committee, and a man of broad knowledge on the subject of taxation, and I would not let this occasion pass without expressing my appreciation of the fine contribution he and his staff made to our work in preparing the bill, without which assistance it would not have been possible for our committee to have agreed on a bill of such great importance in so short a time. Neither do I believe we could have done as satisfactory work without

this help. It required the committee approximately 5 days of earnest deliberation and discussion to reach an agreement as to the provisions contained in the bill. I also express my sincere thanks to the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative KNUTSON, the very able and active ranking member of the minority—in fact all the minority members, for cooperating unselfishly and wholeheartedly in the preparation of the bill. Members of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation also rendered invaluable assistance in our committee work. The bill is a fine example of the nonpartisan attitude which our entire committee displayed in its work.

Secretary Vinson recommended that we reduce taxes in the amount of $5,000,000,000, or as near that figure as practicable. The yield in revenue, after this bill is enacted into law, is estimated to be, for the taxable year 1946, approximately $27,100,000,000, or a reduction from what present laws would yield of approximately $5,300,000,000.

Our committee provided relief to corporations through the reduction in, or repeal of the following taxes: the excess-profits tax, the corporate surtax, the capital-stock tax, and the declared value excess-profits tax, and excise taxes.

1. EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

Secretary Vinson, in his appearance before our committee, recommended outright repeal of the excess-profits tax for 1946. Our committee found that it would not be possible to adopt this suggestion of the Secretary if any relief were to be granted to corporations not subject to the excess-profits tax, without exceeding, considerably, the $5,000,000,000 limit set by the Secretary. It was estimated by the Treasury that the repeal of the excess-profits tax for 1946 would result in a revenue loss of $2,555,000,000, which was more than one-half of the $5,000,000,000 tax reduction recommended by the Treasury.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the committee, the distinguished and able Member from North Carolina, yield to me?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, and a very able, fair member of our committee, I am proud to say.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman, I believe, will agree that according to the best information we can secure there are something like 500,000 corporations in this country but that only 19,000 of them have been making excess profits. To follow the suggestion of the administration, it would mean that we would give all corporate relief to the 19,000 and give none whatever to the 481,000 less prosperous corporations.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I was coming to that very point, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. While I am on my feet let me say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I agree with and approve of every provision of this bill. I believe it is the fairest and most equitable tax-reduction bill that has been written by the House of Representatives since I have been a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and it is entitled to the vote of every Member of this House.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] made a very great contribution in the preparation of this bill, and I am proud to say on his behalf that he was most helpful, as was every member of our committee. I do not believe any member of our committee has a monopoly on wisdom, a monopoly on patriotism, or a monopoly on doing what is the right thing by our Government at this or any other time.

Our committee found it would not be possible to adopt this suggestion of the Secretary if any relief were to be granted to corporations not subject to excess-profits taxes without exceeding considerably the $5,000,000,000 limit set by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. RICH. While we are considering the revenues of the country let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the national debt as of October 8 stands at $262,235,000,000. I suppose the Ways and Means Committee have been given an assurance by the administration that they are going to cut down expenses in greater proportion than the taxes are reduced. If they do not, what is going to happen?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The gentleman is as good at answering that as any Member of the House. He and the other Members can form their own conclusions or draw their own inferences.

Now I wish to develop a little more fully this excess-profits tax reduction because that is the bone of contention in the bill, but I think largely a political bone, if I may be pardoned for expressing my personal opinion.

An analysis of the corporations subject to the excess-profits tax, who would benefit from outright repeal of the excess-profits tax for 1946, disclosed that at least 70 percent of the relief would go to only 900 corporations, 25 percent to 6,000 corporations, and only 5 percent to 12,200 corporations. The amount of the relief which each of these groups would receive is as follows:

Number of excess-profits corporations	*Amount of tax relief*
900	$1,797,000,000
6,000	628,000,000
12,200	130,000,000
Total, 19,100	2,555,000,000

It is estimated that for the year 1946 there will be approximately 500,000 corporations filing income-tax returns. Of this number around 19,000 will file excess-profits-tax returns and 261,000 will file taxable income-tax returns. Therefore, it can be seen that if our total corporate relief was granted through the repeal of the excess-profits tax, I repeat, it would benefit only 19,000 corporations, and 70 percent of the relief would go to only 900 corporations. In this way that part of the 261,000 not making excess profits would receive no relief whatever. Our committee could not defend such a restricted application of the corporate-tax benefits. Instead, we endeavored to distribute the corporate-tax relief among as many corporate-tax payers as possible. Instead of repealing all the excess-profits tax for 1946, our committee reduced the rate for 1946 from 85½ to 60 percent, which would cut the tax in half, in dollars, and repealed the remainder of the tax, effective as of January 1, 1947. This would result in a tax benefit to the excess-profits-tax payers for the year 1946 of $1,300,000,000. This will constitute about 65 percent of the corporate-tax relief.

Second. Capital-stock tax and declared value excess-profits tax:

By not confining the entire corporate relief to the excess-profits tax we were able to repeal, effective for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, the capital-stock tax and the related declared value excess-profits tax. The capital-stock tax is at the rate of $1.25 per $1,000 of the declared value of the capital stock of a corporation. This tax is paid not only by corporations subject to normal and surtax but also by corporations with deficits. Its repeal will, therefore, benefit the large number of corporations filing income-tax returns, whether taxable or not. It will also result in corporate-tax simplification and relieve corporations of the necessity of maintaining additional records. The dollar tax benefit for this repeal is $183,000,000.

3. CORPORATE SURTAX

Our committee granted relief to the 261,000 corporations liable only to normal and surtax by reducing the corporate surtax by 4 percentage points.

To understand the effect of this provision, it should be remembered that corporations with not more than $25,000 surtax net incomes are subject to a surtax of 10 percent, and corporations with a surtax net income over $50,000 are subject to a surtax of 16 percent. These rates are reduced 6 percent and 12 percent, respectively. The effect of these changes can be seen through the combined normal and surtax rates. Under existing law, a corporation with a net income of $5,000 pays a normal tax of 15 percent and a surtax of 10 percent, or a total of 25 percent. Under the bill, such a corporation will pay a normal tax of 15 percent and a surtax of 6 percent, making a total of 21 percent. Under present law, a corporation with income of $50,000 pays a 24-percent normal tax and a 16-percent surtax, or a total of 40 percent. Under the bill this total is reduced to 36 percent. Corporations with incomes between $25,000 and $50,000 also receive a corresponding reduction. The loss in revenue from this reduction will amount to approximately $405,000,000.

4. EXCISE TAXES

The reduction of war excise tax rates will result in a revenue loss of approximately $535,000,000. The reduction in these war-tax rates will benefit not only individuals but also corporations. This is evident from an examination of

the list, which reduces, among others, the telephone tax, the telegraph tax, the tax on transportation of persons, and the tax on seats and berths. It is believed reasonable to assume that at least 25 percent of this total revenue loss, or $134,000,000, will inure to the benefit of corporations.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. When will the reduction on individual income taxes apply? Will that become effective January 1, 1946?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Of course, the amount of the reduction in the individual income tax will vary, but in the case of a man who has a wife and no dependents and earns approximately $5,000 a year, what reduction in the percentage of tax would he get?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Whatever his surtax may be now, it will be reduced by at least 4 percentage points and by an additional exemption for normal tax purposes. If his surtax is 25 percent, it will be 21 percent.

II. INDIVIDUALS

The reductions afford relief to individuals through three sources:

(a) Reduction in individual income tax.

(b) Repeal of the automobile use tax.

(c) Reduction in excise tax rates.

REDUCTION IN INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1946—NORMAL TAX EXEMPTION

First. By allowing each taxpayer a $500 exemption for himself, $500 for his spouse, and $500 for each dependent in computing his total normal and surtax liability, we removed 12,000,000 taxpayers out of a total of 48,000,000 taxpayers from the tax rolls, who, under existing law, are required to pay a normal tax of 3 percent on their net income in excess of $500. This group of taxpayers consists of married persons and persons with dependents. Now that the war is over our committee believes it desirable and proper to remove these 12,000,000 income recipients from the tax rolls.

This is accomplished by allowing the same marital exemption and credit for dependents for normal tax purposes, as we now allow for surtax purposes. Thus, a married person, whose net income does not exceed $1,000 will not be required to pay, under the bill, any income tax for 1946. Under the existing law, a married person with two dependents, whose net income is $2,000 pays an income tax of $45, while under the committee bill he pays no tax. The reason for this is that under the bill we allow every individual for both normal and surtax purposes, an exemption of $500 for himself, plus an additional $500 for his wife and $500 for each dependent. The loss in revenue from this change amounts to $782,000,000, of which $310,000,000 results by relieving twelve million from tax.

2. SURTAX RATE REDUCTION

Our committee gave additional income-tax relief to the remaining 36,000,000 taxpayers by reducing the rates applicable to each surtax bracket. The surtax rate applicable to each surtax bracket was lowered by 4 percentage points, and the surtax schedule rearranged so that each individual income taxpayer will have at least a 10-percent reduction in his total normal and surtax income-tax liability. This change, which will benefit all individual taxpayers on the tax rolls, amounts to $1,845,000,000.

The burden tables showing the relief afforded to individuals are contained in the report and I invite the attention of the committee to the tables appearing in the report. However, I will give a few examples of the relief afforded. A single person with a net income of $1,000 pays a tax under existing law of $115. Under the bill, his tax will be $95, or a saving of $20. If his net income is $2,500, he now pays a tax of $460 and under the bill $380, or $80 less than he now pays.

A married person with no dependents, with a net income of $2,500 pays $360 tax under existing law and $285 tax under the bill, or a tax saving of $75.

Your committee was also concerned about the individuals in businesses. The latest available statistics indicate that in 1942 89 percent of all businesses in the United States, excluding agriculture, forest, and fishing industries, were not incorporated but were carried on as sole proprietorships and partnerships.

In the manufacturing, retail and wholesale trade, and service industries, these businesses in 1939 employed over 25 percent of the persons employed in that year. These groups are benefited by getting at least a 10-percent reduction in their normal and surtaxes for 1946.

Our total individual income-tax reductions are estimated to result in a total loss in revenue of $2,627,000,000.

3. USE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES AND BOATS

Effective as of July 1, 1946, our committee repealed the $5 use tax on automobiles and boats. This means an annual tax saving of $5 to each automobile owner. Figures indicate that there are approximately 30,000,000 automobile owners in the United States. The tax benefit in dollars amounts to $140,000,000 for the year 1946.

4. EXCISE TAXES

The war excise tax increases which were adopted in the Revenue Act of 1943, are terminated as of July 1, 1946. This will result in a tax benefit for the last half of the year 1946 in the amount of $535,000,000 of which at least three-fourths, or $401,000,000 will inure to the benefit of individuals.

Thus, the rate of tax on distilled spirits, after June 30, 1946, will be $6 per gallon instead of the war tax of $9 per gallon. The tax on furs and jewelry will be 10 percent of the retail price instead of the war tax rate of 20 percent, and the 15 cents per gallon tax on still wines will revert to 10 cents per gallon. The tax on luggage under the existing law reverts to the old manufacturers' tax base and becomes a manufacturers' tax on the first day of the first month following 6 months after termination of the war either by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution. Your committee reduced the rate of this tax from 20 percent to 10 percent, effective July 1, 1946, but continued it as a retailers' tax with the present retailers' base. A table showing all of the reductions will be found on page 13 of the Committee report.

5. FLOOR STOCK REFUNDS

In the report on the revenue bill of 1943, our committee stated that it was brought to the attention of the committee that in the case of distilled spirits, wines, and fermented malt liquors, upon which floor stock taxes had been paid, there might result extremely heavy burdens upon dealers who have floor stocks on hand when the reductions take effect. Since the committee has provided that these reductions shall take effect on July 1, 1946, we have provided for refunds of the tax paid with respect to floor stocks on hand as of this date, under proper safeguards and under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner and approved by the Secretary. Somewhat similar relief has been afforded to dealers in electric light bulbs who bore the manufacturers' tax on electric light bulbs in the increased price they paid the manufacturer. The revenue loss from this source is $160,000,000.

6. FREEZING TAX RATES FOR OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE

Our committee has a special staff which is now engaged in a study of social-security legislation. An issue which must be met before the end of this year is whether the tax rates for old-age and survivors' insurance should rise on January 1, 1946. Such increase in rates has been postponed up to the present so that the rate now is 1 percent on the wages paid by the employer and 1 percent on the wages received by the employee. Unless some action is taken prior to the end of this year the rate of tax will rise from 1 percent each to 2½ percent each. Our committee has agreed with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury that the 1 percent rate should be continued for 1946, and the question of what proper rate should finally be adopted should await further action on social-security financing as a whole.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I notice on page 13 of the report with respect to repealing the use tax on cars and motorboats that the report says the war is ended and the reason for retaining the tax no longer exists, and, therefore, your committee believes the tax should be discontinued. Suppose a man buys a new car now. Should he be compelled to pay a use tax on it since the war has ended and the reason for continuing the tax no longer exists, according to the report of your committee?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It is repealed, effective July 1. If he buys a new car, of course, he would have to pay the tax.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. According to the report of the committee, you say the war is ended and this tax should not be imposed.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. But this is a tax that is paid for an annual period. If you buy a car at the first of the year, you would have to pay a part of this tax for the proportion of the annual period for which you owned the car.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Does not the gentleman believe the bill should be amended so that no more use tax should be paid on automobiles or on boats?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That would not be fair to the people who paid the tax last July for the whole year. We try to keep all taxpayers on an equal basis.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is it not true that when these taxes were put on, the war was in existence?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That is true, but the taxpayer will have to pay only a pro rata part of the tax for the remainder of the year. He will not have to pay for the full year. He will just pay for the part of the year that had not expired when he purchased the car.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The automobile-use tax is prorated by months. It is on a monthly basis.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

The total relief under the bill for 1946 may be summarized as follows:

Individuals:	
(1) Individual income tax	$2,627,000,000
(2) Use tax on automobiles	140,000,000
(3) Excise taxes	401,000,000
Total relief to individuals	3,168,000,000
Corporations:	
(1) Reduction of the excess-profits tax to 60 percent for 1946, with outright repeal for 1947. Tax benefit for 1946	1,300,000,000
(2) Reduction of corporate surtax by 4 percentage points, effective for 1946	405,000,000
(3) Repeal of the capital-stock tax for the year ending June 30, 1946, and its companion, the declared value excess-profits tax	183,000,000
(4) Termination of excise taxes as of July 1, 1946. Tax benefit to corporations, approximately	134,000,000
Total relief to corporations	2,022,000,000
Total individual relief	3,168,000,000
Total corporate relief	2,022,000,000
Floor-stock refunds on liquor, wines, fermented malt liquors, and electric-light bulbs	160,000,000
Total benefits	5,350,000,000

In closing, I must emphasize the importance of enacting this bill promptly, so as to afford relief for 1946 to individuals. The administrative machinery required to print and distribute the new withholding tables made necessary by these changes make it imperative to enact this bill into law by November 1, 1945. Future tax reductions will depend upon curtailment of governmental expenditures. To accomplish this, it will be necessary for special groups to refrain from requesting Federal grants for nonessential projects. The States and local governments can also assist in helping us to reduce taxes by taking over functions which properly belong to them, and which the Federal Government has been forced to assume during the past several years. Our expenditures must not only be placed in balance with our receipts, but we must make every effort to provide at the earliest possible moment for a reduction of our debt, and the annual carrying charge thereon.

To make taxes bearable it is important that all nonessential Federal spending be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the tax bill now before us marks an innovation that will be welcomed by the country. Since the New Deal came into power in 1933 we have had 17 tax bills, all of them imposing new and increased burdens in the form of additional taxes. This is the first tax bill in 13 long years that is designed to lighten the tax burdens of the American people and, as such, will be hailed with varying degrees of satisfaction by those who foot the bills.

The ten to twelve million who will be relieved from paying Federal income taxes will greet the measure with joyous hosannas, and they can thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] for freeing them from their burden. Those who remain chained in bondage to the Federal tax collector will experience a feeling of thankfulness in varying degrees.

When your committee began consideration of this measure, Secretary Vinson appeared before the committee for an entire day and gave us the benefit of his views. He recommended that the total tax reductions be held within an arbitrary $5,000,000,000 limit, stating that the deficit for the current fiscal year would be in the neighborhood of $30,000,000,000. Of course, with such an enormous deficit facing the country it was thought neither possible nor desirable to go to the length in tax reduction that many of us had hoped would be possible. Indeed, there were those who questioned the wisdom of making any reductions whatever under the circumstances.

However, we were given considerable encouragement to go ahead and effect substantial tax reductions when Mr. Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, later stated to the committee that he estimated the deficit for the calendar year 1946 at $12,000,000,000.

The vast spread between the two estimates may be accounted for by the fact that Mr. Vinson's estimate was for the present fiscal year, ending June 30 next, which period will call for substantial military expenditures. On the other hand, Mr. Stam's estimates embraced the entire calendar year 1946, the last half of which should witness greatly curtailed military expenditures.

Our chairman has given you a comprehensive and factual analysis of the bill now before us. He has told you that the total tax liabilities under the committee bill for 1946 are estimated at $27,140,000,000, or $5,350,000,000 less than the estimate for the existing law during the next calendar year; that of this reduction $2,627,000,000 is attributable to reductions in individual income taxes; $1,888,000,000 to reductions in corporate taxes; $535,000,000 to the return of certain excise taxes to their 1942 rates; $140,000,000 to the repeal of the tax on the use of motor vehicles and boats; and $160,000,000 to the tax refunds to be made of the war excise taxes on floor stocks of alcoholic beverages and light bulbs.

In the calendar year 1947 the tax liabilities, under the bill before us, will be $7,252,000,000 lower than the estimates under the existing law, which is an additional loss of nearly $2,000,000,000 over that of 1946. I call to the attention of the House the tables contained on pages 3 and 4 of the committee report which give an itemized analysis of the tax reductions made in the pending bill.

Following that will be found a general discussion of recommended individual income tax reductions. On page 6 will be found a table giving comparison of individual surtax rates and cumulative surtax under the present law and under the committee bill. Other helpful and informative tables follow on pages 7, 8, and 9.

Your committee was quite generally in accord on most proposals contained in the pending bill, save in the matter of excess-profits tax repeal. The Republican members of the committee felt with the Treasury Department that the excess-profits tax should terminate as of December 31 of this year. Our reason for taking that position may be briefly summarized by saying that the war is over and the tax has served its purpose. None can successfully argue that it should be retained as a part of our permanent peacetime tax structure. Unfortunately for the country, a majority of the committee preferred to do the job piecemeal and voted to reduce the net excess-profits rate from 85½ to 60 percent for 1946, the balance to be terminated the following year, December 31, 1947. We do not feel that this action is in keeping with the promise made to the country when the excess-profits tax was first adopted in the Second Revenue Act of 1940. At that time the Congress assured the country that the tax would be terminated when the war was over. The war is over. It ended in August, so we of the minority feel that this is the time to make good on the promise then made.

We can only hope that the Senate will complete the job.

I direct the attention of the House to page 9, which sets forth in considerable detail the action taken by your committee with reference to corporate taxes. The bill before you would reduce surtax rates by 4 percentage points, effective January 1, next. This reduces the present combined normal tax and surtax rate of 40 percent on corporations with net incomes of $50,000 and over to 36 percent. A similar reduction is also provided in the bill for corporations having incomes of less than $50,000.

At the outset of my remarks I called attention to the fact that from ten to twelve million taxpayers will be relieved from paying individual income taxes. This is because of our having extended to the normal personal income tax the same exemptions as are given under the surtax in the present law. An analysis of that action will be found on page 15 of the report.

The bill before us today provides for the repeal of the capital-stock tax and declared-value excess-profits tax as of June 30 next. This action was advocated by Secretary Byrnes, while Stabilization Director, and later by Secretary Vinson while he held the same position. The Treasury terms these taxes troublesome and unsatisfactory.

At this point I wish to call to your attention another phase of the bill which provides for again freezing the 1 percent employment tax that is levied on employers and employees to finance the old-age and survivors' insurance program. It is the third time we have frozen this tax and there are several reasons for the action taken. In the first place, your committee is without dependable information as to just what rate it is necessary to levy in order to keep the fund solvent. We are now having an exhaustive study made of this subject. I am happy to announce to the House that the old-age and survivors' insurance fund is in a very satisfactory condition, so no apprehension need be felt that the action of your committee may jeopardize its solvency.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is the amount now in the old-age and survivors' insurance fund?

Mr. KNUTSON. The old-age retirement fund now stands at $6,649,300,000.

Again let me state that H. R. 4309 is a step in the right direction because it will give some relief to the harassed taxpayers of America. However, it does not go far enough. Further tax reductions will be necessary before our economy can be placed on a sound, secure, and durable basis. Further reductions are imperative if we would gear industry to the high speed needed to satisfy domestic needs.

Many of the tax increases that have been imposed upon us the past 13 years were made necessary by New Deal waste, and squandering of the taxpayers' money. Congress cannot escape its share of the responsibility for this deplorable program of waste.

Even before Pearl Harbor we saw appropriations for the various departments, and the ever-increasing number of bureaus and commissions, greatly increased year after year. All attempts on the part of the minority to eliminate needless and wasteful appropriations were shouted down by a power-drunk majority that only thought in terms of political spoils. Their slogan was "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect."

Little or no attempt was made to supervise the spending of the astronomical sums of money that were appropriated by a blind and obedient majority and which must be paid by unborn generations.

Since the inauguration of the New Deal there has been a steady procession of long-haired spenders coming to Congress with their fantastic and frothy plans for tapping the Federal Treasury, and sometimes it seemed that the more fantastic and impractical the plan appeared, the more readily the desired appropriation was secured.

I am not indicting the Appropriations Committee as a whole, but I do say that there have been times when the committee could have shown greater concern for the harassed taxpayers, and I want to take this occasion to suggest to the minority members of the committee that henceforth whenever the majority rams through, by brute force, unjustifiable and indefensible appropriations they bring in a minority report that the House may be fully apprised of what is being proposed.

The Ways and Means Committee has every right to demand that the money they raise through taxation be wisely and judiciously expended. We must return to the old order, when every supplicant appearing before the Appropriations Committee will again have to prove the soundness and the necessity of what he is asking, before being given a single dollar.

The time has come for the President to reduce the operating expenses of the Government to the lowest possible level consistent with efficient operation. Even today, with the war over, the Federal pay rolls continue to be padded. Instead of reducing the number of employees they are being constantly increased.

Gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee, that sort of business has got to stop if the Government is to remain solvent.

We are committed to a program of tax reduction. It rests with the Appropriations Committee and the President if that program is to be carried out.

Clearly, we cannot have tax reduction and increased spending at one and the same time.

It is going to take something more than mere lip service to bring about a balanced Budget.

In making appropriations from here on all doubts should be resolved in favor of the Federal Treasury and the American taxpayer.

With a depleted Treasury, with taxes higher than ever before, the committees of Congress must carefully weigh and appraise all requests for authorizations and appropriations.

I pledge to the country, here and now, the continued support of all Republicans to every move toward a balanced Budget.

Deficit spending must stop.

From here on all expenditures must be within receipts, and necessary.

Let the Congress and the President ever bear in mind that taxes can be lowered only as we reduce spending. The two are bound together, and move up or down, together.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, H. R. 4309, grants tax relief to individuals and business in the amount of about $5,350,000,000 to aid in the difficult period of transition from war to peace. The peak of Federal wartime expenditures was reached in the fiscal year 1945 when war expenditures totaled $90,500,000,000, and total expenditures of the Government reached $100,100,000,000. The estimate of the Bureau of the Budget for the fiscal year 1946 indicates a decline in war expenditures to $50,500,000,000, and of total expenditures to $66,400,000,000. Although expenditures will continue to decline, they will remain at relatively high levels.

The peak of wartime revenues was reached in the fiscal year 1945 with total receipts of $46,500,000,000, leaving a deficit of $53,600,000,000. The latest estimate for the fiscal year 1946 indicates that revenues will decline to about $36,000,000,000, leaving a Budget deficit of $30,400,000,000. Although a $30,400,000,000 deficit is a great improvement over a $53,000,000,000 deficit, it is still a very large amount, and must be borne in mind when we consider tax relief. We would naturally like to give all the tax relief that is possible, but we must bear in mind that our paramount duty is to see that the credit of this Government is maintained, and that the 85,000,000 holders of Government bonds are properly protected.

At this point I would like to quote from our good friend and former colleague, Hon. Fred M. Vinson, the present Secretary of the Treasury:

> Hence, after considering all the factors, economic and budgetary, it is my considered judgment that total reductions should not exceed $5,000,000,000 for 1946.

Your Committee on Ways and Means has worked out a program which adheres substantially to this figure and gives tax relief on as fair and equitable a basis as is deemed possible at this time.

The pending bill provides tax relief for individuals and corporations and reduces certain excise taxes. These reductions are effective next January 1 and apply in the main to the taxable year 1946 except in the case of the excise taxes, which is next July 1. With respect to the individual income taxes, the present surtax exemptions are made applicable to the normal tax so that the normal tax exemption of $500 for each taxpayer is eliminated and he is allowed in its place exemptions of $500 for himself, his spouse, and each dependent. This will result in about 12,000,000 low-income taxpayers being eliminated from the tax rolls.

Second. The rate applicable to each surtax bracket is reduced by 4 percentage points. The combined normal tax and surtax starting rate will thus be 19 percent instead of the present 23 percent.

Third. It is also provided that the reduction for each taxpayer shall be not less than 10 percent of the amount of his tax.

As to the corporation taxes, the excess-profits tax rate is reduced to 60 percent from the present net tax rate of 85½ percent. The entire excess-profits tax is repealed for 1947.

The corporate surtax rate is reduced 4 percentage points. This results in a minimum combined corporate, normal, and surtax rate of 21 percent in place of the present 25 percent, and a maximum combined rate of 36 percent instead of the present 40 percent.

The capital-stock tax is repealed. Also, the accompanying declared value excess-profits tax.

With respect to excise taxes, the excise war-tax rates as provided in the 1943 Revenue Act are reduced to the rates carried in the 1942 Revenue Act, and a proper floor-stock tax-refund provision is included in the bill, which is necessary when excise-tax rates are reduced.

The bill also provides for the repeal of the automobile-use tax as of next July 1.

The social-security-tax rates for old-age and survivors' insurance are frozen at the present 1 percent each for employer and employee instead of being allowed to increase next year to 2½ percent for each employer and employee.

The estimated losses of revenue for the various items in the pending bill are about as follows:

For the calendar year 1946, in comparison with the present year of 1945, the excise-tax loss is $535,000,000. The excess-profits-tax loss is $1,300,000,000. The corporation surtax, 4 percent, the loss is $405,000,000. The individual-income-tax loss is $2,627,000,000. The capital-stock-tax loss is $183,000,000. The automobile-use-tax loss is $140,000,000. The floor-stock-tax-refund loss is $160,000,000; making a total for the year 1946 of $5,350,000,000.

For the calendar year 1947, in comparison with the present year of 1945, the excise-tax loss is $1,041,000,000. The excess-profits-tax loss is $2,555,000,000. The corporation surtax, 4 percent, loss is $646,000,000. The individual-income-tax loss is $2,627,000,000. The capital-stock-tax loss is $243,000,000, and the automobile-use-tax loss is $140,000,000, making a total loss for the year 1947 of $7,252,000,000.

Thus it will be seen that there will be $1,902,000,000 loss in revenue in 1947 more than in 1946.

It is believed by your Committee on Ways and Means that every effort has been exerted to work out the pending bill on as fair and as equitable a basis as is possible under the existing situation. When we had presented to us the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, the responsible official of this Government charged with supervising the fiscal policies of the Government, that it would not be safe for us to afford at this time more than $5,000,000,000 of tax relief, your committee felt that it should work out as fair and equitable a program as is possible within that figure.

You will see from the estimates that have been given here that individual taxpayers receive a little larger benefit in tax reduction than is realized by other taxpayers; but it is felt it is in the best interests of the country as a whole to relieve these 12,000,000 low-income taxpayers. It should be borne in mind that at present a single person making about $10 a week—that is only about a dollar and a half a day, has to file an income-tax return. A married person making about $24 a week has to file an income-tax return. With the increase in the cost of living it is felt by your committee that these people should be given the relief that is provided in this bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I think the gentleman has accented the most important thing in this bill. There are those who say this bill does not do anything for the little man. It does, it takes 12,000,000 of them out of the tax picture at just one stroke of the pen.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee yields back 6 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to use a blackboard in order that I may better be able to illustrate a point that I believe is one of the most important and one of the most abstruse in connection with this and almost any other tax bill, especially when we deal with corporate taxes.

Mr. Chairman, before I get into my blackboard presentation, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. I should like also to insert in my remarks if it has not already been done elsewhere in the RECORD, the views of the minority as expressed in the report filed by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment those who are responsible for drawing the report which was prepared to accompany this bill under consideration. I think it is one of the most comprehensive and elucidating reports I have ever seen. All tax matters, of course, are very complicated and are difficult to put down in legend form. They are not altogether easy to explain by figures. If my colleagues would permit, I should like to suggest to them that they file away for future reference a copy of this report. The report was prepared I believe by the Ways and Means Committee's regular staff assisted by the Treasury staff.

I believe one of the most complicated subjects considered in connection with our tax program is the subject of excess profits. It is very difficult to understand and I feel some trepidation in attempting to explain it, but I believe this illustration on the blackboard will be a worthy visual aid to me and to the membership. I shall insert this blackboard illustration in the RECORD at this point:

EXHIBIT A

Illustration showing how excess-profits tax is computed

1. Assuming a corporation with net income of	$250,000
2. Assuming an excess-profits base by average earnings method or invested capital method of	75,000
3. Adding the regular exemption of	25,000
4. Total amount exempt	100,000
5. Total amount subject to excess-profits tax	150,000
6. Tax on $150,000 at excess-profits rate of 60 percent as provided in new legislation	90,000
7. Subtract $150,000 upon which tax has been paid from $250,000 there remains subject to normal and surtax	100,000
8. Tax on $100,000 at normal and surtax rate of 36 percent as provided in new legislation	36,000
9. Excess-profits tax of $90,000 plus normal and surtax of $36,000 makes total tax under new law	126,000
10. Tax under present law would be	168,250

In this illustration I am assuming net earnings of $250,000. It is purely an assumption, of course. I assume that is what the corporation earned after all legitimate expenses have been paid out of earnings. Let us see how we must dispose of this amount of earnings as far as taxes are concerned. In the computation of excess-profits taxes we generally think of the normal and surtaxes first and then from what is left we consider what will be our excess profits, but that is not the way it is done. The first determination that we must make is to find out what the excess-profits tax base is going to be. On this assumption of $250,000 let us find out what the excess-profits base will be. There are two methods by which this can be established. We wrote them into the law several years ago after a great deal of study and patient consideration. The corporation has a choice of one of two methods to establish this base. It can take the average earnings method or the invested capital method. In connection with this bill we have had some complaint from new corporations that are springing up. These new corporations will be required to take the invested capital method because that is their only choice. They have no history of average earnings. An established corporation has an advantage in this respect. It has a history of average earnings and it can take whichever of these two methods will give it the best advantages.

Assuming now that the taxpayer in this case, a corporation, makes a tax return which it must do, it follows the average earning method or the invested capital, whichever he pleases to follow, and having made its choice it finds a that it has a base of $75,000. That is its base for tax computation. That is the base upon which it starts the computation. None of these other computations shown below on this chart can be made until that has been established.

For the purpose of our illustration therefore we will take this $75,000 figure and begin our computations.

Every corporation is allowed an exemption of $25,000. A corporation that does not earn more than $25,000 would not pay any excess-profits tax at all. It would be exempt from the excess-profits tax provision regardless of what its excess-profits tax base might be.

Now, we will add these two together, the $75,000 and the $25,000, which gives us $100,000. That is the excess-profits base. That is the total amount of the taxpayers' exemption from excess-profits tax; $100,000 taken from $250,000 would leave the amount subject to the excess-profits tax. That would be $150,000 subject to the excess-profits tax.

Under this new bill which we are passing today, we change the excess-profits rate from 85½ percent to 60 percent. Sixty percent of $150,000 is $90,000. This is the amount of excess-profits tax that this corporation will pay. If the corporation is small and its earnings are small but large enough to be subject to an excess-profits tax, it will pay 60 percent. At the present time all corporations that are subject to this tax pay the same rate.

The rate is now 85½ percent but under this bill now under consideration this is reduced to 60 percent. This is a 50-percent reduction. Next year, 1946, under the terms of this bill the other half of the excess-profits tax will be repealed, and after 1946 there will be no provision of law levying an excess-profits tax.

Let us go back to the chart and see what the other taxes are going to be. We are not going to pay a tax on this $150,000 twice. We have already paid the sum of $90,000 excess-profits tax as you can see. We will now take the $150,000 from the $250,000, which leaves us $100,000. We must compute the tax due on this amount. That is the base upon which we commence to compute the normal and surtax. You will find in this report a table showing a graduated scale for normal and surtaxes on small corporations. A small corporation on the first $5,000 of its earnings pays, under the present law 15 percent. If its earnings run on up to $50,000 or more it would take a 40-percent rate. If and when the bill under present consideration becomes a law, four percentage points will be taken off of the 40 percent, making it 36 percent. At the rate of 36 percent the tax on this $100,000 would be $36,000. So the $90,000 excess-profits tax plus the $36,000 normal and surtax will make a total tax of $126,000 as the tax which that assumed corporation will have to pay.

Under the present law that corporation would be compelled to pay $168,250. The difference between the present law and the proposed law is $42,250.

You could no doubt ask me many questions concerning this chart and these computations that I might not be able to answer. The truth of the matter is that probably nobody could answer them unless he had the corporation's financial structure before him. Many corporations have some problems peculiar to themselves, but there is a sameness in all their tax structures. It will be remembered that Congress increased this $25,000 exemption only a short time ago. It increased the exemption from $10,000 to $25,000. This increase has been a benefit to small corporations. Of course, it is likewise a benefit to the big corporations, but not so much in proportion. A corporation with no more earnings than $25,000 would not pay any excess-profits tax. It would be exempt from that tax, but it would have to pay normal and surtax.

As I have indicated, I have put this illustration in the RECORD in the hope that if a Member is called upon to explain how the corporation taxes are levied he can find this illustration useful.

I want to emphasize that you cannot start at the bottom of this chart by figuring your normal and surtax and then work your way up to the excess-profits computation because you must first ascertain the excess-profits tax.

I would not have you believe that it is always easy for every corporation to figure out its taxes. There is frequently a lot of trouble in arriving at net earnings. But after net earnings are ascertained and the excess-profits tax base is established, it is not hard to work out the normal and surtax.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I shall not have time to discuss fully several other phases of this proposed legislation. There is the matter of the reductions in the individual income taxes which is very important. When 12,000,000 taxpayers are relieved from paying income taxes that is a significant fact this matter has already been discussed exhaustively, hence I shall refrain from further comment.

Then there is the matter of the reduction in the taxes of all other personal income taxpayers. These reductions run all the way from 10 percent on the large incomes to 27 percent on the small incomes. This matter has also been discussed ably and exhaustively.

I was personally glad that the Ways and Means Committee took cognizance of the fact that the social-security tax was about to be increased from 1 percent to 2½ percent and on both the employer and the employee. If this bill should become a law this tax will be frozen at 1 percent which is the present rate.

There came to the desk of each of you this morning a very persuasive document. It is not a document that you can easily brush aside if you want to have some additional views on this subject. It has in it some very plausible arguments. However, it was written not with the idea that it would be accepted as a plan to follow but with the idea that it would be a criticism of the plan under consideration in the House now. When those who wrote that document claim that the bill under consideration here today purposely grants huge windfalls to prosperous corporations and grants only meager reductions to the low and middle-class taxpayers they are hardly fair to those they assume to speak for. I am sorry that they gave the impression that the committee intended this bill to be a complete overhauling of the tax structure and that the committee wrongfully failed to permit public hearings. The facts are that in this bill the committee intended to consider only a few pressing subjects and that at some time in the near future it would take up the consideration of the whole tax structure with the idea of revamping it in many ways as the public interest might require.

If you will refer to the tables that have been inserted in the report of the committee filed herein, you will see that the small taxpayer has been given the advantage of the percentages in every case. For instance, quite a number of married persons with no dependents have been exempted completely. Those who have not been exempted and who are taxed start with a 37.5 percent reduction. That is quite a reduction when you come to think about it. The first taxpayer who pays a tax among the married persons with no dependents starts with a 37.7 percent reduction. The man who pays the highest amount receives a 10-percent reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. No tax bill is perfect, but I dare say that if you figure this out with a fair purpose in mind and with the intention of arriving at a fair conclusion you will be forced to conclude that the small corporation and the small individual taxpayer have under this bill been given very fair consideration.

You will recall that 2 years ago there was great demand in this country that we include more people within the purview of the income-tax laws. This was done, and we increased the number from about 25,000,000 to well over 40,000,000. The clamor was to make more people pay taxes. It was then that we passed the laws providing for withholding. Do you know that about half of the individual taxes of the Nation are paid by persons who earn less than $5,000 a year? Why? Because there are so many of them.

Taking it by and large, I repeat that if you read this committee report with a predisposition to be fair you will conclude as most any fair-minded man must conclude that this bill will do all that can be done fairly under the circumstances.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield gladly to my friend, the very learned gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman is making a wonderful presentation, and I am very much interested in everything he has to say. Propaganda has gone out this morning over the radio which perhaps will disturb a great many Members of the House. It is being charged that we would have given greater relief to the ordinary man if we had abolished the so-called normal tax instead of doing what we have done. That is a misleading statement. The real benefit to the average man is not the repeal of that, it is what we have done in providing that the surtax exemption should apply to the normal tax.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. This report sets that out very clearly and emphatically.

In the tax bill which Congress adopted about 2 years ago, there was an innovation. It carried a provision for a tax that had never been tried before. I refer to the provision that set up every person who earned $500 or more as an individual taxpayer and entitled to separate exemptions. If a newsboy made over $500 he was considered as an individual taxpayer. If the wife or daughter earned $500 or more she was a separate taxpayer. We have done away with that plan in this bill, and in doing so we have given to that class of taxpayer a decided advantage. This bill now under consideration takes most or all of that class out from under the requirements of paying a tax. We have reestablished the tax-paying basis much as it was formerly. We have made the husband the head of the family, as it were, and he is entitled to $500, his wife is entitled to $500, and each child is entitled to $500 exemption, at least, the first two or three children are. Under the present law a man who has three or four children did not do as well as he does under this bill. I challenge anybody to dispute that fact. Formerly, a parent was only entitled to a deduction of $350 for a dependent child. Now we go back to the most favorable consideration for exemptions for dependents. This is a tremendous advantage to the man with a large family. He does not pay any taxes whatever until after those exemptions have been allowed.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman and others have stated that this will relieve about 12,000,000 taxpayers from paying income taxes.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does anything go into the relief of these people except the exemption to the taxpayer and his wife and his children?

Mr. JENKINS. I do not quite understand what the gentleman means.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does anything go in to make up that exemption except that?

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman means to make it up in the volume of taxes collected?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. No; there is nothing that goes in, because that is included in that $5,350,000,000 reduction.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is that the exemption for the husband, the wife, and the children? Are those the elements that eliminate these 12,000,000 taxpayers?

Mr. JENKINS. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There is nothing else in it that eliminates those 12,000,000?

Mr. JENKINS. No; the gentleman is absolutely right. That does it and nothing else does it. I repeat, it is claimed that the small taxpayer has been discriminated against, but that is not true. I am afraid that in some of these cases the criticism made that the big taxpayer, the big corporation, gets off too easily is made to prejudice rather than to convince. If you will read these schedules of percentages as set forth in the committee report you will find that the bill is drawn to treat all alike, with the idea that the tax should be widely distributed and collected on a basis that each should pay according to his earnings and his ability to pay. I could show you the figures in these tables, but I do not have the time to do so. Of course, if one is to contend that no small corporation should pay any tax and no individual earning less than, say $3,000, should pay any tax that would be one's privilege, but I think the overwhelming sentiment of our people is that we should keep our tax base as wide as we can without demanding too much. When the income-tax law was first made effective I think the exemption for the head of the family was $5,000. In those days only a very few paid taxes and the amount collected was not a drop in the bucket to the billions that are collected now.

The public would not stand for such exemptions now. The persons who are most entitled to exemptions are the heads of the families and the parents of dependent children. They are the guardians of our homes, and the American home is still the greatest security for our personal and national liberties.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee contributed most constructively toward the preparation and presentation of this bill for the consideration of this House. We were anxious to repeal the excess-profits tax law with the end of 1945. Our reason was that this would go far toward the reconversion of large and small industrial plants and the consequent employment of men and women.

Mr. Chairman, the best guaranty for prosperity is the production of additional wealth. All wealth comes from the ground, plus the labor put on that product by skillful hands and active brains. Work is the best antidote to most ills, both human and national. Any plan that conduces to idleness does not conduce to the production of wealth.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend a careful perusal of the minority views which represent the sentiments of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee. Those views are as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF THE MINORITY

Tax reduction, a balanced Budget, and debt retirement have ever been the traditional fiscal policy of the Republican Party. As a party dedicated to a solvent America we welcome the tax reduction carried in H. R. 4309. If strict economies had been practiced by the administration much greater tax reductions would now be possible. Future reductions in tax rates can only be made if the administration will cut out wasteful and unnecessary spending.

This tax reduction bill comes as a most unusual and welcome experience to the taxpayers of the United States. For 16 long years we have had a series of tax increase bills (18 in number), each successively more burdensome than its predecessor, nearly all of which were made necessary by profligate spending, which yearly piled up deficit upon deficit till the national debt had assumed alarming proportions, even prior to the outbreak of the war. The American people are to be commended for the patience they exhibited as tax increase after tax increase was piled upon their sagging shoulders.

As the problem of raising additional funds grew, it was necessary for the Congress to adopt unusual and extraordinary means for raising revenue. For instance, we have in mind the excess-profits tax, which was probably the best method the Congress could have devised to curb excess profits arising from the war. But it was not a scientific tax program in that its operation imposed many hardships.

The demands upon the Federal Treasury are becoming increasingly heavy and the time has come for the administration to take an inventory of our assets and liabilities with a view to determining what we should do and how far we can go. We already have enough information on that phase of our economy to say without hesitation that we cannot continue to play Santa Claus to the other nations of the earth and remain solvent. Only a solvent American can help meet the postwar problems of the world. Billions will be needed to provide adequate care for those who return home maimed and wounded. The dependents of those who made the supreme sacrifice must be secured against want and uncertainty if we would do our full duty to our heroic dead. These sacred obligations must come before all other considerations.

Additional billions will be needed to reconvert industry to peacetime production. The transportation systems of the country also will need enormous sums for rehabilitation that is long past due. These huge sums can only be secured by restoring the confidence of the investing public. Such confidence can be encouraged and restored through a sound fiscal policy.

The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee are not wholly satisfied with the measure as reported to the House. We favored the outright repeal of the excess-profits tax with the termination of the war. Secretary Vinson concurred in our views. Unfortunately for the country a majority of the committee preferred to do its piecemeal.

It was through our efforts that substantial tax reductions were obtained for business generally, especially for those who did not earn excess profits. It was also through our efforts that substantial tax reductions were secured for all individual income taxpayers. We also urged and supported the repeal of the very troublesome and confusing capital-stock tax and the declared-value excess-profits tax.

Reconversion of business and reemployment of labor are the pressing problems before the Nation today. Nothing will stimulate and encourage these two elements of our economy as much as a sound, fair, and forthright tax program. H. R. 4309 is the first step in that direction, but it is not enough. The country will expect further and more substantial reductions in the next tax bill which will be taken up at the next session of Congress.

HAROLD KNUTSON, DANIEL A. REED, ROY O. WOODRUFF, THOMAS A. JENKINS, BERTRAND W. GEARHART, FRANK CARLSON, RICHARD M. SIMPSON, ROBERT W. KEAN, CHARLES L. GIFFORD, CARL T. CURTIS.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I had no opportunity to prepare a written statement on this bill, but I feel reasonably familiar with the background of the bill, with what happened in the committee on the bill, and with what is written into the bill. Certain

problems of reconversion, of which this bill is but one, weigh so heavily upon my heart, that possibly I could do better by merely speaking to you today in my native tongue. When our beloved President, Mr. Truman, recently sent a message to the Congress on the subject of reconversion, he recommended that a reasonable reduction be made in war taxes as an aid to reconversion. Our committee approached the problem from that standpoint. The essence of the pending bill embodies that philosophy. But I fear, Mr. Chairman, that things are happening today in this fair land of ours which, unless curbed and stopped, will nullify what aid we propose to give for reconversion by the reduction of slightly more than $5,000,000,000 in the current tax load. The problems of reconversion are not less serious in their ultimate consequences than were the problems of war. We were united in war. We made an all-out effort in war. We buried our petty selfishness in war. But now when we are facing problems equally as difficult and as serious, we are not united, and selfishness is rearing its ugly head to mar the picture. I know all Americans rejoiced to hear our President say yesterday at Gilbertsville, Ky., that we must cut out selfishness and that we must cut out foolishness and go back to work. As a good Baptist, like my distinguished friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who has always made such valuable contributions to our tax work, and like myself, though I am not as good as the other two, our President could have reminded us of the fact: "Seest thou a man diligent in his business, he shall stand before kings."

We have now accumulated savings in the hands of individuals estimated in excess of $100,000,000,000. They have long deferred needs for goods and supplies and are ready to go into the market to buy them if they can get them at reasonable prices. Our corporations have accumulated savings in excess of $40,000,000,000, which can be invested in a reconversion program. They are ready, able, and willing to do so because idle plants pay no dividends. We face on the home front a problem of prosperity because we cannot have peace and contentment without prosperity. Prosperity involves full employment at reasonable wages; the ability of the employer to furnish the plant and improved tools for the worker; the ability to consume on the part of 139,000,000 citizens. And it involves a willingness on the part of the worker to produce those goods so that they can be sold at a price which will not involve us in problems of inflation.

Some of you will no doubt recall that in November 1941, when we had before us the price-control bill, I suggested that I did not see how we could prevent inflation unless the agency set up to control prices could likewise control wages, because they were inseparable when wages went beyond a certain point. I offered that amendment. It was overwhelmingly defeated. In speaking against the amendment, our able and distinguished majority leader, for whom I have the highest respect and the warmest friendship, said:

> For all practical purposes, if this amendment were adopted, it would mean the freezing of the salaries of all the employees of America. It would also mean the suspension of all labor legislation. The right of collective bargaining, for all practical purposes, while not specifically suspended in the amendment, would actually be suspended if this amendment were adopted.

And there was more to that effect. The amendment was defeated, and the President said, "I will control strikes under the no-strike agreement. I will control wages."

The interesting thing to me is that he controlled wages, to the extent that they were controlled, by exactly the same formula that I proposed in my amendment, which was this, "No wage increase shall be granted which, of necessity, involves a price increase." So he adopted what we now call the Little Steel formula. "All earners who since January 1, 1941, have not received wage increases equivalent to 15 percent of January 1941 may have that 15 percent increase." And they all moved up to that level, and some went beyond it.

I said at the time that the foundation of the formula was not sound, because the standard of living of a man is determined not by his hourly rate, not by his daily rate, but by his take-home wage. The labor leaders repudiated that. They said, "No. It is the hourly rate that counts." And they forced the hourly rate of pay up to an average of $1.03 in industry on the assumption that the overtime or temporary war pay would not continue. Now the labor leaders take the position which they should have taken all along, and which is a sound position, that it is the take-home wage that determines the standard of living, and that and that alone should be looked at.

I pause to say that I believe in the dignity of labor. I believe that the laborer is worthy of his hire. I have had to work all of my life and my sympathies have always been with those who earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow. I believe in good wages and I believe in good farm prices, because I have found by examining all the available statistics on the subject that the two are very closely related. It adds up to national prosperity. Let the farmers get good prices, let the workers have full employment and good wages so they can consume, and we have prosperity. But I fear that in the face of a trend of falling farm prices, if wages be increased to the extent that price increases become inevitable and inescapable, we will start a spiral of inflation that will be harmful to all concerned.

So in framing this bill we first set out to help sustain the purchasing power in the lower groups, by making them the special objects of our attention. In dealing with the subject of corporations we gave priority to the theory that we wanted to help those who would give increased employment and could put better tools in hands of the workers to reduce the per unit cost of production, in order that the worker might have increased wages without increased prices to the ultimate consumer.

I say that in the face of our desire to help labor and to contribute to the serious problem of reconversion, in which there will inevitably be temporary unemployment and disastrous to all unless it be solved, labor is going on strike. I understand there are four or five hundred thousand now unemployed because of strikes.

What did the President mean, do you think, when he said: "Cut out this foolishness and go to work"? He certainly was not talking about those who did not have jobs; they were not being foolish, and they could not go back to work. He evidently was referring to those who had jobs and had quit them. I know that President Truman is going to do all in his power to solve the problem of wages and of prices and of the disunity that now exists between employer and employee. But I feel, Mr. Chairman, that we likewise have a job to do to help him carry out that program. We passed what is called the Smith-Connally antistrike bill. It was not such a bad bill, I believe, when it left the House, but it was turned into a farce by Senate amendments. Instead of preventing strikes it appears to have stimulated strikes. That act should be repealed. When we approached what was known as labor's Magna Charta and wrote into law that which all of us admitted freely on all occasions should be there, the inherent right of labor to arrive at wage contracts by means of collective bargaining, we apparently acted on the assumption that it was only the heartless corporations with no pants to be kicked and no soul to be damned that could not be trusted to live up to the contracts arrived at by collective barbaining, that the unions could always be trusted to do the right thing. So we wrote into that law a provision that put all the powers of government behind any demand of a union to make a corporation live up to its contract, and we put no legal responsibility whatever upon a union to do the same thing. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, if we are to avoid labor friction that is going to impede seriously, impair, hinder, and maybe defeat a successful reconversion to an era of expanding economy, the Wagner Labor Relations Act should be amended to provide for mutuality of responsibility.

I love to read of Virginia and the work that Virginians did in laying the foundation for the greatest republic on earth. I love to read the debates of the Constitutional Convention in Richmond that ratified the Philadelphia constitution in which, if you will pardon me for saying so, two of my ancestors served. Patrick Henry led the fight in that convention against the adoption of the Constitution because, he said, the rights of the people were not adequately protected from the overweening power of the Federal Government to be established. It was a close vote on the ratification of that Constitution and it was only saved from defeat by the promise of James Madison that as soon as he got to Congress—and he said he would run for Congress—he

would offer an amendment to take care of the point that had been raised by Patrick Henry and others. He did it in the very first session. James Madison offered 10 amendments which are now called our Bill of Rights. When we think about the Bill of Rights we think in terms primarily of human rights, but the fifth amendment dealt with property rights, and those rights are inseparable from human rights. The fifth amendment provided for the sanctity of contract; no legislature could pass a law impairing the validity of a contract. When a man entered into a contract and there was no fraud or deception in its inception, and there was no misunderstanding concerning essential facts, the court would uphold that contract on the part of either complainant; that is in the fundamental law of our land. Suppose we had not had that provision in our Constitution. The average farm in Virginia is of 50 acres, although we do have some of 500 and 1,000, and even some of 2,000 acres. Before the days of tractors and automobiles our horsepower was what the term means, a horse, and there was quite a lot of trading and trafficking in horses. Suppose we had a law that if a poor farmer sold a horse to a rich farmer he could enforce payment of the contract but if a rich farmer sold a horse to a poor farmer he could not go into court to protect his rights. Suppose that were the law of our land and extend that to all human relationships. The man who could carry the biggest club when the other fellow reneged on his contract would go to him and would say with references uncomplimentary to his ancestors, "Pay me or I will take it out of your hide."

We would not have a government of men under law; we would have anarchy. I hope this Congress will agree with me that it is only fair, just, and proper that we preserve the fundamental law of the land, written into our fifth amendment to the Constitution; and it is in the constitution of every State in the Union. A law against the repudiation of contract which has always been regarded as the fair and proper way of adjusting disputes between individuals. Let them go into court, let them prove the contract, let them prove breach of the contract, and let the guilty respond in damages.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I am always delighted to listen to the gentleman on tax matters. He has made a very delightful speech. I would like to know if he can give us one good excuse why we should vote for this bill. I assume he is for the legislation. I ask this question, in view of the fact that we have a $300,000,000,000 debt, the war has been over for a whole 2 months, the soldiers are still over there, yet the committee comes out with a bill to reduce taxes at the present time.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I get the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the question asked by the gentleman from Utah is a fair and a proper one. I know we are all war weary, we are all impatient, and if a speaker gets up to talk about taxes, naturally he ought to talk about taxes and not take up his first 20 minutes laying the background for why we should do certain other things. Now I will come very gladly to this bill.

I will give you first the background. You will find, on page A4216 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 17, that I outlined a suggestion for repeal of the 3 percent normal tax and the excess-profits tax. That statement is as follows:

TAX RELIEF SUGGESTIONS

Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee has decided to frame a relief tax bill which, on account of time limitations, must be limited in scope and on account of revenue needs, must be limited in its effect. To enable the Treasury Department to print and distribute over 50,000,000 income report blanks action on any new tax bill should be completed in the next 2 months. To protect the confidence of investors in Government securities, revenue receipts for fiscal 1947 should be kept within speaking distance of disbursements. The most fatal mistake that could be made with respect to fiscal affairs is to assume that because we have survived deficit spending for the past 15 years the ultimate balancing of the Budget has ceased to become a major concern.

The deficit for the current fiscal year is now estimated at $30,000,000,000. In estimating the measure of relief that can be safely given to individuals and corporations for the next fiscal year, assumptions as to the national income for 1946, the revenue to be derived from existing rates on such an income and the size of the Budget for fiscal 1947 must necessarily be made since all three lie beyond the realm of positive knowledge.

In offering tentative suggestions for tax relief, I am making the following assumptions:

First. That the produced national income in 1946 will not fall below $130,000,000,000.

Second. That revenue from existing rates in that year would not be less than $28,000,000,000.

Third. That the Budget for fiscal 1947 will be limited to essential expenses and will not exceed $22,000,000,000. On the basis of those assumptions, I suggest the elimination of the 3-percent normal tax on personal incomes and the elimination of the excess-profits tax on corporations.

The elimination of the 3-percent normal tax on personal incomes is desirable for the following reasons:

First. It was imposed on all net income over $500 as a necessary war measure to distribute the unavoidable burden of war taxes and without regard to the fundamental peacetime policy of ability to pay.

Second. Its elimination would help to sustain purchasing power in 1946 during a period of falling national income.

Third. Its elimination would provide relief to all on the same percentage basis but the measure of actual relief would be greatest where the need is greatest as illustrated by the following example: A married person with two dependents with a net income of $2,500 will get relief in the sum of $52.50 on a total tax liability of $102.50, whereas if his income were $25,000 his relief would be $750 on a total tax liability of $9,395. If relief be given by means of a 20-percent credit against total tax liability, which would cost the Treasury more than the elimination of the normal tax, the relief in the first instance would be only $20.50, whereas in the second it would be $1,879.

Fourth. Elimination of this tax would further simplify returns made on Form 1040, leaving only the exemption in multiples of $500 on the long form for computation of the full tax. On the short form the tax would be shown in the printed table. It would likewise eliminate much clerical work incident to the collection of the withholding tax—a welcome relief from some of the free paper work business has been doing for the Government.

Fifth. Any plan to give relief on personal income taxes by increasing personal exemptions now based on $500 and multiples thereof would destroy the foundation upon which the simplicity of Form 1040 now rests, unless the same ratio in some new multiple be substituted. To raise the $500 credit for each dependent above that figure would involve much revenue loss.

The elimination of the excess-profits tax on corporations, adjusted for equality of treatment between calendar and fiscal years, is desirable for the following reasons:

First. It was imposed as a war tax to control the profits on war contracts and was never intended to be a permanent part of our taxing system.

Second. The law is unscientific and inequalities are inevitable.

Third. If continued it will stifle postwar expansion, curtail opportunities for private employment, and prevent the establishment of new enterprises that could successfully compete with established enterprises enjoying a favorable capital structure or favorable earnings in the base period.

It is generally agreed that the $5 use tax on automobiles will be eliminated, as the revenue loss involved will be relatively small, while the psychological gain from the elimination of a tax that irritates will be large.

A tax-relief bill covering the items I have mentioned can be written in three brief paragraphs, action on the House side can be completed within 1 month, and it would give about $2,000,000,000 of relief to individuals and about the same amount to corporations, and in each instance the relief would facilitate reconversion to a peacetime economy.

Mr. Chairman, when we got into committee, after doing a little friendly sparring here and there in discussing what should be done, I made a motion to repeal the 3 percent normal tax. After I had made that suggestion I was pleased to see the same suggestion made by a very high and independent source, the Committee on Postwar Taxation, headed by Dr. Roswell McGill. When the Secretary of the Treasury came before our committee I was naturally gratified that he had the same thought.

Some preliminary amendments were offered to my motion in the morning session, which were defeated. We came back to the afternoon session and I was informed by staff experts: "You can get exactly the same result for exactly the same people if you will change your motion to grant the full exemptions to all incomes, then cut the surtax 3 percent." So I changed my motion to that effect, to get the same result.

I can explain it to you gentlemen who may not be experts in the politics of taxation but still understand what you learned of the three R's in the public schools. Suppose the normal tax rate is 3 percent and the surtax rate is 3 percent.

You take off your exemptions, you take off your deductions and you arrive at your net taxable income. You multiply that by six to get the amount of the tax.

Now, a politician may tell you it will make a heap of difference if you cut off the 3 percent above the line or cut it off below the line, but mathematicians will tell you if you take off 3 percent and multiply by the remaining 3 percent, it does not make any difference whether it was the top or the bottom 3 percent. I hope I make that clear.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I want to again stress the point that if the gentleman's first motion had prevailed and we repealed the 3 percent normal tax, the same group would have been eliminated from paying the tax that is eliminated under the present bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I thank the gentleman. He is a very kind and able friend and he is absolutely right.

That was the motion that I made. The distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] offered what he called a substitute, but it was actually an amendment, to raise the 3 percent to 4 percent. The committee adopted that. I did not vote for it, I may say to my friend from Utah because it added $435,000,000 to tax relief when, as has been said, we are facing a 30 000,000,000 deficit this year. We face a budget for 1947 which may be 300 percent above any previous peacetime budget and I was unwilling to go too far in giving tax relief, because we do owe a duty to the 80,000,000 holders of Government bonds that we will pay them back in good money, and not in greenbacks, recalling that Bob Ingersoll once said:

> I want every greenback to be able to stand on end and say I know that my redeemer liveth.

If money were wealth, Germany in the days of the Hindenburg republic would have been the richest nation in the world because it had more money in circulation than any nation in the world. The money we have that makes us feel rich, the bonds we have that make us feel rich, are but the I O U's for future goods which are the real wealth to replace those that have been consumed by war during the past 4 years.

Instead of feeling rich, no man should feel that he has profited by the war, if he is the head of the average family of four, unless he has saved in bonds during the war in excess of $7,500, because that is his share of the national debt, which on October 8 stood at $262,000,000,000 and is still going up. It is a first mortgage lien on everything he has. Unless he can go to his bank and find there bonds in excess of $7,500 as an I O U against somebody's future production, he is poorer by reason of the war, not richer.

That is the reason I will say to my distinguished friend from Utah that I prefaced my remarks about taxes by the statement that we are in debt, and the only way we can get out of debt is by work. It is the production of real wealth, and can come only by work. If we are to have successful reconversion, we must have the spirit to work, and to work at wages that can be paid without price increases that mean inflation.

We gave that tax relief to the small fellow, as I explained in this statement last September, because we wanted to help sustain his purchasing power during what may prove to be a trying period. We took off the 3 percent because when that was put on in the Senate as a victory tax it was accompanied by a definite statement that it was a war tax only and automatically ended with the end of the war.

The same thing applies to the excess profits tax. It was put on as a war tax, and it was put on to prevent excessive earnings during the war. To a large extent it accomplished its purpose, but I am glad we also enacted a bill to require renegotiation of excessive earnings, by which we recovered for the taxpayers billions of dollars. However, the continuation of that excess profits tax into the postwar era will be calculated to put a brake upon business expansion. It will defer the establishment of new enterprises without a favorable capital structure or a favorable base earning period, which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] showed you is the base on which the deductions against the tax must be claimed.

When I offered the motion in the committee that we repeal it as of January 1, 1946, I was acting in accordance with what the President wanted, I knew I was acting in accordance with what the Treasury Department had recommended, and I was doing what I thought would really help reconversion and give more jobs at good wages. I will tell you what happened about that. I made that motion over in the big committee room. Some did not want to vote right then. They said, "Oh, what about these loopholes, about this carry-back and carry-forward and lost refund? There are some bad loopholes in that. Let us study that awhile." So we studied that awhile and we heard the experts. Then they said, "Oh, I have to get on the floor now. We will meet later over in the little committee room in the Capitol to finish up this action."

That is where we met. We had a little more sparring over there. A motion was made and adopted to split the repeal, one-half in 1946 and one-half in 1947, give 4 percentage points reduction against the normal taxes and surtaxes of all corporations, and repeal the tax on capital stocks and declared value. That motion was made as a substitute for my motion and there was a voice vote. There was not any hand showing, there was no division, and there was no roll call.

I cannot disclose what happens in executive session, except that I can tell you what I did. I voted against the motion, and if anybody else voted against it they did not do it in a voice loud enough to be audible. The motion was adopted.

I may say to my friends who wanted to know some reason for voting for this bill, you can vote for this bill to aid the small fellow because we want to help him sustain his purchasing power at a period when he will not have as much money as he has been having and he may not have any job, and it will help him in that respect.

You vote for it as an aid to corporations in the hope that we will settle these labor disputes, and that we will agree on a fair wage. I believe in a fair wage and I believe in a good wage, but I think the wage will have to be conditioned by the value of the product produced because that is the only way a private corporation can stay in business.

On both of those theories I think you would be safe in voting for the bill, but I believe the plan I advocated would have been just a little better.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened as I always do to my colleagues with profound interest. I learn a great deal from what my colleagues have to say with reference to bills, even those reported from my own committee where I have been present at the discussions. I certainly have enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia. He is a distinguished and able student of taxation as well as many other subjects, particularly the fundamental principles of this great Government of ours.

There is certainly something wrong in this country. The public feels very much disturbed. Members of Congress are getting unpleasant reactions from the public through their mail and they hear many complaints when they visit their districts. I think that once before on this floor I tried to analyze the difficulties that confront the country by quoting from a very distinguished gentleman. Years ago when our country was in a very chaotic state, though not so disturbed as it is now, George William Curtis made these remarks:

> When the educated, industrious, temperate, thrifty citizens are as prompt and zealous and unfailing in duty as the ignorant and venal and mischievous, or when it is clear that they cannot be roused to their duty, then, but not until then, if ignorance and corruption always carry the day there can be no honest question that this Government has failed. But let us not be deceived. While good men sit at home, not knowing that there is anything to be done or caring to know, half persuaded that this Republic is a contemptible rule of a mob and secretly longing for some splendid and vigorous despotism; then remember, that it is not a Government mastered by ignorance, it is a Government betrayed by intelligence.

We now face a national problem which the intelligent citizens must solve, not left to the venal and ignorant.

The time has come when the question of coddling those who would destroy this Government must cease; when handouts and subsidies for political purposes will have to be stopped or this country is going to finally reach the edge of the abyss and eventually plunge over into the abyss to its destruction. The whole world is in a state of revolutionary disturbance. Here we are like a great oasis in a great world-wide desert. We should be and must be the hope of a free people. But this hope must be on the basis of a sane legislative program, one that permits our economy to function to its fullest extent without any retardation on

the part of revolutionary elements, pressure groups, or economic saboteurs. This must be a Government of laws and not of men. This Congress must represent the whole people and not any class of people. It has been said that Anglo-Saxon liberty has been fought out on the battlefield of taxation. I believe it must be fought out on this field again today. We must have pay rolls. We must have venture capital if we are going to have pay rolls, and above all else we must have production in this country. Otherwise, we shall soon be right on the very verge of state socialism, communism, and anarchy.

I feel that it is most unfortunate for the country that legislation most essential to achieve rapid reconversion from war production to peace production should be delayed for many months when the stimulating effect of a common sense long range tax bill is sorely needed. The vast business enterprises, actual and potential, which require definite knowledge as to the theory of taxation to be pursued in order to furnish employment and production are held in check at this time. A postwar revenue bill should have been in preparation prior to the cessation of hostilities, instead of being deferred for legislative measures of far less importance to the Nation. The time has come—it is here now—when tax legislation should have been ready to be placed upon the statute books. Unless all classes of business can be assured of a sane and sensible long-range tax bill, there will not be that steady flow of risk capital into old and new enterprise which is the recovery plasma now desperately needed. There should be no delay in the revitalization of business, large and small, because there cannot be a maximum of employment and production of goods unless venture capital can, with its revivifying effect, be turned into the arteries of private enterprise. I repeat that venture capital is the blood plasma necessary to achieve the fullest measure of reconversion to peacetime production.

I maintain that in the present condition of the world with all its chaos and confusion the line of demarkation between state socialism and free enterprise is very slight. There are revolutionary forces at work in this country, and I may add, very powerful forces masquerading under one name or another, which seek to replace our system of free enterprise with a socialistic form of government. This is no time to temporize with a subject so important as postwar taxation. This Congress knows what the country needs in this respect and every moment it delays in letting the country know definitely what the long-range tax plan is to be, the more difficult it will be to bring about business stability, furnish employment, and plan for a balanced Budget, a gradual retirement of the public debt, all of which are necessary to assure a solvent America. We know now that this administration has in mind a continuation of deficit spending as indicated by the initial message of President Truman to the Congress. It has been said that there are 85,000,000 holders of United States bonds who expect to realize the face value of their investment. There is no doubt that they will be paid the face value on these bonds whether the Government goes to the "left" or to the "right," but the important question is what will be the purchasing power of these bonds when and if cashed by the holders?

Immediately following the First World War, German bonds did not drop below their face value, but their purchasing power went down to a point where they were practically worthless. It was true also of the workingmen's wages which were increased from time to time, but the purchasing power of those wages depreciated so rapidly that the workmen had to be paid four or five times a day and even then if the distance was too far to the store from which they wished to purchase goods, their entire wages turned to ashes. We want no such conditions to prevail in this country and the only way to prevent it is to set up a tax bill which will give courage to those who believe in private enterprise to engage in it and produce goods in sufficient quantities to prevent the very type of inflation to which I have referred. A tax bill that will encourage the private investor to risk his capital in private enterprise will make possible the absorption of all those men and women who are anxious and willing to work. There is no other goal in sight that can be more important to the preservation of this grand Government of ours than a long range common sense revenue bill. Free government, free enterprise, rests upon confidence and no spendthrift government which relies upon deficit financing can create that confidence in the minds of sensible people.

The tax bill before us is the first one in 12 years that has sought to reduce taxes. It is good so far as it goes but it is only a temporary expedient and does not fulfil the requirements which the country so sorely needs. There cannot be production, full employment until the people are satisfied that they can invest their savings with some hope of realizing a profit from their investment in proportion to the risk which they assume. Once they know the tax policy of this country and can rely upon its continuation, there will be an utpouring of venture capital, such as this Nation has perhaps never before witnessed. Risk-capital will come in ever increasing amounts from the men and women who have saved. I had hoped that the Ways and Means Committee would take up a long range tax bill and have it ready to act upon soon after hostilities ceased. If this had been done the thrifty frugal citizen, realizing that his government would not rob him of his savings once they were invested in private enterprise would have responded to the needs of the country just as he did in the purchase of bonds to prosecute the war.

I call attention to the old saying: "The power to tax is the power to destroy." This truism applies to venture capital. It is through venture capital that jobs are created. We all know that excessive taxation of the profits earned by risk capital, if long continued will destroy the incentive to invest savings in business ventures. Men will not take a risk in any new venture when they know that the tax policy of their government is to confiscate the profits resulting from their investments.

This bill is so clear in what it seeks to do as a temporary tax relief measure that it requires no explanation except the one made in the majority and minority reports. I want to emphasize what was said in our minority report; that if there had not been a wild and reckless waste of money by the Administration even prior to this war, great relief could be given to the taxpayers of this country at this time. That, however, is water over the dam, but it does not prevent us from being realistic at this time, so far as establishing a simplified free enterprise tax system that will stop this steady and rapid drift today toward state socialism. Deficit spending will have to be stopped. The shackles will have to be removed from business in order that more and more revenue will be available without crushing private enterprise in the process of obtaining it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the discussion here this afternoon. It has been one of the most informative debates we have had on any tax bill.

For 16 years it has been the duty of Congress to levy increased taxes on our people. During this period we have been forced to write tax bill after tax bill which placed increased and sometimes extreme burdens on our people. The huge costs of depression and war made this essential.

In the fiscal year 1945 the Federal Government raised over $45,000,000,000 in taxes. This amount, plus approximately $10,000,000,000 of State and local taxes, totals approximately one-third of our national income. Taxes, in instances, are so high that they are destroying initiative and incentive. The history of every backward nation is one of oppressive taxation that sooner or later destroys private economy and free enterprise.

Reasonable tax rates on a prosperous economy have become our peacetime goal.

Our Nation cannot expand and grow under present tax burdens imposed in time of war. We have now reached the turning point. It becomes the duty of Congress to review and rewrite our tax statutes with a view of securing full employment and full production. This bill is the first step in that direction.

There are provisions in this bill which do not meet my complete approval. However, it was necessary that we act speedily in order to have the legislation effective immediately. The Ways and Means Committee is committed to a broader revision of the entire tax structure. The chairman has stated that hearings on these changes will be the first order of business next year. I am sure that many matters, including desirable technical and administrative provisions which could not be taken care of in this immediate bill, will be properly treated by the committee when it next considers tax legislation.

Obviously, Congress must be concerned with the credit of the Government which stands back of bonds which are held by 85,000,000 citizens. However, we are in an excellent position to recommend a major tax reduction at this time in the light of an estimated $34,000,000,000 reduction in the Federal Budget during this fiscal year.

Even with the tax reduction which would result from this bill the burdens levied upon our people will be far greater than Federal spending after war and unnecessary expenditures are eliminated.

Careful students of Government believe that eighteen to twenty billion dollars will be adequate to support the Federal Government. The estimated yield of Federal taxes under this bill is over $27,000,000,000.

In our committee considerations we were advised by our experts that the national income for the coming year is expected to be $130,000,000,000. Even after the tax reductions made by this bill are taken into account the Federal collections, in combination with State and local levies, shall continue to take about one-third of our entire national income. Can we produce an expanding economy by continuing to collect one-third of our national income in taxes?

Tax reductions for individuals in this bill are important. With lower taxes our people will have more money to buy the things they need and to maintain our American standard of living. Even today in the backward countries throughout the world unbearable taxes take so much of the individual's labor that they continue to exist as little better than slaves.

By far the greater part of business in the United States is conducted by individuals. Eighty-nine percent of the number of concerns in this country are in individual or partnership form. Many of our returning veterans will want a business of their own. Present high individual taxes practically prohibit the starting and growth of new business.

It is important that we create a tax climate that will encourage the growth of new businesses. The $2,600,000,000 relief given individuals by this bill should go a long way toward establishing this healthful tax climate.

No one receives less than a 10-percent reduction in his tax and those with low earnings and dependents receive much more substantial reductions. Lower individual tax rates will be helpful as the earnings of the farmer and workingman are likely to be reduced from wartime levels.

The committee bill proposes certain revisions in the corporate tax structure, designed to speed reconversion and business recovery. Corporations are the great job givers. The latest figures available show that they employ about 75 percent of the total working force in this country. These business units must be encouraged to maintain and expand employment. Reasonable corporation taxes will be helpful in the Nation's goal of full employment with high wages and reasonable prices to the consumer.

I don't maintain this bill is a perfect solution to our immediate tax problems but I think it is a step in the right direction. It is the first important piece of peacetime legislation to come before Congress designed to rebuild our country into its proper place in this world. Its passage will give encouragement to every business and individual taxpayer.

I have been interested in some of the questions arising in the minds of the Members who had not had the privilege of spending days and days on this tax bill and other tax bills. From what I have heard being discussed in this Committee today there are many Members who are concerned about reducing the tax base. That is a fair question. It is one that has caused us much concern. We studied this in the committee not only on this bill but on other bills and I believe in all fairness we should as a Committee furnish some reasons why at this time we should reduce our tax base by eliminating 12,000,000 low-income taxpayers.

Let us go back to 1940. Do you know that we had less than 4,000,000 personal income-tax payers in that year? In 1945 we have 48,000,000 personal income-tax payers. Why did we reduce the base by twelve millions at this time? For three reasons: First, several million of these 12,000,000 taxpayers had such a small tax liability that the revenue received did not pay the costs of collection by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. It was a loss instead of a gain. Secondly, those eliminated are either married people with families or persons with dependents. I do not believe there is a Member on this floor or a person anywhere in the country who believes that a married man with wife and one or more children, maybe seven or eight, should pay a personal income tax on an income of $500. You cannot justify it. That is the group we eliminated. The third reason is this: Just imagine what it costs our employers, those in industry, who must make this tax collection, collecting taxes from 12,000,000 people who paid sometimes much less than it cost to collect the tax. These are the three reasons why we eliminated 12,000,000 taxpayers at this time.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I wish to ask the gentleman a question, for he is a very able member of the Committee on Ways and Means and one especially well versed in matters of tax and revenue, with reference to making returns. I know that the small taxpayer, the man who pays just a normal tax has an exemption of $500 for himself and $500 for each dependent. Assuming that a man's income were $2,000, that he had a wife and two children. That would make his exemption $2,000. Would he under this law be exempt from filing a return? Or would he have to file the return and claim the exemption?

Mr. CARLSON. This man with a wife and two children who earns an income of $2,000 or less would still have to file a return.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. There was no difference among members of the committee as to relieving these twelve million in the low income brackets, was there?

Mr. CARLSON. Absolutely none. I did not hear a word of objection during all of the discussions we had on it. We were unanimous on it and we did it for the three reasons I have just given.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Suppose a businessman has a net income of $5,000, but that he is married, that his wife has no income: Is he entitled to claim that joint exemption of both the husband and the wife of $500 each?

Mr. CARLSON. Under the law as we are writing today the exemptions that apply for the surtax will apply equally for the normal tax. He will be entitled to this exemption. Of course, if the wife had other income and filed a separate return the husband would only be entitled to claim $500 exemption. This is covered on page 4 of the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. That is he could take an exemption of $500 for his wife and $500 for himself.

Mr. CARLSON. Five hundred dollars in filing a joint return or separate return?

Mr. DONDERO. A joint return filed by the husband. He has a net income of $5,000; the wife has no income. Can he still file a joint return and claim the exemption for both?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is correct, if the gentleman from Kansas will yield.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct. It is covered on page 4 of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. A man who has the income can take his $500 and can take his wife's $500 and he can take $500 for every child regardless of age to which he contributes 50 percent or more to its support.

Mr. MICHENER. I understood the gentleman's question to be that if the wife filed a separate income return.

Mr. CARLSON. No.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If she does not have an income, she does not file a return.

Mr. DONDERO. That was not my question. My question was if they filed a joint return.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Recurring to the $2,000 illustration given by the gentleman from Texas, suppose a man has an income of $2,000 which he earns from dividends. In other words, he is a retired man. In that kind of a case he would not be required to file a report, he would not be required to pay any taxes if he is married; but suppose he is a working man, the withholding tax would apply and he would have to clear through his employer. That is all he would have to do.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion about a tax reduction at this time; that is, how can our committee and this Congress justify a reduction in taxes with a $300,000,000,000 debt? I repeat my earlier statement on that, and I want you to think about it. The history of every backward na-

tion is one of oppressive taxation that sooner or later destroys private initiative and free enterprise. That is true in every instance. History repeats itself. You are not going to have an expanded, growing economy in this country with an extremely high tax rate. In fact, the reverse is true.

Let us get away from the thought that we are going to have a solvent Government because we have a high tax rate and a high tax collection. In 1940, for instance, we collected $5,900,000,000 in taxes. In 1945 we collected $45,000,000,000. This $45,000,000,000, plus ten to eleven billion dollars in State and local taxes, amounts to $55,000,000,000, which is over one-third of our national income.

What are we doing in this bill? We are going to reduce the Federal tax take by $5,000,000,000. If we collect $27,000,000,000, as has been stated by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and if we add to that the 10 or 11 billion dollars for State and local taxes, we will collect somewhere between 33 and 40 percent of our national income in taxes.

The question arises, Should we not release some of these burdens on our people and try to get an expanding economy that will bring up our national income far above the $130,000,000,000, instead of trying to keep industry and the individual ground down to the point where we cannot have this expanding economy that is so necessary?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. In that connection, it will be recalled that the Treasury gave us in executive session a chart based upon a national income of $130,000,000,000. The gentleman and I know that we face in the next Budget an interest charge of about $5,500,000,000 on the national debt. This chart, the gentleman will recall, showed that those with net incomes above exemptions of $10,000 will have out of the $130,000,000,000 only $5,285,000,000, which means that if we confiscate every penny of income above $10,000 we still would not have enough to pay the interest on the national debt; so we cannot lower everybody's taxes and keep the Government solvent.

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and I am glad he called that to the attention of the committees. We have come to the turning point, where we will have to work out a tax program that will furnish full employment and an expanding economy. Our distinguished Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has stood on this floor time and time again and urged this House to vote increases in taxes. Now, it is his privilege to present a bill providing needed tax reductions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, we come here with our first tax-reduction bill. It is my contention that it will stimulate recovery, expand business, and furnish high employment.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. The subject of national income has been brought up here and, in my opinion, in many respects so far as basing taxation upon it is concerned, it is a myth, because that can be jacked up by deficit financing to any point they want to. It is nothing more nor less than inflationary. A national income that is not based on products does not amount to a thing as the basis for figuring taxes. Is not that right?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has spent much time studying this important problem.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I quite agree with the gentleman that private industry in order to progress and do business in this country must be given an opportunity. I think you are doing the right thing in this tax bill. But while we are reducing taxes in order to encourage people to go ahead and do things, the only way we are ever going to acquire a balanced budget or near a balanced budget is for the Congress to reduce the expenditures of government. Is not that the only way we are going to keep this country solvent?

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consistently spoken on this floor in behalf of a balanced budget, and I think he is absolutely right. The time for a balanced budget is here, in fact it is past due. We must not continue deficit financing. If we get this industrial machine of ours moving we should have no difficulty in securing a high national income, but it has to start moving. I regret very much the delay that seems to be taking place in the Nation at the present time. Every day lost now will enhance our difficulties next year.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Does the gentleman think seriously that he will ever live to see the time when the national income will be $130,000,000,000 a year?

Mr. CARLSON. My reply to that is that we have been operating, of course, during a war economy, and our national income has been $165,000,000,000. The question is, will we be able to carry our regular Government expenditures and our debt retirement without a national income in excess of $130,000,000,000? My personal opinion is we cannot.

Mr. GRANGER. Then it seems to me the only alternative, from the experience of everybody, is to get money when people have money and not try to get it when they do not have it. It seems to me this next year, when people will be in a better position to pay than they ever have been before, it is absolute folly to take away from the tax revenues $6,000,000,000 and then next month go back and sell those people bonds for $11,000,000,000.

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman has a very good point there. However, I still insist that we must have the national economy moving in order to get a national income. I agree with the gentleman as to how difficult it is to get $130,000,000,000 of national income. Does the gentleman know that in the boom year of 1929, which we like to talk about, we had a national income of only $85,000,000,000, that in 1933 we got down to $42,000,000,000, and that the average from 1930 to 1940 was $59,500,000,000? So I assure the gentleman that a $130,000,000,000 national income is not easily achieved, but I believe it can be; in fact, I think it must be.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman care to express his own personal opinion or that of the committee, if the committee has any views on it, as to the percentage of the total debt the committee plans to recommend the people pay for the purpose of amortization of the principal? The gentleman from Virginia has mentioned $5,500,000,000 in interest and carrying charges.

Mr. CARLSON. I assure the gentleman that our committee is going into this difficult problem. Our distinguished chairman has stated that he will call the committee together after the first of the year for a study of our tax structure; this will include amortization and refunding of our national debt. It is a serious problem but one that must be met.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, last March, I introduced House Joint Resolution 131, to authorize our representative on the International Security Council to pledge the use of our armed forces when the member nations of the Security Council decide such action is necessary to suppress any breaches of the peace. Today, I am introducing a new resolution for the same purpose, but changed in language, and with new provisions in order to more definitely conform to the obligations we have assumed under the United Nations Charter.

My resolution seeks to implement the provisions of articles 42 and 43 of the Charter wherein the Security Council will agree as to action necessary to maintain or restore the international peace and security.

The power that my resolution grants to our representative can be exerted immediately without resorting to Congress but in no way may it be construed as taking away from the Congress its constitutional right to declare war.

Moreover, my new resolution specifically sets up the office of United States Representative on the Security Council, affording our representative such staff and such expenses as will be adequate for him to thoroughly and properly carry out the high duties entrusted to him.

Our representative must at all times be in constant touch with the President and act under his instructions. The President must immediately apprise the Congress of any measures or actions taken, for the furthering of the agreements we make under the requirements of articles 42 and 43 of the Charter.

Measures taken under my resolution by our representative must be construed merely as preventive measures, in the nature of police action, taken in any community to keep the civil peace. We want to prevent aggravations that will lead to war between any two nations because we have learned from the sorrowful destruction which has enveloped the world that war between two nations can well lead to war between many nations.

We must always remember with pride that the United States led in creating the Security Council. In working out the provisions of the Charter, we emphasized the importance of quick action by the Big Five. We opposed the small nations who wanted to pass on decisions in the Assembly so that problems could be solved and decisions made speedily. The purpose of my resolution confirms the stand we took at San Francisco in that regard.

This legislation would not be needed by our Allied Nations. Their government set-up is different. But we, a democracy at all times, have a President who is elected by the people every 4 years and who is always accountable to them. Our representative on the Security Council merely carries out the President's considered judgment and his decisions which are reached after constant consultation with the elected and appointed leaders of our Government.

Other legislation will determine the complexion of the Army that we must establish and maintain to carry out the obligations we assume in accepting the Charter—in being its first signatory. My resolution deals merely with the emergencies wherein we will use our armed forces. The passage of my resolution, ladies and gentlemen, will declare to the world that we mean what we say when we announce our unalterable determination that our every power will be used to prevent another war of whatever size or compass. It will declare to the world that we have moral strength behind the leadership we displayed in pointing the path for others to follow us in developing an organization wherein the nations of the world may work together as a family. The sooner this resolution is adopted, the better. Now is the time, now when our people are confused and worried over the apparent frustration of our initial steps to reach complete harmony with our allies in working out the peace.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, in preparing this legislation the Ways and Means Committee has succeeded in bringing some help to almost every taxpayer, with the hope that this will give to each of them sufficient courage to use their funds for productive purposes and thus employ more workers, create new jobs, and generally stimulate the economy.

But if we merely looked at the question from the cold black and white figures and did not take in psychological factors, there is no justification for any tax decreases at this time.

Even in the calendar year 1946 the Treasury estimates an $8,000,000,000 deficit, which, as a result of the passage of this bill, will be increased to thirteen billion.

It is hoped, however, that the stimulation to business which will result from this bill will increase incomes and thus lower the deficit.

I would like to vote for further tax relief in the permanent tax bill which we are planning to write in the spring. However, whether I can do so in good conscience will depend entirely on what you and I do here when the question of appropriations comes before us.

Members of the Ways and Means Committee are constantly being approached with suggestions for reducing taxes. Many of the suggestions seem justifiable. However, we are confronted with a condition—not a theory. In fairness to future generations we cannot continue spending more than we take in.

It is all very well to blame the administration for its recommendations for continued deficit spending, but appropriations cannot be made without approval of Congress. So that the ultimate responsibility lies with the majority party in these Halls.

If our constituents want further tax relief, there is only one way that we can get it for them. We must tell them that we cannot give it to them if, at the same time, they expect the Federal Government to continue to spend money for sectional benefits, or even for many worthy causes.

We will determine right here when we consider the next few appropriation bills, whether or not we can have further tax reductions.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The question was raised a while ago by one of the members of the committee with respect to the potential national income, independent of Government expenditures. The gentleman is familiar with the Atlantic seaboard and its industries. What reason have we for not assuming that our national income in peacetime, in the absence of deficit financing by the Government, can reach $130,000,000,000 or $150,000,000,000 per annum on today's price level, if we make up our minds to go back to work? What is to prevent it?

Mr. KEAN. Nothing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I simply want to get into the RECORD that I happen to be one who believes, sincerely believes, that I will live to see $150,000,000,000 of national income produced by our people, independent of the Federal Treasury, if the Federal Government will keep its hands out of the industry of this country.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman is completely correct.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If we continue to have strikes in the country, as we are having today, what does the gentleman think our annual income will be this year, for the balance of the year?

Mr. KEAN. Naturally, the strike situation is slowing up production, but the amount of people on strike, although large, is comparatively small in comparison with the total number of people who are producing in this country.

Mr. RICH. But when the people continue to strike it cuts down our national income?

Mr. KEAN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, many of us, before we studied this bill, did not know whether we wanted to vote for it or not, but I believe that now I shall vote for the bill. However, I want to give a warning about any plans for further reductions, especially in the higher brackets.

I have interviewed a great many businessmen and all of them admit to me they are making more money now than they ever did, or more than any class ever did in the history of the country. We have a large debt. We have boys returning from the service who need jobs. Our country is in good condition, and I believe we should have faith in it. I believe that the corporations and wealthy individuals can afford to pay the taxes they are now paying. While I do not object to this reduction, I do not want any more of it. The banks of this country have over $145,000,000,000 of depositors' money in addition to their own great resources. Our business leaders practically own their stocks of goods. Less money is owed now than ever before. We are in a position to go forward to a balanced economy and full employment. The point I make is that the resources of our country and the capital of the country need employment the same as labor. I give you warning now that many of us in this Congress will oppose any further plans for radical reductions for those who are making good money. This is the limit which we will accept.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The gentleman will no doubt recall that when Ezekiel was called to rule over Israel he said, "For 7 days I sat where they sat." Our distinguished colleague has sat where the workingman sits. He now sits in the seats of the rulers. As a ruler, does the gentleman think it would be unfair or improper for us to ask the workingman who enters into a contract with his employer to live up to that contract?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The laborer who enters into a contract should live up to it. But I want to say, further, that all the strikes are not the fault of labor. At least half of them are due to the bosses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I hardly expected I would indulge in the luxury of a speech on this bill. There have been some departures from the bill in the debate that has taken place, departures that have been very interesting. I should like to make similar departures but first I must pay high tribute to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from North Carolina. He was extremely fair in the committee in apportioning the time and listening to the suggestions offered. I was the youngest on the committee and felt obliged to play with my ears rather than with my tongue. I feel that I acted wisely inasmuch as the committee is so able and so splendidly staffed. I wish to pay tribute not only to the members but to the advisers also. Some of the Treasury officials astonished me with their knowledge of this complicated subject. So let not the gentleman from Oklahoma, MIKE MONRONEY, think he needs to streamline the Ways and Means Committee. They need but little of this so-called reformation. I am profoundly and favorably impressed with the work of this committee.

Years ago when I entered the legislative halls of my home State I was called a taxation crank, and I was appointed to take prominent part in the field of taxation. I was appointed to attend taxation conventions by the governor of my State. I thought I knew a little about taxation. I seem now to know so little. What has been done to me? I first learned that taxes should be reasonable and that they should press equally, like the atmosphere, upon everybody. How you have departed from it? Punitive taxation! Find the wealthy fellow who has been fortunate; take 91 percent from him. Did I agree to taking 91 percent of a man's income and his State taking 6 percent more, and under the Ruml plan require him to pay 25 percent of the forgiven tax all in one year? The man who had a $350,000 income found out that he still owed about $20,000 after his entire income had been taken. What has happened that we would take 91 percent of a man's earnings, money he has earned legally and properly?

I had one important decision to make regarding this bill: Shall the banker to whom you owe $50,000, in order to get the interest, lend you some more money with which to pay the interest, and reduce the face of the debt a trifle at the same time? That is what this bill does. The creditor sees fit, knowing that we are to increase the debt $30,000,000,000, to reduce the tax. Do not fool yourselves that the Government is not the people themselves. We forget, but it is true. At this particular time, however, under reconversion it seems that we cannot save the patient unless we reduce his burden and increase his loan. A strange situation. But under this bill we are to increase the debt $30,000,000,000 and reduce his taxes. I have decided it is necessary to do so. Strange doctrine. But I welcome this bill; I welcome the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia. He said something. Some of you gentlemen on that side of the House, courageous fellows that you are, say courageous things, but I am waiting for you to do courageous things. You are the dominant party and you cannot dodge your responsibility to take action and curb these strikes that ruin our economy and cause real suffering to the general public. I come from a State where one of its citizens once declared: "There is no right to strike against the public safety at any time, anywhere." That now rings in my ears. What is meant by "public safety"? When the bread does not reach the doorstep? When the child does not get milk because of a teamsters' strike? Why do we not do something to protect our people, who are the real sufferers? They are not unionized and are helpless. When the Government takes over a business it is made to appear that the business is wholly at fault. This is a time for real courage and real action. The CIO send their emissaries lately, do they not, to put the heat on us? Well, if they put very much heat on some of us we would explode. That might be a good thing.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Naturally we should look to the President for leadership in these perilous times, and I know if he is properly quoted in the papers, after fishing at Reelfoot Lake and attending the county fair out in Arkansas, he said, "This is just sort of a blow-off after the let-down and everything is going to work out all right."

In other words, as I understand it, he does not propose to do anything about it and thinks it is only incidental in the life of the Nation.

Mr. GIFFORD. Why should Congress wait for a proposal from him? You were not here, as I was when the sit-down strikes were taking place. I then stated that if the President is a Democrat, he is everything Grover Cleveland was not. It depends so much on the personality of the President. But when such a personality is elected by the people four times, I can understand the cowardice of Congressmen who might feel that the people have spoken and want that particular man to have everything he wants. You gave it to him because you thought the people had spoken; but an aroused people may sometime unionize themselves and be heard.

I have belonged to the minority party for some years now. I have not hesitated to speak and I am not lacking in courage. I may be lamentably lacking in judgment. I think physically my health is good, but sometimes I think I ought to have my head examined because I so greatly fear deficit financing. My judgment may be poor, but I cannot vote for many of these so-called social gains that mean continuous and highly dangerous deficit financing.

You say, take the Government off the neck of business and we will have an income of $150,000,000,000 a year. Perhaps so. It is high time that we tried it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman now speaking in the well of the House is a man of thrift. He has saved and invested.

Mr. GIFFORD. Not saved much.

Mr. CRAWFORD. By doing that he has provided the means whereby men and women can go into the factories and manufacture tools and turn out goods; but that capital so invested and the machinery, the buildings and the materials brought together are no good with respect to national income unless we have willing workers. In my previous statement I assumed that the American people still have a sufficient amount of horse sense to go and do the work with the tools that are provided; but if that sense is lacking, no further deficit financing program that could be conceived will ever amount to anything in this country and we might as well kiss the good old United States of America good-by.

Mr. GIFFORD. We have many problems. My industries have recently agreed to a minimum wage of 65 cents an hour, yet one firm writes me that they have 2,200 employees, but if the OPA does not let them raise their prices they will have to shut down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the OPA must take its feet off the neck of this industry. How can they pay added labor cost if they cannot advance prices?

I intended to talk more about the violent changes in tax ideas and tax laws. Taxation does not now press, like the atmosphere, equally upon our citizens. We seem to be trying to take something away from somebody in order to give it to somebody else under some sort of socialistic theory. Every step you take towards socialism means a step toward dictatorship, because no form of socialism can succeed without a dictator forcing people to live up to such doctrines.

Another phase of taxation! For 40 years I have owned a tract of land. I pay a yearly tax of about $30 a thousand on it. I have held it as you would hold mining or other stock hoping some time I might sell it at a profit—there has been no income from it. The man who bought mining stock pays no taxes unless there is an income. Even in the State of Iowa where they have a mill tax they probably do not dare enforce it as the owner would quickly move it into a more favorable locality.

Mr. Chairman, a country that needs many regulations and laws is called a country of corrupt people. The more laws and the more regulations you make the more tricks are invented to avoid them. Laws make more and more lawbreakers. Your great President Jefferson once said, as I recall it, "that good

people do not need many laws and bad people are not made better by them." A gentle law is seldom obeyed. A severe law is seldom executed. Our multiplicity of laws, regulations, is sapping the vitality of our economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill because it will relieve some 12,000,000 of our low-income people from the necessity of paying income taxes out of their very necessities of life. But I believe this bill represents all the net tax reduction which Congress ought to provide for a considerable length of time in view of the commitments which our Nation has assumed. And I am frank to say the bill before us is a very different measure from what I believe it should have been. I want to put in the RECORD what I believe we should have done and what I believe should in the future be our approach to the tax and revenue problem.

In the first place, I think that business taxes on the one hand and individual taxes on the other are two quite different fields of consideration. I think that individual income taxes graduated in accordance with ability to pay plus taxes on idle wealth and socially created values are the basis of a sound tax system in any nation. With our Nation in the financial situation in which it finds itself today, and particularly since we have not as yet put an end to the unsound and irrational financial system whereby our Nation never uses its own credit directly but "borrows" it from private banks thus causing utterly needless increases in the national debt, we must face the fact as citizens that taxes must continue to be heavy.

What I believe would have been the best thing to do in this bill with respect to individual taxes is simply to have increased the exemptions in a reasonable amount and left the rates where they are. There should be an exemption of an amount of income sufficient for a decent standard of living and beyond that the rates should be fixed in accordance with the needs of the Nation. I think the relief in this bill accorded to people whose incomes afford more than a good standard of living is more than can possibly be justified under the present circumstances of our country. I want that to go in the RECORD. I know it is not popular and I know it is not the politically "smart" thing to say, but that is what I believe.

Now about business taxes. I think that in the days that lie ahead, with corporate taxes as heavy as they will probably remain in almost anybody's book, if we really want to help the little business—for example, the new business of a veteran who is coming back from this war—what we need to do is to provide a specific exemption of a certain number of thousands of dollars of earnings. I am not prepared to say exactly how much it ought to be, but maybe $10,000, maybe $15,000; I do not know. At any rate, it should be a certain number of thousands of dollars of earnings, which would be absolutely exempt from corporation and income taxes. A business that made less than that amount of money would only need to file an affidavit to the effect that it had earned less than that. It would not even need to file a complex tax return. Beyond that, I think corporation income taxes ought to be graduated. I think they ought to be graduated more than they are, because I think if we are going to do more than pay lip service to the cause of little business the tax structure has to reflect that fact. At present it does not do so to any real extent.

One more remark on corporation taxes which I should like to make is this: I believe that the main reason why large profits were made during the war period and retained by corporations as mentioned this morning has been the excess-profits tax credit, and the fact that under the average earnings plan of computation it has been possible for a very high base and a very high amount of credit to be taken by some corporations. Over and over again I have pointed this loophole out, but nothing has been done to plug it.

I believe it is bad public policy to do as this bill does, namely, to freeze the social-security rates again. I believe those rates should not have been frozen during the war. I think the right policy would have been to permit those social-security tax rates to increase at the beginning of the war. I think it would have made possible one of the best means of providing savings for millions of people that we could have had. And today I do not believe they ought to be frozen. The commitments to our people contained in that act must be made good and now is the time to provide for meeting them.

I cannot refrain from saying that it does not seem to me right at all to take some hundreds of millions of dollars off the taxes on liquor as this bill does. It seems to me that that is one place where the taxes should certainly have stayed at their present level.

On the other hand, I want to say that I believe the committee did a very wise thing in removing the automobile-use tax. I think it has been an unsatisfactory and inequitable tax from the beginning. It has fallen with equal weight on the little "jalopy" that somebody had to have on his farm or to get to his job and on the big limousine. It has been difficult to collect. Some have paid it and some have not, and I am glad the committee removed it.

I have not attempted to analyze this whole bill. I conclude by saying that in my judgment the whole tax system needs a revision and a simplification; that I hope the day will come when certain types of taxes will be levied only by States, some types only by localities, and certain types only by the Federal Government, so that we will have a more rational system of taxation in this country. It is going to have to be a tax system, however, that is geared to the ability of the taxpayer to pay, which is the reason why I lay emphasis on the basic exemption with regard to the individual income tax and say that is the place that the relief should have been given in this bill, rather than in the upper tax bracket rates.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today to reduce taxes is the first bill of its kind to come before the Congress in a long time. It makes some reduction in individual income taxes, in corporation taxes, provides for the ultimate repeal of the excess-profits tax, repeals the auto-use tax, repeals the corporation capital stock tax, it brings to an end certain war excise taxes, and restores their prewar level, and this bill freezes the social-security tax at its present rate of 1 percent.

The most important factor in the fiscal policy of the United States is that we must have a solvent America. If the United States Government continues on with deficit spending we will eventually reach that point where we cannot turn back. Then we have not only betrayed the millions of bondholders of the United States Government, but we have betrayed posterity, and we will have betrayed the world. If the United States is to be strong, and if our Government is to endure we must maintain our solvency.

It is both right and proper that taxes be reduced some, now that the war is over. We need to get industry in the United States going again. Idle dollars and idle factories make for idle men. The resources of our Nation must be put to work under our system of private enterprise and freedom. Risks will be taken if there is a reward to be gained for such a risk. As a reconversion measure, this tax reduction is not only desirable but it is a necessity.

It should be borne in mind, however, that future tax reductions rest not in the hands of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. How high the taxes are going to be for the next 20 years depends upon those who direct the spending of the money from the Public Treasury. If we intend to continue to obligate the taxpayers of the United States for billions and billions of dollars, in every corner of the world, there is no way that he can honestly lower taxes.

We hear a great deal of talk about the benefits of Government from the cradle to the grave. We need to start talking about bondage from the cradle to the grave. Let us consider a young life coming into this world at this time. If the Government undertakes to pay the expenses of his birth, provide a nursery where he can be reared, protect him from all the hazards of life, give him medical care, and unemployment compensation, and take care of him in his old age, pay the expenses when he dies, and take care of his dependents, the Government is going to have to say to him, "You turn over to the Government a big share of your adult life." At the present time someone in the 25-percent income-tax bracket works January, February, and March for the Government. If they are in the 50-percent bracket, they work until July 1 for the tax gatherer. That is bondage. That is slavery. Instead of

talking all the time of what we will do for the citizens, we should be honest with them and tell them what we will do to them.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. If some of the do-gooders had their way, Americans would be a race of mollycoddles inside of 50 years.

Mr. CURTIS. There are many things we should do to help the unfortunate, but certainly there is a limit to all things and at least we should be honest and tell the people, "If you get from this Government such and such a benefit, the Government will take away from you a part of your adult life and make you repay in toil and sweat for what the Government gives you."

In considering the expenditures of the United States Government, we are forced to speak of the fiscal year. Taxes are levied on the basis of a calendar year, and it is very confusing. Our Committee on Ways and Means asked the Treasury Department to break down the figures on expenditures for calendar years so that we might better view the receipts and expenditures of our Government. I wish to mention some figures in connection with such a comparison.

First let me say that this tax bill, even after the reductions called for will raise more than three times the amount of revenue that was collected in 1941 which was the highest of all prewar years. In the year 1940 the United States Government spent almost $10,000,000,000 and collected in taxes only about $6,000,000,000.

In 1941 we spent over $20,500,000,000 and collected less than $9,000,000,000 in taxes.

In 1942 the United States Government spent almost $58,000,000,000 and collected less than $17,000,000,000 in taxes.

In 1943 the expenditures of the United States Government were $90,000,000,000 and our tax receipts were less than $35,000,000,000.

In 1944 our expenditures were almost $98,000,000,000 and we received in taxes a little less than $45,000,000,000.

In 1945 we will have expended almost $92,000,000,000 and our tax receipts are about the same as in 1944, a little less than $45,000,000,000.

It is estimated that in 1946, after the reductions herein provided for are made, we will collect in taxes somewhere between twenty-seven and one-half billion dollars and thirty billion dollars. This is a tremendous peacetime tax burden. With a proper management of the United States Government, we should be able to pay as we go, carry our national debt, and retire a portion of the debt each year systematically on less than twenty-seven and a half billion dollars.

There will be a deficit in the year 1946, however. This is because there will still be war expenditures in 1946. War contracts will be settled next year, our armed forces will be up to near wartime strength for a part of the year, and other items will have to be paid that properly belong in a war budget.

How much taxes can be reduced in the years that lie ahead depends on how much money the United States Government spends. In other words, the responsibility is with the spenders.

This bill was written in our committee in 1 week's time. It reflects the ideas and opinions of 25 men. It is a compromise. There are items in it that I do not like, there are other things that are omitted which I favored, but I shall support the bill. I urge its passage as an important step toward reconversion and jobs in our country.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman made the statement that the responsibility is with the spenders. Will the gentleman elucidate on that and tell us what he means?

Mr. CURTIS. I was not speaking for anyone except myself. As far as my vote on the Ways and Means is concerned, I shall cast it for a pay-as-you-go basis. If we want low taxes we will have to have lower appropriations.

Mr. RICH. That is the point I want to make. If we are going to continue to operate this Government successfully, and we want lower taxes, we must have less spending in the Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. But we cannot place our trust in a reorganization bill. If you look over the record for the past 12 years, the expenditures that have been eliminated have been eliminated by the Congress and not by the Executive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY].

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, when we face a problem of the magnitude posed in this tax legislation bill, it is well perhaps to start from the vantage ground of a survey of the existing economic situation against which we are to pose the bill. SEC estimated as of March 31, 1945 that American corporations had $46,900,000,000 of liquid capital on hand, which is $22,300,000,000 more than in 1939. The Department of Commerce estimated that corporations had made $25,900,000,000 in dividends between 1940 and 1945. In other words, our business structure is at the strongest and wealthiest point in its history.

Our big corporations do not need the relief this bill provides in the reduction of excess-profits taxes.

At the same time, following VJ-day the estimated national wage and salary payments dropped and will drop from an approximate rate of $115,000,000,000 a year to $78,000,000,000 anticipated for 1946. About 90 percent of this shrinkage, of course, will be felt in the incomes of the working people of this country. When we judge this tax bill, therefore, we should judge it as an instrument for assisting in equalizing this process, for assisting us to reconvert on a sound postwar program of purchasing power, for a continued production program. The bill has a number of very good features. It also has some unfortunate features. The good features, of course, are that it exempts 12,000,000 from paying further taxes and removes war-excise taxes, including the auto use tax. These are substantial steps forward.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. Not at this time, if the gentleman will permit me to proceed.

Another good feature in this bill is the tax relief which is granted to small corporations through the percentage point reduction; but I think we cannot help noticing that of the excess-profits tax reductions which are granted by this bill, we are going to grant 850 corporations which have had a million dollars or more income a year something like $910,000,000 of the $1,270,000,000 which will be cut off from the excess-profits tax alone. That is, only .003 percent of all the corporations that pay taxes will receive 71.6 percent of the tax relief through reduction in the excess-profits tax. A majority of the corporations, however, will realize no benefit whatsoever from this portion of the measure. On the personal-income side we should assist the reconversion process by increasing the personal exemptions from the present $500 to $1,000 per individual with $2,000 for each man and wife and $500 for each dependent. The present bill does not do this. I think, likewise, that men who are in the service should have forgiveness for their accumulated income taxes during the war up to $250 a year. The present bill does not give this type of relief, either.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman at this point.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I believe one of the most constructive things about this tax bill is the repeal of this obnoxious $5 use tax on automobiles. It is obnoxious to every person who drives a car and has been irritating him for the past 3 or 4 years. I believe the gentleman will agree with me that it was one of the most unpopular taxes ever levied by the Congress. Its repeal in this bill is a good thing.

Mr. DE LACY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Another aid we should provide the individual is opening to him the same carry-back and carry-forward provisions which so substantially protect business against loss of profit in the troubled days ahead.

A sound tax bill should help small business. We should set a flat $5,000 exemption for small business firms and permit them the option of paying on the partnership basis.

The present bill, on the contrary, provides $910,000,000 relief for 850 corporations whose annual incomes are $1,000,000 or more; $290,000,000 relief for 6,960 corporations whose incomes are between $100,000 to $1,000,000; and only $70,000,000 for 12,190 corporations under $100,000 in annual income. This leaves the rest of the 250,000 corporations with no help from this provision.

Even the help this bill extends to smaller corporations is, through the flat

application of the 4-percentage-point reduction, outbalanced by what that reduction gives to the biggest corporations which need no help.

An illustration of how the flat cut works is to be seen in the committee report on pages 6 and 7. The flat 10-percent cut means 4 percentage points reduction on $2,000 and 9.5 percentage points on $200,000. It means a $4 saving on a $600 income and $450,000 saving on a $5,000,000 income.

The flat 10-percent cut means that one-half of 1 percent will get a sheer gift of $110,000,000 over what this tiny group would have gotten if the reduction had been held to a straight 4-point reduction.

This bill does not establish a sound over-all pattern for our reconversion taxation.

Yet it does help 12,000,000 in the lowest brackets.

For that reason, I am voting for it, in the hope that before the Senate acts, full discussion in the press and by the public will clarify the bill, permitting the elimination of what is unsound and the strengthening and extension of its good features.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. All taxes are unpopular, some more so than others.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, there are several very interesting features about this bill and the proceedings today.

In the first place, we are made very happy, because this is the first tax-reduction bill that has been considered by the House and on which we have had an opportunity to vote in the last 15 years and during which time we have had 18 tax bills, all of them increasing taxes and the tax burden of the American people. That brings genuine joy to me and will bring happiness to millions of American taxpayers. That is No. 1.

No. 2. I do not know when I have sat through a debate that was more interesting, informative, and conducted on a higher plane than this; but after we have all spoken we cannot, under the gag rule making this bill in order, amend it; we must take it or leave it as it is.

No. 3. The third peculiar thing about this bill is that we are reducing taxes, passing a tax-reduction bill, in the face of a deficit for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, of thirty billions or more. That is passing strange, and interesting. It can be justified only on one ground, and that is, the encouragement it will bring to private initiative and private enterprise in this country to invest their money, create jobs, and start the wheels of industry going good and strong, so that we may realize one hundred and thirty billions national income for the next year.

I know you will pardon me if I say I was here after World War I, and our very able, distinguished, and lovable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. DOUGHTON] was likewise here; and so were our distinguished friends, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], of the Ways and Means Committee, who have made able speeches today on this bill.

The people of the country in 1920 elected a Republican President and a Republican Congress. When we met here at the extra session called by President Harding, I believe in April 1921, two very important matters were brought before the Congress. One was a reduction in taxes. At that time we still had the heavy, burdensome taxes of World War I. The other was to reduce the expenses of government. We did pass a real tax reduction bill and cut out many taxes entirely. The bill before us merely gives $500 exemption to the taxpayer and to his dependents. For instance, the husband and wife are each allowed $500 and also $500 for each of their dependents. This will have the effect of cutting from the income-tax rolls approximately 12,000,000 low-income taxpayers of today. This is quite a relief to these 12,000,000, but it is not as much relief as was given in our tax-reduction bill in 1921. As I recall, under that bill all income-tax payers with dependents whose income was $3,000 or less were cut from the tax rolls. As late as early in 1940, the number of Federal income-tax payers was approximately 4,000,000. In 1945, we had somewhere between 45,000,000 and 50,000,000 Federal income-tax payers, and they were allowed $500 for the taxpayer alone and nothing for his dependents. As pointed out above, this bill will allow $500 for the taxpayer, also for his wife and each of his children who are dependent upon him for as much as 50 percent of their support. The Honorable John Garner, Democrat, of Texas, and of the Ways and Means Committee, helped to pass that bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; and I should say that my distinguished friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] was also present at that time and took a prominent part.

Mr. KNUTSON. During the period to which the gentleman just referred we had three tax reductions. We paid a billion dollars a year on the debt for 10 years and the national income kept going up and up and the receipts of the Government kept going up and up.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Exactly. As a matter of fact, we had five tax reductions in 10 years. There was a tax reduction every 2 years. We paid on our national debt and always had a big surplus in the Treasury.

It was contended by some that if we passed the tax-reduction bill of 1921 the tax would not bring in enough money to meet the expenses of the Government and we would thereby have a deficit. Our action greatly encouraged and expanded business with plenty of jobs and prosperity for all.

Here is another important matter that went with that program. It was a Republican Congress and a Republican President that put through the budget law, so when the year was up, living up to that budget law, instead of a deficit we had a large surplus in the Treasury. This surplus kept up every year. We followed the Budget every year, we reduced taxes every year, business was encouraged, private enterprise was encouraged, business expanded, and the income of the country grew under that wise policy. With all the good things in this bill for the small income taxpayers, it also aids small business and gives all business a boost. It gives real help and encouragement to private enterprise. We have not been following the Budget for 15 years—ever since you Democrats took charge of the Congress in 1931. We have had deficits upon deficits, recklessly wasting and spending, with constant increase of debts and taxes.

Mr. Chairman, we have to get back to balancing the Budget before we will accomplish anything in the way of real tax reduction. In this bill we give the American people this year $5,000,000,000 by way of tax reductions, but before the snow flies the administration will be going over the country selling bonds to borrow back $5,000,000,000 from the people in order to carry on the expense of government. Our deficit next June will be at least $30,000,000,000 for this fiscal year.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. At the time the gentleman speaks of, when we reduced the national debt from $27,500,000,000 down to $16,500,000,000, we had a Congress that cut down expenses. We balanced the Budget and that is the reason they accomplished that in those days. We will have to do the same thing in the immediate future if we are going to be successful.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It cannot be done in any other way. Until the Congress and the administration make up their minds that they are not going to spend more than they take in, a permanent tax reduction is an idle dream.

The 10 Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee issued a very able and illuminating statement that clearly sets forth the fiscal policy of the Republican Party through the years before the Democrats took control: This is still the policy of the Republican Party.

The minority views as set forth in their statement, in part, are as follows:

> Tax reduction, a balanced budget, and debt retirement have ever been the traditional fiscal policy of the Republican Party. If strict economies had been practiced by the administration much greater tax reductions would now be possible. Future reductions in tax rates can only be made if the administration will cut out wasteful and unnecessary spending.

This Nation cannot continue to play Santa Claus to the other nations over the earth and remain solvent. Only a solvent America can help meet the postwar problems of the world. Billions will be needed to provide adequate care for those who return home maimed and wounded; and to provide for the dependents of those who have made the supreme sacrifice we must be secure against waste and uncertainty, if we are to do our full duty toward our heroic sons. These sacred

obligations must come before all other considerations.

Other billions will be needed to reconvert industry to peacetime production. These huge sums can only be secured by restoring the confidence of the investing public. Such confidence can be restored through a sound fiscal policy. Reconversion of business and reemployment of labor are the pressing problems before this Nation today. Nothing will stimulate and encourage these two elements as much as a sound, fair, and forthright tax program.

We were greatly cheered when our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman COLMER, and his Committee on Economic Postwar Planning, came back after a trip to Europe during which they interviewed Premier Stalin, Prime Minister Attlee, and other important officials in various countries of Europe, and stated that we should go slow in extending further credits to these foreign countries.

We should not extend more credit than is absolutely necessary and we should see to it that it is no longer a lend-lease give-away but that these loans are properly secured. It is generally conceded however, that if the Congress carries out the very elaborate program set forth in the recent message of President Truman, there will be many billions more added to the $30,000,000,000 deficit that it is estimated we will have at the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1946.

We have seen nothing yet on the part of this administration to encourage us to believe that they are going to cut out or cut down and give us a consistent tax reduction policy through the years. We cannot balance the Budget or encourage the people to put their money and savings into business enterprise with such an unsound fiscal policy on the part of the Government. We have taxed, borrowed, and spent for 15 years; with a huge deficit facing us at the end of each year. This is a real threat to our country, to the American way of life, and it has promoted and it will promote inflation that at any time may become uncontrolled inflation and ultimate disaster to our country and our people. In addition to these considerations we must also bear in mind that 85,000,000 Americans have bought bonds; that our national debt is now approximately two hundred and sixty-five billion and on June 30, 1946, it will be approximately three hundred billion, with billions of other obligations not expressed in the national debt.

This two hundred and sixty-five billions is owed to the American people. Millions have bought bonds and have put them away to buy homes, equip homes, enter business, or to have something for that rainy day. We must not destroy the credit of this great Government by this needless waste of the tax and bond money of the people. The day of reckoning will come if this administration does not change its policies.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, what is our policy in the Far East going to be? This is a question which I have been mulling over in my mind ever since the surrender of Japan and to date, with the exception of our policy in Japan, I have been unable to find the answer. Perhaps this is due to our concentration on European affairs and the widely publicized, though highly secretive, meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers in London. Perhaps it is due to a reversal to our old Atlantic policy and a forgetfulness of things Asiatic and their possible consequences to us. The fact is that much which has been happening in Asia has escaped the attention of the American people and the real significance of what has been occurring there has not been brought home to us by either the press, the radio, or our own State Department. The State Department has proposed a far eastern Advisory Commission but it appears it will be a body primarily concerned with Japan's occupation. It is time that we wake up, if we value our future, and understand just what is happening across the Pacific.

The continent of Asia today is a cauldron of unrest and the questions affecting that continent are of tremendous importance to us and to the peace of the world. The questions are varied and many and while I will not attempt to discuss all of them I will list them and discuss those which directly affect us. They can be summarized as follows:

First. Syrian and Indochinese demands for independence from France.

Second. The Moslem-Hindu clash in India between themselves and their demands for freedom from Britain.

Third. The attempt of the Indonesians to escape from Dutch domination.

Fourth. Anglo-American rivalry for the oil of Arabia.

Fifth. Anglo-Russian sphere of control politics in Iran.

Sixth. The question of Kuomintang Communist relationship in China, the Sinkiang revolt, and the Yunnan incident.

Seventh. The question of Korea.

Eighth. The question of policy in occupied Japan.

There are many more questions affecting Asia which could and should be brought to your attention but time does not permit a detailed analysis of each specific one. However, I do feel that the questions affecting the use of United States military forces in the Far East are of paramount importance at this time and should be discussed in the Congress of the United States. I bring this matter to your attention now because I am interested in my country above all things, and, in my opinion, the matter of our foreign policy in the Far East should be given the attention it deserves. Without going into great detail I would like to present my views on our policy in Japan, China, Korea, and to a lesser extent, in Burma and India.

In my opinion all of our troops should be under orders to withdraw from India and Burma at the earliest possible moment. We have no vital interests in those two countries now that the war is over except to make an agreement with the Government of India and Great Britain covering our expenditures there. This agreement would cover the building of roads, railroads, and telephone lines, and the equipment we have expended in their construction so that we may recover an equitable share of our costs there relative to our efforts. There is absolutely no need for retaining more than a skeleton crew of our armed forces in Burma and India at this time as our job there has been completed.

In Korea it would be wise to allow Chinese occupation forces to move into that country as they would understand far better than we the situation there. The traditional friendship between Korea and China, based on mutual understanding over the years, would do much to ameliorate the difficult situation which has confronted our forces since our occupation policy was promulgated. Korea was promised her eventual independence in the Cairo Declaration and the one country which I think is in the most advantageous position to help her achieve that status is China.

In China, itself, our position is confusing to say the least. There are too many powder kegs in that country, and we do not desire to become involved in any of China's internal difficulties. Fuses could easily be applied to such powder kegs as Manchuria, now under Russian control; Sinkiang, where a revolt has been in progress for many months; Shantung and Hopeh Provinces, where our marines are stationed and our warships anchored; Hongkong, whose future status is by no means definitely established, and many others.

We should withdraw our soldiers, sailors, and marines as soon as possible from China, because the longer we stay there the more possibility there is that we may become involved in the internal Chinese situation. It was my hope that we would get out of China at the earliest opportunity once the war with Japan was ended. However, the opposite seems to be true, because with the defeat of Japan we are strengthening our forces in China and funneling more troops into that country. This statement is borne out by the landing of the veteran First Marine Division at Taku, and its progress inland toward Tientsin to the west; the landing of elements of the Sixth Marine Division at Tsingtao on yesterday, and the sending of five American cruisers to Chefoo. These moves have created a potentially dangerous situation for us because, first, it might cause the Russian forces in Manchuria to refuse to withdraw in the 3-month period agreed to with China and, second, in case of local civil war between Kuomintang and Communist groups in that area we might be unable to maintain a hands-off policy. It must be remembered that Shantung and Hopeh Provinces are in reality next door to Russian-occupied Manchuria, and also that these two provinces contain sizable Communist elements which

might decide to maintain their separate status no matter what the outcome is between Mao Tse-tung and Chiang Kai-shek in their present negotiations.

The landing of the First and Sixth Marine Divisions and the dispatch of the American cruisers to Chefoo constitute an unwarranted interference in the affairs of China and, while these moves undoubtedly had the approval of Chiang Kai-shek, I feel that we are making a serious mistake in furthering this gunboat policy.

Surely there are no American business interests to be protected and no American civilian lives at stake. However, should this policy continue, the lives of the men in our armed forces stationed in that area, may become involved. I need only recall to you the sporadic fighting which occurred at Kunming some days ago when Chiang replaced Lung Yun as Governor of Yunnan. While we lost no lives then the incident presented an opportunity which might have turned out differently and made it extremely dangerous for our men stationed there.

Now that the war with Japan is ended the best thing that we could do would be to withdraw all our forces from China just as soon as we possibly can and to allow the Chinese to settle their own internal affairs.

In Japan we are, of course, committed to an indefinite period of occupation. All of us were greatly heartened by General MacArthur's statement that within 6 months' time only 200,000 men would be needed to occupy the country. Whether or not that number will be sufficient only time can tell. However, MacArthur's policy to date has been extremely successful and he is to be commended for what he has accomplished. An occupation without the loss of a life; a gradual and forceful shifting of control to more liberal elements, and a realistic knowledge of Japanese psychology all are accomplished which merit the approval of the American people. I am sorry to note the criticism of MacArthur's policy by various segments of the press and radio because the difficult task which he has undertaken and which he has handled so well has been a tribute to his full understanding of the job confronting him.

Incidentally, there has not been the friction between the State Department and MacArthur which one would imagine after reading and hearing reports in the press, on the radio, and even on the floor of Congress. The State Department has furnished advisers to MacArthur, at his request, and placed all its facilities at his disposal. In sending George Atcheson, Minister to Siam, to MacArthur as his adviser, they have given him one of the most realistic and competent of our far eastern authorities.

MacArthur is solving the more immediate problems confronting him in a sound and practical manner, but the more difficult problems are going to be in the future. It is going to take a great deal of patience and cooperation on our part in understanding the tremendous job facing MacArthur in the months and years ahead.

Summing up, there is and will be a need for a long time to come to keep a strong occupation force in Japan. However, there is no sound reason for maintaining all our troops in India, Burma, Korea, and China, and certainly there can be no justification for sending additional marines and sailors to the Asiatic mainland. The best interests of the United States would be well served if we were to withdraw all our servicemen from these four areas at the first available opportunity. It is time that we called for an explanation of our policy in the Far East, so that we will not again become involved in hostilities in that area. With the exception of Japan, our military business has ended in the Far East and the best procedure for us to follow would be to let those countries in that part of the world settle their own internal difficulties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has again expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. In case the United States should be invited by the Government of China to supply a military mission to help that Government modernize and develop its army and air force along the lines that General Chennault, General Stilwell, and General Wedemeyer have instituted, would the gentleman have any objection to our supplying such a mission to China, as we have to a good many other countries at one time or another?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Not at all. As the gentleman has pointed out, that is a part of the policy of our Government toward many countries in the world, but I do object to two Marine Divisions being sent up to North China, because I am afraid that we may become involved too much in China's internal affairs. We should be extremely careful.

Mr. JUDD. I appreciate the gentleman's apprehension. I merely wanted to make clear that there is a distinction between the two situations. About 1922 Sun Yat-sen came to this country and later to various countries in Europe, trying to get a military mission to help modernize the Chinese Army. He could get no help here or in England or in France—the democratic nations. But Russia sent a military mission which worked there for years and gave birth to the communist movement in China. Hitler sent a mission with Von Falkenhausen, who started Prussianization of the Chinese Army. Mussolini sent a mission to help build up the Chinese air force. The Chinese Government may invite the United States to furnish a military mission to help modernize and develop the Chinese military. If we do not furnish it some other nation certainly will, and thereby will help mold Chinese thinking. I wanted to make clear that there is a difference between sending a military mission on China's request and sending troops into China as we did during the days of extraterritoriality.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. That is very true; but I think China has had an American military mission for some time, and it has done a very good job.

Mr. JUDD. Yes. An excellent job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for H. R. 4309 because it will aid both individuals and business, and I agree that it is a step in the right direction.

I urge the Congress to follow closely the recommendations for economy by the Comptroller General, Lindsay Warren, in order to make possible a real tax reduction for the American people.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may care to use to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the tax bill, but I am going to do it with much reluctance. In the first place, I do not believe that it is fair to the small-income group, because the exemptions are not sufficient. When one considers that 54 percent of our people have an income of less than $2,000 a year, it is difficult to realize how they can exist, especially if they have a family, let alone pay taxes on that income.

There is no doubt in my mind but that those who make large incomes should pay the large share of taxes, and those of low incomes should be given exemptions until they reach a certain level, such as $3,000 for people with families. Above that amount there should be a graduated tax.

I believe also that a relinquishing of taxes on the low-income group will add greatly to the purchasing power of the Nation and will be of great assistance in the reconversion period.

For people engaged in small business enterprises that do not have an income in excess of $100,000 a year, existing rates should be lowered. Small business, as well as the low-income group, is the first to suffer in a depression, and many small concerns are driven into bankruptcy. The larger corporations are fortified to withstand periods of depression; the smaller are not. It is to the best interest of this country to protect and promote small business.

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate the necessity of a closed rule in the formulation of a coordinated and studied tax program. The Ways and Means Committee is in a far better position to draw a tax measure than is the Committee of the Whole House. However, I cannot concede that the present measure is either a coordinated or a studied tax program. While it does grant some meritorious tax relief, it almost completely disregards some of the most elemental principles of sound taxation. For that reason I believe that this measure should be recommitted for further study.

While a program of taxation is designed primarily to raise revenue we cannot ignore its impact on our economic life. Relief has been granted to corpo-

rate incomes not only through a reduction in the surtax rate but also through reductions in excess-profits rates and exemptions, and the carry-back mechanism. We have created a situation which makes it virtually impossible for corporations to suffer from the impacts of reconversion to civilian production. Some of this, I concede, is necessary to bring production to high levels as soon as possible.

However, I find that, though we have shown great consideration on the one hand, we have shown virtually none on the other. Why have not the prewar exemption levels on personal income taxes been restored? When present exemption levels were established it was declared that it established a more democratic base for revenues by allowing a greater portion of the American people to contribute to the cost of government. I believe that the American people have cheerfully borne their share of the cost of the war which has just ended. Personally, I have never been able to admit to the democracy of a tax bill which levies on incomes in excess of $12 per week, when this amount will not by the widest stretch of imagination permit a decent American standard of living. It is time that we dispense with such distorted conceptions of democracy.

I am concerned not only with the human aspects of taxation policy but also with its effect on our whole business and economic life. Mr. Snyder, of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, recently predicted that we must expect unemployment to run in the millions during the year 1946. This will have a severe contracting effect on purchasing power in our country. Are we to further contract it by keeping an undue burden of taxation on those who are fortunate enough to be employed, but receiving small incomes? If business is to be reimbursed from taxes paid in the past for losses they may suffer in the next 2 years, why should not a similar provision be made to the man who is unable to find employment?

Perhaps this is too much to ask. However, I do feel that it is only fair to recommend that exemptions on individual income taxes should be increased to $1,000 for an individual, $2,000 for a married couple, and $500 for each additional dependent. The normal tax should be totally repealed, and excise taxes except on luxuries should be repealed.

It is with these recommendations that I urge the recommitment of this bill to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the Ways and Means Committee was confronted with a welcome and unusual task as we considered this bill for a reduction of taxes. In recent years the committee has devoted its efforts toward tax increases. It is a pleasant change of course under the distinguished leadership of our chairman the committee has, in my opinion, done an excellent job in presenting this bill to the Committee with its unanimous support.

We were greatly aided by the appearance before the committee of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Vinson. As you all know, he was formerly a Member of this body, and a most capable member of the Ways and Means Committee. He has had long legislative experience, and has learned, above all else, that you cannot force down the throats of a committee of this Congress your wishes. Consequently, Mr. Vinson, in appearing before our committee and presenting his plan, very clearly set forth that he was making recommendations to our committee, and he hoped that we would adopt his recommendations. As you know, our committee very carefully considered his recommendations, adopted some, rejected others in part, and others in toto. But the result of his method of approach to our committee was so highly satisfactory that there is no feeling on our part, and I am certain on his part, of a turn-down by the committee of his recommendations. I know that in the future when Mr. Vinson comes before our committee he will come with the knowledge he will have every consideration given his recommendations, and that the committee will then do as any legislative body should, determine the issue as its judgment dictates.

I commend the Secretary for recommending tax reductions long advocated by the tax-study committee of the Republican House membership, a committee of which the distinguished Member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is chairman.

We Republicans have recommended, among other tax changes, the complete repeal of the excess-profits tax, elimination of the normal tax, the auto-use tax, a reduction of the corporate surtax, and substantial reductions in the taxes on individuals in business. I regret this tax bill does not reduce some taxes still further, for as tax rates go down business revives, and with a revival of business tax income increases and there are jobs for all. We realize that by repealing the excess-profits tax alone only that part of industry which in the past has been in the excess-profits brackets would profit directly. It is this part of industry which makes the larger profit and where in general there is ample money for reconversion. We recognize that all of industry must provide jobs if there are to be jobs for returning soldiers and for the former war workers. So I am glad to say that the committee decided to adopt only a partial repeal of the excess-profits tax for the beginning of 1946 and to include in the bill some direct benefit to other corporations and to other forms of doing business. I believe this is far better for business as a whole. We cannot be accused of placing all our tax-saving eggs in one basket; we have distributed them to some extent over all industry, both that doing business as corporations and that doing business as individuals and partnerships.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman feel that the Carlson amendment, which would remove ten to twelve millions from the tax rolls, will be very well received by the country?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I believe there is very little question but that the Carlson amendment, which calls for a 4-percent cut up and down the line on personal income taxes, will be welcomed by the public. Every individual income-tax payer will benefit. I will say that my personal hope was that we might find it possible to retain the broad base but make a percentage cut right down the line. After considering the matter, however, and having the judgment of the members of the committee, I am pleased with the bill as adopted and presented to the House.

Our estimates are based on an over-all business of $156,000,000,000 for 1946. I believe this estimate fails to reflect the possibilities for next year.

I want to point out, too, that we today are apt to contrast 1946 and the estimate of $156,000,000,000 in that year with the earlier years when income was considerably less, as, for example, in 1929, when it was about $85,000,000,000, and to take pride and glory in the comparison. If we do not think a bit, we are apt to say: "My! We have made great advancement in the past 16 years." But if one thinks, he will realize that today that dollar which goes to make up the anticipated income for 1946 is a dollar which has been inflated; it is now a 59-cent dollar, when compared with the dollar of 1929; and when an adjustment is made of the income in 1929 in the present-day dollar, we find that to make a true comparison of the income of 1929 with the anticipated income for 1946 we must use for 1929 about one hundred and thirty billion.

Hence, as we look to 1946, we can only see in prospect an increase in national income of about twenty-five billion, despite the fact our people are eager for articles they have been unable to purchase for years. What we need is production, and with great production the national income will go up, as will tax receipts. My point is that I believe the Secretary, in appearing before our committee, was not sufficiently optimistic in anticipating our national income for the next year if, as we all hope, capital, labor, and management work together. I think it is a conservative report; I think we today should be optimistic in this country and not be the least bit pessimistic. We should reduce our taxes. If as a result of the tax reductions we are reasonably sure business will expand, that jobs will be found, we should reduce taxes still further. We must realize as a legislative body that unless jobs at high wages are provided by the individual, the partnership, or corporation, there is no way on earth that our production can absorb the vast sums available for trade, and that unless absorbed and used, we will have further inflation. Our tax revenues, of course, are dependent upon our national income. So I suggest that lower tax rates and substantially large national income resulting from the lower tax rate is the way to get that revenue which will enable us to reduce our indebtedness.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to say that that was proven many times during the twenties, especially from 1922 to 1928, because we reduced taxes several times, and every time we reduced taxes our revenue increased. We were then operating under healthy conditions and everybody was busy.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That is so evident as to need no further comment. As the gentleman well knows, the Republican Party have long advocated and practiced the policy of low tax rates on a large volume of business and income. Such a policy has been successful in the past and will work in the future, if the Government does not interfere unduly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the distinguished chairman. Mr. Chairman, we need so-called venture capital badly today, and we should do whatever we can through lessened taxation to make it worth while for a man to risk his money in order to start new business going.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. On the premise the gentleman gave about the value of a dollar so far as the $130,000,000,000 national income is concerned, it is true also, is it not, that the $300,000,000,000 we owe has the same relationship in value?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That is right. The dollar today is clearly not the same dollar in purchasing power that it was prior to its devaluation. That is one reason it costs more to live today than in 1929.

I hope very much that this bill will be passed, in order to indicate to the country an opinion on the part of the Congress that it will go along with a reduction in taxes in the hope, yes, in the belief, that by making taxes lower, there will be both increased revenue, more jobs for everybody will be found, and jobs for all, through increased business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, two features of this bill are disturbing to me and they have close relationship to each other.

With more than a dozen years of deficit spending behind us and a balanced budget not in sight in the immediately discernible future, we are here asked to create $5,000,000,000 of additional unbalance. Viewed from that angle alone, we are pushing the country further toward national bankruptcy.

It is my hope, of course, that the bill's stimulation to private initiative will bring added revenue which will, at least to some extent, offset the $5,000,000,000 Treasury loss. But notwithstanding that offset it is perfectly evident that there must be economy in appropriations. Yet by the terms of this bill we add 12,000,000 to the category of those who pay no apparent Federal taxes. To them the other fellow henceforth will be footing the bill. Congressional resistance to requests for extravagant appropriations under that circumstance becomes all the more difficult.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] 3 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree that the tax bill under discussion is one that is very necessary if we are going to have private initiative take up and continue the jobs that are so necessary toward keeping this country moving in the right direction to full employment, jobs for everybody who can and will work.

I want to call the attention of the committee to one section of the bill. I have a lot of bakeries in my district who are asking for additional sugar so that they can make more bread for the people who need bread in the district. You know bread is the staff of life. So give them bread. It is advocated here cutting down the taxes on distilled spirits which use corn. Now, the more corn you use the more sugar they will want, and the less sugar we will have for the making of bread. I do not think that is a good thing, especially in view of the condition existing at the present time with the rationing of sugar, of corn sirup, and other sweets that are necessary to make bread.

On distilled spirits you are cutting down the tax 33⅓ percent. On imported perfumes containing distilled spirits you cut the tax 33⅓ percent. On still wines with not over 14 percent of alcohol you cut the tax 33⅓ percent. On still wines with not over 21 percent of alcohol you cut the tax 33⅓ percent. On still wines with over 21 percent of alcohol you cut the tax 50 percent. Some cut in taxes for more drinks.

The point I make here is that you are going to cut down the revenues you are going to receive on these liquors. Is that a good thing to encourage more drinking? I'll say it seems to me we are having too much now. They are going to use more corn to make alcohol, and you are going to have less sugar for bread. Is that a good thing to do?

Another thing, you are cutting down on the cabarets and the roof gardens. You cut them 75 percent. The people that have money to spend for those things today are not kicking about these taxes, and I do not know why you should cut them down to the extent of 75 percent. That does not smack good to me. Cut the taxes on the man for the necessities of life.

I think we ought to cut the taxes on the things that will give the poor man bread and butter. There is where we ought to cut the tax. We ought to give our best endeavor to try to help those people, because they need bread and butter, and that is what I want to see them have for their families, for the wives and children.

If we are going in for drinking, then we are only trying to help the fellow that is going to drink more, and that is not going to help him any, that will only hurt him, because he will drink more and the more he drinks the worse off he will be. The more revenue in taxes in alcohol we get the better off the country will be and the better off the people of the country will be. So I think we ought to change some of these taxes in this bill.

On champagne you cut the tax 33⅓ percent on artificially carbonated wine 50 percent, and you cut the tax on liqueurs 50 percent. These cuts should be eliminated from the bill. That part of the bill I do not like because I do not think it is necessary. Its not wise to do it now. But the rest of the bill I think ought to be supported. I think it is necessary to give consideration to the fact that we want to encourage people in private business to create jobs. That is a most important factor of the bill. The other thing you have to do is to conserve on your Government spending. Conserve on your spending if you are ever going to keep this country from sinking financially. You cannot cut down on revenues without cutting down more on your spending. Let that sink in to the thought of all Members of Congress, the Senate and the President.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have heard hearts bleed here this afternoon at the misdoings of the Committee on Appropriations. I have heard other hearts palpitate for the 12,000,000 men and women who today pay from $3 on a $600 income and $45 on a $2,000 net income. Those are the figures under the present law for a married person with 2 dependents. If he receives $100 per month income today or $1,200 per year he pays, and willingly, $21 to Uncle Sam. Now the Ways and Means Committee puts great emphasis on the fact that these 12,000,000 of our lowest income group have no income tax to pay whatsoever if this bill is passed. Let us check into this and try to obtain a clearer picture of what we are asked to agree to.

While this bill cancels anywhere from $3 for the $600 income person to $45 for the $2,000 person, just what does it do for you and I in the $10,000 group. It merely reduces our tax from $2,245 to $1,830, a nice little reduction of $365 to those of our income in order to help the poor little fellows get their reductions of from $3 to $45 each.

What about the higher-income group who today earn $50,000—and plenty do. That man or woman pays today under the present law $26,865. This bill would make him a gift of a reduction of $2,745 down to $24,120—yes, just to keep poor Paul Jones from paying a $3 tax on his $600 income and also to relieve Bill Smith of the necessity to pay $45 on his $2,000 income.

How about those very few today—but there are some—who earn $500,000. That man under the present law pays our Government, which is riddled with debt, the sum of $442,985 for the privilege of being an American citizen and whose rights have been fought for by $50-a-month men on battlefields over the world. This man through this bill today, so unanimously espoused by the Ways and Means Committee, is given an extra amount of $44,645 for his own pocket. The crocodile tears shed here today for Paul Jones and his $3 and Bill Smith and his $45 must have seared the soul of the gentleman with a present tax of $675,000 on a $750,000 income who mournfully grasps at the additional $67,500 pocket money handed him today by the critics of our Appropriations Committee.

Why is it necessary in order to give Paul Jones forgiveness from his $3 tax, gladly paid to help maintain the solvency of our Government, that you and I receive as individuals a nice little plum of $365? Why must we, in order to help Bill Smith, a $2,000-a-year man, save his $45 which he has been proud to pay toward our Nation's upkeep, to give to our million-dollar-income friend, $90,000? These questions have not been answered here today.

I agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in that perhaps there are 2,000,000 returns or more that should not be collected because they cost more to collect than what the Government gets out of them. I also agree that we must cut down to a certain extent the excess-profits taxes so that firms may expand and make jobs. It is not logic or reasonable to assume, however, that we are doing the individual taxpayers of our Nation a favor by perhaps imperiling the future financial structure of this Nation through making it difficult for the much maligned Appropriations Committee to balance the Budget by reducing the tax paid by $3,000,000,000, now cheerfully paid by individuals. I heard the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] say that the individual taxpayers today had $100,000,000,000 in purchasing power, yet here we are adding to that potential vast pool of inflation $3,000,000,000 and taking away from a nearly empty Treasury that same amount.

I claim that in this bill today we take away from 12,000,000 Paul Joneses and Bill Smiths one of the greatest privileges they have—and that is the right to give to Uncle Sam from $3 to $45 to help meet a small portion of our enormous national debt. My people, I am sure, want their bonds to be worth 100 cents on the dollar when these bonds are cashed. How can we conscientiously vote a dividend here today to the stockholders of America when that three or four billions are so badly needed to reduce this year's coming deficit of thirty billions? No business firm would vote dividends under such conditions. Why should we, the board of directors of the United States, do so?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, since the rule under which this bill (H. R. 4309) does not permit amendments, I nevertheless feel impelled to state my views on certain parts of the bill that should have been amended to extend relief to many overburdened small taxpayers. For instance, the amount for dependents should be higher than $500 because you may have a son or daughter 19 years old attending college who earns $500 a year from odd jobs and uses the $500 for tuition, yet the parent pays for all food, clothing, and shelter for the son and daughter, still the parent cannot claim exemption and the son or daughter must pay income tax on the $500 earned.

The individual exemption should be higher, as high in my opinion as $1,000 for a single person, $2,000 for a married person living with husband or wife, and $500 exemption for each dependent.

Another thing is that the bill penalizes the man with a family and makes him pay taxes on his children over 18 years old, when the child begins to cost the most and before the child is self-supporting.

In my opinion the bill should have provided for a greater reduction for individual income-tax rates than it provides for excess-profits- and corporation-tax rates.

If the rule had permitted amendments, I would have submitted amendments to give greater relief to the lower-bracket wage and salary earner, especially if he has a family to support and educate.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned over the haste in which this proposed legislation was initiated behind the closed doors of the Ways and Means Committee, and in the equally speedy efforts to clear it through this House. I also want to register my protest against the "gag rule" that prevents the offering of amendments.

Tax reduction at this time that does take into consideration fixed debt charges, an adequate Army and Navy, veterans care and pensions as well as some assurance of job security and individual purchasing power, in the immediate postwar period, may well be false economy.

I am in hearty accord with the committee's desire to give some relief now from our wartime tax burdens. Particularly is this true if the relief given will in any way contribute to a stabilization of our postwar economy and provide adequate exemption for family groups. When we consider that 24 percent plus of the $5,500,000,000 relief to be granted or $1,270,000,000 is going to 19,000 of the Nation's 60,000,000 taxpayers and that another 3 percent of the "plum" is being handed the consumers of liquor, fur coats, and cosmetics, the proposals are indeed questionable. Economically our Nation is still in "sackcloth and ashes" and will be for years to come.

Did the committee ascertain from these 19,000 taxpayers that they would use this $1,270,000,000 for reconversion and for expansion of postwar facilities? In plain words, what will it mean in postwar jobs and in added purchasing power? I am sure the distinquished members of the committee will agree that sustained purchasing power is the basis of any lasting prosperity.

Expert economists are a unit in estimating the Government's annual revenues will suffer a drop of approximately $9,000,000,000 for 1945 or will be $34,000,000,000 as compared to the $43,500,000,000 for 1944. Assuming that the year 1946 will be no worse than was 1945 we still must reduce our 1946 revenues of $34,000,000,000 plus by the approximately $5,000,000,000 plus contained in this proposal, which will show a return of less than $29,000,000,000.

This is indeed a lot of money. Since no one wants us to default on our national debt we are obliged to set eight billion of the twenty-nine aside for debt service. Since no one wants us to junk the Navy and disband our entire Army we feel obliged to set aside another ten billion for national defense. We cannot afford to neglect hospitalization care and pensions for our war veterans and their dependents so we charge up another item of eight billion already appropriated. To all of these items let us add $4,500,000,000 for the ordinary running expense of the many governmental departments and we will have exceeded our income by $1,500,000,000.

When we consider that we are already obligated for a postwar highway program costing $3,000,000,000 and are now considering a billon dollar postwar public building program, a three-quarter billion dollar postwar airport program, and another three-quarter billion dollars for United Nations Relief we find ourselves face-to-face with the problem of deficit budgeting and deficit spending in peacetime.

I doubt seriously whether the GOP elephant has smiled since 1932. He will sure have a real grin on his face when he sees the donkey staggering along under such a mighty peacetime load. The whole picture would, indeed, be tragic were it not for the amusing angle of some of the gentlemen who ride the donkey and at the same time want to feed the elephant.

The need for limited tax slashing is generally conceded. It should be the kind of tax relief that will stimulate business expansion and create new jobs. With the near approach of the 1946 congressional elections there is the grave danger that for political reasons these reductions may go far beyond what sound economy will warrant.

Conservative estimates of the amount of deficit budgeting for 1946 are above the twenty billion mark. These are grim facts and they make it plain that political jockeying should have no place in the proposed legislation. There must be no interference with the collection of every dollar of revenue possible without injuring our national economy.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of

the time, 5½ minutes, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to speak this afternoon on this bill, but my attention has been called to the fact that some criticism has been made of the provisions of the bill, that criticism coming from outside of the Halls of Congress, from forces that evidently have not made a thorough study of the bill. That criticism of the bill, in my opinion, is entirely unjustified. I want to first call the attention, Mr. Chairman, of the House and the country to the fact that the bill as reported out by this committee gives individual relief to the lower-income groups of the country by a much greater percentage than the plan advanced by the Treasury Department. In other words, when this committee reported out this bill it gave a tax reduction from present rates of 4 percentage points to individuals and also provided that every individual must receive a tax reduction of 10 percent of what he pays under present rates. Thus it gave the most relief to the low-income-bracket taxpayers, the 30,000,000 group who now pay under the simplified supplement T taxation scheme; that is, those whose net income is less than $5,000. There is a very interesting table on page 31 of the report wherein it shows that every person who is married with two dependents and makes up to $2,000 a year is entirely relieved of the payment of taxes. That shows we took care of the very low income groups. I may say for the benefit of the gentleman who just spoke that we do not feel those people who are making so little money should be burdened with taxation because they do not make enough money to live according to the American standards of living. That is the reason we relieve them from the payment of taxation.

I want to call your attention to the case of a married person with two dependents where he makes $2,250 net income. He formerly paid; that is, under the law as it presently stands, $53. Now he only pays $7. In other words, his taxes are reduced 86 percent. In the $2,500 bracket, the reduction amounts to 52 percent, and so on down the line. Those with a higher income have their taxes reduced by a lower percentage.

Mr. Chairman, of the reduction granted to all individual taxpayers in the country, the table shows that those making up to $3,000, get 56 percent of the reduction granted by this bill. That is the low-income group. With reference to those whose income runs up to $5,000, they get a total of 74 percent of the relief granted to individuals by this bill. I just want to state those facts, Mr. Chairman, so that the country might know that we took care of the lowest-income groups and we did not only take care of the war profiteers or the corporations.

I will say I think it is the unanimous opinion of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means that we reported a bill to the House which is a much better bill than any one of us thought it would be possible to report when we first commenced consideration of tax relief. We spread the tax relief so as to help the reconversion program and keep spending power in the hands of all the people of the country. We want the economy where we will not run into a depression. That is the reason we do not want to reduce only the excess-profits tax or wipe it out entirely as recommended by the Treasury Department. We want to give some relief to the small corporations in the surtax brackets and we wanted to give relief to all of the individuals who pay taxes so that we can continue to have spending power and so that this transition period from a wartime to a peacetime will be such that we will not go into a spiral of deflation. I think it would be foolish on the part of any Member to vote against this bill because there is one little feature that he perhaps does not like. There are some minor features, perhaps one or two, which I thought should not go in the bill. But there is no important feature in the bill which I do not think belongs in it. It is a very, very good tax measure for the transition period. Next year we intend to go over the entire tax structure and perhaps we will be able to give more relief. But we could not do it in this bill. We did not have the time. We had to have a bill which could be enacted into law by the first of November so that the Treasury could get out its tax forms. We had to hurry along with the matter. I hope we will have a unanimous vote in favor of the passage of this measure. The tables I will have inserted at this point will show clearly to whom the individual tax reductions go.

TABLE 12.—*Tax burden under supplement T of present law compared with that under committee bill*

MARRIED PERSON WITH 2 DEPENDENTS

Adjusted gross income of individuals using the standard deduction	Tax		Effective rate (percent)		Reduction over present law	
	Present law [1]	Committee bill	Present law [1]	Committee bill	Amount	Percent
$500	$0	$0	0	0	$0	0
$600	2	0	.33	0	2	100.00
$700	4	0	.57	0	4	100.00
$800	7	0	.88	0	7	100.00
$900	10	0	1.11	0	10	100.00
$1,000	12	0	1.20	0	12	100.00
$1,100	15	0	1.36	0	15	100.00
$1,200	18	0	1.50	0	18	100.00
$1,300	20	0	1.54	0	20	100.00
$1,400	23	0	1.64	0	23	100.00
$1,500	26	0	1.73	0	26	100.00
$1,750	33	0	1.89	0	33	100.00
$2,000	39	0	1.95	0	39	100.00
$2,250	53	7	2.36	.31	46	86.70
$2,500	105	50	4.20	2.00	55	52.38
$2,750	157	92	5.71	3.35	65	41.40
$3,000	211	137	7.03	4.57	74	35.07
$3,250	263	180	8.09	5.54	83	31.56
$3,500	315	223	9.00	6.37	92	29.21
$3,750	366	266	9.76	7.09	100	27.40
$4,000	418	308	10.45	7.70	110	26.32
$4,250	470	351	11.06	8.26	119	25.32
$4,500	523	395	11.62	8.78	128	24.47
$4,750	579	442	12.19	9.31	137	23.66

[1] Assumes only 1 spouse has income.

Reduction in individual income tax liability, Ways and Means Committee bill; reduction by income classes

Net income class ($000)	Tax reduction	
	Amount	Percent
	Millions	
0–1	$108	4.1
1–2	786	29.9
2–3	584	22.3
Total 0–3	1,478	56.3
3–4	295	11.2
4–5	169	6.5
Total 0–5	1,942	74.0
5–10	$197	7.5
10–25	183	7.0
25–50	113	4.3
Total 0–50	2,435	92.8
50–100	93	3.5
100–250	66	2.5
250–500	17	.6
500–1,000	9	.4
1,000 and over	6	.2
Total	2,627	100.0

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the bill is considered as read for amendment.

Under the rule, amendments by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means are now in order. Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. There are no committee amendments to offer, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JARMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 368, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 343, nays 10, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

YEAS—343

Abernethy	Bell	Buck
Allen, Ill.	Bender	Buffett
Allen, La.	Bennett, Mo.	Bulwinkle
Anderson, Calif.	Bennet, N. Y.	Bunker
Andrews, Ala.	Biemiller	Burgin
Angell	Bishop	Butler
Arends	Blackney	Byrnes, Wis.
Arnold	Bland	Camp
Auchincloss	Bloom	Canfield
Baldwin, Md.	Bonner	Cannon, Fla.
Barden	Boykin	Carlson
Barrett, Pa.	Bradley, Pa.	Carnahan
Barrett, Wyo.	Brehm	Case, N. J.
Bates, Ky.	Brooks	Celler
Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ga.	Chapman
Beall	Brown, Ohio	Chelf
Beckworth	Bryson	Chenoweth

Chiperfield	Herter	Powell
Church	Heselton	Price, Fla.
Clark	Hill	Price, Ill.
Clason	Hinshaw	Priest
Clevenger	Hobbs	Quinn, N. Y.
Cochran	Hoch	Rabaut
Coffee	Hoeven	Rabin
Cole, Mo.	Holifield	Ramey
Colmer	Holmes, Mass.	Ramspeck
Combs	Holmes, Wash.	Rankin
Cooper	Hope	Rayfiel
Corbett	Horan	Reece, Tenn.
Courtney	Huber	Reed, Ill.
Cox	Izac	Reed, N. Y.
Cravens	Jackson	Resa
Crawford	Jarman	Rich
Crosser	Jenkins	Richards
Cunningham	Jennings	Riley
Curtis	Jensen	Rivers
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson,
Daughton, Va.	Johnson, Ill.	N. Dak.
Davis	Johnson, Ind.	Robertson, Va.
De Lacy	Johnson,	Robinson, Utah
Delaney,	Luther A.	Robsion, Ky.
James J.	Johnson,	Rockwell
Delaney,	Lyndon B.	Roe, Md.
John J.	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Fla.
D'Ewart	Jones	Rogers, Mass.
Dingell	Jonkman	Rogers, N. Y.
Dolliver	Judd	Rowan
Domengeaux	Kean	Russell
Dondero	Kearney	Ryter
Doughton, N. C.	Kee	Sadowski
Douglas, Calif.	Keefe	Sasscer
Doyle	Kelley, Pa.	Savage
Durham	Kelly, Ill.	Schwabe, Mo.
Dworshak	Kerr	Schwabe, Okla.
Earthman	Kilday	Sharp
Eaton	Kirwan	Sheppard
Eberharter	Knutson	Sheridan
Ellis	Kopplemann	Short
Elsaesser	Kunkel	Sikes
Elston	Landis	Simpson, Ill.
Engel, Mich.	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Engle, Calif.	Lanham	Slaughter
Ervin	Larcade	Smith, Maine
Fallon	Lea	Smith, Ohio
Feighan	LeCompte	Smith, Va.
Fellows	Lemke	Smith, Wis.
Fenton	Lewis	Snyder
Fisher	Luce	Somers, N. Y.
Flannagan	Ludlow	Sparkman
Flood	Lynch	Spence
Fogarty	McConnell	Springer
Folger	McCormack	Starkey
Forand	McCowen	Stefan
Fuller	McDonough	Stevenson
Fulton	McGehee	Stewart
Gallagher	McGlinchey	Sullivan
Gamble	McGregor	Sumner, Ill.
Gardner	McMillan, S. C.	Sundstrom
Gary	McMillen, Ill.	Taber
Gathings	Madden	Talbot
Gearhart	Mahon	Talle
Geelan	Maloney	Tarver
Geriach	Manasco	Taylor
Gibson	Mansfield, Tex.	Thom
Gifford	Martin, Iowa.	Thomas, N. J.
Gillespie	Martin, Mass.	Thomas, Tex.
Gillette	Mason	Thomason
Goodwin	May	Tibbott
Gordon	Michener	Tolan
Gorski	Miller, Calif.	Towe
Gossett	Miller, Nebr.	Traynor
Graham	Mills	Trimble
Grant, Ala.	Monroney	Voorhis, Calif.
Grant, Ind.	Morgan	Vorys, Ohio
Green	Morrison	Vursell
Gross	Murdock	Wadsworth
Gwynne, Iowa	Murphy	Walter
Hale	Murray, Tenn.	Wasielewski
Hall,	Murray, Wis.	Weaver
Edwin Arthur	Neely	Weichel
Hall,	Norrell	Weiss
Leonard W.	O'Brien, Ill.	Welch
Hancock	O'Brien, Mich.	West
Hand	O'Hara	Whitten
Hare	O'Neal	Whittington
Harless, Ariz.	Outland	Wickersham
Harness, Ind.	Pace	Wigglesworth
Harris	Patman	Wilson
Hart	Patrick	Winstead
Hartley	Patterson	Wolcott
Havenner	Peterson, Ga.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hays	Philbin	Wolverton, N. J.
Healy	Pickett	Woodhouse
Hébert	Pittenger	Woodruff, Mich.
Hedrick	Ploeser	Worley
Hendricks	Plumley	Zimmerman
Henry	Poage	

NAYS—10

Andersen, H. Carl	Granger	Link
Bailey	Hook	Mansfield, Mont.
Cannon, Mo.	Hull	Marcantonio
	LaFollette	

NOT VOTING—78

Adams	Fernandez	Norton
Andresen, August H.	Gavin	O'Konski
	Gillie	O'Toole
Andrews, N. Y.	Gore	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Granahan	Pfeifer
Barry	Gregory	Phillips
Bolton	Griffiths	Rains
Boren	Gwinn, N. Y.	Randolph
Bradley, Mich.	Hagen	Rees, Kans.
Brumbaugh	Halleck	Rizley
Buckley	Heffernan	Rodgers, Pa.
Burch	Hess	Roe, N. Y.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoffman	Rooney
Campbell	Howell	Sabath
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scrivner
Clements	Keogh	Shafer
Cole, Kans.	Kilburn	Stigler
Cole, N. Y.	King	Stockman
Cooley	Kinzer	Sumners, Tex.
Curley	Latham	Torrens
Dawson	LeFevre	Vinson
Dickstein	Lesinski	White
Dirksen	Lyle	Winter
Douglas, Ill.	McKenzie	Wood
Drewry	Merrow	Woodrum, Va.
Elliott	Mott	
Ellsworth	Mundt	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Kinzer.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Brumbaugh.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Adams.

Mrs. Douglas of Illinois with Mr. Hess.

Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Howell.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Wood with Mr. Gillie.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Clements with Mr. Rees of Kansas.

Mr. King with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Fernandez with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Burch with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Hagen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the tax bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GREGORY] accompanied the President of the United States to Kentucky for the dedication of a dam, and will be absent today and tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that he be granted leave of absence on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made before the Committee of the Whole a chart of figures and also to include portions of the minority report.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter and a newspaper article.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD to include an article.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JONKMAN (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to include as a part of the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole the majority and minority views on the tax bill.

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a radio address and in one to include an article.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Catholic entitled "Take-Home Wages."

Mr. ROGERS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which appeared in the Rochester Chronicle under date of October 9, 1945, written by a 15-year-old girl.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Los Angeles on the subject of child-care centers.

Mr. WEISS (at the request of Mr. DE LACEY) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered at Dallas, Tex., by General Marks.

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made in Philadelphia.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two particulars, and in each instance to include a short newspaper article.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of his own on the subject, We Can Conquer Infantile Paralysis.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from a New York City newspaper.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert as a part of my remarks an article by a writer of note, and professor of a Wisconsin university, on the activities of politicians in public life and why they should also be entitled to consideration and to medals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID IN DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report, House Resolution 371, for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved. That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3615) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air navigation facilities; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted, if any, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments, if any, thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table but before the legislative business of the day, I may be recognized for 1 hour on the subject of Palestine and that I may be permitted to yield time to other Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today and insert a table.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF OCTOBER 15

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of my good friend the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, and if House Joint Resolution 243 awarding a medal to General Marshall is objected to there may be one suspension.

Tuesday: Prior to the legislative program of the day 1 hour will be set aside in accordance with the request just submitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], and under his control, on the subject of Palestine.

On Tuesday also the Lea bill, H. R. 3615, relating to airports will be taken up for consideration and if not completed on Tuesday will constitute the continuing order of business for Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand it is not likely that it will be considered under the 5-minute rule on Tuesday, but that if it should be, there will not be a vote on Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is an understanding, if it is agreeable to my friend from Massachusetts, that if the bill is completed on Tuesday to the point of a vote on passage, the roll call vote will not be taken until Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will be very agreeable to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Wednesday, there will be further consideration of the airport bill if it is not completed on Tuesday. Also on Wednesday if time permits it is planned to take up the bill S. 805 to prohibit the disclosure of information secured from official sources. Its consideration is entirely dependent on the time element on Wednesday.

Thursday and Friday are definitely allocated for the consideration of a resolution coming out of the Committee on Appropriations known as the Rescission Resolution, a resolution to permit the recapture of moneys heretofore appropriated and contract authorizations heretofore granted in the prosecution of the war as a result of the actual termination of the war.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are we going to recapture some appropriations?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We should make it a national holiday.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a day to be looked forward to with pleasure because it could happen only with the actual termination of the war. We are all very happy and we all thank God that the war has terminated so successfully and as quickly as it did.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And we thank God there is a little money coming back to the Treasury.

Mr. McCORMACK. As the result of the end of the war.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—UNRRA OPERATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the fourth report to Congress on UNRRA operations for the quarter ending June 30, 1945, in which there has been included a summary statement on the status of the United States contribution to UNRRA as of August 31, 1945.

Unconditional surrender of both Germany and Japan has brought full victory to the United Nations on the battlefields, but victory can have real meaning only if it is speedily translated into a secure peace. That great task is just beginning. Victory over the enemy has been costly in material things and in blood and suffering. Victory in securing a lasting peace will continue to call for the combined efforts of all peoples to bind up the wounds left by the war so that solid foundations will be laid for the future.

In the period under review in this report UNRRA, increasingly freed from the restraints imposed by military needs, moved into the large-scale operations for which it had been maturing plans, scheduling purchases, and building an organization. In Greece, Yugoslavia, and Albania it took over supply responsibility at the request of the Allied military authorities. Operations were under way in Poland and Czechoslovakia and considerable shipments of supplies had arrived in these countries. On the basis of the prior agreement with SHAEF and at the urgent request of the military authorities, UNRRA teams were assisting armed forces in the care and repatriation of millions of Allied displaced persons in Germany and Austria. In the Far East the military situation was less favorable to UNRRA activities but significant operations were carried on in China, and the program for the Far East was further elaborated in preparation for the day of liberation.

In order to carry through these operations and to ensure that the supply pipeline would remain full, UNRRA had to draw heavily upon the $450,000,000 ap-

propriated by the Congress, and arrangements were made to exercise the authority contained in the appropriation act to utilize for UNRRA purposes up to $350,000,000 of supplies, services, and funds available under the Lend-Lease Act. In the succeeding months UNRRA's need for United States supplies has continued to increase with the result that it has been necessary to utilize virtually all the funds and authority available under the appropriation act.

Through UNRRA the United States is making and will make its contribution for relief to the liberated peoples. In order that these people may move ahead toward the tremendous task of reconstruction, they must have the basic materials to regain their strength. Where we at home have shortages and inconveniences, millions in other lands lack even the bare necessities of life. Life abroad in the coming winter will depend upon the outside assistance which this country and other countries can render to the liberated peoples.

UNRRA, struggling as it has in the face of world deficits of critical supplies and of shipping, has made a substantial beginning in the immense task of relief and rehabilitation. The more this task can be speeded up through the early delivery of vitally needed supplies, the sooner it will be possible for UNRRA to withdraw, leaving the liberated peoples on a firm footing to carry on their own life. The Government of the United States and the other members of UNRRA are meeting this common problem as the United Nations are attempting to meet other world problems—together and to the best of their respective abilities.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 11, 1945.*

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] such time as he may desire.

PALESTINE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a concurrent resolution which, I am quite certain, will arouse the sympathetic interest and enthusiastic approval of all humanitarians to whose attention it is called.

My distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS] and myself earnestly believe that we express the will of the people and Congress of the United States in jointly introducing the concurrent resolution calling for the transfer of the Hebrews of Europe to Palestine and the setting up of intergovernmental machinery to establish Palestine as a free and independent democracy.

Official reports to the President of the United States emphasize the hopeless position of the Hebrews of Europe in their stateless status behind the barbed wire of concentration camps. We must understand that a permanent solution to this problem lies not in improved concentration camps, but in the transfer of the Hebrews in Europe to the ancient homeland of their ancestors where, we sincerely believe, they can and will live in peace and complete harmony with their Arab neighbors, under the beneficent influence of a democratic way of life.

The passage of this concurrent resolution will contribute much to the accomplishment of that end so devoutly to be desired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SASSCER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech of General Somervell and an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

INFLATION THREATENS POSTWAR HOUSING—ARE SPECULATIVE GROUPS MISLEADING BUSINESSMEN?—SMALL HOME BUYER MAY PAY THE BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, my mail is very heavy these days, probably three times its normal volume. The reason for this sudden increase in incoming letters and telegrams is principally due apparently to the fact that I have seen fit to stand up in open meeting and declare myself in opposition to the proposal of the real estate speculative interests of the country who wish to see all governmental controls over home building programs removed immediately.

If I can believe 50 percent of those who write me, I am doomed to political oblivion for my stand. If I listen to the writers of the remaining wires and letters, my stand is right and they will support me.

I did not enter into this housing control fight for political reasons. I entered into it because I fear inflation and I despise profiteers in any guise.

Yesterday, I pointed out to the House the probable plight of almost a million and a half veterans who were married just before the war or who contemplate marriage and its attendant home life as soon as their discharge papers are signed. I showed where these veterans could not expect to find new homes ready for their occupancy. I showed where, at best, only about one-third of them could expect to find these homes between now and July 1. Also, I showed where there would still be millions of displaced war workers and others also seeking homes. For all of this demand, the estimated 400,000 new dwellings would be only a handful.

It is not trite to point out that many a fox-hole dream or many a lonely mission was sweated out to the accompaniment of thoughts of the kind of world these boys would come home to. Foremost in the thoughts of the majority of these men and women was the picture of the new home they would buy or build as soon as discharges became a reality.

Many of the wires and letters I have received during the past few days have a mass-production ring to them as though they were all dictated with only slight variations by a single group. Let me quote from a typical one of these wires, which says in substance what many of the others say in more words:

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:
We urge your support in the complete lifting of L–41 order and other Government housing controls immediately so that necessary housing can be provided by private industry. As long as Government controls exist, this cannot be done.

The man who sent me that wire is a good personal friend of mine and as sincere and patriotic an individual as I know. In my opinion, however, he has been given some misinformation on this whole housing and controls picture, and it is to his misconception of the true facts that I address these remarks—and his misconception is typical of many others.

L–41 does not prevent private industry from building houses. If the mere lifting of a Government control could build houses, I would be the first to advocate its discontinuance.

Unfortunately, the nub of the problem is that it takes building materials—lumber, brick, and plumbing—to build a house. Today, we do not have these materials in sufficient supply to meet the Nation's housing needs, and nothing that the real-estate speculators, the mass-production builders, or their Washington representatives can say or do will place these items in the pipe lines of distribution until they have been manufactured in greater volume than is now being done.

All that L–41 accomplishes today and all that it is intended to do is to control the available supply of materials so that all builders are given a fair share of the materials we have for the most important purposes for which these materials are needed. Lifting the order will not magically increase the supply of lumber, brick, and tile. What I fear that its revocation would do would be to throw the building industry into a mad scramble for existing inventories where the big, wealthy builder with the best connections would gobble up the bulk of these scarce items while the little builder, depending primarily on retail and normal channels of supply, would get considerably less material than he now gets under L–41.

If L–41 should be removed, hundreds of these small builders might be forced into bankruptcy. Why? Because in an uncontrolled, tight market, available stocks would go to the highest bidder and the little man, in my opinion, would never be able to outbid his competitors even if he went into the black market to do so.

The plain fact is that the question of the actual scarcity of building materials has been curiously obscured in this general discussion between Government and business in connection with L–41.

Less than a month ago, leaders in the speculative building field blithely persuaded administration leaders that sufficient building materials could be produced if only governmental controls on construction were removed. They flatly asserted that a gigantic building program could get under way immediately.

Within the past 10 days, the administration and responsible leaders in the building industry have been suddenly shocked into the realization that the supply of lumber, pipe, and a hundred other items which go into the building of a house, is critically short. There are not nearly enough of these materials to go round and meet the demand, according to many experts.

This discovery brings up bleak prospects of curtailment in our original grandiose postwar housing plans.

There is a definite threat of a wide-open competitive scramble for scarce materials, once the bars are down.

Thousands of veterans and their families may find themselves without shelter unless relatives or friends will crowd over in their own homes to make room for them.

The dread specter of uncontrolled inflation is moving in on a $15,000,000,000 industry, with its attendant impact on our national economy.

These shortages are severe and cannot be underestimated if we are to look the true facts in the eye. Lumber, for example, has gone to the top of the critical-materials list. It is expected to remain there for some time.

The speculators said that cancellation of Army contracts would flood the civilian market with lumber. As I pointed out yesterday, we know now that most of the lumber called for in Army contracts is still in the forests in timber form.

Manpower was expected to flow into the foundries and mills producing cast-iron pipe, gypsum lath, brick, and tile. But war workers did not go into these jobs as expected. It was dirty, hard work in many instances, and they elected to take jobs elsewhere which were still open and paid them more money than these manufacturers could pay. So, production of these products also failed to increase.

Then the pressure groups demanded that OPA increase prices for those materials so mills could pass the increase along to their workers in wage boosts. OPA did grant this "incentive" increase. But nothing happened. No new workers could be induced to come to these waiting jobs even at the increased wage schedule.

That, gentlemen, is the real reason we are not building more houses. The critical shortages and not L–41 constitute the bottleneck in the deal.

I have discussed this situation at length with various qualified agency officials who know this supply and demand picture backward and forward. I have assured myself that all of the material available for building purposes is being channeled out to the industry. That fact, however, as I stated before, has been strangely obscured in all of these public statements which the advocates of control revocation have issued in recent weeks.

I hesitate to say this, but I sincerely believe that certain mass construction and real estate development interests believe that, once these controls are lifted, they can get the major portion of what is available, and, if necessary, freeze out the little builder. They have even gone so far as to convince many little builders that they should come along with them, and the little builders do not recognize that, in so doing, they are helping to celebrate their own business funerals.

The administration has now become so concerned over the false advice given it by these selfishly interested speculative building groups that a special committee has been named by Mr. John Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The assignment of that committee is to ascertain the true facts of the situation and to report back to Mr. Snyder immediately with a recommendation as to what should be done.

That is accomplishing one of the purposes of my stand. I have never advocated retention of a governmental regulation for the sheer sake of regulation. I asked that the building situation be thoroughly examined before hasty action should be taken. I feared then, and I fear now, that this critical shortage of material is going to send building prices skyrocketing. I still firmly believe that we should keep some control over these prices for the next few months until this period of critical shortage in building materials is over.

My principal concern is for the ordinary citizen and what will happen to him in any uncontrolled boom. Let me read to you a part of a letter I received this morning from the wife of just such a man:

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Please fight on with all your power to put a ceiling on real estate. The housing situation in our city is a scandal and the profiteering on both old and new homes is rampant. Professional real estate operators are avidly waiting for L–41 to be lifted so they can make more profits. My husband and our friends are of the "middle-class white-collar workers." We have invested heavily in war bonds. We want to buy or build a home. We cannot do so unless the price is fair and unless the value of our war bonds is maintained. We must be protected from this widespread inflationary trend. Every one I talk to thinks the same way on this vital issue.

On the basis of a study of the various factors in the materials shortage, I am convinced it will take 6 months to 9 months to fill up the pipe lines of distribution to the point where controls can be safely relinquished.

Coupled with this present material shortage, we face the greatest demand for housing in history.

Some 800,000 houses badly needed have gone unbuilt during the war. That demand is over and above the great deficit in housing resulting from earlier depression periods.

In addition to an estimated 1,500,000 returning service men and women who will need homes, we have had an increase of 2,000,000 other families during war years whose housing needs are unsatisfied. Add again to this the more than 870,000 homes that have become substandard during the 5 years of the war period.

During the war we built 2,740,000 homes over and above those which were destroyed by fire and other causes during that period. Over-all, however, there is roughly estimated to be a deficit of 9,760,000 homes in the Nation today.

Therein lies the danger of inflation—the overwhelming demand, with the attendant possibility of runaway prices.

There is a greater need today to protect the general public against high prices in housing than there was during the war. As history has shown time and again from as long ago as 1600, inflation follows war, rather than accompanying it. We have just now reached this critical point in our civilian battle against this threatening danger. Now is certainly no time to give up the fight.

In wartime, we all realize that home building demand gives way to war needs during the conflict, but families go right on multiplying and houses continue to deteriorate. That was clearly shown in our own lifetime, directly after World War I.

During World War I, building material prices rose 92 percent. After the armistice, they rose an additional 122 percent over the July 1914 price.

Fifty-eight percent of World War I total inflation came after the fighting was over. The prewar inflation, moreover, was spread over 53 months. The postwar rises took place in 18 months, three times as fast.

This time, our accumulated deficit in home building is double that of World War I. The public's savings during the present conflict are six times greater than during the last war.

After World War I, the accumulated demand for homes created a sustained building boom. In 1918 only 170,000 homes had been built. In 1919, some 405,000 units were erected, nearly at the prewar level. But prices of building materials soared, as I have shown. So did total construction costs. Buyers rebelled. Home building dropped off 40 percent in a year. Hundreds of workers lost their jobs and the building industry suffered a disastrous collapse.

After the 1920 collapse, building-material prices came down and construction activity got under way again. Building costs, however, did not come down all the way. They leveled off at more than 100 percent above 1913 prices, compared to a 36 percent similar rise for all commodities.

In 1926, 3 years before the general business collapse, home buyers became disgusted with high construction costs and the rising tide of mortgage foreclosures following in their wake. Building declined and mortgage foreclosures rose. That was one of the major factors in the tragic financial collapse of 1929.

After World War I, we tried exactly the same recipe now being sought for by the speculative builders—uncontrolled building at the highest prices they can squeeze from the buyers.

We removed all controls at that time and let inflation provide us with homes. The result was a 1-year boom that collapsed and indirectly led to the 1929 crash.

Are we going to stand idly by and watch the same catastrophe happen again because of the selfish interest and greed of one small group?

As I stated yesterday, I have confidence that our administration leaders will meet this emergency with a careful program and will reconsider any decisions, previously made, which may have been occasioned by the propagandized efforts of the selfish few. If the administration officials who are charged with this important duty fail to see this danger and provide the necessary controls, Congress will have no recourse other than to solve this question by immediate legislation. This is no time for us to succumb to high-pressure tactics inspired by a selfish minority.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

BUREAU OF MINES SHOULD CONTINUE EXPLORATION AND RESEARCH WORK

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the Deficiency Subcommittee of Appropriations of the House is currently preparing a bill to recover to the United States Treasury a large portion of the appropriations made for this fiscal year relating to the war effort. Among those agencies which have been called in is the Bureau of Mines. The subcommittee has indicated to the Bureau of Mines that it should be prepared to bring to an end all of the activities which are now in progress relating to the exploration and research work in minerals and metals. This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, of serious concern to the mining industry of this country which believes that these programs should be continued.

This will mean that the magnesium pilot plants and research work at Boulder City and Salt Lake City will have to close down, ending all research on magnesia and magnesium beneficiation. The investigation for raw materials for steel production principally carried on at Redding, Calif., Laramie, Wyo., Rolla, Mo., and Raleigh, N. C., will be closed. The experimentation in the use of the alumina from low-grade bauxite will be terminated as will be the research and investigation into bauxite and aluminum clays, most of which is carried on in Arkansas. The investigation into deposits of critical and essential minerals and metals will be brought to a close.

Last week a delegation of Congressmen interested in these projects appeared before the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations and urged that all of these projects be continued on a modified basis. We took the position that the necessity of these projects for national defense did not start with the war and did not end with it. It will be extremely unwise in our judgment to terminate these projects without examining into their usefulness in the postwar years. We do not intend to terminate our experimentation and development on the atomic bomb and on a much smaller scale the exploration for essential and critical minerals and metals and research into their use stands on the same basis.

If we suddenly call a halt to the Nation-wide mineral exploration and research program which the Government pursued so diligently and with such good results during the war years, it will be like the man who could not patch the leaky roof during the rain and who saw no need of patching it when it was not raining.

In 1939 when war clouds were looming on the horizon, we recognized that we were going to be short of certain strategic metals and minerals. We appropriated a small amount of money to the Bureau of Mines to find domestic deposits of these metals and minerals and to work out processes for utilizing them.

When the shortages of metals and minerals became acute after our entrance into the war, we gave the Bureau of Mines somewhat larger appropriations and asked them to patch the roof in the middle of the storm. At the most difficult possible time, when manpower and materials were at a premium, they were asked to redouble their efforts in exploring and developing deposits of scarce minerals and to develop processes for treating and utilizing off-grade materials. The analogy breaks down at this point.

The Bureau of Mines did not cry that they could not patch the roof. Although new shortages were developing overnight and were constantly becoming more acute, they assembled an efficient staff of engineers and accomplished some truly remarkable results. Approximately 6,000 individual deposits of 82 types of minerals were examined and reported upon in 48 States and Alaska. Of these more than 1,000 were explored in detail by means of trenching, drilling, and sampling and 113 deposits were actually brought into production during the war as a direct result of this program. Strategic reserves were indicated in many of the other deposits explored. These are still available when needed.

One deposit alone, in Idaho, has produced over half a million tons of tungsten ore because of this program. In addition to the inestimable value to the Nation of this production, the income tax return to the Government on this one operation has been in excess of $2,000,000.

Antimony and mercury deposits were brought into production in Alaska. Bauxite production in Arkansas and Alabama was increased. Chromite deposits in my own State of California were opened because of the work of the Bureau of Mines. Coal production for the Army was made possible in Alaska. New copper producers were brought in in Arizona and Vermont, fluorspar in Utah and Illinois, manganese in Nevada and Virginia, strategic mica in South Dakota and New Hampshire. Yes; they patched the roof, not once, but many times in the midst of the storm.

At the same time that this exploratory work was underway, we asked the Bureau of Mines to develop new processes for treating and utilizing our domestic deposits. Specific jobs of producing alumina from low-grade domestic ores, of producing high-purity metals such as electrolytic manganese and electrolytic chromium, of developing sponge iron processes, to mention only a few, were heaped upon this hard-driving agency.

Skilled technical staffs were assembled, although men were scarce; pilot plants were built and operated, although supplies and materials were next to impossible to find. And results were obtained. Electrolytic manganese is being produced from our domestic ores; a premium product from low-grade raw materials. If the war had continued or if our imports had been completely cut off, we would have been able to supply our needs for some time by using this process. Montana chromite can now be made into high purity electrolytic chromium on a small scale. There are still many problems to solve to permit the effective utilization of this important resource, but progress is being made and the answer will be obtained if the Bureau can continue its work.

Now that the war is over, now that it has stopped raining, it is proposed to discontinue our roof repairing. Now that men will soon be plentiful through the return of veterans and materials available, it is proposed that all the exploratory work and all the pilot plant work of the Bureau of Mines be stopped. Actually, now is the time to fix the roof. Now, between storms, before another emergency is upon us, the program of the Bureau to point the way toward the effective utilization of our domestic mineral resources should be put upon a continuing basis.

The mighty industrial and military power of this Nation is founded upon its mineral wealth—iron, coal, copper, lead, manganese, and many others. No one disputes the fact that without these minerals we never would have reached our present pinnacle of leadership of the entire world. I propose that we insure a perpetuation of this leadership by a wise and careful use of our mineral resources, a complete inventory of everything that we have, and a continuing study of ways and means to utilize these valuable resources. I propose that we patch the roof now, and be ready for the next rain.

One of the essentials in an orderly reconversion from war to peace is a healthy domestic mining industry which will provide full employment. An exact knowledge of the location and extent of our domestic mineral deposits is a prerequisite for the existence and survival of such a solvent domestic mining industry. For each deposit now known or to be discovered, we must ask the question, "Can a mining enterprise be based upon it?" The position of the United States in the world mineral picture will depend upon the number of affirmative answers we can give to that question.

With this in mind, it should be our business to find out just how it should be done. I am sure that the Bureau of Mines can suggest a sensible, peacetime program of mineral exploration and development, and that this agency can submit estimates for carrying it out through the regular budgetary channels.

During the wars, the normal rate of depletion of our mineral resources was greatly accelerated. Our chances of

maintaining a favorable competitive position and of approaching full employment in the years ahead are therefore dependent upon a concerted effort to learn all we can about our mineral resources and to utilize them to the greatest advantage.

The national economy and the national security are closely linked in all fields, and particularly so in the mineral industry. A healthy, going mineral industry is as necessary to the national security as it is to the national economy. It is well recognized that future national security demands that we continue to explore our mineral resources if we are to be in any sense secure. But knowing where our deposits are is not sufficient; we must also know how they can best be used. As a result of our wartime experiences, we now know that, in the case of marginal deposits that may be of importance to the national security, production does not always result merely because we are willing to pay a high price for the contained metal. Costly delays, if not insurmountable obstacles, result when methods of mining and treatment have not been tried out in advance.

In order to help in the orderly reconversion from wartime to peacetime economy and at the same time promote the closely related national security, the Bureau of Mines should be directed to exert every effort toward maintaining a solvent domestic mineral industry. As a part of this program, and as the first essential steps in it, the following activities should be delegated to the Bureau of Mines:

First. Examination of mineral deposits that appear from preliminary evidence to warrant investigation from the national viewpoint.

Second. Geophysical exploration of promising areas that do not lend themselves to visual examination.

Third. Exploration and sampling of those deposits that examination and geophysical work indicate to warrant it.

Fourth. Analysis of samples obtained by exploratory methods.

Fifth. Testing of ores from deposits explored to determine the most feasible treatment method.

Sixth. Study of labor-saving and money-saving innovations in mining and milling methods.

Seventh. Study of the state of the mineral industry and its future possibilities in individual mining districts.

Eighth. Experimental work on exploratory methods.

Ninth. Experimental work on mining methods.

Tenth. Experimental mining, with application of innovations, of parts of typical deposits in order to demonstrate the most effective methods of extracting hitherto unused ores from the ground.

Eleventh. The milling of low-grade bauxite ores in Arkansas to establish the possibility of alumina production from these ores on a peacetime basis, thereby keeping the bauxite mining industry of Arkansas alive, with the consequent employment of labor. The pilot mill on which construction was started as a war measure will serve as the basis for this work.

Twelfth. The direct production of iron and steel by various processes. The possibility of producing special steels and intermediates without going through the standardized and centralized blast-furnace plants has been strongly indicated. Regional peacetime industries on this basis can be established at several points. Pilot and demonstration plant work, using equipment available from wartime pilot plants should be started immediately.

Thirteenth. The utilization of low-grade manganese and chromium ores for the production of electrolytic manganese and chromium. Substantial progress has been made during the war in the development of methods for producing electrolytic manganese and chromium. Further operation of these plants to demonstrate peacetime uses of the products is necessary.

Fourteenth. The production of new metals, such as titanium and zirconium. The full-scale production and use of these metals needs to be demonstrated. Progress in titanium production has been made under a wartime appropriation, and zirconium has been produced in the laboratory. Further pilot and demonstration plant work is planned.

The pilot plants listed in the last four items are merely examples of the pilot and demonstration plant work which the Bureau should be directed to carry forward, if it is to serve effectively in pointing the way toward the use of our mineral resources in peacetime as well as to help keep the Nation in the best possible position from the viewpoint of security.

This program will contribute in large measure to establishing and maintaining the healthy, solvent mineral industry that is essential to reconversion, to the long-range national economy, and to the future national security. It cannot be considered undue subsidization of or interference in the industry. The mineral industry recognizes a world-wide trend in public thinking regarding mineral resources that is well described editorially in the June 1945 Engineering and Mining Journal as:

> The increasing tendency of people to view resources as public property, at least to the extent of demanding that materials so vital to national well being must be handled with full regard for the public interest.

It is true that such a program should be justified as a peacetime proposal. It would be unfortunate indeed, however, in view of the fact that we all agree that it is well worth doing and that it must be done, if a hiatus should occur between the termination of the present program and the beginning of the continuing peacetime roof repairing. The Bureau of Mines has, with considerable difficulty, assembled an expert staff. If their national-defense appropriations are summarily rescinded most of these professional and technical men will have to be discharged. The knowledge and know-how that they have laboriously acquired during the wartime program will all be dissipated. Pilot plants now constructed, some of them in active operation, will have to be closed and declared surplus. Many contracts for carrying out drilling and other exploratory work, which should be done whether we are at war or in an era of peace, will have to be terminated with consequent loss to the Government.

I need not remind you of the tremendous public interest in scientific research as a result of the atomic bomb achievement. There is pressure on all sides to continue and expand scientific research, especially on the part of the Government, to the end that the United States shall forever occupy the front-row seat in this respect. Certainly the work of locating mineral resources and devising means of treating the ores and fashioning them into useful articles and materials falls into the category of scientific research, and as such should not be relegated to a secondary position in our national economy.

As the continuing program is similar in many respects to the one that has been conducted under these national defense appropriations, and as the continuing program is actually for national defense, even though we are no longer at war, I urge you to not rescind this money until estimates for the continuing peacetime program can be presented through the regular channels. Let us learn from the experience of the man with the leaky roof. Let us now proceed with all dispatch to patch the roof and keep it patched while the weather is fair.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TRIBUTE AND MEMORIAL TO OUR UNKNOWN HEROES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I introduced last week House Joint Resolution 251, which provides for bringing back to the United States the bodies of two unknown Americans who were members of the American forces who served, one in the European theater of war and the other in the Pacific theater of war.

My thought was that the unknown hero brought back from the Pacific area would be either a marine or a sailor, because it is important to have both the Navy and the Army represented in the bringing back of the men. A soldier could be brought back from the European theater of war.

If we are fortunate enough to have this measure passed, it is my feeling that if we did not bring back two heroes of this war to be buried in Arlington Cemetery the public would feel that this war was just a continuation of the First World War. In visiting the grave of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington they would think that it was all one war.

My thought was that these two men should be buried on either side of the present memorial to the Unknown Soldier of World War I now in Arlington Cemetery. My thought also was that it would be a fine plan to have a big light over the three graves there in Arlington in order that the people in Washington and the surrounding country could always see that light even from a great distance, and could see the white shape of those monuments in memory of these brave men.

While the monuments would be dedicated to all unidentified heroes, everyone who has a son missing or everyone who knows that a son has actually given his life in this war, and whose burial place is unknown, would feel that the son actually was buried there at Arlington and that the monument covered their son. I know it was the feeling of many of the parents of the men who gave their lives in the First World War but whose burial place was unknown or the spot where they died was unknown. We feel the Unknown Soldier represents all the men and women of our armed forces.

We had fine celebrations when General Eisenhower and General Wainwright, of the Army, and Admiral Nimitz, of the Navy, came back here. We paid them great tribute. It seems to me the very least we can do is to pay a great tribute of respect to the men who have given their lives.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a letter from John Thomas Taylor, of the American Legion, who speaks for the American Legion. He says:

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Please accept our sincere appreciation for the introduction of the necessary legislation to bring back a body of an unknown soldier from the Southwest Pacific and from the European theater. If and when the time is propitious, you can suggest it be a body of a sailor from the Pacific theater. Nobody ever pays very much attention to the sailors. We always keep talking about the Army.

Now I am putting out a news release that this is the first step in a plan that you fostered and I am listing some of the details of the plan.

1. Bringing of the bodies of the two unknown heroes to Washington to rest in state in the rotunda of the Capitol.

2. Formation of an armed escort of all Congressional Medal of Honor winners to escort the heroes from the Capitol to Arlington Cemetery for entombment.

3. A commitment ceremony at Arlington with highest American dignitaries of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths officiating.

4. Participation in the Arlington ceremonies of President Harry S. Truman, Gen. George C. Marshall, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, Admiral Ernest J. King, and Admiral Chester W. Nimitz; Speaker of the House, Representative SAM RAYBURN; and President of the Senate, Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR.

5. High light the ceremony by parade of 500,000 or more members of all branches of the armed forces participating while a flight of 5,000 bombing and fighting planes fly overhead.

6. Extend invitations to the commanders in chief of the armies and navies of all Allied Nations to send units to join in the review and to participate in the ceremony.

7. Issuance of a special medallion to officers and men participating in the grand review.

8. Return of the bodies of the two heroes from abroad on the largest navy combat ships which can be anchored in the Potomac at Washington.

9. Accord places of honor in the parade to the two outstanding heroes of each of the four branches of the armed forces—one to be an enlisted man and the other to be an officer.

10. Place control of arrangements for the ceremony in a joint committee of the House and Senate.

Let this ceremony be a living symbol of the heroism of the members of our armed forces and let the record of it be an everlasting memorial not only to them but to the mothers and fathers of the country.

The sacrifices of members of our armed forces can never be repaid in material things. The least, then, that we can do is to accord to them the honor and the glory which they so richly deserve as members of the greatest battalions of peace in all history.

Of course the date is something that will have to be decided by the Congress itself.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the resolution, House Joint Resolution 251, will pass. I feel very sure it will because everybody in the United States and I believe in the entire world will want to pay tribute to our heroes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein certain statements and excerpts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. BIEMILLER, for October 15, on account of official business.

To Mr. GORDON, for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, from October 15 to October 19, on account of official business.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George Catlett Marshall and to Fleet Admiral Ernest Joseph King and to the members of the armed forces of the United States who served under their direction; and providing for the striking and presentation to General Marshall and Fleet Admiral King of appropriate gold medals in the name of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth C. Stone;

H. R. 476. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.", approved June 14, 1933, as amended;

H. R. 656. An act to provide further for the appointment of postmasters for fourth-class offices in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Laura May Ryan;

H. R. 1565. An act for the relief of Inglis Construction Co., a corporation;

H. R. 1629. An act for the relief of Michael C. Donatell;

H. R. 1765. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the Agricultural Byproducts Laboratory on the campus of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts;

H. R. 1849. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ora R. Hutchinson;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Anna Mattil and others;

H. R. 1958. An act for the relief of L. A. Williams;

H. R. 2317. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virginia M. Kiser;

H. R. 2690. An act to amend the Bonneville Project Act;

H. R. 3081. An act for the relief of August Svelund;

H. R. 3150. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River, between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1939;

H. R. 3373. An act authorizing the reconstruction of the Spring Common Bridge on Mahoning Avenue, across the Mahoning River in the municipality of Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio;

H. R. 3871. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas; and

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will meet at 10 a. m., Friday October 12, to continue hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

There will be a meeting of the Federal Power Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, October 16, 1945.

Business to be considered: Resumption of public hearings on the bill H. R. 1742 relating to rural electrification planning programs.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in open session, on Friday, October 12, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the committee room, 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Tuesday, October 16, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes, in the Rivers and Harbors Committee Room.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons

who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in executive hearing to consider the bill (H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

729. A letter from the Administrator, Surplus Property Administration, transmitting the third quarterly progress report of the Surplus Property Board; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

730. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service from the period August 1, 1945, to September 30, 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

731. A letter from the rear admiral, United States Navy, Director of Budget and Reports, transmitting report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned from civilian life into the United States Naval Reserve, during the period August 1, 1945, to September 30, 1945, inclusive, who have not had prior commissioned military service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

732. A letter from the Administrator, Surplus Property Administration, transmitting a report with respect to Government-owned iron and steel plants and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

733. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting copies of letters addressed to the heads of the various agencies which establish limitations on the amounts which may be expended for travel expenses and printing and binding from sums set apart in appropriations to these agencies for special projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

734. A letter from the Acting President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3444. A bill to grant the title of public lands to the town of Safford, Ariz., for the use of its municipal water system; with amendment (Rept. No. 1117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATTERSON: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1192. A bill granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands; with amendment (Rept. No. 1118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 371. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3615, a bill to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air-navigation facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1119). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3, of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4362. A bill to abolish the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., to authorize and direct the restoration to the former owners of the land comprising such refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 4363. A bill providing special facilities for handicapped veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4364. A bill to abolish the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., to authorize and direct the restoration to the former owners of the land comprising such refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4365. A bill to extend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 4366. A bill to make eligible for immediate discharge from the Navy of the United States all persons who have served 12 months or more at sea; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4367. A bill to make eligible for immediate discharge from the Army of the United States all persons who have served 12 months or more overseas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4368. A bill to extend and broaden the existing programs for the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 4369. A bill terminating the war tax rates of certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H.R. 4370. A bill amending Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN:

H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare of the United States by authorizing the representative of the United States on the Security Council of the United Nations to pledge the use of armed forces of the United States for the purpose of the joint maintenance of a peaceful international society based on effective world organization, and to establish the office of United States representative on the Security Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution urging the executive department to initiate steps in conjunction with other interested United Nations to set up a supervisory international commission to effectuate the immediate transfer of the Hebrew people of Europe to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution inviting Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur to address the two Houses of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution urging the executive department to initiate steps in conjunction with other interested United Nations to set up a supervisory international commission to effectuate the immediate transfer of the Hebrew people of Europe to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 4371. A bill for the relief of Eva Bilobran; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 4372. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Harris Casardi; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Carl and Naomi Fitzwater; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4374. A bill for the relief of Rudolph K. Bartels; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4375. A bill for the relief of Charles Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1241. By Mr. CORBETT: Petition of 1,000 persons residing in the Thirtieth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, requesting the War Department to release at once all fathers and all men who have had combat experience so that millions of children, still believing in Santa Claus, may have their fathers back for Christmas of 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1242. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Acting Director, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, for approximately 3,200 conscientious objectors petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to immediate and unconditional release of all conscientious objectors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, from whom all holy desires and all good counsels do proceed, rise mercifully with the morning upon our darkened hearts. In this tragic and tangled world we are conscious of our woeful inadequacy to sit in the seats of judgment, to balance the scales of justice, and to respond with equity to the myriad calls of human need. Wilt Thou crown our deliberations with Thy wisdom and with

spacious thinking. Wilt Thou light our eyes with Thy sympathy for all mankind.

As we face the questions which confront us and almost confound us, quicken in us, we beseech Thee, every noble impulse and sanctify for Thy glory and for human good our best endeavors. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, October 11, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts.

On October 11, 1945:

S. 888. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands in the vicinity of the War Department Pentagon Building in Arlington, Va.; and

S. 1062. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Norfolk, Va., on February 13, 1945.

On October 13, 1945:

S. 136. An act for the relief of the Oregon Caves Resort;

S. 573. An act for the relief of Lee D. Hoseley; and

S. 857. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Ford.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 11, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 620) for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO ISSUANCE OF CHECKS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION CONTRACTS

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, stating that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2 (d) of Public Law 46, Seventy-seventh Congress, no contracts had been entered into or modified for the period July 1 to September 30, 1945; to the Committee on Commerce.

TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PRINTING AND BINDING FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of letters addressed to the Foreign Economic Administration, Selective Service System, Office of Price Administration, and the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which establish limitations on the amounts that may be expended for travel expenses and printing and binding from sums set apart in appropriations to those agencies for special projects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to continue wartime child-care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Cambridge, Mass., favoring immediate abolition of present restrictions and limitations on free Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. James A. Ward, of Salt Lake City, Utah, praying for the prompt release of certain members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition of several citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that the results of the investigation of the Naval Board of Inquiry with reference to the Pearl Harbor disaster be made public; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Irma Jenkins, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the prompt release of certain enlisted men of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

A resolution adopted by the Lowell (Mass.) Hebrew Community Center, favoring the establishment of a Jewish democratic commonwealth of Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SCHOOLING FOR DISCHARGED SOLDIERS—RESOLUTION OF MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and I are in receipt of a resolution passed by the Missouri House of Representatives regarding discharges from the Army of youths who desire to reenter schools. We ask that the resolution be referred to the Military Affairs committee for their advice in handling of this matter.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 250

Whereas the school work of thousands of our boys and young men was abruptly terminated by their induction into the armed forces of our country during World War II; and

Whereas said war has now been brought to a successful end and the further need of armed personnel diminished to that of occupation forces in the countries of our defeated enemies and to that of an adequate standing land, naval and air force; and

Whereas the further retention in service of boys and young men who were in school at the time or just prior to their induction into the armed forces may have a strong tendency to cause them to lose interest in school work and may even destroy their former desire for a college education; and

Whereas while we are anxious to see all men and women now in service who desire release returned home at the earliest possible moment, because of the tragic results which may occur to the boys and young men taken into service from the schoolroom: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of Missouri hereby respectfully memorializes the Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States, now in session, to do all within their power to secure the immediate release from the armed forces of the above-mentioned boys and young men, that they may resume their school work, said release to be conditioned upon their entering some institution of learning within 6 months after their release from the armed forces of our country; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate in Washington, D. C., and a copy to each Congressman from Missouri and to Senators DONNELL and BRIGGS and the President of the United States.

MURRAY E. THOMPSON,
Speaker pro tempore of the House.

I hereby certify that House Resolution No. 250 was adopted by the house on October 3, 1945.

[SEAL] HEROLD D. CUNDRAY,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITION OF MEMBERS OF NATIONAL FEDERATION OF TELEPHONE WORKERS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask that a protest addressed to me in the form of a letter signed by 34 members of the National Federation of Telephone Workers, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred. This is a national organization of several hundred thousand members and the letter protests a recent ruling of the NLRB. I ask that the protest, with the signatures, be printed in full and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the protest was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures, as follows:

SIDNEY, NEBR., *October 6, 1945.*

Hon. HUGH A. BUTLER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: We, the undersigned, as members of the National Federation of Telephone Workers, having met in sessions this 5th day of October, 1945, the aforesaid meeting being held as part of a national plan to protest the National Labor Relations Board's recent ruling ordering the dissolution of the Western Electric Employees Association, of Kearney area, do hereby beseech and beg you to do all in your power to induce the NLRB to reverse the aforesaid ruling.

As you know the NFTW is an organization of several hundred thousand members and we believe is fully capable as a collective bargaining agency to properly represent its members.

We wish, at this time, to call your attention to the fact that all during the war no serious labor trouble between the members

of the NFTW and management of the Bell Telephone operating companies occurred, nor during the entire existence of the NFTW.

This, we believe, is definite proof that the NFTW is capable as a bargaining agency and is instrumental in promoting harmony in the ranks of labor and management in the communications field.

H. L. Wolverton, John K. Buck, F. G. Harrington, C. M. Lowell, J. W. Sherwood, Jean Stutzman, Luella L. Marx, Beverly Kaylor, Lorene Ellsworth, Betty M. Broun, W. L. Wells, Eldora Nienhueser, Lula K. Smith, Bernice S. Brauer, Melba L. Fleming, Lois Stockamp, Leona Williams, Eleanor Barcher, Milo C. Griffiths, Evelyn Mae Vizina, Phyllis V. Mauser, Thelma Wasser, U. C. Brown, G. M. Schofield, Marjorie L. Sellers, Beverly A. Black, Carlene B. Kettler, Rita P. Tilbin, Virginia Beavers, Bettie Herboldsheimer, Joan Bernhard, Margie Kretz, Evelyn Borcher, Alice E. Huttle.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 179) creating a special committee to investigate problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy, reported it with amendments, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of September 1945, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relating to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURPLUS PROPERTY,
October 1, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Surplus Property Subcommittee (S. Res. 129) of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Surplus Property Subcommittee.

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Kurt Borchardt	6007 34th Pl. NW, Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	$7,240
Mabel Graham	1474 Columbia Rd. NW, Washington, D. C.	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.	2,320
Hilda Hamilton	705 18th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	2,890

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1480. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Hooper; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1481. A bill to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national-defense purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 1482. A bill to establish a Department of Military Security, to consolidate therein the military-security activities of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARVILLE:

S. 1483. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska," approved May 3, 1943; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1484. A bill to prevent the placing of liens upon lands of Indian recipients of old-age assistance benefits; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1485. A bill to enable the people of Puerto Rico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the States; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1486, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4309) to reduce taxation, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SUFFRAGE FOR RESIDENTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by John Ihlder, executive officer of the National Capital Housing Authority, in which he goes on record as being strongly in favor of suffrage for the residents of the District of Columbia. I am glad to have his support for the bill introduced by Representative SUMNERS of Texas and myself which proposes to give the people of the District of Columbia the right of suffrage, which so long has been denied them.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 26, 1945.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: In accordance with our conversation yesterday, I am sending you this statement of my belief in favor of suffrage for residents of the District of Columbia.

I have been a resident of the District for many years. Before that I was a voting citizen in other communities. The difference between being a citizen with legal responsibility for affairs in his community and a mere resident who is permitted only to express opinions and to petition his rulers may be intangible but it is very real. As with nearly all human differences, it is one of emphasis or of degree, but lack of responsibility tends to make for a negative attitude, for a tendency to avoid issues, in our case, a tendency to pass the buck to Congress on the score that, after all, Congress will decide, "so why should I stick my neck out."

Of course, there are many Washingtonians who do all they can for their community under the limitations imposed upon them. But often they have a sense of futility, knowing that, however strongly they may be supported by their fellow residents, the decision rests in the hands of those to most of whom the District is of minor importance.

Of course, I subscribe to the arguments for suffrage based upon our rights as American citizens and upon the injustice of our being governed without our consent. But as a convinced believer in the democratic system of government, there is, to me, something even more fundamental. It is the strengthening of the moral fiber of the individual citizen by giving him responsibility for decisions. Even those citizens of other American communities, who, being entitled to vote, refrain from voting, have a little struggle within themselves. As you know, it is accepted as practically an axiom that one grows only when he makes decisions; betweenwhiles he lies fallow.

Sincerely,

JOHN IHLDER.

ADDRESS BY GEN. MARK W. CLARK ON ACCEPTING AWARD OF THE ITALIAN-AMERICAN LABOR COUNCIL

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Gen. Mark W. Clark on the occasion of the Columbus Day celebration of the Italian-American Labor Council, October 12, 1945, Hotel Biltmore, New York City, in accepting the "four freedoms" annual award, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY LUIGI ANTONINI AT PRESENTATION OF AWARD TO GEN. MARK W. CLARK

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Luigi Antonini, president of the Italian-American Labor Council, on October 12, 1945, on the occasion of the presentation of the "four freedoms" annual award to Gen. Mark W. Clark, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF AWARD TO GEN. MARK W. CLARK

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the President of the United States addressed to the President of the Italian-American Labor Council on the occasion of the presentation of the annual "four freedoms" award to Gen. Mark W. Clark, which, as embodied in the presentation address of the president of the Italian-American Labor Council, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix a radio address entitled "Needed, a Federal Relations Policy,"

delivered by him on October 9, 1945, from Philadelphia, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

LOOKING AHEAD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Looking Ahead," delivered by him before a meeting of the Independent Voters of Illinois at Winnetka, Ill., on October 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE—EDITORIAL FROM BOTTINEAU (N. DAK.) COURANT

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Need for Conscription," published in the Bottineau (N. Dak.) Courant, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to the magazine Progressive and published in the issue of March 12, 1945, under the title "Wake Up America," which appears in the Appendix.]

WESTERN MINING ACTIVITY—ARTICLE FROM NEVADA STATE JOURNAL AND LETTER FROM W. CLIFFORD DUNHAM

[Mr. CARVILLE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Nevada Mines Now Produce 22 Minerals," published in the Nevada State Journal of September 28, 1945, and a letter addressed to him by W. Clifford Dunham, which appear in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

SECRETARY FOR THE MAJORITY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 181), as follows:

Resolved, That Felton M. Johnston, of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the majority of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

LEO T. CROWLEY

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, Hon. Leo T. Crowley is leaving the Government service today. I wish to say that in my opinion Mr. Crowley has rendered most distinguished public service. His administration as Chairman of the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has been an outstanding success. He took charge of that very important responsibility against a background of the bank failures which swept over the country in the depths of the great depression. He has administered the Corporation without regard to political considerations, and in the public interest.

He has also had other heavy responsibilities. In each of them he has attempted to protect the best interests of the United States. During his service Mr. Crowley has won the confidence of Members of the House and Senate. His untimely departure from the public service will be regretted by the Congress and the people.

I personally regret very much, Mr. President, that this distinguished public servant from my State is now returning to private life. I wish for him the greatest possible success. I did not want his retirement to take place without registering my appreciation of the great service he has rendered to his country.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have read Mr. Crowley's letter of resignation to the President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, September 29, 1945.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In writing this letter, my thoughts go back to the widespread human suffering in the late twenties and early thirties resulting from the loss of depositors' funds in closed banking institutions.

It is extremely gratifying to me that since the inception of Federal Deposit Insurance there has been virtually no loss to any depositor in an insured bank. Deposit insurance has played a very important part in reestablishing and maintaining public confidence in our banking system. Of course, this confidence is due to many factors. Principally, I believe, it springs from the active interest which the Members of Congress and the State bank supervisors have always taken in our operations, the cooperation we have received from the bankers of the Nation and the other Federal agencies, and the complete acceptance of the principle of deposit insurance by the public.

Today there are 60,000,000 insured accounts and as of June 30, 1946, the Corporation will have built up capital and surplus amounting to about $1,000,000,000. We are proud of this record; particularly of the fact that after 11½ years of deposit-insurance protection, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation could liquidate today, reimburse the Government the money it invested plus a dividend of 22 percent, and return every penny of the assessments the banks paid to the Corporation.

In our country it is vital that the people have a banking system in which they can have complete confidence. It is inevitable that our banking structure will be subject to future strains. But I am convinced that if Federal Deposit Insurance is operated in the future according to the principles that have guided it in the past, the Nation's depositors will have every justification for their continued confidence. In all legislative discussions incident to the drafting of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as well as in many communications to the public and to the banking system, it has been made abundantly clear that Federal Deposit Insurance is dedicated solely to the protection of depositors and that it would never be used in any fashion for monetary or credit control or any other purpose. If this policy is maintained, we can be assured that deposit insurance will continue to exercise a stabilizing influence on our economy.

When the deposit-insurance law was drafted, it was tentatively agreed that when the insurance fund reached $1,000,000,000 we would give consideration to a reduction in the assessment rate. That sum will soon be reached and I believe that we could properly give consideration to a possible reduction in the assessment rate.

As you know from your service in the Senate of the United States, Federal Deposit Insurance has always enjoyed the unanimous support of Congress. Because of this and my deep interest in deposit insurance, it is not an easy thing for me to relinquish the office of Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Nevertheless, I must ask you to accept my resignation from this office to take effect on October 15.

You have been very generous to me and I deeply appreciate your confidence and trust.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Chairman.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who has just spoken, in expressing my profound regret at the departure of Mr. Crowley from public service. In my judgment, Mr. Crowley has been one of the ablest, most alert, most intelligent, and one of the most forward-looking men who have held office in Washington since I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States.

In all his appearances before the committees of which I was a member, in reference to the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, which was sponsored by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and with respect to all other legislative questions before that committee dealing with the agencies of which Mr. Crowley was in control, or with which he was associated, and in his appearances before the Committee on Foreign Relations dealing with lend-lease and other activities of the Federal Government growing out of the war, Mr. Crowley has been constructive, he has been frank, he has never withheld from any committee anything which would in any way contribute to a better understanding of the legislative proposal involved.

Mr. Crowley has been unselfish in his service to the people of the United States and in his cooperation with the executive and legislative branches of the Government. It is really a source of genuine regret to me that he is now departing from all connection with the Federal Government as an officer.

I have known for a good many months, in fact, for a year or two, that Mr. Crowley desired to relinquish the responsibilities of public office in Washington, for which, from a personal viewpoint, I could not blame him; yet, I have been one of those who urged and hoped that he would not retire until he felt that he had accomplished the mission for which he came here in the first instance.

Mr. President, I join the Senator from Wisconsin, and all other Senators, for I am sure in this instance I can speak for them all, in wishing Mr. Crowley every success in whatever future enterprises he may undertake, and in wishing him the repose and satisfaction which come from the inner knowledge of public duty well done and a mission well consummated.

I wish Mr. Crowley good health and long life, and I hope he may find occasion frequently to come among us, not only that we may have the pleasure of his charming presence, but that we may be the recipients of his able counsel and advice, and enjoy his friendly association.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that what the able Senator from Wisconsin and the distinguished majority leader have said

about Mr. Crowley is richly shared on the Republican side of the aisle. I speak with a very deep personal sense of gratitude in this connection, because it has been my pleasure to be rather intimately related to Mr. Crowley's activities during the lifetime of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. I think Mr. Crowley has rendered one of the great, outstanding services of our time to the American people.

When the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was initiated, it was looked upon as something of an experiment, in many quarters it was viewed with considerable skepticism. In the first instance, the then President of the United States and his Secretary of the Treasury were opposed to the idea. Therefore, this great adventure was launched not only in the midst of considerable doubt in the Government itself, but it also was launched, as everyone knows, at a time when the fiscal pulse of the American people was beating very low.

Mr. Crowley was the original chairman of the FDIC, and has continued in that capacity down to this hour. I cannot begin to express the depth of my regret that he is leaving this responsibility today.

Over the intervening decade, as indicated in his letter of resignation to the President, he has seen the FDIC develop to such a point that it now insures 60,000,000 banking accounts in the United States, and has reached such a fiscal status that its capital and surplus are not only $1,000,000,000, but if it were liquidated today, it could reimburse the Government for the money invested plus a dividend of 22 percent, and still return every penny of the assessments the banks paid to the Corporation.

Mr. President, I do not think we can put too much emphasis upon this sort of a record in the public service. The FDIC has been the steel beam of public confidence throughout the last treacherous and difficult decade. I hesitate to think what might have happened in this country in the late thirties if there had not been popular reliance upon this underlying warranty that the bank accounts in America were safe, and that can never be dissociated from the utterly impartial, utterly unpartial, always courageous, always effective management which Mr. Crowley has given to this great institution.

It is a source of very great regret to me that he is leaving. I hope that the spirit in which he has administered the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will live after him. If it does, it will continue to be a benediction to the American people.

Mr. Crowley has done many other things in his service for the Government. He has occupied many difficult and responsible fiscal positions, and in every instance, Mr. President—and this is, I am afraid, a somewhat unique record—in every instance he has been absolutely faithful to the intelligent self-interest of the United States.

I join my distinguished friends in wishing Mr. Crowley Godspeed as he returns to civilian life. He has rendered a very great service to his country, and if there were a medal for distinguished civilian service I would nominate him to receive it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues who have spoken in tribute to Mr. Crowley. I endorse all they have said.

I did not know Mr. Crowley before he came to Washington to be the head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, but he has lived at the same hotel at which I live, and I have seen him almost every day during the time he has been in office here. I therefore speak from knowledge of the man. I do not know that I ever met a more delightful gentleman. He is courteous to a degree, considerate of everyone with whom he comes in contact, kindly, affable, and, I believe, one of the most engaging personalities I have ever known.

As an official of the Federal Government he has no superior. As my colleagues have said, he has met every task in a fair, frank, open, sensible way, and I do not believe any man in our country could have filled better or more successfully the various positions he has held here during the last few years.

There is another attribute of Mr. Crowley to which I wish to refer. That is his fearlessness of speech and of action. Just to look at him, just to hear him talk ordinarily one would not be certain that he was an absolutely fearless person. He is so gentlemanly one might think he was not entirely fearless. But I have heard him express his opinions and his views under circumstances when it took great courage to express them, and he did so in the most considerate way in the world. He did it in a way that was inoffensive, and yet he was as determined and as fearless as I ever knew any man to be in expressing himself. He has moral courage, and that kind of courage is of the greatest value to any man in public life.

I like Mr. Crowley personally. I admire him officially. I believe he is one of the best Americans we have, and he has made one of the best public servants.

Mr. President, I arose merely for the purpose of adding my simple tribute to his worth, to his ability, to his sagacity, and to his fearlessness.

I wish for him continued success in life and the best of health and happiness.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the words of my distinguished colleagues, and especially those of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], respecting Mr. Crowley strike a very responsive chord in my heart. I am very familiar with the situation in the Dust Bowl in the Northwest in the early thirties. In the early part of 1933 our late colleague, Senator Herring, of Iowa, called a meeting of the governors of the Northwest. Eleven governors attended, and five of us were sent to Washington to confer with the late President Roosevelt. On that occasion in Washington we met Mr. Crowley in the White House. He was in the complete confidence of the President. I remember the President saying to him, "Now, Leo, you know what the situation is up there in the Northwest, and I am going to be guided by what you say." Mr. Crowley produced at that time six telegrams he had received that morning setting forth that six creameries in Wisconsin had either been blown up or burned, or had coal oil poured upon essential parts so as to render them useless. Mr. Crowley did a magnificent job in helping the people throughout the Northwest in those drought years, and I believe they will be eternally grateful for what he did for them and think of him in most affectionate terms.

Not only that, Mr. President, but after he came to Washington he was ever helpful to the new Senators from the Northwest. Time and time again I have personally called upon Mr. Crowley to help me, sometimes in connection with rather trivial matters, and I always found the door open and found him ready with a hearty welcome when some of my constituents and I went to see him.

Mr. President, I join my colleagues in hoping for Mr. Crowley long life and success in all his undertakings.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I am sure the entire membership of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency join with me when, as chairman of the committee, I express my deep regret over the resignation of Mr. Leo T. Crowley. It is no exaggeration to say that Mr. Crowley was at the head, at one and the same time, of more important agencies of Government than any other administrator and the whole country recognized his invaluable service not only to the country but to the whole world. I warmly endorse everything that has been said on the floor of the Senate today respecting this faithful and most able public servant. For his unusual services to his country, Mr. Crowley should receive the distinguished service medal, and I heartily join the Senator from Michigan in proposing such a medal for Mr. Crowley.

Inasmuch as our committee deals with banking matters, including the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Mr. Crowley appeared before it on a great many occasions. The committee has the greatest confidence in Mr. Crowley, and when we knew that he was in favor of a certain piece of legislation the committee would be 75 percent in favor of it even before any hearings were held.

Mr. Crowley has rendered most distinguishd public service. I heard some time ago that he contemplated resigning, and I called him up personally and asked him please to remain because of the importance to our country and to the world in the present crisis of the work he was performing. He had served a long while, however, and felt he should leave the service. Though leaving, I am sure the Government can always look to him for counsel and advice. That is a comfort to all of us. I greatly regret his departure from public office. I am sure all Senators regret it. I wish for him every success in his new endeavors, and pray that he may have a long life and enjoy to the fullest extent good health and happiness.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has voiced with completeness and warmth of feeling our sentiments toward Mr. Crowley. We of the minority appreciate what he has said.

I cannot help, however, adding a purely personal word. In the long years in which I have served in the Congress I have known no man who so completely merited the confidence of his fellow Americans and the Members of both branches of the Congress than did Mr. Crowley. He has worked with amazing industry. He has had sure and sound judgment upon public questions. He has always had courage in reaching and giving utterance to his beliefs upon public affairs, and at all times he has had the highest standards of public duty and the highest conceptions of public service. I express my deep regret that he is leaving the public service, and that we are no longer to have the benefit of his judgment and the wisdom of his counsel. I wish for him every good thing in the life which I hope stretches before him for many years.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as a minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency I very earnestly second the remarks made by the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. WAGNER] with reference to Mr. Leo T. Crowley. We of the minority have enjoyed working with him. We have learned to respect him fully, and we regret very much to see him leave the important position which he has held.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I rise merely to say a few words about Mr. Crowley. Very appropriate tributes to him have already been paid by my colleagues, and I shall not repeat them. As Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have had considerable contact with Mr. Crowley. I have always found his views to be very sound. I have found him to be courageous, and I very deeply regret that he is leaving the public service. We have too few of his type in the administrative branch of the Government.

FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE—REPORT OF GENERAL MARSHALL

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the final chapter in the report of the Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall. The chapter is entitled "For the Common Defense." I have read the report in its entirety. I should like to have all of it printed in the RECORD. Unless I am very much mistaken, the report will go down in our history as one of the greatest of American state papers. In order that its circulation may be larger than it would otherwise be, I particularly wish to have printed in the RECORD the final chapter, which is a warning to our country as to the future.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not expect to object—why does not the Senator from North Carolina have the entire report made a Senate document, so that the report in its entirety may be available to us?

Mr. BAILEY. Mainly because of the cost.

Mr. CONNALLY. The concluding chapter is very fine; but the basis for the concluding chapter is spread throughout the report. I hope the Senator will not restrict his request to placing in the RECORD merely the concluding chapter.

Mr. BAILEY. At this time I ask that the final chapter be printed in the RECORD. At a later time I shall ask to have the entire report made a Senate document. I believe that at least 100,000 copies should be printed. However, as a rule, the Senate authorizes the printing of only a limited number of copies of a Senate document—sometimes 200, and sometimes 2,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection to the number suggested, but I believe that the report should be printed in its entirety.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I have had a great many requests for copies of this report, and I hope the Senator will see fit to ask that it be made a Senate document.

Mr. BAILEY. I shall send forward the final chapter, to be printed in the RECORD in accordance with my request. Later I shall ask that 100,000 copies of General Marshall's report to the Secretary of War be printed as a Senate document. It is a great history and a great lesson.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I feel that it would be well to make an appropriation so that the War Department may have it printed, because I feel that it is a wonderful document. Last night I spent about 2 hours reading it. I am sure that its value would be much greater if the maps were printed as a part of the document. If the report were printed as a Senate document, it would not be nearly so informative or valuable as it is in its present form.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, why is it that the War Department can print the maps and we cannot?

Mr. BAILEY. There is a very limited number of copies of the report available in the form in which it was printed. As I understand, the report was printed by the Government Printing Office and made available to the public at cost.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the Senator is aware of the fact that the report has been printed in pamphlet form, and is on every newsstand. Before the report was finished, arrangements were made with Simon & Shuster to publish it. It is available in much better form than it would be in a Senate document, which would not include the maps. Anyone who wishes to pay a dollar for it can buy it.

In the form in which it has been published, it is much easier to read than a Senate document would be. It is published in large type. The United States News has published it in finer print. Certainly anyone who wishes it had better pay a dollar and buy it at a newsstand than try to get it in the form of a Senate document.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the considerations which the Senator from Ohio has mentioned had all occurred to me. I believe the report to be so valuable and so important, containing, as it does, the story of such a marvelous piece of work by our Army and Navy that we ought to arrange for its circulation by the Congress. I have made my request. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] has made a suggestion. Why not have my request referred to the Committee on Military Affairs with a view to having the appropriation authorized?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the request would have to be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. BAILEY. I have no objection to that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest that the Committee on Printing be instructed to consider the publication of the maps and charts. If they can be published for the Army, I do not see why they cannot be published for the United States Senate. If not, we had better change our rules.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the law, if 100,000 copies are desired, it will have to be done by concurrent resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. How about 50,000? Does the law apply to 50,000?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If 100,000 copies are desired, a concurrent resolution is required.

Mr. CONNALLY. How about 99,000 copies? That is up to the Senate, however.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the first request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE

To fulfill its responsibility for protecting this Nation against foreign enemies, the Army must project its planning beyond the immediate future. In this connection I feel that I have a duty, a responsibility, to present publicly at this time my conception, from a military point of view, of what is required to prevent another international catastrophe.

For years men have been concerned with individual security. Modern nations have given considerable study and effort to the establishment of social-security systems for those unable or unwise enough to provide for themselves. But effective insurance against the disasters which have slaughtered millions of people and leveled their homes is long overdue.

We finish each bloody war with a feeling of acute revulsion against this savage form of human behavior, and yet on each occasion we confuse military preparedness with the causes of war and then drift almost deliberately into another catastrophe. This error of judgment was defined long ago by Washington. He proposed to endow this Nation at the outset with a policy which should have been a reasonable guaranty of our security for centuries. The cost of refusing his guidance is recorded in the sacrifice of life and in the accumulation of mountainous debts. We have continued impractical. We have ignored the hard realities of world affairs. We have been purely idealistic.

We must start, I think, with a correction of the tragic misunderstanding that a security policy is a war policy. War has been defined by a people who have thought a lot about it—the Germans. They have started

most of the recent ones. The German soldier-philosopher Clausewitz described war as a special violent form of political action. Frederic of Prussia, who left Germany the belligerent legacy which has now destroyed her, viewed war as a device to enforce his will whether he was right or wrong. He held that with an invincible offensive military force he could win any politcial argument. This is the doctrine Hitler carried to the verge of complete success. It is the doctrine of Japan. It is a criminal doctrine, and like other forms of crime, it has cropped up again and again since man began to live with his neighbors in communities and nations. There has long been an effort to outlaw war for exactly the same reason that man has outlawed murder. But the law prohibiting murder does not of itself prevent murder. It must be enforced, The enforcing power, however, must be maintained on a strictly democratic basis. There must not be a large standing army subject to the behest of a group of schemers. The citizen-soldier is the guaranty against such a misuse of power.

In order to establish an international system for preventing wars, peace-loving peoples of the world are demonstrating an eagerness to send their representatives to such conferences as those at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco with the fervent hope that they may find a practical solution. Yet, until it is proved that such a solution has been found to prevent wars, a rich nation which lays down its arms as we have done after every war in our history, will court disaster. The existence of the complex and fearful instruments of destruction now available make this a simple truth which is, in my opinion, undebatable.

So far as their ability to defend themselves and their institutions was concerned, the great democracies were sick nations when Hitler openly massed his forces to impose his will on the world. As sick as any was the United States of America. We had no field army. There were the bare skeletons of three and one-half divisions scattered in small pieces over the entire United States. It was impossible to train even these few combat troops as divisions because motor transportation and other facilities were lacking and funds for adequate maneuvers were not appropriated. The Air Forces consisted of a few partially equipped squadrons serving continental United States, Panama, Hawaii, and the Philippines; their planes were largely obsolescent and could hardly have survived a single day of modern aerial combat. We lacked modern arms and equipment. When President Roosevelt proclaimed, on September 8, 1939, that a limited emergency existed for the United States we were, in terms of available strength, not even a third-rate military power. Some collegians had been informing the world and evidently convincing the Japanese that the young men of America would refuse to fight in defense of their country.

The German armies swept over Europe at the very moment we sought to avoid war by assuring ourselves that there could be no war. The security of the United States of America was saved by sea distances, by allies, and by the errors of a prepared enemy. For probably the last time in the history of warfare those ocean distances were a vital factor in our defense. We may elect again to depend on others and the whim and error of potential enemies, but if we do we will be carrying the treasure and freedom of this great Nation in a paper bag.

Returning from France after the last war, with General Pershing, I participated in his endeavors to persuade the Nation to establish and maintain a sound defense policy. Had his recommendations been accepted, they might have saved this country the hundreds of billions of dollars and the more than a million casualties it has cost us again to restore the peace. We might even have been spared this present world tragedy. General Pershing was asked against whom do we prepare. Obviously that question could not be answered specifically until nearly 20 years later, when Adolf Hitler led the replenished armies of defeated Germany back into world conflict. Even as late as 1940 I was asked very much the same question before a committee of Congress. Not even then could I say definitely exactly where we might have to fight, but I did recall that in past wars the United States forces had fought in Latin America, in France, in Belgium, in Germany, in Russia, in Siberia, in Africa, in the Philippines, and in China, but I did not anticipate that in the near future American soldiers would fight in the heart of Burma and in the islands of the vast Pacific, and would be garrisoning areas across the entire land and water masses of the earth. From this lesson there is no alternative but that this Nation must be prepared to defend its interest against any nation or combination of nations which might sometime feel powerful enough to attempt the settlement of political arguments or gain resources or territory by force of arms.

Twice in recent history the factories and farms and people of the United States have foiled aggressor nations; conspirators against the peace would not give us a third opportunity.

Between Germany and America in 1914 and again in 1939 stood Great Britain and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, France, Poland, and the other countries of Europe. Because the technique of destruction had not progressed to its present peak, these nations had to be eliminated and the Atlantic Ocean crossed by ships before our factories could be brought within the range of the enemy guns. At the close of the German war in Europe they were just on the outer fringes of the range of fire from an enemy in Europe. Goering stated after his capture that it was a certainty the eastern American cities would have been under rocket bombardment had Germany remained undefeated for two more years. The first attacks would have started much sooner. The technique of war has brought the United States, its homes and factories, into the front line of world conflict. They escaped destructive bombardment in the Second World War. They would not in a third.

It no longer appears practical to continue what we once conceived as hemispheric defense as a satisfactory basis for our security. We are now concerned with the peace of the entire world. And the peace can only be maintained by the strong.

What, then, must we do to remain strong and still not bankrupt ourselves on military expenditures to maintain a prohibitively expensive professional army, even if one could be recruited? President Washington answered that question in recommendations to the first Congress to convene under the United States Constitution. He proposed a program for the peacetime training of a citizen army. At that time the conception of a large professional regular army was considered dangerous to the liberties of the Nation. It is still so today. But the determining factor in solving this problem will inevitably be the relation between the maintenance of military power and the cost in annual appropriations. No system, even if actually adopted in the near future, can survive the political pressure to reduce the military budget if the costs are high—and professional armies are very costly.

There is now another disadvantage to a large professional standing army. Wars in the twentieth century are fought with the total resources—economic, scientific, and human—of entire nations. Every specialized field of human knowledge is employed. Modern war requires the skills and knowledge of the individuals of a nation.

Obviously, we cannot all put on uniforms and stand ready to repel invasion. The greatest energy in peacetime of any successful nation must be devoted to productive and gainful labor. But all Americans can in the next generations prepare themselves to serve their country in maintaining the peace or against the tragic hour when peace is broken, if such a misfortune again overtakes us. This is what is meant by universal military training. It is not universal military service—the actual induction of men into the combatant forces. Such forces would be composed during peacetime of volunteers. The trainees would be in separate organizations, maintained for training purposes only. Once trained, young men would be freed from further connection with the Army unless they chose, as they now may, to enroll in the National Guard or an organized reserve unit, or to volunteer for service in the small professional army. When the Nation is in jeopardy, they could be called, just as men are now called, by a committee of local neighbors, in an order of priority and under such conditions as directed at that time by the Congress.

The concept of universal military training is not founded, as some may believe, on the principle of a mass army. The Army has been accused of rigidly holding to this doctrine in the face of modern developments. Nothing, I think, could be further from the fact, as the record of the mobilization for this war demonstrates. Earlier in this report I explained how we had allocated manpower to exploit American technology. Out of our entire military mobilization of 14,000,000 men, the number of infantry troops was less than 1,500,000 Army and Marine.

The remainder of our armed forces, sea, air, and ground, was largely fighting a war of machinery. Counting those engaged in war production there were probably seventy-five to eighty million Americans directly involved in prosecution of the war. To technological warfare we devoted 98 percent of our entire effort.

Nor is it proposed now to abandon this formula which has been so amazingly successful. The harnessing of the basic power of the universe will further spur our efforts to use brain for brawn in safeguarding the United States of America.

However, technology does not eliminate the need for men in war. The Air Forces, which were the highest developed technologically of any of our armed forces in this war, required millions of men to do their job. Every B-29 that winged over Japan was dependent on the efforts of 12 officers and 73 men in the immediate combat area alone.

The number of men that were involved in the delivery of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima was tremendous. First we had to have the base in the Marianas from which the plane took off. This first required preliminary operations across the vast Pacific, thousands of ships, millions of tons of supply, the heroic efforts of hundred of thousands of men. Further, we needed the B-29's and their fighter escort which gave us control of the air over Japan. This was the result of thousands of hours of training and preparation in the United States, and the energies of hundreds of thousands of men.

The effective technology on the military structure is idential to its effect on the national economy. Just as the automobile replaced the horse and made work for millons of Americans, the atomic explosives will require the services of millions of men if we are compelled to employ them in fighting our battles.

This war has made it clear that the security of the Nation, when challenged by an armed enemy, requires the services of virtually all able-bodied male citizens within the effective military age group.

In war the Nation cannot depend on the numbers of men willing to volunteer for active service; nor can our security in peace.

In another national emergency, the existence of a substantial portion of the Nation's young manpower already trained or in process of training, would make it possible to

fill out immediately the peacetime ranks of the Navy, the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserve. As a result our armed forces would be ready for almost immediate deployment to counter initial hostile moves, ready to prevent an enemy from gaining footholds from which he could launch destructive attacks against our industries and our homes. By this method we would establish, for the generations to come, a national military policy: (1) Which is entirely within the financial capabilities of our peacetime economy and is absolutely democratic in its nature, and (2) which places the military world and therefore the political world on notice that this vast power, linked to our tremendous resources, wealth, and production, is immediately available. There can be no question that all the nations of the world will respect our views accordingly, creating at least a probability of peace on earth and of good will among men rather than disaster upon disaster in a tormented world where the very processes of civilization itself are constantly threatened.

The decision in this matter is so grave in consequence that it demands complete frankness on my part. Therefore I must say that many of the objections which have been made to universal military training appear to be influenced by ulterior motives, or to ignore completely the tragedies of the past and present which we are seeking to avoid for the future. They often seem to give undue importance to restrictions on our freedom of life, trivial in comparison with the awful tragedies we are seeking to avoid and the great blessings we hope to secure for succeeding generations.

The timing of our decision on the question of universal military training is urgent. The officials of the State Department have been strongly of the opinion that a decision in this matter prior to the final peace negotiations would greatly strengthen the hand of the United States in securing acceptance of a genuine organization to handle international differences.

The terms of the final peace settlement will provide a basis for determining the strength of the regular or permanent postwar military forces of the United States—air, ground, and naval—but they cannot, in my opinion, alter the necessity for a system of universal military training.

The yardstick by which the size of the permanent force must be measured is maximum security with minimum cost in men, matériel, and maintenance. So far as they can foresee world conditions a decade from now, War Department planners, who have taken every conceivable factor into consideration, believe that our position will be sound if we set up machinery which will permit the mobilization of an army of 4,000,000 men within a period of 1 year following any international crisis resulting in a national emergency for the United States.

The Regular Army must be comprised largely of a strategic force, heavy in air power, partially deployed in the Pacific and the Caribbean ready to protect the Nation against a sudden hostile thrust and immediately available for emergency action wherever required. It is obvious that another war would start with a lightning attack to take us unaware. The pace of the attack would be at supersonic speeds of rocket weapons closely followed by a striking force which would seek to exploit the initial and critical advantage. We must be sufficiently prepared against such a threat to hold the enemy at a distance until we can rapidly mobilize our strength. The Regular Army and the National Guard must be prepared to meet such a crisis.

Another mission of the Regular Army is to provide the security garrisons for the outlying bases. We quickly lost the Philippines, Guam, and Wake Islands at the beginning of this war and are still expending lives and wealth in recovering them.

The third mission of the permanent Army is to furnish the overhead, the higher headquarters which must keep the machine and the plans up to date for whatever national emergency we may face in the future. This overhead includes the War Department, the War College, the service schools, and the headquarters of the military areas into which continental United States is subdivided to facilitate decentralized command and coordination of the peacetime military machine. This was about all we had on the eve of this war, planners and a small number of men who had little to handle in practice but sound ideas on how to employ the wartime hosts that would be gathered in the storm. Had it not been for the time the British Empire and the Soviets bought us, those plans and ideas would have been of little use.

The fourth and probably the most important mission of the Regular Army is to provide the knowledge, the expert personnel, and the installations for training the citizen-soldier upon whom, in my view, the future peace of the world largely depends.

Of the citizen Army, the National Guard is in the first category of importance. It must be healthy and strong, ready to take its place in the first line of defense in the first weeks of an emergency, and not dependent upon a year or more of training before it can be conditioned to take the field against a trained enemy. It is not feasible under the conditions of peace for the National Guard within itself to provide the basic, the fundamental training which is an imperative requirement for its mission. Therefore, in my opinion, based on a long and intimate experience with the guard from 1907 until 1941, the essential requirement for such a system under modern conditions is universal military training from which to draw the volunteers for the ranks of the guard. Without such a firm foundation, I am clearly of the opinion that a sufficiently dependable force for our postwar needs cannot be maintained.

The second important component of the citizen army is the Organized Reserve through which full mobilization of the Nation's resources to war footing is accomplished. At the start of the present war the Reserve was almost entirely an officer corps, the regimental and divisional groups lacking a practical basis for mobilization. The contribution of this component was therefore largely one of individuals, but of wide extent and great importance. The depleted officer ranks of the Regular Army were filled by the Reserve, the countless new staffs and organizations were mainy composed of Reserve officers, the great training camps for men inducted through the Selective Service System drew in the beginning on the officer strength of the Reserve Corps. The officer-candidate schools from which our present Army acquired its vital small-unit leadership were staffed by Reserve officers. These officers were largely veterans of World War I and graduates of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. Pitifully small appropriations had limited training to a brief period once in every 3 or 4 years and so few numbers of troops that the limited training the Reserve officers received had little relation to actual battle.

This lack of troops with which Reserve officers could require practical experience in command and staff work was the most critical limitation. There was no enlisted strength in the Reserve force. There was little connection and understanding between the Officers' Reserve Corps and the National Guard—which had an enlisted strength—and the number of enlisted men in the Regular Army was so small that it was impossible to qualify Reserve officers by training with Regulars. Especially in the dense centers of population there were few Regular troops. Yet here were located the largest groups of Reserve officers. Even had funds for transportation to the areas where Regular troops were stationed been available, and they were not, the few troops on the Regular rolls would have been completely submerged under a deluge of Reserve officers. For example, the strength of the Officers' Reserve Corps in 1938 was more than double the number of Regular soldiers in combat units in the continental United States.

Only by universal military training can full vigor and life be instilled into the Reserve system. It creates a pool of well-trained men and officers from which the National Guard and the Organized Reserves can draw volunteers; it provides opportunities for the Guard and Reserve units to participate in corps and Army maneuvers, which are vital preparations to success in military campaigns. Without these trained men and officers, without such opportunities to develop skill through actual practice in realistic maneuvers, neither the Regular Army, the National Guard, nor the Reserve can hope to bring high efficiency to their vital missions.

Though ROTC graduates composed 12 percent of the war officers, its most important contribution was the immediate availability of its product. Just what we could have done in the first phases of our mobilization and training without these men I do not know. I do know that our plans would have had to be greatly curtailed and the cessation of hostilities on the European front would have been delayed accordingly. We must enlarge and strengthen the system. It must be established on a higher level, comparable to the academic levels of college education in which the young men of the ROTC are engaged. All this is made easily possible if the student has participated in universal military training, and at the same time the length of the course can be shortened by 1 year. He would enter the ROTC as far advanced as his predecessors were after 2½ years of the original 3-year course. He would have completed his elementary training—the military equivalent of his grammar-school and high-school courses—and would be prepared for college work, that is, for training as an officer, a prospective leader of men. The product of such an ROTC would provide the National Guard and the Organized Reserves with an officer corps of exceptional character.

An unbroken period of 1 year's training appears essential to the success of a sound security plan based on the concept of a citizen army.

It is possible to train individual soldiers as replacements for veteran divisions and air groups as we now do in a comparatively short period of time. The training of the unit itself cannot be accomplished at best in less than a year; air units require even more time. The principle is identical to that of coaching a football team. A halfback can learn quickly how to run with the ball, but it takes time and much practice and long hours of team scrimmage before he is proficient at carrying the ball through an opposing team, utilizing the aid of the 10 other men on the team. So it is with an Army division or combat air group. Men learn to fire a rifle or machine gun quickly, but it takes long hours of scrimmage, which the Army calls maneuver, before the firing of the rifle is coordinated with the activities of more than 14,000 other men on the team.

All men who might someday have to fight for their nation must have this team training. The seasoned soldiers of our present superb divisions will have lived beyond the age of military usefulness. The situation will be similar in the peacetime army to that which obtained when we began to mobilize for this war and all men had to have at least a year of unit training before we had divisions even fit for shipment overseas.

The training program would be according to the standards which have made the American soldier in this war the equal of the finest fighting men. It would be kept abreast of technical developments and the resulting modifications of tactics.

Throughout the training a strenuous program of instruction would have to be followed, but it would not be possible in peace to carry on the work under the tremendous pressure we now follow in wartime. Athletics, recreational opportunities, short week ends, and other vacational opportunities such as at Christmas time, would, of course, be necessary. However, if the Government is to be justified in the expenditure of the funds involved, a vigorous schedule should be enforced; otherwise we would produce a half-baked product which would fail to command the respectful attention of the nations of the world, and therefore negate the primary purpose of the entire system.

To those who fear the Army might militarize our young men and indoctrinate them with dangerous conceptions, to those who express doubts of the Army's capacity to do the job, I submit the evidence of our present armies. The troops have been trained sufficiently to defeat a first-class enemy. Their minds have not been warped—quite the contrary. The American people are satisfied, I am confident, that their armies are, in fact, armies of democracy. They know that the men composing those armies are far better physically than they otherwise would have been, that their general health has been better than at home, except for those serving in the tropical jungles. The officers who trained our armies were largely citizen-soldiers. They did have the initial guidance of Regular officers, but only 2 percent of the entire officer corps was professional. Only slightly more were of the National Guard; 25 percent were products of the Officers' Reserve Corps, 12 percent more were men commissioned direct from civil life because of certain professional qualifications. The great majority of the officers came up from the ranks, 59 percent of the total, which guaranteed the democracy of the Army.

To those who consider the introduction of a system of universal military training an imposition on democracy, I would reply that in my opinion it would be the most democratic expression of our national life. Whatever my limitations may be in judging this matter, I submit the evidence of the proposal of our first President.

Washington's program provided for universal training of all men arriving at the age of 17. The citizen militia was to be divided into three classes, men from 17 to 21, known as the advance corps, men 21 to 46, known as the main corps, and men from 46 to 61, known as the reserve corps. All of the peacetime training would have been concentrated in the advance corps, but eventually all members of main and reserve corps would have been graduates of the training program. The militia bill was first introduced in the third session of the First Congress. It was considered in the House on March 5, 1792, and as finally enacted contained no element of any of Washington's recommendations. It was so emasculated when finally adopted that the representative who introduced the bill himself voted against its passage.

It appears probable that had the bill been approved by Congress, the United States might have avoided much of the war making that has filled its brief history. The impressment of American seamen would not have been regarded as a harmless pastime in the early 1800's, nor would the Kaiser have been so easily disposed to avenge the death of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand in 1914 with a world war, nor Adolph Hitler have been quite so quick to break the peace, if over these years the United States had been recognized by the warmongers as a Nation immediately to be reckoned with.

The peacetime army must not only be prepared for immediate mobilization of an effective war army, but it must have in reserve the weapons needed for the first months of the fighting and clear-cut plans for immediately producing the tremendous additional quantities of matériel necessary in total war. We must never again face a great national crisis with ammunition lacking to serve our guns, few guns to fire, and no decisive procedures for procuring vital arms in sufficient quantities.

The necessity for continuous research into the military ramifications of man's scientific advance is now clear to all and it should not be too difficult to obtain the necessary appropriations for this purpose during peacetime. There is, however, always much reluctance to expenditure of funds for improvement of war-making instruments, particularly where there is no peacetime usefulness in the product.

The development of combat airplanes is closely allied with development of civil aeronautics; the prototypes of many of our present transport planes, and those soon to come were originally bombers. Many of the aeronautical principles that helped give this Nation the greatest Air Force in the world grew out of commercial development and our production know-how at the start of this war was partially the fruit of peacetime commercial enterprise. Since many vital types of weapons have no commercial counterpart, the peacetime development of these weapons has been grossly neglected. Antiaircraft weapons are a good example. The highly efficient antiaircraft of today did not materialize until long after the fighting began. The consequent cost in time, life, and money of this failure to spend the necessary sums on such activity in peacetime has been appaling.

There is another phase of scientific research which I think has been somewhat ignored—the development of expeditious methods for the mass production of war matériel. This is of great importance since it determines how quickly we can mobilize our resources if war comes and how large and costly our reserve stocks of war matériel must be. Serious thought and planning along this line can save millions of tax dollars.

We can be certain that the next war, if there is one, will be even more total than this one. The nature of war is such that once it now begins it can end only as this one is ending, the destruction of the vanquished, and it should be assumed that another reconversion from peace to war production will take place initially under enemy distant bombardment. Industrial mobilization plans must be founded on these assumptions and so organized that they will meet them and any other situation that may develop. Yet they must in no way retard or inhibit the course of peacetime production.

If this Nation is to remain great it must bear in mind now and in the future that war is not the choice of those who wish passionately for peace. It is the choice of those who are willing to resort to violence for political advantage. We can fortify ourselves against disaster, I am convinced, by the measures I have here outlined. In these protections we can face the future with a reasonable hope for the best and with quiet assurance that even though the worst may come, we are prepared for it.

As President Washington said in his message to Congress of December 3, 1793:

"I cannot recommend to your notice measures for the fulfillment of our duties to the rest of the world, without again pressing upon you the necessity of placing ourselves in a position of complete defense and of exacting from them the fulfillment of the duties towards us. The United States ought not to indulge a persuasion, that contrary to the order of human efforts, they will forever keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms, with which the history of every other nation abounds. There is a rank due to the United States among nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness—if we desire to avoid insult we must be ready to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful institutions of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 1, 1945.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a second request?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I think I shall consult with the Committee on Printing and draw a resolution to be presented later.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business having been concluded, the calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRICE AND STATUS OF AMERICAN SILVER

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill which contains two separate provisions with respect to silver. The first section provides for the payment of the full monetary price of silver to the American miner, and the second of its provisions is intended to restore American commercial leadership in silver and to make that leadership as unquestioned as our monetary and industrial leadership is today. This I propose to do by repealing sections 6, 7, and 8 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934.

The text of my bill follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised," approved July 6, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The silver so received shall be coined into standard silver dollars or otherwise added to the monetary stocks of the United States as the President may determine; and there shall be delivered therefor in standard silver dollars or any other coin or coinage of the United States, the monetary value of the silver so delivered, less such deductions for brassage, coinage, and other mint charges as the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President shall have determined, not to exceed the actual cost thereof."

SEC. 2. The following statutes and portions of statutes are hereby repealed:

(a) Section 1805 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

(b) Sections 6, 7, and 8, and the second proviso in section 3, of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934.

Mr. President, the earliest recorded history of the use of silver as a medium of exchange was about the year 1870 B. C., and that of gold as early as 1100 B. C. From these early periods to 1300 A. D., there are many missing pages from the history of money, although the record that is available indicates a preference by all the world for silver over gold because of the necessity for the settlement of small but multitudinous transactions. In the years that followed, many attempts were made to establish bimetallism, with ratios of silver to gold ranging from 10 to 1 to 15 to 1.

In 1066, silver was the principal money of England and continued to be until the early part of the eighteenth century. The pound sterling contains 5,400 grains

of standard silver and weighs a pound. It is divided into 20 shillings and each shilling into 12 pence or "sterlings." The gold coin first appeared in England in 1257. It weighed 45 grains, or one one-hundred-and-twentieth of a pound, and was valued as equivalent to 20 "sterlings," giving a ratio of silver to gold of 10 to 1.

From the period of the Napoleonic wars, gold and silver served either concurrently or independently all of the functions of money throughout the world. Their price ratio varied, however, from 15, 15½, or 16 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold, in accordance with their production ratio and their supply and demand.

England realized the difficulties encountered in the nineteenth century, and in 1814 decided to peg the price of gold at £3, 17s and 9d per standard ounce, or $20.67 in United States money, and agreed to buy and sell gold at the same price. This unilateral action by England marked the beginning of the gold standard. Regardless of the varying production of gold resulting from the newly found gold fields of California, Australia, South Africa, Alaska, and Canada, the price of gold did not fluctuate more than a few cents per fine ounce from 1814 for more than 100 years, notwithstanding the fact that in the early part of the last century less than 400,000 ounces of gold were produced annually and 100 years later the annual world production of gold was more than 21,000,000 ounces. Throughout that entire period the supply of gold was adequate to serve the monetary needs of the world, but today there is not enough gold, even at the current price of $35 an ounce, to meet all the monetary requirements of the world.

From 1792 to 1834, the ratio of silver to gold in the United States was 15 to 1; and from 1834 to 1873, the ratio was 16 to 1, where it remained until Germany and England collaborated, after Germany's triumph in the Franco-Prussian war, in extending the single gold standard and allowing silver to drift around in the commodity markets at any price it would bring, regardless of the fact that silver was the sole standard of value in China, India, and other Near East and Far East countries, where it served exclusively as money more than half of the world's population.

This neglect of silver resulted in loss of prestige for the white metal, and led to exploitation of the silver-using countries, the adverse effects of which have been far-reaching. Since 1873, the market price of silver has fluctuated from 24½ cents to $1.375 an ounce, both of these extreme prices having been reached before China abandoned the silver standard in 1935 and prior to the passage of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934.

The Constitution of the United States, the organic law of our country, vests in Congress alone the power "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin." It also provides that "no State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

The first coinage act, approved on April 2, 1792, provided that 371¼ grains of pure silver constituted one dollar. Today, after a period of 153 years, the silver dollar of the United States still contains 371¼ grains of pure silver, or 412½ grains of silver nine-tenths fine. One dollar's worth of silver in the monetary system of the United States has always been measured in units of 371¼ grains of pure silver. That is the monetary value of silver today—approximately seventy-seven one hundredths of a fine ounce being a dollar's worth of silver. Therefore, a whole ounce of silver is and has been, ever since the inception of our Government, worth $1.29 as money of the United States.

For the past 72 years, with the exception of a few months following World War I, the miners of America have not received the full value for their silver. During a part of 1932 and 1933 they received only 24½ cents per fine ounce. Today they receive only 71.11 cents per fine ounce, or 55 percent of the monetary value of silver. The Government makes a profit of 45 percent on every ounce of silver delivered to the mint by the American miner, and has been making this unreasonable profit since July 1, 1939.

My bill is designed to correct this injustice. It will not give to the miner a bonus; it will only give him the monetary value of silver which has been on the statute books of our Government since 1792.

Following the First World War the peoples of many countries demanded silver coinage to replace some of the enormous quantities of paper money in circulation, much of which was worthless, in order to arrest the attendant inflation, and to restore confidence in their monetary systems. The unfortunate practice of melting down silver coins in order to reduce their fineness was initiated by Great Britain in 1920. It spread rapidly to other countries, including India, and the silver extracted from those coins was sold, even auctioned, in the open bullion markets of the world with the deliberate purpose of breaking the market price, and thereby reducing the buying power abroad of the countries then on the silver standard.

The gold standard was suspended by England at the beginning of World War I, but was restored for a few years between World Wars I and II. It was abandoned entirely by England in 1931 after a complete break-down. Every other country in the world, including the United States, also abandoned the gold standard following this action taken by England. Today no country is on either a gold or silver standard. In fact, today there is no monetary standard.

The United States possesses more than half of the world's monetary gold and silver, and is the only country in a position to play a leading role in aiding in the reestablishment of monetary systems and in the rehabilitation and coinage of both gold and silver for monetary use. I can conceive of no greater service that can be rendered this stricken world today than to restore both gold and silver, each readily interchangeable with the other at a fixed ratio, to their former place as money throughout the world, so as to give intrinsic value and confidence to the moneys of the teeming millions of peoples everywhere, and thereby enable their countries to recover more promptly from the greatest economic and political shock in all history.

Section 6 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to investigate, regulate, or prohibit the acquisition, importation, exportation, or transportation of silver.

Section 7 authorizes the President to nationalize "any or all silver by whomsoever owned or possessed," in 1934.

Section 8 imposes a tax of 50 percent on all profits arising from private transactions in silver, the remaining 50 percent of such profits being, of course, subject to all other income and corporation taxes. This section contains two provisos for abatement or refund of the special tax of 50 percent, provisos, however, which no longer serve—if indeed they ever served—their original purposes.

These three sections were inserted in the act in order to vest in the Government of the United States the most complete freedom of action in connection with the substantial acquisitions of silver which the Government was about to undertake in 1934 at home and abroad.

During the course of these acquisitions section 6 may have served some useful purpose. It serves none today.

The nationalization of silver which took place on August 9, 1934, accomplished the intent of section 7.

It was estimated by a former Secretary of the Treasury that section 8 might possibly produce $25,000,000 of tax revenue. Instead, it has produced a total of only $3,300,000 in 11 years. Of this sum $3,000,000 was produced in the first 6 years and only $300,000 in the past 5 years. Only $25,000 was produced last year, probably less than the cost of administering it.

Section 8, however, which constituted an overzealous effort to protect the national interest, is primarily the section which destroyed the American commercial market in silver. This market was laboriously built up in the two decades following World War I to a point where it transacted a volume of commercial business equal to that of London. Unfortunately the destruction of this American market restored to London the commercial supremacy in silver which London had previously lost to us.

It is difficult to estimate the annual volume of business which this market would transact under present conditions. Judging from the experience of similar commercial markets, however, it might amount to from 300,000,000 to 400,000,000 ounces annually.

The advantages that will accrue to the many companies—producers, refineries, distributors, bankers, and manufacturers—are substantial. Of paramount importance, is the enhancement which the restoration of this commercial market will lend to our present unchallengeable position in silver, firmly securing not only our rightful monetary and industrial position, but our commercial preeminence in silver as well.

Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to come to the defense of silver as sound money in the monetary system of the United States. A full defense has been written into the organic law of this Government, but more than that, Mr.

President, the peoples of the civilized world in every country, and in every clime, and in every status, are now clamoring for silver as the soundest money of which humanity, in dealing with humanity, has any knowledge. Everywhere the soundness of paper currency is being looked upon askance, is being questioned, is being interrogated. Nowhere, in all the world, is the soundness of silver money at all in question. It may take a bale of paper to buy a loaf of bread in many of the countries of the world, but a piece of silver the size of your little fingernail will attain the sustenance of life. Hence, I do not, today, come to the defense of silver. Those of us who are advocating its remonetization by the Government of the United States are no longer called upon to defend our position. Today silver is on the offensive, and its offensive is backed by the peoples everywhere on the face of the earth. Let America be first in this great peace movement for restoring sound money under a silver standard, as she has been first in the great movement for freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks statement 19 of letter No. 1413, of September 29, 1945, distributed by Whaley-Eaton Service, of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Silver: World currency difficulties may result in the remonetization of silver. It would not necessarily be linked with gold, but established as an independent currency base in such countries as China and India. Inflation of paper currencies in the Far East has reached such fantastic levels that only a metallic currency could achieve stability. Introduction of silver coins would, of course, necessitate elimination of existing paper. Otherwise, the silver would merely be hoarded. Substantially higher prices would be necessary, however, to attract large-scale new production. While silver is now valued by the United States for monetary purposes at $1.29, the Treasury's buying price for both domestic and foreign production is only 71 cents an ounce.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Silver Demand Runs Ahead of Available Supply," published in the Wall Street Journal of October 10, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILVER DEMAND RUNS AHEAD OF AVAILABLE SUPPLY—SO USERS MUST DRAW ON FREE TREASURY METAL SALABLE UNDER GREEN ACT—BUT IT EXPIRES AT YEAR END

Demand for silver from the arts and industry continues to run well ahead of available foreign and domestic mine supply, and it has now reached the point where it is necessary to tap again the large unsold portion of free Treasury silver that is made available under the Green Act. This act expires at the end of this year.

Because of this lack of supply and in order to bring the price of foreign silver more nearly in line with domestic and Treasury silver, Handy & Harman, leading bullion dealer and silver processor, yesterday advanced its official price one-eighth cent an ounce to 70¾ cents an ounce for silver in ore. This is equivalent to about 71 cents an ounce for the silver recovered and approximates the prices for Treasury and newly mined domestic silver in commercial bar weight form.

Current estimates in the trade indicate that the war-born pent-up demand for silver is running at a rate af about 125,000,000 ounces annually, while available supply from newly mined domestic and foreign sources is figured at an annual rate of less than 100,000,000 ounces.

When the Office of Price Administration several weeks ago raised the price on imported silver 26 cents, to 71.111 cents a fine ounce, the supply of foreign silver showed a fair-sized bulge. Subsequently this moderately increased supply has dwindled, and it is the opinion of silver authorities that recourse now will have to be made to the Treasury for additional silver to supply processors who make silver into semifinished forms for the arts and industry.

The supply of Treasury silver is estimated at about 250,000,000 ounces. But there remain only 2½ months in which it can be obtained before the Green Act expires.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Higher Costs Will Offset Silver Rise—Mexico May Sell Metal to United States," from the London Financial Times of September 25, 1945, and an article entitled "Sharp Rise in Silver."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER COSTS WILL OFFSET SILVER RISE—MEXICO MAY SELL METAL TO UNITED STATES—BIDS BY SOUTH AMERICA, INDIA, CHINA

BOSTON, September 25.—Although the advance in the United States buying price of foreign silver, quickly reflected in approximately parallel advances in the New York and London market prices, will benefit foreign producers, those conversant with silver affairs believe that certain factors are likely to neutralize much of this gain.

In Mexico, especially, operating costs will rise along with the price. Rates for electric power in some localities of the country are geared directly to the price of silver. As a general rule, wages follow changes in quotations for the metal, particularly when the movement is upward.

Furthermore, the Mexican Government is likely to withdraw the subsidy it granted to many gold and silver producers. Because mining costs had risen so materially, threatening to close down the number of mines, Mexico at the end of 1944 granted an indirect subsidy through a reduction in the production tax. This rebate may now be ended.

When the probable increases in power rates, wages, taxes, and other elements are added, it may be found that 70 or 80 percent of the benefits of the higher silver prices have been lost.

BANK RETICENT

Reports from Mexico City state that the Bank of Mexico is remaining silent on possibilities of renewing shipments of silver to the United States. However, silver circles there feel that the bank will soon accept the attractive American price of 71.111 cents per fine ounce and again start deliveries at the rate of about 1,500,000 fine ounces monthly.

Meanwhile, it is reported that Mexican banking authorities have received tentative offers for silver from Argentina and other South American countries, together with requests from Cuba, China, and India. These nations are understood to have been seeking surplus Mexican silver which is not needed for coinage and for industrial and merchandising purposes.

Nevertheless, it is believed that the Bank of Mexico will very likely prefer to accept the United States offers for silver in view of the gentlemen's agreements that have existed between the Governments of Mexico and the United States, whereby the former furnished the metal to America from its surplus.

DATE OF RESHIPMENTS

Mexico has been shipping only a relatively small portion of its silver production to the United States since February-March, 1944. While it is expected that shipments will be renewed soon, none in authority in Mexico is willing to commit himself as to when they will start.

One result of the increased price for foreign silver is the requests for price relief from large users of silver. Major users of silver were canvassed by Office of Price Administration representatives before the foreign price was raised to the 71.111 cents established for the domestic product.

A spokesman of the OPA explained that during the war the foreign metal was allocated only for essential uses, and manufacturers of many products were forced to use the higher-priced domestic silver. Hence the raising of the former's price to that of domestic will affect only a few manufacturers. Among these is the photographic industry, whose war business was based on a 45-cent price for silver.

SHARP RISE IN SILVER

The London silver price was raised from 25½d. to 44d. per ounce today by way of adjustment to bring it into line with the advance in the ceiling buying price in the United States. Bombay silver quotations were a shade lower after their sharp increase of the previous few days.

* * * * *

Spot silver in Bombay receded 4 annas to Rs. 132 annas 8 per 100 tolas, while forward was 2 annas off at Rs. 132 annas 8 also. Gold, however, rose 5 annas to Rs. 77 annas 10 per tola, while sovereigns were 12 annas dearer at Rs. 53 annas 8 apiece.

In London gold was fixed at 172s. 3d. per fine ounce. Alexandria gold was unaltered at 189 piastres per dirhem. The Argentine special account rate for settlement of peso debts was unaltered at 16.16 pesos to the pound.

Mr. McCARRAN. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point several articles headed respectively "The course of silver," "Silver price raised," and "Bombay bullion strong," all pertaining to the present condition throughout the world with respect to silver. The articles were published in the London Financial Times of September 25, 1945.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COURSE OF SILVER

Primarily, the raising of the London price for silver to 44 pence per ounce fine yesterday represents only an adaptation to United States action at the week end in moving up its own ceiling for foreign-produced silver to 71.1 cents. Allowing for shipping charges, the action of the authorities on this side puts the two countries on virtually the same plane. Entailing as it does a rise of 18½ pence here, the change is marked as well as abrupt, but without it London obviously would stand no chance at all of replenishing its supplies. The new levels can have no pretensions to being regarded as effective world prices, any more than those of 70 pence and 60 pence which have been reached in Egypt and India respectively. Those markets have been segre-

gated, while London and New York have been closely controlled, in order that supplies of the metal should not be diverted from essential war purposes nor run up to exorbitant prices.

The probable future course is by no means clear. It may be recalled that after the war of 1914–18, the price reached 89½ pence per ounce standard, as the form of quotation then was, equal to about 96⅔ pence per ounce fine, or more than double the quotation now current. Within a year there had been a drop to 36¼ pence per ounce standard, and it is much to be hoped that no such disturbing fluctuations will be permitted to occur this time. In this connection, it may be noted that a commission of the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference recommended that the question of the problems arising for some nations as a result of such fluctuations should be further studied, and this received the support of the United States Treasury. The status of silver is, indeed, a perennial problem for the United States, where an energetic and powerful political bloc repeatedly presses the case for producers of the metal within the country, and, as part of the plan, urges the remonetization of silver. The existence until now of differential prices for domestic and foreign silver in the United States is itself proof of the effectiveness of the silver-producers' campaign. This is further attested by the vast stocks of the metal held in that country, only the fringe of which has been touched by releases during the shortages of the war period.

Those releases impinge on another factor in the outlook for the metal. The United States exported over 400,000,000 ounces of the metal to various countries under the lease-lend arrangement. Some part of it came to Britain, and presumably it will have to be returned in kind eventually. The need for the requisite purchases, coupled with a recrudescence of commercial requirements which may be expected, will maintain a demand for the metal for some time to come. Its extent, and consequent reactions on prices, is impossible to gauge at this stage, irrespective of whether relaxation of controls gives free play to the law of supply and demand. As in the cases of other commodities, substitutes have had to be employed during the war for various purposes. How far this element will favor the contention of those who urge that silver should be a low-priced commercial metal, against the cause of those who would have it raised to the United States maximum of $1.29 per ounce is another unknown quantity.

MONEY-MARKET NOTES—SILVER PRICE RAISED—FOLLOWING UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The answer to one of the questions posed before the week end—namely, what would happen to the British-controlled price following the raising of the American quotation for foreign silver—has been quickly forthcoming. As indicated elsewhere, the London quotation was itself increased yesterday from its former level of 25½ pence to 44 pence per ounce.

This may cause surprise in some quarters in which it had been thought that, as the British market is completely insulated, no alteration in the price here would be actually necessary—at least immediately. The fact remains that this country has to purchase silver. Consequently, it could hardly be expected that producers would continue to sell to us with the United States prepared to pay a price several pence higher.

As for the Bombay market, there was no further advance yesterday; indeed, the spot quotation was a trifle lower but it has to be remembered that (a) the price rose there sharply on Saturday; (b) it had previously had a very sharp recovery after a period of extreme nervousness; and (c) it is already much above even the newly fixed New York price. The Bombay price gives a sterling equivalent of rather more than 60 pence per ounce, while the Egyptian price is even higher at somewhere around 70 pence per ounce.

It is the isolation of the silver markets of the world as a result of the war which has caused these widely divergent prices in different centers. If arbitrage operations had been posible and, of course, shipping available, such differences between the principal world markets would have been quickly adjusted.

The new London price—which, incidentally, is a buying price although the authorities do supply the trade for special purchases at that price—is slightly above the straight London-New York parity, which is a little over 42 pence per ounce, but the authorities have obviously made allowance for shipping and other charges and, probably, added a little more. It is, of course, impossible either to import or export silver without the necessary permits being obtained from the Government.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA SETS THE PACE

Recent events justify the contention always made in London that the world market for silver would continue to be dominated by American politics. During the 1931 slump in commodity prices, silver dropped to levels which threatened to make it only a "base" metal. American politics alone saved it from this fate.

Years of silver purchases and price manipulations have failed to find the objectives of the United States silver bloc attained—namely, the buying of silver until such time as the monetary stocks of the United States Treasury equalled in value one-third of its gold stocks, or, alternatively, until the price had been raised to $1.29 per fine ounce.

The small but at the same time vociferous and powerful United States silver bloc may well urge another uplift in the domestic silver.

MONEY AND EXCHANGES—BOMBAY BULLION STRONG

In sympathy with the rise in London silver prices, Bombay quotations were advanced sharply today. Ready silver rose Rs.3 annas 10 and forward Rs.3 annas 8 to Rs.136 annas 2 per 100 tolas in each case. Gold was Rs.1 annas 11 higher at Rs. 79 annas 5 per tola and sovereigns were 8 annas dearer at Rs.54 each. The London price of silver was again fixed at 44 pence per ounce and business was on a small scale with trade requirements satisfied from official sources. Gold was fixed at 172 shillings 3 pence per fine ounce. The Alexandria gold quotation was raised to 190 piastres per dirhem. No change was made in the Argentine special account rate for settlement of peso debts from the previous level of 16.16 pesos to the pound.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the London Financial Times of Friday, September 28, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD articles under the following captions: "Bank's silver," having to do with the Bank of England; and "Mexico pleased with silver rise."

All these articles are pertinent to my remarks and pertinent to the bill which I now introduce.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

BANK'S SILVER

Of some interest in view of the recent excitement in silver is the further decline in the gold and silver in the banking department. The fall is nearly £51,000 and the total of the item at only £224,292 must be an all-time low. Less than a year ago, on November 8, to be exact, this item stood at its highest level in recent years, at £2,324,352. It is understood that this item has for years consisted only of silver coin, the Bank of England acting as a channel through which the coin is received from the mint and passed on to the clearing and other banks.

Thus, the holding of coin is affected by the demands of the public on the banks on the one hand and on mint supplies on the other. Demands for silver in recent months have been known to be heavier, partly due to service requirements and partly to shortage among the ordinary public. The total of all coin issued in the latest statistical bulletin of the Bank of England was at the record figure of £127,000,000.

MEXICO PLEASED WITH SILVER RISE—GOVERNMENT NOTE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON, September 27.—The Mexican Chargé d'Affaires, Señor Rafael De La Colina, has presented a note to the Acting United States Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, expressing satisfaction at the United States action in raising the ceiling price of foreign silver (to 71.111 cents per fine ounce).

"We hope that it is a happy augury of increasing trade relationship between the United States and Mexico," Señor De La Colina told correspondents.

Questioned as to whether he would suggest a similar increase in the price of coffee, he answered that the subject had not been raised, but "generally, an increase in prices of goods we produce for which the ceiling price is considered low will tend to increase the purchasing power of producing countries."

Ready silver in Bombay was 6 annas up at Rs. 136 annas 10 per 100 tolas, as was forward delivery at the same price. Gold was 2 annas off at Rs. 77 annas, 8 per tola, and sovereigns cheapened Rs. 1 annas 8 to Rs. 52 annas 8 apiece. A small to moderate business in silver was reported in London and the price held at 44d. Gold was fixed at 172s. 3d. per fine ounce. The Alexandria gold quotation was unaltered at 190 piastres per dirhem and silver was called 920 piastres per kilogram. The Argentine special account rate for settlement of peso debts remained at 16.16 pesos to the pound. American account sterling in New York was called $4.02½ to $4.02⅝, and 3 months forward at $3.98 bid with no offers.

The bill (S. 1486) to repeal provisions of the Internal Revenue Code imposing a tax upon transfers of any interest in silver bullion; to remove certain limitations on the use of silver; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICAN NATIONALS IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, on Thursday last I read into the RECORD some correspondence with the State Department with reference to the attitude of the British Government concerning facilities of our nationals in the British Empire and the restrictions which have been placed upon our nationals with reference to the rehabilitation of such facilities as have been destroyed during the war. I made no point whatever and expressed no sentiment with reference to the trade restrictions. I merely said, in substance, that under the ruling made by the British Government our nationals are prevented from shipping in from our own country supplies for rehabilitation purposes and are required to

buy such supplies in the sterling bloc area of the British Empire.

I also stated, as disclosed by the State Department, that such supplies were unobtainable in the British Empire. I made no reference whatever to reluctance on the part of our nationals to buy in the British Empire if the supplies were obtainable, nor did I make any reference to exchange.

A Washington newspaper commenting on my statement undertakes to belittle it by imputing to me a narrow attitude with reference to trade restrictions with Great Britain, suggests that there was some breast beating on Thursday about the imperialistic trade policies of the British Empire, and especially deplores the fact that other Senators, especially the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had abetted in the so-called breast beating with reference to this question.

Mr. President, I had no intention whatever—and there is nothing in the statement I made from which such an implication could be gathered—of indicating that I am not in full sympathy with international trade and trade with the British Empire.

On last Thursday the Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Harold Ickes, when questioned by representatives of the press with respect to the action of the British Government in denying American oil companies the right to use material and equipment within the United Kingdom not procured from sterling sources, denied all knowledge of such fact; and when told that I had stated the action of the British Government to be a fact, his answer was that he would like to be furnished with a better authority than that.

Very well, Mr. President; it is indeed a pleasure to accommodate Mr. Ickes. In this connection I should like to read for the RECORD, and for the information of Mr. Ickes, a letter from Mr. C. Victor Barry, United States State Department petroleum attaché in London, addressed to Mr. Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War, which was in response to official request of the Petroleum Administration for War that the matter be taken up by our State Department representatives in London with the responsible British agencies. The letter is as follows:

The letter from the United States State Department petroleum attaché in London to Mr. Davies, and Mr. Ickes, is as follows:

OCTOBER 2, 1945.

Memorandum.

To: Mr. Ralph K. Davies.

From: Mr. C. Victor Barry, United States State Department petroleum attaché, London:

The papers you gave me for Mr. Snodgrass are returned herewith.

The subject matter of these papers was discussed fully by Snodgrass (PAW's London representative) and myself yesterday afternoon with Fred Starling and his financial advisers of the Ministry of Fuel and Power. The British view, which, it was emphatically stated, has the full endorsement of the British Treasury and, in fact, of the entire British Government, is to the effect that all equipment for petroleum and other industries destined for what they consider to be sterling areas, must be purchased in and supplied from those areas during this period of extreme dollar stringency. The fact that Standard Vacuum has offered to supply the material under reference for the Federated Malay States from the United States of America and has relinquished all claims for dollar exchange even including depreciation, does not, in the British view, alter their position in any way. They firmly maintained that this would still constitute an eventual dollar obligation and, as such, must be refused. They further stated that ,material which, in the sterling area, they considered to be essential, will in its procurement receive full support from the Ministry of Fuel and Power to expedite delivery.

Mr. President, according to further information I have from authentic sources the time within which any supplies may be procured is entirely indefinite, and some of the supplies needed are not even manufactured in the British Empire, as I am authentically advised, which means, Mr. President, that our nationals whose facilities have been destroyed or injured or damaged cannot proceed to rehabilitate them, and so the business in which they have been engaged in the British Empire is shut down while the British facilities are being rehabilitated by supplies bought in this country, which is the only country in which such supplies are available:

Material for all petroleum and other industries throughout the sterling area will be programed in London by the British Government, and this applies to British, American and any other interests involved. Requests for programing and for material should be placed, not through the office of the British petroleum representative in Washington, which will shortly be liquidated, but should be presented in London by the company's representative direct to the appropriate British Ministry.

We pointed out as strongly as possible—

This is a letter to Mr. Davies and Mr. Ickes of which he has denied any knowledge whatever—

We pointed out as strongly as possible that a continuation of any such policy could only lead to uttter chaos, and although they agreed fully with that statement, they felt that during this interim period and until some permanent solution was found—

What, Mr. President, do you suppose is the permanent solution to be found? The permanent solution, no doubt, could be nothing more than the making of a loan to Great Britain, such as is now being negotiated by the State Department—

they felt that during this interim period and until some permanent solution was found, they had no other alternative. They confidently believed that a solution would be found—

The solution, of course, of our furnishing the money—

and must be found, but even after this admission they were unwilling to permit any company to take the risk of supplying dollar materials for which the British Government, at this moment, could not see their way eventually to pay.

If there is any lack of information on the part of Mr. Ickes, who declined to admit that he knew anything about this situation, it certainly is stated by the State Department in the correspondence I had with them that we are doing everything in our power to correct this situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that it is not my intention, in the comments I shall now make on the subject to which the Senator is addressing himself, to reply to any press story, because I am always willing to let my record speak for itself.

However, I have been amused at the reaction which any criticism of British trade policies seems to arouse in some quarters in this country. It happens to be a view of mine that those who wish to develop stable trade relations throughout the world do not serve their purpose well when they take the attitude that no one should even venture the suggestion that some of the trade practices of Great Britain are not conducive to peaceful trade relations throughout the world.

I want the RECORD to show that I think that my votes in the Senate, including my votes for Bretton Woods and the reciprocal-trade policy as well as the ardent support of aid to Great Britain long before we entered the war, clearly demonstrate my friendliness to Great Britain. However, I am of the very firm conviction that we are not going to avoid economic warfare throughout the world, with resulting military warfare, unless Great Britain and the United States and other peace-loving nations of the earth reach mutual agreements as to what concessions each should make in the interest of economic as well as diplomatic cooperation.

I insist that when we are in the midst of negotiating, through our State Department, a $5,000,000,000 loan to Great Britain, it becomes the public obligation of every Member of the Senate to make perfectly clear to the State Department and to Great Britain that before we use American tax dollars for such a loan we desire to reach more amicable relations with England insofar as British trade preferentials and sterling area trade policies are concerned. As a friend of Great Britain, I say that it is in her best international interest to see to it that her trade policies are put on top of the table for the inspection and the judgment of the Senate before we agree to make her any such loan as $5,000,000,000. It is one thing to give Great Britain unsparingly of our resources to help defeat a common military enemy but it is quite a different thing to loan or give to her for a token the funds with which to carry on economic war against us. I am ready for this country to make real earnest money concessions to Great Britain and other nations in the United Nations organization in the interest of world economic stability. I recognize that Great Britain's economic rehabilitation is vital to a stable economic world but she must be willing to give up her sterling area policy of trade isolationism and her preferential barriers.

Hence, Mr. President, in the debate which is on its way—and it is perfectly clear, I think, that a debate is on its way so far as the international loans of this country, to be approved by the United States Senate, are concerned—it is going to be the position of the junior Sena-

tor from Oregon that there is an obligation resting on Great Britain, as well as on the United States, to see to it that this thing called international trade cooperation works both ways. I do not intend to cast votes in the Senate which sell American industry and American international trade short.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I may say that I am in full accord with the views he has expressed with reference to international trade.

I am fully cognizant of the necessity of our having trade with the British Empire. I merely made reference to the muddle-headed editorial in the Washington Post as having just missed the point entirely, displaying complete ignorance of the position which had been stated, or being deceptive in an attempt to belittle statements made on the Senate floor. With reference to the statement I made, I did refer, I am sure, to the recent treaty we have negotiated with Great Britain, which will presently come before the Senate for ratification, having to do with our handling of the oil industry throughout the world. I said the practice to which I referred was a violation of the proposed treaty which the Senate will be called upon to ratify.

Mr. Ickes said he knew nothing about it, and that as a matter of fact he had to have some additional and better authority than what I had submitted. So I have tried to give it to him.

The attitude of Mr. Ickes poses the question whether he was falsifying to cover up the facts or was merely guilty of ignorance of what was going on in his own department. At any rate, in either case Mr. Ickes' truthfulness and information are demonstrated to be about as accurate as usual.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing a nomination, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received or withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John F. Sonnett, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Francis M. Shea, resigned.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harvey Jones Gunderson to be a member of the Board of Directors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 15, 1945:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Frank D. Norton for appointment as an administrative officer, District of Columbia headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of administrative officer, District of Columbia headquarters, Selective Service System, will be at the rate of $5,600 per annum.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Maj. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Assistant to the Chief of Engineers, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Brig. Gen. John Jennings Kingman. (This appointment will not vacate his earlier appointment as major general in the Army of the United States.)

IN THE NAVY

Admiral Frederick J. Horne, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of December 1944.

Admiral Richard S. Edwards, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of April 1945.

Vice Adm. William S. Farber, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of April 1945.

Civil Engineer Ben Moreell to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of vice admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of February 1944.

Pay Director Robert F. Batchelder to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Director of the Navy Material Redistribution and Disposal Administration and until reporting for other permanent duty.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 15, 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 1, SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE, AND CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Leland B. Morris
Willys R. Peck

TO BE CONSUL GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Harold D. Finley

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Parker T. Hart	Walter Smith
Robert J. Cavanaugh	Philip P. Williams
William H. Christensen	Roswell C. Beverstock
Perry Ellis	Easton T. Kelsey
Charles S. Millet	John Ordway

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Herbert D. Brewster	Weldon Litsey
Maurice J. Broderick	LeRoy Makepeace
James M. Byrne	Miss Betty Ann
Francis H. Columbat	Middleton
Robert F. Corrigan	Cabot Sedgwick
Russell H. Fifield	Herbert D. Spivak
John F. Fitzgerald	Norman C. Stines, Jr.
John C. Hawley	Edward L. Waggoner
Thomas E. Hoffman	

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Harvey Jones Gunderson to be a member of the Board of Directors for the unexpired term of 2 years from January 22, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Gertrude A. Holloway, Falco.
William L. Stephens, Kinston.

GEORGIA

Frank R. Roundtree, Egypt.
Nina E. Story, Ellabell.
J. Elton Braddy, Tarrytown.

IDAHO

Parley B. Rees, Inkom.
Lena Butt, Teton.
Andrew C. Miner, Tetonia.
Allen D. Marler, Thornton.
Mary Ritchie, Ucon.

LOUISIANA

William S. Lewis, De Ridder.
Belva C. Dyess, Folsom.
Lucy Van der Linden, New Sarpy.
Grace A. Rownd, Springfield.

MONTANA

Ella Gray, Ashland.
Helen M. Cyr, Milltown.

NEW MEXICO

Ray U. Johnston, Dulce.

NORTH CAROLINA

Sallie O. Tarkington, Camden.
Mae Barber, Maury.
Laura Church, Purlear.

OKLAHOMA

Alfred Connelly, Achille.
Oda L. Benn, Dougherty.
Velma B. McKinzie, Elmer.
Frances Ausmus, Garvin.
William A. Sweeney, Hendrix.
Kennie W. Gassaway, Monroe.
William T. Dunsworth, Thackerville.

OREGON

John W. Knott, Coburg.
Alice W. Porter, Long Creek.
Walter E. Hickok, Terrebonne.
Florence N. Pearson, Timber.
Laura Thompson, Tualatin.

VIRGINIA

Doris B. Reames, Ford.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate October 15, 1945:

POSTMASTER

NEW YORK

William H. Smith to be postmaster at Swormville in the State of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Robert E. Sherrill, pastor of Washington Heights Presbyterian Church, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, we do pause to acknowledge Thee as creator and ruler of the ends of the earth. Thy majesty is in the heavens and Thy glory does cover the world. We thank Thee for the privilege of drawing near unto Thee and claiming Thee as our Father and our God.

Forgive us for the things that have separated us from Thee—our haste with the affairs of the world, our blindness to lasting values, our indifference to those in need, our supreme interest in self, our ignorance of our own folly, our stupidity in failing to profit by the past, our lack of zeal for things that matter most. Hear us and bring us back into Thy way.

Almighty Father, give us the wisdom and courage to put our faith into practice. Teach us to respect and honor one another, that we may meet our common problems without contention and strife. Build up our Nation into a force for righteousness, that we may not lose the last chance that is before us. Let Thy wisdom and Thy benediction rest upon those who guide the affairs of government in our land, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 11, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution permitting alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirup simultaneously with the production of alcohol until July 1, 1946.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Gastonia Gazette of October 13, 1945.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an article from the Brooklyn Eagle of October 14 entitled "Team Play Won Brooklyn Its Veterans' Hospital," and in the other to include a set of resolutions of the Clan-Na-Gael of New York and Bronx Counties.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BUNKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Geary Post-Tribune.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include short editorials.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on three separate subjects and include in each editorials or newspaper articles.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on two subjects, one on the subject of the Communications Act of 1934, and in the other to extend an address by Thomas E. Lyons, executive secretary of the Foreign Trade Zones Board, Department of Commerce, on the subject of port efficiency—key to increased foreign trade.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a magazine article and in the other to include a report of four Members of Congress who visited two Army separation centers.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very splendid article on the atomic bomb written by Dr. E. M. Langer, research associate of physics of the California Institute of Technology, which appeared in Collier's Weekly for September 29, 1945.

This is a rather lengthy article and exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing. The Printing Office advised me it will cost $156 to print. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, October 7, by Dr. George S. Townes, director of the division of the foundation of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, on the question of conditions in Russia.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow, Tuesday, after the legislative business of the day and other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

A BLOW TO COMMUNISM

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ROONEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each extension of remarks newspaper items.

IN HONOR OF PFC PAUL E. DAVIS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House of 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

IF TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE WHY NOT SAVE IT?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BENNETT of Missouri addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BRINGING OUR SOLDIERS AND SAILORS FROM OVERSEAS BACK HOME

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extracts from a letter and newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article by Gordon Duke, of Southeastern Oil and Affiliates, Jacksonville, Fla. This is an article well worth while and should be read by all the people.

I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an advertisement appearing in the Washington Star of October 6, entitled "Who's Right and Who's Wrong?" This article is also well worth while to determine who was right and who was wrong.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE MEDITERRANEAN AND LOWER ITALIAN PENINSULA CAMPAIGNS

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, It has always been my opinion that the spearhead Mediterranean and the succeeding lower Italian peninsula campaigns definitely informed Germany as well as our own country that it was only a question of time as to when Hitler would be defeated.

Gen. Mark Clark was a leading figure in these areas. No campaign was ever conducted under greater difficulties than the Italian.

From the time he carried on the well-known exploit in contacting the French authorities in north Africa until his troops marched through Brenner Pass in their victory pursuit of the enemy, he gave constant proof of great leadership.

His quiet but firm manner combined with military genius commanded the obedience and devotion of his officers and men and instilled fear in the enemy.

I believe it appropriate because of his visit to Washington Saturday to recall the outstanding services of General Clark in bringing final victory to the allies in Europe. It is also an opportunity to encourage him in the splendid work he is now doing in the American occupied sector of Austria.

HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection,

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday Wilson College, in my district, celebrated its seventy-fifth anniversary on the campus. It was my privilege, with several thousand others, to sit at the feet of one of our elder statesmen, America's greatest living citizen, Herbert Hoover.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech delivered on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DRAFT BOARD

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, to all those who are so anxious to keep our men overseas policing and rebuilding other lands, the following letter may be of interest. This is not from a drafted or enlisted man. This is from a member of a draft board who writes:

DEAR SIR: As you may know, I have been an active member of Barry County local selective service board, since selective service started 5 years ago, and now that the war is over I wonder what action Congress is going to take to see that all such members get dismissed from their jobs and no longer required to keep drafting young men.

I am not unmindful of the fact that we can resign, but after such a long period of service one just doesn't like to do that until the job is completed or without some good reasons.

As an example of what I mean, our call for October was for 30 men, which is almost as high as it was during conflict. We no longer have men available except the new registrants, those just now attaining 18 years of age, and a few farmers within the 18- to 26-year group. Many of our men, 18-year-olds, are in school and by the act are entitled now to complete their education.

It will be interesting to learn what Congress proposes toward the continuation of selective service, but, so far as I am concerned, 5 years with thousands of hours of gratuitous time is a long hard grind, and I await with patience the time when I am fired from this job.

Yours truly,

STUART CLEMENT.

The writer has served long, and now he is on the draft board and when we fire him I imagine there will be a lot of mothers around the country who will be perfectly glad to have him out, and the conscription law repealed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Thursday Study Club, of La Crosse, Wis., pledging support of H. R. 3939 for the eradication of cancer and polio.

SOCIALIST BRITAIN

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Socialist Government of England has published the bill to nationalize the Bank of England. The Government will issue debt obligations to pay for the bank shares amounting to $232,000,000. Bills to nationalize mines, factories, and so forth, in accordance with the Socialist program will no doubt follow in due course. This ought to cause the people of the United States who still believe in free enterprise and liberty to sit up and take notice and ask themselves whether they want to assume additional burdens of taxation to promote communism in England while they are already heavily laden with taxes to destroy our own freedom.

Any funds England may obtain through the negotiations that are now taking place would inevitably be used by the Government in control to carry out its nationalization program.

If England wants to destroy herself with communism, that is one thing. But I cannot see why we should help her to carry out that atavistic process.

UNRRA

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CARNAHAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we realize now that the point system for discharging men in the armed forces is a dismal failure.

Congress is going to have to act. Men are being held in uniform, in idleness, some of them almost in walking distance of their own homes, and denied the opportunity to go home and care for their loved ones, while the younger ones are being denied the opportunity to return to school.

I have introduced a bill to cure this situation. When the necessary time elapses I am going to file a petition for Members to sign to bring that measure before the House for final passage. Then it will be open for amendments.

But for the sake of common justice, let us get rid of this policy that is keeping our young men in the armed forces when they ought to be at home supporting their families, or denying to them the opportunity to return to their schools.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement prepared by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and himself.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TITLE 18 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, a rule has been granted on this bill; therefore, I object.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I object, Mr. Speaker.

COMPLIANCE WITH STATE INSPECTION LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3321) to provide that the several States shall continue effective measures of control and protection against the importation, introduction, and spread of noxious weeds, injurious insects, and animal and plant diseases, and to guarantee that purchasers or recipients of seeds, livestock and poultry feeds, nursery stocks, fertilizers, and other agricultural chemicals shall have the protection guaranteed them under the laws enacted by the several States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 6 OF THE DEFENSE HIGHWAY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2840) to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah rose.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill carries too much money for consideration on the Consent Calendar; therefore, I object.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KEEFE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask unanimous consent that the bill be stricken from the calendar. The bill has already passed the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean it passed the House over the objection of these three gentlemen who rose a moment ago?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; it passed with their consent.

The SPEAKER. This bill, H. R. 2840, has not passed the House. It has just been stricken from the calendar.

CHIEFS OF BUREAUS, NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after March 1, 1945, the rank of chief of bureau in the Navy Department, including the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, shall be vice admiral, and that of assistant to such chief of bureau shall be rear admiral.

SEC. 2. That upon the completion of 3 years or more of service by an officer of the Navy as such chief of bureau he may, at any time thereafter, without regard to total length of service, upon his own application, in the discretion of the President, be retired from active service and placed upon the retired list with the rank and retired pay of vice admiral: *Provided*, That if not retired during or at the expiration of his term of service as chief of bureau, such officer, after the expiration of such term of service, shall have the permanent rank of rear admiral, if of lower permanent rank, with the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half), and shall be carried as an additional number in the line or appropriate staff corps and senior to officers of the line or staff who became rear admirals during his service as chief of bureau.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "that", strike out the words "on and after March 1, 1945."

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "including the Judge Advocate General of the Navy."

In line 6, after the word "admiral", insert a colon and the words *"Provided*, That an officer designated as chief of bureau shall have completed at least 1 year of service as chief of bureau and be designated by the President for promotion to vice admiral before taking rank as such."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "service", strike out the words "by an officer of the Navy", and after the word "as" strike out the word "such."

In line 3, after the word "bureau", strike out the word "he" and insert the words "a vice admiral."

In line 7, after the word "vice", strike out the words "admiral: *Provided*, That if" and insert the word "admiral" and a period.

In line 8, insert the words "A vice admiral who is retired for physical disability during his term of service as chief of bureau shall be placed on the retired list with the rank and retired pay of vice admiral. If a chief of bureau is."

In line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. That the terms 'chief of bureau' and 'assistant to chief of bureau' as used in this act include the Judge Advocate General and the Assistant Judge Advocate General, respectively."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 320) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (57 Stat. 306).

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3772) to prevent a point system for the release of conscientious objectors performing assigned work under civilian direction pursuant to section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, from being put into effect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill involves a question of policy and should not be considered on the Consent Calendar and, therefore, I object.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Under the rule, the bill was stricken from the calendar.

CAMPAIGN TO ERADICATE MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY IN FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3760) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill also involves too much money to be considered on the Consent Calendar and, therefore, I object.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I object.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Under the rule, the bill was stricken from the calendar.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PROPERTY LOST IN NAVAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 559) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service," approved October 27, 1943, so as to make the provisions thereof effective with respect to losses occurring on or after October 31, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New York stated last week, the report on this bill does not comply with the Ramseyer rule. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF UNDER SECRETARY OF LABOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3864) to establish the office of Under Secretary of Labor, and three offices of Assistant Secretary of Labor, and to abolish the existing office of Assistant Secretary of Labor and the existing office of Second Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill also involves the question of policy and should not be considered on the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I object.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. ROCKWELL objected.

Under the rule, the bill was stricken from the calendar.

SYSTEM OF LAWS FOR SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS IN THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3759) to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed over at the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] previously. As he is not present, I ask unanimous consent that the bill now be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

RETIREMENT OF JUDGES OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF ALASKA, PUERTO RICO, VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND THE CANAL ZONE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 565) to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a committee amendment in the bill that would provide for a time at 8 years instead of the usual 10 years. That being the case, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

SAFEGUARDING MILITARY INFORMATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 805) to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEEFE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have that bill explained.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. I understand a rule has been granted on this bill. Therefore, I think it may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the bill.

REFEREES' SALARY BILL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4160) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, although this may be a good bill, it is a very long one and quite involved, and it is too much for the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I object.

COMPENSATION OF POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3709) to amend section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928, and section 3 of the act of March 29, 1944, affecting the compensation of postmasters.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 940; 39 U. S. C. 303), entitled "An act to amend title II of an act approved February 28, 1925 (43 Stat., p. 1066, U. S. C., title 39), regulating postal rates, and for other purposes," is amended by omitting the two provisos therein and substituting a period for the colon immediately preceding the first proviso.

SEC. 2. Section 3 of Public Law 271, approved March 29, 1944, entitled "An act to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof," is amended by omitting the second proviso therein and substituting a period for the colon immediately preceding such proviso.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect January 1, 1946.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR DEPARTMENT LAND IN THE CITY OF MENLO PARK, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2965) to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary under the laws of the State of California to provide for or permit the inclusion within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif., of the tract of land occupied by the Dibble General Hospital, if requested so to do by such city within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act. The inclusion of such tract within the corporate limits of such city shall not affect the exclusive jurisdiction over such land heretofore accepted by the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIMS OF POSTMASTERS FOR LOSS BY BURGLARY, FIRE, OR OTHER UNAVOIDABLE CASUALTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882 (22 Stat. 29), as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, sec. 49), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"The Postmaster General may investigate all claims of postmasters, Navy mail clerks, assistant Navy mail clerks, Coast Guard mail clerks, assistant Coast Guard mail clerks, Army mail clerks, and assistant Army mail clerks for the loss of any funds or valuable paper which they may have in their official custody, resulting from burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty, and for the loss occurring after April 1, 1924, by bank failure of any such funds deposited in National or State banks, and if he shall determine that such loss resulted from no fault or negligence on the part of such officers or employees, may pay to them or credit them with the amount so ascertained to have been lost or destroyed, and may also credit them with the amount of any remittance of such funds or valuable paper made by them in compliance with the instructions of the Postmaster General, which shall have been lost or stolen while in transit by mail to the office designated as a depository, or after arrival at such depository office and before the postmaster at such depository office has become responsible therefor, or to the postmaster at any other post office, and authorized shipments of postage and other stamp stock or valuable paper lost while in transit by mail from one such officer or employee to another such officer or employee, or to or from the Post Office Department, and such funds remitted after April 1, 1924, in compliance with instructions of the Postmaster General in the form of drafts or checks which have been returned unpaid or dishonored by reason of the closing of the banks issuing such drafts or checks: *Provided*, That in all cases of bank failure the postmaster shall first file with the receiver of the insolvent bank a claim for the full amount of the funds involved and assign such claim to the Postmaster General, who shall receive all dividends accruing in any such case. No claim exceeding the sum of $10,000 shall be paid or credited until after the facts shall have been ascertained by the Postmaster General, and an appropriation made therefor. All such claims must be presented within 6 months from the time the loss occurred: *Provided further*, That in the case of claims of Navy mail clerks, assistant Navy mail clerks, Coast Guard mail clerks, assistant Coast Guard mail clerks, Army mail clerks, assistant Army mail clerks, and postmasters outside the continental United States this limitation shall not apply to claims for losses occurring while the United States is at war: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act, as regards Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks, shall be applicable to claims which have arisen or may arise at any time subsequent to the act of August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks, and likewise shall, in the case of Coast Guard mail clerks and assistant Coast Guard mail clerks, be applicable to claims which have arisen or may arise at any time subsequent to the act of July 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 586), authorizing the designation of Coast Guard mail clerks and assistant Coast Guard mail clerks.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall not be applicable to claims for losses cognizable under the Government Losses in Shipment Act (act of July 8, 1937, 50 Stat. 479, as amended; 5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., sec. 134–134h), nor to claims for losses by Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks relating to stamps which were supplied to them by the War Department and not by the Post Office Department, nor to the funds received through the sale of such stamps, nor to claims for losses by Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks relating to stamps which were supplied to them by the Navy Department and not by the Post Office Department, nor to the funds received through the sale of such stamps."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY AND NATIONAL PARK COMMISSIONERS TO SERVE AS UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2465) to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 20, chapter 252, of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), be amended, to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. Except as provided in section 24 (ch. 252, 29 Stat. 186), as amended (28 U. S. C. 591), no marshal or deputy marshal, attorney or assistant attorney of any district, jury commissioner, clerk of marshal, no bailiff, crier, juror, janitor of any Government building, nor any civil or military authority of the Government, except as provided in section 19 (ch. 252, 29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 526), and no clerk or employee of any United States justice or judge shall have, hold, or exercise the duties of the United States commissioner. However, nothing herein shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner: *Provided, however*, That a national park commissioner for his services as a United States commissioner shall receive no fees or other compensation in addition to his salary as a national park commissioner. And it shall not be lawful to appoint any of the officers named in this section receiver, or receivers, in any case or cases brought in the courts of the United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT AT KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3281) to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix a term of the United States District Court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Oregon shall constitute one judicial district, to be known as the district of Oregon. Terms of the district court shall be held at Portland on the first Mondays in March, July, and November; at Pendleton on the first Tuesday in April; at Klamath Falls on the first Tuesday in June; and at Medford on the first Tuesday in October. The marshal and the clerk for said district shall each appoint, in the manner provided by law, at least one deputy at Pendleton, one at Klamath Falls, and one at Medford, who shall reside and maintain an office at each of said places.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "one at Klamath Falls."

Page 2, line 4, after the word "places", insert "*Provided*, That no terms of the court shall be held at Klamath Falls unless suitable quarters and accommodations for holding court are furnished without cost to the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have someone explain what this bill does.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be pleased to. The object of the bill is to provide a temporary extension of the period during which minors whose parents were naturalized in this country during their minority but who have moved abroad and taken the minors with them, may return and claim citizenship in this country. That provision of the Immigration Act was extended until January 1943, but war conditions have prevented many of these minors from returning to this country. This bill merely extends the time to 1947 during which these minor children born in the United States, who went abroad with their parents, resided there, may return and become citizens of this country if they have not in the meantime become citizens of a foreign country. This bill simply states that if they have not acquired citizenship over there, they may return to the United States before January 1, 1947, and retain their citizenship as American citizens. They are American born.

Mr. CLEVENGER. My objection was motivated by the constant habit of amending the Nationality Act, sometimes a half-dozen times during a session on the Consent Calendar. I just wanted to be sure this was not another whittling away of our nationality laws.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is not at all.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell us approximately how many cases are involved under this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; we do not know the number, but it is comparatively few.

Mr. BARDEN. Does it in any way affect the status of the parents? Does it permit them to come back?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It does not; it simply gives the minor a right to come back and claim his citizenship, because during the past years of war conditions he could not come back.

Mr. BARDEN. Suppose these minors had participated in the government of other countries?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This bill takes care of that situation. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will find it provides that if the individual by his own voluntary act had not done anything that would prevent his becoming a citizen of this country, he may. If he has done anything that shows he wants to become a citizen of a foreign country, he cannot return.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman says "anything." What would that include, if he had done "anything"?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If he has not performed some act to indicate that he wants to become a citizen of the foreign country where he is living or has lived since he left the United States.

Mr. BARDEN. Would that include voting?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It would include voting or the holding of office.

Mr. BARDEN. Or serving in the Army.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly, if he served in the Army he would not be eligible, he would not have the right to come back; he would lose his American citizenship then.

Mr. BARDEN. Would the gentleman have any objection to this bill being passed over without prejudice?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think it is only fair to the individuals affected to have their time extended until 1947. We extended it once to 1943 but the war has prevented their taking advantage of that extension.

Mr. BARDEN. Which individuals?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The individuals who were natural-born citizens of this country but whose parents went abroad and took them with them while they were minors. Their parents may have become citizens of a foreign country but certainly the minors who were born in this country should have the right to claim their American citizenship. Remember, these individuals are only minors.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. If that is the fact, if they were American born, their citizenship follows them and obtains right now.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It would obtain except he loses that right under the Nationality Act because he resides abroad. The time was extended until January 1943 during which he could return to this country and claim his rights as an American citizen.

Mr. PATRICK. That is new to me.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If we do not pass this bill they will lose their citizenship even though they were American born.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

FACILITATING ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF HUSBANDS, WIVES, AND CHILDREN OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES DURING THE PRESENT WAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 714) to facilitate the admission to the United States of husbands, wives, and children of United States citizen men and women who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during the present World War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask some member of the Committee the meaning of the phrase "termination of hostilities." In most of the bills we have considered which included the phrase "termination of hostilities" it has been defined as the time when they terminated either by proclamation of the President or declaration of the Congress. All this bill states is "termination of hostilities in the present war." When will the termination be, according to this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am sure there would be no objection to an amendment to make the same provision in this measure as in others.

Mr. KEAN. I wonder if it would not be better to have that amendment. I have not that amendment written out. Would if not assure that the person who comes under the bill would understand what it means?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I may say to the gentleman that I did not prepare this bill, but there would be no objection to an amendment. I will be glad to permit an amendment to do that very thing. I see no objection, however, to the bill as it is.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman thinks there would not be any question?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No.

Mr. KEAN. When would hostilities terminate?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's judgment would be as good as anybody else's.

Mr. KEAN. Under this bill when would hostilities terminate?

Mr. REES of Kansas. When either the President or the Congress declares hostilities terminated.

Mr. KEAN. If the gentleman states that, then we have a record of what the intention of Congress is; therefore I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 9 of the Immigration Act of 124 (43 Stat. 157–158; 50 Stat. 164; 8 U. S. C. 209 (a)–209 (f)), a consular officer of the United States may issue nonquota immigration visas to aliens specified in section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 155; 44 Stat. 812; 45 Stat. 1009; 46 Stat. 854; 47 Stat. 656; 8 U. S. C. 204), if such aliens are admissible under existing law, on direct application by any citizen husband of an alien wife where the marriage occurred on or after December 7, 1941, or by a citizen parent of an unmarried minor child, if the citizen husband or parent has served honorably in the armed forces of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities in the present World War, and if the application for visa or visas is filed within 1 year after the termination of hostilities.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of existing law providing for a nonquota status for the husband of a citizen of the United States only where the marriage occurred prior to July 1, 1932, a nonquota status shall be granted to a husband of a United States citizen woman, if the husband is admissible under existing law, where the marriage occurred on or after December 7, 1941, and where the citizen wife has served honorably in the armed forces of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities in the present World War. All privileges and limitations in the issuance of visas provided for in section 1 of this act to nonquota wives and minor children are accorded to the husbands of citizen wives as herein provided.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address made by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, president, Radio Corporation of America, on October 5, before the American Academy of Political and Social Science at Philadelphia, Pa. I am informed by the Public Printer that this exceeds the allowable number of pages and will cost an additional $130. I ask that it be included, notwithstanding the additional cost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FURNISHED OUR COMBAT VETERANS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, late on Saturday afternoon I received a telegram, a very long one, from some officers who complained about the travel facilities which they encountered out in Colorado.

This telegram is as follows:

NEWBURG, MO., *October 13, 1945.*

Honorable REED,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Troop train main 38184 which left Camp Kilmer, N. J., October 11, 1945, for Fort Leavenworth, Kans., reception and separation center with 452 combat veterans aboard destination changed to Fort Logan, Colo., this date. Entire trip including extra wasted travel has been over slow routes, coaches without sleeping and washing facilities furnished other troops on same travel orders going to destinations much closer than Leavenworth were furnished pullmans. Plans of vast majority of these veterans as concerning meeting of friends and relatives are upset by this last minute change. Officers and men are thoroughly browned off. Request immediate action to be taken to have destination changed back to Leavenworth, inasmuch as we believe human consideration outweighs administrative consideration involved. Copies also sent to War Department, Congressmen, and newspapers.

A. P. CLOYER,
Major, Medical Corps.
H. L. HOWE,
Major, Infantry.
A. C. DAVIS,
Pfc, Medical Department.
F. E. SEDLACEK,
T/4, Twenty-fourth Cavalry.
SGT. LEO MILLER,
Troop A, Twenty-fourth Cavalry, RACN
(and 440 others).

Mr. Speaker, if such conditions as these exist they are deplorable. Our returning veterans should not be put on old dirty cars with no facilities for either eating or taking care of other necessities. I want this to go into the RECORD to show what the conditions are insofar as the transportation of our troops is concerned. It may be that other Members have received similar telegrams. If you have, all right; otherwise I shall take this up with the War Department.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address he made over the radio on yesterday relating to a bill he introduced giving our representative on the International Security Council the right to act promptly in case of the possibility of war.

Mr. COFFEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and to include in each excerpts from newspapers.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the failure of America's efforts to get cooperation from some of our allies in connection with the restriction of the movement of opium.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say at this time there will be no recognition for suspension of the rules today.

DISPOSAL OF THE BIG AND LITTLE INCH PIPE LINES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] is recognized for 45 minutes.

REPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON STUDY MADE OF GENERAL CONDITIONS IN EUROPE, SCANDINAVIAN, AND MIDDLE EASTERN COUNTRIES

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, our committee of 11 members, consisting of 1 member from each of 11 different committees of the House of Representatives, was the first congressional group to visit the Soviet Union since the war and one of the first to make special inquiries into conditions in the Scandinavian area, the Balkan area, and throughout the Middle East.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this committee in making this study during the congressional recess was to make a study of general conditions relating to transportation, coal, food, clothing, housing, UNRRA, matters affecting our servicemen, matters pertaining to the possibilities of securing a lasting peace, and other matters of national interest, particularly matters affecting committees of which we were members, such as Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, Judiciary, World War Veterans' Legislation, Flood Control, Mines and Mining, Territories, and so forth.

MEMBERSHIP

The membership of our committee consisted of the following: VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Democrat, of Oklahoma—I acted as chairman; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Republican, of Michigan, vice chairman; SAMUEL A. WEISS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; WALT HORAN, Republican, of Washington; MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio; CHESTER E. MERROW, Republican, of New Hampshire; WALTER B. HUBER, Democrat, of Ohio; HOMER A. RAMEY, Republican, of Ohio; A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Democrat, of Missouri; JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania; and FRANK L. CHELF, Democrat, of Kentucky. We were accompanied by Maj.

James E. Whitmore, of the War Department, a very capable and efficient officer.

We traveled under written orders from the War Department, which authorized us to proceed as a joint committee. We left Washington, D. C., on July 20, 1945.

COUNTRIES OBSERVED

All 11 committee members remained together for 37 days, during which time we traveled 20,000 miles and visited 20 countries. The original committee observed conditions in Labrador, Newfoundland, Iceland, Scotland, England, Ireland, France, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Holland, Belgium, Germany, Russia, Italy; and then Congressmen DONDERO, WEISS, CHELF, and RAMEY returned to the United States from Italy, while Congressman FULTON left the group to make additional studies of naval installations. The six remaining members of the original committee went on to analyze the situation in the following countries: Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Greece, Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Turkey, and Palestine. Congressman HORAN left us at Palestine to return to the United States. The five remaining members of the committee—Congressmen WICKERSHAM, MERROW, CARNAHAN, HUBER, and FEIGHAN—continued onward to visit Iran, Saudi Arabia, India, Bahrein Isle, Iraq, Libya, Algiers, and French Morocco, returning via the Azores to the United States, arriving here September 22, 1945. In our 64-day itinerary we traveled through 32 countries, a distance of 38,000 miles.

Mr. Speaker, it would be wise for the various countries to exchange visits with law-making bodies of other countries for the purpose of observing conditions and building good will, thus cementing friendly international relations.

GI'S AFFECT THINKING

While in these countries we were impressed by the widespread effect of the presence of American servicemen over a period of years upon the thinking of the people of other nations. The American GI's are natural born good-will ambassadors. Although maintaining their national individuality, these people of other nations are increasingly looking toward the American way of life and are becoming more interested in American products. They are also adopting many American mannerisms.

RECOVERY IN ENGLAND

We noted the remarkable recovery from the devastating effects of early German bombing and the latter-day V-weapon attacks.

REPORT REPRESENTS CONSENSUS OF MEMBERS

Obviously it would be practically impossible for 11 different Members of Congress from 11 different geographically located districts, with their many different views, political ideas—and incidentally being members of 11 different church affiliations—to unanimously agree upon a report of such magnitude and in which so many complex phases of conditions are discussed; however, as chairman of our committee, I should like to state at this point that this report represents the general consensus of the members of the group. After having inspected various bases, camps, posts, installations, ports, docks, and so forth during the prepared daily schedule arranged by the Army, assisted by officials of OSS, OWI, UNRRA, Red Cross, and other officials, then at night we met with the American Ambassadors, Ministers, Consuls, and members of their staffs to discuss conditions as they affected the particular country we were studying. In particular in practically every instance our Embassy officials, at our request, had the leading experts in their field present to answer our questions at an informal forum. The officials of many of the foreign countries were present at many of our hearings. The fact that so many of them spoke English fluently aided our cause.

What we saw in Germany bore out the Biblical proverb that, "He who sows the wind reaps the whirlwind." The German farming country is productive. It must be utilized to the fullest extent by the Germans to feed themselves, since the United Nations' primary responsibility in regard to food is to the countries whose crops were stolen or destroyed by the Nazis. In the German cities we witnessed the results of our aerial assaults on Hitler's industries. We saw the wrecked Munich airport. We saw hundreds of German planes, including jet-propelled planes, piled in a junk heap. Germany is actually the junk graveyard of the world. In badly damaged Munich, we saw the battered remnants of nazism: The Hitler beer garden, Mussolini's hideout, and the building in which the Munich pact was signed. We not only saw this destruction but we saw the reason this destruction was visited upon Germany. We visited the infamous concentration camps near Dachau, where countless thousands of displaced persons were starved to death, shot, gassed, or burned. We saw the dirt banks where these unfortunates had been made to kneel before they were shot. We saw the series of slotted wood coverings, placed like slats over small ditches in order that the blood would flow into the ditches as persons were shot. We talked with two Poles who had served 4 and 5 years respectively in these camps. They said that those who could work, lived; those who were weak were shot without delay. We saw several ovens used for the cremation of victims. There were still two barrels, half full of human ashes near these grim evidences of Nazi inhumanity. We saw the steel stretchers used to thrust the bodies in the ovens, the lines of stacked coffins, the urns for the ashes of the men and women who had been murdered. Thirty-two thousand lives had been snuffed out in one death factory alone. There were gas chambers where SS guards looked through glass peep holes to gloat over the mass executions. Today, hundreds of those SS troopers are behind the same high fences from which they once looked out over their prospective victims. We wonder if there will be peepholes in the fiery furnaces of Hades where the victims will be allowed to see the torture that is meted out to these murderers. No retribution is too harsh for the offenses which these barbaric people committed.

WAR CRIMINALS

The United States should quickly rid the conquered enemy countries of Germany and Japan of all their war criminals. We must remember that if the democratic pattern of government is to survive, the youth of the world must be properly guided for years. Since democracy thrives only on enlightened masses we are convinced that very careful attention must be given to a definitely organized and efficiently administered system of free public education. Democracy can survive only if the democracies will assume the responsibility of developing youth into the type of world citizen who will, of their own accord, choose and defend the democratic pattern. The media of free public education is the only road to enduring democracy. It should be a pleasant task, though not easy, to substitute teaching today for bloodshed tomorrow. The ingrained zest of the war criminals of the defeated aggressor nations for bestiality must be eradicated.

THE SOVIET

As the first congressional group to visit the Soviet Union since the war, we gave considerable study to the conditions in the areas visited, to the attitudes of the Soviet people to the United States and to the adjustment of our own ideas of the Soviet Union through our personal observations.

Russia is fully aware of the part the United States has played during the war to bring about our common victory. Russians are not only aware of these facts, but they are deeply appreciative of them. We were impressed by the friendliness of the Russian people and their eagerness to raise their standard of living. We found no one who wanted another war. We, too, are cognizant of the vital role of Russia in this same conflict. We watched some of the Soviet physicians perform several complex operations. Russian hospitals do not appear to meet the standards of cleanliness of those of our country. We observed the homes, factories, collective farms, stores, and labor conditions in Russia. They are endeavoring to improve all of these. They point out that the war has greatly retarded their advancement.

Although the Russians are Communists, certain class distinctions persist. In spite of the fact that the Government owns all real estate, businesses, and industries, various groups enjoy special advantages. Doctors, engineers, musicians, generals, mothers of 10 or more children, or outstanding civic leaders receive a larger compensation and greater discounts on purchases than ordinary people. Farmers are required to sell portions of their products to the Government ration store at extremely low prices; he can sell the remainder of his goods on the open market at a much higher price. Prices in these markets range much higher than in the stores where individuals make purchases with ration coupons.

The Russians reward those who have accomplished great achievements. Individual students, for instance, who show talents as musicians, doctors, engineers, or leaders are given special encouragement and unlimited educational advantages.

The lack of churches is very noticeable. Their lack of knowledge or belief in God is shocking to a church believer.

Russia's social situation or industrial progress cannot be judged entirely by our own standards. In order to appreciate Russia's advancement, we must compare her present progress with conditions in Russia 25 or 30 years ago.

We recognize that Russia suffered more casualties, with the possible exception of China, than any other nation in this war. Because of these losses and because of the heroic stand of the Russian people at a time most critical for the cause of the United Nations, they have been treated with special consideration. During the war they were supplied by the United States with enormous supplies and equipment which they sorely needed for the prosecution of the war.

THE BALKANS

In many of the Balkan areas we visited we saw literally thousands of Russian soldiers driving horses, wagons, and cattle along the roads to Russia. The citizens in these countries claim that their property is being taken away as loot. The Russians claim that the disputed goods or animals are Russian property being retaken or German property that is being taken as reparations. The Soviet military leaders claim that they have issued orders against the confiscation of this property. The order has not been very effective. Our officials are making every effort to discourage the practice and the situation is not as bad as it was.

We observed conditions in Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Iran. In all of these places, the presence of Soviet influence in varying degrees of intensity was quite obvious. Our officials are endeavoring to see that free and fair elections are held. The English are doing likewise in the areas where some of their men are stationed. In all areas where the Allied Council is operating it appears to be operating very effectively.

Anxiety over the future of Iran is mounting. Skepticism over promises of some allies to evacuate Iranian territory since the war is over is on the increase. The Iranians are concerned over the possibility that the Russians might bring in a ruler into northern Iran, the Soviet-occupied zone and start an independent movement to separate the northern part of Iran from the southeastern section. Northern Iran is the food-producing section. The south and southeast is largely arid and could not subsist without the north.

Americans are not really occupying the country of Iran. They were sent there for the original purpose of speeding up lend-lease shipments to Russia at the time the Soviet Union was fighting for its life at Stalingrad. Our men built railways, warehouses, ports, docks, highways, repair shops, and other facilities to help Russia stave off defeat. These installations represent the investment of hundreds of millions of dollars and the war material sent over them to Russia represents other hundreds of millions.

Today, in peace, Russia wants access to a warm-water port in the Persian Gulf. The Iranians are alarmed over the implications of such a move on the part of the Soviet Government.

Iranians claim that Iranian independence was specifically guaranteed by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin at Teheran. In the declaration of December 1, 1943, these leaders stated that they were "at one with the Government of Iran in their desire for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Iran." It is becoming difficult for some Iranians to believe that the Russians are not digging in both politically and economically, as if they intend to stay.

FOREIGN POLICY

Many officials we encountered felt that international cooperation cannot be one-sided. In order to achieve even a limited scope of cooperation there must be a give-and-take among nations. Furthermore, it is felt by these officials, that in essence Russia is demanding the right to participate in international and commercial affairs everywhere. The officials we conferred with felt that we should be willing to accept Russia's cooperation, provided, however, that Moscow does not refuse us our rights to free access to territories over which the Soviet Government has assumed unilateral control. They feel that Russian leaders should have it brought forcefully to their minds that cooperation is a two-way proposition. They feel that Russia must be willing to cooperate in international agreements, and to abide by international decisions when made. Many of our officials felt that Russia had been isolated—not by the democracies—but by her own acts.

Our observations cause us to believe that the United States must continue to champion the United Nations Organization. Winter is coming on with the prospect of terrible suffering in a chaotic Europe. Many constructive international decisions must be made, and as many uncertainties as possible must be removed.

The establishment of free international seaports in certain sections of Europe and the Middle East would relieve much of the desire for aggression of some countries. Some officials advocate that one of these be established 15 miles north of Tripoli.

Peace is no longer a question of something we hope to attain in the future. It is an absolutely vital necessity to the continuation of our civilization on earth. We must realize that we now live in a new era. We must appraise the situation in the light of new developments.

ZHUKOV

Marshal Zhukov is a capable leader, according to many of his associates. He is considered by our officials on the Allied Council as very cooperative. We must clear the air of suspicion between the Russians and the United States when discussing matters with him, and thus promote better understanding. We must tell Zhukov of our big fighting in Europe, heavy cost in Japan, and let him know that the forecast has been made showing the possibility of 8,000,000 people as unemployed in the United States in 1946. We must impress on him how easy it is for Russian officials to have freedom of travel in the United States and request the same consideration for our Army officials in occupied areas. It is hoped that there might be an official Soviet visit to this country while public interest in international affairs is at its height. It is believed Marshal Zhukov will be the one who will make the visit. It would be possible to demonstrate to such an official visitor the widely held American opinion that, although we are willing for Russia to have its form of government, we do not believe it to be conducive toward world peace to have that form of government imposed on people who do not want it, whether those people be in the Balkans or in the United States or some other country.

STRESS POINTS OF AGREEMENT

We should reach certain fundamental agreements in the near future. Many Army and State Department officials feel that members of the United Nations should approach the Soviet Union immediately on the problem of disarmament or a great reduction in Russia's armed services—estimated at 10,000,000. Likewise, many feel that Yugoslavia should be approached on the problem of disarmament or a considerable reduction in its army of a million. We earnestly look forward to any means of meeting the Soviet Government on common grounds of understanding; so that, in the future, we may place more stress on points upon which we all agree instead of highlighting points on which we fail to agree.

AMERICAN SERVICEMEN ABROAD

In most of the countries we visited, the Army arranged to have the GI's from our States to meet with us. We ate with them and asked them to give us their ideas and complaints. The GI's are naturally anxious to get home. They are also anxious to do the job well that has been assigned to them so that this war will not be repeated a generation hence. We believe the Army should do everything within its power to further expedite the release of all men above its minimum requirements. Likewise, this applies to other branches of service. We believe that if a method whereby men could be released at the company level could be put into effect it would be very helpful.

We found that our servicemen are highly respected by the people of all countries. They are well disciplined, well clothed, well fed, well housed, and are given proper physical training.

We believe that the educational advantages should be expanded under the GI bill of rights. Inclusion of extension courses would aid many returning veterans.

Equalization of the point system of the Army and the Navy would meet with hearty approval among servicemen. Some form of ROTC in the schools would meet with the approval of the vast majority of the servicemen with whom we conferred.

POINT SYSTEM

We would suggest a further reduction of the number of points required for release consistent with the essential needs of the service at the earliest possible moment.

INFLATION

The full effect of inflation became a reality to us as as we entered many of the countries which had been seriously affected by its blight. Although we have disagreed with many of OPA's methods, we are glad that the United States at least had some form of price control.

NEED FOR EXPERTS

We were greatly impressed to see the contrast of abject poverty and riches existing side by side in many of the middle eastern countries. We found many officials who believed that it would be highly beneficial if our country could lend them expert technicians, industrial, scientific, medical, and agricultural experts. They feel that with the aid of these they can develop many of their natural resources and greatly aid the countries in maintaining an economy. Likewise this same suggestion came from other countries, including Turkey, Lebanon, Syria, Palestine, in addition to Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, and others.

STERLING BLOC

The British sterling bloc policy and the French monetary policy affecting many of the countries needs studying. These blocs should only be used to stabilize the currency and should not be used to restrict the free flow of goods to and from these countries as it has done in the past. Because of these bloc restrictions, many of these countries have been unable to obtain the merchandise from various parts of the world which they sorely need. There is a tremendous backlog of needs for merchandise in the United States, however, this is nothing to compare with the backlog of needs in nearly all of the countries we observed. If our workmen and factories can produce the full strength, we can sell these countries a large portion of their needs; provided that we do not delay too long.

UNRRA

We made an extensive study of UNRRA throughout all the countries we visited where it operates. The greatest difficulty was the recruiting of personnel under adverse conditions; also, the lack of priority authority for the purchase of needed merchandise and supplies; lack of transportation facilities for moving supplies, and so forth. In Greece the program had a better chance of succeeding. With the close of the war UNRRA's responsibilities and functions increased. Most of us feel that under existing conditions that UNRRA can do a better job. Some members feel that certain requirements should be met when additional funds are advanced. The Army, State Department, and Red Cross officials are cooperating. As UNRRA's displaced-person program decreases the relief problem increases.

RELIEF

Cold, hungry, starving, sick, and dying people in Europe are easy victims for dictators. This widespread condition and the need of transportation, coal, food, clothing, medicine, and shelter increases as the supply diminishes. It will be necessary for us to exert every effort to prevent delay in fulfilling at least a portion of their needs; otherwise, a revolution may ride in the wake of want. Even then, we were told that countless thousands upon thousands would die of hunger, exposure, and lack of proper aid. Peace cannot be built on misery or despair. We fought a terrible war. But it will not have been fully won until the people can secure bread, work, food, shelter, medical aid, clothing, and stability. In most of the countries visited, the four greatest problems were the securing of coal, transportation, food, and clothing. The shortage of coal and lack of transportation in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, and Holland caused many factories to remain at a standstill. Little Holland was extremely short of coal, rolling stock, and shipping facilities. The enemy had stripped the country of many of the livestock, farming equipment, industrial machinery, rolling stock, and merchandise from the shelves of both Holland and Norway. In Holland and Belgium we slept on the bare straw mattress with one thin blanket as a cover. No sheets or pillow cases. We did not complain after seeing conditions of others. Last fall the situation was so acute in Holland that much of the asphalt was removed from the top of the pavement to be used to provide warmth to families. Many of the buildings were wrecked because of the fact that citizens had gone into vacant buildings to remove woodwork, thus causing the collapse of the buildings. Many of them ate the tulip bulbs and sugar beets as food. One wealthy man, who had owned a very large million-dollar factory had worn the tires off his bicycle riding out into the country trying to find a few bites to eat. In Belgium the effect of the buzz-bombs and V-bombs, also other types of rockets, certainly had a telling effect on the country. The Red Cross has done a wonderful job in all areas observed by us.

STANDARD OF LIVING

Most of the people from the United States with whom we conferred abroad were greatly interested in our production program and program of reconversion. They felt that we should maintain a high standard of living for the wage earner and the farmer, with sufficient incentives for private business. They stated, however, that wages and prices must not rise to such an extent as to cause inflation. They warned that both employers and employees should be careful and warned not to be careless of the welfare of the millions. They voiced opinions that the people of the country are the real victims when an important segment of industry is shut down by an industry-labor dispute.

STATE DEPARTMENT

The requirements and needs of the State Department necessitate careful study in the light of present-day international relations. Employees of the State Department in foreign lands should spend a considerable portion of their time within the States. The Interim International Information Service—formerly the United States Information Service—should be expanded so that America can at least be on a comparable level with similar agencies of other countries. The United States has been greatly undersold in the past. In the future, the American story must be widely and clearly told abroad.

PROUD THAT WE ARE AMERICANS

Our observations made us appreciate America more. We should continually advertise America and sell American products in order that we maintain full employment. We found that American ways are the ideals of most countries. The faith placed in America and in our leadership by the countries which we studied, makes us extremely conscious of the tremendous responsibility placed upon us for our share of leadership and material aid necessary to restore order in a war-torn world. The enlargement and expansion of facilities like the American University at Beirut, Lebanon; the American Mission at Teheran; Robert College, Istanbul; the University in Egypt; and American hospitals in various places, will prove of great and lasting value to the United States. The missionaries in these countries have done more to cement friendly relations than nearly any other group. We found that the greater number of outstanding leaders of the various countries obtained their training in one of the above-mentioned institutions. We had many requests from various countries for further exchanges of scholarships of outstanding students. It is felt that this will prove of great value to countries who send their outstanding students here for training for return to their own countries to aid in educating others.

INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

Our Government should be constantly advised through an intelligence office of conditions in foreign fields, especially is this essential in areas where unrest, turmoil, and strife have prevailed in the past and led to wars.

RESEARCH AGENCY

We recommend that the research agencies be combined into a single Federal Research Agency to promote sufficient development for the benefit of America in the future.

PALESTINE SITUATION

Six of our group went to Palestine, to wit: WICKERSHAM, MERROW, HORAN, HUBER, FEIGHAN, and CARNAHAN. The area of Palestine is 10,429 square miles; there are 700,000 Jews there; there are 1,300,000 Arabs in Palestine. The Arab world, composed of 7,114,927 square miles of Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and Trans-Jordan, contains 70,000,000 people. These lands are at the cross roads of the three Old World continents. Because of the conflicting views of the Jews and the Arabs, those who are responsible for finding a solution face a great responsibility.

SURPLUS PROPERTY

Surplus ships, suitable for merchant shipping, should be disposed of at the earliest possible date. Preference should be given to American shipping firms in order to solve the transportation problems quickly and in order that we may maintain strong merchant shipping lines.

The Surplus Property Administrator has properly placed sale of foreign sur-

plus property in the hands of the State Department officials in countries affected. A monetary exchange between some of these countries and the United States should be established. Until such time, currency accepted for surplus property could be used for purchase of needed embassy sites or properties, or for our future trade needs. Many governments are anxious to obtain the surplus property. American oil companies of Saudi Arabia and the Isle of Bahrein are anxious to purchase some of our surplus equipment at reasonable prices and can give us credit in American dollars for their purchases, provided we act quickly while the merchandise is salable.

In nearly every country many are complaining because of the slowness of the various officials in forming a policy as to the disposition of the surplus. Immediate action is required. Activity in recent weeks is much more noticeable. We must dispose of this with as great speed as possible, at the same time safeguarding the Government's interests. The Administrator has adopted that policy. The actual sales of property are made through other Government disposal agencies. Reconversion is just getting under way. There is a great dearth of goods of many kinds in this country as well as abroad.

Veterans should be given every possible opportunity to purchase Government materials which are surplus, without undue delay; requirements should be very simple. Others having priority, including local, county, State, and national agencies, as well as foreign governments, should be allowed to make purchases without delay.

OIL IN THE MIDDLE EAST

After observing the oil fields hereinafter named, we made a careful study of them in the light of our observations. The Bank of England owns 56 percent of the shares of the Anglo-Persian Oil Co., located near the head of the Persian Gulf. A great refinery is at Abadan on the Tigris-Euphrates Delta, and pipe lines connect the refinery at Abadan with the principal oil fields about 100 miles to the northeast. The British operate under a long-term concession whose terms give the Iranian Government $1 per ton for all oil extracted, regardless of price; 20 percent of the company's net profits above a stated minimum; payment of $1,125,000 annually in taxes; provision of $50,000 annually for the education of Iranians in Great Britain; and the sale of oil to the Iranian Government at a discount from prevailing world prices.

At this point we would like to state that we were greatly impressed and really astounded to see the contrast of abject poverty with ultra riches. In Teheran we saw people washing clothes, bathing children, watering horses, washing buggies, and drinking from the same small stream which runs through the city.

The Abadan refineries had a production capacity of 200,000 barrels a day in 1939. They have approximately double that production capacity now.

The oil of Iraq is developed by the Iraq Petroleum Co. of which almost half is owned by the British Government's Anglo-Iranian Oil and British-Dutch Royal Dutch Shell. An American combination of Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum owns almost a quarter and the French own the same amount. A small little-known share is held by an American named C. I. Gulbenkian. Americans, who are allowed to use the British-owned Haifa Refinery at the Mediterranean end of the Iraq pipe line, market their Iraq oil in Europe. The oil from the Kirkuk fields in Iraq now runs through the 850-mile pipe line to Haifa and Tripoli at the rate of 88,000 barrels a day; 80,000 to Haifa refineries, 8,000 to Tripoli in Syria. Most of the oil is refined at Haifa in Palestine.

One of the most valuable areas is the Mosul fields in Mesopotamia, Turkey. The Iraq Petroleum Co., an international concern in which British capital and control predominates—but with a provision that French and American interests might each receive 23.75 percent of the oil produced—operates these fields. A pipe line is built from Kirkuk to the Mediterranean, the main line going to Haifa in Palestine and a branch line to Tripoli in French Syria. The Haifa refinery has a capacity of 80,000 barrels daily. The British would like to build another parallel pipe line from Kirkuk to Haifa in order to double the flow of oil.

The British thus have two great oil supplies readily accessible for their Navy: At Haifa, for ships operating in the Mediterranean, and at Abadan, for ships operating in the Indian Ocean and the Far East. Abadan can also supply oil to be shipped to Britain around Arabia through the Suez Canal or around South Africa, should the Mediterranean be closed, as was virtually the case for a period during the recent war.

In his remarkable rise to power, Ibn Saud has at times seemed to have been somewhat distrustful of the British. He believed Americans would have no imperialistic ambitions in the Middle East and could be safely trusted. He wanted revenue. He wanted to improve the living conditions of his people and his own living conditions. His current expenses were getting out of hand. He has about 35 sons and nearly 60 grandsons, not counting the daughters and granddaughters. His belief that Americans had no imperial designs influenced him to make concessions to American interests. "And besides," he added, "you are so far away." The concession was signed May 29, 1933, and the American-Arabian Oil Co., a United States corporation, owned on equal terms by the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co. It has already invested $100,000,000 in its main oil wells on the Arabian coast and on the island of Bahrein along the western shore of the Persian Gulf. It has a large refinery on the island of Bahrein and is completing another on the nearby mainland. Together, these will be able to process 110,000 barrels of crude oil daily.

The concession covers 439,500 square miles in northern, eastern, and southern Arabia, as well as north of Bahrein. Near the head of the Persian Gulf another American firm, the Gulf Oil Corp., owns equally with the British the oil concessions of the lesser Koweit oil fields.

Saudi Arabia's known oil reserves are 5,000,000,000 barrels. Probable reserves are estimated from twenty to fifty billion barrels. It is the greatest bonanza in the world. Its oil wealth is practically untouched. A large portion of it is only 500 feet below the surface of the desert. Production costs are extremely low. The first oil was found in 1935 near Dammam at 2,400 feet, after British geologists, some 10 years earlier, had said that there was no oil there.

When King Ibn Saud signed the contract with Aramco in 1939 he said British, Germans, Japanese, and Italians had all bid for the concessions. The Japs had offered twice as much as the American firm, and, furthermore, the Japs had offered that amount for only one-third the amount the American firm was getting. He said he had taken the American offer because the Americans would give him fewer headaches. The greatest trouble is getting the oil out of Saudi Arabia. In February 1944, Secretary Ickes proposed that the United States build a pipe line to Mediterranean ports.

The Bahrein concession is held by Bahrein Petroleum Co., jointly owned by Standard Oil of California and Texas Oil Co. The sheik has been persuaded to invest some of his royalties in schools, hospitals, and social reforms. He is a friend of the United States. He believes a drop of oil is worth a drop of blood.

With preferential rights on an additional 177,000 square miles, the total area is slightly larger than Texas, California, Oregon, and Washington combined, or about one-fifth the total area of the United States. The original concession has 53 years to run, while the supplement has 59 years. The reserves in Saudi Arabia may be richer than previous discoveries. With American companies holding that reserve, we will be insured for many years to come against dependence on other foreign sources, especially for oil needed for our Navy in that area.

The British Government's Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., which rivals in size Standard of New Jersey, Royal Dutch Shell and the Soviet Naptha Trust, now gets all the oil from Iran. It pays Shah-of-Shahs Mohammed Reza Pahlevi $25,000,000 a year and the rest of the royal family nearly $12,000,000 a year. We were guests of the shah while at Teheran. Russians, French, Dutch, and Americans are angling for more of Iran's oil. The Iranians fear the Russians and rather dislike the British.

SUMMARY

The Iraq oil fields are approximately 50 percent British, 25 percent United States, 25 percent French.

The Kuwait fields are 50 percent United States and 50 percent British.

The Iran oil fields are 100 percent British.

The Saudi Arabia oil fields are 100 percent United States.

It is not true that the monopolistic forces in the Middle East withheld oil from wartime uses while American reserves were being rapidly depleted. In 1944 alone the output there was 163,000,000 barrels, about 50 percent more than

in peacetime. For 1945, an output of 200,000,000 barrels is predicted. The British-controlled Iranian oil fields produced 100,000,000 barrels in 1944, almost 30 percent more than in 1939. Egypt produced over 9,000,000 barrels, twice as much as in 1939; and the output of Saudi Arabia topped that of Egypt. For 1945, Saudi Arabia's production may exceed 35,000,000 barrels. In Lebanon, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. have applied for licenses from the Government to construct refinery facilities in Tripoli, indicating that the capacity of the Iraq-Tripoli pipe line will also be enlarged. The Haifa refineries will be expanded.

Whoever has his hand on the oil valve controlling the oil supply from the Middle East will dictate the world's oil supply in the future.

CABLE SYSTEM

Many individuals in the Middle East, including many Americans in service, feel that the cable system, controlled by the British, is too costly and that a new cable system should be built in that area.

AVIATION

We need an expansion of aviation. The United States holds the key to the expansion of international aviation and should do everything possible to remove any restrictions and to increase the establishment of international airports.

FOREIGN POLICY

The United States should establish a more clear-cut foreign policy with the British and should be firm in requiring the British to remove any restrictions on trade, aviation, or sterling bloc requirements which might be restricting the economy of any country or which might affect the national economy or the possibility of a permanent world peace.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of this committee, I desire to compliment each member for his representation of America to each country we visited and for the splendid job each Member has performed. We worked long hours each day, arising early and retiring late. We regret that we could not accept an invitation from General MacArthur to return via China, Japan, and the Pacific. Pressing business of the House of Representatives required our presence in Washington at a much earlier date than we had previously anticipated.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may sit during general debate during the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include certain articles in each instance.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address made last week.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Thursday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

ARMY AIR FORCES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a bill is coming up for consideration tomorrow on the airport situation and that there may be an amendment to revive the Civil Aeronautics Authority. I wish to incorporate in these remarks a list of the airports which I understand the Army expects to hold for the duration.

The Army Air Forces has recommended after more than 2 months' intensive study by a board of senior commanders and staff officers its plan for the flying fields, depots, hospitals, and other major establishments which it proposes to retain to accommodate the interim Air Forces.

It was emphasized that the recommended plan is confined to stations housing combat tactical units and the major depots, hospitals, and establishments of the supporting services, and does not cover the flying fields and subsidiary and auxiliary establishments of lesser magnitude and importance which are now under consideration.

It was pointed out that the recommended list, which follows, of the stations in the Air Forces plan does not include the flying fields for the organized reserve and National Guard air units, or those included in the Army airways system.

In submitting its plan to the War Department, the commanding general, Air Forces, pointed out that the permanent size of the over-all postwar Air Forces had not yet been determined by the Congress, and that the station list was based on the maximum requirements for the interim Air Forces. Obviously, subsequent legislation and appropriations by the Congress may indicate changes in this list. Other assumptions which governed the preparation of the list of stations in the Air Forces plan included the maximum use of Government-owned stations and facilities, the greatest possible consolidation on stations in the interest of over-all economy, the ability to marshal the Air Forces toward any threatened section of the United States, and the maintenance of a school and logistic system which would make it possible to increase the size of the Air Forces in time of danger without confusion or waste.

The Air Forces pointed out that the publication of this list does not imply final War Department action or that all other stations and facilities are instantly abandoned. The demobilization process, it was explained, will be a continuing and graduated one, as the Army Air Forces cuts back from its over-all wartime size of more than 2,300,000 men to its postwar size as later determined by the Congress.

COMBAT UNITS

Clovis Army Air Field, Clovis, N. Mex.
Fort Worth Army Air Field, Fort Worth, Tex.
Grenier Field, Manchester, N. H.
MacDill Field, Tampa, Fla.
Merced Army Air Field, Merced, Calif.
Pocatello Army Air Field, Pocatello, Idaho.
Rapid City Army Air Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.
Roswell Army Air Field, Roswell, N. Mex.
Selfridge Field, Mount Clemens, Mich.
Smoky Hill Army Air Field, Salina, Kans.
Walla Walla Army Air Field, Walla Walla, Wash.
Casper Army Air Field, Casper, Wyo.
Dow Field, Bangor, Maine.
Kearney Army Air Field, Kearney, Nebr.
Seymour-Johnson Field, Goldsboro, N. C.
Dover Army Air Field, Dover, Del.
March Field, Calif.
McChord Field, Tacoma, Wash.
Portland Army Air Base, Portland, Oreg.
Westover Field, Chicopee Falls, Mass.
Biggs Field, El Paso, Tex.
Las Vegas Army Air Field, Las Vegas, Nev.
Brooks Field, San Antonio, Tex.
Shaw Field, Sumter, S. C.

AIR TRANSPORT AND TROOP CARRIER UNITS

Bergstrom Field, Austin, Tex.
Pope Field, Fort Bragg, N. C.
Sedalia Army Air Field, Knob Noster, Mo.
Fairfield-Suisun Army Air Field, Fairfield, Calif.
Fort Dix Army Air Base, Wrightstown, N. J.
Great Falls Army Air Field, Great Falls, Mont.
Morrison Field, West Palm Beach, Fla.
Topeka Army Air Field, Topeka, Kans.

CONVALESCENT HOSPITALS

Fort George Wright, Spokane, Wash.
Miami District Convelescent Hospital, Miami Beach, Fla.
Pawling Convalescent Hospital, Pawling, N. Y.
San Antonio District Convalescent Hospital, San Antonio, Tex.

FLYING TRAINING

Columbus Army Air Field, Columbus, Miss.
Goodfellow Field, San Angelo, Tex.
Moody Field, Valdosta, Tex.
Randolph Field, San Antonio, Tex.
Perrin Field, Sherman, Tex.
Enid Army Air Field, Enid, Okla.
Turner Field, Albany, Ga.
Barksdale Field, Shreveport, La.
Luke Field, Phoenix, Ariz.
Williams Field, Chandler, Ariz.
Langley Field, Hampton, Va.
Mather Field, Sacramento, Calif.

TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

Scott Field, Belleville, Ill.
Boca Raton Army Air Field, Boca Raton, Fla.
Buckley Field, Denver, Colo.
Chanute Field, Rantoul, Ill.
Keesler Field, Biloxi, Miss.
Lowry Field, Denver, Colo.

TACTICAL SCHOOLS

Maxwell Field, Montgomery, Ala.
Gunter Field, Montgomery, Ala.
Craig Field, Selma, Ala.

AAF CENTERS

Eglin Field, Valparaiso, Fla.
Army Air Center, Orlando, Fla.

MATÉRIEL CENTER

Wright and Patterson Fields, Dayton, Ohio.

MAINTENANCE AND SUPPLY DEPOTS

Kelly Field, San Antonio, Tex.
Olmsted Field, Middletown, Pa.
McClellan Field, Sacramento, Calif.
Spokane Army Air Field, Spokane, Wash.
Tinker Field, Oklahoma City, Okla.
Robins Field, Macon, Ga.

SATELLITE DEPOTS

Brookley Field, Mobile, Ala.
Hill Field, Ogden, Utah.
Rome Army Air Field, Rome, N. Y.

SPECIALIZED WAREHOUSE INSTALLATIONS

Buffalo Specialized Depot, Buffalo, N. Y.
Dayton Specialized Depot, Dayton, Ohio.
Gadsden Specialized Depot, Gadsden, Ala.
Maywood Specialized Depot, Maywood, Calif.
Memphis Specialized Depot, Memphis, Tenn.
Miami Army Air Field, Miami, Fla.
Shelby Specialized Depot, Shelby, Ohio.
Topeka Specialized Depot, Topeka, Kans.

SPECIAL AIR CORPS INSTALLATIONS

Lockbourne Army Air Base, Columbus, Ohio.
Muroc Army Air Field, Muroc, Calif.

GENERAL RANGES AND TESTING AREAS

Alamogordo Army Air Field, Alamogordo, N. Mex.
Avon Park Army Air Field, Avon Park, Fla.
Myrtle Beach Army Air Field, Myrtle Beach, S. C.
Tonopah Army Air Field, Tonopah, Nev.
Tyndall Field, Panama City, Fla.
Wendover Field, Wendover, Utah.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution from the city counsel of the city of Los Angeles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. REED], is recognized for 15 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the people in this country are living under abnormal conditions at the present time. If there is any one thing that is disturbing most of the homes of the United States, it is the fact that somewhere in this world they have a boy or perhaps boys who would like to get home. I assume most of these boys in the Army and Navy are looking with hope and great expectation toward coming home. Many of them have been away for 2 and 3 years. Some of them have wives. Some have a child that they have never seen. These boys have fought this great war and have won it, and they just cannot understand why they are being held in remote corners of the world. They were told there is a lack of transportation. Of course that does not deceive many of the boys who see ships floating out on the high seas opposite where they are stationed, doing nothing. It does not deceive those who see great long lines of planes which are not being used. It does not deceive those who know that some of the ships are being brought thousands of miles to take part in a great demonstration here on Navy Day. These lads want to come home. There is another group abroad who want to take up their studies. They want to enter life on a par with those who have had a chance to go to school and finish their courses. But that is not one of the reasons given by the Army and Navy for letting these boys out, the fact that they want to get an education. The officers who refuse to relax these rules have had their education at public expense. They are all set. They are set for life, with the prospects of retirement soon. All those boys are asking for their suffering and the blood which they have spilled, now that the war is over, that they may be allowed to come home.

As I have said before repeatedly, there is a great moral question involved in the family life of this nation. We ought not to trifle with those things, because now we are entering, we hope, a long era of peace. That is what we are praying for and hoping for, although the facts of history are not altogether reassuring.

This letter was written on October 2, 1945, by a corporal on Okinawa:

Hon. DANIEL A. REED.

DEAR SIR: As a former worker in your behalf, I believe I am privileged to ask a question. The question is this: Who is running the country, Congress or the War Department? The time for action is at hand; we have had enough hollow, broken promises. These rosy promises to the folks at home are not getting us home. Actions speak louder than words with the voters. The 50-pointers and 38-year-olds are still on this island. My mother tells me you are working on a 2-year-service bill. I am in favor of this bill. I hope it is put into use at once by congressional action.

I am enclosing some clippings from an Army paper. I am in full agreement with them. Most of the men are against the use of ships on needless Navy Day. It is far too late in the day to worry about economy. It is funny they are suddenly economy-minded. It would be more economical to send the men home. We came here from the European theater of operations without our redeployment furlough, and we haven't done a thing since. We are just sitting here wasting the taxpayers' (my own) money while the bay is full of ships. Is this economy?

All men with 2 years' service should be discharged immediately.

Respectfully yours.

The clipping this corporal sent to me reads as follows:

[From the Stars and Stripes]

We are expected to believe everyone in authority is bending every effort to get us home, but are hamstrung in their mighty endeavors by a lack of ships. I should think there must be a lack, all right. The papers report the Navy is planning a fine show on October 27—Navy Day—in which a "galaxy of battleships, aircraft, carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and other vessels" will participate in an effort to "impress the people."

Leading all the ships will be the now-famed *Missouri*. Isn't it just dandy they find they can drag that ship all the way from Tokyo Bay to New York Bay to celebrate one completely unimportant day in a manner "to exceed anything heretofore seen in New York"?

It almost seems as if the Navy doesn't give a damn how long we rot out here so long as they can get home, exhibit their nice ships (unsullied by marks from boots of rough field soldiers), and try to persuade the public to let them keep them all, and the sailors it takes to run them, too, for a big postwar Navy.

I thought it too sensible to last when they stripped the *Saratoga* and took over 3,000 sailors to freedom.

I've also read recently that all Italian prisoners have been promised they will be home during the winter. I do hope we don't disappoint them. We must be sure to give them priority over our own GI's, or they might think us nasty people.

RILED GI.

A private in the Army writes as follows:

DEAR SIR: I've spent 3 years in this damn Army away from my wife and son. I didn't mind while the war continued, but now that it is over, I want to go home. Isn't 3 years enough? I'm lucky at that; I have a child which gives me an additional 12 points for a grand total of 59 points—just enough to remain in Europe another year. Before VE-day I spent 6 months in the line, for which I received one battle star (5 points), while other divisions never ever committed, picked up 3 and 4 stars (15 or 20 points). Air Corps mess sergeants never out of England have six and seven stars. Is that combat credit? Why is it possible for some single kid to spend a year or two in some nice easy spot in England with an Air Corps unit and never even see a German, except prisoners of war, yet have enough combat credits for discharge, while I have spent 3 years with infantry divisions and have 59 points? I'm pretty disgusted already, wait another 6 month. Why not draft these boys who because of minor physical defects were classified IV-F, or the ones with occupational deferments? Let them see what hell is like, and the Army, even now, is hell.

A sergeant writes this next letter from a casual detachment:

DEAR SIR: Today's copy of the Stars and Stripes, Wednesday, September 12, contained a statement by yourself in which you requested the release of all men who have had more than 2 years of service. Sir, your suggestion improved my subzero morale considerably. I have more than 36 months of service in the Army, including 14 months of overseas duty, all totaling 50 points, and now, under the Ground Forces Reinforcement Command (ETO) plan, I find myself slated for Army of occupation duty. Men with 15, 20, 30 points, and, sir, even less than that were sent to the States to provide a strategic reserve in the States, and some to man army of occupation posts in the CBI (China, Burma, India theater). Furthermore, GI's having more than 45 points and now in the States are ineligible for overseas duty, while fellow GI's having points between 45 and 60, and still in the ETO, are eligible for further overseas duty. In sum, sir, I do not see the fairness of the present Army discharge and redeployment plans.

Perhaps, like the thousands of other stranded GI's in the ETO, I may be able to return in some dim distant future to my home in New York. Perhaps.

Respectfully yours.

This letter signed by six servicemen comes from the Philippine Islands:

DEAR SIR: You have our heartiest approval in demanding the speediest possible discharge of veteran soldiers from the Army.

Most of us here in the Seventy-seventh Infantry Division, which is a predominantly New York outfit, have 3½ years' service, 18 months of which were served overseas. In addition we participated in three major campaigns, Guam, Leyte, and the Ryukyus

Islands (Kerama Retto, Ie Shima, and Okinawa).

We have followed with interest the actions and statements of our Senators and Representatives. Frankly we were quite disgusted with those Senators who urged elimination of the draft and other similar proposals which would inevitably retard our return to the States.

We feel that we have contributed our share in the prosecution of the war. Had the war continued we would have gladly stayed on and fought till the Japs were defeated. Now that the war is over we feel it is only fair that other Americans, who have never served in the Army, or those soldiers who have never been overseas or in combat, should come over here to replace us.

We are following your efforts with interest. You have our complete support and we sincerely hope that the other Senators and Representatives will follow your footsteps in giving the combat soldiers a square deal.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield or would he rather finish?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What I cannot understand about the attitude expressed in the letter the gentleman has just read is: Why should the writer want someone else to come over and take over the job? I can realize, and I believe we all can, that having served over there so long he is entitled to come back home; but does it follow that someone else must take that job and continue it indefinitely? That is to say, must we always have a million or two young Americans over there? Are we to continue taking boys out of school to send over there?

Mr. REED of New York. Here is what that boy believes, he believes that we are going to have a permanent army of occupation over there; and if that be true he wants to get home and spend some time with his family.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I can sympathize with him; and he is right if we were to keep an army of a million or two or three million men over there all the time.

Mr. REED of New York. Another point, the only act General MacArthur is now being punished for and for which he is on the way out is in consequence of the action of those people who want a large army of occupation. General MacArthur has been reducing the number of American soldiers required in Japan and he is constantly reducing the number as conditions develop, which justifies him in the demobilization of his troops.

Of course, for that he is to be pilloried.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from New York will remember that prior to the time we got into this war, while some folks were planning for it and trying to get us in, we were being told all the time that the overwhelming majority of the people of this country wanted to get into the war, wanted to carry what they called the four freedoms to all the corners of the earth, and they wanted to force our form of government on the people of these other nations. Where has that overwhelming majority gone, if it ever existed?

Mr. REED of New York. They are silent at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They did not take any part in the war either, as far as I know.

Mr. REED of New York. No; not to any great extent.

I have a letter here from a corporal in India, reading as follows:

DEAR SIR: We soldiers here in India read with real enthusiasm your proposal to discharge men with 2 years of service. There are a great many of us here who have been here for 20 months and more and still do not have enough points to get home on. Without a doubt that proves the point system to be unbalanced and unfair. I have been here since December 1943 and only have 42 points.

We hope you and clear-thinking men like yourself can get us veterans home soon. We don't even care if they don't discharge us right away. All we ask is to get reassigned back in the States and not be insulted with the offer of a 30- or 45-day furlough back home and then to be sent back here. Yes, they actually propose to offer us men 30- or 45-day furloughs to the States after being here over 20 months.

We surely deserve better treatment than that.

Thank you again for your interest, and I am sure we will be able to thank you in other ways in days to come.

Sincerely.

A corporal in the Infantry sent this next letter:

DEAR SIR: Life or death? One month ago I might be called dramatic for saying that—but not now. One month ago I would never have bent so low as to plead for something. It's positively against all my manly principles. But I am now. We young single fellows with long service to our country both home and abroad need help. We need it badly.

I write to you, sir, because I have read your policy on discharge and I know it to be the most fair of all. What else can possibly compensate for long, arduous service? If ever there was unfairness, a gross injustice to man, the Army redeployment and discharge plan has been guilty of it.

I have spent over 2½ years in the Army, with a year of that overseas in the ETO. And in that time I have earned the incredible low score of 37 points, as of VE-day. Thirty-seven points for a combat infantryman of over 2½ years in the Army. Is it fair and just that now I should spend months and months and possibly years in the Army of occupation?

There are many like me here overseas—young single men wasting, rotting our lives away. We want to come home soon so that we can marry our fiancées we left behind. We want to start our own families—we want to begin our lives. Help us, please.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include three letters at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the following letter comes from a father in Texas:

DEAR MR. REED: Sir, this is to express my deepest approval of your attitude toward a more hasty demobilization of our armed forces. I wish that it was within my power to knock some sense into our Congress and encourage it to be more considerate of the millions of fathers and mothers and less considerate of one-half dozen admirals and generals.

My eldest son has served 5 years in the Navy, 3½ years of which was in actual combat in the south Pacific. He is now on the U. S. S. *Rocky Mount* in China. My other son and my son-in-law have served in the Army, overseas service, 3 years each, but they have no promise of a return home or a discharge. Frankly I do not understand; it is why I'm encouraging you to hasten your plan of a speedier plan of demobilization. I understand that we have a huge Army and Navy to demobilize, but considering this, I still can't understand why there is such an unexcusable delay in relieving those soldiers, sailors, and marines who have borne the brunt of the fighting.

You represent a district in New York State, but after all you represent all of us. You will stand ace high with us if you will hasten your proposed bill.

Very truly.

A private first class writes from the Philippines:

HONORABLE SIR: We, the members of the Army, have watched with great interest and admiration your fight in Congress on demobilization. At the moment we are aboard ship bound for Japan.

It has been about 4 days since we have heard a radio broadcast and we do not know the results of the congressional investigation. but we are afraid that the War Department will soft soap the Congress with doctored figures and statistics.

The War Department has announced that men over 35 and men with 80 points will be discharged immediately, yet the commanding general of the — army has suspended that directive. Unfortunately, I am in neither of those classifications, but if a general officer is allowed to suspend discharges, how can the rest of us ever hope to get home?

I would like to direct your attention to a fact which it was impossible previously for me to write. Just prior to VE-day in Europe, General Marshall told the committee that there was a shortage of infantry replacements in the ETO. That same day that he made that statement, we had 16,000 infantry replacements sitting in the harbor of Le Havre, France, with no place to send them for every depot on the continent was so crowded there was no place for them. At that time we had the Second, Third, Eleventh, Fourteenth, and Eighteenth Reinforcement Depots completely filled and overcrowded. The Sixty-nine Hundredth Provisional Depot which had been set up was also full and our depot at Le Havre was so full, no additional space was available. I am not coloring these facts in any way. It can be proven by a subpena of the morning reports of the battalions, companies, etc., of those depots. All morning reports are on file with the Adjutant General in Washington. The time, sir, is ripe for an investigation into facts and not just words.

Personally, we would like to see men with 18 months overseas or 3 years of service discharged now.

Very truly yours.

A Navy father writes the next letter:

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: For the last 2 days or so my shipmates and I have listened to your criticism of the discharge program of the Army and Navy. We have been highly elated that Congress has taken a part in this discussion, for most of us feel that both Army and Navy have fouled up the discharge program by an unfair and discriminatory system of points. To prove this, I shall cite my own case, not because I am more worthy than thousands of others but because my shipmates are afraid to write to their congressional representatives for fear of Navy retaliation against those who "talk too much." Here are the facts:

Age, 34 years; married, 13 years; two children, 9 and 5 years.

Occupation before induction, high-school teacher (history), Philadelphia, Pa.

Inducted, April 6, 1944; left United States for sea, May 6, 1945.

Education, bachelor of science education; 2 years' graduate work economics, University of Pennsylvania.

My Navy job, routine office clerical work aboard ship.

Navy's point system as it applies to me as of this date:

	Points
Age, ½ point each year	17
Dependency (no matter how many dependents)	10
Service (½ point each month)	9
Sea duty (¼ point each month duty outside United States)	1
Total	37

Points needed for discharge, 44; meaning 9 more months at sea or 14 months within United States.

The point system can be criticized as follows:

1. Men with families at 34 years do not take 9 months at sea like the 20-year-old youngsters, in spite of Navy's insistence that if they can I can—our hearts and thoughts are home with our families.

2. I receive 10 points for dependency—so does a man with a wife but no children, or a young boy helping to support a mother or father. My wife cannot work and be both father and mother to my children. The wife without children is not in the same position.

3. My wife has existed in Philadelphia for 18 months now on $100 a month, plus what I can send her. Her cost of living has been exactly what it was for the defense worker making that much a week.

4. The United States Government contributes $78 per month toward the $100. The total amount of money for the support of the families of servicemen must amount to many hundreds of millions of dollars monthly. Most of us fathers have our old jobs and careers waiting us as soon as we are discharged, and this drain on the public purse would cease, a not inconsiderable item when we think of the postwar national debt.

These are the facts, Mr. Representative. I leave their interpretation to your judgment.

Mr. Speaker, may I say, in conclusion, that one of my anxieties about getting these boys home is that human nature can stand just about so much unfairness and no more. The time has come to give the boys the opportunity which their fighting qualities and their fine Americanism readily entitles them to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I heard the gentleman read a quotation from one of the letters in reference to the fleet coming back and spending a certain amount of time in all ports in honor of the Navy. Does not the gentleman feel it would be a very much greater honor to the Navy if the fleet would keep every one of its ships, from the battleships on down, busy going back and forth bringing the boys home as fast as they can get them here?

Mr. REED of New York. In answer to that question, I believe the American people as a whole would applaud the use of the Navy in getting the boys back to their homes as quickly as possible.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. I have received letters from people who are saying that Congress has been back now about 5 weeks and the only thing we have done is to pass a bill to bring us back to normal times.

Those people cannot understand why Congress does not do something and take some constructive action to speed the return of these young men to their homes now that the war is over. Certainly two of the three basic rights of the Declaration of Independence, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, are being denied to some millions of Americans; is that not true?

Mr. REED of New York. That is true. May I say this to the gentleman, realizing that the boys all over this globe were saying, "Wait until Congress meets," that on the 12th of September I introduced H. R. 4010, and I am waiting for action on the part of the committee and on the part of Congress. That bill will provide for the release of all those who have served honorably for 18 months or more. On another occasion on this floor I said that I would exhaust every parliamentary means to bring that legislation to the floor so that Members of Congress can vote either for or against the soldiers and sailors of this Nation. I am just biding my time under the rules when I can place it upon the desk and permit each one to sign it who wants to help the soldiers come home.

Mr. BUFFETT. I want to commend the gentleman for his efforts and urge him to persist along that line, because the people feel that there is entirely too much oratory in Congress about the "four freedoms" and about what we are going to do to bring freedom and justice to these foreign lands when we are denying freedom and justice and opportunity to millions of our own citizens. That is our foremost problem.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. May I call this situation to the gentleman's attention? I am sure he will agree with me that this is not a cry-baby attitude of either the parents or their loved ones to get these boys back. But a very serious situation exists both in the Pacific and in Europe in that the morale of these boys is at a terrifically low ebb. The gentleman will agree with me that many of them want to come back to their families, which is the natural, human thing for them to do. There are literally hundreds of thousands of these boys who have had a year or two years of college who want to go back and finish their education.

Mr. REED of New York. Which is a perfectly laudable ambition.

Mr. O'HARA. Yes. In that regard some of these boys feel that if they do not come back pretty soon they will never go back to college to finish their education to fit them for some profession, which I think the Army and the Navy should be just as much concerned about as our colleagues in Congress, since it deals with the future of this country. Certainly if we permit these boys who would normally become doctors, lawyers, engineers, or of other professions to reach a point where they will not be able to finish their education, we are certainly going to have a very much lower standard in this country. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. REED of New York. I agree with the gentleman, and I will say this, too, that there is potential power here in the education of our GI's and that it is the duty of the Government to encourage the use of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. I wish to commend the gentleman, too, for the very fine attitude he has taken. May I say that I also receive, as other Congressmen do, a great many letters from men in the service who have been in for 2, 3, even 4 years, many of them with the required number of points, but they are not receiving their discharges. Some of them are right here in the continental United States. May I ask the gentleman if that difficulty is due to errors and lack of following out the policy of the national administration or due to local conditions in the field? Why is it that the rules which are promulgated here by those who are in charge of the program are not being carried out in the field?

Mr. REED of New York. I think one of the reasons is their machinery is too complicated to quickly carry out the demobilization of the men. I think it can all be simplified. That is one reason. Another is that I think it is rather a matter of indifference on the part of some higher-ups. In regard to another group, I think they do not want their organizations broken up. It means their demotion and smaller pay.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say to the gentleman that some of the men in the field write me that their commanding officers evince no desire to get them out of the service.

Mr. REED of New York. I gave one of the reasons for that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the question just asked by the gentleman from Oregon, this morning came a letter from the commanding officer of one of

these boys who wanted out. I had written a letter transmitting the affidavit supporting his request. This commanding officer sent back and asked that my signature to that letter be verified, sworn to. There was nothing to it except just a letter of transmittal, that was all, yet he sent it way back here. Delay was the only purpose in that.

Mr. REED of New York. One thing I want definitely understood is this. I have a profound respect for the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and all these branches of the Government that have done such a fine job during the war, but that does not mean that now that the war is over these boys should not be permitted by the Army and the Navy to come back and live a normal life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

VETERANS' JOB AND INTEGRATED NATIONAL PROGRAM

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing for study and enactment a bill to establish a veterans' job and integrated national program, to foster and assure maximum work opportunities and careers in a free competitive economy. This program would be carried out through the combined efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, foreign trade, the service trades, private agencies, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

I propose to activate this program, under existing laws already passed by the Congress, by utilizing the Retraining and Reemployment Administration which was created for this purpose during the war and now transferred to the Department of Labor. The Congress gave that agency ample authority to do the job but unfortunately the Congress did not charge the Retraining and Reemployment Administration with specific projects. The purpose of this legislation is to make use of the unused industrial capacity of the Nation, which we developed during the war, and which can be more fully utilized in winning the peace by putting it to profitable use for the benefit of unemployed veterans seeking careers and opportunities without harm to established business, trade, or industry, or investment of private capital.

There are two schools of economic thought: The first advocates static or controlled economy; the second advocates a free and ever-expanding economy. With the first school of thought it is inevitable that we shall have increasing unemployment for the reason that our scientific and industrial genius has been obliged, due to manpower shortage during the war, to devise machines, plants, production systems, distribution systems, engineering and scientific methods to compensate for the manpower shortage. All of this has resulted in an enormous step forward in labor-saving devices and methods, but the irony of it is that we now can produce increasingly more goods, services, and productions with fewer and fewer people.

Why should we sit back and accept unemployment as inevitable when by careful planning and a sound program such as this we can find work for those who want to work.

During the war, with one hand tied behind our backs by the war effort, we still managed to lift the standard of living of the great mass of our population to a level never before reached. Now that we have both hands free for useful production we should be thinking of lifting that living standard even further, instead of contemplating and accepting periods of depression and unemployment. With our vast undeveloped natural resources, raw materials, and productive know-how we should have more job openings available than we have workers to fill them.

We are now at the fork of the road. We must make the choice between a static, tightly controlled economy which will inevitably lead us into some sort of stateism from which we fought this war to keep ourselves free; or on the other hand we shall enjoy an ever-expanding economy, growth, and individual freedom in job opportunities, business, professions, and investment of private capital.

Wars are made by people and waged between people. Business, peace, prosperity, and economic development are likewise made by people. It is the human mind and the skill of human hands which will give us either war or prosperity and peace. It is just as simple as that.

On the premise that war and peace are made by people, let us plan our strategy now on the people. It is very likely that if we solve our economic problem in this country we can then solidify more easily our position in world security and set an example for other nations of the world who look to us for leadership in prosperity and security.

After World War I we had approximately one-third the veterans returning from that war as we have from World War II. From both wars we now have a total of 20,000,000 living veterans. When the veterans of World War I sought counsel and information on job or business opportunities they found very little organized information or service facilities. The inevitable conclusion was that they received the run-around.

After World War I the veteran had nine different agencies of government to go to in seeking information, advice, or counsel. Now the veteran has three times that many agencies of the Federal Government alone. In addition to that, every State has passed laws applying to veterans' affairs. Some of them have set up agencies of their own to serve the veteran. In the communities, many agencies have been organized to serve the veteran. We have considerably more interest in serving the veteran by all concerned, but following World War II we have hardly any better organization to unify these increasing agencies and activities. The one purpose of this veterans' job and integrated national program is to unify these varied activities to enable the Federal Government to supply coordinated, intelligent, and authoritative information to the communities and States in order that they may serve the veteran with efficiency. The paradox in this complex situation is that we have in existence an amazing amount of information, technical knowledge, and varied facilities to aid the veteran, but very little of it is correlated and organized.

This is a challenge to the Members of Congress, to industry, organized labor, business, private agencies, and the city fathers of the communities, to rise to the occasion as they did in fighting the first global war of all history, and in creating the arsenal of democracy. We all rose to that occasion in war by the science of organization. The city fathers, the communities, counties, and States are pleading for coordinated information and a pattern of increasing national purpose in serving the veteran upon his return to the community, in order that he may be assimilated into civil life as smoothly as possible, and to enable him to become self-reliant and self-sufficient as early as possible. It is to the advantage of the business world, labor, the educational world, and our economic system to enable the veteran as rapidly as possible to recapture those months and years which he lost while serving and fighting to preserve for the remainder of the people those things the people who stayed at home now enjoy. It is not only a moral duty and a national commitment to organize this veterans' job and integrated national program, but it is a definite economic asset.

I am returning to the principal theme that all of this is a human problem. We skimmed off the cream of our people. In this cream we screened out all except those with the highest physical, mental, educational, and moral capacities. Our veterans compose the finest body of men and women in one group the world has ever seen. Even if we did not look at the veterans' problems as a national responsibility we would be fortunate to have such select and trained people who can inject a new power in our economic bloodstream. It is well that we make a note of warning at this time—that if any part of our 20,000,000 living veterans are unemployed and are buffeted around from pillar to post as they were after the last war, it will bring on inevitably a downward spiral affecting our economic stability.

In looking at this as a human problem again, the vigor with which we develop the veterans' job and integrated national program will affect not only our economic future but our future security in world affairs. If the veterans are disillusioned and disappointed as they were after World War I, we shall have allowed a vacuum of discontent to spread throughout the land, and in the elemental laws of physics, force abhors a vacuum. It is just as inevitable as the night follows the day that if we have a segment of our people, such as the veterans, who have not been as adequately served upon their return as they served the Nation in the war, the blame will fall upon those of us who are lawmakers

and have it in our power to afford them the necessary facilities.

This is the great opportunity in the history of organized labor, business associations, and veterans' organizations, to get solidly behind this unified program which has a unified purpose. The faster we all discharge our obligation to the veterans by giving him the organized facilities he needs, the faster the veteran will be assimilated into civil life and scratched from the unemployment rolls. This will serve to protect the prosperity of other workers, professional people, and businessmen throughout the Nation.

Labor, management, capital, and our lawmakers are all agreed that under the system of private enterprise we have raised our standards of living for the common man higher than at any time in human history. The private-enterprise system cannot stand unless it provides jobs. As developers of the private-enterprise system and the engineers of our own destiny, we are all concerned with the specter of technological unemployment. Not only is this a long-range view toward anticipating recessions and depressions, but it is a short-range view as well. If we are going to increase our national prosperity to a point where we shall avoid chronic dislocations in our labor force, we must now take the first step. That first step in the minds of all the people is our veteran, who belongs to all the people because he has served all the people. The veteran does not belong to any one of the 48 States, to any race, or denomination. He belongs to the Nation. Many veterans have grown beyond their early surroundings and occupation and are equipped to work elsewhere. If we handle his case now we shall not only have discharged our national obligation but we shall have injected a new human power into our economic power which has made this country the greatest Nation of all time.

Again, I say this is a human problem, and we know by experience in recent years that psychology can affect a nation in peace as in war. The organization of this veterans' job and integrated national program is a mental attitude. In the depths of the greatest depression this country has ever known, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, when he moved into the White House, electrified the Nation with his statement that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself." The positive psychology of the Nation took hold in an ever-upward trend. If we have no fears and have the courage to carry out this program we shall have gone far in avoiding our increasing internal strife and do much to unify our national policy of increased prosperity and full employment for all. This veterans' job and integrated national program will put teeth in that over-all objective.

By way of illustrating the attitude and hopes of the veteran, I recite my experience in June of this year when I landed in New York harbor, on the U. S. S. *Monticello*, after spending 11 days aboard with 7,000 troops returning from the European theater of operations. Half of them had been liberated from the prison camps in eastern Germany. It was my privilege to spend most of my time discussing with these veterans what they want this country to do for them during the postwar period. You and I have heard so much about what the GI wants and what he does not want, and what he is going to do, that it was very beneficial to me as a legislator to get first-hand information from the boys themselves as to what they want.

The only two civilians aboard the ship were the gentleman from California, Congressman NED HEALY, and myself. A bulletin was published each morning on the ship, and the boys consequently soon knew that two Congressmen were on board, and they were very anxious to talk to us. They did not mind letting us know exactly what they were thinking. Contrary to general belief, a great many of the boys do not want their old jobs back. They feel they are equipped to handle better jobs. Some of them had been working only a few months on something they considered as a temporary job, and therefore are not interested in returning to it. Many of the boys went into the service directly from school without any experience at all. Incidentally, looking back to my experience as an employer as well as a labor official, I have seen many boys just out of school go on to jobs. Nearly all of their fellow workers, because they were boys, would help, advise, and train them. However, boys who left school to go to war and have spent several years in the service of the Nation are now mature men, minus the knowledge of how to get a job or how to handle it. He cannot go on a job and stumble around while learning because the attitude of others on the job toward a mature man is that he is supposed to know how to do his job, and he cannot get by without knowing how, as can the boy just out of school. Therefore, a training program for millions of our young fellows is vitally necessary.

Many of the veterans have learned trades and professions while in the service and are planning to go into business in the line of the training they received. Most of the veterans say that they want better jobs than they had, and others state that they are seeking business opportunities. Incidentally, surveys indicate that 1,000,000 veterans state that they are going into business for themselves.

They appreciate courtesies that Congress has done for the servicemen, like the GI bill of rights, and so forth, but they do not want to be set aside as a special-privileged group. Those interested in business told me that they realized clearly that before they could succeed in jobs, business, or professions the Nation would have to enjoy prosperity. They said that all the people would be their customers and that if the servicemen were set aside and the rest of the people were in the throes of a depression it would only be a matter of time until the veterans would also be in the midst of the depression. So they said that above all they did not want to see another depression such as the one which followed the last war, and that they are now looking to Congress to do something to prevent it. When I asked them specifically what they wanted Congress to do, I was told in no uncertain terms, "You are the Congressman, and it is your responsibility to figure that out. Just see that a depression does not happen. If the fellows who are in there now cannot do it, we will see that somebody is elected who can." Veterans all seem to be of one mind. The veterans of World War II state that they were not going to "miss the boat" as the veterans did following World War I.

Again I stress that the veterans do not want to be set aside as a special group, apart from the people of the Nation. They said that that would be isolationism—the very thing that has caused the war they have just been fighting. The boys asked that prosperity be maintained in the country, which would provide opportunities so that they could doff their uniforms and don civilian clothes and again become a part of their respective communities along with the rest of the population, and join in regular pursuits.

It was the opinion of the boys that our economic system is supposed to serve the people, and that it is not the purpose of the people to be servants to the economic system.

I feel that since we owe the boys so much for what they have done for our democracy, the least we could do is to maintain the prosperity for them which they so much desire.

Most authorities in science, industry, labor statistics, and business agree that we have not yet begun to develop the full capacities of this Nation. Uncle Sam is a giant who does not know his full strength. This is a time for courage and explanatory thinking.

We legislators might even consider this as a device to reduce the taxes of our constituents, and even show a profit on the operation of this veterans' integrated national program. By statute we have already given the veteran an adjusted-compensation allowance. In fact, it is an unemployment allowance, which has already cost the taxpayers $34,000,000, and to the end of the fiscal year of 1947 it is estimated that it will amount to over $1,000,000,000. If we are good businessmen in the interest of the veterans and in the interest of the Nation, we can divert these expenditures into a profit in work opportunities and careers for the veterans and a profit to the Nation instead of setting up this $1,000,000,000, and inevitably more billions to come, on our books as a liability. Why not put the veterans' job and integrated national program on a businesslike basis immediately by more efficient coordination of our Federal agencies to assist the communities and the States toward this end. Reduced to its most factual and elemental basis, this entire program should not cost the taxpayers one additional cent, but, rather, it would show an immediate saving, and, in so doing, make the veteran more self-reliant, self-sufficient, and he will surely have a better opportunity to maintain his self-respect.

This is a challenge for those of us who are charged with making the laws under which our Government operates. Our greatest responsibility, as Congressmen, to the veterans and the Nation, is to help maintain a permanent peace. To do that it is most essential that we maintain prosperity at home.

The enactment of this program will go a long way toward accomplishing that goal.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has before it at the present time the so-called full employment bill. Tomorrow it will hear William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Murray, of the CIO; and some other witnesses. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he said the veterans told him the thing they did not want was another depression.

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And then they said, when you asked them what they wanted you to do about it, that that was your job?

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, what is worrying some of us on that committee is that very fact. It is all very easy to say, "We do not want another depression." I do not know of anyone who does want it, but just what particular steps is a Congressman or the Congress as a whole to take to avoid that depression? That is where they fall down on the thing. They do not give us any idea of how we can bring about what they want. What is your suggestion on that line?

Mr. SAVAGE. In the first place, there are several millions of the boys who have never been trained to work. This National Training and Reemployment Administration was set up by the Congress and never did function. It was placed under General Hines, and I think he had too much to do to get it started. However, it was a postwar set-up, really. Now the time has come when there is a necessity for training some of the boys who are coming back and assisting in channeling them out to opportunities. This bill in no way conflicts with the full employment bill you mentioned.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand.

Mr. SAVAGE. Now, the full employment bill merely establishes a policy of the Federal Government and does not do any of the things that this bill does. In other words, to accomplish the purposes of the full employment bill after it has been passed by the Congress, it will still be necessary to pass additional legislation if we are going to bring about full employment, because the bill itself actually only sets up a policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Am I correct in understanding that your bill is to train these young men along some specific lines, and then channel them into industry or into professions?

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right; it is to train them and to help employ them. The first thing it does is to coordinate some thirty-odd agencies that are handling veterans' affairs and giving advice to veterans.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Pardon me, does the gentleman mean Government agencies?

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right; and they will be coordinated under this Reemployment and Retraining Administration so the veteran will have a more uniform program. No two States have any similarity of program and the veteran in going from one place to another has to learn all over again what the program is. This will assist them a great deal in rehabilitation, and the veteran will know what he can expect from the Government agencies.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I also understood the gentleman to say that he was speaking as a former employer and union official.

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the testimony supporting the unemployment bill we have had advanced the idea that if private industry does not supply these jobs then the Government, through a system of public works, should appropriate some money and create jobs. If this be true, after those jobs are created should there not be some corresponding obligation on the idle of the country to accept and work at those jobs?

Mr. SAVAGE. I have had a great deal to do with the administration of unemployment funds, and I know it is very difficult for a man to draw unemployment compensation if he is in any way idle because of some labor dispute, whether it be a lock-out or a strike. If he is thrown out of work because of some labor dispute he cannot draw unemployment compensation. I think probably the gentleman's question relates to compensation during strikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; that was not my thought. My thought was this, why should the Federal Government go ahead and draw plans for jobs in the future and public works, appropriate perhaps billions of dollars, get the work started, and then find that the Federal Government cannot get the people to work even though there are a million or more idle in the country. Does the gentleman understand my point?

Mr. SAVAGE. If they are idle because of inability to obtain employment they will accept the jobs, in my judgment. In other words, the Government will not sponsor work when people do not want it. The full employment bill states in the amendment adopted in the Senate "when they desire work."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but the gentleman as an employer knows that work has to be planned ahead.

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the Federal Government wishes to build a highway from Washington to Philadelphia, it first has to procure plans, draw blueprints, then it has to buy a right-of-way before it can put anybody to work. But when they are ready to pour concrete, grade the right-of-way, or do something else they find that the fellows do not come forward because they say the job does not pay enough, or the hours are too long, or the work is too hard.

Mr. SAVAGE. Suppose I were drawing unemployment compensation today and the USES comes along and offers me a job. If I do not take it they cut me off immediately and I cannot draw any more compensation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That part is all right but it does not cure it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Steamships in Air Transportation," written by the late Col. Edgar S. Gorrell.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution permitting alcohol plants to produce sugars or sirup simultaneously with the production of alcohol until July 1, 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On October 11, 1945:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

On October 12, 1945:

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth C. Stone;

H. R. 476. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.," approved June 14, 1933, as amended;

H. R. 656. An act to provide for the appointment of postmasters for fourth-class offices in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Laura May Ryan;

H. R. 1565. An act for the relief of Inglis Construction Co., a corporation;

H. R. 1629. An act for the relief of Michael C. Donatell;

H. R. 1765. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the Agricultural Byproducts Laboratory on the campus of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts;

H. R. 1849. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ora R. Hutchinson;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Anna Mattil and others;

H. R. 1958. An act for the relief of L. A. Williams;

H. R. 2317. An act for the relief of Mrs. Virginia M. Kiser;

H. R. 2690. An act to amend the Bonneville Project Act;

H. R. 3081. An act for the relief of August Svelund;

H. R. 3150. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River, between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1939;

H. R. 3373. An act authorizing the reconstruction of the Spring Common Bridge on Mahoning Avenue, across the Mahoning River in the municipality of Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio; and

H. R. 3871. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 16, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in executive session, Tuesday, October 16, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will meet at 10 a. m., Tuesday, October 16, to continue hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

There will be a meeting of the Federal Power Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, October 16, 1945.

Business to be considered: Resumption of public hearings on the bill (H. R. 1742) relating to rural electrification planning programs.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Tuesday, October 16, at 10 o'clock a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes, in the Rivers and Harbors Committee Room.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in executive hearing to consider the bill (H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

735. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 15, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Nissequogue River, Long Island, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

736. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

737. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act authorizing the commencement and conduct of legal proceedings under the direction of the Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

738. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting pursuant to provisions of section 2 (d) of Public Law 46, Seventy-seventh Congress, information that no contracts were entered into or modified under authority of Public Law 46 for the period beginning July 1, 1945, and ending September 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

739. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $1,641,000 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 311); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

740. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1946, amounting to $1,429,000, and a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 312); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

741. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $928,000,000, for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 313); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

742. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $47,000 for the Smithsonian Institution (H. Doc. No. 314); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

743. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $166,200 for the Securities and Exchange Commission (H. Doc. No. 315); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

744. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $5,924,000 for the Federal Loan Agency (H. Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

745. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $4,800,000 for the Employees' Compensation Commission (H. Doc. No. 317); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

746. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriation for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945, in the sum of $35,234.06, and a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946, in the sum of $45,000, amounting in all to $80,234.06, for the Judiciary (H. Doc. No. 318); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1497. A bill to amend subsection 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3167. A bill to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 1121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4231. A bill to facilitate further the disposition of prizes captured by the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 111. Joint resolution designating January 5 each year as George Washington Carver Day; with amendment (Rept. No. 1123). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4376. A bill to provide for the release from active duty of members of the armed forces desiring to resume their education or training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 4377. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey with a view to the improvement of the navigability of Bayou Segnette, La.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4378. A bill to authorize the payment of pension to certain widows and children of World War I and World War II veterans whose annual income exceeds $1,000 but does not exceed $2,500; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4379. A bill to amend Public Law 16, approved March 24, 1943; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. Res. 372. Resolution for installation of a mechanical device for reporting the roll of the House and authorizing investigation thereof; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4380. A bill for the relief of W. Garland Lillard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4381. A bill for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Bovelek or Georg Bovelek; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:
H. R. 4382. A bill for the relief of Capt. John H. Schmitt and Mildred Schmitt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:
H. R. 4383. A bill for the relief of Floyd L. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1243. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Board of Aldermen of the City of Somerville, Mass., seeking a liberalization of the point system of demobilization for the benefit of prisoners of war in Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1244. Also, petition of Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, upon petition of Boston Chapter No. 10, to clarify and correct the interpretation of Executive Order 9538, regarding eligibles who entered the armed forces to be given probational civil-service appointment; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1245. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of J. Clyde Faries, of Hillsboro, Tex., favoring H. R. 4130; to the Committee on Labor.

1246. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Commander in Chief, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their request for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 35; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1247. Also, petition of the Cambridge City Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the abolition of all present restrictions on free Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

A Good Shepherd of the human family, the night becomes as day when from the heart we pray: May Jesus Christ be praised. Thou from whom cometh the highest good, so manifest Thyself toward us that we shall have no memory of gifts withheld or service unrendered that would mar the bliss of an undisturbed conscience. Let there be under Thy guidance, a human response answering the call for human helpfulness in all things just and sympathetic.

We pray for a serious awakening of the soul of America; without it, O God, Thou art mocked and our hope is slain. Forbid that the selfishness of man should sting to death the sanctities of human rights, whose native roots run deep, scenting the eternal water: "Everything, whithersoever the river cometh, shall live," bearing fruit in every good work. Speak through us, dear Lord, through our imperfections and weaknesses, our errors and misconceptions, that our country may know its true riches, its vast outlooks, and inexpressible joys. Teach us to love Thy law and to walk in the way of Thy commandments. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on Thursday, October 11, 1945, the President approved and signed a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3466. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; and

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The SPEAKER. The Chair trusts that as few Members as possible will ask to proceed for 1 minute, as we have a rather heavy program for today and a special order of 1 hour on Palestine.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Why would it not be better just to go ahead and have the hour special order, then proceed with the 1-minute speeches?

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes it best to proceed as indicated.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

STEPS TAKEN FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN FRANCE

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDERSON of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] may have permission to address the House for 15 minutes after any other special orders heretofore entered. The gentleman has time for today which he will not use.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter showing the taxes paid the Federal Government by the Territory of Hawaii.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if ever a man deserved the complete support of his government and his people, that man is Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Our Government should make it plain to all the world that he has that support.

MacArthur has reported that the demobilization of Japan's fighting force of 7,000,000 is complete. The Japanese imperial general staff, from which all of the Japanese imperialistic schemes have been hatched, has been dissolved.

All of this has been accomplished without the firing of a single shot or the shedding of one drop of Allied blood. It will certainly go down in history as one of the greatest military achievements of all times.

MacArthur reports that the people of Japan are in complete humiliation. Their military spirit has been killed.

Let that fact be an answer to that small group of so-called liberals in this country who have been conducting a campaign of petty sniping aimed at MacArthur.

This Government should set at rest any doubts that may exist, either in this country or abroad, by a vigorous and unequivocal statement in support of MacArthur's leadership in the occupation of Japan.

VETERANS' PRIORITIES

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill which will give returning veterans priorities and real opportunities to purchase surplus property, not only for business purposes, but for personal desires as well, and without paying dealers exorbitant profits.

An honorable discharge will be the veteran's certificate of eligibility; his priority will be immediately below that given the States and municipalities, and his limit of purchase will be fixed at $25,000.

The proposed amendment to the Surplus Property Act, if enacted, will give the veterans the opportunity which I am sure we all want them to have.

From expressions heretofore voiced on the floor of the House, I expect immediate action with no opposition to this proposed legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by John O'Donnell, appearing in the Times-Herald, regarding General MacArthur.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. Paul Jones, judge of the district court, Cleveland, on constitutional government.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by him.

RETURNING SOLDIERS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the American Legion, and a letter from the State Department.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two matters, and to include in the first a resolution and in the second a telegram.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Millard Rice, of the Disabled American Veterans, entitled "Retirement Review Tips Are Compiled."

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Polish American Congress.

Mr. LEWIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the authors of one of the bills for the St. Lawrence waterway canal and power plant. The following article that appeared in the Minneapolis Star-Journal on October 9 on this subject is short and to the point:

Only 258 miles of the water route need to be improved to give Duluth and Minnesota a deep channel to the Atlantic. More than 2,400 miles of the total distance is already deep enough for seagoing ships.

Now with the feasibility and need of the project demonstrated by the war emergency, the prospects for favorable congressional action are brighter than ever before. In his special message and by other encouragement, President Truman has done well by the St. Lawrence seaway proposal.

Still, the undertaking faces tough opposition. In its last appearance before Congress it was defeated in the Senate 56–25. That time it was offered as an executive agreement with Canada, requiring only a majority vote in both Houses. The present bill was introduced by Senate Leader BARKLEY also as an executive agreement.

Some questioners, however, still maintain that a treaty with Canada, which must be ratified by a two-thirds vote in the Senate, is the only legal way to provide the seaway.

But no matter how it is authorized, the project should get started. The President in his message to Congress cited four benefits to be gained by the development:

1. Cheap water transportation.
2. Employment opportunities.
3. Cheap electric power, notably for New York State.
4. Joint defense and added prosperity for the United States and Canada.

The Midwest and the continent would be the richer for the seaway. The war effort would have been facilitated had the waterway been completed before Pearl Harbor. America hopes another war will never come, yet if it does—and for the commerce of peace—the deep waterway is logically urgent.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, before we begin the march into Palestine today, waving a red flag in the face of the British Empire, I desire to say a few words in defense of one of the most patriotic organizations on earth, the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I understand that an hour has been set aside at this time for political speeches on the Palestine question, which, as I said, is like waving a red flag in the face of the British Empire, or hurling an atomic bomb into our international affairs.

The anti-Zionist Jews, who are also anti-Communist, do not want this Palestine question agitated.

However, if the Zionist Jews really want some place to go, and their alleged friends in the House want some place to send them, that can be arranged without creating a war with the Arabs or stirring up friction with the British Empire.

I understand that Stalin has expressed a willingness to have them settle in one of the States of the Soviet Union, possibly east of the Urals.

I believe such an arrangement can be easily worked out, and since practically every Communist among them came from Russia, I am sure they would not protest—especially after they got over there.

But, Mr. Speaker, I resent, and every decent American ought to resent, the communistic attacks that are now being made on the DAR. When a Member of this House goes into the Associated Press and refers to Mrs. Truman as "the last lady" of the land for having taken dinner with the Daughters of the American Revolution, we have come to a terrible pass.

Mrs. Truman is one of the finest women who ever graced the White House; and to all decent patriotic Americans she is the First Lady of the land.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

THE DAR AND RACE PREJUDICE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy at this time to congratulate the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] for having written to the chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution with which she is affiliated urging that that chapter condemn the action of the national DAR in refusing the use of Constitution Hall to one of the leading artistes in America, who also happens to be the wife of one of our colleagues in the House of Representatives.

I commend the President of the United States, Harry Truman, also for his action in criticizing the act of the DAR and taking issue with them for drawing the color line in the use of a tax-free auditorium in the Capital City of the Nation.

I join with the Washington Post also in editorially attacking this stand once again taken by the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I recall with pleasure that President Franklin D. Roosevelt said at the time that Marian Anderson was denied the use of the hall that that, too, should be denounced. Later the DAR did permit Marian Anderson to sing at Constitution Hall for a charity benefit. I am shocked to learn now that this great patriotic order has reverted to its original attitude.

Mr. Speaker, we have just concluded a war caused in no small measure by racial

pogroms and bigotry inculpating Hitler and the Nazis. We repeatedly inveighed against that illogical and indefensible policy when practiced by our enemies. Let us not encourage it here. Too many of our people are consciously or unwittingly swayed by prejudice and hatred of fellow Americans. Who is there among us who may justly arrogate to himself superiority over fellow citizens because of a difference in race or religion? We must rise above such tendencies. They sow the seeds of destruction. They are harbingers of chaos and disaster. I urge the DAR to recant. Welcome artists of all races and religions. Encourage cultural attainment and knowledge in our people. Open the doors. Let us reread the immortal words on the Statue of Liberty. Let us rededicate ourselves to the Bill of Rights in our Constitution and to the Declaration of Independence. There is no room in our beloved country for first-class and second-class American citizens.

PALESTINE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it seems rather unfortunate that the gentleman from Mississippi would again say that we are waving a red flag at the British Empire just because we are going to consider the condition of the helpless, hapless, and homeless Jews of Europe seeking entrance into Palestine. It is the gentleman's habitual process of red smearing and witch hunting. The one situation has nothing to do with the other—that is, Palestine has nothing to do with the Daughters of the American Revolution, except that Britain has forgotten her pledged justice to the Jew, and the DAR, by its action, has denied justice and equity to the colored people. I deplore the action of the Daughters of the American Revolution denying the use of Constitution Hall to a very celebrated and renowned artist, Miss Hazel Scott. The Daughters of the American Revolution only repeated their very tragic action with reference to Marian Anderson. Certainly there is no monopoly on artistic talents. Surely it cannot be said that only white people can play as beautifully as Miss Hazel Scott or sing as gloriously as Miss Anderson. The certificate of incorporation of the Daughters of the American Revolution, which certificate we adopted in this very Chamber, provides that there shall be equality to all. They deny that certificate and the provisions therein. Refusal of Constitution Hall, the citadel of the DAR, to colored artists is a violation of the certificate of incorporation of the DAR. I shall offer a resolution dissolving that certificate. Congress created the DAR. Congress must now cancel out the DAR because of its outrageous violation of the tenets of decency and fair play.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein an editorial entitled "The Constitutionality of the FEPC" from the Shreveport Times.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one a radio speech and in the other a resolution of the Milwaukee Common Council.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from a Jacksonville paper on the subject of statehood for Territories.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—PUERTO RICAN INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

It is the settled policy of this Government to promote the political, social, and economic development of people who have not yet attained full self-government, and eventually to make it possible for them to determine their own form of government.

It is our pride that this policy was faithfully pursued in the case of the Philippines. The people of the Philippines determined that they desired political independence, and the Government of the United States made provision to this effect.

It is now time, in my opinion, to ascertain from the people of Puerto Rico their wishes as to the ultimate status which they prefer, and, within such limits as may be determined by the Congress, to grant to them the kind of government which they desire.

The present form of government in the island appears to be unsatisfactory to a large number of its inhabitants. Different groups of people in Puerto Rico are advocating various changes in the present form of government.

These advocated changes include different possibilities: (1) The right of the Puerto Ricans to elect their own Governor with a wider measure of local self-government; (2) statehood for Puerto Rico; (3) complete independence; and (4) a dominion form of government.

Each of these propositions is being urged in the island, and each has its own advocates. Uncertainty has been created among the people as to just what the future of Puerto Rico is to be. These uncertainties should be cleared away at an early date.

To this end, I recommend that the Congress consider each of the proposals, and that legislation be enacted submitting various alternatives to the people of Puerto Rico. In that way, the Congress can ascertain what the people of Puerto Rico themselves most desire for their political future.

However, in the interest of good faith and comity between the people of Puerto Rico and those of us who live on the mainland, Congress should not submit any proposals to the Puerto Ricans which the Congress is not prepared to enact finally into law. We should be prepared to carry into effect whatever options are placed before the people of Puerto Rico, once the Puerto Ricans have expressed their preference.

I hope that this problem can be considered by the Congress at an early date, and that appropriate legislation be enacted designed to make definite the future status of Puerto Rico.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 16, 1945.*

PALESTINE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in yielding to our majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a splendid article published in the Washington Star of last Saturday, written by one whom I respect very much, Lowell Mellett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time I have spoken in behalf of righting the ancient wrong against the Jewish people. Before I proceed I want it emphatically understood that I do not consider that anyone who speaks here today in this just cause is waving a red flag at the British Empire. It is about time we stopped hearing remarks of that kind. A Member should be permitted to take the floor and speak in the cause of humanity without being accused of waving a red flag against anybody.

When the Wright-Compton resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives on January 24, 1944, I told the House that if there was ever a time when the need was great for a national home for the Jewish people the time was now.

I asserted then that I was persuaded "that as soon as the military situation permitted the Palestine resolution now pending in the United States Congress will be passed overwhelmingly."

Later when hearings were conducted before the House Foreign Affairs Committee I appeared before that body and I strongly urged enactment of the pending resolution. At that time I testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee as follows:

> I know that every decent-minded person, without regard to race, color, or creed, has a deep feeling, not only of sympathy but far beyond sympathy, for the unfortunate plight of all persecuted peoples, of peoples who have been maltreated by the Nazi horde, and particularly those of the Jewish faith who have undergone vicious persecution in the past several years. It is the cry of humanity that I have referred to, the cry of justice, and particularly a challenge to Christian justice, that this problem be met. They are human beings just like you and I. They

have their hopes and their aspirations. They have their little families, the men have their wives, and the wives have their husbands, and they have their children as God has blessed them. They are human beings seeking a home, some place where they can live without fear of future persecution.

Nothing has occurred since to cause me to change my opinion about the crying need for a national home for the oppressed Jews of Europe. I am, as a matter of fact, more convinced than ever that the only solution of that tragic problem is through the creation of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

Because I feel so strongly on this subject, it was my pleasure to cooperate wholeheartedly in the incorporation by the resolutions committee of the Democratic National Convention last year, of which I had the honor to be chairman, of a plank pledging our party to creation of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

It will be well to quote right here the full text of that platform. It said:

We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

The Republicans did not use the word "Jewish" before "commonwealth," but unquestionably their intent was the same as ours. The Republican platform said:

In order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jewish men, women, and children driven from their homes by tyranny, we call for the opening of Palestine to their unrestricted immigration and land ownership, so that in accordance with the full intent and purpose of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the resolution of a Republican Congress in 1922, Palestine may be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth.

Later during the campaign, both President Roosevelt and Mr. Dewey, the Republican candidate strongly endorsed the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. In a historic letter to the annual convention of the Zionist organization in Atlantic City on October 15 last year, President Roosevelt declared:

Efforts will be made to find appropriate ways and means of effectuating this policy as soon as practicable. I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim and if reelected I shall help to bring about its realization.

A few days earlier, Governor Dewey asserted in a formal statement that, if elected President:

I would use my best offices to have our Government working together with Great Britain to achieve this great objective for a people that have suffered so much and deserve so much at the hands of mankind.

Thus, ladies and gentlemen of the House, there was no political division among Americans last year on the question of justice for the Jews through the establishment of at least one place on this earth where they could go and live as freemen, unbothered either by economic or social or political restrictions and inhibitions.

But long before our political conventions took cognizance of the unhappy plight of these victims of Hitler's barbaric persecutions, this Government and the Government of Great Britain, and later this Congress took cognizance of the need for the establishment in Palestine of a safe, legally created home for the Jews wherein that small people would enjoy peace and tranquility and the good will of the more powerful nations of this world.

On October 2, 1917, the British Government, in a statement known as the Balfour Declaration pledged itself to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. Prior to the issuance of this declaration, Great Britain sought and obtained the approval of the Government of the United States. There was, in fact, prolonged negotiations between President Woodrow Wilson and Mr. David Lloyd George, the then Prime Minister of Great Britain in reference to the issuance of the manifesto which became known as the Balfour Declaration.

There was no question at that time either in the minds of Mr. Wilson or of Mr. Lloyd George or of any of the statesmen and diplomats who had a hand in the promulgation of the so-called Balfour Declaration that as soon as it was humanly possible to transport the necessary number of Jews to Palestine and to establish an orderly economy, that this small tract of land at the end of the Mediterranean Sea would be constituted as an independent nation by, of, and for the Jews, and with, obviously, the majority of the population Jewish people. There was no intent to deprive any other people of any right to which they were entitled, and it was set forth in the Balfour Declaration that the rights of all minority peoples, both religious and economic, would be scrupulously observed. And I might say here, there has never been a contrary thought in the minds of those who are advocating the belated fulfillment of this pledge of the United States and the British Government.

At a peace conference at San Remo on April 25, 1920, the Allied Supreme Council allotted the mandate for Palestine to Great Britain for the express purpose of putting the Balfour Declaration into effect. There was correspondence between the United States and the British Government on the subject and it is of interest to note here, and it is very significant, too, that although the American Government did not participate in the ratification of the Versailles Treaty, this Government did give its approval to the Palestine mandate.

On June 30, 1922, Congress adopted a joint resolution which was signed by President Harding on September 2, 1922, favoring the establishment in Palestine of a national Jewish home. This resolution was sponsored by a very distinguished citizen of my State, the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, who was then the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In 1924, in a treaty between Great Britain and the United States, the terms of the Palestine mandate were formally ratified. In this treaty the United States consented to the administration, mind you, administration, of Palestine by the British Government pursuant to the articles of the mandate. This treaty set forth that no modification whatsoever should be made in the terms of the mandate unless such prior modifications "shall have been first assented to by the United States." It was very clear that the assent of the United States of America, as one of the World War Allied and Associated Powers was necessary for the validity of the administration of Palestine by Great Britain, and that the United States, on its part, had not relinquished the right to a voice in the disposition of Palestine to which we, as an associated power, not only were entitled to, but which we, as a foremost participant in World War I helped to create.

Unfortunately and most tragically, in the light of developments, Great Britain saw fit to violate the provisions of the mandate. Great Britain undertook, without prior consultation of the United States, to impose what has since become known as the Chamberlain white paper, wherein, arbitrarily, Great Britain undertook to shut off Jewish immigration into Palestine, the only place on earth where victims of Hitler's persecutions could find asylum at a time when the need for Palestine was greatest in its history. Had not Great Britain imposed this policy as a part of the then prevailing appeasement policies of the British Government, Palestine would have been available for hundreds of thousands, perhaps more than a million, of homeless Jews seeking to escape from Germany and the satellite countries where Hitler's anti-Jewish laws had been imposed.

It should be noted here that President Roosevelt stated on a number of occasions that the American Government never gave its consent to the Chamberlain white paper. We were completely ignored in this British assumption of complete authority over the fortunes of a people.

The tragic experiences of the Jews through the long years of the World War are all too poignant to discuss in detail here. Never in all history have a people been more sadly and cruelly abused. It has been estimated by competent authority that approximately 6,000,000 Jewish lives were snuffed out by Hitler and his henchmen during the years of the World War. The disclosures from the various prison camps are still all too fresh in our memory and Hitler's work continues, because although liberation has come to the inmates of the prison camps, their sufferings and their weakened condition is such that hundreds of them are dying daily because of sheer inability to recuperate. I heard over the week end that in 1 prison camp alone, 21,000 emaciated Jews have died since their liberation from their German captors.

We are discussing Palestine today because of the splendid action just taken by President Truman in an effort to persuade the British Government to immediately admit 100,000 of these refugees into Palestine. The prompt admission of these homeless people into Palestine is the immediate objective. The long-time objective—and I hope it will soon come to

pass—is the creation, as was contemplated, of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. We must understand that the Jew who escapes with his life from the concentration camp has almost no hope whatsoever of reestablishing himself in his old home. For the most part, their families have been killed and all of their friends have been killed. In addition, they find themselves without property, without businesses, and without the means of rebuilding their lives. They just cannot pick up where they left off. It is necessary that they begin life anew in an environment where there are friendly faces and no tragic memories.

The feeling of the American people on the question of justice for the Jew, through their establishment in a land of their own in Palestine, is very intense. It is deep-rooted, and it is widespread, and it permeates all classes of our people. Sermons have been preached on this subject in thousands of American churches by clergymen of all faiths. Resolutions have been adopted by State legislatures, municipalities, hundreds of civic organizations. Petitions have gone to the President signed by 44 governors of our land and by the majority of the Members of this House and of the Senate. The American people are great believers in fair play, and they do not think the Jews have gotten a square deal.

The British Government, which, we are informed by the press, is objecting to the fulfillment of President Truman's request that 100,000 refugees be admitted immediately into Palestine, will make a great mistake if they do not appreciate the depth of American feeling on this subject. During the war years, this Congress and our Government acquiesced to the British request that action on Palestine by this Congress and by our Government be postponed because it might interfere with the war effort. We realized that every day of delay in the opening of Palestine meant the loss of Jewish lives; but, nevertheless, in our efforts to further the joint efforts of the war, we heeded the British request.

The war in Europe has been over for more than 6 months, but the white paper restricting immigration is still prevailing. This, in my opinion, is not playing fair either with our Government or with the Jews or with the American people.

Millions of innocent persons, simply because they were born Jews, have been ruthlessly persecuted, murdered, and violated. Only a handful, literally, of Jews remain in Europe. I am told that hardly more than a million and a half Jews are still alive throughout all of Europe. In many communities, the barbaric Nazis wiped out every Jewish child, thereby reducing to the lowest possible number the future Jewish population of those areas.

Every effort should be made by our Government and by other governments of good will to save the remnants of this historic people who have contributed so much to this world's cultural, economic, scientific, and religious welfare. The saving and the rehabilitation of these people constitutes a challenge to mankind. The challenge should be met, not ignored. It should be met immediately.

The suggestion of President Truman to Prime Minister Attlee that these refugees be transported immediately to Palestine is a fair one, a sound one, a necessary one. It is aimed to meet the immediate problem of saving human beings. It is not the long-time solution, but it is the one that is most pressing at the moment.

Certainly every decent man and woman in this country and throughout the world wants every effort made to save these lives and to remove them from the category of hopeless, helpless, homeless wanderers. These people, unhappily and tragically, find sympathy everywhere, but they are wanted nowhere. This constitutes a sad commentary on our civilization and our vaunted Christian generosity. Under the circumstances, Palestine is a natural, as well as a national, homeland. Certainly there should be no objection to permitting these people to go there to re-create their lives as useful men and women.

Let me say again that I have spoken in behalf of Palestine on many occasions in this House, and before committees of the Congress and at mass meetings and on other occasions where the subject of Palestine was under discussion. I hope that as long as the good Lord gives me the strength and the breath to do so, that I will continue to raise my voice and whatever influence I may have either as a Member of this Congress or as an individual citizen in behalf of the righting of one of the greatest crimes in all recorded history. Let me say again that I think President Truman's initiative in this matter is magnificent, and I will be grievously disappointed if our British friends fail for any cause whatsoever to heed his generous humanitarian suggestion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the question we are discussing today is one of paramount importance to decent men and women, and I emphasize decent-minded men and women. I view the human race as one family. We may be of different racial origins, our consciences may prompt us to entertain different religious beliefs, we may by accident of birth be born of different colors, but so far as I am concerned without regard to the view any other person may take, in my journey through life I entertain the view that the human race is one family and that we have got to view this question from that angle, the angle given to us by God himself, that the human race is one family.

The problem we are discussing today is a challenge to mankind, and the request of President Truman for the admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine should be granted by the British Government. Such steps will meet the immediate problem. The long-range problem can only be solved by the establishment of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

[From the Washington Star of October 10, 1945]

"ON THE OTHER HAND"—BRITISH ADVISED TO TAKE NOTICE OF FEELING CONCERNING PALESTINE

(By Lowell Mellett)

It is inconceivable that those who make British policy know the extent of the ill-will developing in this country as the result of their behavior in the matter of Palestine. Word has come that President Truman's proposal for the immediate removal of 100,000 Jews from the concentration camps and makeshift miseries of Germany to Palestine, has met with an unfavorable reception in London. And there is no indication that the new labor government will alter the policy established by the Chamberlain government toward the Jewish homeland.

Now in this country is a British financial mission, seeking a $5,000,000,000 loan. Negotiations with our State Department are said to have progressed satisfactorily and very soon an agreement on terms may be presented to Congress for its approval. Whatever the merits of the proposal, and however well it may be argued that assistance to our late ally would work to the benefit of our own country, it might be worth while for this British mission to examine the strength of some of the existing prejudices against Britain.

They will find that the prejudice resulting from the British default on its moral commitment in the matter of the Jews, is a very strong prejudice, one capable perhaps of upsetting their hope of monetary aid. It is deeply rooted in Congress.

The last formal action on the subject occurred a year ago, when a resolution was offered asking the British Government to make good the Balfour Declaration, approved by President Wilson, reopen Palestine to Jewish immigration and permit the building of the contemplated Jewish commonwealth. This resolution was held up at the request of the administration because of the war. The thing for the British to note, however, is the authorship of the resolution—Senators WAGNER and TAFT, two men ordinarily as far apart as the poles. When these two agree on any important policy it can safely be labeled American policy. They still agree in this instance and both are pressing for action, as are many other Members.

If other evidence is required to prove the depth of American feeling, it can be found in a letter to President Truman, signed by a majority of the Members of the Senate and House. It can be found in a petition from the governors of 40 States and in resolutions adopted by 33 State legislatures during the past 2 years; likewise in resolutions of the A. F. of L. and the CIO and the individual pronouncements of 818 labor leaders and 2,000 university presidents and professors.

There is no point in discussing the merits of the issue. Rightly or wrongly, opinion in this country has jelled. The case for the Arabs has been discounted in the light of the showing they made during the war, both as friends and as enemies, and their obvious impotence in these days of mechanized warfare. Junketing Congressmen, after visiting the Near East, are convinced that the Arabs never could have been more than a minor nuisance even when the British situation was really precarious.

The case for the Jews has been made as eloquently by British statesmen as by American. Churchill's charge that Chamberlain's repudiation of the Balfour Declaration was "a plain breach of a solemn obligation," is well known in this country. So, too, is the position taken by the Labor Party before the recent election. "There was a strong case before the war," said a party resolution. "There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews

in Europe. * * * The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales."

So, the financial mission might bestir itself to have this American "prejudice" removed by action in London, before the question of the loan reaches Congress. If any such loan should carry a condition that the British first be required to keep their word to the Jews of the world—and to the American Government—a smell would thereby be attached to British statesmanship likely to last a long, long time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may take.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in a world faced with many grave problems that of the Jews of Europe does not, in terms of numbers, loom very large. Of the six or seven million Jews in Europe before the war, the Nazi butchers have left alive no more than 2,000,000. But in terms of our approach to the problems of the postwar world as a whole, there are few issues by which the statesmanship and the sincerity with which we make the peace, can be better measured.

It was with deep gratification that we here learned of the action of our President in supporting the proposal for the immediate grant, as an interim measure, of 100,000 certificates for Jews to enter Palestine. I understand that the British have not received this intervention with unmitigated satisfaction; I am sure they will not object if I recall that Britain was granted authority over Palestine for the purpose, and that was the main purpose, of establishing there a Jewish National Home for the Jewish people. If Britain is in Palestine today, it is because she accepted that trust and that obligation. In that behalf she entered into a covenant, not only with 50 nations of the League of Nations but also in 1924 with our own country, in which the terms of that trust were clearly specified.

Great Britain undertook, and I quote, "to facilitate Jewish immigration into Palestine." Great Britain undertook, and I quote, "to facilitate Jewish settlement on the land in Palestine." These obligations, the Palestine white paper repudiates unilaterally, and without the authority of those by whom Great Britain was entrusted with the administration of the Holy Land.

If we are to have a world in which law, order, and justice among men are to prevail, it is intolerable that pledges solemnly given should, if convenience so dictates, be treated as scraps of paper. I am aware of the many anxieties which today confront the people of Britain, whose cities have suffered the onslaught of Nazi guns and planes, and whose economy has been subjected to an immense strain in behalf of the common war effort, but I cannot believe it is in her own interest or in the interest of the world at large that she should deny her obligations or fail to carry out her duty in regard to this great humanitarian issue.

We all know, of course, of the pressure which has been brought by the different Arab countries to bring about this decision to continue the Palestine white paper. We have heard threats, on the one hand, that the whole Arab world will rise in flames if another Jew enters the gates of his national home. We have read statements, on the other hand, only this week by the Premier of Iraq, that the establishment of a Jewish state in tiny Palestine would be a "great menace to the neighboring Arab states which are undeveloped along modern lines." I believe that both of these statements are utterly without foundation.

The Arab world has, in the long run, a great future before it, and a great part to play once again in the history of mankind. But today and for many years to come, it is dependent economically, politically, and militarily on the western powers. The threats which some of the more belligerent of the Arab spokesmen—spokesmen who were far from belligerent while the war was on—so liberally dispense today are, realistically speaking, empty threats. If proof is required, let me remind the House that in the worst period of the war, when Britain had neither men or planes to spare, two battalions of British and Indian troops—less than 2,000 men—put a stop to the holy war declared in Iraq by the Grand Mufti with the support of the Iraqi Prime Minister and Iraqi Army.

No; this Arab bogey has no more reality than has that Jewish bogey which has suddenly been invoked by the Prime Minister of Iraq. Does anyone who knows the facts seriously believe for a moment that this Jewish state, when it comes into existence, located in a land no larger than the State of New Hampshire, will dare or will desire to offer a military threat to the neighboring Arab countries occupying vast areas more than 100 times that of Palestine and inhabited by a numerous population. A Jewish state in Palestine can be a bridge between East and West and a fructifying influence for the whole of the backward and poverty-stricken Middle East. I am convinced that once that state is firmly established the interplay of mutual interests with its Arab neighbors will lead to constructive developments of the utmost importance to mankind.

But one thing is certain; the hands of Great Britain and our own hands in this matter should not be tied by any consideration of hollow and unworthy threats. On this question of the future of the Jewish people of Europe and their homeland in Palestine, the world faces a grave moral responsibility. It is a responsibility which cannot be avoided by postponement. The issue is one which must be faced now. I hope and I believe that not only opinion in our country, but the opinion of the man in the street in Great Britain, will unite in pressing for an immediate decision to do away with this infamous white paper and to open the gates of Palestine. We owe it not only to these pitiful victims of Nazi persecution; we owe it also to ourselves as human beings and as members of a civilized society.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I am rising to speak on one of the most important issues before the world today. It is a comforting truth that great moral causes lie at the root of the greatness of nations. The assistance and friendship which our great country has extended to the world cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents. Our record of aid to Cuba, to the Philippines, to the starving nations of Europe after the First World War, to the reestablishment of Czechoslovakian independence, to the creation of a Polish Republic, yes, even to the victims of earthquake and flood in Japan, has been a glorious chapter in world history. We stand challenged today by a cause no less great than any we have championed before in our history.

In the Middle East for 23 years the world has been witnessing an experiment of regeneration. A small part of the little land of Palestine has been reclaimed from the desert by the devotion and the back-breaking toil of Jewish immigrants. They have come from every corner of the earth to restore the Holy Land to fertility after hundreds of years of neglect. As a result of their work, they have made Palestine's 10,000 square miles the most attractive spot in the entire Middle East. Let us remember that in 1918 no one wanted Palestine—neither the Arabs nor the Turks, nor the British. The only people who hungered for it and loved it were those to whom it was denied—the Jewish people.

What is the issue today in Palestine? It is time for us to cut through the double talk and speak plainly. The meaningless formalities of diplomatic conversation have no application to Palestine. For here is an issue which is not a pleasant academic subject. It is not something which can be pushed into the background and postponed for some future day. The plain unalterable fact is that in the past 10 years 6,000,000 Jews have been slaughtered, starved to death, or driven into a state of physical and mental despair for which there is no cure. Of an original population of perhaps seven and a half million living in Europe outside of Russia, there remain fewer than one and a half million Jews alive today. These remnants have found neither welcome nor refuge anywhere in Europe. The countries of their origin have been poisoned against their return. They have become wanderers on the face of the earth, hopeless and helpless. The doors of almost every nation are closed to them. The only country which offers the slightest prospect for them is this little land of Palestine.

Why then are they barred from Palestine? Is it for some logical and justifiable reason? Are the boundaries of the country too small for them? Is there some prime consideration of political necessity which stands in the way?

I say that the answer to these questions is clear and unmistakable. There is nothing which can be justified in logic, in justice, or in the name of humanity, to prevent the return of the Jewish people in Palestine in unrestricted numbers.

To those who say that the land cannot be restored to fertility, I say that the Jewish colonists have demonstrated that nothing is impossible in Palestine. On the shores of the Dead Sea where the water is mingled with salt they have established a colony, inch by inch, and foot by foot, draining the soil of its salt.

They have irrigated it dozens and dozens of times.

The desert of the south was once a blooming valley. Our own Agricultural Department's soil expert, Dr. Lowdermilk, reported only last year that the land of Palestine is potentially one of the most fertile in the world. He compared its possibilities to those of our great State of California. He reminded us that once there were orchards of figs and dates in this ancient land. Palestine in the time of the Roman Empire supported a population of at least two millions without modern agricultural methods, without industrialization, without the enthusiasm and self-sacrificing devotion of a people dedicated to the rebuilding of their ancient soil.

In 1930, the British Government issued another white paper. That document declared that Palestine could not support a single additional Jew. It was repudiated by the British Government. More than three hundred thousand Jews have gone to live in their ancient homeland since that date. There is clearly room for hundreds of thousands more. For these are no ordinary people. They go to Palestine, to give of themselves fully and wholeheartedly, to build, to hope, and to dream.

If the land can support them, why all the obstacles? The Arabs are in opposition, we are told. Yet every inch of Palestinian soil which is occupied by Jewish families today was sold to them by Arab land owners. What Arabs are opposing Jewish colonization? Are the Arabs whose children have been saved by the clinics and hospitals of Hadassah opposing it? Are the Arab peasants who have been able to earn a living for the first time in their lives in Palestine opposing it? The Arabic population of Palestine has increased two and a half times since the appearance of Jewish colonists.

There is no such record of increase in any other Arabic country. We know which of the Arabs oppose a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. They are the political Arabs who see their ability to exploit Arabic workers vanishing before their eyes. They are the members of the Arab League, an instrument created by the British to stimulate a Pan-Arabic nationalism, which would maintain British supremacy in the Mediterranean world.

What justification then is there for the Arabic fears of domination by a Jewish commonwealth? There is no intention on the part of the Jewish leadership in Palestine to injure in any way the Arabic population. There is every evidence that the blessings of better health, better living, better education for the Arabs are available in Palestine above every other country in the Middle East.

There are Arab states in Egypt, in Saudi-Arabia, in Iraq, in Iran, in Syria, with tremendous lands available for colonization and development.

What possible reason is there for our hesitancy in saying to the Arab world, "This is a matter of humanity which must transcend every other consideration. It is more important than oil; it is more important than imperialism; it is more important than any other single consideration." A chain of circumstances has been forged which makes it possible to repatriate the Jewish people in our generation without injury to any other group.

If we fail in this, the blood of the Jewish millions who died in Europe will cry from the soil. We shall have made a mockery of all the fine phrases, of all the protests of humanity and friendship which we have uttered so freely in these years.

This is the time for action in Palestine. The day of talk is over. The nations of the earth, including our own, have endorsed the Balfour Declaration of 1917. They have fixed the mandatory authority of Palestine. They have encouraged, directly and indirectly, the expenditure of millions of dollars in Palestine, the immigration of hundreds of thousands of Jewish men, women, and children.

In our own self interest, for the sake of our own self-respect, our Government must recognize that a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine would be a lighthouse in the Middle East. It would be an example of the devotion of our country and of the world to the principles of justice and righteousness which were first proclaimed to the world by the prophets of this people whom we have deserted in their hour of need. Let us not fail this time. The day of appeasement is over. The Arabs have not fought and died for the cause of human freedom in this war. They have no claim on our generosity or our good will. The martyrs of Israel have both.

We are the descendants of pioneers who came to this country seeking a refuge from religious persecution. We cannot say to those who seek the same salvation today that America has forgotten. I urge every American to join with me in this effort to restore an ancient people to its homeland. They will preserve the holy places sacred to all of the great religious faiths which have sprung from that soil. They will make the land of Palestine bloom once more as a land flowing with milk and honey. In this crucial moment of Jewish history, let us not do what Hitler did. Let us raise our hands to lift these helpless men and women from the abyss to which our indifference and blindness have condemned them. History sits as our judge, and posterity as our witness. We must not fail those who cry to us for help.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished majority leader has so well said, the Jewish-Palestinian problem is not peculiar to the Jewish people, but is the problem of all humanity. It is the problem of all people whether they be Christians, pagans, Moslems, atheists, or agnostics. For thousands of years the Jewish people have been persecuted. The treatment that they have received at the hands of Hitler is nothing new. For centuries and centuries they have been driven from land to land, from country to country, and across the multitudinous seas that cover the earth. They have seen their families torn asunder. They have seen their aged and infirm killed. They have been deprived of education, deprived of the right of making a living, deprived of the right of freedom of movement, but above all deprived of the right of freedom of worship. Yet they have toiled on, wishing, hoping, and dreaming that some day they would have a country or a land that they might call their own.

Wherever they went in their forced travels they established and kept alive the laws of the Old Testament, preaching love of God, respect of mankind, love of liberty, and above all the love of the rights of man as an individual. Wherever they stopped they created institutions for the benefit of their fellow men without regard to their color or creed. Not only in the last century but through the ages, they have built institutions for the aged, the blind, the poor, and for all those less fortunate. In the dark days of Europe when civilization seemed to be tottering they did as much as any other people, through their love of the arts and the development of sciences and their determination to keep religion alive, to save civilization.

Coming as I do from a people who for over 800 years were persecuted by the English and who, too, were denied education as well as the right to worship God in the manner that their own consciences dictated, I can feel the plight and sufferings of these unfortunate people.

Sir Walter Scott very well expressed it when he said:

> Breathes there the man
> With soul so dead,
> Who never to himself hath said,
> This is my own, my native land!

It is the natural instinct of all people to have a home. A home that is more than an asylum—a home that is a guaranty for freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of worship. A home where man is taught to respect not only himself but his fellow humans. A home where the dignity of man is paramount.

As I said before, having Irish blood in my veins, I well know the chicanery, instability, and fluctuating course of the English Government's foreign policy. A policy where human rights and human liberties are always superseded by the needs, desires, and greed of the Empire. A policy where the commercial aspect of any question is always placed above the human equation. A policy that needlessly sacrifices human lives and looks without pity upon human suffering if commercial gain is to be attained.

The Jewish people through natural and moral reasoning are entitled to a homeland. They are entitled to a larger domain than they already possess in Palestine and they are entitled to determine for themselves the number of migrants who may come to their country. Palestine should not be a vassal state, not having the right to determine its own future without interference from outside powers. It must be given the dignity of an independent n tion and the protection that is afforded today to all smaller nations from aggression from stronger powers be they England or any other nation.

It is my sincere hope that our Government may be an instrumentality to the guaranteeing of perpetual freedom to the Jewish people in their desire to establish Palestine as a free and independent nation. It is my hope that this question may be settled in the near future so that the flag bearing the star of David may take its place alongside of the other distinguished banners that recognize freedom and that guarantee its perpetuation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

CONCERN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, why so much concern about Palestine? It is smaller than Maryland and has 200,000 fewer people. The Sinai Peninsula is desert, soil in other areas is wasted, it is a land of friction and bloodshed, and it lies far away. But wait!

GOOD LAND

It is 4,000 years since Moses looked upon it from a little mountain beyond the Jordan and heard it said that it was a good land, with brooks and fountains, a land of wheat, barley, vines, figs, pomegranates, olive oil, and honey where there would be bread without scarceness and nothing would be lacking.

DISPERSION

Much happened to its people since then. They wandered to Egypt for food and were placed in bondage. They were exiled when Babylon conquered that area of the earth. They were driven out by the Romans. They were tyrannized by the Ottoman Turks and delivered in 1917 by the British. They came under a League of Nations mandate. For 25 years and as late as 1939, there were riots and disturbances which wrecked buildings and bridges, border stations and communications and left death in their wake. In that time, seven British commissions investigated and reported. Ten other commissions reported on other matters in that time. Eight white papers were issued dealing with Palestine policy.

THE LAND

Much has happened to the land. It was a good land in the days of Abraham. It was gradually eroded and wasted. The forests were destroyed and the rich red topsoil for centuries discolored the blue Mediterranean as it washed away. Once it was prosperous, self-supporting and healthful. It dwindled to poverty and dependence where the fellahin eked out a miserable existence and malaria took a heavy toll.

DREAM HAS NOT DIED

But in all the centuries, one thing never eroded or died. It was the dream of Zion and the zeal to make fruitful the very land for which Abraham paid. That deathless hope was revitalized in 1917 when Lord Balfour gave assurances that Britain looked with favor on a homeland for Jews and would facilitate the attainment of that objective. In this very Chamber in 1932, the Congress in a resolution expressed its favor for a national home for Jewish people. That hope was incorporated in the League of Nations mandate. In January of 1944 a similar resolution was considered by committees of the House and Senate but for military reasons, its consideration was postponed. In June of 1944, both major political parties expressed themselves in support of a free Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. In November 1944, the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House reported a similar resolution but for political reasons action was deferred. And there it stands.

DISPERSION STILL OBTAINS

After 4,000 years, the great dispersion still obtains. But the dream has not diminished; the vision of a homeland has not perished; the hope has not abated. These have withstood conquest, friction, and persecution. But this is a time for action. The efforts to find a solution for the Jewish-Arab-British problem in Palestine have failed. The longer it remains unsolved, the more complicated it will become.

FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM

Now comes a more fundamental aspect of the problem. Millions have died in a war in which freedom was the issue. How strange now that of all nations, Palestine is the only land where Jews may not enter except in limited numbers and under a quota that now expires; the only country other than Germany where explicit anti-Jewish laws exist; the only land where the Bible is still censored when quoted in the Hebrew press; where strict censorship prevails and where thousands of uniformed and nonuniformed police patrol the whole land. Shall this remain the bitter fruit of sacrifice and a frustrated idealism.

HISTORICAL PROBLEM

The historical controversy between Jew and Arab over who has prior rights in Palestine is an endless fabric studded with argument and counterargument and furnishes no clue for a solution. The political problem, with its many implications involving the whole Moslem world, the existence of oil, trade balances, import controls, exchange barriers, and other factors, is equally devoid of hope for a solution.

PROMISES OF MEN AND STEWARDSHIP OF LANDS

We must turn back to the solemn promises of men in authority and to the stewardship of the land where people dwell for the answer. A solution must spring from common sense and from the basic right of a people to dwell peacefully in a land with which they have historic, religious, and spiritual ties. It must come from the right of a dispersed minority to dwell in a land to which it does have some valid claim, free from censorship and persecution, free from indefensible restrictions on immigration and land purchase, free from espionage and threat, where an ageless hope can find fruition and where a proven zeal for the land will enable it to enrich and bless all who live therein and definitely elevate the living standards, the health, and the well-being of all who live there.

PROOF OF IMPROVEMENT

Where is the proof that this can be done? One need but journey from Dan to Beersheba, from Gaza to Tyre, from Jericho to Tiberias to see the living proof. Rural electrification is there. It is a monument to Pinchas Rutenberg, who made that his life's work. Industry is there as a testimony to Baron Rothschild, to Dr. Weitzman, to Novomeysky, and others. Hundreds of millions of private funds have been invested to prove that a homeland can be established.

LAND IS THE PERSUASIVE EXHIBIT

But the land is the most persuasive exhibit. It can be made the land that Moses saw, a good land where there shall be bread without scarceness. There are hundreds of rural cooperatives and collectives. The annual export production of delectable oranges, grapefruit, and lemons has reached 15,000,000 boxes. Improved strains of cattle, sheep, and fowls have been developed to increase enormously the production of milk, cheese, wool, and eggs. Broad acreages of wheat, barley, and rye in the plain of Sharon and the valley of Esdraelon with improved yields attest the devotion to the land. In the steamy Jordan Valley, one sees evidence of what zeal, courage, and irrigation can do to dispel malaria and make the precious soil produce an abundance. There has been a relentless search for new methods, new techniques, new processes, and all of these have served not only to make the land more fruitful but to benefit the Arab farmers as well.

ABSORPTIVE CAPACITY

What does it all mean in terms of a homeland? Simply this. Even as Palestine once supported a million more persons than the 1,600,000 who now dwell there, so it can do so again. Forty years ago, there were but half a million people there. Today there are more than three times that number. The Jewish people occupy but 6 percent of the whole area of Palestine and but 14 percent of the cultivated lands. The devotion and zeal of the people to the land determines what can be done and how many more may be absorbed. It can take hundreds of thousands of people who today seek safe haven, refuge, and peace. By the test of accomplishment, by the standard of contribution to human welfare, by the measure of historic attachment, by the yardstick of freedom, and by the dictates of common sense, why should not this land be reopened to unrestricted immigration and colonization that it may again become a good land where there shall be bread without scarceness and no lack of anything.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY].

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, the active military phases of the peoples' war against fascism have been brought to a victorious conclusion. In that war, 6,000,000 Jews, one-third that people's total number in the world, were gassed, poisoned, burned, had air bubbles injected in their blood streams, were starved, shot, suffocated, had their heads smashed in with clubs, were boiled down for fat, or murdered in some other slow and ingenious way by the Fascist gangsters who all but conquered the world.

Hitler's armies have been defeated; Hitler himself is reported dead. Yet Hitler's voice is strong in America: Hitler's chief weapons for conquering democracy from within—red-baiting and Jew-baiting—have their echoes even in the Halls of Congress, and Hitler's chief means of dividing the nations—a cunningly inspired hostility toward the Soviet Union—is once again urged, this time by native Americans, as "justification" for rebuilding German industry.

NO DEMOCRACY

The plain truth is that there is no democracy unless it is democracy for all, for the Jew and the gentile, for the Catholic and the Protestant and the nonbeliever, for the black and the white, and for the various political shadings, the reds, the whites, and the blues.

The plain truth is that there will be no freedom from imperialism or from the wars which imperialism breeds as long as we permit the Dutch and the British to use Japanese troops against natives rising for an end to all colonial rule. There will be no free, new world as long as the British divide Moslem and Hindu and use that manufactured division as a pretext for withholding freedom from India. There will be no united and democratic China as long as America keeps gunboats and planes and marines there to reinforce the Chinese faction which has held not a single election nor tolerated a single basic land or tax reform in all the territories under its military rule.

There will be no end, either, to imperialism while powerful groups within the United States and Britain for the sake of oil concessions and commanding positions on trade routes, are permitted to play Arab against Jew and Jew against Arab in Palestine, making contradictory sets of promises to each and keeping neither.

BRITISH CONTROL ARAB LEAGUE

The plain truth is that the British created the Arab league and control it. The Arab kings and pashas are willing to give Britain concessions in oil and communications as long as their dictatorial rule over the Arab people is maintained.

It seems to make no difference, either, to some of these hireling princes who pays them. The Arab Brigade, which fought American and British soldiers in Africa, was furnished by Arab chieftains, reportedly paid by the Nazis. And at the San Francisco Conference, it was freely said that these same gentry were living at hotels and riding in limousines paid for by Standard Oil.

There is no inevitable antagonism between the Arab and Jewish peoples. Anti-Semitism in the mouth of an Arab is the plainest evidence of divisive propaganda, for both peoples are of Semitic origin. Both trace a portion of their religious tradition to Palestine. Each can profit from free association with the other. And both have the same reason for demanding of Britain that her mandate over Palestine be brought to an end, that a congress be convened to frame a democratic constitution which will ensure free elections and representation and cultural autonomy for all.

Either we believe in democracy or we do not. Either we encourage its practice, or we surrender the field to its enemies. If the great American melting pot has proved anything, it has proved that there is room in a democratic Palestine for both Arab and Jew.

ARABS HELPLESS ALONE

We need not fear that the Arab people themselves will resort to large-scale armed violence. Their hot heads can freely expand into 1,000,000 miles of sparsely settled territories indisputably their own. And it is precisely to prevent the settlement of political questions by force that the United Nations organization has so hopefully and after such suffering been born into the world.

We certainly need not fear any lack of devotion to democracy by the Jews in Palestine, for the citizens of the Jewish National Homeland were democracy's only arsenal in the dark days when the Nazis had all but overrun northern Africa. When General Montgomery and his hard-pressed Eighth Army had been driven almost to the waters of the Suez, 30,000 hardened Jewish combat troops, volunteers, carried their full share of the fighting in that heroic army.

When the German and Italian Fascists controlled the whole Mediterranean, 600,000 Jews in Palestine manufactured munitions, optical instruments, precision instruments, chemicals, sending badly needed supplies to the British armies and their young women as nurses and hospital workers and into the fields as laborers to insure care and food for wounded and hungry soldiers.

JUSTICE FOR 6,000,000

Is there any way to do justice now to 6,000,000 Jews murdered, scientifically and calculatingly murdered, as a necessary part of the plan of the Nazi "master race" for German control of the peoples and markets of the earth?

Is there any way now to take the mark of the lash from the backs, and the anguish from the hearts, of 12,000,000 Jews alive in other lands?

We cannot help the dead, but we can extend simple tolerance at home and equal opportunity in the things that count to all our fellow men.

We can also hold out a helping hand to all those Jews who wish to build their own monument to human freedom in a Jewish national homeland in Palestine.

The American people, through countless prominent citizens, public figures, and newspaper editorials, have shown their desire for the abrogation of the British white paper.

BRITISH SHOULD ACT

The British people, for centuries the guardians of liberty, have every reason in justice and in humanity to urge their Government to abrogate a decision made when Chamberlain was still appeasing Hitler.

The multi-national peoples of the Soviet Union, having passed from the bitter anti-Jewish pogroms of the Czars to the elimination of all discrimination, are known to be friendly toward Jewish aspirations to develop their life and culture freely in a homeland of their own.

Here is one issue, therefore, in which the Big Three should have no differences. An early solution backed by America, Russia, and Britain and bringing democratic government, cultural autonomy, and suitable and equal economic opportunity to Jew and Arab alike in Palestine, would be the means of satisfying the legitimate dreams of two peoples and stabilizing an important area of the world. It would deal a strong blow at those evil forces still hoping to divide and rule, and it would establish a sound pattern for handling other actual or potential trouble zones.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to raise my voice in behalf of the oppressed and starving people of the Jewish race in Europe. Since the rise of the Nazi Party in Germany, the world has witnessed one of its great tragedies in the deliberate slaughter of this oppressed people. The pictures that we have seen of the infamous German concentration camps have been the most revolting spectacles that people of this generation have ever witnessed. That these pictures are authentic has been attested to over and over again by newspaper publishers, by the members of our armed forces, and by Members of this Congress who have visited these horror camps.

The remainder of the Jewish peoples of Germany and of the German satellite nations are now wandering outcasts in the lands of their birth, homeless, and without any place to go unless the land of their fathers is opened to them. Palestine, the ancestral home of the Jews, it seems to me, is the natural and the logical place for these displaced Jews of Europe to find at last a home and some measure of peace.

Under the former policy of Great Britain, who was entrusted with the mandate over Palestine by the League of Nations, many Jews migrated to Palestine in the period between the two great World Wars, and by their thrift and industry they transformed a barren and inhospitable land into a land of irrigated and watered fields in that portion where they settled and the squalid village which they found into the modern, sanitary, and beautiful city of Tel Aviv. Now Britain has changed her policy and apparently, unless an aroused world opinion changes it again, the Jews are to be excluded from Palestine. Where in the world shall they go? They cannot remain among the hostile populations once dominated by Nazi Germany and no land is open to them. Certainly the only possible place for these miserable and persecuted people is the land of their fathers, and those who are in authority in this country should raise their voices in behalf of these people and their yearning desire to return to the land of Abraham—to the Palestine homeland.

I need but mention the fact that this solution to the Jewish problem settles apparently forever many problems arising through the presence of the dispersed Jewish peoples throughout the world. It is said by some that Palestine will not support the increased population that

would enter there if the prohibition of immigration to the Jews were abolished, but the answer to this, I think, if the remarkable transformation of that land under the industry and intelligent planning of the Jews who have gone there in the last 20 or 25 years. They have shown that it is entirely possible by the application of modern methods of irrigation and industry for Palestine to support a population several times larger than that now there. It is, therefore, entirely possible for Palestine to be open to the Jews and at the same time for the Arab population that is now there to remain, and certainly the Jews, with their thrift and industry and their introduction of modern methods of sanitation, building construction, irrigation, and agriculture can, and will, if given an opportunity, raise the entire standard of living for all the people of Palestine—Arab and Jew alike. The Arabs should welcome them, and in espousing the cause of Jewish immigration to Palestine, we can be sure that we are helping to solve not only the problem of the Jews but also the problems of the Arabs who live in Palestine. I sincerely trust that those who are entitled to speak for the people of the United States shall make it clear that we in America, Jew and Gentile alike, support the legitimate claim of the Jews for a national home in their ancestral homeland.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. WOODHOUSE].

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, it is very logical that the House of Representatives is discussing the tragic plight of the Jews in Europe and the possibility that Palestine offers to relieve their situation. The United States has always stood for a policy of equal opportunity. We have opened our doors to the peoples of the world. We now have in this country people of practically every race and religion living together in peace and prosperity. We are only asking other nations to do in a small way what we have done ourselves in a much broader way.

The best estimate indicates that more than 5,000,000 Jews lost their lives in Europe under the Hitler terror. How many of these people could have been saved had the doors of Palestine been opened to them, as was promised in the Balfour Declaration, is, of course, problematical. There is every reason to believe, however, that many hundreds of thousands of homeless, hunted, and unwanted Jews in Hitler Germany and its satellite countries could have found their way into Palestine and been saved had it not been for the illegal restrictions of the Chamberlain white paper. This was another example of a "Munich appeasement," an appeasement with no moral foundation and with tragic consequences.

During the war efforts were made to repeal the white paper and to make it possible for some of the victims of Hitler to escape with their lives into Palestine. But it was claimed by the British Government that admission of Jewish refugees into Palestine during the war years would retard the war effort and endanger our Allied position in the Middle East. We bowed to this decision. But again, after the British and Americans had cleared the Middle East and north Africa of the Nazi forces, the road to Palestine remained blocked.

The promises made to the Jews by the Balfour Declaration are promises made to all decent people of the earth. They are promises which have been broken. The British people have always held to their contracts. They were not truly represented by Chamberlain. Today we are facing the shaping of a new world—a world in which there must be justice, tolerance, and good faith if any of us are to live in peace and prosperity. There is still a possibility of saving the lives of some of the unfortunate Jews whom Hitler failed to eradicate. Neither we nor the British people will forget that it was a Jewish woman scientist, a refugee, who gave us a vital link in the research which led to the perfection of the atomic bomb.

The war is over. There are, of course, still problems in the Middle East. But they can be solved. The presence of the Jews in Palestine has been an asset in the development of that country. They have been anything but a drain on its economy.

The President of the United States, with his usual direct forthrightness, has requested that immigration certificates for 100,000 refugees be issued immediately in order that the Jewish people still in the concentration camps of Germany, with no homes to which they can return, may go to Palestine and there live as decent hardworking men and women. We have a right to ask this of the British Government. There still exists a treaty of 1924, between the United States and Great Britain, wherein Great Britain agrees to make no change in immigration regulations pertaining to Palestine without the prior consent of the United States. This treaty still exists. But the United States was not consulted prior to the promulgation of the immigration restriction law.

But let us not be content merely with blaming Great Britain. Has our Government done everything it could in order to carry out the pledges made to the Jews? Support has been pledged to them by both political parties and by a majority of Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. And yet I understand that the Department of State answers inquiries to the effect that it has received no instructions from the White House as to what the policy of this country is in regard to Palestine.

People who came back from the Middle East report that there is no realization among either the Arabs or the British of how overwhelmingly this country supports the case for entrance of the Jews into Palestine and how deeply it would value foreign concurrence with this policy. The State Department and American representatives abroad should be instructed that the policy as laid down in public statements is in truth the policy favored by the people of the United States and the policy which every member of our foreign service is committed to further.

The President has taken the first step. We in the Congress well know the feeling of the people of America. I am very certain that the people of my district are in favor of opening Palestine to the Jewish refugees in Europe. We should make this feeling of the American people vocal. We should ask that our Government officials charged with administering our foreign affairs be instructed as to this feeling.

There was pending before the last Congress a resolution which declared that the United States shall use its good offices to the end that the gates of Palestine should be opened for free entry of Jews and that Palestine might ultimately become a free and democratic commonwealth with Jew and Arab living together in peace. I understand that the Congress was about to pass this resolution but that for war reasons requests were made that it not do so.

The fighting phase of the war is now over. We are facing the great and difficult task of building a world based on peace. But can we have peace if we do not have justice? We cannot. The time has come when we in the Congress without further delay should pass such a resolution and put ourselves squarely and officially behind this great project of doing justice to a stricken people, of saving thousands of human lives by opening the gates of Palestine to the Jews.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, these are sad days in history. When nations do not carry out their solemn obligations, hope for permanent peace cannot be strong. Great Britain solemnly pronounced the famous Balfour Declaration, and in 1939, even though this Nation and most other nations of the world had already agreed to the Balfour Declaration, Great Britain by its own act had decided to abrogate and nullify the Balfour Declaration.

How much better it would be if today we could rise and say that Great Britain, a democratic nation, had kept its solemnly pledged word? How can we speak of the sanctity of treaties when nations, for the sake of expediency, repudiate their solemnly pledged word?

A promise was made by Great Britain to open the gates of immigration into the Holy Land so that Jews could establish there a national homeland. Had that promise been kept, then thousands upon thousands of Jews whose bones litter the fields of Europe, and thousands upon thousands more whose ashes have been scattered to the four winds, might be living today in peace in Palestine.

No nation can escape its share of the dreadful responsibility for what has happened in Europe. Millions upon millions of Jews were killed, many after horrible tortures, for no reason whatever except their religious belief. It was impossible for us even to believe or imagine that such dreadful acts could be perpetrated on such a large scale by maniacs led by a diseased mind. Today, we plead for the lives of a hundred thousand Jews—who are no more than living skeletons—whom we have liberated in Europe. They can find no peace in the places they once called home. Germany, the Balkan

countries, central Europe are not places of refuge for them. They look to Palestine, and what do they find?

In the face of this tragedy Great Britain dares to shut the gates to their immigration, in spite of its solemn promise.

The Arabs were liberated from Turkish rule by the Allies after World War I. Five Arab states have been set up. Their area comprises over a million square miles—an enormous underpopulated area. And Palestine constitutes not even 1 percent of this total space.

In 99 percent of Arab territory they enjoy national sovereignty. Less than 1 percent has been reserved for the Jewish people in the land of their fathers.

The Arabs who live in Palestine have prospered and multiplied. They are far better off there than even in the states where the Arabs are ruled by their own leaders. They have learned to live side by side with the Jews in Palestine.

Once there were millions of Jews living in Europe; today only a few hundred thousand, perhaps not even that many. None of these is well. What an indictment of the whole world that this could happen in our generation, and how much more horrible it is to contemplate keeping these men, women and children in Europe when they want to go to Palestine, the only place that will receive them, so that they can live decent lives.

It seems incredible that Great Britain should delay granting the hundred thousand immigration certificates that President Truman has asked them to grant. Who is it that seeks to keep them out of Palestine? Is it our allies who fought side by side with us, whose blood was spilled with ours on the battlefields of Africa and Europe in our battle against the Fascist world? On the contrary it is the people whom we freed in 1918, who either cooperated in the recent past with Hitler or who stood by passively even when Rommel stood at the gates of Alexandria.

Winston Churchill denounced the infamous white paper, the repudiation of the Balfour Declaration. On May 23, 1939, his voice rang out, crying:

> What will the world think about it? What will our friends say? What will be the opinion of the United States of America? What will our potential enemies think? What will those who have been stirring up these Arab agitators think? Will they not be encouraged by our confession of recoil? Will they not be tempted to say "they are on the run again, this is another Munich"; and be the more stimulated in their aggression?

The Labor Party under Prime Minister Attlee has been just as strong in its denunciation of the white paper. The Republican Party and the Democratic Party in their national platforms have spoken out in favor of Palestine and the establishment there of a national homeland.

What is it that keeps nations from carrying out their solemn obligations? Can it be said that Great Britain is today fearful of the effect on Arab states which are dependent upon the democratic nations for their economic upbuilding? Are the nations that were able to destroy the greatest armed forces in the world afraid now to speak up for what is right?

Great Britain must not refuse to grant this request of our President for immigration certificates for these dying Jews of Europe. The blot on British conscience would be so dark that not even a thousand years would serve to lighten it.

We in the United States owe a duty. We in Congress must pointedly and frankly tell Great Britain we expect that nation to keep its solemn pledged word. We are determined that our voices shall be heard—even in London.

BALTIMORE, MD., *October 11, 1945.*

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I know that you receive a tremendous amount of mail, and ordinarily I would not burden you with this note. However, I cannot let the opportunity go by without thanking you and your colleagues for the very sympathetic hearing you extended me and our committee when we called on you last Thursday.

Your promise of unequivocal help is tremendously encouraging, and I am sure will help us to carry on in our difficult task of providing a permanent home for those Jews who have no place in the war-torn countries of Europe.

Respectfully yours,

ISAAC POTTS.

SENATE OF MARYLAND,
Annapolis, Md., October 12, 1945.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOMMY: Your handling of the meeting of the Zionist and Jewish organizational groups was splendid.

Everyone spoke highly in praise of your manner and attitude.

Cordially,

E. MILTON ALTFELD.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, both the United States and Britain are pledged to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. These pledges ought, in justice and good conscience, to be fulfilled without further delay.

Since the Balfour Declaration and American congressional endorsement of the policy enunciated therein 23 years ago, very little progress has been made toward keeping faith. The treatment of Jewish minorities continues to constitute a dark blot on the face of civilization.

Let us grant that Palestine is a problem for the British on account of the Arabs, but it certainly is not insurmountable. The Arabs can hardly have any justifiable complaint if asked to give over to the Jews what amounts to less than 1 percent of Arab lands in Asia alone. Without counting their large possessions in north Africa, the Arabian possessions in Asia are almost a million and a quarter square miles of territory. The Jews, on the other hand, have no territory at all which, as a people, they can call home.

Four million Jews have been murdered in the short span of 3 years. Mass annihilation by violent death, the gas chamber, and unspeakable forms of torture constitutes one of the darkest pages in all the volumes of human history.

Out of all the misery, persecution, and suffering of the past comes the augmented cry for justice to the Jews. The cry has now swollen to such proportions that it cannot longer be disregarded. As we search for a proper pattern for lasting peace this cry dins in our ears.

American Palestine policy is definitely woven into the very fabric of world peace. Unfortunately anti-Semitism still exists.

The frictions resulting from the last world war, unless alleviated, may well be a contributing factor in the making of another world war.

It is the duty of Britain to repudiate the white paper of 1937 and make good on the promises of the Balfour Declaration. It is the duty of the United States to press vigorously to that end and help bring about the establishment of a Jewish homeland in a free Palestine.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

THE JEWS ASK FOR JUSTICE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we have poured out our blood and our treasure to beat back the fury and the hate which almost conquered us. The battlefields are quiet. Our men are coming home. With a sigh of relief we turn our backs on the war which has been won.

Or has it?

The terrible sights and sounds are gone. The dead are buried. The screams of the wounded and the tortured no longer ring in our ears. We think the war is over.

Even the hideous murder factories at Belchen are quiet. The fires which furnaced human beings are out. Instead of preparing the victims for death we have established displaced persons camps on these horror sites, preparing them for what?

We are trying the Nazis for their crimes against humanity, but what solution do we offer to the victims who wait? What victims? The Jews, who were the first and the most appalling sacrifice exacted by the Fascist terror. Over 1,000,000 of these victims wait, suffer, and starve while we, the victors, dally with diplomacy.

These victims are not wanted even in the countries we helped to liberate. They must move on, to somewhere. That refuge is their ancient homeland—Palestine. By every historical, cultural, and religious claim it belongs to them. But the door of escape remains closed. And we are helping to keep it closed, in spite of our conscience, in spite of the moral leadership which we owe to the world. On the one hand, we sympathize with the Jews; on the other hand, we keep an active interest in the private oil lines which runs through Arab countries adjoining Palestine.

We are compromising ourselves by this shameful hypocrisy.

Britain temporarily controls Palestine under a mandate from the old League of Nations. She holds it in trust, as a guardian. But for whom? Arabs or Jews? The Arabs have several independent countries, the Jews none. They have no place else to turn to. I submit that we cannot stand aside and let these unfortunate people suffer and die. After all these years of common effort against a common foe, we have the right to ex-

pect that our ally, Britain, will work with us to achieve a solution to this problem, and not an evasion. For the problem is not alone one of empire security, it has been an age-old problem that now becomes a world problem, the first test of our purposes as we face the task of making a fair and durable peace.

The Balfour pledge of 1917 said that His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment of a home for the Jews in Palestine. Later, the British white paper qualified this to provide for the stabilization of Palestine's population in the proportion of one-third Jews and two-thirds Arabs. Where, then, is the meaning in this promise of a home if the doors are closed to the majority who are seeking sanctuary?

In principle, we, the United States, have endorsed the claims of the Jews. Every President has supported them. Our own Democratic and Republican Parties have committed themselves to this. President Truman has asked the British to admit 100,000 of the homeless. The British have agreed to admit 1,500 a month, a token compromise that falls far short of justice and mercy.

Our intentions have been good. Our performances have been empty. If this be a measure of our approach to the solution of great problems, it is high time that we overhaul our diplomatic machinery. We cannot afford to fail on our promises. Our integrity stands challenged, and must be redeemed.

The rise to power of a Labor Government in Britain gives us hope that a solution to this problem may be nearer than we think. The Tories, holding fast to a policy of "no change," have been replaced by a government that more truly reflects the experience and the conscience of the people. And the common people of Britain know, as we know, that some limitation of national sovereignty, some abdication from yesterday's wrongs, is necessary to gain the true peace which all of us need.

At the peace conference, when it comes, the nations which brought death and suffering to millions, will be represented. The criminals will have a voice. But the victims? The bones of 4,000,000 Jewish civilians, starved, beaten, and murdered in their homes and their synagogues, these bones will have no voice except in our uneasy conscience.

Remembering our Christian martyrs of old, we cannot forget the Jewish martyrs of our time. They stood and died in the name of our common human dignity.

The prayers they offered to God even as they were being butchered, ring in humanity's ears.

That is the voice of the Jew calling upon us for atonement to make sanctuary for the pitiful few who survived.

This is our responsibility.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut spoke of a resolution and the desirability of action by the Congress by resolution. The gentleman from Illinois who preceded me spoke of promises. I want to speak for a moment about resolutions and then for a moment about promises; some of them broken.

This matter has been before the Congress for quite some time. Resolutions upon which the Congress could act have been introduced. On October 15, 1944, the then Democratic candidate for President, Mr. Roosevelt, addressed a letter to Senator WAGNER of New York in which he used these words:

> I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim and if reelected I shall help to bring about its realization.

I have been reading from a supplemental report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. That report also refers to a promise made by the Republican candidate for President, Mr. Thomas E. Dewey. Incidentally, the report also contains a letter under date of October 10 from Secretary of War Stimson to Senator TAFT withdrawing his opposition to the resolution.

What happened? Acting upon that evidence the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House reported a resolution on November 30, 1944, declaring the Congress favoring the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine. That resolution in due course came before the Committee on Rules, of which I am a member, for consideration and determination as to whether or not it should be sent to the floor for consideration. That was in early December of 1944.

I went to the Committee on Rules ready to vote for that resolution. I am convinced that the majority of the members of the Rules Committee felt the same way about it. Action was had in executive session and, of course, I am not permitted to divulge the details of what happened. But I think I can properly say this, to my utter amazement it developed that the Roosevelt administration did not want the resolution passed and it never was reported out of the Committee on Rules. I am right well convinced, in fact I know, that that opposition is the reason it was not so reported out.

Now I ask: If promises are made, what sort of responsibilities do they create? Are we to be marched up the hill and down again?

I say to the gentlewoman from Connecticut that there was before the Committee on Rules exactly the sort of a resolution to which she refers. I agree with her, if I understood her correctly, that a resolution is the formal, effective way by which the Congress may act.

What happened between October 15, 1944, and December 1944 except an election? Nothing, so far as anyone knows.

I rise not in a spirit of political controversy. I have referred to the statement of my candidate for President, who was not elected. I have referred to the things that happened and transpired only because they constitute what seem to me to be clear indications of promises, commitments, and responsibilities.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of June of this year, I had the opportunity of visiting the Holy Land. I was amazed at the progress and development in the modern city of Tel Aviv and the surrounding area. Here in the midst of a poor, backward country, still using the primitive methods of agriculture and transportation of 20 centuries ago, was a modern city and an agricultural area using the methods of today.

The refugee Jews from Europe's ghettos with the aid of financial support from Jewry throughout the world had made this possible. In bringing this development to Palestine, they raised the standard of living of both the original Jewish inhabitants and the native Arabs.

Further increased inmigration of refugee, homeless, and stateless Jews will be of further benefit to the Arabs.

The propagandists at this point always raise the bugaboo of conflict between Jew and Arab. I talked with several leaders while there, as well as members of American organizations and it was their opinion that no real foundation existed for this charge. It is true that there are fanatics among the Arabs and troublemakers among the reactionary original Jewish inhabitants.

There is good reason to believe that these elements have been encouraged and financed by certain British interests, who have consistently refused to comply with the Balfour Declaration or the treaty of Lusanne.

It is time for the Congress of the United States to take a firm stand on this Palestine matter. The compliance by Britain with her pledges and treaties are a matter of world concern.

We ask for humane and simple things in humane and simple language. But above all, they ask for justice—justice for the Hebrew and justice for the Arab.

I would like to add a word of strong approval of the policy of a democratic Jewish Palestine. This seems to be the right policy not only because Palestine was promised to the Jews and because they deserve this reward for all the sufferings they have gone through, but also, if I may be frank, because such a policy seems to me to be most in accord with American interests.

A lot of nonsense is being spoken about the extreme need for this country to prove itself a friend of the Arabs on every question. May I ask why? We certainly should support the Arabs wherever they are in the right, just as we ought to support anyone else who happens to be right. But why are we under any compulsion to embrace the Arab cause, irrespective of whether it is right or wrong?

The Arab peoples are poor and undeveloped. They need money, machinery, and disinterested assistance in raising their cultural and economic standards. We know, and, what is more important, the Arabs know that we are the only great power able and willing to give them such assistance and guidance without plotting to obtain political control over them. This is why the Arab countries

are so anxious to give their oil concessions to us, to invite our teachers and our engineers to help them along on the road to development. To put it shortly, they need us more than we need them. It is preposterous, therefore, to maintain seriously that the attitude of the Arab peoples, whether in Saudi Arabia or in Syria, or in Egypt, or anywhere else, would be seriously affected by our position with regard to Palestine. The Arab peoples invited American cooperation in the first place in their own interests, and not for the sake of Palestine, and they will continue to desire American cooperation above all. However, the future of Palestine is decided by the great powers of the world.

It should be evident to anyone who is not a babe-in-the-woods that the attempts of Arab politicians to threaten us with the loss of Arab friendship in case the United States joins Great Britain in deciding that the pledge to the Jews regarding Palestine be carried out is merely a bluff. We in this House can see through this bluff without difficulty, and I do not see why the experts in the Department of State cannot see through it just as easily.

Even more childish are the threats which we are reading currently in newspapers of the Arabs starting a war against the Jews of Palestine or against the nations which would admit the justice of the Jewish case. I understand that in Palestine proper, despite vicious German and Italian propaganda conducted by that Axis agent who used to occupy the position of a Mufti in Jerusalem, two to three thousand was the largest number of Arabs who ever took any part in the riots against the Jews, and that even of that small number a goodly portion had to be hired by the gang leaders at so much per diem. As for the Arabs outside Palestine, I understand that their armies are ill-trained and ill-equipped; that most of the arms which they possess they got from us on a lend-lease basis—certainly not for the purpose of fighting Jews. And I further understand that a full-fledged attempt to wage war on England which was undertaken by the Arab country of Iraq in the middle of the war was suppressed by the tremendous force of two British battalions. Our Government has participated in some territorial and political decisions in recent months in which the justice of the decision arrived at was much less evident and in which the dangers were far more serious. I do not see why we should permit ourselves to be bluffed out of supporting a solution of the Palestine question which most people in this country consider just and to which our Government and both the Democratic and Republican Parties are pledged.

The Hebrew in Europe, behind the wire of his camp, sees only one future of promise, a free and democratic life in Palestine.

The Arab, in his miserable field, sees himself the victim of the cruelest feudal system left on the face of the earth. He looks forward to the day when he, too, may have fertile fields, prosperity, and good health.

The hopes of these two peoples are not in conflict—they are identical. They can be described in one word—democracy.

The Hebrew people of Europe should have a chance not only for survival but for decent and dignified existence; and give to the Hebrews and the Arabs in Palestine the opportunity to carve a decent future in harmony and amity.

Oil, imperialism, prejudice are walls of desert sand before the mechanized forces of outraged American public opinion. Our duty is simple. We must answer the call of humanity.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, a great humanitarian principle is involved in the movement to rehabilitate the Jewish race in its historical home, Palestine.

To permit all Jews who so desire to return to their traditional homeland where they can find opportunity for economic self-development, establish their own homes unhampered and pursue happiness in their own way, is a right that should not be withheld.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that those who have been permitted to reestablish themselves in Palestine have laid the ground work of sound economic order that will bring happiness to those who may follow. They have applied modern methods of irrigation to reconvert desert lands into thriving farms.

It is the obligation of civilized nations of the world to remove every restriction and encourage their return to Palestine.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I join those of my colleagues on both the Republican and Democratic sides of the aisle in support of the pending resolutions as an expression that the House of Representatives of the Congress favors the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish homeland.

In that respect, I am proud to follow on the road laid out ahead of me by such distinguished American statesmen as the late Woodrow Wilson and the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill when he was a member of His Majesty's opposition, Sir Clement Attlee when he was a member of the Labor Party as a minority and before he became Prime Minister, and such distinguished statesmen in American public life as Senator ROBERT TAFT, of Ohio, Gov. Thomas Dewey, of New York, and President Truman, our present President of the United States.

The Labor Party of Great Britain, when offering itself to the people of the British Isles in the recent elections set forth one of the most decisive and plainly worded planks it has ever been my pleasure to see, in which they pledged to the British people and to the Jews throughout the world that they would actually carry out the pledges that have been made since 1917, or in fact, at least since 1924, that Palestine should become the homeland of the wandering and stateless Jews of the world. I quote the exact words:

> Here we have halted halfway, irresolute between conflicting policies. But there is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home, unless we are prepared to let the Jews, if they wish to, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe.
>
> Here, too, in Palestine is the case on human grounds, and to promote a stable settlement for the transfer of populations, let the Arabs be encouraged to move out as the Jews move in. Let them be compensated handsomely for their land and let their settlement elsewhere be carefully organized and generously financed.
>
> The Arab has many wide territories of his own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area—Palestine—less than the size of Wales.
>
> Indeed, we should reexamine also the possibility of extending the present boundaries by agreement with Egypt, Syria, or Trans-Jordan. Moreover, we should seek to win the full sympathy and support of the American and Russian Governments for the execution of this Palestine policy.

We recently fought a war, one of the main reasons for which was to help the persecuted peoples of Europe emerge from the thralldom imposed by the Hitlers and the Mussolinis.

Mr. Speaker, we should exercise every possible influence on the British foreign office in a sedulous endeavor to make it see the light. We should try our utmost through every honorable means to induce our British Allies to keep the promises made to the Jews that Palestine would be their homeland. It was on that basis that 52 nations signed the agreement whereby Great Britain was given the mandate over Palestine. Over 400 Congressmen and Senators have in writing subscribed to this viewpoint. Thirty governors have likewise urged it. We must not let the subject of oil interfere. The Arabs have vast quantities of oil within their borders. The indications are that the welfare of the Jews and promises made are being subordinated to the scheming whereby this Arab oil may be exploited by British and American oil interests.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken here several times in behalf of the establishment of a free Jewish democratic commonwealth. Hardly more than a week ago I urged our Government to take immediate action to resolve this vital question and open the doors of Palestine to the millions of sorely afflicted Jews who are wandering over the face of Europe today seeking a haven and refuge from cruel persecution and destitution.

I am honored once again to join with so many of my distinguished colleagues in urging our President and our State Department to intensify their efforts to solve this vital problem and enable our Jewish brethren not only to enjoy their own homeland, their own free government but what is of greatest immediate concern—escape from a European winter which holds for them nothing but starvation and suffering.

Let us act at once. Let England act at once to keep its pledged word to this great race. Let the pleas of humanity be heard. Let Palestine be opened at once as a Jewish homeland and a Jewish refuge from harm and destitution.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank my colleagues for their compassionate as well as statesmanlike views on the subject of Palestine.

Britain is asking our largesse. Britain asks us to do justice to her. I say to Lord Keynes and Lord Halifax, her representatives now in Washington, before you seek aid from America, let Britain do justice. It is only just that Britain redeem her pledges with reference to Palestine and help the helpless and stateless Jews get into their homeland of Palestine, as was promised by Great Britain when she received the mandate over Palestine. Tell your Government, Lord Keynes and Lord Halifax, that the American Congress resents the action of Britain in Palestine. Indeed, the perfidy of Britain with reference to Palestine sticks in the eye of the Congress like a cinder.

It is very significant that Herbert Stanley Morrison, in the House of Commons—and Herbert Stanley Morrison is now one of the leaders of the Labor Cabinet—said in connection with opposition to the nefarious white paper, which slams the door of Palestine against the driven Jew:

> We regard this white paper and the policy in it as a cynical breach of pledges given to Jews and the world, including America. This policy will do us no good in the United States.

Indeed, this policy of the Labor Government is doing it no good in the United States. Mr. Churchill made similar remarks against this damnable white paper when he was in the opposition benches. He called it the "filing of a petition in moral bankruptcy." Mr. Attlee made similar remarks when he was campaigning for election. Those high promises have gone for naught. They have vanished into thin air. Shall we say, as did the savant, "Alas, a friend in power is a friend lost."

Jews are generally law-abiding, but will not abide injustice.

They do not recognize the white paper of 1939, just as they refused to recognize the Nuremberg laws. They will flout that white paper just as the American colonists set at naught the Stamp Act and the tea tax—just as Gandhi rejected the salt tax. The white paper was a bribe—baksheesh—for the Arab aid in the war. That aid was not forthcoming. Instead, the Arabs in Iraq revolted against Britain, and the Arabs in Saudi Arabia would not even give a donkey.

The Jews will not break the law. They will help downtrodden refugees to enter Palestine. There will be shooting. The responsibility is Britains. Britain will reap a whirlwind.

I doubt whether the enlightened people of the world will stand idly by and see the remnants of a martyred people shot at by British police and soldiers—shot at in cold blood as they approach their historic homeland. The Jews in Palestine have weighed well the consequences. They are willing to make the necessary sacrifices. They will defend to the death their right of asylum in Palestine—their right to make it a homeland for their distressed and displaced brethren.

There is an old Moslem-Turkish law still in effect in Palestine. Anyone who settles on and works on uncultivated wasteland becomes its owner. We shall settle the European Jew on these desert lands. Let the British or the Arabs try to dislodge them. The Jews will accept the challenge of British imperialism. The Jewish DO-day is near at hand. There is great tension. Decency and justice bid Americans to stand by the brave band of Jewry in Palestine.

We do not want a Laval firing squad to kill the MacDonald white paper of 1939. We want an outright killing of the damnable white paper. Attlee, Bevin, and Morrison must be forced to use a revolver of abrogation and aim and shoot it directly at the head of the nefarious white paper.

Britain is pouring wealth into the Lavant to stir up Arab antipathy to the Jew. Unfortunately, America is lending such aid, although indirect. As of June 30, 1945, we had transferred to Saudi Arabia under lend-lease, goods valued at $9,492,000. These goods consisted of industrial and agricultural commodities. As of the same date we had furnished lend-lease aid amounting to $4,144 to Iraq. If the United States made its position clear, these Levantine countries would not want to escape out of the orbit of the United States good will. The artificially stimulated antagonism between Jew and Arab would evaporate quickly if these countries were firmly advised that we have dropped the role of appeasers.

A letter I received from one Frank I. Hogan makes very interesting reading. It states:

> If you want to know the reason why the Jews in Palestine, with the aid of the modern Herod (Ibn Saud, no doubt a lineal descendant of that scoundrel), who was also an Arab or Edomite, descendants of Esau, the son of one of the patriarchs from Abraham, from whom the Arabs (really Jews, but Moslems) claim descent will not get home rule under British rule, read this from the morning paper and then form your own conclusions:
>
> "* * * Standard Oil Co. of California today announced definitely that * * * company * * * and the Texas Co. (owned by the former Secretary of the Treasury under Hoover—born in northern Ireland) will build a 1,000-mile Arabian pipe line from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean. The cost, estimated between $70,000,000 and $100,000,000, will be borne by the two companies without government aid. (Isn't that just too bad.) * * * Clearance has been assured by the British Government (not the Jews, mind you) and * * * documents are ready for signature. These will provide the green light for crossing the Trans-Jordan (the country mandated to the Arabs by the British and ruled by the eldest son of Ibn Saud Herod. * * * Oil will pour through it from Arabian reserves estimated to total between two and twenty billion barrels * * * controlled jointly by the Standard and Texas Co. King Ibn Saud (Herod) receives 21 cents a barrel and he has granted a concession covering an area as large as California, Oregon, and Washington combined."
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> FRANK I. HOGAN.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this subject at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to have this opportunity to add a few words in behalf of the cause of providing a refuge and a home for the oppressed Jewish peoples, particularly those unfortunate victims of this war who are suffering so much today on the continent of Europe.

This is not a Jewish problem, one that is to be solved by the Jewish people. It is a problem that lies at the threshold of every Christian community in this Nation. The treatment that has been accorded the Jewish people, particularly in Nazi Europe, is a blight on the picture of a civilized world.

America should use her good offices to assist in the solution of this problem. We should urge that the British Government carry out its promises made long ago to provide a home for the Jewish people.

A year ago the House Committee on Foreign Affairs approved a resolution through which Congress could express its sentiments on behalf of this cause. My colleague [Mr. HALLECK] has told the House how, following the Presidential election, that resolution was held in the Rules Committee and has never been permitted to receive the consideration of the House. I am sure that it would have overwhelming support from this House if it had not been pigeonholed in that committee a little less than a year ago.

Our hope is that we may have the sincere support of our Government in behalf of this cause. We earnestly plead for the establishment of this homeland. Only in that way can we discharge our responsibilities as a Christian nation.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to understand why there should be opposition to the use of Palestine by the Jews of the world. I know of no more logical place for a homeland. For thousands of years that small part of the great continent of Asia has been identified with the Jews; and certainly since biblical times the majority of those living there have been Jews.

Perhaps the economic deficiencies are such that standing alone Palestine can never hope to become as great and powerful a nation as our own. And certainly the territorial limitations are most definite. But there is no good reason why this land should not be made a refuge where the oppressed people from many parts of the world could find a haven and a home.

This Government can well afford to acquaint all the Allied Nations with our feelings in this matter since we cannot possibly be charged with having any designs on that territory. I believe a strong stand by the United States today

will obviate turmoil and suffering in the days to come.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the time allotted this morning for a general discussion of the Palestine question has been limited to 1 hour. I am not justified in demanding the attention of the House merely to repeat what I said on October 11: The Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A4270, clearly records my position.

Indeed, I made my position clear when I sought election to Congress in 1944. I have never hesitated to make it clear since election. The people of my district have no reason to doubt where I stand.

I am proud to be a member of the American Christian Palestine Committee. I shall continue my fight for a Palestine open without restriction to Jewish immigration. I am ashamed of the past quarter century of broken promises.

The time for action is now, and toward that action I shall make every contribution which is within my power.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this Government will exert its full influence to find asylum for the Jews in Europe who have become entirely displaced through the wanton cruelty of the Nazis. It is difficult to realize what it must be to feel homeless in every sense of the word, as these people must as they wait in camps for some action to be taken in their behalf. Let us do what we can to open Palestine for their immigration.

Let us lend our full effort to the formation of the United Nations Organization, and press it to speed more permanent solutions for the oppressed and hopeless of the world. There are no new continents to be opened up, but there are still new ways of life to be developed. Let us pray and work for a world in which men may live and move about in friendliness and freedom. These barriers have been made by man, and they must be removed by him.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that Great Britain has no moral right to bar the return of the Jewish people to their homeland. I believe that the President and Great Britain should act to accomplish that purpose without further delay. They can and should act now without further promises and delays. I call attention to the following letter I received from one of my distinguished constituents Rabbi Solomon Jacobson and a fine editorial on this subject appearing in the Waukegan News-Sun with which I agree:

CONGREGATION AM ECHOD,
Waukegan, Ill., October 11, 1945.

The Honorable RALPH CHURCH,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my deepest appreciation for the courtesy of the appointment with you on Thursday last. It was good of you to grant me the time to discuss Palestine with you.

I do hope that you will find it possible to bring your effective support to any and all measures designed to open the gates of Palestine for the unrestricted immigration of the remnant of the Jewish people now left in Europe, and for the establishment of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine in accordance with Great Britain's pledge in the Balfour Declaration and in accordance with the platform pledges of both our political parties.

To convey to you the sense of our Waukegan community, Jewish and Christian alike, I am enclosing herewith clippings from our local paper bearing upon the reaction of our community to the situation.

With every appreciation, I am,
Respectfully,

SOLOMON JACOBSON.

P. S.—I am indeed sorry I was unable to avail myself of your kind luncheon invitation. It would have been a pleasure.

[From the Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun of October 4, 1945]

OPEN PALESTINE

While much of the civilized world is watching for British action toward opening Palestine to the Jewish victims of the Hitlerian viciousness of prewar and wartime periods, the consensus in Waukegan and vicinity is that returning their homeland to the Jewish people is one of the vitally necessary steps toward solution of the postwar problems.

Jewish people have been herded into refugee camps, housed temporarily in German homes, and thousands of them are facing the future with no place to go, no program for living, and little hope for anything but a bare and meager existence. The people have suffered untold horrors at the hands of the Huns. Their families have been scattered, their homes destroyed, their belongings taken from them, and thousands have been slain simply because they were Jews.

The time is long past due when the Jewish people of Europe are given a chance to live. By far the greater number of innocent victims of the war have been the Jews. In the name of humanity, they must be provided with a place to settle where they can handle their own affairs, create their own government, and revive the culture that has been theirs and which they have given for the enrichment of the civilized world.

The failure of Britain to take action on the opening of Palestine to Jewish settlers has been an enigma to most Americans. The theory that the peoples of Palestine will uprise against the incoming Jews has been repeated time and again. Britain maintains control of the area and is established there to maintain peace. Britain has no moral right to bar the return of the Jewish people to their homeland.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to record my voice and to give my total support for the objective sought by Jewry throughout the world. In the brief few moments allotted to me, as a Christian and an American, I want to state pointedly that unless we assume our place on the side of right and justice, we, particularly in America, will stand adjudged in history as having failed our conscience in the fulfillment of the prophecy which promised unto the Jew and his progeny the assumption and the fruit of the Holy Land. America fought for the liberation and the rights of all nations, particularly for the weak and the oppressed.

Palestine, like a score of other countries, is entitled to self-determination, to independence, and to formulate, free of outside interference, her policies while building for the future. She shall shape her own destiny in the world, plan and assume responsibilities in the family of nations. There is no earthly superpower to circumvent or deny what God Almighty ordained and declared in the Bible. The time is here and now. Let us shoulder our responsibility, let us act faithfully, fearlessly, and positively.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, the world rehabilitation, we have set for ourment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine is more obvious and more imperative today than ever before. The historical oppression of the Jewish peoples of Europe became so accelerated in the past several years under the inhuman Nazi policies that the present suffering of these homeless people is now beyond description.

As the natural leaders in a program of world's responsibility for the establishselves the task of easing the pain of a war-torn world and assisting in great measure in reestablishing those unfortunate people of every race and nationality in their homes with a view toward stamping indelibly upon the entire surface of the earth the Godlike principles of the Atlantic Charter. We all know that we have set for ourselves a difficult task. Certainly the official insistence of this Government that necessary immigration certificates be issued now to European Jews and that the United Nations lend its complete support to the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine would go far toward the realization of that objective.

Measures now being taken by the United Nations in Europe represent at best an honest attempt to bring relief to suffering, homeless people. These attempts are merely temporary stop-gaps and do not represent a full measure of rehabilitation. The suggested establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine would successfully answer the age-long justifiable plea of world Jewry and would immediately decrease the staggering problem of rehabilitation in Europe itself.

As we glance into the pages of history, have we not every reason to believe that our failure to take immediate determined steps in this direction now inevitably would lead to the same problem under which European Jews have suffered for centuries.

Under our sacred principles of democracy, under the Atlantic Charter, under the motives for which we fought and won this great world war, these people, as well as any others, must have the right to determine their own destinies. Today, in its position of world leadership, the Government of the United States if it so chooses, can promptly attain these objectives.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the victorious close of the war makes this an appropriate time to test our determination to establish a peace upon the stable foundations of justice and democratic equality.

Other speakers here today have dramatically recited the tragic story of the atrocities perpetrated upon the Jewish people by our inhuman enemies during the long, bitter years of the war. That frightful record need not be repeated by me. It is sufficient to emphasize again the fact that the Jews suffered beyond all other peoples in the terrible world conflict which has finally been terminated, and that they and their problems are entitled to the immediate sympathetic

consideration of all civilized peoples, now that peace has been restored in the world.

During the war, while the Nazis were proceeding systematically upon their program to exterminate Jews—a program in which they were horribly successful, and would undoubtedly have carried to completion but for their military overthrow—immigration into Palestine was restricted to a bare minimum, and at times completely shut off. Millions of Jews were massacred during the war, but only a paltry few thousands were permitted to seek refuge in their ancestral homeland. Today the doors of Palestine are closed to hundreds of thousands of wandering Jews whose present lot is still desperate, and who have no future assurance of rest from their wanderings or permanent security of mind and body.

Civilized thinkers throughout the world have long recognized the justice of the Jewish cause in Palestine. They have joined in a universal demand for an honest fulfillment of the pledges made to the Jews in the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine mandate.

Every President of the United States since Woodrow Wilson has asserted the support of the American Government for the reconstitution of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth. This Congress, nearly a quarter of a century ago, endorsed that policy, which was reaffirmed by the American-British Conference of 1924. In the last Presidential campaign both of the major political parties of America declared in their national platforms their unqualified indorsements of this policy and three-fourths of the State legislatures of the Union have adopted resolutions in support of Jewish aspirations in Palestine.

The time for action is now. With world-wide hostilities at an end, all the powers of our Government should be exerted toward the immediate fulfillment of the policy to which America is so definitely committed.

I earnestly hope that this Congress will use all of its great influence to persuade the Government of Great Britain to open the gates of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization in the immediate future.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity of joining with my colleagues in an expression and reaffirmation of belief that Palestine should be opened to the Jewish peoples of the world as a homeland.

Last year I had the privilege of testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee in behalf of the Palestine resolution at a time when the world was at war and the tragic persecution of the Jews offered one of the most concrete and terrible examples of the philosophy against which we fought. It was our avowed purpose in fighting that war to pledge to all peoples and all minority groups the right to live and work in their own lands in freedom from fear and persecution, there being no recognized boundaries to human dignity.

That war is now over, but the principles for which we fought need constant redefinition, and it is increasingly necessary that we daily reaffirm those faiths unless they are to become a thing of the past.

I have recently returned from a two months' observation tour of Europe, during which time I studied the operations of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration on the Continent. As you know, one of the major problems that UNRRA has had to face is the disposition of the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons. At the center of this problem is what might be called a hard core of some one hundred thousand homeless Jews. The reopening of Palestine and the removal of immigration restrictions presents a partial, immediate solution to that problem. Palestine has indicated her willingness and ability to absorb these people. There is already a well-established economy and a large Jewish community. There is room for expansion in both industrial and agritultural development.

I believe that our Government and its representatives should take a firm stand in advocating the removal of immigration restrictions. In so doing, however, I think it even more important that we do not glibly propose and sponsor such a course merely as an easy answer to a troublesome problem. There is too apt to be something a little dogmatic and a little patronizing about presenting a solution per se. What we are emphasizing is the right of the Jewish people to a homeland. We are not delegating them to a corner of the globe. We are recognizing the right of all peoples to work out their own salvations, to cultivate their own lands, and to live in dignity and equality with other peoples of the world.

Mr. RESA. Mr. Speaker, the administration of the territory of Palestine was allocated to Great Britain by mandate based upon the assumption by Great Britain of responsibility for placing Palestine under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, the development of self-governing institutions, and the safeguarding of the civil and religious rights of all inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion. This obligation Great Britain clearly expressed and unequivocally assumed by the Balfour Declaration, the covenants of the mandate, and by the representations made by Great Britain to the United States in the course of extended negotiations which preceded both.

By treaty ratification, official statement, and congressional resolution the United States has placed beyond question its complete reliance upon the obligation thus assumed by Great Britain.

That Great Britain's so-called white paper which ended all Jewish immigration into Palestine on April 1, 1944, is a violation of the obligation assumed by Great Britain with reference to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine is too manifest to require argument. Indeed, Mr. Churchill himself has called it a "sacrifice of our declared purpose" and an act of "moral and physical bankruptcy." Regarding this renunciation of a sacred obligation, the United States was never consulted and its consent to it has never been granted.

There is no occasion now to examine the merits of the Jewish claim to a homeland in Palestine. These were conceded and established by the assumption of the obligation of which the white paper is a renunciation and violation. But it is worth bearing in mind that the large import of Jewish capital into Palestine has worked a general improvement of the economic life of the whole country, the expansion and improvement of Arab industry and citriculture have been largely financed by the capital thus obtained, Jewish development and enterprise have increased the employment of Arab labor in urban areas, and particularly in the ports, institutions founded with Jewish funds have also served the Arab population, and Jewish cultivation and development of the country's resources and improvement of living conditions have vastly increased the capacity of the country to sustain a growing population, with the result that the Arab population has almost doubled under Jewish development of the country.

To say that our insistence upon the fulfillment of Great Britain's obligation with reference to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine is an interference by us with British territory is utter nonsense. Palestine does not belong to Britain. The British have no more rights in Palestine than we have or than anyone else has. Great Britain controls Palestine under a trusteeship which imposes upon Great Britain obligations of a trustee not only for the benefit of the Jewish people but for the benefit of every nation, including the United States, which consented to the mandate upon the assumption that Great Britain's solemn obligations would not be dishonored. The characteristics of a trusteeship do not pertain to any rights claimed by the trustee; the essence of a trusteeship consists in the solemn obligations which the trustee has undertaken to fulfill. An honorable nation having given its word will not reckon the cost of keeping it.

Among the nations entitled to insist upon the performance by Great Britain of its obligations with reference to Palestine, the position of the United States is of special validity. Victory has just been achieved in a great war in which, but for our intervention at great cost of life and blood and treasure, Great Britain would have been destroyed. Our purpose in fighting the war was to establish permanent universal peace. It has always been understood that this peace would be based upon international agreements and cooperation. We may find that we have wasted our substance and our effort if our principal ally in the war just concluded persists in a policy calculated to convince the world that international agreements cannot be relied upon and that international cooperation is a snare for the unwary.

America must insist upon the fulfillment of the Palestine commitment.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great disappointment to one who is sincerely interested in the solution of the so-called Palestine question that an aggressive and definite attitude was not assumed by the President at the recent conference at Potsdam. This whole matter could have been decided with the representatives of Russia and Great

Britain and the details could have been left to the respective Secretaries and Ministers of State. It is perplexing to those of us who want something accomplished to have to contend with the rather negative attitude of the British Government. One is forced to the conclusion that inasmuch as Great Britain seems unable to solve this perplexing problem or because of some sinister reason she refuses to grapple with it, the whole question should be thrown into the lap of the United Nations without further delay. Whether this would be a satisfactory solution or not, time alone will tell but it would be an effort to solve the matter from a world-wide point of view and take it out of the control of selfish interests.

There can be no doubt that the Jewish emigrants to Palestine have done and are doing a remarkable job in transforming that poor portion of Asia into a modern state. This has been accomplished by hard work, self-sacrifice, and a determination which should command the admiration of the world. The Jewish people want to found a Jewish commonwealth which is the natural instinct of a free people. Because of the enthusiasm with which a start of this Jewish commonwealth has been made, it becomes increasingly evident that Palestine as it is now bounded, will not be large enough, which is another reason why this question must be solved by the United Nations gathered around a table in peaceful assembly. The whole matter should be taken out of the control of the British; it is definitely a matter for the United Nations.

A most pressing need for prompt action is the relief of those thousands of stricken and homeless Jews in central Europe. They long to go to a Jewish commonwealth of their own where they may establish themselves and make a definite contribution to their own rehabilitation, and it seems only logical that this desire should be encouraged.

I include as part of my remarks a letter that I wrote to the President of the United States under date of June 29, 1945, shortly before he left this country for the Potsdam Conference. This letter was not prompted by any suggestion from outside sources but was the result of my own intense feelings on the subject of a Palestine commonwealth. In about 3 weeks time I received a reply from the State Department, signed by the then Acting Secretary of State, Hon. Joseph C. Grew. The reply said, in effect, that the State Department knew of the urgency of the matter and would give it thoughtful study and close attention. The truth is that our State Department has no policy on this question and sometimes it is difficult to learn what its policy is on many other grave international problems.

It is much to be desired that a clearly stated and comprehensive American foreign policy will soon be adopted, particularly on such questions as whether the United States will insist that governments established in the former enemy satellite nations shall be representative and that the rights of freedom of speech and assembly shall be guaranteed; whether the United States plans to extend substantial financial aid to England and Russia and any other country and if so, upon what terms, in what amounts and for what purposes; whether the United States plans to allow Russian participation in the occupation of Japan, and there are many other similar questions. I feel, however, that our country's attitude toward the so-called Palestine question ranks among the most important matters to be considered at this time and the sooner a definite attitude is adopted in place of the nebulous, wishy-washy uncertainty of the present policy, the sooner our country will be able to hold up its head high among the nations of the earth.

My letter to the President under date of June 29, 1945, follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1945.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am taking the liberty of writing you to urge that you discuss the Palestine question at your approaching conference with Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin. The San Francisco Conference has resulted in a long step toward establishing international peace and understanding, but as yet no workable and acceptable solution of the settlement of Palestine by the Jews has even been proposed.

Appeasement is no longer the order of the day in dealing with matters of international justice, and it is high time that the undoubted will of the American people to end the expediency of the Chamberlain white paper and to enact the provisions of the Balfour Declaration for a Jewish home in Palestine should be consummated.

You are doubtless aware that many of us in the Congress urged this policy on our Government a year or more ago, but our efforts were necessarily restrained because of the statement by the authorities that serious military and diplomatic questions were involved. A lot of water has passed over the dam since then, and now is the time to grapple with the problem and solve it. Further delay would be too late.

You are well aware of the pressure placed on Members of Congress by groups of citizens in matters of this kind, but I want to assure you that this letter is not prompted by any such influence. My stand on this question is well known by my many friends of all religious beliefs, and I am sure that the people whom I represent approve thoroughly of my attitude. I feel confident, Mr. President, that your good common sense and the high standard of statesmanship which you have displayed will guide you in the leadership in this matter to the end that an honest conclusion with justice for all may be reached soon.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, for over 12 years we have heard on the radio and read in the public press of the persecution and the barbarous treatment of the Jewish people in Germany. This persecution started with the rise to power of Hitler and the Nazi Party. From the time Hitler came into power, he began his inhuman and tortuous treatment of these unfortunate and defenseless people. He not only tortured the Jewish people in Germany, but as his armies conquered other European countries, their first object was to inflict their cruel treatment on those of the Jewish faith.

We know, now, how millions of Jews died. They were starved, tortured beyond human endurance, beaten to death, and executed in gas chambers. This treatment was meted out to men, women, and children regardless of age.

We know that people of the other conquered nations also suffered indescribable tortures, and our heartfelt sympathies go out to them; but of all of those who have suffered from the bestial treatment of the Nazis and their collaborators, the Jewish people were the first to be singled out, upon whom the Nazis inflicted these barbaric tortures which were so gruesome that the thoughts of them shocks the decency of mankind.

These unfortunate people were robbed of their life's savings and belongings, driven and uprooted out of their homes, and thrown into concentration camps. From there, those who were able to work were taken as slave laborers and under the lash of the Gestapo were forced to slave long hours, undernourished and underfed on starving rations, until they became too weak and exhausted to work. Then they were taken to the extermination prisons where they were brutally murdered.

We all hoped that when the Nazis were defeated these unfortunate people would find a place to go where they could earn a living and live in peace, and the hopes of millions of Jewish people was that they might be able to go to Palestine and there settle and make it their homeland. Those who have been fortunate to get to Palestine in the early days of the war have developed the country and made it a thriving community.

I believe there is room for several more millions to settle in Palestine but they are not permitted to enter. I feel that our Government should intercede in behalf of these Jewish people and help those who want to go there to obtain permission to enter, so that they may be able to have a homeland and live a useful and peaceful life.

Under unanimous consent, I insert a resolution passed by the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, of Chicago, into the RECORD:

Conscious of the spiritual and physical homelessness of the Jewish survivors of nazism and fascism in Germany and other places in Europe, and responsive to the simple demands of humanity, decency, and justice, the Decalogue Society of Lawyers endorses and vigorously supports the efforts of President Truman to facilitate the immediate immigration of Jewish refugees in Europe to Palestine—the land that wants them and the land to which they wish to go. Palestine alone, of all countries of the world, welcomes them and offers to share with them her bread, her homes, her farms, and factories. Palestine affords them an opportunity to rehabilitate their tortured lives and be restored to mental and physical well-being.

The Decalogue Society of Lawyers, speaking for its 1,200 members of the bar and judiciary, respectfully urges President Harry S. Truman, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, Senators Scott W. Lucas and C. Wayland Brooks, and all Members of the House of Representatives from Illinois to use all means at their disposal and the great moral influence of the United States to permit all Jewish refugees in Europe desiring to do so to make their homes in Palestine as free men, with full democratic rights for the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Adopted unanimously by the board of managers of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, October 5, 1945.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish people have been denied too long the opportunity to immigrate to Palestine, where they have proved to the world that they can develop the resources of the land and establish a free and democratic nation. Since the surrender of Germany they have been left stranded by an arbitrary rule by England that the white paper must be left standing in spite of the fact that the war is over and won by the Allies. What greater proof of independence, industry, willingness to cooperate with all nations of the world is needed to convince the British that the Jewish people are entitled to free entry into Palestine.

As a member of the American Christian Palestine Committee, I have developed a keen interest and high regard for the Jewish people's case to return to Palestine. The terrible persecution they suffered in Europe during the war years, the suffering they are going through since the war is over, should bring to their aid the respect and regard of all citizens of the United States to help them gain their objective. England with her present liberal government, which is devoted to helping the common lot of mankind, should prove what they stand for, and under Clement Attlee and his party now in power open Palestine to the Jewish people which they have earned and are entitled to.

PALESTINE FOR THE JEWS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, a quarter of a century ago the British Government through the Balfour Declaration promised Palestine to the Jews for their homeland. Fifty-three nations of the world, including the United States, joined by resolution in the Balfour Declaration.

In failing to redeem this pledge, the British have violated international law. Consequently millions of Jews became the victims of Nazi bestiality. However, there is still time for the Christian world to save the 100,000 Jews now living in concentration camps throughout Europe who face a winter of starvation, misery, and death. I have appealed to Prime Minister Attlee to abrogate the infamous British white paper of 1939 and fulfill the pledge of his party made recently to give Palestine to the Jews. I appeal to my Christian colleagues in this Congress to join with me in my plea to Prime Minister Attlee. These destitute Jewish men, women, and children seek only a home of their own. This can be accomplished without any cost to world society.

As part of my remarks I include a copy of my letter addressed to Prime Minister Attlee under date of October 4, 1945, on the Palestine problem:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 4, 1945.

The Honorable CLEMENT R. ATTLEE,
Prime Minister of Great Britain,
London, England.

MY DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: I am sadly disappointed in the policy of the British with respect to Palestine. As a Member of the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses, I have heartily endorsed the entire war program, including lend-lease to our allies. I most vigorously supported aid to and cooperation with Great Britain. However, during the war I hesitated to criticize the white-paper policy of the British as I knew that such criticism would give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Now the war is at an end, and I can no longer sit idly by without voicing my protests to the present policy in not opening the gates of Palestine to the Jews. With your Labor Party in control, I had hoped that favorable action would be taken in behalf of the 100,000 Jews now living in concentration camps throughout Europe. I expected favorable action because of the denouncement by your party leaders in May 1939 of the Chamberlain government's white paper. At that time the Right Honorable Herbert Morrison declared that:

"If we do this thing today we shall have done a thing which is dishonorable to our good name, which is discreditable to our capacity to govern, and which is dangerous to British security, to peace, and to the economic interest of the world in general and of our own country. Moreover, it will not work * * * the Government must understand that this document will not be automatically binding upon their successors in office, whatever the circumstances of the time may be."

Mr. Prime Minister, you are the successors in office. Your Labor government is in power in Britain. Your party is now in control of Palestine's destinies. As recently as May 1945 your party adopted a resolution declaring:

"There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a 'Jewish national home' unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe. * * * The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales."

A splendid declaration, Mr. Prime Minister. The American people acclaimed your action. The Jews—at long last—looked with hope for tomorrow.

Yet, the doors of Palestine are closed to millions of stateless and homeless Jews facing starvation, misery, and death in Europe. They live in desperation filled with bitter recollection of past horrors. They are badly clothed. They are tragically underfed. They look to you for relief. They simply ask for a home which is rightfully theirs by tradition, by biblical history, and by the mandate of the Balfour Declaration which was endorsed by resolution of 53 nations of the world a quarter of a century ago. The Christian world demands full recognition of Jewish rights to Palestine. Patience is at an end.

Unless Great Britain practices the equity and justice toward others as she seeks for herself, I assure you, Mr. Prime Minister, that I shall oppose every measure that comes before Congress that would give relief and assistance to the British, and I shall urge my colleagues to do likewise. You cannot expect sympathy for the social advancement of Britain's masses when you withhold the right to a life of self-support and self-respect from the first victims of nazism. You cannot pledge or talk of social or economic progress and at the same time bolster the reactionary pro-Fascist, feudal Arab rules in the Middle East. I plead with you to keep faith with the Jewish people and with the nations of the world. I plead with you to redeem Britain's pledge to the Jewish people now. Otherwise, I intend to speak the length and breadth of America and tell the American people the facts.

Very sincerely yours,

SAMUEL A. WEISS.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, we have just fought and emerged victorious from the greatest war in the history of the world. Yet can we, or any other nation, say the war has been won as long as millions are suffering untold misery and are denied the promised blessings of the "four freedoms."

Peace on earth will never prevail as long as man fears the aggressor's tread on his threshold.

I have seen the transient and stationary millions in Europe plagued by disease, disaster, and damnation, and I feel that common decency demands that all countries support President Truman's recommendation that 100,000 Jews be admitted to Palestine. These surviving Jews have been abused, tortured, and degraded, and the civilized nations of the world should offer sanctuary to all oppressed peoples.

We know that the United States could not endure half-slave and half-free. Neither can this now small world endure half-slave and half-free. If nations can be forced into slavery why can they not be encouraged into freedom?

Now is the time to settle the Palestine question. The provision of the Balfour Declaration, establishing a Jewish homeland in Palestine, should be carried out. Not tomorrow—not in 1965—but today. Such action will prove to all minority groups that their future rights will be protected.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I favor the opening of Palestine to the Jewish people. Some 4,000 years ago this land was promised them as an inheritance. There should be no interference with their right of occupancy today. I believe the Congress should go on record asking the British Government to repeal the so-called white paper and reestablish the Balfour resolution so Palestine will again be open to the Jewish people.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Jewish people, I call attention to the wrong perpetrated against them by continuing to bar their immigration into Palestine. Now, that victory has been achieved, it is ironical that great numbers of "liberated" Jews find themselves unable to enter the one land where history records their right to live as free men.

Unqualified praise is due President Truman for his great humanitarian effort in urging Great Britain to allow 100,000 Jews to enter Palestine at once. As an immediate emergency measure, this would provide relief for many Jewish survivors of Nazi atrocities. But it does not constitute a solution of the basic problem.

The right of the Jewish people to establish a National homeland is historically established. The Balfour Declaration enunciates a policy to which the government of Great Britain committed itself without reservation. Our Government has repeatedly expressed its approval of Jewish aspirations in Palestine. Yet the British Government issued in 1939 a white paper in repudiation of its duty as the mandatory power and of its obligations under the Balfour Declaration. Efforts made from time to time to have this white paper set aside were

met, during the war years, with the statement that exigencies of military strategy required that it remain in force. Though military considerations no longer apply, the present British Government has shown no intention of dealing justly with the Jewish people in this matter. The British Labor Party officially condemned the white paper and committed itself to the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. However, since its accession to power, it has done nothing to redeem these solemn pledges. On the contrary, reports indicate its intention of continuing the present restrictive immigration policy, with but slight modification.

Our Government has not only the right but the duty to make its position unmistakably clear. Both the Democratic and the Republican Parties, as well as many of our Senators and Representatives, have from time to time expressed themselves in favor of opening the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration. The dictates of simple justice and humanity demand amelioration of the horrors inflicted upon European Jews. The vast majority of American Jews cherish the hope for a Jewish commonwealth.

I urge that our Government announce at once its approval of President Truman's suggestion for immediate admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine; its urgent insistence that the British Government repudiate the white paper of 1939 and permit free entry into Palestine of those Jews who wish to settle there; and, finally, that we exert our influence to the utmost with our British ally, to the end that steps be initiated now and carried forward at the Peace Conference for the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the British white paper of May 1939 has practically closed Palestine to all Jewish immigration. At a time when millions of European Jews have been massacred by the Nazis, the chief and almost the only door to escape will be slammed in the face of those hundreds of thousands who still survive and whom the Nazis have starved, impoverished, uprooted from home and occupation.

The Palestine white paper followed by a few months the Munich surrender. It reflected the same crisis in world statesmanship and international morality. The League of Nations mandate by virtue of which Great Britain governs Palestine made her responsible "for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home" and obligated her specifically to facilitate Jewish immigration. By abandoning these obligations to the Jewish national home, Britain hoped to secure the support of the Arab world in the great struggle that was clearly about to begin.

The white paper is not and cannot be the last word on the future of Palestine or of the Jewish people, linked to Palestine by the unbreakable bonds of history, tradition, and international recognition. It remains for the conscience of the democratic peoples, for an enlightened statesmanship in a world which has been through the crucible of a terrible war, fearlessly to face a problem which has challenged mankind through 2,000 years of history. The problem is that of the national homelessness of the Jewish people, a minority everywhere with no land which it may call its own and to which it may turn for escape from the recurrent persecution to which it is subject. In a wise and courageous solution of this problem, the white paper can have no part.

During the six long and bitter years of the war—while the Jews of Europe were being systematically exterminated by Nazi bestiality—immigration into Palestine was for periods completely shut off by the British administration, and, when permitted, restricted to a bare minimum at best. While millions of Jews were being massacred, not more than ten or twelve thousand were permitted to enter Palestine each year since the promulgation of the Chamberlain white paper in 1939. Today the certificates of immigration have been exhausted and still the doors of Palestine are closed to the hundreds of thousands who are waiting in the desperate hope of at last finding rest from their wanderings and of attaining permanent security of mind and body in the Jewish homeland.

There is no valid economic reason for keeping the Jews out of Palestine. During the last 25 years Jews all over the world have bent their energies toward the upbuilding of Palestine and have poured in great resources of capital, labor, and scientific knowledge to increase the absorptive capacity of the country.

Many people throughout the world have all along recognized the justice of the Jewish cause in Palestine. They have been resolute in their demand for a repudiation of the 1939 white-paper policy and for an honest fulfillment of the pledges made to the Jews in the Balfour Declaration and in the Palestine mandate.

From the time of President Wilson, who played a creative role in obtaining the Balfour Declaration, every succeeding President has reiterated support for the Jewish national home. In 1922, shortly before the approval of the Palestine mandate by the League of Nations, the Senate and the House of Representatives in a joint resolution expressed themselves, in the language of the Balfour Declaration, in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. Although the United States was not a member of the League of Nations, it became party to the terms of the mandate through the Anglo-American Convention of 1924, in accordance with which our Government consented to the administration of Palestine by Great Britain.

On March 9, 1944, President Roosevelt gave assurance that "the American Government has never given its approval to the white paper of 1939," and expressed the belief that full justice would be done in the matter of the Jewish national home.

The traditional American position on the Palestine question has been reaffirmed and strengthened during the past 2 years by planks included in the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican parties and by President Roosevelt's statement of October 15, 1943—historic pronouncements pledging support for the Jewish people's aim to reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

We of Maryland call upon the leaders of the United Nations no longer to neglect the pressing Jewish need, and we appeal for an immediate decision on Palestine on the two minimum requisites of any solution of the Jewish problem:

First. To abolish without further delay all restrictions on free Jewish immigration into Palestine and all limitations on the right of Jews to purchase and settle the land.

Second. To make simultaneously a definitive announcement, in the spirit and purpose of the Balfour Declaration and the mandate, of the determination to reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, hostilities have ceased. Suffering, torture, death, privation, and starvation have been visited upon the many. Surely no one will deny that horrors have been visited upon the Jews, both before and during hostilities.

One need not travel throughout the devastated areas of our war-torn world to realize the chaotic conditions that follow in the wake of the world's mightiest conflagration. The multitude of displaced persons are hungry for food, for habitation, and for freedom. Those who have suffered the hardships of war look hopefully and patiently for a haven of rest, where the wounds of war may be healed, where they and their loved ones may look forward to the opportunity of living out their lives in a world in which they may enjoy the four freedoms.

Not for one moment do I underestimate the gravity and complexity of the problems confronting the leaders, the governments, and the peoples, displaced or not, throughout this troubled world.

It is my firm belief that the provisions of the Balfour Declaration should be fulfilled.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, never before in human history has the need been so acute for practicing the Golden Rule, which is the very heart of Christianity. Never before has the impact of great and shattering forces made so clear the role religious values must play in human life if human life is to survive on this planet. Christianity today faces perhaps the greatest challenge in its history; it must make the Golden Rule work in a world that has grown cynical and callous.

If we are to attempt—and it is young people upon whom the burden of that attempt will fall primarily—if we are to attempt to remake our world in the image of true Christian faith, we cannot fail to see as one of the test problems confronting us, the question of the future of the Jewish people. It was out of Judaism that Christianity grew; it was on the Old Testament as well as the New that this country and democracy throughout the world were based. It was because of their undeviating adherence to their Old Testament heritage that Jews remained a group apart through the ages, and it was because their life was so bound up

with the words and the vision of the Book of Books that during 20 centuries of dispersion they continued to see the goal of Jewish history as the restoration of Jewish national life and the renaissance of Jewish ethical and cultural values in the promised land of their ancestors, the land of Israel—Palestine. For over six decades now, Jews have been returning to the land of Israel. They have done noble and extraordinary things there. A British chaplain, Ronald Grange-Bennet, who served for 3 years with British forces in Palestine, said recently that "The Jews of Palestine are the most fascinating collection of human beings on earth." They are indeed unique; they are in their overwhelming majority workers and farmers, but they have not lost the intellectuality and the esthetic gifts so characteristic of their people. They base their education and their lives upon the ancient writings of their people, but they are evolving a cooperative agricultural and industrial economy which has much to give by way of example to the rest of the world. Writing of the Jewish collective and cooperative villages in Palestine, Sir E. John Russell, England's greatest agricultural expert says:

> The Jewish settlers have done far more than making a home for themselves and their community; they have lighted a torch to show the way through some of the obscure and difficult problems awaiting us in the postwar world.

Jews in Palestine today are making the Bible's prophecies come true; they are consciously attempting to build a society worthy of their ethical heritage. Because they know that spiritual values must pervade every aspect of life, they have made a religion of labor and have applied themselves with self-sacrificing zeal and devotion to the reclamation of the neglected soil of Palestine. Theirs is "the greatest ameliorative project of this century," says Dr. Norman Maclean, former moderator of the general assembly of the Church of Scotland. The most remarkable example of soil conservation in the modern world, says Dr. Walter Lowdermilk, assistant chief of our United States Soil Conservation Service. The interests of the Jews of Palestine and those of their Arab neighbors are complementary rather than conflicting; the standards of those Arab neighbors has already been appreciably raised, and the effect of Jewish progress in Palestine is destined, impartial observers feel, to be a force of revolutionary significance in the underdeveloped and underpopulated lands of the Near East.

Palestine—

To quote Dr. Lowdermilk again—

> can serve as the example, the demonstration, the lever, that will lift the entire Near East from its present desolate condition to a dignified place in a free world.

All this is, so to speak, the positive aspect of the Palestine question. There is enough in this positive aspect to make every progressive American an ardent supporter of the great democratic and cultural effort Jews are putting forth in Palestine. Peace and democracy are both indivisible, and peace and democracy will both be imperiled by the continuance in the strategic Middle East of the present semifeudal, reactionary regimes under which national wealth is concentrated in the hands of some few percent of the population and illiteracy, disease, and grinding poverty are everywhere rampant. What Jewish Palestine has already done by force of example to change these conditions gives us assurance as Americans that it is the key to the democratization of the Arab lands and that its development is, therefore, to America's own interest.

But there is a compelling and tragic and very timely aspect to this Palestine question that I have not mentioned thus far and that is, I am certain, in the minds of every one of you. The unsolved question of the Jewish position in the world has reached a ghastly climax in our day—a climax so inhuman and staggering in its cruelty and complete disregard of moral values that it is still—despite the documentation of newspapers, judicial trials, and testimony by many witnesses—almost inconceivable. No reader of the daily press needs to be told any longer how methodically the Nazis proceeded to exterminate the Jews of Europe, using new scientific and economical equipment carefully prepared for that purpose. They succeeded better in this than in any other of their aims, and the ashes of 6,000,000 Jewish dead fertilize fields in Poland and Germany. There is no Jewish family left intact in any land from France and Holland in the west of Europe, to Greece, Yugoslavia, and Russia in the east. There are no economic positions, no homes, for the few shattered survivors to come back to. But there is something Hitler left that they return to—a poisonous legacy of anti-Semitic doctrine that is making life in Europe impossible for the million and a half Jewish survivors of Hitler's holocaust. In the Poland Jewish partisans helped to free, the Poland nine-tenths of whose Jews were murdered, Jews must today flee from pogrom, assassination, intimidation. The ancient urge for a home of their own in the land of their fathers has been invested with a new and terrible urgency for these remaining Jews of Europe. You need only read Earl G. Harrison's report submitted to President Truman on the condition of the hundred thousand Jews still in camps in Germany to realize how for them Palestine is the magic name, the desired goal, the one place on earth which offers home and refuge. It is the land where most of them have relatives living, eager to shelter them; the land where a new productive civilization, with room for millions of more working hands, is being built up; the land sacred in tradition and prayer; the land solemnly promised as the national home of the Jewish people in the Covenant of the League of Nations—a fact too often obscured in the interests of Briitsh appeasement politics, of Arab chauvinist propaganda.

The Allied statesmen who made the last peace intended to give the Jews the opportunity to reconstitute their national life in their historic homeland. Lloyd George's memoirs make that incontestably clear, as do any number of statements by men like Woodrow Wilson, Arthur James Balfour, Robert Cecil. The spokesman of the Arabs at the Versailles Peace Conference assented to this point of view. It was clear to him, as to the Allied statesmen, that Palestine was no Arab land; it had a universal character as the birthplace of Christianity, a historically Jewish connection as the ancient and never forgotten home of a people which had never severed its ties, either physical or spiritual, with it.

What was true at the end of the last war is equally true now—equally true and even more essential to human decency and human progress. The case has been put very strikingly in a resolution adopted only last December by the British Labor Party, whose leaders now govern Britain and cannot, it seems, find in themselves the moral strength to carry out the pledge they gave with full understanding of all its implications only a short time ago. Last December a resolution adopted by the annual conference of the Labor Party said:

> There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home unless we are prepared to let the Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war, and there is an irresistible case for it now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold-blooded, calculated German-Nazi plan to kill all the Jews of Europe.

Last April, reaffirming this pledge, another resolution called upon the British Government "to remove the present unjustifiable barriers on immigration, and to announce without delay proposals for a future Palestine, in which it has the full sympathy and support of the American and Russian Governments."

Will this be done now when a hopeless future stares in the face of European Jewry, when every consideration of mercy, justice—yes, and even political logic—calls for a Jewish Palestine?

I can end only by telling you of a little report from Palestine I saw the other day which left an indelible impression on my mind. It was written by a woman who had gone to meet a train bringing some 1,300 new refugee immigrants to Palestine. She stood with an old man waiting with tears in his eyes for a granddaughter, the only living member of the large family he had left behind him in Europe; with a physician, whose wife had been gassed to death in Germany but whose son had somehow escaped and was coming to him; with hundreds of other tremulous, bereft human beings, waiting for some one miraculously rescued relative. Then the newcomers began to descend from the train—an orphaned girl from Italy, an orphaned lad from France, a youth who, when asked from where he came, replied: "What difference does that make? What matters is where I have come to, not where I've come from. I've come home." And he stretched out his hands in joy, and the woman saw the number scorched into his flesh—108,223—his slave number in a labor camp. There were such numbers on the hands of all the 1,300 newcomers; on the hands, too, of a little boy of 6, who came shyly up to the woman and told her, in reply to her question, that he had come from a town in Poland. He was 6 years old and his

8-year-old sister was with him. "She and I," he said simply, "are the only Jews left of all the thousands in our town. Just she and I."

And to help to give new life to these children in the land of their people's beginnings is without question an integral part of our responsibility as Christian Americans dedicated to the building of a better world.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been shocked and outraged by the stories which have come to me concerning the persisting persecution and killing of the Jewish people in Europe. I blame our inaction on House Resolution 268, which provides for a Jewish homeland in Palestine, and hope that we will have the foresight to act upon it in the immediate future.

The United States must make recommendation to Britain to open Palestine to these poor, homeless souls. We will have been a party to the annihilation of the Jews in Europe if we take no action. Our military forces there seem unable to cope with the problem; therefore, I feel it must be done on the diplomatic level.

I note that President Truman has acted on the request of many, including myself, and recommended to Britain that she take the only just action and live up to the Balfour Declaration.

The historic connection of the Jewish people with Palestine dates from Biblical times. In our own day, in 1917, Great Britain, recognizing this historic connection, issued the Balfour Declaration pledging the development of Palestine as a national home for the Jewish people.

In July 1922 the League of Nations gave to Great Britain the mandate over Palestine to facilitate Jewish immigration, and close settlement by the Jews on the land, for the purpose of establishing a Jewish homeland. In September 1922 the Congress of the United States, by joint resolution, gave its recognition and approval to the Balfour Declaration. In 1924 Great Britain and the United States signed a treaty ratifying the Balfour Declaration and the mandate, requiring the assent of the United States to any modification of the mandate.

In 1939, contrary to these legal guaranties and in violation of its agreement with the United States, Great Britain issued a white paper nullifying the terms of the mandate, and closing the doors of Palestine to further Jewish immigration and land purchase. As a direct result of this action, hundreds of thousands were barred from the Palestine haven and left to ruthless slaughter by the Nazis. Protests to Great Britain went unheeded. The excuse was always, "Military expediency."

In 1944, however, both the Republican and Democratic Parties, recognizing the great wrong that had been done to the Jewish people, included in their platforms pledges supporting the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

With the ending of the war, the Jewish people had every reason to expect that Great Britain would immediately reverse its white-paper policy of 1939.

Six million Jews have perished—victims of the Nazis. A million and a half—100,000 still in concentration camps—remain in Europe. The vast majority of them look to Palestine as the answer to their homelessness.

I feel that these victims of Nazi oppression should be given not pity, not words, but justice through action. The time for action is now.

Every dictate of law, humanity, and national honor—every principle for which this war was fought—demands that the gates of Palestine be opened to unrestricted Jewish immigration and to the establishment there of a free and democratic nation based on the right of self-determination.

The British Government has proved its incapacity to handle this problem with either justice or discretion. They have secretly armed the Arab people and then fomented riots to create an incident. They have been anything but fair and honest in this matter.

I hope that the Congress will see fit to remind Britain of its former commitments in this regard, and forcefully recommend that the Balfour Declaration be restored and earnestly put into practice.

The alternative to this is that the United Nations Organization take control of the area and allow self-determination of the peoples in Palestine.

I do not feel that we can sit back any longer. In the name of human decency we must act to protect these people who have suffered so at the hands of Fascist tyrants.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for us to conceive of the misery, hopelessness, disaster and despair which has pervaded the world. The wholesale starvation and torture as suffered by the Jews in Europe during the past decade is almost beyond our comprehension. Nothing can be done for the thousands who have fallen under this horrible carnage. The job of restoring the survivors to normal living is being undertaken by Allied military and civil authorities. It is no easy task, but it is an issue that must be met and handled in the same manner as are other international problems. In our attempt to make a permanent world structure, these homeless and hopeless people cannot be temporarily disposed of or overlooked. They were liberated by the joint efforts of the Allies, and, as in all disputes which have arisen and shall continue to arise among the victor nations in their efforts at maintaining a peaceful world, this problem will have to be settled so that prejudice may never again be the springboard of another maniac to ignite the world in flames of hate.

We as individuals have met the challenge and shown our disposition to give succor to these unfortunate people by temporary measures, through UNRRA and other organizations; we as a Nation must soon take a stand as to a fixed policy of restoration leading to self-sustenance. Our Government should take active steps directed toward the opening of Palestine as a homeland for the Jews of Europe. It would be a logical and humane solution and in keeping with the principles and declarations of a civilization based on the "four freedoms."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I had expected to obtain time today to express my thoughts and convictions concerning the plight of the Jewish people insofar as the situation in Palestine is concerned. I have listened with great interest to the learned and eloquent remarks of the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and to the addresses of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. I thoroughly concur in their expressions on this subject and am in entire accord with their every remark. They are entitled to public commendation for their forthright views. I trust that President Truman's request of Great Britain will be granted, and that the original intent of the Balfour Declaration will be carried out immediately.

AM I MY BROTHER'S KEEPER?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, war is a ruthless violator of human dignity and inflicts sorrow and despair on the victor and the vanquished. Shattered bodies and shadowed minds are a grim reminder of the desolation that is visited upon many of those who escape with their lives; while their dead comrades by the tens of thousands are a symbol of the futility of man's uncontrolled desire for world domination. The anguish, sorrow, and death that war adopts as its boon companions are not confined to the battlefield, but are inflicted upon millions of defenseless civilians unfortunate to be caught in its path.

When the history of World War II is written the world will learn of countless atrocities to peoples of all nations, but I venture to assure you that no account of willful persecution and ignominious torture and cruel death will surpass the sufferings of European Jews. It is estimated that from a population of 12,000,000 Jews in Europe at the beginning of World War II and exclusive of the 3,000,000 now in Russia slightly over 1,000,000 persons of the faith of Abraham have survived the cruel persecution bent on complete extermination of the oldest of all human races.

Millions of defenseless Jews have disappeared from the face of the earth as completely as though atomic energy had reduced them to a state of nothingness; while tens of thousands lie forgotten in crude and nameless graves. The depravity of those responsible for these wholesale murders of a defenseless race is beyond description and certainly the God of us all will mete out stern justice when these international murderers make their appearance before the seat of judgment.

Death is a heavy cross to bear even when fortified by the knowledge that it is but the door to the happier state of eternal life. When such a sorrow overwhelms us we are consoled to a degree by the comforting words of our relatives and friends and their presence in the months that follow in counseling us very often is of great assistance in aiding us to become

accustomed to the loss of a loved one. With this thought in mind it is not difficult to realize the barbarous treatment accorded adherents of the Jewish faith in being subjected to infamous torture and death and their loved ones unable to learn a shred of knowledge concerning their departure from this life. In countless cases survivors often followed in quick succession in joining their dead or they were obliged to undergo a living hell in filthy concentration camps where they welcomed death as an escape from their tortured existence. Truly the greater part of this world has been literally a weeping wall to the Jewish race since the crazed brains of world dictators pronounced their doom. Surviving Jews looked confidently to the day when an all-merciful God would hearken to their prayers and restore peace to a troubled world.

Today with the dove of peace figuratively hovering over the international peace table, world Jewry finds that homeless European Jews are certain to die by the thousands this very winter if the Christian nations of the world do not decide to do something practical concerning their plight.

They have looked with confidence to the discarding by Great Britain of the white paper promulgated in 1939 and whose terms have abrogated the Balfour Declaration to open Palestine to the Jewish people. We are all familiar with the action taken by Great Britain in restricting the number of Jews admitted to Palestine to 1,500 monthly. President Truman's appeal to admit 100,000 has been answered by the plan to admit 1,500 monthly which in terms of the urgent need reveals that a mere handful are to be admitted and the remainder of homeless Jews are to be left to perish as vagabonds without home or country anywhere on the face of the earth.

World Jewry for the past 25 years has contributed money and material things and as a result Palestine has been developed in a remarkable manner with its wasteland reclaimed and other marked achievements that have astonished the world. Given the opportunity to continue the program of reclamation and national development the Holy Land is destined to provide a haven for the oppressed Jews of the world and at the same time guarantee liberty and equality to all other races who may now inhabit Palestine.

Civilized nations who boast of being Christianized have a wonderful opportunity now to raise their voices in behalf of a defenseless race and at the same manner to the teachings of the Lowly Nazarene who once trod the hallowed ground of Palestine. The age-old Biblical question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" can be answered in the affirmative time to give allegiance in a practical by the Christian nations of the world by the use of their combined voices in a sincere effort to aid a stricken and homeless race. Those of us privileged to call the United States our home have a clear concept of liberty for it has been purchased and preserved to us by the blood of American martyrs from the bleak winters of Valley Forge to the burning sands of Okinawa. We speak of Christian charity as being a great virtue and one of the most desirable attributes. In this particular instance we have a splendid opportunity to heed the divine admonition, "Let us not love in word, neither with the tongue, but in deed and in truth."

One of the many exhortations of St. Paul was his appeal for charity in our daily lives as evidenced when he spoke to the Corinthians:

Brethren, if I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not charity I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And if I should have prophecy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains and have not charity, I am nothing. And if I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned and have not charity, it profiteth nothing. Charity is patient, is kind; charity envieth not; dealeth not perversely; is not puffed up; is not ambitious; seeketh not her own; is not provoked to anger; thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity but rejoiceth in the truth; heareth all things; believeth in all things; hopeth all things; endureth all things. Charity never falleth away, whether prophecies shall be made void, or tongues shall cease, or knowledge shall be destroyed. For we know in part and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child I spoke as a child; but when I became a man I put away the things of a child. We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face. Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known. And now there remain faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.

Then, too, our Christian religion reminds us of the answer Jesus made to a certain lawyer who asked him what he must do to gain eternal life:

The pharisees came to Jesus, and one of them a doctor of the law asked Him, tempting Him: "Master, which is the great commandment in the law?" Jesus said to him, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with thy whole mind. This is the greatest and the first commandment. And the second is like to this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments dependeth the whole law and the prophets." And the lawyer wishing to justify himself said to Jesus, "And who is my neighbor?" Jesus took him up and said, "A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho and he fell in with robbers, who after both stripping him and beating him went their way, leaving him half dead. But, as it happened, a certain priest was going down the same way; and when he saw him he passed by. And likewise a Levite also, when he was near the place and saw him, passed by. But a certain Samaritan as he journeyed came upon him, and seeing him, was moved with compassion. And he went up to him and bound up his wounds, pouring oil and wine. And setting him on his own beast, he brought him to an inn and took care of him. And the next day he took out two denarii and gave them to the innkeeper and said 'Take care of him; and whatever more thou spendest, I on my way back will repay thee.' Which of these three in thy opinion proved himself neighbor to him who fell among the robbers?" And he said, "He who took pity on him." And Jesus said to him, "Go and do thou also in like manner."

These references to the need for charity and our understanding of the clear-cut definition of "And who is my neighbor?" are timely reminders that God has revealed the sacred dignity of the human body and it is also referred to in Holy Scripture as "the temple of the Holy Spirit."

The plight of world Jewry is the common problem of all nations and with true Christian charity I am hopeful that the United States will lend its voice in a sincere effort to rescue a perishing race by assisting in convincing the civilized world that the doors of Palestine should be opened immediately to the Jewish race if we are to practice the tenets of the Christian religion and answer affirmatively the Biblical query: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur in what is being said here on the House floor in favor of opening the gates of Palestine to the Jewish race.

For years I have been one of the sponsors in favor of this just and humane movement.

We have just finished a victorious world war and millions have died that all men may be free. We did not fight it for all races except the Jews, but for all mankind. If we give freedom to all people except the Jews, who knows what race will be next on the list. It is a terrible threat to democracy itself to ostracize one race.

Promises have been made to the Jewish race and broken. Now is the time for Congress to act and I, for one, am ready to stand up and be counted in favor of the resolution for a free Palestine. We cannot enslave millions of Jewish people and make them wanderers on the face of the earth, homeless and nationless, without crippling civilization itself.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has directed the attention of the world to the immediate need of opening the doors of Palestine to 100,000 homeless European Jews. I have myself recently returned from Europe where I studied some of the problems of the so-called stateless persons. The poignancy of their needs today, added to the tragic persecution which they have suffered with growing intensity during the last decade, makes me welcome the hundreds of letters I have received from Illinois, urging support of the President's appeal.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous telegrams and letters within the last few days in reference to the Palestine mandate. The purport of these messages is that the Jewish people from all over Europe should be allowed to enter Palestine and to settle in this land which is under the protection of Great Britain. These are the people who in a large measure were persecuted by the totalitarian powers immediately before and during the Great World War which has just been brought to a conclusion. They are now looking for a place of refuge and a land to call their home.

From the time when the mists of antiquity lifted from the annals of history, Palestine has been known as the land of the Jews. Anyone who reads the story of the creation and development as portrayed in the Old Testament must realize that Palestine is the land which the Jewish people can, and should, call their

homeland. As indicated by the letters and telegrams reaching me, they now want to return to their heritage in Palestine; and I think the British Government, which has the mandate over this land, should respond to the call and allow free emigration.

Britain has many colonies and much territory. Much of it is well settled and a large part of it needs settlement and development. I have never been fortunate enough to be able to travel through the Near East, but I am of the firm conviction that Great Britain should listen to the call of these persecuted peoples and grant them free access into Palestine and the right to live and develop this little land which lies on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that this time has been secured to give Members of Congress an opportunity of expressing their hopes that the Baldwin white paper may be modified so as to permit immigration to Palestine. I wish that more time had been secured so as to give Members an opportunity of speaking at greater length on the subject.

There is little doubt that the overwhelming majority of the American people and of their Representatives in Congress are insisting on action to relieve the present distressing situation. The blunt facts are that almost 6,000,000 Jews have lost their lives in Europe during the past few years and only about 1,500,000 are left. A large part of these are still living in concentration camps. They have no homes to which to go. They have no opportunity of being restored to a decent life in the countries where they now exist. The doors of all nations are practically closed to them.

The Jewish colonists at Palestine have shown what can be done if they are given an opportunity. It is right and proper that this great Christian and democratic Nation should exert its influence toward giving the Jewish people of Europe aid in finding a new life in Palestine. I hope that early consideration will be given to the resolution now pending in Congress. Furthermore, we should support and applaud President Truman in his position.

I wish to here read a letter I wrote to him on October 6, 1945:

OCTOBER 6, 1945.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing clipping from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, which contains a letter to me from George Berke, chairman of the Chattanooga Zionist Emergency Council. Mr. Berke sets forth, in very persuasive language, the justice and necessity of British Government allowing 100,000 homeless Jews to enter Palestine.

I was glad to know the strong position you have taken in the matter. I hope that you will continue to use your influence in the interest of enabling these people to find refuge from persecution and the concentration camps in which so many are still living. I think the people are behind you in the stand you have taken. We should exert every available effort, if for no other than humanitarian reasons, to bring relief to these unfortunate people. Unless they are allowed to enter Palestine there is little hope for the survival of countless thousands of them.

With good wishes,
Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

Mr. Speaker, this country is a legal party to the mandate over Palestine. The least we can do is to exert every possible effort and influence toward seeing that these unfortunate people have an opportunity for a new life in this country which has been set aside for them.

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic aftermaths of the war which has just concluded in Europe is the terrible dislocation of the Jewish people. It is quite unnecessary for me to relate the crimes which have been committed against these people by the Nazi overlords of Germany. Though these men have been shorn of their power and most of them are now in custody of the Allied War Crimes Commission, the poison of anti-Semitism has spread through the greater part of continental Europe. I was not a little shocked when Edvard Beneš, of Czechoslovakia, whose adherence to the principles of democracy cannot be denied, said in effect that Jews would be unlikely to find a haven in Europe for some time to come.

President Truman recently recommended to the British Government that Palestine should be immediately opened to the migration of 100,000 Jews. It is my understanding that no reply has yet been received from the British Government.

It is entirely proper that the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States take cognizance of this situation. It is extremely doubtful that the Chamberlain white paper promulgated in 1939 restricting immigration to Palestine is valid under existing international agreements. Palestine is held in trust by Great Britain under the Covenant of the League of Nations. Britain is not a sovereign authority in Palestine. Inasmuch as the United States was not a party to the League of Nations Covenant, a bilateral agreement was entered into by our country and Great Britain and promulgated in December of 1925. Under this agreement Great Britain was obligated to consult with our Government as well as those of League members when any substantial change in this trusteeship was anticipated. The British Government under Mr. Chamberlain sought no such consultation and its action at that time was one of appeasement—a policy which was demonstrated to be tragically fallacious.

We will not be able to obliterate the filthy philosophy of nazism in the immediate future. Germany held control of the greater part of Central and Western Europe for over 4 years. A studied policy of exterminating all decent elements and influences in this territory was practiced during this occupation. Until the results of this policy can be removed we must provide for the protection and refuge of persecuted peoples.

Since the capitulation of Germany I have been informed that over 1,000 Jews have been killed in pogroms in Poland. This in spite of the fact that the fighting elements of the Polish underground were composed in a substantial degree by Jews. None of them dare live in Poland except in the larger cities. Many of them have fled Poland to live in American and Russian-occupied Germany.

This uncivilized and inhuman situation cannot be permitted to continue. Both of the major parties in the United States pledged themselves in their platforms of 1944 to call for unrestricted immigration to Palestine. The British Labor Party and many of its leaders have urged the same action. The Labor Party has formed the present British Government and I feel that our Government should continue in its representations to the British Government until action is taken to provide refuge for the harassed Jewish people.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, when the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who is our able majority leader on the floor of this great House, stated in substance that he viewed the human race as one family and that we had to face the Palestine question, under discussion today, with that relationship of men of all the world in view, he stated that it is the foundation stone upon which we can choose and have an enduring peace, or we can again have world wars. When, and only when, we view men of all races, creeds, and colors and origins as belonging to the brotherhood of man, will be sufficiently set in motion economic and social thinking and planning which will preserve democracy against devastating attacks from other parts of the world resulting from fear, starvation, poverty, daily hunger, intolerance, and ignorance, superstition, and prejudice.

I am happy to emphatically raise my voice in unison with the other distinguished members in this House who have already spoken or will yet speak in support of the worthy objectives of emphasizing and urging fair and just and humane treatment to the homeless Jewish people of Europe who have been driven from pillar to post and are asking a place of reasonable security in which to live back in their fatherland of Palestine. The white paper should not be continued a scrap of paper, and the declaration and pronouncement of the Balfour document should have immediate opportunity to have practical application in terms of humane and civilized treatment to people of Jewish birth or descent, who ask this reasonable opportunity to enter Palestine.

I commend President Truman for his expressed request of England that 1,000 certificates be granted to the Jewish people at this time that they might enter Palestine and there settle and live. But while this request can only be considered an interim request it will stop hundreds of thousands of people from suffering starvation and further privation.

This war has catapulted us into a world neighborhood, and from which we cannot emerge nor apart from which we cannot safely live unto ourselves. No physical or material or artificial boundaries can again cause eradication of our

relationships or responsibilities as living in this world neighborhood. Therefore whatever relates to the hunger or security or daily mistreatment or abuse of the masses of people anywhere in the world relates to the safety and security of we folks of the American continent. Therefore, it is soundly and sanely our duty and responsibility to speak up in behalf of and to the end that these Jewish world neighbors of ours, wherever they now are, shall have justice done unto them. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is fundamentally not less a necessity to the Jews—or to any other people in the world—than it is to us in our great Nation. It is not enough that we think that the freedoms and that the justice and that the security of America is made only for ourselves. We must be willing that all people shall have the same for themselves. Enduring spiritual values will never set in motion nor perpetuate as a result of promulgation of prejudice or hatred or ill will against other people on account of their race or creed or color. Neither is material prosperity or progress permanently made as a result of applications of such undemocratic principles or thinking or action. These citizens about whom we are speaking today are neither voters nor residents of the United States. But they are citizens of the world in which we must live. They are a minority people it is true. But only as the rights of the minority are respected and fought for by the majority will democracy endure. This is true in world thinking and action as well as in the experience of our own Nation. My own son and millions of other sons of America were either killed or injured or disabled for life on account of the need and necessity of fighting to preserve the democratic way of life. They have died that such a way of life might have a new birth and renewed vigor. We who live after them, we who live because they died, cannot now safely, or at all, refuse or neglect to continue to give our best endeavor by consecrated patriotic thinking and action to the end that these homeless, persecuted minority peoples shall have this place which is their desire; and which should be made available to them.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, some days ago a delegation called on me from my congressional district to discuss the Palestine problem. Among the delegation were some of the leading citizens of my community. They were extremely anxious that everything be done in order to provide a commonwealth for the homeless Jews in Palestine. I heartily agree with this objective. I want to, by my voice, by my vote, and my every act, do everything I can to persuade those in authority in the United States Government, as well as to persuade those in authority in the British Government, to act, and act quickly, to see that this worthy objective is brought about at the earliest possible moment.

Recently I enjoyed seeing the March of Time, in which was portrayed the excellent work done by the Jewish people in Palestine—great land developments, beautiful homes, beautiful public buildings, the establishment of institutions of learning, the reclamation of what was considered a lost land; altogether, a vast amount of public improvement.

If in the short time allotted to those people such magnificent results can be accomplished, would it not be to the interest of Jewish refugees, would it not be to the interest of the Arabs themselves—yes, to civilization—to reclaim lost land, to put it to good use, and to bring about such remarkable, successful results?

I hope that every Member of this great body will join with me in lending their every aid to see that this problem of Palestine is solved, and solved properly, by the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth.

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, I include a talk which I delivered at a protest meeting held under the sponsorship of the Zionist Emergency Committee of New Haven at the Commercial High School last Sunday evening:

Nowhere at the present time are the Jews in the majority and the masters of their own fate. Everywhere they are in the minority, easily subject to discrimination, indignities, and even attack. This is not a normal condition for the Jews or for any other people, and this disability must be corrected. This can only be done through national independence.

The Jews are a nation. They possess all the attributes of a nation. They have a history, a national tradition, a powerful urge for nationhood, a language, a common religion and culture. They possess all the attributes of a nation except one—a free land. This is not normal and demands rectification.

Now that the war is over, it will be absolutely necesary to provide opportunity for resettlement of some millions of Jews. No place will be open to them, except as yet wild and undeveloped territories. Only Palestine begins to fill the requirements necessary to meet this problem. It has the room, the basic development, and as far as the Jews of Palestine are concerned, the welcome sign is on the door. These prospective immigrants need Palestine; Palestine needs them for its further growth. But the basic condition for that growth is sovereignty, and it is this condition which must be established and recognized by the nations. The Jews have proved such excellent nation builders that they have surprised everybody. They have given the lie to the charge of their detractors that they are not pioneers and creators, but can only utilize the labor of others to make profits as middlemen. They have achieved results in Palestine that have astounded the whole world. They might have achieved results in some other territory, but there can be no question but that Palestine has been the real stimulus for the accomplishment of so much in so short a time.

Jewish devotion of the soil of the ancient homeland, all of its sacred and historical associations in the memory and faith of the Jewish people, the omnipresent urge to return and redeem the land and, not least, the utter necessity for doing so, are the basic factors which have made possible the results. If the Jews are given the opportunity freely and under their own authority to further the development of the country, who can now doubt but that they will ultimately build a nation, a civilization, a culture, and produce a social order which will be a source of honor and satisfaction to not only themselves but to the world.

The persecution of the Jews under the Nazis and under other governments has made the problem of a Jewish national home urgent. From 1942, when the Nazi extermination began, to June 1944 between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 European Jews were killed. Even since VE-day injustices have continued to exist and inhumane methods have not been eliminated. In Slovakia many returning Jews are being refused certificates of political and moral reliablity, which are needed in order to obtain employment. In innumerable instance returning Jews have not been allowed to reenter their homes, shops, or factories, and according to Mr. Earl G. Harrison, in his report on conditions in Europe to President Truman, it is estimated that in February of 1945 there were 1,500,000 Jews still in Europe, and that not more than one-third of them would wish to return to their former homes.

It is true that there are still thousands of displaced persons in Europe, but I am of the opinion that the Jews among these displaced persons present a much more touching problem than their fellow sufferers, because Jews have always been more severely victimized than the non-Jews and also because many of these Jews are stateless or do not wish to return to their previous homes; as a result, they have seen many instances of quick return of liberated people to their homes, while liberation has meant little improvement in their own position, but rather continuation of their plight as internees living behind barbed wire in concentration camps, in buildings unfit for winter use, wearing their concentration camp garbs, with high death rates continuing, living on a very poor diet, separated from their families and with little or no opportunity to make use of their capacity for productive work.

The main solution, and in many ways the only real solution, of the problem lies in the quick evacuation of all nonrepatriable Jews in Germany and Austria who wish to go to Palestine.

Some people will ask, but will these Jews want to leave their native land now that nazism is defeated? The answer to this by a number of qualified, realistic observers of the European scene is that the desire will be overwhelming among most of the Jews of central Europe, just as they know that most of the statesmen of Europe will be glad to see them go.

But the Jewish needs come last. Even if physically present, economically the Jew has been expelled. Any and every attempt on the part of a well-meaning government to admit or reintegrate them into the economic community will meet with approximately the same respect that would be accorded to a policy of large-scale physical immigration. We all know how unthinkingly fanatic populations become in time of stress on the subject of immigration and how ill-advised a government would be to disregard these needs. The attempt would never succeed, were it seriously tried.

Another argument advanced by those who oppose further Jewish immigration into Palestine is its limited absorptive capacity. But the absorptive capacity of any country is a dynamic and expanding conception. It changes with the ability of the population to make the maximum out of its land. It is clear, however, that full utilization of the Jordan Valley depression for reclamation and power will in time make possible the absorption of at least 4,000,000 Jewish refugees, principally from Europe. Therefore, limited absorptive capacity may be looked upon as a red herring drawn across the trail of those who are trying to design a sound policy for the United States to pursue in relation to Palestine. Some arguments are entirely contrary to American tradition for the American people have always believed in the creative

ability of man to master his destiny by new economic development through invention and enterprise.

Although there is opposition from the Arab Federation at the present time to the Zionist program, it is nevertheless true that the building up of the Jewish population in Palestine has resulted in economic advancement for the Arabs, and in this connection it should also be noted that at the peace conference held following the last war that the proposals submitted by the Zionist organization were approved by the Arab delegation when, speaking through their chief, Emir Feisal, they stated, "we regard them as moderate and proper." It might be well at this point to review British policy and position on this question because no satisfactory solution of the problem can be reached without full and complete cooperation of the British Government. In 1917 the British Government, by reason of the Balfour Declaration, declared that the establishment of a national home in Palestine was the policy and object of the British Government, and that this privilege should be extended to them without prejudices to the civil and religious rights of the non-Jewish residents of the community. In September of 1923, as a result of a previous Allied agreement at the peace conference, Palestine was declared to be a mandated territory with Great Britain as the overseer. The terms of this mandate stated specifically that the mandatory power was to create a national home for the Jewish people. But the British did not pursue firmly the purposes underlying the Balfour Declaration and the terms of the mandate, but whittled down the idea of a national home in order to attempt to satisfy the Arab nationalists. Arabs are more numerous and evidently more important to the British Empire than Jews and oil is thicker than blood. An example of this was when in 1930 the British proposed to limit Jewish immigration into Palestine as a relief for Arab unemployment, and the further instance is the recommendation of Lord Peel's commission in 1937 to partition Palestine and establish an independent Arab government there in order to stem the increasing tide of Jewish immigration, which developed during the years of Nazi oppression.

This policy of appeasement on the part of the British Government encouraged the Arabs to hope that violence would stop Jewish immigration, and Fascist and Nazi sources gave financial aid to the Arabs to carry out their sinister purposes. The climax came, of course, in 1939 with the issuance of the infamous white paper in which the principles of the Balfour Declaration and the mandate's constitution were abandoned, and which further proposed that Jewish immigration end in 5 years unless the Arabs acquiesced to further immigration, and that no more than 75,000 immigrants be allowed in that period, and that Jewish purchases of land be limited.

Neither the United States nor any other member of the League of Nations, by whose authority and consent England was given the mandate, was consulted prior to the issuance of the white paper, which was evidently not only done for the purpose of appeasing the Arabs but to gain for themselves certain special commercial and strategic advantages in the area.

It may be argued that even though all of these contentions are true, just where does the United States fit into that picture? What is our responsibility? Are we not meddling in affairs which do not concern us? The answer is an emphatic "No." Because in 1920 the United States asserted its right as a participant in the First World War to be consulted regarding the terms of the Palestine mandate and the British Government concurred. Congress then, by the adoption of a joint resolution, affirmed this Government's approval of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people without prejudice to the civil and religious rights of the other inhabitants. Further, on November 17, 1930, Lloyd George, in a report to the House of Commons, declared that the United States Government had been consulted and had given its consent to the Balfour Declaration before it was announced. Following the Balfour Declaration and prior to the granting of mandatory powers to Great Britain, President Wilson also stated, and I quote, "I am persuaded that the Allied Nations with the fullest concurrence of our Government and the people are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth." And at an earlier date, in his Fourteen Points Wilson said, and I quote, "The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured of secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development."

In 1924 a trade convention was held between the United States and Great Britain as a result of which an agreement was entered into extending equal trade rights to the United States in Palestine which Great Britain and the other members of the League enjoyed under the mandate. This convention quoted the no discrimination article of the mandate and stipulated that nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States, and President Roosevelt told the Zionist leaders on March 9, 1944, that the United States had never given its approval to the white paper of 1939, which abrogated the terms of the mandate and nullified the Balfour declaration. We all are familiar with subsequent events when, as a result of platforms adopted by both major political parties, resolutions were introduced into the last session of Congress which restate the position of the United States regarding Palestine and the establishment of a homeland for the Jewish people therein. These resolutions in the last Congress were not passed by reason of a request from the War Department that passage of the resolution would be prejudicial to the prosecution of the war. Subsequently, Secretary of War Stimson stated that military considerations were now not as strong as they had been and that in his judgment political considerations now outweigh the military, but at a later date Secretary of State Stettinius appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and requested postponement of consideration of the resolution at that time.

Similar resolutions were before introduced in this session of Congress, one by me; and now that the war is over our representatives are meeting with representatives of the other Allied Nations of the world, in which boundaries of nations are being established and other matters of vast importance concerning the world of tomorrow are being determined, and I certainly think that the Congress should at this time adopt this resolution and declare to our representatives thereby what the feeling and attitude of the American Nation is toward the establishment of a homeland for the Jewish people, and reemphasize our traditional policy that all people should be free and independent to rule themselves in their own land, in a democratic manner.

CAN GREAT BRITAIN CONTINUE TO DISREGARD ITS MANDATE OBLIGATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am in honor bound to congratulate the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and all of the Members who have spoken today on the unfortunate Palestine situation.

I know that the Jewish people of this country and the world over, as well as all fair-minded men and women, will applaud and be grateful to all of them for their straightforward reasoning and splendid expressions in behalf of the Jewish people who have dreamed for centuries that many of their brethren might finally reestablish a home in the Holy Land.

There is nothing that I can add to what has been said on this question, but I hope the expression of so many outstanding Members of Congress will strengthen the determination of President Truman to pursue this cause. And I also hope today's demonstration will have some effect upon Great Britain, who has wilfully violated the obligation it assumed under the mandate.

With respect to the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] on the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House in the last Congress, I wish to say that the Committee on Rules was ready to act favorably, to provide for its immediate consideration by the House. Only upon the urgent request of the then Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, who stated he feared that it would increase the friction between the United States and Great Britain, was action deferred. Though vitally interested in the resolution I myself felt that it was my country first and I could not be a party to anything to bring about discord and hamper the war's prosecution or that might delay the defeat of Hitler and the Japs.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, numerous members here have expressed their desire that Palestine be opened as a national home for the Jews.

For several years I have urged that our Government take a more active part in pressing the British to recognize their Anglo-American Treaty of 1924, which confirms the Balfour Declaration, and which would bring about the desire of many Jewish peoples of the world.

I speak not for the purpose of repeating those things which we have heard here today. I desire principally to point out that it is a solemn obligation of the British Government to fulfill both the Balfour Declaration and the treaty. If it is necessary to afford temporary military protection that these people might establish themselves peacefully, then I contend that it is likewise an obligation of the British Government.

America has an unusual lever at this particular moment. Britain is in need of American funds for postwar stability. American intentions in world operation for peace and American hopes in postwar international trade set up certain pertinent desires which should be a part of our definite foreign policy. Among these various concessions which we should demand there seems to me to be ample reason for the demand for the fulfillment of Palestine. I cannot escape the feeling that there is a moral obligation on the part of the American Government to make such an inclusion. Yes, we will help Britain, but we have every right to expect that full responsibility and performance will be given by Britain in the recognition of her treaties.

I was one of the original members of the American Palestine Committee, now known as the American Christian Palestine Committee, and I propose to share my responsibility in helping to push toward this worth-while goal.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there are many individuals, in fact a majority I presume, who feel that the widely discussed issue of reopening Palestine for Jewish immigration does not concern them.

I feel the Palestine question is one sore spot in today's world about which something can and should be done quickly. These sores are the breeding spots of the international wars that do affect all of us, as we of this generation know only too well.

Thus it behooves all of us to move toward real solutions. Too long have we been content merely to talk pros and cons, putting off final decision or action. That has been true of the Palestine issue.

The Jewish people have built a tremendously progressive new civilization in the Palestine area. They have turned barren land to miraculous new fertility. The job they have done in giving new life to that previously worn-out area is one of the startling developments in Near East history.

I recently visited Palestine. I saw the wonderful development by the Jewish people. I saw it from the air. I saw young forests and crops of various kinds being planted and growing, new irrigation and hydroelectric projects, all in an area that had been desolate and unproductive for a thousand years. This was the land which Moses saw, the Promised Land for the Israelites. It was then productive. For subsequent generations it was barren under Arab rule. It was again promised the modern Israelite under League of Nations jurisdiction.

Due to political considerations, the British saw fit in 1940 summarily to prohibit further Jewish immigration to the world homeland the Jewish people themselves had worked hard to create in the Palestine area. The British had no real authority to issue this white paper edict. But ticklish wartime relations, particularly in regard to oil reserves controlled by the Arabian peoples, permitted the edict to stand. Other nations, for similar reasons, failed to interfere.

Now the war is over. In the meantime thousands of Jewish people have been made homeless, in addition to infliction of persecutions on them on a scale hitherto unparalleled in history. The minority who have survived have, in part, no homes to which to return. In part, they do not wish to return, due to massacre of relatives and other reasons.

A portion of these people should be permitted to settle in the one world homeland which is their own. Our own United States experts estimate that the Jewish homeland in Palestine is capable of absorbing between four and six million more persons. So it is not a question of overcrowding in Palestine, at the expense of the Arabian peoples in the same area. The issue is not between Arabs and Jews in Palestine; it is a political issue between the rulers of the other nations surrounding Palestine, a question of maintaining the "traditional" balance of power in that region.

Here are thousands of displaced people, and here a short ways away is their homeland, where at least a portion of them could find good homes and a useful future—a best possible chance to start again under welcome conditions.

In our endeavor to help provide real solutions to some of the many problems of this world, here is a place to start. Now is the time to resume immigration into Palestine. I hope the resolution before the House and Senate, urging such action, will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has acted in the best of American traditions in urging that the British Government permit 100,000 dispossessed Jewish people of Europe to enter Palestine. Our country was founded by men of ability and character who were not given a chance to exercise their talents and worship as they saw fit in Europe. We know that when such people are given a chance in a new land, they, the land, and the whole world will profit from the experiment.

The civilized world owes the Jews the opportunity for a new life. For 12 years the Nazi Party used them as its chief scapegoat. Long before Hitler had the strength to mobilize his attack on other countries he had developed his theory of racial superiority and was teaching the brutal and ignorant people who made up most of his immediate following to persecute the Jews. It gave them a feeling of superiority to have someone to bully. The Jews were hounded and harried, robbed of their possessions, driven from their jobs, denied the exercise of their religion, systematically starved, beaten, and murdered.

We have just fought and won a great war against nazism in all its forms. It is only fair and fitting that we should now give every aid to the first and worst victims of nazism, the people whose stand for intellectual freedom brought upon them the foulest persecutions of modern times.

Between five and six million Jews have lost their lives, most of them through infamous torture. Many more are mental or physical wrecks from what they have been through. One of the most vivid pictures in my memory is a description by a correspondent early in 1940 of elderly Jews sitting in cold, dark rooms hopelessly waiting for death. They were allowed no heat or light or food rations; they had no longer the strength to creep out and forage in garbage cans. They simply sat there until they died.

But there are many who somehow survived, with the strength and ability to start life anew in a new land, where their skill and character can help build a fine civilization. The achievements of the Jews who returned to Palestine under the Balfour Declaration prove what can be done. It is up to us to see that as many as possible of the Jewish victims of Hitler who want to go to Palestine and start life over can do so. Palestine is able to absorb many more than are now there. Europe does not have a place for them at present. Emigration may have had to be stopped during the war, but there is no excuse for not encouraging and aiding it now. What are we waiting for?

Members of Congress and others who have been to Palestine recently bring back glowing reports of the Jewish colonies there. With the use of modern methods of irrigation and soil culture, the desert has been made to bloom and bear fruit. Many industries have developed, all of which were important to the United Nations in the war against Hitler. Likewise the Palestinian Jews furnished many thousands of valuable troops in the successful military struggle against nazism.

I sincerely hope this House will show its appreciation of the debt all lovers of democracy owe the Jews. The President has led the way. Soon, very soon, we should pass a resolution indicating our disapproval of the infamous white paper and urging that Palestine be opened for settlement by those brave survivors of the Hitler fury. It is the least we can do for those who suffered from the extreme barbarism of the Nazis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in PM.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial, a letter, and some short excerpts.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks on the Palestinian question, I ask unanimous consent to include a letter that I wrote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID AIRPORT ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 371 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3615) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air navigation facilities; that, after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted, if any, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto, if any, to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

This rule makes in order the bill (H. R. 3615) providing aid and assistance to

the States to build and construct airports greatly needed throughout the United States.

If I am not mistaken, the bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The rule provides for 2 hours' general debate, after which it will be taken up for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill is endorsed by nearly every organization in the United States and, as you all know, President Truman is very anxious to have this legislation enacted, because he feels it is needed; that all phases of air service are bound to increase, and that the additional construction, expansion, and improvement of airports will be of great benefit to the commerce of the people of the United States.

The Senate has passed a bill similar to this one. I want to commend the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for having, after careful consideration, improved the Senate bill. Originally, I was fearful that the Senate bill might restrict and preclude some of the larger cities from being able to obtain the cooperation of the Department or Commission in expanding or improving their airports. But the House bill eliminates any doubt pertaining to that and makes provision whereby any municipality can, of its own volition, make direct application, if it is shown that expansion and improvements are necessary.

I am not going to explain the provisions of the bill except to say that it provides for $650,000,000 to be expended within the next 10 years. Three million dollars is provided to be used for surveys and preliminary work. I am of the opinion that within a short space of time many sections of our country, alive to the advantages of having air-service facilities, will be greatly benefited.

I do not know and I hesitate to call attention to one fact, but for the year 1945 we are spending $35,000,000 for air-mail service; for 1946, it is estimated that domestic air-mail service will be subsidized to the extent of $43,000,000 and foreign air mail in the amount of $7,000,000. For 1947 it will be $50,000,000 for domestic air mail and $7,000,000 for foreign air mail. I wish to leave the thought with the committee, with the House, and with the country that we have a large number of airplanes which I feel could be used to great advantage to carry our mail, and in all likelihood if properly handled might effect a saving of 50 percent or perhaps even 60 percent of the tremendous amount we are paying to the air lines.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois is aware of the fact that in the fiscal year 1944 air mail provided a profit to the Government of about $50,000,000?

Mr. SABATH. It did?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; according to the report of the Postmaster General.

Mr. SABATH. At any rate, it was collected from the people because of the increased cost of air-mail service.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; that is not altogether because of the increase. It caused a part of it, to be sure.

Mr. SABATH. But it was partially responsible.

Mr. HINSHAW. It was a collection by the Government.

Mr. SABATH. Furthermore, because the Department handled the matter economically and gave the country splendid service, savings were made and that amount of profit was shown to the Government, but it was not a direct profit; there was a residue after we had increased the cost of air-mail service. Is not that right? The gentleman is well informed, I know.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is in part correct; yes.

Mr. SABATH. We cannot be 100-percent perfect in everything.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe the gentleman has stated correctly the amount paid the air lines for carrying air mail, but the Government charged an additional amount of postage which was in excess of that by more than double.

Mr. SABATH. All right. Why do I call attention to it? Because I read in the newspapers only yesterday an article to the effect that efforts are being made, or a contract has been entered into by one company to obtain control of another. Should this continue, instead of having four or five air lines we would have but two or three.

Let me mention the fact also before I yield the floor that an effort was made on the part of some gentlemen, among them being the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], to embody in this bill a provision that would compel the Commission to grant permits to railroads, steamship lines, truck and bus lines. We felt such a provision had no place in this bill, especially in view of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], who presented the application for the rule to the Committee on Rules, assured the Committee on Rules that his committee has been considering this proposition and that within a short time they would submit to the House legislation to take care of these needed permits for these various shipping, railroad, and transportation companies.

I feel that these opportunities should not be restricted to the four air lines, and that the railroads, the shipping companies, or the bus lines, be excluded from obtaining the privilege and the right also to enlarge and increase their facilities through obtaining a permit, because, in my opinion, there will be a tremendous increase in air transportation.

Knowing how thoroughly the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] will explain the bill and its details, I am not going to impose upon the House further and delay consideration of this extremely meritorious proposition. I will conclude my remarks by saying that I hope the resolution providing for the consideration of the bill will be approved and that the bill itself will be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of H. R. 3615, which is a bill to furnish Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air-navigation facilities. The rule provides for 2 hours' general debate, after which it shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It also provides for one motion to recommit.

The basic purpose and objective of the proposed Federal Aid Airport Act is to bring about, through a program of grants-in-aid, the establishment of an integrated Nation-wide system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics in the United States and its Territories and possessions. This airport system is to include not only the large terminal airports needed to accommodate commercial air transportation but also the many smaller airports needed for private or personal flying.

It is needless for me to say that the airplane has demonstrated its usefulness. It is now regarded as one of our larger industries. It will continue to contribute to our economic progress. The need for the passage of this bill is urgent. Greater airport facilities are needed in order to serve the ever-growing needs of the public. This program will materially advance the general welfare by bringing about improved transportation facilities and service; it will make available the advantages of air-mail service to a larger proportion of the population; it will make the flying machine of more value and use. It will benefit the communities served by the airports, and protect and promote the public health and safety.

As far as I have been able to learn there is not anyone of the minority who is opposed to this rule. However, I understand that several amendments will be offered which are entitled to your attention and thoughtful consideration.

I have asked permission to speak out of order. Of late I have received many letters from young men in the naval service. In most instances these young men have given long and commendable service. In no uncertain terms they have denounced the policy of the Navy relative to discharge. I now ask your in-

dulgence in the reading of one of these typical letters. Unquestionably you have all received similar ones. I am frank to confess that I personally have been dissatisfied with the actions of the Navy Department regarding demobilization of its personnel. Many times I have vigorously urged a more equitable consideration on their part in the discharge of seasoned veterans. Undoubtedly many of you read The Washington Merry-Go Round today pertaining to the discharge of Navy personnel. I quote:

On September 10, Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal stated that the total size of the United States Navy was 3,369,000 men. Seven days later, September 17, Admiral Lou Denfeld, in charge of Navy personnel, told the House Naval Affairs Committee that the Navy totaled 3,415,000 men. In other words, at a time when men were supposed to be discharged, the Navy increased 26,000 men in 1 week.

I would ask you if there is any justification for this position on the part of the Navy. There is only one way to stop this unjustifiable condition and that is by congressional action on our part. This is the letter that I received from a very admirable young man. I know that it will be of interest to you.

OCTOBER 2, 1945.

Mr. LEO E. ALLEN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEO: It has been quite some time since I have written you, but, believe me, I wouldn't be writing this letter unless I figured you could help me and a few million other fellows in the service with enough points for discharge from the Navy.

I have known you for quite some time, and I'm sure you realize that this is an important matter for you as well as for me.

The question is this: Why is it that we are not getting home the way we were promised? There surely isn't any efficiency in the Navy Department or else we would be on our way home. I can't for the life of me understand why the Army can get its men back and not the Navy. We have been here in the Pacific for almost 2 years and we have not as much as seen a liberty port or a white woman.

Truly the war is over and millions of us have answered the call to our country in her need. We have served her faithfully and well. Now all we ask is a little consideration for us. If you men in Congress expect to be reelected to office you people better get on the ball. Truly, these have been trying times for all of us, and one cannot expect a miracle, but, after all, Leo, I hate to be lied to continually. All I'm asking is the opportunity to get home to my wife. We have been apart for almost 2 years and I know if you were in my shoes or anyone else's you would feel the same as I.

If you men in Congress expect us to sit idly by—well, Leo, I'm afraid you are mistaken.

Truly the war is over; what a marvelous victory for us; with all our high ideals and equality and justice, if you call being left holding the bag after we have done our part, I'm afraid we have lost the victory for which this war was fought.

Can it be possible that you men in whose hands rests the fate of a Nation sit idly by and leave us the ones who have really sacrificed ourselves to preserve this, our United States, be left in an out-of-way place so that whenever the Navy Department gets ready it will release us to return to our loved ones? Why is it that men who have been stationed Stateside since the war began be released with a total number of 35 points before us who have served at sea since our enlistment. If that is justice, equality, and the pursuit of happiness, then it cannot be the United States, the country in which I was born and brought up to uphold the traditions on which our country was founded. I'm sorry I had to write this way, but, believe me, this is the viewpoint of a few million men. Hoping that you men in Congress can help settle this issue but quick, I remain,

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I shall support this Federal-aid airport bill—H. R. 3615—which proposes to provide aid for the development of public airports.

The bill authorizes an aggregate appropriation of $650,000,000 to be spent over a period of 10 years beginning with the next fiscal year.

I have always been a strong advocate of the development of our air facilities to their maximum efficiency. Air development is a guaranty toward our national security, as the history of the recent war clearly proves. It is likewise a valuable asset in the development of our peacetime economy.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a relief to every Member of Congress who is interested in the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine to know that this act will be administered by the Civil Aeronautics Authority rather than the Civil Aeronautics Board. As I have heretofore pointed out, there are four interdependent principal links in the chain of our national defense—the Army, the Navy, the merchant marine, and our Air Forces. By its action in refusing the right to American ship operators to operate air lines parallel to their surface routes, the Civil Aeronautics Board has clearly demonstrated its inability to recognize this fact. On the contrary, its policies and actions tend to destroy one with the other. Too few people realize the seriousness of this situation. The United States Maritime Commission at the present time has 19 excellent passenger ships to sell which cost some $304,000,000. Each of these ships will carry more than 500 passengers. They are excellent ships to compete with foreign ship operators on surface routes. Because the Civil Aeronautics Board will not give the right to operate air lines parallel to surface routes, the Maritime Commission cannot find American ship operators to purchase these 19 ships. This is but a single illustration of the vast harm being done to our American merchant marine by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. Speaker, it was hoped by many Members of Congress that this bill might have been brought in with a rule sufficiently broad to lift the heavy hand of injustice that has been placed upon the American merchant marine by the action of the Civil Aeronautics Board in denying American shippers equal opportunity with every other maritime nation in the world. No other nation would tolerate such action.

It is to be hoped that first consideration will be given by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in administering this act to publicly owned and financed terminal airports, which are international in their service.

The city of San Francisco has been one of the most forward-looking in regard to airport facilities. Strategically located at the air crossroads of the Occident and the Orient, it has one of the finest airports in the world. Although some $20,000,000 has already been spent in its development, the voters of San Francisco will go to the polls next month to authorize another $20,000,000 bond issue for the further development of its airport facilities. Just as the port of San Francisco has been one of the world's greatest ports of embarkation in the war, so its great airport will be one of the keys to our future national defense in the air.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be speedily enacted into law.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include communications on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the rule, but, Mr. Speaker, I favor the Howell amendment to this bill because the Federal-city pattern can only serve to create a competition between various units of the State for Federal aid. The Federal Administrator would be required to bargain separately with thousands of municipalities and other subdivisions of the various States. What we might find is a high-pressured campaign put on for Federal funds to support excessive and extravagant projects. Larger projects contemplated by the large cities would not be coordinated with plans of the State governments for a State-wide system, conferring maximum benefits on the State as a whole and on the Nation.

A Federal-State pattern has worked successfully under the Federal Aid Road Act of 1916, as carried forward under the Federal Highway Act of 1944. Our experiences under these highway acts certainly indicate that we should continue the Federal-State pattern for airports. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from the attorney general of Maryland, the Honorable William Curran; a letter from the Council of State Governments; a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; and a telegram from the State Aviation Committee of Maryland:

ANNAPOLIS, MD., *October 16, 1945.*

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Member of Congress:

Urgently request your favorable consideration of proposal for establishment national system of airports to provide that Federal airport agency should operate through States in accordance with long-established successful pattern of Federal-States cooperation. This proposal unanimously backed by Council of State Government, by Governors' Conference, and by National Association of State Aviation Officials. Understand Congressman HOWELL has introduced amendment to House bill making this provision. Would appreciate your helpful support.

HERBERT O'CONOR,
Governor of Maryland.

THE STATE LAW DEPARTMENT,
Baltimore, Md., August 29, 1945.
Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR TOMMY: I am in receipt of a bulletin from the Council of State Governments, which I think should be brought to your attention. I am attaching a copy of it. The matter is self-explanatory, and I do think it is of considerable importance.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM CURRAN,
Attorney General.

[Enclosure]

THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS,
Chicago, Ill., August 24, 1945.

To All Attorneys General:

Two bills are now pending in Congress having to do with a national system of airports: Senate bill No. 2 in the Senate (commonly known as the McCarran bill), and House bill No. 3615 (commonly known as the Lea bill).

The States—through the Council of State Governments and its affiliated agencies and the National Association of State Aviation Officials—while strongly supporting a Federal program for the establishment of a national airport system, nevertheless, have opposed certain features of these bills which, in their opinion, would be very detrimental to the program itself and to the States.

The House bill provides that the National Government in the development of a national airport program would deal directly with the thousands of political subdivisions of the States, without any reference to the States whatever; while the Senate bill provides that the national administration would deal directly with all of the larger political subdivisions (numbering more than 800) and would deal through the States only with respect to the smaller airports.

If either of these bills were enacted, they would:

1. Abandon the long-established pattern of Federal-State relations that has been used in practically every continuing cooperative service, such as agriculture, highways, vocational education, public health, social security, etc.

2. Establish a new principle of intergovernmental relationships on a continuing basis, a principle which in large part short-circuits all State governments; and this principle, if established with respect to airports, would without a doubt be advocated as an administrative pattern for all future programs participated in by the Federal Government, many of which are now under consideration, such as education, hospitals, general public works, etc.

3. Establish a duplex system of administration—Federal-State on the one hand, Federal-local on the other—and such a duplex system of necessity would be ineffective in operation, extravagant in the use of public funds, and a source of widespread controversy.

4. Require the enormous expansion of a Federal agency, the employment of thousands of additional Federal workers who, in large part, would duplicate the very work that can be done—in fact, is now being done—by State institutions and agencies already established.

5. Establish over a very short period of time just a Federal system—Federal policy, Federal program, Federal direction and operation. That has been the history of practically all of the emergency programs which were attempted on a Federal-local basis.

The bills are now pending on the floors of the House and the Senate, and action upon them can be expected soon after Congress reconvenes early in September.

I, therefore, urge that you study these bills, copies of which have been sent to you, and advise your congressional delegation about this subject.

This is a most important matter, involving not only the development and construction of a national airport system but also the governmental pattern which we are to adopt with respect to all postwar public works.

Action on this is badly needed now.

With best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

FRANK BANE,
Executive Director.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., October 13, 1945.
Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: When you have an opportunity to vote on the Lea airport bill, H. R. 3615, which is scheduled to be brought up in the House very soon, we would greatly appreciate your favorable consideration of certain proposed amendments:

1. An amendment to require Federal aid to be handled through the States in the same manner as highway aid.

2. An amendment which would cause all airport projects to be initiated by the States in cooperation with local authorities, the Federal Administrator to have power to approve or require modifications.

3. An amendment which would restrict the use of Federal funds to grading, runway construction, lighting and other safety features. With such a change, State and local authorities would be obliged to pay for buildings, as well as lands, thereby making possible substantial reductions in Federal appropriations.

4. An amendment eliminating from the bill the provision which would authorize the use of the Federal power of condemnation in the acquisition of airport sites.

The foregoing proposals would bring the pending bill into conformity with basic principles adopted by referendum vote of the member organizations of the United States Chamber of Commerce. We respectfully request your support of appropriate revisions in the bill which in other respects is in satisfactory form and should be enacted.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD L. VOLGENAU.

BALTIMORE, MD., *October 2, 1945.*
Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Copy has been received of telegram dated September 27 sent by the mayor of Baltimore presumably to each of Maryland's Representatives in Congress. Previously I have urged you to support amendments to the Lea bill similar to the Brewster amendment to the McCarran bill in the Senate so that channeling of Federal funds in aid for the construction of airports will be kept on the State-Federal Government level. What Baltimore's mayor is contending for will create a hodgepodge development of airports in this State and hamper public airport construction which will serve the entire State. I repeat my request that you advocate amendment of the Lea bill in the manner I have previously suggested.

CHARLES H. BUCK,
Chairman, State Aviation Commission of Maryland.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this airport bill involves an appropriation, I believe, of about $700,000,000 to build airports all over the country. I think it is very distinctly a case of putting the cart before the horse because at this time the Civil Aeronautics Administration has not settled their policy about who is going to use these airports that the taxpayers' money is going to build. Reference has been made to it in this debate. At the present time, ship companies, railroad companies, bus companies, and so-called feeder companies have never been able to get an established policy from the Civil Aeronautics as to whether they are going to be able to operate or whether they are not going to be able to operate. I have no complaint against the four big air lines, but it does seem to me to be a rather remarkable situation that the Federal Government should be spending $700,000,000 to build airports for stopping places for the four big air lines, who are the only air lines up to now who seem to have obtained an established policy of who can use these airports. It does seem to me that before we can proceed with this program all the transportation lines of the country ought to know whether we are building a billion dollars' worth of airports for the four big air lines or whether we are building them for the benefit of all the transportation systems in the country. I hope some thought will be given to the question of getting a definite policy of whether or not these airports are going to be used just for the four big air lines or whether they are going to be used for the benefit of the country generally before we spend all this money for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 167]

Adams	Ellis	Kearney
Bailey	Ellsworth	Keogh
Baldwin, Md.	Elsaesser	Kilburn
Baldwin, N. Y.	Ervin	King
Bates, Mass.	Flannagan	Kinzer
Bennet, N. Y.	Fulton	Kirwan
Bishop	Gamble	LeFevre
Blackney	Gardner	Lesinski
Bloom	Gary	Luce
Bolton	Gerlach	Lynch
Bradley, Mich.	Gifford	McConnell
Bradley, Pa.	Gillespie	McGehee
Brumbaugh	Gillie	McKenzie
Buckley	Gordon	Madden
Burgin	Gore	Maloney
Butler	Granger	May
Byrne, N. Y.	Griffiths	Merrow
Campbell	Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Calif.
Canfield	Hagen	Miller, Nebr.
Cannon, Fla.	Hall,	Monroney
Clason	Edwin Arthur	Mott
Cole, Kans.	Hall,	Norton
Cooley	Leonard W.	O'Neal
Corbett	Hare	Outland
Courtney	Harless, Ariz.	Peterson, Ga.
Cox	Hart	Pfeifer
Curley	Hartley	Phillips
Daughton, Va.	Heffernan	Plumley
Dawson	Henry	Powell
De Lacy	Herter	Price, Fla.
Dickstein	Holmes, Mass.	Quinn, N. Y.
Dingell	Holmes, Wash.	Rains
Dolliver	Hope	Rayfiel
Doughton, N. C.	Izac	Rich
Douglas, Calif.	Jensen	Rivers
Drewry	Johnson,	Rizley
Durham	Lyndon B.	Robertson,
Eaton	Judd	N. Dak.

Robinson, Utah	Stigler	Wadsworth
Roe, N. Y.	Stockman	Wasielewski
Rogers, Fla.	Tarver	Weiss
Rogers, N. Y.	Taylor	Whittington
Rowan	Tolan	Winter
Savage	Torrens	Woodrum, Va.
Short	Vinson	Worley
Simpson, Pa.	Voorhis, Calif.	
Starkey	Vursell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 293 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT ACT

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3615) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air navigation facilities.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 3615, with Mr. BARDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss briefly some of the principal provisions of this bill.

The bill proposes a national airport program. It has in contemplation a synchronized system of airports covering the country. Those airports are intended to provide for commercial aviation as well as private flyers.

You may divide the airports provided for into two general classes. One would be what is called class 4 or larger and the other would be what are called class 3 or smaller. There will be approximately 6,200 airports in the program, of which about 800 will be of the larger type and 5,400 small ones for private flying and for local and domestic commerce.

The plan proposed is to be formulated by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. It will be the duty of the Administrator under this bill to consult with the Civil Aeronautics Board in formulating this program, and with the States and municipalities of the country. He shall also confer with the War and Navy Departments, for two purposes: one, for consulting with the War and Navy Departments as to how these new airports may serve national-defense purposes so far as is feasible; and the other purpose of consultation with the War and Navy Departments is to procure so far as feasible the use of military airports for civilian purposes when peace is fully restored.

The grants to be made by the Federal Government are limited entirely to funds already provided for that purpose. The total appropriations authorized by this bill would be $703,000,000. Of this sum $3,000,000 is to be appropriated for immediate use in planning surveys and preparing preliminarily for the institution of this program.

The program is to cover 10 years, to begin this year under the terms of this bill. Not exceeding $650,000,000 is authorized for airports in the States, at a rate not to exceed $100,000,000 a year. This gives the Committee on Appropriations a wide discretion as to when and how much shall be appropriated for these purposes. All the way through the bill it provides that not exceeding the specified sums may be authorized.

The advantage of a long-time program for this purpose is apparent. This is a great program. It probably marks a great change in the transportation system of our country. It is not at all improbable that the changes that will occur in the next decade or two as affecting aviation will be similar to what was accomplished in this country when we gave Federal aid to public roads.

This plan gives the Committee on Appropriations complete control of the money that is simply authorized in this bill. The time for carrying out the program will give the country the benefit of experience as it progresses. It will permit the Federal Government to proceed cautiously and with regard to the changing conditions that may develop as the program advances. In the end, it will make it possible to have a complete, comprehensive, and practical program for the advancement of aviation. Within a few years the passage of this bill will be a landmark in the progress of aviation in our country.

Not exceeding 5 percent of the amount appropriated for these projects will be used for surveying, investigating, and preliminary purposes including administration. There is also a provision for the authorization of $50,000,000 for the Territories and possessions of the United States to develop aviation fields in those areas. Of this sum, there is authorized not exceeding $10,000,000 for the 10-year program for Alaska, $15,000,000 for Hawaii, and $10,000,000 for Puerto Rico, and $15,000,000 for places not specifically named for the possessions of the United States. That might include any mandated territory that the United States may take as the result of treaties following the war.

The plan provides that after an appropriation is made, the Administrator will apportion among the various States of the country 75 percent of the funds available for projects. Fifty percent is to be allotted in the proportion of the population and area of each State to the total population and area of the United States. That formula was adopted in an attempt to assure every State in the country that it would have a reasonable and fair share of the money appropriated for this purpose. Naturally, the fundamental purpose is to provide airports where they are needed and not to provide them unless they are needed.

This particular formula to a certain extent is an abstract one. It does not with absolute accuracy reflect the purpose of the bill to provide airports where needed, but it does serve the purpose of guaranteeing to each State a fair share of the funds appropriated. In order to cover cases where there might be an unfair or unnecessary apportionment of funds or where there would be an improvident apportionment of funds if this formula were followed strictly, the bill provides that 25 percent of the funds appropriated for projects are to be spent at the discretion of the Administrator in sections of the country where they are most needed. But money used out of the discretionary funds must be matched by at least a 50-percent contribution by the sponsors of the project.

Approvals of projects and therefore for Federal funds must provide for no more than 50 percent as the share of the Federal Government.

The agencies that may apply for these aid funds may be a State or Territory, or an agency of the State or Territory, or a county or municipality, political subdivision, or a tax-supported corporation.

Two or more qualified sponsors may join in an application. Undoubtedly, that will frequently occur. Municipalities near each other will join in applying for the funds to establish a jointly used airport. States may also cooperate with municipalities. We hope they will.

Under this bill as it is written, it should be distinctly understood that it does not bar any appropriate sponsor from applying for these funds. The State itself can apply. A State ordinarily has power to prohibit municipalities from applying for such aid. So far as the bill is concerned, it permits a municipality, State, county, or city, or political subdivision to qualify as a sponsor. It would permit a State and any other qualified sponsor to apply jointly.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. Very briefly.

Mr. HÉBERT. I just want to get a bit of information. Where a municipality wants to apply, then it does not have to go through the State, provided the municipality provides the funds to match the Federal fund. Is that right?

Mr. LEA. That is right.

Mr. HÉBERT. Suppose a State also has a similar set-up? If a State wants to locate an airport in a municipality, the State would have to furnish the funds to match the Federal fund?

Mr. LEA. It would. Yes. At least there must be a sponsor who will match the Federal funds. Airports are for municipalities. Ordinarily a State will not own these airports. They are for the municipalities of the country and they will be maintained by the municipalities and operated by the municipalities, as a usual thing. Of course, a State could, if it wanted to, have an airport of its own, maintained at its own expense, but I think it is likely that many States will be little disposed to go in, and out of the State treasury, build State airports, or support municipal airports.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is the point I am getting at. The city puts up the money and the city controls the airport, with the Federal Government?

Mr. LEA. That is right. This goes on the theory that the man who pays the bill ought to have something to say about

how the money is spent. He ought to get what he wants for the money he puts up.

Every project must be approved by the Administrator before any money can be spent by the Federal Government. In addition to that, after an agreement is reached, it must be reduced to writing. No money can be spent by the Federal Government until it is in writing, and that contract must provide a specific and definite sum of money as the total maximum liability of the Federal Government. We put that in there to avoid running up costs on contracts after they are made.

The Administrator must determine that the funds for the Federal Government's share are available before he approves it. He must ascertain that matching funds are available and that all the sponsorship requirements have been met. In addition to that, after it is proposed to build one of these airports, a public hearing is had, at which any person, or community, or organization substantially interested has the right to appear in support of or in opposition to the establishment of the airport.

I should mention in passing that the only exception to this 50-percent matching requirement of Federal funds is in the case of Alaska. Provision is made that the Federal Government may contribute 75 percent of the project costs in Alaska. One reason for this is because of the meager population of Alaska and its wealth is so limited in proportion to its area. In addition to that, all authorities on aviation agree that Alaska is going to be a very important part of the world in future aviation. There is a national necessity to take care of that situation.

One of the sponsorship requirements, among others, is that the air field will be subject to undiscriminating use by the public on reasonable terms; that it will be suitably operated and maintained; that the aerial approaches will be cleared and kept clear; that the facilities of the airport will be available at all times, without charge, to the United States Government, except for expenses in repairing damages that the use of the airport may suffer, or a reasonable charge where there is substantial use of the airport for military purposes.

The sponsors must also agree to give the Government space, without charge, in the airport buildings for air-traffic control, for weather-reporting service, and for communications. The airport authorities must keep records.

One provision of this bill that has excited some criticism is the provision providing that on request of the sponsor of an airport to the Administrator he may bring suit in the Federal court to condemn property, as provided in the Federal Act of 1931.

The municipality or whoever owns the airport must bear all the expense of that condemnation proceeding. They can proceed that way only when the Administrator determines that there will be unreasonable delay or no practicable method of condemning the property without that procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I was just wondering as I listened to the gentleman's able presentation, is not this a complete departure from the general rules of Federal aid, inasmuch as it permits a municipality to deal directly with the Federal Government?

Mr. LEA. No; we have been doing that in airports up to date. Ordinarily the Government deals in direct contracts with those who assume their obligations.

Mr. REED of New York. I am talking about other Federal-aid projects.

Mr. LEA. It is not similar to roads. The roads belong to the State; the State draws the money and builds the road. These airports belong primarily to the municipalities.

Mr. REED of New York. Suppose a State has worked out an aviation plan which they believe is suitable for that State. Could this municipality totally disregard the State plan and deal with the Federal Government?

Mr. LEA. It could. It could only in case the State law permitted it to do so and if the representatives of the Federal Government saw fit to accept its application. It might be that the city offered a better plan than the State. If here were two applicants for the same airport it would be for the Administrator to determine which would be accepted.

Mr. REED of New York. I am not quarreling with the bill necessarily; I do not know enough about the bill at this time, I have not had an opportunity to study it, but I should like to clear the atmosphere a little bit as I go along.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I may state to the gentleman from New York that if the State law requires a channeling of funds through a State agency we feel that matter should be settled between the States and the municipalities as to which law should govern. Is not that correct?

Mr. LEA. Yes; the State has complete control of it. If the State does not want its municipalities to apply it has the right to prohibit them.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I may call the gentleman's attention to the fact that fewer than half the States have any of these acts at all.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. On page 3 of the committee report appears the statement that the funds shall be channeled through the aeronautics commission of a State or other State agencies in the event any State has legislation setting up its own aeronautical commission, and providing for the funds to be disbursed under the direction of that State commission. Can the gentleman point out in the bill itself the provision in law to which that statement in the report makes reference? I have gone through it rather hurriedly but I confess I have not found it in the bill.

Mr. LEA. That statement in the report is the legal conclusion from the provisions of the bill. No exclusive privilege is given to the municipalities or to the State. The State, however, has power to prohibit a municipality from applying if it so desires.

Mr. KEEFE. Then we understand the situation to be as stated in the report, that as to those States which have legislatively set up aeronautical boards or commissions the funds will be channeled through such State agency.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Just a minute, if the gentleman from California will permit. The State's authority would have to go a little further than just setting up the board, the State would have to provide for the channeling of funds through that board.

Mr. KEEFE. Then do I understand the situation to be that unless the State has by legislation directed that all funds to come through this bill shall be handled by a State agency that they will be handled directly with the sponsors, each municipality? Is that right?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is unless the State acts as a cosponsor.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not get a good answer.

Mr. LEA. I believe the situation is simply that this bill does not provide any exclusive approach to either the State or the municipality in applying; either may apply until there is some law that disqualifies one from applying. Whichever applies must arrange to pay the bill.

A sponsor must be legally qualified to assume its obligation under the Government grant. The sponsor must be legally qualified under State law and meet the Federal requirements of a sponsor.

Ordinarily a State would have no legitimate reason for wanting to deprive a municipality of the right to build an airport by using its own funds to match Federal funds.

One of the deplorable features of the present situation is the strenuous efforts being made by agents of States to secure State channeling in States that are unprepared to match Federal funds.

I am afraid if we compel State channeling by the States, we will definitely delay aviation progress. In fact, I think it is very improbable that many States, in any large measure, are going to buy these airports for the municipalities.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to get this clear. I think it is the most controversial thing in the entire bill, and for this reason I am asking the question. Assume that the State of Wisconsin, one of the districts of which I represent through its legislature passes legislation setting up an aeronautical board in contemplation of the enactment of this legislation, and in that legislation provides and directs that any moneys obtained under the sponsorship of either the State or municipality shall be channeled through and be subject to expenditure under the direction of this State body.

Mr. LEA. That would give the State sole jurisdiction.

Mr. KEEFE. That would give the State sole jurisdiction. Is there anything in this bill that would permit the State to do that, or is there anything in here that would prevent that?

Mr. LEA. Yes. The State can do that. It can decide that question for itself.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot find language in here either way.

Mr. LEA. There is, because a municipality is legally disqualified in view of that situation. It lacks legal authority to assume the responsibilities of a sponsor.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. REED of New York. Suppose we have a situation such as exists in the case of some of the airports in my State, where they have runways already erected and in operation, as well as certain other improvements, can the Federal Government step in and say, "You will have to build these approaches as we suggest before you get any more money," or are they going to get any more money under this bill?

Mr. LEA. If they will comply with the Federal requirements, they can qualify for funds. The theory of Federal aid here, as in case of public roads, is that the standards of construction must conform to Government specifications, or matching funds are not provided.

Mr. REED of New York. They must comply with the Federal requirements to get any further benefits?

Mr. LEA. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. Those are conditions precedent?

Mr. LEA. And they must have the approval of the Administrator for the money that is spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has given long and serious consideration to all matters that have a direct or indirect bearing upon the development of an adequate and efficient postwar system of air transportation.

The committee is fully aware of the important part that aviation can and will take in the postwar period in promoting the general welfare, economic prosperity, and a system of national defense.

The bill, H. R. 3615, now before the House makes provision for the development of one of the most essential features of postwar aviation, namely, a system of Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States.

The bill, generally speaking, accepts the fundamental principles recommended by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in connection with the national airport plan it presented to Congress in November 1944—House Document No. 807, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

I am of the opinion, after listening to the testimony of many distinguished and informed persons in aviation matters before our committee, and who have given this bill their approval, that such an airport program as provided for in this bill would give civil aviation a real chance to expand rapidly, now that the war is over, and will, in addition, provide a public-works program of Nation-wide proportions which can be undertaken immediately so as to provide thousands of jobs for ex-war workers during the period of reconversion from war work to civilian industry.

An analysis of the bill, by sections, follows:

TITLE I—FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

By this section title I is given the title of "Federal-Aid Airport Act."

SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS

This secion defines he terms "Administrator"; "airport"; "airport development"; airport hazard"; "project"; "project costs"; "public agency"; "public airport"; "sponsor"; and "possessions."

The term "airport development" includes, among other things, the construction, alteration, and repair of airport administrative buildings, but such term does not include the construction, alteration, or repair of airport hangars. While the Administrator will be authorized to pay not in excess of 50 percent of allowable project costs in the case of airport administrative buildings, he will be authorized to grant such aid only to the extent that expenditures for such buildings are reasonable and necessary in connection with the operation of the airport in question.

By reason of a limitation in the definition of "project costs" the Administrator will not have authority to pay any part of the cost of acquiring land or any interest therein, or any easement through or other interest in air space.

SECTION 3. NATIONAL AIRPORT PLAN

The Administrator is directed to prepare, and revise annually, a national plan for public airports in the United States and its Territories and possessions.

The plan is to specify general location and types of development, adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics.

The plan shall take into account the needs of both air commerce and private flying and the probable growth of civil aeronautics.

The Administrator shall consult and consider recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the States, Territories, and possessions and their political subdivisions; also the War and Navy Departments, and he shall determine the extent to which the military and naval airports and facilities will be available for civil use. The War and Navy Departments are required to consider the views of the Administrator to the end that military fields may be used for civil purposes to the extent feasible.

SECTION 4. FEDERAL AID AIRPORT PROGRAM

To carry out the national airport plan, the Administrator, within the limits of available appropriations, is authorized to make grants to public agencies for public airports.

SECTION 5. APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations for preliminary expenses

(a) An immediate appropriation of $3,000,000 is authorized to cover preliminary planning and surveys by the Administrator incident to the initiation of the program.

Appropriations for projects in States

(b) For projects in the States, there is an authorization for annual appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $650,000,000 over a period of 10 fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. The appropriation for any one fiscal year may not exceed $100,000,000. Not to exceed 5 percent of the annual appropriation is to be available for planning and research and administrative expenses. The appropriation for each year is to remain available until June 30, 1956, unless sooner expended.

Appropriations for projects in Territories and possessions

(c) For projects in the Territories and possessions, there is an authorization for annual appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $50,000,000 over a period of 10 fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. Not more than $10,000,000 will be available for Alaska, not more than $15,000,000 for Hawaii, and not more than $10,000,000 for Puerto Rico. Provisions similar to those in subsection (b) are included as to administrative expenses and as to availability of appropriations.

Administrative expenses

(d) This subsection defines the type of administrative expenses for which funds may be expended.

SECTION 6. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR PROJECTS IN STATES

Apportionment of funds

(a) This subsection provides for apportioning among the States 75 percent of the funds available for projects under the program for the States, one-half in the proportion which the population of the State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States. Amounts apportioned for a State may be used only for projects in that State.

Discretionary fund

(b) The funds, amounting to 25 percent, which are required to be apportioned among the States will constitute a discretionary fund which may be used by the Administrator in carrying out the airport plan, regardless of the State in which the projects are located. In using these funds the Administrator is directed to take into account the needs in the various States for airport facilities.

SECTION 7. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR PROJECTS IN TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

The funds appropriated for the Territories and possessions may be used in carrying out projects deemed appropriate under the airport plan, subject to the limitation regarding Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico indicated above.

SECTION 8. SUBMISSION OF PROJECTS

Submission

(a) Any public agency, or two or more public agencies, may submit an application for approval of a project included in the then current national airport plan. Proposals are to conform with standards established by the Administrator, including standards for site selection, airport lay-out, grading, drainage, seeding, paving, lighting, and safety of approaches.

Approval

(b) The Administrator may approve a project if satisfied that the proposal is sound; that sufficient funds are available; that the project will be completed without undue delay; and that sponsorship requirements have been or will be met.

Hearings

(c) Applications shall be public documents. Any person having a substantial interest may file a memorandum in support of or in opposition to an application. A public hearing with respect to the location of the airport as to which airport development is proposed shall be accorded upon request. Hearings will be held in accordance with the Administrator's regulations.

SECTION 9. FEDERAL SHARE OF PROJECT COSTS

The Federal share of project costs may not exceed 50 percent except in the case of Alaska, in which the share may be not to exceed 75 percent.

SECTION 10. SPONSORSHIP

As a condition precedent to approval, the Administrator shall receive written assurances, satisfactory to him, that—

(1) the project will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms without unjust discrimination;

(2) the airport will be suitably maintained;

(3) aerial approaches will be protected and the creation of future hazards prevented;

(4) the facilities will be available to the United States by Government aircraft at all times without charge other than (*a*) for damage done, and (*b*) if the use by military or naval aircraft be substantial, a reasonable charge based upon such use;

(5) the owner or operator of the airport will provide the Government with space in airport buildings, free of charge, for traffic control, weather and communication activities;

(6) a standard accounting system prescribed by the Administrator will be maintained;

(7) annual or special airport reports will be made as the Administrator may reasonably request;

(8) the airport and its records will be available to the Administrator's inspection.

To insure compliance with sponsorship requirements, which the Administrator is directed to prescribe, the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with public agencies on behalf of the United States. Such contracts will be enforceable by decrees for specific performance.

SECTION 11. GRANT AGREEMENTS

The Administrator may offer to pay not exceeding 50 percent of allowable project costs. The offer shall state the maximum obligation of the United States and stipulate the obligations to be assumed by the project sponsor. Such offer and acceptance in writing by the sponsor shall comprise a grant agreement.

SECTION 12. ALLOWABLE PROJECT COSTS

The United States is not obligated to pay any part of a project cost unless the Administrator has first determined that such cost is allowable. A project cost shall be allowable—

(1) if it was incurred for airport development conforming to plans for an approved project and according to the terms of the grant agreement;

(2) if it was incurred subsequent to the grant agreement, unless the cost related to necessary preliminary work;

(3) but only to the extent that it is determined by the Administrator to be reasonable in amount.

SECTION 13. PAYMENTS

The Administrator determines at what time and in what amounts payments shall be made, the aggregate of which at any time is not to exceed 50 percent of the project costs of development already performed. If excess payments are made they may be recovered by the United States.

SECTION 14. PERFORMANCE OF CONSTRUCTION WORK

Construction work shall be subject to inspection and approval by the Administrator. Regulations shall require cost and progress reports by the sponsor.

SECTION 15. ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR SPONSORS

Where the Administrator is of the opinion that necessary property cannot be acquired without undue expense or delay, he may, at the request of the sponsor, exercise the Federal power of condemnation to acquire the property for the sponsor. He is authorized to use the procedure of the act of February 26, 1931, under which possession and title may be taken in advance of final judgment. The entire cost is to be borne by sponsor, and the necessary funds are to be made available by the sponsor as needed.

SECTION 16. USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS

Requests for use

(a) When the Administrator determines the use of lands owned or controlled by the Government is reasonably necessary, he shall file a request with the agency having control of such land that the needed property (which may be any interest in land, including easements through or other interests in air space) be conveyed to the public agency sponsoring the project.

Making of conveyances

(b) The agency to which request is made shall determine whether compliance with the request is inconsistent with the agency's needs, and is to notify the Administrator within 4 months. If compliance is not inconsistent with such needs the agency is authorized and directed, with the approval of the President and the Attorney General of the United States, to convey the property requested. The interest conveyed shall automatically revert to the United States if not developed or it ceases to be used for airport purposes.

SECTION 17. REPORTS TO CONGRESS

The Administrator shall report to Congress as to his activities on or before the 3d day of January of each year.

SECTION 18. FALSE STATEMENTS

Any employee or agent employed by the United States or any public agency in connection with the submission of plans, contracts, and estimates of costs, who shall knowingly make any false representations in any report required to be made with intention to defraud the United States, is punishable by not to exceed 5 years' imprisonment or a fine of $10,000, or both such fine and imprisonment.

SECTION 19. EXISTING AIRPORT PROGRAMS

The enactment of this bill is not to interfere with any existing airport program.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAWS

SECTION 201

This section amends the Civil Aeronautics Act by clarifying the definition of "airport" and provides for the use of that term in the Civil Aeronautics Act wherever the term "landing area" is now used.

SECTION 202

(a) This subsection amends section 302 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

The principal change relates to the power of the Administrator to establish, operate, and maintain air-navigation facilities. Paragraph (1) of section 302 (a) now provides that air-navigation facilities may be established, operated, and maintained along the civil airways. The amendment would permit the Administrator to establish, operate, and maintain these facilities "wherever necessary." In addition, the present subsection is amended by requiring the Administrator to provide such airways and air-navigation facilities as may be necessary for the operations of air carriers under certificates of public convenience and necessity issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

(b) This subsection amends section 302 (c) of the Civil Aeronautics Act to give the Administrator power, in carrying out section 302, to acquire property through gifts or other methods of acquisition, including condemnation, and to dispose of property.

Such condemnation would be directly in behalf of the Government for its own air-navigation facilities and conducted under the act of February 26, 1931, hereinbefore referred to.

SECTION 203

(a) This subsection amends section 303 of the Civil Aeronautics Act, which now forbids the expenditure of Federal funds (other than those expended for military purposes or under the Civil Aeronautics Act) on airports or air-navigation facilities without a written certification by the Administrator that the landing area or facility upon which the funds are to be expended is reasonably necessary for use in air commerce or in the interests of national defense. The principal amendment to this provision makes it perfectly clear that the Administrator also has jurisdiction under section 303 with respect to airport buildings and other airport facilities and that he must find that the facilities are safe and adequate for present and prospective aeronautical use. Other amendments are made for the purpose of facilitating the exercise of power under this section and making it more effective.

(b) This subsection adds to the Civil Aeronautics Act a new section 304, to condition expenditure of Federal funds on airports under the Civil Aeronautics Act upon the giving of assurance to the Administrator that the airport will be open for public use on fair and reasonable terms, that it will be operated and maintained suitably, and that the approaches will be cleared and protected.

The new section 304 also deals with the granting of exclusive rights to the use of civil airways, airports, and other air-navigation facilities. It forbids the granting of an exclusive right for the use of any civil airway. This prohibition is now contained in section 302 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act and is merely being transferred to this new section for the purpose of better placement in the statute. The section also forbids the granting of an exclusive right for the use of an airport or other air-navigation facility upon or in connection with which Federal funds have been expended. This provision is contained in section 303 of existing law, but has been interpreted to permit the granting of an exclusive right if it is required in the interest of safety and the granting of such a right to the Government of the United States. In rewriting this provision the committee retained the exception which would permit the granting of an exclusive right to the Government of the United States by writing it into the law specifically. However, the committee omitted a provision contained in H. R. 3170 which would have expressly authorized the Administrator to permit the granting of exclusive rights in the interest of safety, it being the committee's intention that exclusive rights should not be granted, even under such circumstances.

SECTION 204

This section amends section 305 of the Civil Aeronautics Act to conform to the existing law by virtue of which the Weather Bureau is placed within the Department of Commerce instead of the Department of Agriculture.

SECTION 205

This section adds a new section 804 to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, imposing upon the Coast and Geodetic Survey duties in connection with the preparation of aeronautical charts. The addition of this section is for the purpose of clarification since under its general powers the Coast and Geodetic Survey has been performing this work for many years.

SECTION 206

This section amends section 5 (d) of the Air Commerce Act of 1926. This section now provides that any Government agency having jurisdiction over an airport or emergency landing field owned or operated by the United States may provide for the sale of fuel, oil, equipment, supplies, shelter, and mechanical service. Under the present provision such sales or other assistance may be provided only if, by reason of an emergency, it is necessary to the continuance of the aircraft to the nearest airport operated by private enterprise. This limitation has been changed so that sales and other assistance may be provided at any Government airport or emergency field located outside the continental United States or in a Territory or possession when comparable services and assistance are

not readily available from any other source. Such sales and other assistance may be provided within the continental United States only if, by reason of an emergency, such action is reasonably necessary to permit the continuance of the aircraft on its course. Limitations in this section do not restrict the Administrator's power under existing law with respect to the Washington National Airport.

SECTION 207

This section amends existing law to provide that funds appropriated for air-navigation facilities shall remain available for two fiscal years. This section does not apply in the case of appropriations made pursuant to title I of the bill, which contains its own provisions as to the availability of appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, every witness appearing before the committee on this legislation was in favor of the Federal-aid airport construction and improvement program which this bill authorizes. There was some difference of opinion as to the method to be pursued in channeling Federal funds for the purposes of the act, but there was no difference of opinion as to the desirability and necessity of legislation to accomplish the broad objectives sought by this bill.

The witnesses in support of the bill represented different Government agencies, Federal, State, and municipal, having responsibility in the development of aviation. Airport operators, airport users, aircraft manufacturers, aviation insurance, veterans, general business, and construction industry also gave unanimous support to the purposes and fundamental principles of the bill.

These witnesses included, among others, representatives of the Council of State Governments, the National Association of State Aviation Officials, the United States Conference of Mayors, the American Municipal Association, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, the Port of New York Authority, the Air Transport Association, the Feeder Airlines Association, the National Aviation Trades Association, the National Aeronautics Association, the Aircraft Distributors and Manufacturers Association, the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Associated General Contractors of America, the American Road Builders Association, and the American Legion.

The testimony before the committee clearly and forcibly demonstrated that the proposed airport program is a matter of national necessity in that it would serve many national needs and prove of great benefit to the public in many ways.

It was evident that such a program of airport development would stimulate and improve commerce, create a strong and efficient air-transportation business, stimulate aircraft manufacturing, and allied industries, and the many airport businesses such as the servicing and selling of aircraft and aviation materials and supplies. Furthermore, it would undoubtedly, by stimulation of aircraft and transportation business, increase permanent employment, stimulate private investment, and increase the national income.

It is equally clear that the development of airfields will create improved and cheaper transportation facilities and services; make available the advantages of air-mail service to a larger portion of the population; bring private flying within the reach of the general public and make the private plane more useful; benefit the communities served by airports, and, in general, it would stimulate commerce by providing a new growth industry for personal and commercial transportation.

It was also pointed out that such a program as contemplated by this bill would prove valuable to our national defense as it would provide facilities needed for use by the armed forces, both in times of war and in peacetime, by ensuring a strong and efficient aircraft manufacturing industry; by making possible a larger and more efficient air-transport system; by stimulating pilot and mechanic training; by providing a proving ground for military aviation; and by generally making the Nation more air-minded.

In conclusion, may I also bring to the attention of the House that the committee, probably with exception as to one point, is in favor of the adoption of this bill. I trust that it may have the support and approval of the House.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. When the chairman of the committee the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] had the floor, he indicated that Alaska would get $10,000,000, Puerto Rico $10,000,000, Hawaii a certain amount, and so forth. Why was the District of Columbia left out of this bill?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I am of the opinion that, under the provisions of the bill, it would be included. If there is any doubt as to the effect of the language in the bill, then I would favor any necessary amendment to make such purpose clear and definite.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that an assurance from the gentleman that the District of Columbia will be included in this and can participate?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I am certainly in favor of it. If it is not already provided for by the language of the bill, then an appropriate amendment should be made to accomplish the purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think the provisions of this bill have been pretty well explained in general. I notice the Members of the House have a good many questions to ask. I am prepared to offer myself for their questioning. To the best of my ability I will answer them.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. In view of the gentleman's willingness to cooperate with us by answering questions, can he advise us whether the bill contains any reference which would either permit or prohibit the charge of a landing fee to any federally owned airplane at an airport constructed from these funds?

Mr. HINSHAW. The bill provides that at such airports as are covered by the bill, where Army and Navy planes stop as an occasional matter, no charge shall be made. However, if the Army or the Navy establishes a base at any airport or uses it as a base, in other words, makes frequent use of it beyond what might be considered ordinary transit, that is, organized use, it shall pay a reasonable fee to the owner and operator of the airport, generally a municipality, in order that it may maintain that airport and carry on its functions.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does not that privilege extend also to the airplanes of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and other Federal agencies?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is not limited just to the Army and the Navy?

Mr. HINSHAW. No. The language used is "Government aircraft."

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I should like the gentleman to clear up the jurisdiction of the States and the municipalities. I understood the gentleman from California to say that the State is prior, and yet the municipality has authority. If the State is prior, how could the municipality have authority in case of a conflict?

Mr. HINSHAW. Permit me to discuss that briefly to the best of my ability. The gentleman will realize very clearly that there is a great conflict between the jurisdiction of the States and the municipalities when it comes to the business of receiving Federal contributions. Of course, both groups insist that their rights shall be maintained. The committee did its utmost to compromise the matter fairly. In other words, the jurisdiction of the bill is such that wherever a State passes a law or has a law in effect stating that all such contributions shall go through the State, naturally it will go through the State. If there is no such law on the statute books, then the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics is required to be sure that the sponsorship for the airport shall meet certain conditions. The principal qualifications for sponsorship is contribution of funds. Wherever the State legislatures desired to make appropriations for the contribution of funds toward the airport, naturally they would join in the sponsorship of the airport. Without that sponsorship, the municipality would have to do it alone. So there is this encouragement, that wherever a State desires to make a contribution, of course the State will be consulted, but if the State refuses to make a contribution, refuses to have anything to do with it in any way, the Administrator is then permitted to proceed directly with the municipality or the municipalities.

Mr. JENKINS. In that connection, then, after the arrangement has been made, the bill provides that whoever asks for the airport must come forward with at least 50 percent of the expense thereof.

Mr. HINSHAW. They must contribute 50 percent of the expenses excluding lands. The bill specifically excludes land from that 50-percent provision. The funds are precluded from being used for the purchase of land.

Mr. JENKINS. The municipalities then must provide the land?

Mr. HINSHAW. They must provide the land and clear the approaches.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In other words, the municipality or the local sponsors must provide the land plus 50 percent?

Mr. HINSHAW. They must supply the land plus 50 percent and clear the approaches.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does this bill do anything to unfreeze the Army air bases that have been inactivated but which have not been made open for civilian plane use?

Mr. HINSHAW. This bill does not deal directly with that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It does deal with the use of bases where there is some continued use. I will say the gentleman referred to that a minute ago.

Mr. HINSHAW. According to my present information, may I tell the gentleman the Surplus Property Disposal agency is now making arrangements with reference to the naval airfields which are declared surplus or soon will be, and the military fields, for the disposition of those fields in accordance with the degrees of priority that were set forth in the Surplus Property Disposal Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The question posed by the gentleman from South Dakota, I think, is important, and I think it should be pointed out that it is expected and hoped that the military airfields that are no longer needed for military purposes will be available in this program and it is specifically provided in the bill that in formulating the program the Administrator shall confer with the Army and Navy to the end that those airports be made available and a demand made as to those that are available.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, they would become part of the over-all airport plan as soon as they are made available. The committee, I know, is of a mind to encourage these agencies to dispose of their surplus fields in that way.

Mr. HALLECK. May I make one further suggestion. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] inquired as to the charge for the use of airports for federally owned planes. I think it should be pointed out also that we provide in this bill that the sponsors of the local airport shall provide space for Weather Bureau equipment and operation and other things incident to the operation of the airport provided by the Government and that it shall be provided free of charge to the Federal Government.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct within the limitations placed in the bill. There are three services, the weather service, the airways traffic control, and the communications incident thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wish I had the time, in the 5 minutes allotted to me, to express my regard for the great committee which reported this bill, and especially for the distinguished chairman of the committee. I have served with him for many years and on that account regret all the more that I have to oppose the bill reported by the committee. I also regret having to oppose the bill because of the strong sentiment in favor of the bill in some parts of my own State. A lot of people out there want the Government to continue to build their airports for them and to continue to furnish the money to provide other facilities and advantages which they should furnish for themselves.

But the bill is an anachronism. It harks back to the old WPA days before the war when this program was started and when the Federal Government was contributing large sums to the States and municipalities to prime the pump. Those days are gone—let us hope forever. This bill would have been in order at that time. It would have been an appropriate part of that program. But it is out of place and wholly obsolete in this modern day when WPA programs have been discarded and the States and cities have funds with which to finance their own improvements. The bill should not be passed.

In the first place, this bill should not be passed because we do not need it. At the beginning of the war we had a very complete system of airports, numbering 1,857, distributed strategically throughout the United States, as of July 1, 1940. To that number we have added during the war CAA airports, War Department ports, and naval ports until we have today a total of 3,774 airports, as of September 1, 1945.

That we do not need further airports at this time is demonstrated conclusively by the fact that the representatives of the War Department testified before the Committee on Appropriations last week that they are now arranging to return all of the 305 airports which they have operated during the war except 152. They say the 152 which they will retain are ample for all their needs and the rest are being turned over to the local authorities and municipalities without compensation.

The Navy is also returning all the ports which they have built or owned or operated during the war with the exception of 96. They testify that 96 will more than supply their requirements in time of peace. The remainder of the 3,774 airports—most of which have been built and all of which have been enlarged during the war—are available for any purpose for which this bill proposes to provide.

It should also be noted that few if any of our commercial planes will require as long runways and as commodious facilities as required by our largest war planes. In fact it has been repeatedly testified by the highest authorities that in contravention with the views expressed here this afternoon, few if any of the war planes to be declared surplus can be used or reconditioned for use as peacetime planes. They require too much fuel, too much oil, and the cost of reconversion is higher than a new and better adapted commercial plane would cost. We not only have enough airports but we have as large and as adaptable airports as civil aviation will require for many years to come. In fact the principal purpose for which any funds made available under the pending bill would be used would be merely to enlarge and enhance and aggrandize existing ports to promote the commercial and civic interests and ambitions of enterprising municipalities and chambers of commerce. Pork—in large and luscious chunks—at the expense of the taxpayers and the United States Treasury.

In fact, the report on the bill plainly states that there is no present need for this money, but that it is to provide "airports adequate to anticipate the needs of civil aeronautics in the United States." In critical times like these when we can't balance the Budget this bill proposes to spend money we have not got to anticipate alleged needs—which the bald statistics of the CAA, the War Department, and the Navy Department show we do not need.

In the second place, we should not pass this bill and authorize this Arabian Nights program for the simple reason that we have not the money.

Mr. Chairman, we must get down to earth again. We must realize that we are operating under quite a different financial status from that we knew in the old days before the war. Then we were a rich nation. Money was plentiful. We could afford to buy whatever we needed or whatever pleased our fancy. If we incidentally wasted a billion dollars or two, it was not such a serious matter. There was always more where that came from.

Today the situation is drastically different. We owe nearly $300,000,000,000. We are short billions of dollars of balancing our Budget. We must pay our debts. We must practice some elemental economy. We cannot spend money for a program merely because the money would be advantageously spent. That day has gone by—for the present at least. We can now spend money only for that which is indispensable. And this diamond tiara airport program is not indispensable. We can use the 3,774 airports and get along very well in the language of the classical legal adage. We must be just before we are generous. We must pay our honest debts before we make a gracious present to these favored cities of half the cost of these glittering airports refurbished at Federal expense to attract local business.

In short, the program to be promoted by the pending bill is an unholy combi-

nation of two ancient institutions with which we have had long experience—WPA and the pork barrel. The program here sought to be continued was initiated and had its beginning in the WPA of prewar days. This bill proposes to resuscitate the WPA program when most of us had hoped to avoid another WPA, or at least defer it until every other resource had been exhausted. It also includes the old pork-barrel program under which favored localities dipped their hands deep in the Federal Treasury for local benefits and free contributions.

But the most serious menace of this bill is that it opens the doors to unlimited deficit spending. We have before us the warning example of what deficit spending will do in the present precarious condition of the English exchequer. They began spending money they did not have even before the war—living on borrowed capital. This bill proposes to adopt the same vicious policy of deficit spending for America. For every dollar of the money to be spent under this bill will have to be borrowed. We are already preparing on a gigantic scale for the Eighth War loan. We have not enough money to pay even our legitimate expenses. We must float a huge loan to pay a portion of our current obligations. If we add to our obligations the money proposed in this bill, we will have to borrow it. That is the road England took and which has led to her present embarrassing state. A vote for this bill is a vote for deficit spending, a vote for the strongest inflationary influences that can be brought to bear against our fiscal system, an undermining influence upon our national credit. And for what purpose? To turn over millions of dollars to States and municipalities which are in far better financial condition than the National Government. The Federal Government is in the red—approaching $300,000,000,000 in the red. And the States and municipalities are without exception in the best financial condition in their history. If anyone doubts that, let him go out and check up on the financial condition of his State or city as of September 1, 1945. And then, if he has the heart to do it, let him check up on the condition of the United States Treasury.

And, Mr. Chairman, this bill is but the entering wedge. It opens the way to endless extension. Read the report on this point. Here it is on page 2 of the report:

> This airport system is to include not only the large terminal airports needed to accommodate commercial air transportation but also the many smaller airports needed for private or personal flying.

The bill specifically provides for a favored few favored cities.

But the CAA some months ago issued the report of a survey listing all the potential airports in the country. It comprised a book the size of a telephone directory. It listed towns all over my congressional district and every other congressional district and right after breakfast the next morning, when the newspapers carried excerpts from the report, commercial clubs and chambers of commerce in my State began writing me to send them the money. They thought it was already here waiting for them and they prepared to spend it. They are still waiting. And when the towns provided for by this bill begin to get their money every town listed in the CAA survey will begin to get impatient for like favors and the line will begin to form on the right. Billions of dollars would not suffice to care for this program extended to its ultimate conclusion. The time to stop it is right now. We do not need these airports. And we have not the money to pay for them. And we must protect the country from the inflation which inevitably accompanies such expenditures.

Every Member of this House favors economy—at least he favors economy as an abstract virtue when approached on the subject by constituents or newspaper reporters. There is not a man who favors this bill who did not vote last week to cut $5,000,000,000 out of our national revenues. And the newspapers in reporting the debate reported a general demand on the floor for retrenchment. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means especially—for whom I have the deepest respect and affection—is reported to have demanded, both on the floor and in the lobby, that the Committee on Appropriations cut down expenditures. And here the next bill on the floor is a proposition—not to retrench—not even to hold expenditures in status quo—but to increase expenditures.

My friends, spending money does not begin with the Committee on Appropriations. It begins with the legislative committees. It begins in bills just like this, to which nobody pays any particular attention. When the point of no quorum was made here this morning there were less than 30 people on the floor. The Members did not have enough interest in the bill to be here. But a committee brings in a report and everybody takes it as a matter of course and it is passed practically by unanimous consent. Then they come to the Committee on Appropriations and say, "This bill was passed by a large majority. You are under a mandate to appropriate the money."

The war is not over. War expenditures are still continuing. Billions of dollars must be spent, because of the war, in the next 2 years. War incomes are still flowing. War wages, prices, and profits are still accruing and accumulating in vast amounts. We are still spending war money. We are still drawing war incomes. But we are cutting down war taxes. This generation which made this debt ought to pay it. We ought to pay it while we can pay it, while our national income is high, while everybody has the money to pay it. But we vote to cut $5,000,000,000 off of taxes and off the national income. And the alibi we offer is that we are going to economize and the Committee on Appropriations is admonished to cut down expenditures. Then you bring in a bill like this. Instead of economizing you propose to increase expenditures.

The trouble with this Congress is that it has got used to spending money, and it is going to be hard to get down to a plane of not spending money. If we are not going to repudiate our debts, if we are not going to go into a great tailspin of inflation; if we are to get back on a sound common-sense business basis, we must stop throwing money around in this profligate way.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I have not more time. The bill ought to be defeated. The country wants it defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I believe it appropriate, because of the remarks made by our friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to review quickly, but factually, what has happened in the United States through the action of the Congress in reference to Federal-aid highway legislation, and is now proposed for airport development, and which has become a recognized part of the American system of transportation.

In 1911, 1912, and in 1914 measures were brought before the Congress to initiate a Federal-aid highway program for this Nation. On those occasions the legislation was defeated and it was not until 1916, on the fourth attempt, that Congress realized the necessity for a coordinated system or pattern by which we would construct the Federal-aid highways. You will recall the time in America when you would ride on a hard-surfaced road for 30, 40, or 50 miles and then drop off literally in the mud and rocks, and after 50 miles of that sort of transportation condition you encountered another short stretch of improved or surfaced road.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It was not until 1921. I had charge of the bill that created this Federal highway system. Up until that time there was not an organized highway system in this country.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Would the gentleman from Kentucky, disagreeing with the date I have used, agree with my statement as to conditions?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In 1916 we merely authorized a little money to build some test roads over the country.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct, and is what I desired to say. The Congress embraced the theory, and began the practice, of our Federal-aid highway system. I congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky for his interest then in such legislation and his continued support since when such legislation has been considered.

We came out of World War I and because of these roads that were being constructed and the automobiles that were being developed, became a nation on wheels. We were then and have continued since as the No. 1 transportation country of the World. We are emerging from the present global struggle not only a people on wheels but, more than that, a nation on wings.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. At the time they said that Federal-aid road legislation would bankrupt the country. It has instead proved a wonderful thing for the country.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct. When we provide a dollar in contribution to a Federal-aid highway or a Federal-aid airport system we are spending a dollar that will return multiplied dividends in the advantages it brings back to this Nation and to the people's well-being. Such values could never have been gained by a hodge-podge or a hit-and-miss system of development such as took place prior to our Federal-aid highway program and such necessary airport construction as we have had in this country.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] should recall that Federal aid to air lines brought back to the Government $50,000,000 profit from air mail.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from California is correct in that observation. I return to observe a case in question, in Missouri, for my fine colleague from that State. In the year 1928 the city of St. Louis decided to issue $2,000,000 in bonds for the construction of an airport. Those who desired the issuance of the bonds felt that the building of that project was in the public interest, but there was a group of individuals in St. Louis who believed that it was a private project and fought the program on that score.

What happened? In view of what our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has said, I read the declaration which was made by the spokesman in opposition to that airport development:

> It will afford a starting and landing place for a few wealthy, ultrareckless persons, who own planes and who are engaged in private pleasure flying. They may pay somewhat for the privilege. It will afford a starting and landing place for pleasure tourists from other cities, alighting in St. Louis while flitting here and yon. It will offer a passenger station for the very few persons who are able to afford, and who desire to experience, the thrill of a novel and expensive mode of luxurious transportation. The number of persons using the airport will be about equal to the total number of persons who engage in big-game hunting, trips to the African wilderness, and voyages of North Pole exploration. * * *
>
> In the very nature of things, the vast majority of the inhabitants of city—a 99 percent majority—cannot now, and never can, reap any benefit from the existence of an airport. True, it may be permitted to the ordinary common garden variety of citizen to enter the airport free of charge, so that he may press his face against some restricting barrier, and sunburn his throat gazing at his more fortunate compatriots as they sportingly navigate the empyrean blue. But beyond that, beyond the right to hungrily look on the ordinary citizen gets no benefit from the taxes he is forced to pay.

It is noteworthy that the Missouri Supreme Court did not hold to that viewpoint, and replied to the plaintiff with this opinion:

> An airport with its beacons, landing fields, runways, and hangars is analogous to a harbor with its lights, wharves, and docks; the one is the landing place and haven of ships that navigate the water, the other of those that navigate the air. With respect to the public use which each subserves, they are essentially of the same character. If the ownership and maintenance of one falls within the scope of municipal government, it would seem that the other must necessarily do so. We accordingly hold that the acquisition and control of an airport is a city purpose within the purview of general constitutional law.

This very airport, the facilities of which were to be used by so few, according to the short-sighted opponents, brought to St. Louis on scheduled air lines last year the number of approximately 175,000 individuals. The figure does not include departures. We arrive at the basis of some 35 scheduled departing planes each day, multiply the figure by the 365 days of the year, and use 20 passengers per plane. The over-all total is conservative, but canceled flights due to weather, and so forth, have been considered.

Justice Cardozo, in 1928, gave the following view in connection with the desire of Utica, N. Y., to issue airport bonds:

> We think the purpose to be served is both public and municipal. A city acts for city purposes when it builds a dock or a bridge or a street or a subway. Its purpose is not different when it builds an airport. Aviation is today an established method of transportation. The future, even the near future, will make it still more general. The city that is without the foresight to build the ports for the new traffic may soon be left behind in the race of competition. Chalcedon was called the city of the blind because its founders rejected the nobler site of Byzantium lying at their feet. The need for vision of the future in the governance of cities has not lessened with the years. The dweller within the gates, even more than the stranger from afar, will pay the price of blindness.

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Members, let us not be blind to our responsibility for leadership. The country calls for us to display realism in a world where the plane has shrunken distances.

We must remember that for many years a large part of our airport construction has been, first, a part of the work-relief program and, later, a part of the defense program. But we are now approaching a period when civil aviation is to be so important a part of our peacetime national economy, that airport development is a necessity to insure in the near future that aviation can maintain its rightful position as a major form of transportation along with the highway, water, and rail systems of our country.

It seems fair to use as an analogy the growth of the automotive industry after the last war. The Government provided the roads that the automobile needed, while today the airplane needs airports. These highways created traffic and, as a result, thousands of small service and repair stations came into existence, as they will come into existence at future airports. As road construction increased, the use of the automobile increased, and sales mounted rapidly. These sales were followed by an increased number of better jobs in manufacturing plants, service and repair stations. This employment increase created a greater ability to buy. Thus was established a creative circle, with city, county, State, and Federal Governments providing the road facilities and law enforcement. Private industry contributed the manufacturing, service facilities, motortruck and bus transportation that meant an ever increasing demand for motor vehicles.

When we bring this type of legislation here, it is not truth to charge that in building airports we will benefit the air lines alone. We know that in 412 city communities with a population above 25,000 in this country, there are 602 airports. Only one-third of the 6,300 towns with 1,000 to 25,000 population have any airports whatsoever. Yet the gentleman from Missouri says we have too many airports today. We know that the metropolitan districts cover about 1.5 percent of the land area of this country, and they average one airport for 80 square miles, while in the remainder of the United States we have only one airport for approximately 1,230 square miles.

This legislation before us today is not primarily in the interest of the operation of the air carriers of this country. It will be to the benefit of the private flyer, and by "private flyer" I do not mean for pleasure travel; I mean by "private flyer" the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker in the conduct of their business, and these boys who are returning by the hundreds of thousands from the armed services, who will want to fly, and they will not expect to drive 50, 60, or 75 miles in order to pilot an airplane. They want that facility to be in their own community, and they have a right to expect it. These airport facilities will also provide for the feeder lines which are absolutely necessary to fit naturally into the system of the great air transport carriers of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, it is well for us to remember that in the Presidential message of our late Chief Executive in January of this year he made this statement:

> To avail ourselves fully of the benefits of civil aviation, and if we use the automobiles that we can produce, it will be necessary to construct thousands of airports and to overhaul our entire highway system.

When President Roosevelt made that observation and challenge it was not alone for himself but he voiced the feeling of an awakening American people, as I believe this Congress will speak for the air era now on us. Aviation has come of age and we who believe in aviation, and certainly this Congress as individuals and as a collective body believes in aviation, are strongly in favor of the purposes of this bill.

Turning aside for a moment, a very dear friend became 75 years of age. He became interested in taking a flight not so long ago and wanted to fly over his friends below. A little two-place aircraft was secured and he climbed in with the pilot. After he had flown over the com-

munity for approximately 20 minutes, the pilot brought the ship in and he said to his passenger, whom we call "Uncle Dudley" affectionately: "Uncle Dudley, were you frightened?" Uncle Dudley replied, "No, but I never did let my full weight down in it."

Mr. Chairman, the citizens of the United States have literally placed their full weight of approval for this plan of providing the airport facilities that are absolutely necessary if America is to continue, as it has in the past, as a great forward-moving Nation. Whenever we bring peoples closer together, whenever we let communities rub shoulders, as they will through aviation, then we are doing a good job for better business relationships and mutual understanding. When we build an airport in a community we widen the circumference of living for each and every person there and that airport becomes the focus of radiating lines of communication with other cities, States, and countries. Such is the backbone and the basic philosophy of this legislation.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Speaking of the St. Louis proposition, the air lines are now meeting railway competition and a businessman can come to Washington from St. Louis in less than half of the time he would if he used the railroad. If we take a plane to St. Louis, it takes some of us longer to get down to our homes from St. Louis than it takes to go from Washington to St. Louis. That is why we want these airports scattered throughout the rural sections so we can have these facilities.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is quite correct. I recently flew from Chicago to Kansas City in less time than it took to drive from Kansas City to Maryville, a distance of 93 miles. An airport is ready for personal plane use in Maryville, but it can be improved under the help from this bill so that a feeder airline can operate successfully. Hundreds of like instances could be cited as proof that we need now coordinate the planning and construction of airports for the travelers who are ready to use this speedy and safe means of transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, for the first time in many years I can see some hope of our being able to balance the Budget in the near future. For years there has been a little group in this House, led by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who has constantly fought to protect the Treasury and the taxpayers of the United States. But you will recall that every attempt that we made in these years to reduce appropriations was beaten down by a group of spenders led by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. We now welcome him to our ranks. He is going to be a tower of strength to those of us who have been looking with yearning eyes to the balancing of the Budget. So, do not tell me that a leopard cannot change his spots. But there is another aspect to this matter. Where are we going to get the money for these enormous expenditures? I need not tell you that the national debt is now about $270,000,000,000, which is a sum that is astronomical in its proportions and will require 10 to 15 generations to pay off. I am not decrying this particular appropriation, because I realize that we are on the threshold of the air age and must make provisions for it. It may be necessary, but I am wondering whether we could not prolong this program a little longer than is provided for in the bill before us. Six hundred and fifty million dollars is not a sum to be sneezed at, and I need not remind you Members that every State treasury in the Union is better able to finance local improvements than is the Federal Treasury. As a matter of fact, we are now scraping the bottom of the Federal bin. Let me ask you this: How can you expect tax reductions on one hand while constantly increasing appropriations on the other? The two do not mesh. When appropriations go up taxes must of necessity also go up, or deficit spending must be resorted to, and we want to get rid of deficit spending. We have had this unhealthy situation for about 14 years, and it is high time that we place our house in order. To attain that objective, which we strive for, I am going to suggest that we set up a Budget committee of the House, to be composed of members of the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs, as well as members of other committees, and let that committee meet yearly and determine just how much we must and can afford to spend during the current fiscal year. Then let the Congress keep within that budget. We cannot continue along the present line of loose spending when committees act on their own initiative in bringing in bills that call for the expenditure of hundreds of millions, if not of billions. We are going to have a tremendous load in taking care of those who come back from this war wounded and ill and the dependents of our heroic dead, also in servicing the debt, in addition to the ordinary expenditures of the Government. This is the hour to begin a program of real economy through retrenched spending. Henceforth expenditures must be kept within receipts. Any other course can only lead to a bankrupt Treasury.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think probably one of the most important questions in the minds of many Members today is whether or not the Federal Government is authorized by the provisions of this bill to circumvent the jurisdiction of the State government and to make its allocations and its designation of funds direct to the political subdivisions of a State. If any of you have any doubt about that, I direct your attention to page 3, line 7, of the bill wherein "public agency" is defined:

> "Public agency" means the United States Government or any agency thereof; a State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or an agency thereof; a municipality or other political subdivision; or a body politic, public or quasi-public corporation, or tax-supported organization.

Under that definition, according to the testimony of Mr. Charles B. Donaldson, Assistant Administrator for Airports, Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Federal Government might very well find itself doing business with 4,300 different units of Government. I quote Mr. Donaldson:

> As the bill is presently drawn it would require that the Administrator deal directly with the sponsors of each project undertaken under the program. This would require direct dealings with approximately 4,300 units of Government. It is obvious that from an administrative point of view this would be extremely difficult and cumbersome.
>
> We believe that a better solution would be a division of the program into two parts—an urban program and a State program.

In a bill recently passed by the other body such provision is made. Thirty-five percent of the funds go direct to the urban population for class 4 and 5 airports and 65 percent of the funds go to the States for class 1, 2, and 3 airports; but not under the terms of the House bill. The entire amount of not to exceed $100,000,000 which is available in any one year—$650,000,000 for 10 years—might very well be siphoned off entirely by a large municipal airport such as New York, or by our new airport in the city of Chicago, whereby those municipalities could go in and take practically all the funds, and your States and your rural communities would have little left available to them. So when the proper time comes, I propose to offer an amendment to this section which would cause all these funds to be channeled through the State governments, because after all our whole program over a period of years has been predicated upon this Federal-State cooperation.

As pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, over a period of 30 years the Federal Government and the States have developed cooperative programs in a number of different fields: in agriculture, highways, public health, vocational education, and social security. In the main, these programs have followed the same pattern—a Federal-State pattern. Such programs have, on the whole, been effectively and economically administered; and when the Congress in 1944 generally revised the National Highway Act, it reestablished and reaffirmed the same pattern—this, after 28 years of experience in this public-works program.

At the present time some 44 States have created the necessary agencies to handle aviation matters and are ready to act. On page 332 of the hearings you will find an outline of the 42 States which already have those agencies created. Certainly, this represents a far greater realization of the obligation and responsibility in the development of a sound aviation program. So when the statement was made a minute ago that less than half the States had appropriate agencies to deal with the Federal Government, it is contrary to the publication made in the hearings themselves

and contrary to the latest tabulation of States that have resolutions pending at the present moment to establish appropriate agencies to do business with the Federal Government in the development of a Federal-State aviation program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there was an accord in the committee with respect to the purposes of this bill. All the members of the committee hold the view that a national airport program should be set up. If this program is to accomplish its purpose, it must be an extensive program for the purpose of carrying air facilities to all the communities in the United States. It is my purpose to support this bill. There was some disagreement, however, with reference to the procedure. Some of us felt that before we set up a national airport program calling for the expenditure of very large sums of money, the Civil Aeronautics Act, under which the national airport program is to be administered, should be modified, brought up to date, and put in a condition which the Members feel it should be in order to accomplish an effective administration of the program. If the law is not brought up to date in advance of the establishment of the airport program, then it should be done concurrently with the establishment of the program. That is a view which some of us have held and do now hold, but under the parliamentary procedure, amendments to the general provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 which do not relate to the airport program would not be germane and, therefore, such amendments cannot be offered. There are two important considerations in connection with the modification of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. One is the question of whether we should go back to the independent Civil Aeronautics Commission which existed before it was made a part of the Department of Commerce under one of the reorganization proposals. The other is determining the question of whether surface transportation should have a right to make application for air transportation certificates of convenience and necessity under such regulations as the law itself might set up by which the Commission could be guided in determining those applications. As many Members of the House and all the members of the committee of which I am a member understand, I am one who feels that the widest opportunity should be given for the development of civil aviation and that no organization or individual should be barred from the opportunity of making application and having that application considered on its merits by the Civil Aeronautics Board under the authority granted to the Board by the act itself. Otherwise, we are apt to get a transportation system which will be out of bounds and thus greatly jeopardize one of the important branches of our transportation system, which I am sure none of us want to do.

I think that in establishing an extensive CAA program in advance of determining these important questions which have to do with the basic law under which such a program is to be administered, there is danger of jeopardizing our unified transportation system. There is a possibility, as the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] has stated on this floor many, many times, that we might drive the American merchant marine off the seas. Our merchant marine might be unable to operate successfully in competition with foreign lines which engage in air transportation in connection with their shipping operations unless it is permitted to likewise do so. None of us wants to do that. I, for one, am greatly disappointed that we at this time are not given an opportunity to determine those fundamental questions in relation to this problem at the same time we are considering setting up a national airport program. However, I have been assured by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], that he will hold hearings at a very early date on a bill dealing with those problems. Since that is the case, I am reconciling myself to going along with the enactment of this bill in setting up an airport development program at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, permit me to call attention to the fact in the consideration of this bill by the committee that most extensive and exhaustive hearings were had. The record shows some 500 pages of testimony. I do not know of any interest for or against this bill that was not heard to the fullest possible extent.

I want to say further in support of this bill that I have never seen a bill brought to the floor of this House so completely and fully rewritten as was this bill by the committee following the hearings. I recall that we had the hearings and then took the printed suggestions made by the various witnesses and went over them and rewrote the bill as it was originally introduced by the chairman of our committee the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

In passing, let me say that I believe this airport bill starts out on a sound basis of setting up and creating an over-all aviation picture for the development of the air. It is a sound approach that has been made upon a program which is dealing not particularly with the consideration of the larger air carriers, but the over-all picture of the various private, semiprivate, and public uses that our airports of the Nation may be used.

Permit me to say this with reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to the effect that many of the Army and Navy airports will be turned back to the communities and therefore there is no need for additional airports to be built. I do not know what power the gentleman exercises as to having military and naval airports in his own district, but I can say that in the State of Minnesota not only in my own district but the State as a whole we had two airports which were used by the military. One of them was the largest commercial airport in our State, which was used jointly by the Army and the Navy. The other was a small naval air-training base which happened to be in my district and was for light training planes only. That is the trouble with the entire picture in this country. The Army and Navy set up these air training bases on which millions, yes, billions of dollars were expended usually in the southern part of the country because they felt it gave them more flying and training time. We did not have that consideration in the North, and let me say that I do not know of any State that needs an over-all development of airports more than Minnesota. There is so much need of further air development that I think this program will be of tremendous benefit to all.

I believe I can say frankly that one difficulty in the committee turned on the question of whether the funds were to be channeled through the State or through the individual sponsors. When it came out of committee we were in practical agreement upon it. Since that time the State group have put on quite a drive to impress the need of having the funds channeled through the State government. Let me say that my own aeronautical commissioner and at least the attorney general of my State support that view.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Let me point out that there is disagreement between municipalities and State officials on this question. If we do not have an over-all program developed by the national administration are you going to divide it up and have 48 different viewpoints as to what the over-all picture should be and will run into conditions that are rather inconsistent?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, from the beginning of civilization progress has moved forward on transportation. From the creation of the wheel to the development of the jet motor man's advancement has been measured by the form of transportation used. So, today we come to the problem of whether or not our Nation is going to contribute to the development of a new and expanding form of transportation and stay abreast of the world. It is my opinion from a study of this question that it is our duty and our responsibility to see that this country stays in the foremost ranks in the development of the highest form of transportation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Or would it interrupt him to yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The statement the gentleman is making is important. I recall that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], spoke about the Civil Aeronautics Administration bringing to Congress this tremendous program. The gentleman from Arizona is a member of the committee which brought out a resolution that the House passed, calling upon the CAA to bring an airport plan to the House and that is the reason for this bill.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. That is true. We have contributed to the various forms of transportation down through the years that this Nation has progressed. The last appropriation to rivers and harbors was $1,000,000,000; for highways, to be expended over a period of 3 years, $1,500,000,000, or $500,000 per year, and I understand that for flood control $800,000,000. We are providing in this bill for a development program equal to $650,000,000 to be expended over 10 years.

This means more than the creation of airports for people to land on. It is the creation of a new industry; it is the creation of jobs in the factories which will manufacture airplanes; it is the creation of jobs for men who will facilitate the movement of traffic, both passenger and freight. It is a contribution toward the enlightenment and improvement of this great country of ours. It will keep us abreast of the rest of the world in aviation. When another war strikes we will be a leader in transportation.

It should not be necessary to go on explaining that the expending of this money will create wealth. The improvement of transportation always creates new wealth. I am amazed at the penny-wise and pound-foolish attitude of some people who would defeat this legislation. We know that if we had taken that attitude in 1911, 1916, and 1921 and since that time, we would be a backward nation. I dismiss that attitude as not a sound, fundamental, and progressive one.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested particularly in one feature of the bill and that is the retention of the provision which will channel the funds through either the State or municipality. I am interested not only because my State does not yet have a State agency, and it will be 1947 before my State legislature meets and could take advantage of a bill which would limit funds to a State agency. There are many States that do not have State agencies. Many States do not have the funds to match the Federal funds provided for in this bill.

If the gentleman from Illinois were afraid of the actions of Chicago when dealing with a board so remote from Illinois as the CAA I should say he should be more concerned if Chicago had to deal with a State agency which by all means could be influenced by the political power of this great city.

I call the attention of my distinguished friend from Illinois to the fact that after careful and thorough consideration the committee determined that at this time it would be better to leave the avenue open for both the State and the municipality to apply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a deep appreciation for the work the committee has done during these many months in connection with bringing a bill to the House dealing with expansion of airports in the United States. Those of us who have had considerable to do with appropriations for the Department of Commerce, in which the CAA is located, know something about your troubles. Only recently I visited nine States on a tour of inspection in connection with aviation and I corroborate what the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] had to say about the tremendous interest in the possibilities of expansion in aviation.

I visited one airport where over 400 men from the Army Air Corps were undergoing tests in order to secure pilot licenses. I talked to many of those men and every one of them wanted to go into some phase of aviation, either in flying, charter work, or the mechanical end.

I predict that by the end of this year the CAA will have issued at least 400,000 civilian pilot licenses. I believe that this airport bill is of national necessity. However, I am one of those who does not agree entirely with your committee, especially in the matter of channeling these funds through the various subdivisions of the States.

My State of Nebraska has been a leader in aviation and the construction of airports. We have an aeronautical commission in my State, most of the members of which are trained aviators. They have had much experience. We have cooperated with the CAA. We raise money by the taxation of aviation gasoline. That money is used for the purpose of assisting various towns with their airport problems. That money is used for the purpose of developing some landing areas, furnishing blueprints, specifications and plans. The Nebraska State aviation program has been in operation and doing well for a long time. If you are going to channel all these funds through every town or county in my State, my aviation commission might just as well fold up. You may have a hodgepodge administration of these funds. I hope, however, that when this bill goes to conference there will be some compromise. This is the real controversial part of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman's interest in aviation matters is well known and deeply appreciated in this House. I hope the gentleman realizes that under the terms of the pending measure, where a State has an authority which is contributing funds, that that State will, of course, join in the sponsorship of this program, and consequently the funds would be channeled through the State.

Mr. STEFAN. Not unless legislation is passed by the States as shown on page 3 of the report.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman does not suppose that the people in his State are going to come direct to the Federal Government for funds when they can get part of them from the State, does he?

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Indiana propounded a question of the gentleman from California in reference to the airports to be declared surplus. I am reliably informed that those are going to be turned over to the RFC for sale in cooperation with the CAA. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana that those airports should be considered in this bill, and when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule, I hope the gentleman from Indiana has an amendment prepared in order to clarify that situation.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to see this Federal aid for airports bill brought up as early as it was. I have a deep interest in this bill because for the past 2 months, I have been in daily contact with the CAA and the CAB pertaining to a bill which I had prepared which would provide funds for the erection of a class IV airport at Superior, Wis., dedicated to the memory of Maj. Richard I. Bong, the world's ace of aces, who so bravely and gallantly gave his life for our country.

I have contacted every Member of Congress of the Wisconsin delegation and they all enthusiastically supported such a bill. I have also contacted more than 200 Members of Congress personally, asking their support of the bill. More than 120 Members of Congress told me that they would support such a bill.

However, it was after getting the consent of 120 Members that I ran into trouble because the vast majority of the Members of Congress felt that the Federal aid for airports bill, which is under consideration, would provide ample funds to the city of Superior for the construction of a class IV airport. The members of the CAA and the CAB also felt that this Federal aid bill under consideration would provide ample funds for the construction of such an airport. The majority of the Members of Congress felt that the entire cost of such an airport should not be borne by the Federal Government because the State and the local community should also have a share in the construction of such a memorial.

Therefore, I am very happy that this Federal airport aid bill is up for passage today. From my observations, it is going to pass this House overwhelmingly. I am especially happy because the thing that is uppermost in the hearts and minds of all the people of northern Wisconsin is that an airport be built at Superior, Wis., as a memorial to Maj. Richard I. Bong. I see in this bill, if the State and the city of Superior cooperate, where they can get $800,000 from the Federal Government as their half of the $1,600,000 needed for the construction of a class IV airport in the city of Superior. I am in hopes that the State government will share at least 30 percent so that the cost to the city of

Superior will not be more than 20 percent. I am in hopes that the State of Wisconsin will go even higher than 30 percent, making the cost to the city of Superior as little as possible.

Besides the appropriation of $800,000 from the Federal Government for this airport, I am positive that the CAA will, when the case is presented to them, assume the responsibility of maintaining this airport. As a lasting memorial to Major Bong and because such an airport would have great utility in the national aviation progress, I am sure that the CAA will assume that responsibility.

I have contacted the Federal Works Agency in Chicago to speed approval of the money applied for by the city of Superior for planning purposes. I expect a favorable reply within a few days.

I want to thank the Members of this House for speeding the passage of this bill. The citizens of Superior and all northern Wisconsin are deeply eager to start the construction of this memorial to Maj. Richard I. Bong. I know that if the city of Superior acts under this legislation with the cooperation of the State that their application will receive immediate consideration because of its nature and because of the great need for a class IV airport in the city of Superior. I have been thus assured.

For the reasons mentioned above, I am withholding my bill which I had prepared, awaiting to see what progress is being made under this bill. If for some reason things work out so that immediate construction cannot be started on this memorial airport, I shall beg and prevail upon the Members of Congress that the Federal Government owes a debt to Maj. Richard I. Bong and introduce the bill and hope that it will be passed.

I want to remind the Members of this House that Maj. Richard I. Bong is not only a national but a world hero. When the going was tough, his fighting in the Pacific resulted in downing 40 Japanese planes. Major Bong was called to the States when he had 28 Jap planes to his credit. He was given the choice of staying in the States at that time. But this was not Major Bong's spirit. He volunteered instead for additional duty in the Pacific and within a short time he downed 12 more Jap planes. This made him the world's ace of aces. At that time he was called to the States again and was told that because of his medals which he had, he was eligible for a discharge from the armed forces. This boy had every golden opportunity to be discharged from the armed forces. Several aviation companies tried to get a discharge for him over Major Bong's wishes but Major Bong volunteered to stay in the armed forces until the bitter end.

Before that fatal day that Major Bong was killed, he was advised by his superiors that he did not have to fly that plane because he had every requisite for a discharge so that he could enter civilian life. But Major Bong's response alwas "This fight is not finished for me until it is finished for everybody. If these planes are not safe enough for me, they are not safe enough for any GI."

This was the spirit behind Major Bong. He sought no favor ever and he would not accept any favors ever. His record has no equal and most unfortunately, he has been taken from our midst.

It was in the city of Superior that Major Bong first became interested in aviation at the Superior State Teachers College. It was in the city of Superior that his wife graduated last January. For these reasons, I feel that a memorial is due Major Bong. Since his field was aviation and since he was a credit to the field of aviation, I feel that a memorial should be in the category of aviation. What more splendid and convincing reason need there be for the construction of an airport as a memorial at the city of Superior?

I think we have made some progress by passing this bill. I am waiting to see what the results will be with the State and city of Superior cooperating before I take further action. If, as a result of this bill, little or no progress is made, I then feel that this Congress ought to take action by way of passing a separate bill for such a memorial.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this bill—H. R. 3615—because it provides a uniform program Nation-wide for the development of aviation and the construction of airports with financial aid from the Federal Government.

I believe we should encourage greater use of air transportation for the commercial and industrial development of the Nation.

The bill authorizes the Administrator to pay not to exceed 50 percent of the allowable costs of an approved project except with respect to projects in Alaska, in which cases the Federal share may be as high as 75 percent. Project costs which may be shared by the Government include all necessary costs incurred in constructing, improving, or repairing a public airport, including the construction, alteration, and repair of airport administrative buildings and the removal, lowering, relocation, marking, and lighting of airport hazards, but do not include the cost of constructing, altering, or repairing hangars or the cost of acquiring any interest in land or air space.

Any public agency, or two or more such agencies acting jointly, may submit a project application to the Administrator. Each project is subject to approval by the Administrator, which can be given only if, first, Federal and non-Federal funds are available for the development proposed; second, the project is within the scope of the national airport plan; third, the public agency submitting the application has legal authority to engage in the development as proposed; fourth, the plans and specifications are satisfactory to the Administrator; and, fifth, the project sponsor has met the sponsorship requirements prescribed for him.

The Administrator may require project sponsors to enter into agreements insuring, among other things, the continued availability of the airport for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination, proper maintenance of the airport, protection and clearing of its aerial approaches, use of the airport by Government aircraft on certain terms, and the availability of adequate airport building space to civil agencies of the Government, without charge, for use in connection with their air-traffic control, weather reporting, and communications activities.

Once a project is approved, the Administrator will enter into a grant agreement with the public agency or agencies which submitted the application, which will then proceed to procure the accomplishment of the work, usually by contract. Payments will be made by the Government only as work proceeds and all project costs are subject to review by the Administrator to determine that they are allowable.

The Government shall be obligated to pay only the Federal share of allowable project costs, several requirements for which are prescribed. All work is subject to inspection and approval by the Administrator, although the primary responsibility for engineering supervision of construction is on the public agency or agencies to which the Federal grants are made.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I think we should not overlook the fact that in dealing with this legislation we are dealing with a national airport system. There has been a lot said about the States and the different localities and the "pork barreling" and what have you; but the main purpose of this legislation is to develop a national airport system for the benefit of the people, the public of the United States, in order that we may continue to prevail as a world leader.

I do not believe there is anyone in this House who has any greater claim to the interest of the public, any greater claim to the interest of economizing and the interest of our taxpayers, than I or other members of this committee. I cannot agree with some of the thoughts expressed by some Members of the House that this is purely a piece of "pork barrel" legislation.

I recall that not so long ago, last year, 1944, this House debated and passed the war mobilization and reconversion bill. We knew the purposes and policies of that legislation. I do not recall hearing certain gentlemen get up on the floor of the House and say that this matter would cost the taxpayers a lot of money and therefore it should be defeated. When we passed the flood-control authorization bill of more than $800,000,000 last year I did not hear certain gentlemen in this House get up and protest that it would cost some money to the taxpayers; nor, Mr. Chairman, did I hear a voice raised when the rivers and harbors bill was passed in this House authorizing a billion dollars for what? For the interest of the people and the public and our development throughout this whole country of ours. Neither did I hear certain gentlemen in this House get up and criticize it as a "pork barrel" proposition when this Congress authorized the postwar highway program of $1,500,000,000. Why, Mr. Chairman, when we have an airport program, a national airport-development plan, do certain people come

forward and say it is not needed because it a "pork barrel" proposition?

Transportation has played an important part of our winning this war. We have the finest and most efficient system in all history, and it is because we have made it so. Everyone knows what an even greater handicap we would have had if we had not already provided an airport program. The future is going to demand the development of aviation and it will take airports. We must provide for an adequate national defense.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman correctly calls attention to the highway program. I believe it is important that the membership of the House remember that the highway legislation is only a 3-year proposition. The highway bill provides for a 10-year development. It is a modest approach.

We provided $1,500,000,000 of Federal funds to be matched in a $3,000,000,000 highway program for 3 years. I did not hear the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] raise their voices against that legislation last December. In fact, the matter was so unanimously accepted that there was no roll call taken.

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly the gentleman is correct. Carrying out the mandate of this Congress, the Civil Aeronautics Administration made a national survey and reported to this Congress last year. Extensive hearings were held in which every phase of the national airport plan was thoroughly gone into. From that investigation and from the knowledge that we had as to the need of a national airport program, we have brought this bill here. I want to again remind you it is not a sectional nor a State nor a local airport program, but it is a national airport program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, some years ago an old friend of mine told me a little incident of his boyhood days in Iowa. A railroad was building westward across the State. I believe it was the North Western Railroad. The people in the community where he lived were a little disturbed about this evidence of progress, and they were afraid of what was going to happen to their fields. They proposed to stage what we would now call a sit-down strike and go out there and sit on the right-of-way and prevent the railroad from being built. This old gentleman, a veteran of the Civil War when I knew him, said he went out and gave a little talk to the people on this theme: "You can't stop the cars." From that he developed a lecture which brought him some fame. The lecture was entitled "You Can't Stop the Cars."

Within the last 24 hours I have been in four of the larger municipal airports of the country, and, judging from the jam of people in every one of those airports seeking transportation by air, I want to say that today, "You can't stop the planes."

They are coming. They are here.

In every community there are boys who are coming back from the Army and the Navy wearing wings which they have won by hard work. Those boys are going to fly planes and their friends and relatives are going to be riding those planes.

The fact is that this airport program is modest as compared with the highway program. I want to call your attention to one point. The $1,500,000,000 authorized for a 3-year highway-construction program carries with it contractual authority. The Appropriations Committee will have no right to reduce whatever obligations are legally incurred by the States or by the Federal Government under the highway program. There is a program on which the Committee on Appropriations will be helpless. The $1,500,000,000 can be expended. The contractual authority is carried in the act. Here, however, only a parliamentary authorization for appropriations is established.

The Appropriations Committee will have the authority to reduce the amount in any one year. They have it in their hands to control the situation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Appropriations of this House. He has done very distinguished service during the past several years in connection with the War Department appropriations. I think the gentleman could well tell the House that the advance of aviation which this bill is intended to produce will be of material aid in the preparation of our young men in the event we should again have to defend our shores.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, that is true; and it is a point worthy of consideration. If one were to take the time, he could make a very definite national-defense case for such a program as is here visioned.

It may be that some will feel that an authorization of $650,000,000 for 10 years might be reduced; it might be $500,000,000, or something like that. But actually the appropriations will be passed upon each year. The House each year can determine whether it shall be $5,000,000 or $50,000,000, or $65,000,000, but not in excess of $100,000,000 in any one year, nor in excess of $650,000,000 in the aggregate for 10 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I wonder if the gentleman could explain something to me that I cannot seem to make much sense of in this bill. That has to do with the channeling of funds. According to the report, it states that—

> Regarding the operation of the program in the States, if a State has legislation requiring that all Federal grants for airport development for that State be channeled through its aeronautics commission or other State agency, that law will control.

That is in the report at the bottom of page 3.

Then, under title I, section (g), on page 3 of the bill it states:

> "Public agency" means the United States Government or an agency thereof; a State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or an agency thereof; a municipality or other political subdivision; or a body politic, public or quasi-public corporation, or tax-supported organization.

What I am trying to get clear is this: Are these funds to be channeled through the State alone, or are these other public agencies mentioned in the bill, channels through which these funds can be channeled also?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not being a member of the committee in charge of the bill, I would hesitate to give an answer on that, because it would not be authoritative. I would prefer to have the chairman, the gentleman from California, or some member of the committee answer the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, of course, in the proposition before us we have for primary and first determination the question as to the responsibility, if any, on the part of the Federal Government to participate in the accomplishment of an airport program for the Nation. There are some who contend that it is no part of the responsibility of the Federal Government; that the building and development of airports should be left to the States and their subdivisions. There are others who very earnestly contend that it is a matter for Federal attention, intervention, and participation, and that only in that way can the desirable result which is sought by all be adequately and fairly achieved.

I hold to that latter view. It is my view that it is not only the right of the Federal Government but the responsibility of the Federal Government to participate in the development of a national airport program. There is ample precedent in our history for such participation. The entire history of the country reveals the fact that by the participation of the Federal Government in the development of the different systems of transportation have we achieved that efficiency and completion that enabled this great country of ours to become the greatest Nation on earth and, more recently, meet the crisis of war.

But for the splendid accomplishment of the great transportation system who is there among us who would contend that we would have been able to bring our enemies to the defeat which they have suffered? We need efficient transportation in all fields, we need the development of transportation to the end that the economies of each type of transportation be brought to the benefit of the country and all of our people.

In working on this bill we have given careful consideration to all of the different viewpoints. To my mind one of the

important features of the bill is the formula by which the money is to be distributed over the country, 75 percent of the Federal money to go according to a formula giving 50 percent attention to area and 50 percent attention to population. Because a formula cannot be inflexible for the purposes of a real national program we provide in the bill for a discretionary apportionment of 25 percent of the money. I believe that will make for a proper distribution and will avoid the concentration of the expenditure of funds in certain preferred areas against other areas which for some reason or other in the past have not been able to obtain their fair share of moneys to be spent in such development.

We have provided in this bill for the payment of land acquisition costs by the sponsors, that is, the States or municipalities. There is some objection to that provision, but as far as I am concerned I still believe it is a good provision. It is something of an added brake upon reckless or excessive or unnecessary expenditure of money.

Question has been raised about the channeling of funds through the State organizations. At the time the subcommittee and the full committee were working on this bill there had not been much said about that. Since the bill was reported, however, there has been great controversy, and I am frank to say that the representations and statements that have been made to me by persons who have given careful thought to this matter, including people in my own State, have led me to the conviction that I should support the amendment which is to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL]. I might suggest parenthetically that in my State the governor and the newly appointed State aeronautics commission, and the mayors of the cities and their organizations conferred about this proposition and the governor informed me in a telegram that there was agreement on the part of the mayors of many of the municipalities that a better result would be achieved in my State if the funds were channeled through the State commission.

There is another proposition about which I wish to speak. I urged it as vigorously as I could in the committee, but without success. It has been said that this bill was reported unanimously. I do not know that that is quite correct, for I believe perhaps I voted "no" on reporting the bill because I thought before we undertook this great program—and it is a great program—we ought to re-create the Civil Aeronautics Administration as an independent agency of Government, that we ought to know where the responsibility would lie for the accomplishment of the program. As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] pointed out in connection with another matter in which he is interested, I seriously doubt whether an amendment at this time would be germane, but I shall have to determine that later, as will he. I have had assurances that this is a matter that will be taken up by the committee. I know how the majority of the members of the committee feel about it. They feel now as they did when they opposed the reorganization order and when they reported the omnibus air transport bill a short time ago, that the Civil Aeronautics Administration should be an independent agency of the Government. And again may I state that the then Senator Truman felt the same way about it when he opposed the reorganization proposal in the Senate.

Let me just point out to you how ridiculous this situation is. We are told that reorganizations are had to avoid duplication of effort and division of responsibility. I am for reorganization on that basis, but when the Civil Aeronautics Administration was put under the control of the Department of Commerce we did not achieve unified responsibility, and did not avoid duplication. We did not cut down on personnel. What we did was to bring about a situation under which you cannot tell who will be responsible for this program.

Now, read the bill. It says that the Administrator shall lay out this program according to certain requirements that are written in the act. Will the Administrator have that responsibility? Why, no. The language of the bill is a misnomer. Anyone who might read the bill and think that the Administrator would have the decision to make is completely in error because under the reorganization bill there is superimposed upon the judgment of the Administrator the judgment of the Department of Commerce acting through the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Burden, who is Under Secretary of Commerce for Air—a worthy, able, estimable gentleman; I have no quarrel with him; I quarrel only with this ridiculous arrangement—appeared before the committee and I wanted to find out what the score was. So I said:

> Now, what I want to know is if this bill becomes law, is the Administrator free to exercise his own judgment or is there superimposed upon his judgment the determination and decision of the Secretary of Commerce?
>
> Mr. BURDEN. He is under the supervision of the Secretary of Commerce in the same way as any other bureau of the Department of Commerce is.
>
> Mr. HALLECK. That simply means then that any final determination that is to be made is made by the Secretary of Commerce.
>
> Mr. BURDEN. The determination is made by the Administrator but the Administrator, of course, would come under the Secretary under the reorganization plan.
>
> Mr. HALLECK. In the event of a dispute under the conditions that now exist, in the event of a dispute or difference of opinion between the Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce, whose opinion would prevail?
>
> Mr. BURDEN. The opinion of the Secretary, of course, would prevail. He is the senior officer.
>
> Mr. HALLECK. And has not that Executive order resulted in the situation under which the CAA as an independent agency of the Government has disappeared?
>
> Mr. BURDEN. It certainly is not an independent agency of the Government now, under the present system.

We just passed a reorganization bill in the course of the consideration of which I argued as vigorously as I could for exemption of independent agencies that I did not think ought to be subjected to political control and domination of Cabinet positions and political departments. We were not successful in our effort. But here we are with reorganization sold to the country on the basis of unified responsibility and avoidance of duplication and we see in this very instance before us that that is not what has been accomplished.

We are setting out to put into effect a program to spend $650,000,000, and I am supporting it. I think it is necessary for the development of the country. Apparently we place a great responsibility on the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, yet when we get down to the truth of the matter we find out that when we undertake to determine just who should lay out the program the ball will be kicked back and forth between the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator. I do not think that is good government and I think it ought to be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] as he may desire.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H. R. 3615, has been fully discussed already; I shall not trespass on the time of the membership by endeavoring to review the provisions of the bill.

I do know that this legislation has been considered in a very thorough, painstaking and conscientious manner over a long period of time; the bill has not been hastily drawn. Objective No. 1 has been and is "to provide Federal cooperative aid for a national system of airports."

No division of our military service has been less criticized throughout the war and since than the Air Corps; likewise no sector of industry has been criticized less than our civil aviation industry; its efforts have been universally successful and efficiently carried out.

It is impossible, I feel, to accurately evaluate the importance of civil aviation to military aviation. Suffice it to say, had it not been for the relatively advanced position of civil aviation in this country at the beginning of World War II, our military effort would have been significantly slowed, perchance to a much closer approach to disaster. In short, what civil aviation did before the war determined in a great measure what aviation was able to do during the war. To the extent to which we fail to go forward in civil aviation from a domestic and foreign standpoint, to that extent we retard our ability to go forward in aviation for security purposes.

It may be urged by him who does not look into the future that we are authorizing to be spent for airports a sum of money entirely too large. Our bill is a most reasonable one in this respect. This is no pump-priming proposition although it will mean work for many people; this authorization is a worth-while investment in potential industrial expansion and national security just as practically all the money we have spent for good roads and other transportation facilities has been an investment in industrial expansion and national security.

At present we as a nation are out in front in aviation in its many aspects; by

being out in front when the war began we were able to win in record time the hardest and most difficult war the world has ever known; we cannot afford to fail to be out in front in aviation even for a day. I honestly believe that country which gets behind in aviation in the future stands a chance very quickly thereafter to be behind as a world power; this bill, H. R. 3615, is a good bill; it is needed now. What we do today to keep our own civil aviation out in front will determine what our aviation is tomorrow. The bill is constructive, in my opinion. I am glad to support it and trust that all the Members of the House will do likewise.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this bill has received a very full discussion of all its provisions this afternoon. It has been exceedingly well explained from the opening statement of the gentleman from California, Chairman LEA, down through other discussions by various members of the committee. I want to emphasize what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] just said, that the bill did receive the most careful attention of a subcommittee that studied every phase of it. Every argument that has been presented or will be presented in favor of or against the channeling of funds or any other provision of the bill already has been very seriously considered in committee. I believe that all of us here are anxious to preserve the rights of States, and I want to emphasize at this point that when the subcommittee finally reached the point of determining what should be the procedure for channeling funds, it was an agreement among all members of the subcommittee that we had arrived at the best possible State-rights solution, and at the same time the best possible formula in the interest of a national airport program.

I know that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] is very much interested in the amendment that he will offer on the question of channeling funds, providing that a portion of the 75 percent of the total shall be channeled through a State agency. But I just want to emphasize once more that under the terms of the bill as it has been presented by the committee, if a State requires such procedure, then there is nothing in the bill to prohibit such procedure, and it would be channeled through State agencies. The gentleman from Illinois, my good friend and colleague, mentioned that at least 44 States had set up some sort of commission or board to handle aviation problems, but the gentleman did not state how many of these 44 States had been authorized to appropriate money for the purpose of matching Federal funds for the construction of airports.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HALLECK. I was really seeking information, because I was disturbed at the suggestion made in some quarters that, if the money was to be channeled through the States, that the States themselves would have to put up all the money. However, it has been reported to me that the effect of such an amendment would still leave to the States the right to insist upon the municipalities putting up the money, the amendment referring only to the channeling of the funds.

Mr. PRIEST. I think that would be true under the amendment. I think, however, as the bill is now drafted, and even if the amendment should be adopted, there would still be required among many of the States legislative action to deal with the question of the handling of matching funds. Even though the States may have an aeronautical commission or a board for the purpose of handling aviation, I think enabling legislation still would be necessary by the State legislature in order to provide for matching funds and for cooperation with municipalities in an airport-construction program.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In the great State of California, which is exceedingly aviation-minded, such a commission was refused by the State legislature at the last session. We do not have an aviation commission.

Mr. PRIEST. You do not have an aviation commission in the State of California. Do you have any agency in the great State of California that could properly represent the municipalities or other subdivisions of that State in matching funds of the Federal Government for airport construction?

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe that in the proceedings that have been had so far the suggestion was made that such funds shall go through the department of public works, which department is engaged in a wholly different occupation.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say, in conclusion, that this matter has been very carefully studied; that every argument relating to this question of channeling funds came before the subcommittee, and before the House takes any action to change that procedure and that formula let us be very certain that we are not taking action which will delay considerably, and create a great deal of confusion in, the national airport program.

Under the provisions of this bill, no State is told by the Federal Government that it must handle the Federal-aid funds for airports. On the other hand, no State is denied the right to maintain jurisdiction over such funds.

I hope the amendment to be offered later by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] will be defeated.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said here this evening about the channeling of the funds. Mr. William P. McCracken whom many of you know, appeared before the committee and filed with the committee in connection with his remarks statements from the different States in the Union. Thirty-three States have no legislation necessary to enable them to match or to handle the Federal funds. Ten States do. This is what I said a little while ago when the gentleman from Illinois said it was not in the record.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOWELL. Since that time a number of legislatures all over the Union have passed such legislation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; the gentleman cannot make that appear to be the case because that statement ran up to May 7 of this year, and at that same place in the record it is stated what legislatures had adjourned before then. That is one reason we had the trouble, that we realized in the committee that if this thing was to go into effect it would be 2 years before some of the States could possibly set up any agency, and what were you to do about it? Would you say just to wait until the State did do it, with 33 States not having it?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Do the State laws of those 33 States authorize or permit the municipalities which are creatures of the State, to apply for and accept direct contributions from the Federal Government?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I doubt if it is mentioned in any State law in the United States, but I will tell the gentleman that during the WPA days and the other days we took up this program of airport construction direct with the municipalities from the Federal Government, and that was done.

I call this to your attention, not because it makes a great deal of difference, except that if you want a real airport program for the United States you must be willing, because if you would leave out one State it is not a complete program. Leave it to the States. That is what we did. If they pass the necessary legislation to take charge of this, then that is for them to do. I call to your attention the State of Wisconsin, which went further and under its legislative enactment provided that its municipalities could deal with the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, we spent a great deal of time on this bill and I think it is a good bill. In all frankness, I would say that it is a much better bill than the bill which came from another body. I say that with all modesty. But be that as it may, when the bill is read for amendment under the 5-minute rule, if there is anything that anyone does not understand about it, I know the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] or any other member of the committee will be glad to explain it fully.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I—FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. The title may be cited as the "Federal Aid Airport Act."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. BULWINKLE. If the gentleman will withdraw the point of order, I will move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has already been recognized.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this bill and have been one of the protagonists in defense of civil aviation. I want to see airports built and airport facilities provided in this country. But there are one or two questions which I would like to have resolved before being compelled to vote for this bill. This bill follows the general pattern of Federal aids. It is expected that upon the passage of this bill the Federal Government will provide up to 50 percent of the construction costs and some other costs of the building of an approved airport project. It provides that the municipalities may set up the projects as well as the States themselves, if they see fit to do it. It is hoped that under this bill great stimulation can be given to the construction of airport facilities.

I am realistic about this thing, Mr. Chairman, because I have had some experience in the last 2 years in my own district and I know how municipalities operate. I am not quite as optimistic as some of you gentlemen are in the rather grandiose statements that have been made as to what may be expected under this program. Under this program, if my town or another city in my district wants to initiate an airport program and construct an airport, they would first have to acquire the land and pay for it themselves under the terms of this bill. They will have to build a hangar and pay for it themselves under the terms of this bill. Do not get the idea that this is a 50–50 proposition, where the Federal Government is going to go in 50–50 with the municipality. When the municipality finds that it is going to cost $150,000 to acquire the site and that it is going to cost them more money to build the hangar and that they have to pay that out of their own pocket whereas the Federal Government only comes in and pays 50 percent of the construction cost to put in the lighting and landing areas and runways and some incidentals in connection with the construction of the administration building, you are going to find as a realistic proposition the people in the towns and cities would like to have an airport, will raise the question that the local community cannot afford to make this large expenditure of money, and they have been somewhat misled in the idea that the Federal Government is going to go 50–50 with them on this program. So what are they going to do? They are going to turn to the pattern that has been in vogue with them for years under the highway-construction program where they say, "Why, we are building this airport not alone for the city of Sheboygan or Manitowoc or the city of Racine or some other city, but we are building it as a part of a national program and the whole State is interested in it just as much as it is interested in the highways that go through the State. We are going to ask the State to come into this proposition and bring in State funds to assist the local municipalities in order to see that this project comes to a complete fruition."

Then, what happens? Then when they come to the State legislature and ask for an appropriation of funds by which the matching funds of the State will be provided by the State and the local community that sponsors the airport, you are going to find that the State legislature is going to insist upon some control over the expenditure of these funds under an integrated State-wide program. I know that the State of Wisconsin has been in the forefront in this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. The situation is this: For example, to show our interest in this program, we have a constitutional provision which prevents the State from making expenditures of State funds for improvements of this character.

Some years ago we amended that so as to permit the State to come into the highway program. We further amended the constitution by popular vote, so as to permit the State to expend moneys in forestry development. Last April we amended our State constitution to permit the State to make expenditures of money in connection with the aeronautical development program. The legislature passed a law setting up a State aeronautical commission that will integrate the program in the State in connection with the Federal program so that we may have a well-organized program. The legislature did not appropriate any money. Why? Because it did not know the character of the law that would be passed by this Congress.

I am rasing this for your consideration because I am fearful that you may have in other States of this Nation the same situation confronting you that confronts us in Wisconsin. Municipalities are going to demand that the State share with State funds in the development of this aeronautical program. They want the State to assume its share of responsibility and to pay its proportionate share of the cost of building these airports which are of State-wide concern, national concern, if you please, as well as merely local. Unless you can make provision whereby the fund will be channeled through the administration of the State agency, under those circumstances, you will find that the State legislatures will not respond.

Under the terms of this act, as explained by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], the State legislature has it within its power to say whether or not, in the event there is State contribution to this fund, they will make that expenditure without State control of the fund, or whether they will permit it to be channeled through the local municipality. Am I correct in that?

Mr. LEA. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. And if a State sees fit to make an appropriation to assist local communities who sponsor an airport program, and if they see fit to make the expenditure, they may in the same legislative enactment, determine how much control the State will determine to exercise. That is right, is it not?

Mr. LEA. The State legislature could; not the Congress.

Mr. KEEFE. So, as I understand this program, you have left the matter very fluid and flexible so that any State can control the channeling of the funds as the State legislature of that State determines. Is that right?

Mr. LEA. That is true. If you will refer to the bill which passed the Senate, I think you will see that in substance they confessed the plan will not work, and they allowed 3 years for adjustment of the plan, such as you suggest.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say that when the legislature in my State passed upon this question, while they provided for the channeling of funds through a State agency under certain conditions, they did provide that "nothing in this section shall prohibit any local unit of Government from dealing directly with the Federal Government in any transaction involving Federal aid for any airport or aeronautical facility owned by it or hereafter acquired or constructed."

The fact of the matter is, am I correct in the legal assumption that any municipality is the creature of the State sovereignty? The State gives power to the municipality and the municipality has only such power as the State confers upon it. It can enlarge that power or it can rescind or revoke that authority. So, after all, are we not up against this proposition: That the whole program is dumped into the lap of the various State legislatures; and if they insist, by legislative enactment, that the fund must be handled by a State board, then the legislature of the State has the right and authority to so act?

Mr. LEA. The municipality will have that authority unless it is denied by State law.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, under leave obtained in the House, I include at this point in my remarks a letter from Mr. M. W. Torkelson, director of the State Planning Board of the State of Wisconsin, and a copy of chapter 513 of the laws of 1945:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
STATE PLANNING BOARD,
Madison, September 22, 1945.

DEAR WISCONSIN CONGRESSMAN: As the executive officer of the State planning board, which has been the official State agency concerned with airport development in the State

of Wisconsin for the last 4 years, I have been requested to present to you my views regarding the merits of S. 2 and H. R. 3615 in connection with your consideration of the Federal aid for airports legislation now pending in Congress.

It is appropriate to state in this connection that the State planning board will not remain the official State agency for airport development in Wisconsin after June 30, 1947, at the latest, and that the writer has no personal ambitions in the matter since he will soon reach the age of retirement and is, therefore, in a position to consider the subject objectively. Also, our 1945 legislature enacted legislation (ch. 513, Laws of 1945), copy of which is attached hereto, which creates a State aeronautics commission whose powers and duties are set out in sections 114.31 and 114.32, pages 5 to 10, inclusive, of the printed act. It is especially requested that you read section 114.32, beginning on page 7 of the printed act. Although the members of the commission have been appointed by Governor Goodland, the commission has not yet met to organize, and it is reasonable to expect that it will be a month at least before it can be functioning. In the meantime, the State planning board is the only operating State agency having had experience, or in any other way concerned with aeronautics.

I do not have copies of either S. 2 or H. R. 3615 before me and am, therefore, at a disadvantage. It is my understanding, however, that both of these provide substantial amounts of Federal aid for the construction of airports on a national system, the annual appropriation being allocated to the States on a matching basis according to a formula which would give our State slightly in excess of 2 percent of the appropriation. The amount so allocated to the State would be reallocated for airports to be built by subdivisions of the State.

One important difference between the two bills, as I understand them, is that S. 2 provides that the money allocated to the State shall be channeled from the Federal administrative agency to the subdivisions of the State through the State aeronautics agency, while H. R. 3615 provides that this money shall be channeled directly from the Federal administrative agency to the subdivisions of the State, without the State aeronautics agency having anything to do with the handling of the money. This, as I understand it, is the principal question which has to be decided by Congress in the legislation now pending.

Of course, we have the experience of 29 years in the administration of Federal-aid for highways which well may serve as a guide. Right from the beginning, this Federal highway aid has been channeled to the subdivisions of the State through the State highway department. I was in a position of intimate connection with the administration of Federal aid for highways for about 16 years, and have been fairly familiar with its operations during the entire period. I think it must be said that the administration of Federal aid for highways with the money channeled through the State highway departments has been entirely successful, so successful, in fact, that no other procedure has ever been suggested.

An airport development program is not essentially different from a highway development program. Both are projects whose administration and operation are within the field of the civil engineer. Each requires a certain specialized knowledge regarding the particular branch of civil engineering applicable to that particular kind of work. But the development of an airport is no more the function of an airman than the development of a highway is the function of a motor vehicle operator. The development of a highway system and the development of an airport system both require a strong administrative organization to carry out a program in which a specialized knowledge of civil engineering is necessary for planning the work and the administration of its execution.

While it is true that the larger cities in Wisconsin—Milwaukee, for instance—could get along without the services of a State department, it will be quite difficult for any other community in Wisconsin to do so. The services of a well-organized State aeronautics agency, well staffed and well equipped, will be invaluable to the subdivisions of the State in dealing with the various problems which will arise in connection with an airport development program, and particularly as an aid in dealing with the Federal administrative agency. And, furthermore, it would seem to me that the Federal administrative agency would greatly prefer dealing with the subdivisions of the State through a single State administrative agency which would become familiar with its procedures and requirements, thereby greatly facilitating administrative processes.

The foregoing, however, is not the most important reason, in my opinion, for channelization through a State aeronautics agency. That is the following:

There will be in every State a demand for State financial participation in the Federal aid airport program. The subdivisions of the State will demand that the State provide a portion, at least, of the funds that are necessary to match the Federal aid allocated to the State, and it seems that the legislatures will, in most cases at least, be inclined to comply with this demand. As you probably are aware, article VIII, section 10, of the Wisconsin constitution, which provides that the State shall never contract any debt for works of internal improvement or be a party to carrying on such works, which was amended in 1908 as to highways, and in 1926 as to forestry, was again amended in 1945 as to airports. The joint resolution providing for amendment, which was approved by the legislatures of 1943 and 1945 by practically unanimous votes in each case, was approved by the people by a vote of 187,000 to 101,000 at the last April election, and while the 1945 legislature did not enact any State aid for airports law, it seems certain that such legislation will be introduced into the 1947 legislature. It is most highly improbable, in my opinion, that the State would participate in a Federal aid airport program unless on such conditions as the legislature might see fit to set up, and one of these most certainly would be the channelization of the Federal aid through the State treasury for administration by the State aeronautics agency. This is the only way that the State possibly could have any knowledge of the uses to which the funds were put and the manner in which they were being administered.

That our 1945 legislature, in enacting chapter 513, expected that Federal aid for airports would be channeled through the State aeronautics commission, seems plain from a reading of section 114.32, to which special attention has already been directed. The State Aeronautics Commission is authorized, among other things, "to accept, receive, and receipt for Federal moneys and other moneys * * * for and in behalf of this State or any municipality thereof, * * * for the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of airports and other aeronautical facilities," also "to act as agent for any municipality of this State upon request of such municipality in accepting, receiving, and receipting for such moneys in its behalf for airports, and in contracting for the acquisition, improvement, maintenance or operation of airports financed in whole or in part by Federal moneys." It is further provided that all moneys accepted for disbursement by the commission shall be deposited in the State treasury. The commission is authorized, whether acting for the State or as the agent of a municipality, to disburse such moneys for the designated purposes.

It is true, of course, that the law is drafted in such a manner as to permit the municipalities of the State to deal directly with the Federal Government, and such provision was very wise in view of the fact that the legislature had no means of knowing just what the procedure set up by Congress might be, and especially in view of the fact that no State money was made available by the 1945 legislature for airport development. It seems entirely clear, however, that it was the legislative intent that the State aeronautics commission should exercise the greatest measure of control over the development of aeronautical facilities in the State that would be consistent with Federal legislation on the subject, and from this it is a fair inference that if, as, and when the State of Wisconsin participates financially in any airport development program, it will desire that the funds for carrying out such a program shall pass through the State treasury and be administered by the State aeronautics commission. In this way, and in this way only, it would seem, can be avoided that confusion which seems inevitable if each local municipal unit is to proceed on its own, without regard to other parts of the State.

It is my considered opinion that unless provision is made for the channelization of Federal aid from the Federal administrative agency to the local subdivisions of the State through the State aeronautics agency, our State legislature will be very reluctant about giving airport development the financial support of the State, which will be so important for the success of the program. As regards legislation now before Congress, it is my understanding that there is a possibility of a compromise whereby the larger cities will be exempted from dealing through the State aeronautics agency, and I personally would not be opposed to such in the case of our State. But it is my opinion that even the larger cities would find it to their advantage to deal through a well-organized and experienced State department.

Thanking you for your consideration, I am,

Very truly yours,

M. W. TORKELSON,
Director, State Planning Board.

S. 458

An act to amend 14.71 (1) and to create 20.053 and 114.30 to 114.33 of the statutes, relating to aeronautics, and making an appropriation

The people of the State of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. 14.71 (1) of the statutes is amended to read:

"14.71 General Departmental Powers—(1) Appointment of Subordinates: Except as expressly provided by law, the governor, secretary of state, State treasurer, attorney general, State superintendent, commissioner of insurance, State fire marshal, director of purchases, public service commission, industrial commission, adjutant general, grain and warehouse commission, director of personnel, department of taxation, board of tax appeals, commissioners of public lands, State conservation commission, State supervisor of inspectors, banking commission, banking review board, free library commission, State chief engineer, director of agriculture, director of the budget, geological and natural history survey, State board of health, State highway commission, State planning board, State board of medical examiners, State board of dental examiners, State board of pharmacy, Wisconsin real estate brokers board, State board of vocational and adult education, Wisconsin employment relations board, commissioner of the motor vehicle department, director of public welfare, State aeronautics commission, and State athletic

commission are each authorized to appoint such deputies, assistants, experts, clerks, stenographers, or other employees as shall be necessary for the execution of their functions, and to designate the titles, prescribe the duties, and fix the compensation of such subordinates, but these powers shall be exercised subject to the State civil-service law, unless the position filled by any such subordinate has been expressly exempted from the operation of chapter 16 and subject, also, to the approval of such other officer or body as may be prescribed by law."

SEC. 2. 20.053 of the statutes is created to read:

"20.053 Aeronautics Commission: (1) There is appropriated from the general fund to the State aeronautics commission on July 1, 1945, and on July 1, 1946, $20,000 for the purpose of carrying out its functions under chapter 114.

"(2) All moneys received by the State from the United States for the promotion of aeronautics or for airports or other aeronautical facilities, or from any unit of local government for such purposes, shall be paid within 1 week after receipt into the general fund to be held in trust, and are hereby appropriated therefrom to the State aeronautics commission for expenditures as provided by section 114.32."

SEC. 3. 114.30 to 114.33 of the statutes are created to read:

"114.30 Aeronautics Commission — (1) Membership: There is hereby created a State aeronautics commission consisting of five members to be appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate. The members of the said commission shall be men qualified by their knowledge of, experience in, or interest in aeronautics. Of the members first appointed, two shall serve for terms ending April 30, 1947; two for terms ending on April 30, 1949; and one for a term ending on April 30, 1951. Successive members shall be appointed for terms of 6 years each. Members shall continue to serve until their successor is appointed and qualified. Members of the commission shall receive no pay for their services as such members, but shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

"(2) Organization, meeting, report: The commission shall, within 30 days after its appointment, meet, organize, adopt a seal, and make such rules and regulations for its administration, not inconsistent herewith, as it may deem expedient and may from time to time amend such rules and regulations. At such organization meeting it shall elect from among its members a chairman, a vice chairman, and a secretary, to serve for 1 year, and annually thereafter shall elect such officers; all to serve until their successors are appointed and qualified. Meetings may be called by the chairman and shall be called on the request of two members, and may be held as often as necessary, and may be at places other than the State capitol. Three members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. All regular and special commission meetings shall be open to the public. It shall report in writing to the governor on or about December 1 of each year. Said report shall contain a summary of its proceedings during the preceding fiscal year, a detailed and itemized statement of all revenue and of all expenditures made by or in behalf of the commission, such other information as it may deem necessary or useful and any additional information which may be requested by the governor.

"(3) Director; Salary, Qualifications, Duties: The commission shall employ a director of aeronautics who shall continue in office at the pleasure of the commission and whose salary shall be fixed by the commission, but not to exceed $5,000 per year, and shall be reimbursed for all traveling and other expenses incurred by him in the discharge of his official duties. Said director shall be a person having executive ability and experience in aeronautics, and shall not be subject to the provisions of chapter 16 governing the competitive division of the classified service. He shall be administrative head of the commission, shall be responsible to the commission for the execution of its policies; and shall exercise the powers of the commission in the interim of its meetings but subordinate thereto. He shall not have any pecuniary interest in or any stock in or any bonds of any civil aeronautics enterprise.

"114.31. Powers and duties of commission— (1) General: The commission shall have general supervision of aeronautics in the State and promote and foster a sound development of aviation in this State, promote aviation education and training programs, assist in the development of aviation and aviation facilities, safeguard the interests of those engaged in all phases of aviation, formulate and recommend and promote reasonable regulations in the interests of safety, and coordinate State aviation activities with those of other States and the Federal Government and in general prepare for the generally expected extensive expansion of aviation following the termination of World War II. The commission shall have all powers that are necessary to carry out its policies. The commission is especially charged with the duty of informing itself regarding all Federal laws that affect aeronautics in this State, all regulations pursuant to such laws, and all pending legislation providing for a national airport system, in order that it may recommend to the Governor and the legislature such measures as will best enable this State to derive the maximum benefits from such legislation if and when it shall become effective. It shall be the duty of all other State boards, commissions, departments, and institutions, especially the appropriate educational institutions to cooperate with the aeronautics commission.

"(2) Studies and investigations: It shall conduct studies and investigations with reference to the most effective development and operation of airports and all other aeronautical facilities, and issue reports of its findings from time to time.

"(3) Aviation education and training: In cooperation with the appropriate educational institutions of the State, and jointly with them it shall formulate programs of aviation education and training, and disseminate information regarding such programs.

"(4) Cooperation with Federal aeronautical agency: It shall cooperate with and assist the Federal Government, the political subdivisions of this State, and others engaged in aeronautics or the promotion of aeronautics, and shall seek to coordinate the aeronautical activities of these bodies. To this end, the commission is empowered to confer with or to hold joint hearings with any Federal aeronautical agency in connection with any matter arising under chapter 114, relating to the sound development of aeronautics, and to avail itself of the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of such Federal agencies, as fully as may be practicable, in the administration of said sections. It shall furnish to the Federal agencies its cooperation, services, records, and facilities, insofar as may be practicable.

"(5) Air marking system: It shall cooperate with the Federal Government in any air marking system and weather information.

"(6) Technical services to municipalities: It may, insofar as is reasonably possible, offer the engineering or other technical service of the commission, without charge, to any municipality desiring them in connection with the construction, maintenance, or operation or proposed construction, maintenance, or operation of an airport. Municipalities are authorized to cooperate with the commission in the development of aeronautics and aeronautical facilities in this State. The State planning board and all other agencies are authorized and directed to make available such facilities and services, and to cooperate as far as possible to promote the best interests of aeronautics of the State.

"114.32 Federal aid for airports—(1) Commission may accept: The commission is authorized to cooperate with the Government of the United States, and any agency or department thereof, in the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of airports and other air navigation facilities in this State, and to comply with the laws of the United States and any regulations made thereunder for the expenditure of Federal moneys upon such airports and other air navigation facilities, and may enter into any contracts necessary to accomplish such purpose. It is authorized to accept, receive, and receipt for Federal moneys and other moneys, either public or private, for and in behalf of this State, or any municipality thereof, for training and education programs, for the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of airports and other aeronautical facilities, whether such work is to be done by the State or by such municipalities, or jointly, aided by grants of aid from the United States, upon such terms and conditions as are or may be prescribed by the laws of the United States and any rules or regulations made thereunder, and it is authorized to act as agent of any municipality of this State upon the request of such municipality, in accepting, receiving, and receipting for such moneys in its behalf for airports, and in contracting for the acquisition, improvement, maintenance, or operation of airports financed either in whole or in part by Federal moneys, and the governing body of any such municipality is authorized to designate the commission as its agent for such purposes and to enter into an agreement with it prescribing the terms and conditions of such agency in accordance with Federal laws, rules, and regulations and with chapter 114. Such moneys as are paid over by the United States Government shall be retained by the State or paid over to said municipalities under such terms and conditions as may be imposed by the United States Government in making such grants. Nothing in this section shall prohibit any local unit of government from dealing directly with the Federal Government in any transaction involving Federal aid for any airport or aeronautical facility owned by it or hereafter acquired or constructed.

"(3) Contracts: All contracts for the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of airports and other aeronautical facilites, made by the commission either as the agent of this State or as the agent of any municipality, shall be made pursuant to the laws of this State governing the making of like contracts: *Provided, however,* That where the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of any airport or landing strip and other aeronautical facilities is financed or partially financed with Federal moneys, the commission, as agent of the State or of any municipality thereof, may let contracts in the manner prescribed by the Federal authorities, acting under the laws of the United States, and any rules or regulations made thereunder, notwithstanding any other State law to the contrary.

"(4) Disposition of Federal funds: All moneys accepted for disbursement by the commission pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the State treasury, and, unless otherwise prescribed by the authority from which the money is received, kept in separate funds, designated according to the purpose for which the moneys were made available, and held by the State in trust for such purposes. All such moneys are appropriated for the purposes for which the same were made available to be expended in accordance with Federal laws and regulations

and with chapter 114. The commission is authorized, whether acting for this State or as the agent of any of its municipalities, or when requested by the United States Government or any agency or department thereof, to disburse such moneys for the designated purposes, but this shall not preclude any other authorized method of disbursement.

"114.325. Review: Orders of the commission shall be subject to review in the manner provided in chapter 227.

"114.33. Severability: If any section, subsection, paragraph, or other provisions contained in chapter 114, or its application to any person or circumstance shall be held unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the constitutionality of any other section, subsection, or paragraph or its application to other persons or circumstances."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect July 1, 1945, if passed and published by that time otherwise upon passage and publication.

Senate: Ayes 23; noes 3.

Assembly: Ayes 60; noes 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN and Mr. LEA rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEA: On page 1, line 5, strike out "the" and insert "this."

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, this is merely the correction of a clerical error.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. LEA. I hope the gentleman will permit this amendment to be acted on.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I withhold the point of order to permit the gentleman from California to conclude his remarks.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment simply clarifies a clerical mistake. It was recommended by the legislative counsel of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. BARDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3615) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air navigation facilities, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a letter from the director of the State planning board of the State of Wisconsin and a copy of chapter 513 of the laws of 1945, passed by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement made by Mr. L. E. Kopitzke, president, and George L. Mooney, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, a year ago I ran for Congress on a platform of "win the war abroad and win prosperity and security at home." So did most of you. We asked our districts to support us on that basis, and they did.

The war has been won, and now we are faced with our obligation to carry out the second part of that platform, to establish security and prosperity at home. I may be a little bit naive, Mr. Speaker, but I still consider that platform a solemn pledge to my people, and to like-minded people everywhere, to do all in my power to see that reconversion proceeds in a rapid, orderly, and thorough way.

Our goal is full production and full employment. We must let nothing turn us from this aim until it has been accomplished. I do not intend to hedge or stall myself, and I do not want to see this house hedge or stall, in facing this most pressing problem of today. We must pass the full employment bill.

We are passing through a difficult and dangerous period. Unemployment grows daily, as more men and women are released from the armed services and millions are jobless through cancellation of war contracts. True, there are some housewives who will return to their kitchens, youths who will go back to school, and older people who will return to well-deserved retirement. But the most optimistic estimates place these voluntary withdrawals from the active labor force at six to ten million, while the number of job seekers runs into many more than that—just how many we do not yet know.

Throughout the land, there are alarming signs of domestic strife. Labor and employers are growling at each other like two strange bulldogs. Tempers are mounting; old feuds are breaking out. Our social and economic machinery may not be able to halt the progress of this creeping conflict. Sometime within the next few months there will be a turning point at which we as a nation—and we as responsible representatives of the people in the Congress—will have to choose which way we will go and how to steer in that direction. We will have to choose between sinking back into the stagnation of the early thirties on the one hand, and moving on and up into a busy and prosperous economy of full employment on the other.

What is the reason for this domestic strife that is mounting by the minute and threatening the success of return to peace? Why are workers and management alike, holding back or actually striking for more wages and more profits? Why are there such alarming signs, such mutterings of racial discord? Why are the pressure groups making life miserable for more than one man within the sound of my voice?

It is fear that brings these things about. It is our old enemy, fear and the fear of fear—lack of confidence in the future. Reconversion measures will bog down and may fail, Mr. Speaker, if we do not find the way to lay the necessary firm foundation of confidence in the future.

I have this on the authority of the man responsible for demobilization and reconversion. He is a sober and thoughtful man, a middle-western banker, close to the temper and the thinking of our people from the grass roots on up. Here is how John Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, describes his job:

> My task is one of the redirecting from war to peace of the four main resources from which the health of our economy springs; our manpower, our raw materials, our plant and equipment, and our managerial know-how (p. 1064, Senate hearings).

That reflects a clear understanding of this job on the part of the man who has been designated to do the reconversion job, and who is struggling manfully with it in the face of terrific obstacles—and one particular obstacle—the specter of fear, the widespread lack of confidence in the future. Facing his task against

these terrible odds, John Snyder goes on to say in sober earnest:

> It would be a useless task if it did not have as its goal full production and employment—a high standard of living and long-range stability (p. 1064).

And then he goes on to plead for action by the Congress that will make it possible for him to discharge his tremendous responsibilities. He says:

> The mechanism by which we will attain our long-range goal should be established now.

Notice that John Snyder said "should be established now." He did not say anything about long-drawn-out debates in search of a perfection which we can never expect to reach. He did not suggest that we should wait until next year and thrash this problem out in the primaries and in the fall elections. He asked for prompt and practical action now to make possible prompt and practical transition from war to peace—prompt action that will head off this creeping paralysis of fear which we see reflected in the headlines telling us of labor strife.

John Snyder asks for action, and he says:

> If this is done—

Note that he says, "If this is done"—

> present policies can readily be integrated with long-term measures and the new machinery can be functioning effectively by the time we have finished our immediate task of reconversion.

And, again, still quoting this responsible official, this sober, clear-sighted man from the grass roots of the Middle West:

> Our peacetime goal must be and will be full employment. To do its part in the achievement of this goal, the Federal Government must set up now the machinery through which it will act. The legislation which you are now considering sets up that machinery (p. 1061).

Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the United States has acted in response to Mr. Snyder's plea and in response to the urgent desire of the overwhelming majority of our people, and in line with the good sense and good judgment of the overwhelming majority of the Senate itself. I do not like the bill as passed. I do not think it is strong enough. I do not think it is definite enough. In their attempt at clarification I think that our distinguished colleagues in the Senate have gone too far in the direction of weakening the original bill. I urge that we in the House shall do a better job.

But above all, Mr. Speaker, I do urge that we act promptly. We have so little time. I am frankly fearful of the way things will go throughout the country if we do not act. I am fearful that the counsels of reaction, of inaction, of delay—the counsels of too little and too late—will have their way among us.

Mr. Speaker, we must not fail. We must act. We must pass the full-employment bill.

Let me be specific about why we need this long-range legislation now. Let us consider the immediate reconversion problems and see just how it can be made less difficult if we act now on long-range policies and procedures that will create an atmosphere of confidence—procedures that will help us here in Congress, that will make it possible for us to discharge our own heavy responsibilities in the trying months that lie ahead.

I hold in my hand the fourth report to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. It was published only last week. Here in the front of the report is a tabulation that breaks down the reconversion problem into its components. The title of this chart is, "Where We Stand on Reconversion October 1, 1945." It is a summary of what the agencies have done, what the major policies are, and what problems lie ahead. It includes recommendations for congressional action needed.

As I look down this analysis it appears to me that neither the executive branch nor the Congress can possibly handle the job without adoption of the full employment bill. That alone can enable us to lead the country out of the critical period next spring, out of the domestic discord that we face today and into a period of domestic tranquillity with the full production and employment which we must reach, and reach promptly, if we are to preserve our cherished American institutions.

First on the list of reconversion problems set forth by the Director of Reconversion are two items on which he does not ask for further legislation at this time. These items are contract termination and plant clearance.

These important problems, which could have been such terrific headaches, which could have stymied the whole task of switching back to peace production—these jobs, the Director says, are under control. He says contracts totaling $23,000,000,000 have been canceled since August 14—less than 2 months. He says further—and in the light of our experience with governmental delays this is a matter for applause and admiration—that Federal procedures have been set, personnel has been trained and made available in the agencies; that personnel has been trained in contractors' organizations to handle the details of these settlements; that the interim financing system is in operation. His goal is to settle all canceled contracts within a year, and he does not ask for more legislation in this field.

In respect to plant clearance, where the problem was to remove Government-owned supplies and equipment speedily so as to permit rapid change-over, the Director reports that the necessary warehouse space has been acquired and that practically all requests for plant clearance have been met within 60 days.

This is a remarkable record of accomplishment. Why was it possible for this relatively new organization to begin this job so promptly and so well? The answer is that in these particular cases we had acted. We had looked ahead. We had developed and passed legislation to anticipate these far-flung problems and to make it possible for them to be solved adequately and promptly. Here, Mr. Speaker, we were not too little and too late, and I think we may well take pride in this record.

But let us take this lesson to heart. Let us act promptly and wisely on the enormously larger job for which contract termination and plant clearance only open the door. Let us adopt the full-employment bill.

Following down the analysis by the Director of Reconversion, he next grapples with the problem of surplus disposal.

SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Machinery has been set up to handle the disposal of materials and plants, but the work has hardly begun. How can prospective buyers make intelligent bids on this property which we want to get rid of unless they can see ahead, and unless they think they can find markets for it, or markets for the output of the plants? How can the administrative officials tell what bids they should accept? How can we tell what policies to adopt when in important cases a decision is referred to us, as is required by law?

These are not isolated decisions that can be made in a vacuum. Each case affects the others. They all depend fundamentally on whether we are going to get full production and full employment promptly. They depend on whether we can look forward confidently to stability in our economic system. They depend on whether action is taken to build the necessary confidence on the part of business and of labor and to coordinate the work of government, which, whether we like it or not, will govern the economic climate of the country.

Mr. Snyder asks for legislative action covering the disposal of merchant ships and certain phases of foreign surplus. We have retained to ourselves in Congress the final authority in respect to many large plants which may be surplus. How are we going to provide this additional legislation—obviously needed—unless we can be reasonably sure what world-trade conditions will be? How can we tell that, unless we can be confident of full employment in the United States; for it is quite clear that there can be no healthy world trade and probably no peace in the world if the largest industrial Nation cannot even keep its own economy on an even keel?

Let us tell the world, let us assure our own people, that we are going to have full employment and full production. Let us not be too little and too late.

PRODUCTION CONTROL

The controls of production that were necessary for war must be removed for peace. This is perfectly clear to all of us, and I am glad to see the promptness with which the War Production Board and the Director of Reconversion have acted.

But everybody knows that we cannot let go all at once. Everybody knows that it is absolutely necessary to prevent inventory hoardings and scrambles for scarce items. Everybody knows that we cannot get rid of all controls until production catches up with demand. The only real protection against inflation is to get production up to match demand. How do we do this? Why should manufacturers increase production unless they think that they can find a market?

Here again, the answer is simply confidence that there will be markets, and this means production, and this means full employment. The Director of Re-

conversion asks us to continue the emergency powers under the Second War Powers Act. How long shall we extend this necessary authority? How can we tell unless we take action to assure continued markets and production and employment after the controls are lifted?

MANPOWER ASSISTANCE

This matter-of-fact analysis by the Director of Reconversion now comes quietly to the human phase of reconversion. Here all controls have been dropped.

Have we acted promptly enough and well enough in this respect? As I read the headlines day by day, I wonder. I wonder whether our action here has been too little or too late. I wonder if inaction with respect to other fields of governmental policy will compel us to adopt emergency rescue measures during the coming months. I wonder if we will see a recurrence of work relief and made work—or whether we will recover after the critcal time next spring.

It depends on confidence and cooperation and coordination. For these things we need and must have the full-employment bill.

DEMOBILIZATION AND VETERANS' READJUSTMENT

Work for veterans is not a separate problem. Veterans' organizations have emphasized again and again their clear understanding of this. They know and we know and General Bradley knows that there can be no real continuing answer to jobs for veterans at decent wages—except full production and full employment. We need, says the Director of Reconversion, legislation for the clarification of veterans' reemployment rights and liberalization of veterans' benefits. But this will be only a temporary stop-gap—unless we move from demobilization promptly into full employment. Veterans, like all the rest of us, have a stake in the general prosperity which is of much more importance to them than their special privileges as veterans.

PRICE CONTROLS—WAGE CONTROLS

The situation in respect to prices and wages is loaded with two kinds of dynamite. There is the urgent danger of inflation on the one hand if wages and prices spiral upward and production lags behind. There is, on the other hand, the urgent danger of deflation, of lost purchasing power, of business volume sagging, of production and employment spiralling downward into stagnation.

The answer—the only real answer to both dangers—is full production and full employment. Full employment means adequate purchasing power, adequate purchasing power means full production, and full production means full employment. The only answer to inflation is to bring the production up to match the demand. In the presence of full production we never have had inflation in time of peace.

Wage disputes and price demands alike can be solved in an atmosphere of understanding and good will—provided that the workers and the business interests both have confidence in the future. This means confidence in full employment—and again I ask for prompt, decisive action by the Congress.

RATIONING AND AGRICULTURE

The unwelcome necessity for rationing was accepted by the people of this country as a necessary evil. All of us would like to see it stopped entirely as soon as possible. We can stop it very soon—provided we can keep production up. The farmers of this country have proved their capacity to expand production. They will continue to provide the food we need—if they can have confidence in their markets.

But the farmer knows that his market is the pay check of the city worker. We have made commitments to our farmers—commitments for protection which I think they well deserve. We have undertaken to protect them against the price collapse that would otherwise overtake them when factory pay rolls collapse.

How can we afford to make good on this recommendation unless we can find the way to see that factory pay rolls do not collapse?

All this again spells full employment. Let us act before it is too late.

CONSTRUCTION AND PUBLIC WORKS

The basis for the boom which many people see ahead, and which I see ahead if we act wisely, is the backlog of private construction and especially of housing. Will this materialize? Yes, if there is confidence in the future.

New houses, new stores, new factories are built when people think they can be used and paid for. This country needs new houses by the million. It needs new factories, new stores. They will be built if people believe in full employment, and at the same time this healthy volume of private construction can provide a major basis for the full employment and full production that are needed to justify this new construction.

So we come again to the underlying need for confidence in full employment—and this means action here and now.

Few of us have delusions any more that public works construction can sustain our whole economy. The job is just too big. There is an urgent need for useful public works but for this very reason we must not handle public works solely for emergency relief. They must be planned ahead.

Private construction and public works alike can make their proper contribution to the country's welfare only with a consistent national policy for full employment and stability. Furthermore, only on the basis of such a policy can we rationalize and stabilize the construction industry itself. On both counts, we need assurance of full employment, full markets, full production.

FOREIGN TRADE

Many people have expressed the view that foreign trade has great possibilities for prosperity at home. Others contrariwise fear the loss of markets through importation of low-cost goods produced abroad by low-wage labor.

My own view is that when we say foreign trade we mean trade—in other words exchanging goods and services for mutual benefit. We mean a fair and honest swap. Our requirements for things we do not have or things we can produce only at high cost are so large that they are a controlling influence in world trade. If we can maintain full employment and therefore full production in this country, it means that economic health can be maintained throughout a large part of the world; and this means economic peace. On the basis of economic peace alone can we build military peace.

On the other hand, a peaceful healthy world will need the very things that we can best produce. It will need our machinery, our automobiles, our locomotives. It will need them and can pay for them—provided that we let them pay; and this means imports and we will need the imports—provided we maintain full employment.

Those who look forward to a peaceful world must act promptly to assure full employment in the United States.

FEDERAL TAX AND BORROWING PROGRAM

Day by day we hear grave warnings of the terrific burden of the Federal debt. Day by day we hear cries about the crushing burden of taxation on the one hand and pleas for financial assistance at home and abroad on the other. The Director of Reconversion, in his report, asks for continued public support for the direct sale of bonds to individuals in order to minimize the inflationary pressure of the sale of bonds to banks. He asks for prompt enactment of a transition tax program which balances the desire for tax relief with the necessity for inflationary controls.

We have acted on transitional tax policies, perhaps not completely, but I think not unwisely. Have we acted to sustain the incomes out of which these taxes must be paid? Have we acted to sustain the employment, the production, which alone can create these incomes?

Have we acted to assure full production and employment? Not yet.

What are we waiting for, Mr. Speaker? Is it that we do not see the need? Listen again to the Director of Reconversion:

> The mechanism by which we will attain our long-range goal should be established now. If this is done, present policies can readily be integrated with long-term measures and the new machinery can be functioning effectively by the time we have finished our immediate task of reconversion.
>
> I hope that the Congress will adopt an efficient mechanism for mobilizing the resources of the country—both private and governmental—for the attainment of full employment and production. I believe that a mechanism such as this bill proposes is a tremendous step toward the attainment of this goal.

Summing up briefly, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize as strongly as I can two things. We are heading into a period of dislocation and reconversion that is going to try our wisdom and our tolerance and our resourcefulness. To cope with this situation, we need the full-employment bill, and we need it now. We need its clear, inspiring statement of the great national objective of full-employment opportunity in a free, competitive economy—a ringing statement, a call to action for human needs as compelling as a declaration of war.

We need the sober, firm commitment that we will direct the resources of the Federal Government to the winning of

this war against the menace of stagnation and depression which is a threat to our institutions hardly less dangerous than the powerful military enemies we have successfully defeated. Nothing less than this open, honest, firm commitment will do; nothing less can build that confidence which must provide a firm foundation for our economic system of private enterprise.

Finally, we need the procedure set up in this bill under which the executive branch and the Congress can discharge their new and heavy tasks. We need the annual National Budget so that we can see within our human limitations where we are headed and what must be done to keep us on the broad highway. We need that annual Budget as an administrative mechanism that will compel a higher order of coordination in the executive branch. And, Mr. Speaker, we need the joint committee of the House and the Senate to receive the President's annual Budget and his economic program, to work it over thoroughly and critically, and then to provide us with a joint resolution which we can in turn debate thoroughly and openly in each House, and which will finally provide a sound, thoughtful, mature statement of our immediate economic objectives and our intentions for well-timed and prudent legislative action.

LIFTING OF L–41 WILL BRING $50,000 ADDITIONAL PROFIT TO ONE WASHINGTON BUILDER—OTHER SELFISH SPECULATORS DOUBLE PRICES ON HOMES—RENTAL PRIORITIES NEEDED FOR VETERANS — UNCONTROLLED BUILDING BOOM UNDER WAY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our uncontrolled building boom is under way. Yesterday, War Production Board Order L–41, the only direct governmental control on selling prices of homes, was swept away as a result of the lobbying efforts of a group of big speculative real-estate operators.

This morning, a speculative builder in Washington put 50 new homes on the market, all of them constructed under the $8,000 price-limitation order. Today, those homes are priced at $9,000. The lifting of L–41 will mean an additional profit of $50,000 to that one builder. He was one of the group which protested Government control of housing prices so vigorously.

In Miami, Fla., last week, a family was negotiating for a similar home, priced at $8,000. Yesterday they were informed the price now would be $16,000.

The headlines in this morning's edition of a substantial New York newspaper tell the same story of inflation. They read as follows:

Real-estate boom—New York City enjoys biggest buying spree since the late 1920's—explanations: Too little living space, inflation fear, high-replacement costs—rise expected to continue.

So we are now embarked on our stormy voyage across the uncharted seas of postwar inflation, without protection against the financial storm against which responsible leaders have sought to warn us for months.

Our ally England has been faced with this same problem, the same danger of inflation, as a result of increased income and war scarcities. On the same day we discarded our major control of a $15,000,000,000 industry, the British Parliament, by an overwhelming majority, voted to continue that country's wartime controls for another 5 years.

A month ago one of the leaders of the speculative building group, in his efforts to persuade the administration to relinquish all control of housing prices, made the promise that builders would refrain from get-rich-quick policies, and that lending institutions would avoid excessive appraisals to help curb inflation.

Let us look a little further into the case of the Washington builder, who stands to make such an excellent profit from the lifting of L–41, and see how well that promise has been kept.

His houses are made of unfaced brick and are two-story, two-bedroom homes. They are small—20 by 22 feet. Each lot is 50 by 100 feet. They are located several miles from Washington. Construction material cannot be said to be of the finest quality. The wooden floor joists and subflooring, for instance—the joists are third-grade green pine. A carpenter said he feared the floors would sag. In most of the houses hardware is still of wartime finish.

Nearby is a similar home, except that it contains one more bedroom, is larger, and is built on a larger lot than the houses in question. This house sold in July 1942 for $6,250, on a $650 down payment. The new homes are appraised by a private lender at $8,990, and require a down payment of $1,700.

Those are the facts. I shall let them speak for themselves.

There has never, in the history of our country, been a building boom comparable in volume to the one we are now facing. Literally millions of our people want homes, millions want them badly enough to pay more than they normally would be willing to pay.

Prospects of supplying sufficient construction material to meet that demand in time to stave off more inflation are discouraging.

The Western Pine Association, in a statement issued October 6, says this:

To summarize the first 9 months performance of the Western pine industry in 1945; lumber production was down 11 percent more than during the same 1944 period, shipments were 10 percent lower, and stocks at the end of September are lower at this date than for many years.

On October 8, the War Production Board said this:

No appreciable replenishment of lumber stocks, which are now at an all-time low, can be expected during the fourth quarter of 1945 because of sharp cuts in production.

Summed up, we have the greatest housing demand in our history, coupled with an insufficient supply of building materials—two of the facts needed to bring the worst inflation of our generation, unless drastic action is taken on prices.

My most urgent concern in the national housing shortage that threatens us is the plight of the returning veteran.

Every boat from Europe and the far Pacific brings thousands of our servicemen back to us. They are pouring home at every port. It is conservatively estimated that 700,000 of them, with wives and children, will be looking for homes. Seven hundred thousand places to live. That is not some problem to confront us in the hazy future. It is here, now, demanding action. And every ship that enters port increases its intensity.

This same question—what can be done to provide homes for these returning servicemen—recently was put to the same group of speculative builders, the group which promises that the building industry can solve the housing shortage without Government assistance. Their reply was:

Nothing should be done. Let the returning soldiers scramble with the rest of us. Once he is out of uniform, he shouldn't receive any better treatment than anyone else.

That callous selfishness is shocking to the average American, but it is indicative of the indifference to be found in some business quarters of the plight of the man who fought your fight and mine for 4 long years. An ordinary sense of fair play and justice demands that those men who have been unable to seek homes on an equal basis with the rest of us while they were battling our enemies, should be given priority for homes at fair and reasonable prices.

For a half million returning veterans to find themselves without shelter for their families should be a source of national shame, demanding instant action.

During the war we very successfully found means to provide priority shelter for hundreds of thousands of in-migrant war workers, coming into industrial centers to produce for war.

Construction material was set aside and channeled to builders to provide them with housing. Rents were held at levels the in-migrant workers could pay. The job was done with dispatch.

Are not our returning fighting men entitled to the same treatment we gave our civilian war workers?

I would suggest that the administration adopt some plan of material control that will channel a certain percentage of available construction supplies to building homes for these veterans—small, modest homes that they can buy at reasonable prices. A certain percentage of all materials allowed contractors might well be allocated for construction of small homes to be sold at fair prices to veterans with families.

In addition to the above, some housing should be allocated for rentals to veterans. Many returning youngsters, newly married, unsure of their futures, would be unwise to buy a home at the present time. In many instances, it will be impossible for them to do so until the veteran is established in his job and becomes settled.

This rental provision could be handled by the same machinery that provided similar rental housing for war workers.

These two objectives could be accomplished by acts nearly as simple as changing the words "in-migrant war worker" to "serviceman" in the housing regulations.

Some step such as this suggestion must be taken soon. Responsibile leaders in the building industry already are worried about the explosive threat that is contained in the pressure of the Nation's housing demand.

Already veterans have been requesting city officials in New York to let them pitch their tents in Central Park, because they could not find shelter in the Nation's greatest city.

In this, too, we might learn from the experience of England. It has only been a few months since British Tommies being demobilized took drastic action themselves to find homes. Vigilante committees were formed in smaller cities. Empty houses were commandeered, and servicemen's families were installed in them. In some instances violent disorders occurred.

Our housing problem must be solved speedily if we are to avoid the seething unrest that might provoke housing riots here.

[From the Washington Daily News of October 16, 1945]

COAST TO COAST "NO VACANCY" SIGNS GREET HOMECOMING VETS

Two months after the end of the war America's cities still suffer from growing pains. A UP survey found today that the housing shortage from coast to coast is worse than it was 6 months ago. And the returning veteran suffers most.

Soldiers, sailors, and marines come back to find the "no vacancy" sign up all over town.

A soldier in Chicago spread a newspaper on the sidewalk and lay down to sleep.

An ex-soldier pleaded in a Boston newspaper's want-ad columns: "Would some kind person have a heart? Veteran and wife urgently need apartment."

A couple with two children in Miami begged for space to park their trailer.

WAR WORKERS STAY

A housing official in Atlanta said "there's not a dog house for rent."

In New York, Detroit, Chicago, Denver, and San Francisco it's the same story—more people than there are living accommodations.

Housing officials estimate that it will be next spring before there will be enough new building to improve the situation.

The jam has grown worse since VJ-day because the veterans are moving into communities already filled with war workers—who like the big city so well they have decided to stay.

HOTELS JAMMED

In Philadelphia, for example, only 9 percent of the war workers plan to leave this year.

A survey by the Cleveland Press showed that 73 percent of the war workers who moved to Cleveland intend to stay there.

Many cities are trying to help veterans find a home, but only a few are having success.

In New York, the Navy Officers Housing Committee has a list of 5,000 waiting for apartments. Veterans get priorities on housing units listed with the city renting agency. Rear Adm. Monroe Kelly, commandant of the Third Naval District, asked the public to give the Navy a break and stay out of New York hotels during the last 2 weeks of October. He said that if the hotel situation is not relieved, thousands of bluejackets from the Pacific front will be deprived of reunions with their loved ones.

The Philadelphia Housing Authority aiding veterans and war workers, has 1,157 families on the waiting list and no vacancies.

Seventy-five percent of the applicants were discharged servicemen.

VETERANS HARD HIT

Atlanta met part of the problem by housing veterans in 400 houses that had been used by workers in a war plant, now closed. Minneapolis set up a housing bureau to help veterans, but in September there were 1,364 new applicants and only 57 placements.

At Salt Lake Veterans' Administration officials said the need for housing was the foremost concern of most ex-servicemen appealing to the Administration for help.

Boston has a war rental housing agency, but the funds were appropriated for servicemen's housing. Officials ruled it would be illegal to use the money to aid discharged servicemen.

The UP survey showed this was the situation in brief:

"WORSE THAN CRITICAL"

BOSTON.—Almost no houses or apartments available. Hotels booked solid for weeks in advance.

NEW YORK.—Hotel, apartment, and house rental shortages worse than 6 months ago, when it was critical. Hotels booked solid through November 15.

PHILADELPHIA.—City officials estimate Philadelphia needs 100,000 new homes to provide space for the war-swollen population.

MIAMI.—Leading hotels booked solid for winter season. Some apartment buildings and hotels being sold as many as four times a year—each time at a profit.

DETROIT.—Hotels Book Cadillac and Statler refuse to take reservations Monday through Thursday when all rooms are filled with businessmen. Detroit Housing Commission reports fewer places to rent now than at peak of city's war production.

"NOBODY'S GOING HOME"

CHICAGO.—City housing center gets 100 applicants a day but has nothing to offer for immediate occupancy. Hotels jammed.

OMAHA.—One moving company reports that residents are moving out five times as fast as those moving in, but still no houses for rent.

INDIANAPOLIS.—John H. Hewitt, executive secretary of the Indiana Hotel Association, said no Indianapolis hotel has been able to supply a room without an advance reservation since VJ-day.

DALLAS.—Holmes Green, head of the War Housing Committee, said "People are not building houses for rent, and nobody's going home."

SAN FRANCISCO.—Hotel, apartment, house-rental situation "definitely worse" since VJ-day. Shortage increased by families of veterans moving to the Pacific coast and by persons arriving to meet returning servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a statement from the Washington Daily News of today, Tuesday, October 16, 1945, entitled "Coast-to-Coast No-Vacancy Signs Greet Homecoming Vets," disclosing a situation where the veterans who are returning from this war are unable to rent a home or to buy a home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts in each.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BIEMILLER for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 17, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will meet Wednesday, October 17, 1945, at 10 a. m. in room 304, Old House Office Building, to consider the bill H. R. 2202.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Wednesday, October 17, at 10 o'clock a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes, in the Rivers and Harbors Committee room.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in executive hearing to consider the bill (H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

747. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

748. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

749. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

750. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1124. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4355) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Shull, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 4384. A bill to amend the act of June 8, 1936, relating to vocational education, so as to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4385. A bill to constitute service in the Organized Defense Volunteers, Territory of Hawaii, for any period from and after December 7, 1941, to June 21, 1945, as service in the armed forces of the United States for such period; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

H. R. 4386. A bill to facilitate and simplify the administration of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4387. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service," approved December 21, 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 4388. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service," approved December 21, 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 4389. A bill to prevent the lapse of reemployment rights of veterans when the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, becomes inoperative; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 4390. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4391. A bill to authorize temporarily the allowance of leave to officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard retired subsequent to September 8, 1939, and retained on active duty, to the same extent as if such officers had not been retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4392. A bill to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations of unpaid balances in the pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 4393. A bill for the relief of the owners of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 4394. A bill to relieve persons who have completed service in the merchant marine from liability for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 4395. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the acquisition and development of systems of State parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. Res. 373. A resolution to provide for travel pay allowance to clerks of Representatives or Delegates in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 4396. A bill for the relief of William S. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4397. A bill for the relief of Theresa Mondell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4398. A bill for the relief of Thelma McMullen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4399. A bill for the relief of William R. Weathers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4400. A bill for the relief of Nolan V. Curry individually and as guardian for his minor son, Hershel Dean Curry; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4401. A bill for the relief of Joe F. Rada and Bessie Rada; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4402. A bill for the relief of Viola McHale; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 4403. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary M. Souders; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 4404. A bill for the relief of Pietro Ghio; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHARP:

H. R. 4405. A bill for the relief of John Bakelaar; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 4406. A bill for the relief of Loyal F. Willis; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1248. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Memorial of the Wyoming State Convention of the American War Mothers, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation to provide for the designation and construction of a national veterans' hospital at the Hot Springs State Park, Thermopolis, Wyo.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1249. Also, memorial of Thermopolis (Wyo.) Pioneer Association, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation to provide for the designation and construction of a national veterans' hospital at Thermopolis, Wyo., for the relief of an emergency now existing in the care and treatment of veterans of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1250. By Mr. HALE: Petition of Frank W. Shaw Post, No. 137, American Legion, Fryeburg, Maine, that Congress extend to those of the armed services who were disabled while in service and are thus identified by the possession of the Purple Heart or by certification of disability, the privilege of free postage on their personal first-class mail; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1251. By the SPEAKER: Petition of August Wessig, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to greater motorist vehicle-pedestrian safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, whose providence flows to us in an unbroken stream, humbly we come to Thee, drawn by Thy boundless love and wondrous compassion. As we bring to Thee our weaknesses and perplexities, set Thy seal upon our hearts that they may be enriched with the living forms of character which are right and grandly right. Turn us toward Thy holy temple that from this sanctuary may come wisdom and grace commensurate with our needs.

So often our thoughts and desires are diverted by the pressing cares of duty; in our necessities, hide not Thy face far from us and take not Thy Holy Spirit from us. Draw near when we are cast down, when burdens are unjust and our thoughts wander as we question the tragedies of these times. As we greet each new day with its wealth of opportunities, keep us from the silken cradle of ease, remembering the multitudes who are loveless and homeless with no chart or compass and with no language but a cry. Make each of us a messenger of light and hope, cheerfully accepting the discipline of life in the joy of Thy companionship. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, October 23, 1945, at 12:30 p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief article from a newspaper and a few excerpts from public documents.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a sermon delivered on the occasion of the third annual Lawyers' Red Mass at St. Louis University on October 12.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the New York Journal American and in the other to include an article from the Boston Post.

PENSIONS FOR THE AGED

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in criticizing others, but I am going to take this time to do so. I am an advocate of pensions for the aged. There is no time in the history of this country when they need them worse and they need them now. We have the Townsend groups, independent groups, and the Fraternal Order of Eagles who are asking for that. I want to say that the way the pension laws affecting the blind, the crippled, and the aged are administered is a shame. I think something should be done and be done now. These people should get together. I received a letter from a man in our State showing that if a man owns a home everything he gets under the pension laws is marked up against him as a lien against his home.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein two articles.

STRENGTHENING THE CONGRESS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after the completion of the legislative business, my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and myself each be allowed to address the House for 40 minutes on the subject of freedom of the air, with the privilege of yielding to other Members.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Washington that that is a rather unusual procedure. If the gentleman from Washington desires to address the House, as well as the gentleman from New York, the Chair will entertain such a request, but does not think he should entertain this request under the practice followed at the present time.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, may I withdraw the request and confer with the Speaker on the subject?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include a letter and table.

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and to include an article on two young men from his district who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Puerto Rican Economic Review.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on unemployment.

DEMOBILIZATION OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, since the war first started, I have purposely refrained from advocating the induction or release of any groups or category of men in our body politic. I have held that all classes should be treated alike so far as the principle of serving one's country is concerned if they were needed in the defense of our country.

However, the war is now over and there are hundreds of thousands of fathers still in our armed forces. Most of those fathers who are overseas have never seen children born to them. All of them want to return home to their loved ones and to normal living. I believe it is to the best interests of America that all fathers be released from the service just as quickly as possible. They are not now needed by the Army and the Navy. There are plenty of others to take their places who want to remain in the service.

It is hardly necessary to point out how much fathers are needed at home. Every household requires the presence and the attention of both husband and wife in order to bring up the children in the proper manner. The place for every father is back home now that peace is here.

If America is to go forward in this post war era with any degree of progress, the American home must be maintained. Our young mothers have done a noble job for the past 4 critical years. They have worked themselves to the bone. The experience of carrying on alone has been a severe strain upon all of them.

To bring about the future stability of the Nation, therefore, as well as relief for countless millions of wives and children of heroic GI's, I am introducing today the following bill:

A bill to direct the discharge of fathers from the armed forces

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be discharged from, or released from active duty in, the military and naval forces of the United States, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit, every member of such forces who—

(a) has on the date of enactment of this act a wife and a child or children with whom he maintains (or would but for his service maintain) a bona fide family relationship in his home;

(b) has indicated his desire for discharge by application for such release through regular military or naval procedures.

I hope Congress will immediately take favorable action upon this pressing issue for the sake of the American people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONTROVERSY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the people must have some rights in this present labor-management controversy. The time has arrived for congressional action on the strike situation. In fact, the time for action is past due.

The administration has failed to act in what threatens to be our greatest national crisis. Continued delay will result in inflation, unemployment, and a general break-down of our economic system. It is suggested that we delay action until after the labor-management conference on November 5. We cannot afford to wait that long. The situation grows steadily worse.

I would earnestly suggest that this Congress—

First. Repeal the Smith-Connally Act immediately.

Second. Amend the Wagner Act to provide mutual responsibility for labor and management.

Third. Enact legislation providing for the enforcement and maintenance of contracts between both parties.

I would vigorously oppose any legislation that would destroy or impair collective bargaining between labor and management but I do firmly believe that labor has grown to maturity and now must assume full responsibility for its actions.

The Wagner Act was lopsided in that it made definite requirements of management but failed to do so on the part of labor. The time has arrived for mutual responsibility. I insist that no special favors be granted either labor or management and that we secure justice for both.

This controversy extends beyond the scope of these two groups and affects all our people. Surely there must be a solution for a controversy that is preventing reconversion, full employment, jobs for our veterans, and suffering by our people generally.

The time for talk has passed. It is time to act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

SINGLE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege earlier today to listen to the statement of Secretary of War Patterson in behalf of the establishment of a single department of defense. In my opinion, his argument, given before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, is unanswerable by the opponents of the idea. I shall place in the Appendix of the RECORD today his clear and convincing presentation, because I believe the Members of the House, and other citizens should read it very, very carefully.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 168]

Adams	Curley	Henry
Auchincloss	Daughton, Va.	Holmes, Mass.
Baldwin, Md.	Dawson	Hope
Baldwin, N. Y.	Dickstein	Jennings
Bell	Dingell	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Biemiller	Drewry	Judd
Bradley, Mich.	Elsaesser	Kearney
Bradley, Pa.	Flannagan	Keogh
Brumbaugh	Fuller	Kilburn
Buckley	Gardner	King
Buffett	Gerlach	Kirwan
Butler	Gifford	Larcade
Byrne, N. Y.	Gillespie	LeFevre
Campbell	Gillie	Lesinski
Celler	Granger	Lewis
Cole, Kans.	Griffiths	Luce
Cooley	Gross	McGehee
Courtney	Hagen	Merrow
Cox	Heffernan	Mott
Roe, N. Y.	Vursell	
Norton	Sheridan	Wasielewski
Peterson, Ga.	Short	Weiss
Pfeifer	Simpson, Pa.	Whittington
Plumley	Starkey	Winter
Price, Ill.	Stigler	Worley
Rayfiel	Taylor	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include therein a tabulation.

FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT ACT

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3615) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air navigation facilities.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3615, with Mr. BARDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that at the time the Committee rose yesterday afternoon the Committee had under consideration the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is merely to correct a clerical error.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the principal controversy in the pending measure is the question of whether or not the funds that are authorized to be appropriated by this bill shall be allocated through the several States through an agency of each State, or whether they shall be allocated by the Civil Aeronautics Administrator direct to the project sponsors. That is an exceedingly important question which our committee has done its best to resolve, in the collective wisdom of the committee. That is an exceedingly difficult question to reconcile as between municipalities and State organizations and these other organizations which are directly concerned and desire the State to have the channeling of the funds, because there are some very large projects in the United States that are being undertaken by municipalities, and there may be perhaps political differences between the heads of those municipalities and the State organizations. For example, there appeared before our committee the mayor of the city of New York and the mayor of the city of Chicago who were vitally concerned that any funds that might be channeled to those cities should come directly from the Administrator. It was pointed out by the mayor of the city of New York that in the plans they have for a new airport some 4,200 or 4,300 acres of land was to be recovered from marsh lands at a cost of some $18,000,000, and that they did not want any State interference whatever in that important airport development.

In the collective wisdom of the committee at the time it considered the measure, it was felt that the best party to reconcile those differences would be the Administrator. Of course, I recognize the fact, as everyone here must recognize, that if all of these funds are to be channeled through the Administrator, every Member of this House is going to be beset by every municipality in his district for the purpose of obtaining approval of the allocation of funds for that particular place. I do not know that it would be much different if the States themselves were handling the matter, because, after all, the municipalities would still be interested in causing activity on the part of Members of Congress with the CAA for the purpose of obtaining approval. I do not know how much less of that pressure would be brought upon Members of Congress. At the same time, of course, if you do not channel it through the States, then you are going to get some little more pressure than otherwise. However, State organizations are not set up all over the United States for the handling of these funds.

There are five different classifications of airports. No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3 are the smaller airports. No. 4 and No. 5 are the very large airports. I personally have no objection whatsoever to permitting the channeling of funds for Nos. 1, 2, and 3 airports through the States, provided the States have an organization for that purpose. It does seem to me, however, that in these very large projects instituted by the large municipalities in most cases these funds should be channeled directly to the municipalities without the intervention of the State. The bill passed by the Senate known as S. 2 contains such a provision. It separates the airports into classifications.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. S. 2 provides for differentiation in the classification of airports that shall be handled directly through the municipalities and those which shall be handled indirectly through the States. There is a great deal of merit in that provision. The pending bill makes no such provision and it is quite possible that inasmuch as there will be that difference between this bill and the Senate bill it will be necessary to reconcile those differences in conference. I personally believe that the conference committee can do a much better job in reconciling those differences if the pending measure is passed as it is than if it is amended here on the floor in a way which has never been considered by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the results of which we do not know.

I have great sympathy with the desire of the State organizations to have the funds channeled through the State agencies, and I believe that in all probability we shall have to make such a

reconciliation to the extent of class 1, 2, and 3 airports. I sympathize with the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL], but I hope that the House in its wisdom will give us the opportunity of working that situation out in conference with the Senate. Let us rewrite the bill there rather than here on the floor. There is no Member of this House who has not stood in the well and said that the best legislation is not written on the floor but in committee; and I trust that those Members who feel that way about it will give consideration to that fact in the coming amendment to this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. My information is that a similar provision is included in the Senate bill. Does not the gentleman agree with me that whatever this particular language may be the decision ultimately will be worked out in conference?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is perfectly true, and that is why it is not necessary to waste a lot of time over it here in the House.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not true that under the provisions of the bill as it came from the committee there is the flexibility which would aid the conferees in working with the Senate ultimately to the best solution?

Mr. HINSHAW. Our bill is as fluid a bill as we could draw and still make it possible to carry on the work in all the States of the Union. If you tie any specific provisions onto this bill you will so snarl it up that it will not be workable, in my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is true, as the gentleman who just took his seat, the gentleman from California said, that the provision he referred to is a most important part of this bill. I come from a large city—not quite as large as the cities he mentioned, but a large city. The people of St. Louis have approved a bond issue for another airport. We already own one airport, but it is not sufficient to take care of our needs. They have not as yet secured the land for the new airport, but so far as I know in Missouri we have no State agency to which the city of St. Louis could apply in order to receive some benefit from the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Therefore, unless the law specifically provides that a city in the position of St. Louis can apply directly to the Civil Aeronautics Administration no benefits would accrue to my city as a result of the enactment of the law. I do not think the State is going to set up such an agency. The larger part of the State is not going to benefit in any way by this bill and as the representatives of the rural sections of Missouri control the legislature; therefore I doubt very much if the State will ever set up an agency. Furthermore, we in St. Louis do not want the State of Missouri in any way to control our airports in St. Louis.

There is another very important part of this bill, however, one that has not been referred to. We might just as well understand what we are doing. Last week we passed a bill that will reduce Federal income-tax collections $5,600,000,000. Here we are considering a bill that will increase the Federal expenditures over a period of 10 years by $650,000,000, if not more. This is the start. No one can predict the end.

It is true that aviation is a comparatively new industry and that it will greatly expand. Last week a glider left St. Louis with a carload of freight and in an hour and a half it was in Louisville, Ky., about 250 miles away. This gives you an idea of what is going to happen. We had gliders during the war that were made in St. Louis that would carry two tanks or two trucks. They are making gliders in St. Louis right now for private aviation companies.

We have no idea how aviation is going to expand, all we can do is guess, but there is one thing certain, and that is, all the passengers that are carried by the air lines and all the express and freight carried by the air lines will be taken away from the railroads and probably a lot of it from the motortrucks. You are going to find a situation where there is an increase in aviation and a decrease in the business of the railroads and the trucks. What will happen then?

In this bill we are subsidizing private aviation. It seems to me we should give some thought to subsidies which right now amount to well over $2,000,000,000 annually. If we are going to continue to increase them we will be compelled to find a way to get the money to pay them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I offer a second amendment to this section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "Aid."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this title—

(a) "Administrator" means the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

(b) "Airport" means any area of land or water which is used, or intended for use, for the landing and take-off of aircraft, and any appurtenant areas which are used, or intended for use, for airport buildings or other airport facilities or rights-of-way, together with all airport buildings and facilities located thereon.

(c) "Airport development" means any work involved in constructing, improving, or repairing a public airport or portion thereof, including the construction, alteration, and repair of airport administative buildings and the removal, lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards; but such term does not include the construction, alteration, or repair of airport hangars.

(d) "Airport hazard" means any structure or object of natural growth located on or in the vicinity of a public airport, or any use of land near such airport, which obstructs the air space required for the flight of aircraft in landing or taking off at such airport or is otherwise hazardous to such landing or taking off of aircraft.

(e) "Project" means a project for the accomplishment of airport development with respect to a particular airport.

(f) "Project costs" means any cost incurred in accomplishing a project under this title, including that of making field surveys, preparing plans and specifications, supervising and inspecting construction work, and procuring the accomplishment of such work, and including any administrative or other incidental costs incurred by a sponsor specifically in connection with the accomplishment of a project, which would have been incurred otherwise; but not including the cost of acquiring any interest in land or any easement through or other interest in air space.

(g) "Public agency" means the United States Government or an agency thereof; a State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or an agency thereof; a municipality or other political subdivision; or a body politic, public or quasi-public corporation, or tax-supported organization.

(h) "Public airport" means any airport which is used or to be used for public purposes, under the control of a public agency, the landing area of which is publicly owned.

(i) "Sponsor" means any public agency which meets the requirements prescribed by the Administrator for sponsorship of a project under this title and which, either individually or jointly with one or more other public agencies, sponsors such a project; but, except with respect to a project located in a Territory or possession, such term does not include the United States Government or any agency thereof.

(j) "Possession" means any area (exclusive of the several States, the Territories, and the Philippine Islands) which is under the sovereignty, protection, or mandate of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 17, strike out "air-space" and insert "air space."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BULWINKLE: Page 3, line 11, after the period, insert the following sentence: "Nothing in this act shall authorize the submission of a project application by any municipality or other public agency which is subject to the law of any State if the submission of such project application by such municipality or other public agency is prohibited by the law of such State."

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is quite a bit of confusion as to whether there is contained in the bill the provision which, as the chairman so aptly stated yesterday, leaves it entirely up to the States to decide what course they want to pursue. In order to clarify it, I have offered an amendment which provides that unless the State directly says that it is controlling the flow of funds or the channeling of the funds, the municipalities may come in and sponsor the projects. I have done this to clarify it. I wish the committee to understand that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as was aptly said by the

gentleman from California a few minutes ago, could not take a part as to saying to the States, on the one hand, "You, and you alone, should have this," when they did not pass any legislative enactment authorizing the States to do so. On the other hand, if the municipalities wanted it, but if the State being the superior unit of government wanted to control it, then it was up to the State through legislative enactment to do so. That is all that is in this question. That is all that the committee did.

As I said to you yesterday, some thirty-odd States have not passed all the action necessary to have the funds channeled through them. In some instances it may be possible that some of the States do not want to set up a commission to handle this but are perfectly willing to let it go through their municipalities.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Suppose a State does not have any legislation to deal with this subject, and suppose a small city is desirous of having an airport right thus and so, to its desire. As the law is now, the Federal Government will have its regulation, but how will the Federal Government work with the people in the municipality to get what might be termed a compromise there if they cannot get everything they would like to have back home? What is there in the bill that will give us the assurance that the people here in Washington are not going to rule and regulate the affair?

Mr. BULWINKLE. One thing that has been forgotten here in the Committee so far is that you are setting up a national system of airports in the entire United States. Every municipality in the United States cannot get an airport, no matter how small it is, for there is not enough money up there for that purpose. That is the first proposition.

If the Administrator and his able assistants decide that a town such as the gentleman speaks of needs an airport and should have it in this system, that it complies with the national system of airports, then it should have it. But if on the other hand the gentleman's State says to the Administrator, "We are handling this proposition in the State of Pennsylvania through our State airport commission," the Administrator in connection with the State would handle the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. If we do not have all the money that is necessary, why not give consideration to the smaller airports which will require the least amount of money so that the money would be distributed as widely as possible?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That has been the misapprehension which my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, spoke of and of which others spoke on yesterday. The whole idea in their mind was that there were to be nothing but commercial airports all over the United States. The primary object of this thing is to promote aviation in the United States and to promote it in such a way that the greater number of airports that will be built will be in the category of class 1, 2, or 3 airports, so that in your town when you and 15 or 20 others want to have an airport for private flying exclusively, the Government will enter into it and help your municipality or your State to give it to you.

Mr. RICH. Then we can feel that this bill if it passes will give the smaller airports the greatest consideration?

Mr. BULWINKLE. They will be by far the greater number. I ask that you stop thinking all the time of these commercial air lines.

Mr. RANDOLPH. What the gentleman says is true. Twenty-nine hundred of the airports out of the over-all total of 3,050 in the CAA national airport plan would fall in the category that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] desires to be built. It is our desire to spread the benefits of aviation to smaller communities. Large cities are not favored in this legislation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Would it be fair to say that the language the gentleman has offered would be designed to give statutory definiteness to those words in the report under the heading of channeling funds, as follows:

> Regarding the operation of the program in the States, if a State has legislation requiring that all Federal grants for airport development for that State be channeled through its aeronautics commission or other State agency, that law will control.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. HALLECK. In other words, there was question raised as to the background for that statement in the report?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND. Why should we not let these monopolistic air lines go ahead and build their own airports instead of taking money out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Then why not let these monopolistic truck lines build their own highways?

Mr. BLAND. This bill does not refer to highways. This bill involves planes and airports.

Mr. HINSHAW. We might answer the gentleman from Virginia by saying that the Federal Government should help in this airport program for the same reason that rivers and harbors are paid for by the Federal Government, and they deserve to be treated equally with the rest of them.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Suppose it is obligatory for the funds to be channeled through the States? Suppose a municipality or political subdivision has a project which is meritorious and which appeals to the Administrator here? Could they go ahead and build that airport without the State's consent?

Mr. BULWINKLE. They could go ahead and build their own airport by putting their own funds into it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. But they would not get any aid from the Federal Government?

Mr. BULWINKLE. They would not get any aid from the State or Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: Amend section 2, paragraph (f), by adding at the end of the paragraph the following:
>
> "It includes any such cost incurred by a State or project sponsors, or both, subsequent to June 30, 1944, and subsequent to approval by the Administrator of the location of and master plans for the project, if the Administrator determines that such cost would have been approved if incurred subsequent to the effective date of this act."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, one of the highly responsible duties which we as Members of Congress have is a sincere and earnest attempt to represent the people in our home States, particularly those who are dealing with the problems of aviation, where we have State aeronautical commissions.

It so happens that the amendment which I have offered has been submitted to me by the commissioner of aeronautics of our State, Mr. Schroeder, after some correspondence with him. In frankness to the committee here, I will say that the substance of this amendment was quite exhaustively discussed in the committee at the time we were considering this bill. That is, the proposition which the language speaks of, where many individual villages, towns, cities, in the different States have commenced the construction of airports.

I recall that certain witnesses appeared before our committee and expressed themselves. I have in mind particularly the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] who spoke ably upon this subject.

I want to say further in presenting this matter, and doing it earnestly in behalf of my people in Minnesota, that your committee in dealing with this subject felt that it became so complicated and went so far that we were troubled to arrive at some basis that would be fair to the entire program. Some people might say, "Why did you not make it the 1st of May 1944?" Or they might say, "If you are going back and pick up some of these airports on which expenditures have been made and pay back those municipalities or those State governments for that work, then you are hindering the program."

So the committee in considering this whole matter, as a committee, felt that it should not adopt any form of resolution such as is contained in this amend-

ment. However, I do submit this. I am bound to do so because I have promised my commissioner of aeronautics I would do so, and I sincerely hope the House will give it most careful consideration.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the gentleman from Minnesota makes a very fair statement of the issue involved. His purpose in offering the amendment is to give credit to a farsighted and courageous community rather than to penalize that community.

Mr. O'HARA. That is right. There are some equities in these situations which deserve the serious consideration of the House.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I should like to support your amendment. The fact of the matter is, I have a similar amendment on the Clerk's desk, but my amendment would go in at page 11, after line 16, and it would make it retroactive to January 1, 1945. My situation in Nebraska is similar to that in your State. This amendment was suggested by the people back home. Your explanation may satisfy those people and it may not, but I do not think it will, and I am going to offer my amendment when we reach that page.

Mr. O'HARA. I have no objection to the gentleman offering his amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understood from listening to the reading of the amendment, it would give credit to those municipalities which have heretofore launched an airport-development program, but it fixes a definite date back of which it will not go, June 30, 1944.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. What about the municipalities that started projects in 1942 or 1943?

Mr. O'HARA. Obviously the language of this amendment would not be of any help to them. I may say to the gentleman that is one of the difficulties, he will recall, that we had in the committee upon this very subject.

Mr. HARRIS. Can the gentleman advise the committee approximately how many airports have been initiated by municipalities since June 30, 1944?

Mr. O'HARA. I am sorry; I cannot.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the membership must realize that any funds taken from this authorization to indemnify municipalities for money already expended will to that extent reduce the appropriation for the future. This plan looks to the future, and I believe we cannot afford to go backward. There is no place that I can find where we can draw the line in an equitable fashion to reimburse municipalities for what they have already done.

We must remember that the municipalities of this country in matching Federal funds to a greater or less extent have built 3,000 airports already. They have done that by direct dealing with the Federal Government and under contracts with the Federal Government. So while this amendment has an appealing effect I believe it is not practical to adopt it as part of this plan.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the committee gave very careful consideration to suggestions that were made that airport costs heretofore paid might be considered in connection with this particular program? Is it not likewise true that in that consideration we recognized that the point beyond which we would not go would be difficult to determine, might set up unfair discrimination, and, beyond that, it would be almost impossible to determine fairly and equitably that for which credit should be given and that for which credit should not be given.

Mr. LEA. That is a correct statement of the activities of the committee. There was no place that we could equitably draw the line. If we went back of 1944 to indemnify municipalities it would take a substantial part of the funds authorized in this bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Would the gentleman say that the discretionary fund to be paid out by the Administrator might help in these instances?

Mr. LEA. That is true, of course. The discretionary fund will be used to make an equitable adjustment as to the States which might otherwise share unfairly if limited to the strict formula that is in the bill.

I want to say to the Members of the House that the gentleman who offered this amendment very ably presented this matter to the committee, but it was the judgment of its membership that the amendment could not be adopted.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the O'Hara amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN as a substitute for the O'Hara amendment:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, in any case in which a non-Federal public agency has incurred or hereafter incurs costs for airport development between January 1, 1945, and the end of the first postwar fiscal year, the Administrator is authorized and directed to pay to such agency an amount equal to the share of such costs which would have been payable by the United States if such development had been carried out pursuant to a grant agreement under this act, to the extent that the Administrator determines such costs to be reasonable and necessary for airport development needed to aid in providing a Nation-wide system of public airports."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very similar to the O'Hara amendment, with the exception that my amendment would make it retroactive to January 1, 1945. The amendment has been thoroughly explained by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], and I shall not take up much of the committee's time; however, I do wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that many municipalities throughout the 48 States have made considerable improvement in their airports, such as development of land areas, and so forth, because they believed they would come under the provisions of either the Senate or the House postwar airport bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I believe the gentleman's amendment would move the retroactive date up to January 1, 1945?

Mr. STEFAN. That is right.

Mr. PRIEST. The O'Hara amendment was June 1, 1944?

Mr. STEFAN. That is right.

Mr. PRIEST. The statement has been made that one of the purposes of this bill, and I agree with the statement, is to reward rather than penalize municipalities that had some vision and aggressiveness in connection with their own work. It would seem to me it would carry out the philosophy of the amendment in that respect if we moved the date back to 1943 because certainly those municipalities that built in 1942 or 1943 had more vision and more aggressiveness.

Mr. STEFAN. Yet they had no information about the pending bill.

Mr. PRIEST. That brings up a great difficulty.

Mr. STEFAN. We are trying to take care of those people who developed their airports in the prospect of participating in this program.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Could the gentleman advise the Committee how many projects would be affected by his amendment? How many municipalities have initiated the program since January 1 of this year?

Mr. STEFAN. I can tell the gentleman about my own State. I could not tell him at this moment about all the 48 States of the Union. He could get that information from the CAA at any time.

Mr. HARRIS. We should have that information in the consideration of this amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. I cannot give the gentleman that information. I can tell him about the State of Nebraska.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Could the gentleman advise me how his amendment contemplates paying out the money?

Mr. STEFAN. I will give the gentleman an illustration.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am talking about generally. The Administrator has control of this. He has to let $75,000,000 go a year. Will that $75,000,000 just be dumped into the laps of these people who have already built?

Mr. STEFAN. By no means. I will give the gentleman one illustration in one of the cities of my State. They voted bonds and are going to build a runway costing many thousands of dollars, but they started this action only recently and they did it because they had a firm belief that either the Lea bill

or the McCarran bill would be passed. My amendment would merely let this new work be embraced in the advantages of this legislation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Are they entitled to any more than the men who did it in 1940 or 1941?

Mr. STEFAN. I believe they are because this is new work still in the blueprint form.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman has not explained to the Committee how he contemplates this money being disbursed by the United States Government for the payment of these things.

Mr. STEFAN. In the way as provided in the bill under consideration.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Over a period of years?

Mr. STEFAN. The bill provides a method of payment and participation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I think the gentleman better look into that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWELL:

Page 3, line 7, strike out "Public agency" and insert "Public authority."

Page 3, after line 11, insert the following paragraphs:

"(h) 'Public airport agency' means a State airport agency or a Federal airport agency.

"(i) 'State airport agency' means any department, commission, board, or official of a State government, which, in the opinion of the Administrator, has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized to satisfy the requirements of the Administrator for participation in the Federal-aid airport program provided for by this title.

"(j) 'Federal airport agency' means the United States Government or any agency thereof; or a Territory or possession of the United States or any agency thereof."

Page 3, line 15, strike out "public agency" and insert "public authority"; and in line 18 strike out "public agencies" and insert "public authorities."

Page 3, reletter paragraphs (h), (i), and (j) as paragraphs (k), (l), and (m) respectively.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is aimed specifically at channeling funds provided for under this national airport development plan through the State aviation agencies. Under the terms of the bill as it is drawn these funds are channeled through any public agency which, as I pointed out yesterday, and with which I am sure everyone will agree, means State, county, city, municipality, town, village, precinct, ward, down to the smallest political subdivision of a State government. My bill goes entirely the other way and requires that these funds go through the State agencies.

Some mention has been made of S. 2, the so-called McCarran bill which passed the other body. They have another formula. They have a middle ground. They provide that 65 percent of their $75,000,000 available each year for 5 years shall go to the States for the development of class 1, 2, and 3 airports, and 35 percent of the $75,000,000 available each year under their plan shall go to the States for development in urban areas of class 4 and 5 airports. Our bill has no such middle ground and no such provision. So, on the basis of the two bills my amendment is at least 65 percent right, where this bill as drawn refuses to recognize participation of the State agencies whatsoever. I want it understood at the outset that I am not in opposition to the national airport development plan. We must recognize the future of aviation in our country and the possibility from every possible angle of national defense, employment, and all those things that go to the development of aviation. I do not share the views of some of those that the amount of money involved here is exorbitant and that it authorizes a raid on the Public Treasury. As a matter of fact, if you look up the figures you will find that $6,500,000,000 has been appropriated for public roads, not including $1,700,000,000 last year. Three billion dollars have been appropriated for rivers and harbors, as well as $800,000,000 for the development of rail transportation. So when you consider that this is a 10-year period and embraces only $650,000,000 to be spread over that period the cost is insignificant when you consider the benefits to be derived.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I should like to say again what I said yesterday, that in view of the fact that some 44 States now have agencies set up to handle their aviation problems, it seems to me that by the gentleman's amendment we would provide for a better administration and disposition of these airports over the country.

Mr. HOWELL. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

As I pointed out yesterday, 44 States have airport agencies. That matter has been questioned not once but twice today, most recently by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], my colleague and friend on the committee. I have here a tabulation listing these and giving the legal citations establishing the State aviation agencies, which I shall insert in the RECORD.

This information is based on a tabulation made by the Federal State Relations Section of the Department of Justice, and on reports of the Council of State Governments.

Yesterday the gentleman from North Carolina made much of the testimony presented by Mr. McCracken, chairman of the legislative committee established by the aviation industry and air lines, to the effect that many of the States did not have aviation agencies. I believe the figure used was that only 33 States were thus equipped at the time of Mr. McCracken's testimony during the first week in May. However, as I pointed out yesterday, many States were in the process of establishing or strengthening their aviation agencies. In fact, 9 States have taken such action since May. I call your attention to the following list of States which enacted the uniform aeronautical department act drafted in cooperation with CAA:

Alabama: Governor's Act 402, State Aeronautics Department, approved July 9, 1945.

Connecticut: Act 271, Revise State Commission, approved June 27, 1945.

Florida: Chapter 22321, Establish Division of Aviation, State Improvement Commission, approved June 6, 1945.

Illinois: H. 518, Aviation Department Act, approved June 28, 1945.

Michigan: Acts 327-328, Aviation Department Act, approved May 28, 1945.

Ohio: S. 269, Aviation Department Act, approved June 6, 1945.

Oklahoma: H. 126, Aviation Department Act, approved by Governor May 1945.

Texas: C. 344, Aviation Department Act, approved June 16, 1945.

Wisconsin: Chapter 513, State Aviation Department Act, approved July 26, 1945.

I call your attention to Mr. Burden's testimony at the time of the Senate hearings on S. 2 and S. 34 in March. This was at a time when many of the legislatures were just getting started. He said then—page 347, hearings:

One Governor here mentioned there are some 41 States that have areonautics commissions but prior to 1945 legislative sessions there were only 36.

Please note that some States acted in June and July.

In addition to establishing the necessary State agencies most of the States have recodified their laws and have enacted a uniform aeronautical department act which was drafted by State aviation agencies in cooperation with CAA and the Department of Justice.

Of course, the States have etablished aviation agencies. The Senate bill 2 by Mr. MCCARRAN, of Nevada, which has been studied by State officials for months, required in paragraph (2) of section 14 that "the State shall have a State airport agency as defined herein." That definition reads as follows:

"State airport agency" means any department, commission, board, or official of a State government, which in the opinion of the Administrator has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized to satisfy the requirements of the Administrator for participation in the Federal-aid airport program herein authorized.

Bills with similar sections requiring the States to have aviation agencies have been before Congress for months and a determined effort has been made by the State aviation officials, the Council of State Governments, and the governors to see that each State had such an agency. The only States without an aviation agency as defined in the Senate bill are Mississippi, whose legislature did not meet this year; Missouri, whose legislature is now in session, and where a bill

(H. B. 913) has recently been favorably reported; and Kansas and Arizona.

It is interesting to note that Arizona at a special session on October 3, 1945, approved S. 15x, Laws of 1945, which provided in part that "the Aeronautics Commission of the State or such other agency as the Governor may designate" is authorized to accept Federal grants for airports and cooperate with Federal agencies and subdivisions of the State in furthering aviation development, and so forth.

As in the case of the National Government, some States have, like New York, established an aviation division in their Commerce Department, and one or two have assigned such functions to other departments as for example the Public Works Department.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, having previously asked and obtained leave to do so, I include this tabulation of States:

STATE AVIATION AGENCIES

At present 44 States have established official commissions or departments to handle aviation matters. The following list shows the particular set-up in each State:

Alabama: State aviation commission, code (1940), title 4–2, also Governor's Act 402 (1945).

Arizona: Arizona Corporation Commission has jurisdiction over aviation.

Arkansas: Department of aeronautics, laws, 1941, No. 457.

California: Aviation division, department of public works has jurisdiction over aviation.

Colorado: State aeronautical commission, laws, 1937, chapter 81–9.

Connecticut: Commissioner of aeronautics, General Statutes (supp. 1935), 1266c–1268c Act 96; 271 (1945).

Delaware: Aeronautics commission, State Aeronautics Department Act, 1945 (S. 165, Laws, 1945).

Florida: Florida State Improvement Commission, chapter 22821, June 6, 1945 (created aviation division).

Georgia: Aeronautic advisory board, laws 1941, pages 237–238.

Idaho: Bureau of aeronautics, department of public works, laws 1929, chapter 137.

Illinois: Aeronautics commission, Revised Statutes of 1939, chapter 15½, amended laws 1941, pages 251–253; also H. 518 approved June 28, 1945.

Indiana: Aeronautics commission, laws 1945, chapter 360.

Iowa: Commission of aeronautics, code (Reichmann, 1939), 8338.01–8338.13, amended 1945, chapter 148, Laws 1945.

Kansas: No aviation agency.

Kentucky: Aeronautics commission, Revised Statutes of 1942, 183.020.

Louisiana: Aeronautics commission, General Statutes Annotated (Dart, 1939), 28.4.

Maine: Aeronautical committee, laws 1939, chapter 8; also aeronautics commission, laws 1941, chapter 236, also H. 789, approved April 12, 1945.

Maryland: Aviation commission, Annotated Code (Flack, 1939), article 1–A, 15, amended 1945 (ch. 760).

Massachusetts: Aeronautics commission, laws 1939, chapter 393, 1, 3, amended 1945, Resolution 87.

Michigan: Aeronautics commission, compiled laws (Mason, Supp. 1940) 4801.1 amended 1945; acts 327, 328, approved May 28, 1945.

Minnesota: Department of aeronautics, Statute (Mason, Supp. 1938) 5494–36 1/2 (d), amended 1945 (ch. 303).

Mississippi: No aviation agency.

Missouri: H. 82 establishing State aviation department pending.

Montana: State aeronautics commission, laws 1945, chapter 152.

Nebraska: Aeronautics commission, compiled laws (Kyle, supp. 1941) 3–201 amended 1945, LB282, approved May 10, 1945.

Nevada: Public service commission has jurisdiction over aviation.

New Hampshire: Aeronautics commission, laws 1941, chapter 199–4, also chapter 156, laws 1945, approved May 11, 1945.

New Jersey: State aviation commission, Revised Statute (Supp. 1941) 6:1–5.

New Mexico: Aeronautics commission, laws 1939, chapter 199.

New York: Division of aviation, Commerce Department; laws 1945, chapter 60.

North Carolina: Aeronautics commission, laws 1945 (S. 80).

North Dakota: Division of aeronautics, public service commission, laws 1945, chapter 38.

Ohio: Bureau of aeronautics, Code Annotated (Throckmorton, 1940) 6310–38, S. 269; approved June 28, 1945.

Oklahoma: State aviation agency, division of State Resources Commission, H. 126, approved.

Oregon: State board of aeronautics, compiled laws, annotated (1940) 45–101.

Pennsylvania: Aeronautics commission, department of commerce, amended Act 112; 85a (1945) Act 213.

Rhode Island: Aeronautics advisory board, department of public works, laws 1940, chapter 851–10.

South Carolina: Aeronautics commission, Code (1942) 7112–4.

South Dakota: Aeronautics commission, Code (1939) 2.0105, chapters 2 and 5 (1945).

Tennessee: Bureau of aeronautics, department of highways and public works, laws 1937, chapter 305; amended laws 1939, chapter 195; amended laws 1945, chapter 72.

Texas: H. 309 establishing State aviation department, pending; chapter 344; approved June 16, 1945.

Utah: State aeronautics commission, laws 1937, chapter 10–2 amended laws 1941; first Ex., chapter 2–1 (2).

Vermont: Aeronautics board, laws 1941 No. 100–2, amended 1945, Act 109.

Virginia: Division of aeronautics, State corporation commission, Code annotated (Michie, supp. 1940) 3775o, laws 1942, chapter 355.

Washington: State aviation commission, laws 1945, chapter 252.

West Virginia: Board of aeronautics, Code Annotated (Michie & Sublett, 1937) 2786 (1), amended 1945, chapter 5 and chapter 6.

Wisconsin: Aeronautics board, Statute (1941) 114.015 amended chapter 513, July 26, 1945.

Wyoming: State aviation commission, revised Statute Annotated (Courtright, Supp. 1940) 103–1801; amended, chapter 32 (1945).

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. May I ask the gentleman what in his opinion would be the effect of the amendment just adopted by the committee, which provides:

Nothing in this act shall authorize the submission of a project application by any municipality or other public agency which is subject to the law of any State if the submission of such project application by such municipality or other public agency is prohibited by the law of such State.

Does not that take care of the situation as far as the gentleman's amendment is concerned?

Mr. HOWELL. In reply to my good friend and colleague on the committee, may I say that that amendment, the Bulwinkle amendment, merely recognizes the necessity of channeling funds through State agencies, yet at the same time further federalizes this plan by placing the burden on 48 States in the Union to pass specific legislation requiring that all such funds be channeled through those agencies. So the amendment itself is a recognition of the fact that this is a strongly federalized program. It merely makes it more so and recognizes at the same time that the States are the proper ones through which the funds should come.

The national airport plan developed in active cooperation with the States, providing for extensive cooperation of the States in development of the plan, will do three things: It will insure a widespread airport plan throughout the country. It will insure the development of an adequate system of airports. It will insure the constructive use of all the planning and engineering facilities that are available in both cities and States. The States will be able to participate in the development and operation of a national airport program. Airports figure prominently in the States' plans for postwar reconstruction and development. The States are in a better financial position than they have been in many years, and generally they are in a better financial position than any other levels of government. Almost all of them have substantial surpluses largely invested in war bonds and a considerable of this surplus in many States is earmarked for postwar public works. It has been contended that the establishment of Federal-State operation with respect to airports would inspire a great deal of controversy. On the contrary, such a pattern would be much less likely to inspire controversy and competition than a dual Federal-city and Federal-State pattern, as provided in the bill now pending before the House. If the Federal-city plan should be adopted in whole or in part, it would first establish a new principle of intergovernmental relations on a continuing basis, a principle which in large part short-circuits all State government. If this principle is established with respect to airports, it will, no doubt, be advocated as an administrative pattern for all future progress participated in by the Federal Government, many of which are now under consideration, such as education, hospitals, general public works, roads, and so forth. It will also require an enormous expansion of Federal agencies and the employment of thousands of additional workers who will in large part duplicate the very work that can be done, and, in fact, is now being done, by established State agencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will my distinguished friend from Illinois yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish to say that I am in favor of the gentleman's amendment and I think it ought to be adopted. I might also say that I received a telegram from Governor Willis, of Kentucky, advising that the State of Kentucky has set up an aeronautics board that can and will handle for the State of Kentucky the matters of airports, and so forth, provided in this bill and that he strongly favors the Howell amendment. He further points out that the council of State governments by Governors' conference and by National Association of State Aviation Officials approved the Howell amendment and urged its adoption. I agree that the amendment of our colleague [Mr. BULWINKLE] improves H. R. 3615, but it does not go far enough. It merely makes it optional whether the funds available to the States under this bill are to be channeled through the municipalities of the several States or through the respective States themselves.

This bill provides that the Federal Government shall cooperate with the States or municipalities on a fifty-fifty basis to build and improve airports in the several States. It cooperates in relation to the improvement of our transportation through the highways of the air as the Federal Government cooperates with the States in improving our transportation by highways on the ground.

The cooperation between the Federal Government and the States since the adoption of Federal Aid Road Act of November 1921 has been most satisfactory indeed.

Prior to November 1921 we had a makeshift highway program of cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, and the counties. It provided, as this bill provides, that the Federal Government could match funds provided by the counties or municipalities. We did not have a system of highways. The rich counties that were able to match Federal funds and already had very good highways were able to secure more highways. When these highways reached the less-favored sections of the several States, they stopped, and we jumped off into mudholes and on bad roads. There was no integrated or correlated highway system. The Federal Road Act of November 1921 among other important changes provided that the State should become the unit of matching Federal funds instead of the county. A system of unified highways was laid out, which reached every county seat and populous community of the Nation, and these highways passed through the rich as well as the less-favored sections of the States, so that a person getting on a good highway can go entirely around the Nation. That unified and coordinated system built through the encouragement and cooperation of the Federal Government with the several States has proved of inestimable value and one of the great blessings that has come to our country.

I had charge of that Federal highway bill in the House and nothing that I have done in my years of service in House and Senate has given me more pleasure than to have had some part in helping work out this great system of highways by cooperation of the Federal Government and the States.

While the Federal Government did not put up as much money as the States and the subdivisions, yet it had a wonderful effect in giving the States the benefit of the experiments and experience in road building in all parts of the country and it eliminated to a large extent the undue influence through wealth and political power of certain sections of the State over the less-favored and weaker political units in the State. But we needed good roads in order to be of service to the people of those less-favored communities, to the State as a whole and to the Nation as a whole.

This great airport program in my opinion will be a great blessing to the people of the several States and to the Nation. It will stimulate industry, agriculture, education, intercourse of the people of all sections of the country and give the less-favored sections of our country some of the benefits enjoyed by the more favored and more populous sections. Already too much has been done to break down the rights of the States and to develop a tremendous bureaucracy here in Washington. If this bill should become law without the Howell amendment, municipalities would deal directly with the Federal Government. The States could be and would be ignored. The States should not be ignored because the States are in their very nature a part of the great Federal system, the 48 States constituting the Federal Government.

In a matter of this kind the Federal Government should deal with the States. In practically every other matter in which the Federal Government has coordinated in a program with the States, the Federal Government has dealt with the States as a unit, and the funds were channeled through the States with the exception of the WPA. The Federal Government dealt direct with the municipalities and other districts as units then and what a mess we had of that—of waste, extravagance, favoritism, partiality, and political interference.

It will be much easier for people of our respective States to go to their capital and meet and deal with their aeronautics board than it would be to require them to come to Washington in making application and working out the details of their application for an airport. And then this aeronautics board would have the picture of the whole State before them and would feel a direct responsibility in doing equal justice to all parts of the State.

The municipalities are a part of their respective State system and the municipalities should deal with their respective States. With the State having a say in this matter, the States will see to it that these benefits are spread out in an equitable way throughout the State, instead of one or two big municipalities alone benefiting by this Federal contribution to the airport program.

The Howell amendment proposes that Federal funds for the airport program shall be channeled through the States, just as Federal road funds are channeled through the States as units, and inasmuch as the Federal road program has enjoyed such a wide success, I am convinced that it is the best plan that we could adopt in handling the contribution of the Federal Government for our airport program in the several States.

It is my sincere hope that the Howell amendment will be adopted.

It has been said in the debate today that a few of the States do not have an aeronautics board. That may be true. It was urged when we had the Federal-aid road bill up that some of the States did not have a highway commission. But it was not long until all the States had what they needed, a highway commission, and the few States that do not have an aeronautics board will soon secure such a board, and then this legislation will be administered uniformly throughout the United States as the Federal-aid road program has been since November 1921.

Mr. HOWELL. They did.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. As I understand, heretofore the Federal Government has adhered to the policy of dealing with the State governments and not dealing directly with the lower levels of the government.

Mr. HOWELL. That is correct.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I understand it is based on the proposition that the State is the creature of the Federal Government and the municipalities and counties are creatures of the State government. Therefore the Federal Government's relationship ought to be with the State, and then in turn the relationship should be of the State with the lower levels of government.

Mr. HOWELL. That is correct. That is the procedure that has been followed in these State-Federal plans from the beginning of this Government.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Only recently when the matter of tax replacements in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority came up it was then adhered to very strongly by the majority of the committee and of the Congress that the Federal Government or an agency of the Federal Government should deal with the State only.

Mr. HOWELL. That is my understanding.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. And the policy was that the Federal Government should not channel any funds directly to the municipal governments.

Mr. HOWELL. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution. In line with the thought advanced by the gentleman from Tennessee, it is interesting to note that at the time the Federal aid road program was established only 2 States out of 48 had highway departments, and working in cooperation with the Federal Road Administration all 48 States in the Union today have highway departments.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. In connection with what the gentleman from Tennessee said, he overlooks the fact that the Federal Government did deal directly with the

cities, counties, and other subdivisions in the Public Works Administration program. I rise pricipally to ask the gentleman if he can tell me how many, if any, airports the States had ever constructed.

Mr. HOWELL. I do not propose to tell you at the present time because very few airports have been constructed anywhere without Federal aid, but I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that most of these PWA airports that were constructed when the Federal Government dealt directly with the cities and villages, are now covered with grass, all over the country due to lack of planning and cooperation with the States.

Now, continuing further, if you follow this practice of channeling these funds around State agencies, you will also establish in a short time just a Federal system—Federal policy, Federal progress, Federal direction and operation. That has been the history of practically all of the emergency programs that were attempted on a Federal-local basis. You will foster and stimulate the already prevalent habit, on the part of too many political subdivisions, of coming to Washington for money for all sorts of projects, irrespective of the financial condition of the localities and the States, thus placing severe and continuing hardships on them and their taxpayers.

You will create an environment in which the impulse would be for State governments, municipalities, and communities to compete with each other for Federal aid.

For the most part, the municipalities and communities will enter the postwar period with serious financial problems, and in sponsoring such projects will need the assistance of the State governments. This is particularly significant in view of the broader taxing powers inherent in State governments as compared with their local subdivisions.

The State governments, rather than the Federal Government, are the appropriate bodies to secure cooperation as to the selection of sites and use, and to resolve disputes between neighboring municipalities and their suburban areas.

In almost every prosperous city the mayors are going to the State legislatures applying for funds, for an increase in their debt limits, and at the same time they are reaching out for Federal funds. This is particularly true in the larger populated cities. In those States the legislatures are wrestling with the problem of new revenue for the cities. During the past 5 years the States have reduced their over-all indebtedness by one-third. Second, they have established postwar reserves of nearly $5,000,000,000 for public works projects, including airports.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, the Bulwinkle amendment has clarified this situation, in that it places specific language into the bill which establishes the fact that the State has the controlling authority, so far as the activities of the State are concerned, in applying for Federal funds. If any State sees fit to deny the municipalities the right to go to the Federal Government for matching funds, it can do so.

I want the House to understand the facts which influenced the committee in the decision it made on this matter.

Two main viewpoints were presented to the committee. One was to force all applications through the States. The other was to require them to all come from the municipalities of the country. After considering this question at length—and it is not a new thing, as the committee considered this thoroughly during the hearings—the committee decided that both of those plans were wrong; that we ought to have a compromise; that it was not justifiable to compel a State to channel these funds unless it wanted to do so, and it was not wise to debar the municipalities of the country from presenting their claim if the State law permitted them to do so.

What was the situation that confronted us in making these decisions? If the membership of this House understands the influences which led to the action of the committee they will agree with us that it is a just and practical plan we have written into this bill for the allotment of Federal funds.

During the last few years 3,000 airports have been constructed in the United States with the aid of the Federal Government. The Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration mainly had charge of that work. The 3,000 municipalities in the United States thus had direct dealing with the Federal Government. The proposal here is to deny municipalities the right to come directly to the Federal Government. This experience of the last 10 years shall be lightly cast aside. This proposed amendment would provide for an intermediate agency between the Federal Government and the builders of airports.

Direct contracts will be made with each one of these municipalities no matter what scheme is adopted. Here you must get a contract with every municipality that builds an airport in this country. Channeling through the States will not change that fact. On the contrary you needlessly impose an intermediate agency, you will add delay, confusion, and uncertainty in many cases.

In other words, our committee takes the view that the State itself ought to decide this question. If part of the States do not want their municipalities to come to the Federal Government that certainly should be acceptable to us. But where is the justification for Congress saying to every State in this country: "Regardless of what you desire you must go to the State organization in your State before you can ask for matching funds for your municipal airport." Do not forget that these are municipal airports. That is what the airports are and that is what they ought to be.

Only the State, if anyone, not Congress, should prevent a municipality, which pays the bill, from coming directly to the Federal Government. By such direct contracts 3,000 airports have already been built. I cannot see any business judgment in Congress stepping in here today and at one swoop obliterating the plan we have had that resulted in the construction of these 3,000 airports.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I prefer to complete my statement, if the gentleman will pardon me.

One fact that is perfectly apparent is that the municipalities of the country are pretty much ready to join in this program immediately. Many of the States are not; some of them are. In fact in all cases the State must be prepared to match funds and comply with the sponsorship requirements before they can qualify for Federal funds to build an airport. A great many of the States cannot do that until after the next legislature has met and given that authority.

The McCarran bill recognizes that and partially postpones State funneling for 3 years. Three years' postponement on a 5-year program does not look like an efficient or businesslike way to handle the Government's affairs.

Let us look at the situation as it would be under this bill. This bill contemplates 6,000 airports. About 3,000 of them, or a large part of the 3,000, are already built. This means about 3,000 new airports will be built. Six hundred and fifty million dollars is authorized for this purpose in 10 years. What does this mean? It means an average of 120 airports for each State. This divided by 10 means an average of 12 airports a year for a State, some more, some less. Is the Federal Government here in Congress going to say to all the little States of this country that they must create special agencies to handle the building of 12 airports or less a year? Most of them are of the smaller type. Why should we attempt to tell the States of the country that they will have to do such a foolish thing as to set up an agency for handling a small amount of money? Why not let the States, each for itself, decide how its applications shall be made? The average amount of money per year to one State is going to be only $1,350,000. Should Congress compel a State to set up a complicated intermediate agency to supervise contracts with its municipalities, for only $1,350,000 from the Federal Government?

Mr. Chairman, each State on the average will have six new airports a year; that is all. Are you going to say to the States that they must have a special agency, an elaborate system, for taking care of six airports a year? Many of them will be for a small amount only.

As I see it, it would be a lazy man's policy here to say that we will turn this money over to the State; we will let it decide where the airports shall be built and how much of the money allotted to the State it can use. If we permit that thing it would be a lazy man's way of earning his salary. You would make the Administrator a mere figurehead. He will not give to this great enterprise of the Government his independent judgment, or his aggressive devotion to duty. This job requires a man who will rise above local political influences and try to carry out a national-airport system

for the benefit of this Nation; but the man who represents the Federal Government cannot do it, if he walks away from his responsibility and makes political or personal convenience the guiding star of his conduct. That cannot be done and it will not be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I may say to the gentleman that would also be true if the things he speaks of as to a national administrator were applied to the State situation. The same danger would apply there if fairness and justice to both the rural and urban populations are not exercised in this whole program.

Mr. LEA. That is true. There is always the possibility of indifference, corruption, or inefficiency. We want to do the best we can to avoid that.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that under our Federal road program where the Federal Government matches State funds a county or municipality that asks for a road must first go to the State highway commission and have that road approved by the highway commission? I would like to know wherein lies the difference between the Howell amendment in relation to this bill as compared to the Federal road set-up?

Mr. LEA. The difference is as clear as the sunshine. In the case of the highways they belong to the State. The State puts up the money and has charge of the construction of State highways. So the interested party, the one who pays the money, deals directly with the Federal Government. Here the airports are built for the municipality. They pay the money.

Mr. JENSEN. But the towns and counties have a certain control over the highways which go through those respective towns or counties?

Mr. LEA. Yes, they have an interest, of course, but the State takes them over and has control of the money it spends on the highways within the State.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. That is why it appeals to me the Howell amendment goes right along the same line as our present highway matching fund program.

Mr. LEA. Does the gentleman know of any similar instance in which the Federal Government deals with the individuals or locations where the fund passes through the State as an intermediate agency?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to answer that?

Mr. LEA. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. In the administration of funds in the Public Health Service.

Mr. LEA. But that is a Government activity and is done in cooperation with the State. Not with localities under contract agreement.

Mr. KEEFE. They advance funds for tuberculosis and venereal disease control, and various other diseases, where we spend huge sums of money. That is all channeled through the State health agencies, and it has been the policy for years to not permit the Federal Government to deal directly with the local municipality.

Mr. LEA. That is an act of cooperation with the State. Here we are interested in cooperation with municipalities.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would say that there are several examples of this type of thing. You might include rivers and harbors, flood control, and several other divisions in connection with Government expenditures, which functions are carried on practically in the localities involved.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Coming back to the Federal-aid highway program, of course the counties make up their programs and send them into the State highway commissioners and they make up a program, and then the Bureau of Public Roads comes in and approves the program. The Bureau of Public Roads may eliminate certain of them. I think the whole design of this bill is to follow the program that has been put in operation by trial and error and worked out and perfected by the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with the Federal-aid program. I do not see why we cannot stay with that system of doing the work with the Federal Government making the contribution.

Mr. LEA. They get this money from State taxes and act for the State while this is a question of the municipalities building the airports. The States build no airports and contributed little in most States. Why should they be given charge over cities by Congress. We have built 3,000 already under this plan. Why prevent it in the future? Why depart from it? Does anybody else say he is going to do it any better?

Mr. WHITE. Is there any difference between the municipality building an airport and the county building a road under the road program?

Mr. LEA. The county has charge of its own roads. The cities, not the State, have responsibility for their airports.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the secondary road program the counties put up the money and deal through the State highway commission with the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. LEA. That is true. But after all, that is neither here nor there. The question is, Which is the sensible businesslike way? Why interpose intermediate agencies that will not put up any money? If the State wants to do it, that is all right, and we have no objection to it, but what we do object to is forcing the States to do what they do not want to do.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman has continually referred to 3,000 airports built under substantially the program provided for in this bill. How many of those 3,000 airports were built under the WPA program?

Mr. LEA. Part of them were, of course.

Mr. KEEFE. How many?

Mr. LEA. I do not know the number.

Mr. KEEFE. How many were built under a direct Federal control program other than the WPA? I would like to have the gentleman give us that information.

Mr. LEA. About 600 or more of our most substantial airports were built under the Administrator without WPA. I do not know how many of the smaller airports. He has experience, understanding, and a record of success.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee made a very thorough study of this subject. We went into it very carefully, and after due consideration we decided that we should adopt the form appearing in the bill; that we should make it in the alternative of either channeling it through the States, if the States wanted it that way, or we should let it be possible for the Administrator to deal directly with the municipalities. May I answer a question that was asked here concerning the difference between this and Federal aid to highways? I respond to the inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin. The construction of airports is a municipal function in itself. For example, a road goes between two cities or counties or States. It is natural that a State will appropriate funds to build a road between two cities, because it benefits the whole State. But take an airport deal, one city quite often does not want to contribute to the taxes of the State to build an airport in another city. For that reason many States will not want to appropriate funds as States to match Federal funds for municipalities. You will find that the municipalities, the ones that will be benefited are the ones that will maintain the airports, and they are the ones that will have an interest in matching the funds to build the airports. Therefore, they should have the right to come directly to the CAA for funds unless the States provide otherwise.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. There is little similarity between a State system of highways and a State system of airways. In my mind they are not comparable. As the gentleman has pointed out, highways crisscross the country on the surface. Of course, the State would be interested in that vast construction within its borders, would it not?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. That is true.

Mr. MURDOCK. The airways, however, are given by nature, except for the airports. Air lanes cross State lines without notice and practically all construction for airways is centralized at points for the fields.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Very true. We have made it possible for those States who want to provide agencies to have the channeling of funds through the States. There are some States that do not have agencies. These States should be considered. This is a Federal project. Some States will never want to appropriate money unless you force it on them, because it is a subject which is within the scope of the municipalities, and those States which do not want to set up an agency should not be forced to do it and should not be put to the expense of doing it. I know that some of the agencies that have been set up are not set up by legislative enactment but merely by gubernatorial executive act. They were created by order of the Governor without legislative authority. They have no funds. For the very reason that some of the municipalities will oppose appropriations for State agencies, State governments in many instances will never set up funds.

We have found that the system that has been used in the past has worked, because the municipalities were encouraged—at least, those municipalities that have enough interest to go ahead were encouraged to deal directly with the Administrator. I think we should continue that system. I know that in my own State, for instance, there has been no appropriation of funds. The municipalities that have been interested enough have gone ahead and built fine airports. They are the ones that have received the benefits. I know there are other cities in my State, and I think it is true in many States, that would not want to contribute to the creation of an airport in another city when they themselves may not want an airport or may already have their airport.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOWELL. Will the gentleman tell us where these municipalities and cities are going to get the money to raise their 50 percent of the funds to match the Federal funds?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. They can get it from bonds or from taxes. They have matched funds in the past and they can do it in the future.

Mr. HOWELL. Without legislative authority from their State legislatures?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. They have done it with the authority as cities to levy taxes and under the general bonding authority of municipalities.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The representative of the California League of Municipalities has conveyed to me his support of the argument the gentleman is now making, and he expresses no concern at all as to the cities being able to handle their part of the appropriation.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I appeal to you to leave it the way the committee has arranged it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a good deal of interest to this debate. I listened with a great deal of interest to the hearings we had in the committee. I thought we had a bill that we had mostly agreed upon, but I see we have not.

It appears to me that the adoption of the Bulwinkle amendment delegates to the States the right to control the participation by the States in this Federal project, so that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is absolutely taken care of by that amendment.

Let me read you the Bulwinkle amendment:

> Nothing in this act shall authorize the submission of a project application by any municipality or other public agency which is subject to the law of any State if the submission of such project application by such municipality or other public agency is prohibited by the law of such State.

Congress is merely saying to the States that we have set up an agency here whereby a municipality or political subdivision, a county, or any other project sponsor might come to the Federal Government and say, "We have something worth while. We will match you. Will you match us?" If the States are against that, all they have to do is to pass a law saying to the Congress or to the Civil Aeronautics Administrator, "You cannot deal with that municipality but you must come and deal with us." Is that not fair? That is letting the State control these funds if they want to. In other words, it is Federal aid with State control. That is, I believe, the intention of this bill. We should not cut out any municipality or political subdivision which goes to the Civil Aeronautics Board and presents a picture which is good for the national plan and which is good for the municipality and good for that State. If it is not agreeable to the State, then the State can pass a law and take care of it and say to the Aeronautics Board Administrator, "You must deal through the State."

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. The gentleman recognizes then that the Bulwinkle amendment which was just adopted would require all 48 States of the Union to pass a law prohibiting municipalities from getting funds directly from the Civil Aeronautics Authority?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Not at all. In other words, it says if a State is not satisfied with what we are doing here today about letting a municipality make an application, that State can pass a law and prohibit the municipality from making the application.

It is just saying to the States, "If you are not satisfied with what we have done in Congress as to the matching of funds and if you are not satisfied to permit municipalities to come in and set up a good project that conforms to the national plan, if you want to control it, then pass a law in your State saying to the Congress that you do not want the Congress to deal with the municipalities, and that we want the Congress to deal with a commission set up by the State and appointed by the governor."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. What becomes of the apportionment of funds under section 6 which reads as follows:

> As soon as possible after any appropriation is made under section 5 (b), 75 percent of the amount thereof available for grants for projects in the several States shall be apportioned by the Administrator among the several States, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States.

If these municipalities are permitted to come in and take away this money, what becomes of the rest of the communities in the State under that provision of the law?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. In answer to the gentleman's question, I say that is only a rule with reference to the appropriations under the program and with reference to the division of the fund. Seventy-five percent is divided between the States, half on the basis of population and half on the basis of the area of the State. Twenty-five percent is a revolving fund which can be spent by the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Board in order to achieve the best results for the national airport program.

Mr. WHITE. If two or three favored communities or municipalities get the bulk of the money, what becomes of the rest of the communities in the State under this rule and regulation?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. They will not get the bulk of the money.

Mr. WHITE. There will not be any money given except to 2 or 3 favored communities.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The Civil Aeronautics Authority Administrator will not approve any project that is not in the interest of the national airport program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate and recognize the sincerity of those who approach this problem from the standpoint of either favoring or opposing the Howell amendment. I hope that in the heat of this debate—and I think probably this is the part of the bill which is most

controversial—we do not lose sight of the important fact that in this program one of the important things is that there should be a national over-all program. I recognize the fact that the State governors and State aeronautical commissions desire to control, as far as possible, the use of funds, for various reasons which I am human enough to understand. For example, I have a wire from my attorney general, which I received yesterday, urging me to support the Howell amendment. I had not heard of the Howell amendment at that time, but the attorney general had. This morning I received a wire from the Governor. I presume that the Council of State Governors has sort of agreed on this amendment. I do want to say with deep respect to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] that he was in faithful and constant attendance upon the committee when we were considering this bill, but I did not hear any amendment offered at the time we were considering the matter.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. With reference to your recent observation, I believe the gentleman from Minnesota has always reserved to himself the privilege of not offering an amendment in the committee but offering it on the floor.

Mr. O'HARA. Always. There was no reflection meant by it at all, I assure the gentleman. However, I do admire the fame of the Howell amendment. It is perfectly proper that we should consider it here.

Let me call attention to two or three things which I think are important in this connection. The municipalities are the ones who will be charged with the responsibility, and it is dependent upon their local interest as to whether that airport is going to be a success or not.

The second point I want to emphasize is that I hope whatever is ultimately done in the channeling of these funds, we will keep in mind this important thing, whether you determine by your judgment to allocate through the State, or whether it is handled exclusively by the Federal Government, or whether you have a combination of those two, unless it is handled fairly, in the interest of both metropolitan areas and urban areas, you can have a very sorry result from this very well-intentioned legislation.

I agree with my distinguished friend the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. I like the idea of the Senate bill in that regard, providing for the control by States of the class 1, 2, and 3 airports, and by the Federal Government of class 4 and 5 airports. For example, the great city of Chicago has a tremendous problem dealing with the needs of the city of Chicago, and the entire airport transportation situation. So has the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, and the city of Newark, N. J., or any of the other metropolitan areas. Equally important are the needs and problems of thousands of airports in rural areas.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes, I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am one of those people who always believe that the Government that spends the money should direct the expenses. I believe they are trying to get a national program for the utilization of airplanes. I do not believe we should make this a pork barrel.

Mr. O'HARA. No, not at all. I want to say to the gentleman, of course, I am just old-fashioned enough, and I am sure he will agree with me when I say we are all a part of the Government. We want to see this handled fairly. I believe that perhaps this bill will have to go to conference, but I feel further that we can probably work the situation out better in conference than in the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is a suspicion among many that there is more or less "pork" in this measure just as the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota called attention to.

Mr. O'HARA. I may say in reply to my good friend from Minnesota that I do not believe there is any "pork" in this situation. I believe it is a very serious situation in the over-all development of our country's aviation program and while some may feel that there is "pork" in it I must say in fairness that my personal belief is to the contrary.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in profound respect the judgment of my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL]. I wish to state, however, that if this amendment is adopted it is going to hinder the progress of aviation in America.

Now, just a word in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, who asked a previous speaker where the money was coming from. My own city, Chicago, has had an agency which surveyed the airport needs of the city, an agency made up of businessmen who serve without compensation for the purpose of fostering aviation, not only local but transcontinental. The people of Chicago have already voted a bond issue in the amount of $15,000,000 for the extension and improvement of existing airport facilities and for the acquisition of land for a new airport. We took care of that matter long before this bill was introduced.

If this money is channeled through the States and not directly to the municipalities, I am fearful of what may happen in large municipalities that are self-sustaining, and their plans for the promotion of commercial aviation. If the background of this amendment were gone into it would be found that the groups sponsoring it have an ulterior motive, for they are interested in another field of commercial transportation. Let us not be fooled by this amendment. If we are interested in the progress of American aviation and the American aircraft industry this amendment should be voted down. The amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina clarifies any doubt as to the intent of this legislation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman believe we ought to follow as nearly as possible the plans which have been worked out under the Federal-aid highway program?

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. The Federal-aid highway system, I may say to the gentleman from Idaho, is an interwoven system of transportation between county seats and States that comes under the supervision of State highway commissions.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman believe the State is in a far better position to know the overall transportation problem and solve it than is any single municipality?

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. No; I may say to the gentleman from Idaho that if the people of the State so desire they can have their legislature act on the matter at its next meeting.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know that under the Federal-aid system for roads the money is apportioned three ways? Each State gets its share. You could not say that the States will get their share if the municipalities could come in and grab off the bulk of the money?

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Yes. A city will get its equal share. In a large municipality the amount of money appropriated may be greater because the expenditure is greater and the expansion is greater. In proportion to the population it would be greater.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to rise in support of the Howell amendment. In view of the fact that 44 of the 48 States have already set up aviation departments in their State governments it shows they are ready for this kind of legislation. I want to refer to the example cited by my very distinguished friend the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. KELLY]. By setting up an agency and channeling this money through the States I do not think that will interfere in the least with the big cities. It will encourage and facilitate construction. At least that is what I hope.

I have the honor of representing a district in one of the larger States of the Union and I have a telegram here from the Governor of Ohio, who, as most of you know if you know anything about Ohio politics, is a Democrat and a distinguished man. Here is what he says:

> Believe that H. R. 3615 providing for the establishment of a national system of airports should contain language authorizing a Federal administrative agency in its dealing with local subdivisions to do so through the various States in the Nation. It would be unwise to have the Federal agency deal directly with local political subdivisions.
>
> The pattern used in building national highways has worked out successfully with the National Government acting with the

State in the construction of local subdivision improvements.

The plan has been tried and proved successful. It ought to apply to the airport program.

FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Governor.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that our Governor agrees with me.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman made reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois. It seems to me when he expressed his concern about the municipalities he put his finger on the point that should concern a lot of us. That is, what is going to happen to the development of the hinterland, or some of the smaller airports, if this bill is designed to favor municipalities. He said he was concerned over the change for fear the municipalities would not get the money that they ought to have. Of course, the bill does contemplate a 25-percent fund being expended within the discretion of the Administrator. According to the language of the bill, this is for the purpose of developing a national airport plan. There are two edges to that particular point. One is that it means no advantage will ever be taken of the so-called Bulwinkle amendment because no State is going to pass a law so that the municipality shall not negotiate with the Federal Government, lest that would preclude them from coming under the 25-percent fund. Therefore, no State is going to do that. Otherwise the State would come within the application of the 25-percent fund. If we are going to have a national airport plan we need to have an agency here that will look after the smaller places in connection with the development of feeder lines and such and that will be possible only if some of this money is channeled through the State commissions under the Howell amendment.

Mr. JENKINS. I think the gentleman is absolutely right, because there is more danger of a very large city which might dominate a State usurping the rights and interests of the hinterland, as the gentleman says, than of the State usurping the rights of a city. I was a member of the State senate of my State, and my observation was that the legislators are always very solicitous of the welfare of the big cities, but sometimes it does not reverse itself when the big cities have that opportunity. I am not afraid that in this case the State will exceed its powers, and I do not think that the cities will abuse their powers. This is a case of the Federal Government providing that some definite agency be set up to carry out what the Federal Government wants done.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to ask if the simple, clean-cut question under the amendment here is whether or not it should go through the State government or local municipality?

Mr. JENKINS. That is exactly right. Forty-four of the forty-eight States are ready to go. The Bulwinkle amendment having been passed, I think this Howell amendment is a very fitting correlary to that. They both work together, and without either of them we will not have a complete program. But with both of them we do have a complete program.

The Federal Government would not be justified in going into this matter of aviation control, except that it is generally recognized that aviation is not only a science but it is now a system of transportation, in which the people are vitally interested. Aviation is more expansive than the jurisdiction of States or cities. The Government has a duty to give to the people all the advantages that have come with this great thing we call aviation. It is now generally considered that aviation is not a State or municipality development. The Federal Government has encouraged aviation from the beginning, and it is primarily the Federal Government's responsibility to initiate plans and programs for the further development of aviation.

Congress has set up a department of Government known as the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The term "civil" is used as in contrast to military or naval. The Army and Navy have the duty to develop aeronautics, which they have done to their great credit. It is the duty of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to develop civil aviation in a broad way—in a national way. It is the duty of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to do everything possible to put and to keep the United States as far ahead of any other country in the world as the Army and Navy have done in the field of national defense. Likewise, it is the duty of Congress to encourage the Civil Aeronautics Administration by the passage of proper legislation and by providing adequate funds. But we must not forget that there are many personal advantages inuring to the people from the location of air fields and from the establishment of airways and air lines. The people must pay their part of these improvements, from which they get so much benefit. Likewise, the States and municipalities must do their part. The Federal Government should lead the way, but the people must also carry on with money and with organization.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois in making his presentation said that there were 44 States that had passed suitable laws for the handling of these funds. He named the four States which he said had not passed those laws. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois what law the State of California, which is supposedly included in the 44, has passed, which refers to the establishment in my State of a civil aviation authority.

Mr. HOWELL. The gentleman will recall that I inserted in the RECORD during my remarks a complete tabulation prepared by a most authoritative source which lists all the States and the laws by sections and chapters, and as soon as that comes back to me from the official reporters, I will be very happy to point it out to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to point out to the gentleman from Illinois that no such law has been passed by the State of California at all. I would like to read the title and reference to assembly bill 2188 which was introduced for this purpose and sent to the Committee on Public Utilities:

> Calls for regulation by State railroad commission of interstate commercial aircraft operations. (This is said to be a verbatim transcription of the National Association of Railroad Utility Commission model, with only two minor changes.)

I think that we can well recognize what is going on here, gentlemen. I would like to leave that subject to your own imagination.

May I mention one other thing—and I am not speaking of the large municipalities. I am speaking of the small municipalities. The municipalities, in any event, whether these funds are channeled through the States or channeled directly, must provide a portion of the money and the land for this airport construction, and then have a portion of it matched by the Federal Government. It is not at all similar to the Federal Road Act. In the Federal Road Act certain moneys are sent to the States and used by the State highway commissions for allocation among the various counties and on the State roads. That is a wholly different situation. The municipalities and the counties have no responsibility for the use of those funds except that they do a certain amount of matching in the construction. In this case the cities—and I am speaking of the small towns as well as the large towns, because it does not matter what size they are—all have the responsibility of not only the building of these airports but the maintaining of them over a long period of years as well as the operation of those airports. To me, there is utterly no sense whatsoever in tying such a program up definitely with any firm State operation. If you do that, you are going to throttle aviation in this country. You are going to prevent from going ahead this new form of transportation in which so many hundreds of thousands of our returning boys are interested in obtaining jobs. Not only that, but you will prevent the establishment of a new industry in this country on a firm footing, which you will absolutely need for the future protection of our country in the event we are attacked. I say that knowing the influences that have been brought to bear upon me in connection with this matter, and with perfect confidence in the belief that I am right. I have no objection whatsoever to the State agencies handling the bulk of these applications, we will say, from the small cities and towns. That would be an easier way to handle it. It seems to me that that portion of the Senate bill might well be included as an amendment to this bill when the bill has been wholly rewritten.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota and Mr. HOWELL rose.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes in order to answer questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What does the gentleman perhaps think of changing the split? Suppose the Howell amendment were adopted, and you changed the split so as to disburse 65 percent through the States, and increased the Administrator's discretionary fund to 35 percent, would you not accomplish the same thing as the Senate bill?

Mr. HINSHAW. The discretionary fund, as I understand it, is for the purpose of equalizing the distribution. It is not a question of whether it should be distributed to the larger cities or the smaller towns of the country, it is for the purpose of equalizing the distribution so that certain areas of the country which have been overstuffed, you might say, with airports, do not need to get so much as those sections of the country where perhaps there have been very few airports constructed by the War and Navy Departments or by the PWA.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That section uses the words "in order to carry out the national airport plan."

Mr. HINSHAW. That is what the whole bill is for.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And I have presumed that the discretionary fund is to be used for the development of airports at strategic points or points which from a national standpoint should be developed.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct. That is a matter of allocating the funds among various localities rather than a question of channeling the funds.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is my opinion that the funds should be channeled in some degree so as to insure some development of the areas which a national agency might overlook.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is the reason we put the discretionary feature in there. I am talking about the channeling of the funds.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. This is what disturbs me about this proposition. Suppose the State has no authority at all, and 25 or 30 cities in that State ask for allocations. Perhaps 10 of them can get allocations. They will be vigorous in their own behalf, and that is as it should be. But suppose the State commission, knowing that situation in the State, believed that for the purpose of developing aviation in the State these airports should be at given places. They would be short-circuited completely, they would have no authority or power to direct anything as to where the airports should be built. It would be wholly between the municipalities and the Federal Government.

Mr. HINSHAW. With all due respect to the airport commissions, which are very fine, there are a number of States that have agencies in which I would hesitate to place that judgment.

Mr. HALLECK. By the same token, I have a little concern as to the competition between municipalities if the State commissions have nothing to say.

Mr. HINSHAW. So do I. That is why we have this money spent over a 10-year period, because we do not think they could spend it all at once. If they could, they would all be doing it.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOWELL. Several times the gentleman has referred to provisions of the McCarran bill which passed the Senate I call the attention of the gentleman very respectfully to the fact that 100 percent of the funds are channeled through the States, 65 percent through the States for the construction of class 1, 2, and 3 airports, and 35 percent through the States for the construction of class 4 and 5 airports.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am taking that portion of the McCarran bill which takes class 1, 2, and 3 airports and channels the money through the States. That would certainly relieve us of a lot of difficulty as Members of Congress. Particularly would it relieve those Members of Congress who represent more than one city, of a small size, of course. I happen to represent several cities of good size and a part of a large city and a county which has nine Representatives for the entire county in this legislative body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. LEMKE. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are about to take an important step in the formulation of a national airport program. In taking this step, I believe we must look forward. We should not look backward. To compare a highway program with an airway program is like comparing a skyscraper with the old Pyramids. The speed with which a plane travels obliterates State lines. When traveling in a plane it is very difficult to say, "Here it is." You almost have to say, "There it was." We must provide for an over-all program. It seems to me that no good, comprehensive program can be planned if it is subject to amendments and limitations imposed by the 48 different States. I fear if we give each State a right to limit this program and to amend it, we will have 48 different types of limitations on the construction of airports.

Now that we are contemplating the appropriation of $650,000,000 for airport construction, the States come to us and say, "Here we are." We say to the States, "Where were you in the past?"

I received a telegram from the Commissioner of the New York State Department of Commerce asking me to support this amendment. I wired him last night asking how much the State of New York has appropriated annually in the last 10 years for the advancement of an airport program and for assistance in the construction of airports. I have his reply. I will not take the time to read it, but the answer is, in effect, "Nothing." The great State of New York has not contributed anything to assist in this airport program. The city of New York has contributed millions and millions of dollars for the convenience not only of the residents of the city of New York, but for the convenience of the entire country and in furtherance of an airport program.

There is a place for the States in this program if they want to come in now. They are welcome to come in. Reference has been made by the sponsor of this amendment to the financial condition of the States at the present time. He says they are strong. Well, if they are strong, let them advance some money and let them inaugurate State programs. There is nothing to prohibit them from doing that. There is another place for the State.

As has been well said, and I must reiterate, the Bulwinkle amendment gives the right to any State to say to any municipality, "You cannot step in and get these Federal funds unless you channel through us. Every State has a right to do as it chooses. Let us not by the enactment of this amendment prohibit a municipality from coming to the Federal Government if the State, the sovereign power, does not choose to do so. We have given to the States under this amendment the absolute right to take full control of the State program if it chooses. There is no necessity for this amendment. It will hinder and limit and retard the progress of aviation. We should permit any city to come here unless its State says it shall not. Until that time, I do not think we should limit a city in its right to come to the Federal Government. I think this amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise very briefly to support this amendment. It has been said that the air program is not comparable to the road program. It is a question of building airways or air roads, as compared with concrete roads or earth roads. The great danger with this bill unless we adopt this amendment, is that all the money will be spent in one section of the State. Two or three municipalities will get the entire money for the State. Instead of having an airport program that is unified and systematized, that will take care of the whole Nation and all of the people of a State, you will find airports in just one section, and many parts of a State will be left out entirely. I know of no program that the Federal Government ever embarked upon of a permanent nature that allowed such a condition.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. The Federal Government has been responsible for the construction of 3,000 airports.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. As a war measure; as an emergency measure. Now we are embarking on a peacetime measure.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Those airports were constructed over a period of 10 years.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Most of them were constructed during the war.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I think the gentleman will find that more than half of them were constructed before the war started. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is well qualified to handle these funds and make an over-all program of all communities. They have demonstrated that.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Under our road program the money is allotted to the States on a population basis. The programs are worked out by the State Road Commission in conjunction with the county commissioner of each county. Those programs are submitted to the Federal Government. Federal money cannot be expended on any program until it is approved by the Federal Government. We should have something like that in this bill. I think this bill has been very loosely drawn. I think the States should have the first say about where the airports should be put in a State, and then the Federal Government should O. K. that program before Federal money is put into the State program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the record should be clear. The gentleman had a colloquy with the gentleman from Arizona as to when these airports were built. Of the approximately 3,000 we now have in this country, only about 630 of them have been built during World War II. The majority of these latter airports were especially for military and naval uses.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. I thank the gentleman.

If we are going to have a proper kind of airport program, certainly I am for this program as we all realize that we will all be traveling by air in the future, we should have a program in which the States and the Federal Government will cooperate and have an independent system of airports that will make it possible for us to use airplanes to travel to every part of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the Howell amendment. In California we do not have a State agency having the power to accept and channel the funds provided by this act. The State as a State had not taken an interest in the development of aviation comparable to the cities of California. Most of them have airports now and others are planning to expand or build airports as postwar projects. A provision that would require the channeling of funds through a State agency would require a new agency to be created and we have no assurance that such an agency would be created or when.

A program for the expansion of air transport is not analogous to a program for the expansion of a State highway system. The main cost in a highway system is the roadway, bridges, and so forth. The expansion of air travel is largely the increase of landing places and facilities for refueling, taking on passengers, weather stations, and so forth. The airways are free, as far as cost is concerned. Such a program is more nearly like a harbor project. The waterways over which the ships ride is free; but terminal facilities, docks, transit sheds, and so forth, are costly and in the past have been provided by Federal funds, plus local contributions. These contributions have been made by cities and States. Stockton, Calif., and Houston, Tex., are conspicuous examples of cities that have developed harbors by large local contributions to supplement the Federal expenditures. These cities dealt directly with Congress and gave the necessary assurance of their ability and willingness to make necessary supplementary contributions.

Consequently I feel that the bill as presented by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is the more practical plan and should be adopted by the House. It will give the cities the freedom they require in building or expanding airport facilities in conjunction with the National Government.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the adoption of the Howell amendment. I believe it would retard the development of aviation in this country. I am anxious by every act of mine to develop a Nationwide air system, and I believe the membership of this House is very anxious to accomplish the same thing. I believe we are all aware of the necessity of, as well as the advantages that would accrue, from such a program. The bill proposed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is one of the steps we believe necessary if there is to be a national development of aviation as we all desire.

I have listened very intently to the arguments that have been presented in favor of the amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, but I confess that I have been unable from any of the arguments I have heard to determine that there is any necessity for it. It would seem from the arguments that have been made that the legislation which has been proposed to the House creates an issue between State control of funds and municipal control. A reading of the bill by any thoughtful individual, who is not prejudiced in his views for one or the other of these two methods of channeling funds, could not help reach the conclusion that there is nothing in the bill that precludes either method being adopted as the policy of any given State. The provision relating to this subject as it appears in the bill was included in the bill, because the committee was aware of the fact that State commissions up to the present time had done little or nothing in the way of providing airport facilities in their respective States. The committee was cognizant of the fact that whatever airport development there has been in this country has been the result of municipal interest and action.

Recognizing the fact that the development already made has been the result of local interest and not State interest would it not be unwise to eliminate municipalities, the very agency that over a period of years has built up aviation in this Nation and turn it over entirely to State authorities which up to the present time have done little or nothing in the way of building airports? The committee, however, recognizing that the States do have some interest, and I wish they took more interest in the matter, has provided by the language of the bill that a State agency or a municipal agency, one or the other, may take advantage of the provisions of the bill.

I am inclined to believe that most of the argument has been based upon a wrong conception of what the bill provides. In this connection I draw attention to the language contained in the Committee report that sets forth the plan and purpose of the Committee in this respect. It says with regard to channeling of funds the following:

> Regarding the operation of the program in the States, if a State has legislation requiring that all Federal grants for airport development for that State be channeled through its aeronautics commission or other State agency, that law will control. Otherwise, all grants in the case of the States will be made directly to the sponsor of the project (the public agency which is to be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the airport to be developed), whether it is a State, Territory, possession, municipality, county, or governmental agency or public corporation.

From this it will be seen that the committee has wisely made provision for both State and local authorities to utilize the funds provided by the provisions of this bill. Thus, when a State authority is the recognized agency it would be the sponsor. If the State has no such authority then the municipality can avail itself of the provisions of the bill. If this provision had not been put in the bill then the muncipalities, in a State that does not have a State agency, would not be able to provide for itself an airport. It is apparent that the Committee has asked wisely in making the provision contained in the bill. By doing so it has made it possible for aviation to go forward and not be held up by lack of State action.

Furthermore, the adoption of the Bulwinkle amendment, earlier this afternoon, gives every reasonable protection

to States that have adopted a State policy, or, that may be opposed to any municipality within its borders incurring indebtedness for building an airport. It reads as follows:

Amendment to section 2 of H. R. 3615: Page 3, line 11, after the period insert the following sentence:

"Nothing in this act shall authorize the submission of a project application by any municipality or other public agency which is subject to the law of any State if the submission of such project application by such municipality or other public agency is prohibited by the law of such State."

This amendment gives every assurance that the right of the States to fix their own policy with respect to building airports shall be preserved. Certainly, there is no need for the Howell amendment with the Bulwinkle amendment written into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include a telegram from the Michigan Committee on Interstate Cooperation regarding the Howell amendment, that committee being in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. At this point in the RECORD?

Mr. DONDERO. At this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to follows:

LANSING, MICH., *October 16, 1945.*

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Howell amendment to H. R. 3615 would harmonize that bill with long-established successful pattern of Federal-State cooperation in reconstruction of national airport system. This recommended by Council of State Governments, Governors' Conference, and National Association of State Aviation officials. Strongly urge your support of Howell amendment.

MICHIGAN COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COOPERATION,
D. HALE BRAKE, *Chairman.*

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE.]

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the objectives of this bill, but I am not in favor of surrendering any more of the liberties or the rights of the people of the States to the Federal Government. There is no difference between this aviation program, if you consider it intelligently, and the public-highway program. One uses the lanes of the air, and is authorized to use those air lanes, using beams and so forth, and the other has the right to use the earth. They are identical in principle.

There are some things that we do here that are not healthy for democracy. We are just beginning to realize that we have been sleeping at the switch. We have allowed part of our form of government to slip away from us. We have accepted Federal domination and regimentation. In the past we asked our Uncle Sam for donations, relief, and aid for all kinds of projects. These he has given us, but the price he exacted—government by bureaucracy—has come too high. In our desire to get something for nothing we sometimes forget that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

There is no reason to doubt but that the States will act when there is money in sight. You cannot pass any Federal legislation or appropriation without having some pork in it. When you pass that kind of legislation the States will act. There is plenty of machinery already set up in most of the States. Every State will create such new machinery as is necessary. It may be necessary to give some additional authority to existing State machinery, but the States will attend to that promptly.

I am told that 44 States out of the 48 have already acted, which seems to have settled the question as to the possibility of not having State machinery. When the road program was passed it did not take very long before every State in this Union had the necessary machinery. If you pass this bill with this amendment, channeling these funds through the State, every State in the Union will have the machinery in less than a few months.

A lot has been said about the Bulwinkle amendment. I will be very frank. I am very much afraid that if this Congress does not stop permitting legislation by negative action we will go down in history as a negative body. We have had enough of this negative legislation heretofore. Let us have the courage and the determination to say positively and affirmatively what we want done and what we do not want done. I do not believe that the States should be asked to do something negatively or that we negatively should leave something to the States to do.

It has been suggested that there may be State politics in this if the funds are channeled through the States. I would just as soon have State politics in it as Federal politics. If you accept this amendment, there will be State and Federal supervision, and one will check the politics of the other. The Federal road program has made a remarkable record. Let us follow that system of check and balance.

Anyway I believe that the Federal politics is more pernicious, it is further away, the people cannot see it as easily as they can local politics. I still have confidence in the Government, but I have just as much confidence in the government of my State as I have in the Federal Government. Personal experience has taught me that lesson long ago.

The question is very simple. We are one nation, and we have 48 sovereign States. If this bill is passed you will create sovereignty in municipalities. You will create friction between State and municipalities. You are already doing that. The big cities want to run the States. They forget that they are but a part of the State. Let me say to my friends from the larger cities that it would not hurt the people of the city of Chicago if they had to go to Springfield rather than have to come to Washington. Springfield is closer, and they will be among their friends—the home people—and not strange politicians. Anyway they might get lost in this big city. They could at least find who they wanted to talk to in Springfield. It would not hurt the people of California any if they had to go to Sacramento rather than Washington. It would not hurt the people of New York any if they had to go to Albany rather than Washington. It is closer. They will be closer to home, they can work with their own people for the best interests of their State, without playing Federal politics and Federal patronage in Washington. I have an abiding confidence in the State governments. I know they are not perfect, but when you begin passing legislation by negativing everything here in Congress I wonder how perfect you are. You are a long way from it. You pass one law after another saying that unless Congress affirmatively denies something that then it will become a law. I think it is about time that we use a little more courage and meet all these issues directly and affirmatively.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL]. I have before me a telegram signed by the Governor of my State suggesting that the best interests of West Virginia would be served in supporting this amendment. I also have before me a telegram signed by the entire membership of the West Virginia Board of Aviation.

I might say in this connection that West Virginia was one of the first States to set up a facility of this kind. For more than 8 years we have had an active aviation board known as the State board of aeronautics. The legislature has regularly appropriated moneys for expenditure by this board. We have erected one State-owned airport. We own a State plane which is at the disposal of the State government officials.

West Virginia is interested in administering this proposal in a manner similar to that in which we are administering the State highway proposal. I note, too, that this legislation has the support of the council of State government. After several years of association as fiscal adviser of the council of State government of my State I have learned to know that those gentlemen who administer the council of State government are usually right about the things that they recommend. I am sure they would not recommend something to the country that was not satisfactory. One thing that impresses me most of all, looking back to the old WPA and PWA days, is to see how much money was wasted in the erection of airports. Then, too, this waste was carried on by very short-sighted members of municipal councils who received the wrong advice, who went out and bought somebody's cow pasture to build an airport, never looking to the future of aviation and its development. Today those airports are obsolete and grown up in weeds. I think that this legislation, if this amendment is approved, will stabilize and set up certain standards in the airport industry that should be set up. I think it is high time that we took notice of the fact that too much money has already been wasted. I trust it will be the pleasure of the com-

mittee to approve the Howell amendment.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Is the gentleman in favor of turning over Federal funds to the States to administer without some control of the Federal Government over those funds?

Mr. BAILEY. We have turned the State highway funds over, and they are cooperating.

Mr. HOOK. Yes, and I have seen the State highway operate where they went up into a section of my State and built 12 miles of concrete road right out in the wilderness, where they were not within 20 miles of a town, just for the purpose of placing that 12 miles of road from the home of a former member of the State government, who donated to the Governor's campaign some $50,000 to get a concrete highway out in the woods, so that he could get into a little town.

Mr. BAILEY. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that we do not do things that way in West Virginia.

Mr. HOOK. All right; let us be fair. If we are going to appropriate money by the Federal Government, let the Federal Government administer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Howell amendment. My reason for that is simply that I know how well the Federal highway-aid fund has worked; I know how well it has been administered by the different States, and certainly the Howell amendment brings this airport program within the same category and under the same kind of rules and regulations.

Certainly the time has come when we cannot safely let the Federal Government have more power. I am satisfied that every Republican Congressman and possibly one-half of the Democrats have assured their constituents that they would bring back to the States and to the people at least some of the power that has been taken away from them in the past few years. I have made my people a pledge that I never would vote for another appropriation which did not give the elected representatives of the people the control over the spending of the people's money, and a more direct control over the laws of the land.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the Federal Government has nothing to say about it, does the gentleman believe it ought to be appropriating the money?

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I have said on many occasions, as I presume almost every Member of Congress has, if he is honest with the people he represents, that with Federal dollars goes Federal control. We have too much of it now, I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota, and the thinking American people want less of it—not more.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the able gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that practically all the States are in better position to help finance this whole project than is the Federal Government?

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly they are. Almost every municipality, regardless of how small it is, is better fixed financially than is the United States Government today.

Mr. RICH. If the Members of Congress want to do the right thing, then, they will either turn this over to the States and give the States the right to say what they are going to do or else vote against the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. Of course, I am just one Member of the House, but I certainly will be obliged to vote against the entire bill unless the Howell amendment is adopted, which would not be easy for me to do because of my great respect for Mr. Poege, Chairman of the CAA, an honest and able public servant.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman know of a State whose treasury is as bad off as is that of the Federal Government?

Mr. JENSEN. I do not.

Mr. RICH. They would be pretty sick if they were, would they not?

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely; so sick that no New Deal panacea could possibly save them. What America needs most today is a new doctor with some good old-fashioned remedy. A good big injection of constitutional Americanism would do the trick I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOWELL) there were—ayes 102, noes 104.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HOWELL.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 135, noes 126.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LARCADE: On page 2, line 3, after the word "aircraft", insert "including emergency landing strips."

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is merely to clarify the bill by giving authority to some agency to have general supervision over the building of emergency landing strips. Formerly this authority was vested in the Public Roads Commission and in several Federal road appropriation bills allocations were made for building such strips. In the last Federal road bill however no such authority was continued and at this time there is no provision for the building of emergency landing strips, yet these emergency landing facilities are very important in transcontinental flying as well as local flights because in the event of forced landings such strips scattered throughout the United States might be the means of saving many lives and much valuable property in the shape of the planes themselves. Emergency landing strips formerly were built paralleling highways. As I stated in the beginning, this authority was vested in the Public Roads Commission and the state highway departments, but that no longer is the case. I believe the authority properly belongs to the Civil Aeronautics Administration and I believe it is important that this bill be clarified to the extent that this authority shall be vested in the CAA. Inasmuch as this amendment is simply for the purpose of clarifying this bill in the way I have indicated I see no objection to the approval of the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Does not the gentleman believe that the langauge of the bill already takes care of emergency landing strips? I call the gentleman's attention to subsection (b) on page 2:

Airport means any area of land or water which is used or intended for use for the landing and take-off of aircraft.

Mr. LARCADE. Some of the Members with whom I have discussed the question seem to feel there is some doubt about it.

Mr. HARRIS. What is the gentleman's interpretation of the phrase "landing strip"?

Mr. LARCADE. An emergency landing strip is different from an airport, and if authority is not given to some agency to construct landing strips who is going to construct them? It has been taken away from the Federal Roads Agency and there is no specific authority in this bill, in my opinion, that gives the right to the Civil Aeronautics Administration to construct landing strips. It deals entirely with airports. I see no harm in adding that. It certainly will not change the bill in any manner except it will extend authority specifically and definitely to some agency to build these landing strips. It is not stated in the bill that they have that authority, and there is some question about it in my own mind and in the minds of many with whom I have spoken.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 we expressly gave to the CAA the power to build all types of airports in the United States. I have just checked a few minutes ago with the legal staff of the CAA and am further assured that agency has ample authority to act in this type of construction.

Mr. LARCADE. Yes, but it says nothing about landing strips. I see no harm in the adoption of this amendment and I submit the matter for your consideration.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand this amendment it authorizes the Civil Aeronautics Administration to build emergency runways. We are discussing a bill under which the Federal Government is matching equally funds raised by the States—50 percent by the States, 50 percent by the Federal Government.

Under the proposed bill as I read it, we give the Civil Aeronautics Administration complete authority to build these landing strips. I am wondering whether or not the State administrations or the State aeronautic committees would not object to the Civil Aeronautics Administration building these landing strips, now that the State aeronautic boards, according to the amendment just passed, have full swing over all the funds; whether or not there might be a clash between the Federal Government and the State agencies over this authority. The State grab-bag artists are supreme. The authority should be in the hands of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to build the landing strips. I have no quarrel with that. The Federal government should have something to say in reference to dispensing the funds that the Congress appropriates. I am getting sick and tired of voting Federal money and then turning it over to some State agency which tells this Congress what ought to be done with that money. You Members of Congress who are so anxious to have the State agencies handle everything should become a part of the State government. The Congress proposes to authorize the establishment of a national airway system in this legislation; then through the adoption of an amendment it sets up 48 different State agencies to administer the bill. If we are going to have a proper airway system the National Government should be in control of it and should have something to say about it. There will be 48 different States with 48 different sets of laws in complete control of all the funds appropriated by the Federal Government for this purpose.

If we are to have a proper national system of airways we should have uniform laws throughout the States if the States are to have the funds. This is an impossible situation as the bill now stands with the amendment just adopted. You might have one type of civil aeronautics bureau in one State and another type of bureau in another State. You will have different laws in the various States set up for the purpose of administering Federal funds appropriated by the Federal Government. If this is allowed to go through 48 different States, 48 different administrations, we will be in such a muddle we will not even know whether we have a national airway system or not.

In my opinion, the various cities should have the authority to make application direct to the Federal Government, but the control of all funds and all ports should be in the CAA. I have heard it said on the floor of the House that some Members have more faith in the State governments than in the national administration. I am wondering whether those same men have faith in their city governments. They do not have faith in the Federal Government. They, by the adoption of the last amendment have shown they do not have faith in their city governments. Why should some State machine make the determination as to whether some city or county may or may not participate in this program.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that the gentleman knows personally the local community in which he lives better than he does the ones in the State? Certainly if that is the case he knows the ones better in his State than he does in Washington.

Mr. HOOK. They why take away from the city governments the right to make application direct to the Federal Government? If you have so much faith in your local government, and you know your local governments better than you know the others, if that contention is correct, then you know your city government better than you know your State government.

Mr. RICH. You have faith in the people you are dealing with back home. If you do not you better get out of that community. It is not safe to be there.

Mr. HOOK. That is exactly what I said. I want the cities, counties, and municipalities to be able to make application direct to the Federal Government without being subjected to the dictates of some State machine. I have faith in the officials of my local governments.

Mr. RICH. I have faith in my district.

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman did not vote that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great big piece of pork-barrel legislation. I am opposed to it because of that, and, also, because I am against bankrupting the United States. The credit of the Government and the value or purchasing power of the dollar are now definitely at stake. The forces of inflation are on the march.

The Federal debt is nearing the $300,000,000,000 mark.

The commercial banks held as of June 30, 1945, $84,000,000,000 in Government securities. When the Government finances its securities through the banking system it creates new money, which is in essence Government-printed money. As of the same date the Government had outstanding obligations in the form of United States savings bonds amounting to $45,500,000,000. These bonds are redeemable within 6 months. They have been sold to the public as being virtually the same as cash and to be available for the purchase of refrigerators, automobiles, and other commodities at the conclusion of the war. Since these bonds would be sold back to the Government their repurchase would have to be financed through the banks as though they had been acquired by these institutions in the first instance. When repurchased by the Government these bonds would be converted into new bank money. Here, then, is $45,500,000,000 of potential Government printing-press bank money, which, when added to the $84,000,000,000 would make $129,500,000,000 in all. Some of this bank money is converted into currency.

To this must be added some of the money in circulation because some of this is a product of Government edict, is not produced through the acquisition of Government securities by the banks, and does not represent goods in production, in the process of transportation, or any other tangible thing. I shall not take the trouble to explain the danger this situation presents to the country. Every Member of this body ought to know what this is. Suffice it to say that it is a serious threat to the credit of the Government, the value of our bonds and to the purchasing power of the dollar.

When I go back to my district I want to be able to look into the faces of my constituents and tell them why I voted against this bill, if they want to know. My explanation will be that from my knowledge of the conditions of the Federal finances and credit and of the currency, I am convinced that the Federal Government cannot afford to spend 1 red cent to build airports, that we need to conserve every penny we can lay our hands on to preserve the national credit. I will tell them that it is more important to do this than it is to build airports with Federal funds, and I am sure they will agree with me. They have sense enough to realize that we cannot preserve our national credit and at the same time continue the program of deficit financing with printing-press money.

I will also tell them that I want airports built where they will transport the most goods and people, which can be done only if private companies do the job, that where the Government builds airports it places them where they will get the most votes. I will also tell them that I not only speak for the preservation of private enterprise but practice what I preach. I am sure they will not object to this either.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 3, line 23, after the word "States", insert the words "the District of Columbia."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a clarifying amendment, to make it clear that "possession" or "Territory" does not include the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. BULWINKLE. If the gentleman will yield, is my understanding correct that the gentleman intends to ask unanimous consent that this and other perfecting amendments in line with the amendment that was adopted by the

committee just now be considered en bloc?

Mr. HOWELL. I had intended to do that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a series of perfecting amendments in line with the amendment previously adopted be considered en bloc at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HOWELL:

Page 5, line 12, strike out "public agencies" and insert "public airport agencies."

Page 8, line 8, strike out "States" and insert "State airport agencies."

Page 8, line 16, strike out "public agency" and insert "public authority."

Page 9, lines 22 and 23, strike out "public agency or two or more public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or two or more public airport agencies."

Page 10, strike out line 21 and the word "application" in line 22, and insert the following, "public authority or public authorities which are sponsoring the project."

Page 11, line 3, strike out "public agency" and insert "public authority", and in line 7 strike out "agency" and insert "authority."

Page 13, line 11, strike our "public agencies" and insert "public authorities"; and in line 23, strike out "public agencies" and insert "public authorities."

Page 14, lines 3 and 4, strike out "public agency or public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or public airport agencies"; and in line 15, strike out "public agency or public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or public airport agencies."

Page 16, line 11, strike out "public agency or public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or public airport agencies"; and in lines 17 and 18, strike out "public agency or public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or public airport agencies"; and on page 17, in line 2, strike out "public agency or public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or public airport agencies."

Page 17, line 9, strike out "public agency or public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or public airport agencies."

Page 18, line 23, strike out "public agency" and insert "public authority."

Page 20, lines 11 and 12, strike out "public agency" and insert "public authority."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDOLPH: On page 3, after line 25, insert the following paragraph:

"(k) 'State' means a State of the United States or the District of Columbia."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I shall use a very short time to direct the attention of the Committee to the reason for this amendment. It would simply make the District of Columbia eligible to proceed under the airport development program.

I believe it would be interesting to my colleagues to know what the situation is here at the present time from the standpoint of the use of the Washington National Airport. I ascertained from Harvey Law, the manager of the Washington National Airport, earlier in the day the uses to which that airport is being put. You will remember that it was only a very few years ago that the project came into being. I recall the charges that were hurled in the Congress and through other sources that the expenditure would be a white elephant, and was to be overbuilt. It is now inadequate and other airports will be needed for this area.

In August of this year there were movements of 14,800 aircraft in and out of the Washington National Airport. In that 1 month there were 74,000 passengers that arrived and departed on scheduled air-transport liners. These figures do not take into account the number of personnel and individuals arriving by Army and Navy transport or by private plane.

It is important to know that the estimate for this present year of 1945 brings the total individuals who will use the Washington National Airport for air travel to 750,000.

I believe it noteworthy, when we think of the magnitude of this legislation, to understand that what is happening in Washington will take place in varying degree in practically all of the communities of this Nation. Of course, in the smaller communities we will not have the tremendous figures we have here, but on a ratio basis we are going to see a development almost staggering our imagination.

I leave the floor with this observation, that I made partially yesterday, when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said that we had enough airports in this country. I remind him now that when we were attacked at Pearl Harbor we had approximately 24,000 privately owned and operated aircraft in the entire country. Not too many airports were needed for that number. But now we come to the period when we are to see probably 600,000 such planes in America in the next 10 or 15 years. We will have 1,500,000 persons who will know how to pilot a plane, and our air carrier system will be tremendously expanded. I make the prediction, not just to throw a figure into the air, that within perhaps 10 years from the passage of this bill the State of Missouri itself will have as many privately owned and operated aircraft as existed in the entire country in 1941.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. What are the financial returns on the National Airport as compared to the expenses?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The returns are excellent. This year the airport will clear a profit of at least $60,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 3, line 10, after the word "subdivision", strike out the remainder of line 10 and all of line 11.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to paragraph a of section 8 of this bill to be found on page 9, it provides that any "public agency," or two or more "public agencies" acting jointly, may submit an application under the terms of this bill for project approval.

The question immediately arises: What is meant by a "public agency," and what is a "public agency"? We then turn to subparagraph g of section 2 which is found on page 3. This is the section we have been talking about all afternoon. We find "public agency" defined. It means, "the United States Government or an agency thereof; a State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or an agency thereof; a municipality or other political subdivision." Up to that point I can understand it. That is what we have been talking about. We have been talking about municipalities, and States, and political subdivisions thereof. But the bill reads further, as follows:

or a body politic, public or quasi-public corporation, or tax-supported organization.

Now, I have made inquiry of several members of this committee as to what they mean by that language. I am familiar with the legal definition of a quasi-public corporation. I pose this question to the committee and to the House: Is an air line corporation operating in the domestic field and chartered under the laws of Pennsylvania, for example, and operating throughout the Nation, which corporation cannot operate until it obtains a certificate of convenience and necessity from the Civil Aeronautics Board, thus giving it all the characteristics of a quasi-public corporation, is such a private corporation chartered to operate an air line a quasi-public corporation in the transportation field so that corporation or any combination of such corporations could make application for participation in this program and receive the same consideration that a municipal corporation would receive?

I yield to the Chairman to answer that question.

Mr. LEA. In my judgment, an air line is not a quasi-public corporation or entitled to qualify as such.

Mr. KEEFE. Did the gentleman's committee hold any hearings on that subject?

Mr. LEA. No; not on that particular subject.

Mr. KEEFE. Then how can the gentleman answer my question with any degree of certainty or definiteness that an air-line company which is in exactly the same status as any other transportation corporation is not a quasi-public corporation? I do not know whether under the charters of the States in which these air-line companies are chartered they have the power of eminent domain.

If they do have, then certainly they are a quasi-public corporation. We should be sure about it. The reason I have offered this amendment to strike that language is in order that when you go into conference on this bill you may have definite information, definite word, as to whether or not legally these private air-line companies can become sponsors, under the terms of this bill, and receive Federal funds.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEA. I am positive that an air line is not a quasi-public corporation. I would like to make this suggestion as to the gentleman's amendment. I believe the words "or a body politic, public, or quasi-public corporation" ought to go out, because that quasi-public corporation as we have it now is practically a dead horse. But I believe "a tax-supported organization" should remain in, because districts can be organized, subject to liability to support an airport application. As far as I am concerned, I think it would be well if those words would go out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. This is an important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. The reason I offer this amendment to strike out all those words is because I have heard no discussion from any member of this committee with respect to what is meant by "or tax-supported organization" or any of these other descriptive words in the bill. I understand the gentleman from California is willing that the amendment shall be accepted if we strike out the words "or a body politic, public or quasi-public corporation," provided we leave in the words "or tax-supported organization."

Mr. LEA. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. What do I understand the gentleman to mean by "tax-supported organization"? What type of organization does that contemplate?

Mr. LEA. That is a body politic. We have a number of them in our State. It may be a portion of a county or a particular area that is organized by law and it is supported by taxes. It is a semi-public corporation, created by the legislature. They have tax responsibility. It is a public corporation and therefore should have the right to make application.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman feels that such an organization should have a right to make application and participate in the program?

Mr. LEA. Certainly. We have instances in our State now where farmers have made application to establish an airport. They create a tax-supported district and make it a public corporation in that way.

Mr. KEEFE. I have no objection with that explanation, to the elimination of that language from my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike from the amendment the words "or tax-supported organization."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. With that language eliminated, I understand the chairman of the committee is willing to accept the amendment which I have offered?

Mr. LEA. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I know the gentleman is a competent lawyer and is well qualified to discuss this proposition. It is very important. We had before the committee the Port of New York Authority, which is an organization composed of several cities in and around the area of New York. The Port of New York Authority desires to have authority to carry on and operate and own airports.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, right there, the Port of New York Authority would be included within the provisions of a tax-supported organization, such as was discussed by the chairman of the committee a few moments ago?

Mr. HINSHAW. Not necessarily, because the Port of New York Authority, I assume, makes charges for its services, and consequently is not a tax-supported organization. For instance, in my own county we have an irrigation district. That irrigation district is authorized by State law to own and operate airports, and does own and operate an airport. That comes under one of those quasi-public corporations, or tax-supported organization. I do not know which it would be, because, after all, they apportion the charges for irrigation purposes among the different members of the irrigation district. There are a great many such units. You might consider a fire-prevention district or a flood-control district or something else, particularly those out in the country areas, as coming under this provision.

It might be possible, for example, to have a very large rural community without an incorporated municipality in it—there may be only a town—which wanted to own and operate an airport. Would you call that a municipality?

Mr. LEA. You certainly could call it a political subdivision.

Mr. KEEFE. So that brings it down to any political subdivision. I presume it might even include a drainage district.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I might call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Port of New York Authority is not a political subdivision; it cannot be a political subdivision.

Mr. KEEFE. What does the gentleman mean, that the Port of New York Authority would not then come under the language?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No. That is not like an irrigation district. There are even mountain districts in western North Carolina that may organize, and they get some taxes or public money.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentleman whether he is in opposition to the understanding I had with the chairman of the committee?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I just wanted to call to the attention of the gentleman the fact that he did not think about all these things which the gentleman from California called to his attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 3, line 10, after the word "subdivision", strike out the words "or bodies politic, public, or quasi- public corporation."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and do so only because the committee in the course of its hearings learned of a number of different types of organization in the United States that not only do own and operate airports but which should have the right to own and operate airports and participate in this program. It seems to me that a public or quasi-public organization such as an irrigation district, the Port of New York Authority, the Port of San Francisco Authority, or the Port of Wisconsin Authority if there might be one, would like to have authority to participate in this program just the same as any other governmental authority entitled to participate.

Then we had the situation down in Tennessee to which attention was called by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], of the Tri-Cities Airport, an airport that is apparently owned and operated by a group of municipalities. There are many situations in which different types of public bodies could get together and own and operate airports economically. The gentleman from Wisconsin will notice that under the terms of sponsorship there are some direct requirements that the sponsor must meet before he can qualify. Likewise it must be authorized by law to own and operate airports in order to qualify for sponsorship of one of these airports, under the laws of the State. The matter of the definition of "public authority" is important but so is the list of the requirements for sponsorship which must be met before the project can be approved.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is understood that an irrigation district is regarded as being tax supported?

Mr. HINSHAW. I am not very sure myself, but it is certainly a quasi-public organization and should fall within the terms of the bill. In my own State irrigation districts are authorized and do own and operate airports.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Has the gentleman given study to the question and can he answer with any degree of authority: Whether or not a private air line chartered under the laws of any State in this Nation which comes to the Civil Aeronautics Board and asks for a certificate of convenience and necessity before it can operate, with its rates fixed by that Board, with its transportation charges fixed by that Board, with its routes fixed by that

Board, whether or not such a private corporation under any law that is known in this country is not a quasi-public corporation? So would not these private air lines be permitted to come in and solicit a 50-percent contribution for the building of their own airports?

Mr. HINSHAW. In reply let me ask the gentleman a question, but first let me say that the gentleman from Wisconsin is a lawyer, while I am an engineer. He knows his business and I know mine. Here in this body each of us must at times cross over into the field in which the other has specialized. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the law considers a railroad is a quasi-public corporation?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; it is a quasi-public corporation and for the very reasons which I have indicated. Transportation lines are quasi-public corporations in every law I have ever seen.

Mr. HINSHAW. If that is the case, of course an air line is a quasi-public corporation, and I would not be in favor of them participating in this program.

Mr. KEEFE. The companies used in the transmission of electricity, your public service and public utility corporations are likewise quasi-public corporations for the very reasons I have indicated. Your transportation corporations are required to subject themselves to the same regulatory laws passed by this Congress in your Civil Aeronautics Act. I want to be sure about this before I vote to bring these public corporations into this picture.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I ask the gentleman whether he would be satisfied to strike out the words "or quasi-public corporations"? I would be willing to go along with him if there is stricken out the possibility of an air line being included. "Public corporation," I assume would include the Port of New York Authority.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot answer that question. The gentleman ought to be able to answer it because he is on the committee that has given study to it. It ought to be perfectly apparent to everyone.

Mr. HINSHAW. That question was not brought up in the committee, consequently it was not discussed.

Mr. KEEFE. It ought to be perfectly apparent, if that is the case, that this Congress should not pass this bill with that language in there because we will be getting into pretty deep water if we do. I think I understand what is behind this proposition, in view of the gentleman's argument.

Mr. HINSHAW. No, this gentleman has no idea whatsoever of permitting an air line, railroad, or truck company to construct an airport with public funds. I trust that the gentleman from Wisconsin did not intend any such implication.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—yeas 65, noes 54.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL AIRPORT PLAN

SEC. 3. (a) The Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to prepare, and revise annually, a national plan for the development of public airports in the United States, including the Territories and possessions. Such plan shall specify, in terms of general location and type of development, the projects considered by the Administrator to be necessary to provide a system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics. In formulating and revising such plan, the Administrator shall take into account the needs of both air commerce and private flying, the probable technological developments in the science of aeronautics, the probable growth and requirements of civil aeronautics, and such other considerations as he may deem appropriate, and shall, to the extent feasible, consult, and take into consideration the views and recommendations of, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the States, Territories, and possessions and their political subdivisions. In carrying out this section the Administrator is authorized to make such surveys, studies, examinations, and investigations as he may deem necessary or desirable.

(b) In carrying out this section the Administrator shall also consider the views and recommendations of the War and Navy Departments to the end that the airport development included in such plan may be as useful for national defense as is feasible, and shall ascertain from such Departments the extent to which military and naval airports and airport facilities will be available for civil use. The War and Navy Departments shall consider the views and recommendations of the Administrator to the end that military and naval airports and airport facilities may be made available for civil use to such extent as is feasible.

FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT PROGRAM

SEC. 4. In order to carry out the airport plan prepared pursuant to section 3, the Administrator is authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made therefor by the Congress, to make grants of funds to public agencies for the development of public airports as hereinafter provided.

APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriation for preliminary expenses

SEC. 5. (a) In addition to amounts hereinafter authorized to be appropriated for administrative expenses, the sum of $3,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated immediately upon the enactment of this title for expenses of preliminary planning and surveys incident to the initiation of the airport program provided for by this title, including administrative expenses, which sum shall remain available until expended.

Annual appropriations for projects in States

(b) For the purpose of carrying out this title with respect to projects in the several States, annual appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $650,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of 10 fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. The appropriation for any such fiscal year shall not exceed $100,000,000 and shall remain available until June 30, 1956, unless sooner expended. Not to exceed 5 percent of any such annual appropriation, as specified in the act making such appropriation, shall be available to the Administrator for necessary planning and research and for administrative expenses incident to the administration of this title in the several States; and such amounts shall be deducted from such appropriation for purposes of determining the amounts thereof available for grants for projects in the several States.

Annual appropriations for projects in Territories and possessions

(c) For the purpose of carrying out this title with respect to projects in the Territories and possessions, annual appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $50,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of 10 fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. The appropriation for any such fiscal year shall remain available until June 30, 1956, unless sooner expended. Not to exceed 5 percent of any such annual appropriation, as specified in the act making such appropriation, shall be available to the Administrator for necessary planning and research and for administrative expenses incident to the administration of this title with respect to projects in the Territories and possessions; and such amount shall be deducted from such appropriation for purposes of determining the amount thereof available for grants for projects in the Territories and possessions. Of the total amount available for such grants, not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available for projects in the Territory of Alaska, not to exceed $15,000,000 shall be available for projects in the Territory of Hawaii, and not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available for projects in Puerto Rico.

Administrative expenses

(d) As used in this section, the term "administrative expenses" includes expenses under this title of the character specified in section 204 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 49, sec. 424). For accounting purposes, all amounts which under the authority of this section are made available for administrative expenses shall be consolidated and carried as a single fund.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 6, line 15, after the word "states", add a new proviso reading as follows: "*Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1946, and ending June 30, 1947, the maximum appropriation of $100,000,000, as authorized in section 5 of this act, shall, when appropriated and after deducting administrative costs, be disbursed by the Administrator on the basis of 75 percent for improvement of airports, contemplated under this act, and 25 percent for new facilities."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, before discussing the merits of this amendment I desire to compliment the Committee on Interstate Commerce and particularly its special subcommittee for a job well done.

It is timely legislation in that it provides a cushion to absorb some of the shock of an all too apparent postwar unemployment situation.

It is contemplated in this act to construct some 3,050 new airports and to improve and complete an additional 1,612 ports now in various stages of completion.

This program covers a 10-year period and provides for annual appropriations. I can, at present, think of no more silly or asinine proposal than one that would give the CAA Administrator power to start 3,000 new ports when it would be sound business sense to first complete some of those already started.

Should it not be the desire of the Congress to get the largest possible number of these ports in operation at the earliest

possible time? Especially is this true of the ports with commercial possibilities in order to develop commerce and improve transport facilities.

There is an added obligation on the part of Congress to reward the forward looking individuals and municipalities that have invested their funds, both private and public, and are still denied service because of inadequate facilities.

In discussing a previous amendment offered to this bill the committee gave serious consideration to reimbursing those municipalities. I think that would have gone entirely too far, but I see no reason why they should not at least have the preference in having the airport, on which they have expended their own private and local tax money, completed during the first year of this program, and that is what this amendment proposes.

I trust it will be the pleasure of the committee to place its approval on this proposition that is both fair and just and has good common sense.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly the Congress within the bounds of economy and prudence is well justified in laying plans and providing funds, as contemplated by this measure, for encouragement and future development of aviation. But I seriously question the adequacy and fairness of the formulas which this bill sets up to allot and contribute funds to the various States. Although I know that the committee has striven faithfully to promote fairness and equity for all sections of the country in allocating these funds, in my opinion, the methods used will work a very clear and definite discrimination against some of the several States. I refer particularly to my own State of Massachusetts which stands very high in the list of States making outstanding annual monetary contributions through taxation to the United States Treasury.

I would like briefly to analyze this measure and its companion Senate bill. Both the pending measure and S. 2 provide generally for the matching of Federal and State funds on a 50–50 basis, and, according to the formula established for apportioning Federal grants, funds will be given on the basis of the population and land area in square miles of each State in relation to the total area and population of all the States.

Under the provisions of the Senate bill, $75,000,000 may be appropriated annually for a 5-year period for Federal aid in the development of the national airport plan, and of this amount 35 percent is to be allotted for a so-called urban program. Consequently, a maximum of 65 percent of $75,000,000, or roughly $48,000,000, is allowed annually for the Statewide program. Fifty percent of this last amount, or about $24,000,000, will be allotted to the States on the basis of population and the other 50 percent on the basis of the relation which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States.

Under the area formula, the allotment for New England would be $536,250 while Massachusetts would receive under the same formula a total of $73,125 annually. Under the population formula New England would do better with an allotment of $1,560,000 while Massachusetts would receive $780,000, but it is very clear that these latter gains in the long run will be offset by losses sustained by these sections under the area formula.

In order to meet these obvious and well-founded objections, the committee has very appropriately established a reserve or contingent fund which would in some circumstances permit the discretionary use of these moneys to meet special local and State needs of the national airport program as the plan develops, yet I think that the bill falls far short of doing justice to the section of the country which I have the honor to represent.

Over a 10-year period under the formulas provided by this measure, for example, Massachusetts would receive a possible total of about $15,000,000, whereas the great State of Texas which we all admire and love, would receive about $60,000,000 and other States correspondingly larger amounts over the full 10-year period. I am appreciative of the fact that it is most difficult in a measure of this kind to set up a system of allocation that will parcel out abstract justice to all sections of the country, yet I am firmly convinced that it is possible to establish formulas that will more closely approximate a fair distribution of funds. In any genuine airport program the great open spaces so dear to the heart of every American, are surely entitled to consideration and cannot be overlooked. On the other hand, the great centers of population along the eastern seaboard and in other sections, where vital industrial activity and commercial intercourse is so heavily concentrated must also be justly considered. It is no answer in my opinion to leave the consideration of the airport needs of these great population centers entirely to the discretion of an administrative board. It seems to me, while I have no objection to the creation of a revolving fund to be used by the administrators of this bill and for the national air program as it unfolds, that a more equitable adjustment could be effected by changing the formulas of this bill, and apportioning Federal funds on a 60–40 basis, 60 percent of the funds to be allocated on the basis of population and 40 percent on the basis of land area, this in the interest of minimizing discrimination and efficiently providing for the heavy passenger and freight air traffic of the more populous centers of the country.

Moreover, I am of the opinion that the Army and Navy should be consulted in connection with the over-all plan for a national airport development. Under plans recently announced, the Army, for example, has indicated that it will not continue to operate many important well-developed air facilities throughout the country. Millions of dollars of Government funds have been spent constructing and improving these developments, and where possible they should be embraced in the integrated national system of civilian and commercial airports.

It is in part for the above-stated reasons that I respectfully suggest to the very able Chairman of this Committee and its distinguished membership that careful consideration be given to the readjustment of formulas contained in this bill. I realize that it is not always possible to deal with complicated technical matters completely and comprehensively on the floor of the House, but I express the hope that when the measure goes to conference earnest efforts will be made to accord more equitable treatment to great population centers like Massachusetts and New England, whose contribution to the national wealth, the national development, and the national spirit of enterprise and initiative has been so conspicuous and fruitful for our country.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Let us read this amendment:

Page 6, line 15, after the word "States" add a new proviso reading as follows: "*Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1946, and ending June 30, 1947, the maximum appropriation of $100,000,000 as authorized in section 5 of this act, shall, when appropriated and after deducting administrative costs be disbursed by the Administrator on the basis of 75 percent for improvement of airports, contemplated under this act, and 25 percent for new facilities."

I just call this to your attention. No one knows yet, and no one could tell whether or not the funds from the various States, as we have it now, or municipalities, as we might have it, whoever it is, want to meet this or not, whether it is to be asked for by the sponsor. The sponsor in your State, Mr. O'HARA, may not ask for any improvement of an airport, but this states that notwithstanding that you disregard the sponsor and just go over and say to the State of Minnesota: "75 percent of what you are going to get will have to be used for the improvement of existing airports."

And that is all that is involved in this. I call the attention of the Committee to it and I ask that it be defeated.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. This amendment if adopted would very largely prevent the establishment of a new airport?

Mr. BULWINKLE. It would.

Mr. HINSHAW. The committee contemplates that a great many new airports would be established, particularly in the more remote localities that do not already have airports. That is one of the great objects of the committee in the bill to establish some 2,000 or 3,000 new airports where airports do not now exist.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARLSON: On page 6, in lines 2 and 6, strike out the figure "$650,000,000" in line 2 and insert "$500,000,000"; strike out the figure "$100,000,000" in line 6 and insert "$75,000,000."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a very easy amendment to understand. We all agree on a national airport program, but I think it might be well to consider a reduction in this amount of $650,000,000 for a 10-year period to $500,000,000 and in the annual expenditure provided in the bill from $100,000,000 to $75,000,000. It is well to consider that we are going to have difficulty in raising half a billion dollars. Money spent now will be deficit financing. Some of it may be raised in the next bond drive. Let us keep in mind the Senate has already passed similar legislation. What did they do? They voted $75,000,000 for 5 years or $375,000,000. It seems to me that if this House should vote a sum of $500,000,000 it should be sufficient to care for this program. Let us remember the States and municipalities must also raise an equal amount. Someone will say, "Well, this is only an authorization." That is true, but you and I who have served in this House a number of years know that once we authorize these appropriations the Committee on Appropriations feel morally bound to bring in the full amount every year. I want to urge that this Committee consider seriously this reduction. It will not impair the construction of these airports. We are going to build plenty of them in the next few years. Aviation has a great future, and our Government will supply ample funds. I sincerely hope my amendment will be adopted.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. They are not going to get the airports they contemplate with this amount of money, anyway. The building-loan head testified at a hearing before our committee that building costs on private homes have gone up from eight to ten thousand dollars and they expect them to go higher in the next 3 years. They cannot get all the airports. They will have to appropriate more than this bill mentions. Your money may not be worth anything 10 years from now.

Mr. CARLSON. The gentlewoman from Illinois, I believe, is just as concerned about inflation as I am, and certainly that is one phase of the problem which should be considered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I can understand the reason why the gentleman would be for an over-all reduction in expenditures of the Government. However, I am sure the gentleman did not oppose the $1,500,000,000 Federal aid highway program last December because he was thoroughly sold on the belief, as the people of America believed, in continuing and developing our highway transportation system. Is that not correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is absolutely correct. That is a program which has been in operation for years. This is a new program. We will have plenty of opportunity to expand as time goes on.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I remind the gentleman that that program is telescoped into 3 years. This program covers a period of 10 years and certainly it is a modest amount which is asked for. We know we are going to need 10,000 to 12,000 airports and landing facilities in this country. This provides for approximately only 6,000.

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman does not contend that we will be carrying as much in the air as we are going to carry over the highways during the next 10, 25, or 100 years, I assume?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I will say to the gentleman that the expansion in air transportation will be greater than the expansion in other modes of transportation.

Mr. CARLSON. There is not any question that we are going to have a greater airport program. I am in favor of it. But I think this Congress might well consider that $500,000,000 is one-half billion dollars.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The people already have their investments in automobiles, but if the Congress keeps on depreciating the currency through deficit financing, they will not have enough money to ride in airplanes, much less build airports.

Mr. CARLSON. That is a very good point. My thought is that we can expand this program in the future if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at this time we are facing in this country a deficit in the operation of the Government this year of from thirty-five to forty billion dollars. That is the best we can hope for. It will be a couple of years before we can possibly balance the Budget if we try to do business in a careful way.

I have serious doubts about the advisability of passing any bill that authorizes the expenditure of $450,000,000 or $600,000,000, even spread over a 10-year period. Unless we permit our factories and our businesses to get going, to replenish the empty shelves of our merchants and to give the people the things they need, that they have done without for so long, if we try to throw the Government into that picture, we will just delay and prevent reconversion. We are just going to delay the time when our Government can be solvent and we can say that we are balancing the Budget and moving along right side up.

This is an enormous capital expenditure. It is laid out on a very elaborate scale, more elaborate than a great many people feel should be done.

If we are going to consider a bill like this, the very least we should do would be to lop off $150,000,000, such as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has proposed.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I shall take but a minute or two.

I call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and others who are opposed to measures like this, to the fact that, according to the logic they advance, it would be the duty of this House and the Congress not to engage in any kind of activity—river and harbor improvements, highway construction, aviation—but just sit supinely down and say, "We have got a $300,000,000,000 indebtedness and we had better not do anything at all." Under that argument we would become less than a third-rate power. Great God, has it come to pass that we would stop everything? I cannot believe it, and I do not believe the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Missouri, or anyone else who has spoken, is in favor of that.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

I have not spoken before. I have hitherto let my fellow committeemen of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee work this out, but I am going to have to say something now. It is interesting to see how men get up here opposing this legislation with an appeal about economy. This amendment is presented in the great name of economy. It is an attractive appeal, and, until analyzed, might seem to strike for economy. But that is not so at all in a case of this kind. We were all impressed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] when he told us yesterday that at the time they began to develop roads over the Nation it was said in the name of economy that it would bankrupt the Nation; yet nothing was ever done that helped bring more wealth or add more value to the Nation. You remember Seward's folly, when the United States bought Alaska. It was said that the money for those icy wastes had been thrown away, yet Alaska has paid for itself many times in fish alone.

Is anything in life more necessary than to plan for the development and expansion of our airways, our air lines, and our air transport? It is not economy at all to cut down on things like this. No; it is only following the course of the farmer who has let the weeds grow and choke his corn to death because it cost too much to file his hoe to cut the weeds out.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that the Federal Government has spent more than $27,000,000,000 on our Federal-aid highway system, and that it has paid dividends?

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman is right. When you spend $1 and get back two you are not losing money. When the time for expansion comes and you do not expand you are starving to death the industries that provide employment and make the kind of nation we want our grandchildren to live in. Such blind economy is not economy at all.

Some people are like the phillilooloo birds, they do not see where they are going at all; they fly backwards and see only where they have been.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, anyone can advance at any time a plausible argument for spending, just as the gentleman from Alabama has advanced a very plausible argument which I am sure

will have great appeal to those who believe in spending and spending and taxing and taxing. The gentleman from Alabama is evidently not very well acquainted with the fiscal condition of his Government. The gentleman perhaps does not know that at the present time we owe practically as much as the total value of the country.

Mr. BULWINKLE. No.

Mr. KNUTSON. Almost—within a few billions. The national debt is now about $270,000,000,000, and the total wealth of the country was estimated, I believe in the census of 1930, at $330,000,000,000.

We have reached the point where we have got to scan every dollar that we spend. The gentleman from Alabama talks about wanting to hand this country down to his grandchildren in better shape than he found it. If that is the case he had better put his shoulder to the wheel and help economize or there will not be any country when his grandchildren reach maturity.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The trouble with this Congress is they have the Russian idea, they think this country cannot go forward unless the Congress spends money. The thing that is holding up progress in this country is that businessmen think their money is not going to be worth anything because of congressional spending and they are afraid to invest their money. That is the paramount thing that is holding up reconversion today.

Mr. KNUTSON. Our businessmen are afraid to invest their money on account of the high tax rate which has been made necessary by wasteful Congresses that have been functioning for the last 10 or 12 years. It is time we called a halt, or we shall not have any country left. I believe there is more danger to this country from wasteful spending than from the atomic bomb.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman stated that the national wealth of the country was $330,000,000,000. The gentleman also stated that $270,000,000,000 is the national debt; however, that figure is the Federal Government debt. It does not take into consideration the debt that the States, cities, towns, municipalities, and other public utilities owe; so that the total public debt probably exceeds the assessed valuation of the property of the country.

Mr. KNUTSON. The total debt—national, State, and including all political subdivisions—amounts to $2,200 for every man, woman, and child.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the Committee for speaking again today, but I would like to call the attention of the Committee during the heat of this economy-wave argument that the program under consideration has been studied for many months, perhaps for years, by our Civil Aeronautics Authority and presented to the committee for its consideration in connection with the over-all airport program.

We are reminded of the fact that now we are going to have economy after we have been spending some $63,000,000,000 for lend-lease alone. Now, because we speak of $650,000,000 we must have an economy wave. We appropriated not so long ago approximately $1,750,000,000 for UNRRA to do something toward aiding the people in all parts of the world; but when we come to doing something that is constructive in an economic way in this country, something that is necessary for the building of our transportation system in this country, it then becomes very much a matter of economy.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is the ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee. That committee brought in a tax bill the other day which reduced our taxes something over $5,000,000,000. I voted for that bill. That bill came in under a gag rule. This bill properly comes in here to be amended as the committee and House see fit. I shall not be angry at anyone if they want to reduce it, but I want to say to the gentleman from Minnesota that our committee should receive the same consideration on bills which we have spent weeks and even months in preparing that his committee does. Under those circumstances this bill would not be amended.

I would like to see the same respect and consideration given to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that has considered this bill a long, long time that is given to other committees. We should be given the same credit as other committees get. We should not listen to some gentleman who gets up here and says, "This is terrible." We are spending under this bill only $650,000,000 in 10 years. We appropriated and spent $50,000,000,000, yes, $100,000,000,000, some of the war years I have been here and nobody said anything about economy. They all said it was necessary to win the war. I am, likewise, for a wise economy. Let us not be carried away by all of this argument on economy. I have the highest respect for those who urge as they do. Please give the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce credit for having a little common sense and for having in mind the transportation development in this country and the future of our Nation. Heretofore we have been thinking in terms of doing good all over the world. Now let us do a little thinking toward doing something for our own country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know how unpopular it is to oppose these pork bills—and especially when the pork is to be so widely distributed over the country. But the purported analogy constantly reiterated both yesterday and today, between this proposed appropriation for airports and former appropriations for highways, is in fact, no analogy at all.

At the time to which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] refers there were no highways. There was not a mile of paved highways in the Nation. But today, on the contrary, we have in continental United States the most magnificent system of airways and airports ever conceived by the most optimistic aviation engineers of the past decade. The highway situation then and the airway situation now have nothing in common. There is no analogy in any respect.

The gentleman's illustration serves to bring out all the more convincingly the utter lack of need for this profligate spending. We have today in the United States 3,774 completed airports servicing every section of the country, however remote. The truth is we have so many that both the Army and the Navy are relinquishing large numbers of airports because they are superfluous. The Army is transferring to local communities, gratis, more than half their airports and retaining only 152. The Navy is abandoning all of their airports but 96. Those remaining from the 3,774 airports are more than sufficient to supply every real need of civil aviation. The money proposed in this bill will, if appropriated, be used to erect handsomer and more imposing structures to gratify the vanity of ambitious chambers of commerce.

The proposition is not only to spend money we do not have, but to spend it for something we do not need.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I wish to remind the gentleman that the President of the United States asked Congress for an airport program, and in furtherance of that message of the President your committee has brought the bill out.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am certain the gentleman does not mean to intimate that the legislative branch of the Government should be governed, against its better judgment, by suggestions from the executive branch of the Government.

However, granting the gentleman's inference, the many messages received almost daily from the President do not necessarily reflect his personal point of view. As everybody knows, these messages are written by the departments, or some bureaucrat in the Department, and merely transmitted by the President. At best they are recommendations which Congress accepts or rejects as its judgment dictates. And the President so understands it.

The Congress has a tremendous responsibility here. It is for the Congress to decide whether——

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The only thing I want to say to the gentleman is that I kind of resent that the President of the United States is not expressing his own wishes but is sending down a message here because, forsooth, some bureaucrat asked for it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am certain the President would not resent it. It is nothing new in the history of representative government. One morning when Charles II rose, he found a placard which some wag of his court had pinned to the door of his bedchamber:

Here lies our sovereign lord, the King,
Whose word no man relies on,
Who never said a foolish thing
And never did a wise one.

Charles' retort was that his words were his own but his acts were his ministers'. This proposal was undoubtedly handed to the President. I do not know whether he would really approve it after he had studied it or not. But I do know that he would not want to borrow money for such purpose and further increase our national debt and impair the national credit to that extent, if we already had sufficient airports to supply our legitimate needs. And that is precisely the situation here today and no one has produced any scintilla of evidence to the contrary.

I used to laugh at that old joke about the Congressman who always voted against taxes and always voted for appropriations. But I do not laugh at it any more. It has become too serious a reality. With the greatest deficit in history staring us in the face, and with war incomes, war wages, war prices, and war profits still pouring in, the House voted to cut war taxes last week. Voted to cut war taxes when the Nation is marshaling its forces for a gigantic campaign to put across the Eighth War Loan drive. We throw away tax money and then start out to borrow more money. And now we propose to spend the money we hope to borrow in the Eighth War Loan drive for something for which we have no earthly need. We went on record in an aye-and-nay vote when we voted against taxes. I wonder if we will be willing to also go on record when we vote to spend money for these superfluous airports—and the inflation which always accompanies deficit spending.

Let no one minimize the difficulties and dangers ahead of the Nation in the crucial days to come. Let us tear our eyes away from these glittering improvements on our airports long enough to look back and remember what happened after the last war. Do not pull the sheet up over your head. Soldiers are coming back after this war just as they came back after the last war—millions of them. And they must have jobs. They are entitled to jobs and to an American standard of living for themselves and their families. And war factories are closing just as they closed after the last war, and workmen are pouring out into the streets and highways just as they did in 1920. And they must be provided with employment. Men will no longer starve peacefully. Of course, we expect private industry to take up the slack in unemployment. And there are encouraging indications that they will be able to handle a large part of it. But even the most hopeful must realize that the Federal Government must be in a position to meet emergencies of this nature, and that it will require money. Where will that money come from? We are already borrowed up to the hilt. If the United States Government was a private business it would be bankrupt. Its total obligations, national, State, and municipal, and of minor civic units, aggregate more than our assets. Under ordinary business practices, the sheriff would close us out.

But it is comforting to know that if this bill passes, we can always have this last recourse. When a veteran or a workman comes to us with a plea for his hungry family, and the Treasury is as bare as Old Mother Hubbard's cupboard, we can point with pride to the new buildings on our airports and say, "See what an improvement the new buildings are over the old buildings we used to have, and you will forget you are hungry."

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan there may be 10 minutes of debate, 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against, and that if the motion is defeated the 10 minutes of debate on the amendment still remain to be used. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, like so many other Members of the House, I am in favor of economy if it does not interfere with the requests of any of my constituents. That seems to be the convenient yardstick when we vote on bills carrying appropriations, though when we talk economy, we all admit the dire necessity for lessened expenditures. I am also with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and other gentlemen on the majority side in my willingness to support the President when he happens to recommend something that I am in favor of doing. I have noticed that occasionally when the President's recommendations do not run counter to the individual's idea his—the President's—support of the measure is cited as reason for its passage.

I just wonder if the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], who has been handling this legislation for the committee and who made the inquiry of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and told him that this was a request by the President, is following that other request of the President that we enact the FEPC bill without any delay. I have not heard any speeches from the gentleman from North Carolina or from Members on that side fron the deep South urging that we adopt the President's request for the adoption of FEPC. None of that group has jumped up into the collar to pull that one on the House floor.

One of the committees of which I am a member is considering now the full employment bill. One of the representatives of one of the great unions testified yesterday that there are at the present time, after 12 years of the New Deal—the four last years during the war, but 8 before—in which the New Deal had full opportunity to prove its efficacy, 8,000,000 men out of employment who are entitled as a matter of right to jobs giving an income or a wage of $3,000 a year, President Truman demands we pass the so-called full employment bill. Something like $24,000,000,000 would be needed for that purpose alone. That is not small change even to a Congress like this. And neither the President nor anyone else has told us where we can get that little item.

Then there is another request sent down by the President not very long ago for the 26/25 unemployment compensation, $25 a week for 26 weeks to be paid to the unemployed. I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] whether he is in favor of that, and I wonder if he ever figured up the cost of it, and if he realized it would be 26 times 25 times 8,000,000 workers, or not less than $5,200,000,000.

Of course, I suppose a majority of the gentlemen over there on the Democratic side are in favor of the request from Russia for $6,000,000,000. We can put some money in there. And if you are going to vote for all of those requests of the President, I will be tempted to vote to spend somewhere, sometime in the United States where our people will get the good of it, some of this money we are to borrow.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] said quite truthfully, "There will always be a United States of America if the Congress does not give it away." Congress during the last few years, under Presidential guidance, has done a fairly good job of giving it away.

The papers told us last night that Britain was going to take 1,000 of our Liberty ships.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Two thousand.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, call it 500; any number will do to illustrate the point that they are going to take those ships away from us. And we know that England is over here, the British Empire's representatives are here, asking for $6,000,000,000, and that twelve billion for Russia and Britain must be borrowed. I feel sorry for the Englishmen and I feel sorry for the British Empire, but I am a darn sight sorrier for the American taxpayer. If you want to give the British $6,000,000,000, I do not know of anything I can do to prevent it.

Those little items add up to forty-one billlion two hundred million. And none of this is for regular Federal expenditures, which will amount to many more billions.

UNRRA is coming in. One of the little girls who has been working around Washington came back from England on a plane the other day. UNRRA brought her back at a cost of $525. Now they are

going to send her to China. I do not know how much money you are going to give UNRRA, and I know that I cannot prevent it. I do know the responsibility is not mine.

I am just thinking back about 10 or 12 years when your President promised economy and he fussed along for 8 years until the war came, saving us from bankruptcy but costing billions of dollars and a million casualties. Now we are again on the same road to bankruptcy. It is all right with me because and only because, I cannot prevent it. If you know where you can get the money, if you know where to get it, give it away, if that is what you are determined to do. I do not—should I say—care? Yes, I do, but it does not do any good, nothing is gained by worrying about it—protests get me nowhere. Yes; the practice is "I am in favor of economy if it does not affect my constituents and if they do not want anything." But figure up the total if you will and answer the question so often asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], "Where are you going to get the money?" While I cannot prevent deficit spending to aid a business—aviation—well on its feet and on the road to expansion and profit, I can at least not only make protest, advocate economy, but I can be consistent and vote against appropriations for millions of dollars to be expended for things that are not necessities—not essential to recovery.

Let us either quit talking about balancing the Budget, about economy, or else vote only for appropriations which must be made to carry on our national economy or provide for the veterans and the unfortunate who cannot help themselves. Let our acts, rather than our words, henceforth inform our constitents of our policy. We cannot forever continue to spend and give away.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, of course the gentleman when he made the motion to strike out all after the enacting clause did so merely for the purpose of obtaining the floor for 5 minutes. Therefore, I ask for a vote upon the gentleman's motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very reasonable reduction and I desire to compliment the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] for their efforts toward securing this saving of $150,000,000.

I regret that we do not have the same energy and enthusiasm toward a balanced Budget here today as was expressed by the members of the Ways and Means Committee, just a few days ago in the well of this House. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are showing here now that they mean what they said then and I feel sure that the numerous gentlemen of the Committee on Ways and Means, who were so critical of our Appropriations Committee last Thursday, will now join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and others of us who are desirous of holding down to a reasonable level this new field of governmental expenditure. Certainly we wish to help aviation, but let us also remember that our Treasury is empty and that every dollar of this $650,000,000 will have to be borrowed. I hope the Carlson amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I merely call attention to the fact that if there is one thing of importance to the economy of the United States, it is transportation and communications. I suppose if we had never built the canals we would never have moved up the rivers or gone beyond the rapids or joined the headwaters of navigable rivers. If we had never built the railroads the Middle West and Far West would still be a wilderness. If we had never built the State, county, and city roads, we would still be wandering around in the mud hauled by horses and mules. It is necessary for the progress of our Nation that we improve our transportation system continuously.

This is the way the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce believes we can materially aid our country in improving its business and its opportunities for jobs and its general economy. I hope the Committee will not adopt this pending amendment. We must utilize the advantages that aviation offers us to the fullest possible extent and bring its potentialities into being as realities as quickly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY], is recognized.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the great Appropriations Committee, and especially to know that he so ardently favors economy at this time. It is also of interest to have him explain to us just how the President acts in sending messages down here to committee or even to the floor of the House. I am surprised to know that the President does not speak his own mind. I had thought better of him. Also, I am reminded of the fact that from the time I became a Member of this body on January 3, 1939, right up to the crux of the Presidential election year of 1940, when the late Mr. Roosevelt was running for a precedent shattering third term, there seemed to be little disposition on the part of the gentleman from Missouri to preach economy at that time, especially economy in public works, because I am sure that had there been real economy in public works at that time Mr. Roosevelt's success at the polls might have been doubtful to say the least.

However, Mr. Chairman, my opposition to this pending amendment is, I feel, based on common sense and on good-business grounds. The gentleman from Missouri seeks to defend the recently enacted highway appropriation bill on the grounds that our expenditures for highways had always proven sound investment. With that position I am in wholehearted agreement. I know that in our own State of Michigan, our excellent system of concrete highways, which we started to construct after the last war, opened up two gigantic industries in our State, both of which have returned handsome dividends to our State economy. We could not have enjoyed the gigantic expansion of our automobile industry had it not been for the Nation-wide expansion of our splendid highway system. That automobile industry is our largest and, incidentally, it performed a miracle in production during the past war.

But our second largest industry in Michigan stems directly from our splendid highway system. In our State in the last prewar year the total revenue derived from the tourist industry was $400,000,000 and that industry would still be in its infancy were it not for our State-wide system of splendid highways.

I say to you now with reference to this particular bill, and this particular amendment, just as following the last war the automotive industry came into being principally because of the development of the automobiles themselves for transportation in that war and the development of new metals which put new life into those automotive vehicles, just so following this war will the aircraft industry come into its own. Truly it was difficult to visualize, as we look back, the remarkable changes that have been made in aircraft since the start of this war. Truly it is difficult to look ahead and visualize what the commercial airplane of the future will bring into a world-wide system of air transportation. And above all is it difficult to foresee at this time just what the private plane of the future will be. We do know that as soon as they are able to get out of the services we will have at least a million or more military trained fliers returned to private life who will be potential buyers of the private plane of tomorrow.

In the consideration of this bill we must remember that the only way those planes can be operated safely either on the air lines or in private operation is by having an adequate system of highways for the air. Airplanes must have airports on which to land. Both the commercial and the private plane will have their own spheres of operation, but both require a tremendously expanded system of airports over those now in existence in this country. It has been said our country is literally swarming with military airfields which are being turned back to the public. The trouble is that by their very nature most of them were located in remote areas to which neither the commercial air lines nor the private pilot will wish to go. Air lines must go where there is business for them and most of the military fields—adequate as they are to handle the air liner of today, were, nevertheless, located, for obvious reasons, far away from the pay-load factor. I cite one example. In the later prewar days, the Pennsylvania Central Airlines expanded their system to in-

clude service up to Sault St. Marie, Mich. Strange as it might seem in the short time it operated the line was forced to double its capacity during the tourist season and even then it was difficult to get a reservation in advance. But those planes landed, Mr. Chairman, on the Sault Ste. Marie municipal airport located within 5 minutes drive from the heart of town. When the war came on the Army authorities immediately closed that municipal field and Pennsylvania Central Airlines were forced to suspend their service and even yet they have not been permitted to renew it.

The next step was for the Army to spend several million dollars building two beautiful widely concreted airports some 25 miles outside of, and on either side of Sault Ste. Marie. Is there any air line that is going to patronize those Army fields when there is one located on the very edge of the city, and which, incidentally, needs considerable work done on it to make it suitable for the air liner of the future? Are any of the private pilots going to utilize either of those outlying airports and walk to town?

No; we must have an adequate system of airports to permit landings all over this Nation as near as possible to the local centers of population.

And so I say to you that if there is one condemnation to be leveled at this bill—and I say this not in criticism of the committee which has done such a good job—but if there is one condemnation for this bill it is the fact that they have not gone far enough, and I hope this amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CARLSON) there were—ayes 60, noes 109.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 6, lines 6, 7, and 24, strike out "until June 30, 1956" and insert "for 3 years."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered would simply reduce the time that funds would be available under this bill. The language of the bill is, on page 6, lines 5, 6, and 7:

The appropriation for any such fiscal year shall not exceed $100,000,000 and shall remain available until June 30, 1956, unless sooner expended.

What I propose to do is to strike out the words "June 30, 1956" and substitute the words "for 3 years."

I cannot see any sense in appropriating funds and having them available for 10 years; I believe we ought to keep our appropriation and expenditures at least within a reasonable range, and 3 years is a very liberal time for anything of that kind. We should not appropriate 10 years ahead.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the reason the committee approved this provision making appropriated money available until 1956 was to assure each State that it would not lose its proportion of the money by reason of the money's reverting to the Treasury. Should the amendment be adopted, its only practical effect would be that of possibly increasing expenditures.

It may be that some of the funds authorized by this bill will never be used because some States may not match it. Such unused money would never be withdrawn from the Treasury. If the money reverted to the Treasury, it would be subject to matching in other States that had already taken advantage of the act. So the committee in reporting the bill with the date 1956 felt this would be to the interest of the States and the country and would not cost the Treasury one cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 25, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR PROJECTS IN STATES

Apportionment of funds

SEC. 6. (a) As soon as possible after any appropriation is made under section 5 (b), 75 percent of the amount thereof available for grants for projects in the several States shall be apportioned by the Administrator among the several States, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States. All sums so apportioned for a State shall be available only to pay the United States share of the allowable project costs of approved projects in that State. Upon making an apportionment as provided in this subsection, the Administrator shall inform the executive head of each State, and any public agency which has requested such information, as to the sums apportioned for each State. As used in this subsection the term "population" means the population according to the latest decennial census of the United States and the term "area" includes both land and water.

Discretionary fund

(b) All Federal funds available for projects in the several States which are not apportioned as provided in subsection (a) shall constitute a discretionary fund. All moneys in such discretionary fund shall be available to pay the United States' share of the allowable project costs of such approved projects in the several States as the Administrator may deem most appropriate for carrying out the national airport plan, regardless of the States in which they are located.

With the following committee amendment:

The Administrator shall give consideration, in determining the projects for which the moneys in such fund are to be used, to the existing airport facilities in the several States and to the need for or lack of development of airport facilities in the several States.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDOLPH: Page 8, line 13, section 6 (a): Strike out "In that State" and insert "located in that State or sponsored by that State, or some public agency thereof, but located in an adjoining State."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I believe the committee will desire to accept this amendment. We have in the States many airports that are actually, from a physical standpoint, located within a certain State but the sponsorship, or the local money was paid by a community in an adjoining State. Cumberland, Md., has an airport. It is located, however, across the Potomac River in the State of West Virginia. In my State we have the Huntington Airport, but it has been located in the State of Ohio. We find here in Washington a national airport located in Virginia. There will be many instances where this amendment will provide the necessary language in the bill so that the sponsorship can come from a community or other political subdivision even though the airport be located in another State.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will recall that in a colloquy I suggested such an amendment ought to be put in this bill, but we were told that was not necessary because the District of Columbia was considered a municipality and could come in under the provisions of the bill. With this amendment in the bill we will be assured that the District will be considered and taken care of. On the Senate side I do not think the District of Columbia is mentioned in that bill either.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to compliment the gentleman, who is chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, for offering this amendment, and I shall be glad to support it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The members of the committee on this side have spoken to me concerning the gentleman's amendment and we have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BARDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3615) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air-navigation facilities, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. BENDER, and Mr. HOFFMAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I mentioned a statement of the Secretary of War on behalf of a single department of defense and stated at that time I would put his statement in the RECORD. I have ascertained from the United States Government Printing Office that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $138.80, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

TO ESTABLISH A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 374, Rept. No. 1130), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4160) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

REDUCING CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS AVAILABLE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1946

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 375, Rept. 1131), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read by appropriation titles for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by his colleague Hon. JERRY H. VOORHIS, on modernizing Congress.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication from his district and an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague the gentlewoman from Maine, Hon. MARGARET C. SMITH.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, I have received petitions from 1,500 members of the Stewart-Warner Local 1154 of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, in Chicago, Ill., urging support of their program, namely:

Murray-Patman full employment bill.

Unemployment compensation, $25 for 26 weeks.

Minimum wage law, 65 cents per hour.

Permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee—FEPC.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I am wholeheartedly in favor of this program and I shall lend my support and full cooperation in having these measures reported by the legislative committees having jurisdiction so that the House may consider them.

APPRENTICE TRAINING FOR VETERANS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, from the 1939 national-defense era to VJ-day, the constant cry was for skilled men—men with the all-around know-how of their trades. America's shortage of skilled mechanics was met by the stopgap of dilution of the skills. We had three, four, and more people doing the job of one all-around skilled worker. A study of the 1940 census revealed some startling facts. It showed that we had about 5,000,000 skilled tradesmen in this Nation. Of this number approximately 5½ percent were over 65 years of age. Twenty-five percent of them had learned their trade in a foreign country, before coming to America, and less than 3 percent were beginners, or apprentices.

America reached its place as the greatest industrial nation of the world through the skill and ingenuity of its craftsmen. We have always been able to out produce every other nation on this account. If we are to continue to occupy this position and maintain the high standards of living and safegard our future security, we must take immediate steps to replenish our reservoir of skilled workmen.

Along with the professional men, the skilled craftsman has always been a respected member of the American community. Through his skill we have been able to enjoy many of the finer thing in life. The automobile, the railroads, the airplane, mechanical refrigeration, telephone are only a few of the things that have been produced through his skill.

The pages of history shows that many of the founders of this great Nation started as apprentices, became journeymen, and later exercised a potent voice in our national affairs. The opportunity to have a trade is one of the things that has made America great. This opportunity should be extended and safeguarded to the millions of American boys who have worked and fought so gallantly to give us victory over our enemies and bring peace to a war-torn world. They are now beginning to return to civilian life. These young men are anxious to take up where they left off when they entered the service 3 or 4 years ago. Uppermost in their minds is the desire to have the opportunity to choose, prepare for, and practice one of the professions or trades and take their place in the economic life of America. It is our duty to make immediate and definite plans for the future of these returning veterans.

Some of these young men will resume their studies in institutions of higher learning, so as to prepare themselves for the professions. They will be our future doctors, dentists, lawyers, and so forth. The great majority of returning veterans plan to make one of the trades his life work. It is the preparation for, and planning of, the future of this large group that I am at this time particularly interested.

As a doctor must complete his education in medicine and serve his internship before practicing his profession, so, likewise, a skilled tradesman must study the techniques of his trade and serve an apprenticeship before he can become a journeyman.

Before the veteran, who desires to enter trade training, is discharged from the service, he should have an opportunity to become familiar with his rights

and responsibilities. He should be in a position to know what he can possibly expect from his training and what he must give to satisfactorily complete his apprenticeship. Congress has provided in the GI bill of rights, a training subsistence for veterans of $50 or $75 a month, but this support alone will not accomplish the desired results. Systematic training and sensible supervision is the only way to protect the veteran in training and insure the best possible economic returns from his investment of money, time, and labor.

Labor, management, and the public should work as a team to give the veteran a definite program under which he will be assured the protection and advice which he needs before choosing and entering trade training, and which will guarantee him a full and complete opportunity to learn his trade. This program should be given wide publicity. The veteran should be in a position to insist that his employer carry out the program to the minutest details, and likewise the employer must have the right and the opportunity to check the record of his employee.

The best possible training program for veterans in any of the trades can be developed by representatives of management sitting in with representatives of labor. This group, with a common understanding of all the training problems involved, can easily come to a mutual understanding on all parts of a program which will be in the best interest of the veteran.

In planning an apprenticeship program, measures must be taken to reasonably assure the veteran that he will receive an all-around training in the trade. A job analysis of the trade in each plant, or community should be made. Those things that a journeyman must know before he is qualified to carry on his chosen trade should be listed. The machines used and the operations performed must be set forth in a schedule of work experience. The minimum time spent in training on each machine, operation, or in learning a definite phase of the trade should be clearly stated in hours. If this work break-down is made the veteran can at any time during his training check on the progress he is making and be assured that his employer is giving him a full and complete training.

It is very important to the veteran that the total time required for his training be fixed. Some trades require 8,000 hours of "on the job training" based on an estimated 2,000 hours per year. Under this formula the complete training would normally take 4 years. If hours rather than years are used, it would be possible for an energetic and ambitious apprentice to complete the prescribed training in less than 4 years. Hours rather than years. is therefore a fairer way of determining the exact amount of training needed to justify salary increases, or qualify the apprentice as a journeyman.

Increasing wages naturally tend to boost the apprentice's interest in his work and keep his morale at a high level. While training as an apprentice the veteran will actually produce, as he works and earns while he learns. He starts as an unskilled worker at a low salary and his wages increase as his knowledge of the trade broadens, and his production increases, until he finally becomes entitled to receive the salary of a journeyman.

Everything possible should be done to guarantee the veteran, who spends his time in apprenticeship, an opportunity of continuous employment at fair wages in the trade for which he trains. Necessary precaution must be taken to avoid training too many veterans in the same job or trade at the same time. If we are foresighted now and take the necessary steps to limit the number of veterans in training in each plant or local trade at any one time, we will avoid the possibility of unemployment. Supply and demand in this respect should be studied and the veteran advised about present employment conditions in each trade.

Veterans serving an apprenticeship will greatly benefit from related classroom instruction. Every training program should provide that a certain number of hours be devoted to such related subjects as shop arithmetic, blueprint reading, psychology, English, current labor legislation, or economics. This will not only make it easier for the veteran to learn his trade, but will give him a much more thorough knowledge of the technical nature of the work. Classroom study is very necessary to qualify for the highest jobs in the trade, such as supervisors, foremen, superintendents, and owners.

Work records of each apprentice should be made and kept available at all times. These records should disclose what and how much training the veteran has had at any time, and what and how much training is necessary before the veteran can qualify as a journeyman. That will tend to put the veteran on notice that he is, or is not doing the job expected of him. The employer may also check on the skill and aptitude of the veteran at various times during his apprenticeship. This periodic accounting will be beneficial to industry and the veteran.

Good management requires proper supervision over employees in training. During their apprenticeship, veterans will be shifted from one part of the trade to another. These changes will necessarily require the veteran to serve under many different instructors, who will supervise his immediate work. In the course of his training, problems will rise, personalities are likely to clash, and questions pertaining to the over-all program will have to be settled without delay. A single supervisor of apprentices, in each plant, to whom the veteran can appeal, is essential. This person will be responsible for the proper keeping of training records, timely shifting of the veteran, and one to whom the veteran can go to for advice and guidance.

An agreement signed by both the employer and the veteran setting forth the conditions of employment should be executed before the veteran starts training. This is evidence of their good faith and sincerity. If we are conscientious in what we say we intend to do for the returning veteran, we should not object to promise in writing to abide by the provisions of our own fair and just contract of employment, which will be of our own making.

When a person completes school or college he receives a diploma or degree as a form of recognition showing that he has satisfactorily completed a prescribed course of study and is qualified for a particular position. Likewise, when a veteran has satisfactorily completed his training, he should be given a certificate as evidence that he has satisfactorily completed his apprenticeship and has qualified as a skilled workman in the trade.

We are very fortunate in these United States to have a decentralization of apprenticeship. Over one-half of our States have had the foresight to establish their own State apprenticeship agency at the suggestion of the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship. The main purpose of these State agencies is to assist industry in their respective States to promote apprenticeship and to act as a clearing house on all apprenticeship matters. Also, by clearing through the national office, an exchange of ideas is made possible, which enables all sections of the country to benefit from experience in any one section.

There is one other important matter that should be made known to the veteran who is entering trade training. The GI bill provides for supplying tools to each veteran who enters training. The veteran should be familiar with this provision and should have such tools as he is entitled to, before he begins his training.

We must all understand that high wages alone is not what the veteran expects. He has fought long and hard and has endured many privations in order that the American way of life may survive. The American way of life spells for him the opportunity to follow his calling and take his place in society, and work for a bigger and better America and a more cooperative and peaceful world.

Both labor and management can repay their debt to the veteran by making it possible for him to receive a bona fide apprentice training. Once properly trained, the veteran will have something no one can take away, a knowledge of his trade—a definite guaranty for his future economic security.

A parent who sends his son or daughter to college has a definite knowledge of what the course will consist of and how he will be educated. We should not expect our veterans to go into training as apprentices without a definite bona fide program.

Current surveys at Army, Navy, and Marine separation centers show that over 10 percent of the dischargees expressed a desire to have a trade. If we consider only one-half this percentage, there will be over 800,000 veterans serving an apprenticeship. The income of this group, including wages and training subsistence provided for in the GI bill, will total approximately $2,000,000,000 each year. This is really big business. It must be protected. The training received by this group will total nearly 2,000,000,000 hours of "on the job training" per year. We must have a definite

workable program planned to meet the tremendous problem. It is our responsibility to make sure that this plan is carried out. It is our duty to each and every veteran. It is our duty to future security and prosperity of our country.

There are 12 fundamental points, general in scope, which I propose as the basis for every apprentice-training program. It is my earnest hope that every trade-training program for veterans will include the following 12 points:

First. Individual training programs should be established in each trade for each locality. These training programs should be formulated by representatives of management sitting in with representatives of employees.

Second. Each program should contain a predetermined schedule of work experiences in the trade and should state the minimum number of hours required for training in each major part.

Third. Each program should show the total number of hours in training necessary to qualify the veteran as a journeyman in the particular trade.

Fourth. Each program should contain a progressively increasing wage schedule for the entire training period.

Fifth. Each program should provide a ceiling as to the number of veterans to be in training at any one time.

Sixth. Each program should allow for approximately 150 hours per year of related classroom instruction.

Seventh. Each program should require adequate training records to be kept.

Eighth. Each program should provide for a supervisor of apprentices.

Ninth. Each program should provide for a written agreement, signed by the employer and the veteran, covering the terms and conditions of the training.

Tenth. Each program and written agreement should be recorded with the local State apprenticeship agency, or, in the absence of a State agency, with the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship.

Eleventh. Each program should provide for the issuance of a certificate of completion of apprenticeship to those who have satisfactorily completed their apprenticeship.

Twelfth. Each program should provide for the issuance of the necessary and proper tools. The GI bill provides for the tools for veterans in training.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have learned that Gen. Douglas MacArthur will shortly return to this country. I am sure that all the Members of the House will want to hear him address the Congress. I therefore ask unanimous consent, having discussed the matter with the Speaker and having consulted both the majority and the minority leaders, that it be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair, at a date to be later named, during which period a joint meeting shall be held in this Chamber, at which time General MacArthur will address us.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object—I desire to say to the gentleman from Arkansas that we hope that at an early date we can join in the celebration in honor of this great American who has performed such great and distinguished service.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. It is understood then, Mr. Speaker, according to my request, that it be on a date agreeable to General MacArthur and to the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BLAND), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. FLANNAGAN (at the request of Mr. RAMSPECK), for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 1 day, October 18, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will meet at 10 a. m., Thursday, October 18, to continue hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will meet Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m. in room 304, Old House Office Building, to consider the bill H. R. 2202.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Thursday, October 18, at 10 a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes, in the Rivers and Harbors Committee room.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, October 18, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in executive hearing to consider the bill (H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

751. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1946, "Foreign-service pay adjustment, appreciation of foreign currencies" (H. Doc. No. 320); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

752. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the sum of $4,608,360, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 321); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

753. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $560,300, for the National Labor Relations Board (H. Doc. No. 322); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

754. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $335,500 for the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 323); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

755. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 amounting to $1,222,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 324); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

756. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $1,878,420, for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 325); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

757. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the War Department (H. Doc. No. 326); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

758. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 amounting to $534,826 for the Civil Service Commission (H. Doc. No. 327); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

759. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 amounting to $3,559,000 for the General Accounting Office (H. Doc. No. 328); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

760. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $3,998,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 329); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

761. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $128,475,000, to remain available until expended, for the War Depart-

ment, for rivers and harbors and flood control (H. Doc. No. 330); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

762. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $93,367,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 331); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4407. A bill reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 236. Joint resolution providing for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property in the District of Columbia when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross; without amendment (Rept. No. 1126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4283. A bill to require parking facilities for the persons employed in Federal office buildings in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3429. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1128). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 940. An act to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada; with amendment (Rept. No. 1129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 374. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4160, a bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1130). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 375. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4407, a bill reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1131). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 4407. A bill reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4408. A bill to provide that the performance of notarial acts by commissioned officers of the armed forces of the United States, in certain cases, shall have the same effect as though performed by notaries public or judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4409. A bill to provide an additional allowance for military and naval personnel in computing net income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4410. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4411. A bill to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4412. A bill to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4413. A bill to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution to extend the time for consideration of the report of Surplus Property Board on the disposition of Government-owned aluminum plants and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4414. A bill for the relief of Eva D. Champlin, Robert H. Howell, Emily Howell, and Stella Ward; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 4415. A bill for the relief of L. O. Gilliam; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4416. A bill for the relief of George H. Buxton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4417. A bill for the relief of Mikalaj Gis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 4418. A bill for the relief of the city of San Diego, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 4419. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James Plumb; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1252. By Mr. COLE of Missouri: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of Missouri to the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States asking that they do all within their power to secure immediate release from the armed services of boys and young men so that they can return to their schooling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1253. By Mr. LANE: Resolution of the Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1254. Also, resolution of the Salem-Peabody Joint Board, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, Salem, Mass.; to the Committee on Labor.

1255. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of Murray E. Thompson, speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives of Missouri, adopted Resolution No. 250, October 3, 1945, to release all boys and young men from the services to resume their education; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1256. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition forwarded by Nellie G. Saunders and signed by citizens of Rockland, Maine, urging action on the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1257. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to control of atomic power; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our God and Father, out of the darkness with its starry beacons of twinkling light has come from Thy hand a bright new day, enshrining in its purple folds the splendor of another dawn. Amidst its busy hours we would bow in reverence, dedicating anew our souls' desires and our minds' powers to the holy service of God and country and to the healing of a sorely wounded world.

Enrich our attitudes and actions with that love for our fellows without whose golden gleam all we say, though we speak with the tongues of men and angels, is but as tinkling cymbals. Mastered by that love which seeketh not its own but the coming of Thy universal kingdom, may the words of our mouths and the meditation of our hearts be this day and always acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 15, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 16, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 620. An act for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin; and

S. 1007. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward P. Standley.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which

it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 714. An act to facilitate the admission to the United States of husbands, wives, and children of United States citizen men and women who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during the present World War;

H. R. 1862. An act relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2465. An act to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner;

H. R. 2985. An act to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.;

H. R. 3281. An act to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix a term of the United States District Court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June;

H. R. 3709. An act to amend section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928, and section 3 of the act of March 29, 1944, affecting the compensation of postmasters; and

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) providing for a joint session of the Congress on Tuesday, October 23, 1945, at 12:30 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR PUERTO RICO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

It is the settled policy of this Government to promote the political, social, and economic development of people who have not yet attained full self-government, and eventually to make it possible for them to determine their own form of government.

It is our pride that this policy was faithfully pursued in the case of the Philippines. The people of the Philippines determined that they desired political independence, and the Government of the United States made provision to this effect.

It is now time, in my opinion, to ascertain from the people of Puerto Rico their wishes as to the ultimate status which they prefer, and, within such limits as may be determined by the Congress, to grant to them the kind of government which they desire.

The present form of government in the island appears to be unsatisfactory to a large number of its inhabitants. Different groups of people in Puerto Rico are advocating various changes in the present form of government.

These advocated changes include different possibilities: (1) The right of the Puerto Ricans to elect their own Governor with a wider measure of local self-government; (2) statehood for Puerto Rico; (3) complete independence; and (4) a dominion form of government.

Each of these propositions is being urged in the island and each has its own advocates. Uncertainty has been created among the people as to just what the future of Puerto Rico is to be. These uncertainties should be cleared away at an early date.

To this end, I recommend that the Congress consider each of the proposals, and that legislation be enacted submitting various alternatives to the people of Puerto Rico. In that way the Congress can ascertain what the people of Puerto Rico themselves most desire for their political future.

However, in the interest of good faith and comity between the people of Puerto Rico and those of us who live on the mainland, Congress should not submit any proposals to the Puerto Ricans which the Congress is not prepared to enact finally into law. We should be prepared to carry into effect whatever options are placed before the people of Puerto Rico, once the Puerto Ricans have expressed their preference.

I hope that this problem can be considered by the Congress at an early date, and that appropriate legislation be enacted designed to make definite the future status of Puerto Rico.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 16, 1945.*

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 96, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, October 23, 1945, at 12:30 p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

DEMOBILIZATION PROGRAM OF THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in view of the interest of the Members of the Congress in the demobilization program of the Army and Navy, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I received from Fleet Admiral King in reply to a letter which I sent him dealing with certain phases of the demobilization subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES FLEET, HEADQUARTERS OF THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF,
Washington, D. C., October 9, 1945.

The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs, the United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Receipt of your letter dated October 3, 1945, with respect to correspondence you have received alleging discrimination in the return of ships from western Pacific areas is acknowledged. Your interest and concern that naval policies with respect to the current reorganization not be the subject of any unjustified criticism is gratefully appreciated.

I am satisfied that our responsible naval commanders in the Pacific gave careful consideration to the selection of ships now returning to United States ports. Not alone the past battle record of ships but their eventual disposition and the possible contribution to accomplishment of the Navy's present tasks must be considered. The immediate return of all ships which can be spared from active operations and which are destined for decommissioning and disposal obviously contributes most to the rapid demobilization of personnel. It is also necessary to return to the United States as soon as possible those ships destined to be part of our active peacetime fleet in order that they can discharge their temporary personnel and reorganize with Regular Navy crews to be ready then to carry on naval tasks without further rapid loss of their men due to demobilization. When so reorganized these ships will go out to the forward areas to take up the naval responsibilities which must be met.

Until the above reorganization can be accomplished numerous deserving ships must "carry on." In the meantime, transfer and relief of individual officers and men who can be spared from the crews is taking place as opportunity offers in accordance with priorities determined by the point system.

The opportunity has been taken to publicize the visits of returning naval vessels this month in connection with Navy Day and visits to as many ports as possible have been arranged to enable the people of the United States to become acquainted with their Navy. However, the selection and distribution of these ships had to be governed largely by the considerations set forth above in order that demobilization of the Navy be expedited by the visits and not delayed. Each ship is returning loaded with men destined for discharge on the coast where the visit is to be made. All of these ships will, during this visit, discharge every high-point man in the crew who can be spared under peacetime conditions. Also deserving Regular Navy veterans of 2 or 3 years' overseas service are given the rightful opportunity for leave to visit their homes.

Under present conditions, I feel that public interest in demobilization (and this includes many officers and men in the Navy awaiting demobilization) tends to overshadow an appreciation of the continuing tasks of the Navy. To summarize the present tasks, the most important are, first, the naval requirements in connection with enforcing the surrender of Japan; second, the transportation to the United States for discharge of the wartime forces built up overseas; and, third, the redeployment and reorganization of the Navy to less than one-sixth its wartime personnel strength. To these must be added the training operations required to absorb the young recruits from civilian life with which it is necessary to replace those in essential positions and now being rapidly discharged. In numerous ways the requirements for accomplishment of these tasks seriously conflict, but it is the foremost aim of the Navy command that they be performed with the same loyalty, devotion to duty, and efficiency that characterized the operations against an active enemy. And with the same spirit I am sure that the officers and men concerned, when their keen disappointment over not being the first to return is balanced against an appreciation of the present naval situation, will be as determined to uphold their ships' and Navy's reputation in these trying times as they were while earning their battle stars.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. KING,
Fleet Admiral, United States Navy.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimated report of the number of men in active training and service in the land forces on July 31, 1945, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twentieth report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, covering the period from August 1, 1945, to September 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, which were referred as indicated:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the League for the Development of California's Mineral Springs, San Francisco, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish one or more military hospitals in mineral spring areas of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the forty-sixth annual national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States assembled in Chicago, Ill., relating to the development and control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from the Americans United for World Organization, Inc., New York, N. Y., relating to the development and control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INVESTIGATION OF INDUSTRIAL CENTRALIZATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under the head of petitions and memorials I wish to say that a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce is conducting hearings on Senate Resolution 15, to continue during the present session of the Congress the authority of the Senate Special Committee to Investigate Industrial Centralization. The chairman of the subcommittee is the able senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. I hold in my hand a letter addressed to the senior Senator from Connecticut, signed by 49 Members of this body, which has been made a part of the subcommittee record with respect to Senate Resolution 15. I also have a telegram addressed to me from Mr. Willard B. Rogers, of Connecticut, which has also been made a part of the subcommittee record. I ask that these two documents may be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
October 8, 1945.

Hon. BRIEN MCMAHON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Senate Resolution 15, Committee on Interstate Commerce, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Every section of our country is entitled to full equality of opportunity in the development of its natural resources, and the exploitation of its natural advantages.

Such equality of opportunity has not been accorded in the past. It is a goal for the future.

Progress toward this goal has been assisted in the past by the work of the Senate Special Committee Investigating Industrial Centralization. It is reasonable to assume that the work of this committee, if continued, will be equally helpful in the future.

The importance of the problems involved in fostering and developing a truly national economy within which no section of this country, and no State, shall be the subject of discrimination, is certainly great enough to have the special attention of the United States Senate. Creation and maintenance of a select committee of the Senate to deal with these problems is an effective way to focus this attention.

By the same reasoning, abandonment of such a select committee, after it has once been created, and before its work is done, is a step away from the objectives outlined above, in which we believe.

Sincerely,

WALTER F. GEORGE, ELMER THOMAS, H. M. KILGORE, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, A. B. CHANDLER, E. H. MOORE, CHAN GURNEY, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, CLYDE R. HOEY, ARTHUR CAPPER, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, J. W. FULBRIGHT, HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, JAMES E. MURRAY, WILLIAM LANGER, DENNIS CHAVEZ, LISTER HILL, B. B. HICKENLOOPER, CLAUDE PEPPER, GEO. A. WILSON, ED. C. JOHNSON, TOM STEWART, PAT MCCARRAN, ABE MURDOCK, E. V. ROBERTSON, KENNETH MCKELLAR, M. E. TYDINGS, J. H. BANKHEAD, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, BURNET R. MAYBANK, EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, GUY CORDON, HUGH BUTLER, ALEXANDER WILEY, CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, CHARLES O. ANDREWS, GLEN TAYLOR, THEO. G. BILBO, FRANK P. BRIGGS, JOHN H. OVERTON, WAYNE MORSE, JOHN THOMAS, JAMES O. EASTLAND, SHERIDAN DOWNEY, ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, TOM CONNALLY.

HARTFORD, CONN., *October 10, 1945.*

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations upon your clear-cut and clean-cut explanation of your conception of deindustrialization before Senate subcommittee Tuesday. Although of the opposite political party, I have always believed you to be one of the able and fair-minded Members of our august Senate and have doubted from the beginning of this matter that your objective was to leave industrialized New England without industry. I consider your energizing statements most wholesome.

WILLARD B. ROGERS,
Chairman,
Connecticut Development Commission.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 473. A bill relating to pay and allowances of officers of the retired list of the Regular Navy and Coast Guard performing active duty in the rank of rear admiral; without amendment (Rept. No. 640).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1438. A bill to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States Navy a career; with amendments (Rept. No. 641).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1142. A bill for the relief of Florence Barrows; without amendment (Rept. No. 642);

S. 1296. A bill for the relief of John A. Hatcher; with an amendment (Rept. No. 643); and

H. R. 851. A bill for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert; with an amendment (Rept. No. 644).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1084. A bill for the relief of John C. May and Eva Jenkins May; with an amendment (Rept. No. 645).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1465. A bill for the relief of the State of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 646).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1122. A bill for the relief of Charles Bryan; without amendment (Rept. No. 647);

S. 1131. A bill for the relief of Jess Hudson; without amendment (Rept. No. 648);

H. R. 1563. A bill for the relief of N. Owen Oxley and the legal guardian of Lamar Oxley, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 649); and

H. R. 1890. A bill for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 650).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2172. A bill for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis; without amendment (Rept. No. 651).

By Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

S. Res. 179. Resolution creating a special committee to investigate problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy; without additional amendment.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—REPORT ON SENATE BILL 1120

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably with an amendment Senate bill 1120, to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 638) thereon. I solicit and urge that every Senator read the report and the bill, because the matter is one which affects the Government of the United States most vitally, and it will be before the Senate for extended discussion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

REPORT OF SURPLUS-PROPERTY DISPOSAL IN CANADA (PT. 4 OF REPT. NO. 199)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs, I submit a report pursuant to Senate Resolution 46, authorizing an investigation of war contracts, termination of war contracts, and related problems.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION (REPT. NO. 639)

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation I submit an adverse report on Senate bill 555, to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes, known as the Missouri Valley Authority bill, accompanied by a revision of the bill made by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For what purpose does the Senator rise?

Mr. MURRAY. I rise to interrogate the Senator with reference to the report. I understand that the hearings have not been printed, and that there is an intention to file a minority report in connection with this matter. I ask that the majority report be withheld until the minority report can be prepared. Of course, we have been anticipating this adverse report, but it seems to me that in the interest of placing both sides of the question before the Senate we ought to be permitted to file a minority report at the same time the majority report is filed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana object?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; I object. I ask that the majority report be withheld until the minority report is ready.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I cannot accede to that suggestion. A member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation who desired to submit a minority report suggested that he wanted to do so when the full committee was in session. The full committee instructed me to file the majority report today, and I am complying with that duty. The committee has a right to file its majority report. A minority report may be submitted at any time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator from Montana that the Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the Senator from Louisiana is privileged to submit his report, and that the Senator from Montana may file a minority report at any time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I regret very much to hear that ruling, because reports adverse to our bill have been coming to the Senate with great rapidity. I think it would be only fair if the majority report were withheld until the minority are able to set forth their views.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Of course, the Senator may appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should be very glad to accede to the request of the Senator from Montana; but the people throughout the Missouri River Basin, and practically all over the United States, are waiting for this report, and are crying for it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in response I should like to say that polls which have been taken in the Missouri Valley have indicated that two-thirds of the people there are in favor of the Missouri Valley Authority, and that it is only a very small, special interest group with great wealth, of course, that is fighting the bill and undertaking to block its progress through the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to make one other observation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Nine of the governors of the 10 Missouri Valley States have met and have resolved against this bill. A count of the newspapers in the Missouri Basin indicates that, 10 to 1, they have come out editorially against this bill. All the irrigation companies in the Missouri River Basin are on record as being against this bill. Whatever legislatures of the Missouri Basin States have acted on this bill—and several of them have acted—have adopted resolutions against it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report on Senate bill 555 will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under the provisions of Senate Resolution 97, agreed to March 15, 1945.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like again to refer briefly to the Missouri Valley Authority bill. I wish to say that the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana to the effect that the press of that area is opposed to this proposed legislation is not correct. The leading newspapers of the Missouri Valley area are supporting this measure. Both of the two great newspapers of St. Louis, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the St. Louis Star-Times, are supporting this bill. Two-thirds of the people of the valley have signified their approval of the bill, by polls. The opposition to the bill is by a special industry which is opposed to a bill because of a fear it might affect its interests, but which would be of tremendous benefit in the development of that area and of enormous benefit to the Nation as a whole. I think we should be permitted to submit our minority views in connection with this matter at the same time that the majority report is being filed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can submit minority views at any time and they will be received and printed.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

REPORT OF JOINT INAUGURAL COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the Joint Inaugural Committee, showing an expenditure of $526.02 for the inauguration of January 20, 1945.

An appropriation of $25,000 was made on September 24, 1944, and, of this amount, $24,473.98 is being returned to the Treasury.

I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report submitted by Mr. BYRD was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Expenses of inaugural ceremonies, fiscal year 1945

Payee	Description of payment	Amount
Max Scher	Blueprints	$39.43
Times-Herald	Advertising	2.40
The Washington Post	do	2.20
The Evening Star	do	2.20
Washington Daily News.	do	2.04
U. S. Bureau of Engraving and Printing.	Invitations	477.75
Total		526.02
Balance		24,473.98
Total		25,000.00

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1487, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate bill 1488, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah) introduced Senate bill 1489, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1490. A bill to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks, of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1491. A bill to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1492. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 141 at the United States naval repair base, San Diego, Calif., on May 1, 1945;

S. 1493. A bill to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields;

S. 1494. A bill to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes; and

S. 1495. A bill for the relief of Constantine N. Perkins; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. WALSH):

S. 1496. A bill to abolish the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., to authorize and direct the restoration to the former owners of the land comprising such refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. TAYLOR):

S. 1497. A bill for the relief of the owners of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1498. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken;

S. 1499. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Croff Adams;

S. 1500. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Peter Tange;

S. 1501. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott; and

S. 1502. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Fred Clark; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1503. A bill for the relief of Lewis L. Dudley; and

S. 1504. A bill for the relief of Edith Roberta Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. ROBERTSON) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 109, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW OF COUNSEL OF PEARL HARBOR COMMITTEE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution providing that the counsel of the committee to investigate the Pearl Harbor disaster shall be exempted from certain provisions of law. I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALUMINUM FACILITIES

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on September 21 of this year, in compliance with the Surplus Property Act, the Surplus Property Board submitted to the Congress a report on the disposal of the aluminum facilities owned by the Government of the United States. These facilities were built during the period of the war at a cost to the Government in excess of $700,000,000. The problem of what the Government shall do with these plants is one of the most momentous questions now before the people. The report was submitted to the Military Affairs Committee and by that committee to the Subcommittee on Surplus Property. The subcommittee was unable to begin hearings upon the report until Monday last. Circumstances were such that it was altogether beyond the power of the committee to assemble prior to that date. The 30-day period, however, will expire before the end of this week. The hearings have been conducted by three committees, namely, the Committee on Small Business, which studied the problem of light metals over a long period, and submitted a very illuminating report earlier in the year; the Industrial Reorganization Subcommittee of the Special Select Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning; and the legislative committee, the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Great interest was displayed in the hearings. Many Members of the Senate who are not members of the committee have participated, and several Members of the House of Representatives have come from the other Chamber to participate in the hearings.

The members of the committee have come to the conclusion that it is highly desirable in the public interest to extend the period of 30 days within which, under the Surplus Property Act, disposal may not be made. I am therefore authorized to introduce a joint resolution on behalf of Senators who are present this morning, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is chairman of the Small Business Committee, and also a member of the Committee on Military Affairs; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], who is also a member of the Committee on Military Affairs; the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is a member of the Committee on Small Business; the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who has been especially interested in the matter because of the location in his State of two of the most important of all the aluminum plants; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], who is interested because of the location in the State of Washington of some of the plants; the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], who, I understand, is a member of the Committee on Small Business; the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]; my colleague the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and myself.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As a minority member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, I wish heartily to endorse the action of the Senator from Wyoming, and I hope the joint resolution may be adopted immediately. It is absolutely necessary that the committee have this extended time in order to act in behalf of the country on this subject.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, this is the first I have known of the joint resolution, but, if I understand correctly, the Senator has consulted with the minority members of his committee; and if they are of an approving mind, I certainly have no objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They have joined in and will be joint sponsors of the joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to inform the minority leader, speaking in behalf of the minority members of the Senate Committee on Small Business, that we are in absolute accord with the resolution, and hope no objection will be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Therefore, Mr. President, having consulted the majority leader, and having sought, but not having as yet obtained, consultation with the minority leader, I ask leave to introduce the joint resolution, and I shall ask unanimous consent that it may be given immediate consideration.

The joint resolution introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (S. J. Res. 109), to extend in the case of aluminum plants and facilities the time during which disposition of such plants and facilities is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, was read twice by its title.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That subsection (c) of section 19 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "thirty days" the following: "(or 60 days in the case of aluminum plants and facilities.)"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained this morning from the meeting of the committee. It was necessary for me to attend a meeting of the Military Affairs Committee with General Marshall. I am heartily in favor of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is proceeding in the morning hour, and, as all Senators know, 5 minutes is the limit any Senator may take in speaking.

Mr. BARKLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are we still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in the morning hour, and during the transaction of the routine morning business, no debate is in order if objection is made; but the Chair is not called upon to make an objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Frankly, I think it is the duty of the Chair to enforce the rules whether any Senator objects or not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will enforce the rules whenever any Senator asks that the rules be enforced.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not care to interfere with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], but I think that all Senators present agree that during the transaction of the routine morning business Senators who come to the Senate to introduce bills or resolutions should not be required to wait around while other Senators make speeches. Later we will take up legislative proposals in which Senators are interested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair agrees that the Senator from Kentucky is correct; and if the Senator makes the point of order it will be sustained.

Mr. GUFFEY. I raise the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin has not the floor if he is about to make a speech. If he desires to put something in the RECORD, he will be recognized.

Mr. WILEY. I have a bill I wish to introduce, and I desire to make a few remarks on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is in order.

PROHIBITION OF POLITICAL EXPENDITURES BY NATIONAL BANKS, CORPORATIONS, AND LABOR UNIONS

At this point Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1487, and proceeded to discuss it, when he was interrupted by——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am reluctant to make a point of order against the Senator from Wisconsin, but this is a time allotted to Senators for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions. The Senator from Wisconsin has now had 5 minutes. I shall not make a point of order, but I do not think it is quite as courteous as it might be when a Member takes up time allotted for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions so that other Senators cannot get before the Senate important proposed legislation which must first be considered by committees. In view of the volume the Senator holds in his hand, I ask him if it is not possible to terminate his remarks in the very near future so that other Senators may introduce bills which are of importance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that if a point of order is made no Senator can speak during time allotted to morning business.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I appreciate that. The Senator who spoke before me consumed exactly 12 minutes. I made no point of order against him. I realize that I was speaking on a bill which I have introduced. The rule referred to is more observed in the violation than otherwise. I agree fully that the Senator has a right to take me off my feet. He speaks of the volume I have in my hand. I have two pages remaining.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, allow me to interject that the Senator from Wisconsin is taking all of us who have bills to introduce off our feet. I have a bill I wish to introduce which deals with one of the most serious problems now before the country. Six hundred thousand Filipinos are being fed in Manila by the Army. I want to try to cure that situation, which is costing the Federal Government millions of dollars. The way things have been going I cannot even get a chance to introduce the bill so that it may be referred to the appropriate committee. What is more important than a bill dealing with the situation of these Filipinos? I could deliver a long speech on the subject, but I do not want to interfere with other Senators who have bills equally important which they wish to introduce. This is the time for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and if the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin continue much longer I inform him that I shall be compelled reluctantly to make a point of order.

Mr. WILEY resumed his remarks.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I make a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Introduction of bills and joint resolutions is still in order.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that I be privileged to introduce the bill to which I have referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1487) to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, so as to prohibit political expenditures by national banks, corporations, and labor unions, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, after the distinguished Senator from Maryland has made his remarks, I request that I be privileged to have the remainder of my remarks go into the RECORD in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin can ask unanimous consent to that effect.

Mr. WILEY. I ask for such unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I also have a bill to introduce, and I do not want to wait until the Senator has completed his speech in order that I may introduce my bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is my request that I may speak after Senators are through introducing bills and joint resolutions. I am very thankful for all the courtesy shown me to this point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair requests the Senator from Kentucky to wait for a moment. The Senator from Wisconsin had partially completed a speech when objection was made, due to the fact that the morning hour had not concluded. The Chair thinks the Senator from Wisconsin should be recognized at this time in order to enable him to complete his speech. The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation for the extreme courtesy of the Chair, and I am sorry if the subject I was discussing irritated any Member of the Senate. I shall continue with my remarks at this time.

(Mr. WILEY resumed and concluded his speech on Senate bill 1487. His entire speech is as follows:)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill which I humbly believe will cope constructively with one of the greatest single menaces to the Republic now existing on the American political scene.

I refer to the menace of unionism shackled to politics, a menace absolutely inimical and injurious to the America which I, for one, would want my children and grandchildren to enjoy.

THE DANGER AHEAD

To all thinking observers, it is apparent that the political high-pressure drive which was organized by labor-dictators in the 1944 election was a toy machine compared to the well-greased juggernaut with which these dictators are preparing to steamroller the 1946 and 1948 elections.

It is obvious that some power-drunk labor leaders are going to try to bully, browbeat, and blackmail the great rank and file of American labor when primary and election times return.

They are going to try to force labor to contribute to gigantic slush funds in order to elect political stooges who will mouth the hand-outs of the labor leaders and jump when those leaders crack the whip.

I, for one, am not the servant of any one man, any one group, any one interest. And I would not want any brother Senator or Representative in this great legislative institution to be so beholden. Yet that is what the left-wing labor leaders are aiming at—to be able to pull the strings and make puppet legislators jump. That is not the America we want, an America dominated by any group blindly led by autocratic leaders. That is not the America of free and creative checks and balances.

These labor leaders of whom I speak are principally in the CIO Political Action Committee, which is crawling with both alien communistic doctrines and alien-minded Communist representatives. These men are going to continue to attempt to put the squeeze on the Seventy-ninth Congress. They will continue to try to force Congress to knuckle under to their demands for wild deficit spending and further Government regimentation.

Unionism shackled to politics is patently un-American and detrimental to the best interests of labor and the American public as a whole. Unionism shackled to any type of politics and in particular, PAC politics, is absolutely intolerable in this constitutional Republic. It does not act as a check and balance; it operates as an instrument of dictatorship.

Now, what are we going to do about it?

THE REMEDY

I, for one, propose that we immediately break the chains which bind some segments of American labor to any political faction or party. I propose that we do so by amending the Corrupt Practices Act so as to prohibit expenditures by labor

unions, national banks, and corporations for election purposes. I emphasize the word expenditures.

After the 1944 election, it became apparent that millions of dollars of union funds accumulated for legitimate union labor purposes had been poured through a loophole in the law. That loophole banned political contributions to elections by unions, national banks, and corporations. But the matter of expenditures for political purposes was completely omitted.

It is a farce to bar contributions but not expenditures. If one prohibition is justified, so is the other. We must plug the loophole, which has already resulted in great harm to our free American institutions and which has made possible through the PAC the expenditure of money belonging to union members for the diabolic purpose of getting a throttlehold on Government.

The justification for this amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act is clearly seen when we recognize that under the constitutions and charters of labor unions, national banks, and corporations the funds in their treasuries are designed to be used for specific purposes representative of each type of institution.

Let me read the definition and purpose of a labor organization as set forth in the Wagner Act:

The term "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employees representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

Union, bank, and corporation funds are not designed to be used to capture the Congress or the Government of the United States or elect any man to Congress or to defeat him. Yet that is the reason why almost three-fourths of a million dollars of union funds were turned over to the PAC in the last election: to capture the United States Government. That is how the PAC got to print 100,000,000 pieces of literature in the last election, including over fifty-seven million leaflets.

Mr. President, make no mistake about it, the PAC is out to stampede American labor into totalitarian government in the 1946 and 1948 elections.

The PAC is out to plunder union treasuries, which one columnist has called "the largest single block of uncontrolled money in the world." Twelve A. F. of L. and CIO unions, for example, have a total reserve of $160,000,000 which is unhampered by any restraint of law applicable to other citizens' funds of the Republic. Under the present law, those and other treasuries can be raided for political purposes by labor dictators in spite of the inarticulate opposition of the great mass of labor.

Unfortunately, individual members can also be intimidated into making "voluntary" contributions to political war chests. I refer you specifically to a press release given out on October 10 by the Communist-controlled International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union:

In reaffirming ILWU support of CIO political action, the board took steps to collect needed funds to finance political action now and for the 1946 elections. This action included a campaign to secure continuous monthly contributions of 10 cents per member, such funds to be used for legislative and political action within existing laws. The board also ordered a drive to collect at least $1 per member as a voluntary contribution to finance political action in 1946, including support of candidates for office. Collection of this voluntary fund will begin in January 1946.

Woe unto the longshoreman who dares fail to contribute this slush money voluntarily.

We must also bear in mind the CIO's alliance with the Communist puppet unions of Soviet Russia—which are unions in name only—the widely spoken proposals for a worldwide PAC, and such a significant incident as the singing of the red revolutionary anthem, The Internationale, at the closing session of the World Federation of Trade Unions recently held in Paris, and attended by CIO and Soviet delegates.

Bearing these items in mind, we can see more clearly the deadly menace of unionism shackled to politics.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to unionism. I have supported it. We know that almost every week in various sections of the country agreements are arrived at between employers and employees by means of collective bargaining. I believe in collective bargaining. We all believe that there must be maintained in operation a system of checks and balances in order that extreme power may not become lodged in the hands of any particular group. That is why the American Government has been so successful. It has operated under a system of checks and balances. However, no one would assert that the officers of the Knights of Columbus, the Masonic fraternity, the Knights of Pythias, the Odd Fellows, or any similar group, which was organized for specific purposes, should take funds out of the treasuries of those organizations for the purpose of endeavoring to defeat or elect candidates for public office. Yet that has been done in the case of labor unions. Labor unions were not organized for purposes of that nature. The Wagner Act states upon what grounds they were organized and for what purposes. Yet because the language of the act inadvertently included one word instead of another, it was held that the the disbursement by the PAC of certain funds for the defeat of certain candidates for public office was a legitimate and proper act.

Mr. President, I know something about the activities of the PAC during the last election. They distributed more than a million pieces of several issues of literature into the campaign against me because I would not take their orders. However, that is not why I am speaking on the floor of the Senate. I have 5 years yet in which I shall stand and express freely my conviction before my head is to be taken off. I believe that by the end of that time the American people will awaken to the realization that it is unsafe to permit any organization to use for political purposes funds which were accumulated in its treasury for other purposes.

Under the proposed amendment which I am submitting I believe that probably an organization such as the PAC would be practically put out of the election business. But let no loose thinkers exclaim that this would be depriving union members of their civil liberties. This amendment would do no such thing. The individual union members could, if they were so inclined, still make contributions on their own initative as private citizens to political parties or committees, even as you, Mr. President, and I may do. However, no corporation in which we may be stockholders may contribute funds for the purpose of defeating a candidate for office, although we, as individuals, may contribute funds for such purpose. I am thinking of the $160,000,000 now lying in the treasuries of labor unions. I am speaking for legitimate labor. I do not want the door to be opened so that funds which are in those treasuries for use in protecting the birthright of members of the labor organizations—and this Republic is the birthright of labor organization members—may be used, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of having elected to office candidates who represent the convictions of labor racketeers.

I repeat: The individual union members could, if they were so inclined, still make contributions on their own initiative as private citizens to political parties or committees.

And so my amendment is a protective measure designed to maintain the laboring man's union funds intact and inviolate.

Also, let no one claim that it would be difficult for labor unions to differentiate political expenditures from educational expenditures. Our courts can establish clear grounds of differentiation between these two kinds of expenditures.

Finally, I may say that I have proposed this bill while bearing in mind Senate bill 1161, now in the Committee on Privileges and Elections. This latter bill would amend the Corrupt Practices Act so as to cover primaries and national conventions in addition to elections, as at present. Without commenting on the other features of S. 1161, I may say that I believe that this particular feature of Senate bill 1161 is entirely desirable, and should be enacted into law. It plugs another legal loophole.

It is my humble but earnest hope that my own bill will also be enacted so as to plug another and more important loophole—the loophole that enables the shackling of labor to politics.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial from this week's Liberty magazine entitled "We Want Bargaining—Not Bickering."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE WANT BARGAINING—NOT BICKERING

Every week, throughout the country, hundreds of agreements are arrived at between employers and employees by means of collective bargaining. For the most part, these proceed without fanfare or publicity, without strikes or lock-outs, without recrimination or bitterness on either side. Union representatives and employers sit down at a table and negotiate whatever they are negotiating in a spirit of sweet reasonableness and for the purpose of arriving at an

agreement which is mutually satisfactory. Meanwhile work proceeds without stoppage. The employers do not lose production and the workers do not lose wages. When the bargainers get through, both sides are better off.

Why, then, do many of the big labor unions, such as the autoworkers, the steelworkers and the coal miners, when they feel adjustments of their contracts coming on, open up negotiations by hurling insult and defiance at the managements with whom they must do business? Why do they, before ever a foot is put under the bargaining table, inflame their members against the employers, promote, or at least countenance, annoying wildcat strikes and slowdowns? Why do they begin to try their cases in the newspapers, making exorbitant claims and extravagant statements which the facts do not support? In short, why, before starting to bargain collectively, do they set everybody's teeth on edge so that calm, reasonable, collective bargaining is impossible?

Spite generates spite, defiance calls forth defiance, hate breeds hate and always will. This lesson, already learned or spontaneously perceived by many a labor leader who never gets his name in the papers because he never has to call a strike, needs to be learned by some of the leaders of the big unions who, though they aspire to be called labor statesmen, are a long way from knowing how to live up to the title.

Statesmanship demands vision and understanding, reasonableness, responsibility, honesty, and the respect for others which in turn wins their respect. It calls for diplomacy and a skill in negotiation which wins the objective without wasteful strikes and the misery and physical violence which often accompany them. In this day and age the labor leader who must strike his union to get a fair deal thereby accuses himself of lack of stature as a labor statesman.

These days the matters at issue between unions and employers are usually concerned with cold figures which are there on the books and can't be argued with. Employers generally are willing to pay as high wages as can be earned. Both labor and management have a stake in keeping them from going higher than productivity warrants. If wages are too high, the product won't sell and no one can live off the proceeds of nonrevolving machines. If the capital invested in a business doesn't earn a profit, it will go where it can, and then there will be no business. All these facts of economic life are well known and cannot be changed by bluster, bluff, or bludgeoning.

Organized labor must play a constructive part in the creation of a stable and prosperous America. Many unions are doing so, but some of the biggest are not. No labor leader can discharge the obligation he owes his members and all of us until he removes the chip from his shoulder, the arrogance from his attitude, and the mistrust and suspicion from his soul.

PAUL HUNTER.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have introduced be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1487) to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, so as to prohibit political expenditures by national banks, corporations, and labor unions is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or an expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or an expenditure in connection with any election to which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. For the purposes of this section 'labor organization' shall have the same meaning as under the National Labor Relations Act."

REHABILITATION OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill the title of which is to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes. This bill contains five titles: The war damage title, the trade relations title, the disposal of surplus property in the islands title, and two other titles dealing with Filipino rehabilitation.

I am taking this opportunity to notify members of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs that hearings will begin on the bill the first of next week, and that representatives of the War Damage Commission, the State Department, the Tariff Commission, the Interior Department, and the military authorities will appear and give testimony. As the bill embraces quite a wide range of subjects and carries substantial appropriations, I am hopeful that members of the committee will make it a point to be present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1488) to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

GRANTING OF TERMINAL FURLOUGHS TO ENLISTED MEN

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on March 12, 1945, I introduced Senate bill 721, to provide for the granting of terminal furloughs to enlisted men. That bill was referred to the War Department. The department is quite sympathetic with its objectives, but it has never been able to clear its recommendations with the Bureau of the Budget. At this time on behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], I desire to introduce a substitute for that bill, which goes more into detail and makes certain changes in the original bill.

The situation at present is this: An officer and an enlisted man may serve side by side in some combat area. When those men return to the United States, the commissioned officer is allowed terminal leave, and the enlisted man, who served with him under the same conditions, is not entitled to receive any furlough or terminal leave pay. The same situation applies in the case of a commissioned officer and an enlisted man on a vessel. When the vessel returns after 3 or 4 years the commissioned officer is allowed 2½ days furlough for each month of service, while the enlisted man gets absolutely nothing. That is manifestly unfair. That situation was made possible by laws enacted by the Congress. This bill attempts to correct the situation and give the enlisted man the same consideration which is now given under the law to the commissioned officer, who is allowed 2½ days terminal leave for each month of service.

The bill (S. 1489) to authorize payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave to persons whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ACCUMULATED FURLOUGH BENEFITS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY OR NAVAL FORCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 721) to provide for granting terminal furloughs with full pay and allowances to enlisted men upon separation from service, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. WALSH, the Committee on Naval Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1465) extending certain recognition and rights to temporary members of the United States Coast Guard Reserve, including the Voluntary Port Security Force, and members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary, and it was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as follows:

H. R. 714. An act to facilitate the admission to the United States of husbands, wives, and children of United States citizen men and women who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during the present World War; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1862. An act relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2465. An act to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner.

H. R. 3281. An act to amend section 102 of the act of Congress of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1122; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 183), to fix a term of the United States District Court at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on the first Tuesday in June; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2965. An act to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3709. An act to amend section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928, and section 3 of the

act of March 29, 1944, affecting the compensation of postmasters.

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REPORT ON WESTERN STEEL PLANTS AND THE TIN PLATE INDUSTRY (S. DOC. NO. 95)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Attorney General, in compliance with section 205 of the Demobilization and Reconversion Act, has filed with the Senate a report on western steel plants and the tin plate industry. This report was referred by the Chair to the Committee on Military Affairs, and by the Committee on Military Affairs was referred to the Subcommittee on Surplus Property. I ask unanimous consent that the report, with its illustrations, may be printed as a Senate document, for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CLARIFICATION OF STATUS OF THE UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on October 3, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and I jointly introduced Senate bill 1456, to provide for the clarification of the status of the United States Employment Service. The bill which we introduced enables the States to administer the employment service functions in a way which insures adequate protection to both the Federal and State Governments.

For the information of Senators who are interested in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD, following my remarks, a summary of the provisions of the bill.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ACT OF 1945—S. 1456

The Employment Service bill contains 12 sections. The general content of these 12 sections is as follows:

Section 1: Short title of the bill: "United States Employment Service Act of 1945."

Section 2: This section is a general declaration of congressional policy. The United States Employment Service is retained as a part of the Department of Labor as already provided by Executive order of the President of September 19, 1945. This section makes no basic change in the existing Wagner-Peyser Act, approved June 6, 1933, which established the United States Employment Service.

Section 3: This section is a general declaration of the duties of the United States Employment Service. The 13 provisions included in this section outline the general functions necessary for an effective employment service. The Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 did not contain any such specific listing of duties. The 12 years of experience with the operation of the Employment Service has resulted in a more general agreement as to the functions of an effective employment service. By incorporating this experience into the basic legislation, the Congress, employers, and employees will be better able to appraise the effectiveness of the Employment Service from time to time. The listing of these duties is not intended in any way to give the Employment Service any functions which it has not had in the past. But it is intended that by enumerating these functions that they each will be strengthened and expanded to their full potentiality so that employers, employees and the community will obtain the maximum usefulness from the service.

Section 4: This section provides for five conditions under which the Employment Service shall not refer any person to an available position. The language of the first three conditions is identical with the language passed by the Congress in 1935 in the unemployment-insurance provisions of the Social Security Act. The fourth condition embodies the no-discrimination policy established during the war, while the fifth condition is intended to assure that every reasonable effort has been made to place an individual in a position to utilize his highest skill which is in the interest not only of the individual but the entire community.

There are no specific labor standards in the Wagner-Peyser Act except for "the giving of notice of strike or lock-out to applicants before they were referred to employment." However, the five standards in this section taken as a whole merely embody the labor standards already acknowledged either by congressional statute or administrative policy. This section merely states that it is the policy of the Federal Government not to use Federal funds for the Employment Service to assist in breaking down existing labor standards. This section does not in any way give the Employment Service any regulatory control over labor standards or any judicial functions relative to these standards or conditions.

Section 5: This section provides that a State agency which desires to operate the local offices of the United States Employment Service in such State may do so, provided that the State meets a plan which contains nine provisions. The Wagner-Peyser Act already contains the provision for a State submitting detailed plans, but no specific content for such plans is contained in the law itself. The procedure of submitting a plan which must meet specific conditions is similar to that found in the Social Security Act and other existing laws relating to Federal-State programs, such as for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, maternal and child-welfare services, and unemployment insurance. The enumeration by the Congress of the specific requirements which a State plan must meet is a safeguard to both the Federal Government and the States and fosters more harmonious Federal-State relations.

Many of the nine provisions in this section are similar or identical to those embodied in existing legislation; for instance, the requirement for the establishment of a single State agency to administer the plan, the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, cooperation with other agencies charged with the administration of any unemployment-compensation law, the making of reports, and the replacement of moneys lost or improperly expended. All these already are requirements which a State plan must meet under the Social Security Act. The requirement that each State establish advisory councils already is contained in the Wagner-Peyser Act. The requirement that the same agency shall administer the employment service as administers the unemployment-compensation law does not require any change in the organizational pattern of the States since in every State the same agency administers both laws. The two remaining provisions in this section provide that any State agency must carry out the policy and obligations specifically established by the Congress by this act and must assure effective administration in those offices which operate in labor markets extending across State lines. This latter provision would make certain that employers and employees in one labor market would have to file in only one office in order to take full advantage of all opportunities in the labor market. It would also help to eliminate discrimination against employers and employees on the opposite side of the State line.

Section 6: This section contains the usual procedure for certifying grants to States through the Secretary of the Treasury. It provides that the Federal Government will pay the total cost of operating the employment service offices of the State. This policy is consistent with the policy already established by the Congress in 1935 of paying to the States the entire cost of administering their unemployment insurance laws. This section, in effect, repeals the financial provision of the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933, which provided for Federal grants of about $3,000,000 to be matched by the States in approximately equal amounts. In view of the policy adopted by the Congress of 1935, with respect to the financing of unemployment insurance, the close relation between unemployment insurance and the employment service, and, since in every State the same agency administers both, the same policy should be established by the Congress for financing both programs. If the Congress changes the financing arrangements for unemployment insurance to some kind of matching basis, then, of course, the matching arrangements for the employment service should be put on the same basis.

Section 7: This section contains the usual provisions for giving the States notice and opportunity for hearings before withdrawal of approval of the State plan. This is the same language found in other Federal-State cooperative programs.

Section 8: This section provides for the establishment of a National Advisory Employment Service Policy Council. Such a Council is already provided for in the Wagner-Peyser Act. This section of the bill merely spells out in a little more detail the method of selecting the members of the Council, their terms of office, and compensation. It also authorizes the Council to establish special advisory or technical committees on any particular subject and for meeting at least twice a year and whenever at least one-third of the members of the Council request a meeting.

Section 9: This section provides for the franking privilege which is identical with language now found in the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Section 10: This section provides for authorizing appropriations to carry out the provisions of the legislation.

Section 11: This section defines "State" to include not only Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia which are included in the present legislation, but also Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Section 12: This section provides for the repeal of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

JACK HALL, KANSAS' STAR FARMER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Jack Hall, a fine young Kansas farm boy, a member of the Highland Park chapter of Future Farmers of America, was recently named "star farmer" for the State of Kansas at the eighth annual convention of Future Farmers of America, held in Kansas City, Kans.

This young man started his farming operations 5 years ago with a debt of $78, and today his net worth is $3,252. The following statement of his success was printed by the Topeka Daily Capital:

Jack Hall, of the Highland Park chapter of Future Farmers of America, was named "star farmer of Kansas" last night at the eighteenth annual convention of Future Farmers of America in Kansas City. The

son of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Hall, he is the immediate past president of the Kansas association of FFA.

This honor, carrying a cash award of $75, went to Hall for his progress in breeding livestock, development of outstanding leadership in the FFA, and participation in cooperative activities.

Jack started his supervised farming program in the fall of 1940 with one Holstein heifer calf and one purebred Angus heifer calf and a debt of $78.

Today he has a fine start in his plans for establishing a herd of registered Angus cattle and the purchase of land and farm machinery. On January 1, 1945, his farming program consisted of a herd of 9 registered Angus cattle, one-half interest in a registered Angus bull, 1 purebred Holstein cow, 1 purebred Duroc gilt, 8 purebred Duroc pigs, one-half interest in 285 White Leghorn hens, and 500 White Leghorn chicks, 21 acres of wheat, and one-fifth interest in 160 acres of land planted to brome grass, wheat, alfalfa, native pasture, meadow, oats, corn, and atlas sorgo.

Starting with a debt of $78 in 1940, Jack has today a net worth of $3,252. In 1944 Jack was winner of the Carl Raymond Gray $100 scholarship award and was also winner of a $136 Firestone award. In 1945 he was given recognition for outstanding agriculture work by the Topeka Kiwanis Club.

Two other young Kansas farmers were among the 170 State farmers awarded the American Farmer degree.

The Future Farmers from Kansas awarded this honor, the highest award made by the national organization, are Jack Hall, of the Highland Park, Topeka chapter; Paul Conrardy, of the Kingman chapter; and Bob Jones, of the Ottawa chapter.

The awards were made on the basis of scholarship, leadership, and a supervised farming program.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE D. THOMPSON RELATING TO STRIKES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an interesting statement from one of my constituents, George D. Thompson, 729 Monroe Street, Topeka, on the problems of our Government. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strikes and other disturbances are upsetting the country more and more every day. Wanton extravagance and reckless spending go on and on. Taxes burden everyone. High prices of food and clothing are a menace. Out of my small salary which I receive from the State highway commission where I work and which is all the job is worth, I pay $15 a month in taxes besides all the special and hidden taxes every time I go into a restaurant to eat or buy anything from a store. It is time to stop worrying about Europe and Asia and all the islands of the seas and see if America can't be put back on a level road once more.

GEO. D. THOMPSON.

TOPEKA, KANS.

THE FARMERS' STAKE IN FULL EMPLOYMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Farmers' Stake in Full Employment," delivered by him at Trenton, N. J., Thursday, October 11, 1945, before the convention of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROLLING ATOMIC ENERGY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McMAHON

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Controlling Atomic Energy," delivered by him on September 25, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH OF HERBERT BROWNELL, JR., BEFORE ADVERTISING CLUB OF WASHINGTON

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Herbert Brownell, Jr., chairman of the Republican National Committee, before the Advertising Club of Washington at the Statler Hotel, on October 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CENTENNIAL MEMORIAL SERMON AT THE NAVAL ACADEMY

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon entitled "The Creative Force of the Great Dead," delivered by Chaplain W. N. Thomas, Chief of Chaplains, United States Navy, at the centennial memorial service for graduates of the Naval Academy who have given their lives in line of duty while serving their country, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISCRIMINATION IN MEDICAL COLLEGES—ARTICLE BY FRANK KINGDON

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Discrimination in Medical Colleges," written by Frank Kingdon and published in the October issue of the American Mercury, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANALYSIS OF WISCONSIN UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION LAW—ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN FEDERATIONIST

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Unemployment and the Functional View," analyzing the Wisconsin unemployment compensation law, which appears in the Appendix.]

FULL EMPLOYMENT—EDITORIAL BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Full Employment," written by David Lawrence and published in the United States News of October 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RACE PROBLEM—LETTER FROM W. HUME LOGAN

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to Miss Dorothy Thompson, of New York City, from Mr. W. Hume Logan, of Louisville, Ky., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DRIFT TOWARD CHAOS—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA (NEBR.) WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Drift Toward Chaos," published in the Omaha (Nebr.) Morning World-Herald of October 15, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR "LIBERALS" AND MacARTHUR—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our 'Liberals' and MacArthur," published in the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

LET'S PROMOTE AMERICANISM—ARTICLE BY SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Samuel B. Pettengill under the heading Let's Promote Americanism, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD FOREIGN POLICY—ARTICLE BY GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on foreign policy, entitled "It Makes No Sense," written by George E. Sokolsky, and published in the New York Sun of October 3, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ERNIE PYLE—TRIBUTE BY J. FRANK LINDSEY

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Ernie Pyle, delivered by Mr. J. Frank Lindsey, at Indiana Gamma of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity at Indiana University, October 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPA CONTROLS PERIL RADIO SET MAKING—ARTICLE BY BILL BAILEY

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "OPA Controls Peril Yule Set Making," by Bill Bailey, published in the October 1, 1945, issue of Broadcasting, which appears in the Appendix.]

HIGH-SCHOOL DIPLOMAS FOR VETERANS—LETTER FROM SECOND LT. HUGH A. McNEILL, JR.

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Second Lt. Hugh A. McNeill, Jr., under date of October 6, 1945, dealing with a plan for issuance of high-school diplomas to veterans, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIALIZATION OF INDUSTRY IN ENGLAND—ARTICLE BY WILBUR J. BRONS

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a reproduction of the Round Table column by Wilbur J. Brons, published in the Chicago Journal of Commerce of September 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

BACK-TO-WORK PROPAGANDA

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Merritt Fields, executive manager, Indianapolis Association of Credit Men, and editorial comment by Mark Gray, dealing with the subject of back-to-work propaganda, published in the Indianapolis Commercial of September 12, 1945, which appear in the Appendix.]

WANTED: A PENNSYLVANIA LEO—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record, entitled "Wanted: A Pennsylvania Leo," which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF MILITARY DEMOBILIZATION—VIEWS OF A SERVICEMAN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a letter received by him from a serviceman now serving in Europe, on the question of certain problems of military demobilization, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM OF DISCUSSION—RADIO BROADCAST BY JOHANNES STEEL

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast by Johannes Steel, on October 11, 1945, dealing with the question of freedom of discussion on the air and in the press, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF QUICKSILVER PRODUCERS—ARTICLE FROM SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the problems of quicksilver producers, published in the San Francisco Examiner of September 15, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES—ARTICLE FROM STARS AND STRIPES

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject of demobilization of the armed forces, written by Sgt. Buck Buchwach, and published in the Pacific edition of the Stars and Stripes, which appears in the Appendix.]

SLUM CLEARANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1426, known as the slum-clearance bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by its title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1426) to provide for the replanning and rebuilding of slum, blighted, and other areas of the District of Columbia and the assembly, by purchase or condemnation, of real property in such areas and the sale or lease thereof for the redevelopment of such area in accordance with said plans; and to provide for the organization of, procedure for, and the financing of such planning, acquisition, and sale or lease; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMERICAN LABOR PARTY OF PENNSYLVANIA—PRESERVATION OF TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate very briefly on a matter affecting the preservation of the two-party system and the integrity of the courts in my own State of Pennsylvania.

We have heard a great deal from the Republican side during the last 10 years or so about the necessity of preserving our two-party system and about the integrity of the courts.

Some of us may have wondered just how firmly the Republican leaders, and particularly the Republican leaders in the State of Pennsylvania, were attached to the principle of a two-party system, and how genuine was their concern over the integrity of our courts.

Certain events and incidents have occurred in the State of Pennsylvania in connection with the election to be held there on November 6 which demonstrate clearly and beyond any possibility of contradiction that in Pennsylvania, at least, the leaders of the Republican Party who have so piously expressed concern for the principle of the two-party system and the integrity of the courts are willing callously to sacrifice those principles for political expediency.

The Republican leaders in Pennsylvania have made it clear that so far as they are concerned adherence to and belief in a two-party system is not something to which they are committed as a matter of principle, but is, in the words of a defeated Presidential candidate, "just campaign oratory."

There will appear on the ballot in Pennsylvania at the general election to be held November 6 the name of a so-called American Labor Party.

This is a spurious and fraudulent party, created entirely through forgery, and having no existence except in fraud.

The district attorney's office of Philadelphia is making an investigation of the signatures affixed to the Philadelphia petitions of this spurious party for the purpose of beginning criminal proceedings, and has reported that the preliminary investigation showed that almost all of the signatures were forged.

The Committee of Seventy, a nonpartisan civic organization interested in good government, has denounced the petitions as being fraudulent almost in their entirety.

The State vice president of the American Legion has denounced the persons who prepared the nomination petitions for this so-called American Labor Party because those who circulated the petitions were guilty of the callous and contemptible practice of forging the signatures of soldiers killed in action overseas, and soldiers serving overseas, who had no means of protecting their good names.

The perpetrators of this fraud went even further. Some of the names affixed to the petitions, according to the Committee of Seventy, illustrate "obscene humor and a putrid imagination."

Through the efforts of the Democratic Party of Philadelphia, the State chairman of this so-called American Labor Party was arrested on a charge of forging names to the nomination petitions of the American Labor Party and is now under $10,000 bail awaiting the action of the court.

The candidate for city treasurer of the American Labor Party was arrested for filing fraudulent petitions, and also is under bail awaiting action by the court.

Several persons who circulated these petitions also were arrested through the efforts of the Democratic Party.

Naturally, one may wonder how such a party was able to get on the ballot in the great State of Pennsylvania.

It was able to get on the ballot because the Republican election officials in Philadelphia and in Harrisburg wanted it on the ballot, despite its fraudulent nature, and not only certified it as a legal party to the election boards of the various counties but when the Democratic Party challenged this spurious American Labor Party in the courts the only persons who came forth forcefully to defend it were attorneys for the Republican boards of election, who are the very persons charged with the sacred duty of protecting the integrity of the ballot and who should have thrown it out.

The Republican-dominated Supreme Court of Pennsylvania upheld the arguments presented by the attorneys for the Republican board of elections and refused to disqualify this phony party.

The highest court in the great State of Pennsylvania admitted that it was powerless to protect the people of the State of Pennsylvania against fraud because of a legal technicality, although this court has on numerous occasions taken advantage of legal technicalities to protect the Republican Party.

Why, it may be asked, were the Republican leaders interested in seeing to it that an American Labor Party, even a fraudulent one, appeared on the ballot?

The reason is obvious.

They wished to create this fraudulent party in the hope of deceiving the voters and diverting the votes of progressive and liberal forces in Pennsylvania from the Democratic Party.

That brings in the question of our courts.

Running for election to full terms on the State Superior Court of Pennsylvania at the November 6 election are two incumbent judges, appointed by the Republican Governor, Edward Martin.

They are Judges W. Heber Dithrich and John C. Arnold.

They were used by the Republican State leaders in the furtherance of this conspiracy—in the furtherance of a conspiracy to create a fraudulent political party.

The Republican leaders were not so much interested in the election to be held this November 6 as they were in the gubernatorial, congressional, and legislative election of 1946.

They therefore wanted this spurious and fraudulent American Labor Party to appear on the ballot in 1946.

If this fraudulent party receives 2 percent of the total vote cast for the highest candidate in 10 of Pennsylvania's counties at the election on November 6, 1945, it will be automatically entitled to a place on the ballot in 1946, and this fraud will thereby be legalized.

However, this so-called American Labor Party, which has no connection whatever with the legitimate organization of the same name in New York State and which has been disowned by the leaders of the New York State party, could not poll 2 percent of the total vote cast at the November 6, 1945, election in 10 counties without the active help and support of the Republican Party.

Therefore, these Republican leaders persuaded Judges Dithrich and Arnold to file as the candidates of the so-called American Labor Party at this election.

I make that statement on the authority of one of the judges—Judge W. Heber Dithrich—who told the newspapers that the affidavits which had to be filed along with the nomination petitions of the American Labor Party were forwarded to him for signature by M. Harvey Taylor, the State Republican chairman of Pennsylvania.

Apparently he was reluctant to execute this affidavit, since to do so truthfully would require deleting a portion of the affidavit, because Judge Dithrich informed the press that Mr. Harvey Taylor called him on the telephone and told him it was very important that the affidavit be executed and filed promptly.

Judges Dithrich and Arnold dutifully executed the affidavits and thereby became the candidates of the American Labor Party, and thereby lent to this fraudulent and spurious organization the respectability of their names and the protection of their judicial robes.

What is even more, they thereby became active partners in this conspiracy fostered by the Republican organization to legalize a fraudulent party.

And, Mr. President, who do you suppose was the person who joined Judges Dithrich and Arnold in executing the affidavits necessary to make these two judges the candidates of the American Labor Party at the November 6 election?

It was this same chairman of the American Labor Party, Mr. Bernard Davidowitz, who was arrested in Philadelphia on a charge of forging signatures and now is under $10,000 bail awaiting action of the courts.

You would think that these two superior-court judges, in view of the circumstances, would have repudiated the American Labor Party and withdrawn their candidacies on the ticket.

You would have thought that at the very minimum they would have investigated this so-called American Labor Party before allowing their names to be used.

This they did not do, and to this date no word of condemnation or rebuke for the leaders and perpetrators of the American Labor Party conspiracy and fraud has ever come from these two judges.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party in Pennsylvania believes in the preservation of the two-party system.

It believes that the courts should be jealous of their integrity and that when judges stoop to allowing themselves to become partners in political conspiracies they should be rebuked by the voters and removed from the bench.

I call this situation to the attention of the Members of the Senate because I think it is a matter of supreme importance to the future of Pennsylvania and the Nation.

The Republican leaders may feel that they will be able to kill this fraudulent party after it has served its present purpose for them, but they may find that it is easier to create a fraudulent party than to kill it.

The preservation of the two-party system and the upholding of the integrity of the courts are two of the firmest rocks on which American democracy is founded, and any move which would weaken these two bulwarks of democracy deserves the condemnation of all Americans, regardless of party.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RAILROAD RATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WHEELER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana indicate what the proposed legislation is?

Mr. WHEELER. It is the bill providing for discontinuance of land-grant railroad rates.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I now renew my motion that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

ELMIRA AREA SOARING CORP.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 842) for the relief of Elmira Area Soaring Corp., which was, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "$39,397.21" and insert "$53,046.86."

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is this a claim bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a claim bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. MORSE conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FINANCE COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during any recess of the Senate following today's session the Committee on Finance may have until Saturday at midnight to file its report on the tax bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SLUM CLEARANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1426) to provide for the replanning and rebuilding of slum, blighted, and other areas of the District of Columbia and the assembly, by purchase or condemnation, of real property in such areas and the sale or lease thereof for the redevelopment of such area in accordance with said plans; and to provide for the organization of, procedure for, and the financing of such planning, acquisition, and sale or lease; and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Senate as the unfinished business Senate bill 1426, known as the slum-clearance bill for the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate of the United States, I became a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. Since that time I have remained on the committee, either as its chairman or as one of its members, because I thought it was the duty of those of us who could possibly do so to give some of our time to look into the affairs of a community of approximately 1,000,000 souls whose only representation was that which they might have through the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. As I have made tours through the city of Washington from time to time, my attention has been arrested, and I have been shocked by the conditions which prevail regarding the places of habitation of many of those who reside in this city. Here, in one of the most beautiful cities in all the world, here in the Capital of the Nation, here, indeed, in the Capital of the world, we might well say, a condition prevails which is, to say the least, revolting. There are existent in the city of Washington today places where human beings live, if it may be called living, which should not be tolerated in a civilized community, places from which pestilence and disease are spread and where conditions prevail which would be regretted all over the United States if the people knew they existed here.

Mr. President, Senate bill 1426, Calendar No. 593, was reported to the Senate from the Committee on the District of Columbia on September 25. I may say that there was no dissenting vote in the committee on the question of reporting the bill favorably.

At the very outset let me say that the interest which the senior Senator from Nevada had in this matter was also made manifest by the able senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and, indeed, by the able Senator Burton, of Ohio, now a Justice of the Supreme Court. He gave many hours and many days, indeed, many weeks, of his time in making a study of conditions here and in attempting to prepare the bill which is now before the Senate and which he hoped would become law, looking toward relieving the shocking conditions which prevail. I tried to have the bill considered by the Senate before Senator Burton took his place on the Supreme Court of the United States, because I wanted it to be in the nature of a monument to him, in view of his zeal and diligence in studying conditions and seeking ways and means to eliminate the slums of Washington.

Mr. WHITE. Is the bill, in the form reported and now before the Senate substantially as it was introduced?

Mr. McCARRAN. There will be offered by me, before the bill shall finally be acted on by the Senate, some amendments which have been agreed upon by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. WHITE. Have the amendments been before the Committee on the District of Columbia, so that the minority members of the committee are advised concerning them?

Mr. McCARRAN. They have not been before the committee as such, because it has been almost impossible to obtain a meeting of the full committee; but the amendments have been presented to the minority members of the committee, as well as to the majority members.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator will permit me to say a word, some days ago—I do not recall just how long ago—I made an effort to ascertain the sentiment of the minority members toward the proposal in its then form. I talked with six of the seven minority members and found complete unanimity of approval of the bill in its then form. I merely wanted to be sure that they have since been consulted, or that there have been no radical changes.

Mr. McCARRAN. First of all, there have been no radical changes made. There have been some explanatory changes, and some changes which will benefit the measure, but none that alters the philosophy of the bill. In each instance the minority members, as well as the majority members, have been consulted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator from Maine that there is now pending before the Congress a national bill, and it was the purpose of some of us to make the District of Columbia bill conform as nearly as possible to the national bill. That, I believe, has been done in the six or seven perfecting amendments which the distinguished Senator from Nevada will present.

Mr. WHITE. The bill as it is proposed to be amended applies only to the District of Columbia?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is all.

Mr. WHITE. It does not include the stadium project?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and as a member of the subcommittee, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Maine that I have studied the amendments which the Senator from Nevada intends to propose, and as one individual I believe that they improve the bill, and make it a perfectly satisfactory slum clearance measure for the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHITE. For whatever it may be worth, I interpolate that I have no objection whatsoever to the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think, however, that a little explanation of the bill will not be amiss.

Senators have had before them for the past three weeks the report of the Committee on the District of Columbia which fully explains the provisions of the bill. The report states:

> This bill is the fruition and culmination of more than 2 years of intensive effort to produce a bill which will at once make adequate provision for clearing the slums of the District of Columbia, and at the same time reconcile, so far as possible, the conflicting views long held by public and private housing advocates, with regard to how the job should be done.

At this point I may say that in my opinion those conflicting views never will be completely reconciled. In spite of the more than two years which some of us have spent in trying to achieve such a reconciliation, it was still surprising to me how closely we were able to bring the divergent factions together.

The bill S. 1426, as now before the Senate, is not opposed by any private housing interests, so far as I know, and is satisfactory to those who have been the principle exponents and spokesmen for public housing in the District of Columbia. With a few amendments which I propose to offer, I believe the bill will be completely satisfactory to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and I hope also to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who represent the broad national viewpoint on the problems of slum clearance and redevelopment, and who have had a natural interest in protecting the principles of the national legislation on this subject which bears their names.

Perhaps it would be wise to make it clear at this point that there is nothing in the idea of a slum clearance and redevelopment bill for the District of Columbia which is in any way inconsistent with the proposed national legislation commonly referred to as the Wagner-Ellender bill. As a matter of fact, some legislation of this type will be absolutely required in the case of the District of Columbia, even if the Wagner-Ellender bill is enacted by the Congress. This is because the Congress acts as city council and State legislature as well for the District of Columbia, and no District agency would be authorized to spend money, or issue bonds, or receive grants, or otherwise operate under national legislation for slum clearance and urban redevelopment without separate enabling legislation. The bill now before the Senate would set up in the District of Columbia an agency which would be ready to operate under any national slum clearance and housing bill which the Congress may subsequently enact. At the same time, enactment of this bill will make a real start toward solution of the slum problem in the National Capital, a start which has already been far too long delayed.

I wish to say further that the pending bill (S. 1426) is not intended to establish principles for national legislation, and does not involve action on national issues, but is directed solely at the slum problem in the District of Columbia, as it exists, and as it has been studied, meticulously and painstakingly, during the period of more than 2 years within which this proposed legislation has been under consideration by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia.

I have indicated that this bill is favored by outstanding representatives of public-housing interests in the District of Columbia. In that connection, I desire the record to show that Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and for many years a leading authority on public housing, has characterized the bill as "A remarkably sound compromise, fair to both interests, and good for the public." It is my understanding that General Grant approves in principle the amendments to the measure which I shall shortly propose. However, General Grant has stated that he would rather see the bill enacted as it stands than delay passage by argument over any particular amendment.

As further evidence of the satisfaction with which public-housing advocates view this bill, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Washington Housing Association, after carefully considering this bill, issued a public statement endorsing the measure as "a workable compromise." I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated September 28, addressed to me, and signed by Mr. J. B. Wyckoff, president of the Washington Housing Association, together with a copy of the press release of the same date issued by the Washington Housing Association, be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON HOUSING ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., September 28, 1945.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: The legislative committee of the Washington Housing Association, at its meeting yesterday, gave careful consideration to Senate bill 1426, known as the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945.

Following the meeting the enclosed statement was released to the press.

In reference to the second paragraph which states, "its definition of public low-rent housing may make it impracticable to build public housing on areas acquired by the new agency," we enclose by way of explanation a redraft of a paragraph to replace item (f) in section 3 on page 4 of the bill which we believe would be adequate. We will recommend at the hearings of the House District Committee that this redraft be adopted or the whole paragraph omitted.

We greatly appreciate the time and effort given by the Senate District Committee to the drafting of this bill.

Very truly yours,

J. B. WYCKOFF,
President.

The redevelopment bill for the District is a workable compromise of the two bills introduced in Congress last January, the Capper bill, S. 610, and the McCarran bill, S. 13, is the opinion of the legislative committee of the Washington Housing Association as expressed at a meeting Thursday afternoon.

It meets most of the provisions for a good redevelopment bill as set forth by the association in its May housing letter, although its definition of public low-rent housing may make it impracticable to build public housing on areas acquired by the new agency.

The bill gives private developers every chance to enter the low-rent housing field. They will have reasonable help from Government condemnation of slum and blighted areas, and the assembly of the land in a state ready for redevelopment.

The Senate District Committee is to be congratulated for having drafted and reported a bill which gives such promise for the redevelopment of our slums and blighted areas.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the approval given by the Washington Housing Association to this bill was qualified in one respect. The association expressed some dissatisfaction with the definition of public low-rent housing, and suggested a change in this definition. One of the amendments which I propose to offer touches upon this point, and I believe it fully meets the views of the Washington Housing Association.

I have received a number of telegrams from all parts of the country, mainly from housing authorities, urging that action on Senate bill 1426 be deferred, and expressing the view that the bill in some manner conflicts with the pending national legislation on this subject. While it is my opinion that these telegrams were based largely on misinformation, I thought it wise to consult with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] to make sure that this bill was entirely satisfactory to him. Between us, we have worked out four amendments to the bill. A fifth amendment has been drafted for the purpose of meeting a viewpoint expressed by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I propose to offer these five amendments now, in order. I hope the Senate will approve them. I have every confidence that with these amendments Senate bill 1426 will be entirely satisfactory to the sponsors and proponents of the Wagner-Ellender bill. I wish to say further that these amendments do not destroy the compromise embodied in this bill, and do not do violence to the views of private enterprise in the field of home construction.

I hope that after the amendments I now propose to offer have been disposed of the Senate may vote promptly on the bill. I cannot too strongly emphasize the statements contained in the final paragraph of the committee report on this measure:

> Your committee believes that prompt enactment of this bill is necessary as an emergency measure. The job of clearing Washington of its slums has been too long delayed. It should be commenced immediately. Enactment of this legislation will, in the opinion of your committee, be a long forward step toward an objective with which no one can quarrel—namely, the elimination of slum conditions which should not be permitted to exist in the Capital of the United States of America.

I now send to the desk the amendments, which I ask to have stated and adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The first amendment was, on page 4, in line 18, to strike out "santitary" and insert "sanitary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of Mr. McCARRAN was, on page 4, in line 24, beginning with the words "Public low-rent housing", to strike out down to and including line 12 on page 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of Mr. McCARRAN was, on page 6, following line 6, to insert the following new subsection:

> (k) "Public low-rent housing" means low-rent housing constructed by a public agency for families whose net family income does not exceed the income level (as determined, or from time to time redetermined, after public hearing, by the District Commissioners) at which a family of comparable size may be reasonably able to afford to pay the lowest rental at which adequate private enterprise is providing an adequate supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of Mr. McCARRAN was, on page 8, in line 13, to change the period after the word "Commissioners" to a comma and insert "subject to confirmation by the Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of Mr. McCARRAN was, on page 8, in line 19, after the word "engaged", to insert "or employed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of Mr. McCARRAN was, on page 13, in line 1, after the word "the", to insert "amount or"; and in line 2, after the word "any", to insert "low-rent."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of Mr. McCARRAN was, on page 19, after line 14, to strike out:

> SEC. 8. (a) In relation to the location and extent of housing, the Planning Commission and District Commissioners are directed to, and in the timing of clearance and rebuilding the Agency is directed to, give consideration to the transitional and permanent provision for adequate housing for families to be displaced by redevelopment projects, and shall make a report upon the accommodations available for such displaced families.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

> SEC. 8 (a). Prior to approval by the District Commissioners, pursuant to subparagraph (2) of subsection 6 (b), of any redevelopment plan, the District Commissioners shall satisfy themselves (and shall so state at the public hearing required by such subparagraph) that decent, safe, and sanitary housing, substantially equal in quantity to the number of substandard dwelling units to be removed or demolished within the project area, under the proposed redevelopment plan, are available or will be provided (by construction pursuant to the redevelopment plan, or otherwise) in localities, and at rents or prices, within the reach of the low-income families displaced or to be displaced (temporarily or permanently), pursuant to the redevelopment plan, from the project area.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of Mr. McCARRAN was, on page 21, at the end of line 11, to insert the following:

> The aggregate use value placed, for purposes of lease or sale, upon all land, within a project area, leased or sold by the Agency pursuant to this act, shall be not less than one-third of the aggregate cost to the Agency of acquiring all such land (excluding the cost of old buildings destroyed and the demolition and clearance thereof).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of Mr. McCARRAN was, on page 29, after line 6, to insert:

> (d) In the event that, subsequent to the passage of this act, Congress enacts general legislation authorizing Federal assistance to localities for purposes of land assembly and preparation for redevelopment, any Federal agency allocating such assistance shall, in extending such assistance to the District of Columbia, take into consideration the assistance of similar nature authorized under this act, with a view to assuring that other localities may be equitably treated with respect to Federal aid for land assembly and preparation for redevelopment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a very brief question in connection with his amendments. Would not the amendment on page 6 to subsection (k) necessitate relettering the other subsections?

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment provides for the relettering of the other subsections.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia which has considered this matter from the time that I became a Member of this honorable body, I hope that the bill, with its amendments, will pass. I have followed the situation as closely as possible. I have attended all the public hearings in connection with it. This bill is a very carefully drawn compromise. It does not entirely please either those who want the work of slum clearance done entirely by private enterprise or those who want it done entirely by public bodies. It does give private redevelopment companies the first opportunity to bid on land acquired by the Redevelopment Agency, which is a public body. If private redevelopment companies cannot bid in such a way as to accomplish the housing required in a certain area, the bill permits a public housing body to build the necessary housing. It permits the Federal Government to make an appropriation and receive back, at the end of 10 years' time, after an accounting over a period of years, half the money which it has appropriated for the District of Columbia.

In conclusion, I believe that this is a practical, workable bill to eliminate slums in the District of Columbia, and I hope that the bill, with the amendments offered by the Senator from Nevada, will be passed. The Senator from Nevada and the former Senator from Ohio, now Mr. Justice Burton, worked very hard on the bill. The compromises and technicalities of the bill have been worked out by those two gentlemen with a great deal of care and thoroughness.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in connection with the bill which is now before the Senate, let me say that last year our committee on housing held hearings on a national plan for housing. Among the proposals which were made, and approved by the committee, was a plan for urban redevelopment. This bill is in fact an urban redevelopment bill, and not really a housing bill. The private enterprises which may buy the land may buy it somewhere else today if they wish to do so. The public enterprises which may buy the land may buy the land somewhere else if they wish to do so.

The importance of the bill is that it would permit the accumulation by a public body land which would then be available for housing or, in some cases, other purposes. The large urban redevelopment plans presented to our committee by Mr. Hansen and Mr. Bettman provided for general redevelopment of

cities and accumulation of land for various purposes. Personally, I feel that the Federal Government is not interested in such a program, and that it ought to confine its urban redevelopment plan to projects having a close relation to housing. This bill would serve that purpose for the District of Columbia. It would limit accumulation of land and urban redevelopment to slum areas and places where there is some hope of reconstruction of housing. I think, therefore, that it is an important step, and in full accord with the national policy on which our committee has agreed.

Whether it will produce housing, I do not know. The money which is appropriated is provided, as I say, not for housing, but for the accumulation of land in such a way that it may be attractive for building purposes. I have no doubt that a considerable part of it will be used for private building purposes, and perhaps some of it for public building purposes.

I do not believe that we should hesitate to go ahead in the District of Columbia simply because the national bill has not been passed. In fact, I think we have a much greater responsibility for action here than we have in the Nation as a whole. We have here the local interest. We have the interest which any city ought to have in getting rid of its own slums and providing decent housing. We have the same interest here that the city of New York has in New York; and New York has gone ahead of the Federal projects.

How far the Federal Government should assist local communities and States to redevelop land and build housing is a doubtful question, which I think really does not arise in this case. We are legislating as the local legislative body for the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I believe that the pending measure is a hopeful and progressive measure, and that it should be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada has made an excellent statement in support of the pending bill. Slum conditions in the National Capital are in reality shocking, and should have been corrected long ago. They have had attention from the Committee on the District of Columbia, but difficulty has been encountered in working out a program which would be satisfactory all around. I believe that the program proposed by the Senator from Nevada is the best attempt which has ever been made, and that the pending bill should be enacted as quickly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a question in regard to the bill, beginning on page 4, line 18. I suppose the Senator will agree with me that of the many causes of slum conditions in American cities, the primary cause probably is that the inhabitants of slums simply cannot afford to pay rents which would permit them to live under better conditions. I regret that time has not permitted me to make the careful study of the bill which I should like to have made. Hence I rise to seek information.

I have heard it said—in fact, I believe that some of my mail alleges—that the bill will not result in housing facilities at rentals which the people now living in slum areas in the city of Washington can afford to pay. Certainly we must eliminate the slums, but we must be assured that when we vote for this bill we are voting for a bill which will result in rentals which people now living under slum conditions can afford to pay. I raise the question as to the meaning of the language in lines 22 and 23 on page 4. I was not able to hear the amendments the Senator offered, and I do not have copies of them. So I wish to query whether the language including the phrase "$13 per room per month" will not automatically, as legislation of this type comes to be administered, become the going rental. Of course, if $13 a month is the going rental, I think it is perfectly obvious and I believe we can take judicial notice of the fact that these people cannot pay such a rental, because a family of, let us say, four or five children and a mother and father, who will need a house of five or six rooms—certainly, if they are going to maintain a decent standard of living, they ought to have five or six rooms—cannot pay $13 per month per room.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that the bill does not contemplate that, at all.

Thirteen dollars is to be the ceiling. The rentals under this bill will be fixed by an agency set up under the bill and by the District of Columbia Commissioners. The ceiling will be $13. The rentals will be fixed under that ceiling, in keeping with the circumstances of those who will occupy the places and in keeping with their incomes—that is to say, their take-home incomes. The object and aim of the bill is to accommodate those of the very lowest incomes, when, as, and if public housing is constructed.

Mr. MORSE. What check does the bill provide upon the District of Columbia Commissioners, to make certain that the $13 figure which now is in the bill, as the Senator says, in theory as the ceiling, will not actually become the going rental?

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment I offered today will be in the nature of a check, and it will be a check.

Mr. MORSE. I thought there was something on that point. I missed the amendment when it was read.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall read it again, to the Senator:

(k) "Public low-rent housing" means low-rent housing constructed by a public agency for families whose net family income does not exceed the income level (as determined, or from time to time redetermined, after public hearing, by the District Commissioners) as which a family of comparable size may be reasonably able to afford to pay the lowest rental at which private enterprise is providing an adequate supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

That is the check which has been worked out by such authorities as General Grant, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, former Senator Burton, and the senior Senator from Nevada, with the idea of always constituting a safeguard, so that any housing built by a public agency shall accommodate those of the very lowest income group.

Mr. MORSE. Let me make one further query about the amendment, Mr. President. Does the amendment mean that the public-housing agency must make available to such poor families houses built under this bill, at rates at least as low as the lowest rates which would be charged by private industry? Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. McCARRAN. The rates will be lower than those which could possibly be charged for housing constructed by private industry looking to any degree of profit. The rate must be lower than that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Public-housing rents would not be fixed under this bill. They would be fixed under the general USHA law.

This bill would have no effect whatever on public-housing rents. All this bill says is that public housing shall be provided only to those who cannot obtain normal, private housing, whatever the rate in Washington may be at that time. That is all that amendment refers to. It does not affect in any way the rates for public housing. Public-housing rates are fixed under the USHA law. They run, as Senators know, from $5 to $7 or $8 a room a month, approximately, as I remember—much lower than the figure contained in this measure.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The $13 figure contained in the pending measure as a limit is merely to indicate that private housing can go somewhat lower than that, but without subsidy it cannot possibly go down to the rates which may be provided for public housing which may be built in the city of Washington.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I do not have the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may further point out to the Senator that section 8 of the bill was amended so as to provide housing for those who might be dispossessed. The amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 8 (a). Prior to approval by the District Commissioners, pursuant to subparagraph (2) of subsection 6 (b), of any redevelopment plan, the District Commissioners shall satisfy themselves (and shall so state at the public hearing required by such subparagraph) that decent, safe, and sanitary housing, substantially equal in quantity to the number of substandard dwelling units to be removed or demolished within the project area, under the proposed redevelopment plan, are available or will be provided (by construction pursuant to the redevelopment plan, or otherwise) in localities and at rates or prices, within the reach of the low-income families displaced

or to be displaced (temporarily or permanently) pursuant to the redevelopment plan, from the project area.

So I believe those who may be displaced are amply protected.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1426) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945."

GENERAL PURPOSES

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be a matter of legislative determination that owing to technological and sociological changes, obsolete lay-out, and other factors, conditions existing in the District of Columbia with respect to substandard housing and blighted areas, including the use of buildings in alleys as dwellings for human habitation, are injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and welfare; and it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to protect and promote the welfare of the inhabitants of the seat of the Government by eliminating all such injurious conditions by employing all means necessary and appropriate for the purpose; and control by regulatory processes having proved inadequate and insufficient to remedy the evils, it is in the judgment of Congress necessary to acquire property in the District of Columbia by gift, purchase, or the use of eminent domain to effectuate the declared policy by the discontinuance of the use for human habitation in the District of Columbia of substandard dwellings and of buildings in alleys and blighted areas, and thereby to eliminate the substandard housing conditions and the communities in the inhabited alleys and blighted areas in such District; and it is necessary to modernize the planning and development of such portions of such District. The Congress finds that the foregoing cannot be accomplished by the ordinary operations of private enterprise alone without public participation in the planning and in the financing of land assembly for such development; and that for the economic soundness of this redevelopment and the accomplishment of the necessary social and economic benefits, and by reason of the close relationships between the development and uses of any part of an urban area with the development and uses of all other parts the sound replanning and redevelopment of an obsolescent or obsolescing portion of such District cannot be accomplished unless it be done in the light of comprehensive and coordinated planning of the whole of the territory of the District of Columbia and its environs; and that this comprehensive planning and replanning should proceed vigorously without delay; and to these ends it is necessary to enact the provisions hereinafter set forth; and that the acquisition and the assembly of real property and the leasing or sale thereof for redevelopment pursuant to a project area redevelopment plan, all as provided in this act, is hereby declared to be a public use.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. The following terms, whenever used or referred to in this act, shall, for the purposes of this act and unless a different intent clearly appears from the context, be construed as follows:

(a) The term "Agency" means the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency established by section 4 of this act.

(b) "District Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

(c) "Housing" includes housing, dwelling, habitation, and residence.

(d) "Housing project" means any low-rent housing (as defined in the United States Housing Act of 1937, U. S. C., title 42, ch. 8), the development or administration of which is assisted by the United States Housing Authority.

(e) "Land" includes bare or vacant land, or the land under buildings, structures, or other improvements; also water and land under water. When employed in connection with "use," as for instance, "use of land" or "land use," "land" also includes buildings, structures, and improvements existing or to be placed thereon.

(f) "Low-rent housing" means safe and sanitary housing within the financial reach of families of comparatively low income and, as a guide for the standard of rental to be used as a maximum at the time of the enactment of this law but not necessarily thereafter, it is specified that such housing shall be rented at not more than $13 per room per month, excluding utilities.

(g) "Lessee" includes the successors or assigns and successors in title of any lessee.

(h) "Planning Commission" means the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

(i) "Proceeds" means the money proceeds of sales or transfers by the Agency; and "net proceeds" means the gross proceeds after deducting commissions or other expenses of the sales or transfers.

(j) "Project area" is an area of such extent and location as may be adopted by the Planning Commission and approved by the District Commissioners after public hearing as an appropriate unit of redevelopment planning for a redevelopment project separate from the redevelopment projects for other parts of the District of Columbia. In the provisions of this act relating to lease or sale by the Agency, for abbreviation "project area" is used for the remainder of the project area after taking out those pieces of property which in accordance with section 7 (a) of this act shall have been or are to be transferred for public uses.

(k) "Public low-rent housing" means low-rent housing constructed by a public agency for families whose net family income does not exceed the income level (as determined, or from time to time redetermined, after public hearing, by the District Commissioners) at which a family of comparable size may be reasonably able to afford to pay the lowest rental at which private enterprise is providing an adequate supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

(l) "Purchaser" includes the successors or assigns and successors in title of any purchaser.

(m) "Real property" includes land; also includes land together with the buildings, structures, fixtures, and other improvements thereon; also includes liens, estates, easements, and other interests therein; and also includes restrictions or limitations upon the use of land, buildings, or structures other than those imposed by exercise of the police power.

(n) "Redevelopment" means replanning, clearance, redesign, and rebuilding of project areas, including open-space types of uses, such as streets, recreation and other public grounds, and spaces around buildings, as well as buildings, structures, and improvements, but not excluding the continuance of some of the existing buildings or uses in a project area. For the purposes of this act, "redevelopment" also includes the replanning, redesign, and original development of undeveloped areas which, by reason of street lay-out, lot lay-out, or other causes, are backward and stagnant and therefore blighted and for which replanning and land assembly are deemed necessary as a condition of sound development.

(o) "Redevelopment company" means a private or public corporation or body corporate, whether organized under the District of Columbia Code or the laws of the United States or any State, or an unincorporated association, trust, or other legal entity, which, by virtue of the statutes, charter, articles of incorporation, instruments of trust, or other instrument defining its powers, has the power to become a lessee or purchaser of a project area and to conform to the provisions of this act and to perform fully and comply with the terms of the lease or sale of such area or part thereof to it.

(p) "Rentals" means the rents specified in a lease to be paid by the lessee to the Agency; "net rentals" means gross rentals after deducting taxes payable by the Agency.

(q) "Revenues" means the revenues or income received by the Agency from real property while held by it and operated or temporarily let by it and not yet leased, transferred, or sold by it; and "net revenues" means the gross revenues after deducting repair, management, maintenance, insurance, and other operating expenses and taxes paid or payable by the Agency.

(r) "Substandard housing conditions" means the conditions obtaining in connection with the existence of any dwelling, or dwellings, or housing accommodations for human beings, which because of lack of sanitary facilities, ventilation, or light, or because of dilapidation, overcrowding, faulty interior arrangement, or any combination of these factors, is in the opinion of the Commissioners detrimental to the safety, health, morals, or welfare of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia.

ESTABLISHMENT AND POWERS OF THE AGENCY

SEC. 4. (a) The District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency is hereby established and shall be composed of five members. Two members shall be appointed by the President and three members shall be appointed by the District Commissioners, subject to confirmation by the Senate. One of the Presidential appointees may be an official of the United States Government; one appointee of the District Commissioners may be an official of the District of Columbia government. Each nonofficial appointee shall have been a resident of the District of Columbia for at least the five next preceding years, and shall have been engaged or employed during such time in private business or industry, or the private practice of a profession, in the District of Columbia. The terms of members shall be for 5 years, except that the first appointment of one of the Presidential appointees shall be for 3 years and the other for 5 years; one of the first appointments of the District Commissioners shall be for 4 years, one for 2 years, and one for 1 year: *Provided*, That in the event any member shall cease to hold the official position held by him at the time of his designation or appointment, such cessation shall be deemed to create a vacancy in his membership on the Agency, such vacancy, as well as all vacancies from other causes, to be filled by designation or appointment by the President or District Commissioners for the unexpired term. The members shall receive no salary as such, but those members who hold no other salaried public position shall be pair a per diem of $20 for each day of service at meetings or on the work of the Agency.

(b) The said District of Columbia Redevelopment Agency is hereby made a body corporate of perpetual duration, the powers of which shall be vested in and exercised by the board of directors thereof, consisting of the five members thereof appointed as above set forth. It shall have the power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal which shall be judicially noticed; to make contracts; to sue and be sued, to complain and defend in its own name in any court of competent jurisdiction, State, Federal, or municipal; to make,

deliver, and receive deeds, leases, and other instruments and to take title to real and other property in its own name; to adopt, prescribe, amend, repeal, and enforce bylaws, rules, and regulations for the exercise of its powers under this act or governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers granted to it by this act may be exercised and enjoyed, including the selection of its chairman and other officers, together with provisions for such committees and the functions thereof as it may deem necessary for facilitation of its work; to protect and enforce any right conferred upon it by this act, or otherwise acquired, including any lease, sale, or other agreement made by or with it; and in general to exercise all the powers necessary or proper to the performance of its duties and functions under this act.

POWER TO ACQUIRE AND ASSEMBLE REAL PROPERTY

SEC. 5. (a) Subject to and in accordance with the procedures, conditions, and other provisions of this act, the Agency is hereby granted the power to further the redevelopment of blighted territory in the District of Columbia and the prevention, reduction, or elimination of blighting factors or causes of blight and for that purpose to acquire and assemble real property by purchase, exchange, gift, dedication, or eminent domain, and including the power to rent, maintain, manage, operate, repair, clear, transfer, lease, and sell such real property, but excluding the power to build new structures thereon (other than the improvements mentioned in section 7 (i) or the power to enlarge, extend, or make major structural improvements of existing buildings).

(b) Condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of real property for said purposes shall be conducted in accordance with the procedural provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States," approved March 1, 1929 (45 Stat. 1415), or acts which may amend or supplement said act. The title to properties acquired under this present act shall be taken by and and in the name of the Agency and proceedings for condemnation or other acquisition of property shall be bought by and in the name of the Agency.

GENERAL AND PROJECT AREA REDEVELOPMENT PLANS

SEC. 6. (a) The Planning Commission is hereby directed to make and, from time to time, develop a comprehensive or general plan of the District of Columbia, including the appropriate maps, charts, tables, and descriptive, interpretative, and analytical matter, which plan is intended to serve as a general framework or guide of development within which the various project areas may be more precisely planned and calculated, and which comprehensive or general plan shall include at least a land-use plan which designates the proposed general distribution and general locations and extents of the uses of the land for housing, business, industry, recreation, education, public buildings, public reservations, and other general categories of public and private uses of the land.

(b) For the exercise of the powers granted to the Agency by this act for the acquisition and disposition of real property for the redevelopment of a project area, the following steps and plans shall be requisite, namely:

(1) Adoption by the Planning Commission of the boundaries of the project area proposed by it, submission of such boundaries to the District Commissioners, and approval thereof by said Commissioners.

(2) Adoption by the Planning Commission and submission to, and, after a public hearing thereon, approval by the District Commissioners, of the redevelopment plan of the project area which shall contain a site and use plan for the redevelopment of the area, including the approximate locations and extents of the land uses proposed for and within the area, such as public buildings, streets, and other public works and utilities, housing, recreation, business, industry, schools, public and private open spaces, and other categories of public and private uses. Such plan shall also contain specifications of standards of population density and building intensity. Any such plan may also specify, by means of specification of maximum rentals or other basis, the amount or character or class of any low-rent housing for which the area or part thereof is proposed to be redeveloped.

(c) In relation to the location and extent of public works and utilities, public buildings, and other public uses in the general plan or in a project area plan, the Planning Commission is directed to confer with the Federal and District public officials, boards, authorities, and agencies under whose administrative jurisdictions such uses respectively fall. In the project area planning, the Planning Commission is directed to consult from time to time with the agency, and the agency shall be free at all times to submit to the Planning Commission suggestions regarding both the location and extent of project areas and the use and site plans of project areas.

(d) After a project area redevelopment plan shall have been adopted by the Planning Commission and approved by the District Commissioners, the Planning Commission shall forthwith certify said plan to the Agency, whereupon said Agency shall proceed to the exercise of the powers granted to it in this act for the acquisition and assembly of the real property of the area. Following such certification, no new construction shall be authorized by the District Commissioners in such area, including substantial remodeling or conversion or rebuilding, enlargement, or extension or major structural improvements on existing buildings, but not including ordinary maintenance or remodeling or changes necessary to continue the occupancy.

TRANSFER, LEASE, OR SALE OF REAL PROPERTY IN PROJECT AREA FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE USES

SEC. 7. (a) After the real property in the project area shall have been assembled by the Agency, the Agency shall have the power to transfer to and shall at a practicable time or times transfer by deeds to the United States or to the District of Columbia, or to the appropriate Federal or District public body, department, or agency, those pieces of real property which, in accordance with the approved project area redevelopment plan, are to be devoted to public uses (other than public housing) falling within the construction or administrative jurisdiction of Federal or District agencies, such as streets and other utilities and works, Federal and District public buildings, public recreational spaces, and schools. The Federal agencies and the public agencies of the District of Columbia are hereby empowered, respectively, to acquire real property from the Agency for the uses respectively specified in the project area plan and to pay for same out of their funds duly appropriated for such acquisition. Excepting for such property as may be transfered by dedication, gift, or exchange, the transferee agency shall pay to the Agency such sum as may be agreed upon or, in the absence of agreement, as may be fixed by the Attorney General.

(b) The Agency shall have the power to lease or sell the remainder of the project area as an entirety to a redevelopment company or to an individual or a partnership. Said remainder may include streets or parts thereof which in accordance with the plan are to be closed or vacated or other than publicly owned properties; and the Federal and District departments and agencies are empowered to transfer said spaces or properties to the Agency for such sums or other consideration as may be agreed upon.

(c) Any such lease or sale may be made without public bidding but only after a public hearing, after 10 days' public notice, by the Agency upon the proposed lease or sale and the provisions thereof.

(d) The term of any such lease shall be fixed by the Agency and the instrument of lease may provide for renewals upon reappraisals and with rentals and other provisions adjusted to such reappraisals. Every such lease or sale shall provide that the lessee or purchaser shall carry out or cause to be carried out the approved project area redevelopment plan or approved modifications thereof and that no use shall be made of any land or real property included in the lease or sale nor any building or structure erected thereon which does not conform to such approved plan or approved modifications thereof. In the instrument, or instruments, of lease or sale, the Agency may include such other terms, conditions, and provisions as in its judgment will provide reasonable assurance of the priority of the obligations of the lease or sale and of conformance to the plan over any other obligations of the lessee or purchaser and also assurance of the financial and legal ability of the lessee or purchaser to carry out and conform to the plan and the terms and conditions of the lease or sale; also, such terms, conditions, and specifications concerning buildings, improvements, subleases, or tenancies, maintenance and management, and any other related matters as the Agency may reasonably impose or approve, including provisions whereby the obligations to carry out and conform to the project area plan shall run with the land. In the event that maximum rentals to be charged to tenants of housing be specified, provision may be made for periodic reconsideration of such rental bases, with a view to proposing modification of the project area plan with respect to such rentals.

(e) Until the Agency certifies that all building constructions and other physical improvements specified to be done and made by the purchaser of the area have been completed, the purchaser shall have no power to convey the area, or any part thereof, without the consent of the Agency; and no such consent shall be given unless the grantee or mortgagee of the purchaser obligates itself or himself by written instrument to the Agency to carry out that portion of the redevelopment plan which falls within the boundaries of the conveyed property, and also that the grantee, his or its heirs, representatives, successors, and assigns, shall have no right or power to convey, lease, or let the conveyed property or any part thereof or erect or use any building or structure erected thereon free from the obligation and requirement to conform to the approved project area redevelopment plan or approved modifications thereof.

(f) In lieu of the lease or sale of a project area as an entirety, the Agency shall have the power to lease or sell parts of such area separately to individuals, partnerships, or redevelopment companies. Any such sale or lease of a part or parts of a project area shall be fully subject to the provisions of subsections (c), (d), and (e) of this section.

(g) No lease or sale of any project area or portion thereof shall be made by the Agency to any public redevelopment company unless the terms of such lease or sale shall provide greater compensation to the Agency than any offer or combination of offers based on substantially the same area and substantially the same redevelopment plan which shall be received from any responsible private sources (eligible as purchasers or lessees under this act) within a reasonable announced period of time (not less than 30 days) after the public hearing on such proposed lease or sale. It is the intent of this provision that

private enterprise as represented through a responsible private redevelopment company, individual, or partnership shall be given a preference over any public redevelopment company in such lease or sale provided such preference can be given, in the judgment of the Agency, consistently with the protection of the public interest and consistently with a purpose to resort to a public redevelopment company only in the event that private enterprise shall not reasonably be available for the development of the project area or the part thereof under consideration.

(h) The Agency may itself demolish any existing structure or clear the area or any part thereof, or may specify the demolition and clearance to be performed by a lessee or purchaser within a reasonable time after such lease or purchase. The Agency may specify a reasonable time schedule and reasonable conditions for the construction of buildings and other improvements by a lessee or purchaser: *Provided*, That any such time schedule or condition shall be specified prior to the offering of the area or part thereof for lease or sale, and shall be equally binding upon any purchaser or lessee, public or private. The cost of demolition or clearance made by the Agency pursuant to this subsection shall be treated as an item of cost of the acquisition of the area.

(i) In order to facilitate the lease or sale of a project area or, in the event that the lease or sale is of parts of an area, then to facilitate the leases or sales of such parts, the Agency shall have the power to include in the cost payable by it the cost of the construction of local streets and sidewalks within the area or of grading and other local public surface or subsurface facilities necessary for shaping the area as the site of the redevelopment of the area. The Agency may arrange with the appropriate Federal or District agencies for the reimbursement of such outlays from funds or assessments raised or levied for such purposes.

HOUSING FOR DISPLACED FAMILIES

SEC. 8. (a) Prior to approval by the District Commissioners, pursuant to subparagraph (2) of subsection 6 (b), of any redevelopment plan, the District Commissioners shall satisfy themselves (and shall so state at the public hearing required by such subparagraph) that decent, safe, and sanitary housing, substantially equal in quantity to the number of substandard dwelling units to be removed or demolished within the project area, under the proposed redevelopment plan, are available or will be provided (by construction pursuant to the redevelopment plan, or otherwise) in localities, and at rents or prices, within the reach of the low-income families displaced or to be displaced (temporarily or permanently), pursuant to the redevelopment plan, from the project area.

(b) Families displaced by slum clearance or redevelopment under this act shall be given preference as tenants to fill vacancies occurring in housing owned or operated within the District of Columbia by Federal or District of Columbia governmental agencies until appropriate housing is available to such families.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FROM PROSPECTIVE LESSEE OR PURCHASER

SEC. 9. As an aid in the acquisition of the real property of a project area, the Agency may accept a fund or, at an agreed value, any parcel or parcels of property within such area, from any redevelopment company or partnership or individual, subject to a provision that in the event the supplier of any such fund or the conveyor of such property shall become the purchaser of the project area or any part or parts thereof such fund or the agreed value of such property shall be credited on the purchase price of such area or part thereof and if there be an excess above the cost of acquisition of the area such excess shall be returned, and that in the event that such supplier or conveyor does not become the purchaser of such area or any part thereof, the amount of the fund or the agreed value of such property (as the case may be) shall be paid to such supplier or conveyor.

USE-VALUE APPRAISALS

SEC. 10. After the Agency shall have assembled and acquired the real property of a project area, it shall, as an aid to it in determining the rentals and other terms upon which it will lease or the price at which it will sell the area or parts thereof, place a use-value upon each piece or tract of land within the area which, in accordance with the plan, is to be used for private uses or for low-rent housing, such use-value to be based on the planned use; and, for the purpose of this use valuation, it shall cause a use-value appraisal to be made by two or more land-value experts employed by it for the purpose; but nothing contained in this section shall be construed as requiring the Agency to base its rentals or selling prices upon such appraisal.

The aggregate use value placed, for purposes of lease or sale, upon all land, within a particular project area, leased or sold by the Agency pursuant to this act shall be not less than one-third of the aggregate cost to the Agency of acquiring all such land (excluding the cost of old buildings destroyed and the demolition and clearance thereof).

PROTECTION OF REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

SEC. 11. (a) Previous to the execution and delivery by the Agency of a lease or conveyance to a redevelopment company or previous to the consent by the Agency to an assignment or conveyance by a lessee or purchaser to a redevelopment company, the articles or certificate of incorporation or association or charter or other basic instrument of such company shall contain provisions so defining, limiting, and regulating the exercise of the powers of the company that neither the company nor its stockholders, its officers, its directors, its members, its beneficiaries, its bondholders, or other creditors or other persons shall have any power to amend or to effect the amendment of the terms and conditions of the lease or the terms and conditions of the sale without the consent of the Agency or, in relation to the project area redevelopment plan, without the approval of any proposed modification in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of this act; and no action of stockholders, officers, directors, bondholders, creditors, partners, or other persons, nor any reorganization, dissolution, receivership, consolidation, foreclosure, or any other change in the status or obligation of any redevelopment company, partnership, or individual in any litigation or proceeding in any Federal or other court shall effect any release or any impairment or modification of the lease or terms of sale or of the project area redevelopment plan unless such consent or approval be obtained.

(b) Redevelopment corporations may be organized under the provisions of subchapter 4 of chapter XVIII of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia approved March 3, 1901, as amended (title 29, ch. 2 of the District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition); and said corporations shall have the power to be redevelopment companies under this act and to acquire and hold real property for the purposes set forth in this act and to exercise all other powers granted to redevelopment companies in this act subject to the provisions, limitations, and obligations set forth in this act.

(c) A redevelopment company, individual, or partnership to which any project area or part thereof is leased or sold under this act shall keep books of account of its operations of or transactions relating to such area or part thereof entirely separate and distinct from its or his accounts of and for any other project area or part thereof or any other real property or enterprise; and no lien or other interest shall be placed upon any real property in said area to secure any indebtedness or obligation of the redevelopment company, individual, or partnership incurred for or in relation to any property or enterprise outside of said area.

MODIFICATIONS OF REDEVELOPMENT PLANS

SEC. 12. An approved project area redevelopment plan may be modified at any time or times: *Provided*, That any such modification as it may affect an area or part thereof which has been sold or leased shall not become effective without the consent in writing of the purchaser or lessee thereof: *Provided further*, That such modification may be effected only through adoption by the Planning Commission and subsequent submission to and approval by the District Commissioners, as hereinafter provided. Before approval, the District Commissioners shall hold a public hearing on the proposed modification, notice of the time and place of which shall be given by mail sent at least 10 days prior to the hearing to the then owners of the real properties in the project area and of the real properties immediately adjoining or across the street from the project area. The District Commissioners may refer back to the Planning Commission any project area redevelopment plan, project area boundaries, or modification submitted to it, together with their recommendation for changes in such plan, boundaries, or modification, and, if such recommended changes be adopted by the Planning Commission and be in turn approved by the District Commissioners, the plan, boundaries, or modification as thus changed shall be and become the approved plan, boundaries, or modification.

LIMITATION UPON TAX EXEMPTION

SEC. 13. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize or require the exemption of any real property from taxation. No real property acquired by the Agency under this act shall be exempt from taxation by reason of such acquisition or by reason of the holding thereof by the Agency; and, in the case of any piece of real property, which, under the project area redevelopment plan, is designated to be used for Federal or District or other tax-exempt uses, the exemption of such real property from taxation granted by or in the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia (Public Law 846, 77th Cong.)", or other statute, shall not commence until title thereto shall have been transferred from the agency to the United States or the District of Columbia or to a Federal or District public agency as provided in section of this act or sold or leased to a public redevelopment company or other public corporation or tax-exempt agency and may thereby become exempt from taxation by reason of the provisions of statutes other than this present act; the intention being that ownership or operation by the agency in the exercise of its power under this present act shall not, in and of itself, produce tax exemption.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURE AND EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 14. The Agency is hereby authorized and empowered—

(a) to procure services or make any purchase without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, provided the aggregate amount involved is not more than $100;

(b) to secure planning, land economics and valuation services, and other expert services related to the acquisition and disposition of real property, by contract or otherwise, at rates of pay or fees not to exceed those usual for similar services elsewhere, and without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, and

to section 3709 of Revised Statutes, as amended: *Provided*, That this exemption shall not apply to persons employed by the Agency on a permanent basis;

(c) to appoint and employ such officers and employees as it may find necessary for the proper performance of its duties under this act and to prescribe their authorities, duties, responsibilities, and tenures and fix their compensations; such appointments and employments to be made in conformance with the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and

(d) to make such expenditures, subject to audit under the general law, for the acquisition and maintenance of adequate vehicles, furnishings, equipment, supplies, books of reference, directories, periodicals, newspapers, printing and binding, and for such other expenses as may from time to time be found necessary for the proper administration of this act.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 15. On or before the last day of September of each year the Agency shall make an annual report to Congress of its operations and expenditures for the immediately preceding fiscal year, said report to include a financial balance sheet of its entire operations hereunder, and a recital in such particularity as is feasible of what the Agency proposes to do during the next succeeding fiscal year. The Agency shall make such other and further reports, in such form and at such times as the Congress by concurrent resolution shall require.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 16. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, whatever amounts are necessary to the Planning Commission, in addition to other funds which may be appropriated to it on private funds made available to it (the acceptance of which is hereby authorized), for the making or modification of a general or comprehensive plan and the making or modification of project area redevelopment plans and for surveys as authorized in this act, and other administrative expenses in connection therewith. The Commission is also authorized to receive any grants that the Congress may appropriate for said purposes to the various States and municipalities and the District of Columbia.

(b) There is further authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $20,000,000, which sum shall be placed to the credit of a special trust fund to be established for the purposes hereinafter set out. There shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and credited to said special trust fund all revenues, rentals, proceeds, and other funds received by the Agency. The said special trust fund is hereby made available to the Agency for the purpose of acquiring real property and performing any act required or authorized by this act. The Agency shall from time to time submit to the District Commissioners estimates of amounts for the reasonable and necessary expenses of the Agency, including personal services, and such amounts as may be approved by the District Commissioners shall be available from the said special trust fund for such expenses.

(c) As of the last day of the tenth fiscal year beginning after approval of this act, or as of such later date as may be fixed by the Congress, there shall be transferred and credited to miscellaneous receipts of the United States the balance in the said special trust fund after deducting (a) such amount as may be necessary for the completion of any approved project the acquisition of which has been begun and (b) such amount for operating expenses of the agency for 1 year as may be approved by the District Commissioners. If the balance so transferred and credited be insufficient to reimburse the United States for appropriations made pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section, then an amount equal to 50 percent of the deficit shall be payable to the United States from revenues of the District of Columbia in installments of equal amounts for each of 10 years. The District Commissioners shall include in their annual estimates of appropriations items for the payment of such installments. The aforesaid deficit shall be determined by deducting from the total of said appropriations an amount equal to (a) the fund transferred and credited to miscellaneous receipts of the United States, (b) the cost to the Agency of the real property owned by it on said date, and (c) the reserve for completion of approved projects. All subsequent proceeds, revenues, and rentals from said real property shall be credited to the said special trust fund, to be disposed of as the Congress may direct.

(d) In the event that, subsequent to the passage of this act, Congress enacts general legislation authorizing Federal assistance to localities for purposes of land assembly and preparation for redevelopment, any Federal agency allocating such assistance shall, in extending such assistance to the District of Columbia, take into consideration the assistance of similar nature authorized under this act, with a view to assuring that other localities may be equitably treated with respect to Federal aid for land assembly and preparation for redevelopment.

ACQUISITION UNDER DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALLEY DWELLING ACT

SEC. 17. From and after the termination of the period of 3 years, beginning with the date of the approval of this act, all authority granted by the act known as the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended, to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or gift, lands, buildings and structures, or any interest therein, is hereby transferred to and vested in the Agency created by this act. During said 3-year period said authority may be exercised by the National Capital Housing Authority only for projects that shall have been approved by the Planning Commission and the District Commissioners: *Provided, however*, That failure of the Planning Commission or the District Commissioners to approve or disapprove in writing within 60 days after the submission by the National Capital Housing Authority shall be equivalent to a formal approval. Nothing contained in said Alley Dwelling Act or in this act shall be interpreted as precluding the inclusion at any time of any alley or inhabited alley or alley dwelling or dwelling or square containing an inhabited alley in a project area to be planned, acquired, and disposed of under the provisions of this act. Any real property acquired by the Agency under the authority of the Alley Dwelling Act may be transferred or may be sold or leased by the Agency as provided in this act for real property acquired for a project area redevelopment. The National Capital Housing Authority is hereby declared to be a redevelopment company and is hereby granted the power to purchase or lease redevelopment areas or parts thereof from the Agency in accordance with the provisions of this act.

CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 18. (a) On and after July 1, 1955, it shall be unlawful for any owner of such property to use or occupy, or to lease or rent, or permit occupancy of any alley building or alley structure as a dwelling in the District of Columbia.

(b) No alley dwelling shall be constructed in the District of Columbia, nor shall any building or structure be moved, altered, or converted for use as an alley dwelling.

(c) Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months or both. Each week of 7 days of the continuance of any such violation shall constitute a separate offense.

ENCOURAGEMENT AND AID TO PRIVATE LENDING INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 19. (a) To provide for and to facilitate the improvement of housing and other improved real estate in the District of Columbia, Federal savings and loan associations of the District of Columbia and building associations and building and loan associations operating under the laws of the District of Columbia are authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to make loans for the improvement of homes or other improved real estate in the District of Columbia without security: *Provided*, That no such loan without security shall be made in a sum in excess of $2,000.

(b) Any financial institution or other lending organization operating under the laws of the United States or the District of Columbia is authorized, notwithstanding any other law or regulation, to make loans to redevelopment corporations to finance the improvement of any project area as provided in this act.

EFFECT UPON EXISTING STATUTES

SEC. 20. (a) In the making and approval of project area redevelopment plans, the Planning Commission and the District Commissioners shall not be limited or bound by the provisions of sections 7–108, 7–117, 7–122, and 7–301 of the District of Columbia Code (1940 edition) (act of March 2, 1893, 27 Stat. 532, ch. 197, sec. 1; act of May 31, 1900, 31 Stat. 248, ch. 599, sec. 2; act of March 4, 1913, 37 Stat. 949, ch. 150; act of March 3, 1901, 31 Stat. 1429, ch. 854, sec. 1608, as amended) relating to width, location, and length of streets and highways. No department, instrumentality, agency, or official of the Federal Government or of the District of Columbia shall have any power to release or modify or depart from any feature or detail of an approved redevelopment plan or part thereof unless such release, modification, or departure be adopted by the Planning Commission and approved by the District Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of this act or unless the modification or departure be approved by act of Congress.

(b) Any power granted the District Commissioners or any District or Federal agency by the District of Columbia Code or by any statute may, in addition to the purposes now specified, be exercised in furtherance of the protection or carrying out of any redevelopment plan or modification made and approved under this act.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 21. If any provisions of this act or the application thereof to any body, agency, situation, or circumstances be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other bodies, agencies, situations, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 22. This act shall take effect 90 days after the date of its approval.

USE OF SURPLUS EQUIPMENT FOR SOIL-EROSION CONTROL

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at the last call of the calendar, objection was raised to consideration of Senate bill 1414, Calendar No. 583, when it was reached. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Today I have discussed the matter with the minority leader as well as with the majority leader, and also with the Senators who opposed consideration of the bill when it was called some time ago. I ask that the bill be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator again indicate the calendar number of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is Calendar No. 583.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1414) to assist in soil-conservation and water-conservation work by making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for such work through the distribution thereof, by grant or loan, to public bodies organized under State laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill comes from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by unanimous vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; it comes with unanimous approval.

Mr. WHITE. And it would make available to the Department of Agriculture, for distribution among the States certain properties which may be declared surplus and which may be useful in soil-erosion undertakings and related subjects; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed following my remarks a statement from the Department of Agriculture, as well as a letter from the Surplus Property Administrator and the report which accompanied the bill.

There being no objection, the statement, the letter, and the report (No. 584) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, October 17, 1945.

Informal memorandum for Senator ELLENDER.

Confirming my conversation with you regarding S. 1414, the question as to the position of the Department with respect to this bill has been discussed with the Secretary.

Conferences have been held with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Surplus Property Administration. It was agreed with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget that the Department would indicate to the Congress that the question had been discussed with representatives of the agency and that they had no objection to the expressions of our point of view, but believed that it would be desirable for the bill to require the keeping of a record of the transfers of property pursuant to the bill and for the reporting of such transfers in the next annual budget submission. It was also agreed with the Bureau of the Budget and the representatives of the Surplus Property Administration that we would indicate that the Surplus Property Administration believed that the bill was in need of some additional language to correlate its operation with the Surplus Property Act, especially with respect to the application of priorities. The wording of the amendment to meet the views of the two agencies has been discussed with their representatives and approved by them. It is proposed to amend S. 1414 by adding a new section which shall read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is granted the priority given to agencies of the Federal Government under section 12 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 765).

"(b) The Secretary shall maintain a record of all property requisitioned, transferred, and distributed, and the appraised value of all such property distributed for use as provided in section 2 shall be reported in the annual budget as submitted to Congress."

Therefore, subject to the inclusion of these amendments, the Secretary has authorized us to report to you informally that he is in favor of the purposes and objectives of the bill and believes that its enactment would result in much immediate and permanent good to farmers.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of Mr. Symington's letter to Senator THOMAS with respect to S. 1414.

BOB SHIELDS.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of S. 1414 on the subject of transferring, without charge to the Department of Agriculture, surplus property suitable for soil conservation and other purposes.

As you know, the Surplus Property Act of 1944 provides that transfers of property to Federal agencies shall be at fair value in order not to augment through surplus-property disposal the appropriations for Federal agencies otherwise established by the Congress.

While, of course, the Surplus Property Administration has no interest in opposing the donation of property to Federal agencies if the Congress sees fit so to do, I am sure that you will appreciate that the enactment of a bill of this character would be a reversal of the general intent of the Congress indicated above.

I should add that it is our feeling that administration of the Surplus Property Act can best be accomplished by making amendments thereto of a general nature where the Congress deems it advisable rather than by enacting a number of independent acts covering specific cases. If a bill such as S. 1414 is enacted as a separate statute, a number of problems will arise. For example, it will be very difficult to determine the application of the priority and preference provisions of the Surplus Property Act to property covered by the bill.

This letter has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. However, he has asked me to call the committee's attention to the fact that the bill does not contain any provision requiring the Department of Agriculture to keep accounting appraisal and other records with respect to property acquired under the bill or to make appropriate reports. The committee may wish to consider the advisability of including a provision of this kind in the bill.

Sincerely yours,

W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to whom was referred the bill (S. 1414) to assist in soil-conservation and water-conservation work by making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for such work through the distribution thereof, by grant or loan, to public bodies organized under State laws, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The committee amendment does not alter the essential purposes of the original bill. However, the committee made a number of technical changes in the bill and also broadened the scope of its provisions to some extent. Because these changes required a number of changes in the original text of the bill, it appeared to the committee to be most convenient to report the bill with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The purpose of this bill is to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition suitable surplus equipment, materials, and supplies and to use them, or distribute them by grant or loan among States and their political subdivisions for use, in carrying out activities for soil and water conservation and for forest-fire prevention and suppression and forest improvement.

STATEMENT

The soil, water, and forest resources of the Nation are among its basic assets, which have been and continue to be endangered by such destructive forces as erosion, fires, floods, and other natural causes. Because of the indispensability of these resources to the national welfare, their protection and preservation is a matter of Federal concern demanding the immediate use of every facility that is available to the Government for that purpose.

On the side of soil conservation, the Department of Agriculture estimates that 100,000,000 acres of farm land have suffered such erosion as to make them worthless for present agricultural uses; an equal amount of land has been so damaged that it can safely be used only with careful and continuing treatment against erosion.

Recognizing the need for a Nation-wide defense against such conditions, the Congress, in 1935, authorized a national program for combating erosion, which immediately stimulated a response on the part of the States toward the same objective. For example, in practically every State in the Nation State laws have been passed permitting the creation of soil-conservation districts, organized and managed entirely by the local people, who, with surprising promptness, have assumed the burden of combating these national hazards at their source—on the ground where they occur. In approximately 1,400 of these districts, embracing nearly 775,000,000 acres and including more than half of the farms of the Nation, the farmers and ranchers have been battling against great odds against these destructive forces. They have made remarkable gains, but much remains to be done.

For example, the Soil Conservation Service estimates that 100,000,000 acres of land need terraces; 40,000,000 acres are in need of improved or new drainage; 10,000,000 acres need repair or improvement of farm irrigation systems; 376,000 soil-saving dams are needed; about 1,000,000 acres of stream banks should be stabilized; and 1,200,000 stock-water developments (ponds, springs, etc.) should be built. These are jobs that have to be done, if we are to protect and stabilize our lands and insure the fullest utilization of our soil and water resources. But they are public responsibilities that are too big for districts and individual land operators to undertake without help. The greatest handicap against which they have been working has been the lack of modern equipment and their inability to obtain it. Soil-conservation districts in every part of the Nation have indicated that if sufficient equipment is made available, they are ready and willing to put it to work immediately in blanketing the lands against destruction from natural forces.

Approximately 7,250,000 acres of land are being administered under the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. These are lands which have been acquired by the Government under a program for retiring from cultivation lands which are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation. Erosion control and conservation measures are particularly needed on lands of this type.

Considering next the Nation's forest resources, those resources, comprising 630,000,000 acres of forest land of which 67 percent is in State, county, and private ownership, must be protected and developed for the use of future generations. In order to accomplish that vital public responsibility, great quantities of equipment, supplies, and materials are

needed. Mechanized equipment, hand tools, and various other types of supplies and materials adapted to forest protection and development practices should be released to State, county, and Federal organizations charged with the responsibility of protecting the forests. The use of such equipment would greatly increase the ability of these organizations to cope effective with the devastating fires and other hazards which annually take a terrific toll of urgently neded forest products. About 60 percent of our Nation's timber supply is on privately owned forest lads. Destructive forest fires must be controlled if our Nation's present supply of timber is to be saved and future crops are to be grown. Of the 431,000,00 acres of State and privately owned forests needing organized protection from fire, only some 297,000,000 acres are now receiving the benefit of organized protection. An urgent ned exists for equipment to strengthen protection on the organized area and particularly to help start the establishment of much-needed fire control on the privately owned, unprotected forests.

Authorization for Federal cooperation with the States, and through them with private forest owners, was established 34 years ago under the Weeks law and continues today under the Clarke-McNary law. Of the 131,000 forest fires which were reported during the calendar year 1944—burning 16,500,000 acres and causing an estimated damage of $25,-750,000—92 percent occured on State and privately owned forests where more and better fire-fighting equipment is so urgently needed.

In addition to the need for cooperative fire protection and improvement on State and private forest lands there is also the need for protecting and improving the 179,000,000 acres of national forest lands. These lands also contribute measurably in furnishing lumber and other forest products essential to the economy of the Nation. Numerous items of equipment and supplies are needed for the protection and improvement of the resources of these national forests.

It is seen that great quantities of equipment are needed to protect the Nation's natural resources—equipment such as trucks, tractors, bulldozers and other earth-moving equipment, and telephone, radio, and other items of equipment and supplies too numerous to mention—which, fortunately, the Government already has on hand and no longer needs for the purposes for which it was purchased. The use of this surplus equipment for protecting natural resources would result in great public benefit.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

The first section of the bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall requisition from other Government departments and agencies surplus materials, equipment, and supplies which the Secretary determines to be necessary and suitable for carrying out erosion-control and soil-conservation and water-conservation works, or for forest-fire prevention and suppression and forest improvement. The agencies having control of this property are directed by the bill to transfer it to the Secretary of Agriculture without reimbursement or deposit, when it is requisitioned by the Secretary. This procedure recognizes that these items of materials, equipment, and supplies, already the property of the Government, will continue to be used for purposes that are matters of public responsibility and benefit.

Section 2 of the bill relates to the use and disposition of the materials, equipment, and supplies requisitioned by the Secretary of Agriculture under the first section of the bill. It authorizes their use on lands administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and on the national forests. The section also provides that such materials, equipment, and supplies may be turned over to State agencies and political subdivisions, by loan or grant, for use in protecting soil and water resources and protecting and improving forests. The distribution to State agencies and political subdivisions will be made in accordance with standards, conditions, rules, and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to requisition any materials, equipment, or supplies which constitute surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and (1) are suitable for use in carrying out erosion control and soil- and water-conservation works and operations in furtherance of the act approved April 27, 1935, entitled "An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes", or for forest-fire prevention and suppression and forest improvement, and (2) are determined by the Secretary to be needed for distribution or use as provided in section 2. Upon receipt of such requisition from the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to any such property, the head of the Government agency having control of such property shall transfer such property to the Secretary of Agriculture without reimbursement or deposit.

SEC. 2. Material, equipment, and supplies requisitioned by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1 which are suitable and necessary for use in carrying out erosion control and soil- and water-conservation works and operations shall be used on lands administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act or be distributed by grant or loan to soil conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing, and other districts, public bodies, and political subdivisions, organized under State laws with powers to promote and carry out soil- and water-conservation operations and related purposes; and materials, equipment, and supplies suitable and necessary for forest fire prevention and suppression and forest improvement shall be used on the national forests or distributed by grant or loan for carrying out cooperative forest fire protection or forest improvement activities with the States as otherwise authorized by law. Such distribution shall be made in accordance with such standards, conditions, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is granted the priority given to agencies of the Federal Government under section 12 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 765).

(b) The Secretary shall maintain a record of all property requisitioned, transferred, and distributed, and the appraised value of all such property distributed for use as provided in section 2 shall be reported in the annual Budget as submitted to Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which was suggested by the Department of Agriculture. I offer it to the committee amendment, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the committee amendmen, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is granted the priority given to agencies of the Federal Government under section 12 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 765).

(b) The Secretary shall maintain a record of all property requisitioned, transferred, and distributed, and the appraised value of all such property distributed for us as provided in section 2 shall be reported in the annual budget as submitted to Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Without objection, the committee amendment as amended is agreed to.

The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1414) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to requisition any materials, equipment, or supplies which constitute surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and (1) are suitable for use in carrying out erosion control and soil- and water-conservation works and operations in furtherance of the act approved April 27, 1935, entitled "An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes", or for forest-fire prevention and suppression and forest improvement, and (2) are determined by the Secretary to be needed for distribution or use as provided in section 2. Upon receipt of such requisition from the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to any such property, the head of the Government agency having control of such property shall transfer such property to the Secretary of Agriculture without reimbursement or deposit.

SEC. 2. Material, equipment, and supplies requisitioned by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1 which are suitable and necessary for use in carrying out erosion control and soil- and water-conservation works and operations shall be used on lands administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act or be distributed by grant or loan to soil conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing, and other districts, public bodies, and political subdivisions, organized under State laws with powers to promote and carry out soil- and water-conservation operations and related purposes; and materials, equipment, and supplies suitable and necessary for forest fire prevention and suppression and forest improvement shall be used on the national forests or distributed by grant or loan for carrying out cooperative forest fire protection or forest improvement activities with the States as otherwise authorized by law. Such distribution shall be made in accordance with such standards, conditions, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is granted the priority given to agencies of the Federal Government under section 12 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 765).

(b) The Secretary shall maintain a record of all property requisitioned, transferred, and distributed, and the appraised value of all such property distributed for us as provided in section 2 shall be reported in the annual budget as submitted to Congress.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to assist in soil-conservation and water-conservation work, forest fire prevention and suppression, and forest improvement by making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for such work, and for other purposes."

THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, before proceeding I wish to say that I shall speak on the subject of OPA. I merely wish to give that agency a pat on the back and to voice my opinions regarding certain matters now being considered or shortly to be considered by the Senate relative to the OPA.

Recently, two letters which had been written by men in the armed services, came to my attention. I want to read them. One is from a naval lieutenant. He says:

As a Navy veteran about to be released, I wish to strongly endorse the proposed bill to set ceilings on home prices. I am sure that the millions of servicemen overseas, if they knew conditions at home, would also back this legislation. They are the ones who have been constantly told that their release will bring them back to a cozy new home in America. Instead, they will return to a condition of greed and selfishness, inflationary prices and a 20-year mortgage on their lives for a miserable house not worth half the price.

The other letter is equally clear and simple in stating the viewpoint of the boys in uniform who are coming back to civilian life, and want to build homes, settle down and raise families to perpetuate the valor which they have displayed in the four corners of the earth. Here is the second letter, from an enlisted man in the naval air services:

As a serviceman about to be discharged from the Navy, I wish to commend you upon your forthright stand in regard to holding prices to 1942 levels, or slightly higher, on consumer goods, as well as your determination to control new housing through price and material restrictions.

I have saved almost $3,000 in the Navy and I plan to buy or build a house soon, using my savings as a down payment. But, if controls are removed, I'm going to wait awhile to see how the market settles down before I venture in.

Naturally, builders want controls removed, but for the protection of the public in the market for housing, I believe the controls should stay until materials become more plentiful and until the quantity of building increases to a point where inflation will not affect the business.

Let's continue to hold out despite pressure from all directions.

My sentiments are almost precisely expressed by what this serviceman has said.

I find that approximately 1,400,000 GI's have been married since the war broke out. Thousands of others have their brides picked out, and plan to be married as soon as they are demobilized and settled in civilian jobs.

The question is, What kind of an opportunity are we going to give them to acquire honest-built homes at fair prices?

In the GI bill of rights Congress sought to help these boys. We provided for Government guaranty to servicemen of home-building loans up to $2,000. To protect them from being cheated we wrote into the bill that the properties upon which loans would be guaranteed must offer "reasonable, normal value."

Homes offering "reasonable, normal value", however, as I myself discovered, are increasingly hard to find, for Congress never authorized control of prices of homes, and inflation has set in. A bill has now been passed by the House, and is up for consideration in the Senate, designed to loosen the requirement that properties must offer "reasonable, normal value."

If the Senate passes that bill and does nothing else about it, we should hang our heads in shame. GI's deserve honest-value houses, not loans to buy houses at inflated prices. Congress has a clear duty to see that they have an opportunity to obtain such houses. It is high time we squeezed profiteering out of home prices; not only for the sake of the millions of GI's who need homes for their brides, but for all other Americans.

In the last war inflation killed an incipient building boom, and brought on an epidemic of mortgage foreclosures. Let us go back for a minute and examine the facts.

During World War I there was no control of building material prices or of construction costs. Building material prices rose 92 percent during the war. After the war they went on up until they were over more than three times what they were when the war began. And mark this fact: 58 percent of the total inflation came after the armistice.

Construction costs rose 77 percent during the war, or before the crash came, up to 189 percent of beginning-war prices. Sixty percent of the increase came after the Armistice.

Of course, home building was curtailed during World War I; not so much as it was during World War II, but very substantially. Due to a drop in construction, about 400,000 houses went unbuilt in 1917 and 1918.

One would have expected a healthy building boom following World War I, such as we all hope for this time. Actually, one started at the end of the war. Units built went up to the pre-war level in 1919. But construction costs rose 60 percent in 1 year over already inflated prices. People who needed homes refused to be robbed, and the building boom died after 1 short year. The number of homes built fell by more than 150,000 units in a single year.

The construction industries suffered a collapse. Thousands of carpenters, brick layers, plasterers and other building trades workers lost their jobs. The building materials industry, too, suffered a body blow.

Construction costs fell 40 points in a year. They then fell 8 points more. Then the building boom, which never should have stopped, got under way again, adding substantially to the prosperity of the 1920's.

No one can review the sorry spectacle of the building boom of 1918, killed by the greed of inflationists who wanted to make a killing in a hurry, even if it was at the expense of the Nation, without hoping that this time we may have enough sense to prevent such a thing from happening again. Those silly speculators not only hit the Nation a body blow, but killed the goose that would have continued to lay golden eggs for them had they been temperate in their demands, and played for a long-time substantial building prosperity in place of a comet-boom that went to pieces with an atomic crash.

The other day I heard of a man who said that the only way to bring about the construction of a great many houses in a hurry was to take off all controls. He said that the way we had always built houses in the past was to give speculators their lead. He admitted that a great many of the houses so constructed would go through mortgage foreclosure before they got into the hands of owners at reasonable prices, but at least the houses would be built.

I am one of those who believe that with a shortage of some 12,000,000 homes in America, and with plenty of money in the hands of consumers with which to buy them, we do not have to go through an orgy of speculation, and later mortgage foreclosures, in order to assure the building of houses.

Under any conditions, we cannot possibly produce enough building materials to construct all the homes people will want to build in 1946. I am very certain we need no orgy of inflationary home prices in order to bring about the building of those homes.

The situation, however, is menacing. OPA has control only of the price of building materials and of contractors' services. Neither it nor any other Government agency has control of the prices of finished homes.

Now that WPB Order L–41 is rescinded as of October 15, building materials can flow freely into homes, without any restriction, to insure that sales prices are honest.

OPA can fix building material and contractors' charges in the construction, let us say, of a $5,000 home. If built by a speculative builder, the house should sell for $6,000 if built on a $500 lot. He deserves his fair profit. But with 1,400,000 GI's, married during the war, seeking homes in already crowded areas, the demand for houses is certain to be intense. Families will be found willing to pay $8,000 for such a house, and so the speculative builder makes $2,000 more than he deserves. We have controlled the cost of building, but not of the prices of homes. We have failed to protect the public, including the 1,400,000 GI's, from inflation.

Theoretically, the GI who does not want to pay $8,000 can make his own plans and hire a contractor to build his home, all under price controls. But so long as supplies remain short he is going to have difficulty in carrying out his plans. It will be almost impossible to enforce ceiling prices on building materials under pressure of speculative builders who have an extra inflationary profit of one or two thousand dollars in every house they build and can outbid others for materials. Who can prove on-side payments which give certain speculative builders first call upon the stocks of certain building-material dealers?

Until building materials become plentiful there is certain to be a diversion of materials to an over-profitable speculative building field. GI's seeking to get homes at honest prices and farmers seeking to add to their farms or homes will find their operations subject to serious delays, due to material shortages. Thousands will get their buildings half built, then will be stymied for want of some necessary materials.

There has been a vast increase during the war in the Nation's production facilities. In the building field we have expanded capacity to produce structural steel, certain types of lumber, Portland cement, asbestos pipe, and a few other materials. One cannot build a home

however, without all the materials. Capacity to produce many building materials did not increase. That to produce some, notably brick and tile, actually shrank. Indications are that certain types of lumber, brick and tile, millwork and hardware—all important in home building—will be short at least for 6 months. In view of the enormous home-building demand, many building materials promise to remain tight throughout 1946. That is, there will be a big demand, and materials will stay tight if the home buyer gets honest value for his money.

The OPA, under the able direction of Chester Bowles, has done a remarkable job during the war. Prices of building materials in a 72-month war rose only 31 percent, against the 92 percent gain during the 52 months of World War I, and a gain of 218 percent 72 months after the start of World War I.

Construction costs have been held to a gain of 34 percent this time, compared with a rise of 77 percent during World War I, and a gain of 189 percent to the end of the World War I inflation.

The pressures this time, moreover, have been far greater than they were in World War I.

I say there will be a boom in home building if prices remain reasonable, because when in a recent survey by the Architectural Forum prospective purchasers of homes were asked what they would do if the cost of a home rose $1,000, 37 percent said they would defer or abandon their plans.

That soaring prices kill building intent was convincingly proved by what happened after the last war. Let us not have a 1-year building boom this time.

The inflationary trend of both city and real estate and farm lands is alarming the Nation's leaders. That prices have been mounting steadily is best illustrated by opinion surveys made by the National Association of Real Estate Boards. In 1939 only 23 percent of localities reported increases in real-estate prices over the previous year. Remember that figure, 23 percent; then note the figures for the five succeeding years: 36 percent; 62 percent; 87 percent; 88 percent; 86 percent.

In 1939 localities reporting increases said they averaged 10 percent. In 1940 another 5 to 10 percent was added. In 1941 the rise was another 10 percent. In 1943 it was 12 percent, and in 1943 and 1944, it was 12½ percent each year.

In Los Angeles County in California a survey by a private group found a rise of 59 percent in residential real-estate prices between 1940 and 1944.

Another study showed recent sales of homes running 134 percent over earlier HOLC appraisals.

A survey by FHA in Washington, D. C., showed a 42-percent rise between 1940 and 1945 in single family home prices.

The worst of it is that there is no sign of a halt in this inflationary trend. And when the 1,400,000 newly married GI's enter the competition, inflationary tendencies are likely to grow stronger.

Some people say the time has come to get rid of all wartime controls. I am for their removal as soon as inflationary pressures are eased by bountiful production and we have assurance that prices will not rise when controls are removed. I am told that ceiling prices of most foods are likely to be removed early in 1946—some of them sooner. Many so-called soft goods ceilings will be lifted next spring. But no one who has studied the housing situation thinks inflationary pressures are receding. At present, they are definitely intensifying, with the lifting of WPB Order L–41, and the demobilization of 1,400,000 newly married GI's.

Placement of ceilings on homes is the only way to keep present controls on building materials effective until pressures can be relieved by widespread home building. Unless ceilings are placed upon houses, building materials controls will be badly battered by black marketeers, the Nation will continue the present dangerous inflation of real-estate prices, and our GI's will be robbed of their right to settle with their brides in homes acquired at honest values.

Personally, I am becoming rather tired of hearing the reiterated statements that the war is over and the time has come to get rid of all controls. The fighting is over, but he who thinks the inflationary pressures of war are over is simply not well informed. Let us consider a few basic facts:

First. World War I, which caused such disastrous postwar inflation and deflation cost a total of $32,000,000,000. The military expenditures of the Government for the first year after VJ-day are estimated at $41,000,000,000.

Second. During the last war the public saved $25,700,000,000. During the recent war the public saved $149,000,000,000. That sum is equal to a year and nine months of total national income in our most prosperous prewar year.

Third. Every dollar's worth of goods sent in relief to liberated countries and every dollar loaned abroad to enable other countries to obtain our materials and machinery to rebuild their cities and industries are almost as inflationary as war expenditures. So are the vast sums spent in reconverting our factories. In all these cases vast sums are paid for production to industries and workers without any consumer goods appearing for sale in the American market.

On the other side, of course, we have during the war demonstrated an enormous productive capacity. When it once goes into high gear turning out peacetime goods, it will make many backlogs of unfilled demand melt away. But until then we had better watch our step in removing regulations. Our economy is explosive. To lift the hand of control too soon can well create disaster.

The fact that building materials, in the face of far greater pressures, have been held to a 31 percent gain, whereas in the last war they rose 218 percent in a like period, shows the explosive nature of the situation.

We must, in my opinion, safeguard this well-done job by putting a ceiling on residential real estate; until the pressure abates. The removal of WPB Order L–41 on October 15 makes action imperative at this time.

Throughout the war Congress has stanchly withstood the pressures of those who would have destroyed price control and subjected the Nation to the ravages of inflation. Our clear duty now is to do whatever is necessary to keep our economy steady until the pressures of the war can be removed by large scale production of goods and construction of homes.

If we want prosperity and full employment, we should take steps to avoid the tragedy of 1920; we should give our hoped-for building boom a foundation of fair values.

Mr. President, as a part of my remarks I should like to have printed an article from the International Teamster, under the headline "OPA saved Nation from inflation, but Congressmen still fight 'bureaucrats'."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPA SAVED NATION FROM INFLATION—BUT CONGRESSMEN STILL FIGHT "BUREAUCRATS"

When Congressmen and Senators criticize price control and demand the removal of all OPA restrictions, they are working to bring inflation.

But they don't say that. They say they are trying to help the little merchant. During campaign years many of these little merchants swallow that stuff and demand that "the Government keep its nose out of business."

Recently the little merchants of a large midwestern city met and decided that price control had been a benefit to them, as well as to the public.

Here's what one of them told the meeting:

A lot of people will be inclined to say—'to hell with price control.' But that attitude won't accomplish the biggest job facing us today—the job of preventing inflation.

"During the war we've been told what to do here and what to do there. But as a whole we've done better than we've ever done before since we've been in business. You hate to admit that, but it's a fact."

Some of the little merchants who had been listening to their Congressmen and Senators telling them the OPA was killing free enterprise, squirmed in their seats.

But nobody got up to challenge the forthright merchant who told them they had been making more money than they ever had before. They didn't challenge him because they knew it was true.

They must have also known that had it not been for the OPA, most of them would have been out of business because the big merchants would have gobbled up all supplies.

The OPA "bureaucrats" had kept them in business. These same "bureaucrats" had kept the public supplied with food at reasonable prices. They prevented the free-enterprise boys from grabbing it all and forcing the public to pay usurious prices or starve.

Because of the OPA, the war workers being demobilized today have a little money in the bank to tide them over a period of unemployment. If it had not been for the OPA they would be penniless as well as hungry because the free-enterprise monopolies would have taken all their wages for food.

And the little corner grocers and other small merchants would be just as hungry as the war workers. In fact, everybody would be broke and hungry except the people who had bought up all the supplies.

We would have had inflation, and everybody suffers under inflation except these same free enterprisers.

There is still the danger of inflation. If selfish, unscrupulous Congressmen and Senators have their way, all Federal controls will

be eliminated. That would mean no more control over food prices; no more control over rents; no more control over any prices whatsoever.

Every wage earner would be at the mercy of the big speculators.

And if you don't think they would make you pay through the nose, then you don't know much about speculators, or "hard-headed businessmen," as they prefer to call themselves.

Big business never did anything for the public welfare it didn't have to do. The chances are it never will. These are the people who are damning the "bureaucrats"; who are demanding the abolition of all controls on free enterprise.

They didn't get as rich during the war as they wanted to. The "bureaucrats" stopped them. Now they see a chance to get the profits in peace the Government denied them in war.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to read a brief editorial from the Christian Science Monitor. It is as follows:

DON'T TAKE OFF THE CEILINGS

That auction of scarce articles staged by the OPA in Jackson, Tenn., was a hoax. But it showed how vitally necessary it is to continue price ceilings if wild inflation is to be avoided.

It appears an auction sale was held just to see what people would pay for scarce articles. It was ostensibly genuine, but it was not actually a real auction. However, the people bid for the scarce articles. The editorial continues:

Thirty-six cents a pound for sugar, 30 cents a pound for lard, and $2,500 for a Ford car were the prices bid. We might all be forced to pay at such rates if goods were turned loose in a free market, without Government price ceilings. The OPA is the chief barrier against such a catastrophe.

Whoever planned the fake auction certainly knew how to bring home the lesson of inflation. The bidders thought they really were buying the goods. The sale was a plain object lesson in what happens when people have plenty of money and goods are scarce. Congress and the Government agencies will be truly representing the people if they continue to resist the clamor for higher rates by pressure groups of manufacturers, processors, union labor, and all who have goods or services to sell. OPA ceilings must continue till scarcities end.

THE AMERICAN RAILROADS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, during World War I the railroads of the United States were operated by the Government at a cost to the taxpayers of the Nation of approximately $2,000,000 a day. We all know that that operation was not only expensive but inefficient; bottlenecks which greatly hampered efficiency existed at most ports, and the loose system of transportation priorities in effect during the First World War practically made warehouses out of a large percentage of freight cars.

Through the farsightedness of the railroads themselves and through close and effective cooperation between shippers, governmental agencies, and the railroad industry, private operation during the greatest of all wars, World War II, resulted in highly efficient and expeditious service at a taxing profit to the Government and resulted in almost twice as many ton-miles of freight service per month as were handled during World War I, which freight was hauled with 25 percent less freight cars available. The railroads also operated more than twice as many passenger-miles a month in this war as in World War I.

Such splendid operation and results deserve gratitude and praise and have generally merited the thanks of our people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement by myself on American railroads.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the face of almost universal acclaim for the way in which our railroads have done their wartime job, a small but vociferous political group, agitating for its own selfish ends, noisily persists in endeavoring to misrepresent and disparage what has been accomplished, and to sully a great achievement with the false brand of failure. Chiefly, these ill-intentioned activities take the form of circulating defamatory assertions, whose only relation to facts is that of diametrical opposites.

Despite the completeness with which the true story has been told, there is always danger that at least some section of the public mind may be poisoned and perverted by these malicious reiterations. Not only do they do gross injustice to railroad management, but in equal, or perhaps even greater degree, they defame and malign the patriotism and devotion of the great body of railroad employees, without whose faithful cooperation and fine performance of duty it would have been impossible to provide the transportation necessary to win the war. The attempt, at this late day, to fabricate an impression that the rail service of the last 5 or 6 years was inadequate, or in any way fall short of meeting the needs of this country and its allies in their war efforts is a gratuitous insult and libel against these patriotic, efficient, and industrious men and women, and against all who have so ably guided their work.

To answer these malevolent misstatements, various courses might be pursued. Statistics might be cited to show the magnitude of what has been achieved and the high degree of promptness and dependability, considering the unprecedented difficulties that had to be overcome, with which the service was nearly always performed. That has been done repeatedly, and the facts and figures given have never been challenged. They cannot be, for they are matters of public record.

Another way would be to call upon witnesses for their testimony—witnesses competent to pronounce judgment—and for this occasion I shall adopt that method. The witnesses I shall call will not be character witnesses merely. They will be witnesses who can testify as to concrete results, from standpoints affording the most complete opportunities to observe and appraise.

The first witness upon whose words I shall rely is the late President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the record of whose public life there is certainly nothing whatever to indicate that he would be inclined to indulge in unearned or unwarranted praise of the railroads or of their performance. Speaking at Fort Wayne, Ind., on October 28, 1944, President Roosevelt said:

"It has been a tremendous job for the railroads to be converted almost overnight to the demands of fighting the war. The way our railroads have transported munitions and men to all parts of the United States and to our seacoasts to be sent to our fighting fronts all over the world has earned the admiration and gratitude of the entire American people."

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., whom Mr. Roosevelt appointed Secretary of State to succeed the veteran Cordell B. Hull, expressed a very similar opinion. "America," he said, in the Railway Age of June 24, 1943, "is accustomed to efficient service from its railroads, but in this, our greatest emergency, the railroads have written their brightest chapter. They have come through with a performance that sets a new mark for railroading. They are making a major contribution to our united war effort."

Mr. Roosevelt's spokesman in this body, the distinguished Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, who supported practically all of the late President's political and economic policies and objectives, made this comment before the Senate on April 9, 1945:

"The railroads are entitled to have it said that on the whole they have done one of the most magnificent jobs ever done in the history of the United States in serving the people of this country in the midst of the war."

The junior Senator from New York, Mr. JAMES M. MEAD, who also endorsed many of Mr. Roosevelt's political views, in addressing the Senate on January 14, 1943, specifically complimented both the general mass of railroad men and women and the smaller group which plans and supervises. "Let me say a word of high commendation of the employees and the management of our railroads for the splendid response they have made in this emergency," remarked the Senator. "The railroads throughout the United States are doing an excellent job in handling every commodity; they are doing a magnificent job."

The longest experienced member of the Interstate Commerce Commission was the late Joseph B. Eastman, who also served as Director of the Office of Defense Transportation until his untimely death in 1944. No man in American public life has ever had such extensive contacts with railroad problems as Mr. Eastman, and none has ever enjoyed a higher reputation for clarity, sincerity, and impartiality of judgment. He spoke in praise of railroad performance many times. Typical of his views are the following comments from an address given January 19, 1943, before the Associated Traffic Clubs at St. Louis, Mo.:

"Ever since 1939 there have been recurrent predictions, particularly in Washington, that the railroads would soon break down, and those predictions are current again. But they have not broken down. The way they and the other carriers have handled by far the greatest traffic loads in history has been a very remarkable performance."

Mr. Eastman's successor as head of the Office of Defense Transportation, Col. J. Monroe Johnson, has been a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission for a number of years, and is a close student of the railroads. He has, on numerous occasions, expressed high praise for the excellent manner in which the railroads were doing their wartime job and commented upon its essential and indispensable nature. "The thing that is better done than anything in this marvelous age of accomplishment in America," said Colonel Johnson, in a typical expression of his views, during an address to the New England Shippers Advisory Board, March 2, 1944, "is its railroad transportation. And when I say that, I don't except the Army or the Navy or the Coast Guard or the merchant marine, or any other human activity in America. Without the railroads, they could not have performed, and without them they cannot continue to perform."

What sort of comments have the heads of the Nation's armed forces made upon the manner in which the railroads have supported the efforts of the men in uniform? The highest praise and the warmest and most sincere appreciation have uniformly characterized their utterances.

"It is no exaggeration to say," remarked Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, commander of the Army Service Forces, in a radio broadcast, July 17, 1944, "that the railroads are war roads. Half of all the pullman cars in the United States and one-third of all the coaches are in constant military service. That the railroads have been able to handle this enormous military traffic on time and with a high degree of comfort is a record of which every American railroader must be proud."

Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross, Chief of Transportation in the Armed Service Forces, and the officer immediately responsible for seeing that all the Army's transportation needs are fully and adequately met, in talking over the radio January 26, 1943, expressed himself thus:

"The Nation's railroads have supplied all the essential requirements of the military service. They have transported millions of troops swiftly and safely, and they have done this job—a much bigger job than in the First World War—exceedingly well, and to the satisfaction of the military authorities."

The Chief of Procurement and Material of the United States Navy, Vice Adm. S. M. Robinson, in an article published by the Railway Age, July 24, 1943, stated:

"Since the beginning of the war the Navy has been obliged to call on the railroads to perform seemingly impossible feats in the transportation of personnel and munitions. In every case the roads have risen to the occasion and have shown an ingenuity peculiar to Americans in performing the task."

In similar vein, Rear Adm. William Brent Young, formerly Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and now overseas, during a broadcast on July 21, 1944, spoke with equal emphasis. "The strong arm of the railroads," he said, "has helped the Navy gain command of the seas, build our storehouses in the United Kingdom, and finally storm the shores of France. The Navy's transportation requirements for the invasion were exacting and difficult. Supplies for our vessels had to reach the docks in time to meet sailing dates. The railroads have never failed to meet these schedules."

Surely, such a chorus of unstinted praise for the wartime performance of the railroads, emanating from the leaders of the civil government and the heads of the Army and Navy, as illustrated by the comments I have quoted and will further quote, contrasts strangely with the insistence, by the small group of railroad detractors, that the railroads failed in their war work. Seemingly these calumniators, in their isolation, must bolster up their self-esteem with the well-known theory that all the rest of the country is out of step.

Also significant is the fact that the denunciations so lavishly dispensed by this narrow group have not been confined to the railroads alone. They have extended over large areas of the Government, including Congress, as well as numerous regulative, administrative and judicial bodies, and individual officials. The misdemeanors charged have, in all cases, been of the same nature—the accused have ventured to make laws, render decisions or enunciate policies which fail to conform with certain new legal theories about railroads propounded by present and recent members of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Chiefly, these theories have been to the effect that the railroads should be denied means for taking common or concerted action through their central organization, the Association of American Railroads, which should be destroyed; that they should be prohibited from consulting with one another, and with interested shippers, when making adjustments in the structure of freight rates; and that freight rates should be regulated by antitrust suits, rather than by the Interstate Commerce Commission as Congress directed.

With this background, it is particularly interesting and enlightening to note that the close teamwork and cooperation established by the railroads with one another in rendering Nation-wide service—which the Antitrust Division is doing its best to wreck but other agencies of the Government have highly commended—was one of the principal factors making it possible for the railroads to provide the transportation service essential to victory. Let us call some witnesses to testify as to what this cooperation has meant, and has accomplished, during the war, both among the railroads and between the railroads and the armed forces.

"Careful staff planning and the efficient cooperation of the entire American railroad system," it was stated in a joint Army-Navy Review of War, May 16, 1942, "permitted the rapid movement of thousands of troops by rail to strategic points."

The fifty-sixth annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, dated November 1, 1942, stated: "The railroads were much better organized for centralized action than they were when Federal control was assumed in 1917."

General Somervell, head of the Army Service Forces, and his aides, whose testimony has already been quoted on behalf of the excellent quality of the railroad's war work, have joined also in attributing this largely to cooperation. Said General Somervell, in a statement to the press, April 29, 1942:

"Not a man in this room realizes how many million people we have moved since the war began. The thing is moved with the greatest smoothness, thanks to the very effective cooperation we have with the Association of American Railroads. It is done with an efficiency which was never approached during the last war."

Major General Gross, Chief of Transportation under General Somervell, stated in an address to the New York State Chamber of Commerce, June 10, 1943:

"There is no easy way to manage wartime transportation, which requires the utmost careful planning, skillful coordination, and prompt execution, and which requires a system of central control and direction to make it responsive to the ever-changing needs of war. This war found the railroads of the country splendidly organized under a voluntary central control agency known as the Association of American Railroads, and which has responded magnificently to every call."

Brig. Gen. W. J. Williamson, in charge of the traffic control division under General Gross, speaking to the Pacific Coast Railroad Club, March 8, 1945, said:

"How was this mammoth task ever achieved? I think the answer lies in the one word 'cooperation.' All our problems have been faced and solved through the process of genuine teamwork. We have demonstrated that the true meaning and application of joint cooperation is the key to successful transportation of troops within the United States."

The baselessness of any charge that the railroads of America made a failure of their wartime performance is proven, on its face, by the fact that the war is won. If the railroads had actually failed, Germany and Japan would not now be conquered, but would be winning the war themselves, or quite possibly would have already completed the subjugation of our country and our allies. Anyone who has the slightest doubts as to the validity of these statements can have their soundness authoritatively verified by asking any Army or Navy officer highly enough placed to have a grasp of the general tactics and strategy upon which the conduct of the war has been based. He will get the same answer from every such officer he questions. It will be definite and unqualified, and will be that the good performance of the American railroads was absolutely essential to the winning of the war—just as much so as the good performance of our armed forces in the theaters of war—and that without it, the war would most certainly be lost.

Nonetheless, this small political group which is trying to make political capital by ruthlessly distorting facts, endeavors to give some color to the accusation of failure, upon the part of the railroads, by concocting the absurd accusation that the railroads, for selfish reasons and for the sake of conserving private gain, failed to accouter themselves for their war duties by obtaining adequate equipment and other facilities; and that, in addition, during the period preceding the war, they exhausted their resources in dividends and the distribution of profits.

The truth of the matter is—and it can be supported by definite statistics—that the decade before the outbreak of the war in Europe during the late summer of 1939, was the period of greatest improvements, betterments, and progress in the entire history of the American railroads. Despite the fact that the decade was one of unprecedented depression and business distress, our railroads spent many billion of dollars on new equipment of vastly better types and on the improvement of their tracks, yards, terminals, and other facilities. When the freight and passenger traffic of this country began to grow by leaps and bounds as a result, first of the foreign purchasing of war materials and supplies from us, later immensely augmented by our own purchasing and lend-lease, our railroads were in the best physical condition they had ever known. This was a factor of immense advantage and value in enabling the railroads to keep abreast of the war needs from the start.

During the progress of the war the railroads largely added to their freight equipment and to their locomotives, but, owing to the restrictions placed by governmental agencies on the use of steel and other critical materials, they were debarred from making practically any increase in their resources of passenger equipment. This was not in any way due to the railroads' wishes and policies, but in spite of them. The railroads believed, and so stated repeatedly, that the building of a considerable amount of new passenger equipment would have been amply justified. But the governmental authorities who controlled the granting of priorities believed otherwise, and critical materials were not available to build new passenger cars.

It has, of course, been in the field of passenger movement, rather than in that of freight, that the pressure of traffic on equipment has been most severely felt. Save for the shortage of boxcars which existed for a time during the summer of 1945, to move this year's wheat crop, the heavy hold-over from last year, and the lend-lease grain shipments to Atlantic seaports, there has been no important lack of freight equipment in any period since the war broke out. And, let me add, that is a record of achievement for which the Nation may well feel highly proud of its railroads and railroad men and be deeply grateful to them.

Now, let us call our witnesses on the subject of railroad preparedness. The chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA, of California, on September 25, 1941, told his fellow members:

"The railroads have gone through a long period of reduced earnings. They have maintained a credit for equipment beyond that available for other purposes. In nearly all cases railroad betterment has been given first place over dividends and other desirable expenditures. They have frequently spent money not earned in order to keep up their equipment. Twenty-one years have witnessed many changes in railroad management that have improved efficiency, economy, and service. The practical accomplishments growing out of these improvements represent a marvelous record. These things have been done with little fanfare and accomplished

without any decoration of heroes. It is a modernized transportation system that faces the carrier problems of 1941. Our transportation system is unquestionably the best the world has produced."

Senator CLYDE M. REED, of Kansas, speaking in this body on May 11, 1942, said:

"The railroads have been through some lean years. With very few exceptions their credit was impaired during these lean years. About one-third of the mileage of the American railroads was in bankruptcy. Substantial mileage is still in bankruptcy. Yet the railroads of the United States are today doing the most phenomenal job in their history."

Former Congressman Alfred F. Beiter, on March 12, 1942, said in the House of Representatives:

"Preparation by the railroads was not started when the radio flashed the attack upon Pearl Harbor. It began 20 years ago when the railroad managements, realizing the physical condition of their properties after the First World War, were assembled by the then American Railway Association and adopted a program for the maintenance of adequate rail transportation. Since that time the railroads have expended approximately $10,000,000,000 for the construction of new and larger freight cars and locomotives, improved signaling devices, reduction in grades, and scores of other improvements. These expenditures and improvements in operating methods led to greatly increased efficiency and economy in operation."

As a final quotation, I will rely again on some words of the late Joseph B. Eastman, spoken during a radio address, in his capacity as Director of the Office of Defense Transportation. Mr. Eastman, on November 10, 1942, said:

"In spite of the fact that the railroads have been faced with an almost superhuman task ever since the war began, they have continued to move the great bulk of all the things this Nation needs in order to live and work. And they have been doing so superlatively. One of the remarkable things is that they are handling the greatly increased traffic with one-fourth fewer cars, one-third fewer locomotives, and nearly one-third fewer employees than in the First World War."

I have now called my last witness. Those whose comments I have recited to you include men in the highest posts in the civil Government and the armed forces of the Nation. All have been in positions to speak with authority. All have had the most complete access t facts and results. Not one has had the slightest possible reason or motive for saying anything favorable about the railroads that the railroads have not deserved. Yet their verdict is unanimous, that, running entirely counter to some early apprehensions that were felt, the railroads did a marvelously efficient and complete job, in the face of unequaled difficulties, and that this has played a major and indispensable part in conducting the war and proceeding to a successful and victorious conclusion.

If you believe these witnesses—which you must do, or else assume they have been engaged in a conspiracy of prevarication for no conceivable purpose—then you cannot believe the small group of detractors who are endeavoring to besmirch the lustre of the railroads' wartime record. If you believe the late President of the United States, the generals and the admirals, and the heads of great governmental departments, whose statements I have quoted, you cannot believe the assertions of a few, relatively unknown, legalistic politicians whose only objective is quite apparent. It is the incitement of distrust and doubt as background for further propaganda on the theories they have invented about the application of the antitrust laws to the railroads. Between these two mutually incompatible sets of views, the choice is surely clear and beyond question to any unbiased and comprehending mind.

DEFERMENT OF SCIENTIFIC STUDENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, during the last several days of the hearings held by the subcommittee which is considering the Magnuson-Kilgore bill, several witnesses brought out the fact that under our Selective Service System as it is now administered young scientific students are no longer deferred. Many of them were deferred during the conduct of the war itself, and particularly scientists who were engaged in war work.

I have talked to General Hershey and also to Secretary of War Patterson about the matter. Apparently both of them are in accord with the general idea that something should be done, but nothing has been done. On the other hand, it is my understanding that under the selective-service law General Hershey has authority to make regulations which would provide for the deferment of students in science who will be the scientists who are to carry on that work after the war.

I thought it might be interesting to the Senate to have a few facts about the matter. Between 400,000 and 550,000 young people graduate annually from the high schools, and it is estimated that of these from 4,000 to 10,000 might qualify for deferment in the science field; that is, those who have not only taken mathematics, chemistry, and various other science subjects, but who may be considered as having special qualifications in this field.

The main difficulty is in the selection of these students. It would seem that the proper approach would be to set up an advisory board which would select from these particular individuals young students who might show promise of becoming scientists in the future.

I have today received a letter signed by 11 young students in Purdue University, and I want to read the letter to show the Senate the difficulty which confronts these young students who are now engaged in the study of science. The letter is as follows:

CHEMISTRY DEPARTMENT,
PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
Lafayette, Ind., October 11, 1945.

The Honorable Mr. FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are sending this letter to you to call your attention to a situation which we feel requires immediate action.

Because of the end of the war and the concurrent lifting of manpower restrictions, many young scientists, who have been deferred during the war because of their work on important war projects, such as high-octane gasoline, radar, synthetic rubber, antimalarials, DDT, penicillin, and the atomic bomb, are being drafted. Other young men capable of scientific research are already members of the occupation forces. We are representative of the former group. Each of us has had from 7 to 8 years of intensive training in chemistry, including 2 to 3 years of full-time research on war problems, including synthetic rubber, antimalarials, and an Army Air Forces project the nature of which is restricted. Two of us have doctor of philosophy degrees, and the others have completed almost all of the requirements for that degree.

Frankly, we are confused. On the one hand Government heads and other responsible individuals insist that to maintain our present supremacy among nations and to prevent future wars, America must pursue a vigorous course of scientific training, research, and development. Your attention is called to bills 1285, 1297, 825, and 1248 in the Senate and bills 3440, 3852, and 3860 in the House of Representatives. To maintain this program, adequate manpower must be available. Unfortunately, as we are told, the present supply of technically trained men in this country is at a dangerously low level. Many young scientists have been inducted into the armed forces, and their special skills and training are thus lost to the army of technical men where they are so vitally needed. Other young men were prevented from finishing their training in scientific fields. Because of these unfortunate occurrences, not only is our present supply of scientists extremely low, but there is no hope of a substantial increase in the supply for about 7 years (approximately the time required to train, say, a research chemists). It is of vital importance, then, to make every effort to utilize the scientists we have.

On the other hand, most local selective service boards and some Government officials do not recognize the urgency of keeping vitally needed men in positions where their advanced scientific training can be used to advantage in the problems of national defense and reconversion.

As Americans we are willing to do what is required of us. If it is decided that we should do occupation duty, we are ready to go. However, as we have already implied, we are certain that we can render better service to our country by using the training we already have. Futhermore, we feel that the decision should rest with a responsible person or agency who has an over-all picture of the matter, and not with local draft boards, who far too often base their judgment on personal prejudice.

We would appreciate your consideration of this problem and any efforts you may extend to clarify this situation. Since many young scientists are facing immediate induction, we feel that this situation deserves prompt action.

In our hearings the other day Dr. Langmuir of the General Electric Co., one of the most eminent scientists of the country; the Secretary of War; and also Admiral Purnell and other witnesses emphasized that the real difficulty in the administering of the problem which is treated in those bills is one of manpower, that is, competent men. They all testified as to the shortage of scientists and particularly the shortage there would be in the future as the result of the interruption of the education of young people during the war.

It seems to me it is a very gross waste and misuse of our brains and of our manpower to take a man who has spent from 2 to 7 years preparing to be a physicist or chemist or a scientist in any of the other natural sciences, and put him into occupation work in Germany and thereby, I would say, permanently lose—most probably that would be the result—his intelligence and his training for the national welfare.

I recognize it is a very difficult matter to draw distinctions, and that each class thinks it is most important. That is very human. But we have already recognized by our activity in the Senate—and, in fact, it is self-evident—the importance of physics, as the subject has been brought to our attention through

the development of the atomic bomb; therefore it seems to me we have simply got to make decisions which will insure our continued progress in this field.

The other morning Dr. Langmuir testified that in his opinion if something is not done to furnish scholarships and provide inducements to some of our brightest young men to take up scientific studies, other countries, and more particularly Russia, will progress at a greater rate than will the United States during the next 10 or 20 years. That is the judgment of one of the leading scientists in the country, and I am sure it is based upon facts. Only a few months ago he returned from a conference in Moscow, during which he had an opportunity to observe what the Russians are doing in this field. I believe that it is a criminal waste of brains to take young men who are obviously well fitted for science and put them into the Army in the same way that we take everyone else.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Is the Senator proposing legislation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I was just coming to that. As I understand the situation, under present law, General Hershey has the power to do what is required, but he is a little afraid to do it because of fear of criticism, either here or elsewhere, on the ground that he is making a distinction between classes of men.

This proposal is not for the benefit of the boys. It seems to me that it not only involves an important part of our national defense but also our civilian economy. In our national-defense program we lay great emphasis upon all sorts of scientific work. I think there is no question of the importance of atomic energy, and such things as the proximity fuse, which everyone agrees were vital to our defense. However, scientific research and development is also important for our civilian life.

Everyone is afraid to make a distinction between various classes of boys. It is said that they are all Americans, and must all be treated alike. However, only a limited number of boys are carrying on research and scientific studies such as this selected group is capable of.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, this question especially challenges my interest because today I received a letter which very strongly states the case of a young man 25 years of age who has recently been inducted into service under the Selective Service Act. He has been following a scientific course of study, and has actually been engaged in some of the work connected with the Manhattan project.

The decision is a very difficult one to make when a young man claims that he is following a course of scientific study, which, as the Senator from Arkansas has said, permits of a great contribution to the general welfare of the country. When it comes to discrimination between the boy on the farm and the scientist, the decision is very difficult to make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a difficult problem. My idea is that General Hershey should have an advisory committee of scientists who would have the responsibility of saying which ones show promise of becoming scientists such as are needed in defense of the country and in development in this field. There is a very critical shortage of manpower in scientific pursuits. For 5 years we have had an interruption, with no young men entering that field.

Mr. MOORE. It is pretty difficult for those young men to understand, and it is difficult for us to understand, why we should continue inductions into the Army when we are trying to establish a peacetime Army under the voluntary system. I have taken the stand that I should like to see inductions discontinued, but I have met with considerable opposition. I am glad to hear the Senator discuss the question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In this particular instance the Secretary of War, who certainly is not in favor of deferring all such men, recognizes the critical nature of this particular problem. In that connection, I have a letter from the Secretary of War——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to commend the Senator from Arkansas for his discussion of the questions which he has raised. For a number of years I was connected with Princeton University. I have received urgent calls from the university, its graduate school and the Institute of Advanced Study at Princeton, that something be done to release the scientific classes from the selective draft, because not only is there need for the group to which the Senator has referred, namely, those who have already shown ability, but also those in the embryo stages—those who are just entering upon scientific studies, or who indicate their desire to do so, and who are then drafted. I have had the question presented to me by our scientific faculty. They have less than 50 percent of the number of students they formerly had. If men are to enter the important scientific fields, they must be trained.

The second class comprises men who have already indicated some ability. A third class consists of those who were formerly in the scientific industries and who are now in the services abroad. The scientific industries in New Jersey are urging me to do all I can to see that these trained scientific men are released so that these scientific industries can be started up again. This is vitally important if we are to expand our employment opportunities.

I believe that here there is involved a very important question of policy which we should look into. Unfortunately, I have not been able to obtain any solution from the War Department. I have taken the question up with General Hershey, the head of the Selective Service, and General Persons, who has charge of the machinery for releasing men from the service. With the question of the atomic bomb before us, I feel that this is a matter of primary importance which we cannot afford to neglect. I thank the Senator for bringing the question up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I know that the Senator was present at some of the hearings. I do not know whether he was present today when the subject was being considered specifically in connection with the Magnuson-Kilgore bill.

Mr. President, I have before me a letter dated October 10, 1945, signed by Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, which I think might be of interest. It is addressed to General Hershey. It shows the view of the Secretary on this question. The letter reads as follows:

OCTOBER 10, 1945.

Maj. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY
Director, Selective Service System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: The War Department and the Nation are greatly indebted to the contribution made in the war by our scientists. It is important that with the cessation of hostilities we do not relax the concerted effort which was made during the war to concentrate the best of our scientific brains on the development of weapons. As you know, it is the firm policy of the Government program as an essential part of our national security system.

Much of the splendid work in the Nation's laboratories was done by young men who interrupted their scientific education to enter war research projects and who were during the war deferred from military service. These men, relatively few in number, are a very picked group of young scientists who have had valuable research experience during the war. They represent some of the best talent which we have to devote to our postwar national research and development program. Many of these men now wish to return to the universities to complete their studies.

In view of these circumstances, I am strongly of the opinion that provision should be made for the deferment of these young men who have been engaged in war research activities, thereby interrupting their scientific education, and now wish to complete or further their education in the scientific fields.

You are, of course, in a better position than I to draft regulations which would carry out this objective. However, it is my suggestion that the regulations provide for the deferment of men under 26 who meet the following criteria: (1) Continuation of course of studies leading to a bachelor's, master's, or doctor's degree in science or engineering or their equivalents at a recognized college or university; and (2) at least 2 years of service in a scientific or engineering activity supporting the war effort; and (3) acceptance by a recognized college or university for continuation of their scientific or engineering education, and evidence of intention to pursue such further education.

I strongly commend the foregoing proposal to your favorable consideration. Its adoption will have an important effect on the success of our research and development programs in the coming years.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Suggestion No. 2 seems to me to involve too great a restriction. As Dr. Oppenheimer brought out the other day, what we have been doing in this country is not fundamental research. We have been using the knowledge which has been accumulated, the facts which we have acquired in scientific fields during a period of many years. Pure research, the kind which actually discovers the principles upon which nuclear energy is developed, has been interrupted, and very little has been done. We have

simply been applying the knowledge which we developed in prior years.

The big job before us is to resume fundamental research, in order to keep up with the knowldge of what is going on in scientific fields, not only for our own military protection—which, of course, in the view of the Secretary of War would come first, and naturally so—but also for civilian purposes. Every witness always comes back to the point that the real difficulty is not organization, so to speak, but manpower, or brain power. We all know that that is always the main problem, whether it be in connection with business or anything else. It is particularly acute in this case because of the interruption in the training of young men during the war period.

The decision must not be left to these young men. They should not be put in the position of asking for deferment, because their patriotism would be immediately suspected. The problem must be handled in the regular way by the Selective Service itself laying down the regulations and creating some means by which men who are really qualified may continue their studies. I believe that it is one of the most important questions before us.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas has brought up a very important and vital point which needs to be considered by the Selective Service. Let me point out to the Senator that last week I introduced Senate bill 1473, dealing with the question of universal military training, and providing for the establishment of a system of points so that a boy pursuing his educational course through high school and university might accumulate a certain number of points. If he accumulated a sufficient number of points during his educational process, he would then not be subject to 1 year's military training at the conclusion of his educational work. That covers the very point which the Senator brings out, namely, the interruption of the young man's education, and the effect which it would have upon scientific development.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. Of course, although that bill is certainly on the point, it looks more to the future. What we wish to have now is immediate regulation, because, as Secretary Patterson has pointed out, the young men who have been engaged in this work during the war are now being drafted, and perhaps those who will be drafted will include the four scientists who played a very great part in the development of the atomic bomb. The other day, in appearing before the committee, two or three of them looked almost like children. I did not ask them how old they were, but I dare say they are not over 25 years of age. Yet they have been playing a very important part in the laboratory work at Oak Ridge, Tenn., at the Clinton Laboratory and at the other laboratory there, and at Richland, near Pasco, Wash., and in the laboratory near Santa Fe, N. Mex.

I think it is the most stupid thing in the world to take these men, of whom there are very few, and put them in the Army for the purpose for which our Army is set up, namely, national defense. If General Hershey has the power, which I understand he does have, to prevent the drafting of these particular men, I think he should do so. If he desires to have Senators express themselves on the subject, because of a feeling on his part that that will encourage him to do something to help in this situation, Senators should express themselves. I think there is fear of some criticism by someone here, on the ground that he would be discriminating.

Dr. Bush was very positive on this same point the other day, namely, that it should be done now, that we should not wait for 6 months, because once those men are taken into the armed forces and their courses of study are interrupted, there will be great probability that they will not resume them when they complete their service in the armed forces, since afterward they may be diverted into other work; they may start selling bonds or something of the sort. That is what has happened in the past to many of our best brains. I hope that many Members of the Senate who have received letters on this subject will make their views known.

APPLICATION OF RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT TO KENTUCKY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 640, House Joint Resolution 116, to facilitate the execution of subsection (d) of section 13 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended. I may state for the benefit of Senators that this measure deals with a certain amount of money in the Treasury of the State of Kentucky, paid there by employees of the railroads prior to the enactment of the Railroad Retirement Compensation Act, in 1939. In that act provision was made for the enactment of legislation by the States to permit the Federal Government to take over the responsibility of administering the railroad retirement pay. The Legislature of Kentucky complied with the statute by providing for the transfer of the fund which was in the treasury of the State of Kentucky, and which had been paid there by railroad employees, to the Federal Railroad Unemployment Insurance Board. Twice the Court of Appeals of Kentucky, which is the court of last resort in that State, held it unconstitutional, and that the fund could not be transferred. The legislature then enacted another law on the subject, but during the interim the Railroad Retirement Board and the Social Security Board declined to allocate to Kentucky money for the administrative expenses of the retirement fund.

House Joint Resolution 116 merely fixes the amount which shall be withheld by the Social Security Board and the Railroad Retirement Board, which must be absorbed before the Federal Government will pay out any money to administer this law in the State of Kentucky. Enactment of the resolution will take no money out of the Treasury. It will affect only the State of Kentucky. The matter has been pending for some years, and considerable effort has been made to adjust it. House Joint Resolution 116 will adjust it.

The resolution was unanimously reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and I hope it may now be considered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall interrupt merely to say that this measure was considered by the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as I understand, and was unanimously reported by it to the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. It does not change substantive law, as I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. WHITE. But it simply would determine the amount of money——

Mr. BARKLEY. It would determine the amount of money which shall be withheld for administrative expenses in the State of Kentucky, under the Railroad Retirement Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I hope the joint resolution will be passed, because the money was paid by the railroad workers of Kentucky, and it rightfully belongs to those who paid it before the passage of the Federal law. At various times during the last 3 or 4 years, my colleague and I have had measures introduced to make effective what this measure will do, namely, to pay back to workers in Kentucky money paid by them. The joint resolution will not affect any other State. For one reason or another, decisions of the Kentucky Court of Appeals absolutely prevented the transfer of the money. Each time we postponed the fateful day, so that control of the funds would not be lost and so that ultimately the money could be paid back to the workers in Kentucky who actually are out of pocket this money and who have made other contributions, pursuant to a Federal law, which in effect means that they have paid this money in addition to other money already paid in other contributions.

I appreciate the fine work my colleague has done in having this measure reported from the committee at this time, because at various other times each one of us during 3 or 4 years has introduced bills for the purpose of having this money paid back to those who are rightfully entitled to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me say in conclusion that when I came to the Senate one of the first bills I introduced was a measure providing for the return of the money to these Kentucky workers, and I have diligently pursued the matter all the time since I have been here. The passage of the pending measure keeps my pledge to the railroad workers of Kentucky.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

BOUNDARY LINE BETWEEN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND VIRGINIA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3220, providing for establishment of a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia. When the bill was reached during the call of the calendar a few days ago it went over because of an objection made under a misapprehension of what the bill would do. The bill relates to the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia. The Virginia Legislature has already endorsed this bill, the House of Representatives has passed it, and the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia has made a unanimous report in favor of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3220) to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand that enactment of the bill is recommended by the Attorney General.

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I further understand that the bill deals only with the question of the boundary line between the District of Columbia and Virginia.

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. It does not deal with boundary lines between other jurisdictions; is that correct?

Mr. HOEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3220) to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, on page 5, in lines 7 and 8, after the words "United States", to strike out "for use in the exercise of essentially governmental functions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPMENT, USE, AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on October 9 the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] submitted Senate Resolution 179, which would create a special committee on atomic energy, to be composed of nine Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and that committee reported unanimously in favor of it. The resolution then automatically went to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, of which the Senator from Illinois is chairman. From that committee I report the resolution favorably. I would ask unanimous consent that it be taken up immediately, but the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], acting chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, left on my desk a note saying that if the resolution were brought up today, he would be compelled to interpose an objection. Consequently, I am making the report from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MCMAHON. If the resolution goes to the calendar, as I understand, it will not be subject to objection by the Senator from Colorado when the Senate next meets.

Mr. LUCAS. It must lie over for a day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the resolution goes to the calendar, it will take its place on the calendar, like any other resolution or bill, and it may be taken up when the calendar is called or any Senator may move to have it taken up separately. Unanimous consent will not be required in order to have it considered.

Mr. MCMAHON. Unanimous consent would not be required?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it would not be. It would be subject to a motion to take it up, and such a motion could be carried by a majority vote of the Senate.

Mr. MCMAHON. I give notice that I should like to have it called up at the earliest possible opportunity.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly upon the resolution which has just been reported. I have not changed my opinion with respect to how atomic energy in this country should be handled insofar as the legislative branch of the Government is concerned. I am convinced beyond any question that this subject is of such vital importance to the safety and to the security of this Nation that the resolution which was submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported unanimously, and passed by the Senate, provides the type of committee which, in reality, should handle the matter. It was unfortunate that the resolution of the able Senator from Michigan did not carry with it the same provision which is now carried in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Connecticut, namely, that the committee shall have power and authority to consider all legislation with reference to the subject, and make any report which it may deem wise and necessary to make in the interest of the general welfare of the Nation.

I express the earnest hope that even at this late hour the House of Representatives, which now has the Vandenberg resolution, will return it, with amendments, giving the committee power to report legislation so that the Senate may cooperate in this action through the conference committee.

Mr. President, this is the most important question the Congress of the United States has ever considered. The statement in the morning newspapers of a scientist who has told the people of the world that 44,000,000 Americans can be wiped out overnight by one bomb, surely must cause every citizen of this Republic to shudder when thinking of the potential power which is wrapped up in atomic energy.

Only a short while ago Congress created a joint committee for the purpose of studying what had taken place before and following Pearl Harbor. The importance of that subject, Mr. President, is only a drop in a huge barrel when compared to the importance of the question which is pending at this moment before the two Houses of Congress and the Nation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to read one sentence from the bill which has been sponsored by the administration, and which is awaiting reference to whatever committee shall be agreed upon for the purpose of proceeding in this matter. I think it is totally corroborative of the position which the able Senator from Illinois has cited. I read from the administration bill:

> In the highest national interest, and to protect the national existence, it is essential that all further development and exploitation of this newly tapped source of energy be centrally directed and controlled for the benefit of the entire nation.

By the same analogy, I think the able Senator from Illinois is entitled to argue that the urgent control of this matter be taken charge of and centrally directed in the same way and for the same reason.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I concur in the remarks of the able Senator from Michigan. I would go even further. After having given life to a joint committee of the kind to which reference has been made, it seems to me that the Congress of the United States should never lose control or, at least, it should always have its hands on the control of what is taking place with respect to the development of atomic energy in this country. I would be willing to vote for an appropriation of any amount which would establish behind this joint committee a group of experts, a group of independent persons, if you please, Mr. President, such as some of the civilian scientists who are now taking issue with the scientists in the War Department on the question of what should or should not be done in connection with this tremendous problem with which we are confronted.

Before we conclude consideration of this matter, people of this country will demand that the Congress keep its hands on the control of it from beginning to end. I do not mean to say that the Congress should develop the subject from every conceivable angle, but whatever is done, and wherever it is necessary to go in this world for the purpose of learning any future secrets with respect to the welfare of this country, the Congress of the United States should have its representatives sitting side by side with the representatives of the War Department, with the State Department, and with any other department which has representatives on hand in dealing with the matter.

Mr. President, this subject is one which the Congress should be considering almost constantly. It is the most important question, I repeat, which has ever been presented to the country for its consideration.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I thoroughly approve of what the Senator from Illinois has said, and I intend to speak very briefly on the resolution when it comes before the Senate for consideration.

In view of what the Senator has said about the magnitude and importance of the matter, I regret very much that our good friend the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], a fine and able Member of this body, whom I do not doubt is engaged in important work, is unable to be present. I am sure that his presence would enable us to facilitate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am concerned about the censorship which has been placed upon certain individuals who have been partially responsible for the scientific development of atomic energy. As I have already said, I am unalterably opposed to the military officials of the Government being given complete control over the future development of atomic power.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, let me inquire if any person in authority in the country is now advocating that control of the development of atomic energy be placed in the military department of the Government?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know whether anyone is advocating it directly, but I will say to the able Senator from Kentucky that from all the information which I have received through the press, and from what may be considered more or less as rumor, the indication is that the Army would like to have control.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to express my accord with the views which have been stated by the Senator from Illinois, because the country does not wish ever to be run by the military. If the military has power to control atomic energy it could take the country into a war, or into any other situation which became purely a military matter. The subject is of importance to all the people, because the life of each one might be snuffed out without a moment's notice unless control of atomic energy is placed in the representatives of the people.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to be misunderstood in the position I am taking in regard to the Army. I know that the Army did a magnificent job in the development of the atomic bomb. We are all very happy over the winning of the war by the use of the atomic bomb, thereby saving the lives of perhaps thousands upon thousands of our boys.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am not certain what part the Army played in the development of the atomic bomb, except to give it security. Probably it gave it just the security that it needed. The persons who developed the atomic bomb should receive the lion's share of the credit.

Mr. LUCAS. Recently, almost every time I read the press I observe statements to the effect that General Groves, of the Army, has said something about the subject of atomic energy. I understand that it was General Groves who issued orders resulting in a certain amount of censorship being placed upon the scientists of the country who are outside the control of the military authorities, and who almost fear to talk to a United States Senator about the matter. I know that to be a fact. The scientists to whom I have referred are as much interested in the proper development and safeguarding of atomic power as are the scientists who are connected with the War Department. It is at that point that the Congress of the United States should take a hand with respect to the independent research men who also have the know-how as to engineering data and scientific research.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, I do not agree with persons who believe that we can keep secret the facts concerning the atomic bomb. I believe that the sooner everyone in the world knows the facts and is acquainted with atomic energy and atomic weapons the better off everyone will be. During the war all nations had gas and knew how to use it. Yet they realized how destructive its use could be, and each nation knew that if it used gas in warfare the opposing nation could use it also. It seems to me that the people of the United States should have, as a matter of their own defense, control of atomic energy as a weapon. The control must be in the hands of the people of the United States, as I have said, and not in the hands of any organization, clique, or group of men or officials of the Army or Navy.

It is possible to have each of the services, and certainly the Senate and House of Representatives, and perhaps the Supreme Court, represented on a supreme council which would have the authority not only to develop this thing but to dictate, with other safeguards, its ultimate use. I do not think we are going to be able to keep it from any other country. I think that sooner or later, in some form or other, every country in the world will have it and know how to use it.

Mr. LUCAS Mr. President, along the line of the statement made by the junior Senator from Kentucky, I have in my hand a letter from a scientist who lives in the State from which my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Tennessee comes. I shall now read a part of that letter. This scientist says:

> The recent proposals regarding the setting up of a joint committee which would call on the nuclear scientists for advice regarding atomic energy is one of the few sensible proposals I have seen since the bomb was dropped on August 6. One of the primary fears of those of us who have been active in this work is that the problem will not receive the profound investigation and study it deserves. It is obvious that an independent body such as—

He says "you propose"; he means such as the Congress proposes—

> will be better able to evaluate the fact than would a standing committee which must consider other matters as well.
>
> You might be interested in learning that more than 90 percent of the scientists here at Clinton Laboratory have joined together as the Association of Oak Ridge Scientists of Clinton Laboratory, for the purpose of disseminating our beliefs.

Here is the first one:

> There is no secret which can be kept for more than a few years.
>
> 2. There is no effective defense against atomic bombs.
>
> 3. Now is the time to start working on an international organization which will have the requisite power to handle a problem of this magnitude.

I submit, Mr. President, that a joint committee of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, working hand in glove with the Executive and the State Department, is the one body which can do what this scientist hopes may be done, insofar as our powers as legislators are concerned.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator think that the study of the idea of making peacetime use of atomic energy by harnessing it can be carried on?

Mr. LUCAS. There can be no question about it, but the first requisite is that something be done with the bomb from the standpoint of our national defense. Unless we can, as this gentleman says, control the atomic power of the world through an international organization, then what the Senator talks about, insofar as the development of atomic power for our domestic activities is concerned is meaningless, because, after all, if half of this Nation can be wiped out by one bomb, the domestic use of atomic power becomes more or less academic.

This scientist is absolutely correct so far as control is concerned. I do not know a thing about atomic energy; I am only a layman, expressing an intuitive "poker" judgment which I have about this matter from what I have read and from what I have studied, but I undertake to say that while we now contend that we have the engineering know-how, and that we are one of the few nations having the money with which to do the work to make this deadly Frankenstein monster for destruction, I would remind the Senate and the country that the atomic bomb is merely in its infancy. I undertake to say that within a short while there will be few countries in the

world which will not find some way, some how, at a cost which they can stand, to develop and make an atomic bomb. Whenever that time comes, then our Nation will be in mortal danger.

Why are we in danger? We are a peace-loving nation. We always wait until we are attacked before we want to fight. That has been the history of our country from the beginning. We have always hold to fight an aggressive foe, an imperialistic group seeking to take something from us.

If we continue in the future to take the same position we have taken in the past, and if the atomic bomb is developed as many believe it will be, it is impossible to conjecture the awful devastation which may be wrought by just a few planes, or perhaps just a small box weighing not over 3 pounds, properly planted in a skyscraper in New York or here in Washington, with a time fuse on it to go off in 24 hours. Who knows the possibilities of the destruction of this death-dealing device?

The best brains of the country are none too good to cope with the problem, and every man who can be enlisted in the development of this power, from the standpoint of aid to our country, and from the standpoint of ultimately establishing an international body to control it, should be enlisted.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that before work is done toward developing the peacetime use of atomic energy we should arrive at a decision about control of the bomb?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not say we should not continue to move along in the proper paths of development for domestic use, but at the same time the big question, the over-all question which must control everything, is the necessity for some kind of an international organization which will really outlaw the atomic bomb. That is the point I am making.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree that we have to revise our ideas of war in this country. In the last two great wars the United States has always fought as one of a coalition. In the early stages we always had some other country to bear the brunt of the war in the initial stages, while we had time to prepare. We needed it in the First World War, and the good Lord above knows we just simply had to have it in the last war. When another war comes along we will not have any time. We will not have any notice. We have to learn again everything about how to start a war, because the next time, as a scientist said a short time ago before the Committee on Military Affairs, "Planes will appear suddenly over a city the size of Washington and in 10 minutes there will be no city there." It is a question of doing either what the Senator suggests or run the risk of perishing, and not only that, but of speculating on the safety and security of all the people of the country.

We must revise our ideas of the sort of world we are living in. There will be no more coalitions, no more time to prepare. If we hesitate or delay we not only invite disaster, but make it certain. I am sorry to have imposed on the Senator's time.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to have the able Senator interrupt me.

Mr. CHANDLER. I very much appreciate the position of the Senator from Illinois takes on the subject. I think the people should realize the condition they face.

Mr. LUCAS. I am certain that our country within a few years will be in a most difficult dilemma unless there is provided some type of international organization which will control this new force.

Mr. STEWART. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator is now discussing an idea which those who have always been idealistic have had in mind, that of total disarmament. General Marshall a few days ago said, in the report he made which has been hailed so widely throughout the country as one of intelligence and one which has given the country a picture of the situation in very precise and sensible form, that we should have a large Army, that is, peacetime universal military training, men trained to such a point that we might have an Army of about 4,000,000 men available on short notice. On the one hand, that is preparedness. On the other hand, the thing the Senator from Illinois is talking about certainly must lead in the end to complete an absolute disarmament. So long as we continue to maintain an Army and a Navy and an Air Force just so long it is possible to continue, clandestinely or otherwise, the manufacture of bombs and other things that destroy people—atomic bombs and other types of bombs.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me answer my distinguished friend in this way. I undertake to say that this Nation must in every conceivable way be prepared to meet any thrust of an aggressor nation, and certainly no one knows at this hour what is going to happen with respect to the ultimate and final control of atomic power through an international body. Until the time comes when we definitely are convinced beyond the peradventure of a doubt that we have got atomic power controlled, it seems to me that we would be foolish not to keep prepared to the best of our ability between now and that time in every phase of military preparation. I am thinking, for instance, about supremacy of the air. It is said that there is no defense to this bomb. But I am definitely of the opinion that had Japan had supremacy of the air Japan might have shot down the bomb before it reached Hiroshima. So, from the standpoint of defense, at least at the moment, it seems to me that air force is the one great defense we might have against the bomb. But as I stated in the beginning, Mr. President, because of the fact that we have never started a war—we have always waited for the other fellow to strike first—I do not know whether even a superior air force might be able to turn the trick in the event we were attacked without warning as we were at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. STEWART. Again I ask the Senator, does it not seem a little inconsistent for us on the one hand to advocate preparedness, and on the other hand to have an international agreement that no one will use this weapon of total destruction?

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all. I will say to the able Senator that it is not until we can reach an agreement that we can talk about disarmament. This is all in the embryo stage. No one knows what kind of agreement if any we could work out with the rest of the world with respect to atomic energy. Until that time comes we cannot let down from the standpoint, as I see it, of our own preparedness in the best way possible. We can see at this moment the difficulties encountered in some of the world conferences over trivial matters, compared to atomic power. As an example, the question of the Dardanelles is a small matter compared with attempting to control the atomic power of the world, yet it will be a difficult question to settle.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator speaks of agreement with other nations not to make use of this destructive weapon, and that it is not known what kind of an agreement we might be able to procure.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. Likewise it is not known what nations might live up to agreements. Agreements in the past have been referred to on historic occasions as mere scraps of paper.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true. But I believe that under the circumstances, if the people of the rest of the world realize that they are going to live or perish under the power of this force, we ought to be able to create some kind of international organization equipped with laboratories and scientists from every part of the world to see that it is not exploited for military purposes. I think that can be worked out.

Mr. STEWART. History teaches us that most nations—and nations are but groups of individuals—respect nothing but power. They are not afraid of anything except what can be done to them. Hitler would never have attacked England had he known she was prepared. He would not have attacked Russia had he known that she was properly prepared to resist him. I belong to that group which feels that we should retain this atomic secret. Of course, I know, like my friend the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], that it is a secret which cannot be kept always.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point I am making.

Mr. STEWART. But I want others to get the secret the hard way, as we found it. It cost us a couple of billion dollars to find this secret. We had to work for it in the hills of Tennessee and in the State of Washington. We had to dig out the secret the hard way. I think we ought to have others go to all the trouble that is necessary for them to get it, and probably by the time they have discovered the secret we shall have so advanced with the development of our secret that we will be too far ahead of them and they

will be afraid to use the secret they have discovered.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not disagree with my friend. Now is the time to drive the bargain with the other nations with respect to this power, in view of our prior position in the world concerning atomic power. If some aggressor nation had this power we would be feeling just a little shaky. If the Argentine crowd, with their Nazi set-up, had this power we would, I am sure, be a very unhappy Nation.

Mr. STEWART. If they had it we would want it.

Mr. LUCAS. If they had and we did not, I do not know just what we would do.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Just a little unhappy, does the Senator state?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that we would call together the largest congress of scientists possible, and we would open up the Treasury with all the billions of dollars we thought necessary.

Mr. President, I am obliged to attend a meeting of the Finance Committee, but I want to congratulate the Senator from Illinois on his splendid address and for calling the attention of the Senate and of the people of our country to this great and overwhelming problem. I say to the Senator in all seriousness, after profound consideration—and I am careful on this floor never, I hope, to be overstrong in my utterances—I say that the discovery of a method of dividing the atom is the most important event that has happened in the world's history since the birth, the life, and the death of Jesus Christ.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Before the Senator from Connecticut leaves the Chamber I wish to say a word. I have read General Marshall's report on the conduct of the war. I think perhaps one of the most significant statements he made, and one which may be overlooked, appears at the outset where he says that after 6 years as Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States he is now able to say for the first time that the security of the American people resides in our own hands. Is that not a magnificent statement? During 6 years the security of the people of the United States was not in our own hands.

Mr. McMAHON. With the permission of the Senator from Illinois, I should like to say to the Senator from Kentucky that General Marshall is correct. Our security is in our own hands. But unless we move swiftly in this field and act wisely, then I certainly look on the future with the darkest of pessimism.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, what I wanted to call attention to primarily in this short debate was the fact that there are scientists in this country who were in the midst of the development of atomic power when the war was going on who definitely say, as the man I quoted said—and he is not the first one—"There is no secret which can be kept for more than a few years."

That is the point I am talking about today, and that is why it is so necessary that we move forward with rapidity toward accomplishing a goal which I have discussed heretofore. When we have the tools we ought to use them. We have at the present time the proper base from which we can make the type of approach to other powers of the world that I believe will cause them to look with serious and deep consideration upon any proposition we might submit.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. We have never used that method before. We have never dealt with countries when we had the advantage. We have always waited until the advantage passed from us, or in many instances passed to them. Then it has been too late. I am of the opinion that other nations will discover the secret. They may be behind us far enough so we can protect ourselves. We will either have to share this secret or else it will be up to us, in the long run for the protection of the American people, to manufacture a lot of atomic bombs and drop them. That is the only way to make certain that the people of our country will never be destroyed by the bomb in the hands of other people. As a country, we have always insisted that other nations become equal or perhaps superior in a given field. We have never used any advantage we have had.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to use any other advantage; but I want to say to the Senator from Kentucky that as the result of what has been discovered through war, I can see a day coming in this country when we may have to adopt and employ drastic methods, whatever they may be, in order to live.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; for the preservation of the people of this country.

Mr. LUCAS Self-preservation is the first law of nature. We may ultimately come to the point of following that law, but I pray to God that time will never come. I have, however, some forebodings along that line, of what may happen unless we pursue the control of atomic power—with caution, candor, and skillful diplomacy.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I might say to the Senator that in speaking publicly on this matter I have suggested that the knowledge we have now is like money in the bank at 100 cents on the dollar, but every day which goes by without our using it and spending it toward the objectives of world security and world peace, the money is depreciating, and at the end of 2½ or 3 years, when every other country in the world has secured the ability to manufacture atomic bombs, then our capital will be gone.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to conclude by reading the objectives of this scientific group. They deserve the consideration of the Congress and of the country:

1. The objectives of this group shall be to:

(a) Give all possible emphasis and publicity to our conviction that a continuing monopoly of the atomic bomb by the United States is impossible.

(b) Give similar publicity to our own conclusion that the future security of this Nation requires that the information and facilities involved be placed under the jurisdiction of an international authority. This proposal assumes that appropriate safeguards will be established to prevent exploitation by any nation.

That is what we referred to a moment ago.

2. We recommend that the above stated plan be developed through the following means:

(a) Individual communications to Members of the Congress and other officials concerned, both State and national.

(b) Similar communications by the group as such.

(c) Representation in hearings before committees of the Congress.

(d) General publicity through sponsored advertisements, news releases, editorial comments, and radio commentaries.

(e) Individual contacts with responsible persons who are active in civic affairs.

Mr. President, I have spoken on this question longer than I had intended. I am primarily making a plea for independent scientists who have been in the thick of the fray in the development of atomic energy throughout the country. Under no circumstances am I wiling to permit a single group in any agency of Government to have complete control and domination of the future development of this awful power. I am almost in thorough accord with the objectives expressed by this group of scientists from Knoxville, Tenn., one of the groups responsible for the development of atomic power during the war. I am thankful to receive this valuable information.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Spruille Braden, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John F. Sonnett to be Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, my attention was diverted, and I did not hear what was done with respect to the treaties on the calendar. Were they passed over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They were passed over.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 22, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 18, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Samuel J. Fletcher, of Maine, now a foreign-service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Renwick S. McNiece, of Utah, now a foreign-service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Hasell H. Dick, of South Carolina, now a foreign-service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Robert B. Streeper, of Ohio, now a foreign-service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Stephen C. Brown, of Virginia, now a foreign-service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

James J. Connors, of Juneau, Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska. (Reappointment.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the positions indicated, from the 1st day of October 1945:

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEER WITH RANK OF CAPTAIN

Frank S. Borden
Otis W. Swainson

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEER WITH RANK OF COMMANDER

Charles K. Green
Roland D. Horne

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEER WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Wilbur R. Porter
George A. Nelson

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Maj. Gen. Edward Fuller Witsell (colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as The Adjutant General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from the date immediately following that upon which Maj. Gen. James Alexander Ulio, the present incumbent, vacates his appointment as The Adjutant General.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONELS WITH RANK FROM OCTOBER 1, 1945

Lt. Col. Lester Atchley Sprinkle, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Robert Walker Grow, Cavalry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Joseph William George Stephens, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Richard Kerens Sutherland, Infantry (temporary lieutenant general).

Lt. Col. Emil Watson Leard, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Terrill Eyre Price, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Walter Frank Adams, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. William Henry Kasten, Finance Department (Chief of Finance with the rank of major general).

Lt. Col. William Alexander, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Frances E. Gaty, Bassett, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Jethro Denson, Fountain Hill, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CALIFORNIA

Thomas Sawkins, Montague, Calif., in place of W. T. Martin, resigned.

COLORADO

Albert Ross Mauro, Weston, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONNECTICUT

Catherine O'Brien, Gildersleeve, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clara B. Snow, Wapping, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

DELAWARE

Lorraine E. Kane, Bellevue, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Frederick Camilli, Montchanin, Del., in place of J. A. Ragazzo, removed.

FLORIDA

William Sylvester Middleton, Pomona Park, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

ILLINOIS

Antonio Leone, Maryville, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary Floyd, Seatonville, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

INDIANA

Arlie C. Henry, Laketon, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James H. Smith, Metamora, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

IOWA

Loretta Stapleton, Elma, Iowa, in place of H. L. Conway, resigned.

Carl W. Bruggeman, Farmington, Iowa, in place of J. S. Forgrave, resigned.

Grover B. Chryst, Forest City, Iowa, in place of W. R. Flemming, resigned.

KANSAS

Clifford H. Johnson, Bucklin, Kans., in place of H. J. March, transferred.

Helen M. McNally, Havensville, Kans., in place of P. D. Randel, transferred.

Mary J. Gardner, Republic, Kans., in place of T. W. Moore, transferred.

Elaine E. Harrell, St. George, Kans., in place of P. R. Warren, retired.

MAINE

Arthur B. Silkworth, Center Lovell, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Peter C. Sanfacon, Grand Isle Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Blanche D. Voisine, Keegan, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John R. Walsh, Kennebunk Beach, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Howard L. Annis, Lincoln Center, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elva Brackett, Monhegan, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Addie E. S. Smart, Monroe, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edward E. Kennison, North New Portland, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Don W. Worthing, Palermo, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Eber J. Johnson, Poland, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Enid L. Monaghan, Port Clyde, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Violet G. Blake, South Casco, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Fay A. Patchell, Wytopitlock, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MARYLAND

Dorothy H. M. Williams, Charlestown, Md., in place of M. B. Cooper, retired.

Katherine L. Reter, Phoenix, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

William E. Warner, Bedford, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clara S. Moore, Curtis, Mich., in place of Asher Sheppard, resigned.

Reatha M. Linke, Filer City, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Gertrude C. Frank, Moline, Mich., in place of M. C. Pepper, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Kenneth V. Sartain, Osage, Minn., in place of S. M. Sartain, retired.

Robert J. Ingham, Willernie, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSISSIPPI

Edward E. Perry, Byhalia, Miss., in place of G. D. Myers, retired.

MISSOURI

Joseph L. Haw, Caledonia, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert L. Hawkins, Monroe City, Mo., in place of P. M. Christian, retired.

MONTANA

Dessie Burnsides, Birney, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEBRASKA

Bertha A. Lancaster, Barnston, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Russell E. Wilson, Blue Springs, Nebr., in place of R. A. Gillham, transferred.

Lois H. Lincoln, Scotia, Nebr., in place of J. J. Burns, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Lena B. Elwell, Beachwood, N. J., in place of R. J. Hughes, Sr., resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Vincent C. Steele, Grenville, N. Mex. To correct spelling of name of office.

NEW YORK

Clarence A. Parker, Burlington Flats, N. Y., in place of E. M. Cross, deceased.

Sherman G. Simmons, Byron, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary M. McCaughey, Leicester, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

Floyd P. Thomas, Madison, N. C., in place of J. R. Hughes, resigned.

Helen H. Johnson, Morrisville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NORTH DAKOTA

Joseph L. Goudreau, Shields, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OHIO

Vane Wagner, Clayton, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gertrude Deming, Rootstown, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Daphne G. Sherer, Union, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OKLAHOMA

Charles H. McMullan, Blackwell, Okla., in place of J. C. Affholder, transferred.

Edward S. Wilson, Byron, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Orlando W. George, Canadian, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Claude W. Hanna, Grove, Okla., in place of M. B. Weathers, transferred.

OREGON

Gertrude Tulloch, Mount Vernon, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Howard E. Gilfillan, Conoquenessing, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vesta Y. Stevens, Flinton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles Frailey, Minisink Hills, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John H. Evans, Agar, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Cornie J. Ver Steeg, Corsica, S. Dak., in place of Martha Nieveen, deceased.

Marion L. Rowse, Lebanon, S. Dak., in place of J. T. Schneider, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Ralph G. Hornbeak, Hornbeak, Tenn., in place of Dewey Darnell, transferred.

VERMONT

Rose M. Wright, Colchester, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edna R. Morris, South Barre, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

VIRGINIA

Susie A. Davis, Nathalie, Va., in place of F. R. Henderson, resigned.

WASHINGTON

John E. Martin, Buckley, Wash., in place of J. E. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lloyd G. Pike, Nooksack, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WEST VIRGINIA

James E. Forbes, Charmco, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edna Nutter, Ivydale, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ellen Barr Wiseman, Powellton, W. Va., in place of O. D. Madison, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Lillian M. Hickey, Custer, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Kathleen F. Baker, Embarrass, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harry C. Lowe, Hazelhurst, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Albert L. Greiling, New Franken, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ellsworth R. Helgoe, Rock Falls, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Erwin N. Theisen, Rockfield, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Urban B. Remmel, West Wrightstown, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, October 18, 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

John F. Sonnett to be an Assistant Attorney General.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Orbie L. Little, Bluffsprings.
Beulah B. Wiles, Captiva.
John T. Carpenter, Myrtle Grove.
Hazel V. Webb, Yukon.

ILLINOIS

Marion Dennis, Chambersburg.
Everett Dees, Coello.
Ross L. Drennan, Dewey.
Helene H. Sauerwein, Piatt.
Fred W. Nash, Gilson.
John P. Early, Penfield.
J. Ross Prather, Rossville.

INDIANA

Charles Peffley, Bridgeton.
Stella Larimore, Brooksburg.
Frank C. Kaper, Brownsville.
Eva Eherenman, Burket.
Ora E. Marlow, Coalmont.
Emerson E. Bridges, Commiskey.
Claude C. Garrison, Donaldson.
Francana McGhehey, Fishers.
Bertha B. Finley, Hartsville.
Jennings W. Luttman, Hudson.
John H. Cox, Ingalls.
Leora B. Alexander, Judson.
Fanny Maurey, Mecca.
Olin S. Mayfield, Memphis.
Louane Neff, Mount Summit.
Emerson A. Behlmer, Napoleon.
Foster D. Sutton, Otisco.
Walter D. Carlock, Paris Crossing.
Jesse Yoder, Plymouth.
Edna Kirkham, Prairie Creek.
Calita Job, Quincy.
Helen McConnell, Scipio.
Hugo L. Hartke, Stendal.
Agnes E. Hall, Stockwell.
Hilda Fern Calvert, Switz City.
Clarence L. Hambright, Tangier.
Louie Monroe, Underwood.
Edna Howard, Velpen.
Arthur E. Shirley, Walkerton.
Oscar Nierste, Westphalia.

KENTUCKY

Leslie V. Beckham, Sr., Boaz.
Robert D. Murphy, Clementsville.
Thomas Harold Hall, Coxs Creek.
Louise F. Kelly, Lejunior.
James W. Atkins, Liggett.
Essie M. McColpin, Melber.
Paul W. Moss, Rockfield.
Dora Lankford, Sunshine.
Charles S. Guthrie, Yancey.

LOUISIANA

Anthony Aucoin, Chataignier.
Vivian B. Allgood, Summerfield.

MARYLAND

Roger W. Curfman, Libertytown.
Walter H. Davis, Still Pond.

NEVADA

James E. Hughes, Mesquite.

PENNSYLVANIA

Winifred P. Murray, Laurel Gardens.

WEST VIRGINIA

Minnie F. Diem, Fort Spring.
Charles H. Gillilan, Frankford.
Earl Edward Bailey, Notomine.
Claude J. Anderson, Six.
Ballard B. Mitcham, Stephenson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. R. Paul Schearrer, D. D., pastor of the Takoma Park Presbyterian Church of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

"Great God, to whom since time began
The world has prayed and striven,
Maker of heaven and earth and men,
To Thee our praise is given."

From the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, the Lord's name is to be praised. We would exalt and magnify Thy holy name together.

Vouchsafe unto us now, O God of our salvation, a sense of Thy guiding and sustaining presence both in our hearts and in our midst. In mercy purge us from all base desires and secret faults, and in love forgive us of the sins we so readily confess and so reluctantly forsake. Deliver us from the bondage of every fear and enfranchise us with the courage and hope that is born of a vibrant faith in a God who overruleth the pride and folly of men and nations and suffereth not His sovereign will to be defeated in a world of His own creation.

Consecrate afresh each new day, we beseech Thee, these chosen representatives of our people in this time of terrifying responsibility and unparalleled opportunity and commission them as stewards of Thy justice and compassion and as servants of all that is true and honest and lovely in Thy sight; and to Thee, our Father, be the glory forevermore. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. LYNCH asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TIDEWATER BILL

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, everybody in this House knows that I am a follower of the theories of Henry George and Woodrow Wilson. I believe the earth, as I have said, belongs to the

children of men. I want to compliment the Washington Post on their exposé of the tidewater bill.

EDUCATION OF VETERANS

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today asking that Congress go on record as recommending in the case of veterans and all former members of the armed forces who enter colleges and universities as candidates for degrees that such colleges and universities give credit to the greatest extent practicable for work done and educational courses taken by individuals while they were serving in the armed forces. As an example, there is one soldier who had only 4 months to go to get his master's degree in one of America's leading universities. He could have remained to receive his degree. Being patriotic like thousands of others, he voluntarily quit school to go in the Army. Now that he has come back he has been told by this particular university that he has to go all the way back and take all the work that he had taken before he left for the armed forces in order to get his degree. I think certainly in this particular case, and in every case where it is practical to do so, that all universities should give credit for the work which all members of the armed forces did prior to entering the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. DOUGLAS of California addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ATTACKS ON THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House fo. 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if this country has grown great it has been because of the policy advocated and the fights won by the ancestors of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

It comes with poor grace from people who are continuously complaining about the treatment accorded racial minorities to rise on this floor and attack the Daughters of the American Revolution for following a policy of segregation that has been in existence in Washington for more than 100 years.

The Daughters are doing exactly what is being done in the public schools in the District of Columbia. Why do not some of you people who are attacking the DAR rise on the floor and advocate taxing the schools of the District of Columbia because they separate the races?

Why do not you rise and advocate taxing every Masonic lodge and every other fraternal organization in Washington that draws the color line?

Why do not you advocate taxing every white church in Washington because they do not invite colored preachers, or pander to another race?

Why do not you add an additional tax on every hotel, every picture show, and every restaurant that draws the color line?

No; you single out the Daughters of the American Revolution, one of the most patriotic organizations on earth, and attempt to browbeat them into submission because they propose to run their own building in their own way.

You people who are making these attacks are doing the Daughters of the American Revolution a grave injustice, and doing the Negroes of this country infinitely more harm than good.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY TO SCHOOLS, HEALTH AND HOSPITAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BUCK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WATCH THE SALE OF SURPLUS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the disposal of surplus property, as I am wondering if the same pattern is being used all over the country.

Up in my district the Government paid $121,789 for dormitories at Plum Brook Ordnance Works. They were never used, and were quietly sold for $4,500 being less than 4 percent of their cost even though they were new, and then were profitably resold on the Government reservation.

Next came the Reconstruction Finance Corporation who sell surpluses and on a sale of wire out of Cleveland it sent the information and notice to the favored persons very early, to the unfavored ones so as to reach them 9 days after the sale. When it was called to the attention of the agency, they blandly said it was only a mistake. However, when the same method was used a second time in another area it is no longer a satisfactory excuse.

Now at the Plum Brook Ordnance Works in my district, public officials were refused the right to examine property declared to be surplus and soon to be sold.

I am wondering if this property is to be quietly sold like the $121,000 worth of dormitories. There are water plants and other surplus property throughout my district, and I am now serving public notice on the administration that these properties, lands, and chattels be sold according to law, that the veterans, municipalities, counties, townships, school boards, public agencies, and all citizens be given the full opportunity to examine and purchase surplus property as intended by the Congress.

President Truman—News Week October 15—has piously "indicated the importance of close supervision over what otherwise might become a $50,000,000,000 scandal." I agree with the President, but he should do the watching for the gentlemen of the surplus disposal are his appointees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

WHAT IS HOLDING UP DEMOBILIZATION?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my mail would not indicate that a very serious effort is being made to demobilize our armed forces. When schools in need of teachers cannot obtain the release of limited-service men; when young men cannot be released to comfort their dying parents; when husbands cannot be released to assume their obligations to their families, it is very evident that the maximum effort is not being made by the powers that be to accomplish the desired results. When these men and women are kept in camps with nothing whatever to do, it is apparent that the brass hats think more of their own jobs than they do of the welfare of the people.

It is hoped the movie actors, the football and baseball players, and pugilists will all soon be released so that the business, professional, and farm men will have some consideration. Tom Dewey must have had the facts when he stated that the New Deal planners intended to keep the men in the armed forces as long as they could because it was cheaper than to put them on the WPA.

Anyway, the time has come to get some action. A 41-point football player that is married or single is not as much entitled to consideration as thousands of married men and the thousands of business, professional, and farm men with families that are still kept in service.

HOUSING AT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER Mr. Speaker, in speaking with one of the trustees of Ohio University, he reminds us of the difficulty of obtaining housing for married servicemen who are going back to school. We have some 79,000 units of demountable emergency housing, with one, two, and three bedrooms. I suggest it might be possible, in view of the fact that this material is bringing so little at public sale, that we lend those to the various colleges and universities and then liquidate them after we have liquidated this education program for our veterans. Plenty of land is available near public utilities for their location.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make on the rescission bill and include therein two tables and some statistics.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject of strikes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Telephone Workers Union at Sidney, Nebr.

Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made this morning before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments by George S. Benson. He is a self-made man, and he certainly gave us something to think about.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business on Wednesday next the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EQUALITY FOR ALL

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, this country became great because it was the land of the free and the home of the brave. It became great because it was a haven of freedom. It became great because those principles were established by our ancestors. It also became great because of the advocacy of the principles laid down by one of the greatest Americans we ever had, the principles advocated by Abraham Lincoln, who advocated equality for all.

Talk about New Dealers! I think he was a pretty good New Dealer himself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next I may address the House for 20 minutes after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, and in each to include newspaper articles.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 169]

Bailey	Drewry	LaFollette
Baldwin, Md.	Elsaesser	Lesinski
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fernandez	Lewis
Barry	Flannagan	Luce
Beckworth	Fuller	McGehee
Bender	Gardner	Merrow
Biemiller	Gary	Miller, Calif.
Bolton	Gerlach	Mott
Brumbaugh	Gifford	Norton
Buffett	Gillie	Patterson
Burgin	Griffiths	Plumley
Butler	Hagen	Price, Ill.
Campbell	Halleck	Roe, N. Y.
Celler	Heffernan	Rogers, Fla.
Clements	Henry	Short
Cole, Kans.	Herter	Starkey
Cole, N. Y.	Holifield	Stigler
Cooley	Hope	Taylor
Courtney	Johnson,	Wadsworth
Curley	Lyndon B.	Wasielewski
Daughton, Va.	Judd	Weiss
Dawson	Kefauver	White
Dickstein	Keogh	Whittington
Dingell	Kilburn	Winter
Dondero	King	Woodhouse

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include an article from the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. CANNON of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT ACT

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3615) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air-navigation facilities.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3615, with Mr. BARDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR PROJECTS IN TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

SEC. 7. Subject to the limitations contained in section 5 (c), all funds available for grants for projects in the Territories and possessions shall be available to pay the United States' share of the allowable project costs of such approved projects in the Territories and possessions as the Administrator may deem most appropriate for carrying out the national airport plan.

SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECTS

Submission

SEC. 8. (a) Any public airport agency, or two or more public airport agencies acting jointly, may submit to the Administrator a project application in such form, and containing such supporting information, as may be prescribed by the Administrator and setting forth the airport development proposed to be undertaken. No project application shall propose airport development other than that included in the then current revision of the national airport plan formulated by the Administrator under this title, and all such proposed development shall be in accordance with standards established by the Administrator, including standards for site location, airport lay-out, grading, drainage, seeding, paving, lighting, and safety of approaches.

Approval

(b) All such projects shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator, which approval shall be given only if, at the time of approval, funds are available for payment under this title of the United States' share of the project costs, and only if he is satisfied that the project will contribute to the accomplishment of the purposes of this title, that sufficient funds are available for that portion of the project costs which is not to be paid by the United States under this title, that the project will be completed without undue delay, that the public authority or public authorities which are sponsoring the project have legal authority to engage in the airport development as proposed, and that all sponsorship requirements prescribed by or under the authority of this title have been or will be met.

Hearings

(c) Project applications shall be public documents in the office of the Administrator. Any public authority, person, association, firm, or corporation having a substantial interest in the disposition of any application by the Administrator may file with the Administrator a memorandum in support of or in opposition to such application; and any such authority, person, association, firm, or corporation shall be accorded, upon request, a public hearing with respect to the location of any airport the development of which is proposed. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe regulaitons governing such pub-

lic hearings, and such regulations may prescribe a reasonable time within which requests for public hearings shall be made and such other reasonable requirements as may be necessary to avoid undue delay in disposing of project applications.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWELL: Page 10, line 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That where a State has not appropriated any State funds which will be available for use in connection with the airport development program under this act, or where a State does not have legislation which permits participation in such program through an adequate State airport agency, the Administrator may carry out projects under this act, upon submission of project applications by any qualified public authority, or authorities within the State, under the same terms and conditions as are provided in this act in the case of project applications by a State airport agency."

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the debate on this bill and the amendments offered thereto, it has been pointed out that there are a few States remaining which do not have adequate airport authorities. The purpose of this amendment is to authorize public agencies in such States which do not posses adequate airport authorities to do their business direct with the CAA. In other words, this amendment, coupled with the amendments which I offered and which were adopted yesterday, will cover every situation which occurs within the 48 States, as well as the Territories. It is a part of the McCarran bill which was passed by the Senate, and should be adopted in equity and justice, in order to make a full rounded bill of our bill in the House today.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am not sure whether I am for or against the gentleman's amendment, but it strikes me the gentleman is undoing just what he did yesterday. Yesterday I understood the gentleman's amendment turned this authority over to the States. Now the gentleman offers an amendment this morning which is about what the gentlemen on the other side yesterday said they wanted to do. So it looks to me like we have marched up the hill and now we are marching down again.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. It should be understood that there are a number of States that have no organizations.

Mr. RIZLEY. I understood there were four.

Mr. WELCH. Yes; four or more including California, through which the funds could be channeled. In the absence of an authority established by State legislation the gentleman's amendment would permit subdivisions such as the city and county of San Francisco to make direct contract with the Federal Government for funds made available under the provisions of this act to assist in expanding its publicly owned airport.

Mr. RIZLEY. I have no objection to that; I just called attention to the fact that it looked to me as though having marched up the hill yesterday we are just marching down the hill today.

Mr. HOWELL. I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma there are five States particularly involved, Mississippi, Missouri, Kansas, Arizona, and California. In these States until such time as an adequate airport authority is established their political subdivisions or public agencies will be able to negotiate directly with the CAA officials.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for inquiry?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does the gentleman's amendment permit States that do not now have such an authority to come under the operation of the act until such an authority is established?

Mr. HOWELL. That is my understanding, that the wording of the amendment is such that until a State authority is established the municipalities may deal directly with the CAA.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I confess that I heard the reading of the amendment imperfectly, and have not had an opportunity to study it, but I was not so impressed.

Mr. HOWELL. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that this amendment taken in connection with the amendment adopted yesterday takes care of the situation.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I suggest to the gentleman that he modify his amendment to incorporate in it some such wording as "until the States shall establish an authority."

Mr. HOWELL. That was in the amendment that was adopted yesterday to section 3.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does that hook up with this amendment?

Mr. HOWELL. It does.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. HAVENNER. San Francisco has a municipally owned airport. It is about to vote a bond issue of $20,000,000 for improvements. There is no State agency in California. As I understand it this amendment would enable San Francisco to deal directly with the Federal Government?

Mr. HOWELL. That is the very purpose of the amendment, to cover such a situation as San Francisco and other cities find themselves in.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. According to the gentleman's amendment "a State has not appropriated any State funds," and so forth—that means that a State may appropriate say $10 and then go ahead.

Mr. HOWELL. That is a matter of construction. I believe the gentleman from Arizona places a rather strained construction on it. There is another provision that requires that a State must have an adequate airport authority. Certainly the CAA would judge as to whether they had an adequate airport authority.

Mr. MILLS. The point I am trying to make is that there has been some discussion here to the effect that a State will not put up the money but will handle the funds between cities and the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. There has been some discussion here that some of the States perhaps have no money and no funds available and therefore will not put up any money for this program but the State will control the channeling of the funds where a city in the State puts up all the money on the one hand and the Federal Government on the other. Under this amendment a State could have an adequate agency put up an appropriation, an amount of funds, whether it is $1, $10, or $10,000.

Mr. HOWELL. This amendment reads:

That where a State has not appropriated any State funds which will be available for use in connection with the airport development program under this act, or where a State does not have legislation which permits participation in such program through an adequate State airport agency the administration may carry out projects under this act upon submission of project applications by any qualified public authority or authorities within the State under the terms and conditions as are provided in this act in the case of project applications by a State airport agency.

Mr. MILLS. In other words, then, it would not be necessary to provide any funds at all to participate in this program if they had an adequate agency set up to handle the funds. Is that right?

Mr. HOWELL. The purpose of this amendment is to enable those political subdivisions of States, first, that have not appropriated money, or, second, that do not have an adequate airport agency, to negotiate directly with the CAA. With all due respect to my distinguished friend from Arkansas, he is looking at the amendment from the reverse side. There is no requirement with reference to the appropriation of funds on the part of the State; it merely says if they have not appropriated funds or have no agency, then the political subdivision can come to the CAA and deal directly.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand the gentleman's explanation, but the point I am trying to make here is that the State may have complete control of the program, even though it did not appropriate and provide any funds whatsoever.

Mr. HOWELL. I cannot agree with the gentleman on that construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I introduced a clarifying amendment providing as follows:

Nothing in this act shall authorize the submission of a project application by any municipality or other public agency which is subject to the law of the State if the submission of such project application by such municipality or other public agency is prohibited by the law of such State.

Regardless of what may be said here, Mr. Chairman, there are quite a number of States which do not have sufficient enabling acts to take care of this situation if the Federal Government goes into it. Now we come here today on this proposition which is already a part of the bill, and, if you will read the bill and see what "public agency" you will find that an amendment is being offered as follows:

That where a State has not appropriated any State funds which will be available for use in connection with the airport development program under this act, or where a State does not have legislation which permits participation in such program through an adequate State airport agency, the Administrator may carry out projects under this act, upon submission of project applications by any qualified public authority or authorities within the State.

We come right back to the original bill, and to just what was in it. Today somebody has discovered that something was wrong about it in the original bill; so they come in here with this amendment.

The amendment which was offered yesterday, as I said, was offered to clarify the situation because the gentleman from Louisiana called it to my attention and I told him I would offer an amendment so that there would be no mistake about it and so that he could understand it. That is all there is in the amendment.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOWELL. I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina that this amendment is intended to cover the very situation he has complained about all through these debates, namely, those States that have not already set up a proper State airport authority and where they have not done so—there are only a few that have not—then the Administrator may carry out projects under this act upon submission of project applications by any qualified public authority or authorities within the State.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I have read it.

Mr. HOWELL. So that it actually qualifies them to do business direct where a State does not have a proper agency.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yesterday we heard that all of them had the proper agency to take care of this situation. Now, today, it develops that they do not.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. At no time did I ever indicate that more than 44 States had appropriate agencies, and I put them in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Then the gentleman's amendment would force upon those States who did not want an agency the requirement that they have one, and that is what I called attention to yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOWELL) there were—ayes 89, noes 70.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HOWELL.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 121, noes 106.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 10, at the end of line 25, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That any sponsor may appeal to the Secretary of Commerce from any decision of the Administrator made under the authority of this paragraph or of section 10 hereof, where such sponsor is aggrieved thereby, and the final determination of the Secretary under such appeal shall be binding upon the Administrator."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I submitted a copy of this amendment to the chairman of the committee yesterday. I thought it might be acceptable unless there is something in basic law which takes care of the question of appeals. You may notice one of the aggravations in this bill, if there is an aggravation, is the personal pronoun, which is so devastating in legislation. You find it in an aggravating way here.

For instance, on page 10 you find there are certain conditions with which there must be compliance before a project will be approved. Then there is this language: "If he is satisfied." That means the Administrator. He must be satisfied about the legality and about the availability of funds and the sponsorship. He must be satisfied that there will be no delay. Section 10 then provides that it is up to the Administrator to determine as a condition precedent whether there is going to be adequate maintenance and whether the approaches will be maintained. All together there are fifteen or twenty items on which he must be satisfied. But I have not found any provision for an appeal in the bill. It may be in the very nature of the relationship between the Civil Aeronautics Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce that that may constitute an appeal. But I do believe it would be eminently more satisfactory if it were written specifically into the bill. Therefore, the only force of my amendment is that in case a sponsor is aggrieved, believing that he has complied with every requirement and has been turned down by the Administrator, he at least can go to a court of last resort, and that is the Secretary of Commerce, who is in charge of the whole operation after all. I doubt very much the advisability of reposing in the caprice of one man all the determinations that are written into this bill. I would rather it were possible for a municipality in my area, when they are turned down, at least to be able to walk into the office of the Secretary of Commerce on a basis of an appeal and say, "Mr. Secretary, we believe we have complied and we believe now that the Administrator should grant to us the necessary approval and the necessary share of funds."

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Let us suppose a city in the gentleman's district which we will designate as city A. Suppose their site is not selected for an airport. They have the money and financial backing. They have the land and everything, but suppose in this whole scheme of things they are not selected. Then what are you going to do about it? Will that city A be the one who goes to the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Anybody who has in good faith complied with the requirements of the bill and is still aggrieved after the determination of the Administrator ought to have somewhere to go on appeal.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Then let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that if you consider the amendment which your colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, offered yesterday, the States will be the sponsor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us try to consider my amendment without regard for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois yesterday.

Mr. BULWINKLE. We must consider it, however.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am thinking in terms of the bill here before us at the moment wherein you lay down some 15 or 16 requirements or more and place it within the caprice of a single individual to determine whether a State, municipality, or any other public organization is going to have an airport and a share of the funds. If that single individual says "No," then there is no court of last resort and there is no other place for the municipality to go. We have had this problem of appeal from the determinations of Administrators, not only here but in almost every agency of the Government. There is involved here this question of a review of the facts. Do not forget that before a project ever comes down here there will have been invested thousands of dollars in title examinations of property, thousands of dollars for legal fees, and thousands of dollars for engineering fees and blueprints and everything else that is necessary. Yet one man can say "No" and that would be the end of it. The only purpose of this amendment is to see to it that there is at least one more place or court to go to, which would be the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that I do not think his amendment is clear:

Provided, That any sponsor may appeal to the Secretary of Commerce from any decision of the Administrator.

For the sake of discussion, we will leave out the amendments offered by your colleague on yesterday, but take your city, for instance. Your city thinks it should have 500 more feet, or 200 more feet, or the width of the airway should be such and such; no matter how minor that grievance may be, you would have the office of the Secretary cluttered up with all that. I do not think the gentleman means anything like that. I do not think the gentleman has any idea of offering an amendment like that. But we stand here now as members of the Committee voting on this amendment, and we will have to vote upon it on the basis of what is in the present bill, including the amendments offered and accepted yesterday. The States, then, are the exclusive sponsors of the programs. That is what it really means.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to the gentleman, what difference does it make whether it is first transmitted to the State and then transmitted down here, the grievance may be exactly the same.

Mr. BULWINKLE. All right. Let me ask the gentleman this question: What does the gentleman mean by "aggrieved" in legal language? "Where such sponsor is aggrieved." It can mean anything from having his feelings hurt, on up. That is the reason I am calling it to the gentleman's attention.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Manifestly, a grievance cannot be anything more than the requirements recited in this very bill. That would include all of section (b) on page 10 and it would include all of section 10.

Mr. BULWINKLE. You do not state that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely. How could there be a grievance other than the withholding of consent on the basis of what is to be required?

Mr. BULWINKLE. There could be many grievances.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is the same language that is used almost invariably in every appeal section that the Congress has ever written into law.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That may be so, but I tell the gentleman he is absolutely wrong.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. In view of the Howell amendment, where the State is the sponsor, if a village is aggrieved, the State alone under this amendment could appeal, could it not?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes; it could.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. So that would simplify that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. But you do not know what "grievance" is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I hesitate to go along with this amendment, but my hesitancy rests on somewhat different grounds than those expressed by my distinguished colleague on the committee who has just spoken. The thought has been on the part of the committee generally that the agency administering civil aeronautics, and likewise this airport program, should be kept, insofar as possible, on a nonpolitical, quasi-judicial basis. With that in mind originally, we set up an independent Civil Aeronautics Commission. Many members of the committee feel that in order to maintain that independent position the Commission should be reestablished as an independent agency. Even if that should not be done, the Administrator is the authority best equipped to make the final decision. He is the one most familiar with the subject; he concerns himself solely with the administration of this act and has a staff of experts to advise him; and I am inclined to think that he is in a better position to exercise final authority on these matters than some other official whose major duties lie in another field. For this reason I myself feel that the amendment should not prevail.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. LEA. One phase of this, of course, is that the Administrator at the present time is under the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary is the head over the Administrator. It is somewhat unusual to grant an appeal from a subordinate to the head man. That right exists as a matter of law, but is it not also true that the committee has a bill now pending, which it probably will report out, which will give the Civil Aeronautics Board control over the administration in making these decisions?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Yes; that is true, and I feel it would be best to let this provision stand as written in the bill at the present time until this question has been decided by the committee. I understand the committee expects to take it up and pass upon it at a very early date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I know of no Member for whom I have a higher personal admiration than the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He is able and he is very keen in debate. When he offers an amendment I attempt to listen carefully and follow, if I can, the logic of his presentation. What he attempts to do today, however, is absolutely not in accordance with what is necessary if we are to develop a proper airport program for the United States of America.

We have set up over a period of approximately 28 to 30 years, in this Nation, a system of federally planned highways. Although those roads are not actually controlled by the United States Public Roads Administration but are constructed through the State agencies, the decisions are made upon the pattern of those roads, in the last analysis, by the Administrator of the Public Roads Administration. We believed in establishing a pattern that the organization within the Federal structure which had the experts and the knowledge to deal with proper highway planning. We therefore go to the properly designated authority for that advice and counsel which are needed. Now we begin to plan in another field of transportation, by the use of aircraft, not aircraft for pleasure travel alone but planes which will be fitted into the economy of the Nation, into our business interests, with the backlog always of use for national-defense purposes. Where should we go? To those who have no knowledge of the proper procedure which must be laid down? If you pass the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois that is exactly what you will like to do when controversy arises.

Under the proposed legislation, as presented from the committee, we go to the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration who has determined with his experts and with the individuals who by research and knowledge know what should be done. In this way you will get that help and counsel which are absolutely vital if we are to get away from hodgepodge, hit and miss, and hop, skip, and jump programs on which our airports will be badly planned and executed.

If we are to embark—and I believe we will do so—on this Nation-wide airport construction, let us realize it is sound judgment and common sense that we do so with an authority that has knowledge which we need for an airport development as we have been doing for years with the highway program; that is, to place responsibility where it belongs. In connection with highway construction, such responsibility is placed with the United States Public Roads Administration. Here it should properly be placed with the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the Committee will not support the amendment here offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL SHARE OF PROJECT COSTS

SEC. 9. The share of the United States on account of any approved project under this title shall be such portion of the allowable project cost thereof (not to exceed 50 percent) as the Administrator may deem appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this title, except that in the case of any approved project in the Territory of Alaska the share of the United States may be not to exceed 75 percent of the allowable project costs.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCK: Page 11, line 21, after the word "exceed", strike out "50" and insert "25."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any State, or even of any political subdivision thereof, that is not in better financial condition than the Federal Government. Therefore I see only two important reasons for the expenditure of Federal money for airport construction. Those reasons are, first, coordination from the standpoint of national planning and, second, standardized adequacy of the airports built.

Those reasons would be served equally by a 25-percent Federal contribution.

We hear a great deal on this floor about the need for economy in Federal spending. Now is a good time to make a start.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. Chairman, I dislike opposing any amendment offered by my distinguished friend from New York, and I would not do so were it not for the fact that he may be under some slight misapprehension concerning the provisions of the bill.

The bill provides, of course, that the Federal Government shall not participate in the purchase of land or the construction of hangars. As a matter of fact, the bill is confined in its terms to improvements other than those things, such as runways, lighting, drainage, administration buildings, and items of that character.

From the studies that the committee has made and from what I have learned, in all probability at the present time under the terms of the bill as drafted by the committee on the average over the United States the contribution by the Federal Government would not exceed 25 percent of the total costs of airports. I say that when you include in the total the cost of the acquisition of land, the construction of hangars and other buildings which are not included under the provisions of this bill. Therefore I believe that the desire of the gentleman from New York has already been accomplished under the terms of the bill, and I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA. Would not the effect of this amendment be to reduce the appropriation by 50 percent?

Mr. HINSHAW. It would only reduce the appropriation to an individual airport project.

Mr. LEA. That is true, but the money actually available would only be 50 percent of what it is under the terms of this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not read it that way.

Mr. LEA. I am not speaking about what is actually spent, but the money that is available for spending. If you reduce the Federal appropriation from 50 percent to 25 percent, that splits it in half and would, in effect, reduce the money available from $650,000,000 to $325,000,000. when the House yesterday refused to reduce it to $500,000,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not read the amendment that way. I am sorry to disagree with the gentleman. Authorization is made in another paragraph, and this merely provides the proportion of Federal contribution to an individual project. I do not think it affects the total amount.

Mr. LEA. I am speaking about the money available. The money available is 50 percent. Here it is reduced to 25 percent.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; but then you could probably double the amount of projects with half the amount of contribution to each.

Mr. LEA. That might be so, but that would entirely disrupt the plan advanced in this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the objective of the gentleman from New York has already been accomplished by the committee in the drafting of the bill, and I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYLE: After the period on line 25, page 11, add "The limitation of this section shall not apply to municipalities within the continental limits of the United States sponsoring class 1 and 2 airports as defined by Civil Aeronautics Administration."

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment as complementary to the splendid work of the committee on this most important legislation, for I am sure that the objective of the proposed program as outlined in the report of the committee expresses the sincere desire of this Congress, that is, an integrated, Nation-wide system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics in the United States and its Territories and possessions.

As expressed by the committee, this airport system is to include not only the large terminal airports to accommodate air transportation of a commercial nature, but also the many smaller airports needed for private flying.

The goal of this legislation is the construction of more than 3,000 new airports. Information furnished by the Department of Commerce reveals that towns of less than 25,000 population show the greatest lack of airport facilities, and that less than a third of the towns of from 1 to 25,000 population have any airports at all.

Consequently, a national system of airways and airport facilities contemplates that approximately 2,860 of the 3,000 airports to be built will be in the category of class 1 and 2, and that only one-hundred-and-forty-odd will be of class 3, 4, and 5.

If we are to justify this program at this time it must be upon the proposition that it will materially contribute to the general welfare of this country, its people, and industry, and we must give life and meaning to the objectives of the program. To do so I sincerely believe it is necessary to adopt this amendment.

I have personally convinced myself after considerable study of the proposed projects in my district, which amount to more than $10,000,000, that the program as outlined in this legislation cannot possibly accomplish its objective. I will be surprised if more than $1,000,000 of the proposed $10,000,000 is utilized for the very simple and basic reason that the average municipality of less than 25,000 people—and I believe that those in my district are average—cannot contribute the 50 percent necessary to take advantage of the Government's offer.

I would cite for a practical example one of my counties having a population of 20,565, an area in square miles of 1,814, tax valuations of $26,000,000, bonded indebtedness of $14 per $100 valuation, income of $9,000,000 a year, and bank deposits of $1,218,000.

Under the proposed plan there are to be three airports built in that county totaling $2,737,405, or a cost to the citizens of $1,368,703.

I am sure that it does not take us long to realize that it would be impossible for the local municipalities to sponsor these projects, no matter how vital they might be to the national airport system, for you can easily see that if they drew every dime out of all the banks they would still have to add approximately $150,000 to it to carry out their share of the program.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. In listening to the amendment read, as I understand if the amendment is adopted there would be no limitation whatsoever on Federal funds for class 1 and 2 airports.

Mr. LYLE. That is exactly right. If you are to give life and meaning to this legislation you simply cannot develop airports on the ability of municipalities to contribute their share. A Federal airport system will have to depend upon the strategic location of the project.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman's amendment would mean that under the provisions of the bill the Administrator could pay 100 percent of all projects on class 1 and class 2 airports.

Mr. LYLE. That is correct.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That does not include the acquisition of land, does it?

Mr. LYLE. That is correct. You have taken care of that in your bill. What I am endeavoring to show is this: If you

mean what you say, if you want to develop airports throughout America, if you are to justify an authorization of $650,000,000, then you must amend this legislation. The bill as written will not help one of the little cities in my district, which I believe to be typical of thousands. It will help Houston and Dallas, Chicago and Los Angeles, and other great cities in America. But as I understand the objective, you want to develop a system of airports, both large and small, and not simply to help the great terminal airports.

There are more than 23 projects proposed for my 19 counties, and I am certain that no more than 1 or 2 of them could possibly materialize under this proposed legislation, which means that the program would be only one-twentieth carried out.

Under the proposed amendment the Administrator would have the privilege of recommending more than 50-percent participation by the Federal Government in those localities where he felt it necessary to develop airport facilities in the interest of the national program, and although I am convinced that he would not find it necessary to build all the airports proposed in either my district or yours, this amendment would give meaning and life and possibility to this legislation and the objectives that justify its consideration.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is undoubtedly true that the more free money you would give by the Federal Government the more airports you would have. But this bill is not framed on that philosophy. The policy here is encouragement by cooperation—sharing the burden. It is a proper thing that the local communities should contribute, because in the course of years they will be greatly benefited. In my judgment, it would be very unwise to discriminate in policy as between these different classes of airports. They should be helped by the Federal Government in proportion to their need, and they should all contribute their legitimate part. I think in the main these communities that really need airports will be willing to contribute their 50 percent; but as proposed here the Federal contribution is generous.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I listened to my friend and I have a high admiration for him. We must not forget that of the 3,050 airports to be constructed under the airport plan, if this legislation is passed, some 2,900 are in the category where the individual project expenditure would be $150,000 to $200,000. They do not go into the million-dollar classes.

Mr. LYLE. That is right.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Here are the facilities that will be used by the charter and the feeder services plus private flying, which will spread the benefits of aviation. I think we cannot overlook the fact that the great majority of these 3,050 airports fall in the smaller categories. It will be in some instances similar to farm-to-market roads, secondary highways that reach into the heart of our Nation.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. In my judgment, and after examining the finances of my district, and I believe it is typical, you will not build 100 out of the 2,900 airports under this bill. If you want it to have life and effectiveness, you will have to be able to contribute whatever is necessary to build the airport wherever it falls within the plan of your Federal system.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. In the event a city should not be in a position to bear its full share of the cost, there is nothing in the bill to prohibit the State from cooperating with the city. There is nothing in the bill to prohibit the State from coming to the aid of the city and joining it and putting up its share of the total cost of the airport.

Mr. LEA. That is true. The bill contemplates cooperation. In many instances, I have no doubt, it will occur.

Every new airport tends to increase the value of other airports. It adds one more to the places to go by air. It opens up one more community as a tributary to the air world.

We must not forget these airports within this plan are not going to be built at once. The program covers 10 years. We will see a progressive growth and demand for airports. The area that can build only a few today can establish more for tomorrow. We are trying to meet the need of 10 years, and not merely the need of today or tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: On line 25, page 11, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, the share of the United States shall be increased by a percentage of the project cost equal to one-half the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of its total area."

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on this legislation. Many Members have expressed their deep concern with the tremendous appropriation authorized in this bill. The time has come when the people of America expect the Congress to curtail expenditures and to make a determined effort to balance the Budget. On the other hand, it seems to me that we are on the threshold of a tremendous expansion in air transportation. After the last war the automobile came into its own in a big way. In the postwar we can reasonably expect that the aeroplane will become a major factor in the transportation field of America. When the Federal highway system was initiated, large Federal grants were necessary in order to provide an integrated highway system. Very little was returned to the Treasury because of those expenditures for a period of 10 or 12 years after the program got under way. Today the Federal Government has a tremendous investment in the highways of this country, and today more money is paid into the Federal Treasury by motorists in the form of special taxes, including the gasoline tax, than is paid out for improvement of highways.

This legislation contemplates a 10-year program for the construction of airports in thousands of communities over the country. It seems to me that Congress should take steps to insure that this money be spent in self-liquidating projects through an equitable system of taxation on the users of the services provided under this bill. I am advised that the Federal revenue from the gasoline tax, as applied to aviation gasoline, from 1932 to date, was over $11,000,000. Before long that amount should be realized each year from aviation gasoline tax alone.

In this country we had 30,000 aircraft registered at the end of the war and it is reliably estimated that over 400,000 aircraft will be registered in 10 years. A reasonable tax on registration would yield a great deal of money. It is estimated that within 5 years we will have 1,000,000 certificated pilots in this country. An annual license placed on pilots and on airplane mechanics would produce a tremendous revenue for the Federal Treasury. I am told that each pilot on the average will use 420 gallons of gasoline per year, and so we can reasonably expect that in addition to the regular air line, that 420,000,000 gallons of gasoline will be used annually within a period of 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that an equitable system of taxes must be worked out so that over a period of 10 years the income in taxes from this industry will be sufficient, even when divided between the Federal Government and the States, to make these projects self-liquidating. I think that a national aviation tax bill could be enacted which would bring to the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities sufficient funds to make the national airport projects self-liquidating. Taxes could be levied on the following items which would in no way cripple the industry: Aviation gasoline and lubricants, aircraft licenses, pilots' licenses, mechanics' licenses, tax on sale of aircraft, and transportation tax.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we must look at this legislation in a realistic

way. To my way of thinking, most of the small communities in the West where class 1 and 2 airports should be built will be unable to comply with the matching provisions of this bill. It has been stated on the floor that this bill provides for an equal contribution by the Federal Government and the local authority. Now the fact of the matter is that the State or municipalities must acquire the land for the airport and build the hangar at their own expense and, in addition, they must match, on an equal basis, the contribution of the Federal Government for the remaining cost of the installation. I doubt if many of the small communities of the West are financially able to comply with such an arrangement. It has been repeatedly said here that this legislation follows the pattern of the Federal highway system. Now the Federal Government owns outright 51 percent of the total area of Wyoming. Obviously, our State is at a disadvantage in raising funds to match the funds provided under this bill. In passing, I might state that in the 55 years of our statehood there has been paid into the Federal Treasury over $125,000,000 from the public lands of our State. Most of this income is from oil produced on lands belonging to the United States within the confines of our State. Now, Mr. Chairman, when the Federal highway system was inaugurated, Congress in its wisdom took into consideration that a peculiar situation is presented in the public-land States of the West and you will find in that law the exact provisions of the amendment which I am offering here today. The only effect of this amendment would be that the contribution from the Federal Government in my State would be a trifle over 64 percent as against a State or municipal contribution of slightly more than 35 percent. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the formula adopted under the highway system is wholly equitable and that in all fairness my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. LEA. One consideration which I think rather militates against the conclusion which the gentleman has expressed is that there may be some injustice to these public-land States by not giving additional credit on account of the public land. I think an examination of the facts will not verify that, however, because most of these public lands are large in area and they get a much larger proportion of their funds due to that large area than other States of the Union. My own State of California is in the same situation. We have a great public land area, but I do not believe we deserve anything more on account of it.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. But Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the fact that the precise question that I am raising does not concern the amount of money allocated to Wyoming under this bill but rather to the fact that the State of Wyoming or the small towns of Wyoming will be unable to match the funds available under this bill, by reason of the fact that such a large portion of the area of our State belongs to the United States. As I have pointed out the United States owns, outright, more than one-half the area of Wyoming. Also, I might call attention to the fact that the United States owns the minerals under an additional 30 percent of the area of Wyoming on lands in which the people of my State own only the surface. Consequently, the State of Wyoming can spread a tax only over one-half of the area of Wyoming, and our ability to raise funds to match the money appropriated under this bill is restricted to that extent. Of course, the chairman of this committee knows that the same situation prevails among all the public-land States of the West. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that, inasmuch as the formula which Congress provided for the Federal highway system has worked quite satisfactorily, your committee could well have written into this bill the provision incorporated in my amendment, which is the same provision as contained in the Federal highway legislation. I might also say that when this legislation was before the other body that this amendment was passed without opposition.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman will find that public land States are very well represented on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the provisions of the bill are indeed quite fair. For example, we permit the use of Government-owned lands in airports, not only when constructed by municipalities, but likewise if they may be constructed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HINSHAW. Certainly.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Is there any good reason why the same pattern and the same formula that was adopted on the Federal highway system should not apply here?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. There are very good reasons why it should not apply. In the first place, we are not traversing a State by a line. We are building spot airports. If we were going to traverse a State by roads, then of course such a provision would be highly desirable.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I think the gentleman is entirely mistaken, because the basis upon which a different division was made in the public land States was because of the fact that the Federal Government owned such a large part of the area of those States. The other body wrote this provision into S. 2 and I trust that the conferees will agree to the provisions of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is a matter that has caused some concern among some of us. As to section 9, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill as to the intention of the committee in providing that the Administrator of CAA may participate up to 50 percent. That is as to any particular project. It does not require him to participate 50 percent, and as I read it, leaves this decision subject to unbridled discretion of the Administrator. In a project in your city he could allow the full 50 percent and on another project of the same kind in my city he could allow 10 percent or 5 percent or 2 percent. In other words, there is nothing in section 9, as I see it, which assures nondiscriminatory action with respect to allocation of Federal funds for airports. I am sure it is not the intention of the committee to allow any such situation to exist, but it appears to me there should be something said by the chairman of the committee which would have the effect of showing that that intention does not exist in this bill, and that there cannot in reality be discrimination between similar projects.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. Certainly.

Mr. LEA. Of course, it is the intention of this bill that the Administrator is not required to approve up to 50 percent in the case of any project. If that were true, it would no doubt lead to the rejection of some projects which might otherwise be approved for a smaller sum. It is very likely that some of the large airports of the country could not possibly receive a 50-percent contribution from the Federal Government because the expense is too great. One airport at New York cost $72,000,000. The Government could not possibly contribute half of that sum. So the Administrator must have some discretion, and I have no doubt that in these small projects, in practically every case, there will be no difficulty about getting approval for 50 percent, unless there is some unusual situation involved.

Mr. CRAVENS. In other words, we may be assured there will be no discrimination.

Mr. LEA. That is the intent, as manifested by the program that was formulated by the Commerce Department.

Mr. CRAVENS. We may take it, then, that on the ordinary average type of airport there will be no discrimination in the allocation of Federal funds between projects.

Mr. LEA. I am sure that is a safe assumption.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS] has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROJECT SPONSORSHIP

SEC. 10. As a condition precedent to his approval of a project under this title, the Administrator shall receive assurances in writing, satisfactory to him, that—

(1) the airport to which the project relates will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination;

(2) such airport and all facilities thereon or connected therewith will be suitably operated and maintained;

(3) the aerial approaches to such airport will be adequately cleared and protected by removing, lowering, relocating, marking, or lighting or otherwise mitigating existing airport hazards and by preventing the establishment or creation of future airport hazards;

(4) all the facilities of such airport developed with Federal aid and all those usable for the landing and take-off of aircraft will be available to the United States for use by Government aircraft at all times without charge other than (a) a charge sufficient to defray the cost of repairing damage done by such aircraft, and (b) if the use by military or naval aircraft shall be substantial, a charge which is reasonable in consideration of the character and extent of such use;

(5) the airport operator or owner will furnish to any civil agency of the Government, without charge, such space in airport buildings as may be reasonably adequate for use in connection with any air traffic control or weather reporting activities, and communications activities incidental thereto, which such agency may deem necessary to establish and maintain at the airport;

(6) all project accounts and records will be kept in accordance with a standard system of accounting prescribed by the Administrator, after consultation with appropriate public authorities;

(7) the airport operator or owner will submit to the Administrator such annual or special airport financial and operations reports as the Administrator may reasonably request; and

(8) the airport and all airport records will be available to the Administrator's inspectors upon request.

To insure compliance with this section, the Administrator shall prescribe such project sponsorship requirements, consistent with the terms of this title, as he may deem necessary. Among other steps to insure such compliance the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with public authorities, on behalf of the United States, and such contracts shall be enforceable by decrees for specific performance.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEA: Page 13, line 17, change the period after the word "request" to a semicolon and insert "and (9) during the period of any national emergency due to war or imminence of war, the United States shall have the right to the full and exclusive possession and control, for use by military and naval aircraft, when ordered by the President, of any or all airports, including all facilities thereof, developed and improved with Federal aid, at charges reduced in proportion to the Federal aid granted."

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment at the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. In effect the amendment provides that in case of war or great imminence of war the President can issue an order permitting the use of any or all these fields constructed by the aid of Federal funds, by the military and naval air forces.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may ask a question about it?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. What about the class 1, 2, and 3 airports that are not necessary for the Army and the Navy?

Mr. LEA. This amendment leaves discretion with the President as to which airports shall be taken. We must assume the President would have common sense enough to select only those needed.

Mr. BULWINKLE. This amendment as it is now drawn would take over and put all airports first in the hands of the President——

Mr. LEA. No; it provides that the President may take over any or all. Those words were put in there for the purpose of giving the President discretion as to the fields he should take over.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. In case of war or great national emergency is not authority given to the President anyway to do the things which this amendment contemplates should be done?

Mr. LEA. I have no doubt that in time of war or any great emergency special legislation would be enacted by the Congress. But this is what the Secretary of the Navy suggested, according to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and I agree with him that this provision would be properly in this bill. I do not think it provides for any transgression of civilian rights in giving this authority to be exercised in case of war.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. But we are writing it into permanent law.

Mr. LEA. That is true.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. That has not been done in the case of other facilities that might be required for war purposes.

Mr. LEA. Yes; there are a number of other provisions that give similar authority to other activities; for instance, transportation.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. But uniformly we have adopted a policy of delegating that authority when the emergency rose. I hesitate very much to not accept the gentleman's view on this because I know how sincere he is in reference to these matters.

Mr. LEA. In the case of great imminence of war there might be need of action before there was time for legislation. The President should have authority to act promptly. Certainly, the Congress would not hesitate if it had the time to do so.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. But it is an extension of authority which always rests in the executive where he would become the one to determine whether the emergency is of such character as to enable him to seize an airport and this, it would seem to me, would more or less create an uncertainty about an airport which might jeopardize the financing of it or its management, because tremendous sums will be invested in these airports.

Mr. LEA. They are to be paid a reasonable sum for use by the Government; so it seems to me there is no practical danger such as the gentleman anticipates. These airports have a military value to the country. An amendment like this would be a fitting recognition of the great contribution our Government is making to this program.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant always to oppose the chairman of my committee, but I would like to relate an experience to the House of a special committee some years ago. That committee was known as the Air Accident Investigating Committee. As war became stark reality for the United States, that committee, of which I had the honor to be a member, saw that the need for transportation service by air in the War and Navy Departments was going to be great. We likewise discovered that the War and Navy Departments at that time had the full intention of taking over the air lines of the United States and placing the pilots, all of the mechanics, and so forth, under the military services. They could do that under the terms of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which provided that the air lines of the United States were, in effect, an auxiliary in the event of war.

This committee, of which I was a member, saw that if that were done, the military and naval services of the United States would lose a great opportunity for expansion by destroying the seed corn from which that expansion might grow. In the course of hearings held by our committee, and in meetings with air-line officials and with the War and Navy Departments, that plan was discouraged. Finally, the plan offered by the committee was accepted by the War and Navy Departments, namely, that the air lines be used as the seed corn for the training of new pilots, new crewmen, new mechanics, and so forth, for the war effort. The net result has been the natural expansion of the Navy Air Transport Corps and the Army Air Transport Corps into the fine organizations that they are. Mr. Chairman, I would hate to see this amendment adopted at this time because if it is adopted under the conditions in which it is placed before the committee, it would be possible for both the War and Navy Departments, if they wanted to, to take over every Federal-aid airport in the United States and completely shut down air transportation.

I hope that the amendment will not be agreed to and that we will await the time when the necessity arises to discuss the situation further.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that amendments be in order to the sections as announced consecutively by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

GRANT AGREEMENT

SEC. 11. Upon approving a project the Administrator, on behalf of the United States, shall transmit to the public airport agency

or public airport agencies which submitted the project application an offer to pay the United States' share of the allowable project costs of such project. Any such offer shall be made upon such terms, and subject to such conditions, as the Administrator may deem necessary to meet the requirements of this title and the regulations prescribed thereunder. Each such offer shall state a definite amount as the maximum obligation of the United States under this title, which amount shall not be increased thereafter, and shall stipulate the obligations to be assumed by the sponsor or sponsors of the project. If and when any such offer is accepted in writing by the public airport agency or public airport agencies to which it is made, such offer and acceptance shall comprise a grant agreement constituting an obligation of the United States. Unless and until such a grant agreement has been executed with respect to a project, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of the project costs which have been or may be incurred in carrying out that project.

ALLOWABLE PROJECT COSTS

SEC. 12. Except as provided in section 13, the United States shall not pay, or be obligated to pay, from amounts appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title, any portion of a project cost incurred in carrying out a project unless the Administrator has first determined that such cost is allowable. A project cost shall be allowable if—

(1) it was a necessary cost incurred in accomplishing airport development in conformity with approved plans and specifications for an approved project and with the terms and conditions of the grant agreement entered into in connection with such project;

(2) it was incurred in connection with the airport development accomplished subsequent to the execution of the grant agreement with respect to the project: *Provided, however,* That the allowable costs of a project may include any necessary costs of formulating the project (including those of field surveys and the preparation of plans and specifications, and including any necessary administrative or other incidental costs incurred by the sponsor specifically in connection with the accomplishment of the project, which would not have been incurred otherwise) which were incurred prior to the execution of the grant agreement for such project and subsequent to the enactment of this title; and

(3) it is reasonable in amount, in the opinion of the Administrator: *Provided,* That if the Administrator determines that a project cost is unreasonable in amount, he shall allow, as an allowable project cost under this section, only such amount of such project cost as he determines to be reasonable and no project costs in excess of the definite amount stated in the grant agreement shall be allowable.

The Administrator is authorized to prescribe such regulations including regulations with respect to the auditing of project costs, as he may deem necessary to effectuate the purposes of this section.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 13. The Administrator, after consultation with the public airport agency or public airport agencies with which a grant agreement has been entered into, shall determine at what times, and in what amounts, payments shall be made under this title. The aggregate of such payments at any time with respect to a particular project shall not exceed 50 percent of the project costs of the airport development which has been performed up to that time and which the public airport agency or public airport agencies to which the payments are to be made certify to have been performed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications for such project; and if the Administrator shall determine at any time that the aggregate of such payments exceeds the United States share of the allowable project costs of such project the United States shall be entitled to recover such excess. Such payments shall be made to such official or officials or depository authorized by law to receive public funds, as may be designated by the public airport agency or public airport agencies entitled to such payments.

PERFORMANCE OF CONSTRUCTION WORK

SEC. 14. The construction work on any approved project shall be subject to inspection and approval by the Administrator and in accordance with regulations prescribed by him. Such regulations shall require such cost and progress reporting by the public airport agency or public airport agencies with which a grant agreement has been entered into with respect to such project as the Administrator shall deem necessary. No such regulation shall have the effect of altering any contract in connection with any project entered into without actual notice of the regulation.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR PROJECT SPONSORS

SEC. 15. Whenever it is the opinion of the Administrator that any real property or interest therein, or easement through or other interest in air space, necessary in connection with a project, cannot be acquired by the project sponsor without undue expense or delay, the Administrator may, at the request of such sponsor, institute a proceeding for the condemnation of such property or interest. Any such acquisition by condemnation may be made in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to expedite the construction of public buildings and works outside of the District of Columbia by enabling possession and title of sites to be taken in advance of final judgment in proceedings for the acquisition thereof under the power of eminent domain," approved February 26, 1931 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 40, secs. 258a to 258e, inclusive). The entire cost of any acquisition under this section shall be borne by the sponsor; and the sponsor shall make available to the Administrator, at such time or times as they may be needed, the funds necessary for meeting such cost. When so acquired by the United States, such property or interest therein, or easement through or other interest in air space, shall be conveyed to the sponsor.

USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS

Requests for use

SEC. 16. (a) Whenever the Administrator determines that use of any lands owned or controlled by the United States is reasonably necessary for carrying out a project under this title, or for the operation of any public airport, he shall file with the head of the department or agency having control of such lands a request that such property interest therein as he may deem necessary be conveyed to the public authority sponsoring the project in question or owning or controlling the airport. Such property interest may consist of the title to or any other interest in property, including any easement through or other interest in air space.

Making of conveyances

(b) Upon receipt of a request from the Administrator under this section, the head of the department or agency having control of the lands in question shall determine whether the requested conveyance is inconsistent with the needs of the department or agency, and shall notify the Administrator of his determination within a period of 4 months after receipt of the Administrator's request. If such department or agency head determines that the requested conveyance is not inconsistent with the needs of that department or agency, such department or agency head is hereby authorized and directed, with the approval of the President and the Attorney General of the United States, and without any expense to the United States, to perform any acts and to execute any instruments necessary to make the conveyance requested; but each such conveyance shall be made on the condition that the property interest conveyed shall automatically revert to the United States in the event that the lands in question are not developed, or cease to be used, for airport purposes.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 17. On or before the 3d day of January of each year the Administrator shall make a report to the Congress describing his operations under this title during the preceding fiscal year, including detailed statements of the airport development accomplished, the status of each project undertaken, the allocation of appropriations, and itemized statement of expenditures and receipts, and setting forth his recommendations, if any, for legislation amending or supplementing this title.

FALSE STATEMENTS

SEC. 18. Any officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or any officer, agent, or employee of any public authority, or any person association, firm, or corporation who shall knowingly make any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof, in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or estimates of project costs for any project submitted to the Administrator for approval under this title or shall knowingly make any false statement, false representation, or false report or claim for work or materials for any project approved by the Administrator under this title, or shall knowingly make any false statement or false representation in any report required to be made under this title, with the intent to defraud the United States shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not to exceed 5 years or by a fine of not to exceed $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

EXISTING AIRPORT PROGRAMS

SEC. 19. Nothing in this title shall affect the carrying out of the program for the development of public landing areas necessary for national defense, authorized by the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1946, or the program for the development of civil landing areas, authorized by the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, which programs shall be additional to the Federal-aid airport program authorized by this title.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAW RELATING TO AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

AMENDMENTS TO CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO AIRPORTS AND LANDING AREAS

SEC. 201. (a) The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words "landing area" and the words "landing areas" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof the word "airport" or "airports", as the case may be.

(b) Section 1 (8) of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(8) 'Airport' means any area of land or water which is used, or intended for use, for the landing and take-off of aircraft, and any appurtenant areas which are used, or intended for use, for airport buildings or other airport facilities or rights-of-way, together

with all airport buildings and facilities located thereon."

(c) Section 1 (22) of such act, defining the term "landing area", is hereby repealed, and the succeeding paragraphs are hereby redesignated as paragraphs (22) to (30), respectively.

AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 302 OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

SEC. 202. (a) Section 302 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"General

"SEC. 302. (a) The Administrator is authorized to designate and establish such civil airways as may be required in the public interest. The Administrator is authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress, (1) to acquire, establish, and improve air-navigation facilities wherever necessary; (2) to operate and maintain such air-navigation facilities; (3) to arrange for publication of aeronautical maps and charts necessary for the safe and efficient movement of aircraft in air navigation, utilizing the facilities and assistance of existing agencies of the Government as far as practicable; and (4) to provide necessary facilities and personnel for the regulation and protection of air traffic: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall authorize the acquisition of an existing airport by purchase or condemnation. In the exercise of his powers under this subsection the Administrator shall provide such airways and air-navigation facilities as may be necessary for the operations of air carriers under certificates issued pursuant to section 401 of this act."

(b) Section 302 (c) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Acquisition and disposal of property

"(c) The Administrator, on behalf of the United States, is authorized, where appropriate to carry out this section, (1) to accept any conditional or unconditional gift or donation of money or other property, real or personal, or of services; (2) within the limits of appropriations made available by the Congress for expenditure by the Administrator for such purposes, to acquire by purchase, condemnation, lease, or otherwise, real property or interests therein, including easements through or other interests in air space; and (3) to dispose of any real or personal property or interest therein, for adequate compensation, by sale, lease, or otherwise. Any such acquisition by condemnation may be made in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to expedite the construction of public buildings and works outside of the District of Columbia by enabling possession and title of sites to be taken in advance of final judgment in proceedings for the acquisition thereof under the power of eminent domain,' approved February 26, 1931 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 40, secs. 258a to 258e, inclusive)."

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 303, AND ADDITION OF NEW SECTION 304, OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Amendment of section 303

SEC. 203. (a) Section 303 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"FUNDS EXPENDED UNDER OTHER AUTHORITY

"SEC. 303. No Federal funds, other than those expended by the Administrator, and those expended for military purposes, shall be expended for the acquisition, establishment, construction, development, improvement, installation, alteration, repair, maintenance, or operation of any airport or other air navigation facility, airport building, or other facility on or in connection with an airport, except upon written certification by the Administrator that such project is reasonably necessary in the interest of civil aeronautics or national defense and that the resulting facilities will be reasonably safe and adequate for present and prospective aeronautical use. In each case it shall be the responsibility of the expending agency to apply to the Administrator for the certification required by this section, in accordance with such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe. The Administrator shall include in any such certification such terms and conditions as he deems necessary in order to insure that the facilities covered by such certification will be reasonably safe and adequate for present and prospective aeronautical use; and any such certification may be withdrawn by the Administrator at any time if he finds that any such term or condition is not being complied with."

New section 304

(b) Title III of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding after section 303 thereof a new section as follows, and by renumbering sections 304, 305, 306, and 307 as sections 305, 306, 307, and 308, respectively:

"PROTECTION OF PUBLIC USE

"Conditions in connection with expenditure of Federal funds

"SEC. 304. (a) In case of the expenditure of Federal funds for, on, or in connection with airports under section 302, or in accordance with a certification under section 303, of this act the Administrator shall, to the extent feasible, require such conditions as will result in (1) public use of such airport on fair and reasonable terms; (2) suitable operation and maintenance of such airport and facilities thereon or connected therewith; (3) the clearing and protection of the aerial approaches to such airport by removing, lowering, marking, lighting, or otherwise mitigating existing obstructions and other hazards to air navigation, and by preventing the establishment or creation of, or otherwise mitigating, future obstructions or other hazards to air navigation. Among other steps to assure compliance with such conditions, the Administrator is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to enter into contracts, including contracts with municipalities and other bodies politic, to assure performance of or compliance with such conditions; and such contracts shall be enforceable by decrees for specific performance.

"Restrictions on granting of exclusive rights

"(b) No exclusive right shall be granted for the use of any civil airway designated or established under section 302. No exclusive right for the use of any airport or other air navigation facility upon or in connection with which Federal funds have been expended shall be granted to, or exercised by, any person other than the Government of the United States."

AMENDMENT TO THE SECTION OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938 RENUMBERED AS SECTION 305

SEC. 204. The section of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, hereinbefore renumbered as section 305, is hereby amended by striking out "Secretary of Agriculture" and inserting in lieu thereof "Chief of the Weather Bureau" and by striking out "air commerce" and inserting in lieu thereof "air navigation."

AMENDMENT TO TITLE 8 OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

SEC. 205. Title 8 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after section 803 thereof, the following new section:

"COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

"SEC. 804. In order to promote safety and efficiency in air navigation to the highest possible degree, the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, in addition to any other functions or duties pertaining to surveying and charting for other purposes shall—

"(1) Compile, publish, and maintain such charts, maps, and related data as may be necessary for air navigation;

"(2) Maintain an adequate system for the sale and distribution of aeronautical charts, maps, and related publications which will insure airmen of ready access to current data;

"(3) Conduct research in aeronautical charting and related surveying and mapping activities in collaboration with the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics; and

"(4) Establish and coordinate international exchange of aeronautical charting information."

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 5 (D) OF AIR COMMERCE ACT OF 1926

SEC. 206. Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) The head of any Government department or independent establishment having jurisdiction over any airport or emergency landing field owned or operated by the United States may provide for the sale of fuel, oil, equipment, and supplies, and the furnishing of mechanical service, temporary shelter, and other assistance for aircraft under such regulations as the head of the department or establishment may prescribe. All such articles shall be sold and such assistance furnished at the fair market value prevailing locally as ascertained by the head of such department or establishment. No such services, accommodations, or assistance shall be provided or furnished at any such airport or emergency landing field located outside the continental United States or in any Territory or possession of the United States if comparable services, accommodations, or assistance are readily available from any other source, and such services, accommodations, and assistance shall be provided or furnished at any other airport or emergency landing field owned or operated by the United States only if such action is, by reason of an emergency, reasonably necessary to the continuance of an aircraft on its course. All amounts received under this section shall be covered into the Treasury; but that part of such amounts which, in the judgment of the head of the department or establishment, is equivalent to the cost of the fuel, oil, equipment, supplies, services, shelter, or other assistance sold or furnished shall be credited to the appropriation from which such cost was paid, and the balance, if any, shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts. Nothing in this section shall limit any power or authority which the Administrator has under existing law with respect to the Washington National Airport."

AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIR-NAVIGATION FACILITIES

SEC. 207. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, appropriations for air-navigation facilities (except those made pursuant to the Federal Aid Airport Act), made specifically for the service of any fiscal year, shall be available for expenditure during that fiscal year and the following fiscal year, and amounts thereof remaining unexpended at the expiration of the second such fiscal year shall be applied only to the payment of expenses properly incurred, or the fulfillment of contracts properly made, prior to the expiration of such second fiscal year; but unexpended balances of any such appropriation which have remained on the books of the

Treasury for three fiscal years shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 11?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3615 provides $15,000,000 for the development of airports in the Territory of Hawaii on the same basis of Federal assistance as is provided for the States. I believe the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has acted wisely in incorporating this provision in the measure. The bill as originally presented, and the bill passed for this purpose by the Senate, applies only to the States and contains no provision for the participation in this program of the Territories and possessions on the theory that these areas should be dealt with independently. So far as the Territory of Hawaii is concerned, I believe that, to proceed on this basis, would be unwise. The Territory of Hawaii is fully qualified in every respect to participate in legislation of this kind on the same basis as a State. This has been very amply demonstrated during the period of the past 20 years.

The Territory of Hawaii pays the same taxes as a State. It carries the same financial responsibilities as a State, excepting only that the salaries of the executive and judicial officials are paid by the Federal Government in as far as they are chosen by the Federal Government. The amount involved in these salaries is infinitesimal compared with the total expenditures of the Territorial government.

Hawaii is qualified to participate in legislation providing Federal aid on the same basis as the States both with respect to the financial benefits to be derived and burdens to be assumed.

On page A4681 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appears the record of taxes paid the Federal Government by the States and Territories during the fiscal year of 1945. It shows the total paid by Hawaii was in excess of that paid by 14 States. The amount paid by the people of this Territory on a per capita basis is greater than that paid by the citizens of 39 States. This record shows the capacity of the Territory to assume the financial responsibilities of this legislation is indisputable.

For more than 20 years, Hawaii has participated in legislation providing Federal aid for roads. These highways have been of great benefit in the development of the Territory both in respect to its economy and an adequate system of defense. The same consideration enters in an even more important way into the program for the development of airports in these islands.

There is no area in this country to which air transportation is of greater importance than it is to these islands. There are seven main islands in the Hawaiian Archipelago. They constitute a land area about equal to that of Connecticut and Rhode Island combined, but they are separated by such large expanses of water that the distance from the northernmost tip of the northernmost island to the southernmost tip of the southernmost island is 350 miles.

Long before the outbreak of war, the advantages of air travel among the islands were recognized by the people of the islands. The original development of civilian airports was undertaken by the Territory on its own responsibility. It has in operation a well-organized agency for this purpose. A local company has been operating an air line among the islands on regular schedule for a long period of time. Its record for efficient and safe operation is outstanding. Provision is made in the laws of the Territory that funds realized from the application of the Territorial gasoline tax to air lines be used exclusively for the development of airports. The work done to develop these fields for civilian purposes constituted a valuable preliminary to the great development that came with the outbreak of the war.

The continued development of the airports of the islands in the future is not only vital to this Territory, but of great importance to the Nation as a whole.

It should be self-evident, therefore, that the committee has acted with great wisdom in committing the Territory of Hawaii to participation in the program proposed in this bill.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. The gentleman has made a very able presentation of the requirements of his Territory. In recognition of the manner in which the gentleman has impressed upon his colleagues the importance of his case, the committee has acceded to his views and incorporated in the bill the authority to accomplish the purpose he has in mind. I think it is a great credit to the Territory of Hawaii that they should have in the Congress of the United States a Delegate who so ably represents their interests and the interests of the country.

Mr. FARRINGTON. May I say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I appreciate very deeply the consideration shown the Territory by this committee, and particularly the consideration shown me personally by the chairman of the committee, who granted the Governor of the Territory and me a hearing on this early this spring.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

Are there any amendments to Section 12?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Missouri: On page 15, line 20, after "project", strike out "and subsequent" and in line 21 strike out "to the enactment of this title."

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill and intend to support it. However, those towns and cities throughout the United States that have gone ahead with their airport programs are precluded by the present terms of this bill from participating in the matching of funds. The section dealing with the allowable project costs as set out in the bill at the present time reads as follows:

SEC. 12. Except as provided in section 13, the United States shall not pay, or be obligated to pay, from amounts appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title, any portion of a project cost incurred in carrying out a project unless the Administrator has first determined that such cost is allowable. A project cost shall be allowable if—

(1) it was a necessary cost incurred in accomplishing airport development in conformity with approved plans and specifications for an approved project and with the terms and conditions of the grant agreement entered into in connection with such project;

(2) it was incurred in connection with the airport development accomplished subsequent to the execution of the grant agreement with respect to the project: *Provided, however,* That the allowable costs of a project may include any necessary costs of formulating the project (including those of field surveys and the preparation of plans and specifications, and including any necessary administrative or other incidental costs incurred by the sponsor specifically in connection with the accomplishment of the project, which would not have been incurred otherwise) which were incurred prior to the execution of the grant agreement for such project—

The bill now reads—

and subsequent to the enactment of this title.

My amendment merely strikes out the words "and subsequent to the enactment of this title," and permits those enterprising cities, towns and villages that have gone ahead with their programs pursuant to recommendations of the CAA to participate in the matching of funds by the Federal Government. For instance, the city of Maryville, Nodaway County, Missouri, in my district, in keeping with the trend of the times and following the suggestions and advice of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, voted a $75,000 bond issue in 1944 for the construction of a class 2 airport. The contract was let for this airport in the fall of 1944, and its final grading was completed last spring. Much of the other necessary work has been done, but under this bill as now drawn Maryville cannot participate in the matching of Federal funds. I know there are many other cities throughout the United States in the same situation. I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment in effect is the same amendment which was offered yesterday by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] except that the amendment now offered is much broader than the amendment offered by either of those gentlemen. The amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA would have made this provision to indemnify municipalities effective as of June 1, 1944. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] offered an amendment then to move the date up to January 1, 1945. Let me emphasize this one point, I can appreciate the interest of the gentleman from Missouri and others who

have proposed that we enter into a program of paying these indemnities to cities that have the courage and vision and have been progressive enough to go on and build airports. We considered the matter in committee. We found it was utterly impossible in the opinion of the majority of the committee to reach an agreement as to when such a provision should be effective. If you put in a date of 1944, it still is inequitable in the view of many others who may have done this work before that time. After considering every possible angle, let me emphasize once more what the chairman said yesterday, "This bill looks to the future, not to the past." The committee felt it was impossible, impractical, and unworkable to attempt to write in a provision such as is proposed in the pending amendment.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman not agree with me that the Civil Aeronautics Administration led these various communities to believe they should go ahead with their project and that they would be taken in on the program should legislation be enacted?

Mr. PRIEST. I am not sure that that is true. I have no evidence at hand to that effect and there is nothing that was developed in the hearings to indicate that any agency of the Government led those people on to believing that if they should engage in airport construction they would later be helped. The gentleman may have information to that effect, but no such information came before the committee.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. May I point out to the gentleman that the Civil Aeronautics Administration selected these various locations in my district and classified them and set out the amount that they thought should be expended in developing them, which was, in effect, leading these people to believe that they were going to be taken in on the program of Federal aid. But under the present bill they are excluded entirely from the program.

Mr. PRIEST. I think the Civil Aeronautics Administration was simply carrying out a function of that Administration to advise on the location of airports and on airport needs and other matters relating to the building of airports. I cannot feel that any such advice and help given to a community was in any way indicative of the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to state to such community, "If you build this airport you will receive Federal aid." That is not their function. If they did so, they overstepped the bounds of their authority, because they had no such authority.

I feel that this amendment would be entirely unworkable, for the reasons stated yesterday in the discussion of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have asked the gentleman to yield not so much to speak to the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE], but to say to the membership, because we have been discussing the ability of the small community to pay, that I believe the spirit and foresightedness of the community of Maryville, Mo., which the able gentleman from Missouri represents, is a spirit in which other communities of this country will function. Maryville's population is between seven and eight thousand, or roughly that; yet they had a bond issue—not of the county, but of the municipality of Maryville—in the amount of $75,000, and it carried a ratio of 8 or 10 to 1.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. RANDOLPH. You did a good job, and I would like to see you get some credit. It was my privilege to visit your airport. The airport has been brought to a certain state of construction, and under this legislation Maryville will be able to further develop it, so that it will be used for the charter and feeder service, private flyers, and possibly by larger air-line operations feeding into the bigger cities. I understand the gentleman's plight. I appreciate what he has said. In my district Morgantown is a splendid example of community enterprise in airport endeavor. We need additional funds.

Mr. PRIEST. I am glad that the gentleman from West Virginia brought out the fact that it may aid in further development.

I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amondment in section 13.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 16, line 13, strike out the word "amount" and insert "amounts."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 14?

Are there any amendments to section 15?

Are there amendments to section 16?

Are there amendments to section 17?

Are there amendments to section 18?

Are there amendments to section 19?

Are there amendments to section 201?

Are there amendments to section 202?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to section 202, on page 22, line 23.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERIDAN: On page 22, line 23, after the word "in", insert the word "civil."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to section 203?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment to offer to section 15. When that section was read it escaped my hearing. I ask unanimous consent that we may return to section 15 for the purpose of offering my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REECE of Tennessee: Page 18, line 6, after the period at the end of line 5 add the following: "In the determination of the compensation to be paid in any condemnation proceeding under this section, there shall be included the value of the property and facilities affected and the cost of any changes in or relocation of such property and facilities."

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, section 15 and subsection (c) of section 302 of the bill here under discussion vests in the Civil Aeronautics Administrator a right of eminent domain, which departs from the policy that has existed up to now in the law of eminent domain.

The individual States have always been the supreme authority on property rights within their boundaries except for the few instances where the Federal Government has properly invaded that field, the most notable of which is the condemnation statute in the interest of the national defense.

The individual States have various rules for measuring the amount of damages to be paid in condemnation proceedings. The majority rule is the one I am suggesting be included in this bill.

It must be remembered that the several State rules fixing the measure of damages have been set up with due regard to the broadness of the condemnation right provided by State law.

Practically all States make it possible now for public authorities under certain conditions to exercise the right of eminent domain for the acquisition of property for public airports. I feel that the rights now existing in the several States in this matter are sufficient in themselves. A majority of the Senate felt that way in striking from the McCarran airport bill before its passage the entire condemnation section.

However, if the House desires to provide this new and additional right of eminent domain for the Civil Aeronautics Administrator—a power for a public taking for what may well develop under the terms of the bill to be a private use—then we should, in extending this additional power, spell out in the same law a fair, reasonable, and uniform rule covering the measure of damages in such cases.

The alternative to this amendment would be to drop the entire condemnation section 15 from the bill, leaving the measure of damages or compensation to be governed by the existing law on the subject in the various States.

I submitted a copy of this amendment yesterday to the chairman of the committee in the hope that he might accept the amendment, but I do not know that he would feel that he could in the absence of authority from the committee itself to do so. I believe, however, that it is a provision which should be adopted as a protection to this authority which heretofore has remained vested in the States.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe the gentleman should point out to the House in connection with this provision in the bill that the power of eminent domain can be exercised only upon the application of the sponsors. It is not applicable unless the sponsor agrees to indemnify and completely pay for all amounts of money that are awarded.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. This simply sets up the measure of damages. Furthermore, the sponsor may not be the one that is primarily concerned; the property owner is the one who will have the first interest in the matter.

Mr. HINSHAW. What I am pointing out is not in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, but merely the fact that the right of eminent domain can only be used if it is necessary to enable the sponsor to carry out the project.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. And instead of making a motion to strike out that provision, as was done in the other body, I have simply undertaken by this amendment to set up a guide which shall direct them in case such a condemnation proceeding is undertaken under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as stated by the gentleman from California, whether a sponsor be a town, a municipality, county, or State, it is the one that is going to pay this new rule of damages, not the Federal Government at all. The only reason this section is in here at all is because of the fact that in some of the States, and up until recently North Carolina was one of them, there was no law permitting either under the charter of the municipality or under the State law the right of condemnation for airports. To take care of situations like that which might arise, upon application of the sponsor, with the sponsor guaranteeing the paying of all of it, then the Federal condemnation may take place. The Federal Government pays not one cent on it and will not pay. It will be the sponsor. This rule of damages is entirely different from what is in any Federal procedure up to the present time, so far as I know. It may be a little farfetched to say it, but that is my opinion as far as the rule of damages in condemnation cases is concerned.

That is all this amendment amounts to. It was just to help out the States or the cities or the counties that did not have the right of condemnation.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. It was not my purpose to strike that provision from the bill. I have doubts whether it should be stricken from the bill. It was my thought that some guide should be set up for the payment of damages. It does not concern me who pays the damages. It is the Federal Government that exercises the authority, and whether the Federal Government or the local sponsor pays the damages, to me, is immaterial.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I do not want to put any additional burdens which are not in the law now upon any of your municipalities or upon any of your States.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the arguments for and against this amendment and I find myself unable to understand the exact force of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. As I understand it, the committee in writing this legislation in section 15 entitled "Acquisition of Property for Project Sponsors" has provided that where the sponsor, which is either the State, municipality, or one of the permitted sponsors under the terms of the bill, is unable to acquire the land itself, upon application of the public agency sponsoring the project the Federal authority may step in and acquire this land pursuant to the terms of the Federal condemnation procedure.

Now, then, the Federal condemnation procedure goes a little bit further than the mere provision for the exercise of eminent domain by a Federal agency, because it speeds up the acquisition by providing that the Federal agency may itself determine the price to be paid, fix the price which it so determines as the price to be paid the property owner, and pay the money into court. The public agency may then go into immediate possession of that property and the property owner may contest in the district court for a greater amount in the event he is not satisfied with the amount that has been tendered by the Federal agency. That, as I understand, is the present procedure under the present Federal system of speeding up eminent domain proceedings.

May I say to the gentleman that I have had some experience as a lawyer in that very procedure, and I think I know what I am talking about. As I understand, without this provision in the law the sponsor might run up against a situation, such as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] has so well stated, where the State law does not give to the municipality the power to exercise the right of eminent domain for the acquisition of an airport. In such a case where the sponsor could not secure the site by voluntary purchase agreement the whole project would be stymied. As I understand, that is the reason that you have this provision in the bill.

Now, I ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] this question: Does his amendment change the established procedure for the computation of the damages to be paid the landowner in these so-called condemnation proceedings?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. It would require that the measure of damages be established on the same basis as would be done in case the State law authorized condemnation procedure.

Mr. KEEFE. I rather think, if I may say to the gentleman, that that would be a very complicated element in this bill. In my State, for example, we give to the highway commission the power, something that they never theretofore had, to determine the amount of money that shall be paid for the taking of a piece of land needed for highway construction. They pay that amount of money into the office of the county clerk and immediately the State or county goes into possession of the land. It does not mean that the landowner is foreclosed and barred by that determination because he can accept the amount tendered and still has the right to go into court and in a condemnation proceeding instituted by himself contest for a higher amount. That is the procedure in my State under the accelerated condemnation proceedings. But in the meantime the municipality or the agency acquiring the land has the immediate right of possession and the amount that may eventually be paid may ultimately have to be determined by the court in the condemnation proceeding instituted by the landowner. Do I understand that the gentleman's amendment would provide that in an airport proceeding in my State that that is the type of proceeding that you would want to have controlling to determine damages to be paid to the owners of land taken for airport construction? I confess I am unable to follow the force of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. It is not the purpose of the amendment to set up the legal machinery which will guide the condemnation suit, but simply set up a basis for the assessment of damages.

Mr. KEEFE. In this case, under this very amendment, under the very provisions of the bill, while the acceleration provision is there which permits title to be taken, the landowner still has his right to go into court and prove damages which he claims he has sustained and get an award of damages which may be higher than the award fixed by the agency which has taken the land under the accelerated program.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit, here we are giving the

Federal Government authority to go in and institute condemnation proceedings for what in effect is a private purpose, when no authority in the State law exists for that purpose.

Mr. KEEFE. I am interested in the gentleman's statement that we are giving them authority to go in and condemn land for what in effect is a private purpose. If there is a private purpose involved in this proposition as the gentleman understands it, I should like to know where it is. I tried to ferret that out yesterday in the amendment which I offered. Will the gentleman point out where in this bill there is a private purpose involved? I supposed you were going to furnish funds only to sponsors that were public agencies and not private agencies. If there are any private agencies involved, I should like to have them pointed out, because I do not think, then, we went far enough in the amendment I offered yesterday.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. It is not a private agency, but it is for private use.

Mr. KEEFE. What private use can be involved in the use of an airport which is built with public funds and for public purposes?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. A railroad station is for private use. This is for private use except when used by Government planes.

Mr. KEEFE. But the railroad station is built with railroad company funds, private funds, and not with public funds as is contemplated in the building of these airports.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is not contemplated that these are to be private airports. This is a system of public airports in which a municipality or a governmental unit, including a State, may take part. But this rule of damages is forced upon that State. There shall be included the value of the property and facilities affected and the cost of any changes in or relocation of such property, and so on.

Mr. KEEFE. Those are the elements of damage that are to be considered in any exercise of the right of eminent domain in any condemnation proceeding. It seems to me that under the language of the bill as it now stands we would be much better protected than if we were to complicate it by the adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. The gentleman has stated the case. Then why not follow it in these cases authorized in this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 203?

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: On page 25, line 14, strike out "and 307" and insert "307, and 308."

On page 25, line 15, strike out "and 308" and insert "308, and 309."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 204?

Are there any amendments to section 205?

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: On page 27, line 5, strike out "8" and insert "VIII"; and in line 7 strike out "8" and insert "VIII."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERIDAN: On page 27, line 11, after "in", insert "civil."

Mr. BULWINKLE. I have no objection to that, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERIDAN: On page 27, line 18, after "for", insert "civil"; and in line 19, after "navigation", change the semicolon to a comma and insert "when such charts, maps, and related dat· are not available from other governmental agencies."

Mr. BULWINKLE. I do not agree to that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, section 205 gives the Civil Aeronautics Director the authority to compile certain charts and data. As you know, the Air Force has compiled the most complete map data of any agency in the entire world. The Navy Department through its Hydrographic Survey has likewise numerous charts. In order to prevent the duplication of effort, I oppose the transfer of these agencies from the Air Corps and the Navy Department over to the Civil Aeronautics Director. I ask for the adoption of the amendment because such charts and maps and related data are not available from other Government agencies. These charts and maps are now available for the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Air Corps and in the Navy Hydrographic Service so that there will be economy and more integrated cooperation between the services. I ask favorable consideration of the amendment.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce has been making these maps for a long time. The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if adopted, would create confusion and uncertainty as to whether or not there were such maps in existence before the Civil Aeronautics Board could use them. That is all there is to it, and the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania complains about duplication of service. I would say that when the War Department and Navy Department went into the business of making these civil air maps they were the ones who engaged in a duplication of effort. We require uniformity in airways maps and in the distribution of them. Accidents could result from maps of different dates from different sources—from the confusion over what was the latest official map.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHERIDAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERIDAN: On page 27, line 22, strike out "airmen" and insert "civil aviators of the United States."

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is the interpretation of the Army air service and the Navy air service that the word "airman" as interpreted under the act will include military aviators, both naval, Marine, and Army. I have asked for the insertion of the words "civil aviators of the United States" in order to prevent any misinterpretation if this bill becomes law.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has offered an amendment, but he fails to take into consideration that the part of the bill at section 804 is a part of the Civil Aeronautics Act and the word "airman" is defined in the Civil Aeronautics Act as follows:

(6) "Airman" means any individual who engages, as the person in command or as pilot, mechanic, or member of the crew, in the navigation of aircraft while under way; and (except to the extent the Authority may otherwise provide with respect to individuals employed outside the United States) any individual who is directly in charge of the inspection, maintenance, overhauling, or repair of aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, or appliances; and any individual who serves in the capacity of aircraft dispatcher or air-traffic control-tower operator.

He is a civilian. That is all there is to it. The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHERIDAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERIDAN: On page 28, line 2, after the word "aeronautics", strike out the colon, insert a comma and the following: "and other governmental agencies."

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHERIDAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERIDAN: On page 28, lines 3 and 4, strike out lines 3 and 4 entirely.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, the reason I requested deletion of lines 3 and 4, "established and coordinated national exchange of aeronautical charting information," is that the proposed bill as it is now written, with the other amendments which were just rejected, will make available to the civil director charts, maps, and data that have been compiled by the Army Air Corps, which cover the mapping of almost the entire world—about seven-eighths of the entire world's surface. This would permit the civil agency to disclose or exchange or compile for public distribution such information. I feel that should be a matter reserved to the State Department.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is adopted, then what was accomplished at Chicago, when the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] and I were there, would be absolutely useless. It does not take into account any of the international agreements that have been made or will be made in furtherance of international aviation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from North Carolina has adequately stated the matter. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] is present and can confirm it if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHERIDAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 205?

Are there any amendments to section 206?

Are there any amendments to section 207?

Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BARDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3615) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air navigation facilities pursuant to House Resolution 371, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Howell amendments, three or more groups of amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered and voted upon en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWELL:

Page 3, line 7, strike out "Public agency" and insert "Public authority."

Page 3, after line 11, insert the following paragraphs:

"(h) 'Public airport agency' means a State airport agency or a Federal airport agency.

"(i) 'State airport agency' means any department, commission, board, or official of a State government, which, in the opinion of the Administrator, has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized to satisfy the requirements of the Administrator for participation in the Federal-aid airport program provided for by this title.

"(j) 'Federal airport agency' means the United States Government or any agency thereof; or a Territory or possession of the United State or any agency thereof."

Page 3, line 15, strike out "public agency" and insert "public authority"; and in line 18 strike out "public agencies" and insert "public authorities."

Page 3, reletter paragraphs (h), (i), and (j) as paragraphs (k), (l), and (m), respectively.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 95; noes 98.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 170, nays 185, answered "present" 1, not voting 75.

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—170

Allen, Ill.	Engel, Mich.	Kearney
Allen, La.	Fallon	Keefe
Andersen, H. Carl	Fellows	Kinzer
	Fenton	Knutson
Andresen, August H.	Fernandez	Kunkel
	Fisher	Landis
Andrews, N. Y.	Fogarty	Larcade
Arends	Forand	Latham
Arnold	Fulton	LeFevre
Auchincloss	Gamble	Lemke
Barrett, Wyo.	Gavin	McConnell
Bates, Mass.	Gearhart	McCowen
Beall	Gibson	McGregor
Bennet, N. Y.	Gillette	McKenzie
Bennett, Mo.	Goodwin	McMillan, S. C.
Bishop	Gossett	McMillen, Ill.
Blackney	Graham	Maloney
Bradley, Mich.	Grant, Ind.	Martin, Iowa
Brehm	Gross	Martin, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mason
Brumbaugh	Hale	Michener
Bryson	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.
Buck		Mundt
Buffett	Hall, Leonard W.	Murray, Wis.
Bunker		Peterson, Fla.
Burch	Hancock	Philbin
Byrnes, Wis.	Hand	Phillips
Canfield	Hare	Pickett
Carlson	Harness, Ind.	Ploeser
Case, N. J.	Hedrick	Poage
Case, S. Dak.	Hendricks	Ramey
Chiperfield	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Church	Heselton	Reed, Ill.
Clevenger	Hobbs	Reed, N. Y.
Cole, Mo.	Hoeven	Rees, Kans.
Corbett	Hoffman	Rich
Crawford	Holmes, Mass.	Richards
Curtis	Holmes, Wash.	Riley
D'Alesandro	Horan	Rivers
D'Ewart	Howell	Rizley
Dirksen	Hull	Robertson, N. Dak.
Dolliver	Jenkins	
Domengeaux	Jensen	Robertson, Va.
Dworshak	Johnson, Ill.	Robsion, Ky.
Eaton	Johnson, Ind.	Rockwell
Ellis	Jonkman	Rodgers, Pa.
Ellsworth	Kean	Roe, Md.
Rogers, Mass.	Smith, Wis.	Towe
Russell	Springer	Vorys, Ohio
Sasscer	Stefan	Vursell
Schwabe, Okla.	Stevenson	Weichel
Scrivner	Stewart	White
Shafer	Stockman	Wigglesworth
Sharp	Sumner, Ill.	Wilson
Simpson, Ill.	Sumners, Tex.	Wolcott
Simpson, Pa.	Taber	Wolfenden, Pa.
Smith, Maine	Talbot	Woodruff, Mich.
Smith, Ohio	Thomas, N. J.	
Smith, Va.	Tibbott	

NAYS—185

Abernethy	Gorski	O'Brien, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Granahan	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews, Ala.	Granger	O'Hara
Angell	Grant, Ala.	O'Konski
Barden	Green	O'Neal
Barrett, Pa.	Gregory	Outland
Barry	Gwynne, Iowa	Pace
Bates, Ky.	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Bland	Harris	Patrick
Bloom	Hart	Patterson
Bonner	Havenner	Peterson, Ga.
Boren	Hays	Pfeifer
Bradley, Pa.	Healy	Pittenger
Brooks	Hébert	Powell
Brown, Ga.	Hill	Priest
Buckley	Hinshaw	Quinn, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Hoch	Rabaut
Burgin	Holifield	Rabin
Byrne, N. Y.	Hook	Rains
Camp	Huber	Ramspeck
Cannon, Fla.	Izac	Randolph
Cannon, Mo.	Jackson	Rankin
Carnahan	Jarman	Rayfiel
Chapman	Johnson, Calif.	Resa
Chenoweth	Johnson, Luther A.	Robinson, Utah
Clark		Rogers, N. Y.
Clason	Johnson, Okla.	Rowan
Clements	Jones	Ryter
Cochran	Kee	Sabath
Coffee	Kelley, Pa.	Sadowski
Colmer	Kelly, Ill.	Savage
Combs	Kerr	Schwabe, Mo.
Cooper	Kilday	Sheppard
Courtney	Kopplemann	Sheridan
Cox	Lane	Sikes
Cravens	Lanham	Slaughter
Crosser	Lea	Somers, N. Y.
Cunningham	LeCompte	Sparkman
Davis	Link	Spence
De Lacy	Ludlow	Starkey
Delaney, James J.	Lyle	Sullivan
	Lynch	Talle
Delaney, John J.	McCormack	Tarver
	McDonough	Thom
Doughton, N. C.	McGlinchey	Thomas, Tex.
Douglas, Calif.	Madden	Thomason
Douglas, Ill.	Mahon	Tolan
Doyle	Manasco	Torrens
Durham	Mansfield, Mont.	Traynor
Earthman		Trimble
Elliott	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson
Elston	Marcantonio	Voorhis, Calif.
Engle, Calif.	May	Weaver
Ervin	Miller, Calif.	Welch
Feighan	Mills	West
Flood	Monroney	Whitten
Folger	Morgan	Wickersham
Gallagher	Morrison	Winstead
Gary	Murdock	Wolverton, N. J.
Gathings	Murphy	Wood
Geelan	Murray, Tenn.	Woodhouse
Gordon	Neely	Worley
Gore	Norrell	Zimmerman

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 1

Hess

NOT VOTING—75

Adams	Daughton, Va.	Hartley
Bailey	Dawson	Heffernan
Baldwin, Md.	Dickstein	Henry
Baldwin, N. Y.	Dingell	Hope
Beckworth	Dondero	Jennings
Bell	Drewry	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Bender	Eberharter	
Biemiller	Elsaesser	Judd
Bolton	Flannagan	Kefauver
Boykin	Fuller	Keogh
Butler	Gardner	Kilburn
Campbell	Gerlach	King
Celler	Gifford	Kirwan
Chelf	Gillespie	LaFollette
Cole, Kans.	Gillie	Lesinski
Cole, N. Y.	Griffiths	Lewis
Cooley	Hagen	Luce
Curley	Halleck	McGehee

Merrow	Rogers, Fla.	Walter
Mott	Rooney	Wasielewski
Norton	Short	Weiss
O'Toole	Snyder	Whittington
Plumley	Stigler	Winter
Price, Fla.	Sundstrom	Woodrum, Va.
Price, Ill.	Taylor	
Roe, N. Y.	Wadsworth	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Hess against.
Mrs. Luce for, with Mr. Cooley against.
Mr. Sundstrom for, with Mr. Weiss against.
Mr. Plumley for, with Mrs. Norton against.
Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Chelf against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.
Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Price of Illinois against.
Mr. Bender for, with Mr. Beckworth against.
Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Griffith for, with Mr. King against.
Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Walter against.
Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Lesinski against.
Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Biemiller against.
Mr. Short for, with Mr. Wasielewski, against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Stigler with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Lewis.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Price of Florida with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Henry.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Adams.
Mr. Daughton of Virginia with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. McGehee with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I have a pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK. If present, he would have voted "aye." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. BULWINKLE rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Carolina rise?

Mr. BULWINKLE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Is the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK, recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK, is recorded as voting "aye."

Mr. BULWINKLE. I thought there was a mistake at the time. Someone inadvertently answered to his name.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I may say that the gentleman from Indiana is out of town and has a pair "aye."

The SPEAKER. The name of the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK, will be taken off the roll call.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWELL: On page 5, line 12, strike out "public agencies" and insert "public airport agencies."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWELL: Page 8, line 8, strike out "States" and insert "State airport agencies", and on page 8, line 16, strike out "public agencies" and insert "public authority."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWELL: Page 9, lines 22 and 23, strike out "public agency or two or more public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or two or more public airport agencies."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the rest of the Howell amendments may be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendments be dispensed with, but that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The remaining Howell amendments follow:

Page 10, line 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That where a State has not appropriated any State funds which will be available for use in connection with the airport development program under this act, or where a State does not have legislation which permits participation in such program through an adequate State airport agency, the Administrator may carry out projects under this act, upon submission of project applications by any qualified public authority or authorities within the State, under the same terms and conditions as are provided in this act in the case of project applications by a State airport agency."

Page 10, strike out line 21 and the word "application" in line 22, and insert the following, "public authority or public authorities which are sponsoring the project."

Page 11, line 3, strike out "public agency" and insert "public authority", and in line 7 strike out "agency" and insert "authority."

Page 13, line 11, strike out "public agencies" and insert "public authorities"; and in line 23, strike out "public agencies" and insert "public authorities."

Page 14, lines 3 and 4, strike out "public agency or public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or public airport agencies"; and in line 15, strike out "public agency or public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or public airport agencies."

Page 16, line 11, strike out "public agency or public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or public airport agencies"; and in lines 17 and 18, strike out "public agency or public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or public airport agencies"; and on page 17, in line 2, strike out "public agency or public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or public airport agencies."

Page 17, line 9, strike out "public agency or public agencies" and insert "public airport agency or public airport agencies."

Page 18, line 23, strike out "public agency" and insert "public authority."

Page 20, lines 11 and 12, strike out "public agency" and insert "public authority."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOWELL. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOWELL moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 279, nays 82, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—279

Allen, Ill.	Byrne, N. Y.	Domengeaux
Allen, La.	Byrnes, Wis.	Douglas, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.	Camp	Douglas, Ill.
Andresen, August H.	Canfield	Doyle
Andrews, Ala.	Cannon, Fla.	Durham
Andrews, N. Y.	Carlson	Earthman
Angell	Carnahan	Elliott
Auchincloss	Case, N. J.	Elston
Barden	Case, S. Dak.	Engel, Mich.
Barrett, Pa.	Chapman	Engle, Calif.
Barrett, Wyo.	Chenoweth	Feighan
Barry	Chiperfield	Fenton
Bates, Ky.	Church	Fernandez
Bell	Clark	Flood
Bennet, N. Y.	Clason	Fogarty
Bennett, Mo.	Clements	Folger
Bishop	Coffee	Forand
Blackney	Cole, Mo.	Fuller
Bloom	Colmer	Fulton
Bonner	Combs	Gallagher
Boren	Cooper	Gamble
Bradley, Mich.	Corbett	Gary
Bradley, Pa.	Courtney	Gathings
Brehm	Cox	Gavin
Brooks	Cravens	Gearhart
Brown, Ga.	Crosser	Geelan
Brown, Ohio	Cunningham	Gillette
Brumbaugh	D'Alesandro	Goodwin
Bryson	Davis	Gordon
Buckley	De Lacy	Gore
Bulwinkle	Delaney James J.	Gorski
Bunker	Delaney, John J.	Graham
Burch	Dolliver	Granahan
Burgin		Granger
		Grant, Ala.

Green	McDonough	Resa
Gregory	McGlinchey	Richards
Gross	McGregor	Riley
Hale	McKenzie	Rivers
Hall,	McMillan, S. C.	Robertson,
Edwin Arthur	McMillen, Ill.	N. Dak.
Hall,	Madden	Robinson, Utah
Leonard W.	Mahon	Robsion, Ky.
Hancock	Maloney	Rockwell
Hand	Manasco	Rodgers, Pa.
Hare	Mansfield,	Rogers, Mass.
Harless, Ariz.	Mont.	Rogers, N. Y.
Harris	Mansfield, Tex.	Rowan
Hart	Marcantonio	Ryter
Havenner	Martin, Iowa	Sabath
Hays	May	Sadowski
Healy	Michener	Sasscer
Hébert	Miller, Calif.	Savage
Hedrick	Miller, Nebr.	Sharp
Hendricks	Mills	Sheppard
Herter	Monroney	Sheridan
Heselton	Morgan	Sikes
Hess	Morrison	Simpson, Ill.
Hill	Mundt	Slaughter
Hinshaw	Murdock	Smith, Maine
Hoch	Murphy	Somers, N. Y.
Holifield	Murray, Tenn.	Sparkman
Holmes, Wash.	Murray, Wis.	Spence
Hook	Neely	Starkey
Huber	O'Brien, Ill.	Stefan
Hull	O'Brien, Mich.	Stevenson
Izac	O'Hara	Stewart
Jackson	O'Konski	Stockman
Jarman	Outland	Sullivan
Jenkins	Pace	Sundstrom
Johnson, Calif.	Patman	Talle
Johnson,	Patrick	Tarver
Luther A.	Patterson	Thom
Johnson, Okla.	Peterson, Fla.	Thomas, Tex.
Kearney	Peterson, Ga.	Thomason
Kee	Pfeifer	Tibbott
Keefe	Philbin	Tolan
Kelley, Pa.	Phillips	Torrens
Kelly, Ill.	Pittenger	Traynor
Kerr	Ploeser	Trimble
Kilday	Poage	Vinson
Kinzer	Powell	Voorhis, Calif.
Kopplemann	Price, Fla.	Vorys, Ohio
Kunkel	Priest	Wadsworth
Lane	Quinn, N. Y.	Weaver
Larcade	Rabaut	Weichel
Latham	Rabin	Welch
Lea	Rains	White
LeCompte	Ramey	Wickersham
LeFevre	Ramspeck	Wolcott
Lemke	Randolph	Wolverton, N. J.
Link	Rankin	Wood
Lynch	Rayfiel	Woodhouse
McConnell	Reece, Tenn.	Worley
McCormack	Reed, Ill.	Zimmerman
McCowen	Rees, Kans	

NAYS—82

Abernethy	Gwinn, N. Y.	Rizley
Andersen,	Gwynne, Iowa	Robertson, Va.
H. Carl	Harness, Ind.	Russell
Arends	Hobbs	Schwabe, Mo.
Arnold	Hoeven	Schwabe, Okla.
Bates, Mass.	Hoffman	Scrivner
Bland	Holmes, Mass.	Shafer
Buck	Horan	Simpson, Pa.
Buffett	Howell	Smith, Ohio
Cannon, Mo.	Jennings	Smith, Va
Clevenger	Jensen	Smith, Wis.
Cochran	Johnson, Ill.	Springer
Crawford	Johnson, Ind.	Sumner, Ill.
Curtis	Jones	Sumners, Tex.
D'Ewart	Jonkman	Taber
Dirksen	Kean	Talbot
Doughton, N. C.	Knutson	Thomas, N. J.
Dworshak	Landis	Towe
Eaton	Lanham	Vursell
Ellis	Ludlow	West
Ellsworth	Lyle	Whitten
Ervin	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Fallon	Mason	Wilson
Fellows	Norrell	Winstead
Fisher	O'Neal	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gibson	Pickett	Woodruff, Mich.
Gossett	Reed, N. Y.	Woodrum, Va.
Grant, Ind.	Rich	

NOT VOTING—70

Adams	Boykin	Daughton, Va.
Bailey	Butler	Dawson
Baldwin, Md.	Campbell	Dickstein
Baldwin, N. Y.	Celler	Dingell
Beall	Chelf	Dondero
Beckworth	Cole, Kans.	Drewry
Bender	Cole, N. Y.	Eberharter
Biemiller	Cooley	Elsaesser
Bolton	Curley	Flannagan
Gardner	Kefauver	Price, Ill.
Gerlach	Keogh	Roe, Md.
Gifford	Kilburn	Roe, N. Y.
Gillespie	King	Rogers, Fla.
Gillie	Kirwan	Rooney
Griffiths	LaFollette	Short
Hagen	Lesinski	Snyder
Halleck	Lewis	Stigler
Hartley	Luce	Taylor
Heffernan	McGehee	Walter
Henry	Merrow	Wasielewski
Hope	Mott	Weiss
Johnson,	Norton	Whittington
Lyndon B.	O'Toole	Winter
Judd	Plumley	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Cole of New York against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Short.
Mrs. Norton with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. LaFollette.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Griffith.
Mr. Beckwith with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. King with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Lewis.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Henry.
Mr. Biemiller with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Adams.
Mr. Drewry with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. RABAUT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. VURSELL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BULWINKLE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 3615, as follows:

"TITLE I—FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Airport Act.'

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 2. As used in this title—

"(a) 'Administrator' means the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

"(b) 'Airport' means any area of land or water which is used, or intended for use, for the landing and take-off of aircraft, and any appurtenant areas which are used, or intended for use, for airport buildings or other airport facilities or rights-of-way, together with all airport buildings and facilities located thereon.

"(c) 'Airport development' means any work involved in constructing, improving, or repairing a public airport or portion thereof, including the construction, alteration, and repair of airport administrative buildings and the removal, lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards; but such term does not include the construction, alteration, or repair of airport hangars.

"(d) 'Airport hazard' means any structure or object of natural growth located on or in the vicinity of a public airport, or any use of land near such airport, which obstructs the air space required for the flight of aircraft in landing or taking off at such airport or is otherwise hazardous to such landing or taking off of aircraft.

"(e) 'Project' means a project for the accomplishment of airport development with respect to a particular airport.

"(f) 'Project costs' means any cost incurred in accomplishing a project under this title, including that of making field surveys, preparing plans and specifications, supervising and inspecting construction work, and procuring the accomplishment of such work, and including any administrative or other incidental costs incurred by a sponsor specifically in connection with the accomplishment of a project, which would not have been incurred otherwise; but not including the cost of acquiring any interest in land or any easement through or other interest in air space.

"(g) 'Public agency' means the United States Government or any agency thereof; a State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or an agency thereof; a municipality or other political subdivision; or tax-supported organization. Nothing in this act shall authorize the submission of a project application by any municipality or other public agency which is subject to the law of any State if the submission of such project application by such municipality or other public agency is prohibited by the law of such State.

"(h) 'Public airport' means any airport which is used or to be used for public purposes, under the control of a public agency, the landing area of which is publicly owned.

"(i) 'Sponsor' means any public agency which meets the requirements prescribed by the Administrator for sponsorship of a project under this title and which, either individually or jointly with one or more other public agencies, sponsors such a project; but except with respect to a project located in a Territory or possession, such term does not include the United States Government or any agency thereof.

"(j) 'Prosession' means any area (exclusive of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, and the Philippine Islands) which is under the sovereignty, protection, or mandate of the United States.

"(k) 'State' means a State of the United States or the District of Columbia.

"NATIONAL AIRPORT PLAN

"SEC. 3. (a) The Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to prepare, and revise annually, a national plan for the development of public airports in the United States, including the Territories and possessions. Such plan shall specify in terms of general location and type of development, the projects considered by the Administrator to be necessary to provide a system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics. In formulating and revising such plan, the Administrator shall take into account the needs of both air commerce and private flying, the probable technological developments in the science of aeronautics, the probable growth and requirements of civil aeronautics, and such other considerations as he may deem

appropriate, and shall, to the extent feasible, consult, and take into consideration the views and recommendations of, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the States, Territories and possession and their political subdivisions. In carrying out this section the Administrator is authorized to make such surveys, studies, examinations, and investigations as he may deem necessary or desirable.

"(b) In carrying out this section the Administrator shall also consider the views and recommendations of the War and Navy Departments to the end that the airport development included in such plan may be as useful for national defense as is feasible, and shall ascertain from such Departments the extent to which military and naval airports and airport facilities will be available for civil use. The War and Navy Departments shall consider the views and recommendations of the Administrator to the end that military and naval airports and airport facilities may be made available for civil use to such extent as is feasible.

"FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT PROGRAM

"SEC. 4. In order to carry out the airport plan prepared pursuant to section 3, the Administrator is authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made therefor by the Congress, to make grants of funds to public agencies for the development of public airports as hereinafter provided.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"Appropriation for preliminary expenses

"SEC. 5. (a) In addition to amounts hereinafter authorized to be appropriated for administrative expenses, the sum of $3,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated immediately upon the enactment of this title for expenses of preliminary planning and surveys incident to the initiation of the airport program provided for by this title, including administrative expenses, which sum shall remain available until expended.

"Annual appropriations for projects in States

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this title with respect to projects in the several States, annual appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $650,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of 10 fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. The appropriation for any such fiscal year shall not exceed $100,000,000 and shall remain available until June 30, 1956, unless sooner expended. Not to exceed 5 percent of any such annual appropriation, as specified in the act making such appropriation, shall be available to the Administrator for necessary planning and research and for administrative expenses incident to the administration of this title in the several States; and such amounts shall be deducted from such appropriation for purposes of determining the amounts thereof available for grants for projects in the several States.

"Annual appropriations for projects in Territories and possessions

"(c) For the purpose of carrying out this title with respect to projects in the Territories and possessions, annual appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $50,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of 10 fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. The appropriation for any such fiscal year shall remain available until June 30, 1956, unless sooner expended. Not to exceed 5 percent of any such annual appropriation, as specified in the act making such appropriation, shall be available to the Administrator for necessary planning and research and for administrative expenses incident to the administration of this title with respect to projects in the Territories and possessions; and such amount shall be deducted from such appropriation for purposes of determining the amount thereof available for grants for projects in the Territories and possessoins. Of the total amount available for such grants, not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available for projects in the Territory of Alaska, not to exceed $15,000,000 shall be available for projects in the Territory of Hawaii, and not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available for projects in Puerto Rico.

"Administrative expenses

"(d) As used in this section, the term 'administrative expenses' includes expenses under this title of the character specified in section 204 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 49, sec. 424). For accounting purposes, all amounts which under the authority of this section are made available for administrative expenses shall be consolidated and carried as a single fund.

"DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR PROJECTS IN STATES

"Apportionment of funds

"SEC. 6. (a) As soon as possible after any apropriation is made under section 5 (b), 75 percent of the amount thereof available for grants for projects in the several States shall be apportioned by the Administrator among the several States, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States. All sums so apportioned for a State shall be available only to pay the United States' share of the allowable project costs of approved projects located in that State or sponsored by that State, or some public agency thereof, but located in an adjoining State. Upon making an apportionment as provided in this subsection, the Administrator shall inform the executive head of each State, and any public agency which has requested such information, as to the sums apportioned for each State. As used in this subsection the term 'population' means the population according to the latest decennial census of the United States and the term 'area' includes both land and water.

"Discretionary fund

"(b) All Federal funds available for projects in the several States which are not apportioned as provided in subsection (a) shall constitute a discretionary fund. All moneys in such discretionary fund shall be available to pay the United States' share of the allowable project costs of such approved projects in the several States as the Administrator may deem most appropriate for carrying out the national airport plan, regardless of the States in which they are located. The Administrator shall give consideration, in determining the projects for which the moneys in such fund are to be used, to the existing airport facilities in the several States and to the need for or lack of development of airport facilities in the several States.

"DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR PROJECTS IN TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

"SEC. 7. Subject to the limitations contained in section 5 (c), all funds available for grants for projects in the Territories and possessions shall be available to pay the United States' share of the allowable project costs of such approved projects in the Territories and possessions as the Administrator may deem most appropriate for carrying the national airport plan.

"SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECTS

"Submission

"SEC. 8. (a) Any public agency, or two or more public agencies acting jointly, may submit to the Administrator a project application in such form, and containing such supporting information, as may be prescribed by the Administrator and setting forth the airport development proposed to be undertaken. No project application shall propose airport development other than that included in the then current revision of the national airport plan formulated by the Administrator under this title, and all such proposed development shall be in accordance with standards established by the Administrator, including standards for site location, airport lay-out, grading, drainage, seeding, paving, lighting, and safety of approaches.

"Approval

"(b) All such projects shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator, which approval shall be given only if, at the time of approval, funds are available for payment under this title of the United States' share of the project costs, and only if he is satisfied that the project will contribute to the accomplishment of the purposes of this title, that sufficient funds are available for that portion of the project costs which is not to be paid by the United States under this title, that the project will be completed without undue delay, that the public agency or public agencies which submitted the project application have legal authority to engage in the airport development as proposed, and that all sponsorship requirements prescribed by or under the authority of this title have been or will be met.

"Hearings

"(c) Project applications shall be public documents in the office of the Administrator. Any public agency, person, association, firm, or corporation having a substantial interest in the disposition of any application by the Administrator may file with the Administrator a memorandum in support of or in opposition to such application; and any such agency, person, association, firm, or corporation shall be accorded, upon request, a public hearing with respect to the location of any airport the development of which is proposed. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe regulations governing such public hearings, and such regulations may prescribe a reasonable time within which requests for public hearings shall be made and such other reasonable requirements as may be necessary to avoid undue delay in disposing of project applications.

"FEDERAL SHARE OF PROJECT COSTS

"SEC. 9. The share of the United States on account of any approved project under this title shall be such portion of the allowable project costs thereof (not to exceed 50 percent) as the Administrator may deem appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this title, except that in the case of any approved project in the Territory of Alaska the share of the United States may be not to exceed 75 percent of the allowable project costs.

"PROJECT SPONSORSHIP

"SEC. 10. As a condition precedent to his approval of a project under this title, the Administrator shall receive assurances in writing, satisfactory to him, that—

"(1) the airport to which the project relates will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination;

"(2) such airport and all facilities thereon or connected therewith will be suitably operated and maintained;

"(3) the aerial approaches to such airport will be adequately cleared and protected by removing, lowering, relocating, marking, or lighting, or otherwise mitigating existing airport hazards and by preventing the establishment or creation of future airport hazards;

"(4) all the facilities of such airport developed with Federal aid and all those usable for the landing and take-off of aircraft will be available to the United States for use by Government aircraft at all times without charge other than (a) a charge sufficient to defray the cost of repairing damage done by such aircraft, and (b) if the use by military or naval aircraft shall be substantial, a charge which is reasonable in consideration of the character and extent of such use;

"(5) the airport operator or owner will furnish to any civil agency of the Government, without charge, such space in airport buildings as may be reasonably adequate for use in connection with any air traffic control or weather reporting activities, and communications activities incidental thereto, which such agency may deem necessary to establish and maintain at the airport;

"(6) all project accounts and records will be kept in accordance with a standard system of accounting prescribed by the Administrator, after consultation with appropriate public agencies;

"(7) the airport operator or owner will submit to the Administrator such annual or special airport financial and operations reports as the Administrator may reasonably request; and

"(8) the airport and all airport records will be available to the Administrator's inspectors upon request.

"To insure compliance with this section, the Administrator shall prescribe such project sponsorship requirements, consistent with the terms of this title, as he may deem necessary. Among other steps to insure such compliance the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with public agencies, on behalf of the United States, and such contracts shall be enforceable by decrees for specific performance.

"GRANT AGREEMENTS

"SEC. 11. Upon approving a project the Administrator, on behalf of the United States, shall transmit to the public agency or public agencies which submitted the project application an offer to pay the United States share of the allowable project costs of such project. Any such offer shall be made upon such terms, and subject to such conditions, as the Administrator may deem necessary to meet the requirements of this title and the regulations prescribed thereunder. Each such offer shall state a definite amount as the maximum obligation of the United States under this title, which amount shall not be increased thereafter, and shall stipulate the obligations to be assumed by the sponsor for sponsors of the project. If and when any such offer is accepted in writing by the public agency or public agencies to which it is made, such offer and acceptance shall comprise a grant agreement constituting an obligation of the United States. Unless and until such a grant agreement has been executed with respect to a project, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of the project costs which have been or may be incurred in carrying out that project.

"ALLOWABLE PROJECT COSTS

"SEC. 12. Except as provided in section 13, the United States shall not pay, or be obligated to pay, from amounts appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title, any portion of a project cost incurred in carrying out a project unless the Administrator has first determined that such cost is allowable. A project cost shall be allowable if—

"(1) it was a necessary cost incurred in accomplishing airport development in conformity with approved plans and specifications for an approved project and with the terms and conditions of the grant agreement entered into in connection with such project;

"(2) it was incurred in connection with the airport development accomplished subsequent to the execution of the grant agreement with respect to the project: *Provided, however,* That the allowable costs of a project may include any necessary costs of formulating the project (including those of field surveys and the preparation of plans and specifications, and including any necessary administrative or other incidental costs incurred by the sponsor specifically in connection with the accomplishment of the project, which would not have been incurred otherwise) which were incurred prior to the execution of the grant agreement for such project and subsequent to the enactment of this title; and

"(3) it is reasonable in amount, in the opinion of the Administrator: *Provided,* That if the Administrator determines that a project cost is unreasonable in amount, he shall allow, as an allowable project cost under this section, only such amount of such project cost as he determines to be reasonable and no project costs in excess of the definite amount stated in the grant agreement shall be allowable.

The Administrator is authorized to prescribe such regulations, including regulations with respect to the auditing of project costs, as he may deem necessary to effectuate the purposes of this section.

"PAYMENTS

"SEC. 13. The Administrator, after consultation with the public agency or public agencies with which a grant agreement has been entered into, shall determine at what times, and in what amounts, payments shall be made under this title. The aggregate of such payments at any time with respect to a particular project shall not exceed 50 percent of the project costs of the airport development which has been performed up to that time and which the public agency or public agencies to which the payments are to be made, certify to have been performed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications for such project; and if the Administrator shall determine at any time that the aggregate of such payments exceeds the United States share of the allowable project costs of such project the United States shall be entitled to recover such excess. Such payments shall be made to such official or officials or depository, authorized by law to receive public funds, as may be designated by the public agency or public agencies entitled to such payments.

"PERFORMANCE OF CONSTRUCTION WORK

"SEC. 14. The construction work on any approved project shall be subject to inspection and approval by the Administrator and in accordance with regulations prescribed by him. Such regulations shall require such cost and progress reporting by the public agency or public agencies with which a grant agreement has been entered into with respect to such project as the Administrator shall deem necessary. No such regulation shall have the effect of altering any contract in connection with any project entered into without actual notice of the regulation.

"ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR PROJECT SPONSORS

"SEC. 15. Whenever it is the opinion of the Administrator that any real property or interest therein, or easement through or other interest in air space, necessary in connection with a project, cannot be acquired by the project sponsor without undue expense or delay, the Administrator may, at the request of such sponsor institute a proceeding for the condemnation of such property or interest. Any such acquisition by condemnation may be made in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to expedite the construction of public buildings and works outside of the District of Columbia by enabling possession and title of sites to be taken in advance of final judgment in proceedings for the acquisition thereof under the power of eminent domain," approved February 26, 1931 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 40, secs. 258a to 258e, inclusive). The entire cost of any acquisition under this section shall be borne by the sponsor; and the sponsor shall make available to the Administrator, at such time or times as they may be needed, the funds necessary for meeting such cost. When so acquired by the United States, such property or interest therein, or easement through or other interest in air space, shall be conveyed to the sponsor.

"USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS

"Request for use

"SEC. 16. (a) Whenever the Administrator determines that use of any lands owned or controlled by the United States is reasonably necessary for carrying out a project under this title, or for the operation of any public airport, he shall file with the head of the department or agency having control of such lands a request that such property interest therein as he may deem necessary be conveyed to the public agency sponsoring the project in question or owning or controlling the airport. Such property interest may consist of the title to or any other interest in property, including any easement through or other interest in air space.

"Making of conveyances

"(b) Upon receipt of a request from the Administrator under this section, the head of the department or agency having control of the lands in question shall determine whether the requested conveyance is inconsistent with the needs of the department or agency, and shall notify the Administrator of his determination within a period of 4 months after receipt of the Administrator's request. If such department or agency head determines that the requested conveyance is not inconsistent with the needs of that department or agency, such department or agency head is hereby authorized and directed, with the approval of the President and the Attorney General of the United States, and without any expense to the United States, to perform any acts and to execute any instruments necessary to make the conveyance requested; but each such conveyance shall be made on the condition that the property interest conveyed shall automatically revert to the United States in the event that the lands in question are not developed, or cease to be used, for airport purposes.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 17. On or before the third day of January of each year the Administrator shall make a report to the Congress describing his operations under this title during the preceding fiscal year, including detailed statements of the airport development accomplished, the status of each project undertaken, the allocation of appropriations, and itemized statement of expenditures and receipts, and setting forth his recommendations, if any, for legislation amending or supplementing this title.

"FALSE STATEMENTS

"SEC. 18. Any officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or any officer, agent, or employee of any public agency, or any person, association, firm, or corporation who shall knowingly make any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof, in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or estimates of project costs for any project submitted to the

administrator for approval under this title or shall knowingly make any false statement, false representation, or false report or claim for work or materials for any project approved by the administrator under this title, or shall knowingly make any false statement or false representation in any report required to be made under this title, with the intent to defraud the United States shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not to exceed 5 years or by a fine of not to exceed $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"EXISTING AIRPORT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 19. Nothing in this title shall affect the carrying out of the program for the development of public landing areas necessary for national defense, authorized by the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1946, or the program for the development of civil landing areas, authorized by the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, which programs shall be additional to the Federal-aid airport program authorized by this title.

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAW RELATING TO AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

"AMENDMENTS TO CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO AIRPORTS AND LANDING AREAS

"SEC. 201. (a) The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words 'landing area' and the words 'landing areas' wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'airport' or 'airports', as the case may be.

"(b) Section 1 (8) of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(8) "Airport" means any area of land or water which is used, or intended for use, for the landing and take-off of aircraft, and any appurtenant areas which are used, or intended for use, for airport buildings or other airport facilities or rights-of-way, together with all airport buildings and facilities located thereon.'

"(c) Section 1 (22) of such act, defining the term 'landing area', is hereby repealed, and the succeeding paragraphs are hereby redesignated as paragraphs (22) to (30), respectively

"AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 302 OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

"SEC. 202. (a) Section 302 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'*General*

"'SEC. 302. (a) The Administrator is authorized to designate and establish such civil airways as may be required in the public interest. The Administrator is authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress, (1) to acquire, establish, and improve air-navigation facilities wherever necessary; (2) to operate and maintain such air-navigation facilities; (3) to arrange for publication of aeronautical maps and charts necessary for the safe and efficient movement of aircraft in civil air navigation, utilizing the facilities and assistance of existing agencies of the Government as far as practicable; and (4) to provide necessary facilities and personnel for the regulation and protection of air traffic: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall authorize the acquisition of an existing airport by purchase or condemnation. In the exercise of his powers under this subsection the Administrator shall provide such airways and air navigation facilities as may be necessary for the operations of air carriers under certificates issued pursuant to section 401 of this act.'

"(b) Section 302 (c) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'*Acquisition and disposal of property*

"'(c) The Administrator, on behalf of the United States, is authorized, where appropriate to carry out this section, (1) to accept any conditional or unconditional gift or donation of money or other property, real or personal, or of services; (2) within the limits of appropriations made available by the Congress for expenditure by the Administrator for such purposes, to acquire by purchase, condemnation, lease, or otherwise, real property or interests therein, including easements through or other interests in air space; and (3) to dispose of any real or personal property or interest therein, for adequate compensation, by sale, lease, or otherwise. Any such acquisition by condemnation may be made in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to expedite the construction of public buildings and works outside of the District of Columbia by enabling possession and title of sites to be taken in advance of final judgment in proceedings for the acquisition thereof under the power of eminent domain," approved February 26, 1931 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 40, secs. 258a to 258e, inclusive).'

"AMENDMENT TO SECTION 303, AND ADDITION OF NEW SECTION 304, OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

"Amendment of section 303

"SEC. 203. (a) Section 303 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'FUNDS EXPENDED UNDER OTHER AUTHORITY

"'SEC. 303. No Federal funds, other than those expended by the Administrator, and those expended for military purposes, shall be expended for the acquisition, establishment, construction, development, improvement, installation, alteration, repair, maintenance, or operation of any airport or other air navigation facility, airport building, or other facility on or in connection with an airport, except upon written certification by the Administrator that such project is reasonably necessary in the interest of civil aeronautics or national defense and that the resulting facilities will be reasonably safe and adequate for present and prospective aeronautical use. In each case, it shall be the responsibility of the expending agency to apply to the Administrator for the certification required by this section, in accordance with such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe. The Administrator shall include in any such certification such terms and conditions as he deems necessary in order to insure that the facilities covered by such certification will be reasonably safe and adequate for present and prospective aeronautical use; and any such certification may be withdrawn by the Administrator at any time if he finds that any such term or condition is not being complied with.'

"New section 304

"(b) Title III of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding after section 303 thereof a new section as follows, and by renumbering sections 304, 305, 306, 307, and 308 as sections 305, 306, 307, 308, and 309, respectively:

"'PROTECTION OF PUBLIC USE

"'*Conditions in connection with expenditure of Federal funds*

"'SEC. 304. (a) In case of the expenditure of Federal funds for, on, or in connection with airports under section 302, or in accordance with a certification under section 303, of this act the Administrator shall, to the extent feasible, require such conditions as will result in (1) public use of such airport on fair and reasonable terms; (2) suitable operation and maintenance of such airport and facilities thereon or connected therewith; (3) the clearing and protection of the aerial approaches to such airport by removing, lowering, marking, lighting, or otherwise mitigating existing obstructions and other hazards to air navigation, and by preventing the establishment or creation of, or otherwise mitigating, future obstructions or other hazards to air navigation. Among other steps to assure compliance with such conditions, the Administrator is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to enter into contracts, including contracts with municipalities and other bodies politic, to assure performance of or compliance with such conditions; and such contracts shall be enforceable by decrees for specific performance.

"'*Restrictions on granting of exclusive rights*

"'(b) No exclusive right shall be granted for the use of any civil airway designated or established under section 302. No exclusive right for the use of any airport or other air navigation facility upon or in connection with which Federal funds have been expended shall be granted to, or exercised by, any person other than the Government of the United States.'

"AMENDMENT TO THE SECTION OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938 RENUMBERED AS SECTION 305

"SEC. 204. The section of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, hereinbefore renumbered as section 305, is hereby amended by striking out 'Secretary of Agriculture' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Chief of the Weather Bureau' and by striking out 'air commerce' and inserting in lieu thereof 'air navigation.'

"AMENDMENT TO TITLE VIII OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

"SEC. 205. Title VIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after section 803 thereof, the following new section:

"'COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

"'SEC. 804. In order to promote safety and efficiency in civil air navigation to the highest possible degree, the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, in addition to any other functions or duties pertaining to surveying and charting for other purposes shall—

"'(1) Compile, publish, and maintain such charts, maps, and related data as may be necessary for air navigation;

"'(2) Maintain an adequate system for the sale and distribution of aeronautical charts, maps, and related publications which will insure airmen of ready access to current data;

"'(3) Conduct research in aeronautical charting and related surveying and mapping activities in collaboration with the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, and other governmental agencies; and

"'(4) Establish and coordinate international exchange of aeronautical charting information.'

"AMENDMENT TO SECTION 5 (D) OF AIR COMMERCE ACT OF 1926

"SEC. 206. Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The head of any Government department or independent establishment having jurisdiction over any airport or emergency landing field owned or operated by the United States may provide for the sale of fuel, oil, equipment, and supplies, and the furnishing of mechanical service, temporary shelter, and other assistance for aircraft under such regulations as the head of the department or establishment may prescribe. All such articles shall be sold and such assistance furnished at the fair market value prevailing locally as ascertained by the head

of such department or establishment. No such services, accommodations, or assistance shall be provided or furnished at any such airport or emergency landing field located outside the continental United States or in any Territory or possession of the United States if comparable services, accommodations, or assistance are readily available from any other source, and such services, accommodations, and assistance shall be provided or furnished at any other airport or emergency landing field owned or operated by the United States only if such action is, by reason of an emergency, reasonably necessary to the continuance of an aircraft on its course. All amounts received under this section shall be covered into the Treasury; but that part of such amounts which, in the judgment of the head of the department or establishment, is equivalent to the cost of the fuel, oil, equipment, supplies, services, shelter, or other assistance sold or furnished shall be credited to the appropriation from which such cost was paid, and the balance, if any, shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts. Nothing in this section shall limit any power or authority which the Administrator has under existing law with respect to the Washington National Airport.'

"AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIR-NAVIGATION FACILITIES

"SEC. 207. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, appropriations for air-navigation facilities (except those made pursuant to the Federal Aid Airport Act), made specifically for the service of any fiscal year, shall be available for expenditure during that fiscal year and the following fiscal year, and amounts thereof remaining unexpended at the expiration of the second such fiscal year shall be applied only to the payment of expenses properly incurred, or the fulfillment of contracts properly made, prior to the expiration of such second fiscal year; but unexpended balances of any such appropriation which have remained on the books of the Treasury for 3 fiscal years shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. This means that the bill goes to conference and there will be an opportunity to get the Howell amendment in.

The SPEAKER. There may or may not be.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "To provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air-navigation facilities."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. BULWINKLE, the proceedings of the House whereby the bill (H. R. 3615) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air-navigation facilities, was passed were vacated and the bill was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 172]

Adams	Durham	Lewis
Anderson, Calif.	Eaton	Luce
Andrews, N. Y.	Eberharter	McGehee
Auchincloss	Elsaesser	Maloney
Bailey	Ervin	May
Baldwin, Md.	Flannagan	Merrow
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fuller	Monroney
Barrett, Pa.	Gardner	Mott
Barrett, Wyo.	Gerlach	Murdock
Bates, Mass.	Gifford	Norton
Beall	Gillespie	O'Toole
Beckworth	Gillie	Pace
Bender	Grant, Ala.	Philbin
Biemiller	Griffiths	Ploeser
Bolton	Hagen	Plumley
Boren	Hall,	Powell
Boykin	Edwin Arthur	Price, Ill.
Buckley	Halleck	Rains
Bunker	Harless, Ariz.	Robertson,
Burgin	Harness, Ind.	N. Dak.
Butler	Hart	Roe, N. Y.
Campbell	Hartley	Rogers, Fla.
Cannon, Fla.	Hébert	Rooney
Case, S. Dak.	Heffernan	Short
Celler	Henry	Snyder
Chelf	Herter	Stigler
Clark	Hill	Sundstrom
Coffee	Holifield	Taylor
Cole, Kans.	Hope	Traynor
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson,	Vinson
Cooley	Lyndon B.	Voorhis, Calif.
Courtney	Jonkman	Wadsworth
Curley	Judd	Walter
Curtis	Kefauver	Wasielewski
Daughton, Va.	Keogh	Weaver
Davis	Kilburn	Weiss
Dawson	King	White
Dickstein	Kirwan	Whittington
Dingell	LaFollette	Wilson
Dondero	Lea	Winter
Drewry	Lesinski	Wolcott

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 308 Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to facilitate the execution of subsection (d) of section 13 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended; and

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the Congress on Tuesday, October 23, 1945.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3220. An act to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to extend in the case of aluminum plants and facilities the time during which disposition of such plants and facilities is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 842) entitled "An act for the relief Elmira Area Soaring Corp.;" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. MORSE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 694) entitled "An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to movement of Government traffic"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of War.
5. Alien Property Custodian.
6. Federal Security Agency.
7. National Archives.
8. Office of Price Administration.
9. Office of Defense Transportation.
10. Petroleum Administration for War.
11. Selective Service System.
12. War Manpower Commission.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] may address the House for 1 hour on next Thursday, October 25, following the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today may be put over until next Wednesday, October 24.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit tomorrow during the session of the House while the House is in general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

REDUCTION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 375, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read by appropriation titles for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] is recognized.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

WE MUST COOPERATE FOR SURVIVAL

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last few months of the war we just fought were so stupendous they have left men dazed. We become literally benumbed mentally when we try to comprehend the marvelous and deadly potentialities of radar; rocket bombs, rocket planes, rocket submarines; and a score of other achievements in the scientific world which have reduced the whole globe, from the standpoint of potential destruction to a matter of 3 or 4 hours in time. Distance has been practically eliminated.

When we try to conceive the awful destructive power of the atom bomb we become mentally frozen. Our very brains are benumbed within us.

Mr. Speaker, today, we in this chamber are looking squarely at the awful fact that annihilation of the whole human race is now possible to any group of madmen who may learn the production and control of the atomic bomb, and who in the terrible fantasies of their diseased minds would not hesitate to use it.

Mr. Speaker, is there any person in this chamber who believes that if Hitler could have discovered the atom bomb he would not have used it against the United States of America and against the British?

Who is there in this chamber who believes that another Hitler may not arise, not in Germany next time but in some other nation not too far distant?

Mr. Speaker, who is there in this chamber who is so blind as to believe that if Russia or any other nation should discover the secret of production of the atomic bomb that such nation would hesitate to use it to gain domination over the world if the control of such a nation fell under the evil sway of madmen?

The one nation in the whole history of mankind that has not sought aggression and conquest is the United States of America. Ours is the only Nation which has given of its blood and its men and its money, to free other nations from tyranny without attempting to take them over and rule them ourselves. Look at Cuba. Look at the Philippines. Look at our efforts in the First World War when we poured out our men and our money and at the peace table asked for absolutely nothing but peace. Well, Mr. Speaker, we not only did not get peace; we not only were not repaid the billions of dollars we loaned after the war to our former allies but we did not even get gratitude for our generous efforts and our unselfish motives.

We went into the World War just finished—did I say finished?—I mean which we still have to finish, Mr. Speaker—not to subjugate any nation; not to destroy any nation; not to rob any nation; not to enslave any people. And yet we know today in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, that although we won the war, or are winning the war, we had lost the very objectives for which we fought, before the war was ended.

Is there anyone who doubts that statement? Look at Estonia; Latvia; Lithuania; Poland; Hungary; Rumania; Yugoslavia; Bulgaria; the Danish Island of Bornholm. They have been taken over and subjugated by Russia.

There is no necessity for us to recount again here the betrayal of Poland. It is now a matter of history. It will be regarded by all decent people of the future—if the atom bomb lets us have much of a future for civilization—as one of the basest, blackest betrayals of a nation ever perpetrated by any other nation.

Before the echo of the guns has died away; before the smoke of battle has drifted down the winds of space; before the awful odor of death has ceased to rise miasmalike from the jungles and the swamps of the islands of the Pacific, and from the beaches of Europe, the very men who did the most magnificent job of leadership are being assailed and abused and plotted against by alien-minded men and women in this country who are still intent on serving a foreign master, Joe Stalin; who are still intent on stabbing our soldiers and sailors and marines in the back while they scheme and plot to destroy the free Nation for which those men and women went out and fought for and for which a million of them died.

I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that communism is rampant in this Nation at this very hour. I want to say to you, sir, that most of those men and women or their parents, came to seek the hospitality of this great free, rich Nation. Practically all of them by one trick or another evaded going out to fight in defense of this country. But today they are planning the destruction of our free Government and our free society.

I sometimes wonder, sir, what has happened to the spirit of Americanism. I sometimes wonder what has happened to the intelligence and the courage of American men and women that we let an alien minority come in and practically take over various bureaus of our Government and sections of our press. I sometimes wonder why we tolerate the insolent effrontery of a minority in this country who are almost open and brazen in their arrogant attempts to discredit every worth-while leader of the armed forces while they heap adulation upon Russian marshals and generals.

Who is there in this chamber who does not know in his heart that the reason these Communists want to displace MacArthur in Japan is because Joe Stalin and his henchmen want to communize Japan?

Who is there in this chamber who does not know that in the world grown as small as this world has grown Russian communism and Russian domination of a great section of the globe, and free America, and the wonderful fruits of freedom that are to be found in America, cannot long abide side by side with peace on this planet?

We in the United States of America are now confronted by a new world situation. If we are to survive as a free country, or if we are to survive at all, we must cooperate each man, woman and child with the other. Without regard to class, or race, or section, we must work together to preserve our very existence as well as our freedom. We are like a company on a ship which is drifting against a mine lodged on a reef. If we hit the mine, an atomic bomb, we will be annihilated. If we succeed by the greatest cooperation in missing the mine, we may still be wrecked on the reef of internal political revolution; strikes; unemployment; inflation; depression; frustration.

When the first atom bomb blasted into vapor the human beings and the buildings of Hiroshima the United States suddenly became the keeper of the destiny of the world. We have been told within the last few days by the outstanding experts of our national defense that the fate of the world hangs in the balance. We have been bluntly warned that unless all citizens, men, women and children, in the United States of America do cooperate, the next war could easily result in America being struck without warning

with such a force of atom bombs as would completely destroy in a few minutes our ability to defend ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible for us to comprehend—we who have lived with friendly neighbors to the north and south of us, we who have been separated by the Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans from our neighbors to the east and the west—that we are actually today in danger of sudden annihilation.

Already the atom bomb which we were first to use has made it apparent that we in the United States must face new problems of vast decentralization of our industry. We have been told—and I do not doubt that it is true—that only the accident of a thin piece of lead foil separated the Germans from the discovery of atomic fission, meaning control of the atomic bomb.

It appears futile for us to hope that we and Great Britain and Canada can keep the atom bomb secret to ourselves for all time. There is, in fact, a very grave question as to whether or not the secret is now known to Russia. A report in the press on Monday, October 15, strongly indicates that Russian scientists may possess the atom-bomb secret. A scientific monthly magazine of August 1945 contained an article translated and condensed by the American-Russian Institute from the Russian newspaper Izvestia on November 25, 1944, giving the names of two Russian academicians who even then were far along in their investigations. The article in the press of this October 15 revealed that a Russian Professor Kapitza had studied at Cambridge in England 18 years ago on nuclear theories and atom fission. Since that time Professor Kapitza has become the foremost Russian scientist in atomic research, and a few years ago developed a method of liquefying hydrogen and helium which may offer a new source of atomic energy.

We also know that the leading German scientists who had been working on the release of atomic energy were taken into Russia after the German surrender. They have not been heard of since, officially, although stories drifting out of that rigidly censored and tightly controlled country indicate that they are being induced to develop under Russian direction methods of producing and controlling atomic energy.

Here we are, Mr. Speaker, facing the unimaginable situation in which, with conditions as they are, the question of life or death for every man, woman, and child in this Nation depends for its answer upon our most intelligent and intense cooperation with each other to set up a new and hitherto utterly unconceived national defense.

We know there are too many—far too many—people in this country, most of them of alien origin, all of them of alien doctrines, who would like to see this Nation and its people enslaved under Russian communism. Why, sir, such slavery would be worse, a thousand times worse, than the instantaneous disintegration which would be our portion if we were destroyed by atomic bombs.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 173]

Adams	Elliott	McMillen, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Elsaesser	May
Bailey	Ervin	Merrow
Baldwin, Md.	Fellows	Mott
Baldwin, N. Y.	Flannagan	Murdock
Barry	Fuller	Neely
Beall	Gallagher	Norton
Beckworth	Gardner	O'Toole
Bender	Gathings	Outland
Biemiller	Gerlach	Pace
Bland	Gibson	Phillips
Bloom	Gifford	Plumley
Bolton	Gillespie	Powell
Boykin	Gillie	Price, Ill.
Buckley	Griffiths	Rains
Bunker	Hagen	Robertson, Va.
Burgin	Halleck	Roe, N. Y.
Butler	Hand	Rogers, Fla.
Byrne, N. Y.	Harless, Ariz.	Rooney
Campbell	Harness, Ind.	Short
Cannon, Fla.	Hartley	Smith, Va.
Carlson	Hébert	Snyder
Celler	Heffernan	Stewart
Cheif	Henry	Stigler
Clark	Hill	Sundstrom
Cole, Kans.	Holifield	Taylor
Cole, N. Y.	Hope	Tolan
Cooley	Izac	Towe
Courtney	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Traynor
Crawford	Jonkman	Wadsworth
Curley	Judd	Walter
Curtis	Kefauver	Wasielewski
Daughton, Va.	Keogh	Weaver
Davis	Kilburn	Weiss
Dawson	King	White
Dickstein	Kirwan	Whittington
Dingell	LaFollette	Wilson
Dondero	Lesinski	Winter
Drewry	Lewis	Wood
Durham	Luce	Woodhouse
Eaton	McGehee	
Eberharter		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 310 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REDUCING CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS AVAILABLE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1946

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is recognized.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. May I say to the gentleman that the reason for my making the point of order, that a quorum was not present, had no relation whatever to any remarks in the gentleman's speech which he is now reading, but was because this rule waives all points of order against a bill which contains a provision to which many of us object, and which would otherwise be subject to a point of order.

Mr. COX. Of course, I accept the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for that purpose, and the gentleman should not have taken advantage of the courtesy I extended to him.

Mr. Speaker, man has at last dared to lay his hand upon the primal force of the universe which can work either his utter destruction or his great and lasting benefit. I cannot help feeling deep in my heart that it would have been far better for mankind if the scientists had never discovered the secret of releasing and controlling atomic energy. But, since it lay in the destiny of man to discover this primal force of the universe, I thank God that America, England, and Canada discovered it first, because at least we are Christian, God-fearing nations. No human anywhere in this world can read the history of America and believe for a minute that we want to oppress, or subjugate, or destroy any other people or to take their lands or their wealth away from them by force.

Mr. Speaker, I thank God that this is true of my Nation. I thank God that decency, good will, the impulse to brotherhood with every people of the world motivates us in the United States of America.

In this hour when there has been loosed in the world the most gigantic physical force for evil or for good ever dreamed of by man, we must face not only the proposition of how to make this new-found force the greatest blessing for all peoples; there also confronts us the problem of either controlling the secret or devising a defense against the greatest physical force for evil in the world if it falls into the hands of men of ill-will and evil intent. The question now is not only of our national defense; it is of our individual survival; not only is our freedom menaced by this inconceivably gigantic power; if America goes down, the light of the world goes out. If the torch of liberty, which has for more than 150 years been held aloft in free America beckoning in hope and in promise the oppressed of other lands, shall ever be blown out by an atomic bomb, the hope of free men everywhere will be gone; the beacon light of progress for men everywhere in the world will have been extinguished; the spiritual promise of religious progress will have been blasted; the blood, and the sacrifices, and the hopes of those who down the corridors of time have suffered and striven and died that mankind might progress, that he might raise his eyes from the blood of the battlefields and look for his destiny in the stars, will have been frustrated and rendered of no avail.

And now what is our situation in America in the face of this awful responsibility?

I am reminded of that profound utterance of Thomas Jefferson:

> The station which we occupy among the nations of the earth is honorable, but awful. Trusted with the destiny of this solitary Republic of the world, the only monument of human rights, and the sole depositary of the sacred fire of freedom and self-government, from whence it is to be lighted up in other regions of the earth, if other regions of the earth shall ever become susceptible of its benign influence, all mankind ought, then, with us to rejoice in its prosperous, and sympathize in its adverse fortunes as involving everything dear to man, and to what sacrifices of interest or convenience ought not these considerations animate us? To what compromises of opinion and inclination, to maintain harmony and union among ourselves, and to preserve from all danger this hallowed ark of human hope and happiness. * * * The last hope of human liberty in this world rests on us. We ought for so dear a stake to sacrifice every attachment and every enmity.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, the dust of Hiroshima and Nagasaki had not settled until labor leaders began to precipitate strike after strike in this country. While Russia began to plot how she might extend her domain and grab country after country to subjugate and bring under her rule, communistic unions in this Nation began to stir up industrial strife and strikes.

Let me say to you it is time, sir, that red-blooded Americans stand up and be counted. It is time for us who believe in freedom, in a just God, and spiritual progress, to rise up and stop this minority of communistic agitators from trying to destroy our economy and precipitate unemployment, industrial disorder, class hatreds, sectional disputes; in short, while they are trying to prevent our return to an orderly postwar economy of peace and prosperity.

Cooperation between capital, industrial management, labor, and agriculture is absolutely essential to the welfare of all. Capital is not sufficient unto itself. Industrial management cannot be sufficient unto itself. Labor is not sufficient unto itself. Agriculture cannot be sufficient unto itself. Prosperity for America and for capital, management, labor, and agriculture does not lie in limitation of opportunity for some; it lies in equality in opportunity for all.

Business is not something to be bled white of all the wages which can be extracted from it by labor while labor gives as little effort in return as possible. Labor is not something to be paid as little as possible by management and work to the point of exhaustion. Agriculture is not something to be deluded or defrauded by either management or labor. Our great trouble lies in the fact that there have been some industrial managers who were so blind as to believe that labor ought to be ground down to the lowest and harshest working conditions. Such industrial managers are exceedingly rare in America today. We do have all too many labor racketeers who are not in agreement as to management and labor working conditions. Those labor racketeers can find power and immense profit only in a state of constant agitation and dispute between labor and management. Just as soon as a state of harmonious cooperation is reached between management and labor the jobs of these specialists in disorder would be gone. A handful, so to speak, of such professional agitators and troublemakers is doing all this damage to labor, to agriculture, to management, to the whole country.

The only possible salvation for this Nation, our only possible avenue of escape from disorder and possible revolution lies in the achievement of an agreement and a complete cooperation between management and capital, labor, and agriculture.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker; on October 10, 1945, 418,000 people were out of work in this Nation because of strikes. The day previous to that some 42,000 steelprint and dye workers had just returned to their jobs. If this same total were maintained, it would mean a loss of 1 day of 3,244,000 work hours; it would mean 16,220,000 work hours lost in a 5-day week.

Mr. Speaker, free enterprise has come to be jeered and jibed at by Communists and "pinks" and fellow travelers, as a term of opprobrium to be applied to so-called big business. Of course, Mr. Speaker, business is not necessarily bad because it is big, nor is it necessarily good because it is small. But I want to say that no greater damage was ever done the citizens of this country than that which was wrought when a few semantic experts aided the radicals in the administration and out of it to condemn in the minds of the people both the term and the practice of free enterprise.

Free enterprise means the right of any man to open a grocery store, or a shoemending shop; a restaurant or a delicatessen; or a garage. It means his right to begin as a ditch digger and end up as the manager of a big industry if he has the ability. It means the right of any man or woman to elect what line of endeavor they wish to follow for their life's work, whether it be in the trades or professions and then to be protected by the Government in their pursuit in their trade or profession. Free enterprise means little business; it means community business. A man buying a little plot of ground and running his own farm is just as much of a free enterpriser as Henry Ford. His magnitude may not be as great but the principle governing his right is exactly the same. If this campaign of disparagement and libel and abuse against free enterprise goes on to its logical limit, men and women, boys and girls, even those who risked their lives and their bodies on the battlefields across the Seven Seas, will have to ask the permission of a labor overlord or of some bureaucrat before they can aspire to become a mechanic, a farmer, a grocery-store proprietor, a lawyer, or a doctor. If that day ever comes in this country, Mr. Speaker—and we are not far from it now—liberty in this Nation will be dead; individual freedom will have vanished; the Bill of Rights will be a dead letter, and slavery, however velvet-lined it may appear to be, will be the portion of the citizen of the United States.

It is corollary of American production that no industry is sufficient unto itself. Automobiles and refrigerators cannot be built if the steel industry is not producing. The steel industry cannot produce for automobiles or refrigerators unless coal mines are functioning. With 749 coal mines in 6 States shut down by strikes, and with 182,000 workers off their coal-mine jobs, the effects on our economy follow all these chains, such as the automobile - refrigerator-steel-industry-coal chain. Just the other day 369 ships were tied up in New York harbor because of a longshoremen's strike. Thousands of tons of goods were piled on the docks for export. One hundred and ten thousand tons of those goods were earmarked for relief or for our fighting forces overseas. In the lot there were 8,000 tons of perishable meat. If any of our boys in the occupation forces of Japan or Germany go hungry it could well be the direct result of that particular strike. If these boys return home from their terrible battle experiences across the seven seas, and find no jobs awaiting them, that probably will also be the result of these strikes.

Mr. Speaker, we can lose the peace that those heroic men and women of the fighting forces have won for us by an industrial revolution spawned and sponsored by these Communists and agitators in this country. After the greatest toll of blood and treasure we ever poured out in the history of our Nation, it can all be rendered futile if we do not curb strikes which have no relation to working hours, conditions, or wages, but which are called under the name of "wildcat" strikes.

If the labor leaders who pretend to be the bargaining agents for these unions cannot control the hotheads in those unions who precipitate these "wildcat" strikes, so-called, then those labor leaders are not fit to occupy their posts, and they ought not to be allowed to permit their forces to menace this Nation.

I wonder what can be the strange malady of blindness that seems to make men oblivious to the fact that if America is blasted out by the roots by atom bombs in the future because we have been unprepared due to strikes and industrial troubles, to meet the menace, it will be the wives and the children of the workingmen and the workingmen themselves whose bodies will be rent by the blasts, seared and vaporized by a heat 10 times greater than that of the surface of the sun.

Mr. Speaker, if labor agitators and Communist schemers can successfully connive to throw this Nation into industrial chaos by these strikes, and if some other nation, wishing to take advantage of that awful condition here, should assail us with atom bombs, it would be the wives and children and the members of those unions who would pay the penalty of death and torture.

I find myself amazed over and over again that men will follow the Communist line as Earl Browder followed the Communist line only to be kicked aside

like a craven dog when it suits the purpose of a dictator in Russia to do so. Earl Browder dare not complain of the way he has been treated.

Mr. Speaker, under the campaign of propaganda which has been waged by the Communists and the advocates of alien doctrines and isms in this country for the past 12 or 14 years, we have come to the point—in fact before the war we reached the point—where the term nationalism was used as an epithet. Aliens who had no conception of American ideas actually succeeded in implanting in American thinking the idea that nationalism and isolationism were one and the same thing. It got to a point where it was considered disgraceful, discreditable, indecent, if not actually criminal, for Americans to dare to consider the interests of their own country in connection with those of Russia and Great Britain and Spain and Italy, and the countries of middle Europe. I would like to ask you, my colleagues, where you would go on this globe to find a more intense nationalist than Josef Stalin? Where would you go to find a more nationalist government—I would go farther and say a more isolationist government than Russia? Where would we go to find a greater nationalist than Winston Churchill? Where would wo go to find a more nationalistic government than the government of Great Britain?

After we have poured out billions piled on scores of billions of dollars to those Allies; after we have poured out an ocean of the blood of our men and women in helping those allies; after we have given to them without stint of our men and our money, they now come and ask for five or six billions for Britain—another gift, mind you—and five or six billions for Russia—another gift, mind you—and at the same time they are besieging the Treasury for money—American money, mind you—with which to feed the starving world, and to reconstruct all the war-wrecked economies in the world. According to these alien doctrinaires, when Russia asks us to give her another $6,000,000,000, that is international cooperation. But if we dare mention that we cannot make the loan, that we our ourselves have a debt of scores upon scores of billions of dollars, that we have internal problems of our own to solve, then, according to these alien doctrinaires both in the United States and abroad, we are dirty isolationists. If Great Britain wants $5,000,000,000 free of interest or repayment; if Great Britain wants us to give her a fleet of 1,000 ships so she may again rule world trade; that, Mr. Speaker, is international cooperation. But just let any American suggest that we cannot afford to ladle out five or six billion more to Great Britain to enable Britannia to rule the waves, and immediately these alien doctrinaires brand us as dirty isolationists.

Regardless of what these alien doctrinaires may say about me, Mr. Speaker, I stand here today warning this Nation that we had better begin to think about the United States of America before we allow all of the other scheming rulers of the world to drain off our economic blood to the point where this Nation will collapse of economic anemia and die of debt indigestion.

I do not believe that sensible consideration for our welfare is isolationism. It is just common sense. I do not blame Joe Stalin for being nationalist for Russia. I do not criticize Churchill for being nationalistic for Britain and I do not criticize any man for being nationalistic as far as America is concerned. I would remind you, sir, that true internationalism is a two-way street and it is a street that Uncle Sam had trod clear to the end to meet Joe Stalin and to meet Winston Churchill, but not one single time have Stalin and Russia come back the other way to meet a single reasonable request of America or Great Britain, and the British Government apparently thinks there is a sign at their end of this two-way street which says "Do not enter."

I warn you here, today, my colleagues that if we Americans do not look out for America no one else is going to. I might also suggest that you do not see any of these alien doctrinaires who howl the loudest for America to give anything she possesses, going back to the countries they want us to support. We had better begin in this country to differentiate very clearly between those who believe that America should be kept intact and sound and free, and those who would partition America out to all the other peoples of the world and pauperize America.

I for one, am glad that Louis Budenz, the editor-in-chief of the Daily Worker Communist paper in New York, had the courage to go back to his church and denounce Communism for what it is—a dictatorship over the souls of people. We do not hear any of these communists shouting that from the housetops. There is no doubt that Louis Budenz will be threatened; there is no doubt that his family will be threatened because these communists work like assassins in the dark.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could find the words which would burn into the heart of America the awful fact that we are temporizing here today with a force which will destroy this Nation economically, which will create such chaos, which will generate such confusion, which will nurture such industrial disorders as will make us unable to build our defense against the menace of the future unless we put a stop to lawless, unauthorized, wildcat strikes.

Mr. Speaker, this is President Harry Truman's great hour in history. If, with the assistance of the millions who trust him, he leads this country safely through these perilous times, he will go down in history as one of our greatest Presidents. We all should say to these irresponsible labor leaders and those who follow them in picketing plants, "You are endangering the life of every citizen in this Nation; you shall have every measure of justice due you but you cannot and you must not and you will not be permitted to destroy this Nation in your greed for gain or your desire to control and socialize industry."

Mr. Speaker, if our President should say to the other countries of the world, "You shall not displace MacArthur and take over the control of Japan and communize it; we will not permit the heroic leaders of our Army, Navy, Marine and Air Force to be blackened by the foul tongues and pens of propagandists who want to sink America into the depths of communistic slavery," then President Harry Truman will go down in history not only as a great President, he will go down in history as a great champion of all the peoples of the world; as a great protector of civilization; as the man who had the courage to again say to these in the world who love freedom "You shall not be shackled as slaves or tortured to your death."

Mr. Speaker, President Truman cannot fail to successfully meet this issue. I do not believe he will fail, and I pray God to strengthen him so he will not fail. Failure would leave mankind to weep for that hour of destiny lost to the people of this planet.

This Congress, Mr. Speaker, must rise to its responsibility. No race, no creed, no partisan consideration can enter into this our task to preserve our common liberty; to preserve our lives; to rescue the peoples of this world from a monstrous threat of this dreadful power if it falls into the hands of madmen.

As we turn our gaze back over the years and see the sacrifices and the miracles of those great masters like Jesus of Nazareth who sought on earth peace toward men of good will, we shall have failed our spiritual heritage if we allow this challenge to meet us either unprepared or afraid.

The hope of the world rests upon the United States of America. The hope of the United States rests upon Harry Truman in the White House, and upon this Congress, to lead our people in the crusade which shall make of this atomic power the greatest agency of peace the world ever knew instead of permitting it to become the awful power that shall blast out of existence mankind on this sphere and leave this planet rolling on through eternity a monument to the sad and tragic fact that man could not govern himself.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe mankind is doomed to extinction this way. I believe the spiritual values and the power of spiritual law will help our President in the White House to lead us victoriously against these forces which would beat down and destroy everything that makes life dear and worth while. May God be his strength and counselor.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and I shall be very brief.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of a resolution designed to reduce certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes.

The rule provides for 3 hours of general debate, waives all points of order, and the resolution is subject to amendments under the 5-minute rule.

The resolution is very incomprehensible unless you follow each item with the report of the committee. I understand there is not any minority report.

This resolution calls for cut-backs of over $52,000,000,000 in appropriations and spending authority, and proposes that armed forces be put under financial pressure to speed demobilization. The committee asks Congress to authorize cut-backs of over $1,000,000,000 greater than proposed by the Budget Bureau. It is obvious to all of us that the armed services, especially the Navy, are unreasonably slow in discharging our veterans. It is equally obvious that as long as we unnecessarily retain eight or ten millions of men and women in our service, that our national debt will continue to mount, notwithstanding that we are taxing our people to the limit.

This resolution is a good beginning. I hope that before we adjourn, which I understand will be the first part of December, that another similar resolution will be presented. The people are again becoming economic-minded. Make no mistake about that. In my opinion, this rule should pass without objection.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT TO CONTROL STRIKES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the public welfare requires that Congress deal immediately and effectively with the current strike situation. Today we find ourselves in the position of still drafting 18-year-old boys to protect our interests abroad. How lax we are by comparison in defending the home front.

Correcting the present widespread work stoppage is not primarily a Congressional job, but if Congress does not act in behalf of the people, apparently no one else will. The President has evaded the issue by passing it to his subordinates and they, after a great deal of front page shadow boxing, have made apparent under a blanket of words their fear to move courageously.

I say dealing with the situation is primarily an executive job since the cause of most of our strike troubles originated before the war in White House coddling of a handful of arrogant labor leaders. To the dismay of a hopeful public, the coddling has continued under the Truman administration. Meanwhile, Congress has done its part in accelerating reconversion, even to the point of returning to Washington for a special session, but now Congress finds itself confronted with the task of adding strike solutions to its chores.

Fortunately, the way to halt a majority of these current stoppages and get the country back on a speedy constructive reconversion track is fairly simple. The first thing that is needed is courage. Surely there are enough men with the welfare of the Nation at heart in this Congress to meet the issue from a broad national standpoint. A few labor leaders will seek to block such a course with threats, but nine out of ten of the loyal citizens of the country, including millions of patriotic members of labor unions themselves, will admit that the present work stoppages are intolerable and should be ended by law. So I suggest that every Member of this Congress, regardless of party, get vigorously behind a legislative program embracing these broad general provisions:

First. Repeal the present War Labor Disputes Act. The war is over and there is no reason for keeping the act on the books. What we need is a peacetime act with bulldog teeth.

Second. Provide that labor unions must keep their contracts the same as employers. This can be accomplished by simply prohibiting dues collection by contract-breaking organizations. Also, make unions financially liable for damage done by them during strikes.

Third. It is unthinkable to have work stoppages in public utility, food, fuel, and similar services necessary to the health and comfort of the Nation. When disputes in these services which cannot be readily settled occur, let the Government take over and operate the services with the workers classified as Government employees while employees and employers discuss their differences. Government should act in these instances, as in all other labor disputes, as an unbiased judge and not as a prosecutor.

Fourth. Deny unemployment compensation to all persons on strike. There is no good reason why taxpayers generally should finance strikes of any kind.

Fifth. Make national labor organizations responsible for the activities of their local groups. It is far too easy under present laws for national leaders to promote local strikes under cover and then plead "no local control." Here again suspension of the right to collect dues during wildcat strikes would be effective.

I am making this statement as a citizen and representative of all the people who want to see peace and prosperity restored to this Nation. There is no desire on my part to hamper or penalize any fairly conducted labor organization that has as its only objective the welfare and betterment of its members. Indeed, time will prove that in making this statement, I am a true and frank friend of labor. Neither am I making this statement as a partisan. The situation rises far above partisan action. I will support any effort, by whomever launched, which will accomplish the ends I suggest.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not recall in all the years I have been here when the Committee on Rules has presented a gag rule, if I may use that term, that is more welcome than this. I want to compliment the able chairman of the Committee on Rules for making a move, a very definite move, toward balancing the Budget.

The roll calls we have had this afternoon were doubtless prompted by the opposition to the action of the committee in taking steps to turn back to the States the Federal Employment Agencies.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman designates this rule as a gag rule. For his information, I wish to say this is not a gag rule. It is a rule, however, which waives points of order against provisions which otherwise would not be in order. It is not a gag rule.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does it permit amendments?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, it does?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, then, I withdraw the word "gag" and substitute the word "special", because a "rose by any other name would smell as sweet."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I suppose the gentleman from Minnesota wants to keep in the class with the gentleman from Illinois inasmuch as he complimented him a few minutes ago.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman from Illinois wishes to compliment me, I will be very happy to yield to him.

Mr. SABATH. I will get along without any compliments from the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman would get along much better with a few compliments.

There is some opposition against turning the USES back to the States. That opposition comes primarily from those who wish to see the present order continued. As the law is now operated, all one has to do is go to the USES office and declare oneself without employment. Then he immediately begins drawing what might be called rocking-chair money. In other words, he is being paid for not working and he is given every encouragement to not seek employment until he has exhausted the benefits conferred by the law as it now operates. We had this very important matter before the Committee on Ways and Means and 47 Governors petitioned the Committee on Ways and Means to restore the USES back to the States because it is not being fairly and equitably administered at the present time.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not sure whether the governor of the gentleman's State asked or not. There was one who did not. I would not be too surprised if it was the Governor from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. No, I do not yield.

Mr. HOOK. No, the Governor of Michigan would not because he is a Republican.

Mr. KNUTSON. They are usually wrong up in that neck of the woods and it is not surprising.

Mr. HOOK. I will say they are.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I cannot yield because I wish to complete my statement. No, I do not yield.

Mr. HOOK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the measure which the rule would make in order to be a big step toward a balanced budget. Certainly, the provision returning the United States Employment Service to the States is also a step in the right direction. The governors of

47 States have asked that it be done because local people, who are better acquainted with the local situation would be able to better administer the law. As now operated, unemployment insurance tends to keep unemployed people from seeking work so long as they will be paid for not working. We must break that up before it gets to be a fixed habit.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the very matter which the gentleman from Minnesota spoke about at the conclusion of his remarks is the one on which I want to address the House for a few minutes, the matter of the return of the United States Employment Service. I am definitely in favor of the return of the service. I do not think there is any objection to that on the part of any one of us. It is a question of the time. It seems to me it would be unwise to return the United States Employment Service within 30 days or within 90 days, having in mind the conditions that exist.

The United States Employment Service, as at present set up, is a temporary matter, existing only during the war and the emergency following the war. But it seems to me that it plays a very important part in connection with the demobilization of those who are serving in our armed forces. It is pretty generally understood that our demobilization will be over about July 1 of next year. When men go to the separation centers and are discharged, they go through certain processing. I remember when General Marshall spoke to us over in the Auditorium, General Smith, as I remember, spoke after General Marshall and explained the separation process. We all received one of these charts showing the separation period of about 40 hours, and how it is broken up, which one who serves in the Army went through while being processed for separation. General Smith, as I remember, when he came to "counseling," said that was one of the most important parts of the separation process of those who are being discharged from the Army. You notice the counseling period is from 1:30 p. m. to 3:45 p. m.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I was one of four who inspected two separation centers. We inquired of some of the counselors to determine what percent of the men who were receiving the counseling advice paid any attention to it. We were told in each instance that about one-third or 33⅓ percent. The rest of them did not seem to care about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot take issue with the gentleman. I think probably that is a fair statement. That 33⅓ percent shows an interest, anyway. The men are interested.

Now, what will happen if we return this to the States before demobilization is over? Take Camp Devens, in my State. Ninety percent of the men discharged from there are New Englanders. If we return it to the States before demobilization is over, take Massachusetts for example, certainly those who are being discharged who live in Massachusetts are entitled to receive information as to the employable situation and opportunities in Massachusetts. Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine should do the same thing. Therefore, if we turn this back to the States before the demobilization period if over, the several States that the separation centers serve would have to send a representative of the State to advise the men on separation, as to what the employment situation is in the respective States of the individuals who are being discharged.

Furthermore, it seems to me that during the reconversion period and that for the period of demobilization and reconversion which will be around June 30 of next year, we should continue this system and definitely provide for returning it to the States not before that time.

I rose to make this suggestion now. I think the rule should be adopted. With all respect to my friends who oppose it, the rule should be adopted. It is an open rule and provides for amendments. Amendments can be offered on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were ayes 172 and noes 58.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 323, nays 78, not voting 121, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

YEAS—232

Abernethy	Brown, Ga.	Corbett
Allen, Ill.	Brown, Ohio	Cox
Allen, La.	Brumbaugh	Cravens
Andersen, H. Carl	Bryson	Cunningham
Anderson, Calif.	Buck	D'Alesandro
Andresen, August H.	Buffett	D'Ewart
Andrews, Ala.	Bulwinkle	Dirksen
Andrews, N. Y.	Burch	Dolliver
Angell	Burgin	Domengeaux
Arends	Byrnes, Wis.	Doughton, N. C.
Auchincloss	Camp	Dworshak
Barden	Canfield	Earthman
Barrett, Wyo.	Cannon, Mo.	Elliott
Bates, Mass.	Carnahan	Ellis
Bell	Case, N. J.	Ellsworth
Bennet, N. Y.	Case, S. Dak.	Elston
Bennett, Mo.	Chenoweth	Engel, Mich.
Bishop	Chiperfield	Engle, Calif.
Blackney	Church	Fallon
Bonner	Clason	Fellows
Boren	Clevenger	Fenton
Bradley, Mich.	Cochran	Fisher
Brehm	Cole, Mo.	Folger
Brooks	Colmer	Fuller
	Combs	Gamble
	Cooper	Gary
	Gathings	Kunkel
	Gavin	Landis
	Gearhart	Lane
	Gillette	Lanham
	Goodwin	Larcade
	Gossett	Latham
	Graham	LeCompte
	Grant, Ala.	LeFevre
	Grant, Ind.	Lyle
	Gross	McConnell
	Gwinn, N. Y.	McCormack
	Gwynne, Iowa	McCowen
	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McDonough
	Hall, Leonard W.	McGregor
	Hancock	McMillan, S. C.
	Hare	Mahon
	Harris	Manasco
	Hays	Martin, Iowa
	Hedrick	Martin, Mass.
	Hendricks	Michener
	Herter	Miller, Nebr.
	Heselton	Mills
	Hess	Monroney
	Hill	Morrison
	Hinshaw	Mundt
	Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.
	Hoeven	Murray, Wis.
	Hoffman	Norrell
	Holmes, Mass.	O'Hara
	Holmes, Wash.	O'Konski
	Horan	Pace
	Howell	Peterson, Fla.
	Hull	Peterson, Ga.
	Jarman	Philbin
	Jenkins	Pickett
	Jennings	Pittenger
	Jensen	Ploeser
	Johnson, Calif.	Poage
	Johnson, Ill.	Price, Fla.
	Johnson, Ind.	Priest
	Johnson, Luther A.	Ramey
	Johnson, Okla.	Ramspeck
	Jones	Randolph
	Jonkman	Rankin
	Kean	Reece, Tenn.
	Kearney	Reed, Ill.
	Keefe	Reed, N. Y.
	Kerr	Rees, Kans.
	Kilday	Rich
	Kinzer	Richards
	Knutson	Riley
		Rivers
		Robertson, N. Dak.
		Robsion, Ky.
		Rockwell
		Rodgers, Pa.
		Rogers, Mass.
		Russell
		Sasscer
		Schwabe, Mo.
		Schwabe, Okla.
		Scrivner
		Shafer
		Sharp
		Sikes
		Simpson, Ill.
		Simpson, Pa.
		Slaughter
		Smith, Ohio
		Smith, Va.
		Smith, Wis.
		Sparkman
		Springer
		Stefan
		Stevenson
		Stewart
		Stockman
		Sumner, Ill.
		Sumners, Tex.
		Taber
		Talbot
		Talle
		Tarver
		Thom
		Thomas, N. J.
		Thomason
		Tibbott
		Trimble
		Vorys, Ohio
		Vursell
		Weichel
		West
		Whitten
		Wickersham
		Wigglesworth
		Wilson
		Winstead
		Wolcott
		Wolfenden, Pa.
		Wolverton, N. J.
		Wood
		Woodruff, Mich.
		Woodrum, Va.
		Worley
		Zimmerman

NAYS—78

Barry	Granger	Neely
Bates, Ky.	Green	O'Brien, Ill.
Bloom	Gregory	O'Brien, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.	Hale	Outland
Buckley	Hand	Patman
Byrne, N. Y.	Hart	Patrick
Chapman	Havenner	Patterson
Clements	Healy	Quinn, N. Y.
Coffee	Hoch	Rabaut
Crosser	Hook	Rabin
De Lacy	Huber	Rayfiel
Delaney, James J.	Izac	Resa
Delaney, John J.	Jackson	Rogers, N. Y.
Douglas, Calif.	Kee	Rowan
Douglas, Ill.	Kelley, Pa.	Ryter
Doyle	Kopplemann	Sadowski
Feighan	Link	Savage
Flood	Ludlow	Sheppard
Fogarty	Lynch	Sheridan
Forand	McGlinchey	Smith, Maine
Geelan	Madden	Somers, N. Y.
Gordon	Mansfield, Mont.	Spence
Gore	Marcantonio	Starkey
Gorski	Miller, Calif.	Sullivan
Granahan	Morgan	Torrens
	Murphy	Voorhis, Calif.
		Woodhouse

NOT VOTING—121

Adams	Carlson	Drewry
Arnold	Celler	Durham
Bailey	Chelf	Eaton
Baldwin, Md.	Clark	Eberharter
Baldwin, N. Y.	Cole, Kans.	Eisaesser
Barrett, Pa.	Cole, N. Y.	Ervin
Beall	Cooley	Fernandez
Beckworth	Courtney	Flannagan
Bender	Crawford	Fulton
Biemiller	Curley	Gallagher
Bland	Curtis	Gardner
Bolton	Daughton, Va.	Gerlach
Boykin	Davis	Gibson
Bunker	Dawson	Gifford
Butler	Dickstein	Gillespie
Campbell	Dingell	Gillie
Cannon, Fla.	Dondero	Griffiths

Hagen	Luce	Roe, N. Y.
Halleck	McGehee	Rogers, Fla.
Harless, Ariz.	McKenzie	Rooney
Harness, Ind.	McMillen, Ill.	Sabath
Hartley	Maloney	Short
Hébert	Mansfield, Tex.	Snyder
Hefferman	Mason	Stigler
Henry	May	Sundstrom
Holifield	Merrow	Taylor
Hope	Mott	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Murdock	Tolan
	Norton	Towe
Judd	O'Neal	Traynor
Kefauver	O'Toole	Vinson
Kelly, Ill.	Pfeifer	Wadsworth
Keogh	Phillips	Walter
Kilburn	Plumley	Wasielewski
King	Powell	Weaver
Kirwan	Price, Ill.	Weiss
LaFollette	Rains	Welch
Lea	Rizley	White
Lemke	Robertson, Va.	Whittington
Lesinski	Robinson, Utah	Winter
Lewis	Roe, Md.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BARRY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. King against.
Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. O'Toole against.
Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Weiss against.
Mr. Short for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Robertson of Virginia with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Stigler with Mr. Henry.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Ervin with Mr. Griffith.
Mrs. Norton with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Arnold.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Carlson.
Mr. Davis with Mr. Mason.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR DISPOSITION OF ALUMINUM PLANTS AND FACILITIES

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 109, to extend in the case of aluminum plants and facilities the time during which disposition of such plants and facilities is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that this is supported by all the members of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. MANASCO. This comes to the House with a unanimous report. This resolution extends the time within which studies can be made in the matter of the disposition of these aluminum plants. Unless this action is taken now the recommendation of the Surplus Property Board will go into effect and Congress cannot do anything about it. The original 30 days' time is almost up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When does it expire?

Mr. MANASCO. On the 21st of the month, Sunday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And this is necessary in order to give them further time?

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a 30-day extension.

Mr. MANASCO. This extends the time another 30 days.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this also the recommendation of the Surplus Property Board?

Mr. MANASCO. It meets with the approval of the Surplus Property Board.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That subsection (c) of section 19 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "thirty days" the following: "(or sixty days in the case of aluminum plants and facilities)".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT TOMORROW DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Federal Power Commission of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate on legislation under consideration in the House tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from an auditing firm and a statement on certain aspects of UNRRA's operations.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on three separate subjects.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SOMERS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] be permitted to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an editorial and other matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her own remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an advance release of information to be released today by General Bradley, head of the Veterans' Administration, regarding additional vocational training and approval for the building of 19 new Veterans' Administration hospitals. This is long overdue and I am glad General Bradley has acted promptly in the matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. McDONOUGH and Mr. KEFAUVER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

MEN OF THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries started today to hold hearings on the bill H. R. 2346, the Merchant Seamen's War Service Act.

Men of the merchant marine were the first to fight and the first to die. Their sacrifices are shrouded in the deep silence of the oceans. They, above all others, saved England when she stood alone against Nazi aggression and was but a few weeks away from the starvation which meant certain defeat. Running the gauntlet of ceaseless enemy attacks by sub and plane on the terrible Murmansk route, they brought the sorely needed materials which enabled Russia to stay in the war and become, in time, a major factor in the Allied victory.

In those dark days the merchant marine was our last and only hope. On these men we depended to get the stuff through, to gain for us and our allies the precious time needed to bring ourselves from the poverty of unpreparedness to the abundant strength that was required for survival.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making a very fine speech in paying tribute to these men in our merchant marine. It is very proper and appropriate. The gentleman has in mind a number of bills that are pending before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, including a bill known as the Peterson bill.

Mr. LANE. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Several years ago I introduced similar legislation relating to those who served in the merchant marine during the last war. These men risked their lives on many occasions and served on unconvoyed ships, particularly in the early days of this war. They have rendered a valiant service throughout the entire war. I want to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts for the remarks he is now making and also to express the strong hope that legislation along the lines contained in the Peterson bill will be reported out of that committee. If so, I shall do everything in my power to bring the bill up in the House for consideration as soon as possible and trust it will have overwhelming support.

Mr. LANE. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his very helpful contribution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is making a very fine statement and I know the gentleman will add later that these ships went out not only unconvoyed but were not suitably armed. Also, they were poor ships in many instances.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for taking the stand he has on the floor of the House in reference to these men. Later in his speech he will probably tell us that these men in the merchant marine were men whose patriotism called them into the service. These were men who went into the merchant marine when they could not get into any other service and it was their undying patriotism which inspired them to go into the merchant marine. I think these men should be on the same footing as any others.

Mr. SHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. In line with the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama, may I say that these men in the merchant marine went through hell to deliver the goods. Today they are being drafted under the Selective Service Act as they are being retired from the merchant marine. I have introduced a bill, which is now pending, to prohibit that situation from existing any longer.

Mr. LANE. I would like to join with the gentleman on that bill because I think it is an outrage that such a situation should exist.

Mr. PATRICK. I would also like to join the gentleman from Michigan in that statement.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add my voice to the compliments of the distinguished majority leader when he congratulated my colleague from Massachusetts for his splendid effort on behalf of these boys in the merchant marine. There is no finer class of boys who rendered service to the country than these men. I want to assure my colleague that he has my wholehearted support and I hope he will continue to press action on this bill.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman for his support and assistance.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. May I say, in addition to what has already been said, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has been very diligent in his efforts on behalf of the men of the merchant marine. He has made many excellent suggestions, he has urged early hearings on the bill and was one of the first men in the committee room to testify in support of it. I thank the distinguished majority leader for the suggestions, help, and encouragement he has given in getting this bill reported to the House.

Mr. LANE. May I say that no one has been more active in sponsoring this bill than the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON]. He is to be complimented and congratulated for his work in bringing out this bill and giving it a fair hearing before his committee.

They went down to the sea in ships, matching their skill and courage against the bombs and torpedoes which searched them out. Theirs was a constant, nerve-wracking vigil against enemy ambush that was frequent, swift, and deadly. Many ships went down with many men. But the line never faltered. The cargoes had to get over. Space was too important to be sacrificed to guns and protective armor. The merchant marine was expendable.

It is one thing to fight weapons with weapons. It is another matter to repeatedly run the risk of armed ambush, having nothing with which to fight off the attacks which often broke through the convoys—nothing, that is, except skill and daring and heroism of a very high order. The men of the merchant marine knew the great odds they faced, but they did not quit. They won the first, the critical, the all-important battle of supply.

They were in action, even before our Navy formally entered the fight. They served long and bravely. They suffered death and disability. Their contribution to victory has never been fully recognized by our people. The Englishman knows. The Russian knows. But they are not here, in this Congress, to speak for the men of the merchant marine.

We are.

Their war service, constantly exposed to enemy action, was indispensable to victory. Like others who fought, they ask only that we make some provision for their adjustment in civilian life.

The Merchant Seamen's War Service Act, H. R. 2346, provides for death benefits for surviving dependents; disability benefits; education and training; employment rights; and loans for the purchase of construction of homes, farms and business property.

Some of these men are survivors of several sinkings. At sea, they slept in their clothes, for there was no telling when they might be torpedoed, or how long they might be adrift in open boats, in Arctic seas. They suffered from hunger and exposure. Some were horribly burned in the oil from tankers that spread around their lifeboats and was set aflame by U-boat skippers.

Rescued, they went back to the sea and the cargo ships and the stern job of delivering the goods, come hell or high water.

They served well, these men of the merchant marine.

Now it is our turn to serve them.

How?

By earnest consideration of H. R. 2346, the Merchant Seamen's War Service Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, for 1 day, Friday, on account of important business.

To Mr. BECKWORTH for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia, for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. ROONEY, for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 19, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will meet at 10 a. m., Friday, October 19, to continue hearings on H. R. 2536, the Bulwinkle bill. The Army, Navy, and ODT witnesses are expected to be heard Monday, October 22, 1945.

There will be a meeting of the Special Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Monday, October 22, 1945.

Business to be considered: Resumption of hearing on study of operations under the Public Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a hearing on Friday, October 19, at 10 a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes, in the Rivers and Harbors Committee room.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet Thursday, October 25, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in executive hearing to consider the bill (H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, November 1, 1945, at 10 a. m., to consider the bill (H. R. 3861) to provide special rules for preventing collisions of vessels navigating the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and certain rivers and inland waters emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in executive hearing on Thursday, November 8, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m. to consider H. R. 2633 and H. R. 3802, bills for the refund of frustrated voyages.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing on Friday, October 26, 1945, on the following: House Concurrent Resolution 85, House Concurrent Resolution 86, House Concurrent Resolution 91, and House Joint Resolution 245, declaring the date of termination of hostilities in the present war. The hearing will begin at 10: 30 a. m., and will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

763. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

764. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $433,000 for the Federal Power Commission (H. Doc. No. 332); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

765. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $1,250,000, for the National Housing Agency (H. Doc. No. 333); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

766. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $214,000 for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 334); to the Committee on Appropriations and order to be printed.

767. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1946, for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 335); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MANASCO: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 4350. A bill to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3979. A bill to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2938. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. R. 4420. A bill to condition the tax exemption accorded to the Daughters of the American Revolution on their not denying the commercial use or rental of Constitution Hall by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 4421. A bill to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 4422. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4423. A bill to recommend that colleges and universities give appropriate credit for work done and educational courses taken by individuals while serving in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 4424. A bill to repeal section 8 of the War Labor Disputes Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 4425. A bill to provide for the prompt discharge or release from active duty of certain physicians, dentists, and veterinarians serving in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4426. A bill to exempt from gross income for income-tax purposes earnings of honorably discharged veterans during certain periods after discharge; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4427. A bill to grant members of the military and naval forces the same preferences as are granted to veterans in the purchase of surplus property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4428. A bill to adjust the rate of dividends paid by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation on its capital stock and to decrease the premium charge for its insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4429. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska," approved May 3, 1943; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4430. A bill to repeal the act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 4431. A bill to terminate the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 4432. A bill to authorize the disposal agencies under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to lend or donate surplus camping equipment to the Boy Scouts of America and other organizations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 4433. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Alabama for use as a public park of the military reservation known as Fort Morgan, to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4434. A bill to direct the discharge of fathers from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4435. A bill to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park, to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4436. A bill to condition the tax exemption accorded to the Daughters of the American Revolution on their not denying the commercial use or rental of Constitution Hall by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4437. A bill to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 4438. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, Public Law 228, Seventy-seventh

Congress, so as to increase the amount paid to States from moneys received by the United States on account of certain leases; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 4439. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Seattle, Wash., Post Office; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4440. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to George Newberry; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4441. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John McGowan; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4442. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John J. Stensland; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4443. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Leo Combs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4444. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Melvin Engles; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4445. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Dugald C. Hagadone; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4446. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to James G. Helmer; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4447. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John B. Stensland; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4448. A bill for the relief of DeWitt F. McLaurine; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1258. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of Earnest Nicoletti, 4239 Paul Street, Philadelphia 24, Pa., and others, to Congress and FCC with respect to FM broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1259. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Polish American Veterans of World Wars, 629 High Street, Central Falls, R. I., recommending that immediate provision be inserted in the pension laws that 60 years of age shall constitute total disability, and that any honorably discharged veteran of any war, upon reaching the age of 60 years, shall be entitled to a general pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1260. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of 70 citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., for the early enactment of S. 623, to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.